

## **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-LTYT/11)**

**Further Information No. 5**

**– Response-to-Comments –**

Item	Comments	Responses
<p><b>Comments from the Highways Department Received on 25 October 2024</b></p>		
1.	<p>In the revised TIA, please confirm the applicant or the developer of the captioned development will be the implementation agent of the proposed improvement on the length of CPR bus laybys in Figure 5.2</p>	<p>The Applicant will be responsible for the implementation of the proposed improvement on the length of CPR bus laybys.</p>
<p><b>Comments from the District Planning Office, Planning Department Received on 25 October 2024</b></p>		
<p><u>Major Comments:</u></p> <p>2. Compared with the development restrictions for the existing “R(B)1” zone and the previously agreed scheme under planning application No. Y/TM-LTYT/9, the development bulk of the current application increases substantially. As such, please confirm if any planning gains/merits will be provided, such as provision of social welfare facilities, to support the current rezoning proposal.</p> <p>3. As shown on the indicative scheme, the existing local track will be improved to 7.3m wide road carriageway together with a 2m wide footpath and a 2m wide cycle track. You have responded “Noted” to the previous comments of HyD that <u>“the existing access road connecting the Site and Ng Lau Road is not a public road, the applicant should be responsible for his own access arrangement. HyD is not/shall not be responsible for the maintenance of any access connecting the Site to any public roads.”</u> Please confirm the construction/implementation, management and maintenance responsibility of the proposed road improvement works as well as the access road.</p>		

Item	Comments	Responses
4.	Similarly, please advise the future management and maintenance arrangement of the proposed footpath, i.e. by the applicant for the whole lease term or by the individual owners of the future residential development.	Responsibility of the future management and maintenance of the proposed footpath will be stated in the DMC and to be borne by the individual owners.
5.	Noted in <u>Para. 2.6, Figure 2.5 and Table 3.1 of the Supplementary Planning Statement (SPS)</u> , the applicant intends to rationalize the development potential of the private lots and available GL within the subject “R(B)1” zone. The site areas of the application site and development site are 9,261m <sup>2</sup> and 8,896m <sup>2</sup> respectively. However, it is not known why the portion of GL located at the southern tip of the application site is not included into the development site. Similarly, please also clarify why the proposed access road mentioned above is not included in the application site and/or development site.	Please be kindly confirmed that the Development Site conforms to the pink area and yellow area of the draft lease plan, while the area within the Application Site but outside the Development Site are some GL within the existing “R(B)1” zone that is coloured brown in the draft lease plan (and not included for GFA calculation). According to the conditions under the draft lease, the brown area is a right of way to be granted to the grantee to construct a paved way; the same is also a right of way given to the owners of other lots in the vicinity.
6.	Please formally clarify the latest Government land (GL) involved in the application area (in terms of site area).	Please be kindly confirmed that the application site area is about 9,261sqm (including about 2,928sqm of Government land).
7.	<u>R-to-C</u> <u>R-to-C No. 74:</u> With the application site area reduced from 9,300m <sup>2</sup> to 9,261m <sup>2</sup> , please clarify the changes in GL <u>for the application site area</u> .	GL within the Site has been reduced from 2,967sqm to 2,928sqm.
8.	<u>R-to-C No. 76:</u> Further to the response to the previous comments of DO(TM) that the proposed 3m pedestrian footpath located at the northern tip of the application site will be opened 24 hours daily. However, the ancillary facilities within the pedestrian footpath are not yet responded, please supplement.	The pedestrian footpath and the ancillary facilities (e.g. lighting) will be opened and in place 24 hours every day.
9.	<u>R-to-C No. 79:</u> Please indicate the location of the motorcycle and bicycle parking spaces on a drawings for reference.	The B1/F Plan has been updated to indicate the location of the motorcycle and bicycle parking spaces ( <i>Appendix I</i> refers).
10.	<u>R-to-C No. 82:</u> Typo of “Tun Ma Line Viaduct” is still spotted at Figure 6.3 for Viewpoint 3 of the VIA.	Figure 6.3 has been amended accordingly ( <i>Appendix III</i> refers).

