Table of Contents

1.	Comments from Chief Engineer / Construction, Water Supplies Department	1
2.	Comments from District Planning Office, Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West Section, Planning Department	3
3.	Comments from Chief Town Planner / Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department	4
4.	Comments from Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services	4
5.	Comments from Project Manager / Major Works, HyD	5
6.	Comments from Project Manager (West), Civil Engineering and Development Department	6
7	Comments from Department of Environmental Protection	8
8.	Comments from Chief Engineer / Mainland North, Drainage Services Department	13

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
1.	**Comments from Chief Engineer / Construction, Water Supplies Department**	
1.1	Table 3 – For residential, please adopt a flushing water unit demand of 104 L/head/day instead of 70 L/head/day.	The flushing water unit demand of 104 L/head/day for residential will be updated in detailed design stage.
1.2	Table 3 –The fresh water demand for the resident's recreation facilities, retail and restaurant in Site A should be included as service trade with a unit demand of 40 L/head/day in accordance with DI1309. Therefore the fresh water unit demand for the resident's recreation facilities and retail should be removed.	The fresh water demand for the resident's recreation facilities, retail and restaurant in Site A should be considered as service trade in accordance with DI1309. The submitted WSIA is considered to have adopted a more conservative demand. Nonetheless, it will be reviewed at subsequent detailed design stage.
1.3	Table 3 & Annex 2 – Please provide a breakdown of the fresh water and flushing water unit demand for restaurants for our consideration. Please note that WSD does not accept water unit demands from GESF as a reference.	The fresh water and flushing water unit demand for restaurants will only be defined accurately at subsequent detailed design stage. The fresh water and flushing water unit demand for restaurants will be reviewed accordingly.
1.4	Drawing No. AREA32B/WSIA/FIGURE3 – There are no proposed water mains to be constructed by WSD. Please liaise with WDO of CEDD and update this drawing based on the latest information accordingly.	Noted. The latest water main alignment for connection will be further liaised with respective Government departments and to be adopted at subsequent detailed design stage.
1.5	Drawing No. AREA32B/WSIA/FIGURE3 – Please note that only one set of lead-in connections would be provided to your site. Therefore, please combine those lead-in connections under this application and those reserved for future connections.	Noted. The latest water main alignment for connection will be further liaised with respective Government departments and to be adopted at subsequent detailed design stage.
1.6	Drawing No. AREA32B/WSIA/FIGURE3 – Please present your fresh water lead-in connection as DN200 instead of NS250 for clarity. Furthermore, please also add a separate lead-in connection for fire-fighting water mains and seek comments from Fire Services Department.	The latest lead-in connection and inclusion of a separate lead-in connection for fire-fighting water mains will be submitted to WSD and Fire Services Department for comments and approval at subsequent detailed design stage.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
1.7	Drawing No. AREA32B/WSIA/FIGURE3 – Please liaise with WDO of CEDD to upsize the proposed fresh water mains to the south of your site from DN250 to DN300 and update this report accordingly.	The applicant will further review and propose to upsize the fresh water mains to the south of Site 32B from DN250 to DN300 (if required) at subsequent detailed design stage.
1.8	Drawing No. AREA32B/WSIA/FIGURE4 – Please note that only one set of lead-in connections would be provided to your site. Therefore, please combine those lead-in connections under this application and those reserved for future connections.	Noted. The latest water main alignment for connection will be further liaised with respective Government departments and to be adopted at subsequent detailed design stage.
1.9	Drawing No. AREA32B/WSIA/FIGURE4 – Please present your flushing water lead-in connection as DN100 instead of NS125 for clarity.	To avoid confusion of lead-in connection with flushing water mains constructed by CEDD, NS125 is adopted to match with the notation used by CEDD for Hung Shui Kiu NDA. The details will be further liaised with respective Government departments and to be adopted at subsequent detailed design stage.
1.10	Annex 2 – Please note that WSD does not accept water unit demands from GESF as a reference. Please provide alternative references accordingly.	Please note that the fresh water and flushing water unit demand will only be determined more accurately at subsequent detailed design stage. They will be reviewed and submitted to the satisfaction of WSD.
