

**Section 12A Application from
“Recreation” and “Green Belt” to “Government, Institution or Community”
for Proposed Religious Institution (the Supreme Kwan Ti Temple),
at Various Lots in D.D. 117 and Adjoining Government Land,
Tai Tong, Yuen Long, New Territories**

FURTHER INFORMATION (I)



CONSULTANT TEAM

**Toco Planning Consultants Ltd.
JA Design Architects Ltd.
SCENIC Landscape Studio Ltd.
CTA Consultants Ltd.
EnviroSolutions & Consulting Ltd.
Ecosystems Ltd.
Greg Wong & Associates Ltd.
Land Marker (1980) H.K. Co., Ltd.
PAEMS Engineering Ltd.**



**Section 12A Application from
“Recreation” and “Green Belt” to “Government, Institution or Community”
for Proposed Religious Institution (the Supreme Kwan Ti Temple),
at Various Lots in D.D. 117 and Adjoining Government,
Tai Tong, Yuen Long, New Territories**

(Application No. Y/YL-TT/4)

Further Information I

Responses to Departmental Comments

- 1.1 Responses to Comments from Lands Department
- 1.2 Responses to Comments from Drainage Services Department
- 1.3 Responses to Comments from Fire Services Department
- 1.4 Responses to Comments from Environmental Protection Department
- 1.5 Responses to Comments from Buildings Department
- 1.6 Responses to Comments from Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department
- 1.7 Responses to Comments from Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
- 1.8 Responses to Comments from Urban Design Unit, Planning Department
- 1.9 Responses to Comments from Landscape Unit, Planning Department
- 1.10 Responses to Comments from District Planning Office, Planning Department
- 1.11 Responses to Comments from Geotechnical Engineering Office,
Civil Engineering and Development Department
- 1.12 Responses to Comments from Slope Maintenance, Lands Department
- 1.13 Responses to Comments from Other Departments

Attachment 1: Replacement Pages of the Planning Statement

Attachment 2: Replacement Page of the Landscape Proposal Report

Attachment 3: Replacement Pages of the Visual Impact Assessment

Attachment 4: Revised Environmental Assessment

Attachment 5: Revised Sewerage Impact Assessment

Attachment 6: Revised Drainage Impact Assessment

Attachment 7: Revised Ecological Impact Assessment

Toco Planning Consultants Ltd.
JA Design Architects Ltd.
SCENIC Landscape Studio Ltd.
CTA Consultants Ltd.
EnviroSolutions & Consulting Ltd.
Ecosystems Ltd.
Greg Wong & Associates Ltd.
Land Marker (1980) H.K. Co., Ltd.
PAEMS Engineering Ltd.



1. RESPONSES TO DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS

1.1 Responses to Comments from Lands Departments (LandsD)

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
LandsD (1)	(a) According to desktop checking, the Application Site area comprises various private lots including Lot Nos. 1622, 1624, 1629, 1630 s.A, 1630 s.B, 1630 s.C, 1630 s.D, 1631, 1632, 1633, 1634, 1635 and 1636 (part) all in D.D. 117 (“the Lots”) and adjoining Government land. The private lots are old scheduled agricultural lots held under Block Government Lease. No structure is allowed to be erected on the Lots without prior approval of the Government.	Noted.
LandsD (2)	(b) The Application Site includes substantial areas of Government land. With reference to Table 2.1 of the Planning Statement, the area of Application Site is 18,328m ² , of which about 11,643m ² is Government land.	Noted.
LandsD (3)	(c) The actual site area, site boundary, and lease details, etc. of the Application Site involved will be subject to survey and verification at the land application stage, if applied.	Noted.
LandsD (4)	(d) In the event that the subject application under s.12A of the Town Planning Ordinance (“TPO”) is accepted or partially accepted by the Town Planning Board (“TPB”), the Applicant is reminded that they should obtain the necessary policy support from Home and Youth Affairs Bureau (“HYAB”) and make land application(s) to the Lands Department (“LandsD”) to	Noted.

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
	implement the proposal. Subject to policy support being given, LandsD will consider the application in its private capacity as landlord. However, there is <u>no guarantee</u> that the land application, including the grant of additional Government land (if any), for the proposed development will eventually be approved by LandsD, in particular taking into account the substantial areas of Government land involved. If the land application is approved by LandsD, it will be subject to such terms and conditions as may be imposed by LandsD at its absolute discretion, including payment of premium and administrative fee(s).	
LandsD (5)	(e) As stated by the applicant in Section 5 of the completed Form No. S12A, the subject application involves a total of 13 current land owners and the applicant has obtained consent of 1 current land owner. The Applicant should clarify the ownership particulars and the status of those private lots involved.	After checking, the subject application should involve a total of 27 current land owners instead. Section 5 of the completed Form No. S12A has been amended and will be submitted separately.
LandsD (6)	(f) The applicant is also reminded that applications for land transactions will only be considered and processed when submitted by (a) the registered owner(s) of the lots concerned, or (b) the prospective purchaser under a registered Agreement for Sale and Purchase ("ASP") with the written consent of the registered owner(s), or (c) their representative with written authorization from the registered owner(s) or prospective purchaser whom can act on their behalf.	Noted.

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
LandsD (7)	(g) It is noted that Section 2.4 of the Planning Statement states that the applicant will submit appropriate type of land application(s), such as private treaty grant or other relevant land applications covering the Government land within the Application Site. The Applicant is reminded that LandsD will determine the appropriate type of land application to be processed in its private capacity as landlord and subject to para. (d) above.	Noted.
LandsD (8)	(h) Section 2.4 of the Planning Statement also states that the applicant will submit appropriate type of land application(s), such as short term waiver or other relevant land applications covering the Lots. The applicant is reminded that the application(s) for STW(s) will be considered by the Government in its capacity as a landlord and there is no guarantee that it will be approved. The STW(s), if approved, will be subject to such terms and conditions including the payment of waiver fee(s) and administrative fee(s) as considered appropriate by LandsD. Additionally, since STWs are temporary in nature, the applicant is also reminded that only erection of temporary structure(s) will be considered.	Noted.
LandsD (9)	(i) Additionally, it is noted that the proposed access road improvement area encroached onto Lots Nos. 1475, 1591, 1594, 1595, 1600 s.B, 1602 and 1636 all in D.D. 117 as well as existing STT and STW. Section 2.4 of the Planning Statement states that the applicant has consulted relevant	Noted.

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
	parties of the various private lots and has signed agreement related to access right issues and the use of land. The said "agreement" pertaining to access right would be subject to verification at the land application stage, if applied. The applicant should be reminded to ensure availability of proper access right.	
LandsD (10)	(j) With respect to the STT and STW affected by the proposed access road improvement area, the applicant should also be reminded that details are to be examined at the land application stage in the event that the planning application is accepted, and the STT tenant(s)/STW holder(s) will need to apply for modification of the STT/STW conditions where appropriate to implement the proposal, the application for which will be considered by LandsD in its private capacity as landlord and there is no guarantee that the application(s) will be approved.	Noted.
LandsD (11)	(k) Furthermore, squatter control records, Government land licence and Government land permit are found within the Application Site and the applicant should note.	Noted.
LandsD (12)	(l) The applicant should note that there is no guarantee of provision of right-of-way to be incorporated into the proposed land transaction.	Noted.

