

**S.16 Planning Application  
Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction  
for the Permitted Educational Institution (New Science Building)  
in “Government, Institution or Community” Zone  
at Lingnan University, No. 8 Castle Peak Road – Lingnan, Tuen Mun**

**Planning Application No. A/TM/595**

Comments	Responses
<b>Comments from Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (received on 31 December 2024) (Contact Person: Mr. T K TSE, Tel: 2762 5384)</b>	
1. Based on the layout of the proposed education institution in the GPRR, feature nos. 6NW-C/CR3 and 6NW-C/C299 are located within or in the vicinity of the footprint of the proposed development. The applicant should elaborate whether the effect of these features to the proposed development and vice versa will be taken into account in the design and construction stage.	Noted. Feature nos. 6NW-C/CR3 and 6NW-C/C299 will be considered in the design and construction stage.
<b>Comments from Drainage Services Department (received on 31 December 2024) (Contact Person: Mr. Rycu LEE, Tel: 2300 1542)</b>	
1. General - The SIA for the subject planning application needs to meet the full satisfaction of Environmental Protection Department (EPD), the planning authority of sewerage infrastructure. DSD's comments on the SIA submitted by the developer are subject to views and agreement of EPD.	(The updated SIA is included at <b>Annex A</b> of this FI submission)  Noted.
2. Figures - Please provide a catchment plan indicating the corresponding buildings and pipes/manholes.	Noted. The catchment plan has been provided at Figure 3-1.
3. Section 6.2.1, the % of used capacity for sewer with existing condition should be from 19.6% to 89.02%. Please check	Noted, revised accordingly.
<b>Comments from Transport Department (received on 3 January 2025) (Contact Person: Mr. Dicky WONG, Tel: 2399 2225)</b>	
1. With reference to our memo dated 7/10/2024 regarding the pre-submission, comments on item (ii), (iii) and (iv) have not been addressed yet. Please provide R-to-C table for easy reference.	(The updated TIA is included at <b>Annex B</b> of this FI submission)  Responses for Item (ii), (iii) and (iv) are as follows:

Comments	Responses
	<p>(ii) Design capacities for the road links are derived in accordance to TPDM Volume 2 Chapter 2.4 – Table 2.4.1.1, with design capacity for each link is as follows:</p> <p>L1: Castle Peak Road-Lam Tei Section connects to the Rural Trunk Road in the north (Castle Peak Road-Hung Shui Kiu) and District Distributor in the south (Castle Peak Road-Lingnan). This section is a dual 2-lane carriageway with road with in about 7.3m – 7.5m for each direction, thus, the design capacity for Dual 2 lane in width of 7.3m with no frontage crossings, no standing vehicles, negligible cross traffic for 7.3m is adopted, i.e., 2800 vehicles /hour.</p> <p>L2: Yuen Long Highway is an Expressway with 3 lanes at eastbound and 4 lanes at westbound (2 lanes for main road and 2 lanes for slip road to Castle Peak Road – Lingnan). Thus, design capacity of expressway of 3 lanes in 4700 vehicles /hour is adopted for eastbound. Given the width of westbound main road and slip road are both in 7.3m respectively, the design capacity is adopted as 3000 vehicles /hour for each road sections.</p> <p>L3 and L4 at Castle Peak Road – Lingnan is classified as district distributor. Reference of design capacity is made to the district distributor in 7.3m 2-lane carriageway, i.e., 1700 veh/hr for two lanes.</p> <p>L5: Fu Tei Road is a local distributor with undivided 2-lane carriageway of 7.6m in width. As noted in Table 2.4.1.1 of Volume 2 in TPDM, the design flow of 800 vehicles /hour is adopted for conservative.</p> <p>iii) Written confirmation from Lingnan University is attached as Attachment A of this RtoC for your consideration.</p> <p>iv) The vehicular trip distribution is generally consistent with the existing traffic distribution of the campus. The vehicular trips distribution onto the road network of the vicinity is based on the population proportions of districts from 2019-based TPEDM published by PlanD.</p>

