

APPENDIX 10

Summary Table of Various Departmental Comments

Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Social Welfare Facility (Residential Care Home for the Elderly) and Proposed House Use with Conservation Proposal in “Government, Institution or Community (1)” Zone at Lots 1695 S.E ss.1 RP, 1695 S.F ss.1 and 1695 S.H RP (Part) in D.D.120 and Adjoining Government Land, Tai Kei Leng, Yuen Long, New Territories

(Application No. A/YL/302)

Response-to-Comment Table

Departmental Comments	Response
<p>Email from PlanD received on 9 August 2023 refers: Buildings Department:</p>	
<p>On Further Information (3) (FI(3)) received on 15.6.2023:</p> <p>(a) Regarding the proposed high headroom (7450mm) on G/F in general building plans received by this department on 27.3.2023 and mentioned in applicant’s letter dated 15.6.2023 in FI(3), please be advised that the Authorized Person had been required to provide further justification for high headroom on the whole G/F, in particular of the areas not involving the historical building. Paragraph 7(D)(v) in our disapproval letter dated 24.5.2023 refers.</p>	<p>Further justification for high headroom on the whole G/F, in particular of the areas not involving the historical building, would be provided during building plan submission stage.</p>
<p>(b) Please note that detailed checking for the proposed high headroom of remaining areas on G/F should be justified and proposed gross floor area calculation would be considered during plan submission stage.</p>	<p>Noted with thanks.</p>
<p>On Further Information (4) (FI(4)) received on 7.7.2023:</p> <p>(c) Regarding the Response-to-Comment table and revised layout plan of G/F attached in FI(4), it is noted that the conserved building ‘Siu Lo’ with covered landscaped area is proposed on the G/F of the proposed RCHE building. Please be advised that fire barriers having adequate fire resisting rating (FRR) under Section 35 of the Building (Construction) Regulation should be provided between the fire compartments of the conserved building with landscaped area on G/F and the remained areas of the proposed RCHE building, i.e. walls, fire doors leading to the landscaped area, and floor slab on 1/F of proposed RCHE building covered the conserved building ‘Siu Lo’ with covered landscaped area. Clause C7.1 of Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 (FS Code) refers. Also, protection of all openings, joints and penetrations located in a fire barrier should have an FRR not less than that of the fire barrier. Clause C3.2 of FS Code refers.</p>	<p>Noted with thanks.</p>
<p>Email from PlanD received on 5 July 2023 refers: Buildings Department:</p>	
<p>(a) Regarding the emergency vehicular access (EVA) plans in FI(1), demonstration of the EVA for the existing building on the same site in compliance with Section 6 in Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 shall be provided during the general building plan submission stage.</p>	<p>Noted with thanks. The relevant documents will be submitted during the general building plan submission stage.</p>
<p>(b) Regarding the revised Heritage Conservation Strategy plan in FI(1) and new plan showing the layout of the conserved building block and the area opened for public visit in FI(2), it is noted that the development involves co-existence of new building and existing heritage building, the applicant should clarify on whether there would be any proposed building works to be carried out and/or change in use in the existing heritage building, in particular at the area opened for public visit, during the general building plan submission stage. The applicant should also be reminded that the total development intensity of the site should not exceed the limits stipulated in the 1st schedule of Building (Planning) Regulations during the development process. Detailed comments on the proposed works to the existing heritage building will be provided at the plan submission stage.</p>	<p>Noted with thanks. The relevant documents will be submitted during the general building plan submission stage.</p>
<p>(c) Fire barriers having adequate fire resisting rating under Section 35 of the Building (Construction) Regulation should be provided to separate the new building and the existing building.</p>	<p>A landscaped area between the two buildings is designed to separate the new building and the existing building. Please refer to the G/F Layout Plan of the Appendix 1 - Development Scheme.</p>
<p>(d) Provision of means of escape in case of emergency, barrier free access, open space for the domestic building, lighting and ventilation of the existing building should not be jeopardized by the proposed new building.</p>	<p>It is confirmed that provision of means of escape in case of emergency, barrier free access, open space for the domestic building, lighting and ventilation of the existing building would not be jeopardized by the proposed new building. The relevant documents will be submitted during the general building plan submission stage.</p>

Departmental Comments	Response
<p>Email from PlanD received on 9 August 2023 refers:</p> <p>Lands Department:</p>	
<p>(a) According to our desktop checking, the proposed right-of-way (ROW) is slightly encroached onto a private lot (i.e. Lot 1717 S.C in D.D.120 (“the private lot”), and the adjoining Government Land. The private lot is an Old Schedule “Agricultural” lot held under the Block Government Lease. No structure is allowed to be erected on the lot without prior approval of the Government.</p>	<p>The proposed right-of-way has been updated to only be located on Government Land. Please refer to the Figure 5 - Drawing No. P-101 – Showing GFA to be Doubled Counted and Proposed Right of Way (for indicative only).</p>
<p>(b) As the proposed ROW is slightly encroached onto the private lot, the applicant shall clarify the intention.</p>	<p>The proposed right-of-way has been updated to only be located on Government Land. Please refer to the Figure 5 - Drawing No. P-101 – Showing GFA to be Doubled Counted and Proposed Right of Way (for indicative only).</p>

