

Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio (PR) and Site Coverage (SC) for Proposed Social Welfare Facility (Residential Care Home for the Elderly) (RCHE(s)), Training Centre with Residential Institution and Permitted Residential Development (Flat) in Lot 94 in D.D. 388 and adjoining Government land, Castle Peak Road – Tsing Lung Tau, Tsuen Wan (Application No. A/TWW/129)

Response-to-Comment Table

Departmental Comments	Responses
<p>13 September 2024 refers: Landscape Unit, Urban Design & Landscape Section:</p>	
<p>1 After reviewing the subjected submission, to facilitate the Board’s consideration on the S.16 planning application, please find our following preliminary observation(s) from landscape planning perspectives:-</p> <p>a. The Landscape Technical Information should be provided for individual application and making reference to another approved application will not be considered. As there is no enough information regarding the existing trees within the Site and the proposed landscape treatments, potential adverse impact on the landscape resources arising from the proposed use cannot be reasonably ascertained. The applicant is reminded to provide the following information on landscape impact assessment and proposed landscape treatments in accordance with TPB’s Guidance Note:-</p> <p>i. A broad brush survey on landscape resources including tree/vegetation of dominant species [with information of Old and Valuable Tree (OVT)/Tree of Particular Interest (TPI) if any] within application site boundary, with a broad assessment on landscape impact caused by the proposed development; and</p>	<p>The proposed landscape design, landscape treatments, potential impact are supplemented and elaborated in Attachment 1 – Landscape Proposal and Tree Preservation and Removal Proposal.</p> <p>Ditto</p>

	<p>ii. A conceptual landscape plan to illustrate the overall landscape design with proposed landscape treatments/mitigation measures including a planting proposal with the indicative locations, estimated number of trees to be preserved/planted and responsible maintenance departments of the proposed plantings.</p> <p>b. Discrepancy on the quantity of existing trees was found across the deliverable (including but not limited to Table 3 and Application Form (revised)). Since these are fundamental information of the existing landscape resources, the Consultant should review the factual information of entire submission and ensure accuracy.</p>	<p>Ditto</p> <p>It is clarified that the development proposal will cause tree felling of 20 existing trees. Please find the replacement page (P.10) of the Application Form in Attachment 2 for the clarification.</p>
2	<p><u>Advisory Remarks to the Applicant</u></p> <p>Please be reminded that the approval of the planning application does not imply approval of the site coverage of greenery requirements under APP- PNAP 152 and/or under Lease. The site coverage of greening calculation should be submitted separately to BD for approval.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
3	<p>The Applicant is reminded that approval of the planning application under Town Planning Ordinance 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.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Departmental Comments		Responses
13 September 2024 refers:		
Environmental Protection Department:		
1	<p><u>Comments on SIA</u></p> <p>Section 2.2.3, Section 2.4.1 Table 1 & Appendix 2 Table 1 & Table 3 - The referenced catchment inflow factor should be that of Kwai Chung, instead of Tsing Yi.</p>	<p>Please refer to the Attachment 3 – Revised Sewerage Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Noted and revised.</p>
2	Section 2.4.1 - In view of the latest development scheme, the major sewage contributor(s) under the proposed development should be updated accordingly.	Noted and updated.
3	Section 2.4.1 Table 1 & Appendix 2 Table 1 - The assumed population of the proposed development (302) does not tally with the planning statement (303). Please clarify.	Noted and revised.
4	Section 2.4.1 Table 1 & Appendix 2 Table 1 & Table 3 - Please check whether the referenced population census should be 2022, instead of 2021.	As checked 2022 population census, there is no household size provided. The 2021 population census is the latest updated census.
5	Section 2.4.1 Table 1 & Appendix 2 - Please review the estimated sewage flow from the proposed residential institution. Sewage flow from students staying overnight should be included.	Noted and included.
6	Section 2.6.7 Table 3 - The average flow with the proposed development does not tally with Appendix 2 Table 5.	Noted and revised.
7	Section 2.6.7 Table 3, Appendix 2 Table 5 & Appendix 3 - Please consult DSD and obtain the latest flow data for checking of spare capacity for TLTSPS.	Noted and updated.
8	Appendix 2 Table 2c & 4b - Please review the estimated capacity of the proposed sewer segment T0-T1.	Noted and revised.
9	Please re-visit the hydraulic assessment based on the comments above.	Noted.

Departmental Comments		Responses
23 September 2024 refers:		
Drainage Services Department:		
1	<u>SIA</u> Table 1 - Peaking factor as required in GESF is missing in the table. Unit of m3/day should be used for the overall peak flow after taking account of the peaking factor.	Please refer to the Attachment 3 – Revised Sewerage Impact Assessment. Peaking factor is added in Table 1.
2	Table 3 – How to come up the percentage of 54% for average flow with proposed development? Also, please highlight whether the capacity of pumping station is sufficient to take up the flow from the proposed development.	There is a typo of the peak flow. Table 3 has been updated and confirmed that the capacity of pumping station is sufficient to cater the flow from the proposed development.
3	Figure 1 & 2 – Please indicate the area of Catchment A and the associated upstream pipe connection in the figure.	Figure 1 and 2 have been indicated.
4	Appendix 2 Table 2c – For pipe size up to 900mm dia. It should be designed to achieve a self-cleansing velocity of 1.0m/s in full pipe condition. Currently the pipe cannot fulfil such arrangement.	Noted and revised.
5	Appendix 2 Table 3 – Please confirm whether Catchment A is the only upstream catchment. If not, please indicate all the upstream catchment in this table and update the assessment.	It is confirmed that Catchment A is the only upstream catchment.
6	Appendix 2 Table 4a – Understand that the flow of 2641m3/day should be the summation of 2401m3/day from existing development and 240m3/day, however the flow of 240m3/day has not incorporated a correct peaking factor as required from GESF.	As the contributing population is 9786, which is including the ADWF of existing development and proposed development, peaking factor of 5 is adopted for the population 5,000 to 10,000.
7	<u>DIA</u> Please show the alignment of box culvert and related pipes to	Please refer to the Attachment 4 – Revised Drainage Impact Assessment. The surface runoff from the surrounding has been indicated in Figure 2

	demonstrate the amount of surface water to be collected by this culvert.	and 3. As there is no any public drains show to connect the box culvert in the public drainage record, Catchment A1 has been added for a conversative scenario.
8	Please include design allowance for end of 21st Century as stipulate in SDM Corrigendum 1/2022.	Noted and included.