

Appendix A

Response-to-Comment table

Comments from Related Departments

Page No.

1. Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department, Headquarters, Conservation Branch, Nature Conservation (North) Division, Nature Conservation Section (North), dated 23 July 2024	2
2. Civil Engineering and Development Department, Geotechnical Engineering Office, Planning and Development Division, dated 10 Oct 2024.....	2
3. Planning Department, District Planning Branch, Special Duties Division, Urban Design & Landscape Section, Landscape Unit, dated 4 Oct 2024.....	3
4. Planning Department, District Planning Branch, Special Duties Division, Urban Design & Landscape Section, Urban Design Unit, dated 10 Oct 2024.....	4

COMMENTS FROM RELATED DEPARTMENTS

No.	Comments	Responses
1.	<p>Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department, Headquarters, Conservation Branch, Nature Conservation (North) Division, Nature Conservation Section (North), dated 23 July 2024</p> <p><u>From agricultural perspective</u></p> <p>1. I have no comment on the further information provided by the applicant and our earlier comments dated 27 May 2024 are still valid.</p> <p><u>From nature conservation perspective</u></p> <p>2. It is noted from the RtC that an EcoIA is under preparation. We will provide our comment on the planning application when the EcoIA is completed.</p> <p>3. Regarding the proposed ecological surveys, please remind the applicant to follow our recommendations:</p> <p>While I have no comment on the proposed survey period of 6-month covering both wet and dry season, the ecological surveys should also cover i) mammals; ii) freshwater fauna, instead of freshwater fish only; and iii) both the application stie/ development site as well as the 500m Study Area. The surveys should be conducted in an appropriate frequency. You may also provide the proposed transects and survey programme for our further comment.</p>	<p>Noted. It should be also heeded that, under the changing planning circumstances, the strategic location of the Application Site in the “Boundary Commerce and Industry Zone” under the Northern Metropolis Action Agenda and the proposed rezoning are in line with the Government’s direction for developing Hong Kong as an international innovation and technology centre.</p> <p>An Ecological Impact Assessment (EcoIA) covering findings of ecological survey in the wet season has been conducted. Please refer to Appendix B for details.</p> <p>The assessment of dry season survey has been being undertaken and will be submitted in due course.</p> <p>Noted. These recommendations have been taken into consideration when conducting the ecological surveys.</p>
2.	<p>Civil Engineering and Development Department, Geotechnical Engineering Office, Planning and Development Division, dated 10 Oct 2024</p> <p>1. The applicants are reminded to review corresponding geological publications covering the subject site, such as the geological map sheet number, in both</p>	<p>The section 3.1 and the reference list have been revised accordingly. Please refer to Appendix C for the replacement pages of the revised Geotechnical Planning Review Report.</p>

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p>section 3.1 and the reference list of the GPRR.</p> <p>2. It is noted from the responses to comments table that three additional screening sections have been checked for catchment no. MKT-19. However, as shown in Figure 4.1 of the GPRR, catchment no. MKT-19, which does not have a significant depression, was screened with sections appearing to be curved. The applicants shall carefully review whether catchment no. MKT-19 is still considered as not meeting the alert criteria.</p>	<p>The 2020 Territory-wide LiDAR Survey Data by CEDD has been used to evaluate the topographic conditions for the natural terrain screening within the natural catchments. The screening sections within the catchment no. MKT-19 have been reviewed, which result with the angular elevation varies between 17.2o and 18.7o, and thus considered not meeting the alert criteria.</p>
3.	<p>Planning Department, District Planning Branch, Special Duties Division, Urban Design & Landscape Section, Landscape Unit, dated 4 Oct 2024</p> <p>2. Having reviewed the submitted information and RtC, there is no change on the proposed tree treatments. Proposed planting locations for some mature trees, e.g. <i>Ficus microcarpa</i> (細葉榕) and <i>Cinnanomum parthenoxulon</i> (黃樟) are revised. However, some trees of large mature size (i.e. <i>Cinnanomum parthenoxulon</i> (黃樟)) proposed with 5m spacing are still observed at the periphery of site as shown in Fig. 1.4c and 1.4e. Our previous observations and comments item 10(3) and 10(4) remains valid.</p>	<p>Please be advised that the Landscape Master Plan and tree compensation proposal have been updated after taking into consideration the findings and recommendations of the Ecological Impact Assessment in support of this s12A Planning Application (submitted as Appendix B of this Further Information on 16 October 2024). Several areas in the Development Site have been reviewed and proposed to be further preserved. As a result, the number of retained trees has been increased from 33 nos. to 43 nos. in total. Additionally, about 0.87ha areas have been proposed to be planted as woodland to maximise planting opportunities and mitigate the possible impacts of habitat loss, with an extra 291 nos. seedling trees to be included on top of the fulfilment of 1:1 compensation ratio. Please refer to Section 3.3 of the revised Landscape and Tree Preservation Proposals (Appendix D) for details.</p> <p>Having considered the available planting space along the soft edge, <i>Cinnanomum parthenoxulon</i> (黃樟) has been replaced with a heavy standard tree with a smaller crown (e.g. <i>Cinnanomum burmannii</i> (陰香)) to ensure sufficient growth space, with a minimum 5m spacing to be provided.</p>

