Section 12A Rezoning Application - Request for Amendment to the approved Lung Yeuk Tau and Kwan Tei South Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-LYT/19 from "Residential (Group C)" Zone and "Agriculture" Zone to "Residential (Group A) 2" Zone at Various Lots in D.D. 83 and Adjoining Government Land, Lung Yeuk Tau, New Territories (Y/NE-LYT/16)

Ref.: ADCL/PLG-10248/L009

Further Information (6)

Table of Contents

Table 1 Response-to-Comments

Enclosure 1 Revised Environmental Assessment
Enclosure 2 Revised Sewerage Impact Assessment

Section 12A Rezoning Application - Request for Amendment to the approved Lung Yeuk Tau and Kwan Tei
South Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-LYT/19 from "Residential (Group C)" Zone and "Agriculture" Zone to
"Residential (Group A) 2" Zone at Various Lots in D.D. 83 and Adjoining Government Land, Lung Yeuk Tau,
New Territories (Y/NE-LYT/16)

Ref.: ADCL/PLG-10248/L009

Table | 1

Response-to-Comments

Request for Amendment to the Approved Lung Yeuk Tau and Kwan Tei South Outline Zoning Plan No.S/NE-LYT/19 from "Residential (Group C)" Zone and "Agriculture" Zone to "Residential (Group A)2" Zone at Various Lots in D.D. 83 and Adjoining Government Land in D.D. 83, Lung Yeuk Tau, New Territories

Responses-to-Comments Table

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
7.3.2024	Environmental	Environmental Assessment Report	Please refer to Appendix 1 for the revised EA.
	Protection	Air Quality Perspective	
	Department		
		1. Section 2.3	
		PATH v2.1 has been upgraded to PATH v3.0. Please update the	Table 2-5 has been updated according to the latest PATH model
		relevant text and data where necessary.	data.
		2. Section 2.4.6	Noted. Queen's Hill extension will be discussed as the concurrent
		Please check whether Queen's Hill Extension would be the	project of the proposed development. The relevant sections under
		concurrent project to this proposed development.	Section 2.4 have been revised accordingly.
		3. An EM&A program should be implemented to monitor the dust	Section 2.4.8 is added to discuss the monitoring of dust impact.
		impact arising from the construction activities associated with	
		the proposed development.	
		4. Section 2.4.18 to 2.4.26	
		(a) Please clarify the capacity of the proposed STW which is	The design capacity has now been revised to 5,000 cubic meter per
		7,000m3/day according to the Sewerage Impact Assessment of	day as a more reasonable estimation.
		the 4th round of Further Information.	
		(b) Please make reference to the approved EIA report AEIAR-	At this stage, we could anticipate the key odour sources from the
		207/2017 - Expansion of Sha Tau Kok Sewage Treatment	sewage treatment sludge, chemical input for the treatment, and the
		Works to discuss the potential odour impact. Please clarify	treatment process, with probably the potential impact on nearby air

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		whether there is any chimney emission from the proposed STW.	sensitive receivers (ASRs). Referring to AEIAR-207/2017, regular
			removal of the sludge cake and cleaning of sludge holding tank
			should be adopted by the project team. In addition, odour monitoring
			system should be set up to minimize the odour impact during the
			operation of the STP. Especially, exhaust air flow rate, temperature
			of exhaust, odour emission rate of the deodorization systems should
			be monitored. Weekly monitoring of odour emission at the exhausts
			by taking odour samples is recommended to be conducted in the
			first two months of the first year of the operation in reference to
			AEIAER-207/2017. Frequency of odour monitoring should not be
			reduced unless long term full compliance is observed.
			There is no chimney emission from the proposed STP as advised by
			the project team. However, further information on this issue could be
			provided to EPD and DSD review at detailed design stage.
		(c) Please mark the location of the proposed STW in this	The location of the STP has been shown at Figure 4-2 in the revised
		Environmental Assessment instead of referring to another	report.
		submission.	
		5. Figure 2-1 and 2-4	The location of ASRs of the proposed developments has been moved
		The air sensitive receivers (ASRs) of the proposed	to the point that is closer to the nearby roads.
		developments should be represented by the points which are	
		nearest to the emission sources. Please amend.	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		6. Figure 2-3	The location of ASRs of the proposed developments has been moved
		Please show the names of the roads in this figure.	to the point that is closer to the nearby roads.
		7. Response-to-Comment (9) It is noted that Hai Wing Road would	Road name has been added to Figure 2-2 buffering distance of
		be intercepted during construction stage. Please clarify whether	identified major road.
		Hai Wing Road on the eastern side of the proposed	
		development will re-open during the operation stage.	
		8. Please delete P. 2-15 to 2-17 if they are blank.	We here clarify that the eastern side will be intercepted by the
			boundary of proposed residential development and will become a
			dead end.
		Waste Management and Land Contamination Perspective	
		9. Response-to-Comment (16) – Section 5.1.1	
		(a) The Consultant shall confirm whether the Project involves	(a) Referring to the aerial photo record, majority of the structures
		the removal of structures constructed before the mid-1980s. If	within site area were constructed in 1990s.
		affirmative, please clarify whether asbestos-containing	During the previous site inspection, evidence of ACM usage was not
		materials are anticipated during site clearance. The Consultant	found. Nonetheless, thoroughly assessment of ACM will be
		shall address and evaluate such issues and is advised to review	conducted in the detailed design stage to confirm whether ACM is
		whether mitigation measures and good practices would be	present within site area.
		properly implemented for the handling and disposal of	
		asbestos-containing materials. Please supplement the relevant	
		information and outline the reference materials for further	
		review.	
		(b) The Monitoring of Solid Waste in Hong Kong 2022 has been	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		published in December 2023. The Consultant is advised to refer	(b) The version of Monitoring for Solid Waste has been changed to
		to the latest information in the quantity estimation. Please share	2022.
		the calculation for further vetting and review.	
		10. Response-to-Comment (17) – Section 5.3.1	
		(a) Since the site was only partially covered with building	We point out demolition and excavation because we estimated that
		structure, the Consultant shall note that site clearance and	these two construction activities will generate large amount of C&D
		building demolition are two distinct processes in construction	material and they should be emphasized. Following the concern from
		and land development. The former refers to the process of	EPD:
		preparing a piece of land for construction or development, which	(a) Demolition has been removed from the section to avoid
		involves clearing the site of any existing structures, vegetation,	duplication
		debris, or other obstacles to make way for new construction.	
		Whereas the latter specifically refers to the act of intentionally	
		destroying or dismantling an existing building or structure.	
		(b) Likewise, site excavation and site formation are related but	(b) Excavation has been removed from the section to avoid
		distinct processes in construction and land development. The	duplication.
		Consultant shall note that site excavation refers to the process	
		of removing earth materials, such as soil, rocks, and other	
		obstructions, from a site to shape the land according to the	
		design and engineering requirements of the project. On the	
		other hand, site formation encompasses a broader scope of	
		activities beyond excavation, which involves modifying a site's	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		topography and physical characteristics.	
		(c) The content in the first sentence is duplicated with the	(c) The first two sentence has been rewritten to avoid duplication.
		second one; please remove it accordingly to avoid confusion.	
		11. Section 5.3.3	Metal is mentioned in this section because it is no-inert material. The
		Metals neither decompose nor generate odour; please carefully	wording "generate odour" has been replaced with "corrode" to reflect
		review and update the definition as appropriate.	the degrade of metal.
		12. Section 5.3.7	(a) The word brownfield operation has been mentioned widely in
		(a) Please elaborate and clarify the meaning of "brownfield	government paper. It refers to the warehouse, storage, and repair
		operation" to avoid confusion.	workshop business on site, which is actually a land under residential
			use and agriculture use.
		(b) The Consultant is advised to refer to Figure 5.1 for the	(b) Added a sentence at the last of Section 5.3.7 to make reference
		locations of (i) Tin Wah House, (ii) the vehicle repair workshop,	to Figure 5-1.
		and (iii) the six warehouses.	
		13. Figure 5.1	The site boundary has been inserted to Figure 5-1 as requested.
		Please incorporate the site boundary onto the aerial photos for	
		clarity.	
		14. Response-to-Comment (18) – Section 5.3.8	The previous study by Chen can be found at
		(a) Please note that the quoted reference source "Estimating	https://oversea.cnki.net/kcms/detail/detail.aspx?dbcode=CJFD&filen
		and calibrating the amount of building-related construction and	ame=HJWS200706004&dbname=CJFD2007. We used the
		demolition waste in urban China" did not develop demolition	Estimating and calibrating the amount of building-related
		waste indexes for steel and steel concrete materials but only	construction and demolition waste in urban China as reference

