

Proposed Social Welfare Facilities (Residential Care Home for the Elderly (RCHE)) in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lots 3670 RP (Part), 3671 RP (Part), 3672 RP (Part), 3673 RP (Part) and adjoining Government Land in D.D.104, Nam Sang Wai, Yuen Long (TPB ref.: A/YL-NSW/349)

Response-to-Comment Table

Departmental Comments		Responses
<u>Email dated 9th September 2025 refers:</u>		
<u>Comment from the Commissioner for Transport</u>		
General Comment:-		
Based on the proposed G/F layout plan, the location light bus/ambulance layby, PC/taxis pick-up/drop off as well as the LGV L/UL bay is too close to the site entrance. We have grave concern on the vehicle may queuing back to the public road. The applicant should address TD's concern by critically review the site layout under this application. The applicant is requested to demonstrated the operation arrangement at the area co-used as pick-up/drop off activities, access and parking and demonstrate there will be no queuing back to the public road.		A car park management staff will be deployed to manage vehicles entering and leaving the Proposed RCHE. For example, if one vehicle is entering and another is leaving at the same time, the management staff will halt the vehicle leaving momentarily to allow the vehicle to enter the Proposed RCHD in order to ensure that no queue will occur at Kam Pok Road East.
Specific comment:-		
1.	Should there be any delay of improvement works for junction of Castle Peak Road - Tam Mi/Kam Pok Rad East, the applicant should undertake the works before the commissioning of proposed development.	Noted.
2.	The adopted trip rates in this application is underestimated. Please make reference to the trip rates from the nearby approved RCHE under planning application no. Y/YL-NTM/9 and update the report.	A review of the TIA for planning application no. Y/YL-NTM/9 found that the trip rate adopted for RCHE use is based on the Tung Wah Group of Hospitals – Wong Cho Tong Social Service Building, which has multiple uses, including: - RCHE with 278 beds - District Elderly Community Centre - Day Care Centre for the Elderly - Home Care Services Centre - Integrated Vocational Rehabilitation Centre - RCHD with 120 beds In view that the surveyed building has multiple uses but share a common entrance, it is not possible to distinguish traffic generated only by RCHE use. Hence, this trip rate is <u>not suitable</u> for the captioned project.

- | | |
|----|---|
| 3. | Taking into consideration of the proposed visiting hour as well as the light bus service frequency, please provide 24-hr detailed breakdown of trip rate (both generation and attraction) for the visitor car park, light bus service, LGV L/UL, PCs/taxis PU/DO and other possible source of trip generation due to the proposed development. The total breakdown of 24-hr trip rate should be provided as well. |
|----|---|

[See **Appendix 5** of the R-to-C table.]

Reference is made to the on-site survey from Caritas Li Ka Shing Care and Attention Home in Tuen Mun and the result is shown in **Appendix A**.

Based on result in **Appendix A**, the estimated 24-hour breakdown of traffic generation of the Proposed RCHE is shown in **Table R1**.

TABLE R1 24-HOUR BREAKDOWN OF TRAFFIC GENEATION OF THE PROPOSED RCHE									
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Period	Vehicle Type				Traffic generation	
	Car	Taxi	LGV	Rehabus / Ambulance		
					veh/hr	pcu/hr
<u>In</u>						
08:00-08:59	0	4	1	0	5	6
09:00-09:59	5	3	1	1	10	12
10:00-10:59	0	4	0	0	4	4
11:00-11:59	1	2	0	1	4	5
12:00-12:59	0	5	0	0	5	5
13:00-13:59	0	2	0	1	3	4
14:00-14:59	3	1	0	0	4	4
15:00-15:59	2	1	1	1	5	7
16:00-16:59	1	4	0	1	6	7
17:00-17:59	0	1	0	0	1	1
18:00-18:59	0	2	0	0	2	2
19:00-19:59	0	1	0	0	1	1
20:00-07:59	Ambulance in the event of need					
<u>Out</u>						
08:00-08:59	0	4	1	0	5	6
09:00-09:59	3	3	0	1	7	8
10:00-10:59	0	4	1	0	5	6
11:00-11:59	1	2	0	1	4	5
12:00-12:59	0	5	0	0	5	5
13:00-13:59	0	2	0	1	3	4
14:00-14:59	1	1	0	0	2	2
15:00-15:59	1	0	0	0	1	1
16:00-16:59	4	4	1	1	10	12
17:00-17:59	1	1	0	1	3	4
18:00-18:59	1	1	0	0	2	2
19:00-19:59	0	2	0	0	2	2
20:00-07:59	Ambulance in the event of need					

