

Appendix B

Response-to-Comment table

Comments from Related Departments

Page No.

1. Civil Engineering and Development Department, Geotechnical Engineering Office, dated 28 Jun 2024	2
2. Development Bureau, Northern Metropolis Co-ordination Office, dated 21 Jun 2024	2
3. Drainage Services Department, Operations & Maintenance Branch, Mainland North Division, North Section, dated 9 Aug 2024.....	3
4. Drainage Services Department, Operations & Maintenance Branch, Mainland North Division, North Section, dated 13 Aug 2024.....	3
5. Education Bureau, North District School Development Section, dated 9 Aug 2024.....	4
6. Environmental Protection Department, Environmental Assessment Division, Territory North Group, Sheung Shui, Fanling, Tai Po, dated 8 Jul 2024	5
7. Innovation, Technology and Industry Bureau, Innovation, Technology and Industry Branch, Division 1, dated 9 Aug 2024	5
8. Lands Department, Lands Administration Office, District Lands Office, dated 29 July 2024	6
9. Planning Department, District Planning Branch, Special Duties Division, Urban Design & Landscape Section, Urban Design Unit, dated 15 Jul 2024.....	9
10. Planning Department, District Planning Branch, Special Duties Division, Urban Design & Landscape Section, Landscape Unit, dated 23 Jul 2024.....	13
11. Water Supplies Department, New Works Branch, Construction Division, System Planning Section, dated 26 Jul 2024	16

COMMENTS FROM RELATED DEPARTMENTS

No.	Comments	Responses
1.	<p>Civil Engineering and Development Department, Geotechnical Engineering Office, dated 28 Jun 2024</p> <p>2. Please advise the applicant that a review/discussion on how the existing retaining walls and slopes shown in Figure 3.3 may affect or be affected by the proposed development should be included in the GPRR.</p> <p>3. Please ask the applicant to review the geological map sheet number covering the subject site in section 3.1 of the GPRR.</p> <p>4. Based on our preliminary review, the angular elevations of some catchments (e.g. MKT-6, MKT-7, MKT-9, MKT-14, MKT-15, MKT-19, etc) shown in Figure 4.1 of the GPRR do not appear to be measured based on the most critical section of the catchments. Please ask the applicant to review accordingly.</p> <p>5. It is noted that the proposed development is under an early stage and reference has been made to the proposed preliminary layout plan when carrying out screening of natural terrain hazards. Please remind the applicant to review the screening results at later stage where the development layout plan is finalised.</p>	<p>Noted. The discussion of the slope /retaining walls within the site is provided in the section 3.3.1. Please refer to Appendix C for the revised Geotechnical Planning Review Report.</p> <p>Noted. The geological map sheet number has been revised accordingly.</p> <p>Noted. The NTHS screening has been reviewed accordingly, which reveals that the catchment nos. MKT-6, MKT-7, MKT-9, MKT-14, MKT-15 and MKT-22 have met the alert criteria.</p> <p>However, for catchment no. MKT-19, three (3) nos. of additional screening sections have been checked, and the catchment is still considered as not meeting the alert criteria.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
2.	<p>Development Bureau, Northern Metropolis Co-ordination Office, dated 21 Jun 2024</p> <p>- The Site falls within the study area of the New Territories North (NTN) New Town, one of the New Development Areas (NDAs) in the Northern Metropolis (NM). As the planning and engineering study (the Study) for the NTN New Town is now underway, the impact of any rezoning applications falling within the study area should be carefully considered so as not to unduly pre-empt the results of the Study as well as the full development potential and reasonable layout of the area.</p>	<p>Noted. With the vision of developing Northern Metropolis into a “new international I&T city”, the proposed rezoning application for developing an I&T hub in Man Kam To area aptly aligns with the policy directions of the SAR government and national development strategies. Falling within one of the four major zones of Northern Metropolis – the Boundary Commerce and Industry Zone, the Application Site adjoins Shenzhen city with locational advantage of being next to boundary control points. Hence, being in line with the policy directions, the proposed I&T hub at the Application Site has great potential to create synergy with and complement the planned I&T development in northern New Territories and to</p>