Departmental Comments	Response
<p>Email from PlanD received on 9 August 2023 refers:</p> <p>Social Welfare Department:</p>	
<p>Application for the Incentive Scheme to Encourage Provision of Residential Care Home for the Elderly Premises in New Private Developments (“Premium Concession Scheme”)</p>	
<p>(a) While the applicant has indicated his intention to apply for the Premium Concession Scheme for the development of the proposed Residential Care Home for the Elderly (RCHE), given an enhanced scheme with a 3-year pilot period has been put in place since 20.6.2023, the applicant should study the details of the Premium Concession Scheme in the Practice Note (PN) No. 5/2023 issued by Lands Department on 20.6.2023. As the total Gross Floor Area (GFA) of the RCHE premises will increase and such GFA will be exempted, would the applicant please refer to General Guideline on the calculation of GFA for RCHE premises as set out at Annex in the PN.</p>	<p>Noted with thanks.</p>
<p>(b) With a view to meeting the objective of providing a quality RCHE, the applicant should also refer to the updated version of i) Guidance Note of RCHE; ii) Best Practice in Design and Operation of RCHE; and iii) Best Practices Guidance - Basic Provision Schedule Specific Requirements for RCHE when Designing and Planning for the Proposed RCHE. Given the RCHE is a newly planned project, the applicant is reminded to comply with the entire ventilation requirements stipulated in Para. 4.9 "Heating, Lighting and Ventilation" in the latest version of the Code of Practice for Residential Care Homes (Elderly Persons) (CoP). We would consider the support-worthiness of the proposed RCHE for the Premium Concession Scheme upon receipt of a formal referral from Lands Department and seek the policy support from Labour and Welfare Bureau on the application as and when appropriate.</p>	<p>Noted with thanks.</p>
<p>Email from PlanD received on 30 June 2023 refers:</p> <p>Social Welfare Department:</p>	
<p>(a) While the applicant intended to apply for “Scheme to Encourage Provision of Residential Care Home for The Elderly Premises in New Private Development” (Premium Concession Scheme) for the RCHE and as per last comments, the applicant has not yet clarified in the current further information if the proposed RCHE as an independent building separated from the historic building “Siu Lo” and with its independent facilities (including but not limited to the E&M facilities, parking and loading/unloading provision).</p>	<p>It is confirmed that the proposed RCHE as an independent building separated from the historic building “Siu Lo” and with its independent facilities (including but not limited to the E&M facilities, parking and loading/unloading provision).</p>
<p>(b) Furthermore, for the applicant's submission of General Building Plans to Buildings Departments (BD) in April 2023, the applicant should take note that our recent comments on the salient design of RCHE (including capacity of the dormitory, provision of space on both sides of a bed, no. of isolation rooms/ facilities) provided to the Buildings Department on 4.5.2023 as the points below remain valid:</p> <p><u>Capacity of the dormitory</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> While the dormitory floors of the proposed RCHE is to be situated on 1/F to 3/F, it is noted that the capacity of each dormitory is either a 10-bed or a 2-bed dormitory. According to para of 6(a) of the 	<p>The capacity of each dormitory will be either a 5-bed or a 2-bed dormitory.</p>

