





**Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Social Welfare Facility  
(Redevelopment of The Salvation Army Lai King Home)  
at “G/IC” Zone, 200-210 Lai King Hill Road, Lai King  
(S16 Planning Application No. A/KC/506)**




**Comments forwarded from Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District Planning Office**

Comments	Responses
<b>Comments from Social Welfare Department (received on 20 May 2024) (Contact Person: Ms Eunice LEUNG; Tel.: 3575 8335)</b>	
1. A Lotteries Fund Grant of \$5.385 million was approved to The Salvation Army (TSA) to meet the cost of technical feasibility study (TFS) for the redevelopment in November 2020, and the TFS is now underway. To give effect to the proposed redevelopment, TSA has submitted a s.16 planning application to the Town Planning Board for seeking permission for minor relaxation of building height restriction from 4 storeys to 7 storeys for the G/IC site.	Noted.
2. The proposed redevelopment, if materialised, would optimise the use of the subject site to augment the provision of rehabilitation services so as to meet the existing and future service demands. As the proposed redevelopment is in line with the Government’s policy and the intention of the Special Sites Scheme, we support TSA’s s.16 Planning Application.	Noted and thanks.
3. The applicant should duly address our comments in Annex 1.	Noted.
<b>Comments in the Annex 1</b>	
1. <u>Supporting Planning Statement</u> The updated Table 2.2 and para. 2.8.1 are noted without further comments.  For para. 4.2.1, please revise as indicated in red in the attached extract:	Noted and para. 4.2.1 of the Supporting Planning Statement ( <b>Annex B</b> refers) is revised.

Comments	Responses
 <p>SPS_Para. 4.2.1.pdf</p>	
<p>2. The updated Table 3.1 is noted. Minor revisions are suggested as indicated in red in the extract below:</p>  <p>SPS_Table 3.1.pdf</p>	<p>Noted and Table 3.1 of the Supporting Planning Statement (<b>Annex B</b> refers) is revised.</p>
<p>3. The residential facilities on each floor of the proposed Block 1 and 2 are not specified in the present Architectural Drawings (Appendix 1). According to previous layout plan [Conceptual Layout Plans &amp; Section (Rev. C)], HSMH is only provided in Block 2. Please re-examine and delete the word “HSMH” in line 2 of para. 3.1.3 if appropriate.</p>	<p>Noted and para. 3.1.3 of the Supporting Planning Statement (<b>Annex B</b> refers) is updated.</p>
<p>4. <u>Decanting Arrangement</u></p> <p>The decanting arrangement as mentioned in para. 3.2.3 and 4.5.1 of the Supporting Planning Statement is different from TSA’s response to SWD’s comments in October 2023 in the Submission of 3<sup>rd</sup> TFS Report as recapped below:</p> <p>Details of decanting arrangement are as follows: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Day activity centre services for new users would not be provided.</li> <li>(ii) Old users using day activity centre services would be transferred to other activity centres.</li> <li>(iii) Residents of Block C (to be demolished at Phase 1) would be arranged: -</li> </ul>	<p>The detail of the decanting arrangement has been updated accordingly. Please refer to the updated para 3.2.3 (now 3.2.2) and para 4.5.1 of the Supporting Planning Statement (<b>Annex B</b> refers).</p>

