

Index Page

1.	Buildings Department (received on 12.9.2024)	Pages	1
2.	Drainage Services Department (received on 19.9.2024)	Pages	3
3.	Environmental Protection Department (received on 12.9.2024 and 19.9.2024)	Pages	4
4.	Fire Services Department (received on 12.9.2024)	Pages	15
5.	Highways Department (received on 12.9.2024)	Pages	15
6.	Highways Department (received on 26.9.2024)	Pages	15
7.	Hong Kong Police Force (received on 12.9.2024)	Pages	16
8.	Lands Department (received on 19.9.2024)	Pages	16
9.	Lands Department (received on 18.10.2024)	Pages	17
10.	Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District Planning Office, Planning Department (received on 4.10.2024)	Pages	18
11.	Landscape Unit, Urban Design & Landscape Section, Planning Department (received on 19.9.2024)	Pages	18
12.	Urban Design Unit, Urban Design & Landscape Section, Planning Department (received on 4.10.2024)	Pages	21
	Social Welfare Department (received on 6.9.2024)	Pages	22
14.	Transport Department (received on 19.9.2024)	Pages	23
15.	Water Supplies Department (received on 6.9.2024)	Pages	23

S:\13587 Ting Kau Hotel Redevelopment S16 (2023)\FI\FI-1\20241022 - FI-1 RtoC.doc

October 2024

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
1.	Comments of Buildings Department received on 12.9.2024	
1.1	The development intensity shall not exceed the permissible as stipulated under the First Schedule of Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R).	Noted.
1.2	The site shall be provided with means of obtaining access thereto from a street under regulation 5 of the B(P)R and emergency vehicular access shall be provided for all the buildings to be erected on the site in accordance with the requirements under regulation 41D of the B(P)R.	Noted.
1.3	Before any new building works are to be carried out on the application site, prior approval and consent of the Building Authority (BA) should be obtained unless they are exempted building works, designated exempted works or minor works commenced under the simplified requirements under the BO. Otherwise they are Unauthorized Building Works (UBW). An Authorized Person (AP) should be appointed as the coordinator for the proposed building works in accordance with the BO.	Noted.
1.4	For UBW erected on leased land, enforcement action may be taken by the BA to effect their removal in accordance with BD's enforcement policy against UBW as and when necessary. The granting of any planning approval should not be construed as an acceptance of any existing building works or UBW on the application site under the BO.	Noted.
1.5	All existing/future streets/roads within the development lot(s) should be excluded from site area of the proposed development for plot ratio and site coverage calculation under the B(P)R.	Noted.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
1.6	Areas of the proposed social welfare facilities in the form of day care centre for elderly are to be included in gross floor area (GFA) and site coverage calculation under the BO. Comments will be provided on application for exemption of GFA and site coverage to these facilities upon receiving detail design and justification in plan submission stage.	Noted.
1.7	Sustainable building design requirements and pre-requisites under PNAP APP-151 and APP-152 shall be complied with if GFA concession for green and amenity features and non-mandatory/ nonessential plant rooms and services is to be exempted/disregarded.	Noted.
1.8	Carparking spaces, loading and unloading areas may not be included in GFA calculation subject to the compliance with the requirements under PNAP APP-2.	Noted.
1.9	If the proposed use under application is subject to issue of a license, the applicant should be reminded that any existing structures on the application site intended to be used for such purposes are required to comply with the building safety and other relevant requirements as may be imposed by the licensing authority.	Noted.
1.10	Detailed comments will be given in the building plan submission stage.	Noted.

S:\13587 Ting Kau Hotel Redevelopment S16 (2023)\FI\FI-1\20241022 - FI-1 RtoC.doc

Page 2

October 2024

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
2.	Comments of Drainage Services Department received on 19.9.2024	
	Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA)	
2.1	Section 2.5 – Please provide record of confirmation with the relevant party (EPD/DSD) regarding the increased capacity of the STW.	Please be advised that Section 2.5 of the SIA refers to a leaflet from DSD in public domain. The same reference was mentioned in the approved SIA under the previous S12A planning application Y/TWW/7; with no objection regarding this reference from EPD/DSD.
2.2	Table 3.1 – Peaking factor should also be incorporated to calculate the peak flow from the previous development and proposed redevelopment.	Please be advised that Table 3.1 of the SIA sought to summarize and compare the sewage generation of the existing hotel development with the proposed development, hence only the ADWF and backwash were presented. As the peaking factor and corresponding peak flows are dependent on the cumulative sewage flows at the point of consideration, they are presented in the capacity calculations in the Annex of the SIA.
2.3	Section 4.8 – Please confirm with PlanD that there are no other adjacent proposed development at the upstream of the associated sewerage system.	Please refer to email from Planning Department received on 10 October 2024 (see Annex 1). The adjacent approved developments at the upstream of the associated sewerage system advised by PlanD have been included in the calculation. Please refer to the replacement pages of SIA in Attachment 1 for consideration.
2.4	Section 6.2 – Please indicate which section of pipe subject to high velocities would be further studied. Please also elaborate what further study will be carried and mention in the report.	The section of pipe subject to high velocities is "TK.1" as described in Section 4.10 of the SIA and presented in the calculations in the Annex and shown in Figure No. TIK/SIA/002 of the SIA. The further study mentioned in Section 6.2 of the SIA refers to the site verification of the condition as described in Section 4.10 of the SIA. Please refer to the replacement pages of SIA in Attachment 1 .