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		referred to a previous study conducted by Chen in 2007 "An	because it is an open assess article and it provides a thorough
		exploration of methods for measuring demolition waste	literature review for demolition waste generation rate from different
		generation. Environment and Hygiene Engineering, 15(6), 2-3	sources published in different years. Since the demolition waste
		(in Chinese)". The Consultant shall carefully review the original	generation rate developed by Chen through downstream study has
		paper and confirm whether the generation rates could be	been picked to calculate the demolition waste indexes for steel and
		practically adopted in this Study. If affirmative, please append	steel concrete structure in China, it should be similarly applicable to
		the reference source for clarity.	this report.
		(b) Please clarify the meaning and difference between	In Section 5.3.8, both generation rate and demolition waste indexes
		generation rates and demolition waste indexes to avoid	have the same meaning. The word "waste index" has been changed
		confusion.	to "waste generation rate" to avoid confusion in Section 5.3.8.
		15. Response-to-Comment (19) – Table 5-1	(a) It is estimated to be 226.5343 tonnes, and is round up to be
		(a) Please review whether the total estimated quantity of	227 tonnes.
		demolition waste from Tin Wah House is 226 tonnes or 227	(b) Revised to be "Tonne" within Table 5-1.
		tonnes.	(c) The waste quantities in Table 5-1 are all rounded to whole
		(b) Please revise "Tone" to "Tonnes" to avoid confusion.	number for the convenience of display. The calculated
		(c) The waste quantity of the eight concerned structures does	values with more decimal places are shown as below:
		not sum up to 8,725 tonnes; please review and update as	Tin Wah House 226.5343
		appropriate.	Vehicle Repair Workshop 554.8760
			Warehouse 1 2450.6709
			Warehouse 2 1872.9571
			Warehouse 3 2354.0008
			Warehouse 4 918.3069

