

## **Table A**

---

*Responses-to-Comments (“R-to-C”) Table dated 22.12.2025*

**Table A: Responses-to-Comments (22.12.2025)**

<b>Departmental Comments</b>		<b>Applicant’s Responses</b>
<b>A. Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (received on 23.9.2025)</b>		
<b>Ecological Impact Assessment (EcoIA)</b>		
1.	S.3.1.2 – Please also make reference to Territory-wide Study on Roosting Sites of Ardeids in Winter 2019/20 by AFCD. Citation: AFCD (2020). Hong Kong Biodiversity Newsletter Issue No. 26 (December 2020).	<p>This article has been supplemented in Section 3.1.2 in <b>Annex A</b>. Citation is also supplemented in “Reference”.</p> <p>None of the winter roosts reported in the article falls within the Subject Site or 500m Assessment Area. Section 4.1.5 in <b>Annex A</b> has been revised as <i>“There is no SSSI, ardeid winter roost or egretry within the Subject Site or 500m Assessment Area”</i>.</p>
2.	S.7.2.11 – Please supplement the impact significance of the indirect impact to species of conservation importance.	Noted. Potential impact significance of the indirect impact to species of conservation importance is ranked as <b>Moderate</b> and has been supplemented in Section 7.2.11 in <b>Annex A</b> .
3.	S.7.2.8 – Please beef up the impact evaluation for disturbances due to noise, dust and surface runoff.	<p>Noted. The impact evaluation for disturbance due to noise, dust and surface runoff has been elaborated in Sections 7.2.3 to 7.2.5 &amp; 7.2.8 in <b>Annex A</b>.</p> <p>Impact evaluation for “runoff and drainage/effluent discharge” in Section 7.3.9 in <b>Annex A</b> has also been elaborated.</p>
4.	S.7.3.14 – Please also assess the potential impact of bird collision due to the proposed residential buildings.	<p>Noted. Potential impact of bird collision due to the proposed residential buildings has been assessed.</p> <p>Section 7.3.14 in <b>Annex A</b> has been revised as following:</p>

Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
	<p>“No major flight line was observed over the Subject Site from reviewed literature. Due to the disturbed nature of the Subject Site and surrounding areas, the Subject Site is not considered as important ecological corridor. The potential impact of bird collision is ranked as <b>Insignificant</b>. As a precautionary measure, building materials such as are opaque, non-reflective panels with color will be used for construction of noise barriers (if needed) to minimise the risk of bird collision.”</p>
5. Table 7: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The construction disturbance is of “moderate” instead of “minor” significance according to section 7.2.5. Please review.</li><li>The impact significance of some impacts is assessed as “low” in the table but “insignificant” in the text. Please review.</li><li>The impacts discussed in Section 7 do not tally with Table 7. For example, the impact on species of conservation importance during the construction phase is missing in the table. Please revise for consistency.</li></ul>	Noted. Text in Section 7 and Table 7 in <b>Annex A</b> have been checked and revised accordingly for consistency.

Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
6. S.8.1.2 – Please specify the height of the hoarding.	The hoarding will be 3.5m in height. Text of Sections 7.2.7, 8.1.2 and Table 7 in <b>Annex A</b> has been amended accordingly.
7. S.8.1.5: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Please elaborate regarding the “planting/ landscape treatment”, and specify the type of planting (standard trees?) and the width and height of the planting.</li><li>• Please consider to adopt stepped building height design to further minimize the disturbance impact from the proposed residential buildings to the Ngau Tam Mei Drainage Channel.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Planting/landscape treatment in the setback area will include preserved the number of 80 existing trees of about 16m+ in height and newly planted heavy standard trees. There will be landscape planting area of 8 to 20m in width in the 50m setback area facing Kam Pok Road. Trees and shrub will be also planted near T6 and T2, in the direction facing Kam Pok Road.</li></ul> <p>The above sentences have been incorporated into Section 8.1.5 in <b>Annex A</b>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The NTMDC is adjacent to roads and development areas and subjected to long-term existing disturbance. Waterbirds using the NTMDC as foraging and roosting habitats or flight path are habituated to high level of human activities and traffic. As revealed by the ecological monitoring of the Light Public Housing at Yau Pok Road conducted between April 2024 and June 2025, more than half of the waterbirds (51.5%) recorded</li></ul>

Application No. Y/YL-MP/11 Proposed Rezoning from “Residential (Group D)” to “Residential (Group C)2” Zone for Proposed Residential Development, Lot 4822 in D.D.104 and Adjoining Government Land, Mai Po, Yuen Long

Departmental Comments	Applicant’s Responses
	<p>in NTMDC were ardeids. Ardeids are known to be able to tolerate high levels of disturbance and human activities (Lansdown <i>et al.</i> 2000).</p> <p>Human activities in the Subject Site will be mainly indoors during operational phase and residential blocks will be located 50m away from the nullah of NTMDC and filtered with tall trees (both preserved and planted) planted. Mudflat in the nullah of NTMDC is lower in elevation. Together with the screening effect of landscape planting in the setback area, birds foraging in NTMDC might not see activities within the Subject Sites. Birds habituated to the existing disturbance near NTMDC are not expected to be disturbed by indoors human activities in this long distance. Birds flying along the NTMDC are not likely affected by indoors human activities over 50m.</p> <p>Construction disturbance from the Subject Site will be minimized by the implementation of mitigation measures recommended in Section 8 of the EcoIA report.</p> <p>As discussed above, no significant increase of disturbance to birds utilizing NTMDC is anticipated during both construction and operational phases in the current layout. Hence, stepped building height design is not considered necessary as an additional measure to further minimize the disturbance impact from the proposed residential buildings to the nullah of the NTMDC.</p> <p>Besides, the proposed layout and building heights of all building blocks represent the results of most compromised option between private</p>

Departmental Comments	Applicant’s Responses
	<p>development and site constraints, achieving 15m building separation, and respecting the local building height profile in the area.</p> <p>As pointed out in Section 7.3.4 of the EcoIA report, Black-faced Spoonbills are known to forage in the Tin Shui Wai Channel near high-rise residential buildings (approx. 35m). The current application is only a medium-rise building development but with wider setback area (50m) from the nullah of the NTMDC. No potential disturbance to bird species of conservation importance is anticipated through this comparison.</p> <p>As indicated in Section 4.1.3, please note that the Subject Site is located immediately outside the boundary of Wetland Buffer Area (WBA), and part of the Assessment Area covered the WBA. The “no-net-loss in wetland” principle and wetland enhancement and management scheme according to the TPB Guidelines (TPB PG-No. 12C) do not apply to this Project. The Subject Site is located within the “R(D)” zone. This zone is intended primarily for improvement and upgrading of existing temporary structures within the rural areas through redevelopment of existing temporary structures into permanent buildings.</p>
8. Section 8 – The site is subject to previous EIAO and planning approvals for lowrise development. Please confirm whether the proposed mitigation measures under the previous approvals would be adopted in the current proposed development scheme.	<p>Noted. The proposed mitigation measures under the previous approvals will be adopted in the current proposed development scheme.</p> <p>The following sentence has been supplemented in Section 8.1.1 in <b>Annex A</b>. <i>“The proposed mitigation measures under the previous approvals will be adopted in the current proposed development scheme.”</i></p>

Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
9. S.11.1.1 – Please elaborate regarding the ecological monitoring surveys.	<p>Noted. The following sentences have been supplemented in Section 11.1.1 in <b>Annex A</b>.</p> <p><i>“Ecological monitoring of utilization of the Ngau Tam Mei Drainage Channel within the Assessment Area by birds between October and March during construction phase is proposed. Baseline surveys will be conducted prior to site construction works. Observations during construction phase monitoring will be compared against the baseline data.”</i></p>
10. Figure 1 – Please show the locations of species of conservation importance recorded under literature review.	<p>Noted. Locations of species of conservation importance under literature review has been supplemented in Figure 1 in <b>Annex A</b>. Figure title has also been revised accordingly. Please notice that locations of species of conservation importance were only reported in AEIAR 205/2017 and 2023 Ecological Survey. Hence, Figure 1 only shows the locations of sightings of species of conservation importance reported in these two studies.</p>
<b>B. Highways Department (received on 23.9.2025)</b>	
1. If any proposed road improvements in the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) are considered necessary by Transport Department (TD) due to the subject development, they shall be implemented by the Applicant to the satisfaction of TD and HyD at the applicant's own cost.	Noted.
2. The proposed access arrangement to the application site should be commented by TD. HyD is not/ shall not be responsible for the maintenance of any access connecting the application site and Kam Pok Road.	Noted.

Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
3. We have no direct input on the impact assessments from highways maintenance perspective. The applicant should highlight in the future submission if there be any latest findings/ recommendations/ revisions that may affect HyD inventories including slope features or require HyD's particular input.	Noted.
<b>C. Environmental Protection Department (received on 30.9.2025)</b>	
<b>Environmental Assessment (EA) and Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA)</b>	
1. Having reviewed the information provided, EPD would like to seek further details from the applicant and request revision of the Environmental Assessment (EA) and Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) to determine the environmental acceptability of the development proposal. Our detailed comments are covered in the attached <b>Annex A</b> .	Noted. Please refer to the responses below and the revised EA, NIA and SIA.
2. Please note that the proposed development is covered under an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) report approved (AEIAR-205/2017) and an Environmental Permit issued (EP-515/2017) under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO). The Applicant should review the EIAO implications at later stage and confirm with the EPD. The Applicant should also observe and ensure the proposed development will comply with all statutory requirements under the EIAO.	Noted.

Departmental Comments	Applicant’s Responses
<b>Annex A:</b>	
<p>3. <b>General</b></p> <p>S.1.15: Please revise as “The Proposed Development is a designated project (DP) under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO) under Item P.1, Part 1, Schedule 2 of the EIAO (i.e. a residential development or recreational development other than New Territories exempted houses within Deep Bay Buffer Zone 1 or 2). <i>The Proposed Development will be subject to a separate EIA study and an Environmental Permit for construction and operation of the Proposed Development. Relevant impact assessment will also be conducted in the later stage as part of the EIA process. Since the proposed development is covered under an EIA report approved (AEIAR-205/2017) and an Environmental Permit issued (EP-515/2017) under the EIAO, the Applicant undertakes to review the EIAO implications at later stage and confirm with the EPD. The Applicant will observe and ensure the proposed development will comply with all statutory requirements under the EIAO.</i>”</p>	<p>S1.1.5 in the EA report in <b>Annex C</b> has been revised.</p>
<p>4. Table 1.1: Please indicate the total flat numbers and number of storeys for each block. Please also confirm road improvements/junction improvement works under the project.</p>	<p>The total flat numbers and no. of storeys for each block have been supplemented in Table 1.1 in <b>Annex C</b>. Please note that under this project, minor road junction improvement has been proposed on the approach arm of Fairview Park Boulevard at Fairview Park Interchange. It has been supplemented in S1.3.1 in <b>Annex C</b>.</p>

<b>Departmental Comments</b>		<b>Applicant's Responses</b>																																								
5.	Please cover the construction and operation timeframe of the project.	The construction of the Proposed Development is expected to start in 2028 and be completed by 2031. It has been supplemented in S1.3.1 in <b>Annex C</b> .																																								
6.	Figure 1.1: Please incorporate on-going s.12A applications No. Y/YL-MP/7 and 8.	Y/YL-MP7 and 8 have been incorporated into Figure 1.1 in <b>Annex C</b> .																																								
7.	Please advise whether the population number is 3,866 (shown in Table 1.1 of “Y_YL-MP_11_Environmental Assessment”) or 3,519 (shown in Table 2 of “Y_YL-MP_11_Planning Statement.pdf”).	<p>The population number indicated in Table 1.1 in <b>Annex C</b> accounts for the residential population (3,519) and non-residential population such as staff of clubhouse and population in kindergarten and Neighbourhood Elderly Centre. The number of each type of non-residential population extracted from the SIA report are shown below.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Table 3 - Total Estimated Sewage Flow from the Proposed Development</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Population Type</th> <th>No. of Population</th> <th>Unit Flow Factor (m<sup>3</sup>/d/person)</th> <th>Average Dry Weather Flow (m<sup>3</sup>/d)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Residential Population</td> <td>3,519</td> <td>0.27</td> <td>950.13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Staff of Clubhouse</td> <td>53</td> <td>0.28</td> <td>14.84</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Staff of Restaurant</td> <td>15</td> <td>1.58</td> <td>23.70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Students in Kindergarten</td> <td>180</td> <td>0.04</td> <td>7.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Teachers in Kindergarten</td> <td>23</td> <td>0.28</td> <td>6.44</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neighbourhood Elderly Centre Population</td> <td>138</td> <td>0.28</td> <td>38.64</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outdoor Swimming Pool</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>7.03</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indoor Swimming Pool</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>8.44</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td><b>3,928</b></td> <td><b>-</b></td> <td><b>1056.42</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Population Type	No. of Population	Unit Flow Factor (m <sup>3</sup> /d/person)	Average Dry Weather Flow (m <sup>3</sup> /d)	Residential Population	3,519	0.27	950.13	Staff of Clubhouse	53	0.28	14.84	Staff of Restaurant	15	1.58	23.70	Students in Kindergarten	180	0.04	7.20	Teachers in Kindergarten	23	0.28	6.44	Neighbourhood Elderly Centre Population	138	0.28	38.64	Outdoor Swimming Pool	-	-	7.03	Indoor Swimming Pool	-	-	8.44	<b>Total</b>	<b>3,928</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1056.42</b>
Population Type	No. of Population	Unit Flow Factor (m <sup>3</sup> /d/person)	Average Dry Weather Flow (m <sup>3</sup> /d)																																							
Residential Population	3,519	0.27	950.13																																							
Staff of Clubhouse	53	0.28	14.84																																							
Staff of Restaurant	15	1.58	23.70																																							
Students in Kindergarten	180	0.04	7.20																																							
Teachers in Kindergarten	23	0.28	6.44																																							
Neighbourhood Elderly Centre Population	138	0.28	38.64																																							
Outdoor Swimming Pool	-	-	7.03																																							
Indoor Swimming Pool	-	-	8.44																																							
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,928</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1056.42</b>																																							
8.	<b>Air Quality</b>	The regulation has been supplemented in S2.2.3 in <b>Annex C</b> .																																								

Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
Section 2.2.3: The Air Pollution Control (Fuel Restriction) Regulations are also relevant, please supplement.	
9. Section 2.3.5: As revealed, the buildings of the proposed development have been designed to set back from the nearby roads to satisfy the buffer distance requirement for district distributor (i.e. 10m), please confirm if there is no air sensitive use of the proposed development including openable window, fresh air intake and recreational use in open space with the 10m buffer zone. If affirmative, please add the sentence “There is no air-sensitive use of the proposed development including openable window, fresh air intake and recreational use in open space within the buffer zone” before the last sentence.	It is confirmed that no air sensitive use of the Proposed Development, including fresh air intake ventilation system, openable windows and recreational uses in open space are located within the 10m buffer zone. The description has been supplemented in S2.3.5 in <b>Annex C</b> as well.
10. Section 2.3.5: Please note that the air quality impact from the internal access roads of the proposed development should also be assessed. Please allow 5m buffer distance from all air-sensitive uses unless the internal access roads are EVAs only and hence the buffer distance requirement does not apply. Please supplement.	Please note that >5m buffer zone has been incorporated into the design, which is supplemented in Figure 2.2 in <b>Annex C</b> . As part of the kindergarten and NEC building is located within the 5m buffer zone, this building will be designed in such a way that there shall be no air-sensitive use including openable windows, fresh air intake of air-conditioning system, and recreational use in open space located within the buffer zone, i.e. no air-sensitive use located within the buffer zone. With that in place, there will be no adverse air quality impact due to vehicular emission.
11. Section 2.3.6: Not only the proposed development, the air quality impact arising from the proposed carpark on other surrounding ASRs should also be Annex A considered. In this connection, please delete “on the proposed residential	S2.3.6 in <b>Annex C</b> has been revised accordingly.

Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
development” in the last two lines, or revise in some way taking into account all nearby ASRs.	
12. Section 2.3.8: In addition to the chimneys, please advise if the surveys and/or reviews covered the identification of activities with industrial emissions. Please supplement if there is any active/heavy industrial operation in the vicinity and hence any adverse I/R interface problem is anticipated.	No active industrial emission source was identified during the site visits. The information has been supplemented in S2.3.8 in <b>Annex C</b> .
13. Section 2.3.10: Please supplement if no odour is detected during the site surveys.	It has been supplemented in S2.3.10 in <b>Annex C</b> .
14. Section 4.3.2: Please specify the proposed height of higher hoarding (e.g. 3.5m or above) and supplement after “higher hoarding” in line 13.	It has been supplemented in S4.3.2 in <b>Annex C</b> .
15. Figure 2.2: Please revise Remark (1) as “No air-sensitive use including openable window, fresh air intake or recreational use in open space shall be located within the buffer zone”.	The remark has been revised.
16. Figure 2.4: Please indicate the potential direction of the exhaust emission of the proposed SPS to demonstrate it is directed away from its nearby air-sensitive uses as mentioned in Section 2.3.12.	The potential direction of the exhaust emission of the proposed SPS (facing north-east) has been indicated in Figure 2.4 in <b>Annex C</b> .
17. <b>Noise</b>  Table 4.2 and Table 4.3	Please refer to the revised Tables 4.2 and 4.3 in <b>Annex D</b> .

Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. For the Chuk Yuen Floodwater Pumping Station, the current observation is listed as “no change” in Table 4.2. Please review whether it should still be included under “Updated Observations for the Identified Fixed Noise Sources” if there are no updates.</li> <li>ii. For Fixed Noise Sources ID: L, M, and V in Table 4.3, as the fixed noise source are no longer exists, please also note these under Table 4.2 as an update.</li> </ul>	
18. Fig.3 and Table 4.3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. For Sources ID B, please add a remark stating that the recent site survey revealed the godown no longer exists. However, please align with table 4.3, also stating that “for conservative purposes, the noise assessment based on previous noise measurements is included in Appendix 4.”</li> <li>ii. Similar with Sources ID L,M &amp; V, please revise the name for Sources ID:B to “vacant” in fig and tables.</li> </ul>	Please refer to the revised Figure 3 and Table 4.3 in <b>Annex D</b> .
19. S.4.6 and table A4-1 remark : Please revise the sentence that mentions “conservatism” to “for conservative purposes” for smoother wording.	Please refer to the revised S.4.6 and Appendix 4 in <b>Annex D</b> .
20. S6.3 and Appendix 6.3: The endorsement of the traffic forecast by TD is to be provided. In case TD has no comment on the methodology for traffic forecast only, the consultant should provide written confirmation from the respective competent party (e.g., traffic consultant) that	Noted. A traffic note presenting the traffic forecasting methodology and traffic forecast data will be submitted to TD for agreement. TD's endorsement with the written confirmation from the traffic consultant will be provided once available.

Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
TD's endorsed methodology has been strictly adopted in preparing the traffic forecast data, and hence the validity of traffic data can be confirmed.	
21. TNIA: Please provide the excel file showing TNIA for checking.	Please refer to the attached excel file submitted with the modeling files.
22. Noise model: Please detailed comments in <b>Attachment A</b> .	Please refer to the revised noise model as attached.
<b>23. Water Quality</b>  S3.2.3 – Please explain why the standards for effluents discharged into Group C and D inlands water are applicable to this project.	Please note that only Group D inlands water is applicable to this project. Please refer to the revised S3.2.3 in <b>Annex C</b> .
24. S3.5 and S4.4 – Some contents in these two paragraphs are duplicated. Please review.	S3.5 now reads S3.4 in <b>Annex C</b> . The duplicated text in original S3.5 and S4.4 is now combined and presented in S3.4 in <b>Annex C</b> for clarity. Proposed mitigation measures are now moved to S3.4 in <b>Annex C</b> .
25. S6.1.5 – As a conclusion, please also indicate that the sewage generated by the proposed development will be conveyed to the Yuen Long Sewage Treatment Works for treatment.	It has been indicated in S6.1.5 in <b>Annex C</b> accordingly.
<b>26. Waste Management</b>  Please advise whether the estimation of the waste generated in construction phase already consider the whole development within the project area, including but not limited to neighborhood elderly centre, all non-domestic	The estimation of waste generated in construction phase has already considered the whole development within the project area.

Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
uses, clubhouse, parking spaces, lay-bys, loading/unloading bays, residential blocks, basement, transfer plate, electrical and mechanical floors, GIC facilities, ancillary floor space, basement carpark, kindergarten, outdoor swimming pool, E&M facilities, on-site sewage pumping station, and so on?	
<p><b>27. Section 5.2.1:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please revise accordingly as waste are not only generated from during construction work, but also operation phase.</li> <li>ii. Please review and revise if appropriate <i>“The regulations and requirements regarding waste management (collection, storage, transfer and disposal) of the various waste streams are summarized below.”</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. S5.2.1 has been revised in <b>Annex C</b>.</li> <li>ii. Revised accordingly.</li> </ul>
<p><b>28. Section 5.2.2:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please provide the Cap number for each legislation mentioned.</li> <li>ii. Please check and supplement further whether there are any relevant legislations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The Cap number for each legislation mentioned has been added in S5.2.2 in <b>Annex C</b>.</li> <li>ii. Relevant legislation has been supplemented in the S5.2.2 in <b>Annex C</b>.</li> </ul>
<p><b>29. Section 5.2.3:</b> Please check and supplement further whether there are any relevant guidelines.</p>	<p>Additional guidelines relevant to private project are supplemented in S5.2.3 in <b>Annex C</b>.</p>
<p><b>30. Section 5.3:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. To avoid confusion, please consider to arrange the presentation way in chronological order, i.e. (1) construction phase, (2) operational phase.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Order of paragraphs in Section 5.3 in <b>Annex C</b> has been rearranged. Construction phase is now presented in S5.3.1 in <b>Annex C</b>.</li> </ul>

Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. For operational phase, please provide the estimated figure for recycling and disposal.</li> <li>iii. For operational phase, please provide the disposal method of each type(s) of waste.</li> <li>iv. For operational phase, please critically review, other than general refuse, whether other types of waste may be generated? If yes, please elaborate why the waste would be generated.</li> <li>v. For operational phase, please critically review, whether waste would be generated from sewage pumping station?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. Please refer to S5.3.3 in <b>Annex C</b> for the estimation and disposal method.</li> <li>iii. Ditto</li> <li>iv. Ditto</li> <li>v. Screenings from SPS may be generated during operational phase, which is now included in S5.3.3 in <b>Annex C</b>.</li> </ul>
<p>31. <b>Section 5.3.2:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please review and advise whether the amount of general refuse should include all possible trades, e.g. residential, commercial and industrial during operation phase?</li> <li>ii. Please review and remove this sentence if appropriate <i>“Standard refuse handling approach that is widely adopted in other residential development sites that is required by the government e.g.”</i>.</li> <li>iii. Please elaborate what “regular basis” means? What will be the frequency?</li> <li>iv. Please review whether the recycling should cover food waste recycling?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The amount of estimated municipal solid waste should include residential, commercial and industrial wastes during operation phase.</li> <li>ii. Removed accordingly.</li> <li>iii. Daily collection has been proposed in S5.3.3 in <b>Annex C</b>.</li> <li>iv. Food waste recovery has been proposed in S5.3.3 in <b>Annex C</b>.</li> </ul>

Departmental Comments	Applicant’s Responses
32. <b>Section 5.3.3:</b> Please review the use of the term “best practices” as it is too subjective.	The term “best practices” is now changed to “mitigation measures” in S5.3.1 in <b>Annex C</b> .
33. <b>Section 4.5:</b> Please elaborate mitigation measures further and more for waste during construction phase, e.g. considering elements such as tracking and monitoring by GPS, trip-ticket system, trainings to workers, excavated material in truck with proper covering for preventing spillage and dust generation, and so on.	The PNAP No. 243 (ADV-19) “Construction and Demolition Waste”, which is relevant to private project, is referred. Measures such as trip-ticket system and feasibility of tracking and monitoring of disposal of C&D materials have been supplemented in S4.5.6 in <b>Annex C</b> .
34. <b>Section 4.5.2:</b> Please review whether waste during construction phase can also be generated from other sources, e.g. construction during foundation and piling works and superstructure works.	The construction waste generated from foundation, piling works and superstructure works has already been incorporated as “Construction of New Building” in the assessment in S4.5.2 in <b>Annex C</b> .
<b>Section 4.5.5:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please revise if appropriate “<i>The inert C&amp;D materials which usually comprise e.g. soil...</i>”.</li> <li>ii. Please advise or provide the reference of “<i>cement plaster/mortar</i>” and “<i>aggregates</i>” being categorized as inert C&amp;D materials. Otherwise, please remove it.</li> <li>iii. For “<i>shall be reused in earth filling, reclamation or site formation works as far as possible</i>”, please advise clearly whether this sentence means the “onsite backfilling for reuse” or “delivery to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Revised in S4.5.5 in <b>Annex C</b>.</li> <li>ii. They have been removed from S4.5.5 in <b>Annex C</b>.</li> <li>iii. This sentence means the inert C&amp;D materials shall be reused on-site and any surplus shall be sent to public fill reception facility for reuse as far as possible. The text has amended for clarity in S4.5.5 in <b>Annex C</b>.</li> </ul>

Departmental Comments	Applicant’s Responses
<p>public fill reception facility”.</p> <p>iv. For “<i>junk and general garbage</i>”, please check and advise whether consultant means the general refuse generated during construction phase.</p> <p>v. Please remove the term if appropriate “<i>as far as practicable</i>”.</p> <p>vi. Please be reminded that consultant should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Avoid unnecessary removal or excessive pruning of trees. Preserve trees in their original locations and implement tree transplanting when on-site preservation is not feasible.</li> <li>II. Segregate various types of yard waste and shred wood to facilitate reuse and recycling.</li> <li>III. Reuse wood materials on-site for a variety of purposes (e.g., decomposition and composting, recreational and decorative uses, and mulching in planting areas, etc.).</li> <li>IV. Identify recycling options (e.g. delivery to Y-park) for yard waste that cannot be directly reused on-site.</li> <li>V. Disposal of yard waste directly landfills should only be regarded as the last resort,</li> </ul>	<p>iv. It refers to the general refuse generated during construction phase which has been assessed in S4.5.9. To avoid confusion, it has been removed from S4.5.5 in <b>Annex C</b>.</p> <p>v. Removed.</p> <p>I. It has been supplemented in S4.5.5 in <b>Annex C</b>.</p> <p>II. Ditto.</p> <p>III. Ditto.</p> <p>IV. Ditto.</p> <p>V. Ditto.</p>

Departmental Comments		Applicant's Responses
when no alternatives are available.		
36.	<p><b>Table 4.1:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. For construction phase, please provide the estimated figure for recycling and disposal.</li> <li>ii. Please review whether “<i>garbage</i>” should be regarded as general refuse instead of non-inert C&amp;D materials.</li> <li>iii. Please remove if appropriate “<i>as far as practicable</i>”.</li> <li>iv. Regarding the estimated quantities of C&amp;D materials to be generated, consultant please review and advise whether the depth of the “<i>Basement Carpark/E&amp;M</i>” should be taken into consideration (Appendix 1.1)?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The estimated quantities of recycling and disposal of C&amp;D material have been supplemented in Table 4.2 in <b>Annex C</b>.</li> <li>ii. The word “<i>garbage</i>” has been removed from Table 4.1 in <b>Annex C</b>.</li> <li>iii. Removed accordingly from Table 4.1 in <b>Annex C</b>.</li> <li>iv. The depth of the basement carpark/ E&amp;M has been considered when estimating the quantities of C&amp;D materials to be generated by site formation, excavation &amp; filling activities.</li> </ul>
37.	<b>Section 4.5.7:</b> Please advise any mitigation measures for chemical waste.	Additional mitigation measures for chemical waste have been proposed in S4.5.8 in <b>Annex C</b> .
38.	<b>Section 6.1.6:</b> To avoid confusion, please check and review whether consultant means “ <i>appropriate <del>general refuse waste</del> handling approach</i> ”.	It should refer to waste handling approach. Text amended accordingly.

