Proposed Rezoning of the Site from "Industrial (Group D)", "Residential (Group A)" and "Agriculture" to "Residential (Group A)1" for Residential Development at Various Lots and Adjoining Government Land in D.D. 107, Fung Kat Heung, Yuen Long (S12A Amendment of Plan Application No. Y/YL-KTN/7)

– Further Information No. 3 –

Item	Comments	Our Responses
1	**Comments from Drainage Services Department (Responsible Officer: Miss KWAN Ching Kei, Jessica; Tel: 3965 8924) Received on 12 January 2026**	
1.1	***Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA)*** (A) Specific Comments Para. 2.1: The DIA should include all adverse drainage impacts on the drainage system and adjacent areas resulting from the development, along with recommendations for mitigation measures, improvement works and other measures and works.	Noted.
1.2	Para. 2.2.4 & 2.5.11: As per the requirement in SDM Corrigendum No. 1/2022, storm surge increase due to climate change (Table 30a & Table 30B) and design allowance in end of 21st century (Table 31) should be considered in the assessment.	Storm surge allowance and design allowance have been included in the assessment.
1.3	Figure 2 & Figure 3: Please combine the information in Figure 2 and Figure 3 together such as the catchment area and the proposed manholes would be clearly presented in the plan for ease of reference and checking of calculation in Appendix 2. In addition, the details of the whole drainage system, which receives the runoff/stormwater from the subject site to existing river/stream/drainage pipe or channel, should be clearly presented in the plan.	Existing drainage system have been showed in Figure 2 of the DIA (**Annex A** refers).
1.4	Figure 3, Appendix 2 & Para. 2.5.10 - 2.5.12: Catchment "B1" can't be found in the Figure 3. The applicant should check and amend accordingly. In addition, the applicant should demonstrate that the existing drainage system, which receives the runoff/stormwater from the application site and SPPHD, and the drainage system to be constructed under SPPHD has sufficient spare capacity to	The Catchment B1 has been removed. It is confirmed that the drainage system to be constructed under SPPHD has sufficient spare capacity to accommodate the additional runoff and

