

Appendix A

Responses-to-Comments Table

Comments from Related Departments

Page No.

COMMENTS FROM RELATED DEPARTMENTS	2
1. Environmental Protection Department, Water Quality Management Division, Water Quality Management Group, Specific Waste Management and Land Contamination, Assessment, dated 03 February 2026	2
2. Geotechnical Engineering Office, dated 02 February 2026.....	2
3. Planning Department, District Planning Branch, Special Duties Division, Urban Design & Landscape Section, Urban Design Unit, dated 23 January 2026	4
4. Transport Department, NT Regional Office, Traffic Engineering (NTE) Division, Housing & Planning Section, dated 23 January 2026	4

COMMENTS FROM RELATED DEPARTMENTS

No.	Comments	Responses
1.	<p>Environmental Protection Department, Water Quality Management Division, Water Quality Management Group, Specific Waste Management and Land Contamination, Assessment, dated 03 February 2026</p> <p>Please find the comments from EPD on FI(4) below for your reference.</p> <p><u>Other comments/observation on the supporting SIA to Y/SK-HC/8</u></p> <p>SIA</p> <p>The project proponent is reminded that future connection to public sewer, if available, is subject to the agreement of EPD and DSD. The project proponent would need to review the SIA and assess the potential sewerage impact arising from the development, and where appropriate, to demonstrate the effectiveness of mitigation measures. The project proponent is required to implement the sewer connection and mitigation works, if any, at its own cost to meet the satisfaction of DSD.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
2.	<p>Geotechnical Engineering Office, dated 02 February 2026</p> <p>Please also find the comments from Geotechnical Engineering Office (GEO) on the response-to-comments table and Geotechnical Planning Review Report in FI(4) below for your follow-up action.</p> <p>1. Section 6.3: The revised screening in respect of natural terrain hazard still contains many deficiencies and our previous comments related to the screening in particular those related to catchment boundary have not be fully addressed. The Consultants shall refer to Section 2.3 of GEO Report No. 138 when conducting the screening exercise and the specific comments are provided below.</p>	<p>Noted. The catchment boundary has been revised. Please refer to Figure 4 of the Revised Geotechnical Planning Review Report (GPRR) (Appendix B of this FI refers) for the revised catchment.</p>

Responses to Comments – Departmental Comments

No.	Comments	Responses
	<p>a. Further amendments are required for catchment boundaries clouded in the attached plan. For example, the hillside above the crest of catchment CD(1), OH(A2) and OH(B) shall be included as part of the catchments. Minor portions of hillside to the southeast of catchment TD(1) and OH(A1) shall be included as part of the catchments. The southwestern portion of catchment OH(A1) does not overlook the site. Please review and amend the catchment boundaries based on the topography.</p> <p>b. The toe of the catchments shall extend to adjoin the site boundary.</p> <p>c. Figures 5 - 10: The AOR shall be measured along the steepest credible flow path. For example, in Section B-B (Figure 6), the crest to measure the AOR from the site shall be the point of elevation at +50mPD on the ground profile instead of +54mPD, which will result a steeper AOR at about 28°. Please review the other sections accordingly.</p> <p>2. It is noted that the AOR measured in the screening provided in the GPRR is based on measurement from the site boundary. Given the layout of the proposed development is available, the applicant may conduct the screening based on the facilities involved (i.e. residential buildings, club house, internal roads, swimming pool, footpath, etc.). If this approach is adopted, please classify each individual facility according to Table 2.2 of GEO Report No. 138, and reassess the AOR accordingly. This approach may provide a more refined delineation of the hillside requiring an NTHS. However, please note that the screening and extent of NTHS will need to be reviewed and updated if there are changes to the development layout.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Attached Plan.pdf</p>	<p>Noted. The catchment boundaries for OH(A1) have been revised and separated to OH(A1), OH(A2) and OH(A3), OH(A2) is renamed to OH(A4) and boundaries are extended.</p> <p>The catchment boundary of OH(B) has been renamed to OH(B1) and the boundary has been extended.</p> <p>The catchment boundary of TD(1) has been renamed to OH(B2) and the boundary has been extended.</p> <p>An addition catchment CD(2) has been added to cover the channelized catchment at the north-west of the lot.</p> <p>Please refer to Figure 4 of the Revised GPRR for the revised catchment.</p> <p>Noted. The catchments have been extended to adjoin the site boundary in the Revised GPRR.</p> <p>Noted. The measurement of the AOR has been revised. All sections have been revised accordingly under the Revised GPRR.</p> <p>Noted. The AOR is revised to measure from the nearest facilities. All sections are revised accordingly under the Revised GPRR.</p> <p>The screening and extent of NTHS will be reviewed and updated when the development layout is changed.</p>

Responses to Comments – Departmental Comments

No.	Comments	Responses
3.	<p>Planning Department, District Planning Branch, Special Duties Division, Urban Design & Landscape Section, Urban Design Unit, dated 23 January 2026</p> <p><i>Comments on the VIA:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Photomontages of VP1 and VP3 - the proposed development shown in the photomontages is unclear, please review if the building bulks of the proposed development are accurately reflected in the photomontages. 	<p>The building bulk of the proposed development is accurately reflected in the photomontages. As the building height of Block 4 would be lower than the proposed landscape feature and most of the building profile for Blocks 1 and 2 will be blocked by Block 3. Therefore, only the proposed Block 3 and limited building profile of Block 2 could be seen in VP1 and VP3, which has been reflected in the latest submission of the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA).</p>
4.	<p>Transport Department, NT Regional Office, Traffic Engineering (NTE) Division, Housing & Planning Section, dated 23 January 2026</p> <p><i>Comments from the Traffic Engineering (NTE) Division:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is noted the layout of the internal road and parking space in the basement have been provided in the first submission. Please include the layout in Drawing No. FL-02 in the Traffic Impact Assessment Report. <p><i>Comments from the Transport Operations (NT) Division:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. For Table 3.4, please supplement (1) the date and period of the on-site survey, (2) location(s) of the survey conducted, (3) no. of left behind and (4) survey result conducted during PM peak hour; and 3. The assessment on the projected public transport demand (for both AM and PM peak) should also be included in Section 6.1 Summary. 	<p>Noted. Please refer to Appendix C of the Revised Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) (Appendix C of this FI refers) for details.</p> <p>Please also refer to the Replacement Page of the Revised Indicative Architectural Drawings (Appendix D of this FI refers) for the Revised Basement Plan.</p> <p>Please note that no passengers are left behind during the survey periods. Other information has been supplemented in the TIA report accordingly. Please refer to Section 3.5 of the Revised TIA for details.</p> <p>Noted. The paragraph is included in Section 6.1 of the Revised TIA accordingly.</p>

(Last updated 12 February 2026)