RESPONSE-TO-COMMENTS TABLE

ltem	Departmental Comments	Responses
LU,	Landscape Unit, Planning Department	
PlanD	- Contact Person: Mr. NGAI Chak Man (Tel: 3565 3955)	
	- Via Email dated 4 June 2024	
LU,	Landscape Observations and Comments	
PlanD 1	Based on the aerial photo of 2022, the Site	Noted.
	is located in an area of Cemetery	
	Landscape character surrounded by	
	cemeteries and woodlands. The	
	proposed development under this	
	planning application is considered not	
	incompatible with its surrounding	
	environment.	
LU,	According to the aerial photo of 2022,	Noted.
PlanD 2	most of the site is covered by existing	
	trees and vegetation. According to the	
	Landscape Impact Assessment and	
	Landscape Proposal (LVIA & LP), total 30	
	nos. of existing trees within the Site were	
	surveyed. Among the trees surveyed	
	within the Site, 2 nos. of Artocarpus	
	<i>hypargyreus</i> (Tree ID No. AH1 and AH2)	
	are listed as Near Threatened in "Rare	
	and Precious Plants of Hong Kong"	
	(AFCD 2003), and the remaining trees are	
	common species and no registered Old	
	and Valuable Trees (OVTs) were	
	identified. All surveyed trees within the	
	Site are proposed to be <u>felled</u> as they	
	would be unavoidably affected by the	
	proposed site formation works,	
	temporary and permanent construction	
	works and are not suitable to be	
	transplanted. Impact on existing	
	landscape resources within the site	
	arising from the proposed development	
	is anticipated.	
LU,	Two planting areas with trees and shrub	Noted.
PlanD 3	planting are proposed at Level	
	+117.05mPD (G/F) and a communal roof	
	garden with seating area are proposed at $(P(r))$ leades are a second statement of the second stateme	
	+131.05mPD (R/F). Landscape Areas at	
	G/F and R/F will be accessible to the	

ltem	Departmental Comments	Responses
	public and visitors. 6 nos. of	
	compensatory trees of native and exotic	
	species are proposed to be planted within	
	the Site at G/F. The proposed new tree	
	planting ratio can only achieve a ratio of	
	1:0.20 in terms of number within the Site	
	due to site constraints and the tree	
	planting areas available within the site	
	(para. 4.3.10). According to the LIA, there	
	is currently no suitable receptor site for	
	offsite compensatory planting in the	
	vicinity. In addition, shrubs/groundcovers	
	of both native and exotic species (with a	
	high proportion of native species) are	
	proposed at G/F and R/F.	
LU,	According to para. 4.3.5 of the LIA,	Noted.
PlanD 4	"woodland mix planting of whips or	
	shrubs with native species" is	
	recommended on the surrounding	
	affected slopes located in the	
	northeastern portion within the Site and	
	along the eastern edge of the Site outside	
	the Site. The practicality of the proposed	
	plantings at the slope(s) outside the	
	application boundary is subject to agreement/ approval by relevant	
111	department(s).	
LU,	Detailed Comments on the LVIA & LP	
PlanD 5	Para. 3.1.4 and 4.1.1, Appendices A and B	We have restructured and simplified the
	- It is noted that <u>an assessment area of</u>	report to follow the requirement under
	<u>100m beyond the Site Boundary</u> is	Guidance Note for Application for
	adopted for the Landscape Impact	Permission Under Section 16 and
	Assessment (LIA), which is <u>not</u> required	removed unnecessary information/
	for s.16 application. The applicant should	details. The assessment area for
	make reference to para.28 of the	landscape impact has been reduced to
	guidance notes for application under s.16	include only the immediate
	and Annex B for further details regarding	neighbourhood, i.e. the woodland to the
	the requirement of the landscape	immediate east and southeast of the
	submission to support the application for	Application Site, and the cemetery
	development that may have	landscape to the west of the Application
	impact/implications on the landscape.	Site. The report text and figures have
	Excessive and irrelevant information	been revised accordingly. Please refer to
	would not be reviewed. Our previous	the revised Landscape and Visual Impact

