

## **Response-to-Comment Table**

**Section 12A Amendment of Plan Application under Town Planning Ordinance for Proposed Rezoning from “Residential (Group B)1” Zone to “Residential (Group B)4” Zone for Medium-Density Housing Development to Include a Footpath for Public Use at Various Lots and Adjacent Government Land in DD130, Lam Tei, Tuen Mun (TPB Ref.: Y/TM-LTY/11)**

**Further Information No. 5**

**– Response-to-Comments –**

Item	Comments	Responses
<b>Comments from Urban Design and Landscape Section, Planning Department Received on 16 August 2024</b>		
1.	Our previous comments have not been fully addressed. As an observation to the photomontage at VP3, the planned public housing development at San Hing Road and Hong Po Road shall be shifted to the right (i.e. between the proposed residential towers to the left and with similar height of the lamp pole) in the photomontage at VP3.	Noted, please refer to the replacement pages of the VIA in <i>Appendix I</i> .
2.	However, the summary of the revised VIA in Para. 5 above remains generally applicable.	Noted.
<b>Comments from the Drainage Services Department Received on 20 August 2024</b>		
3.	Our previous comments vide our two emails dated 26 Feb 2024 and 8 May 2024 are yet to be addressed. Copies of our two aforesaid emails are attached at Annex I and II for reference.	Please note the previous comments dated 26 Feb 2024 and 8 May 2024 have been addressed in Further Information No.2 (submitted to TPB on 28 March 2024) and Further Information No.4 (submitted to TPB 24 July 2024).  Our Environmental Consultant re-issued the RtC tables by email (Attn: Alice Fung, email: <a href="mailto:alicefung@dsd.gov.hk">alicefung@dsd.gov.hk</a> ) on 27 August 2024.
4.	Section 2.1 Please incorporate new SDM Corrigendum No. 1/2024 for new rainfall profile.	The rainfall profile of SDM Corrigendum No. 1/2024 has been incorporated in the calculations, which has also been stated in Section 2.21 and Appendix 2.2 of the submitted DIA report.
5.	It is noted from SIA report that sewerage treatment facilities are proposed for the captioned development and treated effluent would be discharged to the nearby nullah. However, it appears that the relevant description/drawings and calculation to include the discharge of treated effluent into surface runoff for the assessment of drainage system are missing the DIA report.	Treated sewage effluent has already been included in the total stormwater runoff calculation for the estimation of storage tank size as stated in Section 2.9.3 and Appendix 2.2 of the submitted DIA report.

Item	Comments	Responses
6.	Besides, we haveno further comment on the Sewerage Impact Assessment Report (Appendix F of Further Information).	Noted.
<b>Comments from the Environmental Protection Department Received on 26 August 2024</b>		
<u>Air Quality</u>		
<b>Comment on Air Assessment</b>		
7.	Section 5.2.7. Suggest to replace “Vehicular Emissions” by “Vehicular Emission Impact” I nthe Title	Noted, relevant text has been updated accordingly ( <i>Appendix II</i> refers).
8.	(Section 5.2.8). Suggest to replace “Industrail Air Pollution” by “Industrial Air Pollution impact” in the Title	Noted, relevant text has been updated accordingly ( <i>Appendix II</i> refers).
9.	Section 5.3.2, 5.3.3, 5.3.6, Table 5.4. Please note that the air quality monitoring data up to 2023 is now available. Please present the latest five year data and revise Section 5.3.2, 5.3.3, 5.3.6, Table 5.4.	Sections 5.3.2, 5.3.3, Section 5.3.6 and Table 5.4 have been revised based on 2019-2023 data.
10.	Section 5.3.3. Please add "10-minute" before "1h" in Line 2.	Noted, relevant text has been updated accordingly ( <i>Appendix II</i> refers).
11.	Section 5.3.5. Suggest to replace "relationship" by "relation" in Line 2	Noted, relevant text has been updated accordingly ( <i>Appendix II</i> refers).
12.	Section 5.5.3. Suggest moving “Apart from the planned public housing development at San Hing Road and its associated infrastructure works, there are no other concurrent projects within the 500m assessment area identified with reference to the records on the OZP portal and the EIAO website” after Hence, cumulative air quality impact is not anticipated from the planned development at San Hing Road” in the last sentence.	Noted, relevant text has been updated accordingly ( <i>Appendix II</i> refers).
13.	Section 5.5.4. Sugest adding “including those” before” on the oppsite side of the nullah” in the 2 <sup>nd</sup> -last Line. Please also address how the sludge/waste from the proposed STP will be handled and disposed of theensure no adverse odor impact on any nearby ASRs.	Noted, relevant text has been updated accordingly ( <i>Appendix II</i> refers).  The sludge will be handled in the enclosed STP with deodorisation equipment and negative pressure maintained, and eventually be