1.11	Annex 2 – Please show the water demand estimation of restaurant for Site A and Site B separately.	Ditto. Please see responses to Item 1.10 above.
1.12	Annex 2 – The flushing water demand for restaurants in Site A should also be included.	Ditto. Please see responses to Item 1.10 above.
1.13	Annex 3 & 4 – Please use the internal pipe diameter for the hydraulic analysis.	Noted. Internal pipe diameter will be adopted for hydraulic calculation during detailed design stage.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
2.	**Comments from District Planning Office, Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West Section, Planning Department**	
	Urban and Green Design Requirements Brief	
2.1	Table 5.1: The exact wordings of the relevant Urban and Green Design Requirements should be quoted and compared against. For example, while the UDB stipulates a direct covered walkway linking Area 32B and Area 32C at +23mPD, the proposed development indicates a level of +19mPD. Strong justifications must be provided for any deviations from the UDB requirements.	Noted. The requirements under UDB to provide a direct covered walkway linking Area 32B and 32C will be respected. Openings for provision of covered walkway / potential footbridge connection have been reserved in the current Proposed Scheme (see latest MLP in **Attachment A** – **Revised Planning Statement** for reference). Illustrative diagrams have also been prepared and updated in **Attachment A** to illustrate the spatial planning framework and the relationship with the UDB with the subject proposed development.
2.2	Master Layout Plan (MLP), Landscape Master Plan (LMP) and relevant floor plans: Please specify the width/height/type of possible footbridge connection/covered walkways to/from Area 32B and 32C. Please also indicate on plan the ground floor level retail frontage facing the promenade in Site B.	The width / height and types of footbridge connections / covered walkway will be subject to detailed design and submission for approval of respective Government departments at subsequent detailed design stage.
	Development Parameters	
2.3	Table 3.1: Please provide precise figures (rounded to 2 decimal places) for the proposed PR.	Please find the updated Development Schedule in **Attachment A** for consideration.
2.4	Table 3.1: Referring to Para. 3.1.6, 3.1.7, Table 3.1, Figure 3.6, 3.7 and Point 9.4 from your R-to-C table dated 25.8.2026, please clarify whether the "Pay for What You Build" Pilot Scheme under LAO PN No, 2/2026 ("the Scheme") is intended to apply to the non-commercial GFA within Site A. If the Scheme applies solely to the non-domestic developments within Site B, please revise the GFA calculations (if applicable) accordingly to demonstrate full compliance with the Scheme.	Noted. The proposed non-domestic development intensity of the Initial Phase Development at 32B (Site B) will amount to at least 60% of the "maximum non-domestic development intensity" of Site B under the subject S16 planning application (i.e. 67,766 * 60% = about 40,660m^2). In this regard, the non-domestic development parameters of the entire Application Site (i.e. 32B) at Sites A and B have been reviewed. The non-domestic development mix have been slightly adjusted accordingly. Please see updated Development Schedule in **Attachment A** for consideration. Detailed implementation arrangement and lands matter will be subject to separate discussions with relevant authorities at subsequent stages.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
2.5	Phased implementation: In relation to (ii)(2) above, please indicate on plans the proposed non-domestic GFA to be implemented within Site A and Site B for the first and remaining phases respectively. The locations/structures/sections to be included in respective stages of development should be clearly presented.	**Site A**: 100% of the GFA will be implemented in Phase 1. **Site B**: 60% of the GFA will be implemented in Phase 1. Please see Sections 3.1.6 and 3.1.7 in **Attachment A** for reference. Details of structures and etc. will only be further developed at subsequent detailed design stage.
3.	**Comments from Chief Town Planner / Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department**	
	Advisory Comment	
3.1	The applicant should be advised that approval of the application does not imply approval of tree works such as pruning, transplanting and felling. Application for any tree works should be submitted to relevant departments for approval.	Noted.
3.2	For compliance of site coverage of greenery requirements under PNAP APP-152, submission should be made to Building Department for comments and approval.	Noted.