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p>3. RtC item 10(3) – Relevant reference on proposed 3m spacing for standard tree is not found in the mentioned Stand Specification of Nursery Plant Materials for Guangdong, Hong Kong and Macau by HKILA. Please review the proposed spacing and ensure sufficient growing space would be provided for the standard trees.</p> <p>4. RtC item 10(4) – It is noted that some trees with large mature size (i.e. <i>Cinnanomum parthenoxulon</i> (黃樟)) with 5m spacing are proposed at the periphery soft edge. Please consider to provide larger growing space and spacing or review the proposed species with a smaller mature size to ensure sustainable tree growth.</p> <p>5. Fig. 1.7 - It is noted that the local open space provision is reduced from 13,126 sq. m. to 12,426 sq. m. compared to the previous submission, please ensure sufficient open space with landscape design is provided. Reference should be made to the Chapter 4 of HKPSG.</p> <p>6. 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>Please be advised that the proposed planting space will adhere to the Proper Planting Practice from DEVB GLTMS, ensuring that there is sufficient space to accommodate the full width of the mature canopy of the standard trees to be planted. Considering the mature width of the proposed standard tree species, a minimum 5m spacing is considered adequate for their growth. Therefore, the landscape plan has been reviewed and revised accordingly.</p> <p>Having considered the available planting spaces along the soft edge, a heavy standard tree with a smaller crown (e.g. <i>Cinnanomum burmannii</i> 陰香) has been proposed to ensure sufficient growth space.</p> <p>Please be clarified that the local open space provision has fulfilled the HKPSG requirements, i.e. not less than 13,126m², with a minimum 1m² per resident and 0.5m² per workers. The number in Figure 1.7 has been rectified.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
4.	<p>Planning Department, District Planning Branch, Special Duties Division, Urban Design & Landscape Section, Urban Design Unit, dated 10 Oct 2024</p> <p><u>General Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<p>The Applicant has made genuine efforts to explore a number of design measures in the Indicative Scheme with respect to the hillside and the riverfront. The current site coverage has been optimised, after taking into consideration the provision of quality local open space for both future residents and workers, a 10m-wide riverside promenade along the R&D Centres cluster, greenery and landscaping features</p>

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p>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.</p> <p><u>Observations and Comments</u></p> <p><i>Appendix E – Revised VIA</i></p> <p>4. Figures 3 and 4 (VP1) – As commented previously, 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. Otherwise, for a more proper assessment of the impact to the public viewers at Chow Tin Tsuen Playground, please rectify the viewing angle and photo/photomontages toward the northwest in Figures 3 and 4, and revise the visual analysis in paras. 5.1.4 to 5.1.9 accordingly.</p> <p>5. In response to our previous comments on the accuracy of the photomontages, it is noted that the photomontages have been revised. Nevertheless, some of our previous comments are not fully addressed (which are recapped below):</p>	<p>(such as the soft edges along the Development Site boundary) for better blending in, as well as the recommendations of woodland avoidance and compensation from the Ecological Impact Assessment (submitted as Appendix B in this Further Information on 16 October 2024).</p> <p>To further avoid dominating the river and increase permeability to the waterbody, the Indicative Scheme has also incorporated a stepped building height profile of 120mPD at the hillside in the southwest of the Development Site descending to 80mPD and 90mPD near the river. Appropriate ground floor setback and building separations (15m and 30m respectively) of the three R&D Centres have also been introduced to break down the building mass of the R&D Centres fronting the river.</p> <p>Please be advised that the viewing direction of VP1, which has been clarified to be towards the southwest, is to accurately reflect where the photo was taken (i.e. at the entrance of Chow Tin Tsuen Playground) and to represent the views of users entering the Chow Tin Tsuen Playground.</p> <p>As per PlanD’s request, VP1 has been updated to looking towards northwest direction from the entrance of Chow Tin Tsuen Playground for the purpose of visual impact assessment. Please refer to Figure 4 of the Revised Visual Impact Assessment (Appendix D refers) for the updated analysis.</p>

