

**Appendix IV**  
**Consolidated Responses to Departmental Comments**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In support of the subject section 16 planning application, a planning enquiry with a Technical Planning Letter was submitted to the Planning Department (PlanD) on 18.4.2024. Besides, a Planning Statement with technical assessments for formal pre-submission was further supplemented to PlanD on 26.7.2024. Valuable comments from the relevant Government departments have been received during the pre-submission stage.

The proposed scheme has been further revised based on the departmental comments recently received after the formal pre-submission on 26.7.2024 and the latest special religious requirements as recommended by the Fung Shui expert. Major revisions to the development scheme are as follows:-

### 1) Rotation of Ceremonial Axis of the Proposed Development

As a prominent religious institution (the Supreme Kwan Ti Temple), feng shui is an integral part of the cultural heritage of ancient Chinese society and used to design buildings and spaces to achieve harmony and balance with the environment. The Applicant has invited the Master of Shun Fung Temple (淳風仙觀) to assist in determining the direction the proposed temple development should face. Thus, the proposed development has been slightly adjusted to face at the direction towards west “子午線坐東向西偏北 273.88 度”.

### 2) Minor Increase in the Proposed Gross Floor Area (GFA)

The following aspects have impacted the GFA calculation, which was previously about 19,405m<sup>2</sup> to the current of about 22,775m<sup>2</sup>:

- The previous arithmetic calculation of the proposed GFA (i.e. 19,405m<sup>2</sup>) during the pre-submission included the proposed GFA concessions (i.e. GFA concession for covered walkway, eaves and E&M facilities). After detailed consideration, it is considered at the planning stage to demonstrate the Buildings Department (BD) calculation format. The GFA concession will be further negotiated after planning approval with relevant Government departments (i.e. Lands Department and BD). Nevertheless, the scale, design, and facilities of the proposed scheme is very similar to the scheme that submitted during the pre-submission stage;
- The above-mentioned rotation of ceremonial axis of the development has led to the slight increase; and
- A covered area to the swords and arts arena area (演武壇場及戲台) has been included to address local adverse weather.

3) Proposed Structure on Lot 1629 in DD. 117 Removed

The previously proposed structure on Lot 1629 in DD. 117 has been cancelled and proposed to be a garden.

The following chapter has consolidated relevant Government department's comments and responses from the Applicant.

## 2. CONSOLIDATED RESPONSES TO DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS

During the pre-submission stage, the Applicant had received a number of comments from the following Government departments:-

- Home and Youth Affairs Bureau (HYAB)
- District Officer (DO)
- Home Affairs Department (HAD)
- Architectural Services Department (ASD)
- Urban Design Unit of Planning Department (UD)
- Lands Department (LandsD)
- Building Department (BD)
- Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD)
- Fire Services Department (FSD)
- Water Supplies Department (WSD)
- Landscape Unit of Planning Department (Landscape Team) (LT)
- Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)
- Drainage Services Department (DSD)
- Environmental Protection Department (EPD)
- Geotechnical Engineering Office, CEDD (GEO)
- Highways Department (HyD)
- Transport Department (TD)
- Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD)
- Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
- Social Welfare Department (SWD)
- Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)

A consolidated table of the Applicant's responses to the departmental comments has been provided in **Table 2.1** to **Table 2.21** in the following sections. Furthermore, the Applicant's responses to the comments from Transport Operations (NT) Division of Transport Department (TONT/TD), which was directly received by the Applicant's Traffic Consultant on 29.10.2024, has been incorporated into the consolidated table and the Traffic Impact Assessment attached in the Planning Statement.

## 2.1 Responses to Comments from Home and Youth Affairs Bureau

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
<b>Comments Received on 30.5.2024</b>		
HYAB(1)	<p>According to the information provided by the Applicant, we note that the Applicant was established in 2015 and promotes Kwan Tai culture by organising various religious activities regularly, including worshipping activities (e.g. 關帝春祭, 關帝秋祭, 關帝誕), talks, seminars and workshops. In view of above, we are satisfied that the Applicant is a bona fide religious organization. Having checked the official website of the Inland Revenue Department, we note that the Applicant is a charitable organization registered under section 88 of the Inland Revenue Ordinance (Cap. 112).</p>	Noted.
HYAB(2)	<p>According to the application material, the proposed temple intends to fulfil the mission of Kwan Ti's philosophy and to promote the idea of the integration of three religions of Confucianism, Buddhism and Taoism. It aims to create a strong environment for religious worship and religious activities, and will be mainly reserved for religious and cultural activities in relation to paying respect to the spirit of Kwan Ti. It appears that the proposed temple is religious-related. As the proposed temple appears to be religious-related, we have no objection to the proposed religious institution in the captioned planning application, following our established practice.</p>	Noted.

## 2.2 Responses to Comments from District Officer

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
DO(1)	Having considered the nature and scale of the proposed development, you are advised to consider conducting a local consultation on the proposed development to collect the views of concerned stakeholders.	A local consultation on the proposed development to collect the views of concerned stakeholders had been conducted in July 2024. A meeting record with photos has been attached in <b>Appendix III</b> for your attention.

## 2.3 Responses to Comments from Home Affairs Department

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
HAD(1)	Having considered the nature and scale of the proposed development, you are advised to consider conducting a local consultation on the proposed development to collect the views of concerned stakeholders.	A local consultation on the proposed development to collect the views of concerned stakeholders had been conducted in July 2024. A meeting record with photos has been attached in <b>Appendix III</b> for your attention.

## 2.4 Responses to Comments from Architectural Services Department

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
ArchsD (1)	Based on the information provided, it is noted that the number of one to three-storey building blocks of the proposed development has been increased to 9 instead of 8 from last pre-submission and the building height (BH) remains unchanged. Based on the submitted VIA, it appears that the proposed development is visually compatible with the existing environment. We have no particular comment from the architectural and visual impact point of view, subject to PlanD's view.	The number of one to three-storey building blocks of the proposed development is 9 (nine) and the building height (BH) remained unchanged. Based on the submitted VIA, ASD opined that it appears the proposed development is visually compatible with the existing environment. The Applicant noted that ASD had no particular comment from the architectural and visual impact point of view, subject to PlanD's view.

## 2.5 Responses to Comments from Urban Design Unit of Planning Department

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
UD(1)	<p><b><u>Urban Design and Visual Impact</u></b></p> <p>The proposed development, which is taller than existing low-rural settlements/ temporary structures, is not fully in keeping with the existing rural character and natural topography in its immediate surroundings.</p>	<p>Noted. The relationship between the proposed development and surrounding natural topography and existing adjacent settlements is further described in the updated Visual Impact Assessment in <b>Appendix IX</b> (refer to new Figure 3.2).</p>
UD(2)	<p>To substantiate the application, it would be advisable to provide more justifications for the proposed BH and explore more effective design measures e.g. stepped BH and building separations/ setbacks to make appropriate response to the surrounding rural setting. As per the consultant's responses in the R-to-C Table (Item No. UD(4) refers), please note the followings:</p> <p>(a) For ease of reference, please indicate the dimensions (e.g. widths) of the proposed building setbacks on Figure 3.1 of the visual impact assessment (VIA) (Appendix VIII refers).</p> <p>(b) BHs (in mPD) of some of the above-ground structures are found missing in Figure 3.1 of the VIA. Please supplement to illustrate the stepped BH as stated in the R-to-C Table.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>(a) The dimensions of the proposed building setback on Figure 3.1 have been indicated.</p> <p>(b) All BHs of the above ground structures have been indicated on Figure 3.1.</p>
UD(3)	<p><b><u>Detailed Comments</u></b></p> <p><b>Planning Statement (Appendix IV):</b></p> <p><b>Table 4.1</b> - Our previous comments have not been fully addressed. The building structures/blocks under the proposed development as stated in this table seem still inconsistent with those as annotated in P.139. For instance, there are three structures (i.e. G1-G3) in P.139 which are not specified in this table. Also, please clarify if "Other Ancillary Facilities" are also standalone</p>	<p>The building structures/ blocks under the proposed development as stated in Table 4.1, 4.2a and 4.2b of the Planning Statement and P.139 of the Design Statement in <b>Appendix V</b> are consistent in this submission.</p> <p>"Other Ancillary Facilities" are not standalone structures, they are facilities such as facilities connecting other floors such as functional elevators, staircases, corridors, inner walls,</p>