Comments	Responses																									
	<p>For the <u>approaching route</u>, 77% of the trips would use Tuen Mun Road to approach, while the other 23% would approach via Yuen Long highway.</p> <p>For the <u>departure route</u>, 76% of the trips would use Castle Peak Road – San Hui to leave, while 10% would use Castle Peak Road – Lam Tei and 14% would leave via Yeun Long Highway.</p>																									
<p>2. Para 4.6.2 refer - Please justify the traffic generation survey 2006 data are still valid or provide an update traffic generation survey for assessment.</p>	<p>According to the recent survey at Lingnan University, the trip generation rate for Lingnan University is as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1167 580 2033 933"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>AM Gen</th> <th>AM Att</th> <th>PM Gen</th> <th>PM Att</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Observed Peak Hour Trips Unit: Pcu/hr</td> <td>10</td> <td>42</td> <td>58</td> <td>17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Observed Peak Hour Trip Rates (total staff number 972) Unit: Pcu/hr/staff</td> <td>0.010</td> <td>0.043</td> <td>0.060</td> <td>0.017</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Estimated Peak Hour Trip Rates (staff capacity: 173) Unit: Pcu/hr</td> <td>7</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Estimated Peak Hour Trip Rates 2-way</td> <td colspan="2">9</td> <td colspan="2">13</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>When comparing with the two-way trip derived from TGS2006 (9pcu/hr and 17pcu/hr for AM and PM peaks respectively), the traffic generation derived by recent survey is generally lower than the trip generation under TGS 2006. Thus, the trip rate for TGS 2006 is adopted.</p>		AM Gen	AM Att	PM Gen	PM Att	Observed Peak Hour Trips Unit: Pcu/hr	10	42	58	17	Observed Peak Hour Trip Rates (total staff number 972) Unit: Pcu/hr/staff	0.010	0.043	0.060	0.017	Estimated Peak Hour Trip Rates (staff capacity: 173) Unit: Pcu/hr	7	2	3	10	Estimated Peak Hour Trip Rates 2-way	9		13	
	AM Gen	AM Att	PM Gen	PM Att																						
Observed Peak Hour Trips Unit: Pcu/hr	10	42	58	17																						
Observed Peak Hour Trip Rates (total staff number 972) Unit: Pcu/hr/staff	0.010	0.043	0.060	0.017																						
Estimated Peak Hour Trip Rates (staff capacity: 173) Unit: Pcu/hr	7	2	3	10																						
Estimated Peak Hour Trip Rates 2-way	9		13																							
<p>3. Para 6.1.5 refer - Since the concerned critical road link L2, will not be improved by Yuen Long Highway Widening Project, the potential improvement is not justified. Instead, the proposed road project such as Route 11 and Tuen Mun Bypass can help to improve by diverting the vehicles. Please update the conclusion.</p>	<p>Noted. Para 5.1.3 and Para 6.1.5 have been updated accordingly.</p>																									
<p>4. Annex E refer - Please provide the detail of queue length assessment in 2031.</p>	<p>Queue length for 2031 are derived as follows:</p>																									

Comments	Responses
	By comparing the traffic flows between 2024 and 2031 for each movement arms, the future queue length is projected by adopting the existing queue and the increase in traffic flow percentage of traffic flows for each movement arms.
5. The comments on public transport related items are as follow: a) Para 3.2.1 refers. Please supplement the details of RMB services in Table 3.1.	Details for RMB services has been supplemented in Table 3-1
b) Figure 3.1 refers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The bus stop located at Tuen Kwai Road eastbound is near the junction between Tuen Kwai Road and Castle Peak Road. Please revise the bus stop location.</li> </ul>	Figure 3.1 has been revised accordingly.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please indicate the location of A-D bus stops of Table 3-9.</li> </ul>	Figure 3.1 and Figure 3.3 have been updated accordingly.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The bus stops located at Castle Peak Road – Lingnan (both bound) outside Tai Estate were not included. Please advise.</li> </ul>	For the purpose of this TIA, spare capacity for PT services in the close vicinity of the academic building was only assessed for conservative purpose. Yet, Figure 3.1 will be updated to include the bus stops for completeness.
c) Table 3.1 refers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The headway of LWB A33X is 15-30 mins instead of 20-25 mins</li> </ul>	Table 3-1 has been updated accordingly.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please indicate the name of bus companies of respective routes.</li> </ul>	Name of bus companies has been included in Table 3-1.
d) Para 3.3.1 refers. Since students and visitors may not have the same peak hours compared with staff, please advise the rationale of conducting the PT survey between 0700 and 1000/ 1600 and 1900 hours. On the other hand, the survey result in table 3-9 only showed the AM peak hour in 0800 - 0900 hours and PM peak hour in 1715 - 1815 hours (table 3-9). Please advise.	Please be advised that the proposed academic building mainly consists of classrooms, laboratory and lecture theatre to serve existing students and staffs. The total population of Lingnan University will maintain at the existing level. Please also be advised that the supporting facilities such as lecture theatre (with capacity of around 100 seats only) are for internal use only and will not lead to increase in visitors to/from Lingnan University. Thus, comprehensive PT assessment is considered not necessary for the purpose of this TIA. Paragraph 5.3.2 has been updated to include the above information.