No.	Comments	Responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In order to leverage market forces to expedite the development of the NM, the Chief Executive announced in his 2023 Policy Address that the Government will extend the Enhanced Conventional New Town Approach (ECNTA) to all NDAs. Under the ECNTA, the Government may allow in-situ land exchange applications from lot owners to carry out developments which accord with Government's planning intention, subject to set criteria and conditions. - The initial development proposal for the NTN New Town is expected to be released in the latter half of 2024. It will provide a better picture of the planning intention of the Government at various parts of the NTN New Town for the Applicant to consider, review and formulate their development plan. 	<p>facilitate close cross-boundary cooperation with Shenzhen.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>Drainage Services Department, Operations & Maintenance Branch, Mainland North Division, North Section, dated 9 Aug 2024</p> <p>I refer to the RtC and the revised SIA submitted by the applicant, please be advised that we have no further comment on the revised SIA.</p>	<p>Noted with thanks.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Drainage Services Department, Operations & Maintenance Branch, Mainland North Division, North Section, dated 13 Aug 2024</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Appendix E of the DIA: It appears that the design rainstorm parameters (i.e. a, b and c) were not in line with the latest update of the SDM pursuant to Corrigendum No. 1/2024. Please be further reminded that the latest design parameters (e.g. updated rainfall parameters in the North District rainfall zone) should be considered in the relevant assessment. 2. Appendix E and F of the DIA: It appears that the design allowance pursuant to Table 31 of the Corrigendum No. 1/2022 of the Stormwater Drainage Manual (i.e. +12.1%) as mentioned in the earlier 	<p>The design rainstorm parameters in the Appendix E of the revised Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) have been revised. Please refer to Appendix D for the revised DIA.</p> <p>Appendices E and F of the revised DIA have been revised accordingly.</p>

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p>comments were still yet to be incorporated. Please review the submission.</p> <p>3. Appendix F: It is noted a catchment plan for UC01 to UC04 was presented. Yet, the location of proposed channels mentioned under this Appendix is still not clear. Please supplement.</p> <p>4. Please be advised that the respective section of Ping Yuen River at the immediate downstream of the site is subjected to tidal effect. Relevant check and discussion was not incorporated. Please review and elaborate in the submission.</p> <p>5. It is noted that the formation level of the proposed structure platforms and some roads were provided. Please also supplement the proposed site formation levels, in particular the river-side promenade which may potentially subject to river flood risk.</p> <p>6. Please clarify whether the proposed development will impact/upgrade the embankment of Ping Yuen River. If affirmative, the formation level and protection level should be justified according to SDM with comments No. 1 and 2 properly taken into account.</p> <p>7. Section 5.2: please further elaborate on the volume, location and operation mechanism of the proposed drainage storage tank.</p> <p>8. It is noted that 10m promenade is proposed besides the Ping Yuen River, please advise if the provision of maintenance access for DSD has been considered under the planning.</p>	<p>Please refer to the dotted line in magenta colour for the proposed u-channels in Appendix F of the revised DIA for details.</p> <p>With the proposed storage tank, the impacts of the increase in the surface water runoff can be contained. No adverse impacts on Ping Yuen River are expected.</p> <p>Please refer to the discussion on the newly added Section 5.4 of the revised DIA.</p> <p>The site formation level of the promenade along the river side is proposed to be around 7mPD.</p> <p>Please be advised that there are no changes to the embankment of Ping Yuen River.</p> <p>Please refer to the discussion on the newly added Section 5.4 of the revised DIA. Details of the proposed drainage storage tank will be provided at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>Please be advised that maintenance access for DSD to Ping Yuen River will be reserved and provided.</p>
5.	<p>Education Bureau, North District School Development Section, dated 9 Aug 2024</p> <p>Our comments still stand. Given that the change of viewing points upon completion of the project does not affect the daily operation of the School as well as the teaching and</p>	<p>Noted with thanks.</p>