Comments	Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Around one-fourth of the residents to be moved to Block A;</li> <li>- Around one-fourth of the residents to be moved to Block B;</li> <li>- Around half of the residents to be moved to temporary building (approx. 252m<sup>2</sup>) which to be erected at existing ball court.</li> </ul> <p>As the above decanting plan has not yet been finalised and SWD have raised comments on the decanting plan pending reply from TSA, please clarify and revise accordingly</p>	
<p>5. <u>Appendix 3 – Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA)</u></p> <p>(i) Please revise line 2 in para.1.1.2 and lines 6 &amp; 7 in para. 1.1.3 on P.1 as indicated in the attached extract:</p> <div style="text-align: center;">  <p>Revised TIA Report P.1.pdf</p> </div> <p>(ii) Please replace Table 2.1 in P.3 by Table 3.1 in P.19 in Supporting Planning Statement with the minor revisions as suggested in item 2 above.</p>	<p>Noted and revised. Please refer to the para 1.1.2 and 1.1.3 of the updated TIA (<b>Annex C</b> refers).</p> <p>Noted and revised. Please refer to the Table 2.1 and Table 3.1 of the updated TIA (<b>Annex C</b> refers).</p>
<p>6. <u>Appendix 4 - Visual Impact Assessment (VIA)</u></p> <p>Please revise the word “(HSMHP)” to “(HSMH)” in line 3 of Para. 1.1.2 as indicated in the extract below:</p> <div style="text-align: center;">  <p>Appendix 4 - VIA (1) P.1.pdf</p> </div>	<p>Noted and the annotation of “HSMHP” has been rectified to “HSMH”. Please refer to the updated para. 1.1.2 of VIA (<b>Annex D</b> refers).</p>
<p><b>II. Care and Attention Home for Severely Disabled Persons (C&amp;A/SD)</b></p> <p>1. The revised short form “C&amp;A/SD” in the Supporting Planning Statement is checked in order.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>Please revise “C&amp;A” to “C&amp;A/SD” in the following Appendices:  <b>Appendix 3 - TIA</b>  Table 2.1 (P.9/239)</p> <p><b>Appendix 5 -Environmental Assessment</b>  Section 1.3.2 (P.7/123)</p>	<p>Noted and revised. Please refer to Table 2.1 of the updated TIA (<b>Annex C</b> refers).</p> <p>Noted. “C&amp;A” has been revised to “C&amp;A/SD” in Section 1.3.2. of the EA report (<b>Annex E</b> refers).</p>
<p>2. <u>Para. 1.1.5 in Appendix 4 – VIA</u>  Please revise “Residential Care Home (Person with Disabilities) Ordinance (Cap.459)” to “Residential Care Homes (Persons with Disabilities) Regulation (Cap. 613A), and “ground floor” to “ground floor (RCHE) / street level (RCHD)”</p>	<p>Noted. “Residential Care Home (Person with Disabilities) Ordinance (Cap.459)” has been revised to “Residential Care Homes (Persons with Disabilities) Regulation (Cap. 613A)” and “ground floor” has been revised to “ground floor (RCHE) / street level (RCHD)”. Please refer to the updated para. 1.1.5 of VIA (<b>Annex D</b> refers).</p>
<p>3. <u>Appendix 6 - Sewerage Impact Assessment</u>  Please revise the abbreviation of Care and Attention Home for Severely Disabled Persons to “C&amp;A/SD”.</p>	<p>Noted. “C&amp;A” has been revised to “C&amp;A/SD”. Please refer to the replacement page of the SIA report (<b>Annex F</b> refers).</p>
<p>4. <u>Remarks for Appendix 1 – Architectural Drawings:</u> To recap our previous comments on the Technical Feasibility Study, accommodating the C&amp;A/SD across 2 floors instead of 3 floors is preferred for better service provision and management.</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the comments of SWD and undertakes to address the comments in the detailed design stage.</p>
<p><b>B. Other comments</b></p> <p>1. Please note that the <u>long form</u> of the scheme is “Special Scheme on Privately Owned Sites for Welfare Uses” (there is no “Sites” between “Special” and “Scheme”). Please check and ensure the correct <u>long form</u> is used throughout the submission.</p>	<p>Noted and relevant sections in the SPS (<b>Annex B</b> refers) are updated.</p>
<p>2. Please replace section 2.7 of the supporting planning statement (i.e. information on long, medium and short-term strategy to identify suitable sites or premises for the provision of welfare services) with a simplified and updated version as provided in the link below –</p> <p><a href="https://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/202403/27/P2024032700185.htm">https://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/202403/27/P2024032700185.htm</a></p>	<p>Noted and section 2.7 in the SPS (<b>Annex B</b> refers) is updated.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>3. Please revise the supporting planning statement as proposed in the attachments below –</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;">             SPS_Para. 2.6.2.pdf         </div> <div style="text-align: center;">             SPS_Para. 3.2.1.pdf         </div> <div style="text-align: center;">             SPS_Para. 4.1.1.pdf         </div> </div>	<p>Noted and relevant sections in the SPS (<b>Annex B</b> refers) are updated.</p>
<p>4. It is found in para. 3.2.1 of the supporting planning statement that the completion year of the construction works is changed from 2033 to 2029 (i.e. only 0.5 year is allowed for the construction works). According to the previous submission from TSA, it is estimated that around 54 months would be required for the phased construction works. Please review the project programme and revise the expected completion year in para. 3.2.1 as appropriate.</p>	<p>For the purpose of conducting technical assessments, completion year of 2029 was adopted back in 2021 when the project commenced. It is understood that the project will enter into detailed design stage upon obtaining approval from the TPB on this planning application. Relevant technical assessments will be updated by adopting the latest completion year if required by the Government Departments.</p>
<p>5. TSA has previously clarified that the subject site is currently occupied by one 3-storey and two 4-storey main blocks but it is still stated in para. 1.1.3 of the TIA report that “It is planned to demolish the existing <b>three 4-storey main blocks</b>.....”. Please clarify and ensure consistent information is provided throughout the submission.</p>	<p>Noted and revised. Please refer to para. 1.1.3 of the updated TIA report (<b>Annex C</b> refers).</p>
<p><b>Comments from District Lands Office, Lands Department (received on 20 May 2024) (Contact Person: Mr Ray CHENG; Tel.: 2402 1113)</b></p>	
<p>1. Some of the facilities under the redevelopment proposal (such as Integrated Vocational Rehabilitation Services and Care &amp; Attention Home for Severely Disabled Persons) may not fall within the user as permitted under the existing lease governing the Lot.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>2. Subject to SWD’s and Labour and Welfare Bureau (LWB)’s advice on the facilities under the proposed redevelopment and their interpretation of the user restriction under the existing lease from their policy aspects, if planning approval is given to the application, the Grantee may need to apply a lease modification to expand or relax the user restriction for implementation of the proposed development. Upon receipt of the application with policy support from SWD and LWB for the proposed lease modification, it will be considered by LandsD</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>acting in the capacity as the landlord at its sole discretion. There is no guarantee that any application will be approved. In the event that an application is approved, it will be subject to such terms and conditions as the Government shall see fit, including, among others, the payment of premium (if any) and administrative fee.</p>	
<p>3. Given the non-building area (NBA) restriction under Special Condition No. 15 of the lease and the applicant's advice that "no structures is proposed within the nonbuilding area under the lease", the applicant shall indicate on the drawing titled "General Layout Plan – R/F" at Appendix I of the Supporting Planning Statement (SPS) for the width of the clearance between the structures on the roof level and the northeastern boundary of the Lot.</p>	<p>Noted. Please refer to the updated Architectural Drawings (<b>Annex A</b> refers) which included the NBA restriction on the roof plan.</p>
<p>4. Barrier fencings are proposed along the boundary at LG/F and G/F as shown in the drawings titled "General Layout Plan – LG/F" and "General Layout Plan – G/F" at Appendix I of the SPS, the applicant shall ensure such fencings be erected/constructed within the boundary of the Lot.</p>	<p>Noted. The fencing will be erected / constructed within the lot boundary. Please refer to the updated Architectural Drawings (<b>Annex A</b> refers).</p>
<p>5. In para. 2.2.1 of the SPS, the parking requirement under lease shall be "not less than 4 motor vehicles" instead of "not more than 4 motor vehicles".</p>	<p>Noted and para 2.2.1 of the SPS (<b>Annex B</b> refers) is rectified.</p>
<p>6. LandsD reserves comment on the proposed schematic design which would only be examined in detail during the building plan submission stage upon completion of the lease modification. There is no guarantee that the schematic design presented in the application will be acceptable under lease if it is so reflected in future building plan submission(s).</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>7. We deter to other relevant departments to provide comments on the various technical assessments submitted.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Comments	Responses
<b>Comments from Landscape Unit, Planning Department (received on 20 May 2024) (Contact Person: Mr Justin OR; Tel.: 3565 3948)</b>	
1. The applicant is reminded that approval of the planning application under Town Planning Ordinance (TPO) does not imply approval of tree preservation/removal scheme under the lease. Thus, the applicant should seek comments and approval from the relevant authority on the concerned tree works and/or compensatory replacement planting proposal, where appropriate.	Noted.
2. The applicant is reminded that approval of the planning application under Town Planning Ordinance does not imply approval of the site coverage of greenery requirements under APP PNAP-152 and/or under the lease. The site coverage of greenery calculation should be submitted separately to the Buildings Department for approval.	Noted.
<b>Comments from Hong Kong Police Force (received on 20 May 2024) (Contact Person: Mr Benson TSE; Tel.: 3661 1388)</b>	
1. I have no strong view against the application, as long as no unnecessary obstruction is caused to drivers or pedestrians by the work or the vehicles of the centre, the public pathways are opened as soon as possible, while diversion routes are kept to a minimum.	Noted.
<b>Comments from Environment Protection Department (received on 23 May 2024) (Contact Person: Mr David TSANG; Tel.: 2835 1038)</b>	
<u>Land Contamination</u> 1. Section 1.4.3 - Please supplement the below information for clarity. i. Please provide the information about the paving condition and the thickness of the concrete slab.	<i>The Replacement Pages of Environmental Assessment is included at Annex E of this Further Information Submission.</i>  The ground surface is composed of concrete paving, and the building section plan indicates that the thickness of the concrete slab in the transformer room matches that of the ground floor in other buildings within the Site. There is no information on the exact thickness of the concrete slab.
ii. It appears that dark stains were observed on the ground near the wall. Please clarify.	Please note that dark stains on the ground near the wall are dust.

