

**S.16 Planning Application for Proposed Minor Relaxation of  
Building Height Restrictions for Permitted Public Housing Development  
at Tung Chung Area 114 and Area 117, Lantau Island  
(Application No.: A/I-TCE/5)**

***Responses to Departmental Comments***

<b>Item</b>	<b>Bureau/Department</b>	<b>Date</b>
1.	Environmental Protection Department	26 August 2024
2.	Civil Aviation Department	26 August 2024
3.	Sai Kung and Islands District Planning Office, Planning Department	9 September 2024
4.	Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department	9 September 2024

Comments Received		Responses
<b>1.</b>	<b>Environmental Protection Department</b> <b>Received via email from PlanD dated 26 August 2024</b> <b>(Contact Person: Mr. Andy WONG, Tel: 2835 1127)</b>	
1.1.	It is noted that the planning statement does not contain any environmental assessment on the developments. We also understand that a EAS is being conducted to assess the air quality and noise impacts associated with the developments. We trust that HD will complete the EAS and demonstrate no adverse environmental impacts of the project for EPD's agreement.	Noted. Revised EAS will be submitted in due course for EPD's acceptance separately.
	For sewerage impact, please find our comments below for follow up.	
1.2.	Section 4.1.1 - As per our previous comments on pre-submission, please advise:  (a) the projected commercial population (i.e. restaurant, welfare, school staff/students and commercial respectively) for the proposed development;	(a) The proposed non-domestic plot ratio under the current application is the same as the endorsed planning briefs, which is both 0.4 for Area 114 and 117, the provision of kindergarten and social welfare facilities also remain unchanged as proposed under the endorsed planning briefs. The slight adjustment in maximum GFA is due to the site boundary adjustment after site handover in June 2024. As such, significant changes in projected commercial population to that adopted under the endorsed planning briefs are not anticipated.
	(b) sewage estimate of the proposed development; and	(b) The difference in maximum non-domestic GFA is minor and in line with the plot ratio

Area	Maximum non-domestic GFA (incl. commercial, kindergarten and other ancillary facilities)	
	Current Application	Endorsed Planning Briefs
114	Not more than 6,368 m <sup>2</sup>	Not more than 6,360 m <sup>2</sup>
117	Not more than 6,720 m <sup>2</sup>	Not more than 6,680 m <sup>2</sup>

Comments Received		Responses																																										
	(c) the referred estimated population and sewage generation as assessed by CEDD.	<p>restrictions and the design residential population in the current application is also within the endorsed planning briefs. As such, no additional sewage impact is anticipated.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Design Population (about)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Area</th> <th>Current Application (calculated based on proposed flat mix)</th> <th>Endorsed Planning Briefs</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>114</td> <td>5,921</td> <td>6,910</td> </tr> <tr> <td>117</td> <td>6,491</td> <td>7,199</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(c) Please refer below for the estimated population and sewage generation assessed for public housing development at Area 114 and 117 under Tung Chung New Town Extension (East) – Design and Construction*</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Area</th> <th>Category</th> <th>Population/Employee</th> <th>ADWF (m<sup>3</sup>/day)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="4">114</td> <td>Special Residential</td> <td>7,886</td> <td>1,498</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Commercial</td> <td>285</td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kindergarten</td> <td>200</td> <td>13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Welfare facilities</td> <td>183</td> <td>51</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="4">117</td> <td>Special Residential</td> <td>8,293</td> <td>1,579</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Commercial</td> <td>301</td> <td>84</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kindergarten</td> <td>200</td> <td>13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Welfare facilities</td> <td>192</td> <td>54</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*Information extracted from the Sewage Impact Assessment Report of planning application no. A/I-TCE/4.</p>	Design Population (about)			Area	Current Application (calculated based on proposed flat mix)	Endorsed Planning Briefs	114	5,921	6,910	117	6,491	7,199	Area	Category	Population/Employee	ADWF (m <sup>3</sup> /day)	114	Special Residential	7,886	1,498	Commercial	285	80	Kindergarten	200	13	Welfare facilities	183	51	117	Special Residential	8,293	1,579	Commercial	301	84	Kindergarten	200	13	Welfare facilities	192	54
Design Population (about)																																												
Area	Current Application (calculated based on proposed flat mix)	Endorsed Planning Briefs																																										
114	5,921	6,910																																										
117	6,491	7,199																																										
Area	Category	Population/Employee	ADWF (m <sup>3</sup> /day)																																									
114	Special Residential	7,886	1,498																																									
	Commercial	285	80																																									
	Kindergarten	200	13																																									
	Welfare facilities	183	51																																									
117	Special Residential	8,293	1,579																																									
	Commercial	301	84																																									
	Kindergarten	200	13																																									
	Welfare facilities	192	54																																									
1.3.	Section 4.1.1 - As per pre-submission and public housing developments in Area 133, buffer on population estimation have been added for sewerage impact assessment. Please advise the type of public housing development proposed (e.g. PRH, SSF or GSH, etc.) and the population buffer	Please note that Public Rental Housing (PRH) is proposed for the public housing development at both Area 114 and Area 117 under the current application.																																										

