Co	mments from Related Departments and Public	Page No.
CO	MMENTS FROM RELATED DEPARTMENTS	2
1.	Buildings Department, New Buildings Division 1, Kowloon Section, dated 12 June 2025	
2.	Civil Engineering and Development Department, Civil Engineering Office, Port Works Division, I Section, dated 30 May 2025	District
3.	Development Bureau, Planning and Lands Branch, Planning Division, Harbour Office, dated 4 Jun	
4.	Drainage Services Department, Electrical and Mechanical Branch, Sewage Treatment Division 2, S. Treatment Division 2 Sub-Division 1, Sewage Treatment Division 2 Sub-Division 1/2, dated 2 Jun	Sewage
5.	Drainage Services Department, Operations & Maintenance Branch, Mainland South Division, Mai South 6(Tseung Kwan O, Sai Kung and Yau Tong), dated 2 June 2025	nland
6.	Environmental Protection Department, Environmental Assessment Division, Territory South Group Kowloon, dated 2 June 2025	
7.	Environmental Protection Department, Environmental Assessment Division, Territory South Group Kowloon, dated 3 June 2025	17
8.	Fire Services Department, Corporate Strategy Command, Planning and Development Division, dat 2025	
9.	Highways Department, Lighting Division, Section 2 (Kowloon, Shatin, Sai Kung, Tai Po Districts Lighting), dated 5 June 2025	
10.	Highways Department, Urban Region, District and Maintenance Section, Special Maintenance Sec Tunnels Section (Kowloon), District Section, dated 5 June 2025	
11.	Marine Department, Planning & Services Division, Planning, Development and Port Security Bran Planning and Development Section (1), dated 2 June 2025	
12.	Planning Department, District Planning Branch, Metro District Planning Division, Kowloon District Planning Office, dated 30 May 2025	
13.	Planning Department, District Planning Branch, Metro District Planning Division, Kowloon District Planning Office, dated 5 June 2025	ct
14.	Planning Department, District Planning Branch, Special Duties Division, Urban Design & Landsca Section, Urban Design Unit, dated 30 May 2025	аре
15.	Transport Department, Urban Regional Office, Traffic Engineering (Kln.) Division, Kln. District E	
	(South) Section, dated 30 May 2025	
PUl	BLIC COMMENTS	33
16.	Comments on Planning Considerations	33
17.	Comments on Impacts to Surrounding Developments	33

COMMENTS FROM RELATED DEPARTMENTS

No.	Comments	Responses
1.	Buildings Department, New Buildings Division 1, Kowloon Section, dated 12 June 2025	
	Further Information (No. 2) submitted on 25.4.2025	
	Application for bonus site coverage (SC) in return for surrender of land for street widening under regulation 22(2) of the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R) will be dealt with individually according to the special circumstances of each case subject to that the surrender is considered essential and acceptable to relevant government departments and the relevant criteria under PNAP APP-20 be complied with. Such application will be processed under the BO in the building plans submission stage.	Noted.
2.	Civil Engineering and Development Department, Civil Engineering Office, Port Works Division, District Section, dated 30 May 2025	
	We have no objection to the planning application from marine works point of view, please remind the applicant that the proposed design and facilities should be adaptive and could be enhanced progressively to cater for the threat of coastal risk, e.g. sea level rise, the threat of storm surges associated with tropical cyclones, wave overtopping, etc. in the future.	Noted.
3.	Development Bureau, Planning and Lands Branch, Planning Division, Harbour Office, dated 4 June 2025	
	Regarding Planning Application No. A/K15/132 for Proposed Flat, Shop and Services and Eating Place Uses with Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions at 4 Tung Yuen Street, Yau Tong, Kowloon. The Further Information (No. 2), including the applicant's responses to the major comments raised by Members of Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing (KTF) during the 49 th KTF meeting on 14 March 2025, has been circulated to KTF	Noted.

No.	Comments	Responses
	Members for their information and submit their comments, if any, to the Town Planning Board by 30 May 2025.	
	We have received one comment from one KTF Member, which is extracted below, which is generally in line with the discussion at the relevant KTF meeting. "I believe that the KTF meeting reached a clear consensus that if the proposed promenade can't connect the proposed harbourfront promenade and Ko Fai Road through the DSD site, HC would not support the captioned application."	Noted and please be advised that the Applicants would take up the construction works of the setback area fronting the Drainage Services Department (DSD)'s YTSPS (about 4.3m in width) (referred as "the Government Land" below) subject to the relevant Government departments' agreement on the draft basic terms below: 1. The Government Land shall be handed over to the Applicants free of structure, drainage system, fence wall, and any other associated facilities for the Applicants to carry out the construction works.
		2. The handover of the Government Land to the Applicants shall occur on or before 18 months from the proposed date of Building Covenant to facilitate carrying out the construction works.
		3. The Government Land shall be designated as a Yellow Area under the provision of the Land Grant to allow for the Applicants to carry out the construction works.
		4. The Applicants will undertake only for the construction of paving blocks, barrier, handrail and similar structures of the proposed waterfront promenade on the about 4.3m-wide Government Land.
		5. Upon the completion of the pavement construction at the Government Land, the area shall be handed over to LCSD upon their request and to their satisfaction.
		6. All detailed technical specifications shall be provided by LandsD/LCSD including type of paving, fence wall, railing, lighting, lux level, drainage, etc.
		7. The construction of proposed waterfront promenade at the setback area of the

No.	Comments	Responses
		DSD's YTSPS will only be provided subject to premium deduction. Subject to the above, the Applicants are committed to coordinate on the design of the proposed waterfront promenade at the Application Site and the setback area fronting DSD's YTSPS to ensure a coherent and seamless public experience.
4.	Drainage Services Department, Electrical and Mechanical Branch, Sewage Treatment Division 2, Sewage Treatment Division 2 Sub- Division 1, Sewage Treatment Division 2 Sub- Division 1/2, dated 2 June 2025	
	Please find the 1st batch of comments from ST2/DSD as follows: - 1. SIA section 3.5: Please critically review the estimated sewage flow for YTSPS. The estimated sewage flow for YTSPS is significantly deviated from the current flow of YTSPS, i.e. the average daily flow at YTSPS in Feb and Mar 2025 are 18,287 and 17,443 m3/day respectively. The 2024 daily flow data is extracted as follows: - Max Average	With reference the information from DSD, the average daily flow at YTSPS of March 2025 is 17,443 m³/day, and the estimated sewage generated Proposed Development is about 352 m³/day. Therefore, the estimated sewage generated Proposed Development with average daily flow at YTSPS is 17,795 m³/day, which the flow is occupied about 62% of the current capacity of YTSPS. It is unlikely that the YTSPS will be overloaded.
	Jan-24 1960217973.29 Feb-24 2237417287.45 Mar-24 2158217264.32 Apr-24 24750 17311.8 May-24 2217618279.87 Jun-24 21186 18202.8 Jul-24 3504617692.26 Aug-24 2435417711.42 Sep-24 29106 19258.8 Oct-24 2494817596.45 Nov-24 38412 19166.4 Dec-24 23562 19154.9	
	2. In view of a planned enhancement in YTSPS, there would be fan noise not exceeding 70dBA at the roof level of the pump house of YTSPS. The applicant shall review whether the noise level from	Noted, the comments would be addressed in the detailed assessment through the approval condition to demonstrate that the proposed development could comply with relevant

No.	Comments	Responses
	the fan is acceptable at the noise sensitive receivers, if otherwise, shall adopt noise mitigating designs at the affected receivers.	guidelines issued by government departments.
5.	Drainage Services Department, Operations & Maintenance Branch, Mainland South Division, Mainland South 6(Tseung Kwan O, Sai Kung and Yau Tong), dated 2 June 2025	
	1. RtC Item 2 and Section 3.4.2 Table 3.1 - Please review the design flow under 2. Club House and 4. Retail;	Noted and revised in Section 3.4.2 Table 3.1 of Appendix E (Updated Drainage & Sewerage Impact Assessment).
	2. RtC Item 3, Section 3.4.2 Table 3.1, Section 3.5.1 and Appendix 3.1 Table 1 - The catchment inflow factor should be 1.1 for East Kowloon, please revise the peak flow accordingly;	Noted and revised in Section 3.4.2 Table 3.1, Section 3.5.1 and Appendix 3.1 Table 1 of Appendix E.
	3. Figures 3.1 & 3.2 and Appendix 3.1 Table 3c - Please check whether "FMD4036721" should be read as "FWD4036721". In accordance with the EPD's Guidelines, the sewage flows should be estimated based on the cumulative average flows/contributing population from all the upstream catchment areas concerned. However, this methodology/approach is not adopted in your sewage flow estimation for pipe segments FWD4036721, FWD4036773 and FWD4125280. This could lead to uncertainty in the subsequent assessment, which may over-estimate or under-estimate the hydraulic impact in checking against the various upper-bound and lower-bound requirements. Please provide justifications and supporting assumptions for not using the EPD's methodology/approach in your sewage flow estimation. Please note that your proposed methodology/approach should be subject to the views and agreement of the SIG/EPD as the planning authority of sewerage infrastructure;	Regarding the pipe segments FWD4036721, FWD4036773 and FWD4125280, we assume the pipes are in full-bore flow (i.e.,100% capacitive). Based on the consultant's experience, this assumption presents the worst-case scenario and would not lead to uncertainty in the subsequent assessment (i.e. over-estimate or underestimate the hydraulic impact). The assessment is based on the best available information to estimate the hydraulic impact. It would be more realistic and appropriate to address the above comments with latest detailed information through given approval condition in the upcoming detailed design and construction stage to demonstrate that the proposed development could comply with relevant guidelines issued by government departments.
	4. Appendix 3.1 Table 3b - Please check and revise the Peak Flow (Without Swimming Pool) of Catchment B;	Noted and revised in Appendix 3.1 Table 3b of Appendix E .
	5. Appendix 3.1 Table 4a - Please verify whether the "Estimated Flow including the	Noted and revised in Appendix 3.1 Table 4a of Appendix E .
1	1	Page 5 of 33