4.	**Comments from Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services**	
4.1	No particular comment on the document from electricity supply safety aspect.	Noted.
4.2	In the interests of public safety and ensuring the continuity of electricity supply, the parties concerned with planning, designing, organizing and supervising any activity near the underground cable or overhead line under the mentioned document should approach the electricity supplier (i.e. CLP Power) for the requisition of cable plans (and overhead line alignment drawings, where applicable) to find out whether there is any underground cable and/or overhead line within and/or in the vicinity of the concerned site.	Noted.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
4.3	Please be reminded to observe the Electricity Supply Lines (Protection) Regulation and the "Code of Practice on Working near Electricity Supply Lines" established under the Regulation when carrying out works in the vicinity of the electricity supply lines.	Noted.
5.	**Comments from Project Manager / Major Works, HyD**	
	Advisory Comment	
5.1	The applicant is encouraged to fully utilise self-mitigation measures against road traffic noise from Kong Sham Western Highway at the residential blocks in Site A to comply with the relevant noise criteria, thereby avoiding the implementation of the relevant Noise Barriers of the Project. While noting that a detailed Road Traffic Noise Impact Assessment would be submitted by the applicant during the design stage of its development, the applicant is encouraged to review and agree at the detail design stage that the implementation of the relevant Noise Barriers of the Project is not required with utilisation of adequate self-mitigation measures at the residential blocks in Site A.	Noted.
5.2	Self-mitigation measures against road traffic noise from Kong Sham Western Highway should be incorporated into the detailed Road Traffic Noise Impact Assessment to be submitted by the applicant for Site A. Such measures may include building setback, low-rise development design, fixed glazing, sliding doors with automatic door closers, maintenance windows, A/C platforms with maintenance windows, solid fence walls, solid planters, acoustic windows, acoustic balconies, and sound-absorptive architectural treatments, as appropriate. The assessment should demonstrate compliance with the relevant noise criteria, covering scenarios with and without implementation of the relevant Noise Barriers of the Project.	Noted.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
6.	**Comments from Project Manager (West), Civil Engineering and Development Department**	
	<u>DIA</u>	
6.1	It is understood that there is no major change in the drainage catchment area and lead-in location. However, the pipe information (e.g. invert level, pipe size) and hydraulic checking is missing, please supplement/clarify.	Noted. The pipe information provided by CEDD is supplemented in **Appendix 1 in Attachment B2** for your reference. As mentioned in the DIA report, same site area and the drainage characteristics are similar to HSK OZP. No additional runoff is anticipated. The Application Site is within HSK/HT NDA and adopts the lead-in location proposed by HSK/HT NDA. A hydraulic model was carried out to assess the hydraulic performance of the proposed drainage system within HSK/HT NDA. Therefore, hydraulic calculation is deemed not necessary.
	<u>SIA</u>	
6.2	Please be clarified that the base case planned ADWF for the subject site is 1,517m³/day instead of 2,389.4m³/day as mentioned in the SIA, please update.	Noted the base case planned ADWF for the subject site is 1,517m³/day instead of 2,389.4m³/day.
6.3	The sewage flow proposed by the applicant (2,088.58m³/day in ADWF) is larger than that under base case, inducing additional flow to gravity sewer, SPS1 and SPS2 with associated rising mains, and HSKEPP. The applicant shall review the sewerage impact and propose mitigation measures for DSD and EPD's acceptance.	With reference to the recently published 2026 Policy Address, 3 University Towns will be developed. One of which will be situated in the core area of Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area, which is located in the same sewage catchment of the Subject Site. Thus, the above changes in land use and planned development parameters of these original commercial sites will lead to changes in discharge to the HSK sewage pumping station No.1. In addition, sewage flow from other committed residential / commercial / mixed-use developments is necessary to be considered within the HSK/HT NDA. The entire sewage system of HSK/HT NDA will have to be reviewed again by respective Government department (e.g. CEDD) in one go taking into account all these changes in planned developments (i.e. UniTown, other committed developments nearby and the subject Proposed Development).

