

**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 (5)**

**May 2026**

# **Contents**

**Attachment 1:** Table of Response to EPD Comments

**Attachment 2:** Revised Air Quality Impact Assessment

**Attachment 3:** Replacement Pages of Environmental Assessment

**Attachment 4:** Updated Table of Response to TD Comments

**Attachment 5:** Replacement Pages of Traffic Impact Assessment

**Attachment 1: Table of Response to EPD Comments**

**Proposed Amendments to the Notes of the 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” 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)

**EPD’s Comments to Further Information No. 3**

**Response to Comment from EPD dated: 6 May 2026**

Comment	Response to Comment
Contact person: Ms. Virginia WONG Tel.: 2835 1109	
<b>General Comment</b>	
1. The site is the subject of a previous S.16 application No. A/H21/150 for proposed hotel, office, shop and services, eating place, place of recreation, sports or culture and elevated walkway with minor relaxation of building restriction, which was approved by the TPB with conditions on 22.02.2019. The applicant has proposed a revised scheme for cultural, tourism and recreational development with residential components at the subject site and the new residential units are air and noise sensitive receivers and are matters of concern with this rezoning application.	Noted. The quantitative AQIA has been comprehensively revised to address EPD’s comments on the previous submissions, with particular focus on consistency of data, modelling set-up, and presentation of results for the new residential ASRs.
2. The subject site is located about 170m from the Eastern Harbour Crossing tunnel portal, about 60m from the Eastern Harbour Crossing Ventilation building, and is adjacent to the Island Eastern Corridor, hence, the site would be <b>very likely subject to adverse air quality impact from these major vehicular emission sources</b> . Several rounds of technical comments have been provided to the applicant to facilitate the preparation of quantitative AQIA report, the quality of this simple and straightforward assessment remains unsatisfactory. A number of discrepancy / incorrect result can still be found in this submission, the consultant is required to re-submit the AQIA and re-run the air modelling to address our comment prior to submit further information.	Noted. The AQIA has been thoroughly checked and updated, including re-running the air dispersion models with corrected inputs, revising the description of source assumptions, and rectifying discrepancies in the results and contour plots.
3. Please find our detailed technical comments in <b>Annex A</b> for the applicant to revise the submission.	Noted. All detailed technical comments in Annex A have been addressed in the revised AQIA and appendices, as outlined in the responses below.

Comment	Response to Comment
<b>Air Quality – Appendix 6 - AQIA</b>	
1. Although several rounds of meetings and phone calls have been held to assist the applicant and the consultant in preparing this quantitative AQIA report, the quality of this relatively simple and straightforward assessment remains unsatisfactory. The consultant does not appear to meet the required professional standard, and more specific comments and guidance, including lots of detailed textual comments, are still necessary for this AQIA.	Noted. The AQIA has been thoroughly reviewed, and the air modelling has been re-run to address all discrepancies and technical comments raised.
2. Please replace all “PM2.5” with “FSP” and “PM10” with “RSP” across the report and appendices for consistency.	All references to “PM2.5” and “PM10” in the AQIA and relevant appendices have been replaced by “FSP” and “RSP” respectively for consistency. Section headings, table titles and figure captions have been updated accordingly.”
3. Section 1.3.1 and Table 2-6 – Please check the maximum height of the ASRs (45+5.5= 50.5mPD) in Table 2-6 which is not consistent with Section 1.3.1 (44mPD).	Section 1.3.1 and Table 2-6 have been checked and revised to ensure consistency between the proposed building height and the maximum ASR assessment heights.
4. Table 2-2 and RtC #2 – The buffer distance requirements for different road types and industrial chimneys with various height differences are not clear. Please rectify the table.	Table 2-2 has been rectified to clearly list the recommended buffer distances between industrial/odour sources and sensitive uses in accordance with HKPSG.
5. Section 3.1.5 and RtC #10 (a) Please delete “ <del>the</del> ” in line 1. (b) Please revise line 11-16 to “A broad-brush approach has therefore been adopted for <b>start</b> emissions estimation from this car park. The same broad-brush approach has also been applied to Hoi Chak Road, where <b>only four coach and heavy goods vehicles parking spaces are provided</b> ; these parking <b>spaces</b> are approximately 135 m from the Proposed Development <b>and are not within its direct line of sight</b> , and hence <b>broad-brush approach would be sufficient to estimate the start emissions</b> .” (c) Please review if the separation distance with the parking spaces should be around 170m instead.	(a) Section 3.1.5 has been revised in accordance with the comment. (b) Lines 11–16 have been rewritten, the description has been revised. (c) The separation distance has been reviewed and updated to approximately 200m based on the measurement from GeoInfo Map data.
6. Section 3.1.6 and RtC #25 – Please delete “and an approved EIA report”.	The phrase “and an approved EIA report” has been deleted from Section 3.1.6.
7. Section 3.1.7 to 3.1.8 and RtC #11 – The last sentence “Major point...Kai Tak Cruise Terminal,” in Section 3.1.7 should belong to	The last sentence “Major point sources...Kai Tak Cruise Terminal” has been moved from Section 3.1.7 to Section 3.1.8, so that all major