No.	Comments	Responses
	learning of students, we have no further comments on the supplementary information.	
6.	<p>Environmental Protection Department, Environmental Assessment Division, Territory North Group, Sheung Shui, Fanling, Tai Po, dated 8 Jul 2024</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Table 2: The total design population should be 16,475. Please check and revise. 2. Table 3: The total estimated sewage flow for Community, Social & personal Services (J11) should be 18.5 m³/day. Please revise the table and Appendix C accordingly. 3. Section 4.4: Please remove Table 7, and briefly illustrate the effluent discharged will comply with the standards stipulated in the TM-DSS. 4. Section 4.14: The capacity of the local STP should be designed for the peak flow rate. Please confirm the design treatment capacity and review whether the STP would constitute a DP under the EIAO and amend this section accordingly. 	<p>Noted. Table 2 has been revised. Please refer to Appendix E of the revised Sewerage Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Noted. Table 3 and Appendix C have been revised.</p> <p>Noted. Table 7 has been removed and Section 4.4 has also been revised.</p> <p>Please be advised that the STP would be designed for the peak flow rate summarised in Table 6.</p> <p>The STP would not constitute to a DP under the EIAO since the installed capacity in term of daily flow rate (ADWF) of the STP is not more than 5,000 m³/day.</p>
7.	<p>Innovation, Technology and Industry Bureau, Innovation, Technology and Industry Branch, Division 1, dated 9 Aug 2024</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) ITIB and OGCI have no objection to the application for the Site for I&T Hub development, but we are not in the position to support the proposed rezoning if it aligns with the Government's land use policy. 2) Data centre are key information and communication technologies (ICT) infrastructure to drive the development of digital economy and technology innovation in Hong Kong. The Government is committed to promoting Hong Kong as the prime location for data centres in the Asia-Pacific Region. The proposed application to rezone the application site from "Agriculture", 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. The proposed rezoning application, which aims to provide the necessary facilities for supporting the growth of the I&T sector, including data centres, aligns squarely with the Government's policy to develop Hong Kong into an international I&T centre.</p>

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p>“Green Belt” and “Government, Institution or Community” zones to a new “Other Specified Uses” annotated “I&T Hub” zone with Information Technology and Telecommunications (IT&T) Industries use as always permitted would make available more potential data centre floor space. Subject to the approval of the amendment of plan, if materialized, it would contribute to addressing the growing demand for high-tier data centres in Hong Kong and benefit the I&T sector development at large.</p> <p>3) As for the provision of R&D centres, the Government is committed to enhancing Hong Kong’s I&T ecosystem by consolidating Hong Kong’s R&D strengths. The proposed rezoning application would provide more space for R&D activities in Hong Kong.</p>	<p>Noted. In line with the Government’s aspiration, the proposed rezoning demonstrates the Applicant’s earnest endeavour to spearhead a top-notch I&T Hub with floor spaces reserved for R&D centres and data centres and to enhance Hong Kong’s I&T ecosystem.</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>Lands Department, Lands Administration Office, District Lands Office, dated 29 July 2024</p> <p>Regarding Appendices A and B, the said information are intended to address respective comments given in para. 3 (iii) to J(ix) of our previous memo dated 28.5.2024 ("Our Previous Memo"). Comments from land administration point of view are as follows:-</p> <p>(a) <u>Para. 3(iii) and 3(iv)</u></p> <p>The Applicant has advised that his proposal would involve certain percentage of Government Land in the "Application Site"/ "Development Site" and has indicated that they would submit land exchange applications to LandsD to facilitate his proposal upon the rezoning application has been approved. Please note that there is no consent from this office LO include Government land in the application, the inclusion of Government land into the Application Site/ Development Site for development is subject to the approval of a land exchange.</p> <p>The Applicant clarified 28% (about 35,242m²) of Government land included in the "Application Site" and 17% (about</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please be advised that the proposed development of an I&T Hub, with maximum non-domestic GFA of 365,180m² and maximum</p>

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p>17,418m²) of Government land is included in the "Development Site" of this application. Please clarify the implication of categorizing the area as "Application Site" vs "Development Site" under this rezoning request in terms of development right, plot ratio, site coverage and any other aspect. There is no guarantee that the land exchange application if submitted will be approved and such application will be considered by LandsD acting in the capacity of the Landlord at its sole discretion. The rezoning application or approval (if given) shall not pre-empt the consideration and decision of the approving authority for the land exchange. if submitted by the applicant, and given that Government Land is involved, there should be no assumption that the inclusion of Government land in the land exchange application would be approved.</p> <p>(b) <u>Para. 3(v)</u></p> <p>Noting the Applicant has clarified that that Transport Interchange and the kindergarten are proposed to be owned and operated by him. We would like to reiterate that comments from relevant B/Ds on the provision, scope, management and maintenance of these facilities shall be sought. The requirements for those facilities will only be imposed in the lease conditions if they are required by the Government and monitored by the relevant B/Ds both at the development stage, after completion at operation stage and thereafter. In this respect, the Applicant should confirm and advise if relevant B/Ds including TD/ HyD and EDB that these facilities are required by the Government and whether they agree to be named as approval authority under lease; take up the monitoring role at development stage and also take up the concerned facilities upon completion.</p> <p>(c) <u>Para. 3(vi)</u></p> <p>The Applicant clarified that the transport interchange are proposed to be counted as non-domestic GFA but is silent on whether TD will take up the transport interchange.</p>	<p>domestic GFA of 170,400m², will be located within the Development Site. The site coverage, based on the Development Site, will adhere to the requirements under Building (Planning) Regulations.</p> <p>The remaining land parcels adjoining the Development Site is included to form the Application Site with the planning intention to better rationalise the boundary and land use zoning.</p> <p>Noted. Please be advised that the Supporting Planning Statement of the rezoning application has been circulated to relevant B/Ds for comment.</p> <p>Noted. Please be advised that the rezoning application has been circulated to relevant B/Ds for comment.</p>