Comments	Responses
iii. Please supplement information on the duration for the transformer occupied the site.	Noted. The transformer room at the Site has been in use since the occupation of the building in 1979. Please refer to the updated section 1.4.3.
iv. Please clarify whether the transformer is still in operation.	Noted. The transformer room occupied at the Site is still operational up to the present day. Please refer to the updated section 1.4.3.
<u>Noise</u>	
2. Traffic Noise Impact Assessment Endorsement Letter (from TD) on the traffic forecast data adopted for the traffic noise impact assessment shall be provided in the assessment report.	Noted. Traffic Noise Impact Assessment Endorsement Letter from TD will be provided in the assessment report upon receipt.
3. In the current submission, the details of quantitative railway noise impact assessment have been missing (e.g. calculation spreadsheet). Please submit the relevant information for detailed review.	Noted. The calculation spreadsheet for railway noise impact assessment has been updated and supplemented.
<u>Air Quality</u>	
4. Please be reminded that it should be the responsibility of the applicant and their consultant to ensure the validity of the chimney data by their own site surveys. Should the information of industrial chimneys be subsequently found to be incorrect, the assessment result as presented in the planning application would be invalidated.	Noted.
<b>Comments from Urban Design Unit, Planning Department (received on 28 May 2024) (Contact Person: Ms Charlotte KO; Tel.: 3565 3946)</b>	
<b>Specific Comments on SPS</b>	
Noted.	
<u>Vertical Greening</u>	
1. It is noted from page 11 of the R-to-C table that no vertical greening is proposed in the proposed development.	
<u>Green Roof/Roof Gardens</u>	
2. For the sake of consistency, please use the term “ <b>roof gardens</b> ” throughout the entire submission. Please update the relevant texts and figures of the SPS and VIA accordingly.	Noted. Relevant text and figures of the Supporting Planning Statement ( <b>Annex B</b> refers) and VIA ( <b>Annex D</b> refers) have been updated to “roof gardens”.
<u>Para. 4.9.1</u>	
3. Please clarify whether the last sentence should be read as “ <i>The</i>	Noted and Para 4.9.1 (now Para. 4.10.1) of the Supporting Planning Statement ( <b>Annex B</b> refers) is revised.