Comment	Response to Comment
<p>Section 3.1.8. Please revise. Also, please revise the first 2 sentences in Section 3.1.8 to “The Cape Collinson Crematorium is located approximately 4.0 km from the Project site and are screened by natural terrain <del>(high-rise buildings)</del>. The Ma Tau Kok Gas Production Plant is located approximately 3.8 km from the Project site and are also screened by <del>natural terrain</del>(high-rise buildings).”</p>	<p>point sources are described together. The first two sentences of Section 3.1.8 have been revised to: “The Cape Collinson Crematorium is located approximately 4.0 km from the Project site and are screened by natural terrain. The Ma Tau Kok Gas Production Plant is located approximately 3.8 km from the Proposed Development and are also screened by high-rise buildings”</p>
<p>8. Section 3.1.8 – Please revise the 2nd last line:...direct line of <del>sign sight</del> to the Kai Tak...</p>	<p>Section 3.1.8 is revised.</p>
<p>9. Section 3.1.13, Appendix F and RtC #13 – Please provide TD’s endorsement once available.</p>	<p>TD’s endorsement on the traffic forecast and methodology will be provided once formally available. In the meantime, the AQIA adopts the traffic data and methodology agreed with the Project Traffic Consultant, which are consistent with the approach discussed with TD and described in Section 3.1.13 and Appendix F.</p>
<p>10. Section 3.1.18 and RtC #15 –</p> <p>(a) Please supplement RtC #15b on rationale of evening the emission for the 2 exhausts of the ventilation building.</p> <p>(b) Please briefly discuss that sensitivity analysis was conducted in Section 5 for scenarios of 100% emission from portal or 100% emission from ventilation building.</p> <p>(c) Please delete “Nevertheless, a worst-case scenario has been adopted in this assessment.” and “The model details are referred to the Report.”.</p>	<p>a) Section 3.1.18 has been revised to explain the rationale for assuming equal allocation of emissions between the 2 exhausts of the ventilation building, reflecting their identical design and balanced operating configuration</p> <p>b) The last sentence in Section 3.1.18 is updated as follow: “In addition, sensitivity analysis is conducted for scenarios of 100% emissions from portal and 100% emission from ventilation building, the findings and results are listed under <b>Section 5</b>”.</p> <p>c) Phrases deleted.</p>
<p>11. Section 3.1.19 and RtC #25– Please confirm that the key pollutants for the paper-artifact furnace would be FSP, RSP and NO<sub>2</sub>. Please delete “Consistent with the approved EIA report referenced in Section 3.1.6, a removal efficiency of 80% for both PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> is adopted in this study.”.</p>	<p>Section 3.1.19 has been updated to confirm that the key pollutants for the paper-artifact furnace are FSP, RSP and NO<sub>2</sub>, which are explicitly modelled in the AQIA. The sentence referencing removal efficiency from an approved EIA report has been deleted.</p>
<p>12. Section 3.1.20 and RtC #17</p> <p>(a) Please revise the 1st sentence to “<b>According to the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal ship calls from 2026 (last edit 13 Feb 2026) and 2027 (last edit 9 Mar 2026),</b> the cruise ship with the largest <b>engine size</b> berthed at the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal is Costa Serena.”.</p> <p>(b) Please revise the last sentence to</p>	<p>a) 1<sup>st</sup> sentence in Section 3.1.20 has been revised to “According to the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal ship calls from 2026 (last edit 13 Feb 2026) and 2027 (last edit 9 Mar 2026), the cruise ship with the largest engine size berthed at the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal is Costa Serena.”</p> <p>b) The last sentence has been revised to:</p>