Item	Comments	Responses
14.	<p>Section 5.5.8. and R-t-c 25. Please supplement the response to Section 5.5.8. Staff from the management office of the Monastery confirmed that the burning of joss paper is not practiced in the premises and the policy remains effective at all times.</p> <p>Section 5.5.12.</p>	<p>collected by a specialist contractor and transported to licensed treatment facilities for disposal.</p> <p>Section 5.5.4 has been revised (<i>Appendix II</i> refers).</p> <p>Section 5.5.8 has been updated to include the response from #25 of the previous RtC.</p>
15.	<p>The Project Profile (PP-643.2022) of the Lam Tei Underground Quarry has been replaced by (PP-669/2024). Please update the relevant information.</p>	<p>The information has been updated in Sections 5.5.12 and 5.5.25 to 5.5.27 (<i>Appendix II</i> refers).</p> <p>Hence, the asphalt plant will be assumed as above-ground in its current location and its cumulative impact will be assessed based on the existing information obtained from EPD's Specified Process Licence Register to avoid any under-estimation of the air quality impact.</p> <p>Section 5.5.12 has been revised and Sections 5.6.25 to Sections 5.6.27 have been added.</p>
16.	<p>The construction phase of the Lam Tei UYnderground Quarry should be in 2025 and commencement of operation (including the asphalt plant) should be in 2026 according to latest information in the Project Profile. Please check.</p>	<p>According to the Project Profile (PP-669/2024), the operation of Lam Tei Underground Quarry will commence in Q1 2026 and hence it has now been included in the assessment.</p>
17.	<p>According to the Project Profile, the production scale of the asphalt plant of the Lam Tei Underground Quarry will be similar to that of the existing asphalt plant at Lam Tei Quarry.</p>	<p>The design of Lam Tei Underground Quarry as well as the emission location and parameters of the asphalt plant are not available in the Project Profile and cannot be confirmed at the time of preparing this EA report, while the production scale of the asphalt plant of the Lam Tei Underground Quarry will be similar to that of the existing asphalt plant at Lam Tei Quarry as stated in the Project Profile.</p>

Item	Comments	Responses
18.	Since the asphalt plant of the Lam Tei Underground Quarry would start operation in 2026 before the population in take of the proposed development in 2030, please check whether not assessing the cumulative impact from the asphalt plant would cause any under-estimation of emission impact.	The emission impact from the asphalt plant of the Lam Tei Underground Quarry has now been included in the assessment to avoid any under-estimation.
19.	Section 5.6.1. Please replace “NO2” by “NOx” in Line 2 and 3  Sction 5.6.4. and R-t-c 27	Noted, relevant text has been updated accordingly ( <i>Appendix II</i> refers).
20.	Please foolow up to obtain TD’s endorsement of the traffic data	TD’s endorsement will be provided once obtained.
21.	Please clarify whether the traffic dad of Year 2033 has included traffic from the Route 11 and Tuen Mun Bypass on the road network.	As confirmed by the traffic consultant, Route 11 and Tuen Mun Bypass would not induce traffic to the traffic data of this Project, instead Route 11 and Tuen Mun Bypass will draw away the traffic within the assessment area.  Therefore, the traffic forecast data in 2033 before the opening of Route 11 and Tuen Mun Bypass has been adopted as a worst-case scenario to avoid under-estimation of air quality impact.
22.	Please clarify if there are only new roads added to the road network but no change of existing roads from Year 2030 to 2033. Otherwise, a vehicular impact assessment based on Year 2030 scenario shall also be conducted.	As confirmed by the traffic consultant, there are only new roads added to the road network without changing the existing roads from Year 2030 to 2033.
23.	Section 5.6.5. Please not that SAMP v2.0 has been released and please check if an updated version shall be adopted.	SAMP v2.0 has been adopted and the air quality impact assessment has been updated.  Section 5.6.5 has been revised ( <i>Appendix II</i> refers).
24.	Section 5.6.7. Suggest adding “of the future scenarios” after “torepresent the emissions” in Line3-4.	Noted, relevant text has been updated accordingly ( <i>Appendix II</i> refers).
25.	Section 5.6.12. Suggest to remove “the use of” in Line 1, and replace “considered conservative” by “adopted” in Line 2-3.	Noted, relevant text has been updated accordingly ( <i>Appendix II</i> refers).
26.	Section 5.6.13. Suggest to replace “within” by “from” in Line 1	Noted, relevant text has been updated accordingly ( <i>Appendix II</i> refers).