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p>PlanD is requested to advise if you agree to the proposed GFA accountability.</p> <p>For the clubhouse and sewerage treatment plant, the Applicant has quoted PNAP APP-104 as a reference for calculation of the maximum GFA for the 4-storey stand-alone clubhouse but is silent on GFA and whether this clubhouse is serving for domestic occupiers only and has quoted B(P)R 23(3)(b) and opined that the sewerage treatment plant may be disregarded from GFA calculation. PlanD is requested to advise if you agree the proposed GFA accountability.</p> <p>(d) <u>Para. 3(vii) to 3(ix)</u></p> <p>The Applicant has proposed "right of access" to the (i) existing River, Ganges Pumping Station/ existing Electric Sub-Station in the northern portion and (ii) two pieces of government land including a public school and "Fung Shui Woodland" in the southern portion. The Applicant should be advised the proposed "right of access" is not viable unless the Applicant could demonstrate that he owns all the concerned private lots as well as a feasible road scheme implementation plan has obtained agreement from TD, HyD.</p> <p>Instead of constructing a public road, only a right-of-way be given to existing occupiers with access available and Government have hear read-across implication.</p> <p>3. As regards Appendices C to F, it involves various requirements under technical assessments. Only upon relevant bureau/ department requesting for or in support of such additional requirements and agreed to be named as approval authority under lease and responsible for monitoring the Applicant's compliance both at development stage and subsequent operation stage, these requirements will be considered for incorporation under lease. In the absence of such bureau/ department's request or support, no conditions would be incorporated under leases for the proposed assessment.</p>	<p>Please be advised that the proposed clubhouse has a GFA of about 724m² for the exclusive use by the owners and residents including their bona fide visitors.</p> <p>The rezoning application has been circulated to relevant B/Ds for comment. Subject to the detailed design, application for GFA concession will be made at the GBP submission stage.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