4.	Please confirm no RCV would enter the subject site.	Please note that no RCV would enter the Proposed RCHE.
5.	In the site entrance, please provide a clear segregation between vehicles and pedestrians from road safety perspective. For the proposed pedestrian entrance in the building in Figure 3.1, apparently pedestrian is expected to walk across the vehicle manoeuvring area (i.e. light/ambulance, LGV, PCs/taxis) which poses a safety concern. Please review.	Pedestrian entrance provided for the Proposed RCHE is separated from the manoeuvring area. Please refer to the Figure 3.1 in the revised TIA report.
6.	Figure 3.3: Unless otherwise agreed by the relevant departments including but not limited to EPD and HyD that the existing noise barrier can be demolished, please demonstrate adequate sight line can be provided at the ingress/egress with the presence of existing noise barrier.	The noise barriers have been indicated in the Figure 3.3 in the revised TIA. The measured length of visibility splay for the motorists leaving the Proposed RCHE is 60m to the left and 60m to the right, so adequate sight line can be provided at the ingress/egress. The detailed design for necessary alterations of affected noise barrier and planters will be further dealt with at the land exchange stage.
7.	Please clearly state the width of the site entrance and provide swept path analysis to demonstrate the width of site entrance could allow vehicle to enter and leave the site simultaneously.	7.3m-wide run-in/out is provided for the Proposed RCHD to allow vehicle including 8m-long Light Bus to enter and leave simultaneously, please refer to Figure R1 . [See Appendix 5 of the R-to-C table.]
8.	From SP1 to SP3, the vehicle manoeuvring of coach, ambulance, LGV and taxi would conflict with each other. Please elaborate how to manage the traffic there such that no vehicle would queue back onto the public road at all time.	Please note that the manoeuvring area is a common area for vehicles to manoeuvre to enter and leave their respective space. In addition, a car park management staff will be deployed to manage vehicle manoeuvring to enter and leave their respective space in order to ensure that no queue will occur at Kam Pok Road East.
9.	From SP7, it is unsafe for PCs/taxis to reverse back to the driveway as the drivers could not see the vehicle entering the site and vehicle driving up from the basement carpark. Please review.	A car park management staff will be deployed to assist vehicle manoeuvring to ensure the safety.
10.	Please review para. 2.2 for the road classification.	Noted. Please refer to the revised Paragraph 2.2 in the revised TIA.
11.	Table 2.6: please review the adopted GMB capacity.	Noted. Please refer to the revised Table 2.6 in the revised TIA.
12.	Please provide swept path analysis for the longest vehicle under this application to demonstrate no vehicle would encroach into the opposite lane when leaving the site.	The 8m-long Light Bus which is the longest vehicle expected to enter the Proposed RCHE can leave without encroaching into the opposite lane of Kam Pok Road East. Please refer to Figure R1 . [See Appendix 5 of the R-to-C table.]

Email dated 11th September 2025 refers:

Comment from the Environmental Protection Department

Based on the revised noise impact assessment chapter, please advise to the following points: 1. The applicant is recommended to submit an updated Noise Impact Assessment under suitable mechanism (e.g., planning approval condition if the planning application is approved) to ensure that any changes in the layout of the proposed development after the planning approval can be taken into account and addressed in the updated NIA accordingly and thus full compliance with relevant noise criteria and relevant requirements under Professional Persons Environmental Consultative Committee Practice Notes, Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines and Cap. 400 Noise Control Ordinance.	Noted.
2. S3.3.1 (last RtC item 2) i. The first sentence is still misleading and unclear. As it is not necessary to explain the control mechanism of NEL in the construction phase impact review, please consider removing it.	The first sentence is removed accordingly.
3. S3.4.10 (last RtC item 6) i. Noted that the endorsement of the traffic forecast by TD is to be provided. In case TD has no comment on the methodology for traffic forecast only, the consultant should provide written confirmation from the respective competent party (e.g., traffic consultant) that TD's endorsed methodology has been strictly adopted in preparing the traffic forecast data, and hence the validity of traffic data can be confirmed.	Noted, the endorsement of the traffic forecast by TD will be provided once available.
4. S.3.4.14 (last RtC item 9) i. Please supplement the explanation in RtC to the noise chapter too. ii. Additionally, the consultant mentioned that a typical dormitory room is 40-50 m ² . Please clarify how the cells are separated (and if the walls are full height), and if there are windows facing the corridor.	The Section is updated accordingly. From the layout, typically 1 dormitory room comprises of 8 beds enclosed by full height partitions with opening next to common toilet. No window facing the corridor.
5. Appendix 3.3 i. Please supplement the date and time for site survey.	The Appendix is updated accordingly.