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
	structure(s). If yes, please also annotate in P.139.	bathrooms and some exterior walls connected to other floors.
UD(4)	<p><b>Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) (Appendix VIII):</b></p> <p><b>General</b> - As stated in the VIA (Para. 1.3. refers), the VIA is prepared in accordance to the Town Planning Board Planning Guidelines on Submission of VIA for Planning Applications to the Town Planning Board (TPBPG-No. 41). Notwithstanding, it seems that some of the analyses/discussions seems not following the</p>	As noted above further figures and description are added to support the analysis and discussions on the VIA for the proposed temple project. Discussion on Construction Stage Mitigation Measures have also been removed from the assessment.
UD(5)	<p><b>Selection of VPs:</b></p> <p>(a) <b>VP1</b> - Please consider if <b>VP1</b> can <u>replaced by VP12</u> which represent view from northeast of the Site in similar distance.</p> <p>(b) <b>VPs 2 &amp; 3</b> – Our previous comments have not been duly addressed, please consider selecting either <b>VP2 or VP3</b> for assessment which both represent view from the northwest of the Site in similar distance.</p>	<p>(a) Whist these two views are from a similar direction and distance, we do consider that they are of a different nature. The requested additional view (VP12) is from the entrance of a holiday camp, with access is restricted to patrons of this facility. This view would also be experienced by similar receivers as VP5. It is at an elevation where there are no views out beyond the wooded road corridor.</p> <p>VP1 is from a large BBQ and open space with elevated views out towards the site. At the northern edge of this area, there is a public viewing point (with interpretation panel), where this hilltop site offers panoramic views across the Yeun Long Valley. As a well-used public space within a country park, it would seem a sensitive receiver which should be included in the assessment. As VP12 was an additional request, we assume this should also be retained.</p> <p>(b) Noted, however the two VP do help illustrate important aspects of the visual impact which we have generally tried to demonstrate in the overall assessment. VP2 looks across the urban settlement on the valley floor from a relatively low elevation and illustrates the compatibility in scale and composition with this urban foreground setting, where the</p>



Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
	<p>(c) <b>VPs 5 to 8</b> – Our previews comments have not been duly responded, please specify the sensitive receivers (public viewers) of <b>VPs 5, 6 and 7</b> and clarify why <b>VP8</b> cannot represent these three VPs.</p>	<p>temple is largely screened by intervening wooded ridges. VP3 is from a much higher elevation where the screening effect of such ridges is largely negated. However, VP3 demonstrated that the development visually forms part of the developed valley floor area, and its massing is compatible with some of the larger warehouse type structures within this view. As such we would suggest that retaining both views does have value in illustrating these different aspects of the relationship between the proposed development and its visual context.</p> <p>(c) VP8 is a pedestrian roadside view in the vicinity of Tai Tong Shan Road; a well wooded section of rural road where transient views for drivers and leisure pedestrians are fully blocked by trees and landform. This would seem different to views from the developed area of the valley floor, where local residents are likely to be the primary sensitive receivers. VP 5 is a view from a local open space within the urban area, where the screening effect of dense village development is demonstrated. VP 6 is from a well-used footpath within the river corridor where the more open urban structure allows views towards the proposed temple through intervening existing development. VP7 is a rural footpath for a few residents at the less densely development edges of the urban area, where views across the rural landscape towards the proposed temple are illustrated. The purpose of providing these views is to demonstrate variations in the relationship between the different parts of the publicly accessible urban area and the proposed temple development and provide a fuller picture of how the presence of intervening structures, vegetation and landform function to help minimise visibility of the proposals. It does not seem that VP5 alone would be representative.</p>

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
UD(6)	<p><b>Photomontages (General):</b></p> <p>Our previous comments have not been duly addressed. With reference to the TPB PG-No. 41, Please be reminded that VPs should be at human eye level for a realistic presentation of views. Notwithstanding, it is noted that <b>most</b> of the site photos/photomontages seem involve <b><u>distortion and wide angle (i.e. panoramic view)</u></b>. In this regard, please consider retaking the site photos for preparation of VIA.</p>	<p>Noted and the photomontage have been further reviewed in this regard. We confirm that all photographic views are taken at human eye level.</p>

## 2.6 Responses to Comments from Lands Department

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
LandsD (1)	<p><b><u>Part A : General Comments</u></b></p> <p>a) According to our desking checking, the Applicant Site area comprises various private lots including 1475 (part), 1591 9part), 1594 (part), 1595 (part), 1600 s.A (part), 1600s.B (part) 1602 (part),1622, 1624, 1629, 1630 s.A (part), 1630 s.B, 1630 s.C, 1630 s.D, 1631, 1632, 1633, 1634, 1635 and 1636 (part) and adjoining Government Land in D.D.117. Tai Tong, Yuen Long. Our comments given under Part A of the memo dated 3.6.2024 remain valid.</p>	Noted.
LandsD (2)	<p><b><u>Part B : Advisory Comments for the Applicant</u></b></p> <p>a) Regarding the issue of the right-of way to the Application Site, the applicant claimed that they have secured consent from Tai Tong Organic Ecopark Company Limited (TTOEC) for access rights pertaining to the access road. The said "consent" of the access right would be subject to verification at the land application stage, if applied. The applicant should be reminded to ensure availability of proper access right</p>	Noted.
LandsD (3)	<p>b) The applicant should be responsible for the costs and ensure technical feasibility of all necessary infrastructure works such as water connections, drainage, sewage, etc..</p>	Noted.
LandsD (4)	<p>c) According of Planning Statement provided by the Applicant, there will be no new building/structures erected on any private lots other than DD117 Lot 1629. However, in the Master Layout Plan of the</p>	Lot 1629 in D.D. 117 is proposed to be a garden. The Master Layout Plan and the Landscape Master Plan have been updated.

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
	<p>same document, It appeared that the proposed development boundary would slightly encroach onto DD117 Lot 1628. Furthermore, it is unclear whether any structure would be erected on DD117 Lot 1629, as it is labelled as "Cultural Art Gallery Facilities" with two storeys in the MLP, while it is found labelled as "Contemplative Cultural Garden" in the Landscape Garden Plan at Appendix V. The applicant should clarify.</p>	
LandsD (5)	<p>(d) Further to para.(b), the Master Layout Plan shows that there will be structures erected over DD117 Lot 1622 and 1624, which appeared to contradict with the previous statement made in the Planning Statement. Please clarify</p>	<p>The Applicant would like to clarify there will be structures over Lots 1622 and 1624 in D.D. 117. Relevant paragraphs in the Planning Statement have been revised.</p>
LandsD (6)	<p>(e) The Applicant also advised that <i>"the Organization will submit an application for a private treaty grant (PTG) covering the <u>government land</u> within the development area... and submit application(s) for short term waiver to allow provision of building(s)/ structure(s) on private lot(s).</i> That said, the potential PTG will cover the Temple development only. In the event that the planning application is approved by TPB, the applicant should be reminded that comment in the memo dated 3.6.2024, in particular para (e), remain valid.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<b>LandsD's previous comments dated 3.6.2024</b>		
LandsD (A1)	<p><b><u>Part A : General Comments</u></b> a) According to our desking checking, the Applicant Site falls within private lots including 1475 (part),</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
	<p>1591 (part), 1594 (part), 1595 (part), 1600 s.A (part), 1600s.B (part), 1602 (part), 1622, 1624, 1629, 1630 s.A (part), 1630 s.B, 1630 s.C, 1630 s.D, 1631, 1632, 1633, 1634, 1635 and 1636 (part) and adjoining Government Land in D.D.117. The Private lots are old scheduled agricultural lots held under Block Government Lease. No structures is allowed to be erected on the Lots without prior approval of the Government.</p>	
LandsD (A2)	<p>b) The Application Site includes substantial areas of private land not in the applicant's ownership as revealed from Land Registry records. The private lots are held under different owners. With reference to the Technical Planning Letter, the area of Application Site is 31,0168m<sup>2</sup>, including about 22,415m<sup>2</sup> of Government land (i.e. about 72% of the site area of Development Site)</p>	Noted.
LandsD (A3)	<p>c) The actual site area, site boundary and lease details, etc. of the Application Site involved will be subject to survey and verification at the land application stage, if applied</p>	Noted.
LandsD (A4)	<p>d) In the event that the planning application for the proposal is approved by TPB, the Applicant is reminded that they should obtain the necessary policy support from HYAB and apply to LandsD for land application to implement to proposal. Subject to policy support being given, LandsD will consider the application in its private capacity as landlord. However,</p>	Noted. At the present stage, we have received "no objection" from HYAB.

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
	<p>there is no guarantee that the land application, including the grant of additional Government land (if any), for the proposed development will eventually be approved by LandsD, in particular taking in to account the substantial areas of Government land involved. If the land application is approved by LandsD, it will be subject to such terms and conditions as many be imposed by LandsD at its absolute discretion, including payment of premium and administrative fee(s).</p>	
LandsD (A5)	<p>e) It is noted that the Applicant claimed that a private treaty grant (PTG) application would be submitted to LansD after the s.16 planning application has been approved by the TPB. The Applicant is reminded that LandsD will determine the appropriate type of land application to be processed in its private capacity as landlord and subject to para.(d) above.</p>	<p>Noted and agreed.</p>
LandsD (A6)	<p>f) The Application Site Boundary, which included the proposed access road, the temple site and Tai Tong Kwan Ti Square, involves private lots not held by the Applicant (as shown from Land Registry), STT and STW. The Applicant shall clarify the ownership particulars and status of those private lots involved, and how to implement the whole development, in particular the access road arrangement to ensure availability of proper access right.</p>	<p>In regards to the right of way to the Temple site, the Tai Tong Organic Ecopark Company Limited (TTOEC) is the tenant who has benefit rights of the private lots involving the access road. The Applicant has already obtained consent for access right from TTOEC. According to the Applicant's legal advisors, the consent obtained is valid.</p> <p>The Applicant will be responsible for resolving any land issues arising from the proposed development.</p>

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
LandsD (A7)	g) The Applicant claimed that in the proposed land application (if applied), Tai Tong Kwan Ti Square and the proposed access road will be excluded from the land application boundary. The Applicant should note that in processing land application, LandsD would, in general, consider the land application boundary in conjunction with the associated planning approval.	Noted.
LandsD (A8)	h) There are existing Short Term Tenancy ("STT") and Short Term Waiver ("STW") found within the Application Site but outside the Development Area. Details are to be examined at the land application stage (if applied). In the event that the planning application is approved, the STT tenant(s)/STW holder(s) will need to apply for modification of the STT/STW conditions where appropriate to implement the proposal, which is not covered by the PTG application. The Application(s) for STT/STW will be considered by the Government in its capacity as a landlord and there is no guarantee that it will be approved, The STT/STW, if approved, will be subject to such terms and conditions including the payment of rental/waiver fee and administrative fee as considered appropriate by LandsD. Beside, given the STT/STW are temporary in nature, only erection of temporary structure(s) will be considered.	Noted.