Item	Comments	Responses
<u>Supporting Planning Statement (SPS)</u>		
11.	<u>Para 1.1.3, 2.6.2, Table 3.1:</u> Please rectify the typo (“9,2619,261m <sup>2</sup> ”) regarding the application site area.	The typos have been rectified ( <i>Appendix IV</i> refers).
12.	<u>Para. 2.6.2 and Table 3.1:</u> Please clarify if any changes involved to the GL with the changes in application site area.	The total of additional GL has been updated accordingly ( <i>Appendix IV</i> refers).
13.	Compare with the original SPS, please also tally all text and figures (e.g. Figures 2.4 and 5.1 in the original SPS) with the latest application site boundary.	Application Site boundary shown in Figures 2.4 and 5.1 have been updated accordingly ( <i>Appendix IV</i> refers).
<u>VIA</u>		
14.	<u>R-to-C No. 85 and 86:</u> The planned developments, including applications No. A/HSK/452 and A/TM-LTY/426 as well as the public housing development at Hong Po Road, are not indicated for the ‘Approved Scheme/Development’ for Viewpoints 5 and 7.	Please kindly note that the photomontages of the ‘Approved Scheme/Development’ were those being considered by the TPB on 24.9.2021, which was well before applications No. A/HSK/452 and A/TM-LTY/426 were being considered (i.e. 23.06.2023 and 19.05.2023 respectively). There were no planned/committed high-rise developments by that time.  The differences in the background photos demonstrate the planning circumstances have changed over the years and more approved/committed high-rise developments will take place in the vicinity. Not least, this also shows that the Proposed Development at the Site is trying to evolve with reference to the changing planning circumstances.
15.	<u>Viewpoint 5:</u> While the planned public housing development under planning application No. A/HSK/452 is now included in the photomontage, relevant discussion related to this planned development had yet been supplemented in the VIA. Please supplement relevant discussion in the VIA.	Section 6.6 has been updated accordingly ( <i>Appendix III</i> refers).
16.	<u>Table 4.1:</u> Please clarify if any changes involved to the GL with the changes in application site area.	Please be confirmed that there is no change to the GL within the Development Site stated in Table 4.1
<u>TIA</u>		

Item	Comments	Responses
17.	Please update the number of surveyed junctions as presented in the SPS to tally the information with the revised TIA.	J10 to J12 have been added to the list accordingly ( <i>Appendix IV</i> refers).
<b>Comments from the Environmental Protection Department Received on 28 October 2024 and 29 October 2024</b>		
18.	<p><u>Air Quality</u></p> <p>Section 5.2.2. The consultant please note that a new set of AQOs shall become effective in 2025 tentatively and the air quality assessment may need to make refer the new AQOs depending on when the report is finalized</p>	Noted.
19.	Section 5.4.3. <b>Please remove</b> "passive/ active" in Line 2	Section 5.4.3 has been revised ( <i>Appendix V</i> refers).
20.	Section 5.5.1. <b>Please add</b> "and air emission from Construction vehicles and machinery" to the end of the paragraph	Section 5.5.1 has been revised ( <i>Appendix V</i> refers).
21.	<p>Section 5.5.2 and 5.5.3</p> <p>- <b>Please replace</b> "dust" by "air quality" in Line 5 and 8 of Section 5.5.2 and Line 5 and 6 of Section 5.5.3</p> <p>- <b>Please replace</b> "to use" by "and use" in Line 7 of Section 5.5.2</p>	<p>- Section 5.5.2 and 5.5.3 has been revised (<i>Appendix V</i> refers).</p> <p>- Section 5.5.3 has been revised (<i>Appendix V</i> refers).</p>
22.	Section 5.6.4 and R-t-c 20. Please follow up to obtain TD's endorsement of the traffic data	TD's endorsement of traffic data will be provided once received.
23.	<p>Section 5.6.4 and R-t-c 21</p> <p>- <b>Please supplement</b> the response to Section 5.6.4: "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". Please seek TD's advice whether this is correct or not and please note that this is outside EPD's ambit</p> <p>- <b>Please clarify and state clearly</b> in Section 5.6.4 that the traffic forecast data in 2033 is before the opening of Route 11 and Tuen</p>	<p>Section 5.6.4 has been revised. The response from the previous R-t-C has been supplemented. TD's confirmation record will be provided once received.</p> <p>Section 5.6.4 has been revised. It is now stated that traffic data for years 2033, 2037, and 2045 has excluded traffic from both Route 11 and Tuen Mun Bypass projects. TD's confirmation record will be provided once received.</p>