6. Appendix 3.4.22 i. Please add “(Excluding Container Vehicle)” after the “public parking area”.	The Section 3.4.22 is revised accordingly.
7. Appendix 3.4 and fig 3.4 , S3.4.23 i. There is a fixed noise assessment point located at 2F_N01, as indicated in Appendix 3.4. Please include the corresponding fixed noise assessment point in Figure 3.4. ii. Additionally, in the main text section S3.4.23 or any where appropriate, please provide an explanation for the selection of this fixed noise assessment point. It should be clarified if this point was chosen due to it being the most affected direction / the shortest distance to the noise sources. iii. Please also provide the calculation excel sheet for our checking.	The Figure is updated accordingly. The explanation is provided in S3.4.23. Noted.
8. Table 3.8 i. For better presentation, please directly present them with the “name” for such fixed noise source, rather than “open storage” under the column of “location”,	The Table is revised accordingly.
9. Last RtC item 3 in Comments on road traffic noise model i. Please explain if “EVA” stands for emergency vehicle access. ii. For the proposal to remove a portion of the noise barrier for the entrance for EVA, please confirm if this has been discussed with the relevant authority. Additionally, please document this communication.	Yes, “EVA” stands for emergency vehicle access. In relation to the Traffic Impact Assessment and comments from Highways Development, the proposed removal of noise barrier is submitted for comment, the information is provided in S3.4.7. Details of modification please refer to Appendix 3.5.
10. Appendix 3.1, and last RtC item 7 in comments on road traffic noise model i. As Link9 has been set to 100 km/h in accordance with the last RtC item 7 regarding comments on the road traffic noise model, please check and update the speed limit in Appendix 3.1 as well.	Appendix 3.1 is updated accordingly.
11. Fixed noise assessment from existing source i. There is open storage located at the SW direction from the proposed development site. Please review and justify if not included into the fixed noise assessment.	The shown open storage located at the SW direction near the Proposed Site are for storage of materials only. No noisy activities and noise

	generating equipment are expected in the area and therefore, not considered as noise source.
12. Fixed noise assessment from planning source i. Please include the discussion of planned fixed noise source in the main text, where appropriate. And state the possible noise mitigation measure in the planning and relevant noise standard.	Discussion of planned fixed noise source is provided in S3.4.16 to S3.4.20.
13. Appendix 3.4 and table 3.8 i. Distances are not tally, please check.	Table 3.8 is updated.
14. Appendix 3.4 and Road traffic noise model i. Coordinates for 2F_N01 are not tally, please check.	The coordinates of 2F_N01 in Appendix 3.4 is updated.
<u>Email dated 25th August 2025 refers:</u>	
<u>Comment from the Director of Environmental Protection</u>	
Based on the revised EA, please advise to the following points on the Air Quality Chapter:	
1. S.2.2.4 – Please delete “open” in line 3	The Section is revised accordingly.
2. S.2.3.1, Table 2.3 and Figure 2.1 – it is noted that there are some structures to the north and to the southeast of the site as shown below. Please review if these structures are considered as ASRs.	New ASR was added for structures to the north of the site. Structures to the southeast of the site should be incorporated in A01. The corresponding Section, Table and Figure are updated accordingly.
3. Rtc 4(d) – The construction programme and relevant information are not provided in S.2.4.2. Please review.	The approximate time period of different construction stages were provided in Table 2.4. A description is provided in Section 2.4.2.
4. Rtc 7(a) – Please be reminded to provide TD’s endorsement on the road type once available.	The TD’s endorsement on the road type is provided in Appendix 2.1.
5. S.2.5.5 – Please clarify which register is referring to.	The Section is revised accordingly.
6. S.2.5.6 - Please be reminded that it should be the responsibility of the applicant and their consultant to ensure the validity of the information by their own site surveys.	Noted.

Should the information be subsequently found to be incorrect, the assessment results as presented in the submission would be invalidated.	
7. S.2.6.2 – Please delete “chimney” in line 2 and 3.	The Section is revised accordingly.
Email dated 24th July 2025 refers: <u>Comment from the Director of Environmental Protection</u>	
<u>Water Quality</u> - S.4.2 - Please be reminded that ProPECC PN 2/23 has been superseded by ProPECC PN2/24; - S4.3.1 and Table 4.1 – Beside Kam Tin River, please review if there are others WSRs (e.g. ponds, watercourses) within the assessment area. Please also indicate the estimated distance of the WSRs to the project site;	The version is updated accordingly. Figure 4.1 and Table 4.1 is updated with others WSRs and its distance to the project site.
<u>Waste Management</u> - Construction Phase • S.5.3.3 - Please provide the estimated quantity of inert and non-inert C&D materials to be generated, including details on how much will be reused on-site and how much will be delivered or disposed of off-site. Please specify the outlets, such as Tuen Mun 38 Fill Bank and/or the WENT landfill; • S.5.3.6 - Provide the estimated quantity of chemical waste, e.g., in the order of a few liters per month; • S.5.3.9 - For general refuse, please provide the estimated quantity to be generated, specify the disposal outlet, and describe the arrangement of separating and handling recyclables; - Operation Phase • Please adopt the latest disposal figures and recovery rates from the Monitoring of Solid Waste 2023 report to calculate	Details of the waste generation is updated in Table 5.1 in S.5.3.3. Estimated quantity of chemical waste is updated accordingly. Estimated quantity of general refuse is updated accordingly. Latest disposal figures and recovery rates from the Monitoring of Solid Waste 2023 report have been adopted.