<p>Best Practice in Design and Operation of RCHE, it is stated that "...To minimise institutional atmosphere and allow for small group living, the capacity of each dormitory is preferred limited to not more than eight persons...". Hence, the applicant should consider to trim down the capacity of the 10-bed dormitory as appropriate having considered our advice.</p> <p><u>Provision of both sides of a bed</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For a 2-bed dormitory, it is noted most beds with its one side is leaning against the wall. Whereas as for the 10-bed dormitory, we observe 2 beds are placed adjoining together with partition. To assist staff/family members to assist taking care of the residents from both sides of a bed, would the applicant please arrange the bed with spaces on bilateral sides. <p><u>No. of Isolation rooms/facilities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As stipulated in note 27 of Para. 12.4.1 of Code of Practice for Residential Care Homes (Elderly Persons) January 2020 (Revised Edition), "All RCHEs shall provide at least 1 designated Isolation room. If there are more than 50 beds, an additional Isolation room/facility shall be provided for every extra 50 beds (or less). For the RCHEs provided 200 beds or above, 4 Isolation rooms/facilities (including at least 1 designated Isolation room) shall be provided". <p>While the proposed RCHE is intended to provide a range of 220-260 beds, there are 3 no. of proposed Sick/Isolation/Quiet Room are found to be installed for the RCHE. The applicant please ensure the proposed provision of number of Isolation rooms/facilities for the intended RCHE shall be in compliance with relevant licensing requirements for infection control purpose.</p>	<p>The applicant will consider arranging the bed with spaces on bilateral sides.</p> <p>There are in total 4 nos. of Sick/Isolation/Quiet room provided on 1/F to 4/F.</p>
<p>(c) Apart from the above concerns, the applicant shall take note that the design and construction of the proposed RCHE should be in full compliance with the statutory and licensing requirements including but not limited to those stipulated in the Residential Care Home (Elderly Persons) Ordinance, Cap. 459 and its subsidiary legislation, as well as the latest version of the Code of Practice for Residential Care Homes (Elderly Persons).</p>	<p>Noted with thanks.</p>
<p>(d) Subject to the applicant's clarification/responses on the above concerns and the result of the planning application, we would consider the support-worthiness of the proposed RCHE for the Premium Concession Scheme upon receipt of a formal referral from Lands Department and seek the policy support from Labour and Welfare Bureau on the application at an appropriate stage.</p>	<p>Noted with thanks.</p>
<p>Email from PlanD received on 26 April 2023 refers: Social Welfare Department:</p>	
<p><u>Salient points on design of the Residential Car Home for the Elderly (RCHE)</u></p> <p>(a) <u>24m height restriction of the RCHE</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As indicated in the planning statement submitted by the applicant (P.12 refers), the RCHE is situated on "Not more than 31.65 mPD (NB: Ground Level at 6.2 mPD and Mean Street Level at 5.75 mPD)". - According to para 5.3 of the Code of Practice for Residential Care Homes (Elderly Persons) January 2020 (Revised Edition) (CoP), "...no part of the RCHE shall be situated at a height more than 24 metres above the ground floor, measuring vertically from the ground of the building to the floor of the premises in which the RCHE is to be situated.... If an RCHE operator can prove the RCHE possesses facilities for fire safety, evacuation and rescue, and appropriate evacuation, contingency and fire drill plans to the satisfaction of the DSW, the DSW may approve the ancillary facilities of the RCHE to which the residents normally do not have access (e.g. kitchen, laundry rooms, office, staff resting room) to be situated at a height more than 24m above the ground....". - In this light, the applicant is advised to ensure provision of the height of the proposed RCHE shall be in full compliance with relevant licensing and statutory height requirements. 	<p>All facilities provided for the elderlies from G/F to 5/F are situated at a height within 21.85m above the ground floor (6.2mPD - 28.05mPD). The proposed RCHE is in full compliance with relevant licensing and statutory height requirements.</p>

<p><u>(b) Heating, Lighting and Ventilation Requirements</u></p> <p>- Regarding the Heating, Lighting and Ventilation Requirements for RCHE as set out in para 4.9 of CoP which has been updated in February 2023, the applicant shall take note of all the latest requirements stipulated in the para. Among others, he shall pay special attention that the proposed RCHE should adopt the requirements on fresh air intake of mechanical ventilation system in compliance with the principles as stated at para 4.9.3a.</p>	<p>Noted with thanks.</p>
<p><u>(c) Minimum Area of Floor Space of Each Resident</u></p> <p>- While the proposed RCHE is intended to provide 240-260 bed spaces within the intended Gross Floor Area (GFA) of 5,400 sqm., the applicant shall ensure the area of floor space to be provided for each resident of the proposed RCHE shall be in compliance with the statutory and licensing requirements.</p> <p>- The applicant should especially take note of the proposed upward adjustment of the statutory minimum area of floor space per resident for different care levels of RCHEs as proposed in the Residential Care Homes Legislation (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 2022 (the Bill) (i.e. the proposed statutory minimum floor space per resident for the "High Care Level Homes" will be increased from 6.5 sqm. to 9.5 sqm., whereas the proposed statutory minimum floor space per resident for the "Medium and Low Care Level Homes" will be enhanced from 6.5 sqm. to 8 sqm. upon passage of the Bill and according to its different implementation stages).</p>	<p>A minimum floor space per resident at 9.5 sqm is allowed which is in compliance with the statutory and licensing requirements.</p>
<p><u>Views on support-worthiness of the Applicant's intention for joining the Incentive Scheme</u></p> <p>(d) For the present S.16 planning application, we note that applicant has further expressed his intention to join "Scheme to Encourage Provision of RCHE Premises in New Private Developments" (Incentive Scheme).</p>	<p>The Applicant intends to seek Formal Policy Support to the proposed RCHE development at the subject site under the "Incentive Scheme to Encourage Provision of Residential Care Home for the Elderly Premises in New Private Developments" to grant concessions to exempt the proposed RCHE from payment of land premium.</p>
<p>(e) Subject to the result of the planning permission considered by Town Planning Board, the consideration of the Planning Department (PlanD) and other government departments, and the applicant's clarification that the proposed RCHE as an independent building separating from the historic building "Siu Lo" and with its independent support facilities (including but not limited to the E&M facilities, parking and loading/unloading provision) for the operation of the proposed RCHE, we may consider the worth-supportiness of the proposed RCHE under the Premium Concession Scheme upon receipt of a formal referral from Lands Department and seek policy support from Labour and Welfare Bureau on the application when suitable.</p>	<p>Noted with thanks.</p>