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	accommodate the additional runoff and treated effluent from sedimentation tank of the application site.	treated effluent from sedimentation tank of the application site. Please refer to Appendix 2 of the DIA for more details.
1.5	Cross sections showing the proposed drainage facilities and existing and proposed ground levels of the captioned site with respect to the adjacent areas should be given.	Figure 4 showed the proposed drainage terminal manhole and the existing and proposed ground level of the site.
1.6	Para. 2.2.3: The applicant should clarify unit of catchment area.	Noted and revised.
1.7	The ground to the north and east of the application site is generally higher. According to the topography around the subject site, external catchment area shall be greater than the one adopted in the submitted hydraulic calculation. The applicant should update hydraulic calculation.	According to the site visit (see Appendix 4 of the DIA), a catchpit near the site was observed. It is believed that the surface runoff from north and east of the Application Site would be collected by road gully and discharged to the catchpit. Therefore, the surface runoff from the surrounding catchment would not flow into the Application Site.
1.8	The applicant should indicate how the runoff (the flow direction) within the site and from the adjacent areas would be discharged to the proposed drainage system.	The flow direction of the site and the adjacent areas have been indicated in the Figure 2 (prefer option) and Figure 3 (fallback option) of the DIA.
1.9	Peripheral surface channels shall be provided along the site boundary to collect the surface runoff accrued on the application site and to intercept the overland flow from the adjacent lands. It is noted that there is proposed land filling works for the development. Proper surface channels should be provided at the lower platform and wall toe to collect the overland flow to/ from adjacent areas.	Proposed peripheral channel has been provided along the site boundary.
1.10	The applicant should demonstrate with hydraulic calculation that the proposed drainage facilities are adequate to collect, convey and discharge the surface runoff accrued on the application site and the overland flow intercepted from the adjacent lands.	Hydraulic calculation has been included in Appendix 2 of the DIA.
1.11	Table 1: In the submitted hydraulic calculation, 5 mins was adopted as design time of concentration. The applicant should clarify the design assumption adopted in the submitted calculation.	Reference of Planning Application YL-KTN/761-2, the assumption as 5 mins of time of concentration was adopted.
1.12	Table 3a, 3b, 3c: The applicant should review roughness coefficient of the proposed drainage facilities.	The value of roughness coefficient (ks) is interpolated for pipe velocities between 0.75m/s and 1.2m/s.
1.13	Tables 3b & 3c: In the submitted hydraulic calculation, flow velocity is suggested to be within a range, i.e. 0.75 m/s to 3.0 m/s.	The flow velocities for all proposed pipes constructed by the Applicant are fall within the acceptable range of 0.75 m/s to 3.0 m/s.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
		Based on the information by SPPHD (Appendix 3), the design velocity for the proposed drainage pipes constructed by SPPGD is over 3m/s. It is assumed that further DIA report for SPPHD will be conducted in later stage, which the design of the proposed drainage pipes will match DSD's standard.
1.14	Table 4b & 4c: Catchment area 'A4' was missing in the submitted hydraulic calculation.	Catchment Area A4 have been removed from Table 4b & 4c of the DIA.
1.15	Figure 2: The applicant should indicate size of the proposed drainage facilities at the downstream of the proposed terminal manhole T1 on the drainage plan.	The size of the proposed drainage facilities at the downstream of the proposed terminal manhole T1 have been indicated in Figure 2 and Figure 3 of the DIA.
1.16	Figure 2: The applicant should clarify connection details of the proposed drainage facilities and drainage facilities to be constructed under SPPHD.	The assumed invert level for the proposed drainage facilities constructed by SPPHD has been indicated in Figure 2 of the DIA.
1.17	Figure 2: A sand trap/desilting type catchpit or provision alike should be clearly indicated on the proposed drainage plan and provided prior to connection to the proposed stormwater terminal manhole or to the downstream stormwater drainage system to be constructed under SPPHD. The sand trap/desilting type catchpit should be regularly desilted by the applicant to prevent sand, silt, cementitious materials or other objects from being washed down into the downstream stormwater drainage system.	A sand trap has been proposed for the proposed peripheral channel. Figure 2 of the DIA is revised accordingly.
1.18	Figure 4: The applicant should clarify connection details of the proposed sewage treatment plant and the downstream drainage facilities.	The connection details of the proposed sewerage treatment plant and the downstream drainage facilities will be provided in the detailed design stage.
1.19	Cover levels and invert levels of the proposed drainage facilities and the downstream drainage facilities should be shown on the drainage plan. Invert levels of drainage facilities at the upstream should be higher than that at the downstream.	Cover level and invert level of the proposed drainage facilities have been indicated in the figure. It is confirmed that the invert levels of the drainage facilities at the upstream is higher than the downstream.
1.20	Catchpit should be provided at where a proposed surface channel changes direction.	The catchpits have been provided at where a proposed surface channel direction.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
1.21	The proposed terminal manhole should be located within the application site as near to the site boundary as possible.	Noted.
1.22	Cover level of the proposed terminal manhole should be higher than that of the downstream stormwater manhole.	The cover level of the proposed terminal manhole is assumed no less than 7.4mPD, would be higher than the downstream stormwater manhole.
1.23	The DTL of the proposed stormwater terminal manhole should be indicated on the drawing complying with the current Government standard and a 150mm difference between I.L. and D.T.I.L. should be maintained.	D.T.L and I.L of the terminal manhole has been indicated in the figure.
1.24	The terminal manhole should be of Type T1, T2, T3, T4 or T10 as appropriate and in accordance with current DSD standard drawings.	Noted. Type of the terminal manhole will be provided in detailed design stage.
1.25	(B) General Comments The proposed development should neither obstruct overland flow nor adversely affect any existing natural streams, village drains, ditches and the adjacent areas, etc. All existing flow paths as well as the runoff falling onto and passing though the site will be intercepted and disposed of via proper discharge points. Free flow condition of the adjacent drains, channels and watercourses should be maintained at all time during and after the development.	Noted.
1.26	The applicant shall be required to place all the proposed works 3m away from the top of the bank of the existing watercourses. All the proposed works in the vicinity of the watercourses should not create any adverse drainage impacts, both during and after construction. Adequate measures should be provided at the resources of the applicant to our satisfaction in order to avoid the subject site from being eroded and flooded and to ensure capacity of watercourses and flooding susceptibility of the adjoining areas would not be adversely affected by the proposed development.	Noted.
1.27	The applicant should be reminded to minimize the possible adverse environmental impacts on the existing watercourses in his design and during construction. DEP and DAFC should be consulted on possible	Noted.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	environmental and/or ecological impacts of the proposed development.	
1.28	The standard sand trap in accordance with current DSD Standard Drawing no. DS1025 is designed for one incoming drain/u-channel with size of 900mm diameter or below. For the construction details of the proposed drainage facilities, reference should be made to the latest CEDD's standard drawings.	Noted.
1.29	Precast concrete pipe should generally be used for stormwater connection. Reference should also be made to Stormwater Drainage Manual published by DSD.	Noted.
1.30	The applicant is required to ensure that no construction debris, silt and sediments, or cementitious materials will be discharged to or deposited inside the public drains from the site. Any blockage or damage of public drains arising from the construction works shall be made good at the cost of the applicant and to our satisfaction.	Noted.
1.31	The applicant is required to liaise with relevant utility undertakers to obtain the latest records, plans and alignments of their utilities in order to ensure the feasibility of the proposed drainage works. The applicant is also required to excavate inspection pits and conduct utility detection to verify the alignments of utilities shown in such utility records if considered necessary.	Noted.
1.32	It is the applicant's responsibility to identify/locate the existing government sewers and stormwater drains to which drainage connections from his site are to be proposed. The applicant should verify the existence of any drains/sewers/utilities and also their exact locations, levels and alignments on site in order to ascertain the positions and levels of the proposed manholes and the associated connection works. The applicant should also verify that the existing government drains/sewer, to which connections are proposed, are in normal working conditions and capable of taking the discharge from the site. Besides, for any excavation works over or in close vicinity to existing government drains/sewers, the applicant should notify DSD in writing at least 14 working days before backfilling the excavation	Noted.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	works and arrange joint site inspection with DSD prior to covering up.	
1.33	The applicant is also reminded that any person wilfully, except with the permission in writing of the Authority, or negligently damages, alters, disconnects or otherwise interferes with any public sewer or drain or any connection therewith, shall be guilty of an offence under Section 6 of Public Health and Municipal Services Ordinance (Cap 132).	Noted.
1.34	Should any undue settlement or damage of the existing public drainage installations be detected, the piling/foundation/excavation works should be stopped immediately by the applicant who shall report the matter to PlanD and this Department as soon as possible. In the event of any damage caused to the existing public drainage installations by the above works, the applicant should be responsible for making good the damage at his own cost and to our satisfaction.	Noted.
1.35	Appropriate sedimentation tanks for proper treatment of site discharge should be provided, properly maintained and operated.	Noted.
1.36	The application site is in adjacent to the planned SPPHD and its ancillary government, institution and community facilities in Yuen Long. Comments from CEDD and HD on the subject application shall be sought.	Noted.
1.37	Consent should be obtained from project proponent of Sha Po Public Housing Development (SPPHD) before using the drainage system of SPPHD to discharge the runoff/stormwater from the subject site.	Noted.
1.38	Temporary drainage system should be provided if the programme of construction drainage system under SPPHD does not align with the construction timeline of the application site.	Fallback option (connect to the existing nature stream) is provided in Section 2.5.10 – 2.5.12 of the DIA.
1.39	The applicant should liaise and coordinate with project proponent(s) of SPPHD to confirm the proposed drainage design and ascertain responsibilities of implementation and maintenance of the proposed drainage works (including but not limited to the proposed upgrading works).	Noted.
1.40	The drainage facilities, to which the applicant proposed to discharge	Noted.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	the stormwater from the application site was not maintained by this office. The applicant should identify the owner of drainage facilities and seek agreement from the owner prior to commencement of the proposed works.	
1.41	This Department will only take over those public drainage facilities constructed on government land and located downstream of the terminal manhole. When the proposed drainage facilities are exclusively used by the proposed development, those drainage facilities shall be maintained by the applicant at his/her own cost.	Noted.
1.42	Where walls or hoarding are erected are laid along the site boundary, adequate openings should be provided to intercept the existing overland flow passing through the site.	Noted.
1.43	The applicant is required to rectify the drainage system if they are found to be inadequate or ineffective during operation. The applicant shall also be liable for and shall indemnify claims and demands arising out of damage or nuisance caused by a failure of the drainage system.	Noted.
1.44	The applicant should consult DLO/YL and seek consent from the relevant owners for any drainage works to be carried out outside his lot boundary before commencement of the drainage works.	Noted.
1.45	Connection of the proposed and existing drainage facilities shall be designed and constructed such that there is no water leakage at the proposed connection.	Noted.
1.46	Consideration should be given to provide grating for the surface channels.	Noted.
2	**Comments from Environmental Protection Department (Responsible Officer: Mr. WONG Kin Wa, Kelvin; Tel: 2835 1117) Received on 15 January 2026**	
2.1	**General** RtC (2) – Please provide TD's endorsement to support the road type before and after the proposed works when available and update the	

