Section 12A Rezoning Application No. Y/YL-MP/9

To Amend the Notes of the "Comprehensive Development to include Wetland Restoration Area" Zone for a Proposed Comprehensive Development at Wo Shang Wai, Yuen Long, Lots 77 and 50 S.A in DD101

Response to Comments (Batch 2)

28 May 2025

Response to Comments

To Amend the Notes of the "Comprehensive Development to include Wetland Restoration Area" Zone for a Proposed Comprehensive Development at Wo Shang Wai, Yuen Long, Lots 77 and 50 S.A in DD101

Table of Contents

Attachments

Attachment A: Air Ventilation Assessment (Updated)

Attachment B: Traffic Impact Assessment (Updated)

Response to Departmental Comments of UD&L Air Ventilation, PlanD

Comments from the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD (Contact Person: Ms Nicole LEE; Tel: [redacted] (Urban Design Unit)/ Mr Samuel HUI; Tel: [redacted] (Landscape Unit))	**Response(s):**
AVA (a) **Table 2.1** - the approximate building heights of the existing developments within the assessment boundary are as follow – - Royal Palms: 14.5 to 17.7mPD - Palm Springs – Arcadia: 13.9 to 16.5mPD - Palm Springs – Westwood: 13.6 to 17.4mPD - Palm Springs Plaza: 13.6mPD - Wo Shang Wai Village: 7.7mPD - Mai Po Ventilation Building: 21.5mPD - Mai Po San Tsuen: 6.4 to 13.3mPD We defer to the Consultant to determine whether the building heights of the listed existing developments should be presented in ranges instead of absolute values.	Table 2.1 revised accordingly. (**Attachment A**)
(b) **Planned / Committed development of San Tin Technopole** (section 4, 3rd paragraph) – Information reported in this paragraph is incorrect. The Consultant claimed that no building structures, elevated structures or noise barriers are proposed in the region at the western trip of the development of San Tin Technopole. It is also noted from Appendix H that the existing temporary transitional housing development may have been adopted in the model. With reference to Appendix G, areas zoned "Government, Institution or Community", "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Amenity Area" and area shown as 'Road' on the approved San Tin Technopole Outline Zoning Plan No. S/STT/2 (the OZP), fall within the assessment boundary (i.e. 2H boundary on Appendix G). According to the Explanatory Statement of the OZP, the concerned "G/IC" zones are for an existing Mai Po Substation, and reserved for government reserve and a workshop and related facilities of the Fire Services Department. While there is no building	Based on government archives, we acknowledge that there will be planned developments for government related facilities in the region at the western tip of the development of San Tin Technopole falls within the Surrounding Area of the current AVA. However, further to our discussion with District Planning Office, it is noted that there is currently no available data for the planned developments in San Tin Technopole to adopt into our model hence our AVA report assumes there are no developments within this region.

height restriction for the subject "G/IC" zone, the Consultant may consider making reference to the Consolidated Report of the First Phase Development of the New Territories North – San Tin /Lok Ma Chau Development Node –Investigation (the Study) and the approved EIA Report of the Study for the assumed building blocks layout and building height.	
(c) **Proposed Scheme (section 4.2)** – Referring to Appendix B, it appears that part of the identified building separations are not well aligned and may not form the effective air paths /wind corridors within the Project Site. The proposed development should refer to the design guidelines of Building Disposition outlined in "Hong Kong Planning Standard and Guidelines" (HKPSG). The consultant should clearly highlight and illustrate the identified building separations on plan.	The alignment and width of the identified building separations are updated accordingly in Section 4.2 and Appendix B. (**Attachment A**)
(d) **Value of H** (section 5.1, 1st para. and Table 5.1) – According to the HPLB-ETWB Technical Circular No. 1/06 on AVA, H is referred to the height of the tallest building on site but not the coverage of Assessment Area. Therefore, the consultant should report the correct value of H as well as the coverage of Assessment Area and Surrounding Area in text.	Section 5.1 is updated accordingly to report the correct value of H and coverage of Assessment Area and Surrounding Area as well as the actual value of H adopted for the study in order to incorporate special surrounding features and open spaces. (**Attachment A**)
(e) **Table 5.1** – The consultant should report the correct information about the blockage ratio and convergence criteria in text.	Typo rectified. Table 5.1 is updated accordingly. (**Attachment A**)
(f) **Demarcation of Focus areas** (Section 5.5 and Table 5.3) – For better understanding the potential air ventilation impact on the residential development nearby, the consultant should demarcate the focus areas on development basis (i.e. Wo Shang Wai, Royal Palms and Palm Springs, etc.) but not along each avenue /drive.	The demarcation of focus areas in Section 5.5, Table 5.3 as well as Figures 5.10 to 5.15 are updated accordingly on development basis. (**Attachment A**)
(g) **NNE wind** (section 6.1.1) – The simulation results show that the Proposed Scheme would create much larger wake on Monterey of Palm Springs when compared with the Baseline Scheme under NNE wind. However, no such discussion has been provided in text.	The discussion on the larger wake on Monterey of Palm Springs induced by the Proposed Scheme is included in Section 6.1.1 accordingly. (**Attachment A**)