Item	Comments	Responses
	<p>Mun Bypass hence the traffic data of year 2033 has excluded traffic from the Route 11 and Tuen Mun Bypass on the road network.</p> <p>- Please confirm that the traffic forecast data in 2033 is higher than those for year 2030 to confirm that the traffic data in 2033 would represent a worst-case scenario otherwise another scenario with 2030 traffic should be provided to determine the worst case assessment year.</p>	<p>Section 5.6.4 has been revised. The traffic forecast data in 2033 is higher than that of 2030 which would represent a worst-case scenario.</p>
24.	<p>Section 5.6.4, R-t-c 21 and 22. According to R-t-c 21, the traffic forecast data in 2033 is before the opening of Route 11 and Tuen Mun Bypass. Please clarify whether Route 11 and Tuen Mun Bypass traffic are excluded in the 2033 traffic data but are included in the 2037 and 2045 traffic data and supplement in the text</p>	<p>Section 5.6.4 has been revised (<i>Appendix V</i> refers). As confirmed by the traffic consultant, Route 11 and Tuen Mun Bypass would have an overall effect of drawing away traffic from the assessment area. Hence, as a conservative approach, traffic from the two projects is excluded from the traffic data for all three years.</p>
	<p>- (Appendix 5.2 and R-t-c 22). Please clarify whether the road network of the 2033, 2037, and 2045 are identical or there are new roads added to the network. If the road network of the 2033, 2037, and 2045 are not the same, please provide different road link maps for the different years and additional scenarios for assessment may be required if the new roads are close to the project site.</p>	<p>The road network of 2033, 2037, and 2045 within the assessment area are the same and no new roads are planned to be added to the network.</p>
25.	<p>Section 5.6.6. <b>Suggest to remove</b> "Vehicle Classifications used in EMFAC-HK" in Line 3</p>	<p>Section 5.6.6 has been revised (<i>Appendix V</i> refers).</p>
26.	<p>Section 5.6.7. <b>Suggest to replace</b> "monthly hourly minimum temperature and relative humidity" by "minimum temperature and relative humidity for each month and hour" in the first bullet</p>	<p>Section 5.6.7 has been revised (<i>Appendix V</i> refers).</p>
27.	<p>Sections 5.6.7, 5.6.8, 5.6.22. Please specify the version of SAMP used and clarify if zero emission vehicle option has been selected to compute the vehicular emissions.</p>	<p>Sections 5.6.7, 5.6.8, and 5.6.22 has been revised. SAMP v2.0 have already been used in the assessment. Clarification on the use of zero-emission vehicle option has been added to section 5.6.7.</p>
28.	<p>Section 5.6.10. <b>Suggest to revise</b> the title as: Air Modelling Approach and Methodology</p>	<p>The title for Section 5.6.10 has been revised (<i>Appendix V</i> refers).</p>

