

Proposed Rezoning of the Application Site from (i) “Residential (Group C) 2” and “Open Space “ Zones to “Residential (Group C) 4” Zone for a Proposed Residential Development at Lot Nos. 519 RP (part) and 520 RP in D.D. 110 and adjoining Government land and (ii) from “Residential (Group C) 2” to “Open Space” Zones at Lot Nos. 121, 137, 138, 139 S.A and 139 RP (part) in D.D. 110 and adjoining Government land at Shek Kong, Yuen Long, N.T. (S12A Amendment of Plan Application No. Y/YL-KTN/6)

Comments Forwarded from Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East District Planning Office (FSS&YLE DPO)

Comments	Responses
Comments from Transport Department (received on 16 February 2026) Contact person: Mr. Phil CAI; Tel. No.: 2399 2421	
<u>General</u> 1. The applicant shall note that this department provided comments on Planning Application No. Y/YL-KTN/4 in January 2025 and did not receive a response. TD understood that the planning application was subsequently withdrew, and resubmitted as Planning Application No. Y/YL-KTN/6. The applicant's quote on TD has no comment on a withdrawn planning application is incorrect.	Noted.
2. The applicant should note that the scenario to separate with or without PWP 6820TH is a sensitivity test on whether the existing road network could be maintained efficient taking into account the traffic flow at design year. The background and development traffic flow are both a main factor for a TIA.	Noted.
<u>Specific</u> 1. Para 2.5, Figure 2.1 - the design of the development access shall NOT affect the traffic in public road. Even though traffic management measures such as banning turns was proposed, it is observed that the vehicles would need to occupy the opposite lane within the site. I reiterate that the applicant should demonstrate how to provide sufficient space within the site and ensure unobstructed manoeuvre of vehicles. The applicant claimed that the frequency of long vehicles entering the site is low but failed to demonstrate how to prevent vehicles queuing back to public road.	To avoid vehicles obstructed by the opposite lane within the site and queuing back to public road, in addition to banning turns, the vehicular access was further revised to access road arrangement rather than run-in/out as shown in Figures 2.1 and 2.2 of the TIA report (Annex A of this Further Information (FI) refers). As shown in the swept path of Figures 2.1 (SP1), 2.1 (SP2), 2.2 (SP1) and 2.2 (SP2) , ingress vehicles will not be blocked by vehicles waiting to egress from the site. Therefore, the traffic will not queue back to the public road.

Comments	Responses
<p>2. Para 3.2.6 - it was stated that new survey was carried out for junction E and F but the performance of these junctions were not updated. Please clarify.</p>	<p>It is a typo, there is no new survey for junction E and F. Para 3.2.6 is amended accordingly.</p>
<p>3. Tables 3.4, 5.2, 5.4, 5.8, 5.10 - the width of L3 appears to be various, resulting that the current proposed road capacity appears to be on optimistic side. This shall be reviewed. In addition, the road capacity in pcu/hr shall not be dependent on the surveyed data. The applicant is required to review the methodology on such derivation.</p>	<p>For conservative, capacity of L3 is reduced to 700 veh/hr (One-way). The assessments are updated accordingly. The V/Cs still have spare capacities.</p> <p>This is a general practice to obtain the road capacity in pcu/hr dependent on the surveyed data. The V/C ratio is derived from survey flow (veh/hr) divided by road capacity (veh/hr). In TIA assessments, the survey flows were converted to pcu/hr by multiplying the pcu factor obtained from the surveyed data. If the road capacities are presented in pcu/hr, same pcu factor should be applied to the road capacity for consistency.</p> $ \begin{array}{ccccccc} & & \text{Survey} & & \text{Survey Flow} & & \text{Survey Flow} \\ & & \text{Flow} & & \text{(veh/hr) x pcu} & & \text{(pcu/hr)} \\ & & \text{(veh/hr)} & & \text{factor} & & \\ \text{V/C} & = & \frac{\text{Road}}{\text{Capacity}} & = & \frac{\text{Road Capacity}}{\text{(veh/hr) x pcu}} & = & \frac{\text{Road}}{\text{Capacity}} \\ \text{Ratio} & & \text{(veh/hr)} & & \text{factor} & & \text{(pcu/hr)} \end{array} $
<p>4. Para 5.1.3 - the current methodology by growth rate does not reflect the traffic flow redistribution in strategic roads. The constraints by this methodology shall be further elaborated in conjunction with the strategic road planning such as Route 11 etc. The statement on "manageable degree of congestion" shall be reviewed.</p>	<p>According to Tuen Mun DC TTC Paper 04/2021, the traffic flow would be redistributed by the strategic road planning Route 11 and associated major roads. The V/C ratio of Tai Lam Tunnel will drop from 1.2 to 0.7 after the Route 11 and associated major roads are completed. Therefore, the congestion of Tai Lam Tunnel would be relieved and become acceptable after the completion of Route 11 and associated major roads. This statement is added to Para 5.1.4 and 5.2.5 of the TIA report.</p>