Comments Received		Responses
	considered for the sewerage capacity check.	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Civil Aviation Department Received via email from PlanD dated 26 August 2024 (Contact Person: Mr. Luke LI, Tel: 2910 6906)</b>	
2.1.	Similar to other applications in Tung Chung Areas earlier, we would like to reiterate our previous comments that subject areas will be subject to aircraft/helicopter noise and appropriate noise mitigation measures should be implemented, despite that the consultant mentioned that the relevant HKPSG standards will be met.	The aircraft noise impacts have been already assessed in the approved Expansion of Hong Kong International Airport into a Three-Runway System (3RS) Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report (AEIAR-185/2014) and the helicopter noise impact has been assessed in the approved EIA report for the Study of Tung Chung New Town Development Extension (TCNTE) (AEIAR-196/2016). Based on the Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF) noise contours as predicted in AEIAR-185/2014, the proposed development in Area 114 & 117 under the current application are located outside the NEF25 contour for the worst 3RS operation mode in Year 2030 and full 3RS operation mode in Year 2032. Adverse aircraft noise impact on the Proposed Development is not expected. The potential environmental impacts on the proposed development have been evaluated in the EAS adhering to the guidance for environmental considerations as stipulated in the HKPSG.
<b>3.</b>	<b>Sai Kung and Islands District Planning Office, Planning Department Received via email from PlanD dated 9 September 2024 (Contact Person: Mr. Nora CHOI, Tel: 2158 6155)</b>	
3.1.	Please provide the following supplementary information for our processing: (a) The GFA allocated for Social	(a) Not more than 4,080 m <sup>2</sup> and not more than 4,940 m <sup>2</sup> would be allocated for Social Welfare Facilities for Site A (TCA 114) and Site B (TCA 117) respectively, which is equivalent to

Comments Received		Responses
	<p>Welfare Facilities (SWFs) in (i) each of the Sites; and (ii) the % of the domestic GFA allocated for SWFs in the two Sites in total; and</p> <p>(b) Non-domestic uses included in the GFA calculation</p>	<p>approximately 4% and 4.5% of domestic GFA for Site A (TCA 114) and Site B (TCA 117) respectively. The GFA for SWFs is subject to GBP approval and detailed design.</p> <p>(b) The non-domestic uses included in the GFA calculation comprise commercial use such as shop &amp; services and eating place, kindergarten, and other ancillary facilities.</p>
<b>4.</b>	<p><b>Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department</b>  <b>Received via email from PlanD dated 9 September 2024</b>  <b>(Contact Person: Mr. Timothy LAM, Tel: 3565 3940)</b></p>	
4.1.	<p>Please find our observations/comments below from urban design and visual as well as air ventilation perspectives.</p>	
	<p><b><i>Urban Design and Visual</i></b></p>	
4.2.	<p>The Sites are located within an urban cluster to be developed into the Tung Chung Extension Area. The BH Restriction in the surrounding range from 45 - 100mPD for sites near the waterfront to 140 - 185mPD for sites closer to the mountain backdrop in the south. The proposed maximum BH of 108.39mPD of the Sites remains lower than the maximum BH of commercial and residential development to the south and southeast/ southwest of Site A and B respectively (i.e. 140-185mPD). The proposed BH increase is minor (i.e. +3.39m), the overall descending BH profile concept would still be maintained.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
4.3.	<p>As demonstrated by the photomontage, the proposed increase in BH would lead</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Comments Received		Responses
	to a slightly taller building barely visible for the public viewers. In the Visual Appraisal, the applicant has proposed mitigation measures tallied with the approved EIA report (AEIAR-106/2016) including detailed design and vertical greening to minimize potential adverse visual impact. Given the minor increase in BH height of 3.39m, significant adverse visual impact arising from the proposed minor relaxation of BHR is not anticipated.	
	<b><i>Air Ventilation</i></b>	
4.4.	Below please find our comments from air ventilation perspective on the Air Ventilation Appraisal submitted by the applicant.	Noted.
4.5.	Section 1.22 – Consultant please clarify is the baseline scheme an OZP-compliant scheme.	Please be clarified that the baseline scheme as presented in table 1 and 2 are OZP compliant scheme.
4.6.	Section 3.1.2 – The statement of “Under ESE and SE wind, the wind flow pattern is expected to be similar to E wind as the adjacent roads and the 20m NBA of Area 133 shall channel and divert easterly wind” is inaccurate. Wind in ESE direction may not blend and flow along Road D1 and SE wind appear to be obstructed by various building blocks. Consultant please consider updating the text.	<p>The text describing wind patterns under ESE and SE wind is revised and presented in separated paragraphs. It says:</p> <p><b><u>ESE</u></b>            Under ESE Wind, a minor breezeway along the 20m non-building area (NBA) in Area 133 is expected to channel incoming wind to the south of Area 117. The breezeway extends to Central Green which brings wind to the south of Area 114. The wind environment under the proposed scheme and baseline scheme is expected to be similar.</p> <p><b><u>SE</u></b>            Under SE wind, the incoming wind to Area 114 and Area 117 is obstructed by the high-rise comprehensive development southeast and south of the site. A breezeway along Road D5 is</p>

