Application for Amendment of Plan under Section 12A of the Town Planning Ordinance (Cap. 131)

Approved Quarry Bay Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H21/28 relating to the "Other Specified Uses (1)" annotated "Cultural and/or Commercial, Leisure and Tourism Related Uses" ("OU(1)") Zone at Inland Lots 8590 RP (Part) and 8723 RP (Part) and Adjoining Government Land, Hoi Yu Street, Quarry Bay, Hong Kong

(Planning Application No. Y/H21/7)

FURTHER INFORMATION (3)

Response to Departmental Comments (2)

April 2026

Table of Contents

Attachments

Attachment 1: Revised Air Quality Impact Assessment

Attachment 2: Revised Environmental Assessment

Introduction

This document contains the Applicant's responses to the comments from the Environmental Protection Department dated 16th and 25th February, and 3rd March 2026. A revised Air Quality Impact Assessment (AQIA) (Appendix 6 of Planning Statement) and Environmental Assessment (EA) (Appendix 5 of Planning Statement) are also provided as part of this Further Information (3) submission, which should be read in conjunction with this document.

1. Response to Comments relating to Air Quality (Appendix 6 – AQIA)

Comments from Environmental Protection Department dated 16th February 2026

Comments of Environmental Protection Department (Contact person: Ms. Virginia WONG; Tel.: 2835 1109)	**Response to Comment**
1. In order to facilitate the applicant to submit a revised submission within the specified period according to TPB PG-No. 32B, EPD's comments are given in batches for your follow-up action. After the clarification from the applicant, please find EPD's first batch of comments on the AQIA under the FI 2, submitted to the TPB on 10.2.2026. Comments on air model and other technical aspects (noise impact and waste management) will be provided in due course.	Noted.
2. EPD would like to reiterate that the applicant should be prepared to re-submit the AQIA and re-run the air modelling to demonstrate all sensitive uses of the proposed development would comply with the relevant guidelines upon receive of EPD's comments on the air model. *[See attachment "20260216_Y-H21-7_Annex A_AQIA Comments (1stbatch).docx"]*	Noted, a revised AQIA is provided in this submission.
Comments provided in the document titled *"20260216_Y-H21-7_Annex A_AQIA Comments (1st batch).docx"*: **<u>Air Quality</u>** <u>Appendix 6 – AQIA</u> 1. Please rectify the numbering of tables in the report. Please repeat the row header if the table splits across two pages	The table numbering has been reviewed and is now presented in consist of name and format; the row headers are repeated where table split across pages.
2. Table 2.2, Table 2.3 under Section 2.2.9 – Please remove Table 2.2 and add buffer	Table 2.2 has been updated and the buffer distances for odour sources have been added to Table 2.3.

Comments of Environmental Protection Department (Contact person: Ms. Virginia WONG; Tel.: 2835 1109)	**Response to Comment**
distance for odour sources in Table 2.3.	
3. Please assign section numbers to the paragraphs after the 1st Table 2.3.	Section numbers have been assigned to the paragraphs following Table 2.3.
4. Section 2.2.10 – Please revise as follows:… and **background contributions from regional sources and** major point source within 4km from the Proposed Development (Tier 3).	Section 2.2. has been revised to include the background contributions from regional sources and major point sources within 4km from the Proposed Development, which in line with the comment.
5. Table 2.2 under Section 2.3.1 – (a) Please check if annual FSP in 2021 and 2024 exceeded AQO, and update Section 2.3.2 accordingly if necessary. (b) Please add a note to state that CO is not measured in the Eastern AQMS. (c) Please delete "Station" in the title.	a) Table 2.2 (now Table 2.4) under Section 2.3.1 has been updated. The average annual FSP values for both 2021 and 2024 are 14.5ug/m^3, which has been rounded up to 15. Fine Suspended Particulates ($PM_{2.5}$) Monthly and Annual Average Concentrations (μg/m^3) (Annual AQO = 25 μg/m^3) (Table D2) of https://www.aqhi.gov.hk/common/api_history/english/report/files/AQR2024e_finalUpdate0305.pdf Pollutant: Fine Suspended Particulates ($PM_{2.5}$) (Annual limit value = 35 μg/m^3) https://www.aqhi.gov.hk/common/api_history/english/report/files/AQR2021e_final.pdf Section 2.3.2 of the report has been updated accordingly. b) A note has been added to state that CO is not measured at the Eastern AQMS. c) Revised.
6. Table 2.3a and 2.3b – Please delete the columns "Number of Exceedances" and combine the two tables.	Table 2.3a and 2.3b are combined and updated (now table 2.5), the number of Exceedance are now deleted.
7. Section 2.4.1 – Please replace "first floor" with "ground floor" in line 3. 8. Table 2.4 – (a) Please use consistent ASR IDs across the report, figures and appendices (ASR 01/ ASR001/ ASR_001, etc.?)	In Section 2.4.1, 'first floor' in line 3 has been replaced with 'ground floor a) The ASR IDs in Table 2.4 (now Table 2.6) have been standardised to a consistent format, all ASR

