Comments from the Director of Leisure	Responses
and Cultural Services (Contact Person:	
Mr. Jaco TSANG) via DPO's email on	
25.9.2024	
(a) Should any venues or roadside areas under the purview of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) be inevitably affected by the project, the project proponent is required to act in accordance with the prevailing and relevant guidelines and technical circulars, and seek prior agreement of LCSD in early planning stage.	Please note no LCSD venues will be affected by the proposed development.
(b) Besides, the project proponent is required to clarify whether any roadside tree(s) is	A Tree Preservation Proposal is attached for LCSD consideration. To sum up as follows:
going to be affected by the proposed development. In case any roadside tree(s) under LCSD's current maintenance is going to be affected, the project proponent should provide relevant information (e.g. tree survey report and /or Tree Preservation and Removal Proposal) for LCSD's comments.	A preliminary tree survey has been undertaken and this identified 12 nos of trees within and immediately adjacent to the Application Site boundary. Based on Development Bureau TC (W) No. 6/2015 Maintenance of Vegetation and Hard Landscape Features we understand that all 12 nos trees fall within LCSD's jurisdiction. The existing trees appear to be both planted and self-colonised based on their spacing and arrangement.
	The Application Site contains no rare or protected tree species (based on Forests and Countryside Ordinance, Cap. 96). There are no trees within the Application Site registered as Old and Valuable Trees (DEVB TC(W) No. 5/2020 Registration of Old and Valuable Trees (OVT), and Guidelines for their Preservation). Two of the trees surveyed are Dimocarpus longan with a DBH measurements of more than 500mm and one is potentially a TPI however this is an old fruit tree which are senescent or approaching senescence and so it is not thought to meet the criteria.
	The proposals have sought to minimise impacts on the existing trees as far as possible with 3 nos. (25%) of the trees within the Application Site being retained in-situ. However, owing to the proposed site formation works associated with the youth hostel development scheme some 9 nos. (75%) of the existing trees shall need to be removed. As these trees are assessed as not being suitable for transplanting, they are recommended for felling. The trees generally have poor form, average health condition, average to poor structural condition and medium to low amenity value. A number of the

(c) LCSD reserves the right to provide further comments when more detailed information is available.	affected trees have defects including leaning main stems and asymmetrical canopies owing to their growth in close proximity to each other. All the affected trees have a low suitability for transplantation. It is also recommended that the canopies of retained trees T01 and T02 are pruned slightly (around 10-15%) where they extend into the application site and conflict with the proposed main building façade and the proposed car park provision. The new tree planting proposal shall compensate for the 9 nos. trees affected by the proposal, representing a replanting ratio of 1 : 1 (new trees planted: trees felled) within the Application Site. Location of the replanting trees to be determined in the detailed design stage. Noted.
Comments from the Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department (Contact Person: Mr. Jeff TSE)	
The applicant is required to confirm whether there is any additional sewerage generated due to the change of site boundary as stated in this submission (i.e. Further Information (18)). If affirmative, the applicant should submit an updated Sewerage Impact Assessment for comments.	Please be informed the site boundary change in Further Information (FI18) is solely to adjust the Application boundary and the strip of private land for providing right-of-way access to the adjoining lots. It is to confirm that there are no changes in the number of units, population and the estimated sewage flow from the proposed development due to the change of Site boundary as compared with previous submitted SIA. As there is no further additional sewage generated from the proposed development due to the change of site boundary, updating of assessment for the previous submitted SIA is no required.