Comment	Response to Comment
<p>“Detailed information for modelling marine emissions <b>and the ship calls</b> schedule in 2026 and 2027 are provided in Appendix I.”</p>	<p>“Detailed information for modelling marine emissions and the ship calls schedule in 2026 and 2027 are provided in <b>Appendix I</b>”.</p>
<p>13. Section 3.1.25-3.1.26, 4.1.10, 6.1.2, 6.1.3, Appendix I, M, N, O and RtC #12 – If SO<sub>2</sub> is not identified as key air pollutant for all the identified Tier 2 emission sources, please delete SO<sub>2</sub> in the discussion and tables.</p>	<p>SO<sub>2</sub> has been removed from the discussion and tables where it is not identified as a key pollutant for the Tier 2 emission sources in Sections 3.1.25–3.1.26, 4.1.10, 6.1.2, 6.1.3 and all relevant Appendices.</p>
<p>14. Section 4.1.1 – Please revise line 2-3 to “incorporating contributions from all identified <b>vehicular, industrial and major emission sources, together with background emission contributions.</b>”</p>	<p>Line 2-3 in Section 4.1.1 has been revised to “incorporates contributions from all identified vehicular, industrial and major emission sources, together with background emission contributions.”</p>
<p>15. Section 4.1.2 – Please replace “selected critical levels” with “worst affected levels”.</p>	<p>The term “selected critical levels” in Section 4.1.2 has been replaced by “worst-affected levels”</p>
<p>16. Table 4-1 – Please remove the Note.</p>	<p>The Note has been removed.</p>
<p>17. Section 4.1.4 – Please revise to “Among the representative ASRs, the <b>19<sup>th</sup> highest</b> 1-hour average,” in line 3.</p>	<p>Section 4.1.4 has been revised to read “Among the representative ASRs, the 19<sup>th</sup> highest 1-hour average...” in line with the AQO definition.</p>
<p>18. Section 4.1.5 – Please revise to “For the <b>10<sup>th</sup> highest 24-hour average</b>, the worst-case...” in line 1.</p>	<p>Line 1 in Section 4.1.5 has been amended, “For the 10th highest 24-hour average, the worst-case...”</p>
<p>19. Section 4.1.6 –  (a) Please revise section header to Respirable Suspended Particulates (RSP).  (b) Please revise to “For the <b>10<sup>th</sup> highest 24-hour average</b>” in line 2.</p>	<p>a) The section header has been revised to “Respirable Suspended Particulates (RSP)”  b) Line 2 revised to “For the 10<sup>th</sup> highest 24-hour average”</p>
<p>20. Section 4.1.7 –  (a) Please specify the worst affected height of annual RSP and respective ASR.  (b) Please revise the last sentence to “The results indicate that cumulative RSP concentrations at all locations within the Project comply with the relevant AQOs.”</p>	<p>(a) Section 4.1.7 has been updated with the worst-affected height and the respective ASR for annual RSP, based on the model outputs  (b) The last sentence also revised to “The results indicate that cumulative RSP concentrations at all locations within the Proposed Development comply with the relevant AQOs.”</p>
<p>21. Section 4.1.8 –  (a) Please revise section header to Fine Suspended Particulates (FSP).  (b) Please revise to “For the <b>19<sup>th</sup> highest 24-hour average</b>” in line 2.  (c) The maximum concentration for 19<sup>th</sup> highest 24-hour average FSP should be at 20 mAG at ASR013. Please revise.</p>	<p>(a) Text under section header has been updated revised to “Fine Suspended Particulates (FSP)”  (b) Line 2, revised to “For the <b>19<sup>th</sup> highest 24-hour average</b>”  (c) The maximum concentration for the 19<sup>th</sup> highest 24-hour average FSP has been corrected to occur at 20mAG at ASR013, and the text has been</p>