Comments	Responses
	<p>Apart from users to/from University, the assessed bus stops mainly serve for the PT demand for the nearby residential sites. With the additional PT demand due to the proposed academic building is trivial, the PT demand is dominated by the background demand, with the peak demand occurs at AM and PM peaks. Thus, survey period covering 0700-1000 and 1600-1900 is considered sufficient for the purpose of this TIA Study. As the overall PT occupancy is the highest in 0800-0900 and 1715-1815 throughout the survey period, the survey result in Table 3-9 only showed the PT capacity at AM peak (0800-0900) and PM peak (1715-1815).</p>
<p>e) Figure 3.3 refers. Please advise the rationale of not conducting survey at the bus stops located at Castle Peak Road - Lingnan (both bound) outside Fu Tai Estate.</p>	<p>For the purpose of this TIA, spare capacity for PT services in close vicinity of the academic building was only assessed for conservative purpose. Assessment results indicated that the existing PT services are sufficient to cater for the PT demand, even with the proposed the academic building in place.</p>
<p>f) Please revise line 3 in para 3.6.1 as “Hence, bus <b>and GMB</b> surveys were undertaken to record the <b>number</b> of bus <b>and GMB</b> trips and occupancy rate at the four nearby bus/GMB stops...</p>	<p>Para 3.6.1 has been updated accordingly.</p>
<p>g) According to the TD’s guidelines on service improvement and reduction, the service adjustment shall be determined on bus routes basis. The survey result shall be provided in accordance to route basis instead of bus stop basis. The details of survey result, including but not limited to the followings, shall be submitted to us for further consideration. Please revise the table 3-9 accordingly.                      a. The individual bus routes with bus companies concerned.                      b. The existing occupancy rate of individual routes.</p>	<p>Please be advised that the proposed academic building mainly consists of classrooms, laboratory and lecture theatre to serve existing students and staffs. The total population of Lingnan University will be maintained at the existing level. Please also be advised that the supporting facilities such as lecture theatre (with capacity of around 100 seats only) are for internal use only, and will not lead to increase in visitors to/from Lingnan University. Thus, comprehensive PT assessment is considered not necessary for the purpose of this TIA. Paragraph 5.3.2 has been updated to include the above information.</p> <p>Yet, for conservative assessment purpose of this TIA, PT assessment on bus stop basis were conducted by assuming additional PT demand making reference to the visitor flows derived from section 4.6.1, with the anticipated peak hour public transport demand for the proposed building would be 22 (53 x 35% = 19 in and 7x35%=3 out) visitors/hr during the AM Peak and 10 (3 in and 18 x 35% =7 out) visitors/hr during the PM</p>

Comments	Responses																																																		
	<p>Peak. Assessment results indicate a sufficient PT spare capacity even under a conservative assessment approach.</p> <p>In conclusion, the new academic building will only result in trivial impact to the PT demand in the vicinity of the site.</p>																																																		
<p>h) Please demonstrate that the existing PT services in the concerned area could cater for the PT demand generated from the proposed new development and taking into account the planned developments in Table 4-3. If negative, please propose the enhancement of existing PT service to cater for the new PT demand generated, if necessary, from the proposed new development.</p>	<p>Please refer to responses to item g.</p>																																																		
<p>i) Please demonstrate if the PT facilities of the six bus stops (including two bus stops located at Castle Peak Road - Lingnan (both bound) outside Fu Tai Estate) concerned are enough to cater for the new PT demand generated by the new development.</p>	<p>Please refer to responses to item g.</p>																																																		
<p>j) Para 5.3.1 refers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only 35% of visitors would travel via road-based transport, please advise the PT mode of remaining 65%.</li> </ul>	<p>Accordinging Census 2021 Table C204, the vehicular split are as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1162 890 2031 1203"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Main Mode of Trans.</th> <th colspan="4">Road Based Public Transport Services</th> <th colspan="7">mode of others</th> <th rowspan="2">Total</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Bus</th> <th>Public light bus</th> <th>Residential coach service</th> <th>Company bus/van</th> <th>Private car/ Passenger van</th> <th>On foot only</th> <th>Mass Transit Railway (Local line)</th> <th>Mass Transit Railway (Light Rail)</th> <th>Taxi</th> <th>Ferry/Vessels</th> <th>Others</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>663,558</td> <td>149,199</td> <td>22,312</td> <td>63,018</td> <td>189,827</td> <td>278,991</td> <td>114,989 4</td> <td>45,876</td> <td>37,855</td> <td>21,043</td> <td>37,500</td> <td>2659,073</td> </tr> <tr> <td>%</td> <td colspan="4">33.77%</td> <td>7.14%</td> <td>10.49%</td> <td>43.24%</td> <td>1.73%</td> <td>1.42%</td> <td>0.79%</td> <td>1.41%</td> <td>100.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Main Mode of Trans.	Road Based Public Transport Services				mode of others							Total	Bus	Public light bus	Residential coach service	Company bus/van	Private car/ Passenger van	On foot only	Mass Transit Railway (Local line)	Mass Transit Railway (Light Rail)	Taxi	Ferry/Vessels	Others	Total	663,558	149,199	22,312	63,018	189,827	278,991	114,989 4	45,876	37,855	21,043	37,500	2659,073	%	33.77%				7.14%	10.49%	43.24%	1.73%	1.42%	0.79%	1.41%	100.00%
Main Mode of Trans.	Road Based Public Transport Services				mode of others							Total																																							
	Bus	Public light bus	Residential coach service	Company bus/van	Private car/ Passenger van	On foot only	Mass Transit Railway (Local line)	Mass Transit Railway (Light Rail)	Taxi	Ferry/Vessels	Others																																								
Total	663,558	149,199	22,312	63,018	189,827	278,991	114,989 4	45,876	37,855	21,043	37,500	2659,073																																							
%	33.77%				7.14%	10.49%	43.24%	1.73%	1.42%	0.79%	1.41%	100.00%																																							
<p>k) Para 5.3.3 and table 5-6 refers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The annual growth rate of PT patronage is +1.79%. Please advise the calculations of Notes (1) and (2).</li> </ul>	<p>Table 5-6 has been updated accordingly.</p>																																																		

