No.	Departmental Comments	Response
A.	**From: Environmental Protection Department ("EPD")** (via Planning Department (**"PlanD"**) in Email dated 17.9.2025)	
A1.	**Noise**	
A1.1.	1. Please document TD's agreement on the traffic forecast data in the report. 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.	For streamline the approval, a qualitative road traffic noise assessment is now being adopted in this revised EA report. Given that a 3m high boundary wall with a surface density of at least 10kg/m^2 is erected around the site to effectively screen the line of sight between the proposed RCHD and surrounding road links, including the major traffic noise sources at Yuen Long Highway, no adverse road traffic noise impact is anticipated. Please refer to the revised Section 2.3 for qualitative road traffic noise assessment.
A1.2.	2. S2.2.1.1 – Nearby road network is mentioned to be shown in "Figure 3.1". However, "Figure 3.1" is about the location of fixed noise source. Please clarify and revise as necessary.	The nearby road network within 300m has been indicated in Appendix B.
A1.3.	3. Table 2.2 – The maximum predicted road traffic noise level at NSR is 63 dB(A) according to Appendix C. Please review and revise as necessary.	Refer to response in this R-to-C A1.1.
A1.4.	4. S3.4 – The impact of the planned fixed noise source to the planned noise sensitive receiver should also be assessed. Please include the planned NSR (e.g. the office or the bedroom of the proposed development) in the fixed noise assessment. Although the potential fixed noise is considered to be minimal with the implementation of appropriate design and mitigation measures, the fixed noise impact on planned NSRs should still be assessed and mentioned in the assessment for proper record.	Planned fixed noise sources have been supplemented in Table 3.3 and S3.2.1.9 and S3.2.1.10. The evaluation of noise impacts from planned fixed noise sources can be referred to S3.3.2. As relevant noise data is not available during the planning stage, noise mitigation measures such as silencer and acoustic louvres are proposed to be installed in the planned fixed noise sources to minimize the fixed noise impact from planned noise sources on the planned NSRs. In view of the above, the paragraphs in S1.2.1.2, S3.4 and S8.2.1.2 have all been revised accordingly. The representative planned NSRs are supplemented in revised Figure 3.2.

No.	Departmental Comments	Response
A1.5.	5. S3.2 – Noted that on-site visit to the identified fixed noise source was conducted on 19 march 2025. Please provide the relevant record and photos in the appendix for proper record.	Noted and supplemented in Appendix G and revised in S3.2.1.1.
A1.6.	**Noise Model** 6. The 3m boundary wall in the model does not tally with the layout plan. Please review and revise as necessary.	For streamline the approval, qualitative road traffic noise assessment is now being adopted in this revised EA report. Therefore, no noise model is required.
A2.	**Air Quality**	
A2.1.	7. Executive Summary (Chinese) (a) The Chinese version is inconsistent with the English version, please update based on the English version.	(a) As the Chinese version is considered not required in this revised EA and there it has been deleted.
A2.2.	8. Section 4.2.4.2 (a) Please delete "recommended" in line 1.	(a) "recommended" in line 1 in S4.2.4.2 has been deleted.
A2.3.	9. Section 4.4.2.3 (a) Please provide TD's endorsement once available.	(a) Noted and TD Endorsement on the road types has been supplemented in Appendix H.
A2.4.	10. Section 4.4.2.6 (a) Please delete “Yuen Long Highway" in line 3.	(a) “Yuen Long Highway" in line 3 in S4.4.2.6 has been deleted.
A2.5.	11. Section 4.4.2.7 (a) Please add “within the proposed development” after “proposed” in line 4.	(a) Noted and revised.
A2.6.	12. Section 4.4.3.1 (a) In addition to site visit, please carry out desktop review to confirm the chimney findings. Please supplement.	(a) Noted and the result of the desktop review has confirmed the chimney findings are in order.
A2.7.	13. Section 4.4.4.1 (a) Please confirm if the odour survey for identification of odour sources covers 500m assessment area of the site boundary. Please supplement.	(a) Yes, it covers 500m assessment area. S4.4.4.1 has been revised accordingly.