No.	Comments	Responses
	Proposed Development and Catchment Areas (L/s)" has already accounted for the upstream flows from FWD4036773 and FWD4125280; and	
	6. Please supplement your calculations in Excel format for DSD review separately.	Noted.
	Please note this is a coordinated reply of LDD and MSD of DSD. Comments on the DIA report will be provided separately.	Noted.
6.	Environmental Protection Department, Environmental Assessment Division, Territory South Group, Kowloon, dated 2 June 2025	
	The applicant has to address all of EPD comments and demonstrate the overall environmental acceptability of the proposed development before we could lend support to the captioned application.	Noted
	EPD's comments on revised DSIA report at Appendix E	
	Specific comments	
	Section 3.2.3	
	The previous comment has not been addressed:	
	Please supplement the UFF for Job Type J11 Community, Social & Personal Services in the text for the avoidance of doubt	Noted and revised in Section 3.2.3 of Appendix E .
	Section 3.2.3	
	The previous comment has not been fully addressed:	
	Typo "Private RR" is found in Section 3.2.3, please revise accordingly.	Noted and revised in Section 3.2.3 of Appendix E .
	Appendix 3.1 Table 1	
	For Appendix 3.1 Table 1, please review the UFF of residential housing to be Private R-1 or Private R-2	Noted and revised in Appendix 3.1 Table 1 of Appendix E .
	Section 3.4.1 Table 3.1	
	- Part 2 Club House	
	I	Page 6 of 33

	Responses
- Part 4 Retail	
The previous comment has not been fully addressed:	
Please supplement the design flow for commercial employee for Club House and Retail in the calculations for the avoidance of doubt.	Noted and revised in Table 3.1 of Appendix E .
Section 3.4.1 Table 3.1	
- Appendix 3.1 Table 1	
- Appendix 3.1 Table 3a	
- Appendix 3.1 Table 3b	
The previous comment has not been fully addressed:	
Please include the catchment inflow factor of East Kowloon in the calculation of peak flows	Noted and please refer to Appendix E for updates.
Section 4.1.2	
This section does not tally with Section 3.5.2 Table 3.2, please review and revise the ID of sewer segments to be upgraded.	Noted and revised in Section 4.1.2 of Appendix E .
Figure 3.1 and Figure 3.2	
Please review and revise the ID of manhole S4	Noted and revised in Figures 3.1 and 3.2 of Appendix E .
Appendix 3.1 Table 2a	
Given some of the invert levels in the hydraulic capacity checking are based on assumption, site surveys at the later stage to verify the invert levels and revised SIA Report should be provided accordingly	Noted and revised in Appendix 3.1 Table 2a of Appendix E .
Appendix 3.1 Table 2a and 4	
Please review and revise the manhole ID of sewer segment S2-S3	Noted and revised in Appendix 3.1 Table 2a and 4 of Appendix E .
Appendix 3.1 Table 3a	
- Part 2 (18 Tung Yuen Street)	

No.	Comments	Responses
	 Part 4 (Other Proposed Residential Development ref. YTML No. 69 & YTIL No. 4RP) 	
	 Part 5 (Kwun Tong Wholesale Fish Market and Tung Yuen Street Cooked Food Market) 	
	- Part 6 (Peninsula East)	
	- Part 7 (Redland Concrete Limited)	
	The previous comment has not been fully addressed:	
	Please provide the breakdown of the estimation of sewage generation from the corresponding catchments.	Noted and please refer to Appendix E for updates.
	Please also delete "from EPD" for the avoidance of doubt	Noted and please refer to Appendix E for updates.
	- Appendix 3.1 Table 3a, 3b and 3c	
	The previous comment has not been fully addressed:	
	Please indicate the sub-catchments in the layout plan for clarity	Noted and please refer to Appendix E for updates.
	General Comments	
	Please re-visit the assessment based on the above comments.	Noted.
	Please note that the implementation of sewerage works shall also meet the satisfaction of DSD.	Noted.
	3. Please note that EPD only provides comments on contents related to sewerage planning. For contents related to drainage impact, please seek views from DSD.	Noted.
	4. The consultant is suggested to provide softcopy of the report (in pdf) as well as all Response to Comments from EPD and DSD as appendix. Please also highlight the revised / updated content of the SIA report in next submission to facilitate review. {Please submit the Calculation spreadsheet (in Excel spreadsheet) to EPD	Noted.

No.	Comments	Responses
	for checking and no need to submit the spreadsheet as part of the SIA report}	
	EPD's comments on revised EA at Appendix <u>F</u>	
	Noise impact	
	It is expected that noise mitigation measures are available for addressing potential noise impacts (including road traffic and fixed noise) associated with the proposed development and thus we have no objection to the proposed development from noise planning point of view. Having said that, should be application be approved, the applicant is required under planning conditions to submit an updated noise impact assessment (NIA) in the detailed design for the latest development scheme to recommend noise mitigation measures to achieve full compliance with the noise criteria/requirement of the HKPSG & NCO. Please also find below our observations on the current NIA:-	Noted.
	1. Noise model: Based on Appendix 1.1, the 1 st NAP has changed from 22.3m to 21.35m compared to the previous report. Please check and update noise model.	Noted. The comments would be addressed in the detailed assessment through the approval condition to demonstrate that the proposed development could comply with relevant guidelines issued by government departments.
	2. s3.3.1: Please supplement TD's endorsement on traffic forecast data in Year 2047.	Noted. TD's endorsement has been attached in Appendix 3.1 of Appendix F (Replacement Pages of Updated Environmental Assessment).
	3. s4.2.2 & s4.3.1: According to Rtc (4), fixed noise sources of Ajisen Group Tower and Safer Industrial Building are out of the 300m assessment area. The mentioned buildings should be removed from s4.2.2 and s4.3.1.	Noted and updated.
	4. s4.3.1: The Hong Kong Government issued an announcement on 07/04/2025, stating that China Concrete Company Limited was closed due to illegal operations.	Noted and updated in S4.3.1 of Appendix F .
	5. Table 4.2: The information from press releases by the Hong Kong Government dated 07/04/2025 mentioned that China Concrete Company Limited was closed	Noted and updated in Table 4.2 of Appendix F .

No.	Comments	Responses
	down due to illegal operations. Please review if the concrete company's fixed noise sources should be removed from Table 4.2.	
	6. Table 4.5	
	- The nighttime noise criteria for F1-02, F1-03 & F1-04 were incorrectly stated.	Noted and revised in Table 4.5 of Appendix F .
	 The predicted noise level for F2-02 to F2-05 & F2-07 during day & evening time should be 63 dB(A) instead of 62 dB(A). It is inconsistent with the calculation from Appendix 4.6. 	Noted and revised in Table 4.5 of Appendix F .
	Table 4.5 Industrial Noise Impact Assessment Results under mitigated Scenario	
	NSR ID ASR Day & Evening, dB(A) Predicted Noise Level, dB(A) Day & Evening, dB(A) dB(A	
	7. Rtc (6): Typing error: The SPL of QJ_1 should be 66.2dB(A) instead of 66.8dB(A) in Appendix 4.3.	Noted and revised in Appendix 4.3 of Appendix F .
	Waste management and land contamination	
	issues	
	(1) Response to Comment (6) - Para. 5.4.1 In addition to excavation and site formation, please clarify whether C&D materials are anticipated from site clearance, demolition of existing buildings, and superstructure works. The Consultant shall update the information accordingly to tally the content under the sub header "Key source of C&D materials."	Noted and updated in S5.4.1 of Appendix F .
	(2) Response to Comment (8) and (20)-Para. 5.4.5	
	(a) Please revise "inert and non-insert materials" to "inert and non-inert C&D materials"	Noted and revised in S5.4.5 of Appendix F .