Item	Comments	Responses
29.	Section 5.6.20. Please clarify whether the latest online bus schedules and bus routes are referred to and <b>suggest adding</b> "latest" before "online bus schedules and bus routes " in Line 8-9.	The latest online bus schedule and bus routes have been referred to and clarified in Section 5.6.20 ( <i>Appendix V</i> refers).
30.	Section 5.6.24. <b>Please replace</b> "would not" by "is not expected to" in Line 15, and add "impact " after "start emission" in Line 16	Section 5.6.24 has been revised.
31.	Section 5.6.25. <b>Please replace</b> "from 4km of" by "within 4km from" in the Title.	Section 5.6.25 has been revised.
32.	Section 5.6.26. <b>Please add</b> "of the future Lam Tei Underground Quarry" after "asphalt plant" in Line 1	Section 5.6.26 has been revised.
33.	Section 5.7.1. <b>Please add</b> "representative" before "ASRs" in Line 3	Section 5.7.1 has been revised.
34.	Section 5.7.1. Please justify if all the air-sensitive uses of the proposed development can comply with the AQOs. Otherwise, please present the contour plots of air pollutants (at least NO <sub>2</sub> ) to demonstrate full compliance of AQOs.	Section 5.7.1 has been revised. Assessment points have been assigned along the site boundary, except the northern and southern tips of the Application Site where no air sensitive uses are proposed. No exceedance of AQOs is predicted at the representative ASRs, hence, it is anticipated that all the air-sensitive uses of the Proposed Development within the Application Site boundary would comply with the AQOs.
35.	Section 5.9.2 - <b>Please replace</b> "all heights" by "all assessment heights" in Line 5. Please clarify whether the assessment height of 1.5 to 105 mAG has covered all air sensitive uses of the 27 storeys building - <b>Please replace</b> "all pollutants" by "RSP, FSP, NO <sub>2</sub> , SO <sub>2</sub> " in Line 5	Section 5.9.2 has been revised. The Proposed Development have a maximum building height of 107.8 mPD, while the modelled assessment heights ranged from 8.20 mPD to 111.7 mPD (with 6.70 mPD base elevation considered). Hence, the assessment heights of 1.5 to 105 mAG have covered all air sensitive uses of the 27 storey building.  Section 5.9.2 has been revised. "all pollutants" have been replaced by "RSP, FSP, NO <sub>2</sub> , SO <sub>2</sub> ".
36.	Figure 5.4. <b>Please indicate</b> clearly the road links with start and without start emissions in the figure or add a new map.	The map showing road links with start and without start emissions has been included in Appendix 5.2. Reference to Appendix 5.2 has been added to <b>Section 5.6.17</b> .
37.	Figure 5.6. <b>Please supplement</b> the date of the latest APCP	The location of the major point source at the asphalt plant of Lam Tei Quarry is now referenced from the modelling files available on SAMP v2.0.