Departmental Comments	Response
<p>Email from PlanD received on 9 August 2023 refers: Commissioner for Heritage's Office and Antiquities and Monuments Office:</p>	
<p>Comments on Further Information (2) received on 25.5.2023:</p> <p>(c) As shown in Figures 1 & 2 of Appendix 6, the later added bathroom in the Annex Block was indicated to be removed but such works were not mentioned in the Supplementary Planning Statement. While AMO has no adverse view on such proposed works, for clarity, please update the Supplementary Planning Statement to include the removal of the later added bathroom accordingly.</p>	<p>The clarification of the removal of the later added bathroom has been included in Section 4.4.3(a) of the Supplementary Planning Statement.</p>
<p>(d) Referring to item (v) of the Response-to-Comment ("R-to-C") and Figure 3 in Appendix 6, we are given to understand that the applicant has committed to continue optimising the structural design so as to reduce the visual impact of the proposed RCHE on the Annex Block of Siu Lo. The applicant is recommended to consider reviewing the positioning and size of the columns in front of the Annex Block. AMO would provide comments at the detailed design stage.</p>	<p>Noted with thanks.</p>
<p>(e) For item (f) of the R-to-C, while CHO and AMO's views and comments to the captioned application are provided to the Planning Department (PlanD) upon circulation of the planning application, we would like to</p>	<p>The sentence in Section 3.2.7 of the Supplementary Planning Statement has been updated.</p>