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p>(a) Figure 7 (VP4) – 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) – Only part of Tower AD3 would be visible to the left (rather than the right) of the existing trees in the middle part of the photomontage.</p> <p>6. In view of the above observations, please ensure the accuracy of the photomontages.</p> <p>7. In response to our previous comments on the assessment of visual impact of the VPs, it is noted that the appraisal of visual changes in Section 5 (including Table 5.1) at some of the VPs have been revised. Some of our previous comments are not fully addressed (which are recapped below) and there are some further comments/observations to new VP10:</p> <p>(a) VP2 & VP3 – 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 obstructed. 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.</p>	<p>Noted. The photomontage has been revised, in which a small portion of the upper parts of DC3, AD2, AD3 can be seen. While R&D2 and a major portion of the R&D3 will be screened by the existing vegetation in the foreground, only a small portion of these building corners will be shown.</p> <p>Noted. The photomontage has been revised, in which only the upper part of AD3 would be visible to the left of the existing trees in the middle, with a corner of AD2 being almost fully screened by the existing trees.</p> <p>The photomontages for VP4 and VP6 have been revised after review.</p> <p>For VP2, while it is noted that the Indicative Scheme will introduce a new visual element, green resources remain as the main visual composition in this view with the introduction of soft landscape edge along the Development Site boundary. While the Indicative Scheme will screen parts of the sky view on the two sides of this VP, unobstructed views towards the Fung Shui Woodland, Robin’s Nest ridgeline and open sky view are maintained through the 40m-wide building separation in the Indicative Scheme.</p> <p>For VP3, although the Indicative Scheme will screen part of the existing fields and village settlements in the foreground, rooftop gardens, plantings and vertical vegetation on buildings have been incorporated to compensate the screened off green features. Architectural design features such as the use of finishing materials, colours, and façade will be given extra consideration during the detailed design stage for better visual compatibility. The incorporation of building separations ranging from 15m to 40m will also serve as important visual relief, allowing visual permeability to the</p>

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p>(b) VP4 – Taking into account our comments on the photomontage at VP4 above, <u>a small portion of the upper part of Towers DC3, AD3 and AD2 would be visible from this VP</u>, it would be more tenable to grade the “effect on public viewers” to VP4 as “slightly adverse” rather than “negligible”.</p> <p>(c) VP6 – 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. While the “visual composition”, “visual obstruction” and “effects on visual resources” can hardly be considered as “negligible”, it would be more tenable to grade the “effect on public viewers” and visual impact to VP6 as “slightly adverse” rather than “negligible”.</p> <p>(d) VP9 – 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. While the “visual composition” can hardly be considered as “negligible”, it would be more tenable to grade “effects on public viewer” and the visual impact to VP9 as “slightly adverse” rather than “negligible”.</p> <p>(e) VP10 - In this connection, it would be advisable to include the rationale in the VIA. With reference to the photomontage at VP10, the proposed development would become an apparent visual element, altering the rural context,</p>	<p>greenery and mountain backdrop/ ridgeline through the proposed view corridors.</p> <p>Noted that public viewers who are primarily villagers of Fung Wong Wu might notice the upper part of the towers when they pass by the VP mostly for commuting purpose or gather at special occasions, the “effect on public viewers” of VP4 has been revised from “negligible” to “slightly adverse”.</p> <p>Noted that public viewers, which are mostly transient passengers, might notice the upper part of AD3 protrudes from the vegetation in the middle ground, the “effect on public viewers” to VP6 is has been revised from “negligible” to “slightly adverse”.</p> <p>Although AD3 will block a small part of the distant sky view, the extent of open sky view remains largely the same. Moreover, visual access to the Tak Ku Ling Police Station, which is a Grade 3 Historic Building, will be maintained. The proposed development will also cause no adverse visual impact on the vegetation in the middle ground, in which the proposed development is largely screened by the lush vegetation instead. Therefore, it is considered that the overall visual impact of VP6 should be considered as “negligible”.</p> <p>Noted that the proposed development would block a minor portion of the mountain, despite no visual change to the ridgelines and the open sky view in the background caused. As hikers are the major public viewers at this VP, the “effects on public viewer” and the overall visual impact to VP9 has been revised from “negligible” to “slightly adverse”.</p> <p>VP10 (Bridge Across Ping Yuen River) is the only road access to Fung Wong Wu, Chow Tin Tsuen and Ta Ku Ling Ling Ying Public School from Lin Ma Hang Road at the north of the river. This VP is selected to assess the visual impacts on transient passengers who have a</p>

