

-	1 Departmental Comments	Response		
A.	Drainage Services Department (Comments receiv	ed on 20.11.2023)		
	Comments on drainage and sewerage impact assessi	nent (DSIA):		
1.	The proposed use and design of the on-site sewerage treatment plant should be subject to the comments and agreement of EPD and any relevant statutory requirements.	Noted.		
2.	Separate sewerage impact assessment shall be submitted for approval when decommissioning of the interim on-site sewage treatment plant is proposed so as to assess the potential sewerage impact on the existing public sewerage system at that time.	Noted.		
3.	The rainfall increase and design seawater levels as stated in the Corrigendum No. 1/2022 of the Stormwater Drainage Manual (SDM) should be taken into account. Please clarify whether there will be an increase in water level and velocity in any section of the drainage system and whether further upgrade of the drainage system is required.	The rainfall increase and design seawater levels as stated in the Corrigendum No. 1/2022 have already been incorporated in DIA Report (Issue 1). Please refer to s5.3.4. The proposed site profile will collect all surface runoff into an on-site underground stormwater retention tank. No additional surface runoff will be generated on the local drainage system due to the proposed development.		
4.	To relieve the increasing pressure on the drainage system due to development and ensure sustainable development in Hong Kong in face of climate change, provision of blue-green drainage infrastructure according to Section 3.2.2 of SDM is strongly encouraged to be incorporated in the development with a view to reducing the quantity as well as improving the quality of site runoff. It is recommended to explore further appropriate blue-green drainage infrastructure for incorporation in this project. Please follow "TC(W) No. 9/2020	Provision of blue-green drainage infrastructure according to Section 3.2.2 of SDM will be explored. The following options are suggested to be adopted on-site if technical feasible: Flood retention tank, Floodable area, Green roof, or Rainwater harvesting.		

nts and limited land area of the Subject
to accommodate a 40-p DE within the
to remind that a piece of sizeable land
of the Subject Site, as marked 'Site C'
nent, is readily available to develop one
complex to meet the needs of the
MI) and others, if the Government has
u land exchange as proposed by the
dministration procedure(s) that to be
the lease exchange application process.
to building this new social welfare
on of the SWD, provided that all design
1

		and construction costs can be premium deductible from the rezoning
		project at Site A.
3.	Kindly note that there has been longstanding difficulty in identifying suitable premises for reprovisioning of the YOT within its service boundary either through site biding of PoP scheme in the past years. In this connection, the YOT has been temporarily attached to the NGO's Integrated Children and Youth Services Centre since its operation in 2013. It would be desirable for the applicant to reconsider incorporating this YOT in this captioned site as far as possible for meeting the operational need and facilitating the service delivery	Ditto B.2 above.
4.	to the needy youth in the district. We note that the applicant has proposed to include a RCHE but remove the proposed 40-p DE in this subject site. We would suggest the applicant to consider including private/self-financing day care service places in the proposed RCHE for service synergy and meeting the day care needs of the elderly. Having said that, whether the adjoining Government land could be included into the application will be subject to the comments from Lands Department and other concerned parties.	As mentioned in B.2 above, after reviewed carefully the overall layout of the proposed RCHE building, the Applicant is happy to integrate a 40-p DE at the G/F of the building by reducing a total of 16 RCHE bed spaces (i.e. from its original 178 to 162 in the present revised scheme, as illustrated in Figures 7a, 8a and 13a). The Applicant is pleased to see a positive and pro-active support from the Government, including SWD and LandsD for this rezoning request application.
C.	Urban Design & Landscape Section, Planning De	partment (Comments received on 24.11.2023)
	Urban Design and Visual Impact	The first confidence received on a military
1.	The Site is located in the coastal area adjoining the beach facing the Tolo Harbor to its west. Its immediate locality mainly comprises low-rise developments/rural settlements of Wu Kai Sha Youth Village/Wu Kai Sha Village and To Tau Wan	Noted.
	Village to the south and north respectively with existing BHs ranging from about 4mPD to 29mPD/1	

	to 3 storeys, while high-rise residential developments (e.g. Double Cove) with existing BHs ranging from about 59mPD to 131mPD/13 to 36 storeys are located to its east across Wu Kai Sha Road. Other residential developments with similar waterfront setting in a wider context such as St. Barths, Altissimo and Villa Oceania are around 22mPD to 58mPD/2 to 18 storeys in BHs. The proposed development with a maximum BH of 55.65mPD/16 storeys (above ground level) is considered not incompatible with its immediate locality to the east and wider waterfront context.	
2.	According to the submission, various design measures including a minimum building separation	Noted.
	of 15m between residential towers, peripheral	
	landscaping treatment, connection between Wu Kai	
	Sha Road and the beach, stepped BH concept	
	between the residential towers and the RCHE, etc	
	are proposed.	
	Comments on Planning Statement	
3.	Section 8 Indicative Rezoning Proposal and Figure	As indicated in Plan A attached, the overall development profile in this
	- As per my previous comments to the pre-	part of the Wu Kai Sha area is being shaped in the form of three major
	submission, with reference to the explanatory	building height bands ascending from waterfront, to immediate inland
	statement (ES) of the OZP (Para. 7.2 refers), the	areas and then to further outer inland areas, so called 'town centre' (i.e.
	stepped BH concept recommended in the Urban Design Guidelines with lower buildings on the	from 30-60mPD alongside the waterfront areas to 61-120mPD in immediate inland areas and then to 121-225mPD in the outer inland
	waterfront/near major open spaces has been adopted	areas). The maximum building height of 55.65mPD proposed under the
	for the subject OZP. There are different height bands	present rezoning scheme is not consider incompatible with the existing
	generally increasing progressively from the	building height profile well established in this part of the Wu Kai Sha area
	waterfront to inland area and decreasing	from the urban design perspective.
	progressively from the town centre and the western	8 rr
	and eastern gateway nodes to respect the distinct	
	urban form of the new town. Please clarify/elaborate	

