

Proposed Rezoning of the “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” Site to “Residential (Group B)13”, “Residential (Group B)14” and “Recreation” and Amendment to the Building Height Restriction on the “Government, Institution or Community” Site from 2 storeys to 8 storeys for Residential Development(s) with Retail, Public Vehicle Park and Social Welfare Facilities Various Lots in D.D. 11 and Adjoining Government Land, Fung Yuen, Tai Po, New Territories (S12A Amendment of Plan Application No. Y/TP/40)

– Further Information No. 3 –

Item	Comments	Our Responses
1	Comments from Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (Responsible Officer: Mr. MOK Sui Chuen; Tel: 2762 5390) Received on 15 December 2025	
1.1	<p>Regarding the response from the Applicant, it is noted that the captioned s12A application is to reflect the existing site condition of the Eastern Portion of the Application Site and no new development is proposed in this portion.</p> <p>However, it is also noted from the Supporting Planning Statement submitted by the Applicant that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the Eastern Portion of the Application Site is proposed to be rezoned as “Recreation” (“REC”) Zone; and some of the land uses under Column 1 are Group 1 to Group 3 Facilities (Table 2.2 of GEO Report No. 138 (2nd Edition) refers) in the Proposed Amendments to the Statutory Notes of “Recreation” (“REC”) Zone. <p>Since the Eastern Portion of the Application Site is overlooked by steep natural terrain and may be affected by potential natural terrain hazards, a natural terrain hazard study and suitable hazard mitigation measures (if found necessary) may be required as part of the future development(s) (which involves Group 1 to Group 3 Facilities) in this portion of the Application Site. The required natural terrain hazard study and necessary hazard mitigation measures may incur significant cost implications to the future development(s).</p> <p>However, if the Proposed Amendments to the Statutory Notes of</p>	<p>Under the proposed amendment to the Statutory Notes of the OZP for “Recreation” (“REC”) Zone, <i>‘No new development, or addition, alteration and/or modification to or redevelopment of an existing building shall result in a total development and/or redevelopment in excess of a maximum GFA of 600m² and a maximum building height in terms of number of storeys as stipulated on the Plan, or the GFA and height of the existing building, whichever is the greater.’</i> Considering that Agricultural Portion of TPTL 183 and 53C Fung Yuen have used up all the permissible GFA of the proposed “REC” zone, please note that <u>land owners who wish to develop their land will be required to submit separate application(s) under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Town Planning Board (“TPB”) for minor relaxation of the GFA restriction, even the proposed use(s) are Column 1 uses.</u></p> <p>Since owner(s) for all future development(s) in the proposed “REC” zone will have to submit planning application(s) to the TPB for minor relaxation of GFA restriction, please note that this will ensure your office be able to provide geotechnical comment at the planning stage.</p>

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	<p>“Recreation” (“REC”) Zone submitted by the Applicant are adopted in the revised Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), it is envisaged that all future developments in the Eastern Portion of the Application Site with land use(s) under Column 1 and involving Group 1 to Group 3 Facilities would always be permitted and it would not be possible for this Office to provide geotechnical comment at the planning stage on these future developments with respect to potential natural terrain hazards.</p>	
2	<p>Comments from Traffic Engineering (NTE) Division, Transport Department on FI(1) (Responsible Officer: Ms. LI Oi Yin, Yanny; Tel: 2399 6936) Received on 19 December 2025</p>	
2.1	<p>I have the following comments from traffic engineering point of view on the sensitivity test for the proposed “R(B)14” zone of the subject application.</p> <p>The trips generation and attraction from the NTEH developments and the proposed residential development should be different with consideration of their characteristics. The direct estimation by proportion of the proposed development shall be fully justified.</p>	<p>As discussed with TD, trip rates in TPDM with similar flat size are adopted to estimate the trips generation and attraction from the NTEH developments. The trip generation by NTEHs is only 2 to 5 pcu/hr (one-way), which is only 1.5 to 3.1% of our proposed development. The traffic impact by the NTEHs is negligible.</p>
2.2	<p>Para. 4.2 – Without detail assessment of traffic impact due to the additional traffic trips of NTEHs, the applicant shall review the conclusion “It is confirmed that these junctions will have sufficient capacities to cater the additional minimal traffic trips of NTEHs.”</p>	<p>The technical note in Appendix 1 of the Sensitivity Test for the Proposed “R(B)14” Zone (Annex A refers) is updated. As the trips are small when compared with our proposed development, it is confirmed that these junctions will have sufficient capacities to cater the additional minimal traffic trips of NTEHs.</p>
3	<p>Comments from Drainage Services Department on FI(1) (Responsible Officer: Ms. HO Mei Yung, Karen; Tel: 3965 8930) Received on 12 January 2026</p>	
3.1	<p>Para. 3.3 refers. Please advise why 12 New Territories Exempted Houses (NTEHs) is assumed to be developed with the proposed “Residential (Group B) 14” (“R(B)14”) Zone.</p>	<p>Under the proposed amendment to the Statutory Notes of the OZP for the “Residential (Group B)” Zone, ‘<i>On land designated “R(B)14”, no new development, or addition, alteration and/or modification to or redevelopment of an existing building shall result in a total development and/or redevelopment in excess of a maximum domestic GFA of 87,356m², a maximum non-domestic GFA of 376m² and a maximum building height in</i></p>