Item	Comments	Responses
27.	<p>Section 5.6.17. (Line 5). Please clarify which parking sites are referred to noting that no parking spaces or car parks for HGV and coaches are identified within the 500 m assessment area according to Section 5.5.10.</p> <p>Section 5.6.24</p>	<p>There is no designated parking spaces or car parks for Heavy Goods Vehicles / Coaches within the 500m assessment area.</p> <p>Section 5.6.17 has been revised to remove “and the roads connected to egress or ingress of parking sites”.</p>
28.	<p>Please supplement the source of information for Negative pressure within the Fu Tai Estate Bus Terminus, or replace “Negative pressure shall be induced by the mechanical ventilation system such that” by “ With the mechanical ventilation system, “ InLine 8-9.</p>	<p>“Negative pressure shall be induced by the mechanical ventilation system such that” is replaced by “With the mechanical ventilation system,”.</p> <p>Section 5.6.24 has been revised.</p>
29.	<p>Please remove “also” in Line 12.</p>	<p>Noted, relevant text has been updated accordingly (<i>Appendix II</i> refers).</p>
30.	<p>Suggest to revise the last sentence as: Considering the separation distance from the bus terminus to the proposed development, the broad-brush approach would not cause under-estimation of emission impact from start emission of taxi and PLB.</p>	<p>Noted, relevant text has been updated accordingly (<i>Appendix I</i> refers).</p>
31.	<p>Section 5.6.27. Suggest to remove “Therefore” in Line 2</p>	<p>Section 5.6.27 has been reordered as 5.6.30. The relevant text has been updated accordingly (<i>Appendix II</i> refers).</p>
32.	<p>Section 5.8.1. Please add “Regulation” after “Air Pollution Control (Construction Dust)” in Line 3-4.</p>	<p>Noted, relevant text has been updated accordingly (<i>Appendix II</i> refers).</p>
33.	<p>Please highlight all the changes/amendments in the next submission.</p>	<p>Noted, the changes have been highlighted.</p>
<p><b>Comment on Emfac Modelling</b></p>		
34.	<p>It is noted that the sensitivity test results in Table 5.9 have been updated, please clarify whether the traffic data has been revised. TD’s endorsement should be sought for any revisions to the traffic data. Please provide the updated SAMP templates for checking.</p>	<p>The traffic data used in R9116_v5.0 is different from the data used in R9116_v4.0. The traffic data used in R9116_v6.0 is the same with R9116_v5.0.</p> <p>TD’s endorsement will be provided once available.</p>