Comments of Environmental Protection Department (Contact person: Ms. Virginia WONG; Tel.: 2835 1109)	**Response to Comment**
(b) Please provide base level. (c) For assessment heights, please revise to 1.5,5,10,15,20,25,30,35,40,45 (mAG/mPD?).	are named under format as "ASR 001", to "ASR 018" across the report. b) The base level has been clarified and confirmed as the ground level. c) The assessment heights have been revised to 1.5, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40 and 45 mAG, in accordance with the comment.
9. Section 3.1.3 – Please delete "That is, there is no Tier 1 contributions." We note that there will be basement carpark in the proposed development. Please note that the proposed carpark shall satisfy the requirements, including design, maintenance and operation of the ventilation systems, stipulated in the ProPECC PN 2/96 - Control of Air Pollution in Car Park. Please indicate the location of the exhaust outlet of the ventilation system to demonstrate the exhaust air outlet will be located as far as possible from nearby air sensitive uses to avoid causing an air pollutant nuisance. Please discuss carpark in the proposed development (e.g. whether ProPECC PN 2/96 will be followed, location of carpark exhaust and fresh air intake, vehicular emission has been reflected in broad-brush approach for open-road emissions).	Section 3.1.3 has been revised and the sentence 'That is, there is no Tier 1 contributions.' has been deleted. A brief discussion on the proposed basement car park design has been added in Section 3.1.3, including confirmation that the design, maintenance and operation of the ventilation system will follow the requirements of ProPECC PN 2/96, and the exhaust outlet locations will be arranged as far as practicable from nearby air sensitive uses.
10. Section 3.1.4 and RtC #28– (a) Please review whether precise approach should be adopted for calculating the emissions from the carpark on the eastern side of the EHT Ventilation Building and coach parking sites along Hoi Chak Street. (b) Please replace "far-field" with "background" in the 2nd last line.	Further site visits were conducted on 24 and 25 February. It was confirmed that the car park located on the eastern side of the EHT Ventilation Building is used only by private vehicles, and heavy good vehicles are not allowed to stay on a long-term basis. Therefore, a broad-brush approach has been adopted for the emission calculations. For Hoi Chak Street, there are 2 coach parking spaces along the street, the parking site is 135 m away from the proposed development, since it is not under direct line of site and therefore the emission is not considered significant. A broad-brush approach has been adopted for the emission calculations. The term 'far-field' in the second last line has been replaced by 'background'.
11. Section 3.1.6 – (a) Please use separate paragraph to discuss the 4m major emission sources instead of grouping the discussion with the FSD pier. (b) Please revise the sentence "The Cape	a) A separate paragraph have been introduced to discuss the four major emission sources in section 3.1.6. b) The sentence is now revised and further justification is included.