Item	Comments	Our Responses
		<p><i>terms above Principal Datum as stipulated on the Plan, or the GFA and height of the existing building, whichever is the greater.</i> Considering that Mont Vert has used up all the permissible GFA of the proposed “R(B)14” zone, <u>third party lots owners who wish to develop their land will be required to submit separate application(s) under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the TPB for minor relaxation of the GFA restriction, even the proposed use(s) are Column 1 uses.</u> Application(s) will be considered based on the individual merits of the development or redevelopment proposal.</p> <p>While adverse infrastructural impact created by a single NTEH development shall not be anticipated, the cumulative impact arising from all the potential NTEH developments may need to be assessed. As such, a sensitivity test assuming all available third party lots for NTEH development has been carried out.</p> <p>Based on the review of the location, size, topography and existing use of the third party lots with the proposed “R(B)14” zone, and the adoption of standard land estimation of 250m² per NTEH, it is estimated that 12 NTEHs can be developed in the potential site for NTEH. Please refer to the Section 3 of the Sensitivity Test for the Proposed “R(B)14” zone (Annex A refers) for more details.</p>
3.2	Para. 4.3 and Para. 1.3.1 in Appendix 2 refer. Existing site photos should be included in order to substantiate the Applicant’s statement.	Figure 3 is added into Para. 1.3.1 of Appendix 2 for the sensitivity test to show the existing land use of the potential sites of NTEH.
3.3	Para. 1.3.4 in Appendix 2 refer. Please justify your assumption “60% of the remaining areas of the potential sites will be paved by brick and 40% of the remaining area will be unpaved”.	Please be clarified that the sensitivity test on the drainage aspect aims to assess the potential drainage impacts from potential developments (i.e. 12 NTEHs) on the available third party lots of northern portion, as requested by PlanD. The development of NTEHs is not part of the development proposal under this planning application. The third party lots owners who wish to develop their land will be required to submit separate planning applications under S16 of the Town Planning Ordinance for minor relaxation of the GFA restriction, even the proposed uses are Column 1 uses, according to the proposed amendment to the Statutory Notes.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
		<p>As mentioned above, since the development of NTENs is not part of the Proposed Development under this planning application, the third party lots owners who wish to develop their land shall determine its own design layout and submit separate planning application under S16 of the Town Planning Ordinance. This sensitivity test is prepared to demonstrate a possible development option for the NTEHs under the hypothetical scenario. For this possible option, there will be 3 NTEHs in Region A and 9 NTEHs in Region B, the building area for Regions A and B is 195m² and 585m² respectively. For the remaining area excluding building area, an assumption “60% of the remaining areas of the potential sites will be paved by brick and 40% of the remaining area will be unpaved” is assumed. In view that small house, similar to rural village house, is assumed in the hypothetical scenario, it is considered that the assumption which has allowed the required building area and reasonable brick pavement is considered acceptable for the sensitivity test.</p> <p>If the design layouts proposed by the third party lots owners in future deviate from the assumption adopted in the sensitivity test, the third party lots owners shall carry his/her own assessment on the drainage impact and proposed necessary mitigation measures such as local onsite stormwater storage tanks if needed.</p>
3.4	<p>Table 1.1 and Table 1.2 in Appendix 2 refer. The forecast runoff generated in Region A and Region B should be incorporated in the Table for comparison/completeness. In addition, it appears that the assumption is made that the site formation levels under the “existing scenario” and proposed development scenario” are identical. If there are variations in the site formation levels, it may affect the time of concentration used to calculate the runoff.</p>	<p>Section 1.3 of Appendix 2 is updated, and Table 1.3 is added to compare the forecast runoff generated from Regions A and B under the hypothetical scenario and the existing condition. It is anticipated that the runoff generated from the potential NTEH development under the hypothetical scenario will be similar or less than that of the existing condition.</p> <p>As mentioned in the response of items No. 3.3, the assumptions adopted in the hypothetical scenario are just for demonstrating a possible development option. For the hypothetical scenario, the assumption that there will be no change in site formation levels in the potential NTEH site as compared with the existing condition has been assumed. Thus, the time of concentration for the development option will be same for both developed and existing condition. If the design layouts proposed by the third party lots owners in future deviate from the assumption adopted in the sensitivity test, the third</p>