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
			Warehouse 5 157.1616
			Warehouse 6 190.7960
			Total 8725.3036
		16. Response-to-Comment (18) – Section 5.3.9	(a) The definition of non-inert C&D material has been revised
		(a) Please review whether steel plates and frames shall be	in Section 5.3.3 according to the comments. Metal is
		categorized as non-inert C&D material as per the definition	classified as non-inert C&D material.
		presented in Section 5.3.3.	(b) The discrepancy is caused by the rounding of numbers.
			For demonstration:
		(b) Discrepancies in the total quantity of inert C&D materials	Non-inert C&D material: 554.8760 + 157.1616 + 190.7960
		have been spotted between Section 5.3.9 and Table 5-1. The	= 902.8336 = 903tonne
		Consultant is advised to revise the minor deviation for clarity.	Inert C&D material: 226.5343 + 2450.6709 + 1872.9571 +
			2354.0008 + 918.3069 = 7822.47 = 7822tonne
			Total: 902.8336 + 7822.47 = 8725.3036 = 8725tonne
		17. Response-to-Comment (20) – Section 5.3.9 & Section 5.3.10	(a) The term "inert construction waste" has been changed to
		(a) The terms "inert construction waste" and "inert demolition	"inert demolition waste" in Section 5.3.9 to keep consistent.
		waste" have been adopted in Section 5.3.9 and Section 5.3.10	
		for the broken concrete from existing buildings and waste	
		generated from the removal of paving slabs, respectively. The	
		Consultant shall define their meaning and review whether	
		consistent terminologies shall be used.	
		(b) The response contradicts the content in Section 1.1.1, of	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		which stating that the redevelopment sites consist of an area of	(b) To avoid confusion, the site area description has been
		22,445m2 comprising various lots in D.D. 83 and the adjoining	modified in Section 1.1.1. The total site area is 22,445 square
		government land of about 1,358m2. Please carefully review and	meters.
		tally the information in this submission. The Consultant shall	
		review and update the calculation or the description as	
		appropriate.	
		18. Response-to-Comment (21), (26) and (27) – Section 5.3.11 and	(a) The layout plan and section plan of proposed development
		Table 5-2	has been added as Appendix I.
		(a) The Consultant shall note that the site layout and tentative	(b) Noted.
		building development plans were not illustrated in Figure 5-1.	(c) Revised as requested.
		Please carefully review the content and revise accordingly.	(d) The addition 0.8m is the space reserved for structural
		(b) Given that there is no available information for us to review	elements by the Architect.
		the extent and elevation of the proposed development, we	(e) The 800mm thickness is reserved for structural elements
		reserve our right to offer further comments on the calculation in	such as beams, column caps, stabs/transfer plate. The
		the subsequent submission.	wording has been changed back to "thickness of structural
		(c) Please revise "m3" and "m2" to "m3" and "m2".	elements" for clarify.
		(d) Normally, section drawing would cover the entire floor height	
		(including the slab), perhaps except the lowest floor of the	
		building. The Consultant shall review whether the addition of	
		0.8m (800mm concrete slab) is reasonable on B1/F of the	
		residential building. Moreover, if an addition of slab is required	
		in the calculation, it seems more appropriate to incorporate such	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		thickness to B2/F instead of B1/F. Please review whether the	
		current assumption is valid.	
		(e) Considering that the concrete slab thickness in industrial	
		buildings is mostly around 200mm to 300mm, please review	
		whether a slab thickness of 800mm is reasonable in retail and	
		residential buildings.	
		19. Response-to-Comment (21) – Figure 5.2	(a) Figure 5-2 has been removed from the updated report. The
		(a) The quality and resolution of the figure are unsatisfactory.	basement plan can now be checked as the second page of
		The Consultant is reminded to ensure the attachment is	Appendix I.
		readable with no distortion.	(b) The layout plan and section plan of proposed development
		(b) The Consultant is advised to supplement section drawing	has been added as Appendix I.
		and tentative building layout plans to facilitate our further vetting	
		and review.	
		20. Response-to-Comment (23) to (25) - Section 5.3.13 & Section	
		5.3.14	
		(a) According to Section 7 of the reference source "The Report	(a) Even though the section 7 of Report 8 mainly discusses the
		on Strategy for Management and Reduction of Construction and	estimation of non-inert C&D material, the upstream
		Demolition Waste in Hong Kong" (Report 6), the quoted	estimation method is for calculating all construction waste
		information in Table 6 (page 395) is under the section	generated from a project. As described in Section 2 and 3
		"Specification for upstream estimation of non-inert construction	of Report 7, the upstream method utilises a proforma as
		waste composition". Please carefully review whether the	shown below to calculate the construction waste from each
		estimated waste volume refers to non-inert C&D wastes or the	material based on the construction contract specification/bill

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		overall C&D wastes from the sample projects. If it is the former	of quantity and an assumed wastage level, and is not
		one, the current assumption and calculation would be invalid,	limited to inert or non-inert.
		and the Consultant is advised to rectify the estimation as	
		appropriate.	Appendix A - Standard Farm for the Estimation of Construction World Control of Provided Farm New Building Construction Standard Farm for the Estimation of Construction World Control of Provided Farm New Building Construction Standard Farm for the Estimation of Construction World Control of Provided Farm New Building Construction From the Project Type: Date:
			building nature at different stage of construction were
			chosen to generate the statistics.
		(b) The second sentence, "This CIC report also reveals that the	Site A included construction of 2 storeyed house, low rising
		portion of inert and non-inert C&D waste within construction	buildings with commercial podium, clubhouse, and

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		waste is 52.9% and 47.1%, respectively, after studying the on-	basement carpark. It is at the end stage of construction
		site sorting statistics of three completed residential	period when the statistic was obtained.
		development projects", is confusing. The Consultant shall	Site B included construction of high rising buildings, low
		carefully review the reference report (pages 291 and 292) and	rising buildings, and five footbridges. It is at the middle
		evaluate whether it is reasonable to adopt the average number	stage of construction period.
		from the three projects with consideration of (i) the nature of	Site C included construction of 2 storeyed house, low rising
		construction (i.e., 2-storeyed buildings, low rise or high rise); (ii)	buildings with commercial podium, clubhouse, and
		the stage of construction during the on-site sorting surveys (i.e.,	basement carpark. It is at initial to middle stage of
		low rise, basement, podium or high rise at the mid or end stage	construction period.
		of constructions); (iii) construction works carried out during the	
		surveys).	The reasons why the averaging number is adopted are:
			(1) The proposed development consisted of basement
			carpark, high rising buildings, clubhouse and
			commercial arcade, which is deviated from building
			nature of every single site from the CIC report, and is
			more likely a merged type.
			(2) Within the report, the C&D material generation during
			the whole construction period is calculated.
			Therefore, taking the averaging statistic will provide a more
			reasonable result than adopting statistic data from one single
			site.

