

Application No. A/YL-NSW/314 Proposed Residential Department 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

**Table A: Responses-to-Comments (12.7.2024)**

Departmental Comments		Applicant’s Responses
<b>A. Environmental Protection Department (received on 24.6.2024 &amp; 26.6.2024)</b>		
<b>A. Environmental Assessment (EA Report)</b>		
1.	It is noted that the Environmental Assessment for the captioned planning application is yet to be finalized. Please submit a revised Environmental Assessment as per our previous comments for our further review.	The Environmental Assessment has been updated accordingly.
2.	S.1.3 – Please supplement other project elements (i.e., a proposed access road, proposed sewers, manholes, drains and etc.) into the scope of this EA.	Relevant project elements have been added in S1.3.1.
3.	S.1.3.4 – According to the submitted SIA, the proposed sewers and manholes under the proposed development would encroach onto an area zoned as Conservation Area on the NSW OZP and their construction would involve earthworks. Thus, the proposed development may constitute another DP (i.e., Item Q.1 under Part 1, Schedule 2 of EIAO). Please include a discussion on it.	Text has been added in S1.3.4 accordingly to include designated element of the proposed sewers.
4.	S5.3.1 – S/YL-KTN/40 11, please check.	Text in S5.3.1 has been amended accordingly.
5.	S.5.5.8 – Please revise ‘site boundary boundaries’	Text in S5.5.8 has been amended accordingly.
6.	S.6.1.2 (i) Please revise ‘For air quality impact, construction dust impact, vehicular emission impact odour impact from the proposed SPS’ (ii) Please revise ‘site boundary boundaries’	Text in S6.1.2 has been amended accordingly.
7.	S.6.1.3 (i) Acoustic fins are not proposed as the noise mitigation measure for the development according to the noise impact assessment section, please review and clarify. (ii) Please revise ‘site boundary boundaries’	No acoustic fin is proposed. Solely typo mistake. Text in S6.1.3 has been amended accordingly.

Departmental Comments		Applicant’s Responses
<b>B. Drainage Services Department (received on 2.7.2024)</b>		
<b>A. Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA Report)</b>		
1.	According to the Technical Note to prepare a Drainage Submission, the applicant should refer to DSD Advice Note No. 1 and should also employ a qualified engineer (Registered Professional Engineer in Civil Engineering discipline) to complete the DIA as requested. The completed drainage submission should be signed and certified by the qualified engineer before it is submitted to DSD for comments.	DIA report certified by a RPE in civil engineering discipline is now provided. Please refer to the signature page of the report.
2.	Fig 2.1 & 3.1: Please advise and indicate the flow direction of catchment areas of C6 and C7.	Flow directions of catchment areas C6 and C7 are now provided.
3.	Figure 3.1: Channel turning at acute angle should be avoided.	Channel turning point in Figure 3.1 has been reviewed and revised accordingly. As mentioned in the DIA, the current study and proposed alignment is indicative only, while the exact alignment will be provided at the detailed design stage.
4.	Figure 3.1: The proposed manhole S2 should not be located at the junction of carriageway from maintenance viewpoint.	As mentioned in the DIA, the current study and proposed alignment is indicative only, while the exact alignment will be provided at the detailed design stage. For clarity, location of manhole S2 shown in Figure 3.1 has been revised accordingly.
5.	Figure 3.1: Please advise the rationale of proposed manhole location. The manhole provision interval should be made reference to relevant design guidelines.	The drainage layout is prepared according to the Stormwater Drainage Manual (SDM). As mentioned in the DIA, the proposed drainage alignment is indicative only. The exact locations of manholes will be provided at the detailed design stage.
6.	The proposed manhole to be handed over to DSD appears to be a special manhole type. Independent checking for the structural integrity of special manhole certified by an Independent Checking Engineer (ICE) should be provided.	As mentioned in the DIA, the current study is preliminary only, should there be any special manhole types identified/proposed in detailed design stage which will be handed over

Departmental Comments		Applicant’s Responses
		to DSD, checking of structural integrity by an Independent Checking Engineer (ICE) will be provided by the project proponent.
7.	Our previous comment 5 has not been addressed. Para. 2.5.3: Please delete “pipes”.	The text in Para. 2.5.3 has been amended accordingly.
<b>C. Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (received on 5.7.2024)</b>		
<b>A. General Comments</b>		
1.	<p>Works programme</p> <p>According to Table 15, the established period after the completion of planting works is just 11 months (from September to July). Phase II and III including 6 units which are immediately adjacent to the WRA will commence in the same month of the planting works (i.e. August 2024).</p> <p>Making reference to the approved EIA study for Comprehensive Development and Wetland Protection near Yau Mei San Tsuen, it is expected that it will take the WRA about 1.5 years from commencement of construction to being fully established and functional, and no construction of superstructure, underground services and utilities, and roadworks shall be commenced before completion of the establishment period.</p> <p>Along the above, please consider to:</p> <p>a. further lengthen the establishment period to 12 months or above after the completion of planting works (i.e. from September 2024 to August 2025);</p> <p>b. commence the construction works other than superstructure, underground services and utilities, and roadworks of Phase II and III (excluding the 6 units immediately adjacent to WRA) only after the construction of WRA completes (i.e. September 2024), and commence the construction works for the superstructure, underground services and utilities, and roadworks only after the end of the establishment period (i.e. September 2025);</p>	<p>Noted, the approved EIA study for Comprehensive Development and Wetland Protection near Yau Mei San Tsuen is reviewed for the current application case. The establishment period of the proposed WRA is now extended to 19 months to ensure a complete establishment of the wetland habitat in the WRA.</p> <p>In addition to the extension of the extension of establishment period as mentioned above, the avoidance of dry season for the building units that are in close proximity to the WRA (i.e. 6 units of Phase III and the whole Phase IV) has been taken into account in the construction programme. Thus the disturbance to the WRA is further minimized.</p>