Item	Comments	Our Responses
		party lots owners shall carry his/her own assessment on the drainage impact and proposed necessary mitigation measures when they decide to develop their lands.
3.5	Appendix 3 refers. Please be reminded that the sewerage impact for the proposed "R(B)14" Zone needs to meet the full satisfaction of Environmental Protection Department (EPD), the planning authority of sewerage infrastructure.	Sensitivity test related to sewerage aspect has been circulated to EPD for comment.
4	Comments from Water Supplies Department on FI(1) (Responsible Officer: Ms. WONG Sin Yan, Kathy; Tel: 2399 6936) Received on 12 January 2026	
4.1	We have no comments in water supply perspective to the sensitivity analysis. Further to our previous comments conveyed via Planning Department (PlanD)'s email dated 18.11.2025 to the applicant which no sufficient information has been provided to clarify whether the boundary zone intersects with water gathering ground (WGG) and no pipe size optimization proposal has been received, our comments still prevail.	It is clarified that the potential NTEH developments assumed in the sensitivity test would not encroach into the WSD's lower indirect water gathering ground.
5	Comments from Environmental Protection Department on FI(1) (Responsible Officer: Ms. TANG Wing Yee, Winnie; Tel: 2835 1096) Received on 12 January 2026	
5.1	It is noted that this FI1 includes sensitivity tests, such as sewerage sensitivity analysis, to assess the potential infrastructural impacts from potential developments (i.e. 12 NTEHs) on the available third party lots of northern portion. No technical environmental assessment for air quality, noise, water quality, waste management, and land contamination have been included in the sensitivity test. We also understand that the third party lots owners who wish to develop their land will be required to submit separate planning applications under S16 of the Town Planning Ordinance for minor relaxation of the GFA restriction, even the proposed uses are Column 1 uses, according to the proposed amendment to the Statutory Notes. In view of the above, below please find the first batch of comments on FI1 for your consideration. Our remaining comments will be provided shortly.	Noted.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
5.2	It cannot preclude the possibility that the NTEH owners might independently negotiate the agreements to construct the sewerage pipe through others lot boundary. To account for this uncertainty, the sensitivity analysis shall incorporate the worst-case scenario that the total design sewage flow from all proposed NTEHs is received by the public sewerage system, so as to evaluate the impacts to the system and identify any necessary upgrading works.	The total design sewage flow from all proposed NTEHs is discharged to the public sewage system is included in the revised design report. No adverse effect will be induced to the public system.
5.3	Please also note that the potential NTEH sites are in close proximity to watercourses. In case septic tank with soakaway system (STS) is proposed, the future applicants for these NTEHs and their Authorised Persons (APs) are reminded to observe relevant requirements on the design of STS and their clearance distance from sensitive receivers e.g., streams.	Noted
6	Comments from Buildings Department on FI(2) (Responsible Officer: Mr. CHENG Hang On, Colin; Tel: 2626 1477) Received on 12 January 2026	
6.1	We have no further comment on the planning application. Our preceding comments to the same application series provided are still applicable.	Noted with thanks.
7	Comments from Water Supplies Department on FI(2) (Responsible Officer: Ms. WONG Sin Yan, Kathy; Tel: 2399 6936) Received on 12 January 2026	
7.1	No objection to the application.	Noted with thanks.
7.2	Existing water mains inside the proposed site as shown in the MRP may be affected. The applicant is required to either divert or protect the water mains found on site.	Noted.
7.3	If diversion is required, existing water mains inside the proposed site areas are needed to be diverted outside the site boundary of the proposed site to lie in Government land. A strip of land of minimum 1.5m in width should be provided for the diversion of existing water mains. The cost of diversion of existing water mains upon request will have to be borne by the applicant; and the applicant shall submit all the relevant	Noted.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	proposal to WSD for consideration and agreement before the works commence.	
7.4	<p>If diversion is not required, the following conditions shall apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Existing water mains are affected as indicated on the site plan and no development which requires resiting of water mains will be allowed. (b) Details of site formation works shall be submitted to the Director of Water Supplies for approval prior to commencement of works. (c) No structures shall be built or materials stored within 1.5 metres from the centre line(s) of water main(s) shown on the plan. Free access shall be made available at all times for staff of the Director of Water Supplies or their contractor to carry out construction, inspection, operation, maintenance and repair works. (d) No trees or shrubs with penetrating roots may be planted within the Water Works Reserve or in the vicinity of the water main(s) shown on the plan. No change of existing site condition may be undertaken within the aforesaid area without the prior agreement of the Director of Water Supplies. Rigid root barriers may be required if the clear distance between the proposed tree and the pipe is 2.5m or less, and the barrier must extend below the invert level of the pipe. (e) No planting or obstruction of any kind except turfing shall be permitted within the space of 1.5 metres around the cover of any valve or within a distance of 1 metre from any hydrant outlet. (f) Tree planting may be prohibited in the event that the Director of Water Supplies considers that there is any likelihood of damage being caused to water mains. 	Noted.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
8	Comments from Highways Department on FI(2) (Responsible Officer: Ms. PONG Kei; Tel: 2762 3980) Received on 12 January 2026	
8.1	Our comments conveyed via Planning Department (PlanD)'s email dated 18.11.2025 remain valid and we have no further comments at this stage. We reserve the right to provide our comments on the proposed road works and highway features when the detailed design become available to us.	Noted with thanks.
9	Comments from Social Welfare Department on FI(2) (Responsible Officer: Mr. CHAN Nim Cho, Clinton; Tel: 3791 2806) Received on 12 January 2026	
9.1	<u>Service Perspective (DCU)</u> Given the proposed 30-p DCU attaching to RCHE will be operated on private self-financing basis, subject to RCHE's reply, we have no adverse comment on the planning application from a service perspectives.	Noted with thanks.
9.2	<u>Service Perspective (RCHE)</u> The proposed 150-p RCHE cum 30-p DCU is located in an 8-storey social welfare complex with a BH of 36mPD. As stipulated in Para 5.3.2 of the Code of Practice for Residential Care Homes (Elderly Persons) (June 2024 Revised Edition) (CoP), "...No part of an RCHE shall be situated at a height more than 24m above the ground floor...". In this regard, the applicant should ensure that the 24m height restriction as set out in the CoP is fully complied. While detailed layout plan of the proposed RCHE is not available and it is understood that detailed layout plan would be provided for comment in the later detailed design stage, we are unable to comment on the proposed RCHE design at this moment.	Noted.
9.3	Subject to the consideration of the Town Planning Board and relevant government departments, it is proposed that we from service perspective generally have no objection-in-principle to the proposed RCHEs under the s.12A planning application on the conditions that –	Noted with thanks.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	<p>(a) The subject RCHEs shall incur no financial implication, both capital and recurrent, to the Government, and</p> <p>(b) The design and construction of the RCHEs shall be in full compliance with relevant prevailing Ordinances, Regulations, and Codes of Practice enforcing in Hong Kong and any licensing requirement issued by the Social Welfare Department (SWD).</p>	