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
2.5	Figure TIK/SIA/002 & 003 – Please confirm whether the manhole highlighted in purple is the terminal manhole. Please advise what further study is required for such manhole. Please state such requirement in the SIA report.	Please refer to the response to comment 2.4 above.
2.6	Figure TIK/SIA/003 – Please highlight which section of pipe subject to high velocities on the figure.	The short section of pipe shown in purple is the section of pipe subject to high velocities. Figure has been revised to describe that section is subject to high velocities. Please refer to Figure TIK/SIA/003 of the replacement pages of SIA in Attachment 1 for consideration.
2.7	Annex C and D – Please indicate the pipe materials in the table.	The relevant tables have been revised with note of assumed pipe materials for the roughness adopted. Please refer to Annexes C and D of the replacement pages of SIA in Attachment 1 for consideration.
3.	Comments of Environmental Protection Department received on 12.9.2024 and 19.9.2024	
	SIA	
3.1	Section 4.8 – 'A/WTT/124' should read as 'A/TWW/124'.	Noted. Relevant section has been updated accordingly. Please refer to Section 4.8 of the replacement pages of SIA in Attachment 1 for consideration.
3.2	Annex C – Please review the cumulative ADWF for the sewers under hydraulic assessment.	The cumulative ADWF has been reviewed and revised. Please refer to Annex C of the replacement pages of SIA in Attachment 1 for consideration.

S:\13587 Ting Kau Hotel Redevelopment S16 (2023)\FI\FI-1\20241022 - FI-1 RtoC.doc

Page 4

October 2024

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
	Environmental Assessment	
	Noise Perspective	
3.3	Errors in the NIA report and noise model are spotted. Please address below comments for our review. We would have further comment, when the rectified noise model with assessment is available from consultant for our further review.	It is a worst-case scenario that the building structures away from the subject site do not include in the model. Nevertheless, since the maximum noise level of the proposed redevelopment is 76 dB(A) and the compliance rate is 100% after the provision of noise mitigation, this project would fulfill the streamlined procedure under the ProPECC PN4/23 Practice Note for the Planning of Residential Developments Against Road Traffic Noise. The noise model is prepared by a Certified Noise Modelling Professional (CNMPro) and checked by Independent Environmental Professional (IEP). According to the ProPECC PN4/23, under this streamlined approach, the EPD acknowledges the professional integrity of the CNMPro and IEP, and accepts the project proponent's self-assessment form to be correct to the best of his knowledge. By completing the self-assessment form, the project proponent is deemed to undertake the implementation and maintenance of the
		noise mitigation measures recommended in the report. Please refer to the revised NIA and the self-assessment form in Appendix 2.5 of the revised NIA in Attachment 2 for consideration and the relevant model has been submitted to EPD via Web-NAT With the implementation of the noise mitigation measures, the proposed development would not be subject to insurmountable noise impact.
3.4	TD's endorsement on traffic forecast shall be provided.	Noted. Please refer to TD's endorsement in Appendix 2.1 of the revised NIA in Attachment 2 for consideration.

	Departmental Comments	, ,
	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
3.5	Please clarify whether there are any nearby fixed noise impact.	Based on the site survey carried out in Dec 2023 and Sep 2024, there are no nearby fixed noise sources in the vicinity. The proposed development would therefore not be subject to adverse fixed noise impact.
	Traffic Noise Model	
3.6	Most of the structures are missing in the model. Please supplement and rectify.	Please refer to the response to comment 3.3 above.
3.7	In appendix 2.6, the schedule of noise mitigation measures is all about the tower 2. The schedule of noise mitigation measures of Tower 1 is not provided.	Please refer to the response to comment 3.3 above.
3.8	According to s2.3.1, TD's endorsement is shown in appendix 2.1. No TD's endorsement spotted in appendix 2.1.	Please refer to the response to comment 3.3 above.
3.9	In appendix 2.6, the NAP, T2TYP39, is missing from the table. According to Figure 2.2, an acoustic window is proposed and located in NAP T2TYP39.	Please refer to the response to comment 3.3 above.
3.10	The location of noise mitigation measures does not tally with appendix 2.6. A layout of location of noise mitigation measures for T2-12F only should be provided.	Please refer to the response to comment 3.3 above.
3.11	Most of the structures are not drawn in the model.	Please refer to the response to comment 3.3 above.
3.12	The hard slope near Castle Peak Road - New Ting Kau (L7E) is not drawn in the model.	Please refer to the response to comment 3.3 above.

