

**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. 4 –

Item	Comments	Our Responses
1	Comments from Environmental Protection Department (Responsible Officer: Mr. WONG Kin Wa, Kelvin; Tel: 2835 1117) Received on 2 June 2026	
1.1	Air Quality Section 2.2.2 a. Please revise “study” in lines 1 and 31 to “assessment”. Also please revise the same in Sections 2.5.1 and 2.5.2 accordingly. b. Please correct the typo “land” in line 22 to “lard”. c. For Sha Po Sewage Pumping Station, please update the last sentence as “Given 200m buffer distance requirement according to HKPSG Chapter 9 Environment can be fulfilled, no adverse air quality or odour impact will be anticipated.”.	Noted and revised. Chapter reviewed to ensure no typo for lard boiling factory. Noted and updated.
1.2	Section 2.3.1 d. For Sha Po Sewage Pumping Station, please update the 4th sentence of this section (lines 7 to 10) that if any odour is detected at the Application site boundary and supplement if 200m buffer distance requirement according to HKPSG Chapter 9 Environment can be fulfilled for this potential odour source such that no adverse odour impact will be anticipated. e. Please revise “also far way” in the 2 nd last line to “located over 500m”.	Noted and updated. Noted and revised.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
1.3	RtC Item 2.8 – It is understood that the applicant’s traffic consultant has sought TD’s comment on the road type of Fung Kat Heung Road and the access road and TD has indicated that the roads are not under their management and will not comment on their road type. Nevertheless, the applicant’s consultant advised that the roads can be categorized as “feeder road” from traffic point of view. On the above basis, please update relevant sections (e.g., S.1.4.20 and S.2.4.1) in the environmental assessment accordingly.	Noted and updated.
1.4	S.2.4.1 – Please revise to read “Even though Given that there is no specific requirement for the feeder road’s buffer distance under HKPSG, 5m buffer distance will be provided between the roads and the air sensitive uses as the traffic volume of the access roads are minimal.”	Noted and revised.
1.5	Sewerage It is noted that the applicant proposed to upgrade the future sewerage infrastructure to be implemented under the Sha Po Public Housing Development (“SPPHD”) such that the infrastructure will have sufficient capacity to convey sewage from upstream catchment areas, including the planned development, to Sha Po SPS.	Noted and confirmed.
1.6	However, the applicant advised that: (i) the future sewerage infrastructure to be implemented under the SPPHD is yet to be confirmed and is still under review by CEDD; and (ii) it will continue to liaise with CEDD regarding the proposed upgrading works to ensure that CEDD’s detailed design of the infrastructure will take the planned development into consideration. And as a fallback option, the applicant also proposed an on-site sewage treatment plant to cater for programme mismatch with the SPPHD or unresolved problems with the SPPHD on the upgrading works.	Noted and confirmed.
1.7	Subject to CEDD’s further review and further SIA conducted for determining the detailed design of the future sewerage infrastructure, if any changes were to be made to the key design parameters (e.g. sewer connection arrangements/sewage estimates, etc.) of the	Noted and agreed.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	planned development in later stages, the applicant is required to provide a revised SIA for EPD's consideration and record. The applicant is advised to keep close contact with CEDD regarding the planning of the said sewerage infrastructure.	
1.8	With the above in mind, the applicant is recommended to submit an updated Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) under the land administration mechanism (e.g., through land lease condition), so as to ensure that, if the application is approved, a mechanism is in place to address any changes arising thereafter. Please also specify it in an appropriate part of the current SIA if an updated SIA will be submitted under the land administration mechanism.	Noted and agreed.
2	Comments from Environment and Ecology Bureau (Responsible Officer: Mr. FONG Yiu Sang, Vincent; Tel: 2594 6507) Received on 9 June 2026	
2.1	<u>General Comments</u> While it is noted from P.10 of the attached applicant's FI(3) that "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.", please clarify whether all parking spaces are to be designed for private cars, light goods vehicles and motorcycles.	EV charging facilities (at least 7kW EV charging or above subject to further review) are proposed for all parking spaces (including private cars, light goods vehicles and motorcycles and excluding bicycle) within the proposed development. This will be taken into consideration during the detailed design of the proposed development at the next stage.
2.2	<u>Advisory Comments</u> The Government announced the Green Transformation Roadmap of Public Buses and Taxis in December 2024, including measures to realise the target of introducing about 3 000 electric taxis by end-2027. A comprehensive fast charging network is needed to effectively support the operations of electric taxis and achieve the aforesaid target. In addition, the Government announced the Updated Version of the Hong Kong Roadmap on Popularisation of Electric Vehicles in February 2026, which states that the Government will leverage market	Noted.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
	forces in the future to build a public charging network with fast chargers as the backbone. In this connection, we recommend that the applicant consider installing some fast chargers with a rated output power of 100kW or higher at the subject site and open up a certain number of charging spaces for electric commercial vehicles for use, e.g. electric taxis, electric light goods vehicles.	
2.3	The applicant is also suggested to consider arranging some of the chargers to also be compatible with Guobiao charging standard to support southbound vehicles.	Noted.
2.4	It is recommended that the applicant provide charger information, including the real-time availability data of each charger, through the government-designated mobile applications such as "HKeMobility" of the TD.	Noted.
3	Comments from Drainage Services Department (Responsible Officer: Miss KWAN Ching Kei, Jessica; Tel: 3965 8924) Received on 2 July 2026	
3.1	<u>Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA)</u> Appendix 2: According to Para. 6.6.2 in SDM, please be advised that pipes with size or box culverts with an equivalent diameter equal to or larger than 1.8 m are normally considered as trunk drains (i.e. 200 years of design return periods should be used).	As the Application Site is located in a rural area, and the upstream area primarily comprises natural and village catchments, it is considered to classify the relevant drainage system as either Village Drainage or Main Rural Catchment Drainage Channels. Therefore, 200 years of design return period was not considered and adopted.
3.2	Table 1 in Appendix 2: For a conservative approach, the runoff coefficient for unpaved area should be 0.35 (instead of 0.2). In addition, the time of concentration should be calculated as per SDM and its Corrigenda published by DSD instead of assuming time of concentration as 5 minutes. Design allowance in end of 21st century (Table 31) should also be considered in the assessment.	The assumption of sandy soil with grassland cover for unpaved area is considered more appropriate. Among the available runoff coefficients of sandy soil with grassland cover in SDM, adopting a value of 0.2 is considered the most conservative approach. With reference to the SDM, the minimum rainfall duration is 5 minutes, which is considered as conservative approach. Also, according to the Guidance Notes on Road Pavement Drainage Design issued by HyD, a 5-minute duration is adopted in the calculation. Therefore, a rainfall duration of 5 minutes has been adopted in this DIA.