No.	Comments	Responses
9.	<p>Planning Department, District Planning Branch, Special Duties Division, Urban Design & Landscape Section, Urban Design Unit, dated 15 Jul 2024</p> <p>I refer to your email dated 21.6.2024 enclosing the Further Information 1 (FI1) providing the revised Indicative Architectural Drawings, Response-to-Comment table, replacement pages of Supporting Planning Statement (SPS), revised Visual Impact Assessment (VIA), site photo taken at the MacIntosh Fort (Nga Yiu) and replacement page of VIA, etc. for the captioned application. Our comments from the urban design and visual impact perspectives are set out below for your consideration and coordination please.</p> <p>2. Please note that: (a) our previous comments (urban design and visual) in paras. 2 to 7 via email dated 27.5.2024 are still valid (with paras. 3 and 5 updated below); and (b) our previous comments (air ventilation) via email 27.5.2024 are still valid. Some of our specific comments (urban design and visual) dated 27.5.2024 are not fully addressed (which are recapped below) and there are some further comments/observations on the updated SPS and revised VIA.</p> <p>3. Updated paras. 3 and 5 of our previous comments (urban design and visual) dated 27.5.2024 (in blue) are set out below:</p> <p><i>Para. 3 - According to the indicative scheme, the proposed development has a site area of about 125,863 sq.m.*, a non-domestic plot ratio (PR) of about 3.57 (equivalent to a non-domestic GFA of about 365,180 sq.m.), a domestic PR of about 1.66 (equivalent to a domestic GFA of about 170,400 sq.m.), a non-domestic site coverage of not more than 60% and a domestic site coverage of not more than 17.67%. The proposed development comprises three blocks of 16-storey R&D Centre (with BHs of 90mPD) with transport interchange, three blocks of 12-storey Data Centre (with BHs of 80mPD), three towers of 31-storey Ancillary Dormitories (with BHs of 110mPD) with kindergarten, five 31 to 33-storey Residential Towers (with BHs of</i></p>	<p>Noted. Please refer to the below responses and supplementary information for your consideration.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p><i>120mPD), one standalone 2-storey sewage treatment plant (with BH of 17mPD), one standalone 6-storey Commercial Centre (with BH of 37mPD) and one standalone 4-storey clubhouse (with BH of 34.7mPD) over 1 to 2-storey basement carpark. A 10m-wide riverside promenade (which would be provided for public enjoyment) is proposed near the R&D Centres fronting Ping Yuen River.</i></p> <p>*and the development site area is about 102,461 sq.m</p> <p><i>Para. 5 - Notwithstanding, to substantiate the application, the consultant may consider exploring further design measures with more respect to the hillside and riverfront setting. For examples, whether the site coverage has been optimized for the proposed BHs, lower developments on the riverfront to avoid dominating the river and increase permeability to the waterbody, breaking down the long building mass of the R&D Centres fronting the river, etc. and providing further justifications for the proposed development as appropriate.</i></p> <p><u>Observations and Comments</u></p> <p><i>Appendix D – Replacement Pages of SPS</i></p> <p>4. Paras. 4.3.8, 4.5.5 and 6.7.2 – The applicant is reminded to reflect the latest proposal (including the proposed four 30m-wind corridors, one 40m-wind corridor, proposed empty bays etc.) in the Air Ventilation Assessment.</p> <p><i>Appendix E – Revised VIA</i></p> <p>5. Given that there is no public viewing point (VP) from the north and in order to demonstrate the visual impact to the</p>	<p>Noted. The overall design layout of the Indicative Scheme has incorporated a stepped building height profile to respond to the hillside and riverfront settings. Along the 10m-wide riverside promenade proposed with quality landscape and open space design, appropriate ground floor setback and building separations (15m and 30m respectively) of the three R&D Centres have been introduced.</p> <p>The Applicant has also made genuine efforts to explore further design measures in the Indicative Scheme. In response to the comments from UD&L Section/ PlanD on the ventilation performance (received on 29 May 2024), one of 30m-wide wind corridors has been widened to 40m (between AD2 and DC3), and one new 30m-wide wind corridor (between AD2 and AD3) is newly introduced to improve air ventilation and minimise visual impacts. These new design measures have been reflected in the revised Indicative Architectural Drawings and relevant technical assessment.</p> <p>Noted. The latest proposal has been reflected in Para 2.2.3, Figure 13 and Figure 14 in the revised Air Ventilation Assessment (submitted as Further Information on 24 June 2024).</p> <p>While the footpath along Lin Ma Hang Road is far from being a prominent route by the public and has minimal footfall based on on-site</p>

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p>riverfront, it would be advisable to explore VP along Lin Ma Hang Road across Ping Yuen River for better illustration of the visual impact of the proposed development.</p> <p>6. Figure 4 (VP1) – It is noted that the viewing direction of VP1 has been revised toward the southwest in Figure 3, from where only the fringe area of the Site would be visible. Please provide justifications for not maintaining the viewing direction of VP1 toward the northwest (from which more of the proposed development would be visible) as per that shown in Figure 3 of the VIA in the original application or rectify the photo/photomontages for a more proper assessment of the impact to the public viewers at Chow Tin Tsuen Playground.</p> <p>7. In response to our previous comments on the accuracy of the photomontages, it is noted that the photomontages have been revised. Our observations of the revised figures are set out below:</p> <p>(a) Figure 7 (VP4) – It seems that the proposed development should appear to be shorter and located to the further left, in which only a small portion of the upper part of Towers DC3, AD3 and AD2 would be visible.</p> <p>(b) Figure 9 (VP6) – It seems that the proposed development should be located to the further right, in</p>	<p>observation, a new VP (VP 10) on the bridge across Ping Yuen River facing the Application Site from the north/ northeast is added to the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) to illustrate the visual impact of the proposed development from various directions. Please refer to paras. 5.1.55 to 5.1.61 and Figure 13 of the revised VIA for the relevant analysis (Appendix F refers).</p> <p>To better demonstrate the enhancement to the riverfront through the 10m-wide riverside promenade proposed with quality landscape and open space design, an Artist’s Impression has been prepared to illustrate the urban design features and visual impact of the proposed development on the riverfront. Please refer to the new rendering as Figure 4.2 in the Supporting Planning Statement (Appendix G refers).</p> <p>After review, please be advised that the viewing direction of VP1 was verified to be towards the southwest from where the site photo was taken.</p> <p>Please refer to Appendix H for the illustration of the field of view from VP1.</p> <p>Noted. The photomontage has been revised accordingly, as such a small portion of the upper part of DC3, AD2, R&D3, and R&D2 can be seen with existing vegetation in the foreground screening off a major portion of the buildings.</p> <p>Noted. The photomontage has been revised accordingly, as such a small portion of AD3 and DC3 will be visible from this VP, with the rest</p>