ltem	Departmental Comments	Responses
	comment item no. 7 on the pre-	Assessment and Landscape Proposal at
	submission via DPO's email to URBIS	Appendix A for details.
	Limited dated 29.4.2024 is still applicable.	
LU,	Para. 4.3.4 – It is mentioned that "47 nos.	The number of trees affected within the
PlanD 6	of existing trees within and outside the	Site and outside the Site have been
	Site (5m extent from the Site boundary)	separately provided. For any existing
	would be unavoidably affected". The	trees and proposed tree treatments
	number of trees affected within the Site	outside the application site boundary, the
	and outside the Site should be separately	relevant paragraphs/ tree information
	provided. For any existing trees and	have been indicated "for PlanD's
	proposed tree treatments outside the	reference only". Comments from relevant
	application site boundary, the relevant	authorities will be sought in the later
	paragraphs/ tree information is advised	stage.
	to be clearly indicated "for PlanD's	
	reference only", and comments from	
	relevant authorities should be sought accordingly.	
LU,	Table 4.3.3 – The remark "for PlanD's	The remark "for PlanD's reference only"
PlanD 7	reference only" in the heading should be	in the heading has been moved to the row
	moved to the row for proposed tree	for proposed tree treatment outside the
	treatment <u>outside the Site</u> . The total	Site. The total number of trees within the
	number of trees within the site and	site and outside the Site have been
	outside the Site should be separately	separately provided. Please refer to
	provided.	Tables 4.3.3 and 4.3.4.
LU,	Para. 4.3.5 – Proposed species for	The proposed species for woodland mix
PlanD 8	"woodland mix planting of whips or	planting of whips or shrubs includes
	shrubs" should be provided.	Machilus chekiangensis, Sterculia
		lanceolata, Mallotus paniculatus and
		Ficus microcarpa. These species are
		native and moderately to highly
		adaptable to the site condition. Final
		species selection will be subject to detail
		design development and market
		availability. Para. 4.3.5 is revised.
LU,	Para. 4.3.9 – Noting the proposed	The opportunity for new tree planting
PlanD 9	compensatory tree planting ratio can only	within the Site has been maximised
	achieve 1:0.20 in terms of tree number	considering the site constraints and the
	within the Site, the applicant should	available tree planting areas within the
	maximise opportunity for new tree	Site (para. 4.3.10). Planting area on G/F
	planting within the Site and/or improve	has already been maximised in view of
	overall value of landscape setting,	the constraints that entrances and narrow
	increase overall site coverage with	areas are not suitable for planting. It is
	diverse vegetation mix, maximise soft	

ltem	Departmental Comments	Responses
	landscape opportunities (e.g. edge planters).	therefore proposed to extend planting area on R/F instead.
		Edge planting has been added on R/F to maximise soft landscape opportunities. The previously proposed planting areas have been extended, a planting strip has been added on the roof along eastern edge and a small planter has been added in the northeastern corner. The updated landscape plan on R/F and landscape section are shown in Drawing Nos. HKBA1-LP03 and HKBA1-SE01.
		In order to increase overall site coverage with diverse vegetation mix, a variety of native seasonal flowering and evergreen shrubs and groundcover have been proposed to diversify the vegetation mix. A total of 20 shrubs and groundcover species are proposed with 3 major heights. It aims at creating layering effects and three-dimensional visual experience for users, envisioning to improve overall value of landscape setting. The majority of these proposed species are native which can enhance biodiversity and local ecosystem and connect to the adjacent hillside landscape. Please refer to updated Table 6.3.3 Proposed Planting Schedule.
LU, PlanD 10	Para. 4.3.12 and Table 4.3.4 – It is mentioned that 1 <u>no. of heavy standard</u> <u>tree</u> is proposed on ground floor. According to Table 4.3.4, the proposed size for <i>Sterculia lanceolata</i> (min. DBH 70mm) is not heavy standard. Please review and rectify.	To address EcolA Para. 8.1.3, <i>Artocarpus</i> <i>hypargyreus</i> , tree species with conservation importance to be felled that shall consequently be compensated, the previously proposed compensatory species <i>Sterculia lanceolata</i> will be replaced by <i>Artocarpus hypargyreus</i> . Its min. DBH has been revised to 75mm to match heavy standard size in Para. 4.3.12 and Table 4.3.5.
LU, PlanD 11	Appendix C –Tree Treatment Schedule – The number of trees affected within the	Tree Treatment Schedule has been separated for the number of trees

