

Attachment 1 Responses-to-Comments Table

Application for Amendment of Plan Under Section 12A of the Town Planning Ordinance (Cap.131), to Rezone the Application Site from “Open Storage”, “Agriculture” Zones and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Mixed Use” Zone, for Proposed Mixed Use Development at Lots 796 and 1008 RP in D.D. 77 and Adjoining Government Land in Ping Che, Ta Kwu Ling, New Territories
Response to Departmental Comment

Comments from Related Departments

Page No.

- 1. Planning Department, Urban Design and Landscape, dated 16 May 2024 2
- 2. Water Supplies Department, dated 4 July 2024..... 8

1.	Planning Department, Urban Design and Landscape, dated 16 May 2024	
	<p><u>Landscape Perspective</u></p> <p>Having reviewed the submitted RtC, there is no change in the proposed landscape layout, number of new trees planting and compensatory ratio (i.e. 1:1 in terms of number). Please be advised that we have no further comment and we maintain our view of “the proposed rezoning for high density mixed use development will bring significant change to the existing rural landscape character of “AGR” zone” from the landscape planning perspective.</p> <p><u>Urban Design Perspective</u></p> <p>1. I refer to your email dated 22.4.2024 enclosing the Further Information 4 (FI4) providing a R-to-C Table, supplementary drawing for visual and air ventilation mitigation measures, replacement pages of updated Supporting Planning Statement (SPS), revised Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) and revised Air Ventilation Assessment – Expert Evaluation (AVA-EE) etc. for the captioned application. Our comments/observations from the urban design, visual impact and air ventilation perspectives are set below for your consideration and coordination please.</p> <p>2. Having reviewed the FI5, please note that our previous comments in paras. 2 to 7 via email dated 5.12.2023 are still valid (with para. 5 reiterated below in that the consultant may consider to substantiate the application), while paras. 37 to 38 are for your office’s consideration. Some of our previous specific comments dated 8.1.2024 are not fully addressed (which are recapped below) and there are some further comments/observations on the replacement pages of updated SPS, revised VIA and AVA-EE.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Please refer to the following responses and corresponding updates of reports for your consideration.</p> <p>Noted. Please refer to the following responses and corresponding updates of reports for your consideration.</p>

<p>3. Para. 5 of our comments via email dated 5.12.2023: To substantiate the application, the consultant may consider providing further information/justifications for the proposed BHs and exploring further design measures with respect to the low-rise and rural setting (e.g. by lowering the BHs, allowing greater variation in BHs, optimizing the proposed domestic site coverages and BHs etc.).</p>	<p>Noted. With reference to various Government’s initiatives, including the NTN Study published in 2017 and Northern Metropolis Action Agenda published in 2023, Ping Che where the Application Site situates falls within the NTN New Town, with the planning intention for a high-dense neighbourhood complementary to boundary economic activities supported by new railway connection, in order to phase out existing brownfield operations.</p> <p>In particular, in the final report of the NTN Study, the proposed building height (BH) of the Application Site and its immediate surrounding were planned with 195mPD, 200mPD, 210mPD and 235mPD under Development Scenario II. According to the Northern Metropolis Action Agenda, the NTN New Town and other New Development Areas such as Kwu Tung North/Fanling North and Lo Wu/Man Kam To and existing new towns in Fanling/Sheung Shui were identified to form the “Boundary Commerce and Industry Zone”. In particular, the NTN New Town and Lo Wu/Man Kam To are recognised with potential to develop various border crossing points (BCPs) related economic uses and uses requiring larger land area for operation, thus develop into a BCP business districts and a base for emerging industries complement to San Tin Technopole and Luohu District, Shenzhen. In addition, the planned Northern Link Eastern Extension and Northeastern New Territories Line with a newly proposed Ping Che Station is expected to enhance accessibility and bring development opportunities around it.</p> <p>Therefore, the Indicative Scheme, positioned as a high-dense Transit Oriented Development with a mix of residential and commercial uses would be compatible with the planning intention of Ping Che.</p> <p>It is noteworthy that the Applicant has exhausted opportunities to minimize overall BH of the Indicative Scheme by maximizing site coverage up to B(P)R level, maintaining a modest floor-to-floor heights for liveability and locating all carparks at basement level. Further effort has been put in the design of the Indicative Scheme to enhance its compatibility with the context.</p> <p>The proposed BH of the Indicative Scheme (i.e. 169.7-175mPD) complements with the BH proposed under the 2017 NTN Study. A rhythmic</p>
---	--