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
LandsD (A9)	<p>i) Tai Tong Kwan Ti Square, which is expected to be excluded from the potential land application boundary, comprises various private agricultural lots. The applicant should provide more details on the improvement works of Tai Tong Kwan Ti Square and clarify whether any structure is to be built thereon.</p>	<p>Topographic Survey for Tai Tong Kwan Ti Square is incorporated into relevant drawings.</p>



## 2.7 Responses to Comments from Buildings Department

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
BD(1)	Please also note that our previous comments on the captioned pre-submission as stipulated in paragraphs 2(i) and 3 of my memo dated 17 May 2024 under reference no.(4) in B.C.Y.L MISC 1723 are still applicable. Copies of which are attached for your information.	Noted.
BD(2)	It is noted that 9 structures are proposed in your application. Before any new building works (including containers / open sheds as temporary buildings, demolition and land filling, etc.) are to be carried out on application site, prior approval and consent of the BA should be obtained, otherwise they are unauthorized building works (UBW) under the Buildings Ordinance (BO). An Authorized Person should be appointed as the co-ordinator for the proposed building works in accordance with the BO.	<p>The Applicant note that before any new building works (including containers / open sheds as temporary buildings, demolition and land filling, etc.) are to be carried out on the application site, prior approval and consent of the BA should be obtained, otherwise they are unauthorized building works (UBW) under the Buildings Ordinance (BO).</p> <p>The Applicant noted that an Authorized Person should be appointed as the co-ordinator for the proposed building works in accordance with the BO.</p>
<b><i>BD's previous comments dated 17.5.2024</i></b>		
BD(A1)	<p>2. Base on the limited information in the pre-application submitted, I have the following comments under the Buildings Ordinance (BO):</p> <p>(i) Existing structures are identified within the application site. According to our records, there are building works approved by the Building Authority (BA) and are being undertaken only on the lot 1635 in D.D.117. Please be advised that I am not in position on offer comments on the suitability of other existing structures identified within the application site for the use proposed in the application; and</p>	The Applicant noted that according to the records of Buildings Department (BD file number 2/9230/18), there are building works approved by the Building Authority (BA) and are being undertaken only on Lot 1635 in D.D.117.

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
BD(A2)	(ii) It is noted that 8 structures are proposed in your application. Before any new building works (including containers / open temporary buildings, demolition and land filling, etc.) are to be carried out on application sit, prior approval and consent of the BA should be obtained, otherwise they are unauthorized building works (UBW) under the building Ordinance (BO). An Authorized Person should be appointed as the co-ordinator for the proposed building works in accordance with the BO.	<p>The Applicant noted that before any new building works (including containers / open temporary buildings, demolition and land filling, etc.) are to be carried out on the application site, prior approval and consent of the Building Authority should be obtained, otherwise they are unauthorized building works (UBW) under the Buildings Ordinance (BO).</p> <p>The Applicant also noted that an Authorized Person will be appointed as the co-ordinator for the proposed building works in accordance with the Buildings Ordinance.</p>
BD(A3)	<p>3. The applicant's attention is drawn to the following points:</p> <p>(i) The site shall be provided with means of obtaining access thereto from a street from and emergency vehicular access in accordance with Regulations 5 and 41D of the Building (Planning) Regulations [B(P)R] respectively;</p>	<p>The Applicant noted that the site shall be provided with means of obtaining access thereto from a street in accordance with Regulation 5 of the Building (Planning) Regulations. The tentative means of the obtaining access thereto from a street is indicated on page 124 of the Design Statement attached in <b>Appendix V</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant noted that the site shall be provided with emergency vehicular access in accordance with Regulation 41D of the Building (Planning) Regulations. The tentative emergency vehicular access layout is indicated on page 140 of Design Statement attached in <b>Appendix V</b>.</p>
BD(A4)	(ii) the site abuts on a specified street (Tai Tong Shan Road) of not less than 4.5m wide and shall be classified as class A site. The Maximum plot ratio (P.R.) and site coverage (S.C.) of a site shall follow the First Schedule of Building (Planning) Regulations [B(P)R] at building plan submission stage;	<p>The Applicant noted that the site abuts on a specified street (Tai Tong Shan Road) of not less than 4.5m wide and shall be classified as class A site.</p> <p>In the proposed Development, it is proposed that for Non-Domestic Buildings with height of Building over 49m but not exceeding 55m, the maximum Plot Ratio (PR) shall be 11.5 and the site coverage (S.C.) shall be 64% following the First Schedule of Building (Planning) Regulations [B(P)R], subject to approval at building plan submission stage.</p>

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
BD(A5)	(iii) if the proposed plot ratio is based on the assumption that Gross Floor Area (GFA) concession will be granted, the pre-requisites for GFA concession in Practice Notes for Authorized Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers (PNAP) App-151 and the Sustainable Building Design guideline stipulated in PNAP APP-152 should be complied with;	The Applicant noted that if the proposed plot ratio is based on the assumption that Gross Floor Area (GFA) concession will be granted, the pre-requisites for GFA concession in Practice Notes for Authorized Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers (PNAP) APP-151 and the Sustainable Building Design guideline stipulated in PNAP APP-152 should be complied with.
BD(A6)	(iv) If the existing structures are erected on leased land without the approval of the BA, they are UBW under the BO and should not be designated for any proposed use under the captioned application;	The Applicant noted that if the existing structures are erected on leased land without the approval of the Building Authority, such structures are unauthorized building works (UBW) under the Buildings Ordinance (BO) and should not be designated for any proposed use under the captioned application.
BD(A7)	(v) Carparking, loading and unloading areas if intend to be excluded from GFA calculation under B.O. shall comply with the criteria set out in PNAP App-2 and APP-111 during the building plan submission stage;	The Applicant noted that if carparking, loading and unloading areas are intended to be excluded from GFA calculation under the Buildings Ordinance, the criteria set out in PNAP APP-2 and APP-111 shall be complied with during the building plan submission stage.
BD(A8)	(vi) for UBW erected on leased land, enforcement action may be taken by the Buildings Department to effect their removal in accordance with the prevailing 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.	<p>The Applicant noted that for unauthorized building works (UBW) erected on leased land, enforcement action may be taken by the Buildings Department to effect their removal in accordance with the prevailing enforcement policy against unauthorized building works (UBW) as and when necessary.</p> <p>The Applicant noted that the granting of any planning approval should not be construed as an acceptance of any existing building works or unauthorized building works (UBW) on the application site under the Buildings Ordinance.</p>
BD(A9)	(vii) Details checking under the BO will be carried out at building plan submission stage.	The Applicant noted that detailed checking under the Buildings Ordinance will be carried out at building plan submission stage.

## 2.8 Responses to Comments from Electrical and Mechanical Services Department

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
<p>EMSD (1)</p>	<p><u>Electricity Safety:</u> Please be advised that we have no particular comment on the document from electricity supply safety aspect. However, in the interests of public safety and ensuring the continuity of electricity supply, the parties concerned with planning, designing, organizing and supervising any activity near the underground cable or overhead line under the mentioned document should approach the electricity supplier (i.e. CLP Power) for the requisition of cable plans (and overhead line alignment drawings, where applicable) to find out whether there is any underground cable and/or overhead line within and/or in the vicinity of the concerned site. They should also be reminded to observe the Electricity Supply Lines (Protection) Regulation and the "Code of Practice on Working near Electricity Supply Lines" established under the Regulation when carrying out works in the vicinity of the electricity supply lines.</p>	<p>The Applicant noted that the parties concerned with the planning, design, organizing and supervising any activity near the underground cables or overhead lined under the mentioned document should approach CLP Power for the requisition of underground cable plans and overhead line alignment drawings, where applicable, to find out whether there is any underground cable and/or overhead line within and/or in the vicinity of the development site. The applicant will observe the Electricity Supply Lines (Protection) Regulation and the "Code of Practice on Working near Electricity Supply Lines" when carrying out works in the vicinity of the electricity supply lines.</p>

## 2.9 Responses to Comments from Fire Services Department

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
FSD(1)	Should the application be confirmed to fall under the regulatory regimes, i.e. lands, buildings, licensing and other control regimes, or be referred by Independent Checking Unit for consultation on FS requirements, we have no objection to removing the relevant approval conditions without the need for further consultation from FSD.	The Applicant noted that the design, installation, and commissioning of the fire services installations for the concerned Development will comply with the "Code of Practice of the Fire Services Installation and Equipment and Testing" and the relevant Fire Services Circulars, and other necessary FSD requirements
FSD(2)	Nevertheless, the following advisory clauses shall be delivered to the applicant: Detailed fire safety 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 Buildings Department.	<p>The Applicant noted that detailed fire safety requirements will be formulated upon receipt of a formal submission of STT/STW, general building plans or referral of application via relevant licensing authority.</p> <p>The Applicant noted that 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 Buildings Department.</p>