Item	Comments	Our Responses
		The design allowance for the end of the 21st century has already been included in the assessment and is shown as Runoff.
3.3	Table 2a in Appendix 2: The total runoff at the respective manhole/channel has not considered the storm surge increase due to climate change (Table 30a & Table 30B) and design allowance in end of 21st century (Table 31).	It is clarified that the estimation of total runoff has already considered the storm surge/ rainfall increase due to climate change (i.e.16%) and design allowance in the end of 21 st Century (i.e. 12.1%) in Table 2a in Appendix 2.
3.4	Notes under Table 3a to Table 4d in Appendix 2: Please specify the materials will be used for the proposed drainage pipes. The roughness values for the concerned proposed drainage pipes should adhere to the values outlined in Table 14 of the Stormwater Drainage Manual (SDM). For example, the roughness values for the “precast concrete pipes with ‘O’ ring joint” under poor condition is 0.6 mm. There is no category of ‘slimed precast concrete” in the Table.	For the proposed drains, slimed uPVC pipes would be adopted and the value of ks=0.3mm is used for the calculation. For the planned drains, slimed concrete would be adopted and the value of ks=3mm is used for the calculation.
3.5	Table 4c in Appendix 2: Practically, the utilization shall be designed lower than 85% for a conservative approach. Please review and amend accordingly.	The relevant DSD manual does not specify a mandatory utilisation limit of 85%. Conservative assumptions have already been incorporated into the assessment, including the adoption of conservative runoff coefficients and the design allowance for the conditions projected to the end of the 21st century. Therefore, as the calculated utilisation remains below 100%, the proposed drainage system is considered to have sufficient capacity.
3.6	Table 9b: Please provide information on the utilization of the existing natural stream without the proposed development for our reference. Additionally, kindly confirm that all catchment areas for the natural stream have been included in the table.	The hydraulic calculation of the utilization of the existing natural stream without the proposed development has been added in Table 9c of Appendix 2.
3.7	Previously conveyed comments dated 12 January 2026 remain valid.	The comments dated 12 January 2026 are well-received and considered in the previous revised DIA report.
3.8	<u>Sewage Impact Assessment (SIA)</u> Previously conveyed comments dated 12 January 2026 remain valid.	The comments dated 12 January 2026 are well-received and considered in the previous revised SIA report.

Encl.

Annex A – Replacement Pages of Environmental Assessment

Annex B - Revised Drainage Impact Assessment

Compiled by: KTA

Date: 07 September 2026

File Ref: 20260907_S3041c_FI(4)_R-to-C