

Table A: Responses-to-Comments (30.8.2024)

Departmental Comments		Applicant’s Responses
A. Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (received on 14.8.2024)		
A. General Comments		
1.	The construction programme is inconsistent among different parts of the submission (e.g. Table 15 and Section 9.3 of EcoIA, Section 5.1 and Table 4.2 of WRP). Please revise for consistency and clarity.	Noted, Table 15 and Section 9.3 of EcoIA, Section 5.1 and Table 4.2 of WRP have been revised accordingly.
2.	There are still a number of inconsistencies in the survey results presented among different parts of the EcoIA, WRP and the Appendices. Besides, some of our previous comments have been overlooked. Please double check critically.	
B. Specific Comments		
1.	<p>Figure 3-1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - White-shouldered Starling and Common Redshank were listed in Table 13 but not shown in figure 3-1. Please revise. - Please add Mallard and Purple Heron under “Species of Conservation Importance” and remove the legend of “Verification Survey Findings”. - White Royal was listed in the figure but not mentioned elsewhere in the report. Please revise. 	<p>Noted, White-shouldered Starling and Common Redshank are now added in Figure 3-1.</p> <p>Mallard and Purple Heron are now under the legend of “Species of Conservation Importance”.</p> <p>Information of White Royal are now added in S.6.3.6, Table 7, Table 13 and Appendix 6 in the EcoIA.</p>
2.	6.2.7 Please supplement about the height of the flight lines surveyed.	Noted, the estimated major height of flight lines recorded are ranged between about 25m to about 30m and much information have been added in S.6.2.7.
3.	Table 12, diversity, abundance/ richness of wildlife We have commented previously that “Only flora, bird, butterfly and dragonfly were mentioned. Please supplement regarding the other taxa groups under survey”. However, no revision has been made. Please double check critically and revise accordingly.	Noted, the diversity, abundance/ richness of wildlife of other taxa groups are now included in Table 12.

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

Departmental Comments		Applicant’s Responses
4.	Table 13 Yellow Orange Tip was considered as a species of conservation importance in Table 13 but not in Section 6.3.6 and was absent in Figure 3-1. Please revise for consistency.	Noted, Yellow Orange Tip has been removed in Table 5, Table 13, Table 16 and Figure 3.1 as it is not rare or very rare butterfly species.
5.	8.2.3 As per our previous comment, please revise as “... species of conservation were recorded within the abandoned ponds during the 12-month survey and verification survey , they only occurred in low abundance...”. Please double check critically and revise accordingly.	Noted, section 8.2.3 has been revised by adding “...during the 12-month survey and verification survey...”.
6.	Table 16, Temporary habitat loss, mitigation required We have previously advised to remove “No.”. However, “No.” was retained while all the other words were removed. Please double check critically and revise accordingly.	Noted, the typos of “No.” in Table 16 have been revised accordingly.
B. Drainage Services Department (received on 19.8.2024)		
A. Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA Report)		
1.	Please advise if Stormwater Drainage Manual – Corrigendum Nos. 1/2022 and 1/2024 have been considered in the assessment.	Please be advised that Stormwater Drainage Manual – Corrigendum Nos. 1/2022 and 1/2024 have already been taken into account in the assessment in the submitted DIA report. For clarity, the text has also been added in Section 2.2.1 has been added accordingly.
2.	Previous comment 5 has not been addressed. Figure 3.1 – The manhole provision interval should be made reference to relevant design guidelines. The manhole provision interval should be correctly presented in the DIA to ensure it is up to current standard.	Noted, the manhole intervals are indicated in Appendix 2.3. Please be noted that the design is based on Stormwater Drainage Manual Clause 11.2 (d) which states that for pipe diameter larger than 1050mm, the maximum intervals is 120m. In the current design, none of the manhole intervals exceeds the maximum interval stated in the manual. As stated in the DIA report, this DIA is preliminary for the purpose of this planning application, and a detailed DIA

Departmental Comments		Applicant’s Responses
		report will be submitted in later detailed design stage in the form of compliance with the relevant planning condition. Accordingly, the proposed drainage system should be reviewed and designed in such a way to comply with relevant requirements in the Stormwater Drainage Manual and to the satisfaction of DSD.
3.	Appendix 2.3 – Please review the utilization percentage, practically, it is suggested to be less than 85% for conservative concern.	<p>Noted and have been revised accordingly. The utilization percentage is now less than 85%, please refer to Figure 3.2 and Appendix 2.3.</p> <p>As mentioned above, a detailed DIA report will be submitted to DSD for its approval in later detailed design stage via compliance with the planning condition. Accordingly, the proposed drainage system should be reviewed and designed in such a way to comply with relevant requirements in the Stormwater Drainage Manual and to the satisfaction of DSD.</p>