Comment	Response to Comment
	updated accordingly.
22. Section 4.1.9 – Please specify the worst affected height of annual FSP and respective ASR.	Section 4.1.9 has been supplemented to state explicitly the worst affected height and corresponding ASR for annual FSP, based on the model results
23. Section 4.1.12 – (a) Please replace “worst-case” with “worst affected” in line 1 and section header. (b) Please replace “unacceptable” with “adverse” in the 2 <sup>nd</sup> last line. (c) Please revise the 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence to “...ASR012 and ASR013, <b>which are in close vicinity to vehicular emissions sources (open road, portal and ventilation building).</b> ” (d) Please supplement that according to the contour plots, there are no exceedance zone within the Proposed Development for all parameters.	Section 4.1.12 is now Section 4.1.11 (a) “Worst-case” has been replaced with “worst-affected” in both the section header and the first line. (b) “Unacceptable” has been replaced with “adverse” in the second last line. (c) The 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence has been revised to: “...ASR012 and ASR013, which are in close vicinity to vehicular emission sources (open road, portal and ventilation building).” (d) This section has been supplemented to state that, “According to the contour plots, there are no exceedance zones within the Proposed Development for all parameters.”, and the corresponding contour plots are provided in Appendices N
24. Section 5.1.1 – Please supplement that the Proposed Development is located close to the EHT ventilation building (around 60m?), and is predominantly affected by the emissions from the ventilation building.	Section 5.1.1 has been supplemented to state that, “The Proposed Development is located close to the EHT ventilation building (approximately 70m, based on GeoInfo Map measurement) and is predominantly affected by the emissions from the ventilation building.”
25. Section 5 – In view of the potential exceedances in the results, please consider whether more realistic assumptions should be adopted e.g. use the daily profile of lowest temperature and relative humidity data in each hour for each month (i.e. 24 hours data in each month and for 12 months) instead of annual minimum. It is noted that the Annual Hourly Min for vehicular emissions were used for all NO <sub>2</sub> averaging periods which is over-conservative and could have resulted in exceedance. The consultant is suggested to use monthly hourly min (for short-term) or monthly hourly average (for annual) to reduce conservativeness to avoid imposing unnecessary restrictions on the proposed development.	The AQIA has been updated to adopt monthly hourly minimum (for short-term) or monthly hourly average (for annual), temperature and relative humidity data.
26. Section 5 – (a) Please delete all discussions on Case 2, which is irrelevant to the sensitivity analysis on different emission splits of portal and ventilation building. Please	a) The previous Case 2, which was not directly related to the emission split between portal and ventilation building, has been removed from the sensitivity analysis. The remaining

Comment	Response to Comment
<p>update relevant appendices as well. Please re-number the cases accordingly.</p> <p>(b) It is noted that the consultant adopted cumulative approach for the sensitivity analysis, please be reminded to include all emission sources in the analysis.</p>	<p>cases have been renumbered accordingly.</p> <p>b) All sensitivity cases now adopt a cumulative approach which included all relevant emission sources (open-road, portal, ventilation building, HKFH, KT and background) for analysis.</p>
<p>27. Section 5.1.2 – Please revise the 1<sup>st</sup> sentence to “For the sensitivity tests, <b><u>different emission splits for the portal of and ventilation building of the EHT were adopted</u></b>, while all other emission sources were held constant.”. Please delete the last sentence.</p>	<p>Section 5.1.2 has been revised so that the first sentence now reads, “For the sensitivity tests, different emission splits for the portal and ventilation building of the EHT were adopted, while all other emission sources were held constant.”</p> <p>The last sentence of the section has been deleted.</p>
<p>28. Section 5.1.3 – Please specify that the base case has been assessed in the above Sections 3 to 4 of the AQIA.</p>	<p>Section 5.1.3 has been supplemented to explicitly state that the base case (now referred to as Case 1) has been assessed in Sections 3 and 4 of the AQIA, and that the sensitivity analysis in Section 5 is carried out with reference to that base case (Case 1) configuration.</p>
<p>29. Table 5.1 – Please delete the superscript for Note 5, and revise the results of Case 4 (re-number to 3) to “Exceedances of the 19<sup>th</sup> highest hourly NO<sub>2</sub> and annual NO<sub>2</sub> at mid-level heights near ASR012 and ASR013 at the site boundary”.</p>	<p>The superscript for Note 5 is removed, the revision, “Exceedances of annual NO<sub>2</sub> at mid-level heights near ASR013 at the site boundary” is now included.</p>
<p>30. Section 5.1.5 – Please delete the last sentence. Please mention that detailed results are presented in Appendix O.</p>	<p>The last sentence of Section 5.1.5 has been deleted. The detailed numerical results for the sensitivity cases are presented in Appendix M.</p>
<p>31. Section 5.1.6 – Please revise line 2-6 to “...localized exceedances of <b><u>the 19<sup>th</sup> highest hourly NO<sub>2</sub> are predicted at 15 mAG at ASR012, and annual NO<sub>2</sub> at 15 and 20 mAG at both ASR012 and ASR013, which are located at the site boundary near the EHT ventilation building. All other pollutants and averaging times comply with the respective AQOs at every ASR and level, and are shown in Table 5.2. Contour plots for NO<sub>2</sub> for Case 4 (re-number to Case 3) are presented in Appendix O</u></b>”.</p>	<p>Section 5.1.6 has been rewritten in accordance with the suggested wording. Since the results been updated, It now states that, “the annual NO<sub>2</sub> at 20mAG at ASR013, which are located at the Southeastern corner of the Proposed Development near the EHT ventilation building. All other pollutants and averaging times comply with the respective AQOs at every ASR and level and are shown in Table 5-2. Contour plots for NO<sub>2</sub> for Case 3 under the worst affected height are presented in Appendix N.”</p>
<p>32. Section 5.1.7, 5.1.8 – Please delete these sections as they duplicate with the discussion above.</p>	<p>Sections 5.1.7 and 5.1.8 in Section 5, have been deleted.</p>
<p>33. Section 5.1.9 –</p> <p>(a) Please replace “on the façade” with “at the site boundary” in line 2.</p>	<p>(a) Line 2, “on the façade” has been replaced with “at the site boundary”.</p> <p>(b) The description of the exceedance</p>