No.	Departmental Comments	Response
A2.8.	14. Section 4.4.4.4 (a) Please advise if the proposed septic tank/soakaway pit system is enclosed with reinforced concrete. If so, please add "and enclosed with reinforced concrete" after "underground" in line 2. In addition, please advise if negative pressure will be maintained inside the proposed septic tank/soakaway pit system. (b) Please explore if higher removal efficiency (e.g. 99% or above) of the deodorizer is available. (c) Please compare the odour impact assessment results of other similar system with similar capacity, odour removal efficiency, exhaust height and separation distance from the nearest ASRs as the proposed septic tank/soakaway pit system to justify it would not impose adverse odour impact to any nearby ASRs. (d) Also please provide a figure to indicate the location of the proposed septic tank/soakaway pit system and the potential location and direction of exhaust with the separation distances with the nearby ASRs.	(a) The original S4.4.4.3 and S4.4.4.4 have been revised and renumbered to S4.4.4.3. Please note that vent pipe instead of negative pressure will be provided for the proposed septic tank/soakaway pit system. However, high-efficiency deodorizer will be installed to ensure that any emissions will be deodorized before entering the atmosphere. (Please also see s4.5.4.2 for details) (b) High-efficiency deodorizer of at least 99% has been proposed. Please refer S4.5.4.2. (c) Please refer to the revised S4.5.4.2 to S4.5.4.3. (d) Noted and supplemented Figure 4.2.
A2.9.	15. Section 4.4.4.7 (a) Please advise the meaning of "Cooker hoods wit" in line 2, and correct the typo "cooling" in the 2nd last line.	(a) The original S4.4.4.7 has been revised and is now renumbered to S4.4.4.6.
A2.10.	16. Section 4.5.1.2 (a) Please revise the last sentence as "Given that the construction works are small in scale and only expected to generate small amounts of excavated materials, with the implementation of the air quality control measures stipulated under the Air Pollution Control (Construction Dust) Regulation and adoption of good site practices, the associated air quality impacts during the construction phase will be controlled."	(a) Noted and revised accordingly in S4.5.1.2.

No.	Departmental Comments	Response
A2.11.	17. Section 4.5.1.3 (a) Please add "'or dusty" after "heavy" in line 5. (b) Please add "adverse" before " cumulative " in the 2"" last line, and revise "are expected to be minimal with a long separation distance in between" in the last line as "and the concurrent project are not anticipated.". (c) Same amendments for Section 4.5.1.4 by incorporating Comments #11(a) and I(b) above. Alternatively, the consultant may consider to combine two sections for presentation to avoid repeated content and for clarity.	(a) Noted and revised accordingly in S4.5.1.3. (b) Noted and revised accordingly in S4.5.1.3. (c) Noted and revised accordingly. The conclusion of air quality impacts in two sections (S4.5.1.3 and S4.5.1.4) have been combined into S4.5.1.4 to avoid confusion.
A2.12.	18. Section 4.5.1.4 (a) Please check if "due to potential delays in the programme" in line 6 could be deleted.	(a) Noted and deleted accordingly in S4.5.1.4.
A2.13.	19. Table 4.4 (a) In the column "Buffer Distance", please revise as "5m" for both Shan Ha Road and Local Access Road.	(a) Noted and revised accordingly in Table 4.4.
A2.14.	20. Sections 4.4.2, 4.4.3, 4.4.4 and 4.5.2 (a) For the operational phase, the evaluation of some air quality impacts are presented in Sections 4.4.2 to 4.4.4 which should be the identification of emission sources. Please review if they should be presented under Section 4.5.2 and update the report structure as appropriate.	(a) Noted and revised accordingly in S4.5.2.4, S4.5.3 and S4.5.4.
A2.15.	21. Section 4.6.1.1 (a) Please revise "(Non-road vehicles) Regulations" in line 2 to "Air Pollution Control (Non-road Mobile Machinery) (Emission) Regulation".	(a) Noted and revised.
A2.16.	22. Section 4.7.1.1 (a) Please delete "if not properly managed" in line 5.	(a) Noted and deleted in S4.7.1.1.
A2.17.	23. Section 4.7.1.2 (a) Please update the summary for operational phase by incorporating the odour impact from the proposed septic tank/soakaway pit system. Same comment for Sections 1.3.1.2 and 8.3.1.2.	(a) Noted and updated in S1.3.1.2, S4.7.1.2 and S8.3.1.2.