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
LandsD (13)	<u>Part B: Advisory Comments for the Applicant</u> (a) With respect to the proposed access road improvement, the applicant should be responsible for the costs and ensure technical feasibility of all necessary infrastructure works such as water connections, drainage, sewage, etc.	Noted.

1.2 Responses to Comments from Drainage Services Department (DSD)

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
DSD(1)	<u>Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA)</u> i) Pursuant to Section 4.2 of DSD Advice Note No. 1, any submission made as part of the DIA process should be signed and certified by the registered professional engineer (RPE) in charge. Please ensure your resubmission is signed by RPE in charge.	This DIA(PP) is a preliminary assessment intended to determine whether technical detailed DIA is required during the detailed design stage. The drainage system with will be developed with a detailed assessment, which will be signed and certified by a RPE, where necessary, during the detailed design stage.
DSD(2)	ii) Section 3.2 & Figure 3-1 – Please seek the latest information from PlanD and/ or LandsD to ascertain whether there are approved planning applications in the relevant catchment area (not yet included in the assessment) to update the percentage of paved and unpaved area in the calculation.	According to the planning submission records, there are no recently approved planning applications within the relevant catchment area.
DSD(3)	iii) Para. 3.2.8 & 3.2.9 – Referring to Figure 3-2, it seems that the road falls towards the western side. Hence, runoff from part of Catchment D will flow into the application site, in particular noting that the site will be formed lower than the existing ground level as shown in Figure C-2. Please review and check similarly for Catchment E.	As a conservative approach, a new catchment - Catchment G comprising part of the previous Catchment D and Catchment E is formed and runoff from Catchment G has been included in the assessment. Consequently, the diameter of the proposed pipe has been increased to 1m to accommodate the additional flow from Catchment G.
DSD(4)	iv) Table 3-3 & Appendix A – A discrepancy was found in the value of runoff coefficient for Catchment B in Table 3-3 (0.46) and Appendix A (0.47). Please check and amend accordingly.	Table 3-3 has been revised accordingly. Revised DIA is attached in Attachment 6 .
DSD(5)	v) Para. 3.2.12 & Appendix A – As per Table 31 of Corrigendum No. 1/2022 of the Stormwater Drainage Manual, a design	Design allowance of 12.1% has been incorporated into the runoff calculations. The DIA(PP) has been revised accordingly.

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
	allowance for a rainfall increase of 12.1% (by the end of the 21 st century) should be incorporated into the design. Please amend the design accordingly.	
DSD(6)	vi) Para. 3.3.1 – Please indicate the peripheral surface drains and catchpits in Figure 3-2. The site formation level of each platform should also be indicated for clarity and confirm that the proposed peripheral drainage scheme is feasible.	The Proposed Development is a permanent development. Detailed drainage design will be carried out at a later stage under the Building Ordinance. As the drainage layout within the site boundary has not yet been finalised, it is not presented in this Project Profile to avoid any potential misunderstanding.
DSD(7)	vii) Section 3 – The applicant should check and ensure the hydraulic capacity of the existing drainage facilities (e.g. streamcourse) would not be adversely affected by the captioned development.	The capacity of the existing stream has been estimated and compared with the cumulative runoff from the Site. The DIA(PP) has been revised accordingly.
DSD(8)	viii) Figure 2-1 & Appendix A – The existing discharge point (streamcourse) proposed for runoff discharge from the subject site via the 900mm diameter of stormwater pipe is not maintained by us and there is no record of it in our office. The applicant shall resolve any conflict/ disagreement arisen for discharging the runoff from the application site to the proposed discharge point. Moreover, please provide the increase in water depth in the concerned streamcourse attributed to the proposed development for further consideration.	Noted. The increase in water depth attributed to the proposed development is supplemented in Para. 3.3.4 and Appendix B.
DSD(9)	ix) Figure 3-2 – The terminal manhole should be located within the lot as near to the lot boundary as possible.	The terminal manhole has been moved to within the Site Boundary.

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
DSD(10)	x) General – 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.	Noted. The drainage system will be rectified as necessary.
DSD(11)	xi) General – 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.	Noted.
DSD(12)	xii) General – 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 times.	Noted.
DSD(13)	xiii) General – 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	Noted.

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
	cost of the Applicant and to our satisfactions.	
DSD(14)	xiv) General – 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. In addition, the drainage works related to existing stormwater drainage systems should be implemented during dry seasons only.	Noted.
DSD(15)	<u>Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA)</u> xv) Please state that the project proponent will be responsible for the O&M of the proposed septic tank and soakaway system, and the proposed storage tank.	Noted. The O&M responsibility for project proponent has been stated in the Section 3.2.4, 3.2.7 and 4.1.6 of SIA attached in Attachment 5 .
DSD(16)	xvi) Please investigate if the size of proposed septic tank or proposed storage tank should be further optimized to cope with the potential inflow during adverse weather.	The watertight design of sewage holding tank, the inflow during adverse weather is not anticipated. The size of the proposed septic tank are capable to store at least 3 days of sewerage produced onsite; therefore it is sufficient to cope with potential inflow during adverse weather.
DSD(17)	xvii) The SIA report needs to meet the full satisfaction of Sewerage Infrastructure Group of the Environmental Protection Department, the planning authority of sewerage infrastructure.	Noted.

1.3 Responses to Comments from Fire Services Department (FSD)

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
FSD(1)	i) Detailed fire safety requirements will be formulated upon receipt of a formal submission of Short Term Tenancy or Short Term Waiver, general building plans or referral of the application via the relevant licensing authority.	Noted.
FSD(2)	ii) 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.

1.4 Responses to Comments from Director of Environmental Protection (EPD)

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
EPD(1)	Noise <u>General Comment</u> 1. The EA submitted does not contain any noise assessment or figures to demonstrate the compliance with respective noise criteria, please find our technical comments below for addressing respective noise issues properly.	Noted. The revised Environmental Assessment is attached in Attachment 4.
EPD(2)	<u>Technical Comment</u> 2. S.3.3.1 – Please clarify if any construction works will be carried out for the access road and clearly state in the report for proper record.	The detail of construction works at the nearby local access roads are included in S3.3.2. Adverse noise impact arising from the road construction works is not anticipated.
EPD(3)	3. S.3.4.1 & 3.4.2 – The applicant shall also specify if there will be any worshipping activities held in the concerned site involving singing, playing music or using of PA system that would become a potential noise source to the nearby NSRs. Please clearly state in the report for proper record.	Section 3.4.1 has been amended to specify majority of worshipping activities will be conduct indoors with within the Grand Hall of the Supreme Kwan Ti as far as practicable. Some recommendation has been provided in Section 3.4.1. No PA system is required to be provided for the Proposed Development.
EPD(4)	4. S.3.4.2 – Noise measurement of the prevailing background noise level should be conducted to determine the applicable noise criteria (i.e. 5dB(A) below the ANL or prevailing background noise level) for their planned noise sources of the proposed M&E, ventilation & a/c equipment (with location and estimated quantity) and demonstrate how the HKPSG criteria can be met. Please supplement in the report for proper record.	As mentioned in Sections 3.4.3 and 3.4.4 of the EA Report, Air Conditioner type will be Window type, Split type and/or Variable Refrigerant Volume (“VRV”)/ Variable Refrigerant Flow (“VRF”). Noise arising from VRV would be insignificant. Quiet air conditioning system will be selected as far as practicable and will be located away from the nearest NSRs to minimise noise impact. On the other hand, M&E equipment will be enclosed in an M&E room. Thus, no adverse noise impact is anticipated from the enclosed M&E equipment. Nevertheless,

