

Table A: Responses-to-Comments (28.5.2024)

Departmental Comments		Applicant’s Responses
A. Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (received on 8.4.2024)		
A. General Comments		
1.	<p><u>Works programme (RtC General Comment no. 1)</u></p> <p>The first two bullet points of our previous comments have not been addressed. The proposed establishment period of 7-8 months only are not enough for the proposed WRA to be well established and functional. Please critically review the works programme to lengthen the establishment period by making reference to other approved projects.</p> <p><i>- Commence construct of the WRA immediately after dry season and start planting in the early wet season.</i></p> <p><i>- Lengthen the establishment period to 1.5 year after the completion of planting works.</i></p>	<p>The Ecological Mitigation/ Habitat Creation and Management Plan for the Development of Lok Ma Chau Loop (Agreement No. CE 5/2018 (CE)) is reviewed. The lengthening of the establishment period of the WRA is now being taken into consideration. The establishment period is extended to 1 year, covering both wet and dry season. During the establishment period, the construction works adjacent to the WRA will be suspended (Phase IV). Sections 9.3.8 and 9.3.12, and Table 15 in the EcoIA, section 5.1.2 and Table 4.2 in section 4 of WRP have been revised.</p>
2.	<p><u>Target species (RtC Specific Comment No. B3)</u></p> <p>- The 2nd and 3rd bullets of our previous comments have not been addressed.</p> <p><i>- In addition to the target waterbird families, the abundance of individual avifauna and non-avifauna species of conservation importance should also be recorded during the pre-construction survey and monitored during the construction and operation phases.</i></p> <p><i>- As the species recorded during the future pre-construction survey may change, the list of mitigation targets should be updated as per the pre-construction survey. Appropriate adjustments to the habitat design of the WRA may be required accordingly.</i></p>	<p>Noted. It has been specified in S.2.3.7 that a pre-construction survey for both avifauna and non-avifauna species will be conducted during the detailed design stage, hence, the details target level including both species and abundance will be reviewed and subject to change according to the ecological condition of the Application Site during the detailed design stage, appropriate adjustment of the habitat design of the WRA might also be required.</p>

Departmental Comments	Applicant’s Responses
<p>- It is stated that 15 bird species of conservation importance were recorded during the baseline survey. However, only 11 species are listed in Table 2.2. Please explain.</p> <p>- Please supplement why only the families/ groups of birds will be set as “presence/absence” target but not the individual bird species of conservation importance.</p> <p>- It is proposed to take action if target bird family / group is absent throughout 1 year. This action level is not strict enough to address to potential failure of the WRA in a timely manner. Please review.</p>	<p>Table 2.2 tabulates the representative species under the target families/groups that were recorded within the Application Site and other habitats during the ecological survey. The species that was scarce and/or flying over has not been listed in Table 2.2 of WRP.</p> <p>The presence/absence target of certain families of bird cover a wider range of bird species that are generally habituated in wetland habitats. The utilization and successfulness of the wetland habitats could possible be reflected by the presence of a wide range of target families/groups within the proposed WRA.</p> <p>In addition, the occasionally occurred bird species of conservation importance within the Application Site are chosen to be the target species of the WRA. Sections 2.3.4, 2.3.5 and 2.3.6, and table 2.2 have been revised.</p> <p>In addition to the mitigation target of “presence/absence of target waterbirds families/groups”, another mitigation target is suggested in Section 2.3.7, which is the “target level of the total abundance of Ardeidae” and the “target level of the total abundance of target species” within the proposed WRA. The target level is determined based on the total abundance of Ardeidae species and target species recorded during the corresponding month of the EcoIA ecological survey. As tabulated in Table 7.1, the action level for this mitigation target is “Not meeting the target level for 3 consecutive months”. Section 2.3.7 has been revised accordingly.</p>