Item	Comments	Responses
38.	<p>Appendix 5.7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Please supplement</b> the date of the latest Specified Process License of the Asphalt Plant at Lam Tei Quarry</li> <li>- The NO<sub>x</sub>, RSP, FSP emission rate, emission height, and exit velocity for EP1 do not tally with those from the latest SP-Licence of the Asphalt plant at Lam Tei Quarry (2023). Please check.</li> </ul> <p><u>Comment on Emfac Modelling</u></p>	<p>The note in Figure 5.6 has been revised.</p> <p>The information of the major point source (i.e. AEP1) at the asphalt plant of Lam Tei Quarry has been obtained from the modelling files available on SAMP v2.0 and the SPL document of SPL no. L-15-041(2) available on the online SP Licence register under the Central Environmental Database (CED).</p> <p>The NO<sub>x</sub>, RSP, FSP emission rates, emission heights, and exit velocities for AEP1 have been revised according to the modelling files available on SAMP v2.0. The model has been re-run.</p>
39.	<p>Response-to-Comments #34 TD's endorsement for traffic data is to be provided.</p>	<p>TD's endorsement of traffic data will be provided once received.</p>
40.	<p>Calculation Excel "PTI Assessment_LT_v6.0" Worksheets "FTE" &amp; "SHE", Running and Idling Emissions of Bypass Buses are not taken into account. Please confirm that there is no Bypass Bus entering the Bus Termini.</p> <p><u>AERMOD Model</u></p>	<p>Based on the findings of site survey in 2023 and latest bus route information online, there are no bypass buses at both bus termini. Hence, 'Running and Idling Emissions of Bypass Buses' has not been included in the calculation of emissions of bus termini.</p>
41.	<p>AERMOD Model Chimney – The adopted exhaust temperature and exit velocity of Emission Point ID D1 are different from the referred EIA for Development at San Hing Road and Hong Po Road, Tuen Mun (No. AEIAR-227/2020). Please revise and rerun the model.</p> <p><u>Textual Comments</u></p>	<p>The adopted exhaust temperature and exit velocity of Emission Point S1 have been revised with reference to the approved EIA report (AEIAR-227/2020). The model has been re-run.</p>
42.	<p><b>Appendix 5.1</b> – Please also present the minimum RH and temperature among 20,43 21,43 21,44 which is generated in Summary.xlsx from SAMP. A footnote should be added to explain the minimum RH and temperature among the 3 grids is adopted for Road L013 spanning across the 3 grids.</p>	<p>Appendix 5.1 has been revised. The minimum RH and temperature among 20,43 21,43 21,44 have been presented. The footnote has been added to explain the minimum RH and temperature among the 3 grids is adopted for Road L013 spanning across the 3 grids.</p>
43.	<p><b>Appendix 5.3 Inventory of Open Roads for 2030 EMFAC x 2033 Traffic</b> – Please change the table name "Inventory of Open Roads</p>	<p>Appendix 5.3 has been revised (<i>Appendix V</i> refers). The table name has been revised to "Modelling Parameters of Open Roads for 2030 EMFAC x 2033 Traffic".</p>

Item	Comments	Responses
44.	<p>for 2030 EMFAC x 2033 Traffic” to “Modelling Parameters of Open Roads for 2030 EMFAC x 2033 Traffic”</p> <p><b>Appendix 5.3 Inventory of Open Roads for 2030 EMFAC x 2033 Traffic</b> – The presented values in the Appendix 5.3 do not match the values in the model, for example:</p> <p>(i) xy coordinates: Index 2, 10 - 13, 72, 82, 83, 86 - 89, 114, 115, 118 – 125, 185 – 190, 198 200, 201, 411 – 413, 424 – 426</p> <p>(ii) Modelled Width: Index 39 – 41, 44- 45, 190 Please check, revise and ensure all the presented values in the appendix match with those in model.</p>	<p>(i) Appendix 5.3 has been revised. XY coordinates for Index 2, 10 - 13, 72, 82, 83, 86 - 89, 114, 115, 118 – 125, 185 – 190, 198 200, 201, 411 – 413, 424 – 426 generated by SAMP is presented in the Appendix excel.</p> <p>(ii) Appendix 5.3 has been revised. Modelled width for Index 39 – 41, 44- 45, 190 generated by SAMP is presented in the Appendix.</p>
45.	<p><b>Appendix 5.3 Summary of Open Road Emission Rates Generated from SAMP</b> – Please only present the emission rates adopted in the model (i.e. MonthlyHourMin) and delete the unused ones to avoid confusion.</p>	<p>Appendix 5.3 has been revised. Only the modelled emission rates are presented (i.e. NO MonthlyHourMin, NO2 MonthlyHourMin, RSP AnnualHourMin, and FSP AnnualHourMin)</p>
46.	<p><b>Appendix 5.6 Emission Inventory for AERMOD Model Start Emission Outside Bus Terminus (Year 2030)</b> – Please revise the incorrect xy coordinates of FTEAS207.</p>	<p>Appendix 5.6 has been revised. The coordinates of FTEAS207 have been updated in the appendix.</p>
47.	<p><b>Section 5.6.16</b> – Please remove “Therefore, the alignment of the road section has been shifted by a distance of 1.5m... in the AERMOD model.” This sentence is not universally true. The shifting distance of the road section depends much on the DCL.</p>	<p>Section 5.6.16 has been revised (<i>Appendix V</i> refers).</p>
48.	<p><b>Section 5.6.31 to Section 5.6.33</b> – Please note that Section 5.6.31 to 5.6.33 could be mistakenly comprehended as the predicted <math>[NO_2]</math> = <math>[NO_2]</math> predicted vehicle + <math>[NO_2]</math> predicted chimney, which is not necessarily true. Suggest to combine Section 5.6.31 to Section 5.6.33 into 1 paragraph and express the cumulative <math>[NO_2]</math> in one equation as below:  <math>[NO_2]_{\text{predicted}} = ([NO_2]_{\text{initial vehicle}} + 10\% [NO_x]_{\text{initial chimney}}) + \text{Min} \{([NO]_{\text{initial vehicle}} + 90\% [NO_x]_{\text{initial chimney}}) \text{ or } 46/48 [O_3]_{\text{PATH}}\}</math></p>	<p>Noted. Sections 5.6.31 to 5.6.33 have been combined and the cumulative <math>NO_2</math> equation has been revised as suggested.</p>