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
			(c) The CIC report is lengthy and most content within are irrelevant to this EA report. As it is open access to public, it is not necessary to append it. (d) Noted.
		 (c) In addition to the hyperlink to the reference source, please append the relevant information from the reference for clarity and further vetting. (d) Given the doubts and uncertainties on the assumption and reference source adopted, we reserve our right to offer further comments on estimating the quantity of C&D wastes generated from superstructure works. 	
		 21. Section 5.3.15 (a) The daily general refuse generation rate calculation is incorrect (i.e., 0.65kg/person/day x 60 workers = 39kg/day, not 31.7kg/day). Please carefully review the assumption and calculation and update as appropriate. (b) The quantity estimation is in the unit of kg/ tonnes, which 	 (a) The calculation has been revised that the general refuse generation rate from the site has been recalculated to be 39 kg/day. Section 5.3.15 and Table 5-3 has been revised accordingly. (b) The word "volume" has been revised to "quantity".
		shall be a weight unit instead of volume; please revise the last sentence accordingly to avoid confusion.	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		22. Response-to-Comment (17) – Section 5.3.17	Referring to the aerial photo record, majority of the structures within
		The Consultant shall confirm whether the Project involves the	site area were constructed in 1990s.
		removal of structures built before the mid-1980s. If affirmative,	During the previous site inspection, evidence of existence of ACM on
		it is highly possible that asbestos-containing materials are	site was not found. Nonetheless, thoroughly assessment of ACM will
		anticipated during site clearance. Please review the relevance	be conducted in the detailed design stage to confirm whether ACM
		of the first sentence of the paragraph and update as	is present within site area.
		appropriate.	
		23. Response-to-Comment (41) and (45) – Section 5.3.19	It is clarified that ACM would be disposed to landfill upon agreement
		Discrepancy on the disposal arrangement has been spotted	with EPD.
		between Section 5.3.19 and Response-to-Comment (45) (i.e.,	
		landfill) and response to previous comment (41) (i.e., CWTC),	
		please review and update as appropriate.	
		24. Section 5.3.21	Added as the last sentence of Section 5.3.21.
		The amount of chemical waste to be generated shall be	
		quantified in the Waste Management Plan (WMP) as part of	
		the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) to be prepared	
		by the Contractor.	
		25. Response-to-Comment (17) – Section 5.3.22	(a) The document can be downloaded at
		(a) Please append the relevant document on the volume-to-	https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2016-
		weight conversion factor from USEPA for further vetting.	04/documents/volume to weight conversion factors mem
			orandum_04192016_508fnl.pdf. We did not append it into
		(b) There is no Table 5-5 in this submission, please review and	the report because only page 6 within is related to the

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		update the document as appropriate.	waste management impact assessment of the report, and
			other content in the USEPA document may cause
		(c) Please note that management options for treatment and	distraction.
		disposal for each waste types have not been covered in the	(b) It has been revised to "Table 5-3".
		entire submission. The Consultant is advised to properly	(c) The wording about management options has been removed
		incorporate the relevant measures accordingly.	from Section 5.3.22.
		26. Response-to-Comment (28) to (30) – Table 5-3	
		(a) Please incorporate a footnote to specify the source of the	(a) The referencing source of conversion factors has been
		reference of the volume-to-weight conversion factor.	shifted from Section 5.3.22 to the Notes of Table 5-3 as
			suggested.
			(b) We have provided justification for the quantity estimation
		(b) Please review and update the quantity estimation as per	mentioned in Comment 14, 15, 17, 18, 20. We are grateful
		comments (14), (15), (17), (18), (20) and (21).	for pointing out the error of general refuse calculation. Table
			5-3 has been updated according to Comment 21.
		(c) Please clarify whether the volume-to-weight conversion	(c) According to the USEPA document, concrete with and
		factor is the same for large concrete with and without reinforcing	without rebar has the same weight-to-volume conversion
		bars.	factor. It is reasonable because the reinforcement ratio for
			general use of concrete is usually kept below 5% to satisfy
		(d) The summation of the quantity of non-inert C&D materials is	ductility requirement in structural design. Typically,
		incorrect (i.e., 903 tonnes + 562 tonnes = 1,465 tonnes, not	reinforcement for slab is usually taken as the minimum ratio
		8,384 tonnes); please carefully review the calculation and	0.13% with high yield steel. The effect of reinforcement bar
		update as appropriate. The same applies to the volume	to weight of concrete is negligible.

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		estimation.	(d) The summary of waste estimation has been revised in
			Table 5-3. The corresponding dump truck demand
		(e) The summation of the quantity of inert C&D materials is	estimation in Section 5.3.25 and Section 5.3.28 has been
		incorrect (i.e., 7,822tonnes + 2,176tonnes + 66,318tonnes +	updated accordingly.
		1,809tonnes = 78,125 tonnes, not 71,206 tonnes); please	(e) The summary of waste estimation has been revised in
		carefully review the calculation and update as appropriate. The	Table 5-3.
		same applies to the volume estimation.	(f) The disposal/transportation arrangement of inert C&D
			waste, non-inert C&D waste has been moved to the end of
		(f) The Consultant shall incorporate the disposal arrangement,	Section 5.3 as Section 5.3.23-5.3.28.
		outlets and estimated quantities for each type of waste to be	(g) The discussion on reuse portion of inert C&D waste has
		generated during the construction phase. Moreover, the	been moved to Section 5.3.24.
		Consultant shall also briefly elaborate on the number of dump	
		trucks for each waste category.	
		(g) Information such as the recycling and reuse rates mentioned	
		in the response to previous comments have not been discussed	
		in the main text. The Consultant is advised to review and	
		properly update the section accordingly.	
		27. Section 5.4.4	Multiplying 100%/30% will get the same result as dividing by 30%.
		Considering the dry content of 30%, please clarify the reason	The "×100%" before dividing 30% there is to remove the percentage
		for multiplying 100%/30% instead of dividing the calculated	sign during the calculation.
		weight by 30%. Please review and update the calculation as	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		appropriate.	
		28. Section 5.4	Added a Section 5.4.1 to outline all the expected type of waste as
		Similar to the introduction in Section 5.3, the Consultant is	suggested.
		advised to outline the type of waste to be generated during the	
		operation phase for clarity.	
		29. Section 5.5.4	(a) After revising Table 5-3, the total volume of C&D waste has
		(a) Please update the total estimated quantity of C&D materials	been recalculated to be 150,162m². No update for Section
		per the comments above.	5.5.4 is required.
		(b) The Consultant is advised to elaborate on the additional	(b) Because the ground condition as well as soil characteristic
		measures to be taken upon the completion of GI works.	of the Site is unknown at this stage. We cannot determine
			the actual excavated material property and detailed
		(c) Rather than the CEDD, the Consultant shall specify the vetting	approach of reusing inert C&D material. Upon the
		party of the C&DMMP for clarity.	completion of ground investigation, the project team can
			optimize the geotechnical design, and investigate further
			opportunity to maximize reuse and minimize construction
			footprint.
			(c) Has been specified to be Civil Engineering and
			Development Department Vetting Committee on
			Construction and Demolition Materials Management.