Item	Comments	Responses
	<p><u>Noise</u></p> <p>35. Based on the EA report, the estimated noise level for Road Traffic Noise assessment under unmitigated scenario is 69 dB(A) and is 100% compliance to HKPSG requirement. The current Railway Noise Impact assessment was conducted based on the preliminary project layout. An exceedance up to 3dB(A) was observed for the planned NSRs, according to the approved EIA AEIAR-227/2020 – Development at San Hing Road and Hong Po Road, Tuen Mun). it is technically feasible to achieve the noise criteria by application of acoustic window/ balcony. Overall, there should be no insurmountable noise impact for the Applicant to meet the relevant noise criteria of HKPSG with the application of all necessary noise mitigation measures for the proposed development. Nevertheless, please include the below statement in to EA report to cater for the changes in the detail design stage.</p> <p>Section 2.7.1.</p> <p>36. Please include the statement, “However, the noise attenuation performance will subject to building layout, train operating frequency, train speed, number of train car etc. A quantitative railway noise assessment would be conducted and take into account the future layout design and re-confirm with MTRC on appropriate railway operation parameters. According to HKPSG table 1.3, adequate railway noise sensitive uses away from the MTR Lines and LRT lines will be followed, proper design guidelines to reduce noise exposure such as self-protecting building design, integrated building and noise sourcedesign, purpose-built noise barriers and acoustic insulation of buildings will be reviewed and considered in a practicable and effective manner to ensure there will be no insurmountable railway noise impact and comply with NCO. During the detail design stage, if exceedance in railway noise assessment is anticipated under unmitigated scenario, full justifications together with technical documents (e.g. mock-up test report, onsite noise measurement report) to verify the required noise reduction for the proposed development would be provided.”</p>	<p>The SAMP templates have been provided and zipped in the calculation and modelling files.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The statement has been added to Section 2.7.4.</p>

Item	Comments	Responses
37.	<p>Since the Proposed Development is still at its early planning stage, a quantitative noise impact assessment shall be submitted under proper lands mechanism based on the exact details of the proposed development (detailed design stage) to demonstrate the compliance of the relevant noise criteria in the HKPSG, and implement all noise mitigation measures where necessary. We will impose NIA submission clause under the land lease mechanism.</p> <p><b>Remaining comment on other air quality perspective (Air Modelling) is provided below-</b></p>	Noted.
38.	Appendix 5.3 and Road AERMOD model – The width of L009, L019-2, L031, L052 and L053 in model do not match with those in appendix 5.3. Please check and rerun the model.	The model has been rerun with SAMP v2.0. Appendix 5.3 has been revised.
39.	PTI AERMOD Model – Please apply the revised release height and initial vertical dimension to all the vehicular emission sources outside bus terminus (i.e. including FTEAS104R to FTEAS206R, SHEAS01R to SHEAS03R).	Release height and initial vertical dimension have been applied and revised to all the vehicular emission sources outside the bus terminus.
40.	Appendix 5.3 – Under Table Inventory of Open Roads for 2030 EMFAC x 2033 Traffic, please revise “Rose Width (m)” to – “Modelled Width (m)”.	“Rose Width (m)” has been revised to – “Modelled Width (m)”. Appendix 5.3 has been revised.
41.	Appendix 5.3 – Please present the emission rates by road segment	The emission rates generated from SAMPv2.0 has been presented by road link as shown in Appendix 5.3. Although it is not presented by road segment, there is no manual adjustment made to the emission rates generated from SAMP v2.0; therefore, the emission rates contained in the modelling files tally with the ones generated from SAMP v2.0.
42.	<p>Figure 5.4</p> <p>The noted for asterisk “Noise barrier has no effect on the dispersion of the vehicular emission as it is outside the 3m mixing zone of the nearby road” in the legend box is missing. Please revise.</p>	The asterisk for “Noise barrier has no effect on the dispersion of the vehicular emission as it is outside the 3m mixing zone of the nearby road” has been added to Figure 5.4.
43.	Please also clarify if asterisk note is still applicable to the planned barrier along L111 as stated in submission in May 2024 since the model includes the 3m mixing zone on both sides. If positive, please revise the figure.	The asterisk is still applicable to the planned barrier along L111. Figure 5.4 has been revised.