S:\13587 Ting Kau Hotel Redevelopment S16 (2023)\FI\FI-1\20241022 - FI-1 RtoC.doc

Page 6

October 2024

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
3.13	The roadside kerb and central divider in some roads are not drawn in the model.	Please refer to the response to comment 3.3 above.
3.14	In appendix 2.1, not all the road links drawn in the model are mentioned in the figure and the table. All public road links within 300m of proposed site should be included in both figure and table.	Please refer to the response to comment 3.3 above.
3.15	The road width of all roads are set as 3.0m rather than 3.5m. Please rectify.	Please refer to the response to comment 3.3 above.
3.16	The road Gradient in some roads seems unreasonable.	Please refer to the response to comment 3.3 above.
3.17	In appendix 2.1, the traffic flow speed of all roads is not provided. Also, the traffic flow speed of Tuen Mun Road should be 70km/hrs rather than 50km/hrs in the model is incorrect.	Please refer to the response to comment 3.3 above.
3.18	In appendix 1.1, a cross section should be provided to indicate the floor-to-floor height of residential block of Tower 2.	Please refer to the response to comment 3.3 above.
3.19	In the model, the road height of access road near Road L11, Ting Yat Road, is consistent to Road L11. It is suggested to move the access road from at-grade level model to elevated level model.	Please refer to the response to comment 3.3 above.
	Air Quality Perspective	
3.20	The project proponent and consultant shall note that if sufficient buffer distances can be allowed for any air-sensitive uses of the proposed development in accordance with the HKPSG's buffer requirements for air emission sources within 200 m from the project site boundary, a quantitative assessment may not be required.	Noted.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
3.21	Sections 1.4.2 and 2.7.6: An updated site survey is strongly recommended to confirm all relevant emission sources within the 500 m assessment area.	Further site visit was conducted on 27.9.2024 to confirm any relevant emission sources including chimney and odour within the 500m assessment area.
		Upon the visits, it is confirmed that there is no chimney or industrial activities within 500m assessment area from the Subject Site. Besides, it is noted that there are sewage treatment plant and RCP at Lido Beach which located at about 100m west of the Subject Site. For the review of potential odour impact, please refer to Section 2.12 of the revised AQIA in Attachment 3 for consideration.
3.22	Section 2.2.1: Please clarify whether this is a government project. Otherwise, please remove 6th and 7th bullet points, Sections 2.2.8 and 2.2.9 since they are applied for public works only.	Noted. Relevant section has been updated accordingly. Please refer to Sections 2.2.1, 2.2.8 and 2.2.9 of the revised AQIA in Attachment 3 for consideration.
3.23	Section 2.2.2: Please delete "To achieve of the community,".	Noted. Relevant section has been updated accordingly. Please refer to Section 2.2.2 of the revised AQIA in Attachment 3 for consideration.
3.24	Section 2.3.1: a) The 2023 monitoring data is now available in SAMP v2.0. Please update the table and relevant sections. b) Please add "Table 2.3" after "summarized in" in line 3.	Noted. Relevant section has been updated accordingly. Please refer to Section 2.3.1 of the revised AQIA in Attachment 3 for consideration.

S:\13587 Ting Kau Hotel Redevelopment S16 (2023)\FI\FI-1\20241022 - FI-1 RtoC.doc