	on how the proposed development has responded to	
	the above-mentioned concept.	
	Appendix X – Visual Impact Assessment (VIA)	
4.	Para. 4.5 VP1 and Para. 4.10 VP2 - Given that VPs 1 and 2 share similar factors, but with VP1 farther away from the Site, please review if their sensitivity should both be low for consistency.	Agreed. The visually sensitivity of VPs 1 and 2 should be "low" and the resultant overall visual impact at VP2 should be slightly adverse.
5.	Para. 4.15 VP3 –In view of the recreational nature and close proximity of this VP, it might not be appropriate to rate the visual sensitivity as "medium". Please review.	VP3 represents a short-range viewing point of the Subject Site. Noting that the proposed development like Villa Athena and Double Cove will take away part of the openness/sky views at this VP, however, having considered there is a group of tall and densely grown vegetations setting as an effective foreground visual element, a mountain backdrop background, and, under normal circumstances, most of the users are watersports-related or beach-related users who will keep spending most of their attention either on the moving objects on the sea or sunbathing/sand playing, the visual sensitive at this VP is 'medium to high'. Indeed, if the planned 20m wide waterfront promenade, presently zoned as "O" on the OZP, is being implemented, more than half of the existing Wu Kai Sha Beach will be taken away in the near future.
6.	Para. 4.19 VP4 –In view of the close proximity of this VP, it might not be appropriate to rate the visual sensitivity as "low". Please review.	The visually sensitivity of VP 4 has been revised to "medium".
	Please ensure the accuracy of all photomontages. Some observations on the photomontages are set out as follows:	
7.	Plan 8 VP1: The proposed development should appear to be narrower and shifted closer to Double Cove in the photomontage at this VP. Please review and rectify, as appropriate.	The Project Architect has reviewed and revised the photomontage. A set of revised Figures (Plan 1a- 13a) is attached for consideration taking into account the amendments due to the changes of the run-in/out location required by the Transport Department. The location and disposition of Block A, Block B, RCHE and clubhouse remain unchanged. Based on these revised Photomontages, the results of the VIA are being updated in Table A below:

		<u>Table</u>	A. Revised	Results o	f the VIA			
			VP1	VP2	VP3	VP4	VP5	VP6
		VS	Low	Low	Medium to High	Medium	Low	Low
		VO	Minor	Minor	Moderate	Moderate	Minor	Negligible
		EPV	Moderate	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Negligible
		ROI	Slightly to moderately adverse	Slightly adverse	Moderately adverse	Moderately adverse	Slightly adverse	Negligible
			ewing Point; VS - ; ROI – Resultant		tivity; VO – Visua	al Obstruction; EF	PV – Effect of	n Public
8.	Plan 9 VP2: The proposed development should appear to be higher and wider (blocking portion of the open sky view on top of Villa Athena) as well as be slightly shifted closer to Double Cove at this VP. Please review and rectify, as appropriate.	Ditto	B.7 above.					
9.	Plan 10 VP3: The proposed development should appear to be much higher and wider (blocking portion of the open sky view on top of Saddle Ridge and Villa Athena) as well as be shifted to the right at this VP. Please review and rectify, as appropriate.	Ditto	B.7 above.					
10.	Plan 11 VP4: The proposed development should appear to be much higher and wider (blocking majority of the open sky view) at this VP. Please review and rectify, as appropriate.		B.7 above.					
11.	Plan 12 VP5: The proposed development should appear to be a bit higher and narrower as well as slightly shifted to the left (blocking a minor	Ditto	B.7 above.					

	portion of the open sky view between the residential towers of Double Cove) at this VP. Please review and rectify, as appropriate.	
12.	Please critically review and revise the relevant analysis and ratings of magnitude of change and/or visual impact in Section 4 with reference to the revised photomontages in particular VPs 2 to 5 in view of our comments above.	Ditto B.7 above.
13.	Section 5 Conclusion – In view of our comments above, please review and revise this section as well as Para.9.4 of the Planning Statement, as appropriate.	Ditto B.7 above.
14.	<u>Landscape</u>	Noted.
14.	Based on the aerial photo of 2022, the site is situated in an area of residential urban fringe landscape character comprising of woodlands, beach, high rise residential buildings, camp sites, village houses and carparks. The proposed rezoning for residential use is considered not incompatible with the landscape character surrounding the Site.	
	With reference to para 2.1 and site photos under figure 3 of the Planning Statement (PS), the Site is currently being used as a temporary convenient vehicles' holding area. According to para 3.1 of Appendix III – Landscape Master Plan and Tree Preservation and Removal Proposal, 80 existing trees within the Site and 3 nos. trees immediately outside the Site were identified. All surveyed trees are common species and no registered OVTs were identified within the Site. According to para 3.4 of Appendix III, all trees within the site are	Noted.

