

**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 (II)



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 II

Responses to Departmental Comments

- 1.1 Responses to Comments from Transport Department
- 1.2 Responses to Comments from District Office, Home Affairs Department
- 1.3 Responses to Comments from Electrical and Mechanical Services Department
- 1.4 Responses to Comments from Drainage Services Department
- 1.5 Responses to Comments from Environmental Protection Department
- 1.6 Responses to Comments from Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department

Attachment 1: Replacement Pages of the Planning Statement

Attachment 2: Revised Environmental Assessment

Attachment 3: Revised Drainage Impact Assessment

Attachment 4: Revised Pages of the 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 Transport Department (TD)

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
TD(1)	She has no objection in principle to the captioned application, subject to the applicant undertaking the design and construction of the proposed road improvement works and liaising with LandsD to resolve the right-of-way issues.	Noted.
TD(2)	As remarks, please note the following:- i) The requirement to design and implement the proposed road improvement works, along the access road connecting Tai Tong Shan Road and the subject development to the satisfaction of relevant government departments, shall be addressed during the lease formulation stage. ii) The proposed road improvement works which widening the existing carriageway to 6m wide to accommodate 2-way traffic does not comply with TPDM's requirement and the extent of the road improvement works involves private lands lots. In this connection, TD will not take over the access road after improvement. The applicant should seek comments from other relevant departments for the proposed improvement works. iii) The proposed access road with improvement works will affect and encroach to the existing Lots. The applicant should liaise with LandsD and affected land lot owners to settle the right of way issue.	Noted and please note that the requirement to design and implement the proposed road improvement works, along the access road connecting Tai Tong Shan Road and the subject development to the satisfaction of relevant government departments, shall be addressed during the lease formulation stage. Noted and please note that the applicant shall seek comments from other relevant departments for the proposed improvement works. Noted and please note that the applicant shall liaise with LandsD and affected land lot owners to settle the right of way issue.

1.2 Responses to Comments from District Office (Yuen Long), Home Affairs Department (HAD)

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
HAD(1)	As portion of the application site falls within the boundary of permitted burial ground YL/42, the concerned Rural Committees and Indigenous inhabitants may have grave concern about the application.	HAD's concern is duly acknowledged. The Applicant has undertaken a series of consultations with relevant stakeholders, including the concerned Rural Committees and Indigenous inhabitants, both prior to and during the submission of the application. These parties have expressed their support for the Applicant on the proposed development. The Applicant will continue to closely communicate with the relevant stakeholders throughout the planning and development stage.

1.3 Responses to Comments from Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD)

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
EMSD (1)	We would like to take this opportunity to remind all parties concerned with planning, designing, organizing and supervising any activity near the underground cable (and overhead line, where applicable) under the mentioned document should approach the electricity supplier (i.e. CLP) for the requisition of cable plans (and overhead line alignment drawings, where applicable) to find out whether there is any underground cable and/or overhead line within and/or in the vicinity of the concerned site. They should also be reminded to observe the Electricity Supply Lines (Protection) Regulation and the “Code of Practice on Working near Electricity Supply Lines” established under the Regulation when carrying out works in the vicinity of the electricity supply lines.	Noted. The Applicant will approach the electricity supplier (i.e. CLP) for relevant information during design stage, and will observe relevant regulations when carrying out works in the vicinity of the electricity supply lines.

1.4 Responses to Comments from Drainage Services Department (DSD)

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
DSD(1)	<u>Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA)</u> (i) Please revise the typographical errors in Section 3.1.4 (“time of concentration”) and Section 3.3.4 (“estimated water depth”).	Noted and the following typos have been corrected (see Attachment 3): 1. Paragraph 3.1.3 – Table 3 has been amended to Tables 3a, 3b, 3c and 3d for storm constants a, b and c. 2. Paragraph 3.1.4 – “time of correction” has been amended to “time of concentration” for t_c. 3. Paragraph 3.1.6 – “was” has been amended to “has been”; and the duplicate “g” in Equation 5 has been deleted. 4. Paragraph 3.1.7 – “Meaning coefficient” has been amended to “Manning’s roughness coefficient” and its unit has been removed. 5. Paragraph 3.3.4 – the typo “estimated wate depth” has been corrected to “estimated water depth”.
DSD(2)	(ii) Please review the runoff coefficient adopted for Catchment G in Section 3.2.12 and clarify whether there has been any change in the surface characteristics that would justify the change in runoff coefficient from 0.38 to 0.33, as adopted in the current runoff calculations in Appendix A. Please also indicate in Figure 3-1 showing how the runoff coefficient of the various catchments as presented in Section 3.2 are derived.	The following amendments have been made: 1. Table 3-1 has been revised to include all the runoff coefficients recommended in Section 7.5.2 of the Stormwater Drainage Manual. 2. Paragraphs 3.2.5, 3.2.6 and 3.2.11 have been revised to improve the presentation of describing conditions of the Site (Catchment A) as well as Catchments B and G, with justifications for the adopted runoff coefficients, including the typo of the estimated average runoff coefficient 0.33 in Table 3-3 to 0.38. 3. Figure 3-1 has been amended to indicatively illustrate the unpaved and paved areas of Catchments A, B and G, and provided with notes regarding the percentages of unpaved and paved areas.