Comments	Responses
5. Section 4.1 - please confirm the completion year 2031.	It is confirmed that the target completion year of the proposed residential development at Site 1 is 2031.
6. Para 5.3.5 - if the works described in this section is not proposed to be carried out by applicant, please elaborate how this paragraph assists to assess / minimise the traffic impact.	Proposed improvement works at Junction C will be carried out by the Applicant to minimize the impact to traffic, in case of programme mis-match between the proposed development and the public works project. The new Para 5.3.4 is revised accordingly.
7. Section 8 - taking into account the above comments, the conclusion shall be adjusted accordingly. The proposed work by the applicant shall be incorporated in this section.	Noted. The new Para 8.1.6 is added in this section to mention the proposed improvement works by the Applicant.
8. Figure 2.1 - the distance between the development run-in/out and the nearest junction shall be indicated. The applicant should also advise whether this could fulfill the requirement in TPDM.	The distance between the development run-in/out and the nearest junction (Kam Tin Road/ Avenue De Versailles) are shown in Figure 2.1 of the TIA report. The distance is min. 30m, which fulfills the requirement in TPDM.
9. Figure 5.1 - in general the proposed improvement works ties in with the development, e.g. population intake, BC date etc, but not a public works. Please demonstrate when the improvement work would be carried out.	The improvement works will be carried out and completed before the population intake of the proposed development, in case of programme mis-match between the development and the public works project.
Comments from Transport Department (received on 19 March 2026) Contact person: Mr. Phil CAI; Tel. No.: 2399 2421	
1) Plot ratio should be provided.	Noted. Proposed Plot Ratio of 1.0 is added into Table 2.1 of the TIA.
2) I reiterate that the road capacity will not be dependent on the surveyed traffic flow and pattern. I do not agree that the v/c ratio in pcu/hr equals to veh/hr.	Further to the discussion with TD on 20/3/2026, with reference to other TIAs for projects in Yuen Long, only capacities in pcu/hr format are adopted in TIA. Please refer to the revised tables in the TIA in Annex A .
3) Please provide a tentative implementation programme for our information. The applicant is reminded that the proposed improvement works shall be completed before population intake.	It is anticipated that the proposed development would be completed in 2031 tentatively, with the improvement works at Junction C to be completed by the Applicant before the population intake (i.e. 2031 tentatively) in case of programme mis-match between the proposed development and the public works project.