ltem	Departmental Comments	Responses
	Site (TG1) and outside the Site (TG2)	affected within the Site (TG1) and outside
	should be <u>separately provided</u> in the Tree	the Site (TG2). For any existing trees and
	Treatment Schedule, including also the	proposed tree treatments outside the
	Grand Total and Summary Table. For any	application site boundary, "for PlanD's
	existing trees and proposed tree	reference only" has been indicated in the
	treatments outside the application site	Tree Treatment Schedule. Comments
	boundary, the relevant paragraphs/ tree	from relevant authorities will be sought in
	information is advised to be clearly	the later stage.
	indicated "for PlanD's reference only",	
	and comments from relevant authorities	
	should be sought accordingly.	
LU,	Appendix C – Tree Treatment Schedule –	TG2 is located within the private lot -
PlanD 12	It should be clarified whether TG2 is	Inland Lot No. 7713. The information has
	located within private lot or government	been provided in the remarks in the Tree
	land.	Treatment Schedule for TG2.
LU,	Appendix D – Landscape Plan and	The extent of OM5 cannot be identified at
PlanD 13	Mitigation Measures – Overall (Dwg. No.	this stage as the actual extent of works
	HKBA1-LP01) – The extent of OM5 along	area is to be confirmed. The extent of
	the slopes at eastern edge of the site	OM5 will be subject to the works area
	should be indicated for reference.	identified in the detailed design stage of
		the Development. Impact to trees on
		slopes will be avoided as far as possible.
LU,	Advisory Comments to the Applicant	
PlanD 14	The applicant is reminded to seek	Noted.
	comments/agreement from the relevant	
	departments(s) on the proposed soft/hard	
	landscape works outside the application	
	boundary.	
LU,	The applicant should be advised that	Noted.
PlanD 15	approval of the application does not	
	imply approval of tree works such as	
	pruning, transplanting and felling under	
	lease, if any. The applicant is reminded to	
	seek approval for any proposed tree	
	works from relevant departments prior to	
	commencement of works.	
DSD	Drainage Services Department	
	- Contact Person: Mr. Lawrence Wong (Tel: 3101 2362)
	- Via Email dated 12 June 2024	
DSD 1	The plan for the proposed diversion of	
	stream	
	 <u>stream</u> The propose development would constrain future improvement on 	The capacity of concerned box culvert, taking into account the latest design

ltem	Departmental Comments	Responses
	the box culvert. The project	rainfall profile and the effect of climate
	proponent should review the	change will be reviewed in the Drainage
	capacity of concerned box culvert,	Impact Assessment in the detailed design
	taking into account the latest design	stage of the development.
	rainfall profile and the effect of	
	climate change.	
DSD 2	2. The construction plan at B/F: The	This will be provided in details in the
	proposed culvert will be connected	Drainage Impact Assessment in the
	to the existing underground box	detailed design stage of the
	culvert at Cape Collinson Road and	development.
	this connection should be carefully	
	designed. Additionally, adequately	
	sized access openings should be	
	installed on the box culvert outside	
	the lot boundary to facilitate future	
	maintenance of the box culvert	
	beneath Cape Collinson Road. The	
	details of these openings should be	
	agreed upon with the relevant	
	government departments, such as	
	the HyD and DSD.	
DSD 3	3. During the heavy rainstorm in	This will be included in the Drainage
	September 2024, a significant	Impact Assessment in the detailed design
	amount of rainwater flowed from	stage of the development.
	the natural terrain in the	
	southeastern part of the proposed	
	building, resulting in a landslide at	
	the WSD slope located on the	
	northern side of the proposed	
	building next to Cape Collinson	
	Road. Therefore, the project	
	proponent should design the	
	intercepting drains, especially on	
	the eastern side, to effectively	
	capture and discharge the rainwater	
	into the storm drainage system. A	
	detailed design, accompanied by	
	hydraulic calculations, should be	
	submitted to the DSD for	
	agreement.	
ArchSD	Architectural Services Department	1
	- Contact Person: Mr. Sherman Sum (Te	el: 2582 5314)
	- Via Email dated 17 June 2024	,