No.	Comments	Responses															
	<p>obstructing the view to the mountain backdrop/ridgeline and open sky, and reducing visual openness. As such, while “visual composition”, “visual obstruction” and “effects on visual resources” can hardly be considered “slightly adverse”, it would be more tenable to grade “effects on public viewer” and the visual impact to VP9 as “moderately adverse” rather than “slightly adverse”.</p> <p>8. 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>9. Table 3.1 – With reference to the Revised Indicative Architectural Drawings in Appendix A, inconsistencies in building height (BH) of the proposed data centre, ancillary dormitories and other residential uses are observed and set out (in red) below.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="300 1599 847 1980"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="300 1599 485 1697" rowspan="2">Data Centre</td> <td data-bbox="485 1599 665 1632">BH</td> <td data-bbox="665 1599 847 1632">72m 73m</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="485 1632 665 1697">mPD</td> <td data-bbox="665 1632 847 1697">73mPD 80mPD</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="300 1697 485 1890" rowspan="3">Ancillary Dormitories</td> <td data-bbox="485 1697 665 1762">BH</td> <td data-bbox="665 1697 847 1762">99m – 102.15m</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="485 1762 665 1827">mPD</td> <td data-bbox="665 1762 847 1827">99-102.15m 110mPD</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="485 1827 665 1890">No. of Storeys</td> <td data-bbox="665 1827 847 1890">30-31 31-32</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="300 1890 485 1980">Other Residential Uses</td> <td data-bbox="485 1890 665 1980">No. of Storeys</td> <td data-bbox="665 1890 847 1980">30-32 31-33</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Data Centre	BH	72m 73m	mPD	73mPD 80mPD	Ancillary Dormitories	BH	99m – 102.15m	mPD	99-102.15m 110mPD	No. of Storeys	30-31 31-32	Other Residential Uses	No. of Storeys	30-32 31-33	<p>view towards the Application Site from the North.</p> <p>Noted that the proposed development will inevitably obstruct part of the mountain backdrop and open sky viewed by the villagers when crossing the bridge in this short distance VP, the “effects on public viewer” has been revised from “slightly adverse” to “moderately adverse”.</p> <p>Although the Indicative Scheme will block parts of the ridgeline and open sky in the background, public views to the blue and green resources of the vegetated Ping Yuen River remain unobstructed. Meanwhile, various positive visual elements are also added to mitigate the visual impacts, including wide building separation to allow a permeable view, soft edge along the boundary to soften the building mass, and rooftop gardens to further enhance the greenery. The impact of the Indicative Scheme from this VP is therefore considered as “slightly adverse” with the incorporation of design mitigation measures.</p> <p>Noted. Photomontages and relevant analysis in the VIA have been revised accordingly.</p> <p>Noted and the BH and mPD have been revised accordingly. For the number of storeys for Ancillary Dormitories and Other Residential Uses, please be advised that it has excluded 1-storey lobby and basement carparks as indicated in the remark (6) of Table 3.1.</p>
Data Centre	BH		72m 73m														
	mPD	73mPD 80mPD															
Ancillary Dormitories	BH	99m – 102.15m															
	mPD	99-102.15m 110mPD															
	No. of Storeys	30-31 31-32															
Other Residential Uses	No. of Storeys	30-32 31-33															

(Last update on 15 October 2024)