(h) **ENE wind (section 6.1.3)** – The simulation results show that the Proposed Scheme would have lower VR in area between Mai Po San Tsuen and eastern part of the Project Site when compared with the Baseline Scheme under ENE wind. However, no such discussion has been provided in text.	The discussion on the lower VR at the area between Mai Po San Tsuen and eastern part of the Project Site induced by the Proposed Scheme is included in Section 6.1.3 accordingly. (**Attachment A**)
(i) **E wind** (section 6.1.4) – The simulation results show that the Proposed Scheme would have lower VR in area immediate east of Blocks D1-7, D2-7, D2-8 and C1-22 when compared with the Baseline Scheme under E wind. However, no such discussion has been provided in text.	The discussion on the lower VR along the south eastern portion of the Project Site and west of Royal Palms induced by the Proposed Scheme is included in Section 6.1.4 accordingly. (**Attachment A**)
(j) **ESE and SE winds** (section 6.1.5) – The simulation results show that the Proposed Scheme would have larger wake and lower VR around Westwood of Palm Springs when compared with the Baseline Scheme under both ESE and SE winds. However, no such discussion has been provided in text.	The discussion on the larger wake and lower VR around Westwood of Palm Springs induced by the Proposed Scheme is included in Section 6.1.5 accordingly.
(k) **SSE wind** (section 6.1.6) – The simulation results show that the Proposed Scheme would have larger wake on the fish ponds located to the north of the Project Site when compared with the Baseline Scheme under both SSE wind. However, no such discussion has been provided in text.	The discussion on the larger wake on the fish ponds located to the north of the Project Site induced by the Proposed Scheme is included in Section 6.1.6 accordingly.
(l) **S wind** (section 6.1.7) – The simulation results show that the Proposed Scheme would have larger wake on the further north of the Project Site when compared with the Baseline Scheme under both S wind. However, no such discussion has been provided in text.	The discussion on the larger wake on the fish ponds located to the north of the Project Site induced by the Proposed Scheme is included in Section 6.1.7 accordingly.
(m) **SSW wind (section 6.1.8)** – The simulation results show that the Proposed Scheme would have larger wake on the further north of the Project Site when compared with the Baseline Scheme under both SSW wind. However, no such discussion has been provided in text.	The discussion on the larger wake on the fish ponds located to the north of the Project Site induced by the Proposed Scheme is included in Section 6.1.8 accordingly.
(n) **Summary of SAVRs** (sections 6.2 and 6.3) – The consultant should update these sections	The summary is updated with reference to the updated demarcation of focus area.

taking into account our comment (see Item 6) above.	
(o) **Conclusion** (section 7) i. The consultant should discuss and conclude whether the Proposed Scheme would result in a significant adverse air ventilation impact on the pedestrian wind environment in the area surrounding the Project Site when compared with the Baseline Scheme. ii. Para. 5 – As mentioned in our previous comments on the pre-submission documents, we would reiterate that the Proposed Scheme is taller and more massive when compared with the Baseline Scheme. As such, we have reservation that the building density of the Proposed Scheme has been reduced.	i. The conclusion is updated accordingly with the discussion of the Proposed Scheme. ii. Noted and this has been removed accordingly. (**Attachment A**)

Response to Departmental Comments of Highways Department (HyD)

Comments from the Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department (HyD) (Contact Person: Mr Stanley CHOI; Tel: [redacted])	**Response(s):**
1. The Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) should be reviewed and commented by Transport Department (TD). If any proposed road improvements in the TIA are considered necessary by TD due to the subject development, they shall be implemented by the Applicant to the satisfaction of TD and HyD at the applicant's own cost.	TIA has also been submitted for TD's review. Applicant would take up the necessary road improvement works, as stated in the final approved TIA, if necessary.
2. The proposed access arrangement to the application site should be commented by TD. HyD is not/ shall not be responsible for the maintenance of any access connecting the application site and Mai Po South Road.	Noted.
3. HyD shall not be responsible for the maintenance of any internal transport facilities within the site, if any.	Noted.
4. Adequate drainage measures should be provided at the site access to prevent surface water flowing from the site to nearby public roads or exclusive road drains.	Noted.