Comment	Response to Comment
<p>(b) According to the contour in Appendix O, the exceedances are not confined to only two ASRs but also the area around ASR012 and ASR013. Therefore, please revise as follows:...and are confined to <b>2 ASRs the south-eastern corner of the Proposed Development</b>. ....</p> <p>(c) Please delete the last sentence, confirm and supplement whether no air sensitive use, including openable windows, fresh air intake, open space for recreation use, would be located within the exceedance zones during the detailed design stage.</p>	<p>area has been revised to state that the exceedances are confined to “the south-eastern corner of the Proposed Development”, consistent with the contour plots in Appendix N.</p> <p>(c) The last sentence has been deleted and the text now confirms that no air sensitive use, including openable windows, fresh air intakes and open space for recreation, will be located within the exceedance zones at the detailed design stage.</p>
<p>34. Section 5.1.10 –</p> <p>(a) Please confirm and rewrite the summary to “Due to insufficient information from the tunnel operator, a sensitivity analysis was conducted to address the uncertainty in the emission split between the tunnel portal and the ventilation building. The sensitivity analysis demonstrates that there would be no exceedance of AQOs for all cases assessed, except Case 4 (<i>re-number to Case 3</i>). Under the conservative Case 3, small exceedance zones for the 19<sup>th</sup> highest hourly and annual NO<sub>2</sub> were observed at mid-level height near ASR012 and ASR013. No air sensitive use, including openable windows, fresh air intake, open space for recreation use, would be located within the exceedance zones during the detailed design stage. With appropriate design, there would be no adverse air quality impact anticipated for the Proposed Development.”</p> <p>(b) Please delete the superscript for Note 6.</p>	<p>(a) Section 5.1.10 (now Section 5.1.8) has been revised to the following: “Due to insufficient information from the tunnel operator, a sensitivity analysis was conducted to address the uncertainty in the emission split between the tunnel portal and the ventilation building. The sensitivity analysis demonstrates that there would be no exceedance of AQOs for all cases assessed, except annual NO<sub>2</sub> in Case 3. (<i>which now re-number to Case 3</i>). Under the conservative Case 3, small exceedance zones for the annual NO<sub>2</sub> were observed at mid-level height near ASR013, i.e. South-eastern corner of the Proposed Development. No air sensitive use, including openable windows, fresh air intake, open space for recreation use, would be located within the exceedance zones during the detailed design stage. With appropriate design, there would be no adverse air quality impact anticipated for the Proposed Development.”</p> <p>(b) The superscript for Note 6 has also been deleted.</p>
<p>35. Section 5.1.11 and 5.1.13 – Please delete these sections.</p>	<p>Sections 5.1.11 and 5.1.13 have been deleted.</p>
<p>36. Section 6.1.2 – Please replace “major industrial and marine point sources” with “industrial and major point sources” in line 2.</p>	<p>Line 2, “major industrial and marine point sources” replaced with “industrial and major point sources”</p>
<p>37. Section 6.1.4, 6.1.5 – Please combine these sections and revise the conclusion with reference to the revised Section 5.1.10 as commented above.</p>	<p>Sections 6.1.4 and 6.1.5 have been combined and revised with reference to the updated Section 5.1.8.</p>