Item	Comments	Responses
<b>Comments from the Transport Department Received on 2 September 2024</b>		
	Figure 4.3	
44.	The vehicular traffic split of about 1 (towards Ng Lau Road north):5 (towards Ng Lau Road south) is noted. Please clarify such design assumption.	The vehicular traffic split is based on the origin – destination of the traffic zones located in the vicinity, where some 17% would travel to Tuen Mun central and south-west. In future, the shortest route from the Proposed Development to Tuen Mun central and south-west, is via Ng Lau Road, Tsing Lun Road and Hong Po Road.
	Table 2.9 and 6.2	
45.	Please clarify if the effective width of footpath P1 should be 1.0m instead of 1.5m.	1.0m has been adopted as effective width of footpath P1.
	Sect 3.2 Table 3.2	
46.	As the subject site is in vicinity to the existing cycle track, please review if bicycle parking spaces could be provided at a rate of 1 space per <u>5 flats</u> with flat size <70m <sup>2</sup> .	Noted, Table 3.2 of the revised TIA has been updated accordingly ( <i>Appendix III</i> refers).
	Sect 4.4 Table 4.2 and R-t-C #60	
47.	It is noted your clarification that Hong Kong Population Projections 2022-2046 is adopted for projecting the estimated traffic growth rate (0.53%) between 2031-2033. Nevertheless, the adopted rate represents only the average within the territory and may not genuinely reflect the local district condition, and is relatively low compared with other nearby developments in Tuen Mun District. Please review by making reference to ATC, TPEDM as well as relevant sources from CSD and PlanD as considered appropriate.	The annual growth rate between 2031 – 2033 has been updated to 1% taking into account references from ATC, TPEDM, and “Hong Kong Population Projection”. Paras. 4.6 – 4.10 of the revised TIA in <i>Appendix III</i> refer.
	Sect 5.7 Table 5.4 and 5.5	
48.	The AM peak generation/attraction rates of road based public transport demand is identical to that of PM peak attraction/generation rates. Please review and update the assessment in the aforementioned and associated tables.	Noted. The generation and attraction rates have been revised based on pedestrian generation survey conducted as described in Chapters 5 and 6 of revised TIA ( <i>Appendix III</i> refers).

Item	Comments	Responses
49.	<p>Sect 5.23 to 5.30, Sect 6.2</p> <p>Similar to our comment on Table 4.2, the adopted rates are relatively low compared with other nearby developments in Tuen Mun District and are significantly different from 3.6%-3.7% as per your R-t-C #60. Please review by making reference to ATC, TPEDM as well as relevant sources from CSD and PlanD as considered appropriate.</p>	<p>Noted. The review of TPEDM and relevant sources from C&amp;SD and PlanD have been incorporated in Chapter 5 of revised TIA (<i>Appendix III</i> refers).</p>
50.	<p>Sect 5.35</p> <p>Please clarify if the effect of the expansion of Lam Tei LRT platform has been considered.</p>	<p>The effect of the expansion of Lam Tei LRT platform (Tuen Mun bound) has been considered.</p>
51.	<p>Sect 6.4 Table 6.1</p> <p>The AM peak pedestrian generation/attraction rates is identical to that of PM pedestrian peak attraction/generation rates. In particular, the rates are far lower than the nearby public and private housing developments near Tuen Mun Area 54 as well as the newly proposed developments in vicinity to yours. Please review the assessment.</p>	<p>Additional traffic generation survey was conducted at nearby development and the updated Pedestrian Generation Rate have been incorporated in Table 6.1 (<i>Appendix III</i> refers).</p>
52.	<p>Please justify the assumption of applying 33% peak hour factor as per R-t-C #67.</p>	<p>This assumption has been revised based on the survey recently conducted at the nearby development. The updated peak hour pedestrian generation have been incorporated in Table 6.1 of revised TIA (<i>Appendix III</i> refers).</p>
53.	<p>The quoted reference (8 Kai Fat Path of Tuen Mun) appears not comparable in terms of its development scale, and the pedestrian generation/attraction rates are much lower than the nearby newly proposed developments. Please advise if any other sources of traffic data can be quoted as reference.</p>	<p>The survey results of 8 Kai Fat Path, Tuen Mun has been excluded. Additional traffic generation survey was conducted, the results have been incorporated in Table 6.1 of revised TIA (<i>Appendix III</i> refers).</p>
54.	<p>R-t-C #70</p> <p>Please supplement a subsection in the TIA report to justify that shuttle service is not necessary for the proposed development.</p>	<p>Justification on not providing shuttle service for the Proposed Development have been included in Paragraph 5.40.</p>
	<p>Table 6.2 and Figure 6.1</p>	

