

Attachment 1

Response-to-Comments Table

Application for Amendment of Plan under Section 12A of the Town Planning Ordinance – Proposed Rezoning of the Application Site from “Green Belt” to “Residential (Group C)1” at Various Lots in D.D. 244 and Adjoining Government Land, Nam Pin Wai, Sai Kung, New Territories
(Planning Application No. Y/SK-HC/7)

Responses to Comments

Comments from Related Departments	Page No.
1. Transport Department, NT Regional Office, Traffic Engineering (NTE) Division, Housing & Planning Section, dated 7 March 2024	2
2. Development Bureau, Works Branch, Works Division 1, Commissioner for Heritage’s Office, Antiquities and Monuments Office, Heritage Conservation Unit, Archaeology Sub-unit, dated 7 March 2024	2

Responses to Comments

No.	Comments	Responses
1.	<p>Transport Department, NT Regional Office, Traffic Engineering (NTE) Division, Housing & Planning Section, dated 7 March 2024</p> <p>Section 5</p> <p>Re. Drawing No. SP-03 and SP-04, it is noted that the ingress route would encroach to the opposite lane. Please review the width of the vehicular access.</p>	<p>The width of the vehicular access of Sites A and B are reviewed. To allow for better vehicle manoeuvring, drop kerbs are incorporated for the vehicular accesses while the width of the vehicular accesses are remained unchanged. Please refer to the replacement pages to Appendix C and Drawing Nos. SP-03 and SP-04 of the revised Traffic Impact Assessment report in Annex A.</p>
2.	<p>Development Bureau, Works Branch, Works Division 1, Commissioner for Heritage’s Office, Antiquities and Monuments Office, Heritage Conservation Unit, Archaeology Sub-unit, dated 7 March 2024</p> <p>General Comment</p> <p>1) Please be reminded that AMO’s comment no. (5) dated 23.1.2024 is still valid. It is recapitulated as follows:</p> <p>“To avoid misunderstanding, the applicant is required to review, verify and confirm the contents of submissions so as to ensure that the next submission is factually correct, consistent and relevant.”</p> <p>We note that the current submission still contains imprecise information, irrelevances and inconsistencies. You are reminded to check through the entire report and revise as appropriate.</p> <p>Specific Comment</p> <p><u>R-to-C nos. 3 and 4</u></p>	<p>Based on the newly acquired information on aerial photos of 1993, the report has been reviewed, verified and confirmed of its content so as to ensure this submission is factually correct, consistent and relevant.</p> <p>Please refer to Annex B for the revised Archaeological Baseline Review Report for details.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

Responses to Comments

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p>2) Please define the extent of the Application Site in the report for clarity and include in Section 2 as appropriate.</p> <p><u>Section 2.1.2</u></p> <p>3) It states that an ancillary road, referred as “proposed works” within the Application Site is still under planning. Please review if this Section is update and relevant to the subject application, and revise as appropriate.</p> <p><u>Sections 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 5.4.3, 6.1.1 and 7.1.5</u></p> <p>4) According to the discussions on Zone 3 in these sections, in which inconsistencies are still found, please provide justification(s) for your conclusion that the site has “no archaeological potential”. When clarifying / justifying your conclusion, please indicate the following parts within Zone 3 on a plan and review the archaeological potential and mitigation measure for this Zone, especially the areas within Ho Chung Site of Archaeological Interest (“SAI”), which are undisturbed and / or unsurveyed due to their inaccessibility for field scanning:</p> <p>a) the part within Ho Chung SAI;</p>	<p>Section 2.1.1 is revised, with reference to the <i>Application Site</i> on Figure 1. Please refer to Annex B for the revised Archaeological Baseline Review Report for details.</p> <p>Section 2.1.2 is deleted to remove unclarity of the description. Please refer to section 2.1.1 and Figure 1 of the revised Archaeological Baseline Review Report in Annex B for the Application Site.</p> <p>Section 3.1.8 has been added to review the newly acquired information regarding the aerial photo of 1993.</p> <p>Table 3.2 has been revised to add summary of land use observations based on the aerial photo of 1993.</p> <p>Section 4.2.4, 5.4.3 and 7.1.5 have been revised, and section 4.2.9 has been added based on the newly added information on Zone 3.</p> <p>Section 6.1.1 remains unchanged.</p> <p>Furthermore, sections 4.2.4 on Zone 2, section 4.2.10 and 4.2.11 on Zone 4 have been revised accordingly based on the newly added information.</p> <p>Section 5.5 has been deleted as it is irrelevant to the conclusion.</p> <p>Please refer to Annex B for the revised Archaeological Baseline Review Report for details.</p> <p>Figures 17 and 18 have been revised to add “Disturbed Area within the Application Site” and “Area Archaeologically Unsurveyed within the Application Site”, where “Ho Chung SAI” has already been marked on those figures. Please refer to Annex B for the</p>