Comment	Response to Comment
38. Figure 2-1 and RtC #21 – Please insert the north arrow in this figure.	A north arrow has been added to Figure 2-1.
<p>39. Appendix E and RtC #23 –</p> <p>(a) Please add titles on the road map by traffic consultant, road link maps with SAMP Road ID and Traffic Consultant Road ID. Please show the assessment areas in the road link map. Please remove the ASR IDs on the road link map.</p> <p>(b) Please indicate which roads have start emissions (e.g. by using different line colours), and the Portal and ventilation building sources in the road link map with SAMP road ID.</p> <p>(c) For SAMP templates, please replace “Analysis 1 &amp; Analysis 2” with “Base Case” (p.148-236 of the combined appendices), replace “Analysis 3” with “Case 2” (p.237-324), replace “Analysis 4” with “Case 3” (p.325-412).</p> <p>(d) For SAMP templates, it is noted that irrelevant roads (e.g. eastbound roads, open roads outside the tunnel) were assigned to portal and VB emissions. Since emissions from portal and VB should only be contributed by the traffic in the westbound tunnel, please only assign “P001” for relevant roads (RD_068, 067, 065) in the “Road Segment” spreadsheet. Please extent RD_068 to cover the entire EHT westbound.</p> <p>(e) Please consider to remove the raw traffic data which is outside the ambit of EPD for AQIA.</p>	<p>Appendix E has been revised as follows:</p> <p>(a) Titles have been added to the traffic consultant’s road map and the road-link maps indicating both SAMP Road IDs and Traffic Consultant Road IDs, and the assessment area is delineated. ASR IDs have been removed from the road-link map.</p> <p>(b) Roads with start emissions and the portal and ventilation building sources are distinguished on the road-link map (e.g. by different line colours) and labelled with their SAMP Road IDs.</p> <p>(c) In the SAMP templates, “Analysis 1 &amp; Analysis 2” have been renamed “Case 1”, “Analysis 3” renamed “Case 2”, and “Analysis 4” renamed “Case 3” to align with Section 5.</p> <p>(d) Assignment of portal and VB emissions has been corrected so that only westbound tunnel roads (RD_068, RD_067, RD_065) contribute to these sources, with RD_068 extended to cover the entire EHT westbound.</p> <p>(e) Raw traffic data outside the ambit of AQIA assessment have been removed from the submission set.</p>
<p>40. Appendix H and RtC #25 –</p> <p>(a) Only the outdated correspondence between the consultant and HKPC is found in the combined appendix. Please append the latest 2 email replies from HKPC.</p> <p>(b) According to HKPC’s replies, please</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revise Note [2] to “Stack height is 3.9m based on information provided by HKPC”.</li> <li>- Revise exit temperature to 373 and revise Note[4] to “Exit temperature of Hong Kong Funeral Home is unavailable. Referenced is made to that of paper artifact furnace at Tai Wai Pofook Memorial Hall as provide</li> </ul>	<p>Appendix H has been updated to include,</p> <p>(a) the latest two email replies from HKPC on the paper-artifact furnace, in addition to the earlier correspondence.</p> <p>(b) Note [2] now states “Stack height is 3.9 m based on information provided by HKPC.”</p> <p>The exit temperature has been revised to 373 K and Note[4] now reads “Exit temperature of Hong Kong Funeral Home is unavailable. Reference is made to that of the paper-artifact furnace at Tai Wai Pofook Memorial Hall as provided by HKPC.”</p> <p>The emission rates for FSP and RSP</p>

Comment	Response to Comment
<p>by HKPC.”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revise the emission rates for FSP and RSP to 0.4 g/s, and add a note “According to HKPC, only TSP emission rate for paper artifact furnace at Tai Wai Pofook Memorial Hall is available, which is 50 mg/m<sup>3</sup> at the peak handling capacity of 200 kg/hr. Hence the peak TSP emission factor (g/kg) = 0.05g/m<sup>3</sup> x flow rate of 4m<sup>3</sup>/s / (200kg/hr / 3600) = 3.6 g TSP /kg. For conservative assessment purpose, the TSP emission rate is applied to both RSP and FSP emission rate.”.</li> <li>- For Note [6], please revise to “Emission factor for NO<sub>x</sub> is 2.84 g/kg, extracted from Table 3 of the research paper Emissions Characteristics of Hazardous Air pollutants from the Incineration of Sacrificial Offerings”.</li> <li>- Delete Note [8], [9].</li> </ul>	<p>have been revised to 0.4 g/s with a new note describing the derivation from the TSP emission factor and flow rate; for conservative assessment, the TSP emission factor is applied to both RSP and FSP.</p> <p>Note[6] has been revised to state that the NO<sub>x</sub> emission factor of 2.84 g/kg is extracted from Table 3 of the referenced research paper, and Notes[8], [9] have been deleted.</p>
<p>41. Appendix J – Noted that the files are provided for checking only. Please remove Appendix J in the full report.</p>	<p>Appendix J has been removed from the full AQIA report.</p>
<p>42. Appendix M, N – Please replace all “Analysis 1” with “Base Case” and “Analysis 2/3/4” with “Case 2/3”.</p>	<p>Appendices L and M, all “Analysis 1” references have been replaced by “Case 1” and “Analysis 2/3/4” by “Case 2/3” to be consistent with the sensitivity case naming used in Section 5.</p>
<p>43. Appendix N – The worst affected height for 19th highest 24-hour FSP and 10<sup>th</sup> highest 24-hour RSP should be 20 mAG and 25 mAG respectively. Please provide the correct contour plots.</p>	<p>Appendix N now Appendix M, has been checked and updated so that the contour plots correspond to the correct worst-affected heights.</p>
<p>44. Appendix O –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Please remove the background concentrations above the tables.</li> <li>(b) For contour plots, please use a different colour for contour line with exceedance and shade the exceedance zones. Please add a remark that “No air sensitive use, including openable windows, fresh air intake, open space for recreation use, would be located within the exceedance zones during the detailed design stage.”.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Background concentrations previously shown above the tables have been removed.</li> <li>(b) For contour plots in Appendix N, different colour has been used for contour line with exceedance and shade the exceedance zones, and a remark stating “No air sensitive use, including openable windows, fresh air intake, open space for recreation use, would be located within the exceedance zones during the detailed design stage.” has been added in Appendix N (Figure N8), Section 5.1.8 and Section 6.1.4.</li> </ul>