Departmental Comments		Applicant’s Responses
B. Specific Comments		
1.	<p>9.3.3 It is stated that “In order to minimize disturbance to the WRA during construction phases I and II of the residential portion that are located further away from the WRA, a protective hoarding will be erected around the WRA, screening the disturbances generated from the construction of the residential portion”. However, it is stated in 9.3.15 that “During the main construction phase for the residential development, there will be temporary WRA hoarding along the interface between the WRA and the residential area”. Please clarify whether the WRA hoarding will be present during the entire construction phase for the residential development (i.e. Phases I to IV) or just Phases I and II.</p>	<p>To clarify, WRA hoarding surrounding the proposed WRA will be present during the entire construction phase of the residential development (i.e. Phase I to Phase IV).</p>
2.	<p>9.3.8 Please revise as “The earth works and water filling as well as planting works of reed and submerged plants for the WRA will be conducted during the wet season.....”.</p>	<p>Noted. Section 9.3.8 has been revised.</p>
3.	<p>When will the landscape planting near the WRA be planted?</p>	<p>Landscape planting near WRA will proceed along with WRA establishment.</p>
4.	<p>Landscape Master Plan (LMP), RtC No. A9 The LMP shows that there are double walls separating the WRA from the adjacent ponds to the north (2.5m high green wall plus 2.5m high partition wall) and from those to the west (two sets of 2.5m high partition wall). These walls and your response at RtC no. 9 do not tally with 8.3.20, which states that “..... the layout plan has intentionally reserves the entire northern part of the Application Site as part of the WRA (without any residential buildings or <u>other structures</u>) to allow connection of the future WRA and the surrounding ponds, especially those to the north. As the WRA would be adjacent to the ponds outside the Application Site, and the <u>future bund dividing the WRA with the adjacent ponds would be of smaller width than a typical earth pond bund currently occurring in the ponds of Pok Wai (both within and outside the Application Site), the connectivity of wetland between WRA and the adjacent ponds could be maintained, and</u></p>	<p>Noted. Small openings in the proposed reinforced concrete wall along the northern boundary, is now being considered to facilitate the movement of small animals, including but not be limited to the amphibians and reptiles species recorded in the ecological survey. Sections 8.3.20 and 9.3.15 have been revised accordingly. The design of the small opening will be further proposed in the later detailed design stage.</p>

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
	<p><u>other measures for connectivity such as wildlife tunnel is not considered necessary.</u> Please clarify.</p>	
5.	<p>RtC no. A10 Please revise 9.6.2 as per the RtC.</p> <p><i>We are not aware of any EM&A Manual submitted under this planning application. Please revise.</i></p>	Noted and Section 9.6.2 in the EcoIA is being revised.
6.	<p>WRA RtC No. B1 Our previous comments has not been addressed. Please elaborate how the WRA could “sustainably provide food supplies”.</p> <p><i>Please elaborate how the WRA could “sustainably provide food supplies, thus safeguarding the waterbird populations form [from?] other potential risks”.</i></p>	The sustainable food supplies will be through regular fish stocking. Section 1.1.5 of the WRP is being revised.
7.	<p>Appendix 1 Please remove the photos and just list out the species name and common name waterbird species and plant species.</p>	Noted and removed from the WRP accordingly.

Departmental Comments		Applicant’s Responses
B. Drainage Services Department (received on 9.4.2024)		
A. Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA Report)		
1.	Appendix 2.3: Please advise if sedimentation reduction has been taken into account. Please specify if affirmative.	Sedimentation reduction has been taken into account. It is now specified in the remarks underneath the table in Appendix 2.3. The calculation has also revised which complied with the latest Stormwater Drainage Manual Corrigendum No. 1/2024.
2.	For the 1350mm dia. pipe, the utilization appears too close to 90% which is not desirable from drainage viewpoint. Please review to upgrade the size as appropriate.	The pipe size is now upgraded to 1500mm and with a utilization below 90%. Please refer to Figure 3.1 and Appendix 2.3.
3.	The cover level of terminal manhole (S1) should not be higher than that of public manhole (S2). Please revise.	The location of terminal manhole is shifted and named S1a with a cover level of 5.10 mPD which is higher than that of S2 at 4.8 mPD. Please refer to Figure 3.1.
4.	Figure 3.6: The legend has not been highlighted on layout plan.	It has now been highlighted on the layout plan in Figure 3.6.
5.	Para. 2.5: Please revise, “2.5.1...to the site boundary with private lot...”; “2.5.2...from site boundary within government land...”; and “2.5.3... of the pipes drainage facilities...”.	Text in S.2.5.1, S.2.5.2, and S.2.5.3 have been revised accordingly.
C. Environmental Protection Department (received on 21.5.2024)		
A. Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA Report)		
1.	S.2.5.7: Noted that the intake year was removed. However, it is essential for our sewage flow projection, please re-provide.	Tentative intake year is now re-provided.
D. Chief Town Planner/Urban Design & Landscape, Planning Department (received on 24.5.2024)		
A. Visual Impact Assessment (VIA Report)		
1.	The defined visual envelope as shown in Plan 8b is not in line with the TPB PG-NO. 41. Please review the defined visual envelope.	Noted. The defined visual envelope has been updated.

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
2.	Numbering of the plans of VIA is confusing, the numbering of plans as quoted in the assessment are different from those as shown on the plans. Please update as appropriate.	Noted. The VIA has been updated.