## 2.10 Responses to Comments from Water Supplies Department

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
WSD (1)	Please provide the water supply proposal including the proposed connection from the existing distribution network.	<p>Please find attached Water Supply Proposal in <b>Appendix XIV</b> for your attention.</p> <p>Based on the Fresh Water Mains Record Plans received from WSD, it is proposed that a 100 mm diam water supply pipe will be constructed by the Applicant from the existing 150 mm diam fresh water main (at more than 1 km away from the Development Site) to the water storage tanks in the pump and tank rooms on G/F of the Development Site. Pumps with associated pneumatic tanks for the inside plumbing services, and fire services pumps will be installed to deliver water to the respective systems.</p>

## 2.11 Responses to Comments from Landscape Unit of Planning Department

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
LT(1)	<p><b><u>Preliminary Comments on the Planning Statement</u></b></p> <p>According to the planning statement, the application site comprises 3 portions, the development area (the Temple site), the Tai Tong Kwan Ti Square area, and the access road improvement area. In Table 8.1 of the Appendix V, a total <b>573</b> existing trees within the application site boundary (including 484 trees within the development area and/or the Tai Tong Kwan Ti Square area and 89 trees within access road improvement area) are identified, of which <b>56</b> trees are proposed to be retained, <b>7</b> trees (i.e. T535, T543, T842 (<i>Aquilaria sinensis</i> which is protected under Cap.586) and 4 trees without Tree ID no. information) are proposed to be transplanted, and <b>510</b> trees including 10 trees of undesirable species (i.e. <i>Leucaena leucocephala</i>), 16 dead trees and the remaining 484 trees of common species are proposed to be felled. No Old and Valuable Trees (OVTs) identified within the application site was reported. The applicant should provide the above-mentioned tree information in table format (i.e. total existing trees <b><u>within the application site boundary</u></b>, nos. of retained trees, nos. of transplanted trees with Tree ID no., nos. of trees to be felled) in Section 4.4 of the planning statement. Trees information located outside the application site boundary are not required. Moreover, please provide the Tree ID nos. and their receptor locations for the 4 trees (which are missing Tree ID no. information) proposed to be transplanted in the planning statement.</p>	<p>Noted, and the Planning Statement has been revised.</p> <p>Tree ID nos. of the 4 proposed transplanted trees are T063, T331, T603, T620. Receptor locations are shown on the new tree planting plans at Appendices (<b>Appendix VII and VIII</b>).</p>

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
LT(2)	In Section 4.4 (a) and (b) of the planning statement, please clarify the meaning of " <i>the proposals within their future landscape and visual context</i> ", would the future landscape deviate from the proposed LMP, please explain.	The Applicant does not propose or anticipate changes to the surrounding landscape and visual context in the future, although such areas are outside the application site and so not under the applicant's control. Landscape areas inside the application site boundary would not be intended to deviate from the LMP proposals.
LT(3)	According to Section 5.9 of the planning statement, Table 8.1 and Figures 4.1 to 4.4 of the Appendix V, a total <b>604</b> new trees (i.e. 530 new trees of heavy standard, light standard and whips at G/F, 1/F and 2/F of the development area and G/F of the Kwan Ti Square area, 74 new trees of lighted standard within and/or the vicinity of the access road) are proposed to compensate the loss of removal of existing trees within the application site boundary. Moreover, shrubs, groundcovers, bamboo and lawn planting at landscape areas at the development area and Kwan Ti Square area are proposed. In Figure 4.1, the landscape design and layout at the Kwan Ti Square area was included in the Landscape Master Plan (All Levels), however, the landscape layout of the Kwan Ti Square area is found missing in either Figure 4.2 / 4.3 / 4.4. Please review and rectify. Moreover, the discrepancy of the new trees nos. for development area and access road found in Table 8.1 in Appendix V, please rectify.	Noted, Kwan Ti Square area has been added to Figure 4.4 (2/F plan) (see attached Landscape Master Plan in <b>Appendix VI</b> ), which is the commensurate level to this existing area.  Noted, Table 8.1 has been revised.
LT(4)	In Table 10.1, please review the spacing (i.e. 4,000mm) for the tree species with large canopy size such as <i>Ficus microcarpa</i> , <i>Cinnamomum camphora</i> , and the spacing (i.e. 1,500) for the tree species <i>Terminalia mantaly</i> whether can provide their future sustainable growth.	Noted, and the spacing is amended to 5000mm for these larger canopy trees. The spacing of 1500mm for <i>Terminalia mantaly</i> is a typo and has been revised to 4000mm.



Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
LT(5)	<p>In Section 5.7 (e) of the planning statement, noting “<i>with the total area of development area is about 17,393m<sup>2</sup>, whereby the site coverage of greenery shall be not less than 3,478.6m<sup>2</sup> (20%)</i>”, which is not tallied with the total area of about 31,068m<sup>2</sup> mentioned in para. 1.1 of the planning statement. Please consult the relevant government department on the matter of site coverage of greening calculation.</p>	<p>The site coverage of greenery is illustrated in the LMP with reference to the Development Area, which will be the subject of a future GB, and stipulations on green coverage as per PNAP-152. The application site area also includes the access road and Kwan Ti Square, where the lower density of development and preponderance of greenery allow a 20% minimum green coverage to also be achieved.</p>
LT(6)	<p>We would reserve our comment upon receipt of the required landscape technical information in the formal s.16 submission</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
LT(7)	<p><b><u>Advisory Remarks to the applicant</u></b>            To facilitate the s.16 application and make reference to relevant Guidance Notes for the permission under section 16 of the TPO, the applicant is required to provide required information on existing trees, including broad brush tree survey, assessment, tree photos showing the existing conditions, proposed tree treatments. In this connection, please be reminded that the attached “Tree Preservation Proposal (Development Area)” of Appendix VI and “Tree Preservation Proposal (Access Area)” of Appendix VII submitted by the consultant are not required in connection with planning application under s.16 of TPO. Moreover, the Figures 2.1 and 2.2 related to information of landscape resources outside the application site boundary are not required in connection with planning application under s.16 of TPO.</p>	<p>Noted, that the tree aspects may be dealt with on a broadbrush survey basis. The survey information for the development area has been simplified to reflect this requirement. Whilst it is noted that tree related considerations are part and parcel of the Landscape Proposal, it is preferred to document the tree aspects separately, for clarity of presentation.</p> <p>Noted and Figure 2.1 and Figure 2.2 have been removed.</p>

## 2.12 Responses to Comments from Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
AFCD (1)	<p><b><u>General comment</u></b></p> <p>It is noted from S.4.1.1 of the EcolA that the shortest distance between the application Site and Tai Lam Country Park (TLCP) is only 30m. The potential impacts to TLCP should be carefully assessed and mitigated with appropriate measures.</p>	Noted.
AFCD (2)	<p><b><u>Specific comments</u></b></p> <p><b><u>S.4.1.6 &amp; 6.3.5</u></b></p> <p>"Tai Tong Country Park" should be read "Tai Lam Country Park". Please revise.</p>	Noted and amended and attached in <b>Appendix XV</b> .
AFCD (3)	<p><b><u>Table 5.7</u></b></p> <p>While the overall ecological value of mixed woodland is rated as "low to medium" but "potentially higher" for that in TLCP, Please clarify the ecological value of the latter with reference to the ecological baseline data. It seems TLCP constitutes most of the woodland in the study area and most faunal species of conservation importance recovered.</p>	<p>Noted and amended.</p> <p>The potential value of overall mixed woodland is considered as low to medium. Potentially be higher for mixed woodlands within TLCP, acknowledging the protection status of those flora species within TLCP but limited by the absence of shade-tolerant tree species indicative of more mature woodlands in Hong Kong. Moreover, when comparing to the mixed woodlands outside of TLCP which link with disturbed and urbanized areas, most of the fauna of conservation importance are recorded inside the mixed woodlands of TLCP. The diversity and abundance of fauna of conservation importance increase as locating closer to the inner part of TLCP.</p>
AFCD (4)	<p><b><u>Table 5.9</u></b></p> <p>Regarding "potential value" of nature watercourses within TLCP, the statement "no obvious sign suggesting that a higher diversity of freshwater-associated fauna, including amphibian, odonate and freshwater fauna species" is unsubstantiated given at least 10 faunal species of conversation importance were recorded. Please review.</p>	Noted and amended.