Comments	Responses
	<p>For Note (1): the 2031 occupancy on arrival is estimated by adopting the existing occupancy data (e.g. 3366 pax/hr for AM Peak and 3016 pax/hr for PM Peak) with the annual growth rate (1.79%) applied. Furthermore, the estimated attractions by the proposed development (i.e., AM Peak attractions 35% x 53 = 19 pax/hr; PM Peak attractions 35% x 8 = 3 pax/hr) are also added:                      AM Peak 2031 Occupancy on arrival = <math>3366 \times (1+1.79\%)^{7+19} = 3831</math>                      PM Peak 2031 Occupancy on arrival = <math>3016 \times (1+1.79\%)^{7+3} = 3418</math></p> <p>For Note (2): for 2031 public demand, it is estimated by applying the annual growth rate (1.79%) on existing alighting and boarding data (e.g., AM Peak alighting of 618pax/hr and boarding of 338pax/hr; PM Peak alighting of 452pax/hr and boarding of 420pax/hr;). Specifically:                      AM Peak 2031 Public Demand of alighting = <math>618 \times (1+1.79\%)^7 = 700</math>                      AM Peak 2031 Public Demand of boarding = <math>338 \times (1+1.79\%)^7 = 383</math>                      PM Peak 2031 Public Demand of alighting = <math>452 \times (1+1.79\%)^7 = 512</math>                      PM Peak 2031 Public Demand of boarding = <math>420 \times (1+1.79\%)^7 = 476</math></p> <p>Please be advised that the proposed development will not lead to increase in visitors to/from Lingnan University, and therefore increase in PT demand is generally not expected. The PT assessment on bus stop is carried out for conservative assessment purpose.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As mentioned above, the assessment on the frequency enhancement required by PT service shall be conducted on route basis. Please revise table 5-6 accordingly.</li> </ul>	<p>Please refer to responses to item g.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please demonstrate the PT service are sufficient to cater for the future PT demand as stated in para. 6.1.5.</li> </ul>	<p>Please refer to responses to item g.</p>
<p><b>Comments from Urban Design &amp; Landscape Section, Planning Department (received on 3 January 2025)</b>  <b>(Contact Person: Mr. Jeff LEUNG, Tel: 3565 3936)</b></p>	
<p><b><u>Visual Aspect</u></b>                  2. Section 3.6 of the Supporting Planning Statement – Please ensure the accuracy of the photomontages e.g. in Figures 3.11 and 3.12 (i.e. VPs 3 and 4), the proposed development should appear to be taller in the</p>	<p>Noted. The photomontages for VPs 3 and 4 have been adjusted and relevant discussions in Section 3.6 have been updated accordingly (<b>Annex C</b> refers).</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>photomontages. Please review and rectify including the relevant discussions in Section 3.6, as appropriate.</p>	
<p><b>Comments from Urban Design &amp; Landscape Section, Planning Department (received on 3 January 2025) (Contact Person: Mr. Leo LAM, Tel: 3565 3956)</b></p>	
<p><b><u>Landscape Aspect</u></b></p> <p><u>Supporting Planning Statement</u></p> <p>a) Figure 3.4 – Locations of terrace planting as shown in Figure 3.4 cannot be referred on ‘Section A-A’ (Dwg no. SK-106).</p>	<p>(Replacement pages of the Supporting Planning Statement and the Landscape Design and Tree Preservation Proposal are included at <b>Annexes C</b> and <b>D</b> of this FI submission respectively)</p> <p>Noted. The Section A-A (Dwg no. SK-106) has been updated to show the external balcony. The pot plants shown on renderings are indicative loose pot plants which in general would not be shown on drawings. The loose pot plants were not counted for green area.</p>
<p>b) Figure 3.6 – The presentation of these LG/F and G/F plans implied that the bottom right planter area will be under cover. Please clarify.</p>	<p>Please be advised that the bottom right planter area is uncovered. Figure 3.6 has been updated accordingly.</p>
<p><u>Architectural Drawings (Appendix 1)</u></p> <p>c) Lower Ground Floor Plan (Dwg no. SK-101) – The legend of green colour area is missing.</p>	<p>Noted. The Lower Ground Floor Plan (Dwg no. SK-101) has been updated to include the missing legend.</p>
<p><u>Landscape Design and Tree Preservation Proposal (Appendix 2)</u></p> <p>d) Table 7.1 – Proposed quantities of corresponding new tree species should be provided in the table for reference.</p>	<p>Noted. The new tree quantity for each tree species has been provided in Table 7.1.</p>
<p>e) Landscape Layout Plan (Figure 1.1 to 1.2):-</p> <p>(i) LG/F (Figure 1.1) – The pedestrian entrance/exit at the bottom right corner will be blocked by planter. Please clarify.</p>	<p>Please be advised that a pedestrian entrance/exit would be provided at the said location. Figure 1.1 has been revised to indicate the correct proposed entrance/exit location.</p>
<p>(ii) Please describe the proposed treatment for legend “existing trees (17 nos.)”.</p>	<p>Noted. The treatment of existing trees (17 nos.) has been supplement in the legend of Figures 1.0 to 1.2.</p>
<p>(iii) It is noted that the locations of “existing trees (17 nos.)” as shown are not tallied with the locations of “trees proposed retained” on ‘Tree Recommendation Plan (Appendix IV)’ (Dwg no. PNTL27A-TR01).</p>	<p>Noted. The locations of existing trees in Figures 1.0 to 1.2 and Tree Recommendation Plan (Appendix IV) have been reviewed and aligned.</p>