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		30. Section 5.5.7	
		(a) Please revise the 8th bullet as follows: "The Contractor shall	(a) Bullet point 8 are revised as suggested.
		use a trip-ticket system for the disposal of C&D materials to any	(b) Bullet point 11 are revised as suggested.
		designated public fill reception facilities filling facility and/or	
		landfill."	
		(b) Please revise the 11th bullet as follows: "The Contractor	
		shall register apply for registration as chemical waste producer	
		under the Waste Disposal (Chemical Waste) (General)	
		Regulation if chemical waste is anticipated produced . All	
		chemical waste shall be properly stored, labelled, packaged,	
		and collected and disposed of in accordance with the	
		Regulation."	
		31. Section 5.5.10 to Section 5.5.15	(a) These sections have been moved to Section 5.3 as
		(a) Please be advised that most of the content in these	requested.
		paragraphs is unrelated to the recommendation of good site	(b) We clarify that the 20% reuse rate for inert-C&D material is
		practices and mitigation measures on the C&D materials. The	a target to be achieved in the construction stage rather than
		Consultant shall relocate them to relevant sub-sections in	an assumption.
		Section 5.3 as appropriate, particularly on the disposal	From the statistics provided in The Report on Strategy for
		arrangement and calculation of dump trucks.	Management and Reduction of Construction and
		(b) Please elaborate on the assumption of recycling/reuse rates	Demolition Waste in Hong Kong, we notice that majority of
		and targets for inert and non-inert C&D materials.	the non-inert C&D waste are wooden/timber and metal.
			These materials usually have high recycling rate after