Comments of Environmental Protection Department (Contact person: Ms. Virginia WONG; Tel.: 2835 1109)	**Response to Comment**
Collinson Crematorium (Ma Tau Kok Gas Production Plant) is located approximately 4.0 (3.8) km from the Project site and are screened by natural terrain (high-rise buildings)." by separating discussion for Cape Collinson Crematorium and Ma Tau Kok Gas Production Plant into 2 sentences. (c) Please supplement that the project site would have direct line of sight to the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal, and the separation distance with the Terminal.	c) The Project site has a direct line of sight to the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal with a separation distance of approximately 1.35km.
12. Section 3.1.7 – If SO2 is not identified as key air pollutants for all the identified Tier 2 emission sources, it is not necessary to model SO2 emissions from the 4km major emission sources. Please revise.	Section 3.17 (now 3.1.8) is revised and SO2 description is not included.
13. Section 3.1.11 and Appendix F – Please provide TD's endorsement once available.	Noted, TD endorsement will provide once available.
~~14. Section 3.1.13 – Please append the calculation of %(LD+RR) (i.e. 21.74%) in the report.~~ *(superseded by the submission received on 13.2.2026)*	
15. Section 3.1.16, Appendix E and G and RtC #29 – (a) According to the reply from the tunnel operator attached in Appendix G, the tunnel operator did not confirm that the ventilation system extracts air from the tunnel and it only mentioned that the air quality inside the tunnel would be controlled by the ventilation fans. In view of the uncertainties in the tunnel portal and ventilation building emissions and the proximity of the proposed development to the ventilation buildings, please conduct a sensitivity analysis by comparing the emission contributed by portal and ventilation building at the project ASRs of 30%/70% split scenario with 2 other scenarios – (i) 100% emission from portal, and (ii) 100% from ventilation building. Please provide the results comparison in appendix and supplement discussion in the report.	A Sensitivity Test has been conducted, total 4 cases of scenario: Base case, case 2 with 70/30 ratio, case 3 with 100% portal and case 4 100% ventilation building. • Base, Case 2 and Case 3 all show **full compliance with NO_2 AQOs** at every ASR, with worst-case 1-hr NO_2 remaining below 200 μg/m³ and similar spatial patterns focused on ASR012–ASR013 mid-levels. • Case 4 assumes 100% of tunnel exhaust is discharged via the Quarry Bay Ventilation Building at continuous full design load, leading to a marginal 1-hr NO_2 exceedance (~202 μg/m³) at ASR012 only; this is an **intentionally extreme, operationally unrealistic** scenario used as a stress test rather than a design condition. • Overall, the sensitivity analysis confirms that under all **realistic** tunnel operating modes, the Proposed Development continues to comply with the AQOs and is **not expected to experience unacceptable air quality impacts** from tunnel / ventilation building emissions.

Comments of Environmental Protection Department (Contact person: Ms. Virginia WONG; Tel.: 2835 1109)	**Response to Comment**
(b) It is mentioned that emission split for portal and ventilation building is 30% and 70% respectively, while the ventilation building emission % in Appendix E is 35% for 2 locations each. Please clarify the source of information for having 2 exhausts for ventilation building and the assumption of evening the emission for the 2 exhausts.	A newly included Chapter 5 of the report will present the findings of the Sensitivity Analysis. Appendix O of the AQIA report is also include the results. b) The assumption used in this case is there are 2 ventilation fan with both on same sizes with the same flow rate, which was confirmed during the site visit.
16. Section 3.1.17 – Please review whether the furnace should follow EPD's Guidelines on Air Pollution Control for Paper Artifacts Burning at Funeral Parlours and Other Places of Worship instead of EPD's Guidelines on Air Pollution Control for Joss Paper Burning at Chinese Temples, Crematoria, and Similar Places. Please supplement that key air pollutants of the paper-artifact furnace are NO2, FSP and RSP only, and explain why SO2 is not a key pollutant for that.	Section 3.1.17 has been revised to confirm that the paper artifact furnace will follow the 'EPD's Guidelines on Air Pollution Control for Paper Artifacts Burning at Funeral Parlours and Other Places of Worship'. The nearest ASR to the HKFH paper artifact furnace is about 210 m away, which is beyond the 200 m buffer distance recommended in HKPSG Chapter 9 for industrial chimneys and similar emission sources, indicating that SO_2 impact from this source is not expected to be significant at ASRs. (HKPSG Chapter 9 Section 3) The furnace adopts the Best Available Technology (water scrubber plus electrostatic precipitator) specified in the guideline to achieve "no visible emissions," with control focusing on particulates (smoke and ash flakes) as the governing pollutants. Given the very low sulphur content of paper and wood fuels, the removal of non-paper materials prior to burning, and the inclusion of wet scrubbing that further attenuates acid gases, sulphur dioxide (SO_2) emissions are inherently minimal. SO_2 has therefore been qualitatively screened out as a non-governing pollutant and excluded from detailed AERMOD dispersion modelling, which instead assesses particulate impacts relevant to air quality and potential nuisance at the ASRs.
17. Section 3.1.18 – Please review the ship calls of future years to confirm that Costa Serana would be the representative cruise for Kai Tak Cruise Terminal. If other cruise should be referenced, please update the calculations of the emission rates from the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal. Please provide the date of the reference report.	The cruise ship call schedules for 2026 and future years at Kai Tak Cruise Terminal have been reviewed using the information available at kaitakcruiseterminal.com.hk/schedule/. The schedules indicate a mix of large cruise vessels, with Costa Serena being a recurring full-day caller (largest engine sizes). Retaining Costa Serena as the representative cruise ship is therefore considered appropriate and provides a conservative upper-bound estimate of emissions from Kai Tak Cruise Terminal. The date of the reference schedule has been stated in section 3.1.20 and Appendix I of the revised report.
18. Section 4.1.1-4.1.7 and Appendix N – Please supplement the worst affected heights of each parameter and explain how the heights	The worst-affected assessment heights for each parameter have been identified and are now presented in Sections 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 4.1.5 and 4.1.6 of the report. The heights