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
AFCD (5)	<p><u>S.6.3.1</u> Please clarify that direct encroachment of works and hence direct impact on TLCP have been avoided.</p>	<p>Since no direct construction works will be done within the TLCP, direct impacts on TLCP have been avoided.</p>
AFCD (6)	<p><u>S6.6.3.5 -6.3.11, Fig 5.2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It seems the statement 'the surrounding habitats of the Application Site have relatively low ecological value' does not tally with the habitat evaluation in Section 5, especially considering the habitats within TLCP in the close proximity.</li> <li>- According to S6.3.5 and Fig 5.2, the rural plantation of the proposed project site is serving the buffer area between the developed area in the vicinity and the mixed woodland. Please advise whether the loss of the rural plantation and thus the buffer area resulted by the proposed project has been taken into account for the impact evaluation process and revise accordingly.</li> <li>- The proposed project site largely falls within Green Belt and in a very close proximity to the TLCP. Please elaborate the statement "the loss of a small area of Green Belt, compared with the total area of Green Belt around TLCP" in S6.3.11 to support the conclusion in impact assessment by clarifying the area of Green Belt to be lost.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>"The surrounding habitats of the Application Site have relatively low ecological value" will be amended to "The surround habitat of Developed Area (Other Urban Area) and rural plantation have relatively low ecological value".</p> <p>The buffer area between developed area (other urban area) and rural plantation would have similar buffer capacity and effectiveness after the construction. The worship activities would change from outdoor and to be held indoor. The compensation planting of 1.2:1 ratio, would help to contribute buffer zone between the existing developed area and relative higher value habitats.</p> <p>Under the current Outline Zoning Plan S/YL-TT/20, part of the proposed development is located within Green Belt (GB), which potentially serves as a physical and ecological buffer for TLCP. However, some of the Green Belt area within the Application Site is already degraded as developed area (other urban area), remaining affected GB area is rural plantation is in relatively small size about 1.41ha compared to overall GB area near TLCP about 54.5ha. The Green Belt buffer capacity is considered as no change. Further details of minimizations refer to Section 7.3. In view that the TLCP is avoided, and the only small area of Green Belt is being affected, potential impact to Green Belt compared with the total area of Green Belt around TLCP is considered to have Minor adverse impact if not mitigated.</p>

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
AFCD (7)	<p><u>S6.4.6.</u> Please elaborate with reference to results of baseline ecological surveys to support "minor indirect glare impacts on the habitats/wildlife within TLCP"</p>	<p>Noted. The indirect glare impact is considered as minor as the Ecological Study Area has existing light disturbance from streetlights and light from village. The proposed development has limited light sources and restricted angle and will not point towards TLCP. In addition, no firefly species and scarce abundance of nocturnal species was recorded. The abundance of sensory receivers is limited. Thus, minor light impact is expected.</p>
AFCD (8)	<p><u>Fig 5.2.</u> Boundary of TLCP is slightly deviated from our record. Please refer to the attached figure for rectification</p>	<p>Noted and amended.</p>

## 2.13 Responses to Comments from Drainage Services Department

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
DSD(1)	<p><b>DIA</b></p> <p>Section 3.2.12 and Appendix A: According to Section 6.8 of SDM Corrigendum No. 1/2022, unless there are practically unsolvable site/technical constraints, projection year up to the end of 21st century for rainfall increase and extreme sea level rise plus design allowance should be considered as far as practicable. As there will be increase in peak runoff due to the proposed site, please advise for the drainage impact to the downstream drainage system.</p>	<p>Rainfall increases of 16% for end of 21<sup>st</sup> Century has been adopted for runoff calculation. Para. 3.2.12, Table 3-4, Table 3-5, Table 3-6, Appendix A and Appendix B have been updated accordingly. DIA is attached in <b>Appendix XIII</b>.</p>
DSD(2)	<p>Section 3.2.8: Please indicate the size and the alignment of the existing slope drain on the drainage plan and provide photos showing the existence and condition for reference. According to the topography, the ground to the east of the application site is significantly higher, please critically review if some of the overland flow from catchment areas D &amp; E cannot be intercepted by the existing slope drain and should be collected by the proposed drainage system inside the application site.</p>	<p>According to the topographic survey, the elevation of the middle of the road between Catchment D and E and the site is higher compared to the slope toe. Hence, the runoff from catchment D and E are not expected to flow into the site. A photo showing the road condition has been added to Figure 2-1, and Para. 3.2.8 has been amended for better clarification.</p>
DSD(3)	<p>According to Section 9.3 of DSD's Stormwater Drainage Manual, suitable allowance should be made in the design for the deposition of sediment in stormwater channels and pipes. Please review.</p>	<p>A 10% reduction in flow area was already adopted to consider sedimentation reduction in accordance with Section 9.3 of SDM. Note 4 has been added for better clarification. Please refer to the revised Appendix B for details.</p>
DSD(4)	<p>Sand trap or provision alike should be provided before the collected runoff is discharged to the public drainage facilities.</p>	<p>The terminal manhole will be provided with sand trap. Para. 3.3.1 has been amended accordingly. The legend of Figure 3-2 has also been amended to include terminal manhole with sand trap.</p>
DSD(5)	<p>Please confirm if any walls or hoarding are/to be erected or laid along the site boundary. If affirmative, adequate opening should be provided to intercept</p>	<p>The design of hoarding is pending, if affirmative of hoarding design, adequate opening will be provided. A new para. 4.1.6 has been provided that adequate opening shall be provided in the</p>

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
	the existing overland flow passing through the site and please provide its details for comments.	design of the Site boundary fencing during the detailed design stage.
DSD(6)	The existing stream, to which the applicant proposed to discharge the stormwater from the subject site was not maintained by this office. The applicant(s) shall resolve any conflict/disagreement arisen for discharging the runoff from the application site(s) to the proposed discharge point(s). In the case that it is a local village drains, DO/YL should be consulted. Moreover, the applicant(s) should ensure that this drainage system and the existing downstream drains/channels/streams have adequate capacity to convey the additional runoff from the application site(s). Regular maintenance should be carried out by the applicant(s) to avoid blockage of the system.	Noted.
DSD(7)	The development should neither obstruct overland flow nor adversely affect existing natural streams, village drains, ditches and the adjacent areas, etc.	The same as Response to Comment DSD(5), adequate opening shall be provided to allow any overland flow passing through the site walls/hoarding. Please refer to para. 4.1.6 for details.
DSD(8)	The applicant should resolve any conflict/disagreement with relevant lot owner(s) and seek permission from DLO/YL for laying new drains/channels and/or modifying/upgrading existing ones in other private lots or on Government Land, where required, outside the application site(s).	Noted.
DSD(9)	<b>SIA</b> Section 3.1.1 - Please clarify the sewage disposal scheme of the anticipated visitors. Please elaborate the sewage estimation and disposal method.	The sewage generated by the visitors including wastewater from flushing, hand washing and micturition has been considered in the SIA report (see attached <b>Appendix XII</b> ). Detailed calculations and assumptions have been provided in Appendix A.

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
		<p>Due to the absence of municipal sewerage system for connection in the vicinity of the Proposed Development, the sewage generation from the Proposed Development is proposed to be temporarily stored in on-site sewage storage tanks and then will be tankered away for off-site disposal in a Sewage Treatment Facility.</p> <p>Please refer to the revised para. 3.1.1 and Appendix A for details.</p>
DSD(10)	Section 3.2.3 - Please indicate that the project proponent will be responsible for the operation and maintenance of the proposed sewage holding tanks.	Para 3.2.3 has been amended accordingly.
DSD(11)	Comments from SIG/EPD, the planning authority of sewerage infrastructure, should be sought.	Please refer to the Responses to EPD's Comments EPD(2) to EPD(4).

## 2.14 Responses to Comments from Environmental Protection Department

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
EPD(1)	<p><b><u>Water quality Perspective</u></b> <b>S4.3.1 and Figure 4.1</b></p> <p>Please tabulate the WSR(s). The table shall include the WSR ID, description, type (natural watercourse, modified watercourse, channelized, pond etc.) statue (active, inactive) and estimated distance to the site.</p> <p><b>S4.4.4</b></p> <p>This paragraph is related the mitigation measures. Please consider to move under "Mitigation Measures".</p>	<p>WSRs have been tabulated in Table 4-1. Figure 4-1 has been amended to include labels for WSR ID. EA Report has been attached in <b>Appendix XI</b>.</p> <p>Para. 4.4.4 has been moved under "Mitigation Measures".</p>
EPD(2)	<p><b><u>Sewerage Perspective</u></b></p> <p>In view of the huge amount of visitors during event date, please estimate separately the sewage generated by visitor for the worse case scenario.</p>	<p>As a conservative approach, sewage generated by the visitors has been considered to represent the worst-case scenario. Table 3-1, Para. 3.1.1, 3.2.1, 3.2.3, 4.1.2 and 4.1.4 and Appendix A have been revised.</p>
EPD(3)	<p>It is noted from the planning statement section 4.1 that there is canteen for staff (宗教員工食堂及廚房), UFF of J10 restaurant should be applied.</p>	<p>“及廚房” in the Planning Statement is typo. The Applicant has confirmed no kitchen will be provided for the Proposed Development. Therefore, UFF of J10 restaurant is not applied. Para. 2.2.1 of the SIA Report has been amended.</p> <p>The relevant sections of the Planning Statement have been amended to delete “及廚房”.</p>
EPD(4)	<p>It is noted that sewage holding tank/tanker away is proposed, please seek DSD's comment on such arrangement.</p>	<p>With reference to the comments DSD(9) to DSD(11) from DSD, no comment on sewage holding tank/tanker away from DSD has been received. Please refer to the Responses to Comments DSD(9) to DSD(11) for details.</p>
EPD(5)	<p><b><u>Air Quality Perspective</u></b> <b>Section 1.3.1</b></p> <p>Please review if the 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet is relevant to the subject application and update/remove s necessary.</p>	<p>Typo, the third bullet point has been removed.</p>
EPD(6)	<p><b><u>Section 2.2.5 and Table 2-2</u></b></p> <p>Please add a table of bullet distances to open space sited for the industrial areas</p>	<p>Para. 2.2.6 and Table 2-3 of the minimum setback distances for industrial areas (chimneys) have</p>



Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
	(chimneys) as referred to table 3.1 of Chapter 9 of HKPSC since it has been in the later part of the report.	been added.
EPD(7)	<p><b>Section 2.3.1 and Table 2-3</b></p> <p>Since there will be improvement works of local access road leading to the Site as referring to the Planning Statement. Please clarify if the identification of ASRs has included the 500m assessment area of the widen/improved local access road and update Table 2-3 and Figure 2-1 if necessary.</p>	Para. 2.3.1 and the table (renamed as Table 2-4) has been revised.
EPD(8)	<p><b>Section 2.4.2 and 2.4.3</b></p> <p>Please also provide the estimated no. of machinery to be used on site at a time in Section 2.4.2 and justify if it will give rise to any air quality impacts arising from the gaseous and PM emissions. Since the air quality impact should not be limited to fugitive dust but also the gaseous and PM emissions from machinery and vehicles during the construction stage, please supplement Section 2.4.2 and 2.4.3 with the appropriate measures and practices accordingly.</p>	Para. 2.4.2 has been revised to supplement the estimated no. of machinery to be used on site. Para. 2.4.3 has been revised accordingly.
EPD(9)	<p><b>Section 2.4.4</b></p> <p>Please delete "dust" in line 1 and revise "dust" in line 2 to "air quality"</p> <p>Please add "Higher hoarding of &gt;3m shall be erected at the work boundary close to ASRs in close proximity (e.g. AASR1)."</p> <p><b>Section 2.4.5</b></p> <p>Suggest to state that the Air Pollution Control (Fuel Restriction) shall also be fully complied with for the machinery to be used during the construction stage to minimize any aerial emissions.</p> <p>Please add "PM" before "NO2" in line 2.</p>	<p>Noted and amended accordingly.</p> <p>Bullet point has been added under Para. 2.4.4 accordingly.</p> <p>Para. 2.4.5 has been amended accordingly.</p> <p>Noted and amended accordingly.</p>

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
	Suggest to add the following mitigation measures: 1. Exempted NRMMS shall be avoided.2. Electric power supply shall be provided for on-site machinery ads far as possible	Bullet point has been added under Para. 2.4.6 accordingly.
EPD(10)	<b>Section 2.5.1</b> Please note that it should be the responsibility of the applicant / consultant to ensure the validity of the chimney data by their own site survey. Should the information of industrial chimneys be subsequently found to be incorrect, the assessment result as presented in the report would be invalidated.	Noted.
EPD(11)	<b>Section 2.5.2 and Figure 2-2</b> Please note that a 5m buffer distance might not be allowed for rural road since some rural roads are considered as district distributions. Please justify if the buffer distance of 5m can be applied for the widen/improved local access road by providing supportive information such as peak traffic flow demonstrate that the traffic flow is very limited or seek TD's endorsement for the widen/improved local access road to be considered as a local distributor. Otherwise, please allow 10m buffer distance between the kerbside of the road and any air-sensitive uses of the proposed development. Also, please revise Figure 2-2 if necessary and adjust the scale of the figure in order to show all concerned sections of the widened/improved local access road to demonstrate clearly if there is nay ASR within the buffer zone.	As advised by the traffic consultant and confirmed by TD, the access road is considered as Local Distributor (LD). TD's endorsement has been provided in Appendix A for information. Figure 2-2 has been amended to show all sections of the widened/improved local access road.
EPD(12)	<b>Section 2.5.3</b> Our previous comment in R-t-C item (3)(c) on the vehicular emission impact due to additional traffic induced by the operation of the proposed development	The separate TIA has concluded that the additional traffic trips generated by the Proposed Development can be absorbed by the nearby road network. Para. 2.5.4 has been added for

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
	<p>has not been addressed. Please provide supportive information to justify the additional traffic trips generated by operating the proposed development and whether it can be absorbed by the capacity of the road networks and hence no adverse traffic congestion problem leading to worsening of vehicular emission impact is expected. Also, please incorporate the administrative measures proposed in R-t-c item (3)(c) in the assessment report.</p> <p>Administrative measures proposed in R-t-c item (3)(c) in the assessment report.</p> <p>Please add an additional bullet to specify if there shall be no recreational use in open space for the proposed development within the buffer zone from all nearby roads.</p>	<p>details.</p> <p>There is no recreational use in open space for the proposed development within the buffer zone from all nearby roads. Additional bullet point has been added accordingly.</p>
EPD(13)	<p><b>Section 2.5.4</b></p> <p>More information about the scale of incense burning based on the estimated no. of visitors and duration of burning activities, etc, should be provided in order to justify the proposed measure (i.e. no more than three incense sticks for each visitor) shall not give rise to the adverse air quality impacts to the nearby ASRs. As revealed in R-t-C item (i), please also supplement in the assessment report if such measure has been successfully implemented by other temples and specify the location of the temple where incense burning activities will take place as far as possible from the nearby ASRs in a map.</p> <p>In addition, please consider to adopt further measures and practice to reduce the emissions as far as practicable (e.g. promotion on the wider use of electric incense sticks and smokeless incense, use of control equipment to treat the emissions, etc). Please supplement.</p>	<p>To minimise the impact from burning activity on the surrounding ASRs, the burning activity will be allowed in the Ceremonial Main Court of the Proposed Development only, which is located no less than 20m from the closest ASR, as shown in Figure 2-3.</p> <p>Moreover, a smokeless incense/joss paper furnace will be provided for the Proposed Development to further mitigate the smoke generated from burning activity. Details of mitigation measures have been supplemented in Para 2.5.5 and 2.5.6.</p> <p>With the implementation of proposed mitigation measures, no adverse air quality impact is anticipated from the burning activity.</p>

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
EPD(14)	<p><b>Section 2.6.1 and 2.6.2</b></p> <p>Please add "air quality" after "adverse" in line 2 of Section 2.6.1.</p> <p>Please add "air quality" after "adverse" in line 2 and 5 of Section 2.6.2.</p> <p>Please revise the 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence of Section 2.6.2 by specifying if the buffer distance of HKPSG can be fulfilled and there will be any adverse vehicular emission impact arising from the additional induced traffic during the operation of the proposed development, as mentioned in the comment #10 above.</p>	<p>Noted and amended accordingly.</p> <p>Noted and amended accordingly.</p> <p>For vehicular emission, no air sensitive use/fresh air intake will be located within the 5m buffer zone of the access road as stipulated in Chapter 9 of HKPSG. Besides, a separate TIA has concluded that the additional traffic trips generated by the Proposed Development can be absorbed by the nearby road network. Hence, adverse traffic congestion problem leading worsening of vehicular emission impact is expected. Para 2.6.2 has been updated accordingly.</p>
EPD(15)	<p>Please note that some responses in R-t-C have not been incorporated in the assessment report, e.g. administrative measures in item (3), no concurrent project within 500m assessment area in item (6), EM&amp;A programme in item (7) and treatment for on-site sewage holding tank in item (9), etc. For item (10) of R-t-C, it is stated that there is no kitchen in the temple but according to the Planning Statement, there will be a Staff Canteen in the proposed development. Please confirm if there shall be no kitchen in the proposed development and hence no associated air quality impact is anticipated. Please supplement.</p> <p>In addition, our comment item (9) on handing and disposal of sewage is not fully addressed and is recapped below: "According to Page 4 of Appendix VIII, it is noted that on-site sewage holding tanks/cesspool will be provided within the proposed Religious Institution. Please clarify whether there is any exhaust and deodorizer from the storage tanks/cesspool. Please also address in details how the sewage is handled and</p>	<p>(3): Details of administrative measures have been supplemented in Para. 2.5.4.</p> <p>(6): As discussed in Para 2.4.3, no concurrent project within 500m of the assessment area is observed.</p> <p>(7): As mentioned in Para 2.4.7, with the provision of EPD's Recommended Pollution Control Clauses for Construction Contracts, no adverse air quality impact during construction stage is anticipated. Nevertheless, a dust monitoring and audit programme would be further reviewed and considered in the detailed design stage.</p> <p>(9): Item (9) has been further supplemented in Para. 2.5.8. Activated carbon will be used for odour treatment of sewage before odour gas emits. Reference to other site with similar mitigation measures, a removal efficiency of approximate 90% is expected. Thus, no adverse odour impact is expected.</p> <p>(10): There will be a staff canteen, but no kitchen. Staff will bring food from outside and there will be no cooking within the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Thus, no air quality impact is anticipated due to the staff canteen.</p>

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
	<p>disposed of and whether any mitigation measures will be implemented to minimize the odour impact.</p> <p>In addition, please specify the odour removal efficiency of the activated carbon filter for the on-site sewage holding tank</p>	
EPD(16)	<p><b><u>Waste Perspective</u></b> Heading of Chapter 5 – Please remove “AND LAND CONTAMINATION” and please update the CONTENTS.</p>	Noted and amended accordingly.
EPD(17)	<p><b><i>Section 5.2.1</i></b></p> <p>(i) The requirement of the circular FTWB TC(W) No.19/2005 shall be applicable to public works contracts, while ADV-19 shall be applicable for private project. Therefore, Please remove ETWB TC(W) No.19/2005 as appropriate.</p> <p>(ii) DEVB TC(W) No.6/2010 is mentioned in Section 5.3.4.1. Please supplement in this section.</p>	<p>(i) ETWB TC(W) No. 19/2005 has been removed.</p> <p>(ii) DEVB TC(W) No.6/2010 has already been mentioned in 8<sup>th</sup> bullet point under Para. 5.2.1.</p>
EPD(18)	<p><b><i>Section 5.3.7</i></b></p> <p>It is noted that the reference Guide was published in 2001. Please review its current relevance and determine if there are any updated figures to be adopted for the estimation.</p>	<p>This reference Guide published in 2001 is the most relevant to the building waste management in Hong Kong.</p> <p>Considering the improvement of construction technique and waste management strategy over the past 20 years, there should be some improvement on the “waste index” as well (i.e. smaller “waste index”).</p> <p>Due to absence of updated figures, the “waste index” in 2001 was adopted in the EA report as a conservative approach.</p>
EPD(19)	<p><b><i>Section 5.3.8</i></b></p> <p>Please specify the similarities in the nature of the Proposed Project and the Commercial Office Project. Otherwise,</p>	For a more conservative approach, the GFA of Private Housing Projects has been adopted.