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
			appropriate waste segregation and sorting. Therefore, we
			assumed a 50% recycling rate for non-inert C&D materials.
		32. Section 5.5.12	(a) Revised in Section 5.3.25.
		(a) Please revise "public fill bank" to "public fill reception	(b) We adopt 30 days/month in the calculation.
		facilities" for clarity.	(c) "Based on the" has been removed from the sentence in
		(b) Please specify the assumption on the number of working	Section 5.3.25.
		days per month to facilitate further vetting.	
		(c) The third sentence, "Based on the Assuming a dump truck	
		capacity of 7.5m3 per trip, the tentative average number of	
		dump truck trips per day could therefore be estimated as 8	
		trip/day", is confusing and incomplete; please review and	
		update as appropriate.	
		33. Response-to-Comment (35) – Section 5.5.13	Noted.
		Per the response to the previous comment (35), only a small	
		amount of vegetative wastes and waste wood are anticipated	
		during the construction phase, therefore, disposal at Y-PARK is	
		considered unnecessary at this stage. The current arrangement	
		is well noted. Nevertheless, the Consultant shall further explore	
		the possibility in subsequent stages to better utilize the valuable	
		resources. We reserve our comment on the arrangement upon	
		the incorporation of the site boundary into Figure 5-1.	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		34. Section 5.5.14	Accumulation of non-inert C&D waste on site may cause hygiene
		Please clarify the meaning of "on a least weekly basis".	problem and generate odour after decomposing/erosion. So, the
			residual non-inert should be transported out of the site to disposal
			facilities on the frequency of a least once every week.
		35. Section 5.5.15	
		(a) The total quantity of non-inert C&D materials does not tally	(a) Table 5-3 has been revised according to Comment 21 and
		between this paragraph (i.e., 12,373m3) and Table 5-3 (i.e.,	29.
		20,939m3); please carefully review and update as appropriate.	(b) Revised as suggested in Section 5.3.28.
		(b) Please revise "m3" to "m3" for clarity.	
		36. Section 5.5.16	The frequency has been specified to be one a day in Section 5.5.10.
		Please clarify the general refuse collection and disposal	
		frequency during the construction phase.	
		37. Section 5.5.24	This section has been moved after Section 5.5.10 as 5.5.11.
		The content of this paragraph is unrelated to chemical waste;	
		please relocate it to Section 5.5.17 on the collection and	
		disposal arrangements for general refuse.	
		38. Response-to-Comment (42) – Section 5.5.26	The handing of ACM is discussed in Section 5.3.17-5.3.20.
		The Consultant is advised to briefly elaborate on the handling	
		arrangements of asbestos-containing materials and control	
		measures to be taken during the collection and disposal.	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		39. Response-to-Comment (51) – Section 5.5.28	(a) These sentences have been replaced by measures for
		(a) The concept of applying less irritating coagulant and	preventing and controlling spillage according to the
		flocculant to reduce the severity of accidental spillage is	comments.
		unreasonable and shall not be considered a mitigation measure	(b) The term "dryness" appeared commonly in DSD papers,
		and good site practice. Please be advised that such measures	describing the degree of dewatering of sludge cake. The
		may lower the treatment efficiency of the wastewater treatment	word "requirement" has been shifted to avoid confusion in
		and sedimentation on both the retention time and quality of the	Section 5.5.23.
		wastewater sludge. Most importantly, preventive measures	(c) We mentioned it in the previous report because we want to
		shall be prioritized so that no spillage occurs during the	explain that the impact from chlorine is expected to be
		proposed STW's operation.	small. These sentences will be removed from Section
			5.5.22 in the updated report.
		(b) The term "dryness requirement" is confusing; please review	(d) Similar to the sentences questioned in Comment 39(c), the
		whether moisture content shall be referred to instead.	carcinogenic potential of chlorine is mentioned to explained
			that the impact from chlorine. These sentences have been
		(c) Please elaborate on the chlorine application and its causal	removed in the updated report.
		relationship with domestic waste.	(e) The collection and disposal arrangement of chemical waste
			during operation of STP has been added to the end of
		(d) The Consultant shall elaborate on the nature and identify of	Section 5.5.22.
		the coagulant and flocculant and explain their correlation with	
		carcinogenic potential as mentioned in the second last	
		sentence.	
		(e) Please elaborate on the collection and disposal arrangement	
		of chemical waste during the operation of the proposed	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		development.	
		40. Response-to-Comment (46) – Section 5.5.29	(a) Food waste will be recycled off-site.
		(a) Please clarify whether on-site or off-site treatment of food	(b) The sentence about food waste in Section 5.5.24 will be
		waste will be adopted during the operation phase.	replaced by Food Waste Recycling Schemes as it is being
		(b) The previous comment has not been duly addressed. Given	promoted by EPD recently.
		that about 70% of food waste is generated from the domestic	(c) The minimal frequency of once a day has been added to
		sector, the Consultant shall review and explore the possibility of	Section 5.5.24.
		collecting food waste alongside other recyclables from the	
		proposed residential developments during the operation phase.	
		(c) Please specify the collection and disposal frequency	
		(minimum) for general refuse during the operation of the	
		Project.	
		41. Section 5.6.1	We currently cannot find evidence of presence of ACM on site. If
		Please clarify whether asbestos-containing materials are	ACM are found during the later investigation, then the measures
		anticipated during the construction phase.	specified in Section 5.3.17-5.3.20 shall be followed.
		42. Section 5.6.2	Chemical waste may be produced during operation of STP. It has
		Please clarify whether chemical wastes are anticipated during	been added to Section 5.6.2.
		the operation phase.	
		43. Response-to-Comment (55) – Section 6.2	Thanks for your constructive comment and suggestion, we have
		The previous comment remains unaddressed. In addition to the	incorporated the methodology for site investigation and the step of
		submission requirements, the Consultant is advised to	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		elaborate on the method statement for identification and	handling the land contamination at the further stage (if land
		evaluation of the land contamination potential of the site.	contamination is demonstrated with evidence) in Section 6.2.2.
		Please specify that documentary justifications shall be	
		supplemented to substantiate whether there is any potential	
		land contamination issue arising from the past and present land	
		use activities on the proposed development site through	
		desktop review and site survey (e.g., site's land use history,	
		aerial photos, site visit photos, spillage records, potential	
		contamination sources, etc.). Please incorporate the	
		introduction of the assessment approach in Section 6.2.	
		44. Response to Comment (53) – Section 6.3.2	(a) In the previous round of comments from EPD, Comment 53 is
		(a) The response to the previous comment (56) was irrelevant	53. Section 5.5.1
		to the comment; please carefully review and rectify.	The Consultant is advised to elaborate on the types of waste anticipated during the construction phase.
		(b) Please graphically indicate the locations accessible during	We added a sentence to Section 5.6.1 to summarize the generation
		the site walkover. If further site inspection is required for the	of waste during construction phase.
		inaccessible areas, please review whether site reappraisal will	56. Response-to-Comment (53) - Section 6.3.2
		be conducted in the subsequent stage.	Please clarify what kind of consents were granted by other landlords within the Project Site.
			We clarified that the consent of TPO Section 12A rezoning
			application from Agriculture/Residential (A) to Residential (C) has
			been granted from other landlords to the planning applicant.