Comments of Environmental Protection Department (Contact person: Ms. Virginia WONG; Tel.: 2835 1109)	**Response to Comment**
for the contours in Appendix N are determined.	selected for the contour plots in Appendix N are based on these worst-affected levels for each pollutant and averaging period.
19. Please repeat table headers in the appendices.	The table headers have been repeated on subsequent pages in the relevant appendices to facilitate reading.
20. Please consider to adopt "Landscape" page setup for the figures and improve the resolution of the figures.	The page layout of the figures has been revised to landscape where appropriate, and the figure resolutions have been enhanced to improve readability.
21. Figure 2-1 – (a) Please overlay PATH grids. (b) The markings of the noise barriers do not match with the legend. Please rectify the figure. (c) There is no legend for the circle of the Hong Kong Funeral Home. Please supplement. (d) The two titles of Figure 2-1 do not match. Please rectify.	The PATH grids have been overlaid on Figure 2-1. The markings of the noise barriers have been rectified so that they are consistent with the legend, and a legend entry for the Hong Kong Funeral Home has been added. The two titles of Figure 2-1 have also been checked and made consistent.
22. Figure 2-3 – Please delete the north arrow in the middle of the page. The two titles of Figure 2-3 do not match. Please rectify.	The north arrow in the middle of Figure 2-3 has been removed. The titles of Figure 2-3 have been revised so that they are consistent.
23. Appendix E – (a) Please provide a road link map overlaid with PATH grids and road IDs, and indicate which roads have start emissions in the map. (b) Please remove irrelevant files "Albedo and Roughness" and "Jenkin_Summary-2020-2024" in Appendix E folder. (c) Map for the VKT road do not align with the SAMP road segment (e.g. HOI SHIN LANE, EASTERN HARBOUR CROSSING). Please ensure consistency with the SAMP road segment.	A road link map overlaid with PATH grids and corresponding road IDs has been provided in Appendix E, and roads with start emissions are clearly indicated on the map The files 'Albedo and Roughness' and 'Jenkin_Summary-2020-2024' have been removed from the Appendix E folder as they are not relevant to this submission The road link map has been updated to align with the SAMP road segment definitions
24. For SAMP files of open road, portal and ventilation building emission: (a) SAMP input file error was found "[11 - Non-franchised Bus ≤ 6.4t] field not found". Please check and fix the input file. (b) It is noted that Portal emissions P001 do not account for the traffic along the whole EHC tunnel. Please rectify.	The model input and output files in the appendices have been reviewed to ensure consistency with the information presented in the main text and figures. Any inconsistencies identified have been rectified, and the updated files are enclosed in this submission
25. Appendix H – (a) According to the HKPC's reply, the parameters provided belong to the	Based on the information from HKPC, we have evaluated the assumptions,