Item	Comments	Responses																								
49.	<b>Appendix 5.7, Figure 5.6, Section 5.6.25 to 5.6.27</b> – Please provide the date of the APCP and the license number of the SP License referred to for our further comments.	The information of the major point source (i.e. AEP1) at the asphalt plant of Lam Tei Quarry is now obtained from the modelling files available on SAMP v2.0 and the SPL document of SPL no. L-15-041(2) available on the online SP Licence register under the Central Environmental Database (CED).																								
<b>Comments of Transport Department Received on 7 November 2024</b>																										
50.	Sect 4.10 refers. It should read as “ <u>Table 4.2</u> shows that the annual average traffic growth of 0.66%”.	Paragraph 4.10 has been revised ( <i>Appendix VI</i> refers).																								
51.	Sect 4.22 refers. It appears traffic generation figures shown in Figure 4.3 refers to the overall of the Proposed Development as per Table 4.6, instead of the net increase as per Table 4.8. If affirmative, Item C should be revised as [A] + estimated traffic generation by Proposed Development + Additional Bus Trips for clarity.	Paragraph 4.22 is revised ( <i>Appendix VI</i> refers).																								
52.	Table 4.10 refers. RC% of J12 which will be constructed by CEDD CE 39/2021 (CE) appears to be on the very high side for the three scenarios. Please review.	The junction capacity analysis for J12 has been revised and this can be found in <b>Appendix A</b> . The revised TIA has been amended accordingly ( <i>Appendix VI</i> refers).																								
53.	Table 5.4 and 5.5 refer. Please review the derived generation and attraction of PM peak.	<p>Although the results of AM attraction and sPM generation of road-based public transport demand are the same. These are estimated with reference to the adopted pedestrian generation rates in Table 6.1 of revised TIA. Tables R2C1 and R2C2 show the calculation to achieve the results presented in Tables 5.4 and 5.5.</p> <p>TABLE R2C1 CALCULATION ON ESTIMATED ROAD-BASED PUBLIC TRANSPORT DEMAND</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1108 1193 2107 1468"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Calculation</th> <th colspan="2">AM Peak</th> <th colspan="2">PM Peak</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Generation</th> <th>Attraction</th> <th>Generation</th> <th>Attraction</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>AM peak road-based public transport demand (2-way) (from <b>Table 5.1</b>) [a]</td> <td>301</td> <td>301</td> <td>301</td> <td>301</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Conversion between AM and PM peak using adopted 2-way pedestrian generation rate (from <b>Table 6.1</b>) [b]</td> <td>= 0.9273 / 0.9273 =100%</td> <td>= 0.9273 / 0.9273 =100%</td> <td>= 0.7233 / 0.9273 =78%</td> <td>= 0.7233 / 0.9273 =78%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Conversion to “generation” and “attraction” using adopted pedestrian generation rate in respective peak (from <b>Table 6.1</b>) [c]</td> <td>= 0.6581 / 0.9273 =71%</td> <td>= 0.2692 / 0.9273 =29%</td> <td>= 0.2662 / 0.7233 =37%</td> <td>= 0.4571 / 0.7233 =63%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Calculation	AM Peak		PM Peak		Generation	Attraction	Generation	Attraction	AM peak road-based public transport demand (2-way) (from <b>Table 5.1</b> ) [a]	301	301	301	301	Conversion between AM and PM peak using adopted 2-way pedestrian generation rate (from <b>Table 6.1</b> ) [b]	= 0.9273 / 0.9273 =100%	= 0.9273 / 0.9273 =100%	= 0.7233 / 0.9273 =78%	= 0.7233 / 0.9273 =78%	Conversion to “generation” and “attraction” using adopted pedestrian generation rate in respective peak (from <b>Table 6.1</b> ) [c]	= 0.6581 / 0.9273 =71%	= 0.2692 / 0.9273 =29%	= 0.2662 / 0.7233 =37%	= 0.4571 / 0.7233 =63%
Calculation	AM Peak			PM Peak																						
	Generation	Attraction	Generation	Attraction																						
AM peak road-based public transport demand (2-way) (from <b>Table 5.1</b> ) [a]	301	301	301	301																						
Conversion between AM and PM peak using adopted 2-way pedestrian generation rate (from <b>Table 6.1</b> ) [b]	= 0.9273 / 0.9273 =100%	= 0.9273 / 0.9273 =100%	= 0.7233 / 0.9273 =78%	= 0.7233 / 0.9273 =78%																						
Conversion to “generation” and “attraction” using adopted pedestrian generation rate in respective peak (from <b>Table 6.1</b> ) [c]	= 0.6581 / 0.9273 =71%	= 0.2692 / 0.9273 =29%	= 0.2662 / 0.7233 =37%	= 0.4571 / 0.7233 =63%																						