Item	Comments	Responses
55.	The third rows in Figure 6.1 should read as "with Proposed Development".	Noted, relevant text has been revised.
56.	<p>There should be at least minimal pedestrian generation/attraction on P1, P4 and P5 instead none. Further, there will be a PTI at San Hing Road public housing development which should attract some pedestrian flow from/to the proposed development.</p> <p>Junction assessment sheets refer.</p>	<p>As advised by the Transport Operation Division of the Transport Department, the new public transport planned for San Hing Road and Hong Po Road and Tuen Mun Area 54, are to cater for their demand but not for the Proposed Development. Nevertheless, a 10% of pedestrians generated by the Proposed Development have been assumed to use P1, P4 and P5.</p>
57.	Please provide flow diagrams of the roundabouts J4 and J5 to ease reference.	Flow diagrams of the roundabouts J4 and J5 can be found in Appendix A.
58.	For J6, the naming of movement arms in the diagram does not match with the phase in the assessment table.	Noted, relevant text has been revised.
59.	<p>J12 refers. Please clarify why junction RC% of 2033 without development is lower than that of 2033 with approved scheme or 2033 with proposed scheme.</p> <p><u>Comments from TONT and BRB</u></p>	The junction analysis for J12 without development in Year 2033 has been updated.
60.	Table 4.3 refers. Please update the planned / committed developments listed.	Table 4.4 in revised TIA has been checked, which included the latest planned / committed developments.
61.	<p>Please note that Tuen Mun Area 54, San Hing Road and Hong Po Road should be excluded (e.g. para. 5.11 and 5.20) in view that (i) the concerned site have their own PTIs, (ii) the bus networks between the subject site and Tuen Mun Area 54/San Hing Road/Hong Po Road are different, and (iii) walking distance from Tuen Mun Area 54/San Hing Road/Hong Po Road to the concerned bus bay at Castle Peak Road. Re. the public transport plan under San Hing Road and Hong Po Road and Tuen Mun Area 54, new services are planned to cater for the passenger demand generated by the above developments but not this subject site.</p>	Noted and this has been excluded in Chapter 5.
62.	Para. 5.6 - 5.10 refers. It is confusing to conduct the assessment with reference to the "Net Increase" between the approved scheme and proposed	Noted, relevant text has been revised.

Item	Comments	Responses
	development. The consultant should conduct the assessment based on the latest no. of flats.	
63.	Table 5.9 refers. Please add the occupancy rate of proposed bus routes before and after the population intake. In addition, please identify and justify the proposed bus routes to be further enhanced, subject to the projected demand. It is unreasonable to assume the new population intake would only take one/two bus routes to HKI/KLN/NT without any assumption on the modal choice and passengers' preference.	<p>Table 5.9 has been revised accordingly.</p> <p>The proposed bus route has been identified by the highest demand of bus route for each district. The arrangement of the bus service will be reviewed based on the latest condition near intake of the Proposed Development and discuss with transport operator in later stage.</p> <p>The modal choice of bus for passenger of the Proposed Development was taken from the working and student population using bus as main mode in Tuen Mun, which was extracted from "Population Census 2021", and has been presented in Table 5.7 in revised TIA (<i>Appendix III</i> refers).</p>
64.	Table 5.15 refers. Table 2.7.6.1 under Vol. 9 of TPDM quoted examples of Stand Capacities in Manchester, UK and shall not be applicable to the current case. Please revise.	The assessment on length of the laybys for bus stops has been revised (Chapter 5 of the revised TIA refers).
65.	<p>Appendix B refers. Please clarify if the survey location for services from Area 54 (outbound) should be LTI - EB instead of LTI - WB.</p> <p>For KMB 960A, it has service during PM peak from HKI only. For KMB 267X, 960C and CTB 950, they have service during PM peak for Tuen Mun bound.</p> <p>For the occupancy rate, please also provide the average occupancy rate in a half-hour basis.</p> <p>Please advise the rationale of picking 0715 - 0815 hours as the surveying hours.</p>	<p>The typo has been revised.</p> <p>Appendix B has been revised accordingly.</p> <p>The average occupancy rate in a half-hour basis has been shown in Table B2 of Appendix B.</p> <p>The peak hours are determined based on the highest number of bus trips observed at the surveyed bus stops during survey hours i.e. 0700-0900 and 1800-2000. Based on the survey results, 0715-0815 and 1830-1930 have been identified as AM peak and PM peak respectively.</p>
	<u>Comments from RMD</u>	