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	fifth sentence in S.1.4.20.	Further to the discussion between the Project Traffic Consultant and TD, Fung Kat Heung Road and access roads are not under TD's management. Thus, TD will not comment on their road type. Since Fung Kat Heung Road and access roads connecting villages or more remote settlements to Rural Roads, according to Volume 2 Chapter 3.2 of Transport Planning and Design Manual (TPDM) published by TD, it is a feeder road.
2.2	S.4.2.7 of the Planning Statement – Please revise "the reply from ECD section of EPD" to "relevant complaint records".	S.4.2.7 of the Supporting Planning Statement (**Annex B** refers) has been revised.
2.3	S.4.2.8 of the Planning Statement – As an on-site STP is proposed as a fallback option, please update the section as appropriate.	The description of the on-site STP as a fallback option has been supplemented in S.4.2.9 of the Supporting Planning Statement.
2.4	Please highlight/indicate all changes for ease of review.	Noted.
2.5	**Air Quality** Sections 1.4.1, 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 – Re. R-t-C #3.4(b), the assessment area should be 500m from the boundary of the subject site instead of 200m. Please revise the relevant parts accordingly.	It is clarified that 500m assessment area and 200m buffer distance has been revised in the report accordingly.
2.6	Sections 2.3.2 and 2.3.3 a. Please delete "in the past five years" since the complaint records were dated from 2019 to 2024. b. In Section 2.3.3, please provide further information to support the containers were well-maintained (e.g. if the waste cooking oils were stored in the fully enclosed containers, if the openings of all containers are properly covered or sealed, no waste cooking oils were found to be exposed to the ambient environment, etc.) which can support any potential odour will be properly controlled.	a. Noted and S2.3.2 of the Environmental Assessment (EA) (**Annex C** refers) has been revised accordingly. b. Further information has been supplemented in S2.3.3 of the EA.
2.7	Section 2.3.5	