Comments	Responses
f) Tree Recommendation Plan (Appendix IV within Appendix 2) – Adequate planting area for proposed retained tree no. NS191 is not observed on plan.	Noted. New planter area adjacent to NS191 is proposed to provide adequate space to extend the existing planter area for NS19. The Tree Recommendation Plan has been updated accordingly.
g) New Tree Planting Plan (Appendix V within Appendix 2) – The key plan as shown on the drawing is too small and the locations of proposed trees planting cannot be clearly referred. Please review the presentation of the drawing.	Noted. The Key Plan has been enlarged to improve the legibility.
<p><u>Advisory Comment</u></p> <p>2. The Applicant is reminded that approval of the s.16 application by the TPB does not imply approval of the site coverage of greenery requirements under PNAP APP-152 and/or under the lease. The site coverage of greenery calculation should be submitted separately to BD for approval. Similarly for any proposed tree preservation/removal scheme and compensatory proposal, the Applicant should approach relevant authority direct to obtain necessary approval as appropriate.</p>	Noted.
3. In regard to site coverage of greenery, it is observed that the planter as indicated “37.090 m <sup>2</sup> uncovered greenery” on drawing ‘Greenery Coverage on LG/F’ (Figure 2.1) is actually covered with reference to the ‘Landscape Combined Plan’ (Figure 1.0). Please review the discrepancy.	Noted. The site coverage of greenery has been updated accordingly.
<p><b>Comments from Lands Department (received on 3 January 2025)</b>  <b>(Contact Person: Ms. Angel NG, Tel: 2451 3222)</b></p>	
(i) While paragraph 3.1.2 and Table 3.2 of the Supporting Planning Statement (“SPS”) and the sectional plan for the New Building with Drawing No. SK-106 at Appendix I of the SPS indicated that there would be a museum on 5/F, the floor plan for the New Building with Drawing No. SK-104 at Appendix of the SPS showed that the 5/F of the New Building would only provide with an exhibition area, three multi-purpose rooms and other ancillary facilities (e.g. lavatories) but without museum. Th applicant is suggested to clarify.	Noted. The 5/F plan (Drawing No. SK-104) has been updated and the “Exhibition Area” is now read “Exhibition Area/Museum” (Replacement pages of the Architectural Drawings at <b>Annex E</b> refers).
(ii) All the measures (e.g. tree compensatory proposal) proposed under various technical assessments, which would be commented by relevant	Noted.

Comments	Responses
<p>technical departments, to support the subject project shall be confined within the Lot.</p>	
<p><b>Comments from Environmental Protection Department (received on 8 January 2025) (Contact Person: Ms. Cindy Tsang, Tel: 2835 1107)</b></p>	
<p><b><u>Noise Perspective</u></b> The Proposed Development is not relying on openable windows for air ventilation. Potential fixed noise sources would be the "outdoor chiller water tank and pump area" and "cooling tower" located on the roof floor. The future fixed noise sources will also be controlled under the NCO.</p>	<p>(The updated EA is included at <b>Annex F</b> of this FI submission)  Noted.</p>
<p><b><u>Waste Perspective</u></b> 1. Section 9.3 &amp; Appendix 9.1 – Re. Rtc item 3), as the assessment area in each aerial photo were filled with a solid color, the structures within the assessment area cannot be observed. Please revise this accordingly, and we reserve our comment on this section upon we receive the updated submission.</p>	<p>Revised accordingly</p>
<p>2. Section 9.4.4 – Re. Rtc item 5, please clarify if those invalid CWPs are located within the assessment area.</p>	<p>Based on the results from chemical waste producer's registry records, the address of invalid CWPs mentioned is located within the campus of Lingnan University.</p>
<p>3. Section 10.3.2 (line 3) – It is suggested to revise "Surplus" as "Non-recyclable".</p>	<p>Revised accordingly.</p>
<p>4. Section 10.3.8 – Sections 10.3.1. &amp; 10.3.2 mentioned that both inert and non-inert C&amp;D materials are anticipated from the project. Please clarify whether the 300m3 of C&amp;D materials are consists of inert or non-inert portion, or provide a breakdown as appropriate.</p>	<p>The information on the amount of inert and non-inert C&amp;D waste is not available at this stage and will only be available in detailed design stage. Such information will be supplemented once available.</p>
<p>5. Table 10-1: a. Please update the table according to the above comment 4).</p>	<p>The information on the amount of inert and non-inert C&amp;D waste is not available at this stage and will only be available in detailed design stage. Such information will be supplemented once available.</p>
<p>b. It appears that no footnote or remark [1] is found. Please supplement.</p>	<p>The remark [1] is deleted.</p>