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
DSD(3)	(iii) Please review and revise the increase in water depth attributed to the Proposed Development in Section 3.3.4. Please also clarify how the increase in water depth was derived.	The estimation of the increase in water depth has been revised, and the associated assumptions are provided in the revised Appendix B. Please also refer to the revised Section 3.3 for details.
DSD(4)	(iv) Please demonstrate the capacity evaluation of the proposed underground pipe with a gradient of 1:200 and a diameter of 1000mm. Please also review and confirm whether the capacity of the pipe is sufficient to cater for the runoff generated after the Proposed Development.	The hydraulic calculations presented in Appendix B have been amended. Please also refer to the assumptions provided in the revised Appendix B for further details.
DSD(5)	(v) Please clarify the locations of the 10m and 3m wide stream/channel in page B-2 and B-3 respectively of Appendix B. It seems that the photo given at the left hand side of Figure 3-2 does not correspond to 10m wide stream, please review.	The width of the stream varies along the watercourse. For the purpose of a conservative assessment, a channel width of approximately 5 m, measured near the footbridge immediately downstream of the proposed discharge point, has been adopted in the drainage capacity calculations. In addition, the following amendments have been made to Figure 3-2: 1. The proposed underground circular pipe has been replaced with multiple underground circular pipes, while the indicative gradient of 1:200 remains unchanged. 2. The proposed pipes are shown in hidden lines with a curved alignment to better follow the site topography. 3. The indicative invert levels have been revised. Please refer to Note 2 on page B-2 of the revised Appendix B and Figure 3-2 for further details.

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
DSD(6)	<u>Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA)</u> (vi) We have no further comment on the SIA from public drainage point of view.	Noted.
DSD(7)	(vii) The SIA needs to meet the full satisfaction of Sewerage Infrastructure Group of Environmental Protection Department, the planning authority of sewerage infrastructure.	Noted.

1.5 Responses to Comments from Environmental Protection Department (EPD)

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
EPD (1)	We consider that <u>no insurmountable environmental impact is anticipated</u> for the site with the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, therefore we have <u>no objection</u> on the subject planning application. Nonetheless, it is suggested that the applicant should revise the EA as below for completeness and clarity.	Noted.
EPD (2)	The applicant is advised: (a) to strictly comply with relevant pollution control ordinances, including Waste Disposal Ordinance and Water Pollution Control Ordinance; (b) to follow Recommended Pollution Control Clauses for Construction Contracts (available at: http://www.epd.gov.hk/epd/english/environmentinhk/eia_planning/guide_ref/rpc.html) to minimize the environmental impacts during the construction stage; (c) that the design and operation of the proposed car park should make reference to Professional Persons Environmental Consultative Committee (ProPECC) Practice Note for Control of Air Pollution in Car Parks (ProPECC PN 2/96), and locate the ventilation exhaust (if any) of the proposed carpark away from the nearby air sensitive receivers as far as practicable;	Noted.

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
	(d) that all joss paper and incense burnings should be carried out in the smokeless incense/joss paper furnace, as proposed by the applicant, and implement appropriate mitigation measures stated in EPD's guideline on Air Pollution Control for Joss Paper Burning at Chinese Temples, Crematoria and Similar Places to minimize any potential environmental nuisances to the nearby air sensitive receivers. (e) to locate the smokeless incense/joss paper furnace as far as practicable from the air sensitive receivers to minimize any impact; (f) to provide adequate supporting infrastructure/ facilities for proper collection, treatment and disposal of waste/wastewater generated from the proposed use. If septic tank and soakaway system will be used in case of unavailability of public sewer, its design and construction shall follow the requirements of EPD's Practice Note for Professional Person (ProPECC) PN 1/23 "Drainage Plans subject to Comment by the Environmental Protection Department " including completion of percolation test and certification by Authorized Person. If sewage storage tanks and tankeraway to a sewage treatment plant are to be used, agreement and advice from relevant authority should be sought before disposal; and locate its exhaust outlet away from the nearby air sensitive receivers as far as practicable; (g) to implement appropriate pollution control measures outlined in	