the generation rate. Please also specify the disposal outlet, such as the WENT landfill, and provide details on the arrangements for separating and handling recyclables; • S.5.4.4 Other waste: Please explain how the maximum amount of “other waste” to be generated, estimated at approximately 1.608 kg per day during the operation phase, was derived; - Mitigation Measures • S.5.5.7 & S.5.5.8 - Remove the detailed description of chemical waste storage requirements; • Please include any measure and outlet for recycling of food waste; • Please clarify whether trip ticket system will be adopted and advise whether dump truck will be equipped by GPS monitoring;	The chemical waste and clinic waste generation rate is updated based on the Monitoring of Solid Waste 2023 report. The maximum amount of other waste is generated from $(0.001+0.003) \times 268 = 1.13\text{kg/day}$. The Section has been removed accordingly. Food waste is mentioned in S.5.5.10. Trip ticket system is mentioned in S.5.5.5.
<u>Land Contamination</u> - S.6.4.2 - From the aerial photos taken between 2019 and 2021, please elaborate on the types of storage visible and describe any visible ground conditions, if identifiable, to provide further justification for the conclusion that no land contamination impact is expected; - Please provide site walkover checklist and site photos; - Appendix 6.1 The EPD and FSD’s response was not attached; and - The checking record for the Chemical Waste Producer (CWP) license should be provided, with an explanation of whether this has any implications for potential land contamination.	Elaboration on aerial photos is provided in S.6.4.2. Site walkover checklist and site photo are provided in Appendix 6.2 and 6.3. The EPD and FSD responses are supplemented in Appendix 6.1. No record of registered chemical waste producers was found on 10/7/2025 during the visit to the EPD Territory Control Office.

Email dated 18th July 2025 refers:

Comment from the Director of Environmental Protection

Noise

1. S3.2.1

i. "Good Practices on Pumping System Noise Control; and Good Practices on Ventilation System Noise Control" has been obsoleted and replaced by "Good Practices on the Control of Noise from Electrical & Mechanical Systems". Please note and update.

The guideline has been updated accordingly.

2. S3.3.1

i. The statement of "There is no statutory control for noise arising from construction activities (except for percussive piling and the use of hand-held percussive breakers and air compressors) during non-restricted hours" is misleading and unclear. Please note that the Cap 400C&D Regulations require that such equipment comply with the noise emission standard and shall be fitted with NEL, rather than controlled under the aspect of "non-restricted hours/ restricted hour". Please rephrase respective sentences.

The statement is revised accordingly.

ii. Please also consider to replace the relevant part in S3.3.1 with below: "ProPECC PN1/24 offers guidance on the existing control on noise from construction activities under the Noise Control Ordinance (NCO) and Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO). It also outlines the requirements and recommendations on the practices for minimizing construction noise. The noise generated by construction activities for the project during non-restricted hours (7 a.m. to 7 p.m. on any day that is not a Sunday or general holiday) should be minimized to the greatest extent practicable. Additionally, the construction noise at the facade of the respective noise-sensitive receivers should not exceed the following noise levels, as summarised

The statement is revised accordingly.

in Table 3.1 below. "	
3. S3.4.2 i. Please suggest the type of area and justify the corresponding area sensitive rating. Please also add the following after this sub-section: <i>"In any event, the ASR assumed in this report is for indicative assessment only. It should be noted that the noise emanating from any place other than domestic premises, a public place or a construction site is controlled under Section 13 of the Noise Control Ordinance. At the time of investigation, the Noise Control Authority shall determine the noise impact from concerned sources on the basis of prevailing legislation and practices being in force and taking account of contemporary conditions/situations of adjoining land uses. Nothing in this report shall bind the Noise Control Authority in the context of law enforcement against all the sources being assessed."</i>	The ASR is discussed and the sub-section is added in Section 3.4.3 and 3.4.4 accordingly.
4. S3.4.3 i. Please explicitly state the use of "Multi-purpose area" on the G & 1st floor to substantiate they don't require a stringent road traffic noise standard lower than 70 dB(A) for the purposed development (i.e. diagnostic rooms and wards for RCHE).	The use of Multi-purpose area is explained accordingly.
5. S3.4.7 i. Please check if it is a typo for "Thee".	The typo is corrected accordingly.
6. S.3.4.8 i. Noted that the endorsement of the revised traffic forecast by TD is to be provided. In case TD has no comment on the methodology for traffic forecast only, the consultant should provide written confirmation from the respective competent party (e.g., traffic consultant) that TD's endorsed methodology has been strictly adopted in preparing the traffic forecast data, and hence the validity of traffic	The TD endorsement and written confirmation from traffic consultant to be provided once available.