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses																																																					
		the equipment will be designed, selected and located during the detailed design stage to comply with the relevant HKPSG noise criteria and statutory requirements.																																																					
EPD(5)	5. S.3.4.5 – Noted that the application will involve an increase of coaches, shuttles, public and private vehicles using the access road. Please clarify if the increase in traffic flow to the access road will not induce a traffic noise impact to nearby NSRs. The applicant shall forecast the no. of vehicles using the access road, its distance with the nearby NSR, any fence wall/ barrier along the access road and review if the noise standards in Table 3-2 can be met. According to the S3.4.5, the applicant cannot demonstrate no adverse traffic noise impact to the surrounding NSR.	According to the Table 4.5 of the Traffic Impact Assessment (“TIA”) report (see below figure), the Proposed Development would generate an additional 6 coaches/hour during normal operation and 24 coaches/hour during ceremony/event days (two-way traffic). Also, TIA report has concluded that the additional traffic trips related to the Proposed Development can be absorbed by the nearby road network. Table 4.5 Estimated Trip Generations and Attractions of Proposed Development <table><tr><th rowspan="2">Normal (Non-Ceremony/Event) Day</th><th colspan="3">No. of Persons⁽¹⁾</th><th colspan="3">No. of 60-seater Coaches</th></tr><tr><th>Per Day</th><th>Per Hour</th><th>Max Per Hour [A]</th><th>(veh/hr/direction) [B]=[A]÷ (60x75%⁽²⁾)</th><th>(pcu/hr/direction) [B]x3⁽³⁾</th><th>Headway (min)</th></tr><tr><td>Visitors</td><td>1,000</td><td>125</td><td rowspan="2">125</td><td rowspan="2">3</td><td rowspan="2">9</td><td rowspan="2">20</td></tr><tr><td>Staff</td><td>60</td><td>N/A</td></tr></table> <table><tr><th rowspan="2">Ceremony/Event Day</th><th colspan="3">No. of Persons⁽¹⁾</th><th colspan="3">No. of 60-seater Coaches</th></tr><tr><th>Day</th><th>8am to 12pm</th><th>After 12pm</th><th>Max Per Hour [A]</th><th>(veh/hr/direction) [B]=[A]÷ (60x75%⁽²⁾)</th><th>(pcu/hr/direction) [B]x3⁽³⁾</th><th>Headway (min)</th></tr><tr><td>Visitors</td><td>4,000</td><td>2,000 (or 500 persons/hr)</td><td>2,000 (or 500 persons/hr)</td><td>500</td><td>12</td><td>36</td><td>5</td></tr><tr><td>Staff</td><td>150</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table> Notes: (1) From Section 2.2. (2) Assumed 75% occupancy of 60-seater coach. (3) PCU factor of 3 for hilly terrain as stipulated in TPDM Volume 2 Table 2.3.1.1. Given the relatively small increase in traffic flow on the existing road network, the corresponding increase in road traffic noise would be insignificant. Therefore, advice traffic noise impact arising from the project-generated traffic at nearby NSRs is not anticipated. Section 3.4.5 has been amended.	Normal (Non-Ceremony/Event) Day	No. of Persons ⁽¹⁾			No. of 60-seater Coaches			Per Day	Per Hour	Max Per Hour [A]	(veh/hr/direction) [B]=[A]÷ (60x75% ⁽²⁾)	(pcu/hr/direction) [B]x3 ⁽³⁾	Headway (min)	Visitors	1,000	125	125	3	9	20	Staff	60	N/A	Ceremony/Event Day	No. of Persons ⁽¹⁾			No. of 60-seater Coaches			Day	8am to 12pm	After 12pm	Max Per Hour [A]	(veh/hr/direction) [B]=[A]÷ (60x75% ⁽²⁾)	(pcu/hr/direction) [B]x3 ⁽³⁾	Headway (min)	Visitors	4,000	2,000 (or 500 persons/hr)	2,000 (or 500 persons/hr)	500	12	36	5	Staff	150	N/A	N/A				
Normal (Non-Ceremony/Event) Day	No. of Persons ⁽¹⁾			No. of 60-seater Coaches																																																			
	Per Day	Per Hour	Max Per Hour [A]	(veh/hr/direction) [B]=[A]÷ (60x75% ⁽²⁾)	(pcu/hr/direction) [B]x3 ⁽³⁾	Headway (min)																																																	
Visitors	1,000	125	125	3	9	20																																																	
Staff	60	N/A																																																					
Ceremony/Event Day	No. of Persons ⁽¹⁾			No. of 60-seater Coaches																																																			
	Day	8am to 12pm	After 12pm	Max Per Hour [A]	(veh/hr/direction) [B]=[A]÷ (60x75% ⁽²⁾)	(pcu/hr/direction) [B]x3 ⁽³⁾	Headway (min)																																																
Visitors	4,000	2,000 (or 500 persons/hr)	2,000 (or 500 persons/hr)	500	12	36	5																																																
Staff	150	N/A	N/A																																																				

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
EPD(6)	Waste management & Sewerage <u>On EA- Waste Management</u> 6. S.5.3.8: it is mentioned that the waste index for “private housing projects” is adopted for estimating waste generation. However, in para.5.3.9, 5.3.10, 5.3.20, and 5.3.21 the waste index for “commercial office projects” is applied instead. Please clarify and revise Table 5-1 and 5-2, if needed.	The waste index for “commercial office projects” is applied for estimating waste generation in para.5.3.9, 5.3.10, 5.3.20, and 5.3.21. Table 5-1 and 5-2 are showing the waste generated using the same waste index. Section 5.3.8 has been amended.
EPD(7)	7. S.5.3.24: should read “Timber and woody materials generated from tree felling works will be sent to the Yard Waste Recycling Centre in Y.PARK ...	Section 5.3.24 has been amended.
EPD(8)	<u>On SIA</u> 8. Table 3.1 and Appendix A: according to Table 4.2 of the Planning Statement, it is noted that there will be a “Dormitory for Religious Practitioners” in Block B serving around 10 people. In relation to this dormitory, please: (i) confirm whether there will also be a canteen with kitchen staff serving these 10 people and other personnel at the institution; and (ii) take into account the sewage generated from the dormitory and the canteen (if any) in the calculation of sewage generation.	(i) In relation to dormitory for religious practitioners, only a pantry will be provided. No cooking activities or canteen serving food will be provided. (ii) The sewage generation calculation has been updated to include wastewater generated from the dormitory. The revised Sewerage Impact Assessment is attached in Attachment 5.
EPD(9)	Water Quality <u>General comments</u> 9. It is noted that the proposed development proposes either on-site septic tank/soakaway system (ST/S) or sewage holding tank with tanker away arrangement. If ST/S is implemented,	Section 4.5.2 clearly stated out the requirement of constructing the onsite ST/S and the responsibility of applicants.