ltem	Departmental Comments	Responses
ArchSD 1	Based on the information provided, it is	Noted. The form and elevation design of
	noted that the maximum building height	the proposed development shall be
	(BH) of development is proposed to be	carefully considered to blend in
	relaxed from 2 storeys to 4 storeys.	harmoniously with the adjacent building
	According to the Landscape and Visual	and its surrounding environment in the
	Impact Assessment, the overall visual	design stage.
	impact of the proposal from different	
	vantage points of VP1 to VP6 on the	
	surrounding context would range from	
	slight to moderate. It appears that the	
	proposed development may not be	
	incompatible with the surrounding	
	environment. We have no particular	
	comment from the architectural and	
	visual impact point of view, subject to	
	PlanD's view. However, the applicant	
	may wish to consider the treatment/	
	articulation of the building form and	
	elevation design in the design stage to	
	blend in more harmoniously with the	
	surrounding environment,	
UDU,	Urban Design Unit, Planning Department	
PlanD	- Contact Person: Ms. Vanessa TSANG	(Tel: 3565 3942)
	- Via Email dated 17 June 2024	
UDU,	According to the submitted LVIA, the	Noted.
PlanD 1	proposed development would cause	
	slightly adverse to moderately adverse	
	visual impacts to the selected public	
	viewing points (VPs). Mitigation	
	measures including onsite compensatory	
	tree planting, sensitive design with	
	natural materials to minimizes potential	
	adverse visual impacts, buffer planting,	
	roof planting to promote visual	
	integration with the surroundings, etc.	
	are proposed. The overall visual impact	
	of the proposed development is	
	considered to be slightly adverse as it will	
	result in some negative visual effects to	
	most of the identified key VPs.	
UDU,	Textual Comments	A note 'All visual impacts are adverse
PlanD 2	(a) Table 5.3.1 – An asterisk is marked	unless stated otherwise.' has been added

ltem	Departmental Comments	Responses
	Insubstantial, Slight, Moderate,	5.3.1. Please refer to the revised
	Substantial)" without any	Landscape and Visual Impact
	remarks/note. Please rectify.	Assessment and Landscape Proposal at
		Appendix A for details.
UDU,	(b) Para. 5.3.23 and Table 5.3.1 – It is	The overall visual impact of VP5 has been
PlanD 3	noted that the magnitude of change	revised to Slight, see Para. 5.3.23 and
	for VP3, VP5 and VP6 are all assessed	Table 5.3.1.
	as Small and the sensitivity of their	
	VSR Group are Medium. To maintain	
	consistency, please consider to	
	amend the overall visual impact of	
	VP5 as Slight as in VP3 and VP6.	
GEO,	Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Eng	ineering and Development Department
CEDD	- Contact Person: Ms. Candy CHO (Tel: .	2762 5383)
	- Via Email dated 17 June 2024	
GEO,	Natural Terrain Hazard Study (NTHS)	
CEDD 1	Report in Appendix E	
	According to the GEO Advice Note for	Noted. A NTHS Report will be submitted
	Planning Applications under Town	to BD for approval in detailed design
	Planning Ordinance (Cap 131) (enclosed),	stage.
	a detailed NTHS Report is not an essential	
	document for this planning application at	
	this stage. The NTHS Report in Appendix	
	E demonstrated that the natural terrain	
	hazard for this site is surmountable. It is	
	presumed that the applicant will submit a	
	NTHS Report to BD for approval in the	
	next stage of the project and our detailed	
	comment on the NTHS will be further	
	provided upon receive the NTHS Report	
	referred from BD.	
GEO,	Nonetheless, we have the following	
CEDD 2	preliminary observations for the NTHS	
	report:	
	a) Section 8.1 of the NTHS Report	Noted. The proposed rigid debris-
	concluded that the provision of a rigid	resisting barrier shall be within the
	debris-resisting barrier at the toe of	application lot (i.e. within the Site Area).
	the natural terrain study area for	Land status adjoining the application lot
	natural terrain hazard mitigation is	is also added in the revised Figure 12 for
	required. It is noted from Figure 12	clarity. Please refer to the replacement
	that the proposed rigid debris-	page of the Natural Terrain Hazard Study
	resisting barrier would fall into the	Report at Appendix B for details.
	adjoining private lot (i.e. Inland Lot	