data can be confirmed.	
7. S.3.4.9 Table 3.6 and Appendix 3.2 i. From Appendix 3.2, the maximum L10(1 hr) under base case scenario would be 75 dB(A) for G/F-1/F Multi-purpose Area; 73 dB(A) for G/F Rehab zone; and 77 dB(A) for 1/F-2/F Communal area. This does not align with S.3.4.9 Table 3.6. Please check. Besides, it is suggested to further separate the table by floor for each facility / room type, (i.e. predicted maximum L10(1 hr) for each floor in G/F-2/F RCHE dormitory), for better presentation.	Table 3.6 is revised accordingly.
8. S.3.4.11 i. Please aware of the inconsistency of block letter for the name of PN.	The letter is revised accordingly.
9. S.3.4.12 and Fig.3.3, Appendix 3.2 i. As shown on Fig 3.3, the reference case for Type 2 AW(BT) is under room size of 18 m² with a specified window design, providing a noise attenuation of 7 dB(A). S.3.4.12 also suggests that noise reduction depends on room size. While Appendix 3.2 proposes the use of Type 2 AW(BT) at 21 NAPs, please provide the room size in the tentative layout and any room size correction, justifying a noise attenuation of 7 dB(A) by Type 2 AW(BT) are appropriate.	Please be clarified that the room size of dormitory is typically 40 to 50 m ² , which is larger than 18 m ² , therefore, no room size correction is included for conservative approach.
10. S.3.4.16 i. In order to provide a guidance for future development, please supplement the prevailing background noise levels with full details of the prevailing background noise measurement, including personnel, equipment, weather, field observations, etc., shall be documented and included in the report for easy future reference.	Discussion of prevailing background noise measurement is added in Section 3.4.16.
11. S.3.4.18 and Table 3.7 i. Figure 3.3 is Location of Proposed Acoustic Window. Please update	Location of existing major noise sources and site inspection record are

and provide the corresponding figure indicating the location of existing major noise sources. Please also attach the site inspection report with photo of the open storage in site visit. ii. The location of S01 is currently unknown, but it is reported to be approximately 100 meters away from the project site. If there are no building separations between S01 and the proposed site, we recommend conducting sound measurements and providing calculations for a noise assessment. This will help to demonstrate that open storage will not negatively impact the proposed site. iii. There was a Section 16 application (Application No. A/YL-NSW/318) for the development of a public vehicle parking area with EV charging facilities near the project site. Please confirm whether this car park is currently in operation. Even though the development may cease operations (since the planning permission for the Section 16 application is for only 5 years) upon the commencement of the proposed development, it is important to note that similar fixed noise sources may arise. Please include this information under the identification of fixed noise sources for future reference.	presented in Figure 3.4 and Appendix 3.3 respectively. Sound measurements are presented in Appendix 3.3. Discussion of public vehicle parking is added in Section 3.4.22.
12. Figure 1.1 and Figure 3.1 i. Please separate the site boundary for the projects A/YL-NSW/348 and A/YL-NSW/349 respectively.	The Figure is revised accordingly.
13. Appendix 3.2 i. Typo of "Multi-prupose room", please check should it be "multi-purpose room"	Appendix 3.2 is revised accordingly.
14. Planning statement S5.7.2 i. It is noted in the planning statement that "during the operation	Please be clarified that air conditioning will be provided for the project