5. For the impact assessments which we have no direct input from highways maintenance perceptive, we assumed that the relevant departments will provide you their comments directly. The applicant should highlight in the future submission if there be any latest findings/recommendations/ revisions that may affect our inventories including slope features or require HyD's particular input.	Noted.

Response to Departmental Comments of Railway Development Office, Highways Department (HyD)

Comments from the Chief Engineer/Railway Development 1-1, Railway Development Office, Highways Department (HyD) **(Contact Person: Mr Philip CHAN; Tel: [redacted])**	**Response(s):**
The subject site is within or close to the railway protection boundary of the High Speed Rail which has been fully commissioned. With reference to DEVB TC(W) No. 1/2019 and/or Practice Notes for Authorized Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers (PNAP) APP-24, please consult MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) with respect to the operation, maintenance, safety and any future works required for the existing railways.	Noted. MTRCL would be consulted, if necessary.

Response to Departmental Comments of Commissioner for Transport

Comments from the Commissioner for Transport (Contact Person: Mr Donald Leung; Tel: [redacted])	**Response(s):**
1. As commented in the pre-submission, the forecast trip generation is significantly greater than 100pcu/hr with the total population approach 10,000 (i.e. 9,999), thus the projects are considered not fulfilling the criteria using 1-tier LATM. The developments are expected to directly generate significant flow into Castle Peak Road and San Tin Highway, a 2-Tier Modeling should be adopted to provide more realistic forecast.	Reference has been made from on-going planning application "Y/YL-MP/10" for proposed development in various lots and adjacent Government Land in DD 104, Yuen Long, N.T., with the review of the adjacent planned development. (**Attachment B**)
2. Table 2.2: Please provide reference on the provision of parking space, loading/ unloading bay as well as taxi/PC pick-up/drop-off space to justify the sufficiency of current parking provision.	With reference to the approved planning application for RCHE development, the parking provision has been updated in the revised TIA. (**Attachment B**)
3. Para. 2.3.4: a. Noted there would be a waiting space between the drop-bar gate and the public road. Please identify it on drawing and specify how many vehicles could be queued within this area. b. Noted a drop-bar gate would be provided within the site for access control. Given a significant number of trips (i.e. over 200 pcu/hr) would be attracted to the subject site in both AM and PM peak, please advise how many entrance gate would be provided to handle the access checking and to demonstrate the access control arrangement would not cause vehicle to queue back onto public road at all time.	In Drawing No.2.2, it is shown that there would be different accesses connecting G/F and basement carpark floor. As mentioned in the TIA, drop bar would be indicated in the layout in later detailed design stage. In Drawing No.2.2, it is shown that there would be different accesses connecting G/F and basement carpark floor. Drop bar would be indicated in detailed design stage and sufficient queuing area would be provided to avoid vehicles queuing back onto public road. (**Attachment B**)
4. Table 3.1: a. As per my comments in the pre-submission, please include San Tin Highway in the road link assessment. b. Noted some of the junctions such as San Tin Interchange and J/O Castle Peak Road – San Tin/ Kwu Tung Road, which have been assessed in the previous planning application (MP/344) are not included in the captioned TTIA Report. Please supplement.	San Tin Highway is included in the road link assessment in the revised TIA. (**Attachment B**) San Tin Interchange and J/O Castle Peak Road – San Tin/ Kwu Tung Road are included in the observed scenario. However, the ingress and egress traffic in the Design Year of 2034 would adopt Junction A (Shek Wu Wai Road / San Tin Highway Slip Road) and Junction B (Shek Wu Wai Road / Road D3 / Road L11 / Road L12) instead.