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
		Subject to the outcomes the above review, it is anticipated that the Government will be responsible for upgrading the public sewerage infrastructures including sewage pumping stations and sewage treatment work where necessary. Accordingly, the Applicant will undertake the upgrading works including connecting sewer and associated manhole(s) for the Subject Site. Should the Board consider appropriate, the Applicant would have no objection for stipulation of relevant approval conditions on submission of updated Sewerage Impact Assessment upon receipt of updated information on the sewerage system under discharge condition of the subject S16 planning application. The Applicant will remain close liaison with respective Government departments at subsequent development stages respectively. Relevant texts of the SIA report have been updated. Please see **Attachment B1** for reference.
6.4	The pipe information (e.g. invert level, pipe size) is missing, please supplement/clarify.	Noted. The pipe information provided by CEDD is supplemented in **Appendix 2 in Attachment B2** for your reference.
6.5	The fresh water and flushing water demands proposed by the applicant are 2,054.3m³/day and 684.1m³/day, respectively, compared with the corresponding base-case demands of 1,459m³/day and 383m³/day. These demands are higher than those under the base-case scenario. The increased water demands are expected to induce additional flow within the adjacent fresh water and flushing water distribution networks and may affect the hydraulic performance of the system. The applicant shall review the water supply impact with consideration of the accumulative effect of adjacent developments and propose mitigation measures for WSD's acceptance.	Similar to the responses-to-comment of Item 6.3, the water demand and supply will also be reviewed at subsequent development stages. Should the Board consider appropriate, the Applicant would have no objection for stipulation of relevant approval conditions on submission of updated Water Supply Impact Assessment under discharge condition of the subject S16 planning application.
6.6	It is noticed that additional water supply lead-ins are proposed. The no. of lead-ins shall be subject to WSD's acceptance.	Noted. WSD's approval will be sought during detailed design of the lead-ins location at subsequent detailed design stage.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
7.	**Comments from Department of Environmental Protection**	
	Air Quality	
7.1	Section 2.3.1: Please revise to "No existing or planned industrial chimneys have been identified within 200 m from the boundary of the Application Site after population intake of the Proposed Development, based on the best available information".	Revised accordingly, please refer to the revised Environmental Review under **Attachment C**.
7.2	Section 2.5.1: Please revise the last two lines to "…and potential kitchen exhaust from the food and beverage areas, if any".	Revised accordingly, please refer to the revised Environmental Review under **Attachment C**.
7.3	Section 2.5.3: Please add "appropriate Air Pollution Control Equipment such as" before "exhaust hood" in Line 2. Please also revise "cooling" in Line 6 to "cooking".	Revised accordingly, please refer to the revised Environmental Review under **Attachment C**.
7.4	Section 2.7.2: Please correct the typo "aera" in Line 2.	Revised accordingly, please refer to the revised Environmental Review under **Attachment C**.
7.5	Section 2.7.3: • Please review whether "safely" in Line 6 should be revised to "safety". • Please delete the last sentence as it is not justified.	Revised accordingly, please refer to the revised Environmental Review under **Attachment C**.
7.6	Section 2.7.4: Please revise "insurmountable" in the last sentence to "adverse".	Revised accordingly, please refer to the revised Environmental Review under **Attachment C**.
7.7	Section 2.8.1: Please revise the last sentence to "…, the proposed development will not be subject to adverse air quality impacts from vehicular emissions".	Revised accordingly, please refer to the revised Environmental Review under **Attachment C**.
7.8	Sections 2.8.2 and 6.2.2: Please revise to "All existing and planned air pollutant and odour emission sources within the 500m assessment area have been identified based on the best available information. No adverse air quality impacts on the air-sensitive uses of the proposed development are anticipated".	Sections 2.8.2 and 7.2.2 (previous 6.2.2) are revised accordingly, please refer to the revised Environmental Review under **Attachment C**.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
7.9	Table 2.1: The description of ASR A2 is unclear. Please review.	The description of ASR A2 is revised to "Planned Commercial Use at Area 32C", please refer to the revised Environmental Review under **Attachment C**.