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
	please explain why the GFA of Private Housing Projects is not utilized for a more conservative approach.	
EPD(20)	<b>Section 5.3.15</b> Please clarify if the reuse of inert C&D materials will be further explored in the later project stage.	The reuse of inert C&D materials will be further explored in the later project stage. Para. 5.3.15 has been amended accordingly.
EPD(21)	<b>Section 5.3.18</b> Please review whether timber or woody materials generated from tree felling works will be sent to the Yard Waste Recycling Centre in Y-Park for recycling prior to disposal at the designated landfill site, to minimize the quantity for off-site disposal.	Timber and woody materials generated from tree felling works will be sent to the Yard Waste Recycling Centre in Y-Park for recycling prior to disposal at the designated landfill site. Please refer to the updated Para. 5.3.24 for details.
EPD(22)	<b>Table 5-3</b> For INERT C & D MATERIAL, since surplus C&D materials will be delivered to Public Fill Reception Facilities for beneficial reuse in other projects, please avoid using the terms "disposed of" in this connection. Please review and update all relevant sections in the report.	Noted and amended accordingly.
EPD(23)	<b>Section 5.3.39 (last sentence) and Section 5.3.42</b> Please revise "public fill" as "public fill reception facilities" as appropriate.	Noted and amended accordingly.
EPD(24)	<b>Section 5.3.41, 5.3.46 and relevant sections</b> Please revise "public filling facilities" as "public fill reception facilities" as appropriate.	Noted and amended accordingly.
EPD(25)	<b>Section 5.3.44</b> Please elaborate if any on-site facilities and detailed collection arrangement for the recycle of food waste generated during construction and operational phases.	Considering the available closest Smart Food Waste Bin in Yuen Long is far from the site, para. 5.3.44 has been deleted.

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
EPD(26)	<p><b>Section 6.3.1</b></p> <p>Please clarify what was the building observed since Year 2006, and whether any potential land contamination was involved.</p>	<p>It is a suspected residential unit. Para. 6.3.1 has been revised accordingly.</p>
EPD(27)	<p><b>Noise Perspective</b></p> <p>Since a significant amount of important information is missed or unsubstantiated, the applicant/consultant should provide further details on the following before we can determine whether any particular noise concerns or requirements would be associated in relation to the proposed development:</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
EPD(28)	<p><b>S1.3.1</b></p> <p>It stated that “proposed measures for compliance with the List of Guidance Notes on Best Practicable Means (BPM) for Specified Processes for Cement Works (Concrete Batch Plant)” which implies that there is a concrete batching plant (CBP) to be proposed under the project. However, no further information, neither qualitative nor quantitative, is provided in the noise section. Please supplement the relevant information in the relevant sections of the EA report.</p>	<p>Typo. There is no CBP proposed under the Project. Thus, this bullet point has been removed from Para. 1.3.1.</p>
EPD(29)	<p><b>S3.1.1</b></p> <p>HKPSG and relevant ProPECC PNs should also be included for completeness. Please revise.</p>	<p>For a better presentation, the following amendments have been made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A new para. 3.1.1 listing HKPSG and ProPECC PNs related to environmental noise has been provided between Section 3.1 Environmental Legislation and Standards and Sub-Section NCO.</li> <li>2. Since the Proposed Development will not provide residential uses, ProPECC PN 2/23, ProPECC PN 4/23 and ProPECC PN 5/23 for residential uses have been mentioned not related to the Proposed Development in a new para. 3.1.2 of the revised EA Report.</li> </ol>

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
		<p>3. The first sentence of para. 3.1.3 previously numbered para. 3.1.1 has been deleted.</p> <p>4. Para. 3.1.4 including Table 3-1 regarding ProPECC PN 1/24 has been renumbered to para. 3.1.9 before Section 3.2. In addition, Sub-Section <i>ProPECC PN 1/24 – Minimizing Noise from Construction Activities</i> has been provided before para. 3.1.9.</p>
EPD(30)	<p><b>S3.2</b></p> <p>The consultant did not advise whether or not the noise sensitive uses at the Taoist Cultural Centre would be provided with central air-conditioning system and would not rely on openable window for ventilation, if negative, they may be considered as a potential NSR if the application is so approved by TPB. Please advise and supplement the relevant information in the EA report.</p>	<p>For the noise sensitive uses at the proposed Taoist Cultural Centre within the Site, it would be provided with central air-conditioning system and would not rely on openable window for ventilation. This information has been supplemented in Para. 3.2.2.</p>
EPD(31)	<p><b>S3.3.2</b></p> <p>For completeness, the 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence should be read as "...The mitigation measures and sample contractual specifications recommended..." 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet should be read as "...quieter construction methods/equipment..."</p>	<p>Noted and amended accordingly.</p>
EPD(32)	<p><b>S3.4</b></p> <p>Among the operation of the proposal, based on our experience in other similar projects, presence of night-time operation, public address or loudspeaker system, or any religious activities in the open area of the site would be essential to noise consideration. Please supplement such information in the EA report.</p>	<p>According to the Planning Statement, the operation hours of the Proposed Development is from 7:30am to 5:30pm. Thus, there will be no night time operation. Tours, exhibitions and performances will be kept at 1-2 hours per session and the 4,000 expected visitors during event days will be divided into 500 visitors per hour, to minimise the noise generation. Please refer to Para. 3.4.4 for details.</p>
EPD(33)	<p><b>S3.4</b></p> <p>There is no information or assessment associated with the proposed road improvement and the traffic noise</p>	<p>According to the Planning Statement, the operation time of the shuttle service is from 7:30am to 5:30pm. Hence, the traffic generated</p>



Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
	<p>impact associated with the proposal. The consultant should confirm whether the traffic generated by the project would fall within the night time or early morning. If affirmative, the induced traffic noise impact assessment associated with the road traffic noise induced by the operation of the project is required.</p>	<p>by the Proposed Development does not fall within the night time or early morning. Please refer to the new para. 3.4.3 for details.</p>
EPD(34)	<p><b>S3.4.3</b> For completeness, please supplement in the beginning: "To ensure the fixed plant noise generated by the Proposed Development would not cause excessive impact to nearby noise sensitive receivers, potential fixed noise sources within the Proposed Development shall be properly designed to meet the relevant noise criteria as stipulated in Chapter 9 of the HKPSG and NCO. Provisions shall be made to control the fixed noise sources by suitable at source noise control measures such a quieter plant, silencers and acoustic linings when necessary. As such, it is anticipated that the fixed plant noise impact on the surrounding NSRs due to the operation of the Proposed Development will not exceed the relevant noise criteris under the HKPSG and NCO."</p>	<p>Noted and para. 3.4.3 previously numbered para. 3.4.3 has been amended accordingly.</p>
EPD(35)	<p><b><u>Other comments</u></b> <b>Figure 3-1</b> Please review whether "ASR 1" be read as "NSR 1". We would like to remind the consultant that one of the key element of the proposed Project is the "Improvement to the Existing Access Road", and the proposed road improvement is missed. Please revise the figure with the proposed road improvement, and the "Study Area" should also be adjusted accordingly.</p>	<p>Figure 3-1 has been revised.</p>