		<p>BH profile has been put forward to create an interesting skyline and centrality as a welcoming entrance from the future Ping Che Station. For instance, the proposed commercial tower 1 will feature a lower BH of +169.7mPD as an “gateway” building facing Ping Che Road with potential connection to the future railway station. The residential tower 2 will go up to a maximum BH of +175mPD and while the BH of residential tower 3 to 6 will be slightly reduced to +171.85mPD and +171.83mPD as it approaches closer to Ha Shan Kai Wat and Sheung Shan Kai Wat. The BH variation is recommended to enhance visual interest at the Application Site with its unique context of sitting in between a major access road with potential connection to future railway station and existing mountains.</p> <p>Moreover, building gaps are reserved between towers and building setback from the periphery of the Application Site as visual and ventilation enhancement measures for visual quality and ventilation enhancement. Other visual measures, such as articulated facades and landscaping features are also proposed for enhancing visual interest, reducing collective visual mass and harmonizing with the surroundings, subject to detailed design. In addition, wind enhancement features, including permeable design on ground floor, chamfered design at building corners, building orientation aligning with wind direction, permeable sky garden, are also proposed to enhance the ventilation environment.</p> <p>In summary, the development scale and urban design of the Indicative Scheme is considered desirable and compatible with the planned context of Ping Che.</p> <p>Please refer to Sections 3.4 and 3.5 of Annex A – Replacement Pages of Revised Supporting Planning Statement for the latest information on the planning circumstances in Ping Che.</p>
	<p><i>Annex D – Replacement Pages of Updated SPS</i></p>	

<p>4. Para. 9.8.8 in Figure 5.3c of the SPS (Proposed Explanatory Statement (ES) of the “OU(MU)” Zone) – As per our previous comments dated 8.1.2024, according to paras. 4.4.10 to 4.4.12, building separation is a design measure to mitigate both visual and air ventilation impacts. While this is confirmed by the consultant in the response under Item 4 of the R-to-C Table, there is no revised proposed ES in the current FI submission.</p> <p><i>Annex E - Supplementary Drawing for Visual and Air Ventilation Mitigation Measures</i></p> <p>5. The widths of the proposed setbacks (No. 1 and 2) should be measured from the Site boundary.</p>	<p>Noted. Please refer to Para. 9.8.8 in Figure 5.3c of Annex A for the revised proposed Explanatory Statement.</p> <p>Please refer to Annex B – Revised Supplementary Drawing for Visual and Air Ventilation Mitigation Measures</p>
--	---

<p><i>Annex F – Revised VIA</i></p> <p>6. Figure 3 (VP1) – It seems that the proposed development should be located slightly to the right while Tower 2 and Tower 3 should appear to be located to the right of Tower 1.</p> <p>7. The proposed high-rise development would become a notable visual element in the surrounding neighbourhood which is rural and low-rise in character. With reference to the submitted photomontages (to which our comments are made in para. 8 above), the height and mass of the proposed development would reduce the visual openness and cause obstruction to the open sky view/mountain backdrop. While all VPs have a sensitivity of “Medium”, the analysis and conclusion that the visual impact of the proposed development on all VPs are “negligible” or “slightly adverse” can hardly be justified. -</p> <p>8. In view of the comments above, please critically review the relevant figures/photomontages and analysis in Sections 5 and 6 of the VIA (including the appraisal of visual changes on the aspects of ‘visual composition’, ‘visual obstruction’, ‘effect on public viewers’, ‘effect on visual resources’ and evaluation of overall visual impact) and the relevant section(s) in the SPS accordingly.</p> <p><i>Annex G – Revised AVA-EE</i></p> <p>9. Para. 3.1.2 and Figure 3-2 – According to the wind availability data from Ta Kwu Ling Weather Station (1986-2023) from the Hong Kong Observatory, the most 3 prevailing annual winds are N, E and ESE, while the most 3 prevailing summer winds are E, ESE and SSW (as correctly indicated in the AVA-EE of the FI1, but not correctly indicated in the current FI4). -</p> <p>10. Table 3-1 – With reference to the RAMS Data, the most 3 prevailing annual winds are ENE, E and ESE wind, while the most 3 prevailing summer winds are E, SE, SSE.</p>	<p>Noted. Please refer to the revised Figure 3 of Annex C – Revised Visual Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Noted. Please refer to Sections 5 and 6 of Annex C for the revised assessments of viewpoints reflecting the visual impacts from the Indicative Scheme.</p> <p>Noted. Please refer to Sections 5 and 6 of Annex C for the revised assessments of viewpoints reflecting the visual impacts from the Indicative Scheme.</p> <p>Noted. Section 3.1.2 of Annex D – Revised Air Ventilation Assessment – Expert Evaluation has been updated.</p> <p>Noted. Section 3.1.4 and Table 3-1 of Annex D have been updated.</p>
--	--