7.10	Please review the numbering in Section 2.9 as there are two "Section 2.9.1".	The numbering of Section 2.9 is revised, please refer to the revised Environmental Review under **Attachment C**.
7.11	Section 2.9.1, PDF Page 10: • Please remove "representing existing & planned ASRs" in Line 3. • Figure 2.2 is missing. • Please delete "Figure 2.1" from the last sentence.	Revised and rectified accordingly, please refer to the revised Environmental Review under **Attachment C**.
7.12	Section 2.9.1, PDF Page 11: • Please revise "Pollutant" in Line 8 to "Pollution". • As the same number is used for two different quantities, i.e. 13,601m³ for excavation volume and 13,601m2 for the work site area, please confirm whether 13,601m³ is a real excavation estimate or an accidental carry-over from the site area total. • Please revise "15 tones" to "15 tonnes". • Please confirm whether there are any concurrent projects within the 500m of the project site boundary and if yes, their cumulative air quality impacts during construction should be assessed.	Section 2.9.1 is renamed to Section 2.9.2. • Revised accordingly, please refer to the revised Environmental Review under **Attachment C**. • It is a real excavation estimation. As there is no basement, it is assumed the excavation depth is 1m. Therefore, the estimated excavation volume 13,601m^2 x 1m = 13,601m^3 • Revised accordingly, please refer to the revised Environmental Review under **Attachment C**. • Cumulative air quality impacts during construction due to concurrent projects are added in Section 2.9.3. Please refer to the revised Environmental Review under **Attachment C**.
7.13	Section 6.2.1: Please revise the section to "As no air-sensitive uses, including openable windows, fresh air intakes for mechanical ventilation, and recreational uses in open areas, will be located within the buffer zones for nearby roads as required under the HKPSG, and no existing or planned chimneys have been identified within 200m of the boundary of the Application Site, it is not anticipated that the proposed development will be subject to adverse air quality impacts arising from road traffic or industrial chimneys".	Section 7.2.1 (previous 6.2.1) revised accordingly, please refer to the revised Environmental Review under **Attachment C**.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
	Noise Impact	
7.14	S3 – Noted that the hotel development in Site B is used to provide noise screening effect to the traffic noise from Kong Shum Western Highway for the residential units in Site A. The future NIA submission should critically review if there are any changes on the design / height of the proposed hotel / office in site B or the interfacing issue of building structure of the Site B will be constructed after the population intake of Site A.	Noted.
7.15	S4.4 – The potential noise impact for the SGMTS should be categorized as Transit Noise instead of Railway Noise. Please address in a separate section.	Potential noise impact for the SGMTS is moved to Section 5, please refer to the revised Environmental Review under **Attachment C**.
7.16	S5.3.5 – Please clarify and revise if Section 5 is addressing the potential construction noise impact instead of road traffic noise impact.	Section 6.3.5 (previous 5.3.5) is revised, please refer to the revised Environmental Review under **Attachment C**.
7.17	S6 – The concerned section is incomplete. Please review and revise.	S6 is renamed to S7. Conclusion of Transit Noise Impact Assessment is added in Section 7.5. Please refer to the revised Environmental Review under **Attachment C**.
	SIA	
7.18	Section 2.2.1 & Annex 4: We note that the base case of the Proposed Development references the relevant OZP and ODP. The Consultant should ensure the latest OZP and ODP are referenced and their numbers are named in section 2.2.1.	Noted. Please be clarified that the OZP reference mentioned in Section 2.2.1 refers to the draft Hung Shui Kiu and Ha Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan No. S/HSK/3. The ODP reference is same as the one mentioned in the same section of SIA report (i.e. Outline Development Plan (ODP) No. D/HSK/1).
7.19	Section 2.2.1 & Annex 4: For the baseline key design parameters of the Application Site (e.g. sewer connection arrangements, projected population, sewage estimates, etc.), the Consultant should make reference to the approved SIA report for the HSK/HT NDA conducted by CEDD, rather than using the development mix in the latest OZP and ODP (if any).	Refer to information provided by CEDD in this RtoC, the base case sewage flow is 1,517m^3/d. No breakdown of each sewage flow type to verify the development mix according to ODP No. D/HSK/1. Due to insufficient information provided, the hypothetical base case scenario using development mix according to the latest OZP and ODP is formed for sewage generation estimation.