	proposed to be felled due to direct conflict with the proposed development and low survival rate	
	after transplantation. According to para 3.5 and	
	4.3, landscape mitigation such as 83 nos. of new	
	heavy standard trees with native species within	
	the site, peripheral planting, and new planting	
	areas are proposed. Moreover, according to para	
	4.4 and Private Open Space Figure (DWG No.	
	LMP_003), approx. 540 sq.m of open space	
	provision for an estimated population of 534	
	persons in accordance with requirements of the	
	HKPSG is proposed. With the proposed	
	mitigation measures, significant adverse	
	landscape impact on the existing landscape	
	resources arising from the proposed use is not	
	anticipated. We have no objection to the	
1.5	application from landscape planning perspective.	
15.	The provision of new tree planting framing and	The description of (1) Children Play Area and (3) Sitting-out Area has been revised.
	shading the children play area as stated in the	been revised.
	legend under Landscape Master Plan (DWG No. LMP_001) is not observed.	
16.	Design enhancement of public footpath along the	Drawing No. LD 04 in the revised MLP (Appendix III) shows the
10.	western site boundary as indicated on the LMP	Section Diagram of the proposed public footpath and the proposed edged
	should be clarified and more information is	planter, the current planter wall is approx. 2m high, which is similar to a
	advised to be provided in the landscape proposal	boundary fence wall height. In order to reduce the wall effect, so that the
	and relevant cross-sections.	planter's TOS level is now 4.65 to allow a better greening effect for all
	WAR 1010 (WAR 01 055 5 0 0 1 2 0 1 5 1	users.
17.	The Applicant is suggested to improve the	Please note that it is not a retaining wall structure and is a 2m high
	landscape treatment for the retaining wall along	boundary wall, which is a normal height of development boundary wall
	the western site boundary (e.g. further setting	for security and safety purposes. As the floor area of the basement
	back the retaining wall to allow tree/ landscape	carpark has been fully utilized for the required parking provisions, the wall
	buffer along and at the same level as the public	is unable to make any further set back.

18.	footpath, vertical greening along the retaining wall, etc.) to soften the alignment of the retaining wall.	Noted.
16.	The Applicant should be advised that approval of the application does not imply approval of tree works such as pruning, transplanting and felling under lease. The Applicant is reminded to seek approval for any proposed tree works from relevant departments prior to commencement of the works.	Noted.
D.	Agricultural, Fisheries and Conservation Department	(Comments received on 24.11.2023)
1.	Since an ecological impact assessment was not performed for the proposed development, our previous comments as shown below remain valid.	The Applicant owns sizeable land area both in Site A (Subject Site) and Site B (in "CA" zone) for decades. Up to the present moment, no particular flora and fauna have been observed or being identified in these
2.	The proposed development is in close vicinity of the "CA" zone, which covers a mature coastal woodland and is of ecological value, and adjacent to an intertidal habitat with some mangrove species. The applicant should include in the submission an assessment on whether the proposed development would induce adverse ecological impacts to the surroundings and propose appropriate precautionary and mitigation measures, if necessary.	areas or its surrounding areas. Indeed, many areas under existing vegetation (mostly <i>Hibiscus tiliaceus</i> 黃槿) in the area have been occupied those rental watersports' facilities/equipment. The coastal area to the western of the Subject Site is a sand beach, which is about 35m away from the existing local footpath immediately west of the Subject Site.

It should be noted that in future, more than half of Wu Kai Sha Beach will be taken away to make way for a planned 20m wide waterfront promenade, presently zoned as "O" on the OZP, as shown on the diagram below. Transport Department (Comments received on 24.11.2023) Traffic Engineering Below comments from traffic engineering point of view on the pre-submission of TIA have not been addressed. General Comments The grade separated junction of Ma On Shan Bypass Noted. Additional assessment has been conducted for the grade and Sai Sha Road should be included in the TIA. separated junction of Ma On Shan Bypass and Sai Sha Road. Please refer to Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 of the updated TIA report. With reference to the AADT from ATC station no. Noted. Additional assessment is being conducted for Saturday's peak. 5005, it is noted from 2016 to 2022 data that the Please refer to **Chapter 3** and **Chapter 4** of the updated TIA report. traffic flows on Saturdays are higher than those on

	Weekdays. Traffic impact for Saturday's peak		
	should also be assessed.		
	<u>Specific Comments</u>		
4.	Table 4.3 – For Cheung Muk Tau Housing	Noted.	Please refer to Table 4.3 of the update TIA report.
	Development, it also consists of retail and several		
	social welfare developments. The corresponding		
	traffic generation should also be calculated and		
	included in the assessment.		
	Please find below our comments on the TIA:		
5.	Table 3.6 – According to the Lease of STTL 502,	Noted.	The concerned walkway is included in the updated TIA report.
	there is a 24-hour public pedestrian walkway within		
	the Lot connecting Yiu Sha Road and Wu Kai Sha		
	Station. I believe this walkway would be the		
	major pedestrian route for the developments in Wu		
	Kai Sha. Assessment of the walkway should be		
	included in the TIA.		
	Figure 3.2		
6.	Existing On Chun Street adjoining Villa Athena is	Noted.	Please refer to Figure 3.2 of the updated TIA report.
	omitted.		
7.	Please also include the junction of On Chiu		nal assessment is being conducted for the concerned junctions.
	Street/On Chun Street and the existing On Chun	Please re	efer to the updated TIA report for details.
	Street outside Villa Athena in your assessment.		
8.	Is there any existing traffic generated from Villa	Noted.	Please refer to Figure 3.2 of the updated TIA report.
	•	110000.	rease refer to Figure 3.2 of the updated TIA report.
	Athena, Wu Kai Sha Youth Village, Cheung Kang	1,000	Trease refer to Figure 3.2 of the updated TIA report.
	Athena, Wu Kai Sha Youth Village, Cheung Kang area, Wu Kai Sha New Village, Kwai Po Lau area	1 (otou	Thease refer to Figure 3.2 of the appeared TTA report.
	Athena, Wu Kai Sha Youth Village, Cheung Kang area, Wu Kai Sha New Village, Kwai Po Lau area and Lok Wo Sha area, which are next to the subject	1,000.	Trease refer to Figure 3.2 of the updated TIA report.
	Athena, Wu Kai Sha Youth Village, Cheung Kang area, Wu Kai Sha New Village, Kwai Po Lau area and Lok Wo Sha area, which are next to the subject site as shown in OZP no. S/MOS/26? If yes, please	1,000	Trease refer to Figure 3.2 of the updated TIA report.
	Athena, Wu Kai Sha Youth Village, Cheung Kang area, Wu Kai Sha New Village, Kwai Po Lau area and Lok Wo Sha area, which are next to the subject site as shown in OZP no. S/MOS/26? If yes, please show those existing traffic in Figure 3.2.		
9.	Athena, Wu Kai Sha Youth Village, Cheung Kang area, Wu Kai Sha New Village, Kwai Po Lau area and Lok Wo Sha area, which are next to the subject site as shown in OZP no. S/MOS/26? If yes, please show those existing traffic in Figure 3.2. Table 4.3 –	Noted.	Please refer to Figure 4.0 of the updated TIA report.
9.	Athena, Wu Kai Sha Youth Village, Cheung Kang area, Wu Kai Sha New Village, Kwai Po Lau area and Lok Wo Sha area, which are next to the subject site as shown in OZP no. S/MOS/26? If yes, please show those existing traffic in Figure 3.2. Table 4.3 – A location plan showing the positions of the site nos.		
9.	Athena, Wu Kai Sha Youth Village, Cheung Kang area, Wu Kai Sha New Village, Kwai Po Lau area and Lok Wo Sha area, which are next to the subject site as shown in OZP no. S/MOS/26? If yes, please show those existing traffic in Figure 3.2. Table 4.3 –		