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
	the applicant should ensure that the design, construction, operation and maintenance of the on-site STS comply with the requirements under ProPECC PN 1/23, and which should be duly certified by an Authorised Person. The applicant's attention is particularly drawn to the percolation test and minimum clearance distance requirements, and no overflow should be allowed.	
EPD(10)	10. Please clarify whether the operation of the smokeless joss paper furnace would generate any wastewater from the air pollution control equipment. If wastewater would be generated, the design, construction, operation and maintenance of the sewage disposal facilities should take this wastewater stream into account. Please also be reminded that the discharge of such wastewater is subject to WPCO control.	It is noted that the wastewater generated from the smokeless joss paper furnace would be separately collected and tankered away for off-site treatment and disposal. Such wastewater will not be discharged into the sewerage holding tanks and ST/S system and has therefore not been included in this assessment calculation.
EPD(11)	<u>Comments on Planning Statement</u> 11. S.4.3(c) - With reference to the SIA, suggest to clarify whether normal days have 1,000 visitors and festival days have 4,000 visitors in total.	With reference to Table 2.1 of TIA report (see below figure), the maximum no. of visitor is 1,000 during normal days and 4000 on festival

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses										
		days. 2.2 Proposed Development 2.2.1 The development schedule for the proposed development is summarized in Table 2.1. Table 2.1 Development Parameters <table><tr><th>Site Location</th><th>Tai Tong, Yuen Long</th></tr><tr><td>Proposed Rezoning Site Area</td><td>~18,325m²</td></tr><tr><td>Total GFA</td><td>~12,756m²</td></tr><tr><td>Estimated no. of Visitors and Staff on Normal (Non-Ceremony/Event) Day</td><td>Visitors: ~100 to ~1,000 Staff: ~20 to ~60⁽¹⁾</td></tr><tr><td>Estimated no. of Visitors and Staff on Ceremony/Event Day</td><td>Visitors: ~4,000 Staff: ~150</td></tr></table> Note: (1) Depending on the type of activities available and bookings.	Site Location	Tai Tong, Yuen Long	Proposed Rezoning Site Area	~18,325m ²	Total GFA	~12,756m ²	Estimated no. of Visitors and Staff on Normal (Non-Ceremony/Event) Day	Visitors: ~100 to ~1,000 Staff: ~20 to ~60 ⁽¹⁾	Estimated no. of Visitors and Staff on Ceremony/Event Day	Visitors: ~4,000 Staff: ~150
Site Location	Tai Tong, Yuen Long											
Proposed Rezoning Site Area	~18,325m ²											
Total GFA	~12,756m ²											
Estimated no. of Visitors and Staff on Normal (Non-Ceremony/Event) Day	Visitors: ~100 to ~1,000 Staff: ~20 to ~60 ⁽¹⁾											
Estimated no. of Visitors and Staff on Ceremony/Event Day	Visitors: ~4,000 Staff: ~150											
EPD(12)	12. S.5.4 - (a) Suggest to clarify that stormwater runoff will be discharged to the stream after passing through silt/sand traps. (b) Suggest to include the tankering away option as well.	(a) The stormwater runoff will be discharged to the stream after passing through silt/sand traps. (b) The tankering away option is included. Replacement pages of the Planning Statement are attached in Attachment 1.										
EPD(13)	<u>Comments on Environmental Assessment</u> 13. S.4.5.1 - Please review if it should be “...on normal days and 52.4m3/day on ceremony/event days...”.	The sentence has been reviewed. The ADWF has been updated in S.4.5.1.										

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
EPD(14)	14. S.4.6.1 - Suggest to clarify “4.4.74.4.5”.	Typo. Text “4.4.5” has been deleted.
EPD(15)	15. S.4.6.3 and S.7.1.9 - Suggest to include the tankering away option as well.	The tankering away option as well has been included in S.4.6.3 and S.7.1.9.
EPD(16)	16. S.7.1.9 - Suggest to clarify that stormwater runoff will be discharged to the stream after passing through silt/sand traps.	The stormwater runoff will be discharged to the stream after passing through silt/sand traps. S.7.1.9 has been amended.
EPD(17)	<u>Comments on SIA</u> 17. S.3.2.7 - With reference to S.2.2.3, suggest to incorporate tankering away for off-site disposal.	Noted. S.3.2.7 has been amended.
EPD(18)	Air Quality 18. Section 2.3.1- Please revise “study area” in line 1 to “assessment area”. Same comment for the title of Table 2-4.	Noted. S2.3.1 and Table 2-4 title have been amended.
EPD(19)	19. Section 2.4.3 - Please revise “is expected to be minimal” in line 2 to “can be controlled with the implementation of mitigation measures as detailed in paragraphs 2.4.6 to 2.4.8”.	Noted. S2.4.3 is revised.
EPD(20)	20. Section 2.4.4 - Please supplement that in any case, close liaison with the contractors of all concurrent projects will be maintained to avoid overlapping of heavy or dusty construction works as far as practicable in order to minimize the potential cumulative impacts.	The sentence has been supplemented in S2.4.4.

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
EPD(21)	21. Section 2.4.5 - (a) Please revise “(emission)” in line 2 to “(Emission)”. Also please note that it should be “Air Pollution Control (Fuel Restriction) Regulations”. Same comment for paragraphs 2.4.7 and 2.4.8. (b) Please delete “dust” in line 4, and add “as detailed in paragraphs 2.4.6 to 2.4.8” after “good practices”.	(a) Noted. The regulations in S2.4.5, 2.4.7 and 2.4.8 are revised. (b) The sentence is amended.
EPD(22)	22. Section 2.5.1 - (a) Please revise “is not concerned in this case” in line 5 to “can be fulfilled”. (b) We would like to remind the applicant that it should be the responsibility of the applicant and their consultant to ensure the validity of the chimney data. Should the information of industrial chimneys be subsequently found to be incorrect, the assessment results as presented in the submission would be invalidated.	(a) Section 2.5.1 is revised. (b) Noted. Based on best available data from HKED, google maps and site visit in 2025, there is no industrial chimney identified within 500m buffer area from the Project site.
EPD(23)	23. Section 2.5.4 - (a) Please note that there shall be no air-sensitive use including openable window, fresh air intake and recreational use in open space within the buffer zone of the local access road, otherwise it cannot be concluded that no adverse air quality impact is anticipated.	(a) Noted.