Page 8

October 2024

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
3.25	Table 2.3: a) Please revise "(19th highest)" under FSP to "(36th highest)".	Noted. Relevant section has been updated accordingly. Please refer to Table 2.3 of the revised AQIA in Attachment 3 for consideration.
	b) Please review whether "(VIA)" in Note d should be removed. The abbreviation for Smart Air Modelling Platform should be SAMP. Please revise accordingly (Note (c) of Table 2.4, Sections 2.8.1, 2.8.3, 2.8.5, 2.8.12, 2.9.4, titles of Appendices 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4).	
	c) Please remove Note e as it is irrelevant.	
	d) Please delete the superscript "(d)" after "CO" if it is unnecessary.	
3.26	Table 2.4: Please revise "(19th highest)" under FSP to "(36th highest)".	Noted. Relevant section has been updated accordingly. Please refer to Table 2.4 of the revised AQIA in Attachment 3 for consideration.
3.27	Section 2.5.1:	
	a) Please revise "construction dust" in line 15 to "construction dust and gaseous emissions".	Noted. Relevant section has been updated accordingly. Please refer to Section 2.5.1 of the revised AQIA in Attachment 3 for consideration.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
	b) Please remove the last sentence and instead provide the estimated numbers of construction trucks and mechanical equipment to be used per time period at the work site.	Noted. Relevant section has been updated accordingly. Please refer to Section 2.5.1 of the revised AQIA in Attachment 3 for consideration. At this planning application stage, there is no detailed information on the construction program or amount of excavated material to be handled; however, with reference to other similar scale projects, there is likely to be around 5 dump trucks per hour during the site formation stage of the Proposed Development. Watering the haul road and the site once per hour would be implemented to minimize the potential dust emission during the traveling of the dump trucks within the site.
	c) Please clarify whether any concurrent projects have been identified within the assessment area and their cumulative constructional air quality impacts shall be addressed.	The identified concurrent projects within 500m assessment and their potential cumulative construction air quality impact have been incorporated. Please refer to Sections 2.5.11 and 2.5.12 of the revised AQIA in Attachment 3 for consideration.
3.28	Section 2.5.11: Please consider revising the section to "With the implementation of recommended mitigation measures and good site practices, the construction fugitive dust and gaseous emissions can be minimized and no adverse air quality impact during the construction phase is anticipated."	Noted. Relevant section has been updated accordingly. Please refer to Section 2.5.11 of the revised AQIA in Attachment 3 for consideration.
3.29	Table 2.6: Please include a note in the table specifying whether the highest levels of the ASRs have been considered in the assessment.	Noted. Relevant section has been updated accordingly. Please refer to Table 2.6 of the revised AQIA in Attachment 3 for consideration.
3.30	Section 2.7.4: Please consider revising "emissions from open roads" to "vehicular emissions" as emissions from PTIs, bus termini, HGV/coach parking sites (if any) shall also be included in the assessment.	Noted. Relevant section has been updated accordingly. Please refer to Section 2.7.4 of the revised AQIA in Attachment 3 for consideration.

S:\13587 Ting Kau Hotel Redevelopment S16 (2023)\FI\FI-1\20241022 - FI-1 RtoC.doc

Page 10

October 2024

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
3.31	Sections 2.7.5 and 2.8.10: Please follow up and provide TD's endorsement once available. Please note that the vehicular emissions shall not be limited to open roads but also any ventilation shaft and portal emissions if applicable. Please revise the title and relevant text to "vehicular emissions".	
3.32	Section 2.7.8: Please specify the type of vehicles that will be parked at the Ting Kau Car Park. Apart from the roads connecting to the carpark, please state clearly if start emissions are also considered at all local and rural roads within 500 m assessment area.	Noted. According to the parking information from HKeMobility, there are several types of parking space for cars/ light goods vehicles/ light buses, Buses/ Coach and motorcycles, no parking spaces assigned for Franchised Bus Double Deck (FBDD) and Franchised Bus Single Deck (FBSD).
		The start emission of all 18 vehicle classes (except FBDD and FBSD) have been assigned to all roads except expressway which connecting to the open carpark (i.e. Road L6, L7, L8, L9, L10, L11, L15, L16, L7, L15, L16, L17, L18, L19, L20, L21, L22 and L23) as broad-brush approach to prevent any underestimation of emission from the open carpark.
		The above statements have also been incorporated in the revised AQIA. Please refer to Section 2.7.8 of the revised AQIA in Attachment 3 for consideration.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
3.33	Section 2.8.11: Please clarify whether population intake for the proposed development will be conducted in phases and note that the highest emission burden within 15 years from the first population	It is confirmed that the population intake for the proposed redevelopment will not be in phase.
	intake or within 5 years after the full population intake shall be considered as the worst-case scenario in the assessment.	As stated in Section 2.8.11 of the revised AQIA in Attachment 3 , the sensitivity tests have been conducted to determine the worst-case scenario given the combination of vehicular emission factors and the projected traffic flow for the following selected years within 15 years after completion of the Proposed Redevelopment. The representative years are 2028 (i.e. commissioning), 2033 (i.e. five year after commissioning), 2038 (i.e. ten year after commissioning) and 2043 (i.e. fifteen year after commissioning).
		Based on the results of the total vehicular emission among these representative years, the highest vehicle emission year was found to be Year 2028, and hence this has been selected as the assessment year for the operation phase air quality impact assessment to represent the worst-case scenario.
3.34	Sections 2.8.11-2.8.13: A description of the basic assumptions used in the calculations should be provided, including but not limited to, use of EMFAC mode to generate the emission factors, maximum start emission factors among different soak time is used for estimating start emissions in broad-brush approach, minor road network percentage from 2022 Annual Traffic Census is extracted to estimate the number of trips within the assessment area, and temperature/RH profiles selected for calculation. For detailed information on the assumptions used in the SAMP platform, the Consultant may refer to the "User Guide for the ROAD Tool in Smart Air Modelling Platform" available at https://aqia.epd.gov.hk/doc/Traffic%20to%20AERMOD%20Input%20Tool.pdf. Please also note that the most updated version of SAMP	The monthly minimum temperature and Relative Humidity (RH) (i.e. ranging from 10°C – 26°C and 19% to 57%) were applied for both short-term (i.e. hourly) and long-term (i.e. annual average) air quality impact of NO2 while annual minimum temperature and RH (i.e. 10°C and 19%) were applied for both short-term (i.e. daily average) and long-term (i.e. annual average) air quality impact of Respirable Suspended Particulates (RSP) and Fine Suspended Particulates (FSP). The temperature/RH profiles selected for calculation are included in Section 2.8.6 of the revised AQIA in Attachment 3 for consideration. Other description of the assumptions adopted in SAMP v2.0 such as zero emission vehicle scenario, trip and Vehicle kilometers travelled
	(SAMP v2.0) should be used for emission calculation.	(VKT) values, etc. are included in S2.8.12 of the revised AQIA in Attachment 3 for consideration.