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	a. Please review if "over 20m as depicted in Figure 2.3" in lines 12-13 can be revised as "at least 25m as depicted in Figure 2.3 which is greater than 20m for Sha Tau Kok STW". b. Also suggest to delete "so that the odour level at the nearby air sensitive uses will be well below the odour criterion of 5OU" at the end.	a. Noted and revised accordingly. b. Noted and revised accordingly.
2.8	Section 2.4.1 - Re. R-t-C #3.9(a), please provide TD's confirmation on the road type of Fung Kat Heung Road and access roads once available.	Further to the discussion between the Project Traffic Consultant and TD, Fung Kat Heung Road and access roads are not under TD's management. Thus, TD will not comment on their road type. Since Fung Kat Heung Road and access roads connecting villages or more remote settlements to Rural Roads, according to Volume 2 Chapter 3.2 of Transport Planning and Design Manual (TPDM) published by TD, it is a feeder road.
2.9	Figures 2.2a and 2.2b a. Please update the remarks "Lard Boiling Factory" as "Abandoned Lard Boiling Factory", and "Chimneys Stacks in Abandoned Lard Factory" as "Abandoned Chimney Stacks". b. Also please update the titles since not the only abandoned chimney stack location is presented in the figures.	a. Noted and the remarks in the figures have been revised accordingly. b. Figure titles have been revised.
2.10	Appendix 2.3 - Please revise "closed and reopend" at the upper left photo for the site survey on 19 December 2025 to "re-opened".	Noted and Appendix 2.3 of the EA has been revised accordingly.
2.11	**Noise** RtC(1) – Please state clearly in an appropriate part of the current noise impact assessment report that an updated noise impact assessment would be submitted under the land administration mechanism.	S.3.6.2 and S.4.7.2 of the EA are revised accordingly.
2.12	**Sewerage** Section 2.5.4 – Please delete "regarding the sewage generation rate	S.2.5.4 of the SIA (**Annex D** refers) is revised accordingly.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	from Proposed Development" and add "to cater for the flow from SPPHD and this proposed development" after "do not have adequate capacity".	
2.13	Section 2.5.6 – Please replace with "The upgraded design to be implemented by SPPHD is subject to further review and SIA report to be conducted by CEDD."	S.2.5.7 of the SIA (S.2.5.6 has been re-numbered as S.2.5.7 in the latest version of SIA report) is revised accordingly.
2.14	Section 3.1.4 – Please delete.	Since DSD's comment on S.3.1.5 of the SIA (S.3.1.4 has been re-numbered as S.3.1.5 in the latest version of SIA report) has been received on 14th Jan 2026, S.3.1.5 has been updated and would be kept.
2.15	**Land Contamination** Rtc. For the historical operations of the Soy and Sauce Factory, please confirm whether there are any records indicating significant use, storage, or spillage of hazardous chemicals that are known to cause land contamination.	The soy and sauce factory operated for around 30 years ago. There were no records indicating significant use, storage, or spillage of hazardous chemicals available. Moreover, the soy and sauce factory was of the nature of food industry. Storage of hazardous chemicals would not be anticipated. Hence, potential land contamination from the soy and sauce factory is not anticipated. S.5.7.9 of the EA has been updated accordingly.
3	**Comments from Environment and Ecology Bureau (Responsible Officer: Mr. FONG Yiu Sang, Vincent; Tel: 2594 6507) Received on 19 January 2026**	
3.1	Please clarify whether each of the parking spaces for private cars, light goods vehicles and motorcycles of the subject site could be provided with at least 7kW EV charging simultaneously (i.e. when all parking spaces for private cars, light goods vehicles and motorcycles are occupied by EVs and are re-charging at the same time, each of the parking spaces could still be provided with at least 7kW EV charging.)	EV charging facilities (at least 7kW EV charging or above subject to further review) are proposed for all parking spaces (except bicycle) within the proposed development. This will be taken into consideration during the detailed design of the proposed development at the next stage. **[Client please confirm]**