Item	Comments	Responses				
		Estimated Road-Based Public Transport Demand [d] = [a] x [b] x [c]	301 x 100% x 71% = 213.71, says 214	301 x 100% x 29% = 87.29, says 87	301 x 78% x 37% = 86.87, says 87	301 x 78% x 63% = 147.91, says 148
		301 (2-way)		235 (2-way)		
TABLE R2C2 CALCULATION ON ESTIMATED RAIL-BASED PUBLIC TRANSPORT DEMAND						
		<b>Calculation Step</b>	<b>AM Peak</b>		<b>PM Peak</b>	
			<b>Generation</b>	<b>Attraction</b>	<b>Generation</b>	<b>Attraction</b>
		AM peak rail-based public transport demand (2-way) (from Table 5.1) [a]	348	348	348	348
		Conversion between AM and PM peak using adopted 2-way pedestrian generation rate (from Table 6.1) [b]	= 0.9273 / 0.9273 =100%	= 0.9273 / 0.9273 =100%	= 0.7233 / 0.9273 =78%	= 0.7233 / 0.9273 =78%
		Conversion to "generation" and "attraction" using adopted pedestrian generation rate in respective peak (from Table 6.1) [c]	= 0.6581 / 0.9273 =71%	= 0.2692 / 0.9273 =29%	= 0.2662 / 0.7233 =37%	= 0.4571 / 0.7233 =63%
		Estimated Rail-Based Public Transport Demand [d] = [a] x [b] x [c]	348 x 100% x 71% = 247.08, says 247	348 x 100% x 29% = 100.92, says 101	348 x 78% x 37% = 100.43, says 100	348 x 78% x 63% = 171.01, says 172
		348 (2-way)		272 (2-way)		
54.	Table 6.3 refers. Please adopt and specify the same unit of the assessed flow / flow rate as per Table 2.9.	Table 6.3 has been revised accordingly ( <i>Appendix VI</i> refers).				
55.	Sect 7.7 refers. Please supplement that construction of footpath and cycle track on top of the unnamed access road as another improvement work.	Section 7.7 has been updated accordingly ( <i>Appendix VI</i> refers).				
56.	Junction assessment for J4 and J5 refer. To ease referencing, the flow diagrams should indicate the name of movement arms.	The flow diagrams for J4 and J5 have been revised ( <i>Appendix VI</i> refers).				
<b>Comments from RMD, Transport Department Received on 7 November 2024</b>						
57.	Table 2.6 – Please indicate that maximum and existing carrying capacity are calculated under 6 ppsm	Footnote in Table 2.6 has been revised accordingly ( <i>Appendix VI</i> refers).				