S:\13587 Ting Kau Hotel Redevelopment S16 (2023)\FI\FI-1\20241022 - FI-1 RtoC.doc

Page 12

October 2024

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
3.35	Section 2.8: a) Please clarify whether the Ting Kau Bridge with the use of hard shoulder as a traffic lane has been considered in the assessment.	· ·
	b) Please clearly indicate version of SAMP (i.e. v2.0) in the report.	
3.36	Please delete the first "2.9.1" under Section 2.9.	Noted. Relevant section has been updated accordingly. Please refer to Section 2.9 of the revised AQIA in Attachment 3 for consideration.
3.37	Section 2.9.1: Please clarify whether there are any industrial emissions considered in the assessment, or remove "and industrial emissions" in line 1.	·
3.38	Section 2.10.1: Appendix 2.5 is presenting the cumulative air quality impact instead of concentrations resulting from the surrounding vehicular emissions alone. Please revise.	Noted. Relevant section has been updated accordingly. Please refer to Section 2.10.1 of the revised AQIA in Attachment 3 for consideration.
3.39	Section 3.1.1: Please revise "insurmountable" in the last line to "adverse".	Noted. Relevant section has been updated accordingly. Please refer to Section 3.1.1 of the revised AQIA in Attachment 3 for consideration.
3.40	Appendix 2.1, Pages 43 and 44: Several road links are not included in the table. Please review.	Noted. All road links within 500m assessment area have been included in the table. Please refer to the Appendix 2.1 (table showing the speed limit and road classification) of the revised AQIA in Attachment 3 for consideration.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
3.41	Appendix 2.6:	Noted. The identified ASRs have been included and the contour plots have been further reviewed and updated. Please refer to
	a) Please mark the identified ASRs on the contour maps.	Appendix 2.6 of the revised AQIA in Attachment 3 for consideration.
	b) Please correct the typos in the titles.	
	c) Please note that the contour plot in Appendix 2.6b does not match the discrete assessment results for A10 at 1.5 mAG. Please review all the contour plots to ensure consistency.	
3.42	Other than the vehicular emissions, please address if there is any odour emission source within 200 m from the project site.	Upon the site visits, it is noted that there are sewage treatment plant and RCP at Lido Beach which located at about 100m west of the Subject Site. For the review of potential odour impact, please refer to Section 2.12 of the revised AQIA in Attachment 3 for consideration.
	<u>Air Model</u>	
3.43	The model files for contour plots are missing. Please supplement.	The model files for contour plots will be provided to EPD further checking separately.
3.44	The contour plot of annual FSP (with all contour lines below background level) should be incorrect. Please rectify.	Noted. The contour plot of annual FSP has been checked and updated accordingly.
3.45	Table 2.4: Please revise "24-hr" under SO2 to "24-hr (4th highest)".	Noted. Relevant section has been updated accordingly. Please refer to Table 2.4 of the revised AQIA in Attachment 3 for consideration.
3.46	The base elevations of some road segments (including L16_2to5, L7E_9&10, L7W_3&4, L10_3) in model were unrealistic. Please double check and rectify.	Noted. The base elevations of the following road segments have been checked and revised accordingly and the model has been rerun.

S:\13587 Ting Kau Hotel Redevelopment S16 (2023)\FI\FI-1\20241022 - FI-1 RtoC.doc