No.	Comments	Responses
	(b) Please clarify why non-inert C&D materials are anticipated during the basement excavation.	Noted and revised in S5.4.5 of Appendix F .
	(c) Considering the Project Site is situated on reclaimed land, the Consultant shall review whether land-based sediment is present. The Consultant shall review the geological profile within or close to the Project Site and the excavation requirements of this Project to determine the necessity of assessing the waste management implications arising from land-based sediment in this Study. If affirmative, please briefly elaborate on the quantity estimation, handling arrangement, disposal options, and mitigation measures to be incorporated.	Noted and please refer to Appendix F for updates.
	(3) Response to Comment (6)–Para. 5.4.10	
	Based on the estimation in Para. 5.4.5, the Consultant shall review and clarify the requirement of this Project regarding the disposal of non-inert C&D materials.	Noted and revised in S5.4.10 of Appendix F .
	(4) Response to Comment (14) – Section 5.4 (Asbestos Containing Materials)	
	Since ACM is classified as chemical waste, please relocate them to proper locations after Paragraph 5.4.14.	Noted and relocated to S5.4.15 to 5.4.17 of Appendix F.
	(5) Para. 5.4.15	
	To evaluate the accuracy of the quantity estimation for general refuse in Table 5.1, the Consultant shall supplement the assumption adopted, including but not limited to (i) the disposal rate and (ii) the number of workers.	Noted and updated in S5.4.15 of Appendix F .
	(6) Response to Comment (15)-Table 5.1	
	(a) Regarding the quantity for on-site and off- site reuse of C&D materials, the Consultant is advised to discuss the portion for inert and non-inert C&D materials separately for clarity.	Noted please refer to Table 5.2 of Appendix F .

No.	Comments	Responses
	(b) Please clarify why non-inert C&D materials are anticipated from basement excavation.	Please note that there would be about 1,620m³ non-inert C&D materials generated during the basement excavation.
	(c) Please review whether land-based sediment is anticipated in the basement excavation.	Please note that there would be about 4,860m³ land-based sediment generated during the basement excavation.
	(d) The Consultant is advised to elaborate further on the assumption adopted for GFA in the quantity estimation of C&D materials for constructing new buildings/structures.	With reference the MLP and development parameter, the total GFA of the Proposed Development is not more than 16,691.1m ² .
	(e) The previous comment has not been duly addressed. Although no information is currently available for the quantity estimation for ACM, the Consultant shall specify the nature of the concerned construction activity as well as the recommended disposal outlet.	Noted please refer to Table 5.2 of Appendix F .
	(f) Should land-based sediment be anticipated, please incorporate its estimation and recommended outlet for clarity.	Noted please refer to Table 5.2 of Appendix F .
	(g) For consistency, please keep in either "tonnes" or tones" in footnote (c).	Noted and updated in Table 5.1 of Appendix F .
	(h) The Consultant is advised to supplement the conversion factor adopted from volume-based to weight-based units for C&D materials. Please be reminded that different conversion factors shall be adopted for inert and non-inert C&D materials.	Noted and updated in Table 5.1 of Appendix F .
	(i) Please discuss and estimate the number of dump trucks for inert and non-inert C&D materials separately.	Noted and updated in Table 5.1 of Appendix F .
	(7) Response to Comment (20) - Para. 5.5.17	
	(a) Considering that Section 5.5 is designated for discussing mitigation measures during the construction phase, the Consultant is advised to relocate the content related to land-based sediment to the proper location in Section 5.4.	Noted and updated. Please refer to S5.4.21 to S5.4.24 of Appendix F for updates.

No.	Comments	Responses
	(b) Please revise "marine sediment" to "land-based sediment" to avoid confusion.	Noted and updated. Please refer to S5.4.21 to S5.4.24 of Appendix F for updates.
	(c) The Consultant is advised to elaborate further on the location of the reference GI records and provide further details to evaluate its relevance.	Noted and updated. Please refer to S5.4.21 to S5.4.24 of Appendix F for updates
	(d) Should relevant GI records be available, the Consultant is advised to supplement such records and provide an estimation of the quantity of land-based sediment.	Noted and updated. Please refer to Table 5.1 of Appendix F for updates.
	(e) The Consultant shall elaborate further on the measures to be taken and the corresponding requirement for reusing excavated land-based sediment on-site.	Noted and updated. Please refer to S5.5.17 to S5.5.26 of Appendix F for updates
	(8) Response to Comment (20)–Appendix 5.1	
	The Consultant shall supplement the locational plan to show the drillhole location and its distance from the Project Site.	Noted and updated. Please refer to Appendix 5.1 of Appendix F for updates.
	(9) Response to Comment (19)–Para. 5.6.1	
	(a) For clarity, please revise "residential and recreational such as" to "residential and recreational uses such as" in the first sentence.	Noted and revised in S5.6.1 of Appendix F .
	(b) To avoid confusion, please do not quote the disposal rate for MSW in the second sentence.	Noted and revised in S5.6.1 of Appendix F .
	(c) Please revise "general waste" to "general refuse" to avoid confusion.	Noted and revised in S5.6.1 of Appendix F .
	(d) The quantity estimation for the disposal of general refuse is inaccurate. Based on those anticipated from the domestic use alone (i.e., 855 x 0.89 = 761kg/day) would have exceeded the current estimation of 614kg/day. The Consultant shall carefully review and estimate the quantity of general refuse that will be generated, disposed of, and recovered daily.	Noted and revised in S5.6.1 of Appendix F .
	(e) To facilitate vetting, please compile a summary table with separate columns for quantity estimation of general refuse from the domestic and C&I sectors.	Noted please refer to Table 5.2 of Appendix F .

No.	Comments	Responses
	(10) Response to Comment (21)- Para. 5.6.6	
	Please specify the personnel responsible for collecting and disposing of chemical waste during this Project's operation phase.	Noted and revised in S5.6.6 of Appendix F
	(11) Section 5.7	
	The Consultant is advised to elaborate further on the type of waste to be generated from the construction and operation of the Project.	Noted and revised in S5.7 of Appendix F .
	(12) Response to Comment (22)–Table 6.1	
	(a) Please revise the description for 1972 as follow: "The Application Site was become vacant land".	Noted and revised in Table 6.1 of Appendix F .
	(b) According to the aerial photograph from 1976, there were some activities on the Project Site, with suspected construction sites for the Wah Tung Godown Building. To avoid confusion, please revise the land use and description.	Noted and revised in Table 6.1 of Appendix F .
	(c) The Consultant is advised to elaborate further on the land use immediately adjacent to the Wah Tung Godown Building (i.e., the two buildings adjacent to the Project Site).	Noted and updated in Table 6.1 of Appendix F .
	(13) Response to Comment (23)–Appendix 6.1	
	The Consultant is advised to graphically indicate the location of the Redland Concrete Batch Plant to facilitate vetting.	Noted and updated in Appendix 6.1 of Appendix F .
	(14) Response to Comment (24)–Appendix 6.2	
	(a) The previous comment has not been duly addressed. The Consultant is advised to clarify whether a site interview with the current or previous occupier was conducted.	Questionnaire with existing Site owner is not applicable as the Existing Site owner didn't join the Site walkover.
	(b) Please further elaborate on the nature of the off-site contamination source, "Redland Concrete Ltd. Ldt." as filled in item 9 of the "Observation" table in the site walkover checklist.	The Table 6.3 (original Table 6.2) of Appendix F has been updated. Irrelated information has been deleted.

No.	Comments	Responses
	(15) Response to Comment (23)–Para. 6.2.6	
	(a) The last sentence is confusing. Please review and clarify why potential land contamination issues within the Project Site need to be further ascertained, considering that the ground level of the existing building has been designated as a car park, with no land contamination potential.	The sentence has been deleted.
	(b) According to Photo 6 enclosed in Appendix 6.2, a suspected chemical container is identified. The Consultant shall elaborate further on its nature and clarify whether any chemical is stored at such locations.	It is the water container for planting. No chemical is stored at the locations.
	(16) Response to Comment (25)–Para. 6.2.7	
	(a) According to photographic records 7 & 8 in Appendix 6.2, non-road mobile machinery and suspected containers and drums were identified from the peripheral inspection. The Consultant is advised to elaborate further on the land use and potential land contaminative activities from the concrete batching plant (CBP).	Access to the plant was not granted as it is still in operation. However, a peripheral inspection of the site revealed no signs of obvious or suspected contamination, such as oil staining, abnormal odors, or dangerous goods and chemical storage. It can be considered that the potential land contamination problem arising from the CBP is not anticipated.
		It is recommended that a further detailed site appraisal may be required to determine whether the site is contaminated in later stage.
	(b) Please revise the second sentence as follows: "As the plant are is still in operation, access was not granted, a site peripheral inspection outside the plant was also conducted instead."	Noted and updated in S6.2.7 of Appendix F .
	(c) While the site was inaccessible during the site walkover, the Consultant shall clarify whether questionnaire was conducted with the occupier to acquire further information of the adjacent site to evaluate its land contamination potential to the Project Site.	It is observed that the ground floor of the CBP generally consists of the carpark for loading/unloading activities, and the ground of the plant was fully paved in good condition. No sign of obvious / suspected contamination such as oil staining, abnormal odour, dangerous goods storage and/ or chemical storage within the area during the site inspection. Therefore, it can be considered that the potential land

