Appendix A

Response-to-Comment table

Comments from Related Departments **Page No.**

COMMENTS FROM RELATED DEPARTMENTS

No.	Comments	Responses
1.	**Environmental Protection Department, Environmental Assessment Division, Territory North Group, Sheung Shui, Fanling, Tai Po, dated 21 Oct 2024** **<u>Appendix E on Revised Sewerage Impact Assessment</u>**	
	1. In Section 4.4, it is noted that an on-site sewage treatment plant is proposed for the development, please be reminded of the following: (i) The capacity of the on-site sewage treatment plant should be designed at all times for handling the peak flow of the proposed development; (ii) The equalization tank could be used to handle the excess flow over the peak flow; (iii) Backup pumps or tanks should be available for any emergency events for the on-site sewage treatment plant.	Noted. As mentioned in Section 4.10, the capacity of the on-site sewage treatment plant is designed for handling the peak flow with the provision of equalization tank. Backup pumps or tanks would be provided for emergency events.
	2. Section 4.11: Please amend typo 'The treated sewage would be discharge**<u>d</u>** to Ping Yuen River.'	Noted. Section 4.11 has been revised. Please refer to **Appendix B** for the replacement page of the revised Sewerage Impact Assessment.
	3. Please check whether Item F.2(b) is applicable for the proposed sewage treatment plant?	Although the sewerage treatment works is less than 200m from the nearest boundary of an residential area (item F2.(b)), the installed capacity is less than 5,000m^3 per day (item F2.(a)). It would not constitute to a DP under the EIAO for item F2, since it does not applicable to both F2(a) and F2(b).
2.	**Highways Department, Railway Development Office, dated 14 Oct 2024**	
	1. Response to the Comment Item 1 refers, it is noted that the Hong Kong Major Transport Infrastructure Development Blueprint (The Blueprint) promulgated by the Government in December 2023 was not mentioned in the revised TIA report. Please add a paragraph or	Noted. Section 4.5 of the revised Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) has been supplemented accordingly. Please refer to **Appendix C** for the replacement pages of the TIA.

No.	Comments	Responses
	section to discuss the interface issue with the Northern Link Eastern Extension (NOLE) mentioned in the Blueprint.	
3.	**Planning Department, District Planning Branch, Special Duties Division, Urban Design & Landscape Section, Landscape Unit, dated 6 Nov 2024** **<u>Revised Landscape and Tree Preservation Proposal</u>** • With reference to Para. 3.3.1.1, "an extra 292 nos. seedling trees are proposed at the proposed woodland…". However, a total of 348 seedling trees is indicated on the Figure - Planting Matrix for Proposed Woodland Compensation. Please review and clarify.	Please be clarified that, among the 275 nos. of new trees for compensation, 219 nos. will be planted in the landscape areas at ground floor and podium gardens, whereas the remaining 56 nos. will be at the proposed woodland. On top of fulfilling the 1:1 compensatory ratio, an extra of 292 nos. seedling trees, in addition to the abovementioned 56 nos. compensatory trees, will be planted at the proposed woodland (with a total of 348 nos.). Para 3.3.1.1 of the Landscape and Tree Preservation Proposal has been revised for clarity. (Please refer to the replacement page in **Appendix D**).
	• 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.	Noted.
4.	**Planning Department, District Planning Branch, Special Duties Division, Urban Design & Landscape Section, Urban Design Unit, dated 8 Nov 2024** • As an advisory comment, further design measures could be explored with more respect to the hillside and riverfront setting, e.g. to optimize the site coverage 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	Noted. The Applicant has already considered and incorporated a number of design measures with respect to the hillside and riverfront setting, including an optimised site coverage after considering the open space provision, woodland avoidance and compensation, a stepped building height profile of 120mPD at the hillside 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 fronting

No.	Comments	Responses
	Centres fronting the river, etc. as appropriate.	the river, and a 10m-wide riverside promenade with greenery and landscaping features. Please refer to Figure 14 of the revised Visual Impact Assessment (**Appendix E** refers) for the Indicative Plan of Proposed Mitigation Measures and **Appendix F** for the Artist's Impression of the Indicative Scheme and Urban Design Features of the Proposed Development of the Riverfront extracted from the Supporting Planning Statement.
	Appendix E – Revised VIA	
	• Figure 4 (VP1) and Paras. 5.1.4 to 5.1.9 – It seems that the proposed development which is visible on the left of this photomontage should be Tower AD3 with BH of 110mPD rather than Tower DC3 with BH of 80mPD.	Noted. The photomontage (Figure 4) has been reviewed and revised, in which Tower AD3 is visible on the left from VP1. The discussion of VP1 in para. 5.1.3 to 5.1.9 have also been revised accordingly. Please refer to **Appendix E** for the replacement pages of the revised Visual Impact Assessment.
	• 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):	
	a) Figure 7 (VP4) and Para. 5.1.24 – While only a small portion of the upper part of Towers DC3, AD3 and AD2 would be visible, Tower R&D3 would be completely screened off by the existing trees in the middle part of the photomontage. Tower DC3 should appear to be shorter than the street lamp in the foreground.	Noted. The photomontage (Figure 7) has been reviewed and revised, in which only a small portion of the upper part of Towers DC3, AD2 and AD3 are visible. The discussion of VP4 in para. 5.1.24 to 5.1.27 have also been revised accordingly.
	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.	Noted. The photomontage (Figure 9) has been reviewed and revised, in which only part of AD3 is visible. Para. 5.1.36 has also been revised accordingly.
	• 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):	