9.4	<p><u>Licensing Perspective (RCHE)</u></p> <p>Licensing Office of Residential Care Homes for the Elderly (LORCHE) has no comment on the planning application. However, the applicant is reminded that, for an RCHE licence to be issued, the intended RCHE has to comply with the licensing requirements as stipulated in the Residential Care Homes (Elderly Persons) Ordinance, Cap. 459, its subsidiary legislation and the latest version of the Code of Practice for Residential Care Homes (Elderly Persons).</p>	Noted with thanks.
10	<p>Comments from Landscape Unit, Urban Design & Landscape Section, Planning Department on FI(2) (Responsible Officer: Ms. KWOK Siu Man, Mandy; Tel: 3565 3953) Received on 12 January 2026</p>	
10.1	<p>According to our tele-conversation with the applicant's landscape consultant – ADI Limited (Contact Person: Ms. Kwong) on 2.1.2025, it is confirmed that the tree Lagerstroemia speciosa (A48A) is a cultivated species instead of a wild-growing species. We have no adverse comment to the application from landscape planning perspective.</p>	Noted with thanks.
11	<p>Comments from Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department on FI(2) (Responsible Officer : Mr. SIT Yiu, Season; Tel: 2150 6953) Received on 12 January 2026</p>	
11.1	<p>We have no comment on the further information provided, and our earlier advice remain valid.</p>	Noted with thanks.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
12	Comments from Traffic Engineering (NTE) Division, Transport Department on FI(2) (Responsible Officer: Ms. LI Oi Yin, Yanny; Tel: 2399 6936) Received on 12 January 2026	
12.1	RtoC 8.3 - The sightline assessment shall comply with TPDM Vol 2 Ch 3.6.3.2 and Diagram 3.6.3.4. No objects, including structures, plants, etc. shall be placed obstructing the sightline.	As shown in Figures 2.3 (SL), 2.4 (SL) and 2.5 (SL) in Annex B , sight distance of 60m could be maintained which comply with TPDM requirement. No objects, including structures, plants, etc. will be placed obstructing the sightline.
12.2	Figure 2.3 - The effectiveness of the proposed road markings and traffic signs shall be reviewed. The placement of the traffic signs shall be reviewed to avoid ambiguity. Appropriate measures shall be implemented to prevent vehicles egress straight from the internal access, including but not limited to lane line road marking, "No Entry" traffic sign and/or mechanical gate system, etc..	Noted. Additional traffic signs and road markings are added and amended in Figure 2.3 in Annex B . "No Entry" and "Turn Left" traffic signs were added to prevent vehicles egress straight from the internal access. Lane line and hatched road markings are added to separate the lanes with contraflow.
12.3	Figure 2.3(SL) - The sight distance to the right of the vehicle egress is only 30m. Please demonstrate the sight distance complies with TPDM requirement.	30m is the distance between the development run-out and the Fung Yuen Road. Sightlines of 60m are also added to Figure 2.3 (SL) in Annex B. The sight distance complies with TPDM requirement.
12.4	Figure 2.3(SP) - Please advise whether the internal access is also an EVA to the PVP and commercial building. Please advise whether the access shall allow maneuvering of emergency vehicles.	The internal access shown in Figure 2.3 in Annex B is also an EVA to the PVP/Commercial building. Due to site constraints, HGV cannot egress from the run-out. Therefore , for normal operation, only vehicles not longer than 7m could enter and leave the PVP/Commercial building. However, in case of emergency, emergency vehicles could enter and leave the PVP and commercial building by using the run-in. Emergency vehicles could do turn around inside the PVP/Commercial building. Swept Path Analysis of 12m Fire Engine is provided in Figure 2.3(SP) in Annex B to demonstrate the ingress and egress route. FSD's comment on the EVA arrangement will be sought.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
12.5	Figure 4.2 - The proposed bicycle parking space is at a distance from the cycle track. Please consider to create a bicycle parking space close to the cycle track, e.g. decking over the natural stream.	Noted. The bicycle parking space is relocated closer to the cycle track which will be decked over the natural stream as shown in Figure 4.5 in Annex B .
12.6	RtoC 8.7 - Note (1) of Tables 6.1, 6.3 and 6.5 remark the determination of “Effective Width”, please demonstrate that the “Effective Width” adopted in critical section E aligns with other sections and complies with relevant requirements.	<p>The critical point at section E does not have railings or bollards on the kerbside, therefore, only 0.5m is reduced from actual width. Moreover, the critical point width is only 1m, if both sides of the width are deducted by 0.5m to obtain “Effective Width”, the effective width will become zero which is not reasonable. Therefore, only 0.5m is deducted from the total footpath width in the concerned section for section E.</p> <p>On the other hand, after the proposed widening in Figure 6.5 in Annex B, it is assumed that railings or bollards will be added on the kerbside. Therefore, 1m will be reduced from actual width to obtain the “Effective Width” in assessment.</p>
12.7	RtoC 8.9 - Figure 4.4 - Please review the sharp bends at cycle track near the pedestrian crossing.	The cycle track is revised as shown in Figure 4.4 in Annex B . The connectivity of cycle track could be maintained and the potential conflict between pedestrian and cyclists are minimised.
12.8	We understand the proposed road improvement works layout are preliminary and the detailed design will be further developed in the later stage. We reserve our comments on the detailed design to be submitted by the applicant in the later stage.	Noted.
12.9	The proposed road improvement works involve the resumption of government land allocation and extensive engineering works including the slope works. The applicant shall ascertain the feasibility of the proposed improvement. In addition, the programme may be optimistic. The applicant shall seek relevant departments’ comments on the appended programme to ensure its feasibility.	Noted. Relevant departments’ comments would be sought.
12.10	Comments from our Transport Operation (NT) Division, if any, will be provided separately.	Transport Operation (NT) Division have no further comment. Please refer to Item 19.1.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
13	<p>Comments from Drainage Services Department on FI(2) (Responsible Officer: Ms. HO Mei Yung, Karen; Tel: 3965 8930) Received on 26 January 2026</p>	
13.1	<p><u>Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA)</u></p> <p>R to C Item No.4.1 refers. Considering that the predicted water levels are still higher than the bank levels at certain control points under “the proposed condition (with mitigation under 50A and 50B cases)”, I should be grateful if you could consider implementing management measures to warn people to stay away from the concerned area during extreme events in order to ensure public safety.</p>	<p>It is noted that the predicted water levels under the proposed condition are higher than the bank levels at certain control points at the downstream section of the existing watercourse under 50A and 50B cases.</p> <p>Since most of the adjacent areas potentially affected by the concerned downstream section of the existing watercourse are owned by the Applicant. The Applicant-owned lands are currently fenced off to prevent trespassing on the lands and access to the watercourse through the land lots (see photo below). The fence will be kept and maintained in future to prevent trespassing and access on the concerned areas. Besides, flood wall has been proposed for the future Social Welfare Complex (SWC) which will further prevent trespassing and access to the existing watercourse.</p>  <p>In addition, warning signages will be posted within Phase I of the Development, future SWC and along the fencing of the Applicant-owned lands to warn the public staying away from the concerned watercourse</p>

