

Table A: Responses-to-Comments (15.9.2023)

Departmental Comments		Applicant’s Responses
A. Drainage Services Department (received on 23.8.2023)		
Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) Report		
(a)	Figure 3.1 — Please advise why the proposed peripheral drains have not covered the south-east of the application site.	Noted, the proposed peripheral drains has been amended to cover the south-east of application site. Figure 3.1 has been revised accordingly.
(b)	Figure 3.1 — The proposed modification of existing watercourse to 1800mm dia. circular drain is not recommended. The existing watercourse at west to north-west of the site is not only serving the proposed development but also surrounding areas in the vicinity. The proposed modification would Substantially reduce the watercourse’s capacity for both collection and retention of surface runoff. Besides, the existing watercourse is not maintained by DSD, the applicant shall identify the owner and seek his approval for the proposed works.	<p>Please be clarified that the proposed upgrading works at existing drains in the submitted DIA will be an open channel design with a view to taking into account the capacity of the existing surface runoff from surrounding areas and the capacity of concerned watercourse can still be maintained. As discussed in the DIA, the current proposed modification is to follow existing flow regime for discharge to Ngau Tam Mei Drainage Channel, and a consent from the owner of concerned existing drain for the proposed upgrading works will also be sought at the detailed design stage. Should the TPB approve this Application, the Applicant is willing to accept a planning condition with regard to conduct a detailed DIA at detailed design stage.</p> <p>For contingency purpose, an alternative discharge route including provision of a new drainage pipe along public road for connection to Ngau Tam Mei Channel has also been considered and reviewed in the revised DIA. The results of the preliminary assessment have demonstrated that this alternative discharge route is also technically feasible. Please refer to Figure 3.2, and relevant hydraulic calculation provided in Appendices 2.4 and 3.2.</p>
Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) Report		
(c)	The SIA report needs to meet the satisfaction of EPD the planning authority of sewerage infrastructure. Particularly, please seek confirmation from EPD whether capacity has been reserved in the NSW SP8 for the proposed development.	Noted, the SIA report has already been circulated to EPD.

Departmental Comments		Applicant’s Responses
(d)	Table 2-2 — Please confirm if there is no planned restaurant/catering service in the proposed development.	To be conservative, restaurant/ catering service, in the proposed ancillary clubhouse, with a total of 10 employees have been assumed in the calculation. Please refer to revised Table 2-2.
(e)	Section 3 - Please indicate that the project proponent will be responsible for the implementation of the required sewerage works.	Noted and text has been added to Section 3.1.3.
(f)	Appendix 2.2 Please include other planned developments in the assessment for report completeness. Please provide the figure/source of the other planned developments if it has been taken into account.	The SIA calculation in Appendix 2.2 has already included other planned developments in the assessment (~15,000m ³ /day from nearby developments as per advice from EPD in Appendix 4.1).
(g)	Section 2.5.6 — Please also state that the project proponent will be responsible for the liaison and coordination with the other interfacing projects for the implementation of the required sewerage works.	Section 2.5.6 has been revised accordingly.
(h)	Figure 2.1— Please clarify why the sewer between MH460 and MHSOO is a proposed one instead of existing public sewer.	This sewer is an existing public sewer, but labelled as the proposed upgrading works under this Application as described in the legend in Figure 2.1.
(i)	Section 1.3.1 — To my understanding, there are no proposed rising mains for the development, please clarify the purpose of the underground sewage pumping station (SPS).	There is a proposed clubhouse above ground at the same location, so that the proposed SPS is proposed underground. The proposed underground SPS can also contribute to minimize the potential odour impact from the SPS.
B. Environmental Protection Department (received on 28.8.2023)		
SIA report		
1.	Appendix 2.1 and 2.2: the roughness should use slimed sewers/ drains. Please check.	The roughness value in Appendix 2.1 and 2.2 has been revised to use slimed sewer/ drains.
2.	Figure 2.1 to 2.3: Twin sewers cannot be identified in the drawings, please check.	Twin sewer has been indicated in legend in Figure 2.1. Figures 2.2 and 2.3 have been revised accordingly.

Departmental Comments		Applicant’s Responses
Environmental Assessment		
A. Air Quality		
1.	Sections 2.3.1, 2.3.2 and Appendix 2.1 - Please note that 2022 air quality monitoring data are available now. Please update these sections and appendix.	Updated historic air quality is presented in Appendix 2.1, and text description in S2.3.2 is updated.
2.	Section 2.4.3 (a) Please add “and rural road ” after “Local Distributors” in line 1. (b) The road type of Castle Peak Road — Tam Mi should be rural road instead of primary distributor. Please revise the text accordingly.	Text in Section 2.4.3 is revised.
3.	Section 2.4.5 (a) It is noted that Castle Peak Road — Tam Mi is considered as rural road based on TD's View (refer to Appendix 2.2) instead of ATC 2021. Please revise the text accordingly.	Text in Section 2.4.5 is revised to state that Castle Peak Road – Tam Mi is classified as a rural road based on TD’s view.
	(b) Rural road can be considered as DD or LD since it's buffer distance is not specifically listed in the HKPSG. Please provide justification for the access road to be considered as LD and hence 5m buffer distance is sufficient (e.g. limited traffic and most of the vehicles are PC, etc.)	Please note that from traffic engineering point of view, <i>“Castle Peak Road – Tam Mi and Kam Pok Road are both classified as a rural road based on TD’s view. According to Chapter 3, Volume 2 of Transport Planning and Design Manual (TPDM) issued by Transport Department (TD), District Distributors (DDs) are Roads Linking Districts to the Primary Distributor Roads. In light of this, the nature of Castle Peak Road – Tam Mei is more or less similar to a DD road as it is connecting to San Tin Highway, which is an Expressway. As for Kam Pok Road, according to the TPDM, Local Distributors (LDs) are Roads within Districts linking developments to the District Distributor Roads. Since Kam Pok Road is connecting various developments to Castle Peak Road – Tam Mei (RR/DD road type) via Kam Pok Road East (LD road type), and that Kam Pok Road has similar road hierarchy function with Kam Pok Road East (LD road type), its nature is more or less similar to the LD road from traffic engineering point of view. As the proposed development is located more than 10m away from Castle Peak Road – Tam Mi (DD) and more than</i>