stage, air conditioning will be provided for the proposed development and not relied on openable window for ventilation, no adverse fixed noise impact and road traffic impact to the Proposed Scheme is expected". However, this differs from the description provided in the NIA report. Please review this discrepancy. ii. Additionally, even equipped with fixed-glazing with air-conditioning, a more stringent indoor noise criteria for fixed noise source (i.e. 10 dB(A) below the ANL) should be applied to the proposed development. Please note and review.	while openable window for ventilation is also provided for Dormitory. Noted.
<u>Comments on the Road Traffic Noise Model</u> 1. Please check the noise model, the unmitigated noise level in the model generated is not tally with the appendix 3.2.	Noise model and Appendix 3.2 are revised accordingly.
2. There are breaks on the noise barrier in the model, please check, and revise if needed.	Refer to building plan in Appendix, part of the noise barrier will be removed for entrance of EVA.
3. Please provide information of the height of existing noise barrier, for our checking.	The height of existing noise barrier is obtained by site observation.
4. Texture depth is usually 1.2m, in the model it is 1.0m. Please check.	The texture depth is set to 1.2m accordingly.
5. Please check if the surface for the below segments at San Tin Highway, such as should it be bitumen instead of pervious?	Bitumen is set for the mentioned segments accordingly.
6. The speed limit for flow link 9 is 100 km/h. Only the zone refers to green coloured below is limited to 50 km/h, but it is located near the roundabout that outside 300m assessment area. Please check.	The speed limit for flow link 9 is set to 100 km/h accordingly.
7. We noted that the is NSR '2F_N30' in the appendix 3.2, but not in the figure and model, please clarify.	Appendix 3.2 is revised accordingly.

Email dated 27th June 2025 refers: Comment from the Environmental Protection Department	
<u>General</u> 1. S.1.2.1 - The site area is inconsistent with that provided in the planning statement, please check.	The site area is corrected.
2. Please highlight all the changes/amendments in the next submission.	Note.
<u>Air Quality</u> 1. Section 2.2.2 and Table 2.1 - The AQOs were updated on 11 April 2025. Please revise Table 2.1 to present the updated AQOs.	The table is updated accordingly.
2. Section 2.2.4 a. Please delete “active and passive” in line 1. Please revise “open road” in line 3 to “vehicular”.	The section is revised accordingly. The section is revised accordingly.
3. Section 2.3.1, Table 2.3 and Figure 2.1 - Please note that not only the domestic premises are the ASRs, some places/premises such as factory and workshop may also be the ASRs. Based on the desktop review, there are some areas in the vicinity of the project site which have been used for workshops/open storage, etc. Please review the potential existing/planned ASRs within the assessment area with reference to the Determination of ASR under the EIAO-TM and update as appropriate.	More ASRs have been identified in Table 2.3 and Figure 2.1. For other areas mainly for open storage use where long duration of exposure to air pollutants is not expected are, therefore, not considered as ASR.
4. Sections 2.4.1 and 2.4.2 a. Please provide the estimated size of site formation, amount of excavated materials, size of active workfront area, no. of construction vehicles and PME to be used at a time, etc. to justify the scale of construction works and hence if the construction air quality impact can be properly controlled with the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures. b. Besides the fugitive dust emission, exhaust emissions from the use of construction machinery and construction vehicles including particulate matters (PM) and gaseous emissions are also another potential source of construction air quality impact, please supplement in Section 2.4.1.	The estimation is provided in Section 2.4.2 to 2.4.3 accordingly. The section is revised accordingly.

c. For the Comment #4(b) above, please consider if the control measures set out in the Air Pollution Control (Non-road Mobile Machinery) (Emission) Regulation will implemented to control the emissions and supplement in Section 2.4.2. d. Please provide the details about the construction programme of the proposed development and review if there are any concurrent projects within the assessment area such that there will be any cumulative construction air quality impact to be addressed.	The discussion is provided in Section 2.4.3 accordingly. The construction programme is provided in Section 2.4.2 accordingly.
5. Section 2.4.2 a. Please revise “dust” in line 1 to “air quality”. Please revise “minimise the dust impact” in line 3 to “control the air pollutant emissions”, and revise “fugitive dust” to “air quality”.	The section is revised accordingly. The section is revised accordingly.
6. Section 2.4.3 a. Please revise “minimized” in line 1 to “controlled”. b. Please revise “dust” in line 2 to “air quality”. c. Please revise “suppression” in line 5 to “control”. Please propose any additional measures for the exhaust emissions from the use of construction machinery (e.g. if electrified NRMM will be used as far as practicable and exempted NRMM will be avoided, etc.) Please supplement in the additional bullets.	The section is revised accordingly. The section is revised accordingly. The section is revised accordingly. Additional bullets is added accordingly.
7. Section 2.5.2 and Table 2.4 a. Please clearly state that the road type of Kam Pok Road East is not available in the latest Annual Traffic Census (ATC) of the Transport Department (TD). TD’s endorsement on the road type of Kam Pok Road East should be sought in order to consider it as local distributor such that 5m buffer distance requirement in Table 3.1 of Chapter 9 of HKPSG can be applied. b. Please delete “of mechanical ventilation” in the 2nd last line, and revise “area” in the last line to “space”. Also please advise if there is any proposed carpark, PTI/public transport lay-by, etc. in the	TD’s endorsement to be provided once available. The section is revised accordingly. Discussion of proposed carpark is added in