<p>reiterate that CHO and AMO were not involved in discussion with the applicant on the current application No. A/YL/302 but the previous application No. A/YL/289 only. In this connection, the applicant is advised to review the sentence "As per preliminary discussion with CHO and AMO, it is generally agreed that the current conservation-cum-development proposal is commensurate with Siu Lo's grading and heritage value" in the Supplementary Planning Statement. Please revise relevant sections of the Supplementary Planning Statement particularly Section 3.2.7 for clarity.</p>	
<p>Comments on Further Information (4) (FI(4)) received on 7.7.2023:</p> <p>(f) It is noted that the loading/unloading area adjacent to the Annex Block Siu Lo is now proposed as a "covered heritage landscape garden" under the revised heritage conservation strategy plan. The applicant shall provide details, including the proposed use and layout of this area, and whether any building works would be proposed, for AMO's comment.</p>	<p>The proposed use of the "covered heritage landscape garden" will be used for landscape and interpretation areas which allow public visit, with an initial theme of "Revival" to tell the story about the transformation of Siu Lo, its conservation process, "before and after" conditions by educational display panels or other media. Given this space will not be used as loading/unloading area, various activities can be held there. It is an extension of the proposed Heritage Garden that intended to be open for the scheduled public visits. It will be incorporated in the CMP.</p>
<p>(g) Regarding the replacement page of the application form part (V)(c) where a remark stated that "The original use of Siu Lo as "House" will be resumed, except 3 rooms on G/F to be opened for regular public visits according to CMP to be approved by AMO", please amend to "...according to CMP to the satisfaction of AMO or of TPB".</p>	<p>It has been updated. Please refer to the updated Application Form.</p>
<p>Comments on Further Information (5) (FI(5)) received on 21.7.2023:</p> <p>(h) It is noted that Appendix 2 of FI(5) provides an updated photomontage viewing from Tai Tong Road towards Siu Lo and the proposed RCHE building, we have no comment on FI(5). Nevertheless, as mentioned above, AMO would provide comments at the detailed design stage as the structural design of the columns will continue to be optimised to minimise the visual impact according to item (v) of the R-to-C in FI(2).</p>	<p>Noted with thanks.</p>
<p>Email from PlanD received on 8 May 2023 refers: Antiquities and Monuments Office:</p>	
<p>Arrangement of Public Guided Tours and Public Access</p> <p>(i) In addition to the provision of display boards for interpretation at the proposed "Heritage Garden", free online virtual tours, free private tours for non-government organizations and schools, and free guided/self-guided visits to the exterior of Siu Lo, we appreciate that the applicant has taken the initiative to enhance the public access arrangement by arranging participants of guided tours and private tours to visit the interior of Siu Lo (Section 4.4.3 (f) & (g) of the Supplementary Planning Statement ("SPS") and Section 2.2 of the Heritage Appraisal refer) . If the subject planning application is approved by the Town Planning Board ("TPB"), the applicant is reminded to include the latest proposed interpretation and opening arrangement in the Conservation Management Plan.</p>	<p>The latest proposed interpretation and opening arrangement will be included in the Conservation Management Plan. Please refer to the Figure 7, which shows the proposed interior layout of Siu Lo with the parts to be opened for guided tours and private tours to visit (highlighted in blue dotted line).</p> <p>Coherently, p.8 of the application form is revised to remark that certain parts of the interior on G/F will be opened for regular public visits for conservation purposes, subject to CMP to be approved by AMO.</p>
<p>Proposed New RCHE building</p> <p>(ii) According to Section 4.4.3 of the SPS, the vertical distance between the new RCHE building and the Annex Block has been raised from 1.2m in the previous scheme to approx. 1.5m to 3.15m under this current scheme to facilitate the occasional roof repair/maintenance works of the Annex Block. From the heritage conservation perspective, AMO has no adverse view on the current proposal given it would allow more vertical distance between the proposed RCHE building and the Annex Block of Siu Lo, hence more space for the repair and maintenance of the pitch-roof of the Annex Block. However, it is noted from Section 4.4.3 on p.11 of the SPS that the vertical distance ranges from approx, 1.5m to 2.3m, instead of 1.5m to 3.15m as observed in relevant drawings. The applicant is advised to clarify and confirm the vertical distance between the RCHE building and the Annex Block.</p>	<p>It is confirmed that the vertical distance between the RCHE building and the Annex Block ranges from 1.5m to 3.15m. The relevant statement of Section 4.4.3 is revised accordingly.</p>
<p>(iii) The name of the graded building quoted on p.11 of the SPS should read as "Taṭ Yan Study Hall". Please revise accordingly.</p>	<p>The name of the graded building is revised accordingly.</p>
<p>(iv) According to Section 4.4.3 (b) of the SPS, it is a heritage conservation strategy to provide an unobstructed view to the Main Building and Annex Block of Siu Lo from the main road, i.e. Tai Tong Road. While the principle of enhancing the vista of the graded building is appreciated, the applicant is advised to supplement elevation(s) or photomontages to demonstrate that the strategy is achievable in the current scheme. Besides, for better understanding of the visual impact on Siu Lo, the applicant is advised to provide photomontage(s) between Viewpoint 3 and Viewpoint 6 of the Visual Impact Assessment in Section 6.</p>	<p>With the intention to preserve the entire Grade 3 historic building as well as to optimize site development potential to provide RCHE facilities, the annex block of Siu Lo will be partially decked over by the proposed RCHE building. In the meantime, a great effort has been made to minimize the visual impact and obstruction of the public views towards Siu Lo, especially the main block.</p> <p>The Figure 6, taken between viewpoint 3 and viewpoint 6, demonstrate that the Siu Lo's vista is</p>

