

Response to Comments s.16 Planning Application No. A/TP/702

Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Social Welfare Facility at Taxlord Lot T77 RP in D.D. 34, Tai Po, New Territories

Contents

<i>Table R1: Response to Departmental Comments</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Comments from Urban Design Unit, Urban Design and Landscape Section, Planning Department</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Comments from Landscape Unit, Urban Design and Landscape Section, Planning Department</i>	<i>1</i>

Appendix 1: Replacement pages of Visual Impact Assessment

Appendix 2: Replacement pages of Landscape Proposal

Appendix 3: Replacement page of Planning Statement

Table R1: Response to Departmental Comments

Comments from Urban Design Unit, Urban Design and Landscape Section, Planning Department

Comments from Urban Design Unit, Urban Design and Landscape Section, Planning Department [Contact person: Mr. KO Chun Ki, Jason (Tel: 3565 3941)]		Response
1	<u>General Comments</u> Having reviewed the FI2, please note that paras. 2, 3, 11 and 12 of our previous comments dated 17.1.2025 shall remain valid.	Noted.
2	<u>Detailed Comments</u> <u>Replacement Pages of VIA</u> Table and Section 4.3 for VP2 –According to this Table and Section, “the existing tree in the photomontage is on Government land outside of the application site”. However, there is contradictory information for “ <u>potential loss of quality woodland at the junction to primary school and residential blocks</u> ”, which should be clarified to determine the visual impact at VP2.	Noted. The relevant mentioning has been removed to avoid contradiction. Accordingly, the Effects on Visual Resources of VP2 has been revised and the evaluation of overall visual impact of VP2 has been revised to “slightly adverse” (Appendix 1 and Appendix 3).
3	VP4 Photomontage (P. 12) – It seems that the proposed development should appear to be <u>shorter and narrower</u> in the photomontage (i.e. slightly taller than Po Leung Kuk Tin Ka Ping Millennium Primary School) and its extent should be approximately up to the right side of the staircase of the said school).	Noted. VP4 Photomontage has been revised (Appendix 1).

Comments from Landscape Unit, Urban Design and Landscape Section, Planning Department

Comments from Landscape Unit, Urban Design and Landscape Section, Planning Department [Contact person: Mr. WONG Wai Ching, Ivan (Tel: 3565 3947)]		Response
1	RtC item 6:- The applicant’s response is noted. It is advised to remove the word “approved” in Appendix B Tree Assessment Schedule to reflect the current status of tree preservation and removal application.	Noted.
2	RtC item 7:- Only 2 Tree group photos (including one photo from far away from the site and blocked by trees outside application site) is observed in the landscape proposal, which is considered insufficient. The applicant is advised to provide more photos of tree groups in different angles to facilitate the application.	Noted. Individual tree Photo Records have been included. Please refer to Appendix I of Landscape Proposal (Appendix 2).
3	Section B-B:- It is observed that soil depth of 1200mm is measured from the top of the berm, while only 600mm of soil depth from the slab level is proposed. Please be advised that the soil depth/	Noted. 1200m soil depth has been provided in Section B-B (Appendix 2).

	volume is considered inadequate. The applicant should review the feasibility and is reminded to provide sufficient space for root growth.	
4	Landscape Layout Plan at 2/F:- Spot levels for key landscape areas should be provided.	Noted. Spot Levels has been added on 2/F Landscape Layout Plan (Appendix 2).
5	Landscape Section:- It is observed that the layout of landscape area at 2/F as shown in the landscape section is different from the landscape plan (e.g. hard-paved area, planter wall, void area and deck are missing from the landscape section). Inconsistencies should be reviewed and rectified.	Noted. Landscape Area at 2/F in the Section has been revised (Appendix 2).
6	Landscape Section:- The applicant is advised to enhance the graphic presentation of landscape section (e.g. indicating hard paved areas within the landscape area, using separate color for section/ elevation of the building, etc.) for clarity.	Noted. The graphic of the landscape section has been enhanced (Appendix 2).
7	The applicant is advised that landscape information and proposed formation work outside the application boundary is for reference only and would not be reviewed by PlanD.	Noted.
8	The applicant is reminded that approval of the application does not imply approval of tree works such as pruning, transplanting and felling. The applicant should seek approval for any proposed tree works from relevant departments prior to commencement of the work.	Noted.