<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Departmental Comments</th><th>Responses to Comments</th></tr>
<tr><td>7.20</td><td>Section 4.1.2: Please note that the design capacities of SPS 1 and SPS 2 are under CEDD's further review. Please consult CEDD to ensure the latest design capacities of SPS 1 and SPS 2 are quoted.</td><td>Noted. According to CEDD information provided, the design capacities of SPS 1 and SPS 2 are as follows:

<table><tr><th>Sewage Pumping Stations</th><th>Design Pumping Capacity (m3/day)</th></tr><tr><td>SPS1</td><td>30,077</td></tr><tr><td>SPS2</td><td>46,121</td></tr></table></td></tr>
<tr><td>7.21</td><td>Section 5.1.1: Instead of mentioning an indicative manhole (i.e. FMH01), please check and specify the proposed public manhole (FMH105a?) to which the sewerage from FMH01 will be discharged.</td><td>Noted. The public manhole and associated sewer provided by CEDD is attached in Appendix 2 in Attachment B2 for your reference.

With reference to the recently published 2026 Policy Address, 3 University Towns will be developed. One of which will be situated in the core area of Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area, which is located in the same sewage catchment of the Subject Site. Thus, the above changes in land use and planned development parameters of these original commercial sites will lead to changes in discharge to the HSK sewage pumping station No.1. In addition, sewage flow from other committed residential / commercial / mixed-use developments is necessary to be considered within the HSK/HT NDA. The entire sewage system of HSK/HT NDA will have to be reviewed again by respective Government department (e.g. CEDD) in one go taking into account all these changes in planned developments (i.e. UniTown, other committed developments nearby and the subject Proposed Development)

Subject to the outcomes the above review, it is anticipated that the Government will be responsible for upgrading the public sewerage infrastructures including sewage pumping stations and sewage treatment work where necessary. Accordingly, the Applicant will undertake the upgrading works including connecting sewer and associated manhole(s) for the Subject Site.</td></tr>
</table>

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
		Should the Board consider appropriate, the Applicant would have no objection for stipulation of relevant approval conditions on submission of updated Sewerage Impact Assessment upon receipt of updated information on the sewerage system under discharge condition of the subject S16 planning application. The Applicant will remain close liaison with respective Government departments at subsequent development stages respectively. Relevant texts of the SIA report have been updated. Please see **Attachment B1** for reference.
7.22	Annex 2: Based on the assumed 3-min backwash duration, the instantaneous peak flow for Outdoor pool should be (8.21m³/day) / (180s/day) = 0.046m³/s instead of 0.023m³/s. Please check the calculations for both outdoor pool and indoor pool.	Noted. The swimming pool backwash calculated for outdoor pool and indoor pool is 0.046m^3/s and 0.031m^3/s respectively. Should the Board consider appropriate, the Applicant would have no objection for stipulation of relevant approval conditions on submission of updated SIA to update the swimming pool backwash under discharge condition of the subject S16 planning application.
7.23	Annex 3: Please specify the proposed invert levels of the upstream terminal manhole (i.e. FTMH01) and the downstream public manhole (FMH105a?) in the calculation.	Should the Board consider appropriate, the Applicant would have no objection for stipulation of relevant approval conditions on submission of updated SIA to specify the proposed invert levels of the upstream terminal manhole (I.e. FTMH01) and the downstream public manhole (FMH105a) when updated information becoming available under discharge condition of the subject S16 planning application.