10.	For the sake of TIA, an allowance of 10% increase of residential units should be applied for the planned public housing developments.	Noted. Please refer to Table 4.4 of the updated TIA report.
11.	Footnote (3) and (4) – Please provide the relevant extract of the TIA report for reference. Para. 4.4.2	The relevant extract is now being enclosed in Appendix B of the updated TIA report.
12.	Please advise the survey dates for RCHEs and public vehicle park respectively.	Noted. Trip generation surveys are being re-conducted at the existing RCHEs and public car parks on 8 December 2023 in order to avoid the effect of the epidemic. Please refer to Table 4.5 of the updated TIA report for details.
13.	I recall that a restricted visiting arrangement for RCHE was implemented during the epidemic. I doubt the trip rate derived during that period would be representative of the proposed development. Please conduct the relevant survey more recently to avoid the effect of the epidemic.	Noted. Trip generation surveys are re-conducted at the existing RCHEs and public car parks on 8 December 2023 in order to avoid the effect of the epidemic. Please refer to Table 4.5 of the updated TIA report for details.
14.	Table 4.5 – Please review the figures for the derived trip rate for RCHE.	Noted. Trip generation surveys are re-conducted at the existing RCHEs and public car parks on 8 December 2023 in order to avoid the effected of the epidemic. Please refer to Table 4.5 of the updated TIA report for details.
15.	Figure 4.1 – Please substantiate the trip split of the development traffic.	Noted. Please refer to Section 4.4 of the updated TIA report for details.
16.	"2030 Design" scenarios for the road link capacity assessment.	Noted. Please be clarified that the "2030 Reference" and "2030 Design" scenarios have been shown in Table 4.8 of the submitted TIA report.
	Section 4.8	
17.	Please advise the survey date for the pedestrian trip survey. As the survey date is key to my review of the assessment, I reserve my further comments on this assessment upon the provision of the information.	Noted. Trip generation surveys have been re-conducted at the existing RCHEs and public car parks on 8 December 2023 in order to avoid the effect of the epidemic. Please refer to Table 4.8 of the updated TIA report for details.
18.	Noting over 95% of total flat of the surveyed development (i.e. The Met. Bliss) is of flat size less	Please note that the methodology for estimating pedestrians induced by the residential component of the proposed development has been reviewed

19.	than 40m2, the composition of flat size for the proposed development is largely different from the surveyed development. Please justify the surveyed pedestrian trip rate is reasonably representative of the proposed development. As mentioned to the above comment item 3(i)b, if the survey is carried out during the period of epidemic, additional survey should be conducted to avoid the effect of epidemic.	and updated. Please refer to Section 4.8 of the updated TIA report for details. Trip generation surveys have been re-conducted at the existing RCHEs and public car parks on 8 December 2023 in order to avoid the effect of the epidemic.
	Table 4.10	
20.	Applying the surveyed trip rate, which is derived from a residential development, for the development of student hostel STTL 600 seems inappropriate. Please review and revise the relevant assessment.	Please note that the methodology for estimating pedestrians induced by student hostel has been reviewed and updated. Please refer to Table 4.10 of the updated TIA report for details.
21.	Noting the remote setting of those planned and committed residential developments in Wu Kai Sha, which is quite significantly different from the surveyed development, the adopted pedestrian trip rate seems inappropriate. Please review and revise the relevant assessment.	Please note that the methodology for estimating pedestrians induced by the residential buildings has been reviewed and updated. Please refer to Section 4.8 of the updated TIA report for details.
22.	Section 4.11 – Please review whether your assessment for footpath capacity assessment is realistic.	It is understood that pedestrians generated by other planned developments, such as STTL 600, STTL 601 and STTL 611, would use the 24-hour public pedestrian walkway within STTL 502 which provide them with the shortest walking distance between their buildings and the MTR station. However, please be clarified that the assessment aims to demonstrate the worst case scenario, therefore it is assumed that all pedestrians not using the 24-hour public pedestrian walkway within STTL 502. Furthermore, the walking distance between the proposed development and Wu Kai Sha Station would be lengthened if the pedestrian induced by the proposed development use the 24-hour public pedestrian walkway within STTL 502, instead using the anticipated routing shown in Figure 3.4 .

