

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>1 November 2024 refers: Landscape Unit, Urban Design & Landscape Section</p> | |
| <p>1 Having reviewed the captioned submission, please find the comment(s) below on the captioned application from landscape planning perspective:-</p> <p>a. Having reviewed the submitted information, the landscape technical information and proposed landscape mitigation measures are found in a document titled “Landscape Proposal and Tree Preservation and Removal Proposal” and such document itself is not required for planning application under s.16 of TPO. However, the Applicant should summaries the following landscape technical information in the Draft Planning Statement with supplementary information as and when appropriate in the Appendices of the Planning Statement.</p> <p>b. With reference to the “Development Scheme_Appendix 2” submitted on the first submission dated August 5, 2024, discrepancy on the proposed landscape area on G/F was observed. This is the fundamental information of the landscape technical information. In addition, there are some landscape area proposed on 9/F – 14/F but missing in the “Attachment 1 Landscape Proposal and Tree Preservation and Removal Proposal”. The Consultant</p> | <p>Section 5.12 updated. Please refer to the Attachment 1 – Extract of Revised Planning Statement (P.28).</p> <p>Figures for the Development Scheme were revised to tally to the Landscape Proposal. For the “Garden” entitled at 9/F-15/F in the MLP is a common hard paved area only, which is for better cross ventilation only, but not a landscaped area with recreational activity. Figures for the Development Scheme were revised. Please refer to the Attachment 2 – Extract of Revised Development Scheme.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>should review the entire submission and ensure accuracy.</p> <p>c. <u>Table 9 (Summary of Proposed Shrub and Groundcover Species) –</u> Please provide column(s) / remarks to show the proposed species are native or exotic for reference. The Applicant is recommended to plant more native species to enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>d. <u>Drawing LP-00 (Landscape Master Plan) –</u></p> <p>i. With reference to the legend table, item “5” – pool deck area is proposed but not indicated on the Landscape Master Plan.</p> <p>ii. With reference to the legend table, item "25" – secondary entrances are proposed at the middle of the west staircase/corridor, but the "pedestrian entrance/exit" is not indicated. Please review.</p> <p>e. <u>Drawing LP-01 (Ground Floor Landscape Plan) –</u></p> <p>i. It is observed that the proposed covered planting area are located in the drainage reserve area. The Applicant is reminded to approach relevant authority / government department(s) direct to obtain necessary approval on the proposed landscape treatment.</p> <p>ii. Section 4.3 (Landscape Design Components) suggests “Layering of plantings at the setback area facing the public pedestrian road as a new green buffering...”. However, only a corner of covered planting area is proposed in the southern corner of the Site. Please clarify.</p> | <p>Noted and rectified. Please refer to the Attachment 3 – Revised Landscape Proposal and Tree Preservation and Removal Proposal.</p> <p>Noted and rectified.</p> <p>Noted and rectified.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Para. 4.3 was revised to tally to the Landscape Proposal.</p> |
|--|---|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>f. Landscape section(s) across the entire Site should be provided to illustrate the spatial relationship of open space between different levels, landscape area and the adjacent footbridge.</p> <p>g. Elevation(s) should be provided to demonstrate the proposed boundary treatment.</p> | <p>Noted and please refer to drawing nos. LS_01 to LS_03.</p> <p>Noted and please refer to drawing nos. LD_01 and LD_02.</p> |
| 2 | <p><u>Advisory Remarks to the Applicant</u></p> <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 tree works concerned and/or compensatory/ replacement planting proposal, where appropriate.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |
| 3 | <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 the Lease. The site coverage of greening calculation should be submitted separately to BD for approval.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |

| Departmental Comments | | Responses |
|--|--|--|
| 22 November 2024 refers: Bridges and Structures Division, Highways Department | | |
| 1 | A preliminary check on a concerned bridge column was presented in the design report. The report revealed that the checking result is satisfactory. The consultant should advise whether the relevant foundation is satisfactory too. | Detailed checking will be submitted for review and approval at a later construction stage. |
| 2 | Preliminary design loads only are adopted for the preliminary check. The consultant should satisfy himself that feasibility of the bridge modification works is assured. | |