	enhanced. Specifically, a larger extent of the Annex Block will be visible under the revised scheme with less obstruction by the necessary structural columns of RCHE.
(v) As noted from Section 4.2 of the SPS, structural analysis of the proposed RCHE building have been conducted, and long structural span and thick structural elements would be adopted to reduce the visual impact arising from the proposed RCHE building on Siu Lo. However, it is noted from Viewpoint 3 of the Visual Impact Assessment that two columns are designed in front of Siu Lo to support the proposed RCHE building, and one of the columns appears to be erected at the mid-span in front of Siu Lo. Compared with the scheme in the approved Planning Application no. A/YL/289 submitted by the same applicant, the design of the columns in the current scheme seems to impose more visual impact on Siu Lo. The applicant is advised to consider whether the structural design of the RCHE building could be further optimized to reduce the visual impact arising from the columns in front of Siu Lo.	For both the previously approved scheme and the revised scheme, the structural columns supporting the new RCHE building will unavoidably be close to Siu Lo under the conservation-cum-development model. Nonetheless, Siu Lo is more hidden behind the RCHE block and its columns at front for ones standing at the site entrance at Tai Tong Road. The vista will be improved when the angle of RCHE block aligns with the Siu Lo Annex Block in the current scheme with the 2 columns standing at the back of the Annex Block. The consultancy team will continue to optimize the structural design to reduce the visual impact at the detailed design stage.
Comments on appendixes (vi) Below please find our observations and comments on the following appendixes: <u>Heritage Appraisal (Appendix 3)</u> Section 4.4 (Table) (a) Please revise the name of the 5th graded historic building to "No. 45 Tai Kei Leng (Entrance Gates and Enclosing Wall)".	The name of the graded building is revised accordingly. Please refer to the Appendix 3 – Heritage Appraisal .
Section 5.2 Character Defining Elements (CDEs) (b) CDE No. S-01 (p.9) - Please provide photo of the boundary wall where it states that it has "Low" significance.	A photo of the boundary wall has been incorporated. Please refer to the Appendix 3 – Heritage Appraisal .
(c) CDE No. ME-10 - According to Section 4.4.3 of the SPS, some of the existing windows of the Annex Block of Siu Lo will be converted into glazed windows without security bars to allow visitors to appreciate the internal area from outside. Noting that the "Window shutters, security bars and timber windows" (i.e. CDE no. ME-10) in the Heritage Appraisal are classified as CDEs of high significance, please advise the number of and indicate which window shutters, security bars and timber windows would be affected by the proposed conversion.	Please refer to the Figure 8 , which shows the location of the proposed windows to be converted to glazed windows without security bars (highlighted in blue). CDE No. ME-10 are refer to the those in the Main Building, not the Annex Block. Please refer to AI-03 of the CDE list of the Annex Block -- Timber windows with iron security bars, which is considered of low significance. Most of the windows of the Annex Block have been replaced or changed, because most of them were broken and removed from the building by former occupants.
Section 7.6 Heritage Garden (d) Please move "Life of Water (生命之水)" to the 4th row "Backyard with the old water well".	The statement is revised accordingly. Please refer to the Appendix 3 –Heritage Appraisal .
Visual Impact Assessment (Appendix 5) Figure 6 (e) Please review the annotation of the drawing of the "Proposed Scheme" (bottom left diagram on that page). Revised drawing with the correct annotations should be provided.	The annotation of the drawing shall be "Proposed Development (Proposed Scheme) 擬議發展 (更新方案)". The revised drawing with the correct annotations has been submitted in FI(1) on 5 May 2023 in addressing Planning Department's comments.
Supplementary Planning Statement (f) Regarding the last sentence of the first paragraph of Section 3.2.7 of the SPS, "As per the preliminary discussion with CHO and AMO, it is generally agreed that the <u>current</u> conservation-cum-development proposal is commensurate with Siu Lo 's grading and heritage value," we would like to clarify that while CHO and AMO have provided comments from the heritage conservation perspective on the previous planning application (No. A/YL/289) regarding the conservation-cum-development proposal, we were not involved in discussion with the applicant on the current application No. A/YL/302.	The heritage conservation strategy outlined in section 4.4.3 of the SPS remains largely unchanged from the previously approved scheme (A/YL/289), with the exception of minor amendments on the scheme of the new RCHE building. The applicant has also taken the initiative to enhance the public visit arrangement by allowing participants of guided tours and private tours to visit the interior of Siu Lo in current proposal.
(vii) To safeguard Siu Lo including the Main Building and Annex Block from deterioration, the applicant is strongly recommended to undertake urgent repair works for Siu Lo including the Main Building and Annex Block before proceeding with the detailed repair proposal for Siu Lo and building plans for the new RCHE building. AMO is pleased to provide technical advice to the urgent repair proposal.	Noted with thanks.
Archaeology (viii) The applicant is required to inform AMO (Mr. Jeffer MAK, tel: 2655 0822 and email: jpwamak@amo.gov.hk} immediately when any antiquities or supposed antiquities under the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance (Cap. 53} are discovered in the course of works	Noted with thanks.

Departmental Comments	Response
Email from PlanD received on 30 June 2023 refers: Fire Services Department:	
(a) Detailed fire safety requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans and referral from relevant licensing authority.	Noted with thanks.
(b) The applicant shall also be reminded that the EVA provision shall comply with the standard as stipulated in Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 under the Building (Planning) Regulation 41D which is administered by the Buildings Department.	Noted with thanks.
Email from PlanD received on 26 April 2023 refers: Fire Services Department:	
(a) Considering a petrol filling station (PFS) is located in the vicinity to the social welfare facility, a separation distance between the filling point/vent pipe and utilities outside the boundary of PFS should be maintained for the sake of safety, particularly for the vulnerable occupant(s) of RCHE. The applicant should be reminded the wall forming part of an occupied building should not be located within 12m of the filling points of PFS from the dispensers of the PFS. Moreover, additional fire safety requirements may be imposed upon vetting of the building details with regard to the safety distance of the petrol filling station at the vicinity.	Noted with thanks. The following mitigation measures are proposed to address the associated risks: 1) A solid reinforced concrete wall, with a Fire Resistance Rating of at least 2 hours and a thickness of at least 300 mm, to be built from G/F to 2/F along the wall of the proposed building facing the nearby PFS; 2) No intake / exhaust openings of the proposed building should be built within 12m from the dispenser of the PFS; and No emergency exit / entrance of the proposed building should be built within 12m from the dispenser of the PFS.
(b) The applicant should be reminded for any new development proposed to be constructed in a close proximity of an existing licensed store, it should be ensured that the existing licensed store is not adversely affected.	Noted with thanks.