		Nevertheless, the assessment has been reviewed and updated to reflect the realistic traffic condition, the pedestrians generated by other planned developments would be assigned to use the 24-hour public pedestrian walkway within STTL 502 and the pedestrians generated by the proposed development would use the anticipated routing shown in Figure 3.4. Please refer to Section 4.11 of the updated TIA report for details.
23.	Section 6.1 – The proposed access lies on the local	Noted.
25.	access road which is not under the management of	Noted.
	TD. The applicant should identify the owner of	
	the concerned access roads, and seek comments and	
	consent from relevant Government departments(s)	
	on the access arrangement and M&M issues.	
	Figure 6.1 (Access arrangement)	
24.		The location of the proposed vehicular access has been reviewed and relocated away from the planned new road.
	On Chun Street.	
25.	Please also clarify the management and maintenance responsibility of the existing access road to Cheung Kang Village and its future status after the proposed widening.	The land status of the existing access road to Cheung Kang Village is government land. The project proponent will be responsible for the proposed widening works but he will not take up the management and maintenance responsibility after the proposed widening.
	The proposed access arrangement is not designed up to the government standard with the following observations:	
26.	The nearside kerb radius at the roundabout exit of 6.0m could be meet the requirement of TPDM. Please review.	Noted. The layout of the proposed access has been reviewed and updated accordingly. Please refer to Figure 6.1 of the updated TIA report for details.
27.	Please advise the arrangement for the U-turn or	At present, there is no such proper facility available at the access road.
	reverse maneuvering of vehicle in case motorists	In case there is a private car enter the access road from the roundabout

	unintentionally enter the access road from the roundabout.	unintentionally, the private car can make U-turn (by three-point turn) at the run-in/out location.
28.	The gradient of the proposed access road appears to be greater than 1:10, which could not meet the requirement of TPDM. Please review.	Noted. The layout of the proposed access has been reviewed and updated accordingly. Please refer to Figure 6.1 of the updated TIA report for details.
29.	Please demonstrate the compliance of the required visibility distance of the proposed run-in according to TPDM.	Noted. Please refer to Figure 6.2 of the updated TIA report for the result of sightline analysis.
30.	Traffic deflection island should be provided on the approach of the roundabout.	Noted. The layout of the proposed access has been reviewed and updated accordingly. Please refer to Figure 6.1 of the updated TIA report for details.
31.	The proposed access arrangement should not affect the existing ingress/egress of vehicles access for Cheung Kang Village.	Please note that the proposed access arrangement improves the section of access road between the Site and Wu Kai Sha Road/Yiu Sha Road, other sections of the concerned access road would remain unchanged. Therefore, the existing ingress/egress of vehicles access for Cheung Kang
		Village would not be affected.
	Table 6.1 -	
32.	Please substantiate the proposed ancillary parking provision for RCHE is sufficient to meet the operational need of the RCHE.	Please note that reference was made to two existing RCHE, namely the Caritas Harold H.W. LEE Care and Attention Home with 276 beds and 8 car parking spaces and the SAGE Kwan Fong Nim Chee Home for the Elderly with 204 beds and 6 car parking spaces. According to on-site observation, the provisions were sufficient and no car parking is observed at the public roads outside the two RCHEs. So, 8 car parking spaces are proposed.
33.	Please briefly demonstrate the parking needs of the visitor for RCHE could be accommodated by the parking provision in the development.	According to on-site observation of the latest trip generation survey at existing RCHE, namely the Caritas Harold H.W. LEE Care and Attention Home with 276 beds) only 2 private cars were attracted to the RCHE during peak hour.
		The proposed RCHE with 162 bed spaces is smaller than those surveyed RCHE in terms of development scale, however, for conservative assessment purpose, it is anticipated the proposed RCHE would have

		same amount of traffic as the surveyed RCHE which can be accommodated by the proposed provision of 8 car parking spaces.
34.	Table 6.2 – Please review if the dimension of the light bus parking space is 3.0m(W) x 9.0m(L) x 3.3m(H).	Please be clarified that the proposed light bus parking space is anticipated to share use with ambulance.
		According to HKPSG, the dimension for light bus space is 3.0m(W) x 8.0m(L) x 3.3m(H), the dimension for ambulance parking space is 3.0m(W) x 9.0m(L). Therefore, it is proposed to provide spaces of 3.0m(W) x 9.0m(L) x 3.3m(H) in order to accommodate both vehicle types.
35.	Drawing No. GP-01 – It seems that the floor area is not fully utilized, in particular between parking space no. 38 and 39 and the space between parking space no. 39 and 66. Please review if more parking spaces could be provided in these area.	Noted. The layout has been updated to fully utilized the space available. Further study will be carried out during the GBP stage.
36.	Drawing No. GP-01 – It seems the car parking layout could accommodate more motorcycle parking spaces. Please consider to further review.	Noted. Additional motorcycle parking spaces are now provided. Please refer to the updated layout plan.
	<u>Transport Operation - Planning Statement</u>	
37.	"MTR Wu Kai Sha Station is located within 500m" is inconsistent with para. 3.5.1 of the TIA Report stated that "MTR Wu Kai Sha Station is located approximately 800m". Please Review.	Please note that the distance as stated in the Planning Statement refers to a generic radius distance measuring from the center of the Site to Wu Kai Sha MTR station. The distance as depicted on the TIA, on the other hand, refers to an approximate walking distance between the Site and Wu Kai Sha MTR Station. Please note that the appropriate walking distance between the Site and Wu Kai Sha MTR Station as set out on the TIA has been revised from 800m to 700m in para. 3.5.1.
38.	Please review if the franchised bus and green minibus (GMB) routes observing Wu Kai Sha Road and Yiu Sha Road should be counted. Some of the franchised bus and GMB routes listed in Table 3.4 of the Tia Report are not serving Wu Kai Sha Road and Yiu Sha Road, e.g. KMB route nos. 89D, 99, 274P, etc. If franchised bus and GMB services in Wu Kai	Noted. Please note that all franchised bus and GMB public transport routes observing Wu Kai Sha Road, Yiu Sha Road, and Wu Kai Sha Station PTI have been revised and updated in Table 3.4 in TIA and para 2.12 in the Planning Statement.