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
	(b) For Comment #23(a) above, it cannot be concluded that no adverse air quality impact is anticipated on ASR 12 if its clerestory windows can be opened even if they will not be expected to be opened very often. In order to justify there is no adverse air quality impact anticipated at this stage in the submission, road alignment should be adjusted such that there is no air-sensitive use within the buffer zone, otherwise detailed/quantitative assessment will be required to demonstrate the acceptability of the air quality impact. Please critically review and supplement. (c) Subject to the response to Comment #23(b) above, please provide an additional figure or a zoom-in figure in Figure 2-2 to clearly indicate the portion of ASR 12 falling within the buffer zone.	(b) As confirmed with the Applicant, the clerestory windows are for maintenance purpose only; it will not be opened during the normal operation of the recreational use at ASR 12 nearby in the local access roads. Thus, no adverse air quality impact is anticipated at this stage in the submission. (c) A zoom-in figure for ASR 12 has been provided in Figure 2-2.
EPD(24)	24. Section 2.5.7 - (a) For the 7th bullet, please advise if the 1st sentence "On occasion, no more than 80 kg/hour of joss paper and no more than 10 kg/hour will be treated/burnt in event and normal days." can be revised as "In any case, no more than 80 kg/hour and 10 kg/hour of joss papers will be treated/burnt in event and normal days respectively." (b) Please revise "which" in line 3 of the 4th bullet to "and its location and exhaust direction", and add "as shown in Figure 2-3" after "Court" at the end of the sentence.	(a) The 7th point has been amended. (b) The sentence has been revised.

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
EPD(25)	25. Section 2.5.8 - (a) Please add “, in order to avoid overloading” after “for this case” in the 1st bullet. (b) Please add “incense/joss paper” after “smokeless” in the 6th bullet.	(a) The sentence has been amended. (b) The sentence has been amended.
EPD(26)	26. Section 2.5.10 - (a) Please revise “It is expected to achieve” in line 11 to “The deodourization unit shall achieve at least”. (b) The location and direction of the exhaust outlet is close to ASR 13 as shown in Figure 2-1, please consider if there is any alternative location.	(a) The sentence has been amended in Section 2.5.11. (b) Exhaust air from the sewage holding or septic tanks will be routed to deodourization unit equipped with activated carbon filtration prior to discharge to the atmosphere, no adverse odour impact from on nearby ASRs is anticipated.
EPD(27)	27. Section 2.6.2 - Please add “local” before “access” in line 7. Also please ensure it is presented consistently in the whole chapter since some other terms have been found (e.g. access road in Section 2.5.3, Proposed Access Road in Figure 2-1, Access Road in Figure 2-2, etc.).	The wordings in Section 2.5.3, 2.6.2, Figure 2-1, Figure 2-2 has been amended.
EPD(28)	28. Section 2.6.3 - Please revise “approximately” in line 5 to “at least”.	The sentence has been amended.
EPD(29)	29. Figure 2-1 - The legend box covered the location of ASR 9, please update.	Figure 2-1 has been amended.

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
EPD(30)	30. Figure 2-2 - Please supplement the boundary of Site area to clearly demonstrate there is no air-sensitive use of the proposed development within the buffer zone.	Figure 2-2 is amended. As stated in Section 2.5.4, the windows of ASR12 facing toward to the road route will not be opened in normal use and are for maintenance purpose, therefore no air sensitive use is anticipated within the buffer zone.
EPD(31)	31. Section 7.1.4 - Please revise “on” in line 1 to “associated with”, and add “during operation phase” after “anticipated”.	The sentence in S7.1.4. has been amended.
EPD(32)	32. Please highlight all the changes/amendments in the next submission.	Noted.

1.5 Responses to Comments from Buildings Department (BD)

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
BD(1)	2. It is noted that 5 structures and associated excavation and filling of land are proposed in your application. Before any new building works (including containers / open sheds as temporary buildings, demolition and land filling, etc.) are to be carried out on application site, prior approval and consent of the BA should be obtained; otherwise they are unauthorized building works (UBW) under the Buildings Ordinance (BO). An Authorized Person should be appointed as the co-ordinator for the proposed building works in accordance with the BO.	Noted.
BD(3)	<u>Part B: Advisory Comments for the Applicant</u> The applicant's attention is drawn to the following points: (a) the site shall be provided with means of obtaining access thereto from a street and emergency vehicular access in accordance with Regulations 5 and 41D of the Building (Planning) Regulations [B(P)R] respectively;	Noted.
BD(4)	(b) the site abuts on a specified street of not less than 4.5m wide and its permitted development intensity shall be determined under Regulation 19(3) of the B(P)R at building plan submission stage;	Noted.
BD(5)	(c) if the proposed plot ratio is based on the assumption that Gross Floor Area (GFA) concession will be granted, the pre-requisites for GFA concession in Practice Notes for	Noted.

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
	Authorized Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers (PNAP) APP-151 and the Sustainable Building Design guideline stipulated in PNAP APP-152 should be complied with;	
BD(6)	(d) carparking, loading and unloading areas if intend to be excluded from GFA calculation under B.O. shall comply with the criteria set out in PNAP APP-2 and APP-111 during the building plan submission stage;	Noted.
BD(7)	(e) if the existing structures are erected on leased land without the approval of the BA, they are UBW under the BO and should not be designated for any proposed use under the captioned application;	Noted.
BD(8)	(f) for UBW erected on leased land, enforcement action may be taken by the Buildings Department to effect their removal in accordance with the prevailing enforcement policy against UBW as and when necessary. The granting of any planning approval should not be construed as an acceptance of any existing building works or UBW on the application site under the BO;	Noted.
BD(9)	(g) detailed comments under the BO will be provided at building plan submission stage.	Noted.

1.6 Responses to Comments from Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
AFCD(1)	He has no objection to the application.	Noted.
AFCD(2)	Specific comments on the EcolA: - Tai Tong Egretty (Wong Nai Tun) should be referred to as Tai Tong Egretty (inactive) to avoid confusion with Tai Tong Egretty 3 (Wong Nai Tun) (active).	Noted and revised accordingly. The indicative location of Tai Tong Egretty 3 (Wong Nai Tun) (active) is also showed in Figure 2.1 now (see Attachment 7).
AFCD(3)	- The EcolA should include assessment and information of Tai Tong Egretty 3 (Wong Nai Tun) (which was discovered in 2023 and still active in 2026). Given the 700m distance between the proposed development and active Tai Tong 3 (Wong Nai Tun) Egretty, the indirect disturbance (noise and fragmentation of flightline) on the active egretty is not expected to be significant.	Noted, information of Tai Tong Egretty 3 (Wong Nai Tun) is described in S4.1.6 to S4.1.7. The indirect impact to active Tai Tong 3 (Wong Nai Tun) Egretty is evaluated in S.6.3.10 and S.6.4.14 (see Attachment 7).

1.7 Responses to Comments from Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD)

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
FEHD(1)	No Food and Environmental Hygiene Department's (FEHD) facilities should be affected.	Noted.
FEHD(2)	Proper licence / permit issued by this Department is required if there is any food business / catering service / activities regulated by the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene (DFEH) under the Public Health and Municipal Services Ordinance (Cap. 132) and other relevant legislation for the public. In accordance with the Public Health and Municipal Services Ordinance (Cap. 132) and the Food Business Regulation (Cap. 132X), a food business licence shall be obtained for any premises intended to operate the relevant type of food business (e.g. restaurant, food factory, fresh provision shop, etc.) listed in the Regulation. The application for licence, if acceptable by the FEHD, will be referred to relevant government departments such as the Buildings Department, Fire Services Department and Planning Department for comment. If there is no objection from the departments concerned, a letter of requirements will be issued to the applicant for compliance and the licence will be issued upon compliance of all the requirements.	We would like to clarify that no canteen provided foods to the outsiders with payment will be provided within the proposed development.
FEHD(3)	Proper licence issued by this Department is required if related place of entertainment is involved. Any person who desires to keep or use any place of public entertainment for example a theatre and cinema or a place, building, erection or structure,	We would like to clarify that no place of entertainment to visitors with payment will be provided within the proposed development.