<p>11. Table 3-2 – In view of the comments in paras. 11 to 12 above, the prevailing annual winds at the Site should be N, ENE, E and ESE, while the prevailing summer winds at the Site should be E, ESE, SE, SSE and SSW.</p> <p>12. Section 5 –</p> <p>(a) Para. 5.2.1 – Please review the annual and summer prevailing wind directions.</p> <p>(b) As per our comments in para. 13 above, the consultant should provide evaluation on N and SSW winds, and omit NNE and S winds.</p> <p>(c) Sections 5.4 to 5.6 - For clarity, the consultant should provide a zoom-in plan to illustrate how the prevailing wind could penetrate the Site with the proposed development, and specify the location and width of the proposed building separation/setback under each wind flow direction. As per Figure 6-5, it seems that all building separations as illustrated are aligned in ESE direction only. As commented previously, the widths of the building separations should be measured from that perpendicular to the prevailing wind directions.</p> <p>(d) As per Figures 5.3A to 5.5A, it is noted that some wind flows are overlapped with the proposed building, along narrow building gaps and/or involve change in direction. According to the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines, the minimum width of the air corridor along its path between buildings shall not be less than 15m. Pleaser review and rectify.</p> <p>13. Para. 6.1.10 and Figure 6-8 – Please indicate the widths of the setbacks (which should be measured from the Site boundary) in respective to the prevailing wind directions.</p>	<p>Noted. Table 3-2 and Figure 4-4 of Annex D have been updated.</p> <p>Noted. Sections 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 of Annex D have been revised.</p> <p>Noted. Sections 5 and 6 of Annex D have been updated.</p> <p>Noted. Zoom in plans with specification of the width of building separation and building setback have been supplemented in Section 5. Please refer to Figures 5-1 to 5-7 of Annex D for information.</p> <p>Noted. Sections 5.3 to 5.7 of Annex D have been updated accordingly for the review of wind flows.</p> <p>Please also refer to the zoom in plans supplemented (i.e. Figures 5-1 to 5-7) of Annex D for information.</p> <p>Noted. Sections 6.1.10, 6.1.11 and Figure 6-8 of Annex D have been updated.</p>
---	--

	<p>14. In view of the comments above, please critically review the relevant figures and analysis in Sections 5, 6 and 7 of the AVA-EE, Annex E (Supplementary Drawing for Visual and Air Ventilation Mitigation Measures) and the relevant section(s) in the SPS accordingly.</p>	<p>Noted. Please refer to Sections 4.4.11 to 4.4.13 of Annex A for the corresponding updates of the Supporting Planning Statement. Please also refer to Sections 5.2.1, 5.2.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 6.1.6, 6.1.10 of Annex D for the corresponding updates of the AVA-EE.</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p>Water Supplies Department, dated 4 July 2024</p>	
	<p><u>WSIA</u></p> <p>1. Figure 5.1 – the proposed DN300 FW main is oversized. Please review</p> <p>2. Please provide the hydraulic calculation</p>	<p>Noted. The proposed fresh water main is revised to DN250. Please refer to Section 5.1.3, Figure 5.1 and Appendix C of Annex E – Replacement Pages of Revised Water Supply Impact Assessment.</p> <p>The hydraulic calculation is provided in Appendix C of Annex E.</p>

(Last Updated: 29 July 2024)