Departmental Comments	Response
Email from PlanD received on 5 July 2023 refers: Transport Department:	
(a) The local track abutting the application site is not under Transport Department's purview. The applicant shall obtain consent of the owners/managing parties of the local track for using it as the vehicular access to the application site.	Noted with thanks.
(b) Sufficient space should be provided within the application site for manoeuvring of vehicles. In addition, no parking, queuing and reverse movement of vehicles on public road are allowed.	Noted with thanks.
Email from PlanD received on 26 April 2023 refers: Transport Department:	
(a) As there is change in planning parameters, the applicant shall provide updated traffic impact assessment for our review.	There is a reduction of 40 beds (from 281 to 241) as compared with the previous approved application. Therefore, the expected traffic generation/attraction will be less than the previous submission, and hence should be acceptable in traffic terms.
(b) The applicant shall state clearly how the proposed development connects to Tai Tong Road.	It is the same as the previous approved application. Pleaser refer to the Figure 5 .
(c) The applicant shall provide layout plan demonstrating that there are sufficient spaces for parking, loading/unloading and manoeuvring.	Superseded.
(d) The local track abutting the subject site is not under Transport Department's purview. The applicant shall obtain consent of the owners/managing parties of the local track for using it as the vehicular access to the subject site.	Noted.
(e) Sufficient space should be provided within the application site for manoeuvring of vehicles. In addition, no parking, queueing and reverse movement of vehicles on public road are allowed.	Noted and agreed. Please refer to response on (c).

Departmental Comments	Response
<p>Email from PlanD received on 10 May 2023 refers: Environmental Protection Department:</p>	
<p><u>NIA</u> (a) S.3.4.8 - We noted that the existing petrol filling station is immediately east of the site as the petrol filling station is one of the potential emitters in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). Please confirm there are no noisy activities within the petrol filling station at night time.</p>	<p>It is confirmed that no noisy activities within the petrol filling station at night time was observed during the site survey. The description has been supplemented in Section 3.4.8. Please refer to the Appendix 6 – Noise Impact Assessment.</p>
<p>(b) S.2.3.1 - Please document the Transport Department’s (TD’s) agreement on the traffic forecast data in the report once available. In case TD has no comment on the methodology for traffic forecast only, the consultant should provide written confirmation from the respective competent party (e.g. traffic consultant) that TD’s endorsed methodology has been strictly adopted in preparing the traffic forecast data, and hence the validity of traffic data can be confirmed.</p>	<p>The TD agreement and written confirmation from the appointed traffic consultant are attached in Appendix 6 – Noise Impact Assessment.</p>
<p>(c) S.3.3 - Yuen Long Baptist Church is located to the north of the site. Please supplement the description for Yuen Long Baptist Church and clarify if the church will not rely on openable windows for ventilation in the report. Otherwise, the applicant should quantitatively assess the fixed noise impact on the church.</p>	<p>With reference to the RNTPC Paper No. A/YL/252A for Proposed Composite School and Religious Institution (Church) Development, with minor relaxation of BH Restriction in Yuen Long Baptist Church, the subject Applicant proposed that the eastern, southern and northern sides of the building will be installed with fixed windows. Please refer to the extracted paper as below:</p> <div data-bbox="1516 751 2264 1644" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p style="text-align: center;">-11-</p> <p>classified as a Class A, B or C site as it does not abut on a specified street, the development intensity should be determined under Building (Planning) Regulation 19(3) unless a right of way not less than 4.5m wide is granted by LandsD for the proposed run-in/out of the Site.</p> <p>(b) If the Site is classified as Class A site, the proposed development parameter of the Site is acceptable under Schedule 1 of the Building (Planning) Regulation.</p> <p>(c) The Site shall be provided with means of obtaining access thereto from a street under the Building (Planning) Regulation 5 and emergency vehicular access shall be provided for all the buildings to be erected on the Site in accordance with the requirements under the Building (Planning) Regulation 41D.</p> <p>(d) Disregarding carparking spaces from GFA calculation under the Buildings Ordinance will be considered on the basis of the criteria set out in PNAP APP-2 during building plan submission stage.</p> <p>(e) The proposed development should follow and comply with the pre-requisite for GFA concession in PNAP APP-151 and the Sustainable Building Design guidelines stipulated in PNAP APP-152 during the preparation of detailed building design.</p> <p>(f) It is noted in applicant’s FI submission in Appendix Id that the eastern, southern and northern sides of the building will be installed with fixed windows. The applicant should be reminded that the Building (Planning) Regulation 30 and 36 for natural lighting and ventilation by the provision of prescribed windows should be complied with.</p> <p>(g) Detailed comment will only be offered during building plan submission stage.</p> </div> <p>The description has been supplemented in Section 3.3. Please refer to the Appendix 6 – Noise Impact Assessment.</p>
<p><u>SIA</u> (d) Table 2.1: Please check if the no. of elderly home guest adopted for assessment should be 260 instead of 300.</p>	<p>The no. of elderly home guest adopted for assessment should be 260. The typo has been amended. Please refer to the Appendix 7 –Sewerage and Drainage Impact Assessment.</p>