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
	whether temporary or permanent, on one occasion or more, capable of accommodating the public presenting or carrying on public entertainment within Places of Public entertainment (PPE) Ordinance (Cap. 172) and its subsidiary legislation, such as a concert, opera, ballet, stage performance or other musical, dramatic or theatrical entertainment, cinematograph or laser projection display, a circus, a lecture or story-telling, an exhibition of any 1 or more of the following, namely, pictures, photographs, books, manuscripts or other documents or other things, a sporting exhibition or contest, a bazaar, a dance party or an amusement ride and mechanical device which is designed for amusement, a Place of Public Entertainment Licence (or Temporary Place of Public Entertainment Licence) should be obtained from FEHD whatever the general public is admitted with or without payment.	
FEHD(4)	There should be no encroachment on the public place and no environmental nuisance should be generated to the surroundings. Its state should not be a nuisance or injurious or dangerous to health and surrounding environment. Also, for any waste generated from such activities/ operation, the applicant should arrange disposal properly at their own expenses.	Noted.
FEHD(5)	The applicant shall conduct, by all practical means, pest control measures to avoid infestation of pest including mosquitos and rodents at the site and its surroundings.	Noted.

1.8 Responses to Comments from Urban Design Unit (UD), Planning Department

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
UD(1)	(m) We have no adverse comments on the application from urban design and visual impact perspectives. Our detailed comments are as follows:	Noted.
UD(2)	(i) the application site (the Site) is situated at a foothill area mainly surrounded by vegetated slopes and some rural settlements/temporary structures with existing building heights (BHs) ranging from about 18mPD to 34mPD/1 to 3 storeys (Po Leung Kuk Jockey Club Tai Tong Holiday Camp and Agriculture Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) ; Tai Tong Forest Nursey and Tai Lam Country Park Tai Tong Management Centre with BH up to about 151mPD/1 storey are located to its further east on higher topographical levels). The proposed development is considered not incompatible with the surrounding setting;	Noted.
UD(3)	(ii) according to the submitted Visual Impact Assessment (VIA), the proposed development would have visual impacts ranging from “negligible” to “slightly adverse” at most of the ten selected public viewing points (VPs) and “moderately adverse” at two VPs given their relatively close proximity to the proposed development, which concludes that significant adverse visual impacts are not anticipated;	Noted.

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant’s Responses
UD(4)	(iii) various design measures including adoption of stepped BH, building setbacks and landscape treatments are considered to have urban design merits;	Noted.
UD(5)	<u>VIA</u> (n) it is noted that the VIA was prepared based on Town Planning Board Guidelines (TPB-PG) No. 41 which has been streamlined and superseded by TPB PG-No. 41A. The overall visual impacts for VPs 1 to 10 should read “negligible”, “slight”, or “moderate” to tally with those ratings as set out in the prevailing guidelines.	Noted, the report has been checked and revised according to TPB PG-No.41A. The overall visual impact for all VPs has been revised to negligible, slight, or moderate correspondingly (see Attachment 2).

1.9 Responses to Comments from Landscape Unit (LU), Planning Department

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
LU(1)	(a) We have no adverse comments on the s.12A application from landscape planning perspective. Our detailed comments are as follows:	Noted.
LU(2)	(i) according to the aerial photo taken in 2025, the Site was situated in an area of settled valley landscape character comprising temporary structures, farmlands, burial grounds and woodlands. The proposed development is considered not entirely incompatible with the landscape character of the surrounding areas;	Noted.
LU(3)	(ii) based on above aerial photo and the site photos taken on 31.10.2025 by DPO, the northern and western portions of the Site zoned “Recreation” were largely formed, and some existing trees and temporary structures were observed on it. Scattered tree groups were observed on the remaining portion of the Site zoned “Green Belt” (“GB”), which was located at the fringe of the wider “GB” zone to the east;	Noted.
LU(4)	(iii) according to the submitted Planning Statement and Landscape Master Plan (Appendix VI), among the 309 trees surveyed within the application site, 205 trees are proposed to be removed and two are proposed to be transplanted. New tree planting at a 1:1 compensation ratio is proposed, with 203 new trees are proposed within	Noted.

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
	the Site and 111 new trees are proposed adjacent to the Site;	
LU(5)	(iv) with reference to Para 8.4 of Landscape Master Plan, three trees of particular interest (Michelia × alba 白蘭) were found, one is proposed to be retained and two are proposed to be transplanted; and	Noted, the three small trees of species Michelia x alba are identified within the application site, which is generally protected under Cap. 96 except for “plants grown outside Hong Kong or on any land held from the Government under a lease, licence or permit or by virtue of an Ordinance”. The three trees are located next to the footpath and are likely to have been planted for ornamental purpose and therefore are not considered to be covered by the intent of the regulations. These are small trees lacking outstanding features of size or form and thus would not be considered trees of particular interest. Details of the trees are described and illustrated in Para. 8.4 and Figure 8.1 of the LMP report (see Attachment 2).
LU(6)	(v) in view of the above, significant adverse landscape impact arising from the proposed rezoning is not anticipated.	Noted.
LU(7)	<u>Advisory Comments</u> (b) in the Planning Statement, discrepancies are observed between Plan E-1: Master Layout Plan and Plan O: Landscape Master Plan on the area of green coverage at Kwan Ti Square and the area of green roof at the northern entrance.	The area of green roof at the northern entrance has been updated such that green coverage and the LMP plans correspond. The Master Layout Plan has also been updated to align with the Landscape Master Plan.
LU(8)	(c) The applicant is advised that approval of the application does not imply approval of tree works such as pruning, transplanting	Noted.

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
	and felling. Application for any tree works should be submitted to relevant departments for approval.	
LU(9)	(d) For compliance of site coverage of greenery requirement under PNAP APP-152, submission should be made to Buildings Department for comments and approval.	Noted.

1.10 Responses to Comments from District Planning Office (DPO), Planning Department

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant’s Responses
DPO(1)	<u>General Comments:</u> 1. Please provide further planning justifications to support the use of a substantial portion of Government Land for a development of this scale, if any. Justifications should extend beyond ‘Fung Shui’ considerations.	As set out in the Planning Statement, the Applicant is a charitable religious institution recognised under section 88 of the Inland Revenue Ordinance, committed to promoting traditional Chinese culture. In conceptualising the establishment of a prominent Kwan Ti Temple in Hong Kong, the Applicant identified Tai Tong as a suitable location, noting the presence of an existing Tai Tong Kwan Ti Square. Extensive consultation was undertaken with relevant stakeholders, including Tai Tong EcoPark, Village Representatives, and District Councillors, all of whom expressed support for the proposed development. With the engagement of a professional consultant team, the subject location has been assessed as optimal for a development of this scale. The use of a substantial portion of Government land is considered necessary to create a landmark of cultural and social significance, a view echoed by the Home and Youth Affairs Bureau in its positive response. The key reasons are summarised as follows: 1. Continuation of existing use: The proposed Temple represents a natural extension of the existing Tai Tong Kwan Ti Square, reinforcing the cultural identity of the area. 2. Utilization of vacant land: The Government land in question is currently vacant. The Applicant acknowledges that land administration procedures and fees will apply, and is prepared to comply fully.