Comments	Responses
<p><i>compensated tree will be planted at the <b>green deck</b> on the first floor of the Proposed Development.”.</i></p>	
<p><u>Para. 4.9.4</u> 4. The last sentence is suggested to be revised as <i>“With the proposed mitigation measures including incorporation of building setbacks, a 15m-wide building <b>separation and ample landscape treatment such as green deck at 1/F, open terraces at 1/F to 6/F and roof gardens, the Proposed Development would unlikely induce significant adverse visual impact on the surrounding townscape.”.</b></i></p>	<p>Noted and Para 4.9.4 (now 4.10.4) of the Supporting Planning Statement (<b>Annex B</b> refers) is revised.</p>
<p><u>Architectural Drawings</u> 5. Please annotate the dimensions of the proposed building setbacks on the section plan</p>	<p>Please note that dimensions of the proposed building setbacks have been annotated on the updated Architectural Drawings (<b>Annex A</b> refers).</p>
<p><b>General Comments on VIA</b> 6. Please rename Section 6 as “Conclusion and Mitigation Measures”. Please supplement (i) methodology adopted in the VIA; (ii) summary of visual impact from different VPs; (iii) mitigation measures proposed; and (iv) whether the proposed development would induce significant visual impact in Section 6.</p>	<p>Noted. Section 6 of the updated VIA (<b>Annex D</b> refers) has been updated to supplement (i) methodology adopted in the VIA; (ii) summary of visual impact from different VPs; (iii) mitigation measures proposed; and (iv) whether the proposed development would induce significant visual impact had been supplemented.</p>
<p>7. Please ensure consistency of the proposed landscape treatments across the entire submission. For instance, (i) the proposed trees on the roofs of Blocks 1 and 2; (ii) 2 nos. of trees at the entrance fronting Lai King Hill Road; (iii) the no. of trees at the green deck on 1/F; and (iv) covered landscape areas on G/F, as shown on Figures 2.3 and 3.1 of the VIA do not tally with the Landscape Master Plan in Appendix 2 and Figures 3.1a to 3.1d of the SPS. Please revisit.</p>	<p>Please note that there is no tree proposed on the roof and at the entrance fronting Lai King Hill Road. Figures 2.3 and 3.1 of the VIA (<b>Annex D</b> refers), as well as Figure 3.1a to 3.1d of the SPS (<b>Annex B</b> refers) have been updated accordingly.</p>
<p><b>Specific Comments on VIA</b> <u>Para. 1.3.5(a) &amp; (f)</u> 8. Please delete the relevant wordings relating to “construction phase” of the proposed development to read as follows: - Para. 1.3.5(a): Brief description of the Project <del>and any of the associated construction works/activities</del> which may cause potential visual impacts;</p>	<p>Noted. Relevant points in the Para 1.3.5 of the VIA (<b>Annex B</b> refers) have been revised accordingly.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>- Para. 1.3.5(f): Assessment and thorough review of the potential impacts <del>(before mitigation), temporarily and/or permanently, and the residual impacts (after mitigation) in at</del> operation stage;</p>	
<p><u>Figure 2.1</u> 9. Block 1 and the podium of the proposed development appear translucent in the photomontage. Please revisit.</p>	Please note that the photomontage of Figure 2.1 has been updated.
<p><u>Figures 2.1 to 2.5</u> 10. Annotations for corresponding names of developments should be supplemented for the adjoining developments visible in the respective photomontages.</p>	Noted. Annotations of the developments have been supplemented in the photomontages of the Figure 2.1 to 2.5 in the VIA ( <b>Annex B</b> refers).
<p><u>Figure 3.1</u> 11. As per our previous comments dated 17.10.2023 and 5.2.2024, the Applicant is advised to annotate all urban design merits (with dimensions) adopted in the proposed developments, such as building setback(s), building separation, green deck, open terraces, roof gardens, entry plaza, boundary fences, etc.</p>	Noted. Figure 3.1 of the VIA ( <b>Annex B</b> refers) has been revised to annotate the proposed urban design merits adopted in the proposed developments.
<p><u>Table 8 (VP2 – Visual Composition)</u> 12. Please revise the last sentence as “The photomontages from VP2 (<b>Figure 2.2</b>) illustrate that the <b>proposed</b> development will induce a slight blockage of the open sky view in the middle of this VP.”.</p>	Noted. Table 8 of the VIA ( <b>Annex B</b> refers) has been updated.
<p>13. Comments from our landscape team have been provided to you under separate cover.</p>	Noted.
<p><b>Comments from Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District Planning Office, Planning Department (received on 28 May 2024) (Contact Person: Mr Sam HO &amp; Mr. Charlie TSUI; Tel.: 2417 6258 / 2417 6252)</b></p>	
<p><b>General Comments</b> 1. In view of the phased redevelopment schedule, the applicant shall look into possible nuisance caused to Social Welfare Facilities users within the Site during construction stage. Please supplement paragraphs in the SPS for discussion.</p>	Nuisance to the welfare facilities e.g. dust, noise and polluted runoff within the Site may arise during the interim construction phase. Pollution control measures recommended in the Environmental Assessment Report will be strictly implemented to minimise the potential environmental nuisance to the welfare facilities within the Site throughout the construction stage. Recommended Pollution Control Clauses for Construction Contracts issued by the Environmental Protection Department will be included in the works contract specification for proper implementation. Para. 4.10.13 has been added to the Supporting Planning Statement.
<p>2. Para. 3.1.4 – It is noted that the proposed development will adopt Modular Integrated Construction (MiC) method. From previous</p>	The proposed building height of about +63.45mPD has already taken into account the adoption of MiC methods for the Proposed Development. MiC