proposed development. If any, their air quality impacts should be assessed.	Section 2.5.4.
8. Section 2.5 – Industrial/chimney emission a. Please review if there is any source of industrial/chimney emission within the assessment area. If any, their air quality impacts should be assessed with reference to Table 3.1 of Chapter 9 of HKPSG. Please supplement in a new sub-section under Section 2.5. As mentioned in Comment #3(a) above, it is noted that there are a number of industrial activities in the vicinity of the proposed development. Please review and further supplement the findings identified in the vicinity to support there is no active/heavy industrial operation in the vicinity and hence no adverse I/R interface problem is anticipated. Please supplement in a new sub-section under Section 2.5.	Discussion of industrial/chimney emission is added in Section2.5.5. Discussion of industrial/chimney emission is added in Section2.5.5.
9. Section 2.5 – Odour emission - Please review if there is any source of odour emission within the assessment area (e.g. livestock farm, lard boiling factory, STP/SPS, temple with incense/joss paper burning, nullah, etc.), if any, their air quality/odour impacts should be assessed. Please supplement in a new sub-section under Section 2.5.	Discussion of odour emission is added in Section 2.5.6.
10. Section 2.6.1 a. Please add “and gaseous” after “Fugitive dust” in line 1. b. Please revise “dust” in line 2 to “air quality”. c. Please delete “at source to acceptable levels” in the 2nd last line, and add “adverse” before “air”. d. Please delete “to be adverse” in the last line.	The section is revised accordingly. The section is revised accordingly. The section is revised accordingly. The section is revised accordingly.

Email dated 25th August 2025 refers:

Comment from the Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department

Based on the submitted SIA, please advise on the following points:

1. Section 2.2,3: Please clarify sentence, i.e.'..... will be implemented and maintained by other development.'.	Please refer to Section 2.4 to 2.5 for revise paragraph.
2. Figure 3: Information of existing sewerage system shown on the submitted sewerage plan is different from our sewerage record. The applicant should clarify discrepancies and advise whether modification of existing sewerage system is required and would be implemented by the applicant for the proposed development. Also, the applicant should clarify management and maintenance responsibilities of the proposed sewerage system after modification work (if any).	More information of existing sewerage system and proposed sewerage system including management and maintenance responsibilities are provided in Section 2.2 to 2.5.
3. Section 3.1.2 & Figure 3: The applicant should clarify whether 300 mm dia. sewers are existing sewers or newly proposed sewers. Also, the applicant should clarify words, i.e. '...existing sewerage system...'.	300 mm dia. sewers are proposed by approved planning application A/YL-NSW/314.
4. Figure 3: For Catchment A, the applicant should provide information regarding the proposed development at private lots (Lot No.: 3670 RP, 3671 RP, 3672 RP and 3673 RP in D.D. I 04). The applicant should also clarify whether Catchment B is referring to another planning application (No.: ANL-NSW/314). Besides, please clarify the mitigation measures if the sewerage works proposed under other planning applications, such as A/YL-NSW/314, Y/YL-MP/10 and etc., could not match with the programme of the proposed development.	Figure 3 is revised accordingly. For situation if the sewerage works proposed under other planning applications, such as A/YL-NSW/314, Y/YL-MP/10 and etc., could not match with the programme, there will be no population intake for the proposed development until proposed sewerage system becomes available. Relevant explanation is provided in Section 2.4.
5. Figure 3: Please clarify the '-' sign of cover levels and invert levels shown on the submitted drawing.	'-' sign refer to height below m.P.D. level.
6. Figure 3: The applicant should clarify invert levels of the proposed foul water manhole P3. Invert levels of the proposed sewerage facilities at the upstream shall be higher than that at the downstream.	The invert level is revised.