No.	Comments	Responses
		contamination problem arising from the CBP is not anticipated.
	(17) Response to Comment (26) and (27) - Appendix 6.3 and Para. 6.2.8	
	Due to the low resolution of the layout plan extracted from BRAVO, the Consultant shall review and clarify whether there is any transformer room in the building. If affirmative, the Consultant is advised to reach out to CLP for further information on the O&M of the transformer room in question, including but not limited to (i) the nature of chemical or fuel used, (ii) spillage and leakage records, (iii) paving condition, to facilitate the vetting of its land contamination potential.	Further review of the floor plan for the Wah Tung godown confirms that there is no transformer room in the building. Therefore, potential land contamination issues are not anticipated.
	(18) Response to Comment (29)- Appendix 6.4 and Para 6.2.10	
	The previous comment has not been duly addressed. While the Consultant specified there are 3 CWP registrations within the Application Site, please elaborate further and compile a summary table with information including but not limited to (i) identity of the CWP, (ii) nature of business, (iii) chemical type, (iv) address, and (v) activeness/validity. For clarity, please also specify the date of inspection of the registry of chemical waste producers. It is understood that information will be supplemented once available. We reserve the right to offer further comment on their land contamination potential.	Noted and updated, the information has been summarized in Table 6.2 of Appendix F .
	(19) Response to Comment (28) and (30)– Appendix 6.4 and Table 6.2	
	(a) The reply letter from the PlanD is incomplete. The Consultant shall carefully review and supplement the full set of relevant information to facilitate vetting the summary tabulated in Table 6.2.	Noted and updated in Table 6.3 of Appendix F .
	(b) Please review whether the description of "Not in a position to provide on the land contamination issues" is consistent with the return from PlansD. If not, please update it accordingly to avoid confusion.	Noted and updated in Table 6.3 of Appendix F .
	(20) Response to Comment (32)–Para. 6.3.2	

No.	Comments	Responses
	(a) The content in Paragraph 6.3.2 does not tally the information discussed previously in Section 6.2. The Consultant is advised to incorporate an additional sub-section to discuss and evaluate the land contamination potential of the Project Site before determining whether further site investigation will be required. Please be reminded to focus on the land contamination potential (i) at the ground level of the existing industrial building and (ii) at the CBP immediately adjacent to the Project Site.	Noted and revised in S6.3.1 of Appendix F .
	(b) The Consultant shall carefully distinguish the difference between "site investigation" and site appraisal". Please be advised that site investigation covers the soil and groundwater sampling works.	Noted.
	EPD's comments on revised AQIA at Appendix G	
	To be provided.	Noted.
7.	Environmental Protection Department, Environmental Assessment Division, Territory South Group, Kowloon, dated 3 June 2025	
	Planning Application No. A/K15/132 - Further Information (No. 2)	
	AQIA Comments	
	R-to-C	
	1. R-to-C #24 & Appendix 2.11: The road link map as provided in Appendix 2.11 should be overlayed with PATH grids. Please show the 500m assessment area and remove those catchment areas. Besides, please indicate the road links with start emission; and label Road Link No.74 in the map. Please provide the map with higher resolution.	Appendix 2.11 of Appendix G (Replacement Pages of Updated Air Quality Impact Assessment) is updated.
	2. R-to-C #32 & Section 2.11.8: [Ref-2] is inserted in the text but no reference is provided. Please rectify it.	It should be referred to Ref 4. Typo is revised in S2.11.8 of Appendix G .

No.	Comments	Responses
	3. R-to-C #39 & Figure 2.2: The locations of A05 and A06 have not been revised in Figure 2.2.	For the point of the nearest air sensitive sues from the site to the proposed development, contour ASRs have been adopted to assess and the contour map can be referred to Appendix 2.14 of Appendix G .
	4. R-to-C #40 & Figure 2.4: The name of the CBP has not been included in Figure 2.4. Please also include the locations and names of Sand Depot (YTML 25 &Ext), Architectural Salvage Store(YTML 26 &Ext) and 全記五金貿易有限公司 into the figure.	Location and name of "Redland Concrete Ltd." and "YTML 25&Ext" are included in Figure 2.4 of Appendix G.
	5. R-to-C #14, #46 & #48 & Appendix 2.8 & 2.11: Please review and confirm if the trucks only transport inside the CBP at the emission source L21 (i.e. road link #74 in Appendix 2.11). Also, the haul road shown in Appendix 2.11 does not match with the road on Figure 2.4. Please review and check.	Based on on-site observation, the trucks only transport inside the CBP at the emission source L21 (i.e. road link #74 in Appendix 2.11). And road link #74 in Appendix 2.11 of Appendix G has been updated to ensure the presentation consistency.
	6. R-to-C #46 & Appendix 2.11, please review and clarify if the trucks in Road ID 74 include both IN and OUT directions. If yes, the Total Vehicles(Veh/hr) should be doubled to 34 instead of 17. Besides, please provide reference for the assumption of their speed.	The trucks in Road ID 74 does not include IN and OUT directions. The Total Vehicle (Veh/hr) of 17 and average speed (km/hr) of 5 are based on on-site observation. Please refer to updated Appendix 2.11 of Appendix G .
	7. R-to-C #49 & #51: Please provide relevant pages from the referenced report for reference.	Referenced report for the assumption of 22 tonnes as the average weight of vehicles in the calculation of emission factor for paved road and the locations of emission sources which are identified in Figure 2.4 are presented in Appendix 2.22 of Appendix G .
	Report	
	1. Section 2.2: Please also discuss the requirements in HKPSG and the criteria for the quantitative odour impact assessment.	Section 2.2 of Appendix G is updated.
	2. Table 2.1: The column label should read "Averaging Time" and "No. of exceedances allowed per calendar year".	Table 2.1 of Appendix G is revised accordingly.
	3. Table 2.1: Please provide the full name of the pollutants similar to Table 2.3.	Table 2.1 of Appendix G is revised accordingly.

No.	Con	nments	Responses
	4.	Table 2.3: Please repeat the header row if the table splits across two pages.	Table 2.3 of Appendix G is revised accordingly.
	5.	Tables 2.3 & 2.4: Please bold all the values which exceed the AQOs.	Tables 2.3 and 2.4 of Appendix G are revised accordingly.
	6.	Table 2.5: Please ensure the nearby air sensitive uses have been identified as ASRs e.g. any air sensitive uses such as office at Redland CBP and Kwun Tong Wholesale Fish Market, etc.	Please refer to updated Table 2.6 and Figure 2.2 of Appendix G .
	7.	Table 2.5: Please check whether A04 should be named as "The Coast Line I".	Planned Residential Development (Application No. A/K15/122) is divided into two application sites and still under construction stage, namely The Coast Line I and The Coast Line II. For better presentation. name of "The Coast Line I and The Coast Line II" is added in to description of A04 and A20 in Table 2.6 of Appendix G .
	8.	Section 2.5.7: Please clarify whether regular site audit would be carried out to monitor the dust mitigation measures.	For example, regular site audit would be carried out to monitor the dust mitigation measures.
			Please refer to updated S2.5.7 of Appendix G .
	9.	Section 2.7.1: Please revise as follows:which cannot satisfyied the buffer distance	S2.7.1 of Appendix G is revised accordingly.
	10.	Section 2.7.5 and 2.11: Please supplement in Appendix the details of site visits, including the date, time, temperature, relative humidity, patrol route, relevant photos and odour assessment results, etc.	Please refer to updated S2.7.2, S2.11 and Figure 2.7 of Appendix G.
	11.	Section 2.7.10: Please specify the year of the cessation of the concrete batching plants.	The year of the cessation of the concrete batching plants is updated in S2.7.10 of Appendix G .
	12.	Section 2.7.11: "Annex I" should read "Annex 2" and "Technical, Management and Monitoring Requirements" should read "Best Practicable Means" in the quoted BPM.	S2.7.11 of Appendix G is revised accordingly.

No.	Comments	Responses
	13. Sections 2.7.13 & 23: Please revise the discussion of "three concrete batching plants" as only one CBP is considered now.	S2.7.13 and 2.7.24 to 2.7.26 of Appendix G are revised accordingly.
	14. Section 2.7.14: Please provide the source of information regarding the enclosed operation environment for sand refilling activities and sand storage area of barge.	The information of the enclosed operation environment for sand refilling activities and sand storage area of barge are based on several site visits. S2.7.14 of Appendix G is revised.
	15. Section 2.7.17: Please supplement the discussion on the information and assumption for the barges serving Architectural Salvage Store and Sand Depot.	The discussion on the information and assumption for the barges serving Architectural Salvage Store Architectural Salvage Store (全記五金貿易有限公司), Sand Depot (YTML 25 &Ext) and Architectural Salvage Store (YTML 26 &Ext) are included in S2.7.24, S2.7.25 and S2.7.26 of Appendix G respectively.
	16. Section 2.7.17: please check and clarify why there are two sources of barge serving Architectural Salvage Store (also YTML 26 & Ext) but only one such route is presented in Figure 2.5. Besides, please clarify what the marine emission source – Kam Kee Recycle Barge is in Figure 2.5, which is not discussed in this Section.	Please note there are one source of barge serving Sand Depot (YTML 25 &Ext) (i.e. Source ID: SD01 to SD27); one source of barge serving Architectural Salvage Store (YTML 26 & Ext) (i.e. Source ID: YTB01 to YTP25); and one source of barge serving Architectural Salvage Store (全記五金貿易有限公司) (i.e. Source ID: TK01 to TK21).
		The discussion on the information and assumption for the barges serving Architectural Salvage Store Architectural Salvage Store (全記五金貿易有限公司) is included in S2.7.24 of Appendix G .
	17. Section 2.7.22: Please clarify the number of location/unloading point for the CBP (is it three?) and the maximum number of barges in operation.	In additions, only one barge can berth at one loading/ unloading point at any one time based on observation, therefore, the maximum number of barge in operation at any time would be one.
	18. Section 2.7.23: Please review if the discussion here is contradicting with Section 2.7.14 regarding the enclosed sand storage area.	It is clarified that the raw materials stored on the barge was not fully enclosed on some occasions, wind erosion of raw materials may impose negative impact on the Proposed Development. Therefore, the wind erosion of raw materials from barge at the concrete batching plant is included in the assessment.