Comment	Response to Comment
45. Please highlight all changes in the next submission.	All changes made in the AQIA report and appendices have been highlighted in the latest submission to facilitate review.
<b>Air Quality – Air Modelling</b>	
46. AERMET – The location of the mid-point of discrete ASRs were slightly different from that generated on SAMP. Please revise the set of AERMET files and be reminded to submit the AERMET zip file downloaded from SAMP for our review.	The AERMET zip download file from SAMP will be submitted along with the AQIA report.
47. Model Input – The emissions from HKFH and KT are missing in Cases 2-4 in the sensitivity analysis. Please review and revise the input as appropriate.	The model inputs for the sensitivity analysis cases have been reviewed. Emissions from the HKFH and KT have now been included consistently in Cases 2 and 3, in line with the Case 1 configuration. The updated AERMOD input files for all cases ensure that these point sources are represented in every cases.
48. Results – Appendix M: The concentrations of SO <sub>2</sub> and RSP are incorrect. In particular the 10-min SO <sub>2</sub> and RSP concentrations are much lower than the results calculated using model output. Please review and revise the values.	All SO <sub>2</sub> have been removed since it is not required to be assessed; The concentration of RSP has been revised, the newly result of RSP has been updated Appendix L.
49. Results – Appendix O: Results for Sensitivity Analysis: exceedances were found for NO <sub>2</sub> in Cases 3 and 4. The concentrations for the following pollutants and cases did not match with the results calculated using model output. Please review and rectify the discrepancies. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Case 3 NO<sub>2</sub> (Note that the output of NO was misplaced in the NO<sub>2</sub> folder)</li> <li>- PM<sub>10</sub> for all cases</li> <li>- PM<sub>2.5</sub> for Cases 3 and 4</li> </ul>	(Now Appendix M) Sensitivity test has been updated; the following items has been reviewed and updated:  The results and the contours are presented in the revised AQIA report and located in the correct submission folders.
50. Contour plots – Contour plot files (*.plt) or model output files for contour runs were not provided for our review. Please provide them in the next submission.	The Contour plot is now prepared along with the latest submission.
<b>Noise Impact Assessment</b>	
1. Section 3.7.3 & Appendix B - Please provide written proof of TD’s Endorsement on the traffic forecast data in Year 2045.	TD’s endorsement on the traffic forecast and methodology will be submitted once formally available.
2. Section 3.7.6 ..... at some floor levels will reach <del>80dB(A)</del> 83dB(A)....	The sentence revised to “It is observed that all the NAPs at the southern portion of the Proposed Development orienting to the IEC will be exposed to a road traffic noise level exceeding L <sub>10 (1 hour)</sub> 70 dB(A), and at some floor levels will reach 83 dB(A).”
3. Section 3.7.6 .....to fully mitigate the adverse road traffic noise impact <i>meeting the</i>	Last sentence revised to “The Developer is committed to implement all necessary