| Departmental Comments | | Responses |
|---|---|-----------|
| 25 November 2024 refers: Highways Department | | |
| 1 | We have no in-principle objection on the preliminary design of the proposed modification of the ramp submitted by the Applicant. The Applicant should provide the detailed design of the modified ramp and the newly formed access road, as well as the temporary barrier-free measures when the existing ramp is demolished. | Noted. |

| Departmental Comments | | Responses |
|---|---|---|
| 09 January 2025 refers: Environmental Protection Department: <u>Comments on the EA - Air Quality Perspective</u> | | Please refer to the Attachment 4 – Revised Environmental Assessment. |
| 1 | Sections 2.2.2 and 2.4.2: The Annual Traffic Census 2023 is available now. Please update the texts accordingly. | Noted and revised. |
| 2 | Section 2.4.2: Please note that a traffic flow of 550 veh/hr is not considered low, as the daily traffic volume may exceed 10,000 vehicles. | Noted and revised. |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | Therefore, it is recommended to maintain a buffer distance of 10 m for L011/L012, unless TD's endorsement on the road type can be sought. However, given the large separation distance between the project site and L011/L012, adverse air quality impacts are not anticipated. Please consider adopting the 10-m buffer distance and revise the corresponding text accordingly. | |
| 3 | <p>Section 2.6.3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please revise the first sentence to "Fugitive dust will be one of the major sources of air quality impact during the construction phase". - Please review whether "of same type" can be removed from the last sentence, as consistent with the statement made in RtoC#6. | Noted and revised the first and last sentence. |
| 4 | Section 2.6.4: Please revise the last sentence to "Therefore, air quality impacts due to emissions of PM, NO2, SO2 and CO, etc. are not considered significant." | Noted and revised. |
| <u>Comments on the EA - Waste and Land Contamination Perspective</u> | | |
| 1 | <p>Response to Comment (8) – Para. 1.4.7</p> <p>Please be advised that the recommendation in relation to the land contamination assessment in the approved EAR is no longer applicable, given that further site investigation has been proposed in Section 6.6 of this submission. The Consultant shall update the second last sentence to avoid confusion.</p> | Sentence deleted. |
| 2 | <p>Response to Comment (11) – Para. 6.6.3</p> <p>(a) The Consultant shall clarify and confirm whether the proposed site clearance works in the Project Site would disturb the subsurface soil profile and features. Please be advised that the soil profile within the Project Site shall remain intact prior to</p> | (a) The proposed site clearance works in the Project Site would not disturb the subsurface soil profile and features. Also, we will ensure that the soil profile within the Project Site is remained intact prior to carrying out intrusive site investigation works. Para. 6.6.3 amended. |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | <p>carrying out intrusive site investigation works.</p> <p>(b) The last sentence, “...to determine whether the site is contaminated as in the previous approved planning application (No. A/TW/122)” is confusing. The Consultant shall note that no potential land contamination was identified in the previously approved EAR. The Consultant is advised to carefully review the content and tally the description for clarity.</p> <p>(c) There is a duplicated Paragraph 6.6.3 (i.e., one located in Section 6.7), the Consultant shall carefully review and remove the irrelevant one as appropriate.</p> | <p>(b) Noted and revised.</p> <p>(c) Noted and removed.</p> |
| 3 | <p>Para. 6.7.1 and Para. 6.7.2</p> <p>Please remove the duplicated Paragraphs 6.7.1 and 6.7.2 to avoid confusion.</p> | <p>Noted and deleted.</p> |
| 4 | <p>Response to Comment (19) – Para. 6.7.3</p> <p>(a) Please carefully review whether it is appropriate to identify open storage for construction materials as potentially contaminated areas. If not, please update the description in the first sentence to avoid confusion.</p> <p>(b) It is stated that “...the extent of the potential contamination should be revised” in the first sentence. The Consultant shall clarify what is the initial contamination areas in this Study.</p> | <p>(a) Noted and updated.</p> <p>(b) Revised. The soil/groundwater sampling will be applied to the entire site plus any hotspot area to be identified afterwards.</p> |
| 5 | <p>Response to Comment (12) – Para. 7.1.1</p> <p>The Monitoring of Solid Waste in Hong Kong 2023 was published in December 2024. The Consultant is advised to refer to the latest document for clarity.</p> | <p>Noted and revised.</p> |
| 6 | <p>Para. 7.2.4</p> <p>(a) Please clarify whether the proposed best management practices in construction sites are applicable to (i) C&D materials, (ii) chemical</p> | <p>(a) The proposed best management practices in construction sites are applicable to (i) C&D materials, (ii) chemical waste and (iii) general refuse.</p> |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| | <p>waste and (iii) general refuse. If affirmative, please update the wording to avoid confusion.</p> <p>(b) Please revise “construction wastes” as “C&D materials” for clarity.</p> | <p>Para. 7.2.4 has been revised.</p> <p>(b) Noted and revised.</p> |
| 7 | <p>Para. 7.2.8</p> <p>The content of Paragraph 7.2.8 is duplicated with Paragraph 7.2.2; please carefully review and update the information as appropriate.</p> | <p>Para. 7.2.8 deleted.</p> |
| 8 | <p>Para. 7.2.10</p> <p>Please clarify why general garbage is identified as part of the non-inert C&D materials.</p> | <p>General garbage is not identified as part of the non-inert C&D materials.</p> <p>Para. 7.2.9 (previously Para. 7.2.10) has been revised.</p> |
| 9 | <p>Para. 7.2.12</p> <p>Please review and clarify whether the proposed recycling bins are designated for all types of C&D materials or specifically for the non-inert portion of C&D materials. The Consultant shall update the wording to avoid confusion.</p> | <p>The proposed recycling bins are designated specifically for non-inert C&D materials. Para. 7.2.11 (previously Para. 7.2.12) has been revised.</p> |
| 10 | <p>Response to Comment (13) – Para. 7.2.13</p> <p>(a) Please clarify the meaning of “constant slope”.</p> <p>(b) Please revise “non-insert materials” to “non-inert materials” to avoid confusion.</p> <p>(c) It is noticed that different construction activities have adopted dissimilar portioning ratios for inert and non-inert C&D materials. The Consultant shall elaborate further and clarify the rationale behind it.</p> <p>(d) To facilitate vetting of the quantity estimation of C&D materials, the Consultant is advised to incorporate an additional table to demonstrate the quantities of inert and non-inert C&D materials to be generated from different types of construction works alongside</p> | <p>(a) The words “constant slope” has been deleted in Para. 7.2.12 (previously Para. 7.2.13).</p> <p>(b) Noted and typo amended</p> <p>(c) Ratio of 100% non-inert materials is applied for site clearance according to a S16 Application in Sha Ling (A/NE-FTA/220) while ratio of 90% inert materials and 10% non-inert materials is applied for site formation, excavation, and building construction activities according to statistic from Monitoring of Solid Waste in Hong Kong 2023.</p> <p>(d) Table 7.1 has been added.</p> |