Comments of Environmental Protection Department (Contact person: Ms. Virginia WONG; Tel.: 2835 1109)	**Response to Comment**
furnace at Tsang Tsui. Please review whether it is appropriate to adopt these assumptions for the Hong Kong Funeral Home. (b) For Note [3]&[4], please specify the calculation of stack diameter and exit velocity. (c) For exit temperature, information provided by HKPC is 90-100ºC, please adopt the lower temperature as conservative assumption instead of referencing to approved EIA Report. (d) For Note [6], please provide proper reference to the paper including the author names, dates, etc. (e) For Note [8], please explain how 80% removal efficiency is assumed.	a) The calculation of stack diameter and exit velocity can be referred from the EIA report Air Quality Appendix 3.7
26. Appendix I – Please provide notes to the table.	Notes have been added to the table in Appendix I.
27. Appendix M – (a) Please provide excel spreadsheets. (b) Please review if the level should be mAG instead of mPD. (c) ASRs are identified as ASR 01-18, while the modelling ASR IDs are ASR001-180. Please review the numbering of ASRs in modelling to avoid confusion.	a) Excel spreadsheets for the calculations presented in Appendix M have been prepared and are enclosed in this submission for ease of checking. b) The levels in Appendix M have been reviewed. The level reference has been corrected to mAG consistently, in line with the convention adopted in the main report and figures." c) The ASR numbering in the modelling files has been reviewed. The model ASR IDs have been updated so that they are consistent with the report notation (ASR 001–018), thereby avoiding confusion between the ASR IDs in the text, figures and modelling files.
28. Appendix N – Please ensure all the contours have concentration labels e.g. For annual PM2.5 at 20 mPD, no label for the contour line near ASR001-004; for 19th highest 24-hour PM2.5 at 20mPD, no label for the contours near ASR013.	The contour plots in Appendix N have been revised and updated to ensure that all contours are provided with concentration labels.
29. Please use consistent terms for PM2.5/FSP, PM10/RSP across the report.	The terminology for $PM_{2.5}$/FSP and PM_{10}/RSP are reviewed and now all in consistent across the report.
30. Please highlight all changes in the next submission.	All changes are highlighted in yellow for easy reference.
31. Comments on air modelling will be provided in due course.	Follow up comments on 2nd March 2026 is addressed and individual respond is listed in the next section.

Comments from Environmental Protection Department dated 25th February 2026

Comments of Environmental Protection Department (Contact person: Mr Kelvin CHOI; Tel.: 2835 1594)	Response to Comment
1. Please find our comments on the air modelling in the attachment. ***[See attachment "20260225_Y_H21_7 (FI2)_EPD - Air Modelling.docx"]***	Noted, please find our responses to the detailed comments below.
2. In view that EPD's previous comments are **not** duly addressed, and there are still a number of missing information / discrepancy / incorrect result, the applicant would need to submit further information for necessary revisions and updates. Please also be reminded to highlight all the changes with RtC in the coming submissions.	Noted.
Comments provided in the document titled "20260225_Y_H21_7 (FI2)_EPD - Air Modelling.docx" **<u>Comment on Air Quality</u>** <u>Modelling Discrepancies:</u> 1. PM2.5 and NOx model input and output files were mismatched (i.e. the output files were not generated from the provided input files). Please provide a consistent set of model input and output files in each submission.	The $PM_{2.5}$ and NOx model input and output files have been thoroughly reviewed. A consistent set of input and output files has now been prepared so that each output file is generated directly from the corresponding input file, and these paired files are enclosed in this submission for EPD's checking.
2. Road template: • Rd_092 has zero road width. Please review and rectify as appropriate. • RD_085: DCL for the noise barrier was smaller than half of road width. Please review and rectify as appropriate. • For the model files, please use the SO INCLUDED file to refer to the emissions generated by SAMP to facilitate our checking. It is hard to check the model input files with altered formatting and source IDs that are not arranged in order. • Consultant should not modify the preset parts of the Filled Template spreadsheet. In this case, the header was altered, which caused SAMP unable to read the spreadsheet.	A review of the road template has been carried out. The issue of Rd_092 having zero road width has been rectified, and the road width has been updated to reflect the actual road characteristics. For RD_085, the DCL for the noise barrier has been revised so that it is no smaller than half of the road width, in line with the required modelling practice. For the model files, the 'SO INCLUDED' file generated by SAMP has now been used as the direct basis for the emission inputs to facilitate checking. The formatting has not been altered, and the source IDs are arranged in order as in the original file. The preset parts of the Filled Template spreadsheet have not been modified; the previously altered header has been restored so that SAMP can correctly read the spreadsheet