7.24	Annex 3: For note (4), please confirm whether FMH01 refers to the proposed public manhole FMH105a to be constructed by CEDD.	Please be clarified that FMH01 refers to the proposed public manhole FMH105a to be constructed by CEDD. As per the responses-to-comments of Item 7.21 above, CEDD is reviewing the sewage flow to develop a holistic view of overall sewerage catchment and scheme. Should the Board consider appropriate, the Applicant would have no objection for stipulation of relevant approval conditions on submission of updated SIA under discharge condition of the subject S16 planning application.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
8.	**Comments from Chief Engineer / Mainland North, Drainage Services Department**	
	<u>DIA</u>	
8.1	Section 3 and 4 refers - Please confirm with CEDD to ensure the drainage characteristics of the subject site is consistent to that in the latest approved DIA.	Noted. Similar drainage characteristics is envisaged between a pure commercial development and commercial cum residential development. No additional runoff is anticipated.
	<u>SIA</u>	
8.2	Section 4.2.1 refers – Please verify whether the total ADWF in the base-case sewage estimation aligns with the latest approved SIA for HSK/HT/NDA. Should the base-case estimation vary, how would the additional sewage be accommodated by the pumping station?	Please note the total ADWF in the base-case sewage estimation is subjected to further review. With reference to the recently published 2026 Policy Address, 3 University Towns will be developed. One of which will be situated in the core area of Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area, which is located in the same sewage catchment of the Subject Site. Thus, the above changes in land use and planned development parameters of these original commercial sites will lead to changes in discharge to the HSK sewage pumping station No.1. In addition, sewage flow from other committed residential / commercial / mixed-use developments is necessary to be considered within the HSK/HT NDA. The entire sewage system of HSK/HT NDA will have to be reviewed again by respective Government department (e.g. CEDD) in one go taking into account all these changes in planned developments (i.e. UniTown, other committed developments nearby and the subject Proposed Development) Subject to the outcomes the above review, it is anticipated that the Government will be responsible for upgrading the public sewerage infrastructures including sewage pumping stations and sewage treatment work where necessary. Accordingly, the Applicant will undertake the upgrading works including connecting sewer and associated manhole(s) for the Subject Site.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
		Should the Board consider appropriate, the Applicant would have no objection for stipulation of relevant approval conditions on submission of updated SIA upon receipt of updated information on the sewerage system under discharge condition of the subject S16 planning application. The Applicant will remain close liaison with respective Government departments at subsequent development stages respectively. Relevant texts of the SIA report have been updated. Please see **Attachment B1** for reference.
8.3	Section 5.1.2 – Please confirm with CEDD to ensure the subject application has been taken into account in their updating SIA report and sewer and SPS design.	Noted. The Applicant will remain close liaison with CEDD at subsequent development stages to ensure the subject application has been taken into account in their updating SIA report and sewer and SPS design. As explained in responses-to-comments of Item 8.2 above, the overall sewerage arrangement and capacity will be reviewed in accordance with the latest planning framework. The Applicant would have no objection for stipulation of relevant approval conditions on submission of updated SIA upon receipt of updated information on the sewerage system under discharge condition of the subject S16 planning application. Relevant texts of the SIA report have been updated. Please see **Attachment B1** for reference.
8.4	Section 5.1.4 refers – it mentioned that sewage discharged from the Application Site contribute to about 7.2% of the capacity of the SPS1. Hence, the sewerage impact is considered insignificant. Please provide justification that this sewage discharge was already accounted for in the original design capacity of SPS1 and that no additional sewage has been introduced. In addition, please advise the original allowable sewage discharge from the Application Site.	Please refer to responses-to-comment of Items 8.2 and 8.3 above. With reference to the information provided by CEDD, the base case sewage flow is 1,517m^3/d which will be subjected to review at subsequent stages.

	Departmental Comments	Responses to Comments
8.5	Section 7.1.2 refers – please clarify the rationale for excluding swimming pool backwash.	Swimming pool backwash is an instantaneous peak flow rate instead of an average dry weather flow. Therefore, the ADWF presented in SIA is excluding the backwash for swimming pool. The peak flow generated from the Proposed Development has taken into account of the backwash for swimming pool for hydraulic checking.
8.6	The SIA report needs to meet the satisfaction of SIG/EPD, the planning authority of sewerage infrastructure.	Noted.