

GEO's Comments	Responses to GEO's Comments
<p>(i) Section 3.6 and Site Layout Plan No. LP-01: It is noted that feature No. 6NW-A/F93 has been mistakenly identified as 6NW-A/F94 and vice versa. The Consultants should revise the report as necessary.</p>	<p>Noted and corrected (see Section 2.1.5, 2.1.6, 3.5 and 3.6).</p>
<p>(ii) Section 3.1 to 3.6: It is noted that the Applicant/Consultants has/have committed to carry out stability assessment on the existing registered man-made slopes (features no. 6NW-A/C38, 6NW-A/C39, 6NW-A/C75, 6NW-A/F67 and 6NW-A/F93 or F94). The Applicant/Consultants should be reminded of the requirement of making necessary site formation submission(s), including but not limited to stability assessment of the existing/proposed geotechnical features within or in the vicinity of the subject site, to the Buildings Department for approval as required under the provision of the Buildings Ordinance if found applicable.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>(iii) Section 3.7: It is noted that the Consultants have concluded that no natural terrain hazard study (NTHS) is required for the subject site. However, the subject site is overlooked by steep natural terrain and meets the alert criteria for a NTHS. The Applicant/Consultants should review the screening results in accordance with the technical guidelines stipulated in Section 2.3.4 of GEO Report No. 138 (2nd Edition).</p>	<p>The subject site is required for a NTHS (see Section 4.0).</p>