Comments	Responses
4) Table 2.2 - the provision of motorcycle parking shall be 5-10% of private car. The applicant should review accordingly.	It is clarified that provision of 1 MC parking space per 100-150 flats in private residential development excluding non-residential elements is in accordance with HKPSG requirement.
5) Para 5.1.5, 5.1.6, 5.2.6, 5.3.5, 8.1.6 and 8.1.7- the purpose of the TIA is to assess whether public road network would have sufficient capacity to support both the background and development traffic flow. As commented before, both traffic flows are critical factors. The applicant should review the suitability of these paragraphs.	Noted. These paragraphs were revised/deleted in the revised TIA report.
6) Para 8.1.7 - there is no request to the applicant to carry out the widening of Kam Tin Road . The applicant may review how the relevant sentence would assist the assessment of traffic impact.	Noted. The paragraph (Now Para 8.1.6.) was revised accordingly.
7) Figure 2.1 - the junction of the internal road and the proposed ingress / egress is very close. The applicant should advise whether this could compile with TPDM and should further demonstrate the traffic management in this location with sufficient details on how to prevent vehicles queuing back to public road. Given the size of the ingress / egress, central island should be considered to assist pedestrians crossing the access.	<p>To avoid oversized access, run-in/out will be used rather than access road arrangement. Thus, no central island is needed. The access arrangement has been revised and is shown in Figures 2.1 (Without Kam Tin Road Widening) and 2.2 (With Kam Tin Road Widening). The swept paths are shown in Figures 2.1 (SP1) to 2.1 (SP5) (Without Kam Tin Road Widening) and Figures 2.2 (SP1) to 2.2 (SP5) (With Kam Tin Road Widening).</p> <p>As shown in the swept paths, most of the vehicles can ingress and egress simultaneously, except for vehicles longer than 7m. To minimize the impact on the public road, one-way traffic flow will be adopted for the internal road. Ingress traffic cannot turn right but go straight inward to reduce conflicts with the egress traffic.</p> <p>Separate gates will be provided for ingress and egress traffic. The waiting area before the ingress gate could hold about 1 HGV plus 1 PV/LGV to avoid queuing back to public road. Ingress traffic has priority to enter the proposed development. When long vehicles enter the proposed development, egress traffic must wait behind the egress gate</p>

Comments	Responses																												
	<p>until the long vehicles ingress. Traffic warden will be deployed at the entrance to assist vehicles in and out.</p> <p>Besides, reference has been made to the surveyed trip distribution at Season Villas next to the proposed development to estimate the M/HGV trips of our proposed development. The estimated trips are shown below:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1144 483 2054 820"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="3"></th> <th colspan="4">Traffic Trips (pcu/hr)</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="2">Weekday AM Peak</th> <th colspan="2">Weekday PM Peak</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Gen.</th> <th>Att.</th> <th>Gen.</th> <th>Att.</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Estimated Trips of the Proposed Development in the TIA</td> <td>25</td> <td>18</td> <td>10</td> <td>13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Surveyed % of M/HGV of Season Villas</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>13%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Estimated M/HGV of the Proposed Development</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>It is revealed that the trips of M/HGV for the proposed development will be very low. Together with the above access arrangement and management, the chance of queuing back to the public road will be very small and negligible and therefore our proposed arrangement is acceptable.</p>		Traffic Trips (pcu/hr)				Weekday AM Peak		Weekday PM Peak		Gen.	Att.	Gen.	Att.	Estimated Trips of the Proposed Development in the TIA	25	18	10	13	Surveyed % of M/HGV of Season Villas	0%	0%	13%	0%	Estimated M/HGV of the Proposed Development	0	0	1	0
	Traffic Trips (pcu/hr)																												
	Weekday AM Peak		Weekday PM Peak																										
	Gen.	Att.	Gen.	Att.																									
Estimated Trips of the Proposed Development in the TIA	25	18	10	13																									
Surveyed % of M/HGV of Season Villas	0%	0%	13%	0%																									
Estimated M/HGV of the Proposed Development	0	0	1	0																									
<p>Comments from Environmental Protection Department (received on 25 February 2026) Contact person: Mr. Kelvin WONG; Tel. No.: 2835 1117</p>																													
<p>It is understood from the RtC table that the consultant is waiting information from TD to address his previous comment (i.e. comment 2(ii) for the Air Quality Impact Assessment). As such, please update the report accordingly once information from TD has been received. Also, please delete the newly added sentence "<i>With reference to the lease of Seasons Villas (Lot 815 RP & Ext Thereto in DD110), this road is a</i></p>	<p>As per verbal conversation and written reply by TD, Avenue de Versailles is not under TD's management and thus TD consider not in position to comment on its road type.</p>																												