Departmental Comments		Applicant’s Responses
	c. commence the construction works of the units adjacent to the WRA (including 6 units in Phase III and all units in Phase IV) only after the end of the establishment period (i.e. September 2025) and avoid winter.	
2.	Inconsistency in survey result  There are inconsistencies in the survey results presented among different parts of the EcoIA, WRP and the Appendices. For example, it is stated that 10 bird species of conservation importance were recorded in the application site in 8.2.13 of EcoIA but 15 species in 2.1.6 of WRP. Please critically review for accuracy.	Noted, the number of bird species of conservation importance are revised as 16 nos. within the Application Site during the 12-month survey and the verification survey. Relevant sections of the EcoIA and the WRP are revised accordingly.
<b>B. Specific comments</b>		
1.	Please provide a figure to show the location of species of conservation importance recorded during the 12-month survey and the verification survey on the habitat map.	The figure showing the species of conservation importance for both 12-month survey and the verification survey is supplemented as Figure 3-1 in the EcoIA report.
2.	Please add a figure to show the bird flight path survey finding.	The figure showing the bird flight path survey finding is supplemented as Figure 3-2 in the EcoIA report.
3.	Table 12 Pied Kingfisher was also recorded during the verification survey according to the relevant appendix. Nineteen (instead of sixteen) species were recorded altogether in both the 12-month survey and verification survey. Please double check.	Noted, the number of the species of conservation importance are revised as “19” in Table 12.
4.	Table 12, diversity, abundance/ richness of wildlife Only flora, bird, butterfly and dragonfly were mentioned. Please supplement regarding the other taxa groups under survey.	Other faunal group species of conservation importance are supplemented in the Table 12.
5.	8.2.3 Please revise as “... Although [?] species of conservation were recorded within the	Noted, the sentence is revised.

Departmental Comments		Applicant’s Responses
	abandoned ponds <b>during the 12-month survey and verification survey</b> , they only occurred in low abundance...”.	
6.	8.2.13 Please revise as “... <del>Ten</del> [?] bird species of conservation importance were recorded in these abandoned ponds <b>during the 12-month survey and verification survey</b> ...”	Noted, section 8.2.13 is revised.
7.	8.2.26 The number of bird species of conservation importance recorded during the 12-month survey and verification survey was 16 according to relevant appendices. Please revise the sentence and update the number of species of waterbirds/wetland dependent bird as appropriate.	Noted, the sentence in section 8.2.26 is revised.
8.	Table 16, Temporary habitat loss, significance of ecological impact Please revise as “minor for construction of WRA and moderate for construction of residential portion”.	Noted, the sentence of Table 16 is revised accordingly.
9.	Table 16, Temporary habitat loss, mitigation required Please remove “No.”.	Noted, the wording is removed.
<b>C. Wetland Restoration Proposal (WRP Report)</b>		
1.	1.1.4 As the application site consists of existing ponds and no additional wetlands will be resulted by the proposed development, please revise the section as follows - “ ..... with an aim to upgrade and enhance the quality of wetland area inside WBA by <b>providing additional converting the remaining abandoned ponds at the application site</b> into ecologically-enhanced wetland habitats and thus be beneficial for the intention of the WBA.”	Noted, the sentence in section 1.1.4 of the WRP is revised accordingly.

Departmental Comments		Applicant’s Responses
2.	<p>1.2.2 As the application site consists of existing ponds and no additional wetlands will be resulted by the proposed development, please revise the section as follows - “The wetland will not only <b>provide additional enhance</b> habitats for wildlife, but will also enhance the quality of the WBA/WCA as migratory bird habitats.</p>	Noted, the sentence in section 1.2.2 is revised.
<b>D. Comments from fish culture perspective:</b>		
1.	The classification method used to group inactive and abandoned ponds within a single "Abandoned" group provides an oversimplification of the actual situation. Please include a fourth "Inactive" category, indicative of ponds that may not be fully active (as defined in the FIA report), but not to the extent of being abandoned, so that a holistic assessment can be obtained.	Noted, the classification of the pond type is now divided into “abandoned”, “inactive” and “active” and the “flood storage pond”, relevant sections are revised.
2.	"Avoidance" and "Minimization" measures have been considered within Section 1.9 of the Fisheries Impact Assessment. Please review the approach of compensation vis-a-vis mitigation of impacts.	Avoidance is considered for the current application. All active fish ponds are avoided within the Application Site. For the “minimization” aspect, opportunity is reserved for fish farming within the WRA. Relevant sections are revised.
3.	The proposed measure of converting 2.47 ha of "abandoned" fishponds into enhanced active wetland. Please critically review the possibility of including fish culture operations within this designated area.	Noted, the opportunity for fish farming within the WRA is reserved, including the operation of harvesting of adult fish remaining in the WRA, selling to the market and the supply of fish stocks in spring time as a general practice of traditional fish farming. Relevant sections of the FIA(S1.9.5) and the WRP(S4.6.1, S4.6.3 – S4.6.4) are revised.