Comments of Environmental Protection Department (Contact person: Mr Kelvin CHOI; Tel.: 2835 1594)	**Response to Comment**
Textual Amendment 3. Appendix H: please name the source ID consistent with those in the model files.	The sources ID in Appendix H (Paper Artifact Furnace) have been reviewed and renamed consistently so they are consistent with those used in the model input and output files.
4. Appendix I with PATH background seems unnecessary. Please consider to remove it.	The PATH background in Appendix I (coordination of sources) are removed.
Results 5. Discrete results: • RSP, SO2 and short-term NO2 have discrepancies compared to EPD calculated results. Please review and revise as appropriate. o Ozone limiting method for short-term NO2: Consultant's use of O3 background is not correct. The hourly ozone concentration from PATH for each hour should be used instead of the annual average value. Please revise and recalculate the short-term NO2 results.	The discrete results for RSP, SO_2 and short-term NO_2 have been re-examined and recalculated. The discrepancies identified previously have been rectified, and the revised discrete results are now consistent with the adopted input data and modelling assumptions. For the ozone-limiting method, the use of ozone background has been corrected. Hourly ozone concentrations from PATH for each of the 8,760 hours per year have now been applied instead of the annual average value. Based on these hourly ozone data, the short-term NO_2 concentrations have been recalculated and the updated results are presented in the revised tables and appendices.
6. Appendix N – contour maps: As the result calculations were not correct for all pollutants and averaging periods other than FSP and annual NO2, please revise the results and update the corresponding contour maps.	The corresponding contour maps in Appendix N have been revised to reflect the corrected results, and all contour plots now present the updated concentration fields

2. Response to Comments relating to Environmental Assessment (Appendix 5 - EA)

Comments from Environmental Protection Department dated 16th February 2026

Comments of Environmental Protection Department (Contact person: Ms. Virginia WONG; Tel.: 2835 1109)	**Response to Comment**
Comments provided in the document titled *"20260216_Y-H21-7_Annex A_AQIA Comments (1st batch).docx"*: **<u>Appendix 5 – Environmental Assessment</u>** 1. Table 2.2 – RtC #5 (p.39) is not addressed. Please repeat header if the table spans in next page.	The header row of Table 2.2 (and all other multi-page tables) has been set to repeat automatically on subsequent pages.
2. Section 2.3 – RtC #6 (p.39) is not addressed. Please update Section 2.3 to align with Appendix 6.	Section 2.3 has been updated to is now consistent with Appendix 6.
3. Section 2.5.5 – Please replace "Air Pollution Control (Vehicle Design Standards) (Emission)" with "Air Pollution Control (Fuel Restriction) Regulations" in line 2-3. Please supplement the size of construction site.	The reference in lines 2–3 has been revised to "Air Pollution Control (Fuel Restriction) Regulations" as requested. The size of the construction site has also been supplemented in line 7.
4. Section 2.5.6 – RtC #11 (p.41) is not addressed. Please replace "fugitive dust" with "emissions of air pollutants" in line 6.	The term in line 6 has been revised from "emissions of air pollutants" to "fugitive dust" in accordance with the comment.
5. Section 2.5.10 – Please delete "Usually," in line 1.	Line 1 has been amended and the word "Usually," has been removed.
6. Section 2.6.1 – Please retain the paragraph number "2.6.1".	Paragraph number is now assigned.

7. Figure 2.1 – Please insert the list of ASR IDs and names in the figure. There are 2 arrows for A1. Please rectify.	The list of ASR IDs and names has been added to Figure 2.1. The duplicate arrows for A1 have been rectified and the figure has been checked.
8. Please highlight all changes in the next submission.	All amendments made in this submission have been highlighted for ease of reference.

Comments from Environmental Protection Department dated 3rd March 2026

Comments of Environmental Protection Department (Contact person: Mr. Kelvin CHOI; Tel.: 2835 1594)	**Response to Comment**
1. Please find our comments on the noise and waste management perspective in the attachment. *[See attachment "20260303_Y_H21_7 (FI2)_EPD - Noise & Waste.docx"]*	Noted and thank you. Please find our responses below.
Comments provided in the document titled *"20260303_Y_H21_7 (FI2)_EPD - Noise & Waste.docx"*: **Comment to Further Information No.2** **Noise** **General** 1. The site located on Hoi Yu Street in Quarry Bay is proposed to be developed into residential, commercial and cultural facilities. From our quick noise assessment, the proposed residential use could be severely affected by noise from the Island East Corridor (IEC), in particular the facades facing the IEC could expose to traffic noise level above 80dB(A) and the northern side facing away the IEC could still expose to traffic noise level of around 78dB(A). Furthermore, fixed noise sources, e.g. ventilation system, from the Proposed Development	The developer acknowledged and is committed to implement all necessary mitigation measures through combination of appropriate building design as described in ProPECC PN 5/23, to address the road traffic noise impact. A range of architectural and building services noise mitigation measures have been identified, including single-aspect building design e.g, arrangement of non-noise-sensitive rooms (e.g. kitchens, toilets, storerooms) on façades directly