## 2.15 Responses to Comments from Geotechnical Engineering Office

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
GEO(1)	<p>The applicant shall amend the GPRR according to the revised information submitted by the representative of the AP/RSE/RGE (Mr. Felix Cheng of Greg Wong &amp; Associates Ltd.) of the applicant to this Office via emails sated 21.8.2024 and 22.8.2024 (copy of the revision as attached). The major amendments to the GPRR are as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Table 6.1 Treatment of slopes that may affected by the proposed development; and</li> <li>(ii) Section 6.4. Maintenance manual shall be provided with slope registration if the slopes formed by the proposed development meet the criteria as stated in PNAP-168 (ADV-8).</li> </ul>	<p>The following amendment is revised with red underlined in the GPRR Page 7 &amp; 8 and attached in <b>Appendix XVI</b>.</p>
GEO(2)	<p>In addition, this Office has the following comments on the GPRR as listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Section 5.2. The applicant should refer to the updated 1:20.000-scale geological map sheet 6 (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition; GEO, 2019) for latest geological information. According to the updated geological map, the site is underlain by fine-grained and fine to medium-grained granite of the Tai Lam Granite. Please also review whether 'Grade III or above Volcanic' should read 'Grade III or above Granite'</li> </ul>	<p>The section 5.2 of Grad III or above Volcanic is a typo and revised with red underlined to Grad III or above Granite in the GPRR Page 6.</p>
GEO(3)	<p>Please remind the applicant that our geotechnical comments in para, 4 to 8 of memo ref. PLN-50-2005-7-YL-TT dated 245.2024 remain pertinent to the pre-submission of the captioned proposed application.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
<b><i>GEO's previous comments dated 24.5.2024</i></b>		
GEO (A1)	Several existing registered man-made slopes (features no. 6NW-D/C196, 6NW-D/C165, 6NW-D/F96, 6SW-B/C57, 6SW-B/C56 and 6SW-B/C273) and a number of unregistered man-made slopes (approximate extents as shown in Appendix A) are present within or in vicinity of the proposed site. The existing slopes are not fully listed in Appendix X of the pre-submission documents. These slopes may affect or be affected by the proposed development and their geotechnical stabilities are uncertain. The applicant is required to identify, investigate, study and carry out any necessary slope upgrading works for all the registered and unregistered man-made slopes that may affect or be affected by the proposed development.	Details of several existing registered and unregistered man-made slopes will be discussed in Appendix X and the Geotechnical Planning Review Report.
GEO (A2)	In view of paragraph 2 above, the applicant is also required to submit a Geotechnical Planning Review Report (GPRR) in support of the planning application. The GPRR should include a preliminary geotechnical review of all the man-made features that may affect or be affected by the proposed development. The GPRR should also include an assessment of the geotechnical feasibility of the proposed development, and address the scope of geotechnical investigation of the existing registered and unregistered slopes and any associated remedial/slope upgrading works that may be required. Other essential contents of a GPRR are given in the attached GEO Advice Note (Appendix B).	A geotechnical planning review report will be submitted for the planning application. In the GPRR, the assessment will mention the man-made features that may affect or be affected by the proposed development. The remedial or upgrading works shall be proposed and carried out if found necessary.

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
GEO (A3)	The subject site boundary would encroach into Feature No. 6SW-B/C56 and part of Feature No. 6NW-D/C196. You are recommended to circulate the proposed application to parties / Government departments responsible for the maintenance of these slopes for comments.	Noted.
GEO (A4)	Further to paragraphs No. 2 and 4 above, you are advised to seek advice from CGE/SMS, LandsD for their comments.	Noted.
GEO (A5)	Please be advised that there were a number of suspected unauthorized slope works (USW) in the vicinity of the subject site. Our geotechnical advice on these cases was provided to DLO/YL via memo ref. in GCMW 2/E1/6NW-D dated 27.8.2014 and 30.10.2014 and to CTP/CE&F, PlanD via memo ref. in GCMW 4/16/22 dated 08.03.2002 (Appendix C). Please take these cases into considerations when processing the proposed application.	Noted.
GEO (A6)	Please be advise that the Office is not the responsible Government department for control of land fill. You may wish to seek comments from the relevant Government department on the proposed land filling for paving works on the road widening proposal.	Noted.
GEO (A7)	Please remind the applicant that they should submit the proposed building works to the Building Department for approval as required under the provisions of the Buildings Ordinance.	Noted.

## 2.16 Responses to Comments from Highways Department

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
HyD(1)	According to Section 2.2 of the planning statement, the access to the application site is proposed to be connecting Tai Tong Shan Road via an existing village track with proposed improvement works. The proposed access arrangement and improvement works should be commented and approved by TD;	Noted. Comment from TD has been sought.
HyD(2)	The access roads connecting the application site and Tai Tong Shan Road mentioned in (a) are not and will not be maintained by HyD. Presumably, the relevant department will provided comments to you , if any.	Noted.

## 2.17 Responses to Comments from Transport Department

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
TD(1)	i) The proposed boundary of the subject development includes the local track road which connecting Tai Tong Shan Road and the subject development. Please note that the local access road is serving various lots in the vicinity of the subject development. The applicant shall clarify the responsible party for the management and maintenance for the concerned access road after improvement in future and relevant lease clauses/ special conditions shall be allowed.	Noted and the Applicant will liaise with LandsD to review the boundary of the subject development accordingly.  The Applicant will be responsible for the management and maintenance for the concerned access road after improvement in future and relevant lease clauses/ special conditions shall be allowed.
TD(2)	ii) The local track road between Tai Tong Shan Road and the subject site is not under TD's purview. The proposed road works at the said road may pose constraints to maneuvering of long vehicles. The applicant should consult the management and maintenance authorities regarding the proposed road works.	Noted and the Applicant will consult the management and maintenance authorities for the captioned proposed no spacing extents of the planning application accordingly.
TD(3)	iii) The applicant should further coordinate with our transport officers regarding the provision of shuttle services for the subject development.	Please note that comments from Transport Operations Division have been received and duly addressed (see TD(A1) to (A3) below).
<b><i>Comments of Transport Operations (NT) Division, Transport Department (TONT/TD) dated 29.10.2024 which was sent to Traffic Consultant direct</i></b>		
TONT (A1)	1. Please provide the estimated public transport demand (e.g. in terms of no. of passengers during the peak hours) to be generated from the proposed development.	The walking distance between the proposed development and the bus stop is ~1.1km. In view of the remote location of the proposed development, the operator would provide 60-seater coaches with stop near Long Ping Station for staff and visitors. Therefore it is anticipated that the proposed development will not generate public transport demand.

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
TONT (A2)	2. Subject to the confirmation of the above demand, please ascertain if the proposed public transport services would be sufficient to cope with the demand.	In view of the remote location of the proposed development, the operator would provide 60-seater coaches with stop near Long Ping Station for staff and visitors. It is anticipated that staff and visitors of the proposed development would take coaches to arrive at the proposed development, it is confirmed that the proposed coaches would be sufficient to cope with the demand.
TONT (A3)	3. Please indicate the location of the bus/GMB stops of the existing public transport services and advise the actual walking distance between the proposed development and the stops.	Please refer to the attached <b>Figure 2.2</b> of the Traffic Impact Assessment in <b>Appendix X</b> for the location of the bus/GMB stops of the existing public transport services and the approximate walking distance between the proposed development and the stops.

## 2.18 Responses to Comments from Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
FEHD(1)	<p>Please be informed that FEHD has no adverse comment on the subject planning application. Our advisory comments are offered as follows:</p> <p>(a) No Food and Environmental Hygiene Department's (FEHD) facilities will be affected.</p>	Noted.
FEHD(2)	<p>(b) Proper licence / permit issued by this Department is required if there is any food business / catering service / activities regulated by the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene (DFEH) under the Public Health and Municipal Services Ordinance (Cap. 132) and other relevant legislation for the public and the operation of any business should not cause any obstruction. In accordance with Section 4 of Food Business Regulation, Cap. 132X, the expression "food business" means, any trade or business for the purpose of which any person engages in the handling of food or food is sold by means of a vending machine. <u>But it does not include any canteen in work place (other than a factory canteen referred to in section 31) for the use exclusively of the persons employed in the work place.</u> As such, a staff canteen that exclusively use by the staff members of that working place does not require a food business licence from this department. <b><u>However, if the said canteen provided foods to the outsiders with payment, a food business licence is required.</u></b> Furthermore, pursuant to section 4 of the Food Business Regulation (Cap. 132X)</p>	We would like to clarify no canteen provided foods to the outsiders with payment will be provided within the proposed development.



Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
	(FBR), the expression of "food business" does not include any club.	
FEHD(3)	(c) Proper licence issued by this Department is required <b><u>if related place of entertainment is involved</u></b> . Any person who desires to keep or use any place of public entertainment for example a theatre and cinema or a place, building, erection or structure, whether temporary or permanent, on one occasion or more, capable of accommodating the public presenting or carrying on public entertainment within Places of Public entertainment (PPE) Ordinance (Cap. 172) and its subsidiary legislation, such as a concert, opera, ballet, stage performance or other musical, dramatic or theatrical entertainment, cinematograph or laser projection display or an amusement ride and mechanical device which is designed for amusement, a Place of Public Entertainment Licence (or Temporary Place of Public Entertainment Licence) should be obtained from FEHD whatever the general public is admitted with or without payment.	We would like to clarify no place of entertainment to visitors with payment will be provided within the proposed development.
FEHD(4)	(d) There should be no encroachment on the public place and no environmental nuisance should be generated to the surroundings. Its state should not be a nuisance or injurious or dangerous to health and surrounding environment. Also, for any waste generated from the activities in the premises, the applicant should handle on their own / at their expenses.	Noted.

**2.19 Responses to Comments from Leisure and Cultural Services Department**

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
LCSD(1)	Nil Return.	Noted.

**2.20 Responses to Comments from Social Welfare Development**

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
SWD(1)	Since the proposal is not related to welfare services, SWD is not in a position to comment and defer to other related departments for comment. Thank you.	Noted.

**2.21 Responses to Comments from Civil Engineering and Development Department**

Items	Departmental Comments	The Applicant's Responses
CEDD (1)	No Comment.	Noted.