No.	Comments	Responses
		S2.7.14 of Appendix G is revised accordingly while the paragraph in S2.7.23 of Appendix G is removed.
	19. Section 2.8.9: Please update the number of road links.	S2.8.9 of Appendix G is revised accordingly.
	20. Section 2.8.10: Please be reminded to provide the endorsement of TD on the traffic data.	TD's endorsement on the traffic data is provided in Appendix 2.11 of Appendix G .
	21. Section 2.11: In view of the proximity of Yau Tong Sewage Pumping Station to the proposed development, please assess its odour impact in the quantitative odour impact assessment. Otherwise, strong justifications should be provided for excluding it from the quantitative odour impact assessment.	Upon the visits, no identifiable odour was detected at the site boundary of the sewage pumping station and the junction of Shung Tai Wai and Tung Yuen Street. In addition, according to the reply from EPD's regional office (see Appendix 2.18 of Appendix G), there is no odour complaint in the concerned area such as Yau Tong Sewage Pumping Station, concrete batching plant & Wholesale Fish Market.
		Based on the latest information from DSD, enhancement work would be carried out at YTSPS and the tentative completion of the enhancement project is 2032. The proposed enhancement works involves provision of deodourisation system, with target odour emission after the enhancement similar to new typical sewage pumping station subject to funding and detailed design. Correspondence with DSD is provided in Appendix 2.11. Furthermore, a separate odour impact assessment for YTSPS with proposed enhancement work would be prepared for relevant departments (EPD & DSD)' approval and the occupation date of the Proposed Development would not be earlier than the completion date of YTSPS enhancement works. With the consideration of the above findings, odour impact from sewage pumping station is not anticipated. Please refer to updated S2.11.3-4, S3.1.5-S3.1.6 of Appendix G.
	22. Section 2.11.9: Please clarify if the said improvement work should be completed more than one year before the operation of the Project as the project will commence in 2032 instead.	Based on the latest information from DSD, enhancement work would be carried out at YTSPS and the tentative completion of the enhancement project is 2032. And the occupation date of the Proposed Development would not be earlier than the

No.	Comments	Responses
		completion date of YTSPS enhancement works.
	23. Section 3: Please also discuss the results for construction phase.	Adequate dust suppression mitigation measures will be implemented during construction phase of the Project so that adverse air quality impact is not anticipated.
	24. Section 3.1.1: Please supplement a separate figure to indicate the exceedance area and its concerned levels, and state that air sensitive uses, openable windows and fresh air intakes will not be located there.	Please refer to S3.1.3-S3.1.4 and Appendix 2.21 of Appendix G.
	25. Figure 2.1: Please overlay the PATH grid on this figure.	Figure 2.1 of Appendix G is updated.
	Appendix 2.2	
	1. Please supplement a table showing the barge schedule.	The barge schedule is supplemented in Appendix 2.2 of Appendix G .
	2. Calculations of Emission Sources with Concrete Batching Plant (CBP): Please update the description with the updated BPM in Note [2].	Note [2] in Appendix 2.2 of Appendix G is updated.
	3. Calculations of Emission Sources with Concrete Batching Plant (CBP): There is no SP information on Redland Concrete Ltd in the referenced EIA Report. Please review and revise the reference for the operation hour in Note [4].	As stated in the referenced EIA Report (Section 3.5.2.12 in approved EIA EIA-258/2018 - Lei Yue Mun Waterfront Enhancement Project), the operation hour of a CBP, typically 07:00 - 19:00, 12 hours a day.
	Appendix 2.3	
	 The first remark under the calculation of emission factor for wind erosion at sand dunes is not shown completely. 	Noted and revised in Appendix 2.3 of Appendix G .
	2. Emission Factor for Barge of Sand Depot (YTML 25 &Ext) and Architectural Salvage Store (YTML 26 &Ext): The input values of	Time-In-Mode for Maneuvering for YTML 26&Ext is revised.
	Time-In-Mode for Maneuvering for YTML 26&Ext are incorrect.	In views of the distance between the emission source and Subject Site (approx. over 320m) and the infrequent event of vessel activity for Architectural Salvage Store (YTML 26 &Ext) which assumed one barge hotelling during the operation hours (i.e. 0700-1900) in the assessment, it is assumed that the emission contribution from the vessel activity for Architectural Salvage