Page 14

October 2024

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
4.	Comments of Fire Services Department received on 12.9.2024	
4.1	Detailed fire services requirements will be formulated upon receipt of a formal submission of STT/STW, general building plans or referral of application via relevant licensing authority. Furthermore, the EVA provision in the captioned work shall comply with the standard as stipulated in Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011, which is administered by the Building Department.	Noted.
5.	Comments of Bridges and Structures Division, Highways Department received on 12.9.2024	
5.1	From highway maintenance of Tsing Ma Control Area viewpoint, on the application: Referring to the email correspondences on the pre-submission for the subject development, Planning Department advised on 20.6.2024 that a minimum horizontal clearance of 3.8m between the proposed development and Ting Kau Bridge will be maintained. In this regard, please add a statement and a figure indicating the minimum clearance in the planning statement.	Noted. The Planning Statement has been revised accordingly. Please refer to Section 3.1 and Figure 3.15 of the replacement pages of the Planning Statement in Attachment 4 for consideration.
6.	Comments of Highways Department received on 26.9.2024	
6.1	For the access road indicated on the drawings, please note that only part of the access road (near Castle Peak Road) is maintained by this Office. The Applicant may need to conduct necessary assessment and seek comment from the relevant party for the use of the access road.	Noted. The proposed development would not affect any roads maintained by the Highways Department. The applicant would conduct relevant assessment and seek comment from the relevant party at detailed design stage, if necessary.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
7.	Comments of Critical Infrastructure Security Coordination Centre, Hong Kong Police Force received on 12.9.2024	
7.1	We have no further comment on the application but we would like to reiterate our recommendation and observation for the development:	Noted.
	 a) The development shall not affect the access control zone for the bridge towers. 	
	b) The setting up of a buffer zone between the bridge towers and the surrounding facilities for emergency and maintenance purposes is recommended.	
	c) Should there be any redevelopment and construction near the bridge towers that may affect the structure of the bridge towers, further liaison with the developer and comments from civil engineer should be obtained.	
	d) Should there be any underground development near the bridge, further assessment will be required.	
8.	Comments of Lands Department received on 19.9.2024	
8.1	The proposed development is considered not contravening the lease conditions governing the application site.	Noted.

S:\13587 Ting Kau Hotel Redevelopment S16 (2023)\FI\FI-1\20241022 - FI-1 RtoC.doc

Page 16

October 2024

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
8.2	This office reserves our comments on the proposed schematic design which would only be examined in detail during the building plan submission stage. There is no guarantee that the schematic design as presently proposed in the subject S.16 planning application if reflected in future building plan submission(s) will be acceptable under lease.	Noted.
9.	Comments of Slope Maintenance Section, Lands Department received on 18.10.2024	
9.1	I have the following understanding based on i) the "Appendix G – Geotechnical Planning Review Report" (GPRR) to the planning application and ii) SMS' maintenance records of the slope feature no. 6SE-C/CR476: a) The whole of 6SE-C/CR476 is outside of and is adjoining boundary line C-D of the application site (Figures 2 and 5 of GPRR refer); b) The portion of application site near to boundary line C-D is demarcated as "unexcavated" in the figures of basement 1 floor plan and basement 2 floor plan (Figure 5 and the following pages of GPRR refer); and	Noted.
	c) Section 4.3 of the GPRR states that "The proposed works area is away from this feature (6SE-C/CR476). The design and construction of the proposed redevelopment is considered in such a way that the effect to this feature is insignificant and vice versa."	
9.2	In view of the understanding presented in paras. 9.1 (a) to (c) above, I have no objection to the subject application from the slope maintenance point of view for 6SE-C/CR476.	Noted.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
10.	Comments of Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District Planning Office, Planning Department received on 4.10.2024	
10.1	For the open space of about 200m² adjacent to the DE for enjoyment of DE users (as stated in section 3.2.5 of the planning statement), please indicate the area and provide the dimensions of the covered landscape area.	Noted. The extent of the open space for enjoyment of DE users has been indicated on the Private Open Space Demarcation Plan in the Landscape Master Plan and Tree Preservation Proposal. Please also note that the width of canopy above the covered landscape area for DE users is about 2m. Please refer to revised drawing under paragraph 3.2.6 of the replacement pages of the Planning Statement in Attachment 4 for consideration.
11.	Comments of Landscape Unit, Urban Design & Landscape Section, Planning Department received on 19.9.2024	
	Appendix A - Landscape Master Plan & Tree Preservation Proposal	
11.1	Section 3.0 – With reference to "Tree Treatment Schedule" (Appendix 1 of Tree survey and preservation proposal), 1 large mature Bombax ceiba (T0024) (DBH: 1000mm) was recorded and proposed to be felled. The Applicant is advised to indicate the information in relevant Section(s) (i.e Section 3.0 - Assessment of the Potential Impacts on Existing Trees).	Noted. Relevant information has been incorporated into Section 3.0 of the replacement pages of Landscape Master Plan (LMP) and Tree Preservation Proposal in Attachment 5 for consideration.
11.2	Dwg. No. 2021204-S16-LMP-01a - 2021204-S16-LMP-05a -	
	(i) To differentiate the private garden and flat roof separately with different color;	Noted. Separate legends to differentiate the private garden and flat roof have been provided for clarification. Please refer to the replacement pages of LMP in Attachment 5 for consideration.