Departmental Comments	Applicant’s Responses
<b>Sewerage Impact Assessment</b>	
39. Please indicate the installed capacity of the on-site SPS.	The installed capacity of the on-site SPS is still under design. The installed capacity of the on-site SPS will be designed in consideration of maximum expected sewage flows including allowance for peak flow and contingency. The design will ensure that the installed capacity is sufficient and includes standby provisions to accommodate flow variations and ensure operational reliability. The installed capacity will be designed not less 3,120m <sup>3</sup> /day. The detailed design will be submitted during detailed design stage.
40. Section 1.3 last bullet – Please clarify the on-site sewerage facilities.	On-site sewage pumping station is proposed to be constructed within the proposed development site to collect the sewage from the proposed development. The detailed design, including capacity and technical specifications, of the proposed sewerage pumping station will be under separated submission.
41. Section 3.1 & 4.4 – Please clarify the inconsistency in the completion year.	Please be confirmed that 2031 mentioned in Section 3.1 is the completion year of the proposed development while the completion year (2028) mentioned in Section 4.4 is the completion year of development under Application no. Y/YL-NSW/7.
42. Section 4.4 – Please also mention the other planning applications proposing the communal gravity sewers.	Noted. Proposed communal gravity sewers under Application no. Y/YL-MP/10 is included in Section 4.4 in <b>Annex E</b> .
43. Table 2 – Please provide the reference for adopting 2.7 as the average household size. Please clarify if the population under “Neighbourhood Elderly Centre” means the elderly or the staff and provide the reference for the population adopted.	According to Table 150-12001 Projected Number of Domestic Households and Average Household Size, the average household size is projected as 2.7 person in 2026 and 2.6 person in 2031. In view of these projections, an average household size of 2.7 persons is adopted for conservative planning

Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
	<p>purposes to ensure the proposed sewerage system will be able to cater for any potential demographic variability and uncertainties.</p> <p>The population for “Neighbourhood Elderly Centre” includes both elderly and staff. For planning purpose, the population is estimated based on an assumption of 4 square meters per person.</p>
<p>44. Section 7.4 –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="271 576 1035 616">Please clarify the approval authority.</li> <li data-bbox="271 624 1035 719">Scenario 1 – Please clarify if it is “If this application is to be proceed before all of the six proposed developments”.</li> <li data-bbox="271 727 1035 838">Scenario 2 – The planned year of 2028 is inconsistent with that as mentioned under Section 7.3. Please clarify.</li> <li data-bbox="271 846 1035 1021">Please clearly list out all the scenarios when each of the planning applications under Section 7.3 is to be proceeded first, the construction and maintenance responsibility and provide the corresponding hydraulic assessment.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1091 576 2046 647">The approval authorities shall be Drainage Services Department and Environmental Protection Department.</li> <li data-bbox="1091 655 2046 751">Scenario 1 is referred to this application to be proceed before all of the six proposed developments. Section 7.4 in <b>Annex E</b> is revised.</li> <li data-bbox="1091 759 2046 782">Section 7.3 in <b>Annex E</b> is updated.</li> <li data-bbox="1091 790 2046 1021">Two main scenarios have been identified to manage the cumulative impacts due to the six proposed developments and the potential Yau Mei San Tsuen site. Construction responsibility will be assigned to each developer according to their obligations under the agreed scenario and formal agreements. The long-term maintenance responsibility for gravity sewers conveying sewage from multiple developers will be handed over to DSD upon completion. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1158 1029 2046 1203">If the proposed development will be implemented before the Y/YL-NSW/7 and Y/YL-MP/10 schemes, the Applicant will undertake the construction of the whole sewage section along Kam Pok Road and Pok Wai South Road as indicated in Figure 4 in <b>Annex E</b>.</li> <li data-bbox="1158 1211 2046 1306">If Y/YL-NSW/7 scheme commences before the proposed development and the Y/YL-MP/10 scheme, and if the proposed development is commenced before the Y/YL-MP/10 scheme, the</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
	Applicant will undertake the construction of the proposed sewerage section between the proposed development and Kam Pok Road East as indicated in Figure 4 in <b>Annex E</b> .
45. Sections 8.4 & 9.3 – Please state the responsible party for upgrading the proposed communal gravity sewer.	The responsible party for upgrading the proposed communal gravity sewer the Applicant.
46. It is noted that there would be multiple rising mains in the vicinity as proposed under the six planning applications, please study the technical feasibility in terms of the underground space.	A comprehensive study on the technical feasibility focusing on the available underground space will be undertaken. Consideration will be given to construction feasibility, maintenance access, and future expansion possibilities to ensure the proposed rising mains can be safely and effectively accommodated within the constrained underground environment. Where necessary, coordination with relevant government departments, utility providers and other developments will be conducted to optimize the design and layout of the rising mains. The detailed design will under separated submission.
47. Appendix C – Please remove “student” under the last table.	Noted. “student” deleted accordingly.
48. Appendix F & Tables 5&6 – Please provide details of pipes e.g. length, pipes sections/manhole numbers, invert levels etc. between conversion chamber and NSWSPS in your calculation under the hydraulic assessment.	In the hydraulic assessment, we have adopted the minimum fall (1 in 300 or 1 in 400) to ensure adequate self-cleansing velocities. The exact lengths/ invert levels will be provided when exact alignment and site condition confirmed. The current assessment focused on the overall feasibility and key hydraulic parameter. The detailed design will be provided in detailed design stage.
49. Appendix F (Scenario 2) & Table 6 – Please add remarks for the corresponding ADWF for each pipe.	Noted. Remarks are added to Appendix F Scenario 2 & Table 6.

Departmental Comments		Applicant's Responses
<b>D. Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (received on 30.9.2025)</b>		
1.	<p>No adverse comment on the subject application, with the following advisory comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Food and Environmental Hygiene Department's (FEHD) facilities will be affected.</li> <li>• Proper licence / permit issued by this Department is required if there is any food business / catering service / activities regulated by the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene (DFEH) under the Public Health and Municipal Services Ordinance (Cap. 132) and other relevant legislation for the public.</li> <li>• Proper licence issued by this Department is required if related place of entertainment is involved. Any person who desires to keep or use any place of public entertainment for example a theatre and cinema or a place, building, erection or structure, whether temporary or permanent, on one occasion or more, capable of accommodating the public presenting or carrying on public entertainment within Places of Public entertainment (PPE) Ordinance (Cap. 172) and its subsidiary legislation, such as a concert, opera, ballet, stage performance or other musical, dramatic or theatrical entertainment, cinematograph or laser projection display or an amusement ride and mechanical device which is designed for amusement, a Place of Public Entertainment Licence (or Temporary Place of Public Entertainment Licence)</li> </ul>	Noted.

Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
<p>should be obtained from FEHD whatever the general public is admitted with or without payment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A swimming pool licence must be obtained from FEHD for any artificially constructed pool used for swimming or bathing and to which the public have access (whether on payment or otherwise) or which is operated by any club, institution, association or other organization. A swimming pool licence is not required for any swimming pool which serves not more than 20 residential units and to which the public have no access.</li><li>• There should be no encroachment on the public place and no environmental nuisance should be generated to the surroundings. Its state should not be a nuisance or injurious or dangerous to health and surrounding environment. Also, for any waste generated from such activities/ operation, the applicant should arrange disposal properly at their own expenses.</li><li>• If provision of cleansing service for new public roads, streets, cycle tracks, footpaths, paved areas etc, is required, FEHD should be separately consulted. Prior consent from FEHD must be obtained and sufficient amount of recurrent cost may have to be provided to us.</li><li>• If domestic waste collection service of FEHD is required in future, prior comments from this Department on the waste collection plan, including the</li></ul>	