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p>which only part of Tower AD3 would be visible.</p> <p>8. In view of the above observations, please ensure the accuracy of the photomontages.</p> <p>9. In response to our previous comments on the assessment of visual impact of the VPs, it is noted that the appraisal of visual changes at some of the VPs have been revised. Our observations are set out below:</p> <p>(a) Paras. 5.1.11, 5.1.13, 5.1.14 and 5.1.15 (VP2) and Table 5.1 – With reference to the photomontage at VP2, the proposed high-rise towers would introduce a new visual element in juxtaposition with the existing rural locality and reduce the visual openness with an apparent portion of open sky view would be obstructed. Even with the mitigation measure (i.e. soft edge along the boundary), the “visual composition”, and “effect on visual resources” can hardly be considered as “slightly adverse”. It would be more tenable to grade the “effect on public viewers” and visual impact to VP2 as “moderately adverse” rather than “slightly adverse”.</p> <p>(b) Para. 5.1.19 (VP3) and Table 5.1 – With reference to the photomontage at VP3, compared to the existing open view towards the village settlements and greenery in Ta Kwu Ling, the proposed development would apparently alter the rural context, reduce visual permeability and obstruct the view to the greenery and mountain backdrop/ridgeline. It would be more tenable to grade the “effects on public viewer” as “moderately adverse” rather than “slightly adverse”.</p>	<p>of the proposed development being screened by the existing vegetation in the middle ground.</p> <p>Noted. The photomontages have been revised to ensure accuracy. In view of the comments above, the relevant discussion in paras 5.1.24, 5.1.25, 5.1.36, 5.1.37 and 5.1.39 has also been revised accordingly (Appendix G refers).</p> <p>Noted. The visual impact of VP2, which is mitigated by the wide building separation (40m between DC3 and AD2), soft edge along the boundary of Development Site, and unobstructed view towards the ridgeline in the background, has been reviewed and revised as “moderately adverse”.</p> <p>Upon review, notwithstanding the proximity to urbanised Shenzhen and incorporation of design features in the Indicative Scheme (e.g. stepped building height profile, various building separation, rooftop garden), the “effects on public viewer” at VP3 is revised from “slightly adverse” to “moderately adverse”.</p>

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p>(c) Para. 5.1.38 (VP6) and Table 5.1 – Taking into account our comments on the photomontage at VP6 above, the high-rise tower would appear as a perceivable visual element from this VP and obstruct a small portion of open sky view. The “effect on visual resources” may hardly be considered as “negligible”.</p> <p>(d) Paras. 5.1.50 and 5.1.52 (VP9) and Table 5.1 – With reference to the photomontage at VP9, the proposed development would become a new visual element in juxtaposition with the existing rural locality. Even it is a long-range VP, the proposed development would cause perceivable loss of view towards greenery and visual openness. The “visual composition”, “visual obstruction” and “effect on visual resources” can hence hardly be considered as “negligible”. It would be more tenable to grade the “effects on public viewer” and the visual impact to VP9 as “slightly adverse” rather than “negligible”.</p> <p>10. In view of the comments above, please review and revise the figure/photomontages and relevant analysis in Sections 5 and 6 of the VIA and Section 6.9 of the SPS.</p>	<p>With reference to the revised photomontage of VP6, only the upper portion of AD3 is perceived while the rest of the proposed development is screened by the vegetation in the middle ground. The open sky view from this VP remains largely the same, with only a minor fraction affected by part of AD3. Hence, the effect on visual resources at VP6 is considered as negligible.</p> <p>As a long-range VP, the urbanised Shenzhen with high-rise development in the background can be clearly seen from this VP. Situating in vicinity of Shenzhen, the “effects on visual composition” caused by the Indicative Scheme is considered negligible.</p> <p>Upon review, although the Indicative Scheme will cause no visual change to the ridgelines and open sky view in the background at this distance, the “effects on visual obstruction” and “effects on visual resources” have been revised from negligible into slightly adverse in response to departmental comments.</p> <p>In terms of “effects on public viewers”, hikers can still enjoy an extensive view of green resources on Hong Kong side and Wutong Mountain across the river on Shenzhen side, as wide as the unobstructed open space view, it is considered negligible after review.</p> <p>Overall speaking, having taken into account that only a minor portion of green resources on Hong Kong side is affected, and that the Indicative Scheme blends in with the visual characters of Shenzhen’s cityscape in the immediate background, the overall visual impact is negligible.</p> <p>Noted. Photomontages and relevant analysis in the VIA have been revised accordingly.</p>
10.	<p>Planning Department, District Planning Branch, Special Duties Division, Urban Design & Landscape Section, Landscape Unit, dated 23 Jul 2024</p>	