Comments	Responses
<p>experience, developments adopting MiC usually consist of a higher building height (BH). Thus, please confirm whether the proposed BH has taken factors such as MiC into account. Also, please clarify if MiC is proposed as planning and design merit. If so, the applicant shall elaborate in the SPS on the implication of adopting MiC on the proposed scheme, such as building design, implementation programme, etc.</p>	<p>has the benefit of enhanced efficiency, improved site safety performance, better building quality, less construction waste, less demand for site labour as well as less construction nuisance. Hence, to contribute to the quality and sustainable built-environment.</p> <p>Planning merits of adopting MiC as construction method have been supplemented in the Para 3.1.4 and 4.9 of the SPS (<b>Annex B</b> refers).</p>
<p><b>Specific Comment</b> 3. Figure 3.1e in SPS and G/F floor plan in <b>Appendix I</b> – The reference points of the centerline of Lai King Hill Road for the proposed setback of 15.3m appear different on the abovementioned plans. Please clarify.</p>	<p>Noted and the G/F floor plan of the updated Architectural Drawings (<b>Annex A</b> refers) is updated.</p>
<p><b>Comments received on 3 June 2024</b></p>	
<p><b>Specific Comments</b> <u>Planning Statement</u> 1. Section 4.2 – Please provide detailed figures on how the proposed social welfare facilities can meet the imminent demand for proposed rehabilitation facilities in the Kwai Chung Planning Area and Kwai Tsing District.</p>	<p>Noted. A table on showing the provision of community facilities in Kwai Chung Planning Area and the proposed provision in the redevelopment has been supplemented in the section 2.8.2 and discussion is included in section 4.2 of the SPS (<b>Annex B</b> refers).</p>
<p><u>Architectural Drawings</u> 2. Please supplement a legend for all drawings to indicate the annotations.</p>	<p>Noted and the legend is updated (<b>Annex A</b> refers).</p>
<p>3. Where abbreviations are used to indicate the use of the premises, please include the full terms in the legend.</p>	<p>Noted and abbreviations are adopted in the updated Architectural Drawings (<b>Annex A</b> refers).</p>
<p>4. Please amend 'Office' to 'Ancillary Office' on the layout plans and in the section.</p>	<p>Noted. 'Ancillary Office' is used in the layout plans and section plan of the updated Architectural Drawings (<b>Annex A</b> refers).</p>
<p>5. General Layout Plan - G/F – The types of parking and loading/unloading spaces (e.g. private car, light bus, accessible, light goods vehicle, heavy goods vehicle and ambulance) should be clearly indicated.</p>	<p>Noted and the G/F floor plan in the updated Architectural Drawings (<b>Annex A</b> refers) is updated.</p>
<p><b>Comments from Transport Department (received on 3 June 2024) (Contact Person: Mr LEE Ying Yin; Tel.: 2399 2741)</b></p>	