Appendix 2.4 1. Calculations of Time-In-Mode (TIM) for Marine Vessels: The discussion on the average travelling speed in Note [2] for the calculations of Time-In-Mode is incomplete. Appendix 2.7 1. Please present the SO2 emission factor and emission rate. Appendix 2.8 1. Wind Erosion of Sand Barge — Area Source [Note 1]: There is no relevant information extracted in Appendix 2.3. Please review and revise the reference. 2. The assumed mean sea levels are different between wind erosion and marine emissions. Please review and ensure the consistency. 3. Please review and revise the referenced Appendix as stated in "Operation Hours" for YTML 25&Ext, YTML 26 &Ex, 全記 五金貿易有限公司, fishing vessels and planned local vessel. 4. Input Parameters of Major Point Sources in AERMOD: Please review and revise the Note numbering. Appendix 2.10 1. Please present the Met Summary of all the PATH grids inside the assessment area. Appendix 2.13 1. AQO for SO2 is 40ug/m3. Please update it. 2. Some largest values are not bolded. Please rectify. Store (YTML 26 &Ext) is relatively low and the impact to the result shall be minimal. Note [2] for the calculations of Time-In-Mode is revised in Appendix 2.4 of Appendix G. Appendix G. SO2 emission factor and emission rate are supplemented in Appendix 2.2 of Appendix G. Note for mean sea level under "Wind Erosion of Sand Barge - Area Source (Source ID: \$804)" are updated in Appendix 2.8 of Appendix G. The relevant information are extracted and presented in Appendix 2.8 of Appendix G. Note for mean sea level under "Wind Erosion of Sand Barge - Area Source (Source ID: \$804)" are updated in Appendix 2.8 of Appendix G. The relevant information are extracted and presented in Appendix 2.8 of Appendix G. The relevant information are extracted and presented in Appendix 2.8 of Appendix G. Note for mean sea level under "Wind Erosion of Sand Barge - Area Source (Source ID: \$804)" are updated in Appendix 2.8 of Appendix G. The relevant information are extracted and presented in Appendi	No.	Comments	Responses
1. Calculations of Time-In-Mode (TIM) for Marine Vessels: The discussion on the average travelling speed in Note [2] for the calculations of Time-In-Mode is incomplete. Appendix 2.7 1. Please present the SO2 emission factor and emission rate. Appendix 2.8 1. Wind Erosion of Sand Barge – Area Source [Note 1]: There is no relevant information extracted in Appendix 2.3. Please review and revise the reference. 2. The assumed mean sea levels are different between wind erosion and marine emissions. Please review and ensure the consistency. 3. Please review and revise the referenced Appendix as stated in "Operation Hours" for YTML 25&Ext, YTML 26 &Ex, 全記 五金貿易有限公司, fishing vessels and planned local vessel. 4. Input Parameters of Major Point Sources in AERMOD: Please review and revise the Note numbering. Appendix 2.10 1. Please present the Met Summary of all the PATH grids inside the assessment area. Appendix 2.13 1. AQO for SO2 is 40ug/m3. Please update it. Appendix 2.21 of the calculations of Time-In-Mode is revised in Appendix 2.4 of Appendix G. SO2 emission factor and emission rate are supplemented in Appendix 2.2 of Appendix G. The relevant information are extracted and presented in Appendix 2.2 of Appendix G. Note for mean sea level under "Wind Erosion of Sand Barge - Area Source (Source ID: SBO4)" are updated in Appendix 2.8 of Appendix C. The referenced Appendix as stated in "Operation Hours" for YTML 25&Ext, YTML 26 &Ex, 全記 五金貿易有限公司, fishing vessels and planned local vessel are revised in Appendix 2.8 of Appendix G. Appendix 2.10 1. Please present the Met Summary of all the PATH grids inside the assessment area. Appendix 2.13 1. AQO for SO2 is 40ug/m3. Please update it. Appendix 2.13 of of Appendix G is revised accordingly. All the largest values were bolded.			
Marine Vessels: The discussion on the average travelling speed in Note [2] for the calculations of Time-In-Mode is incomplete. Appendix 2.7 1. Please present the SO2 emission factor and emission rate. SO2 emission factor and emission rate are supplemented in Appendix 2.7 of Appendix G. Appendix 2.8 1. Wind Erosion of Sand Barge – Area Source [Note 1]: There is no relevant information extracted in Appendix 2.3. Please review and revise the reference. 2. The assumed mean sea levels are different between wind erosion and marine emissions. Please review and ensure the consistency. 3. Please review and revise the referenced Appendix as stated in "Operation Hours" for YTML 25&Ext, YTML 26 &Ex, 全記 五金貿易有限公司, fishing vessels and planned local vessel. 4. Input Parameters of Major Point Sources in AERMOD: Please review and revise the Note numbering. Appendix 2.10 1. Please present the Met Summary of all the PATH grids inside the assessment area. Appendix 2.13 1. AQO for SO2 is 40ug/m3. Please update it. Appendix 2.13 of Appendix G is revised accordingly. All the largest values were bolded. Please recitify. All the largest values were bolded.		Appendix 2.4	
1. Please present the SO2 emission factor and emission rate. SO2 emission factor and emission rate are supplemented in Appendix 2.7 of Appendix G. Appendix 2.8 1. Wind Erosion of Sand Barge – Area Source [Note 1]: There is no relevant information extracted in Appendix 2.3. Please review and revise the reference. 2. The assumed mean sea levels are different between wind erosion and marine emissions. Please review and ensure the consistency. 3. Please review and revise the referenced Appendix as stated in "Operation Hours" for YTML 25&Ext, YTML 26 &Ex, \$\pm\$\frac{2}{2} \text{D} \text{TME 26 &Ex}\$\frac{2}{2} \text{Eming yessels and planned local vessel.} 4. Input Parameters of Major Point Sources in AERMOD: Please review and revise the Note numbering. Appendix 2.10 1. Please present the Met Summary of all the PATH grids inside the assessment area. Appendix 2.13 1. AQO for SO2 is 40ug/m3. Please update it. 2. Some largest values are not bolded. Please rectify. SO2 emission factor and emission rate are supplemented in Appendix 2.7 of Appendix G. The relevant information are extracted and presented in Appendix 2.8 of Appendix G. Note for mean sea level under "Wind Erosion of Sand Barge - Area Source (Source ID: SB04)" are updated in Appendix 2.8 of Appendix G. The referenced Appendix as stated in "Operation Hours" for YTML 25&Ext, YTML 26 &Ex, \$\pext{2}\text{TTML 26 &Ex}\$\text{, \$\pext{2}\text{TTML 26 &Ex}\$\text{, \$\pext{2}\text{TML 26 &Ex}\$\text{, \$\pext{2}\text{TTML 26 &Ex}\$\text{, \$\pext{2}\text{TTML 27 & Appendix 2.8 of Appendix G.} Appendix 2.10 1. Please present the Met Summary of all the PATH grids inside the assessment area. Appendix 2.13 Appendix 2.13 of of Appendix G is revised accordingly. Appendix 2.13 of of Appendix G is revised accordingly.		Marine Vessels: The discussion on the average travelling speed in Note [2] for the calculations of Time-In-Mode is	Mode is revised in Appendix 2.4 of
supplemented in Appendix 2.7 of Appendix G. Appendix 2.8 1. Wind Erosion of Sand Barge — Area Source [Note 1]: There is no relevant information extracted in Appendix 2.3. Please review and revise the reference. 2. The assumed mean sea levels are different between wind erosion and marine emissions. Please review and ensure the consistency. 3. Please review and revise the referenced Appendix as stated in "Operation Hours" for YTML 25&Ext, YTML 26 &Ex, 全記 五金貿易有限公司, fishing vessels and planned local vessel. 4. Input Parameters of Major Point Sources in AERMOD: Please review and revise the Note numbering. Appendix 2.10 1. Please present the Met Summary of all the PATH grids inside the assessment area. Appendix 2.13 1. AQO for SO2 is 40ug/m3. Please update it. Supplemented in Appendix 2.7 of Appendix G. The relevant information are extracted and presented in Appendix 2.22 of Appendix G. Note for mean sea level under "Wind Erosion of Sand Barge - Area Source (Source ID: SB04)" are updated in Appendix 2.8 of Appendix 2.8 of Appendix G. The relevant information are extracted and presented in Appendix 2.22 of Appendix G. Note for mean sea level under "Wind Erosion of Sand Barge - Area Source (Source ID: SB04)" are updated in Appendix 2.8 of Appendix 2.8 of Appendix 2.8 of Appendix G. The referenced Appendix as stated in "Operation Hours" for YTML 25&Ext, YTML 26 &Ex, 全記 五金貿易有限公司, fishing vessels and planned local vessel are revised in Appendix 2.8 of Appendix G. Noted and revised in Appendix G is updated. Appendix 2.10 of Appendix G is updated. Appendix 2.13 of of Appendix G is revised accordingly. Appendix 2.13 of of Appendix G is revised accordingly. All the largest values were bolded.		Appendix 2.7	
1. Wind Erosion of Sand Barge — Area Source [Note 1]: There is no relevant information extracted in Appendix 2.3. Please review and revise the reference. 2. The assumed mean sea levels are different between wind erosion and marine emissions. Please review and ensure the consistency. 3. Please review and revise the referenced Appendix as stated in "Operation Hours" for YTML 25&Ext, YTML 26 &Ex, 全記 五金貿易有限公司, fishing vessels and planned local vessel. 4. Input Parameters of Major Point Sources in AERMOD: Please review and revise the Note numbering. Appendix 2.10 1. Please present the Met Summary of all the PATH grids inside the assessment area. Appendix 2.13 1. AQO for SO2 is 40ug/m3. Please update it. 2. The relevant information are extracted and presented in Appendix 2.22 of Appendix G. Note for mean sea level under "Wind Erosion of Sand Barge - Area Source (Source ID: SB04)" are updated in Appendix 2.8 of Appendix 2.8 of Appendix 2.8 of Appendix 2.8 of Appendix 2.6 Ex, 全記五金貿易有限公司, fishing vessels and planned local vessel are revised in Appendix 2.8 of Appendix G. Note for mean sea level under "Wind Erosion of Sand Barge - Area Source (Source ID: SB04)" are updated in "Operation Hours" for YTML 25&Ext, YTML 26 &Ex, 全記五金貿易有限公司, fishing vessels and planned local vessel are revised in Appendix 2.8 of Appendix G. Note and revised in Appendix G. Appendix 2.10 of Appendix G is updated. Appendix 2.13 of of Appendix G is revised accordingly. Appendix 2.13 of of Appendix G is revised accordingly. All the largest values were bolded.		•	supplemented in Appendix 2.7 of Appendix
Note 1]: There is no relevant information extracted in Appendix 2.3. Please review and revise the reference. 2. The assumed mean sea levels are different between wind erosion and marine emissions. Please review and ensure the consistency. 3. Please review and revise the referenced Appendix as stated in "Operation Hours" for YTML 25&Ext, YTML 26 &Ex, 全記 五金貿易有限公司, fishing vessels and planned local vessel. 4. Input Parameters of Major Point Sources in AERMOD: Please review and revise the Note numbering. Appendix 2.10 1. Please present the Met Summary of all the PATH grids inside the assessment area. Appendix 2.13 1. AQO for SO2 is 40ug/m3. Please update it. Presented in Appendix 2.22 of Appendix G. Note for mean sea level under "Wind Erosion of Sand Barge - Area Source (Source ID: SB04)" are updated in Appendix 2.8 of Appendix Q. The referenced Appendix as stated in "Operation Hours" for YTML 25&Ext, YTML 26 &Ex, 全記五金貿易有限公司, fishing vessels and planned local vessel are revised in Appendix 2.8 of Appendix G. Noted and revised in Appendix G. Noted and revised in Appendix G is updated. Appendix 2.10 of Appendix G is updated. Appendix 2.13 of of Appendix G is revised accordingly. All the largest values were bolded.		Appendix 2.8	
between wind erosion and marine emissions. Please review and ensure the consistency. 3. Please review and revise the referenced Appendix as stated in "Operation Hours" for YTML 25&Ext, YTML 26 &Ex, 全記 五金貿易有限公司, fishing vessels and planned local vessel. 4. Input Parameters of Major Point Sources in AERMOD: Please review and revise the Note numbering. Appendix 2.10 1. Please present the Met Summary of all the PATH grids inside the assessment area. Appendix 2.13 1. AQO for SO2 is 40ug/m3. Please update it. Appendix 2.13 of of Appendix G is revised accordingly. All the largest values were bolded.		[Note 1]: There is no relevant information extracted in Appendix 2.3. Please review	
### Appendix as stated in "Operation Hours" for YTML 25&Ext, YTML 26 &Ex, 全記五金貿易有限公司, 在金貿易有限公司, fishing vessels and planned local vessel. 4. Input Parameters of Major Point Sources in AERMOD: Please review and revise the Note numbering. **Appendix 2.10** 1. Please present the Met Summary of all the PATH grids inside the assessment area. **Appendix 2.13* 1. AQO for SO2 is 40ug/m3. Please update it. **Appendix 2.13* of Appendix G is revised accordingly. **Appendix 2.1		between wind erosion and marine emissions. Please review and ensure the	Erosion of Sand Barge - Area Source (Source ID: SB04)" are updated in
Appendix 2.10 1. Please present the Met Summary of all the PATH grids inside the assessment area. Appendix 2.13 1. AQO for SO2 is 40ug/m3. Please update it. 2. Some largest values are not bolded. Please rectify. Appendix G. Appendix G. Appendix G. Appendix 2.10 of Appendix G is updated. Appendix 2.13 of of Appendix G is revised accordingly. Appendix 2.13 of of Appendix G is revised accordingly. All the largest values were bolded.		Appendix as stated in "Operation Hours" for YTML 25&Ext, YTML 26 &Ex, 全記五金貿易有限公司, fishing vessels and	"Operation Hours" for YTML 25&Ext, YTML 26 &Ex, 全記五金貿易有限公司, fishing vessels and planned local vessel are
 Please present the Met Summary of all the PATH grids inside the assessment area. Appendix 2.13 AQO for SO2 is 40ug/m3. Please update it. Appendix 2.13 of of Appendix G is revised accordingly. Some largest values are not bolded. Please rectify. Appendix 2.10 of Appendix G is updated. Appendix 2.13 of of Appendix G is revised accordingly. All the largest values were bolded.		AERMOD: Please review and revise the	
PATH grids inside the assessment area. Appendix 2.13 1. AQO for SO2 is 40ug/m3. Please update it. Appendix 2.13 of of Appendix G is revised accordingly. 2. Some largest values are not bolded. Please rectify. All the largest values were bolded.		Appendix 2.10	
 AQO for SO2 is 40ug/m3. Please update it. Appendix 2.13 of of Appendix G is revised accordingly. Some largest values are not bolded. Please rectify. 		*	Appendix 2.10 of Appendix G is updated.
 2. Some largest values are not bolded. Please rectify. All the largest values were bolded. 		Appendix 2.13	
rectify.		1. AQO for SO2 is 40ug/m3. Please update it.	
Hourly NO2: D08_2F		· ·	All the largest values were bolded.
		recury.	Hourly NO2: D08_2F