S:\13587 Ting Kau Hotel Redevelopment S16 (2023)\FI\FI-1\20241022 - FI-1 RtoC.doc

Page 18

October 2024

at Tsuen V	Van Inland Lot 5 and Lot No. 429 in D.D. 399, Ting Kau, Tsuen Wan	(Application No. A/TWW/130)
	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
	(ii) To differentiate the boundary line to separate the private flat roof / private garden and public open space; and	Private Flat Roof/ Private Garden Separate legends to differentiate the private garden and flat roof have been provided. Please note that they do not form part of the private open space. Please refer to the replacement pages of LMP in Attachment 5 for consideration.
		Private Open Space Please note that there is no public open space demarcated in the Proposed Development. For demarcation of private open space, please refer to Private Open Space Demarcation Plan of the replacement pages of LMP in Attachment 5 for consideration.
	(iii) To clarify the proposed treatment for private flat roof/private garden and to avoid using green color unless soft landscape treatments are proposed.	Noted. Separate legends to differentiate the private garden and flat roof have been provided for clarification. Please refer to the replacement pages of LMP in Attachment 5 for consideration.
11.3	Dwg. No. 2021204-S16-OSD-01a –	
	(i) To indicate the boundary line to separate the private flat roof / private garden and public open space; and	Private Flat Roof/ Private Garden Separate legends to differentiate the private garden and flat roof have been provided. Please kindly note that they do not form part of the private open space. Please refer to the replacement pages of LMP in Attachment 5 for consideration.
		Private Open Space Please note that there is no public open space demarcated in the Proposed Development. For demarcation of private open space, please refer to Private Open Space Demarcation Plan of the replacement pages of LMP in Attachment 5 for consideration.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
	(ii) To clarify that the proposed ramps connecting from +71.35 to +74.65 on Tower 1 and Tower 2 are not considered part of the private open space.	Please note that no ramps are counted as part of the private open space for communal use. Please refer to Private Open Space Demarcation Plan of the replacement pages of LMP in Attachment 5 for consideration.
11.4	Appendix 1 – Tree Treatment Schedule - It appears that the DBH in the tree treatment schedule may have been rounded up and in 10mm interval. The Applicant is reminded to cross-check for accurately reflect the respective size of the surveyed trees as far as practicable.	Noted. Tree size has been checked to be accurate.
	Advisory Comments	
11.5	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.	Noted.
11.6	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.	Noted.

S:\13587 Ting Kau Hotel Redevelopment S16 (2023)\FI\FI-1\20241022 - FI-1 RtoC.doc

Page 20

October 2024

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
12.	Comments of Landscape Unit, Urban Design & Landscape Section, Planning Department received on 4.10.2024	
12.1	The applicant may wish to clarify the following:	
	a) whether the no. of storeys (excluding basement levels) for Towers 1 and 2 of the proposed development is 15 and 14 storeys (Table 3.1 of SPS and application form refer) or 14 and 12 storeys (Figure 3.14 of SPS refers) respectively.	Please note that the number of storeys (excluding basement levels) for Tower 1 and Tower 2 is 15 and 14 storeys respectively. The number indicated in Figure 3.14 of Planning Statement refers only to the number of residential floors instead of the number of storeys of the two towers.
	b) the ranges of the proposed building setbacks from site boundaries on relevant plan(s).	Although some of the building edges will overlap with the Development Site boundary due to limited site area, please note that the applicant has endeavour to provide a general building setback of about 3m from the site boundary.
12.2	Para. 3.1.2 – Please review if this para. should be read as "The maximum building height of Proposed Redevelopment (including roof-top structures) will not exceed 77mPD." to tally with Table 3.1.	Noted. The Planning Statement has been revised accordingly. Please refer to paragraph 3.1.2 of the replacement pages of the Planning Statement in Attachment 4 for consideration.
12.3	Paras. 3.2.9, 5.3.1 and Table 5.2 – Please review if these paras. and table should be read as "allow visual permeability" to tally with para. 4.1.1.	Noted. The Planning Statement has been revised accordingly. Please refer to paragraph 3.2.9, 5.3.1 and Table 5.2 of the replacement pages of the Planning Statement in Attachment 4 for consideration.
12.4	Para. 3.2.9 – It is assumed that the dotted blue arrow herein indicates how the building mass is broken down by building disposition and separation, without specifying the exact dimensions.	Please note that the drawing under paragraph 3.2.9 of the Planning Statement is prepared for illustrative purpose and for reference only.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
12.5	Para. 3.2.10 – Given Ting Kau Bridge is inaccessible by the pedestrian and the roof garden is located at the high zone of the proposed development, it may not be relevant to consider the roof garden as a merit of enhancing the visual amenity. Please consider discarding the last sentence accordingly.	Noted. The Planning Statement has been revised accordingly. Please refer to paragraph 3.2.10 of the replacement pages of the Planning Statement in Attachment 4 for consideration.
12.6	Para. 4.1.1 – Please review if this para. should be revised as "the proposed residential development would unlikely induce significant adverse effects on the visual character of the surrounding townscape As illustrated in the following photomontages".	Noted. The Planning Statement has been revised accordingly. Please refer to paragraph 4.1.1 of the replacement pages of the Planning Statement in Attachment 4 for consideration.
12.7	Para. 4.2.1 – Please review if this para. should be read as "no significant adverse impact on the pedestrian wind environment is anticipated.".	Noted. The Planning Statement has been revised accordingly. Please refer to paragraph 4.2.1 of the replacement pages of the Planning Statement in Attachment 4 for consideration.
12.8	Figure 3.12 – Please consider annotating the proposed roof garden on this figure for easy reference.	Noted. The Planning Statement has been revised accordingly. Please refer to Figure 3.1 and Figure 3.12 of the replacement pages of the Planning Statement in Attachment 4 for consideration.
13.	Comments of Social Welfare Department received on 6.9.2024	
13.1	Upon reviewing the projected demand and the latest status of the planned projects in Tsuen Wan District, primarily in the early or preliminary stages, and considering the absence of nearby DEs, we believe that the proposed 60-place DE can meet the service demand of Tsuen Wan West.	Noted.