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
			(b) The graphical indication of inaccessible are within the
			development area and surrounding area has been provided in Figure
			6-1. Further investigation might be required at previous inaccessible
			areas to investigate whether land contamination evidence could be
			obtained within the development area. This further stage
			investigation should be incorporated into a separated CAP as
			mentioned above. The implementation of CAP should be further
			discussed with the project team before the detailed design stage and
			submitted to EPD for review before the construction commencement.
		45. Response-to-Comment (57), (59), (60), (61) and (62) – Section	(a, b, and c) Thanks for your suggestion. A separated CAP should
		6.4	be conducted at further stage and submitted to EPD for review
		(a) The site walkover was incomplete and could not accurately	before the construction.
		evaluate the land contamination potential of the proposed	
		development site. The Consultant is advised to properly	(d, f, g, h,i) During our site visit, there is no potential chemical
		address the previous comments to (i) identify the suspected	spillage or suspected area of land contamination. However, further
		contamination areas and (ii) determine whether detailed site	investigation will be done and incorporated in the separated CAP
		investigation and the submission of CAP are required in the	for EPD review and approval before construction.
		subsequent stage.	
		(b) According to the site photographic records and historical and	(e)What shown in Photo 2 is concrete ground covered by serval iron
		current land uses within the project sites, (i) the suspected oil	plate rather than crack on concrete pavement. Further investigation
		stain (e.g. Photos 2 and 20), (ii) contaminative land use (e.g.,	on the pavement condition will be supplemented when the CAP is
		vehicle maintenance workshop, open storage yard and	prepared.
		lubricating oil tank in Photo 29), (iii) chemical/chemical waste	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		storage areas (e.g., for the fuel-driven machinery) and (iv)	
		suspected chemical containers (e.g., Photos 11, 19 and 21)	
		were identified. The Consultant shall individually evaluate their	
		land contamination potential and determine whether detailed	
		site investigation and the submission of CAP are required in the	
		subsequent stage.	
		(c) It is noticed that some site photographic records were taken	
		on 6 December 2022, which is earlier than the one stated in this	
		paragraph; please review and clarify accordingly.	
		(d) Please carefully review whether the housekeeping	
		conditions shall be identified as "clean" with consideration of the	
		conditions in Photos 3, 4 and 11 in Appendix G.	
		(e) Please review whether the description that the site area is	
		entirely paved with concrete is valid, with consideration of the	
		paving condition as shown in Photo 2 in Appendix G. The	
		Consultant shall also elaborate on the paving condition and	
		whether cracks were identified on the concrete paving.	
		(f) Considering the suspected land use, site conditions and	
		contaminative activities mentioned in sub-comment (a), please	
		thoroughly review whether the conclusion that there was no	
		evidence of potential land contamination issue is valid and	
		reasonable. If not, please specify that detailed SI and	
		submission of CAP will be covered in the forthcoming	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		assessment stage.	
		(g) Further information and assessment shall be incorporated	
		for the potential off-site contamination sources as identified in	
		the site walkover checklist.	
		(h) Please specify the areas that require further re-appraisals in	
		the subsequent assessment stage.	
		(i) The Consultant is advised to graphically indicate the extent	
		and locations of potential contamination areas that require	
		further and detailed site investigation in the subsequent stage.	
		(j) The responses to the previous comments are generally	
		unsatisfactory; please carefully review and evaluate the land	
		contamination potential within the proposed development site.	
		46. Response-to-Comment (58) and (61) – Appendix G	(a, b, c, d, e, f): Thanks for your constructive comment and
		(a) The Consultant is required to supplement sufficient	suggestion. Further investigation on land contamination issue with
		information such as site photographic records and site walkover	the development area in a separated CAP should be conducted and
		checklist to substantiate that no potential land contamination	submitted to EPD for review and approval before the commencement
		sources are identified within and immediately adjacent to the	of construction as mentioned above.
		Project Site. The Consultant is reminded to append a locational	
		plan with a clear indication of the location where the photos	
		were taken. Please be advised that all suspected storage areas,	
		warehouses and temporary structures shall be properly	
		evaluated.	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		(b) According to the site walkover checklist, it is stated that	
		lubricating oil is used in daily operations for PME maintenance;	
		please supplement photographic records showing the site and	
		storage conditions.	
		(c) The resolution of the site walkover checklist and some site	
		photographic records are very poor and unreadable (e.g., item	
		19 of the questionnaire. Please thoroughly check the quality of	
		the submission and the presentation of the findings.	
		(d) According to the site walkover checklist, it was identified that	
		chemicals have been frequently used within the site; please	
		supplement photos and descriptions on the chemical storage	
		areas for clarity.	
		(e) Photo 27 is irrelevant to the storage of lubricating oil; please	
		thoroughly review and update the responses and content of the	
		submission.	
		(f) The responses to the previous comments are generally	
		unsatisfactory; please carefully review and evaluate the land	
		contamination potential within the proposed development site.	
		47. Response-to-Comment (62) – Section 6.4.6	(a) We have inquired the government departments and planning
		(a) The term "background research" remains confusing; please	applicant about the past record of chemical spillage and incident. The
		further elaborate on the main text and consider using an	description of background research has been expanded in the first
		alternative description to avoid confusion.	sentence of Section 6.4.6.

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		(b) The previous comment has not been duly addressed. The	(b) At this stage, we have no clear information on the registration by
		finding of no record of valid/invalid chemical waste producers,	project proponent as chemical waste producer in the past. Further
		as enclosed in Appendix I, contradicts the questionnaire taken	investigation will be conducted to confirm or infirm on the chemical
		in the site walkover checklist. The Consultant is advised to	waste producer registration of the project proponent. Such
		confirm whether the project proponent has already been	investigation should also be incorporated in the desktop study during
		registered as a chemical waste producer under the relevant	the separated CAP study.
		regulation under Cap.354. Please be advised that there might	(c) The finding from the response of EPD and FSD has been added
		be a potential violation of the WDO in case contractors or	to Section 6.4.6 separately.
		construction companies (with the production of chemical	(d) Accidental chemical issue refers to the chemical handling
		wastes) fail to register as chemical waste producers. Please	activities that can cause detrimental impact to the land and human
		seek further clarification with the relevant section of EPD and	other than the spillage and leakage incident.
		supplement the relevant correspondence for the record.	(e) The information received from EPD and FSD are specified as the
		(c) Please elaborate on the response findings from EPD and	last sentence of Section 6.4.6.
		FSD.	(f) FSD has confirmed that there is neither record of dangerous goods
		(d) Please clarify the meaning of "accidental chemical issues".	license, fire incident nor incidents of spillage/leakage were found in
		(e) Please specify the information the Consultant were	connection with the site area. The specified information has been
		requesting from EPD and FSD.	added as the last sentence of Section 6.4.6.
		(f) Please be advised that FSD only holds information related to	
		the spillage, leakage and storage records for dangerous goods.	
		The Consultant shall specify such information and the response	
		from FSD in the main text for clarity.	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		48. Response-to-Comment (63) – Section 6.5.1	(a, b, and c) At this stage, we have no potential evidence to conclude
		(a) According to the response to the previous comment (63), it	on the land contamination within the development area. However, as
		is noted that further investigation will only cover the potential off-	mentioned above, further study with separated CAP should be
		site contamination sources; please carefully review the extent	conducted for EPD review and approval before the construction. At
		of site reappraisals and the validity and representativeness of	the CAP stage, in-deep desktop study with the development and off-
		the current assessment.	site should be conducted to see whether land contamination
		(b) Please note that the current assessment is incomplete and	evidence exist within the development area.
		unsatisfactory; please review the level of detail of this	The sentence has been rewritten to avoid confusion.
		assessment and update the first sentence as appropriate.	Noted with thanks.
		(c) Per the comments above, please clarify whether there is	
		literally no evidence of suspected sources and activities during	
		the site walkovers.	
		(d) The 3rd sentence, "In addition, there will be no change in	
		near further of the current site activities before the demolition	
		for the construction related to the development target", is	
		confusing; please review and update the sentence as	
		appropriate.	
		(e) The finding of the investigation is currently incomplete; we	
		will reserve our comments on the conclusion of the land	
		contamination chapter in the subsequent submission.	