Item	Comments	Our Responses
		<p>during extreme events. A warning system consist of loudspeakers will also be deployed at the boundaries of the Phase I of Development and SWC to provide alerts to the public during extreme events.</p> <p>Sections 4.3.10, 4.4.10 and 5.1.5 of the DIA report (Annex C refers) are revised to include the above management measures.</p> <p>The proposed management measures will be provided and maintained by the owner of the development in Area (A) Phase I and the owner/ operator of the SWC. Table 4.4 also updated to include the maintenance party of the proposed management measures.</p>
13.2	<p>R to C Item No.4.2 and Annex C refer. Please provide a section showing the minimum clearance between the building in Area (A) Phase II and the existing streamcourse.</p>	<p>There will be at least 3m buffer area between building areas and existing streamcourse in the developments in Area (A) Phase II. The minimum clearance between building and the existing stream course has been specified in Sections 4.1.2 and 5.1.1 of the DIA report. A new Section 9-9 is added to Appendix K of the DIA report to show the minimum clearance currently allowed on the development plan.</p>
13.3	<p>It is noted that the DIA only covered part of the application site. Please advise if the captioned application has any drainage impact on the remaining portion of the application site.</p>	<p>The DIA only covers the Development Site where the Proposed Development takes place.</p> <p>The Mont Vert residential development and the Agricultural Portion under TPTL 183 <u>outside the Development Site</u> have been completed for more than 10 years. Opportunity has been grasped to rezone these remaining portions of “CDA(1)” zones to appropriate zonings to reflect their existing “as-built” conditions. <u>No new development is proposed outside the Development Site.</u></p> <p>Therefore, the application has no drainage impact on the remaining portion of the application site.</p>
13.4	<p><u>Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA)</u> R to C Item No. 4.3 refers. Please provide the proof of in-principle</p>	