Comments Received		Responses
		identified which can bring downhill wind from Por Kai Shan to the west of Area 114. For Area 117, the majority of wind is blocked by upwind development. Therefore, wind availability of Area 117 would be impeded. The wind environment under the proposed scheme and baseline scheme is expected to be similar."
4.7.	Section 3.1.3 – Similar to the above comment, consultant please consider updating the text and remove the breezeway along Road D1 in Figure 5.	<p>The text describing wind patterns under ESE and SE wind is revised as described in the above response to comment.</p> <p>The breezeway along Road D1 is removed in Figure 5 for ESE wind. Meanwhile, a breezeway along Road D5 is added in Figure 4 and Figure 5 for SE wind.</p>
4.8.	<p>Figures 4 and 5 –</p> <p>(i) Consultant please use the building blocks of the proposed scheme of both Sites in Figures 4 and 5.</p> <p>(ii) Noting the Consultant considered the approved s.16 application no. A/I-TCE-4 as mentioned in Section 3.3, please update the block layout in Figures 4 and 5. Furthermore, in the wind flow pattern, Consultant may consider to reflect the impact of the approved applications.</p>	<p>The building block of the proposed scheme is included in Figure 4 and Figure 5.</p> <p>The building block of Area 133 are adopted from approved s.16 application no. A/I-TCE-4 and included in Figure 4 and Figure 5.</p>
4.9.	Section 3.2.1 – Consultant claimed the NBAs could enhance the wind flow between south and north directions between the sites. However, there is no breezeway or airpath shown in Figures 4 and 5, Consultant please consider	<p>The two sentences are removed and replaced by new text. It says:</p> <p>"The non-building area maintains a good ventilation environment in the localized areas."</p>

Comments Received		Responses
	removing the two sentences “The non-building area allows wind to flow between south and north directions between the sites thus enhancing the localized wind environment”.	
4.10	Section 3.2.2 – It is observed that the podiums for Site A and B extend near to the north boundary of the site compared to the baseline scheme. The Consultant should consider clarifying the impact of these layout changes in the paragraph.	The following text is added to describe the impact of the change of setback distance of podiums.  "Regarding the podium, for Area 114, the setback distance of the podium is decreased from 2.8m to 2.4m from the baseline scheme to the proposed scheme. For Area 117, the setback distance is decreased from 2.8m to 2.5m. The decrease is considered minimal and is expected to cause an insignificant effect on the wind environment."
4.11	Section 3.3 – Please clarify the sentence, “The high-level incoming wind will skim over Area 133 and then the proposed development to the top of the downwind high-rise development”, as the meaning is not clear.	The sentence is revised to say: "These upwind buildings have a major effect on the wind blockage of high-level wind. The minor increase in height of the proposed development has minimal effect on wind blockage."
4.12	<u>Editorial Comments</u> Please include scale bar for the figures in the Air Ventilation Appraisal.	Scale bars are added to Figure 1, and Figure 4 to Figure 7.
4.13	Section 1.2.2 – Should read as “Table <u>21</u> and Table 2”.	Typo of Table number is amended.
4.14	Figures 6 and 7 – “Base Scheme” should read as “Baseline Scheme”.	"Baseline Scheme" is used consistently throughout the revised AVA appraisal.