Departmental Comments		Applicant's Responses
accessibility and maneuverability of RCV to RCP, should be sought.		
<b>E. Chief Town Planner/Urban Design &amp; Landscape Section, Planning Department (“PlanD”) (received on 13.10.2025)</b>		
1.	We have no further comment on the VIA	Noted.
<b>F. Transport Department (received on 3.11.2025)</b>		
1.	Ha Chuk Yuen Road which is a single track road is proposed as the only access to the proposed kindergarten. It is anticipated that congestion would occur during AM/PM peak for kindergarten. Please review.	The vehicular access for the proposed kindergarten has been revised to be on Kam Pok Road, while the second access on Ha Chuk Yuen Road is proposed to serve NEC and for serving vehicles only.
2.	Please confirm if the kindergarten minibuses are with vehicle length not exceeding 7m. Otherwise, p-zone permit application should be submitted.	Should any vehicles exceeding 7m in length require access via Ha Chuk Yuen Road or Fung Chuk Road, the relevant p-zone permit application will be submitted to TD prior to accessing.
3.	To demonstrate the smooth vehicle manoeuvring, please provide swept path analysis for all kinds of vehicles entering / leaving the site, including vehicles to residential blocks through main access and vehicles to kindergarten and Neighbourhood Elderly Centre (NEC) through second access.	Swept path analysis for a 12.8m long vehicle and a 7m long vehicle have been conducted at the main entrance and second entrance respectively in <b>Appendix A of the revised TIA</b> . As demonstrated in the swept path analysis, sufficient manoeuvring space has been provided for vehicle turning into/out from the proposed vehicular access.
4.	It is noted from Drawing 3.1 that the egress routing would use Fairview Park Boulevard. Please note that Fairview Park Boulevard is a private road. To support the assumption of using private road for the vehicle egress route, please provide consent on the right of way from the private road owner.	Considering Fairview Park Boulevard is a private road, a directional sign will be provided at the development egress within the site to alert drivers to avoid using the private road to access Fairview Park Interchange as shown in <b>Appendix B of the revised TIA</b> .

Departmental Comments		Applicant's Responses
5.	If the applicant fails to provide the consent of right of way, please re-visit the proposed egress route and update the TTIA accordingly.	Noted.
6.	Please consider to include the junction between Kam Pok Road and Fung Chuk Road in the TTIA.	Noted and included in the assessment.
7.	Please include Fung Chuk Road, Ha Chuk Yuen Road and San Tin Highway in the road link assessment.	Noted and included in the assessment.
8.	Both Fung Chuk Road and Ha Chuk Yuen Road is a single track road which is proposed as the only access to the kindergarten. Traffic congestion would be anticipated during AM/PM peak for the kindergarten. Please review and propose necessary traffic mitigation measures.	<p>The vehicular access for the proposed kindergarten has been revised to be on Kam Pok Road, while the second access on Ha Chuk Yuen Road is proposed to serve NEC and for serving vehicles only.</p> <p>For the proposed NEC, considering that the target group is mainly the elderly living in the locality and the corresponding peak hour would not overlap with the commuting peak hours, it is anticipated that its trip generations are limited during the commuting peak hours. A road link assessment has been conducted for Ha Chuk Yuen Road and Fung Chuk Road, and the result of assessment demonstrated that the existing Ha Chuk Yuen Road and Fung Chuk Road would still operate within capacity upon commissioning of the development.</p>
9.	The results of traffic survey in PM peak are under-estimated. Please review.	With review of the year 2025 observed flows under the TIA report of the recently approved planning application no. Y/YL-MP/10, adjustment has been made to the year 2025 traffic flows in PM peak.

Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
10. Table 4.1: please seek Planning Department (PlanD)'s endorsement on the planned/committed development. Please show the estimated trip generations for each planned/committed development as well.	<p>The list of the committed/planned developments has been submitted to PlanD for comments. Please find attached the submission email to PlanD in <b>Appendix T1</b> for your information. Reply from PlanD will be provided once available.</p> <p>Noted. The estimated trip generations for each planned/committed development have been included in <b>Table 4.1 of the revised TIA</b>.</p>
11. Please advise how to derive the trip rate for kindergarten and NEC.	<p>Please be advised that the trip rates for kindergarten have been with reference to the surveyed trip rates at the existing similar kindergarten in Yuen Long and the adopted trip rates for kindergarten under the approved planning application Y/YL-MP/10. Details refer to <b>Section 4.2 of the revised TIA</b>.</p> <p>For the proposed NEC, as mentioned in our above reply in Item 8, it is anticipated that its trip generations are limited during the commuting peak hours. Nominal trips for NEC are adopted.</p>
12. For the proposed shuttle bus, please advise the size of coach which could serve 60 persons and this coach size should be adopted in the swept path analysis.	<p>Please be advised that the size of the 60-seat coach is 12m long. Under the swept path analysis, a vehicle of 12.8m long has been adopted to allow for future flexibility in accommodating a vehicle up to 12.8m long.</p>
13. The applicant should not assume their proposed shuttle bus will be approved by the Transport Department. In this connection, please redistribute the feeder demand for railway/SPB to franchised bus / GMB, and review the total peak hour demand for these public transport services / proposed routes and their need for additional public transport facilities as appropriate.	<p>Noted. Please refer to the revised public transport assessment in <b>Section 4.2 of the revised TIA report</b>.</p>

Departmental Comments		Applicant's Responses
14.	Please advise the public transport/shuttle bus pick-up/drop-off bay within the site.	The potential pick-up/drop-off location for bus/shuttle bus is illustrated in <b>Appendix T2</b> .
15.	Noting that the proposed shuttle bus service is to provide connection from the application site to the future PTI in the Ngau Tam Mei Station, please advise the public transport/shuttle bus PU/DO bay in future Ngau Tam Mei Station.	Given that there is no available information on the layout of the future PTI in the Ngau Tam Mei Station at this stage, the proposed bus PU/DO bay in the Ngau Tam Mei Station will be submitted to TD under the future application of the proposed shuttle bus service to TD in the subsequent design stage.
16.	Please provide PT assessment under that scenario that there are delay of the commissioning of NTM station.	Noted. Please refer to the revised public transport assessment in <b>Section 4.2 of the revised TIA report</b> .
17. & 18	Para. 5.2.3 and Drawing 5.7: Please confirm the junction improvement as illustrated in Drawing 5.7 would be undertaken by the applicant of planning application no. Y/YL-MP/9. Please supplement relevant document for information.	It is noted that no junction improvement at Fairview Park Interchange would be undertaken by the applicant of planning application no. Y/YL-MP/9 according to its latest TIA report. The relevant paragraph and drawing in the TIA have been deleted.
19.	It is noted in Drawing No. 4.2 of TTIA that the development traffic flow is more than 100pcu/hr (one-way). Hence, 2-Tier Modelling should be adopted to provide a more realistic forecast.	Please be advised that 2-tier model has been adopted in the traffic forecast. The effect of the toll plan changes of Tai Lam Tunnel has also been considered in the traffic forecast. Please refer to <b>Section 4 of revised TIA report</b> for details.
20.	The applicant is reminded to take into account the latest toll fee of Tai Lam Tunnel in the traffic model submitted.	Noted. The latest toll fee of Tai Lam Tunnel has been adjusted in the assessment.

Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
21. Please incorporate the full transport modelling methodology and assumptions in this submission for our review. We reserve our comments for this assessment upon receiving the missing information.	The assumptions in the traffic forecast have been included in Section 4 of TIA report.
22. Please advise which version of planning dataset is adopted in this assessment. It is presumed the latest planning dataset, i.e. 2021-based TPEDM would be adopted in the assessment.	Please be advised that the traffic forecast has been updated with reference to the latest 2021-based TPEDM data published by Planning Department. Please refer to <b>Section 4 of the revised TIA report</b> .
23. Please note that the 2021-based TPEDM lacks some essential planning parameters, which hampers its use for traffic assessment. Please confirm whether the full set of planning parameters - including, but not limited to, students, school places, household income, visitors, mobile residents, transients, and other pertinent cross-boundary assumptions - has been endorsed by PlanD in alignment with their latest planning intentions.	Please be advised that the 2021-based TPEDM planning data is compiled by PlanD to serve as reference material for development planning. As this planning data is publicly available and obtained from the official PlanD's website, it is presumably endorsed by PlanD.
24. If the applicant of Y/YL-MP/10 does not implement the proposed junction improvement works, please advise whether the applicant of this application would undertake the junction improvement works.	<p>The implementation of Y/YL-MP/10 will include the proposed junction improvement works.</p> <p>In the event that Y/YL-MP/10 does not proceed, a Traffic Review will be conducted by the Applicant to assess the necessary changes to the satisfaction of the relevant departments. At this present stage, the likely possible junction improvement works are illustrated in <b>Drawing 5.4</b> in the revised TIA report.</p>

Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
25. Para. 5.1.7, 5.2.5 and 5.3.5: Please review under what situation to use the wording of "operate within capacities" in the report.	Noted and revised.
26. Please provide a plan showing the section of footpath mentioned in the Pedestrian Assessment.	The location of the section of footpath is illustrated in Drawing 5.9 of TIA report.
27. Please consider to provide a minimum motorcycle parking spaces up to a ratio of 1 per 10 private car parking spaces.	The ratio of 1 per 10 residential car parking spaces has been adopted for the provision of motorcycle parking spaces, as per the comment from TD.
28. To promote green transport modes, please review and consider providing bicycle parking space up to a ratio of 1 per 7.5 flats.	The ratio of 1 per 7.5 flats has been adopted for the provision of bicycle parking spaces, as per the comment from TD.
29. Please clarify whether there would be drop bars controlling ingress/egress at the site entrance.	There is no intention to provide drop bars at the main entrance at Kam Pok Road under this planning stage. If drop-bars are proposed at the main entrance in subsequent design stage, the drop-bars will be located at the appropriate location, where the traffic at Kam Pok Road would not be affected.
30. If there would be drop bars, please provide analysis to demonstrate that traffic at Kam Pok Road would not be affected.	
31. Please provide queue length assessment for all the junctions under assessment.	Noted. The queue length assessment has been conducted. Please refer to <b>Section 5.1 of the revised TIA report</b> .
32. Please advise location for the PC/taxis pick-up/drop off.	The PC/taxis pick-up/drop-off will be carried out along the internal driveway on ground floor, which will not affect the operation of the public road.

Departmental Comments		Applicant's Responses		
33.	Please provide carpark layout for our comment.	Given that the project is under planning stage, the detailed design of the parking layout will be submitted to TD under subsequent detailed design stage.		
34	Under Sensitivity Test 1, noted the junction performance of J1 with $DFC > 0.85$ , please propose necessary junction improvement works for our comment.	Noted. A junction improvement works for J1 has been suggested. Please refer to <b>Section 5 of the revised TIA report</b> .		
35	Under Sensitivity Test 2, noted the junction performance of J1 with $DFC > 0.85$ , please propose necessary junction improvement works for our comment.	Considering that there is no relevant submitted planning application for the potential developments, Sensitivity Test 2 has been removed from the TIA.		
36	Please advise the objective of conducting Sensitivity Test 2.			
<b>G.</b>	<b>Drainage Services Department (received on 5.11.2025)</b>			
(A) <u>Drainage Impact Assessment</u>				
(i) Specific Comments				
1.	Sections 5.3 & 8: The existing box culvert and associated wing wall at the west of the application site is not maintained by this Office. Comments from HyD shall be sought. The applicant should clarify maintenance responsibilities of these features with other relevant department(s).	The SIA report has been circulated to HyD via PlanD.		
2.	Section 5.3: The structural impact due to the proposed demolition of existing wing wall near box culvert at the	Noted. The detailed structural impact due to the proposed work will be assessed and under separated submission in the detailed design stage.		

Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
west of the application site should be assessed and properly addressed.	
3. Sections 5.3 and 8: The applicant should clarify maintenance methodology of existing box culvert if existing wing wall is proposed to be demolished and decked over and advise if there is any maintenance access to be provided for maintenance works by responsible party. The applicant should also clarify maintenance responsibility of the maintenance access (if any) after the proposed decking works.	Maintenance access will be provided for maintenance works of existing box culvert. The detailed design of this area will be provided in the detailed design stage and circulated to DSD and HyD for comments.
4. Tables 7.3 and 7.4 & Appendix D: The discharge point SMH 1019340 should be read as SCH1019340. The discharge point Outlet 1 should be read as Outlet 2.	Noted. The corresponding parts of the submission have been revised accordingly.
5. Tables 7.3 and 7.4 & Appendix D: The applicant should demonstrate the existing drainage system has adequate spare capacity to receive the stormwater/runoff from the application site.	The assessment results in Table 7.3 and 7.4 and the calculations in Appendix D are assessing the existing drainage system. The total surface runoff within the site boundary under post-development is less than the existing condition. As such, the existing drainage system has adequate capacity to receive the runoff from the application site.
6. Appendix D: The applicant should provide evidence to support adoption of design assumptions (e.g. time of concentration and rainfall intensity) mentioned in the submitted hydraulic calculations. The applicant should also provide catchment area plan for clarity.	The assumptions of the calculations are discussed in section 6 of the report. The existing and proposed catchment area plans are shown in Appendix B and Appendix C respectively.

Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
7. Tables 7.3 and 7.4 & Appendix D: Flow velocities of drainage facilities are suggested to be within a range, i.e. 0.75 m/s to 3.0 m/s.	The drains in this assessment are existing drains. The high flow velocity is due to existing steep slope.
8. Appendix D: Please advise if sedimentation as mentioned in Section 6.7 is included in the detailed calculation.	The reduction in flow area due to the sedimentation is included in cross area of the detailed calculation.
9. Cross sections showing the existing and proposed ground levels of the captioned site with respect to the adjacent areas should be given.	Cross sections showing existing and proposed ground levels are enclosed for your information.

(ii) General Comments / Reminders

1. The proposed development should neither obstruct overland flow nor adversely affect any existing natural streams, village drains, ditches and the adjacent areas, etc.	Noted.
2. Peripheral drainage system 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.	Noted.
3. 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.
4. The applicant is required to rectify/modify the drainage system if they are found to be inadequate or ineffective during operation. The applicant shall also be liable for and	Noted.

Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
shall indemnify claims and demands arising out of damage or nuisance caused by a failure of the drainage system.	
5. The applicant should submit form HBP1 to this Division for application of technical audit for any proposed connection to DSD's drainage facilities.	Noted.
6. Comments from HyD, TD and RMO shall be sought when drainage works are proposed to be carried out within highway polygon and on carriageway.	Noted.
7. 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.
8. The existing drains should not be disturbed or interfered with until any necessary diversion works, which have been accepted by DSD, have been satisfactorily completed. Such diversion works should be carried out by the applicant at his/her own cost.	Noted.
9. Please be reminded to comply with “DSD Technical Circular No. 1/2017 Temporary Flow Diversions and Temporary Works Affecting Capacity in Stormwater Drainage Systems” if the proposed works under the Application involve the construction of permanent or temporary works within, over or adjacent to DSD's	Noted.

Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
stormwater drainage systems. In addition, all proposed works should not obstruct any overland flow and all the existing flow paths, along with runoff directed towards the existing watercourse/drain, are to be intercepted and directed to the proposed drainage system.	
10. The applicant should take all precautionary measures to prevent any disturbance, damage and pollution from the development to any parts of the existing drainage facilities in the vicinity of the lot. In the event of any damage to the existing drainage facilities, the applicant would be held responsible for the cost of all necessary repair works, compensation and any other consequences arising therefrom.	Noted.

(B) Sewage Impact Assessment

(i) Specific Comments

1. Table 6, Sections 8.4 and 10.2 & Figure 4: For Scenario 2, the applicant should review number and size of the proposed gravity sewers after upgrading under the subject planning application. Capacity of sewers at the downstream shall not be less than that at the upstream.	The size and number of the proposed gravity sewers have been included in the submission. Also, the capacity of sewers at the downstream is higher than that at the upstream.
2. Tables 5 and 6 & Sections 8.3 and 8.4: The applicant should seek SIG/EPD's confirmation whether the capacity reserved in the proposed communal sewers can be increased from 15,500 m <sup>3</sup> /day to around 18,500 m <sup>3</sup> /day, If positive and	Noted and the SIA report has been circulated to EPD for comments.

Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
<p>depend on the quoted scenario, the applicant should be responsible for the liaisons and communications with the relevant other project proponents in the area to agree on the updated design and to ensure the proposed communal sewers will be constructed up to the updated design (i.e. to avoid subsequent further construction for upgrading).</p>	
<p>3. Appendix F: According to our drainage record, invert level at the outlet of existing manhole FSH1001886 is -4.4 mPD. With reference to the applicant's submission, invert level of the proposed inlet pipe at manhole FSH1001886 is -2.88 mPD. Please review large difference of invert levels at the inlet and outlet of manhole FSH1001886 and advise whether modification of manhole FSH1001886 would be carried out by the applicant under the subject planning application.</p>	<p>Due to the significant difference between invert levels at the inlet and outlet of manhole FSH1001886, FSH1001886 will be modified to a backdrop manhole.</p>
<p>4. The applicant should indicate cover levels and invert levels of the existing and proposed sewerage facilities on the submitted sewerage plan.</p>	<p>Noted. Cover levels and invert levels are included in the sewerage plan.</p>
<p>5. Section 9.3 &amp; Figures 3 and 4: This Department will only take over those public drainage facilities constructed on government land and located downstream of the terminal manhole. When the proposed gravity sewers are exclusively used by the proposed development, those sewers shall be maintained by the applicant at his/her own cost. If the proposed sewers become public sewers that serve multiple</p>	<p>As the public sewers will serve multiple users. They shall hand over to government department(s) for maintenance.</p>

Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
users, the applicant shall hand over the sewer on government to DSD for maintenance.	
<u>(ii) General Comments / Reminders</u>	
1. The SIA needs to meet full satisfaction of Sewerage Infrastructure Group (SIG) of Environmental Protection Department (EPD), the planning authority of sewerage infrastructure. Since there are various proposed developments which are planned to dispose sewage to Nam Sang Wai Sewage Pumping Station (NSWSPS), advice from SIG of EPD should be sought for holistically review of the sewerage arrangement and confirming whether capacity has been reserved at NSWSPS for the subject proposed development. The comments of this department on the sewerage aspect are subject to the views and agreement of EPD.	Noted. The SIA has been circulated to EPD via PlanD.
2. The applicant should note that there are several planning applications / proposed developments in the vicinity of the application site and the sewerage system proposed under the subject planning application may have conflict with that proposed under other planning applications. The applicant should liaise and coordinate with EPD and other project proponents to confirm the proposed sewerage design and ascertain responsibilities of implementation and maintenance of the proposed sewerage works.	Noted.
<b>H. Water Supplies Department (received on 30.9.2025)</b>	

Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
<b>Water Supply Impact Assessment</b>	
<p>1. Please be clarified that the 40L fresh water per day for service trade consumption shall be added to the originally proposed residential unit demand for fresh water of 300L i.e. the unit demand for the residential population shall be <math>300L + 40L = 340L</math> per head per day. This service trade consumption include the water demand of clubhouse activities, the kindergarten and other community services supporting the proposed residential population. Thus, separate estimation for Kindergarten is not necessary. Regarding the NEC, its demand is also included in above service trade consumption unless overnight home service will be provided. For overnight home service, the fresh water demand of 230L per bed per day shall be applied. Please review the water demand estimation accordingly.</p>	<p>Noted. 340L per head per day has been adopted in the water demand calculation accordingly incl. the service trade consumption by clubhouse, 6-classroom kindergarten, and one NEC (no accommodation provided).</p> <p>A Water Supply Impact Assessment Report (WSIA) is attached in <b>Annex B</b>.</p>
<p>2. I believe NTMFWTW shall refer to Ngau Tam Mei Water Treatment Works. Please use the name in full on its first use in the report and the correct acronym shall be NTMWTW.</p>	<p>The proposed development is served by Ngau Tam Mei Fresh Water Primary Service Reservoir (NTMFWPSR), which is stated in the WSIA report in <b>Annex B</b>.</p>
<p>3. 230,000m<sup>3</sup>/day is the capacity of NTMWTW but not the Ngau Tam Mei Fresh Water Primary Service Reservoir which currently has a capacity of 40,750m<sup>3</sup>. After expansion, the Ngau Tam Mei Fresh Water Primary Service Reservoir will gain an additional capacity of 54,000m<sup>3</sup>. Please correct the corresponding paragraphs accordingly. Both the NTMWTW and NTMFWPSR will have adequate</p>	<p>NTMFWPSR has adequate capacity (about 40,750m<sup>3</sup>) and its further expansion works to be completed by 2031. The proposed development requires only 4% (1,585m<sup>3</sup>/day) of the Service Reservoir. Details demand calculation is in attached WSIA in <b>Annex B</b>.</p>

Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
capacity to accommodate the increase in water demand arising from the proposed development after their planned expansion.	
4. A key requirement of the Water Supply Impact Assessment is to propose measures that mitigate the impact of the subject development on the existing water supply system. Specifically, this report should include proposals for any necessary waterworks outside the site boundary, such as the installation of water mains connecting the proposed lead-in position(s) of the development to existing water mains which have sufficient capacity to cope with the anticipated water demand. The proposals shall include at least the alignment and size of the proposed water mains with support of hydraulic calculations.	It is proposed a new DN 300mm water main underneath Kam Pok Road to serve the proposed development by the Applicant. Please refer to the attached WSIA in <b>Annex B</b> for details of proposal.
5. The applicant is required to fund, design and install the proposed waterworks outside the site boundary for the purpose of supplying water to the lot. The works shall be designed and implemented to the satisfaction of WSD. Generally, upon satisfactory completion, WSD will take up the management and maintenance of those new waterworks on Government Land or public road.	Noted. The Applicant will be responsible for all costs related to the proposed waterworks outside the site boundary to the satisfaction of WSD. This is now stated in S2.4.7 of the WSIA in <b>Annex B</b> .