Comments	Responses
6. Section 10.3.13 – Previous comment item 8) has not been duly addressed. Please provide the estimates of general refuse to be generated during construction phase.	Noted. The estimated amount of general refuse generated during construction has been provided.
7. Section 10.4.1 (line 2) – The remaining inert C&D materials shall not be delivered to landfills. Please review and revise. Please ensure all the relevant sections are updated.	Noted. Section 10.4.1 has been updated and “Inert” C&D material is revised to “non-inert” C&D material.
8. Section 10.4.1 (line 3) – Please clarify whether the term "construction waste" refers to inert or non-inert C&D materials.	The term "construction waste" refers to both inert and non-inert C&D waste.
9. Section 11.1.7 – a. The conclusion for waste management section seems incomplete, as it lacks site-specific context.	Noted. This section has been revised accordingly.
b. The concept of "safe disposal" does not appear to be mentioned in the main text. Please review.	Ditto
<b><i>Sewerage Perspective</i></b>	
1. SIA RtC Item 2 and Table 4-1 – This comment was not fully addressed. For surrounding catchments, the UFF for residential development should adopt R2 type.	Noted, revised accordingly, UFF of R2 (0.27 m3/person/day) is adopted
2. Section 3.2.1 – The description “The catchments are divided into 4 upstream catchments and 1 downstream catchment ...” does not tally with the detailed information on sub-catchments mentioned in the same paragraphs. Please review. Suggest to omit the “upstream” and “downstream” from the sub-catchment description for clarity.	Noted and revised accordingly.
3. Section 3.2.2 – Suggest to revise the last sentence to read as “... and collected by 300mm and 450mm diameter sewers.”	Noted and revised accordingly.
4. Section 4.2.1 – Suggest to revise the sentence to read as “..., and discharged into the existing 300mm and 450mm diameter public sewers via Manhole S1...”	Noted and revised accordingly.

Comments	Responses
<p>5. Table 4-2 and Appendix C – It is noted from the GBP in Appendix B that there are multi-purpose rooms and exhibition area on 5/F layout plan. Please clarify whether there would be any sewage to be generated from the users of these rooms and supplement the information if necessary.</p>	<p>Noted. The total no. of person of Multi-function room and sewage discharge have been updated.</p>
<p>6. Appendix D a. Catchment A3 – The backwash discharge should be assumed to occur during the backwash period (i.e. 7 mins).</p>	<p>Noted and revised accordingly.</p>
<p>b. Catchment D and Catchment E1 – Refer to comment item No. 1 above, the UFF should adopt residential R2 type.</p>	<p>Noted and revised accordingly.</p>
<p>c. SIA RtC Item 5(ii) and Catchment E2 – This comment was not addressed. The backwash discharge should be assumed to occur during the backwash period (i.e. 7 mins). Please review.</p>	<p>Noted, revised accordingly.</p>
<p>7. Appendix E1 and Appendix E2 a. Please add a column to indicate which catchments are covered for each sewer segment.</p>	<p>Noted, the last column (Remark) is added and revised</p>
<p>b. For segment FMH1015210 to FMH1015211, the pipe size should be 300mm. And sewage flow conveyed by this segment should NOT include flow from Indoor Sports Complex (Catchment B) and Parkland Villas (Catchment D and Catchment E). Please review.</p>	<p>Noted, revised accordingly.</p>
<p>c. There are 2 sewer segments between FMH1015211 to FMH1015265 (i.e. there is another manhole FMH1015214 in between). The hydraulic assessment should be carried out for each sewer segment. Please also review whether there will be sewage flow from other branches to segment FMH1015214 to FMH1015265.</p>	<p>Noted, revised accordingly.</p>
<p><b><u>Air Perspective</u></b> 1. Section 6.2.2. The consultant please note that a new set of AQOs shall become effective in 2025 tentatively and the air quality assessment may need to make reference to the new AQOs depending on the Project schedule</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Comments	Responses
2. Section 6.3.1 a. Please replace “and” by “which” in Line 1	Revised accordingly.
b. Please replace “localised” by “local” in Line 4	Revised accordingly.
3. Table 6-3 a. The 4-th highest 24-hour averaged SO <sub>2</sub> monitored at the Tuen Mun AQMS for year 2021 is not 5 ug/m <sup>3</sup> .	Noted, revised to 9 ug/m <sup>3</sup> .
b. The annual NO <sub>2</sub> monitored at the Tuen Mun AQMS for year 2021 is not 59 ug/m <sup>3</sup> . Please check	Noted, revised to 44 ug/m <sup>3</sup> .
4. Section 6.3.2 a. Please remove “Urban Trunk Rd” in Line 3	Noted, revised accordingly.
b. Please remove “problem” in Line 4	Noted, revised accordingly.
5. Section 6.3.3. Please check whether “2030” should be “2025” in Line 2	Noted, revised accordingly.
6. Table 6-4. The 10-th highest 24-hour averaged RSP from PATH v3.0 at grid (21, 43) should be 56.67 rather than 56.57 ug/m <sup>3</sup> according to the EPD SAMP. Please check. Please supplement the model year of the Background concentration in the title.	Noted, revised accordingly.
7. Table 6-5 a. Please specify whether the shortest horizontal distance is measured from the Project site boundary or from the proposed building noting that the separation distance do not tally with those shown in Figure 6.1	The shortest horizontal distance is measured from the site boundary of the proposed project to the nearest building façade of the sensitive receivers.
b. Since the building height is presented in mPD, please supplement the ground level in mPD to indicate the height levels above ground	Provided accordingly
c. For ASR05 to 08, please supplement the building height apart from the number of storeys	Provided accordingly