Comments	Responses
<p><b>Traffic Impact Assessment</b></p> <p>1. R-to-C item No. 6 refers. Please provide the calculation for the PCU factor for reference.</p>	<p><i>The Updated Traffic Impact Assessment is included at <b>Annex C</b> of this Further Information Submission.</i></p> <p>Please find the following calculation for the PCU factor for your reference:</p> <p>Total number of surveyed vehicles (in veh) between 7:30am to 9:30am and 5:30pm to 7:30pm = 48,702</p> <p>Total number of surveyed vehicles (in pcu) between 7:30am to 9:30am and 5:30pm to 7:30pm = 64,337</p> <p>Therefore pcu factor = <math>64,337 \div 48,702</math> = 1.32</p>
<p>2. R-to-C item No. 6 and 7 refers. The traffic flow in Table 3.3, 5.3 and 5.4 does not match with the numbers on the corresponding figures. Please review holistically.</p>	<p>Noted. Traffic flows in <b>Table 3.3</b>, <b>Table 5.3</b> and <b>Table 5.4</b> have been checked with <b>Figure 3.8 (Rev B)</b>, <b>Figure 4.3 (Rev B)</b> and <b>Figure 4.4 (Rev B)</b>, please refer to the revised TIA report for details.</p>
<p>3. R-to-C item No. 9 refers. The traffic flows on Figure 4.5 shall match with the traffic generation/attraction of the redevelopment in Table 4.5. Please review.</p>	<p>Noted. Traffic flows in <b>Figure 4.5 (Rev B)</b> have been checked with the traffic generation/attraction of the redevelopment in <b>Table 4.5</b>, please refer to the revised TIA report for details.</p>
<p>4. Comments on junction assessment as following.</p>	
<p><u>Junction A1</u></p> <p>i. The minor road exiting from the bus terminal should be included in the junction assessment.</p>	<p>Noted. The minor road exiting from the bus terminal has been included, please refer to <b>Appendix A</b> of the revised TIA report for details.</p>
<p>ii. DFC b-ac should not be chosen as b-c &amp; b-a are not sharing the same lane.</p>	<p>Noted and b-ac is not chosen, please refer to <b>Appendix A</b> of the revised TIA report for details.</p>
<p><u>Junction A2</u></p> <p>iii. DFC b-ac should not be chosen as b-c &amp; b-a are not sharing the same lane.</p>	<p>Noted and b-ac is not chosen, please refer to <b>Appendix A</b> of the revised TIA report for details.</p>