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
		3. Geotechnical feasibility: The application site is the only location in the vicinity that is geotechnically suitable. Alternative sites are either too hilly, already occupied by existing structures, or subject to complex land status constraints. Finally, it is noted that there are precedent cases where Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) have received policy support to establish social facilities on Government land, such as the SPCA development in Tsing Yi. The Applicant submits that the proposed Temple similarly serves the public interest by providing cultural, religious, and community benefits, and therefore merits favourable consideration. The proposed Supreme Kwan Ti Temple will be a landmark of national and global significance, anticipated to be the grandest of its kind in the coming decade. Rooted in the Kwan Ti Spirit of loyalty, bravery, benevolence, and trustworthiness, the Temple aims to unite worshippers across southern China, Taiwan, Southeast Asia, and beyond, fostering cultural and spiritual cohesion. The existing Kwan Ti Square in Tai Tong has already established its relevance, attracting a steady stream of worshippers and visitors for many years. Building upon this foundation, the proposed Temple at the current application site will be well positioned to cater the existing visitors and future anticipated visitors and quickly establish its importance and reputation as a premier religious and cultural destination, which is also in line with the Government Policy and Planning Regime discussed in Section 6.3 of the Planning Statement.

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
DPO(2)	2. Please demonstrate the planning gains and design merits of the proposed rezoning application beyond “feng shui” consideration, if any, and please submit a drawing similar to the LMP that clearly indicate the design merit.	The proposed development will deliver tangible planning benefits to the surrounding community. Specifically, the proposed development will facilitate road improvement works to the current village track, thereby enhancing access and circulation for neighbouring stakeholders. In addition, the currently vacant and neglected area will be transformed into a managed and orderly site, contributing positively to the local environment. From a design perspective, the proposal incorporates a comprehensive landscape plan, including compensatory tree planting. This will upgrade the existing rural and unkempt appearance, creating a greener, more visually appealing setting. The enhanced landscaping will not only improve the immediate impression of the area but also provide a buffer that integrates the development harmoniously with its surroundings.
DPO(3)	3. Please review if the building height of Block A should be determined based on main roof level 38.75 mPD instead of top roof level 39.75 mPD. Planning statement and application forms should be revised accordingly if applicable.	Noted. Building height of Block A in Table 4.1 of the Planning Statement and the application form has been revised to 38.75mPD (see Attachment 1).
DPO(4)	4. According to the Section Plan, it is noted that the level of upper podium range from 37.55 mPD to 38 mPD. Please clarify the upper podium level.	In clarification of the Section Plan, the upper podium level is confirmed to be 38 mPD. This level has been adopted as the platform for the Grand Hall of the Supreme Kwan Ti, which constitutes the principal structure on the upper podium.

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
DPO(5)	5. Please advise (a) if any shop and services/ retail use will be involved on-site. (b) whether the dormitory for religious practitioners will be used for accommodating external visitors and monks/priests; and details of its operational arrangement (e.g. charges, by reservation etc.). (c) whether catering service will be provided to external visitors, apart from canteen and tea gallery, whether any eating place use will be located.	Our responses are as follows:- (a) No shop and services/ retail use will be involved on-site. (b) No dormitory for religious practitioners will be used for accommodating external visitors and monks/priests. (c) No catering service will be provided to external visitors, apart the proposed tea gallery, and no eating place use will be located.
DPO(6)	6. It is noted that the applicant proposes to rezone the application site from "REC" and "GB" to "G/IC" zone with a building height restriction of 5 storeys imposed in the proposed "G/IC" zone. a. The applicant has not adequately justified the proposed schedule of uses which includes uses that are not considered directly relevant to the provision of a religious institution, provided that the site is situated in a rural fringe area in close proximity to the Tai Lam Country Park (approximately <100m south of the site) and GB zone.	Correct. (a) Based on similar developments, it is noted that most religious institutions such as Ten Thousand Buddhas Monastery or Wong Tai Sin Temple, are accommodated within the General "G/IC" zone, which provides an appropriate planning framework to regulate such developments. Nevertheless, should the TPB or relevant government departments consider it more appropriate, the Applicant has no objection to the designation of a sub-zone of "G/IC" (e.g. "G/IC(2)"), with the Notes of the sub-zone expressly limiting the permitted uses to religious and ancillary facilities for the proposed Supreme Kwan Ti Temple. This

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
	b. Please consider if other development restrictions (e.g. Site coverage, building height restriction in terms of mPD, Plot Ratio, GFA) could be stipulated to ensure the compatibility with the surrounding rural settings. c. Please review if the proposed planning intention align with the proposed development of a religious institution for cultural and religious use. d. Please supplement a proposed amendment to the Explanatory Statement of the OZP.	approach would ensure that the development remains directly relevant to the provision of a religious institution, while addressing concerns regarding compatibility with the surrounding rural and conservation context. (b) Based on precedent cases and the established religious institutions within G/IC sub-zones, it is noted that restrictions on building height and gross floor area (GFA) are commonly imposed to ensure compatibility with surrounding settings, but at the same to provide flexibility for the project proponent to further enhancing the design and facilities of the temple at the detailed design stage. Therefore, the Applicant has no objection to the imposition of similar restrictions should the relevant departments deem them necessary. (c) The Applicant considers planning intention align with the proposed development of a religious institution for cultural and religious use. (d) Noted. A proposed amendment to the Explanatory Statement of the OZP is attached in Attachment 1 for TPB's consideration.
DPO(7)	7. It is noted that: (i) certain portions of land zoned “REC” to the north and northeast of the application site would be physically separated from the main “REC” zone by the application	Our responses are as follows:- (i) As detailed in Section 2.3 of the Planning Statement, the subject “REC” zones were rezoned from “AGR” and “GB” in 1998 to facilitate the provision of a rural theme park, namely the Tai Tong

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
	site and the proposed road improvement area; and (ii) certain portions of land zoned “GB” to the north and east of the application site would likewise be physically separated from the main “GB” zone. Please clarify why these land lots are excluded from the application site and demonstrate that the proposed development and road improvement area would not frustrate the planning intentions of the severed “REC” and “GB” areas.	EcoPark. The operator of the EcoPark has expressed support for the proposed Temple, confirming compatibility between the two uses. It is further noted that the land zoned “REC” to the north and northeast of the application site currently forms part of the existing village track. As such, the said severed “REC” portions no longer function effectively for recreational purposes. Should the relevant departments deem it appropriate, the Applicant has no objection to the rezoning of the said area to a more suitable land use designation, thereby ensuring planning consistency and avoiding fragmentation of the “REC” zone. (ii) The said portions of land zoned “GB” are currently vacant and vegetated, containing existing trees and natural greenery. These areas will remain in their natural state, consistent with the planning intention of the “GB” zone, which is to preserve natural features and define the limits of urban and suburban development. Accordingly, the proposed development will not alter the vegetated character of these said “GB” portions, and their continued preservation ensures compatibility with the broader planning objectives of the zone. These portions were intentionally excluded from the application site, as no structures or amendments are proposed within them, and to maintain a more regular and coherent boundary for the rezoning area.