Comments	Responses
8. Section 6.5.2. The 1 two sentences are contradictory. Please revise. Please check if the amount of stockpile materials is only 350m3 and C&D waste is only 350m3, provided the excavation area is 600m2.	Section 6.5.1 is removed.
9. Section 6.5.3. Please replace “dust” by “air quality” in Line 3	Noted, revised accordingly.
10. Section 6.5.4. Please supplement the number of Construction machinery to be operated on-site to confirm that the number is limited	Noted, provided in Table 6-6
11. Section 6.5.6 a. Please remove “sufficient” in Line 1	Noted, revised accordingly.
b. Please replace “significant adverse air impact” by “adverse air quality impact” in Line 2-3	Noted, revised accordingly.
c. Please remove “dust/ gaseous and particulates” in Line 4	Noted, revised accordingly.
12. Section 6.5.7 a. Please review if on-site continuous dust monitoring is required for this small-scale construction works.	No continuous dust monitoring is required, instead regular monitoring is proposed.
b. Please clarify if regular site audit will be conducted to ensure that all the proposed mitigation measures will be implemented properly .	Yes, regular audit shall be conducted
13. Section 6.5.8 a. Please add “at” before “the Application Site” in Line 1-2	Noted, revised accordingly.
b. Please remove “very” in Line 2	Noted, revised accordingly.
c. Please remove “any” in Line 6	Noted, revised accordingly.
d. Please address whether the concurrent projects within 500m assessment area would cause any adverse construction air quality impact	Noted, Section 6.5.8 is revised.

Comments	Responses
14. Section 6.6.2 a. (Line 4-6). The sentence is incomplete and the meaning is unclear. Please clarify	The section is revised.
b. Please clarify whether any odour emission is detected from the Tuen Mun Treatment Works based on the site visit and elaborate why the odour emission is considered insignificant	The section is revised.
c. Please supplement the separation distance between the Tuen Mun Treatment Works and the application site.	The section is revised.
d. Please provide more information about the Tuen Mun Treatment Works and if there is any odour emission source. If negative, it is not necessary to mention about Tuen Mun Treatment works in the study.	Noted, no odour emission source from Tuen Mun treatment Works. The section is revised.
15. Section 6.6.3 a. (Line 4-6). The sentence is incomplete and the meaning is unclear. Please clarify	Noted, the section is revised.
b. Please replace “air impact” by “air quality impact” in Line 1	Noted, revised accordingly.
16. Section 6.6.5 a. Please note that the Annual Traffic Census 2023 is now available. Please update the assessment with the latest information	Noted, revised accordingly.
b. Please follow up and provide TD confirmation that Fu Tei Road is classified as Local Distributor. Otherwise, please clarify if there are >20m separation distance between the proposed development and Fu Tei Road, hence vehicular emission impact from this road shall not be a concern.	Noted, all 3 roads mentioned in Section 6.6.5 had a separation distance more than 20m, which can meet the buffer distance requirement. No adverse air quality impact due to vehicular emission is anticipated.
c. Please note that the traffic survey done by the Traffic Consultant and consideration of the access road as Local Distributor are outside EPD’s ambit. Please check with TD whether these information are correct	Noted. However, the separation distance of the access road to the application site is more than 20m, no adverse air quality impact due to vehicular emission is anticipated.

Comments	Responses
17. Table 6-6. Please clarify whether “Feeder Road” is “Local Distributor” and replace “Feeder Road” by “Local Distributor” in the Table	It is confirmed that feeder road is local distributor, the Table 6-6 is revised.
18. Section 6.6.7 a. Please replace “or” by “and” in Line 4	Noted, revised accordingly.
b. Apart from chloroethane, chloroform, hexachlorobenzene, arsenic, beryllium, please provide a full list of chemicals to be released during the laboratory testing if available	No information of list of chemicals is available at this stage, the chemical used in the laboratory are subjected to further detailed design.
c. Please supplement “according to Annex 4 of the EIAO-TM” to the end of the paragraph	Noted, revised accordingly.
19. Section 6.6.8 a. (Section 6.6.8, 6.6.9). Please supplement the number, frequency and duration of the chemical tests to support that they are small scale, occasionally and in short durations	Such information are not available at this stage, subjected to further detailed design.
b. Please provide details of the filter in Line 5 and supplement its removal efficiency to reduce emission of chemicals from the fume hood if available	The detail specification of the filter is subjected to further detail designed stage.
c. (Section 6.6.8, 6.6.9). Please supplement a map of the location of the discharge point of the exhaust vent to indicate that it will be faced away from the fresh air intake of the proposed building and nearby ASRs. Please also indicate the location of the fresh air intake and the height of both the discharge point and fresh air intake on the map. Please also provide the separation distance between the nearest ASRs and the exhaust point.	Noted, Figure 6.3 is provided.
d. Please clarify whether the emission rates of the chemicals to be emitted from the Wet Laboratory operation will be comparable to other tertiary institute in Hong Kong and supplement in the Section	Noted, revised accordingly.
e. (Section 6.6.8, 6.7.5, 11.1.2). It is unclear how the estimated emission rates of the chemicals emitted from the Wet Laboratory	Noted, the section is revised accordingly.