Item	Comments	Responses
66.	<p>Table 5.13</p> <p>Why the additional boarding demand of LR Lam Tei LRT Stop (YL bound) is zero?</p>	<p>To be conservative, boarding was assumed to be zero, so that 100% would board at Lam Tei Stop (Tuen Mun bound) and travel towards Siu Hong MTR station. Nevertheless, the additional boarding demand of LRT at Lam Tei stop has now been revised to be in proportion to the surveyed boarding demand at each Lam Tei stop LRT platform.</p>
67.	<p>Table 5.14</p> <p>Which period does the utilization rate referring to? Both AM and PM peaks should be covered separately.</p>	<p>The AM and PM peak periods survey were conducted from 0700 – 0900 and 1800 – 2000 hours respectively.</p>
68.	<p>Para. 5.22</p> <p>It should refer to Table 2.7 instead of Table 2.6.</p>	<p>Noted, relevant text has been revised.</p>
69.	<p>Please use a table to illustrate the change of o/c rate during AM and PM peak for each bound service with and without the Approved Scheme / Proposed Development by 2033 (should have considered the natural growth of Light Rail demand).</p>	<p>The AM and PM peak hour occupancy rate in Year 2033 have been presented in Table 5.12 of revised TIA (<i>Appendix III</i> refers).</p>
<p><b>Comments from the Transport Department Received on 24 September 2024</b></p>		
70.	<p>Table 2.3 and Table 2.10 - Please consider to add a footnote for any reduction made due to the high HGV proportion as mentioned in the R-t-C.</p>	<p>Footnote on reduction made due to high HV proportion has been added to Tables 2.3 and 4.11 in revised TIA (<i>Appendix III</i> refers).</p>
71.	<p>Section 4.24 - The statement "The above results show that the assessed road links operate with sufficient capacity, except for Yuen Long Highway (L3) and Tuen Mun Road (L4), both which operate with V/C ratios at 1.2 or above during the AM and PM peak hours in Year 2033" is incorrect. As shown in Table 4.10, v/c of YLH (L3) is less than 1.2 in 2033.</p>	<p>Noted. The relevant paragraph has been revised accordingly.</p>
72.	<p>Section 4.24 - The statement "In view that there are <u>no</u> changes on the V/C ratios to L3 and L4 for cases without Proposed Development, with Approved Scheme and with Proposed Development" is incorrect. As shown in Table 4.10, there is a slight difference of 0.1 in v/c among different cases for L3 and L4.</p>	<p>Noted. The relevant paragraph has been revised accordingly .</p>