No.	Departmental Comments	Response
A2.18.	24. Please highlight all the changes/amendments in the next submission.	Noted and highlighted.
A3.	**Waste Management**	
A3.1.	25. Section 1.2.1.1 – Please include waste management assessment.	Waste management section already incorporated in S1.6.
A3.2.	26. Tables 5.1 & 5.2 – It is suggested to merge these tables for better presentation.	Noted and merged in Table 5.1.
A3.3.	27. Table 7.1 – Please clarify the difference between "0" and " "	Noted and typo errors in Table 7.1 have been revised.
A3.4.	28. Table 7.2 – For consistency, please either include the frequency of trips for inert and non-inert C&D materials or remove the frequency of trips for general refuse and chemical waste.	Noted and removed the frequency of trips for general refuse and chemical waste in Table 7.2.
A3.5.	29. Section 7.4.1.6 – Please review if recycling arrangement will be included for non-inert C&D materials.	Noted and revised in S7.4.1.6.
A3.6.	30. Section 7.4.1.8 – (a) As lines 1-7 of the sections are not relevant to mitigation measures, please review if these sentences should be relocated under Section 7.3.1.6. (b) Please clarify the discrepancy on estimates quantity of chemical waste to be generated between Table 7.1 and this section (i.e. a few dozen litre per month vs few hundred litres per month).	(a) Noted and revised in S7.3.1.7. (b) Noted and revised to few dozen litres per month in S7.3.1.7.
A3.7.	31. Section 7.4.2.3 – Please supplement CWP registration and the Code of Practice on the Packaging, Labelling, and Storage of Chemical Wastes in the section.	Additional information has been added in S7.4.2.3 accordingly.
A4.	**Water Quality**	
A4.1.	32. S.6.2.1.1 – Please review if "Water Supplies Department (WSD) Water Quality Criteria" is applicable to this project. If yes, please provide more details in Section 6.3.	Noted and deleted accordingly in S6.2.1.1.
A4.2.	33. S.6.8.2.1 last sentence – Please review if it should be read as "...no adverse water quality impact is anticipated."	Noted and revised accordingly.

No.	Public Comments	Response
1.	**Contact: Ms. CHAN Y Y**	
a.	此計劃能善用及活化空置的政府校舍又能提供宿位予有需要的弱勢人士，最近跟精神病患者相關的新聞令人關注，確實是一個雙贏的計劃。 此外，計劃地點跟民居有一定距離，能讓患者和民眾互相留有空間，自成一角，對院友精神病復康也有利。 加上，申請人服務精神病患者有多年經驗，希望能通過此計劃，可多一個地方容納精神病患者。謝謝。	知悉。
2.	**Contact: 喜悅居(復康宿舍)**	
a.	本院希望是次申請能獲 貴局通過，好為精神病患者提供一個安穩的環境，從而讓他們逐步踏出社會及使大眾認知、理解精神病人並非洪水猛獸，只要得到適當的應對及照顧，他們都有空間大放異彩。懇請城規會能盡快批准這申請，本院承諾定當秉持一如暨往的熱誠與關懷繼續服務更多有需要的弱勢人士。謝謝!	Noted.
3.	**Contact: Mary Mulvihill**	
a.	Hopefully this applicant is more reliable than Banyan Services Association 10 June 2022: After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis **for a period of 10 years until 10.6.2032** 15 Mar 2024 Section 16A Application No. A/YL-TYST/1132-4 Application for Extension of Time for Compliance with Planning Conditions **NOT TO CONSIDER** Fully support a genuine operation.	Background of the Applicant has already been provided in the Planning Statement. The scale of development under application is intended to meet the long-term operation and community needs. The application site has been left vacant for a long period of time

No.	Public Comments	Response
	However, maintain objection to elimination of basketball court. Community recreational facilities should be retained. It would also provide exercise space for mobile residents of the RCHE. No approval time indicated on the gist?	
4.	**Contact: 屏山鄉欖口村村代表 及屏山鄉山廈村村代表**	
a.	(a) 就有關前華封學校（部分）有團體向 貴委員會申請改變用途，屏山鄉山廈村及欖口村提出反對。 (b) 前華封學校是屏山鄉山廈村及欖口村興建兩村早前支持「榕光社」建辦老人院舍，經過幾年時間申請，最終未能得到政府支持，擱置有關申請。現在另一間團體申請相同設施，兩村提出反對，希望 貴委員會否決有關申請。有勞之處，不勝感銘。	(a) 擬議社會福利設施是社區嚴重需求及短缺的設施，更是善用土地資源，優化地區環境，體現社區共融，同心協力，建築和諧社區。是次申請主因是受到元朗南新發展區收地影響，而申請人最殷切達成的目標，是希望儘快安置受影響的院友，讓院友們回復「家」的照顧。申請人無論規劃申請或相關重置院舍安排上一直積極地聯繫政府部門將新院舍儘快落實。 (b) 同上。