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| | <p>the assumption adopted, including but not limited to (i) the ratio of inert and non-inert portion of C&D materials; (ii) the excavation depth; and (iii) anticipated site formation depth.</p> <p>(e) Considering that the site is currently densely vegetated, the Consultant shall review whether the non-inert C&D materials to be generated from site clearance shall be included in the quantity estimation</p> | <p>(e) Non-inert C&D materials to be generated from site clearance is included in the quantity estimation. Para. 7.2.12 (previously Para. 7.2.13) has been revised.</p> |
| 11 | <p>Response to Comment (17) – Para. 7.2.3 to Para. 7.2.21</p> <p>The previous comment has not yet been fully addressed. Please review and incorporate relevant mitigation measures, including but not limited to stockpiling and transportation of C&D Materials in the construction phase, particularly the control measures for inclement weather (e.g., heavy rain), in accordance with relevant Ordinances, Regulations, Guidelines, and Technical Circulars on waste management.</p> | <p>The relevant mitigation measures have been included in Para. 7.2.14 to 7.2.16 and 7.2.22.</p> |
| 12 | <p>Response to Comment (16) – Para. 7.2.20</p> <p>(a) Please review whether food waste shall be identified as recyclable waste to be generated during the operational phase.</p> <p>(b) The Monitoring of Solid Waste in Hong Kong 2023 has been published in December 2024. The Consultant is advised to refer to the latest information on quantity estimation</p> | <p>(a) Food waste recycling will be explored in detailed design stage. Para. 7.2.21 (previously Para. 7.7.20) has been revised.</p> <p>(b) Noted and revised.</p> |