S:\13587 Ting Kau Hotel Redevelopment S16 (2023)\FI\FI-1\20241022 - FI-1 RtoC.doc

Page 22

October 2024

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
14.	Comments of Transport Department received on 19.9.2024	
14.1	The applicant shall provide justification for the proposed provision for residential parking spaces in table 2.2 which is lesser than the upper end of HKPSG requirement.	Please be advised that the previous technical note for justification to adopt GPS 6 for the subject development has been approved by TD on 1 December 2021. Based on the current traffic condition and site observation, the findings presented in the approved technical note remain valid. Consequently, it is considered that a GPS of 6 would be still appropriate for calculating the carparking provision at the Proposed Development in accordance with HKPSG requirements. Please refer to the relevant technical notes in the replacement pages of Traffic Impact Assessment in Attachment 6 for consideration.
14.2	The applicant shall obtain consent from SWD for the proposed parking spaces for private light bus and loading and unloading bay for the Day Care Centre for Elderly and provide the SWD's consent for record.	Noted. The subject planning application has been circulated to SWD for comment and SWD indicated no comments on this application.
15.	Comments of Water Supplies Department received on 6.9.2024	
15.1	Existing water mains will be affected as shown on the plan. The cost of any necessary diversion shall be borne by the proposed development.	Noted.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
15.2	In case it is not feasible to divert the affected water mains, a waterwork reserve within 1.5 metre from the center line of the water main shall be provided to WSD. No structure shall be built or materials stored within this waterworks reserve. Free access shall be made available at all times for staff of the Director of Water Supplies or their contractor to carry out construction, inspection, operation, maintenance and repair works.	Noted.
15.3	No trees or shrubs with penetrating roots may be planted within the Waterworks Reserve or in the vicinity of the water main shown on the plan.	Noted.
15.4	Government shall not be liable to any damage whatsoever and howsoever caused arising from burst or leakage of the public water mains within and in close vicinity of the site.	Noted.

Annex 1

Email from Planning Department dated 10 October 2024

Davy Lam

From: Jacqueline Yan Hang CHAN/PLAND
Sent: Thursday, 10 October 2024 4:09 PM

To: Davy Lam

Cc: Winnie Wu; Arnold Koon Sun Fai

Subject: Re: Planning Application No. A/TWW/130 - Submission of Layout Plan for

Permitted Flat and Social Welfare Facility Uses at Tsuen Wan Inland Lot 5 and Lot

No. 429 in D.D. 399, Ting Kau, Tsuen Wan

Dear Davy,

As per our conversation, according to this office's record, below please find the list of proposed developments (with approved planning applications) within the area of influence:

A/TWW/103 (currently under construction)

A/TWW/110

A/TWW/124

A/TWW/125

A/TWW/127

A/TWW/128

Best Regards, Jacqueline CHAN ATP/TW1, PlanD

From: Arnold Koon Sun Fai

Sent: Friday, October 4, 2024 4:45 PM **To:** Jacqueline Yan Hang CHAN/PLAND

Cc: Winnie Wu ; Davy Lam

Subject: RE: Planning Application No. A/TWW/130 - Submission of Layout Plan for Permitted Flat and Social Welfare Facility Uses at Tsuen Wan Inland Lot 5 and Lot No. 429 in D.D. 399, Ting Kau, Tsuen Wan

Dear Jacqueline,

As discussed, in response to the comments from DSD regarding the upstream area of the application site, attached please find the sewerage catchment plan (area of influence) in the upstream of the application site for your checking.

Thank you very much for your kind assistance.

Best Regards, Arnold Koon Associate

1