Comments	Responses
<p><i>non-exclusive right-of-way maintained by the owners of Seasons Villas."</i> from S.7.1 of the report. Other than the above, we have no further comment.</p>	<p>Since Avenue de Versailles connects to Season Villas only, according to Volume 2 Chapter 3.2 of Transport Planning and Design Manual (TPDM) published by TD, it is regarded as a feeder road.</p> <p>Based on the Annual Traffic Census 2024 (ATC) published by TD, Kam Tin Road (ATC Station no.6207) is Rural Road. TD has no comment on the road type of Kam Tin Road.</p> <p>S.7.1, S.7.2 and Table 7.1 in AQIA (Annex B of this FI) have been revised accordingly.</p>
<p>Comments from Drainage Services Department (received on 3 March 2026) Contact person: Ms Jessica KWAN; Tel. No.: 3965 8924</p>	
<p>Revised DIA (A) Specific Comments 1. The applicant should clarify gradient of the proposed 300 mm (W) surface channels.</p>	<p>Appendix B2 of the revised DIA (Annex C of this FI) is revised to show the updated invert levels and gradients of the proposed channels.</p> <p>It is understood that there are existing boundary channels and internal drainage system at the existing development at the north and east of the proposed Development Site. Besides, the runoff arising from the areas at the west of the proposed development are currently directly discharged to the existing watercourse according to the topography. Thus, the proposed 300mm channels are acting as a spare drain. For conservative, the hydraulic calculation in Appendix I is updated to include the proposed 300mm channels and proposed 300mm pipe by assuming they will collect runoff from nearby catchment (i.e. Cat_012A-1).</p>
<p>2. The applicant should clarify discrepancy of invert levels of the proposed 300 mm and 600 mm dia. stormwater drainage pipes shown on the submitted drainage plan and pipe schedule. The applicant should update the submitted hydraulic calculation in Appendix I.</p>	<p>The invert levels of the proposed 300 mm and 600 mm dia. stormwater drainage pipes are revised in Appendix B2. Appendix I is updated to include the hydraulic calculation of the proposed 300mm pipe.</p>

Comments	Responses
3. The applicant should clarify size of the proposed stormwater pipe shown in the proposed connection details of existing watercourse and the proposed stormwater terminal manhole TDM	The proposed stormwater pipe connecting the proposed stormwater terminal manhole is 900mm diameter. The pipe sizes shown in the typical drainage outlet in Appendix B2 are updated.
4. A sand trap/desilting type catchpit should be provided prior to connection to the proposed stormwater terminal manhole or to the downstream public stormwater drainage system. The sand trap/desilting type catchpit should be regularly desilted by the applicant to prevent sand, silt, cementitious materials or other objects from being washed down into the existing stormwater drainage system.	Sand traps (i.e. C1 and C2 indicated in Appendix B2) are proposed at the connection from proposed channels to proposed pipes prior to the proposed stormwater terminal manhole. Appendix B2 has also been updated to include another sand trap/ desilting type catchpit proposed for internal 750mm pipeline at MH3 before connection to the proposed stormwater terminal manhole. Subject to the future drainage plan approval at construction stage the sand trap/desilting type catchpit or alternative design for facilitating desilting will be provided prior to connection to the proposed stormwater terminal manhole. Regular desilting will be carried out by the owner/ management office of the Proposed Development.
5. The DTL of the proposed stormwater terminal manhole should be indicated on the drawing complying with the current Government standard and a 150mm difference between I.L. and D.T.I.L. should be maintained.	<p>The proposed stormwater terminal manhole will comply with the current Government standard and have a 150mm difference between I.L and D.T.I.L of the proposed stormwater terminal manhole (i.e. TDM in Appendix B2).</p> <p>The invert levels of the incoming pipes of TDM are 6.75mPD for proposed 300mm pipe, 6.73mPD for proposed 600mm pipe and 6.675mPD for proposed 750mm. The D.T.I.L of the outgoing pipe of TDM has been set at 6.525mPD, providing the required 150 mm difference between the lowest I.L. (6.675mPD) and the D.T.I.L. (6.525mPD). The information has been provided in Appendix B2.</p>
6. The terminal manhole should be of Type T1, T2, T3, T4 or T10 as appropriate and in accordance with current DSD standard drawings.	As the diameters of the incoming and outgoing pipes are greater than 450mm, subject to detailed design, Type T2 terminal manhole will be adopted. DSD standard drawings will be referenced in later detailed

