

---

**Responses-to-Comments Table and  
Revised Sewerage Impact Assessment**

---

**Table of Contents**

1. Drainage Services Department	1
2. Environmental Protection Department	3
3. Highways Department	3

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
<b>1.</b>	<b>Comments from Drainage Services Department</b>	
	<u>Hong Kong and Islands Division</u>	
1.1	From the drainage system point of view, no insurmountable drainage impact is envisaged from the proposed development based on the s.16 planning application.	Noted.
1.2	Based on the submitted SIA report, the applicants are reminded to keep updated existing record with their latest design parameters, as well as the latest records from the surrounding for their consideration of the upgrading the surrounding sewerage system as necessary. The SIA for the subject planning application also needs to meet the full satisfaction of Environmental Protection Department (EPD), the planning authority of sewerage infrastructure.	Noted.
1.3	The applicants have to submit a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) to the Buildings Department and copy to Drainage Services Department for comments at building plan submission stage.	Noted.
	<u>Land Drainage Division</u>	
1.4	Should “east Hong Kong” be read as “East Hong Kong”?	Revised accordingly in paras. 1.1.1 and 1.1.2. Please refer to the revised SIA.
1.5	<b>Para. 1.2.2</b> - Please review the word “brining” in the 2nd line.	Typo rectified in para. 1.2.2, please see the revised SIA.
1.6	Sewer pipes at upstream and downstream of TaiKoo Shing Sewage Pumping Station (TKSSPS) are required to be upgraded. Please advise and justify whether upgrading of TKSSPS is also required.	As mentioned in Section 2.5.4, the sewage from the proposed development only occupies 5% of the TKSSPS which is deemed insignificant. Therefore, upgrading of TKSSPS is not required.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
1.7	<b>Table 3</b> - For 4b and 8b, what are the basis for assuming 15% GFA and 20% GFA respectively for F&B?	<p>With reference from the Wikipedia about City Plaza, for item 4b of Table 3 in Appendix 2.1, there are 6 floors with some areas of 1/F and 3/F being restaurant. Therefore, it is assumed 15% of GFA is F&amp;B.</p> <p>For item 8b of Table 3 in Appendix 2.1, there are 4 floors with some areas of B1/F, 1/F and 2/F being restaurant. Therefore, it is assumed 20% of GFA is F&amp;B.</p> <p>The information is from <a href="https://zh.wikipedia.org/zh-tw/%E5%A4%AA%E5%8F%A4%E5%9F%8E%E4%B8%AD%E5%BF%83">https://zh.wikipedia.org/zh-tw/%E5%A4%AA%E5%8F%A4%E5%9F%8E%E4%B8%AD%E5%BF%83</a>.</p>
1.8	<b>Table 12</b> - Incorrect values for “g” were adopted for pipe segments from S11 to S15. Please revise.	Revised accordingly, please refer to the revised SIA.
1.9	<b>Figure 2.3</b> - Both the proposed upstream invert level and downstream invert level for pipe segment S6-S7 are +0.15 mPD resulting zero pipe gradient. Please review.	Typo for the downstream invert level of manhole S6. It should be “+0.26” instead of “+0.15”. Please refer to the revised SIA.
1.10	Please advise whether existing sewer manhole FMH7036243 needs to be reconstructed.	As the pipe for the downstream of manhole FMH7036243 has to be upgraded to 900mm, manhole FMH7036243 has to be reconstructed.
1.11	Please review the proposed pipe invert levels for pipe segments between S12 and S15, especially for S15 (FMH7036294) which the incoming pipe invert level is -0.30 mPD whereas the outgoing pipe has a higher invert levels is +2.10 mPD.	Although some invert levels between S0 to S12 are missing on GeoInfo Map, it is expected that the invert level of the existing sewers for S0 to S12 has the pipe invert level lower than the downstream invert level of S12. Also, as shown in Table 11 of App 2.1, some pipes (S2-S4, S6-S10 and S11-S15) do not have enough capacity which require further adjusting the invert level, resulting in the incoming invert level of S15 higher than the outgoing invert level.
1.12	Please review the practicality of the recommended works, for example some pipe invert levels are only slightly adjusted by 40mm (from +0.30 mPD to +0.26 mPD).	The incoming invert level of FMH7036248 is revised from “0.26” to “0.20”. Please refer to the revised SIA.

	<b>Departmental Comments</b>	<b>Responses to Comments</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Comments from Environmental Protection Department</b>	
2.1	For Sections 2.3.1 and 2.5.1, according to Figure 2.1, sewage generated from the Proposed Development will be directed to manhole FMH7036295 rather than to FMH7036243, please revise.	Revised accordingly, please refer to the revised SIA.
2.2	For Sections 2.5.2, 2.5.3 and 3.1.2, please revise FNH7036270 to FMH7036270.	Revised accordingly, please refer to the revised SIA.
2.3	For Section 2.5.3, Table 12 instead of Table 13 should be referred to.	Revised accordingly, please refer to the revised SIA.
2.4	For Section 2.5.4, please revise the unit of design capacity of TKSPS as 22,464m <sup>3</sup> /day.	Revised accordingly, please refer to the revised SIA.
2.5	For Table 3 in Appendix 2.1, podium of East Hong Kong is approximately 1,370m <sup>2</sup> as measured in Geoinfo Map, please revise the area measurement description to avoid confusion.	Revised accordingly, please refer to the revised SIA.
2.6	For Table 3 in Appendix 2.1, when compare this SIA with SIA submitted in April 2026, noted that area of (4a) and (4b) in Catchment B is reduced from 23504m <sup>2</sup> to 21241m <sup>2</sup> and from 5876m <sup>2</sup> to 3748m <sup>2</sup> respectively, please provide with source of reference to substantiate the changes.	As stated in para. 1.1.3, the total GFA of “C(7)” zone, which includes East Hong Kong, City Plaza and 1111 King’s Road, is 123,129m <sup>2</sup> . Therefore, with the increased GFA of East Hong Kong (item 3a in Catchment B), the area of City Plaza will be reduced.
2.7	Please also seek DSD’s agreement on the technical feasibility of proposed mitigation measures.	Noted. The SIA has been circulated to DSD for their comments.
<b>3.</b>	<b>Comments from Highways Department</b>	
3.1	With reference to Public Comment no. 7 – “Concerns on insufficient foundation loading for the proposed development, and any adverse impact to the MTR tunnel”, please observe the following comments from our Railway Development Office:	Noted. Will keep close liaison with relevant departments and parties (including MTRC) during detailed design and implementation stage.

	<b>Departmental Comments</b>	<b>Responses to Comments</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed works fall within the railway protection boundary of the existing Island Line. As the operation of existing railway system is not under the jurisdiction of this office, we have no input on the plans from railway development point of view. With reference to DEVB TC(W) No. 1/2019 and/or Practice Notes for Authorized Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers (PNAP) APP-24, please seek comments from MTR Corporation Limited with respect to the operation, maintenance, safety and any future works required for the existing railways.</li> </ul>	
3.2	We reserve our rights to provide comments upon receiving further submission from the applicants.	Noted.