ltem	Departmental Comments	Responses
	No. 7713). Land status adjoining the application lot should be shown in relevant figure(s) for clarity. The applicant shall consult relevant authorities/parties for the proposed works outside the application lot in particular seeking prior approval/ agreement from the owners of Inland Lot No. 7713 for allowing the applicant to gain access for the purpose of carrying out, completion, inspection and maintaining all necessary mitigation works within Inland Lot No. 7713.	
GEO, CEDD 3	 b) We would also like to draw the applicant's attention that where access to the adjoining private lot is not available to the applicant for the purpose of carrying out investigation and stabilization measures, the proposed mitigation measures including any debris retaining structures which the designed debris retention capacity of such retaining structures shall not rely on any area in the adjoining private lot. 	Noted. The proposed rigid debris- resisting barrier shall be constructed within the application lot. In the next stage of the project (i.e. site formation design stage), further consultation/approval shall be obtained from the owners of Inland Lot No. 7713 whether access can be gained to facilitate the construction, inspection and maintaining all necessary mitigation works. Detailed design of the proposed mitigation works will take into account of this land issue.
EPD	Environmental Protection Department - Contact Person: Ms. Kathy HO (Tel: 28 - Via Email dated 19 June 2024	
EPD 1	Please see our comments on the SIA below from sewerage planning perspective. We will offer comments from water quality perspective (if any) in due course.	Noted.
EPD 2	 Section 4.2, 4.4, 7.3 & Appendix 7.1: The UFF type for staff should be "J11 Community, Social & Personal Services", which UFF of 0.28 should be deployed. Please revise and update the estimation of flow. Hence, please also review section 4.3. 	UFF of 0.28 has been adopted. Relevant sections have been revised / removed accordingly. Please refer to the replacement pages of the Sewerage Impact Assessment Report at Appendix C for details.

ltem	Departmental Comments	Responses
EPD 3	Apart from the above, please confirm	There will be no burning activities and no
	whether there will be installation of joss	joss paper burner/furnace to be installed
	paper burners/furnace at the subject site	in the proposed columbarium.
	and any burning activities would be	
	carried out.	
DLO,	District Lands Office/Hong Kong East, Land	ds Department
LandsD	- Contact Person: Mr. Benny Yu (Tel: 28	35 1664)
	- Via Email dated 25 June 2024	
DLO,	Site Boundary	Noted. It is understood that the
LandsD 1	In addition to the UUGL and Slope	requirements are similar to that
	Feature No. 11SE-D/C69 (1) mentioned in	contained in the basic terms in the
	para. 4.2 of the PS, a piece of UUGL at the	previous lot extension which were agreed
	northern tip of the application site zoned	and accepted by the applicant.
	"Road" on the OZP as marked pink	
	hatched blue on the plan at the Annex has	
	been included in the Proposed Lot	
	Extension as Pink Hatched Blue Area	
	(PHBA). As previously advised by TD,	
	there is no road improvement plan for the	
	PHBA. However, from land	
	administration perspective, it has been	
	considered not inappropriate to include	
	the PHBA in the Proposed Lot Extension,	
	which shall be maintained by the	
	applicant and re-delivered to the	
	Government on demand. No building or	
	structure shall be erected or constructed	
	or placed on, over, under, above, below	
	or within the PHBA. All relevant B/Ds (incl.	
	the then FHB, FEHD, TD, HyD, DSD (as the	
	PHBA would also cover an existing	
	culvert) and the applicant have agreed	
	and accepted the said arrangement.	
	Hence, the applicant should include such	
	arrangement in the subject application	
	scheme.	
DLO,	Formation of Green Area	Noted. Similar to the above, it is
LandsD 2	While I shall defer to TD and HyD to	understood that the requirements on
	consider and comment the TIA, please be	Green Area are similar to that contained
	advised that under the Proposed Lot	in the basic terms in the previous lot
	Extension, the applicant shall form and	extension which were agreed and
	make good a piece of UUGL sandwiched	accepted by the applicant.
	between the application site and Cape	

ltem	Departmental Comments	Responses
	Collinson Road as shown coloured green	
	on the plan at the Annex as Green Area.	
	The applicant should include such road	
	improvement works in the subject	
	application scheme for consideration and	
	comment by all relevant B/Ds.	
DLO,	Vehicular Access	Noted.
LandsD 3	Under the Proposed Lot Extension, no	
	vehicular access would be allowed for the	
	application site based on TD's advice.	
	Presumably, the applicant should make	
	its own arrangement for the required	
	access to the application site through IL	
	7755 RP.	