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p>1. Having reviewed the submitted information and RtC, the proposed tree treatments have been reviewed, i.e. 33 nos. of existing trees (T186 to T219) are proposed to be retained and 290 nos. of existing trees which included 4 nos. of undesirable species are proposed to be felled. 286 nos. of new trees are proposed to meet the compensatory ratio of 1:1 in terms of number of tree felled. The proposed soft edges along the western boundaries adjoining the “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone have been widened to 3m with 2 rows of trees as far as practicable.</p> <p>2. Our previous observations and comments remains valid. The proposed development with 125,863m² site area would bring significant changes to the existing rural inland plain landscape character of the "Agriculture" (“AGR”) zone, in particular where “GB” zone is located within and in close proximity to the site.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. While acknowledging the large-scale development of an I&T hub at this strategic location in the Northern Metropolis neighbouring boundary control points and the urbanised Shenzhen city, the proposed development has incorporated several measures to lessen the changes to the local landscape character and to enhance the integration with the surrounding environment.</p> <p>To align with the planning principle of “Urban-Rural Integration and Co-existence of Development and Conservation” in the Northern Metropolis, the Development Site boundary has been carefully adjusted to allow the preservation of Fung Shui Woodland. Appropriate boundary treatment in the form of 2m – 14m wide soft edges comprised of evergreen trees with dense crowns has been proposed for screening purpose and as a transition between the new development and the surrounding environment. Greenery within the Development Site has been maximised, such as rooftop gardens in the R&D centres and Data Centres. In terms of selection of plant species, ornamental species with colourful flowers or scents have been proposed to enhance the aesthetics of the Development Site, as well as large native evergreen trees will be included to provide shading for pedestrians. The Landscape and Tree Preservation Proposal of the proposed development has been intended to be responsive to the existing landscape character, while exhibiting a balance between development and the surrounding context.</p>

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p><u>Detailed Comments / Advisory Comments</u></p> <p>3. 5th bullet point of RtC item 3 – Please clarify the reference of the statement, “...minimum of 3m growth space is required for the standard trees and 5m for heavy standard trees...” The applicant is reminded to provide sufficient spacing for proposed trees at their attainable mature size.</p> <p>4. It is noted that trees of relatively large mature size, e.g. <i>Ficus microcarpa</i> (細葉榕) and <i>Cinnanomum parthenoxulon</i> (黃樟) with minimum 8-12m crown spread are proposed. Please review the proposed spacing, proposed location, and size of planter (particularly at portions of 2-3m wide) to ensure adequate space is provided for sustainable tree growth.</p> <p>5. Table 3.2 - Chinese name of tree, <i>Cinnanomum parthenoxulon</i>, should be reviewed and rectified as 黃樟.</p> <p>6. Figure 1.9b & 1.9c – Reviewed proposal, e.g. proposed trees to be retained, soft edges of 3m wide, 2 rows of trees..etc, should be shown on the section drawings.</p> <p>7. Figure 1.9b & 1.9c – With reference to the 6th bullet point of RtC item 3, the term “soft edges” will be used consistently throughout the Supporting Planning Statement and Landscape and Tree Preservation Proposal. Please also update/ replace the term “green buffer” in the section drawings accordingly.</p> <p>8. The applicant should be advised that approval of the application does not imply approval of tree works such as pruning, transplanting and felling. The applicant is reminded to seek approval for any proposed tree works from relevant departments prior to commencement of the works.</p>	<p>For details, please refer to Appendix I for the revised Landscape and Tree Preservation Proposal.</p> <p>Noted. The growth space is referenced from the Standard Specification of Nursery Plant Materials for Guangdong, Hong Kong and Macau by HKILA, with assumptions made regarding their mature size of the standard trees and heavy standard trees. The tree planting area will be ensured with sufficient spacing for their growth.</p> <p>The proposed planting locations for mature trees have been reviewed. Revisions have been made to ensure adequate space is preserved for the trees' growth.</p> <p>Noted and Table 3.2 has been revised.</p> <p>Noted and Figures 1.9b and 1.9c have been revised.</p> <p>Noted and Figures 1.9b and 1.9c have been revised.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