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
	the Professional Persons Environmental Consultative Committee (ProPECC) Practice Notes 2/24‘Construction Site Drainage’ to minimise any potential environmental impacts on nearby water bodies during the construction of the project; (h) to locate the proposed mechanical and electrical equipment within an enclosed structure, as proposed by the applicant, to minimize any noise impacts to the nearby noise sensitive receivers; and (i) that it is the obligation of the applicant to meet the statutory requirements under relevant pollution control ordinances.	
EPD(3)	The following comments on the EA are textual in nature which are intended to enhance the clarity and quality of the EA. <u>Comments</u> Air Quality 1. Table 2-1 - Please correct the typo “Nitrogen Oxide” to “Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂)”. Also please provide the chemical formulas for Ozone, Carbon Monoxide and Lead accordingly for consistency with other pollutants.	Noted. The revised Environmental Assessment is attached in Attachement 2. Typographical error corrected. The text “Nitrogen Oxide” has been changed to “Nitrogen Dioxide” in the Table 2-1. Chemical symbols for Ozone (O₃), Carbon Monoxide (CO) and Lead (Pb) have been provided in Table 2-1 for consistency with other pollutants.

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
EPD(4)	2. Section 2.2.6 - Please revise “to open space sites for the industrial areas (chimneys)” in lines 1-2 as “between the industrial areas (chimneys) and open spaces are”.	Section 2.2.6 has been amended.
EPD(5)	3. Section 2.5.1 - Please add “assessment area” after “500m” in line 3.	The text “assessment area” has been added after “500m” in line 3 of Section 2.5.1.
EPD(6)	4. Section 2.5.4 - As discussed with Eva/EnviroSolutions, please consider to revise as “According to desktop review, and the site visits conducted on 5 January 2024 and 13 March 2025, some ~~openable~~ windows were observed located within the buffer zone at ASR 12. However, these are clerestory windows which should be for provision of sunlight only are not expected to be opened for ventilation. ~~As confirmed with the property owner, those clerestory windows and glazed doors within the buffer zone will not be opened during the normal operation. During the site visits, when ambient temperatures ranged from approximately 15 °C to 20 °C and air conditioning was not required, the clerestory windows remained closed. Therefore, it is considered unlikely that these windows would need to be opened for ventilation, and the façade containing these windows is unlikely to be air sensitive. This assumption will be further verified with the property owner during the detailed design stage. Alternatively, as the current road alignment is indicative only, it will be reviewed during detailed design to ensure full compliance with the buffer distance requirement. Based on the aforementioned assumptions, Therefore, there~~	Section 2.5.4 has been amended accordingly.

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
	are no air sensitive uses located within the buffer zone for ASR 12, and no adverse air quality impact is anticipated at ASR 12.”	
EPD(7)	5. Section 2.5.7 – (a) Suggest to relocate the 1st sentence of the 7th bullet to the last sentence of the 6th bullet. (b) Please revise “for” in the 2nd last line of the 8th bullet to “during”.	(a) The 1st sentence of the 7th bullet point has been moved to the last sentence of the 6th bullet. (b) Revised as suggested. The word "for" has been replaced by "during" in the 8th bullet point of Section 2.5.7.
EPD(8)	6. Section 2.5.11 – Please add “all” before “Exhaust air” in line 6 if affirmative that all exhaust air will be treated by the deodourisation unit before discharge.	Section 2.5.11 has been amended.
EPD(9)	7. Figure 2-1 - Please revise “500m Study Area” to “500m Assessment Area” in the title and legend.	The title and legend of Figure 2-1 have been amended.
EPD(10)	Water Quality Please incorporate R-to-C EPD(10)’s response into the EA “the wastewater generated from the smokeless joss paper furnace would be separately collected and tankeraway 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.	Sections 4.5.1, 4.6.3 and 7.1.9 have been revised accordingly.
EPD(11)	Please note that we have no further comments on the SIA.	Noted.

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

Item	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
AFCD (1)	Fig 2.1 Please find the correct location of the Tai Tong 3 (Wong Nai Tung) Egrettry attached. The figure should be updated accordingly.	Noted. Please find attached updated figure attached in Attachment 4 .