Comments	Responses
iv. w-CB shall be 2.1m where no explicit right turning lane is provided.	Noted and w-CB is revised to 2.1m, please refer to <b>Appendix A</b> of the revised TIA report for details.
v. DFC C-A should be assessed as there is heavy right turning traffic C-B and the residual width for through traffic is less than 2.5m.	Noted and DFC C-A has been assessed, please refer to <b>Appendix A</b> of the revised TIA report for details.
<u>Junction B</u> vi. w-CB shall be 2.1m where no explicit right turning lane is provided.	Noted and w-CB is revised to 2.1m, please refer to <b>Appendix A</b> of the revised TIA report for details.
<u>Junction C</u> vii. w-CB shall be 2.1m where no explicit right turning lane is provided.	Noted and w-CB is revised to 2.1m, please refer to <b>Appendix A</b> of the revised TIA report for details.
<u>Junction D</u> viii. Please review the name of junction in calculation sheet.	Noted, the name of Junction D is revised, please refer to <b>Appendix A</b> of the revised TIA report for details.
ix. w-CB shall be 2.1m where no explicit right turning lane is provided.	Noted and w-CB is revised to 2.1m, please refer to <b>Appendix A</b> of the revised TIA report for details.
<u>Junction F</u> x. Inscribed circle diameter is the largest circle that can be inscribed within the junction outline. Please review.	The inscribed circle diameter is revised, please refer to <b>Appendix A</b> of the revised TIA report for details.

Compiled by: KTA

Date: 13 June 2024

File Ref: 20240613\_S3043\_S16\_R-t-C\_V01