5. Table 3.3: The 2024 observed traffic flows in the table does not tally with the flow diagram in Drawing No. 3.13. Please revise.	Traffic flow in Table 3.3 has been revised.
6. Drawing No. 3.13: For Junction H (Fairview Park Interchange), please explain why the 2024 observed traffic flows in arm G is exactly the same as the 2023 observed traffic flows under the previous approved planning application (MP/344).	Further to discussion with TD, though the observed traffic flow in traffic survey in a typical weekday in April 2024 was considered under normal traffic condition, the traffic flow in arm G in Fairview Park Interchange under previous approved Planning Application A/YL-MP/344 was adopted in the assessment in conservative approach.
7. Para. 4.2.10: please explicitly state that the planned/committed developments shown in Table 4.5 are already endorsed by PlanD.	PlanD's comments on the planned/committed developments have been received and reflected in the revised TIA. Please refer to para. 4.2.6 in the revised TIA for an indication of this.
8. Table 4.6: a. The trip generation from residential development should be estimated in accordance to TPDM by breaking down into different range of flat size instead of taking the average flat size of the residential development. Please review. b. Please provide reference for the derivation of RCHE trips. c. Noted only 49% of the daily mechanized trips would use public transport mode while the remaining trips 51% would be rely on other road traffic such as taxis and private car. Hence, it is advised to adopt the high end in the trip rate generation for residential development. Please review.	The trip generation derived by different range of flat size of the subject residential development has been adopted in the assessment of the revised TIA. Based on the in-house traffic survey from the existing similar social welfare development, the RCHE trips are revised with reference to the surveyed trip rates. In accordance with TO/TD comment in item 13, the Public Transport Model Share of TCS (82%) is adopted in the assessment. Therefore, the mean trip rate of residential section would be considered reasonable to be adopted for the induced trip generation.
9. Para. 5.1.3: It is assumed that the junction improvement works in Fairview Park Interchange under Public Housing Developments at Sha Po would be completed before the population intake of the proposed development. Nonetheless, should there be any delay whatsoever such that the abovementioned junction improvement works are not in place, the applicant should carry out those junction improvement works instead. Please explicitly mention in the TTIA report.	Noted. The TIA has been revised accordingly.
10. Para. 5.2.4: Noted the applicant proposes to widen the queuing area at the concerned bus stops such that the	Noted. The TIA has been revised accordingly.

LOS C could be achieved. The proposed widening works should be undertaken by the applicant. Please explicitly mention it in the TTIA report.	
11. Para. 5.3.3: a. Understand that this paragraph is referring to Junction B instead of Junction C. Please review the text in this paragraph. b. In case there is a delay on the proposed road works under San Tin Technopole such at Junction A and Junction B are still under existing setting, the proposed junction improvement works in Junction B stated in this paragraph should be undertaken by the applicant. Please explicitly mention I in the report.	Noted. The TIA has been revised accordingly. Noted. The TIA has been revised accordingly.
12. Para. 5.3.8 and Drawing 5.11: a. Noted there would be proposed junction improvement works undertaken by other planning application. Please clarify these proposed junction improvement works for Junction H should be under planning application of Y/YL-MP/7 or planning application of Y/YL-NSW/7. b. Further junction improvement works are proposed by the applicant as stated in Para 5.3.8. Please explicitly mention that those improvement works should be undertaken by the applicant.	The concerned improvement work in Sensitivity Test 2 is referring to the planning application Y/YL- MP/10, as stated in the revised TIA. Noted. The TIA has been revised accordingly.
<u>Transport operation comment:</u> 13. Table 4.7 (Estimated Passenger Demand): a. According to TCS, the average daily mechanized trips should be 1.83. Please provide the rationale of excluding NHB and EB trips. b. For the public transport modal share, the reference case of Royal Palms (49%) seems not relevant to the current case, as it is unclear whether non-franchised bus would be provided/ approved. Please adopt the Public Transport Model Share of TCS as appropriate and review the estimated passenger demand (e.g. franchised bus and green minibus)	The average daily mechanized trips of 1.83 in accordance with TCS 2011 is adopted in the revised TIA. Subject to review of TCS 2011 Appendix A.3, the 82% of PT model share (exclude private car and taxi) is adopted for the estimated passenger demand.
14. In light of the above, please update the estimated peak hour passenger demand and ascertain the impact to the public transport services.	The estimated peak hour passenger demand has been updated in the revised TIA.

15. Please propose the required enhancement of existing public transport (PT) services and ascertain whether new PT services should be provided to cater for the new PT demand generated from the proposed new development.	Subject to the estimated peak hour PT demand induced by the subject development, the proposed enhancement of existing PT service of franchised bus service (proposed increase of bus frequency and widening works of bus stop) has been included in the assessment.
16. Subject to the updates to the proposed PT services, sufficient PT facilities should be provided to support the operation of the proposed public transport services.	The Level-Of-Service (LOS) of the queuing area is calculated at bus stops, and local widening of footpath at bus stops is also proposed accordingly.