Item	Comments	Responses
73.	Section 4.27 - Please revise as "With the planned strategic road improvement works, both Yuen Long Highway (L3) and Tuen Mun Road (L4) are expected to operate with sufficient capacity in <del>Year 2033</del> " if appropriate.	Noted. The relevant paragraph has been revised accordingly .
<b>Comments from the District Planning Office, Planning Department Received on 24 September 2024</b>		
<u>General Comments:</u>		
74.	It is noted that the application site boundary had been revised with the latest FI dated 24.7.2024. However, the application site area is still 9,300m <sup>2</sup> as stated in the replacement page of the planning statement contained in the FI. Please clarify/confirm and update the information on application site area and update all text across all submitted documents (e.g. including but not limited to Table 3.1, Figs 2.1 and 3.4 in Supporting Planning Statement; Fig. 3.4 & Table 4.1 in VIA).	Please be kindly confirmed that the Application Site boundary is about 9,261m <sup>2</sup> , while the Development Site remains unchanged. Relevant text and drawings have been updated accordingly ( <i>Appendix IV</i> refers).
75.	Please advise the differences in site area for the original and revised application site boundary.	The Application Site boundary has been amended with reference to the comments from the District Lands Office as well as the demarcation of different coloured areas in the draft lease plan.
76.	Further to the previous comments of DO(TM), please clarify the opening hours and ancillary facilities of the proposed 3-m pedestrian footpath.	The pedestrian footpath will be opened 24 hours every day.
77.	As advised by Railway Development Section, Lands Department and Railway Development Office, Highways Department, the Applicant should consult MTRCL regarding the captioned application. Please advise (if any) the comments from MTRCL.	The Traffic Impact Assessment has included an assessment on the rail-based public transport services and concluded that the additional passenger demand created by the proposed development is negligible. The Applicant would further liaise with MTRCL along the process of the proposed development.
78.	Please update the information presented in Supporting Planning Statement to tally with the revised findings across various technical assessment (e.g. no. of trees to be felled as proposed under TPRP, parking provision under TIA etc.).	Noted. Please refer to the revised pages of the Supporting Planning Statement in <i>Appendix IV</i> .

Item	Comments	Responses
	<u>TIA</u>	
79.	Please clarify the location of loading/unloading spaces, motorcycle parking spaces and bicycle parking spaces, whether these facilities are on the underground floors and/or ground floor.	The loading/unloading bays will be located on ground floor whilst car, motorcycle and bicycle parking space will be located at the basement.
80.	Table 3.2: Please clarify the number of motorcycle parking spaces whether 14 or 18 nos.	There will be 18 nos. of motorcycle parking space.
	<u>VIA</u>	
81.	Please consider to revise “Approved Condition” to “Approved Scheme/Development”.	Noted, please refer to the replacement pages of the VIA in <i>Appendix I</i> .
82.	Viewpoints 1 and 3: Please correct the typo of “Tun Ma Line Viaduct”.	Noted, please refer to the replacement pages of the VIA in <i>Appendix I</i> .
83.	Viewpoint 4: If the existing development is hidden by the proposed development in the photomontage, please provide a remark clarifying the situation.	Noted, please refer to the replacement pages of the VIA in <i>Appendix I</i> .
84.	Please consider adopt the same photo for ‘Approved Condition’ and ‘Existing Condition’/‘Existing Condition + Proposed Development’ for same VP for all VPS.	The images that represent the approved condition are the same as (or similar to) those being considered by the TPB under the approved planning application (i.e. Y/TM-LTY/9 approved in September 2021). The differences in the background photos between the ‘Approved Condition’ and ‘Existing Condition’/‘Existing Condition + Proposed Development’ demonstrate the planning circumstance have changed over the years and more approved/committed high-rise developments will take place in the vicinity.
85.	Please supplement the planned development for the ‘Approved Scheme/Development’ for Viewpoints 5 and 7.	The images that represent the approved condition are the same as (or similar to) those being considered by the TPB under the approved planning application (i.e. Y/TM-LTY/9 approved in September 2021). The differences in the background photos between the ‘Approved Condition’ and ‘Existing Condition’/‘Existing Condition + Proposed Development’ demonstrate the planning circumstance have changed over the years and more approved/committed high-rise developments will take place in the vicinity.
86.	The VIA did not reflect all approved planning applications visible from the VPs. For example, approved planning application No. A/HSK/452 was missing. Please review the planned / approved developments in the vicinity of the application site and update the assessment as appropriate.	Noted, all approved planning applications visible from the VPs have been updated.

**Encl.:**

**Appendix I** – Replacement pages of the Visual Impact Assessment

**Appendix II** – Revised Environmental Assessment

**Appendix III** – Revised Traffic Impact Assessment

**Appendix IV** – Replacement pages of the Supporting Planning Statement

Compiled by: KTA Planning Limited

Date: 08 October 2024

File Ref: 20240913\_S3088\_RtoC\_FI(5)