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	agreement from EPD from our reference.	Please refer to the email dated 3.2.2026 (Annex D refers) stating than EPD has no comment on the SIA.
13.5	It is noted that the SIA only covered part of the application site. Please advise if the captioned application has any sewerage impact on the remaining portion of the application site.	<p>The SIA only covers the Development Site where the Proposed Development takes place.</p> <p>The Mont Vert residential development and the Agricultural Portion under TPTL 183 <u>outside the Development Site</u> have been completed for more than 10 years. Opportunity has been grasped to rezone these remaining portions of “CDA(1)” zones to appropriate zonings to reflect their existing “as-built” conditions. <u>No new development is proposed outside the Development Site.</u></p> <p>Therefore, the application has no drainage impact on the remaining portion of the application site.</p>
14	Comments from Electrical and Mechanical Services Department on FI(2) (Responsible Officer: Ms. YAN Oi Ying, Yvonne; Tel: 2808 3884) Received on 26 January 2026	
14.1	Please be advised that we have no further comment from our regulatory services perspective.	Noted with thanks.
15	Comments from Environmental Protection Department on FI(2) (Responsible Officer: Ms. TANG Wing Yee, Winnie; Tel: 2835 1096) Received on 26 January 2026	
15.1	<p><u>EIAO Implications</u></p> <p>RtC item 12.1: The previous comments have not been addressed. Please include a brief discussion in the submission demonstrating why the junction improvement works are not Designated Project. The consultant may make reference to Section 6 of EIAO-TM.</p>	<p>The discussion has been included in para. 7.9.12 – 7.9.20 of the Supporting Planning Statement (Annex E refers).</p>