Departmental Comments		Applicant’s Responses
		<i>5m away from Kam Pok Road (LD), these buffer distances have already complied with the requirement set out in the HKPSG”.</i> Section 2.4.5 has been revised accordingly.
4.	Sections 2.4.7 and 2.4.9 - Please conduct an updated site survey since the site survey was conducted about a year ago.	Noted, Sections 2.4.7 and 2.4.9 has been updated accordingly.
5.	Sections 2.5.3 and 2.5.11 - Owing to the size of the project site (~5.1ha) and the presence of ASRs in close vicinity (~8m), it is suggested that an EM&A programme shall be implemented during the construction stage no matter the dust impact result is found to be not adverse during the EIA stage.	Kindly note that as the proposed development is still at a very early planning stage, details of construction works are unavailable at the moment. The captioned project will require to conduct an EIA study under the other statutory process upon receipt of TPB’s approval, and additional recommendations and mitigation measures may be required in the EIA study, will be subject to implementation. This project is to follow statutory requirement, and the need & details of EM&A programme will be considered in later detailed design stage when more details of required construction works are available. Section 2.5.3 and 2.5.11 have been amended accordingly.
6.	Figure 2.1 — Please clarify if the access road located to the west of the project site is a no-through road with dead end near the vehicular entry of the proposed development. Otherwise, please extend the 5m buffer zone from the road kerb of this access road along the site boundary to cover the western site boundary fully.	The access road located to the west of the project site is a no-through road with dead end near the vehicular entry of the proposed development, such information has already been provided in Section 2.4.5. Thus, no extension of the 5m buffer zone is required.
B. Water Quality		
1.	S5.1.1 “This assessment is to identify the potential water quality impact during the construction and operation phases of the proposed development at the Subject Site.”	Section 5.1.1 has been revised accordingly.
2.	S5.2.2 please remove “Group C and Group D discharge standards are considered relevant to this Project.”	Section 5.2.2 has been removed.

Departmental Comments		Applicant’s Responses
3.	S5.2 (a) The construction works are in close proximity to the watercourse, relevant mitigation measure from the ETWB TC (Works) No. 5/2005 shall be incorporated.	Noted, reference to the best practices stipulated in the ETWB TC (Works) No. 5/2005, are being incorporated in Sections 5.2.6 and 5.5.2 accordingly.
	(b) Best Management Practices (BMPs) for stormwater discharge to minimize stormwater pollution arising from the Project shall be incorporated.	Text added in Section 5.2.5. Relevant BMPs has already been incorporated in Section 5.6.
	(c) Please provide the effluent discharge water quality requirement of Deep Bay WCZ and relevant WQOs.	Relevant key WQOs have been added in Table 5.1.
4.	S5.3 Please tabulate the WSRs, the table shall include the WSR ID, description, type (natural watercourse, modified watercourse, channelized, pond etc), status (active, inactive) and estimated distance to the site. And, please indicate the WSRs in the figure(s) and figure 5.1.	Table 5.1 is now added to summarize watercourses identified and WSRs, including WSR ID, description, type, status and estimate distance to the site. Location of WSRs is also shown in Section 5.3 and Figure 5.1.
5.	S5.4.6 Please provide a table to illustrate the construction activities to be conducted in phases	This project is still at the early planning stage, details of construction works will be thought out only at later detailed design stage. A summary of key construction activities to be carried out at WRA area, has been provided in Section 5.4.6 as a tentative reference.
6.	S5.4.17 Please incorporate the proposed ADWF of the proposed development and to secure the planned sewer system, i.e. YLSTW via NSWSPS, has adequate capacity to manage the wastewater generated, please make reference to S2.4.2, 2.5.4 and 2.5.5 of SIA.	Section 5.4.17 has been removed accordingly.

Application No. A/YL-NSW/314 Proposed Residential Development with Wetland Habitat, and associated Filling of Ponds and Excavation of Land in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Comprehensive Development to include Wetland Restoration Area” Zone, Various Lots in D.D.104, Pok Wai, Yuen Long

Departmental Comments		Applicant’s Responses
7.	S5.6.9 Please clarify if a SPS will be constructed on-site, please provide further information on the design, capacity, location, potential sources of water quality impact, mitigation measures and emergency arrangement.	Sections 5.6.8 and 5.6.9 have been revised accordingly.
C. Noise		
1.	Figure 4.6 - It is noted that the consultant has proposed a 6.9m noise barrier along the site boundary near House E22 to mitigate fixed noise impacts. Please double check the proposed 1.4m architectural fin at House E22 (at 1/F) is still necessary.	Noted, relevant parts in Section 4.6.1, noise calculation in Appendix 4.2, and Table 4.3 have been revised based on noise barrier only. Architectural fin at House E22 has been taken out. Figures 1.2, 3.1 to 4.6 have also been revised accordingly. Sections 3.5.5 and 3.5.7, and Appendix 3.3 have been updated accordingly.