	Sha Station Public Transport Interchange (PTI) should be counted, please be advised that some franchised bus routes only provide special departure originating at Wu Kai Sha Station PTI while the original departures do not observe the PTI, e.g. KMB route no. 85X.	
	Transport Operation - TIA	
39.	Para. 3.5.1 The number of franchised bus and GMB routes (i.e. 22 and 4 respectively) is inconsistent with Para. 2.12 of the Planning Application. Please review.	Noted. Please refer to Para. 3.5.1 of the updated TIA report for details.
	Table 3.4	
40.	Please update the information of existing public transport services, e.g. KMB route no. 40E is providing 4 departures (07:20 and 07:40 from Nai Chung, 18:10 and 18:30 from Kwai Chung) and KMB route no. 40S and CTB route no. 682X were cancelled, etc.	Noted. Please refer to Table 3.4 of the updated TIA report for details.
41.	Please also note our comment on Para. 2.12 of the Planning Application.	Noted. Please refer to Table 3.4 of the updated TIA report for details.
42.	Para. 4.8.3 It is not appropriate to assume all the estimated pedestrian flows would walk to/from MTR Wu Kai Sha Station taking into consideration the walking time of 8-9 minutes. Please review if enhancement of existing public transport services and/or introduction of new public transport services are required, with reference to the passenger demand of public transport services at the stop on Yiu Sha Road near St Barths and on Wu Kai Sha Road near Double Cove during morning peak hours, including but not limited to the commuting need in the vicinity of the Site to University Station and Sha Tin Central.	Bus/minibus utilization assessment has been conducted at the nearby stops. The results show that the existing public transport services can accommodate the demand induced by the proposed development during morning and evening peak hour. Therefore, no enhancement of existing public transport services is required.

43.	Figures - Please review Figure 5 in connection to	Noted.
	our above comments.	
F.	Antiquities and Monument Office (Comments received	ed on 21.12.2023)
1.	Please be informed that the subject site for rezoning falls within Wu Kai Sha Site of Archaeological Interest (SAI). After reviewing the location of the subject site and the previous archaeological works within the site, the project proponent is required to conduct an assessment on the impact of archaeological resources arising from the development works within the SAI. If archaeological investigation is needed based on the result of the desktop study of the assessment, the project proponent should engage an archaeologist to apply for a licence to conduct the necessary archaeological investigation under the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance (Cap. 53). The archaeological investigation proposal shall be submitted to AMO for consideration and agreement prior to applying for a licence. Subject to the result of the archaeological investigation, appropriate mitigation measures (if required) should be proposed for consideration and agreement by AMO, and implemented by the project proponent to the satisfaction of AMO.	Please note that our draft Schedule of Use for the proposed "R(B)6 zoning under the OZP has included a special clause on the provision of an archaeological investigation ("AI") to the satisfaction of AMO before any engineering works commences. Upon Town Planning Board's agreement on the present rezoning request, the applicant will conduct an AI based on AMO's requirements before any site engineering works commences. It should be noted that, under normal circumstances, prior to any site engineering works, all on-site geology conditions or underground archaeological settings/features, if any, will remain unchanged in-situ therein. The results and findings of the AI with respect to the Subject Site are exactly the same. In view of this, the Applicant considers that the proposed on-site AI work to be carried out soon after the TPB's agreement on the rezoning request application is appropriate and represents a fair, reasonable and rational arrangement from the business planning standpoint. Indeed, if any significant archaeological elements are being identified during the AI process, the Applicant is happy to collaborate with AMO's requirements and to comply mandatory actions and orders to preserve and protect them, if so required.
G.	Environmental Protection Department (Comments re	ceived on 21.12.2023)
1	Sewage Impact Assessment	
1.	S.2.1.3 Please note that ProPECC PN 5/93 has been superseded by ProPECC PN1/23. Please update the relevant sections acc	Revised accordingly.
2.	S 2.1.5	Revised accordingly.