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		Water Quality Perspective	The treatment level has been added in Table 4-3. It is required by
		49. Section 4.3.8	EPD Comment 74 on Further Information No.3.
		Please state the treatment level of the STP. [not yet addressed]	
		50. Section 4.4.5	Tertiary treatment will be adopted. The effluent discharge standard
		Please elaborate the sewage generated from proposed	has been copied from SIA and added as Table 4-3. It is required by
		development during operation will be collected, handled and	EPD Comment 74 on Further Information No.3.
		disposed properly by on-site STP as a mitigation measure.	
		Please state the treatment level of the STP.	
		51. It is noted in latest Response-to-Comment that detailed	As mentioned in the previous round of comments, the emergency
		information on emergency plan, bypass discharge quantity	plan, bypass discharge quantity percentage, efficient handling
		percentage and efficient handling management system will be	management system with detailed procedure will be provided at
		provided. Please elaborate in appropriate section(s) in the water	detailed design stage. However, we will elaborate on the emergency
		quality chapter. We will review and provide comments upon	discharge arrangement in the water quality chapter as suggested.
		receiving the submission.	
		Sewerage Impact Assessment Report	Please refer to Appendix 2 for the revised SIA.
		52. Section 3.2.3 and 3.2.5	The design capacity of the STP will be taken as 5000 cubic meter/day
		Inconsistency is noted in Section 3.2.3 and 3.2.5, please clarify	in the revised SIA report.
		if the design capacity of the proposed STP is 3,500 m3/day or	
		7,000 m3/day.	
		53. It is noted that the total sewage generated for this project is	Within the revised SIA, we proposed to use sewage storage facility
		3,005 m3/day, please advise how the design capacity of the	like sewage reception well of sewage storage tank to provide
		proposed STP of 3,500 m3/day is arrived at.	temporary storage for sewage on site. Supposed that the sewage

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
			storage facility can provide retention during the peak hours, the
			design capacity of the proposed STP can be taken as the same as
			the ADWF or more. The design capacity of the STP is proposed to
			be 5000 cubic meter/day in the updated SIA, which is about 66%
			higher than the ADWF to provide both the capacity to rapidly
			evacuate the sewage storage facility when necessary and sufficient
			buffer against potential equipment damage.
		54. Table 3-1, Section 3.2.3 and 3.2.5	Noted. The peaking factor of 2.5 will be adopted for the calculation of
		In Table 3-1, Section 3.2.3 and 3.2.5, it is suggested to adopt	peak flow. The peak flow is now calculated to be 7513.5 cubic
		2.5 for the peaking factor of the proposed STP which is the new	meter/day. This value will be later used for determining the required
		Sewage Treatment Works. Please update if applicable.	pump capacity of the discharge system in Section of the SIA and
			calculate the available capacity of the drainage channel in the DIA
			report.
2.4.2024	Environmental	Environmental Assessment Report Batch 2 Comments:	Please refer to Appendix 1 for the revised EA.
	Protection		
	Department	1. Section 3.2.5	We noticed that PN1/24 has been published recently. Section 3.2.5
		The consultant shall note that PN2/93 was replaced by PN1/24.	and Table 3-1 has been revised accordingly.
		Please review critically and revise accordingly.	
		2. Section 3.2.6	The description about fix noise source criteria in HKPSG Chapter 9
		Noise standards from HKPSG Table 4.1 shall be referenced for	Table 4.1 has been added to Section 3.2.6.
		fixed noise source.	
		3. Table 3-4	As presented in Figure 3-1, the prevailing background noise is
		As indicated in Appendix 4.2, Chapter 9 of the HKPSG, L90 (1	measured at intercepting point of site boundary and the two of the

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		hour) should be generally used as a measure of the	access roads to the site, Hai Wing Road and Dao Yang Road. The
		background noise level. Nevertheless, should the consultant	noise level there is expected to be dominated by the traffic flow from
		prefer Leq, measurement results may be accepted provided	the warehouse operation in site area. The effect of extraneous events
		that the consultant can demonstrate that the measured Leq	is expected to be small.
		does not significantly affected by extraneous events (avoided	
		or edited out).	
		4. Section 3.4.2	The application of tonality correction and intermittency correction is
		Reference to IND-TM shall be made for the application of	subject to the acoustic characteristic of the noise source. At this
		correction for intermittency. Besides, correction for tonality shall	planning application stage, the specification of the mechanical
		also be addressed.	equipment in the proposed development is not yet known. Therefore,
			we did not apply these corrections to the fixed noise source
			calculation.
			A sentence will be added to 3.4.13 to discuss the consideration on
			the tonality and intermittency.
		5. Section 3.4.13	We clarify that the residual noise impact is not planned. We estimate
		No residual noise impact from proposed fixed noise sources	that the noise impact from the proposed outdoor units will be
		shall be planned, please observe the relevant requirements of	acceptable if the criteria in Table 3-7 is followed, and the last
		HKPSG and Noise Control Ordinance.	sentence in Section 3.4.13 refers that mitigation measures can be
			planned to further reduce residual noise impact. The sentence has
			been rewritten to avoid confusion.