No.	Con	nments	Responses
			Daily NO2: D08_2F
			Annual NO2: D08_1F
			Daily RSP: D06_4F
			Annual FSP: D06_4F
			Daily FSP: D06_4F
			Daily FSP: D06_4F
			10-min SO2: D08_2F
			Daily SO2: D08_2F
	App	pendix 2.14	
	1.	Please explain the contour line with its unit in the legend.	Appendix 2.14 of Appendix G is updated.
	2.	Please show the concentrations of all presented contour lines.	Appendix 2.14 of Appendix G is updated.
	3.	The contour maps of NO2 and SO2 show the same exceedance zone as RSP/FSP. While there is no exceedance of NO2 and SO2, the exceedance zone in these maps should be removed.	Appendix 2.14 of Appendix G is updated.
	4.	Please shade the exceedance zones.	Appendix 2.14 of Appendix G is updated.
	5.	AQO for SO2 is 40ug/m3. Please update it.	Appendix 2.14 of Appendix G is updated.
	<u>Apr</u>	pendix 2.15	
	1.	Please present the input odour rates to AERMOD.	The input odour rates are already shown in Appendix 2.15 of Appendix G .
	App	endix 2.16	
	1.	The criterion for odour is not an AQO. Please revise the label at the end of the table.	Appendix 2.16 of Appendix G is updated.
	2.	The largest value is not bolded. Please rectify.	The largest value was bolded at D05_GF.
	Apr	pendix 2.17	
	1.	Please include the contour line with its unit in the legend.	Appendix 2.17 of Appendix G is updated.
	3.	Please remove the exceedance zone as there is no exceedance of odour.	Appendix 2.17 of Appendix G is updated.

No.	Comments	Responses
	4. The criterion for odour is not an AQO. Please revise the title.	Appendix 2.17 of Appendix G is updated.
8.	Fire Services Department, Corporate Strategy Command, Planning and Development Division, dated 2 June 2025	
	Please be informed that I have no specific comment on the captioned work subject to water supplies for firefighting and fire service installations being provided to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services.	Noted.
	Detailed fire services requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of STT/STW or general building plans.	Noted.
	Furthermore, the EVA provision in the captioned work shall comply with the standard as stipulated in Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011, which is administered by the Buildings Department.	Noted.
9.	Highways Department, Lighting Division, Section 2 (Kowloon, Shatin, Sai Kung, Tai Po Districts Road Lighting), dated 5 June 2025	
	Please note that this office has no objection in principle subject to the following items from public lighting point of view:	
	i. If amendment of any existing public lighting utilities is required, including any temporary amendments, please submit the proposal with necessary lighting simulations for our consideration. Sufficient lighting level shall be maintained during construction stage.	Noted.
	ii. Precautionary measures shall be taken to avoid any damage to the lamp posts and public lighting installations during the course of the development. The project proponent shall be responsible for rectification of any damage of public lighting installation aroused by the works at the project proponent's own cost.	Noted.
	iii. Lighting proposal of the surrender area which forms part of public road shall be submitted to this office for agreement	Noted.

No.	Comments	Responses
10.	Highways Department, Urban Region, District and Maintenance Section, Special Maintenance Section, Tunnels Section (Kowloon), District Section, dated 5 June 2025	
	Please confirm you will provide physical demarcation to delineate the boundary of private lot and widened public road from highway maintenance point of view.	Noted and please be confirmed that the physical demarcation of the private lot boundary and widened public road will be provided upon the completion of the Proposed Development.
11.	Marine Department, Planning & Services Division, Planning, Development and Port Security Branch, Planning and Development Section (1), dated 2 June 2025	
	Please note that there is a proposed promenade near the waterfront. If the project involves marine works, kindly inform the Marine Department in advance and ensure compliance with MDN 23/2020 and relevant marine legislation.	Noted.
12.	Planning Department, District Planning Branch, Metro District Planning Division, Kowloon District Planning Office, dated 30 May 2025	
	Key Development Parameters	
	Flat no.	
	R-to-C item 10:	
	Please clarify and rectify the estimated flat no. of OZP compliance scheme	Please be advised that about 285 flats are estimated with the OZP restriction under domestic PR 5.0. With the Proposed Scheme (i.e. Proposed Minor Relaxation of PR), the Application Site will be able to provide an additional 57 flats, bringing the total number to 342 flats by 2032.
	Bonus Site Coverage (SC)	
	Footnote (3) of Table 4-1:	
	2. Please clarify and rectify the bonus SC will be claimed under B(P)R22(2) should be rounded down.	Noted. The bonus SC is revised to 0.256% in footnote [3] of Table 4-1 in Appendix B (Replacement Pages of Updated Supporting Planning Statement).
	Master Layout Plan (MLP) and Sections	
I	l	Page 26 of 33

No.	Comments	Responses
	3. Please indicate the voluntary 1.5m Wide full height setback area in the LEGEND of MLP, G/F, L1 and L2 Plans.	Noted. The area of the voluntary 1.5m wide full height setback has been added. Please refer to Appendix A (Updated Architectural Layout of the Proposed Scheme) for details.
	4. Please consider to indicate a dimension instead of a range of figures for the width of the surrendered setback area in MLP, Basement and Floor Plans.	Noted. The range of widths for the surrendered setback area has been replaced with a single dimension of "about 1m". Please refer to Appendix A for details.
	Illustration of Planning and Design Merits E-0	
	5. The LEGEND of Proposed New Trees is not clear shown in the Drawing, please rectify.	Noted and please refer to Figure E-03 of Appendix A for the updated illustration of Planning and Design Merits.
	Landscape Master Plan	
	6. The Block Layout is not update as shown in the Landscape Master Plan in Appendices A and B, please rectify.	Noted and please refer to Appendices A and C (Replacement Pages of Updated LMP Report) for the updated Landscape Master Plan.
	Landscape Sections	
	7. The Block Layout is not update as shown in the Key Plan of Landscape Sections in Appendix C, please rectify.	Noted and please refer to Appendix C for the updated Landscape Sections A and B .
	Technical Assessments	
	Traffic Impact Assessment	
	Table 4.4: Estimated Trip Generations of Nearby Planned Developments	
	8. Please adopt the latest figures of the planned and committed development in Yau Tong area enclosed in your traffic consultant's email dated 28.4.2025.	Noted and the latest figures of the planned and committed developments have been adopted in Appendix H (Replacement Pages of Updated Traffic Impact Assessment).
	Public comments	
	9. During the 2 nd publication period from 9.5.2025 to 30.5.2025, please response to the public comments as appropriate.	Please refer to the responses to comments in below section of public comments.
13	Planning Department, District Planning Branch, Metro District Planning Division,	