No.	Comments	Responses
	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.	In VP2, while it is noted that DC3 and AD2 situated on the two sides of the existing access road will be visible behind the shrubs and trees in the foreground, the existing visual elements at VP2, including shrubs and trees along the paved access road to the School in the foreground, the mature Fung Shui Woodland in the middle ground, and the ridgeline of Robin's Nest Fung Shui Woodland, are preserved. Design measures with respect to the existing rural locality, such as soft landscape edge along the Development Site boundary, have also been introduced so that green resources remain as the main visual composition in this view. While it is noted that DC3 and AD2 will screen parts of the sky view at VP2, the clear direct view to the open sky in the background is preserved through the 40m-wide building separation, minimising the visual obstruction. Please refer to para 5.1.11 for the detailed analysis. Regarding VP3, the Indicative Scheme will incorporate various building separations with width ranging from 15m to 40m to retain visual permeability and unobstructed views to the greenery and mountain backdrop/ ridgeline in the background. Architectural design features such as the use of finishing materials, colours, and façade will also be given extra consideration during the detailed design stage for better visual compatibility with the rural context. Please refer to para 5.1.17 for the detailed analysis.
	b) VP6 – As shown on the photomontage, the high-rise tower would appear as a perceivable visual element from this VP and obstruct a small portion of open sky view. As such, it would be more tenable to grade the visual impact to VP6 as "slightly adverse" rather than "negligible".	The Application Site is located at the background of the VP behind the shrubs and trees, which Data Centres, R&D Centres, and two of the Ancillary Dormitories will be screened off by the tree canopies. Only the upper part of AD3 would be visible to the left of the existing trees in the middle. The Indicative Scheme will not alter the key visual composition and resources, including the built-up structure in the foreground, and the vegetation in the middle ground, while 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 also be maintained. Taken into account that public viewers at VP6 are mostly transient passengers either waiting for bus under the shelter or driving through this road

No.	Comments	Responses
		junction to enter Ping Che Road/ continue on Lin Ma Hang Road, the overall visual impact of VP6 is considered as "negligible".
	c) 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 it is noted that the Indicative Scheme will block a minor portion of the mountain from a long range, no visual change to the vegetated hill slopes and fallow agricultural land in the foreground, as well as the ridgeline of Wutong Mountain and open sky view in the background will be caused. Public viewers at VP9 can still enjoy an extensive view of green resources. With the stepped down BH profile descending from the hillside to the river, the Indicative Scheme is visually compatible with the natural slope gradient and will not add any visual bulkiness to the existing locality, given the high-density, high-rise cityscape of Shenzhen is in close distance in the backdrop. Please refer to para 5.1.52 and 5.1.53 for the detailed analysis.
	d) VP10 – With reference to the photomontage at VP10, the proposed development would become an apparent visual element, altering the rural context, obstructing the view to the mountain backdrop/ridgeline and open sky, and reducing visual openness. As such, it would be more tenable to grade the visual impact to VP10 as "moderately adverse" rather than "slightly adverse".	While the blue and green resources of the vegetated Ping Yuen River will remain unobstructed, the proposed development will inevitably obstruct part of the mountain backdrop/ ridgeline and open sky at VP10. Upon review, the visual obstruction and visual impact to VP10 is therefore considered "moderately adverse". Various positive design measures have been incorporated to mitigate the visual impacts, such as wide building separation of 15m between DC2 and DC3, 30m between AD2 and AD3, as well as 40m between AD2 and DC3 to serve as important visual relief and corridors allowing a permeable view. Soft edge along the boundary to soften the building mass, and rooftop gardens are also proposed to further enhance the greenery. Please refer to para 5.1.58, 5.1.62 and Table 5.1 for the revised visual assessment result.
5.	**Civil Engineering and Development Department, Geotechnical Engineering Office, dated 11 Nov 2024** The responses by the applicant are noted. The Geotechnical Engineering Office has no further geotechnical comment on the GPRR and subject application.	Noted with thanks.
6.	**Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department, Headquarters, Conservation**	

No.	Comments	Responses
	Branch, Nature Conservation (North) Division, dated 18 Nov 2024 **<u>From agricultural perspective</u>** I have no additional comments.	Noted with thanks.
	<u>From nature conservation perspective</u> *General comments* It is noted the ecological surveys are still underway, we will provide our comment when the survey and the impact assessment is completed.	Noted. The report is updated to include all surveys proposed for this Study. Please refer to **Appendix G** for the Ecological Impact Assessment (including both wet and dry season surveys).
	Specific comments Table 8.1 It is noted there will be direct loss of watercourse and the direct impact on the watercourse has not been evaluated. Please ask the applicant to supplement. Please note that any wetland loss within the Project Area should be avoided as far as practicable.	Based on the survey findings, the watercourse is assessed as of low ecological value. The magnitude of loss in respect of the streams is found to be small to medium in scale only. An assessment of direct loss of watercourse in the development area is added as Section 8.3.1.3 and Table 8.3.
	S.8.4.6.1 Please ask the applicant to clarify if the two *Rhodoleia championii* are located outside the development area which the trees could be retained. Please note that based on our site inspection, the trees are in fair health condition and there is a seedling located next to the two specimen, and they are recorded in a woodland habitat where native trees and shrubs could be recorded. As such, please ask the applicant to avoid adverse impact to this species of conservation importance (both the seedling and the two trees).	As noted in Section 6.2.1.1, the three specimens of *Rhodoleia championii* are located outside the development area and will be left untouched, as will the woodland habitat in which they are located.

(Last update on 9 Dec 2024)