Comments	Responses
	design stage. The note in Appendix B2 has been updated to state Type T2 terminal manhole will be adopted.
<p><u>(B) General Comments</u></p> <p>1. The existing watercourse to be discharged is a designated watercourse under the Land Drainage Ordinance (LDO) and is under the purview of Drainage Authority (DA). An application to the DA for consent and approval under Sections 26(2) of the LDO is necessary before execution of the relevant works. The contents of the application are stipulated in Chapter 446A titled "Land Drainage (Consent and Approval) Regulation".</p>	Noted and thank you for your kind reminder. The Applicant fully understood that the existing watercourse at the west of the proposed Development Site is a designated watercourse under Land Drainage Ordinance. The Applicant will apply for the Drainage Authority's consent and approval before execution of the relevant works in next stage of the project.
<p>2. Peripheral surface channels shall be provided along the site boundary to collect the surface runoff accrued on the application site and to intercept the overland flow from the adjacent lands. It is noted that there is proposed land filling works for the development. Proper surface channels should be provided at the lower level and wall toe to collect the overland flow to/ from adjacent areas.</p>	Noted. Peripheral surface channels will be provided along the site boundary and at the lower level/wall toe. Some existing and proposed ground levels are spotted in Appendix B2 .
<p>3. Flow velocity of the proposed drainage facilities is suggested to be within a range, i.e. 0.75 m/s to 3.0 m/s.</p>	Please note that the full-bore velocities of all the proposed channels and pipes are within a range of 0.75m/s to 3.0m/s.
<p>4. The general comments dated 12.1.2026 remain valid.</p>	Noted.
<p><u>Revised SIA</u></p> <p>1. The general comments dated 12.1.2026 remain valid.</p>	Noted.
<p>The applicant is required to demonstrate in the DIA report that the proposed works will not obstruct the overland flow nor cause any adverse drainage impact to the adjacent areas. The applicant shall be</p>	Noted.

Comments	Responses
liable for any adverse drainage and sewerage impact due to his/her proposed development.	
Comments from Drainage Services Department (received on 23 March 2026) Contact person: Ms Jessica KWAN; Tel. No.: 3965 8924	
<p><u>Revised DIA</u></p> <p>(A) <u>Specific Comments</u></p> <p>1. The applicant should review construction details of the proposed stormwater terminal manhole TDM as the proposed manhole type T2 is only applicable when the proposed connection pipes are in diameter equal to or greater than 450 mm. The terminal manhole should be of Type T1_1, T2_1, T3_1, T4_1 or T10_1 as appropriate and in accordance with current DSD standard drawings.</p>	<p>The pipe connecting from C2 to TDM (i.e. Proposed Pipe PC-2 in Appendix I) has been reviewed and upsized from 300mm to 450mm in diameter. Appendices B2 and I are updated accordingly. Please refer to the revised DIA in Annex C.</p> <p>As the connection pipes to the terminal manhole are all equal to or greater than 450mm, the Type T2_1 terminal manhole will be adopted, subject to detailed design, and DSD standard drawings will be referenced in later detailed design stage.</p>
<p>2. The applicant should employ a qualified engineer (Registered Professional Engineer in the Civil Engineering discipline) to prepare for drainage submission. The drainage submission should be signed and certified by a qualified engineer.</p>	<p>Noted. The drainage submission at a later stage will be signed and certified by a qualified engineer.</p>
Comments from Planning Department (received on 19 March 2026) Contact person: Ms Andrea YAN; Tel. No.: 3168 4049	
<p>1. While noting that Site 2 will be maintained as status quo, please clarify whether improvement works to the existing local paths will be carried out by the applicants, and advise the maintenance and management party of the local paths within applicants' lots.</p>	<p>The Applicant has no plan to undertake improvement works to the existing local paths within the Applicant's lots and the status quo of Site 2 will be maintained.</p>
<p>2. Please provide the mPD for the clubhouse block and sewage treatment plant</p>	<p>The roof levels of the clubhouse block and the sewage treatment plant are 15.40mPD and 13.90mPD respectively. Please refer to the updated Architectural Drawings in Annex D of this Further Information.</p>