No.	Comments	Responses
	Kowloon District Planning Office, dated 5 June 2025	
	Please find the comment for your consideration:	
	Air Ventilation	
	Given the site is relatively small in scale and the frontage to the sea is only about 40m, the proposed development will <u>unlikely</u> induce significant adverse air ventilation impact to the surrounding pedestrian environment.	Noted.
14.	Planning Department, District Planning Branch, Special Duties Division, Urban Design & Landscape Section, Urban Design Unit, dated 30 May 2025	
	Visual Impact Assessment	
	<u>VP1</u>	
	1. Figure 3, photomontages (Baseline Scheme and Proposed Scheme) – The Consultant may wish to outline the extent of the proposed development for the sake of clarity.	Noted and please refer to Figure 3 of Appendix D (Replacement Pages of Updated Visual Impact Assessment) for details.
	2. Para. 5.1.8 – Judging from the photomontage, Peninsula East will be completely screened off by the proposed development under Application No. A/K15/130.	Noted and para 5.1.8 of Appendix D has been revised.
	<u>VP2</u>	
	3. Para. 5.1.15 – As commented previously, as there is very minor additional visual obstruction to the sky view compared with the Baseline Scheme, it would be more tenable to grade the overall visual impact from "negligible" to "negligible to slightly adverse".	Noted and please be advised that the visual permeability of the Proposed Scheme could still largely maintain when compared with the Baseline Scheme from this VP. With the planned and existing development in the YTIA, the view of Quarry Bay across Victoria Harbour still can be seen under the Proposed Scheme. Moreover, the anticipated visual blockage will be mitigated by descending from the inland portion along Tung Yuen Street (100mPD) to a residential portion fronting the Victoria Harbour (80mPD) which echoes with the stepped BH profile from the hinterland to waterfront area

o. C	Comments	Responses
		in the YTIA. Thus, the overall rating for this VP shall remain as negligible .
$\underline{\mathbf{v}}$	<u>7P3</u>	
	4. Para. 5.1.16 (2 nd line) – Judging from the photomontage, both the Baseline and Proposed Schemes would be completely screened off and would not be visible.	Noted and para 5.1.16 of Appendix D has been revised.
V	<u> </u>	
	5. Paras. 5.1.22 to 5.1.27 –	
	(a) Judging from the photomontages, it seems that the Baseline Scheme will be completely screened off by Coast Line I (i.e. approved Application No. A/K15/122) under construction and a minor topmost portion of the Proposed Scheme would be visible from VP4. Please review/update the visual analysis as appropriate.	Noted and and para 5.1.22 of Appendix D has been revised.
	(b) As there is very minor additional visual obstruction to the sky view compared with the Baseline Scheme, please review if the ratings from each aspect and the overall visual impact should be graded as "negligible to slightly adverse" instead of "negligible".	Noted and please be advised that only a minor portion (topmost part) of the Proposed Scheme will result in a slight obstruction to the sky view when compared with the Baseline Scheme. However, the Proposed Scheme does not result in any visually intrusive buildings and is harmonically blended in with the surrounding existing and planned residential developments, respecting the gradation of BH profile descending towards the Victoria Harbour which would not induce further obstruction at this VP. Thus, the overall rating for this VP shall remain as negligible .
V	<u>'P5</u>	
	6. Paras. 5.1.32 – As there is very minor additional visual obstruction to the mountain backdrop compared with the Baseline Scheme, it would be more tenable to grade the overall visual impact from "negligible" to "negligible to slightly adverse".	Noted and the overall rating of this VP shall refer to para 5.1.33 of Appendix D . Please be advised that the Proposed Scheme would induce only slight obstruction to the mountain backdrop when compared with the Baseline Scheme. Nonetheless, the Proposed Scheme will naturally blend into the high-rise residential developments in the middle-ground which would not obstruct the ridgeline at the back. The extent of openness of the existing sky view and the visual permeability will remain unchanged. Thus,

No.	Comments	Responses
		the overall rating for this VP shall remain as negligible .
	Summary of Visual Impact and Conclusion	
	7. Table 5-3 – The ratings in the table should be revised as per the comments above.	Noted and please be advised that the Proposed Scheme at all 6 VPs are considered visually acceptable as compared with the Baseline Scheme, and in full respect to the stepped BH profile of the Yau Tong waterfront area. The ratings in Table 5.3 of Appendix D shall therefore remain unchanged.
	8. Para. 6.1.3 – As commented previously, as per the above comments, it should be revised to read as "the Proposed Scheme will result with negligible to <u>negligible to slightly adverse</u> visual impact".	Noted and please refer to our response above.
	9. Figure 2 – The actual building height (BH) of the development should be 95.6m instead of 95.2m.	Noted and please refer to Figure 2 of Appendix D for updates.
	10. VIA, Figures 3 to 8 (VPs1 to 6), Photomontages for Baseline and Proposed Schemes – Please check whether BHs of the proposed developments under Applications No. A/K15/112 and A/K15/130 are 60.5mPD to 120mPD.	Noted and please refer to Figures 3-8 of Appendix D for updates.
15.	Transport Department, Urban Regional Office, Traffic Engineering (Kln.) Division, Kln. District East (South) Section, dated 30 May 2025	
	TIA Report	
	Section 2.2.2 - Please clarify whether "Yau Tong Estate Phase 3" shall read "Lei Yue Mun Estate Phase 3".	Noted. Please refer to Section 2.2.2 of Appendix H .
	Drawing nos. 3.1 & 3.4 - The width of vehicular access should not be wider than 7.3m.	Noted. The width of vehicular access is reduced to 7.3m. Please refer to latest Drawing 3.4 of Appendix H .
	Section 3.2.3, Table 3.2 and Appendix I - Our comments on the justifications for parking provisions provided to the applicant on 24 April 2025 has not been addressed yet.	Noted. Please refer to Appendix I (Updated Justifications for Parking Provisions) for details.

No.	Comments	Responses
	(See attached file: 20250424 TD comment on parking provisions.pdf)	
	20250424 TD comment on parking	
	With reference to the current master layout plan, it is considered that more parking spaces could be allowed on the basement floors. By relocating the E&M rooms and optimising the layout design for basement and aboveground floors, provision of more parking spaces should be able to archive.	After reviewing the parking space, E&M rooms and ramps, the provision of parking spaces is maximized. A total of 66 car parking spaces can be provided in the Proposed Scheme.
	Please also supplement the written records of agreements on voluntary building setback, 5m-wide public passage and waterfront promenade.	Further to the consultation with KTF (Harbourfront Commission - Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing) on 14 Mar 2025, it is noted that the KTF appreciates the Applicants' genuine intention to provide a voluntary waterfront promenade that open for public enjoyment on a 24/7 basis, and to take up management and maintenance responsibilities. Additionally, the provision of retail activities at lower floors is also supported, as it would increase harbourfront vitality.
		Please find the presentation materials on the consultation with KTF and the Draft minutes of the KTF meeting in March in Attachments A to C of Appendix I for details.
	Section 5.1 and RtoC - Some of our previous comments have not been addressed yet, i.e. the on-going improvement works at J/O Cha Kwo Ling Road / Ko Chiu Road under the PWP Item No. B812CL should also be included.	Noted. The improvement works are included in the assessment. Please refer to Section 5.1.3 of Appendix H .
	(See attached file: B812CL-GZ01.pdf) B812CL-GZ01.pdf	

No.	Comments	Responses
	Section 5.1.2 and RtoC - The proposed improvement works at J/O Cha Kwo Ling Road / Yau Tong Road was not included in the approved TIA report for A/K15/130 Section 16 application of the Yau Tong Bay Comprehensive Development. Please remove this improvement works from the report.	Noted. The J/O Cha Kwo Ling Road / Yau Tong Road is assessed based on current layout in Appendix H .
	Section 5.1.5 - Please advise the proponent of the cancellation of on-street metered parking spaces and propose relocation of the parking spaces.	Noted, the relocation of the on-street parking spaces is proposed in the TIA report. Please refer to Section 5.1.5 of Appendix H .
	Section 6.1.2 - Please incorporate the population growth arising from intake from other residential developments in the vicinity in your capacity assessment.	Noted, the assessment is updated accordingly. Please refer to Section 6.2.2 of Appendix H .
	Follow-up comments on Planning Statement	
	General - As there is no pedestrian assessment in the TIA report, the ODP-required setback areas at footpath, voluntary public passageway at ground floor linking to promenade are not essential nor necessary from traffic perspectives.	Noted.
	Section 4.2.3 - Please delete "safety" unless demonstrated by traffic assessments.	Noted and relevant paragraphs of Appendix B related to pedestrian safety have been revised.
	Table 4-1 - The numbers of parking provision should be updated as per our comments in the TIA report.	Noted and the parking provision of Table 4-1 in Appendix B has been updated.

(Last Updated: 23 June 2025)

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Summary of Public Comments No. 18

No.	Summary of Comments	Responses
1.	Comments on Planning Considerations	
	There are opposing views on the minor relaxation of building height and plot ratio restrictions as the proposed development will cause adverse impacts to the surroundings and views of nearby developments.	Findings in our submitted VIA confirmed that the Proposed Scheme is fully acceptable from visual aspect and fully compatible to the surrounding environment from the 6 public viewing points.
		It should be emphasised that only the inland portion (fronting Tung Yuen Street) will be relaxed to 100mPD, which will be the same BH as the development across Tung Yuen Street. Therefore, the proposed minor relaxation of BH (inland portion only) at the Application Site will be coherent with the stepped BH profile intended in the YTIA and thus creating a more dynamic BH profile within the Application Site.
2.	Comments on Impacts to Surrounding Developments	
	There are concerns on the stepped building height profile of the proposed development which may set an undesirable precedent leading other developments to follow in the future.	Please refer to response to public comment item no. 1.

(Last Updated: 23 Jun 2025)