No.	Comments	Responses
11.	<p>Water Supplies Department, New Works Branch, Construction Division, System Planning Section, dated 26 Jul 2024</p> <p><u>Major Comments on the Application/Main Reasons of Objection:</u></p> <p>Previous comments were not fully addressed. Please find our comments on Appendix F-</p> <p>WSIA:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Para. 3.4.5 – Hydraulic calculation is required. 2. Para. 3.5.1 – As your proposed development is located within the NTN study, CE21/2021(CE), you are required to coordinate with CEDD to include your proposed water demand in the CEDD’s study and provide record to this office. 3. Para. 3.5.1 – You are required to liaise with CE21/2021(CE) and formulate a long-term water supply scheme including fresh water and reclaimed water (ReW) for flushing from CE21/2021(CE) instead of supplying by existing Table Hill FWSR. i.e. Both fresh water and reclaimed water should be supplied by FWSR and ReWSR from CE21/2021(CE). 4. Figure 3.2 - The figure showing the proposed water main is not clear. In the figure, please show:- 1) the connection point between the proposed DN300 FW main and existing FW main to Table Hill FWSR near Man Kam To Road; 2) The demarcation for the proposed FW main to be maintained by WSD and to be maintained by the project proponent near the development site including the connection points between the FW main, TMF and fire service main near Lin Ma Hang Road. 5. Appendix C - Please supplement the power of IT load of the data center. 	<p>Hydraulic calculation is supplemented. Please refer to Appendix D in the revised Water Supply Impact Assessment (WSIA) (Appendix J refers).</p> <p>Please be advised that the WSIA report has been circulated to the North Development Office of CEDD and the proposed water demand has been provided for their record.</p> <p>Please be advised that communication has been made with CEDD and that the fresh water and flushing water will be supplied by the new water supply infrastructure of CE21/2021 in the long term.</p> <p>Noted and revised. Please refer to Figure 3.2.</p> <p>The cooling water demand of data centre is supplemented in the water demand estimation.</p>

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p><u>Other Detailed Comments (if applicable):</u></p> <p>It is noted that part of the proposed site overlaps the WSD land allocation for the River Ganges Lowland Raw Water Pumping Station. The project proponent shall take note and closely liaise with WSD and CLP regarding land requirement issue</p> <p>Existing water mains inside the proposed site as shown in the MRP may be affected. The applicant is required to either divert or protect the water mains found on site.</p> <p>If diversion is required, existing water mains inside the proposed site areas are needed to be diverted outside the site boundary of the proposed site to lie in Government land. A strip of land of minimum 1.5m in width should be provided for the diversion of existing water mains. The cost of diversion of existing water mains upon request will have to be borne by the applicant; and the applicant shall submit all the relevant proposal to WSD for consideration and agreement before the works commence.</p> <p>If diversion is not required, the following conditions shall apply:</p> <p>(a) Existing water mains are affected as indicated on the site plan and no development which requires resiting of water mains will be allowed.</p> <p>(b) Details of site formation works shall be submitted to the Director of Water Supplies for approval prior to commencement of works.</p> <p>(c) No structures shall be built or materials stored within 1.5 metres from the centre line(s) of water main(s) shown on the plan. Free access shall be made available at all times for staff of the Director of Water Supplies or their contractor to carry out construction, inspection, operation, maintenance and repair works.</p> <p>(d) No trees or shrubs with penetrating roots may be planted within the Water Works Reserve or in the vicinity of the water main(s) shown on the plan. No</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p>change of existing site condition may be undertaken within the aforesaid area without the prior agreement of the Director of Water Supplies. Rigid root barriers may be required if the clear distance between the proposed tree and the pipe is 2.5m or less, and the barrier must extend below the invert level of the pipe.</p> <p>(e) No planting or obstruction of any kind except turfing shall be permitted within the space of 1.5 metres around the cover of any valve or within a distance of 1 metre from any hydrant outlet.</p> <p>(f) Tree planting may be prohibited in the event that the Director of Water Supplies considers that there is any likelihood of damage being caused to water mains.</p> <p>* Adopt 1.5 meters for water mains below 600mm dia. and 3 meters for water mains of 600mm dia. And above.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

(Last update on 10 September 2024)