(e) It is noted that Appendix A is missing. Please supplement.	The master layout plan is provided in Appendix A. It is supplemented in Appendix 7 –Sewerage and Drainage Impact Assessment.
--	---

Departmental Comments	Response
Email from PlanD received on 11 May 2023 refers: Drainage Services Department:	
(i) According to Section 6.8 of SDM Corrigendum 1/2022, projection year up to the end of 21 st century for rainfall increase and extreme sea level rise plus design allowance should be considered as far as practicable; and	Rainfall increase due to Climate Change at the End of 21 st century (16.0%) has been considered. The calculation has been amended in Appendix I. Please refer to the Appendix 7 –Sewerage and Drainage Impact Assessment.
(ii) Appendix J: According to Section 9 .3 of Stormwater Drainage Manual, suitable allowance should be made in the design for deposition of sediment in stormwater channels and pipes. Please ensure the existing drainage facilities would not be adversely affected by the captioned development.	10% sediment deposition has been incorporated in the calculation of Appendix J. Please refer to the Appendix 7 –Sewerage and Drainage Impact Assessment.

Departmental Comments	Response
Email from PlanD received on 26 April 2023 refers: Civil Engineering and Development Department:	
(a) The applicant is reminded to submit plans of the proposed building works and site formation works to the Buildings Department for approval as required under the provisions of the Buildings Ordinance.	Noted with thanks.
(b) The applicant is reminded that the subject site is located within the Scheduled Area No. 2 and may be underlain by cavernous marble. Depending on the nature of foundation of the new development proposed at the site, extensive geotechnical investigation may be required as necessary. This would require a high-level involvement of experienced geotechnical engineer(s), both in the design and supervision of geotechnical aspects of the works to be carried out on the site.	Noted with thanks.

Departmental Comments	Response
Email from PlanD received on 26 April 2023 refers: Food and Environmental Hygiene:	
a) No Food and Environmental Hygiene Department’s (FEHD) facilities will be affected and all related work or operation shall not cause any environmental nuisance, pest infestation and obstruction to the surrounding.	Noted with thanks.
(b) For any waste generated from such operation or activity, the applicant should arrange disposal properly at his own expenses.	Noted with thanks.
(c) Proper licence / permit issued by FEHD is required if there is any catering service / activities regulated by the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene under the Public Health and Municipal Services Ordinance (Cap. 132) and other relevant legislation for the public.	Noted with thanks.

Departmental Comments	Response
Email from PlanD received on 26 April 2023 refers: Urban Design and Landscape:	
(a) According to the application no. A/YL/263-1 approved on 16.3.2023, the building height of the proposed RCHE development at the Ex-Hang Heung Factory Site is 33.1mPD instead of 36.7mPD as shown in Figures 4 and 5 and 28.7mPD as indicated in Section 6 of the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA).	The concerned building height of the Ex-Hang Heung Factory Site as mentioned in the VIA, including the statement in para. 3.4 and Section 6, Figures 4 and 5, are amended accordingly. Please refer to Appendix 5 –Visual Impact Assessment. (Remarks: A typo in the photomontage of the proposed scheme shown in Figure 6 is observed and replaced.)
(b) Para. 5.7.1 of the planning statement and paras. 6.3.5 & 6.6.3 (VP3 & VP6) and Section 7 of VIA – Judging from the photomontages, the entire development is perceivable at these two vantage points (VPs) and the open sky view is apparently obstructed. The visual impact to these two VPs can hardly be regarded as	For VP3 (para. 6.3.5), it is considered that the visual impact caused by the Proposed Development from this VP is graded as moderately adverse.

slightly adverse when comparing to the existing condition.	For VP6 (para. 6.6.3), it is considered that the resultant visual impact of the Proposed Development is considered moderately adverse. Please refer to Appendix 5 –Visual Impact Assessment.
(c) The Applicant should provide the Legend to show the design elements shown on all Landscape Plans.	The Legend has been included to show the design elements. Please refer to Appendix 1 – Development Scheme – Plans & Drawings
(d) Please be reminded that the approval of the s.16 application by the Town Planning Board does not imply approval of site coverage of greenery requirements under APP PNAP-152 and/or under the lease. The site coverage of greening calculation should be submitted separately to BD for approval.	Noted with thanks.