	Please note that ProPECC PN1/94 has been superseded by ProPECC PN 2/23. Please update the relevant sections accordingly	
3.	S.4.1.4 Please clarify whether the on-site STP will be decommissioned when public sewage is connected.	Separate sewerage impact assessment shall be submitted for approval when decommissioning of the interim on-site sewage treatment plant is proposed so as to assess the potential sewerage impact on the existing public sewerage system at that time (s. 4.15 om D/SIA report).
4.	S.4.3.1 (a) Please clarify if the proposed development with clubhouse includes swimming pool. If affirmative, please include the swimming pool in the SIA calculation. Please note that the location of swimming pool (indoor/outdoor) will affect the calculation coefficient as well. (b) Please also confirm whether there would be	(a) Please note that no swimming pool will be provided in clubhouse.(b) It is confirmed that no restaurant/ canteens has been proposed within site.
	restaurants/canteens within the proposed development.	
5.	S.4.3.2 It is noted that from S4.1.4 that the sewage generated from proposed development is proposed to discharge to on-site STP will be due to insufficient capacity of CKSPS and program issue. Nevertheless, it is mentioned in S4.3.2 that "The existing demand for the sewage system is determined to estimate the sewage impact to the downstream flows. Sewage generated from catchment areas, as shown in Figure 4-1, is diverted for calculations." Please revise accordingly.	It is confirmed that sewage generated from the proposed development will be discharged to on-site STP and will not be discharged into the public sewer system, unless and until the capacity of the existing public sewer has been upgraded for connection. S4.3.2 has also been revised accordingly.
6.	S.4.5.1 Please confirm the effluent treatment level and denote the technology being employed for the on-	With reference to the TM on Environmental Impact Assessment Process, the proposed STP with Membrane Bioreactor (MBR) Technology with

	site STP, e.g. Tertiary effluent treatment level with Membrane Bioreactor (MBR) Technology with ultra-filtration. The consultant may wish to make reference to clause 2.1.2 of Annex 6 of the technical Memorandum on Environmental Impact Assessment Process.	 ultra-filtration will be provided in accordance with the following conditions: Disinfection may not be required if membrane filtration is provided which can meet the relevant discharge standards for bacteria. For nitrogen removal, the target is 75% total inorganic nitrogen reduction with respect to the annual average influent nitrogen loads or concentrations. For phosphorus removal, the target is 80% phosphorus reduction with respect to the annual average influent phosphorus loads or concentrations All above has been elaborated in S.4.5.2 of the revised D/SIA report.
7.	S.4.5.5	Yes, there will be tanker away arrangement of the tanker away when
	Please clarify if there would be tanker away arrangement if capacity of the holding tank for	emergencies arise. S4.5.5 has been revised accordingly.
	emergency storage is exceeded.	
8.	S4.5.6	Revised accordingly.
	(a) Typo: "A discharge license will be applied	
	prior to the development commencement".	
	It is suggested to revise the last sentence as "All site	
	discharges will be pre-treated as necessary, in	
	accordance with the WPCO, the conditions of the	
	WPCO discharge license and the relevant standards listed in the TM-DSS.".	
9.	Table 4-4	Revised accordingly. Staffing derived from PVP operation has been
	PVP is missing from the table.	added for calculation.
10	Table 4-5 Please clarify the unit of CFU/100ml under "Loading from Proposed Development". Same as	CFU/100ml is being deleted.
	that for Appendix 4-3.	

1.1	0.57.6	(\\T\)
11.	S.5.7.6	(a) The watercourse should be read as a concrete drainage channel. The
	(a) With reference to EPD's Centralised	option of diversion of channel is proposed to maintain the existing water
	Environmental Database (CED), there is a	flow. The existing drainage channel will be diverted and running along the
	watercourse within the Project Site at the south.	southern site boundary of Application Site.
	Please clarify if there would be any WQ impacts on	The diversion of the water main will comply with the requirements set out
	the watercourse arising from the Project.	by DSD. Detailed information shall be provided at later detailed design
		stage.
	(b) Please be reminded that for the effluent produced	
	from construction and operational stages, pre-treated	Please refer to S5.8 and Figure 6.1.
	to compliance with WPCO requirement, should be	
	sited away from natural section of water courses.	(b) Noted and supplemented in S5.8.5.
12.	Appendix 4-3	(a) The contributing population is derived based on Section 12.1 of GESF
	(a)Please clarify how the contributing population of	Contributing Population = $\frac{\text{Calculated total average flow } (\text{m}^3/\text{day})}{0.27 \text{ (m}^3/\text{person/day)}}$
	780 is derived.	$0.27 (\text{m}^3/\text{person/day})$
	(b)Please review if the unit for peak flow should be	
	m3/day	(b) The unit of peak flow should be m3/s, App 4.3 is being revised
		accordingly.
13.	Appendix 5-1	Revised accordingly.
	Typo: "Outfall direct discharge to THolo Habour".	
	<u>Environmental Assessment</u>	
	<u>Air Quality</u>	
14.	Figure 5.1	Site visit was conducted. The houses are identified as residential use and
	Please review whether the houses to the immediate	considered as ASR. Figure 5.1 has been revised accordingly.
	northeast of the site are considered as ASRs.	
15.	S.5.5.2 and S.5.5.7	Site visits and desktop reviews on SP licenses were conducted and
	The Applicant is reminded that it should be the	information was gathered from EPD's CED. No chimney was found
	responsibility of the Applicant and their consultant	within 200m radius of the subject site.
	to ensure the validity of the chimney data by their	
	own site surveys. Should the information of	
	industrial chimneys be subsequently found to be	
	incorrect, the assessment result as presented in the	
	EA would be invalidated	