Comment	Response to Comment
<p><i>standards and requirement stipulated under HKPSG and present the updated.....</i></p>	<p>mitigation measures through combination of appropriate building design and noise mitigation measures as described in ProPECC PN 5/23 “Application of Innovative Noise Mitigation Designs in Planning Private Residential Developments against Road Traffic Noise Impact” (ProPECC PN 5/23) including single aspect building design, architectural fins, acoustic windows and balconies...etc. to address the road traffic noise impact in the detail design stage and to fully mitigate the adverse road traffic noise impact meeting the standards and requirements stipulated under HKPSG and present the updated Traffic Noise Impact Assessment (TNIA) in the S16A application stage and/or land title document”</p>
<p>4. Section 3.9.9 The correction for specific type of acoustic window and acoustic balcony mentioned in ProPECC PN5/23 are applicable to specific room size, dimension, opening, gap width etc., it is inappropriate to simply apply such correction. The para is suggested to revise as:  <del><i>If opening toward IEC for rooms with habitation purpose is found necessary during the detailed design stage, the at-receiver noise mitigation measures shall be provided. According to ProPECC PN 5/23, the Possible Designs of “Acoustic Window (Baffle Type)” for 8m<sup>2</sup> rooms parallel to dominant line source provide a reduction of L10(1-hour) 6 dB(A), while possible designs of “Enhanced Acoustic Balcony (Baffle Type)” in 14m<sup>2</sup> parallel to dominant line source provide a reduction of L10(1-hour) 8 dB(A). As shown in Figure 3-4, about 26% of the predicted traffic noise levels are between L10(1-hour) 71 to 78 dB(A). Acoustic Window and Enhanced Acoustic Balcony would be adopted where necessary to meet the HKPSG’s standards and requirements. As the correction for specific type of acoustic window and acoustic balcony mentioned in ProPECC PN5/23 are applicable to specific room size, dimension, opening, gap width etc., should there be any variation on the proposed acoustic window and acoustic balcony, justifications together with technical documents, e.g. corrections based on</i></del></p>	<p>Section 3.9.9 revised accordingly.</p>

Comment	Response to Comment
<i>acoustic principles, laboratory testing reports, in-situ measurement reports, etc. would be submitted to the EPD for consideration.</i>	
5. Section 3.9.10 Single aspect building design and <del>adoption</del> of non-openable windows <del>could be considered</del> <i>would be adopted where necessary to meet the HKPSG’s standards and requirements.</i>	Last sentence of section 3.9.10 revised to “Single aspect building design and non-openable windows would be adopted where necessary to meet the HKPSG’s standards and requirements.”
6. Section 3.9.11 ...The Developer is committed to fully mitigate the adverse road traffic noise impact. <i>The noise mitigation designs/measures would be exhausted and incorporated where necessary to meet the HKPSG’s standards and requirements.</i> An updated road traffic noise impact assessment .....	Sentence added in section 3.9.11.
7. Section 8.1.8 ....to fully mitigate the adverse road traffic noise impact <i>meeting the standards and requirement stipulated under HKPSG</i>	Last sentence of section 8.1.8 revised to “Appropriate building design and feasible mitigation measures described in ProPECC PN 5/23 will be implemented during the detailed design stage to fully mitigate the adverse road traffic noise impact meeting the standards and requirements stipulated under HKPSG.”

### Waste Management

1. Following up on the previous comment item 4, please update the sections as follows:
- Section 5.5.15 - Please revise the statements to read: "The maximum number of workforces to be employed for the Project is expected at 100 workers. Based on a generation rate of 0.65 kg per worker per day, the general refuse arises from local work force during construction is estimated at 65 kg/day." Moreover, please remove the footnote 1.
  - Table 5.2 – Please remove Notes [6].
  - Table 5.3 – The adoption of 0.53kg/person/day in the previous version is appropriate. Please revert to the previous version as below:

Table 5.3 Estimated Quantities of Wastes to be Generated during Operation Phase

Planned Number of Occupants	EPD's Waste Generation Rate	Estimated Waste Arising	Example of Waste	Management Options and recommended outlets
600 from the commercial activities	0.53 kg/person/day <sup>[2]</sup>	0.32 tpd <sup>[3]</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General Refuse</li> <li>Recyclable Waste</li> </ul>	Recycle as much as possible before disposal to landfill at West New Territories Landfill
429 (+10% allowance = 472) <sup>[1]</sup>	0.86 kg/person/day <sup>[2]</sup>	0.41 tpd		
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.40 kg/person/day</b>	<b>0.73 tpd</b>		

**Notes:**

[1] The flat number adopted for technical assessment shall be 165 + 10% allowance for infrastructure capacity. Average domestic household size at 2.6 from 12/2024 – 2/2025 according to the Census and Statistics Department.

[2] Commercial and industrial waste at 0.53 kg/person/day and domestic waste of 0.86 kg/person/day according to Plate 2.7 Per capita disposal rates of MSW, domestic waste and commercial & industrial waste from 2015 to 2024, [Monitoring of Solid Waste in Hong Kong, Waste Statistics for 2024](https://www.waste.gov.hk/sites/default/files/resources_centre/waste_statistics/mcw2024_eng.pdf)

[3] tpd denotes tonnes per day.