Responses to Comments

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p>b) the part disturbed by modern construction; and</p> <p>c) the non-surveyed area.</p> <p>Revise the relevant sections as appropriate.</p> <p><u>Sections 5.4.3, 6.1.1 and 7.1.5</u></p> <p>5) Please clarify which part of Zone 3 is disturbed by the previous construction of the open storage. The three sections are described differently. Below are some of the examples: “Furthermore, part of Zone 3 is disturbed previously by the construction of the open storage” (Section 5.4.3) “Zone 2 and 3 contains no archaeological potential due to modern disturbance as concluded in the SKNPW2015” (Section 6.1.1) “the southern part of Zone 3 is disturbed previously by the construction of the open storage.” (Section 7.1.5)</p> <p>As such, please review critically and revise as appropriate for clarity and accuracy.</p> <p><u>Section 7.1.2</u></p> <p>6) Please revise the sentence “For the ease of discussion, the Application Site is subdivided into Zones 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 as shown on Figure 16.” as appropriate in order to tally with the extent of the Application Site defined in Section 4.1.1.</p> <p><u>Section 7.1.9</u></p> <p>7) Please revise the recommended mitigation measures, if necessary, according to AMO’s above comment.</p>	<p>revised Archaeological Baseline Review Report for details.</p> <p>Please refer to the response to comment 4a above.</p> <p>Please refer to the response to comment 4a above.</p> <p>Please refer to the response to comment 4a above.</p> <p>Please be clarified that Zone 3 contains no archaeological potential. Aerial photo of 1993 is added as Figure 9 to supplement, with section 3.1.8 supplemented. Please refer to Annex B for the revised Archaeological Baseline Review Report for details.</p> <p>Please also refer to the response to comment 4 and 4a above.</p> <p>Sentence at section 7.1.2 revised as “For the ease of discussion, the Application Site is subdivided into Zones 1, 2, 3, 4and 5, Remaining Phase and Ancillary Road as shown on Figure 16.” (revision is marked by bold and strikethrough). Please refer to Annex B for the revised Archaeological Baseline Review Report for details.</p> <p>Section 7.1.9 has been revised, making reference to <i>Area Archaeologically</i></p>

Application for Amendment of Plan under Section 12A of the Town Planning Ordinance – Proposed Rezoning of the Application Site from “Green Belt” to “Residential (Group C)1” at Various Lots in D.D. 244 and Adjoining Government Land, Nam Pin Wai, Sai Kung, New Territories
(Planning Application No. Y/SK-HC/7)

Responses to Comments

No.	Comments	Responses
		<p><i>Unsurveyed within the Application Site on Figure 17.</i></p> <p>In terms of mitigation measures, since Zone 3 lies within the Ho Chung SAI, an archaeological survey will be conducted in Zone 3 within the extend of the Ho Chung SAI will be recommended. Relevant sections have been revised to reflect this. Please refer to Annex B for the revised Archaeological Baseline Review Report for details.</p> <p>Beside the above revision, the following changes have been made.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reference to the Technical Circular (Works) No. 1/2022 regarding Heritage Impact Assessment is removed. Section 2.4.11 is thus deleted. 2. Section 5.5 on Estimation of Stratigraphy at Zones 4 and 5 is removed as it is irrelevant to the analysis and recommendation of this report.

(Last Updated 5 April 2024)