Item	Comments	Our Responses
15.2	<p><u>Noise</u></p> <p>Transport Department's endorsement of the traffic data is still outstanding.</p>	<p>Please find TD's no comment on traffic forecast on NIA in Annex F.</p>
15.3	<p><u>Water Quality</u></p> <p>RtC item 12.19: it is suggested to review the footnote ** under Table 3.5 which does not appear to align with the table content.</p>	<p>Table 3.5 and footnote ** below in the SIA (Annex G refers) have been revised to align with the table content.</p>
15.4	<p><u>Air Quality</u></p> <p>Section 3.4, RtC 12.5: EPD Regional Office's reply on odour complaint is still pending. Please provide in the next submission.</p>	<p>Inquiry has been made to EPD Regional Office (North), and it is confirmed that no odour complaint against Tin Sam Sewage Pumping Station was received in the past 3 years. The confirmation from EPD has been provided in Appendix 12 of the Air Quality Impact Assessment (AQIA) (Annex H refers). Section 3.5 of the AQIA has been supplemented.</p>
15.5	<p>Section 10.4, RtC 12.11: TD's endorsement on the traffic data is still pending. Please provide in the next submission.</p>	<p>Please find TD's no comment on traffic forecast on AQIA in Annex F.</p>
15.6	<p>Section 10.6: ATC2024 has been published. Please update accordingly.</p>	<p>Considering that the % calculated by raw data of newly released ATC 2024 (i.e. ~21.7%) is similar to that of 2023, while the predicted cumulative concentrations in Appendix 11 well comply with the relevant AQOs, hence, the % calculated by raw data of ATC 2023 (i.e. 21.8%) is kept adopted in the assessment. Section 10.6 of the AQIA is revised.</p>
15.7	<p>Table 4.1: Please delete Note (iv).</p>	<p>Note (iv) of Table 4.1 of the AQIA has been deleted.</p>
15.8	<p>Appendix 4: Title of the first section under "Calculation of Emission Factor for Existing Chimneys" should read "Towngas Combustion" instead of "Fuel Oil Combustion". Please revise the text.</p>	<p>The text of Appendix 4 of the AQIA has been revised.</p>
16	<p>Comments from Urban Design Unit, Urban Design & Landscape Section, Planning Department on FI(2) (Responsible Officer: Ms. CHEUNG Yeung Mei, Grace; Tel: 3565 3936) Received on 26 January 2026</p>	
16.1	<p>We have no adverse comment on the Further Information (FI) submitted.</p>	<p>Noted with thanks.</p>