Item	Comments	Our Responses
4	**Comments from Transport Department (Responsible Officer: Mr. CAI Hao, Phil; Tel: 2399 2421) Received on 21 January 2026**	
4.1	The Applicant advised in the TIA that the existing Fung Kat Heung Road (a local road with one lane two way arrangement) will be greatly overloaded by the development traffic with v/c of 1.7to 2.5. Hence, the development will rely on the road improvement or the new roads constructed under the Sha Po Public Housing Development project. The Applicant also made assumption that the Sha Po Public Housing Development project may be completed by 2035.	Yes, the traffic of the proposed development will rely on the road improvement or the new roads constructed under the Sha Po Public Housing Development project, which is assumed to be completed before 2035.
4.2	The Policy Address 2025 announced that there will be a land use review for Au Tau to capitalise on the development potential brought by the Northern Link. Sha Po Public Housing Development and its associated road improvement would be reviewed and its implementation programme is yet to confirmed.	Noted.
4.3	In view of the above, planning assumption in TIA regarding transport facilities proposed by Sha Po Public Housing Development to be completed by year 2035 and the associated design year of development adopted in the TIA for forecasting traffic and evaluating traffic impact are both uncertain. In view of these uncertainties, traffic impact assessment and technical findings in the TIA would not be conclusive at this stage.	As the details on land use review for Au Tau are not released yet, our assumption and assessment can only be based on the latest information, i.e. the transport facilities proposed by Sha Po Public Housing Development to be completed by year 2035.
5	**Comments from Lands Department (Responsible Officer: Ms. HEUNG Pui Hang, Pinky; Tel: 2443 3300) Received on 27 January 2026**	
5.1	The majority of the proposed sewerage pipelines and manholes to be constructed by the Applicant in Fig.2 of the Revised Sewerage Impact Assessment Report would encroach Fung Kat Heung Basketball Court which is under LCSD's purview and adjacent private lot of DD107 Lot 570. The Applicant should review the alignment to avoid encroachment on the adjacent private land(s) and government facilities.	Figure 2 of the SIA (**Annex D** refers) has been updated and no encroach within the private lot.

Encl.

Annex A – Revised Drainage Impact Asssessment
Annex B – Replacement Page of Supporting Planning Statement
Annex C – Revised Environmental Assessment
Annex D – Revised Sewerage Impact Assessment

Compiled by: KTA
Date: 11 May 2026
File Ref: 20260511_S3041c_FI(3)_R-to-C