Comments	Responses
3. Paragraph 6.8.6 of the planning statement à please update the figures of traffic generation to tally with that of the TIA	<p>Noted. The first sentence in Para. 6.8.6 of Planning Statement has been updated as below to tally with TIA:</p> <p>“The Traffic Impact Assessment (“TIA”) (Appendix 6 refers) has estimated that the Proposed Development would generate (attract) traffic flow of 25(18) pcu/hr in the AM peak and 10(13) pcu/hr in the PM peak.”</p> <p>The replacement page of Planning Statement in Annex E refers.</p>
4. Please advise the landscape condition of Site 2 and whether the existing landscape resources thereat will be affected by the proposed rezoning	<p>Site 2 mainly involves vegetated land (abandoned agricultural land), watercourse along the southwestern boundary of Site 2, with a “Y-shaped” local footpaths connecting the pavement along Kam Tin Road to the south (via a local footbridge across the watercourse) with the rural settlements to the north of Site 2.</p> <p>Upon approval of the rezoning request including, the rezoning of Site 2 from “R(C)2” to “O” zone, the Applicants are prepared to keep their private land in Site 2 as status quo until the Government has a program to resume the land in Site 2 for implementation of the public open space. The existing landscape resources shall still be compatible with the proposed “O” zone. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the existing landscape resources thereat will be affected by the proposed rezoning.</p>
5. Please provide the design capacity of the proposed sewage treatment plant	Please be advised that the design capacity of the proposed sewage treatment plant is 247.5m ³ /day (Average Dry Weather Flow).
6. According to paragraph 7.2 and figure 7.1 of the landscape proposal, the proposed green coverage is not less than 22%, which is inconsistent with that of the planning statement. Please clarify.	The planning statement presents that the proposed green coverage should be not less than 20% in accordance with PNAP APP-152 Sustainable Building Design Guidelines, while the green coverage under the landscape proposal could achieve not less than 22% (before

Comments	Responses
	widening of Kam Tin Road) and not less than 20% (after widening of Kam Tin Road).
<p>7. Please further elaborate the justifications for the current ‘swapping’ proposal. In particular the rationale(s) of having the proposed residential development be placed at the existing “O” zone</p>	<p>Please find below rationale(s) for the ‘swapping’ proposal with residential development proposed at Site 1 instead of Site 2:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rationalised Site Configuration – Site 2 is in irregular shape and without direct frontage along Kam Tin Road. For connection with Kam Tin Road, the location and position of the vehicular access will be constrained by the existing rural settlements to the west and the big mature tree to the east, in result of taking up more Government land and the land zoned “O”. In contrast, Site 1 is more rational in shape and has longer and direct frontage along Kam Tin Road (about 57m). 2. Limited Impact to Existing Use / Nearby Residents – Site 2 involves the existing local footpath frequently used by the nearby residents. With reference to the public comments on the previously withdrawal Application No. Y/YL-KTN/4, the local residents have high concern on the impact to the local footpaths due to proposed residential development at Site 2, even with reprovisioning (detour) proposal. Under the current ‘swapping’ proposal, the local context including the existing footpath and light poles will be unaffected should there be no particular implementation program of the open space by the Government. <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Site 1 is adjoining to the established low-rise residential cluster, Seasons Villas to its northeast, which is compatible in land use. Site 1 only involves abandoned agricultural land without watercourse nor existing footpaths being frequently used by the nearby residents.</p> 3. Implementation Certainty – Cumulatively, with longer frontage for vehicular access arrangement and limited impact to other stakeholders, implementation certainty for proposed residential

Comments	Responses
	development at Site 1 is expected to be much higher than that at Site 2. Site 2 is recommended to be maintained as status quo until the Government has program to implement it as open space.

Encl.:**Annex A** – Revised Traffic Impact Assessment**Annex B** – Replacement Pages of Air Quality Impact Assessment**Annex C** – Revised Drainage Impact Assessment**Annex D** – Updated Architectural Drawings**Annex E** – Replacement Page of Planning Statement

Compiled by: KTA

Date: 2 April 2026

File Ref.: 20260402_s3045a_RtC FI3