Comments	Responses
<p>operation will fulfill the threshold limit value/ permissible exposure limit of relevant international occupational safety and health requirements. Please demonstrate quantitatively. If no quantitative comparison will be shown, suggest to remove the statement since it is unjustified</p>	
<p>f. Please provide further support to justify that impact due to volatile chemical emission of the proposed development is negligible. Please revise the last sentence</p>	<p>The Wet Laboratory is served as educational purposes only and will be comparable to other tertiary institutes in Hong Kong. The chemical tests will be conducted in small scale, occasionally and in short durations.</p>
<p>20. Section 6.6.9 a. Please remove the first two sentences since they are already mentioned in Section 6.6.7</p>	<p>Noted, revised accordingly.</p>
<p>b. Please replace “designed” by “design” in Line 7</p>	<p>Noted, revised accordingly.</p>
<p>c. Please add “odour” before “impact” in Line 7</p>	<p>Noted, revised accordingly.</p>
<p>d. Please clarify whether activated carbon filter shall be installed at the ventilation system exhaust for minimization of odour impact to the nearby ASRs</p>	<p>Noted, activated carbon filter will be provided.</p>
<p>21. Section 6.6.10 a. Please remove “existing” in Line 6</p>	<p>Noted, revised accordingly.</p>
<p>b. Please supplement a map of the exhaust point of the vent to indicate that it will be facing away from the fresh air intake of the proposed building and nearby ASRs</p>	<p>Figure 6.3 is provided</p>
<p>c. Please replace “ASR” by “ASRs” in Line 4</p>	<p>Noted, revised accordingly.</p>
<p>d. Noting that there are ASRs to the East of the building and ASRs to the North and South of the building are further away as shown in Figure 6.1, please review whether the ventilation exhaust should be positioned at the North or South of the proposed building and directed upward rather than at the East of the Building</p>	<p>Noted, the ventilation exhaust is revised and proposed to be positioned at the North of the proposed building.</p>

Comments	Responses
22. Section 6.7.1. Please delete “from diesel-fueled construction equipment” in Line 4	Noted, revised accordingly.
23. Section 6.7.4 a. Suggest to delete the 1st sentence.	Noted, revised accordingly.
b. Please replace “dust gas” by “air” in Line 3	Noted, revised accordingly.
c. The Traffic generation Survey 2006 is more than 15 years ago. Please review whether the findings are still valid and update the information as necessary	No further information is available at current stage, the updated information will be provided once available.
d. Please remove “existing” in Line 6	Noted, revised accordingly.
24. Section 6.7.5 a. Please list out the control measures of the Wet Laboratory	Noted, revised accordingly.
b. As commented above, it is unclear how the estimated emission rates of the chemicals emitted from the Wet Laboratory operation will fulfil the threshold limit value/ permissible exposure limit of relevant international occupational safety and health requirements . Please demonstrate quantitatively. If no quantitative comparison will be shown, suggest to remove the statement since it is unjustified	Noted, the section is revised accordingly.
c. Please provide further support to justify that potential volatile chemicals emissions associated with the operation of the proposed Project are negligible and cumulative air quality impact arising from the Project during operation phase is not expected . Please revise the last two sentences	The Wet Laboratory is served as educational purposes only and will be comparable to other tertiary institutes in Hong Kong. The chemical tests will be conducted in small scale, occasionally and in short durations.
25. Section 11.1.2 a. Please replace “meets” by “shall meet” in Line 3	Noted, revised accordingly.

Comments	Responses
<p>b. As commented above, it is unclear how the estimated emission rates of the chemicals emitted from the Wet Laboratory operation will fulfill the threshold limit value/ permissible exposure limit of relevant international occupational safety and health requirements. Please demonstrate quantitatively. If no quantitative comparison will be shown, suggest to remove the statement since it is unjustified</p>	<p>Noted, the section is revised accordingly.</p>
<p>c. Please provide further support to justify that potential volatile chemicals emissions associated with the operation of the proposed Project are negligible. Please revise the last sentence</p>	<p>The Wet Laboratory is served as educational purposes only and will be comparable to other tertiary institutes in Hong Kong. The chemical tests will be conducted in small scale, occasionally and in short durations.</p>
<p>26. Section 11.1.3 a. Please provide details of the GL Specialist Laboratory and clarify the differences between the GL Specialist Laboratory and the Wet Laboratory</p>	<p>The section is removed.</p>
<p>b. It is unclear how the estimated emission rates of the chemicals emitted from the GL Specialist Laboratory operation will fulfill the threshold limit value/ permissible exposure limit of relevant international occupational safety and health requirements. Please demonstrate quantitatively. If no quantitative comparison will be shown, suggest to remove the statement since it is unjustified</p>	<p>Noted, the section is removed.</p>
<p>c. Please provide further support to justify that potential volatile chemicals emissions associated with the operation of the proposed Project are negligible. Please revise the last sentence</p>	<p>The Wet Laboratory is served as educational purposes only and will be comparable to other tertiary institutes in Hong Kong. The chemical tests will be conducted in small scale, occasionally and in short durations.</p>
<p>27. Figure 6.2. Please indicate clearly which road is the access road in the map.</p>	<p>Noted, revised accordingly.</p>

Compiled by: KTA  
Date: 10 January 2025