16.	S.5.5.4	The road type of the said roads is Local Distributor as confirmed by TD.
	While it is identified that the Wu Kai Sha Road and	Please refer to S5.6.3 and App 5.1
	Yiu Sha Road are local distributor, please provide	
	relevant confirmation (e.g. Annual Traffic Census or	
	TD's advice) on the identification of the road type.	
17.	Table 5.4	(a)Noted and revised accordingly.
	(a) The separation distance between the proposed	
	development including the residential towers,	(b) Noted, revised accordingly.
	clubhouse and RCHE and the nearby road	
	appears to be incorrect. Please check and revise	
	as appropriate.	
	(b) The separate distance shall also be indicated	
	clearly which building block if referred	
18.	Figure 5.2	Revised accordingly.
	Please indicate clearly in Figure 5.2 the separation	
	distance between the proposed development and	
	nearby road.	
	<u>Noise</u>	
19.	S.6.3.6	TD's endorsement on traffic forecast data is not yet available and will be
	Record of TD's endorsement on the traffic forecast	provided once available.
	data or methodology should be documented in the	
	EA report. Please supplement.	
20.	S.6.3.11, Table 6-2 and Fig.6.1a	Sickbays is of nature of diagnostic rooms/ wards of RCHE. The results of
	Please clarify if there are any NAPs being the nature	sickbays are presented separately as they are having a more stringent noise
	of diagnostic rooms/wards of RCHE. If affirmative,	criterion.
	please present these NAPs and the predicted results	
	separately as they have a more stringent noise	
	criterion.	
21.	Figure 3.1	Figure 3.1 is being updated.
	Please indicate Blocks A,B &RCHE in the figure	
22.	Figure 6.1a	Figure 6.1a is being updated to indicate the floor levels.
	Please clarify the floor levels of the RCHE in the	
	figure title	

	RoadNoise Model	
23.	,	Updated.
	marked as "Tick".	
24.	<u> </u>	Updated.
	level of proposed development should be 55.6m	
	instead of 46.0m. Please revise and ensure the height	
	input is correct and consistent with the building	
	sectional drawings	
Н.	Lands Department (Comments received on 23.1.2024)	. /
1.	The subject rezoning site having a total area of 4,325	Noted.
	sq.m comprises (i) about 2,173sq.m owned by the	
	applicant ("Private Lots") and (ii) about 2,152 sq.m	
	government land. The Private Lots, i.e. Lots 148	
	s.A. R.P, and 148 s.B. R.P., 149 R.P., 150 s.A., 150	
	s.B. and 151 all in DD206 are held under the Block	
	Government Lease dated 27.3.1905 ("BGL")	
	demised for "Padi" (148 s.A. R.P, and 148 s.B. R.P.,	
	149 R.P.) and "Waste" (150 s.A., 150 s.B. and 151).	
	For the rezoning and land exchange proposals,	-
<u> </u>	please note that	NY . 1
2.	Under the prevailing land practice, LandsD will	Noted.
	generally not accept any land to be surrendered	
	falling outside the land exchange boundary for	
	development. Hence, Site B falling within "CA"	
	zone and not affecting the proposed development	
	will not e be considered for the proposed surrender	
	when processing the proposed in-situ land exchange	
	(if planning application approved) as proposed in para. 3.1 of the submission dated 25.10.2023	
	annexed to the application.	
3.	A block of 7-storey RCHE building is proposed	Noted.
٥.	under the subject application. According to Lands	Noicu.
	Administration Office LandsD Practice Note Issue	
	Administration Office LandsD Tractice Note Issue	

4. 5.	No. 5/2023 ("the PN"), the lot owner may apply to LandsD, who may grant the concessions to exempt RCHE premises to be provided in the new private development from the payment of land premium and the calculation of total GFA subject to the applicant to fulfil all requirements outlined in para.3 of the PN. The subject site is located within an area of archaeological interest (i.e. AM00-1606). We note that AMO has also been included in the circulation list to comment the rezoning application. The proposed land exchange may take into account AMO's requirement for consideration. It seems that "Site C" in figure 2 of the submission annexed to the application is irrelevant to the application. The applicant should clarify.	Please note that the proposed non-in-situ land exchange for Site C is a genuine attempt to unleash the potential of the long unattended land to make the best use of readily available land resources to meet the needs of the community. Given that the land area of 'Site C' covers more than 7,000m² and can be treated as disposed site for community development at this part of populated the Wu Kai Sha area, it is a golden opportunity to release such valuable land resources for more proper use(s) instead of
6.	Subject to the above comments, we have no in- principle objection to the application. If the	leaving them unattended forever, representing a waste of our limited land resources and will become a planning blight at the end of the day. Noted.
	proposed planning application is accepted or partially accepted by the TOC with a set of clear development parameters (including but not limited to the proposed user, gross floor area and car parking provisions, as appropriate) defined / firmed up and further submission to the TPB is not required, the applicant may submit request for streamlined processing of land exchange application. Depending on the circumstances of each cases,	

7.	LandsD at its sole and absolute discretion may, upon receipt[t of such valid request and subject to payment of the administrative fees (including fee payable to the Legal Advisory and Conveyancing Office, if required) by the applicant, commence the streamlined processing of the land exchange application on a without prejudice and noncommittal basis while PlanD is taking forward the relevant OZP amendment. The applicant is reminded that once the accepted or partially accepted proposal is reflected in the OZP and approved under section 9 of the Town Planning Ordinance, a formal application for land exchange by the applicant to LandsD is still required. Every application submitted to LandsD will be considered on its own merit by LandsD at its absolute discretion acting on its capacity as a landlord and there is no guarantee that the land exchange application will eventually be approved by LandsD. If the application for land exchange is approved by LandsD, it will be subject to such terms and conditions as may be imposed by LandsD at its absolute discretion, including payment of premium and administrative fees.	Noted.
I.	Highways Department (Comments received on 23.1.	2024)
1.	Comments from Transport Department (TD) on the Traffic Impact Assessment should be sought;	Noted.
2.	Please clarify the maintenance responsibility of the modified local access road at the southern side of the Site as it is current not under maintenance of Highways Department.	The Applicant is willing to undertake a short-term maintenance of proposed modified local access road until relevant maintenance Government department is being identified to takeover such local access road.