7. Figure 3: The ID nos of the existing government manholes to which sewerage connection is made should be indicated on the submitted sewerage plan.	Noted.
8. Figure 3: The applicant should clarify cover levels of the proposed manholes Pl-P15. Also, the applicant should clarify whether manhole E1 shown on the submitted sewerage plan is existing foul water manhole FSH1001886. The applicant should indicate cover level and invert levels of existing foul water manhole FSI-11001886 on the submitted sewerage plan for reference.	Cover levels are provided. Manhole E1 is revised to manhole FSH1001886.
9. Figure 3 & Appendix B: The applicant should clarify discrepancy of size of sewer connecting the proposed manholes MH235 and Pl. Also, the applicant should clarify invert level of the proposed sewer connecting to manhole E1.	Size of sewer and invert level is revised and corrected.
10. Appendix B': Design flow velocity is suggested to be within a range, i.e. 0.7 m/s to 3.0 in/s. The applicant should review hydraulic calculation for the sewers connecting the proposed manholes MH235 and P3.	Flow velocity is reviewed and all within 0.7 m/s to 3.0 m/s.
11. According to the submitted SIA, the applicant would like to connect the proposed sewerage system of the subject application site to existing sewerage system which has not yet been commissioned and the proposed sewerage system under other planning applications (No.: A/YL-NSW/314 and etc.). Satisfaction of the submission and implementation of SIA under the subject planning application is subject to acceptance and satisfactory implementation of SIA under other planning applications (No.: A/YL-NSW/314 and etc.).	Noted, further liaison with EPD/DSD and the other future developments near the Proposed Site would be in later stage.
12. Figure 3: The applicant should note that there are several planning applications/proposed developments in the vicinity of the application site and the sewerage system proposed under the subject planning application may have conflict with that proposed under other planning applications (No.: Y/YL-NSW/7 and etc.). The applicant should liaise and coordinate with EPD and other project proponents to confirm the proposed sewerage design and ascertain responsibilities of implementation and maintenance of the proposed sewerage works.	Noted, further liaison with EPD/DSD and the other future developments near the Proposed Site would be in later stage.
13. The SIA needs to meet full satisfaction of Sewerage Infrastructure Group (SIG) of	Noted, further liaison with EPD/DSD and the

Environmental Protection Department (EPD), the planning authority of sewerage infrastructure. Since there are various proposed developments which are planned to dispose sewage to Nam Sang Wai Sewage Pumping Station (NSWSPS), advice from SIG of EPD should be sought for holistically review of the sewerage arrangement and confirming whether capacity has been reserved at NSWSPS for the subject proposed development. Comments of this department on the sewerage aspect are subject to the views and agreement of EPD.	other future developments near the Proposed Site would be in later stage.
--	---

Email dated 18th July 2025 refers:

Comment from the Director of Environmental Protection

Based on the submitted SIA, please advise to the following points:	
1. RtC item 1, Section 2.2.2, Figures 2 & 3 – As shown in Figure 2, there is no existing public sewerage along Kam Pok Road East and Pok Wai South Road. Please clarify and provide information to support the existence of sewer mentioned under S.2.2.2. Please supplement with information of the upgrading works under A/YL-NSW/314 proposed to be utilised for discharging sewage from the application site. Please also clarify the party responsible for the construction of the sewers along Kam Pok Road East and Pok Wai South Road etc. proposed to serve the application site for sewage disposal as shown under Figure 3.	More information of existing sewerage and the proposed sewerage system is discussed in Section 2.2 to 2.5.
2. RtC item 2 & Appendix B – The hydraulic assessment should take into account the existing and planned developments utilising the proposed communal gravity sewer along Pok Wai South Road. Please revise.	Appendix B is revised, existing and planned developments have been considered.
3. As the current sewage disposal scheme solely relies on sewerage to be constructed by others, please provide a fallback disposal option in case of programme mismatch with the construction of such sewerage work to be carried out by others.	There will be no population intake for the proposed development until proposed sewerage system becomes available. Discussion is provided in Section 2.4.

Email dated 23th July 2025 refers: <u>Comment from the Director of Social Welfare</u>	
Regarding the plan of G/F to 2/F in the updated development scheme, the applicant should note that at least 1 accessible water closet shall be provided on each floor with bedroom(s) or sitting/dining room. If the number of residents is more than 50 on that floor, an additional accessible water closet shall be provided for every 50 residents (or less) (Please refer to para. 4.5.2, CoP).	Noted. Detailed design will be considered and submitted at the licensing application stage.
Regarding the end-of-life room, isolation room and sick bay on 1 st floor, applicant should note that if there are more than 50 beds, an additional isolation room/facility shall be provided for every extra 50 beds (or less). For RCHEs providing 200 beds or above, 4 isolation rooms/facilities (including at least 1 designated isolation room) shall be provided (Please refer to note 42 of para. 13.4.1, CoP).	Noted. Detailed design will be considered and submitted at the licensing application stage.
Regarding the updated SoA table, the changes in the proposed provision is noted.	Noted.
It is necessary for the applicant to indicate the “number of operators” of the RCHE in view that the requirement of facilities and design will be different if there is more than one RCHE operator. On the floor plans of proposed RCHE, there is only one laundry, one kitchen cum store and one general office. These facilities are basically provided only one RCHE operator	The proposed development will only be operated by one operator.
It is noted that there are indications for emergency vehicular access on the layout. Would the applicant please indicate/elaborate regarding the location for ambulance layby.	The ambulance layby will share with the light goods vehicle layby (3.5m x 7m) near the emergency vehicular access on the G/F.