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
DPO(8)	8. Apart from the access road improvement area, please clarify if there are any pedestrian access connecting the Site and the adjacent recreational facilities.	Please be clarified that there are pedestrian access connecting the application site and the adjacent recreational facilities.
DPO(9)	9. Please clarify any interface issues between the proposed development and (i) the recreational facilities in the surrounding and Tai Tong Ecopark and (ii) the severed “REC” and “GB” areas as mentioned in (7). Any mitigation measures, if any, to address the interface issues identified:(i) design measures (e.g. building design, boundary treatments, greenery provision) and/or (ii) operational arrangements.	No adverse interface issues are anticipated, as the proposed development is conceived as an extension of the existing Tai Tong Kwan Ti Square, thereby reinforcing the cultural identity of the area. The operator of the Tai Tong EcoPark has expressed support for the proposal, noting that the Temple and EcoPark together can generate synergy with surrounding recreational facilities, enhancing the overall visitor experience. From a design perspective, the proposal incorporates a comprehensive landscape scheme, including compensatory tree planting and boundary treatments, which will integrate the development harmoniously with its surroundings. The Urban Design Unit and Landscape Unit of Planning Department have both raised no adverse comments on the application, confirming that the project is acceptable from an urban design, visual impact, and landscape planning perspective. Operationally, the Temple's activities will be managed to complement nearby recreational uses, ensuring that the development functions as a compatible cultural landmark within the neighbouring uses.
DPO(10)	10. Please advise whether the Kwan Ti Statue in the Tai Tong Kwan Ti Square Area will be preserved while a new 18m Kwan Ti Statue will be constructed within the Grand Hall.	Yes, the existing Kwan Ti Statue in the Tai Tong Kwan Ti Square will remain.

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
DPO(11)	<u>Specific Comments:</u> 1. Planning statement P.11 – Please further clarify the purpose of non-building area and clearly indicate the non-building area in the relevant plans if applicable.	The portion of land located to the southeast of the Tai Tong Kwan Ti Square has been included within the rezoning boundary to achieve a more cohesive zoning configuration. This area is designated as a non-building area and will be reserved solely for access and tree planting (See figure below). All existing trees within this area will be retained in-situ, thereby preserving its vegetated character and ensuring compatibility with the surrounding rural setting.

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
DPO(12)	2. Planning Statement P.14 – Please clarify number of visitors in normal days (in terms of per days / per hours).	During normal days, the Temple will host guided tours, exhibitions, and performances, each lasting approximately one to two hours per session. Based on the Applicant's prior experience, the average daily attendance is expected to be around 1,000 visitors, equivalent to approximately 50–100 visitors per hour during the Temple's operating hours of 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.
DPO(13)	3. Planning Statement Section 4.3 & 4.5 – According to planning statement and TIA, noting that there are greater number of visitors in ceremony/ festive days, please advise if there are any traffic and crowd management for the operation during ceremony/ festive days.	Please be advised that in view of the remote location of the proposed development, the operator would provide 60-seater coaches with stop near Long Ping Station for staff and visitors for Normal (Non-Ceremony/Event) Day and Ceremony/Event Day. Activities of the proposed development require pre-booking and the use of coach provided by the operator to/from the proposed development. Please refer to Section 2.2 and Section 2.4 of the TIA report for details.
DPO(14)	4. Planning Statement Section 4.5 – Please clarify the open-access arrangement of the widened access road and the maintenance and management responsibilities upon completion of improvement works.	Subject to discussion with relevant government departments in the detail design stage, if deem necessary, the Applicant is willing to take responsibility on the maintenance and management responsibilities upon completion of improvement works.
DPO(15)	5. Planning Statement P.13 (GFA breakdown) – Please include the corresponding block for covered walkway + eaves that could possibly grant GFA exemption: - Blk A: Gate of Unity + Gate of Harmony and Covered Walkway - Blk B: Covered Walkway + Gate of Divinity	Noted. The table in page 13 of the Planning Statement has been revised accordingly (see Attachment 1).

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
	- Blk C: Grand Hall of the Supreme Kwan Ti - Blk D: Scripture Library	
DPO(16)	6. Planning Statement P.43 (Minimum Tree Felling and Excavation Works within “GB” Zone) - Please clearly indicate what the percentages refer to (e.g. land filling, excavation, etc.), and whether they relate to the entire zone or the entire site. For clarity, please also provide the corresponding areas in square meters.	Noted. Page 43 has been revised accordingly as follows (also see Attachment 1):- <i>According to Plan X, it only represents about 39.4% (about 2,313m² of the about 5871.49m² “GB” zone involved in the Application Site) in which over 32% (1,883m²) is minor excavation for foundation purpose and about 17% (about 1,000m² of the “GB” zone involved in the Application Site) of landfill respectively of the entire “GB” area.</i>
DPO(17)	7. Plan B – Please clearly indicate the Tai Lam Country Park, Tai Tong Shan Road and K66 bus stop in the plan.	Noted. In view of the size and scale limitation in Plan B, Tai Lam Country Park, Tai Tong Shan Road and K6 bus stop have been indicated in Plan A instead (see Attachment 1).

1.11 Responses to Comments from Head of the Geotechnical Engineering Office (GEO), Civil Engineering and Development Department

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
GEO(1)	Additional extent (northern hatched portion) in this application compared to the previous GPRR submission in s.16 of the Town Planning Ordinance is generally flat land. Mitigation works can still be carried out at the southern hatched portion, if find necessary. The proposed slope works in Table 6.1 and 6.2 are the same as the previous GPRR submission for s.16 application. As such, this Office has no further geotechnical comment on the captioned GPRR.	Noted. The area affecting or being affected by the development permanently or temporarily during demolition & construction works shall be assessed & monitored. Mitigation works shall be proposed and carried out as necessary.

1.12 Responses to Comments from Chief Geotechnical Engineer/ Slope Maintenance (SM), LandsD

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
SM(1)	According to Geotechnical Planning Review Report (GPRR) prepared by Greg Wong & Associated Limited, there are 7 numbers of existing slopes (Feature Nos. 6NW-D/C163, 6NW-D/C165, 6NW-D/C196, 6NW-D/F96 (Sub-division No. 1), 6SW-B/C56 (Sub-division No. 2), 6SW-B/C57 and 6SW-B/C273) which are currently maintained by LandsD are within or in close proximity to the site area. The GPRR indicates that stability of these existing slopes will be assessed and remedial works will be carried out if found necessary under this development. On this basis, I have no comment on the proposed application from slope maintenance point of view.	Noted. The slope affected or being affected by the proposed development/ works shall be assessed under detail design stage.

1.13 Responses to Comments from Responses to Comments from Other Departments

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
-	The following department has no comment on the S.12A application: - Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department - Chief Engineer / Construction, Water Supplies Department - Project Manger (West), Civil Engineering and Development Department - Director of Leisure and Cultural Services - Chief Architect/Advisory and Statutory Compliance, Architectural Services Department - Head(Intangible Cultural Heritage), Leisure and Cultural Services Department - Commissioner of Police	Noted.