Item	Comments	Our Responses
16.2	However, some of our previous comments raised via email dated 18.11.2025 on the Visual Impact Assessment and the Air Ventilation Assessment – Expert Evaluation reports are yet to be addressed/ missing from this round of FI.	Figure 6.3 of the Visual Impact Assessment (Annex I) and Para 1.3.4 and Table 2.2. of the Air Ventilation Assessment – Expert Evaluation (Annex J) have been attached in this FI.
17	Comments from Fire Service Department on FI(2) (Responsible Officer: Mr. QIU Yi; Tel: 2733 5845) Received on 26 January 2026	
17.1	Please be informed that we have no specific comment on the proposal subject to fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting being provided to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services.	Noted with thanks.
17.2	Detailed fire safety requirements will be formulated upon receipt of the formal submission of general building plans or referral from the relevant licensing authority.	Noted.
17.3	Furthermore, the provision of emergency vehicular access in the subject work shall comply with the requirements as stipulated in Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011.	Noted.
18	Comments from Lands Department on FI(2) (Responsible Officer: Ms. SZE Tsz Ping, Christine; Tel: 2654 1107) Received on 12 February 2026	
18.1	The Applicant’s Response in Items 15.4 and 15.5 of the R-to-C is noted, ie “...the said Yellow Area had been reserved for Subsequent Phase Development which could only take place when the Applicant has been able to acquire ALL the remaining private lots scattered within the “CDA(1)” zone ...”; but “... the acquisition of ALL remaining private lots within the “CDA(1)” zone in order to exchange land for implementation of Subsequent Phase Development is therefore pessimistic.” Therefore, the Applicant put forward the captioned application “to include those land owned and newly acquired by the Applicant together with the Yellow Area to resolve the dilemma ownership”. As revealed from the indicative layout plan [i.e. Figure 5.2 of the revised Supporting Planning Statement], three proposed residential blocks would fall wholly or partly on the Yellow Area. In this regard, our previous comments, inter alias, regarding the	Noted.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	development of Yellow Area remain valid.	
18.2	According to Figure 5.1 of the revised Supporting Planning Statement, there is a stream passing through the Development Site. Comments from relevant departments, e.g. Drainage Services Department, Environmental Protection Department and Tai Po District Office, should be sought (i) for proper diversion of the stream; and (ii) to delineate the future management and maintenance responsibilities of the stream.	Comments from relevant departments have been sought.
18.3	Should the Application be approved by the Town Planning Board, applications for land exchange and lease modification would be required for implementation of the proposed developments. The land owner is reminded that every application submitted to LandsD will be considered on its own merits by LandsD at its absolute discretion acting in its capacity as a landlord and there is no guarantee that the land exchange and lease modification applications will eventually be approved. If the applications for land exchange and lease modification be approved, they will be subject to such terms and conditions as may be imposed by LandsD at its absolute discretion, including payment of premia and administrative fees.	Noted.
19	Comments from Transport Operations (New Territories) Division, Transport Department on FI(2) (Responsible Officer: Mr. WU Chun Fai, Carpe; Tel: 2399 2442) Received on 24 February 2026	
19.1	We have no further comment on item 9 of the Response-to-Comments of FI2.	Noted with thanks.
20	Further Comments from Environmental Protection Department on FI(1) (Responsible Officer: Ms. TANG Wing Yee, Winnie; Tel: 2835 1096) Received on 25 February 2026	
20.1	Please be reminded to highlight changes in any future submissions.	Noted
20.2	The Sewerage Sensitivity Analysis incorporated the scenario that the total design sewage flow from all proposed NTEHs is received by the public sewerage system. Please reflect the above in Section 4.6-4.7. of Sensitivity Test, and Section 1 of Sewerage Sensitivity Analysis.	The Section 4.6-4.7 of the Sensitivity Test and Section 1 of the Sewerage Sensitivity Analysis have been revised.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
20.3	Section 2.1: "Appendix D" is missing from the Sewerage Sensitivity Analysis. Please provide.	The sewerage record plans are enclosed in Appendix B instead of "Appendix D". Section 2.1 of the Sewerage Sensitivity Analysis has been revised.
20.4	Section 2.2: Please briefly mention whether discharging the sewage generated from the proposed NTEHs to existing public sewerage system will cause any adverse sewerage impacts.	Section 2.2 of the Sewerage Sensitivity Analysis has been revised.
20.5	It is mentioned in Section 2.2 that the existing sewerage system is insufficient for connecting to the NTEH development, while it is mentioned in Section 4.1 that no adverse sewerage impact is anticipated. Please clarify.	No adverse impact will be caused if there is sufficient sewerage connection from the proposed NTEHs to the existing public sewerage system. Section 2.2 of the Sewerage Sensitivity Analysis has been revised.
20.6	In the table of Appendix C, please include your own proposed development and its generated sewage flow in the Sewerage Sensitivity Analysis to evaluate the impact to the existing sewerage system.	The proposed development discharged from sewerage treatment plant is included in Appendix C.
20.7	The NTEH owners is advised to establish sewer connections from their premises to the existing public sewers as much as practicable, subject to DSD's advice on the technical feasibility; and any written consent(s) from LandsD and other lot owners for laying and maintaining the said sewers. If these connections are considered impracticable and septic tank systems is proposed, the NTEH owners should strictly follow EPD Guidelines "ProPECC PN 1/23" for design, construction, operation, and maintenance of the septic tank systems. Owners should also make sure the systems have sufficient capacity to handle the generated sewage.	Noted
21	Further Comments from Drainage Services Department on FI(1) and FI(2) (Responsible Officer: Ms. HO Mei Yung, Karen; Tel: 3965 8930) Received on 4 March 2026	
21.1	Sensitivity Test R-t-C Item No. 3.4 and Table 1.3 in Appendix 2 refers. As per Remark (iii), the extreme mean intensity in Region A and Region B should be 334.6mm/hr and 378.1mm/hr respectively. Please update accordingly.	Table 1.3 in Revised Sensitivity Test – Drainage (Annex A refers) is updated accordingly.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
21.2	<p>Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA)</p> <p>R to C Item No. 13.1, Sections 4.3.10, 4.4.10 and 5.1.5 refer. Please indicate the extent of the proposed fencing on a layout plan.</p>	<p>The extent of the proposed fencing that has been erected and will be maintained in future is attached in sheet 3 of the Appendix B2 in the DIA (Annex C refers).</p>
21.3	<p>The proposal must not obstruct overland flow or existing flow paths. All existing flow paths as well as the runoff falling onto and passing through the site will be intercepted and disposed of via proper discharge points. Free flow condition of the adjacent drains, channels and watercourses should be maintained at all time.</p>	<p>Noted. Boundary channels are provided to intercepted runoff from nearby catchments. Free flow condition of the adjacent drains, channels and watercourses will be maintained.</p>
21.4	<p>Please be reminded to comply with “DSD Technical Circular No. 1/2017 Temporary Flow Diversions and Temporary Works Affecting Capacity in Stormwater Drainage Systems” if the proposed works involve the construction of permanent or temporary works within, over or adjacent to DSD’s stormwater drainage systems.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
21.5	<p>The applicant is required to rectify/modify the drainage system if it is found to be inadequate or ineffective during operation. The applicant shall also be liable for and shall indemnify Government against claims and demands arising out of damage or nuisance caused by failure of the system.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
21.6	<p>The applicant should take all precautionary measures to prevent any disturbance, damage and pollution from the development to any parts of the existing drainage facilities in the vicinity of the lot. In the event of any damage to the existing drainage facilities, the applicant would be held responsible for the cost of all necessary repair works, compensation and any other consequences arising therefrom.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
21.7	<p>The applicant is required to ensure that no construction debris, silt and sediments, or cementitious materials will be discharged to or deposited inside the public drains from the site. Any blockage or damage of public drains arising from the construction works shall be made good at the cost of the applicant and to our satisfaction.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Item	Comments	Our Responses
21.8	<p>Sewerage impact Assessment (SIA)</p> <p>We have no further comment.</p>	<p>Noted with thanks.</p>
22	<p>Further Comments from Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (Responsible Officer: Mr. MOK Sui Chuen; Tel: 2762 5390) Received on 6 March 2026</p>	
22.1	<p>For the reponse-to-comments table, please be advised that the response from the Applicant has not addressed our concerns on future developments in the Eastern Portion of the Application Site. There could be a redevelopment with land use(s) under Column 1 and involving Group 1 to Group 3 Facilities (Table 2.2 of GEO Report No. 138 (2nd Edition) refers) with no change in gross floor area (GFA) or building height. Such redevelopment would always be permitted if the Proposed Amendment to the Statutory Notes of "Recreation" ("REC") Zone submitted by the Applicant are adopted in the revised Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). Therefore, our previous comments provided are still valid.</p>	<p>The Eastern Portion of the Application Site is proposed to rezoned as "REC" zone solely to reflected the completed Agricultural Portion under TPTL 183. No new development is proposed in the "REC" zone under this Application.</p> <p>Any proposed development/redevelopment of an existing building, even the proposed use(s) are Column 1 uses, would undergo land administration and/or building plan submission procedures. Your office will be able to provide geotechnical comment through land and building regimes.</p>

Encl.

- Annex A – Revised Sensitivity Test for the Proposed "R(B)14" Zone**
- Annex B – Supplementary Figures of Traffic Impact Assessment**
- Annex C – Replacement Pages of Drainage Impact Assessment**
- Annex D – Email Dated 3.2.2026 from Environmental Protection Department**
- Annex E – Replacement Pages of Supporting Planning Statement**
- Annex F - Fax Dated 14.7.2025 from Transport Department**
- Annex G – Replacement Pages of Sewerage Impact Assessment**
- Annex H – Replacement Pages of Air Quality Impact Assessment**
- Annex I – Replacement Page of Visual Impact Assessment**
- Annex J – Replacement Pages of Air Ventilation Assessment**

Compiled by: KTA

Date: 06 March 2026

File Ref: 20250306_S3066a_FI(3)_R-to-C