Comments of Environmental Protection Department (Contact person: Mr. Kelvin CHOI; Tel.: 2835 1594)	**Response to Comment**
and existing building may also be a concern. Although such noise impacts could be mitigated through combination of appropriate building design and noise mitigation measures including single aspect building design, architectural fins, acoustic windows and balconies...etc., the applicant should clearly demonstrate and confirm in the present submission that such exhaustive and appropriate noise mitigation measures are feasible and will be implemented at the detailed design stage of the development to fully mitigate the adverse road traffic noise impact. A proper NIA should also be required under relevant planning approval condition and/or land title document with the above noise mitigation requirements be clearly conveyed to the developer.	facing the IEC, the use of acoustic windows and/or acoustic balconies, and suitable selection and acoustic treatment of fixed plant. Based on the preliminary road traffic noise assessment, these measures are considered technically feasible and effective in reducing domestic facade noise levels to within the criteria under HKPSG. The Developer will further refine and confirm the detailed noise mitigation provisions at the subsequent Section 16 planning application and detailed design stages.
2. With the above general comment, we also have some quick observations on the Environmental Assessment (EA) as given below. As the current EA is prepared to facilitate the consideration of the captioned S12A application for which construction noise assessment is not required, we would not go into the technical noise details of the construction noise assessment in the report. The Applicant should note that our observations are not exhaustive and nothing shall bind us in making a decision or providing further comments on the future NIA(s).	Noted. A detailed Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) will be submitted under the relevant statutory and administrative procedures for the proposed development.
Specific Comment 1. 3.7.5 The Noise model is not provided for assessing and checking the predicted road traffic noise level.	The Noise Map 5 model file prepared for the proposed development is provided in the next submission to facilitate EPD's checking.
2. 3.7.5 RtC, No traffic flow information is found in Appendix B	The traffic flow adopted for assessing the traffic noise impact could be found in the second page of Appendix B – page 80 and 81 of the Environmental Assessment report.

Comments of Environmental Protection Department (Contact person: Mr. Kelvin CHOI; Tel.: 2835 1594)	**Response to Comment**
3. Table 3.8 & Figure 3-3 Predict Road Traffic Noise Level- Only noise level of L02-L11 are presented. How about the other assessment points? There are 69 points identified in Figure 3-3. Please check and clarify.	Figure 3-3 present the layout of all Noise Assessment Points (NAPs) and their id (1- 69). The predicted traffic noise levels at all Noise Assessment Points at all levels are presented in Table 3-7, while the spatial distribution of the predicted noise levels at all the Noise Assessment Points is shown in Figure 3-3. Under the current preliminary development layout, only L2 to L11 are proposed for residential use; therefore, the NAP have been allocated only on these residential floors.
4. 3.6.12-14 Noise from Event Cultural and leisure usage is planned for the Proposed Development. Please confirm if there is any PA system that would cause adverse noise impact.	No large-scale outdoor concert type facilities are proposed within the development. Any PA system design will be provided at the operational stage, once the cultural and event programming is better defined. All relevant regulatory requirements will be complied with.
<u>Waste Management</u> 1. Contents – Previous comment has not been duly addressed. The page number "0" appears to be incorrect. Please correct the page number for WASTE MANAGEMENT section and the subsequent sections.	Page number has been revised. The page number for all related sections are updated and confirmed align.
2. Section 5.5.3 – Follow up on the previous comment, it is suggested to revise the last sentence as "It is estimated that surplus inert C&D materials will be transported to PFRFs."	The last Sentence in Section 5.5.3 is now revised to <u>"It is estimated that surplus inert C&D materials will be transported to PFRFs."</u>
3. Table 5.2 (inert C&D material) – For on-site reuse of inert C&D material, it is suggested to revise "0" to "as much as possible" to align with Section 5.5.3.	The on-site reuse of inert C&D materials is revised as "As much as possible".

Comments of Environmental Protection Department (Contact person: Mr. Kelvin CHOI; Tel.: 2835 1594)	**Response to Comment**
4. Table 5.2 (general refuse) – Please consider referencing the generation rate (i.e. 0.65 kg/person/day) adopted in the approved Environmental Impact Assessment Reports instead of 0.53kg/person/day from "Monitoring of Solid Waste in Hong Kong – Waste Statistics for 2024" for the estimation of the daily quantity of general refuse	The estimation of daily general refuse quantities in Table 5.2 has therefore been recalculated using 0.65 kg/person/day, while all other population and occupancy assumptions remain unchanged.