Item	Comments	Responses
58.	<p>Para. 5.29 – From Table 5.12, under the scenario with the proposed development, the LR service (TM bound) will reach a o/c rate of 97%. To address the issue, it is suggested to convert single LRV to coupled-set LRV. Due to the high passenger demand during peak hours, the additional LRV deployment may not be feasible. Please examine if other PT services shall be further enhanced.</p>	<p>Although the estimated occupancy of the light rail services Tuen Mun bound would reach 97% in AM peak and Yuen Long bound would reach 90% in PM peak at Lam Tei LRT Stop in Year 2033, some measures could be adopted relieve the occupancy, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1106 379 2123 544">(1) The planned Hung Shui Kiu MTR Station of Tuen Ma Line will be completed in Year 2030; and (2) Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area (“HSKNDA”) will provide (i) Smart and Green Transit System”, and (ii) pedestrian network connecting to Hung Shui Kiu and Tin Shui Wai MTR Stations.</li> </ol> <p>With the above planned public transport facilities, feeder service passenger demand to Siu Hong MTR Station in HSKNDA (including Nai Wai, Chung Uk Tsuen and Hung Shui Kiu LRT stops, is expected to be diverted. Hence, the occupancies of the LR services (both Tuen Mun and Yuen Long bound) are expected to reduce.</p> <p>Based on the on-site observation at Siu Hong LRT stop, over 50% of the existing LRT (Tuen Mun bound) passengers would interchange at the Siu Hong Station, to switch to the Tuen Ma Line, and vice versa to Yuen Long bound. In view that the planned Hung Shui Kiu Station is located to the north of the LRT service, it is assumed that 25% of total occupancy will be diverted to the planned Hung Shui Kiu MTR Station. As a result, the year 2033 LRT (Tuen Mun bound) occupancy at Lam Tei LRT Stop is expected to reduce from 97% to 74% (calculation: <math>97\% \times (100\% - 25\%)</math>). For Yuen Long bound, the year 2033 LRT occupancy at Lam Tei LRT Stop is expected to reduce from 90% to 68% (calculation: <math>90\% \times (100\% - 25\%)</math>).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1106 1161 2123 1358">2. Year 2024 of LRT occupancy survey at the Lam Tei LRT stop found that 10 out of 24 Tuen Mun bound LRT trips have occupancies which are less than 80% (Appendix B in revised TIA refers). In addition, it is observed that the busiest period occurred between 0730 and 0800 hours, additional trips could be considered in conjunction with the actual passenger demand.</li> </ol> <p>It is noted that at present two scheduled 751P (from Tin Yat to Siu Hong) trips are operated during the AM peak. To further enhance the capacity at</p>

Item	Comments	Responses
		<p>the LRT Lam Tei LRT Stop (Tuen Mun bound) in the AM peak, additional special departure of LRT route 751P, i.e., from Tin Yat to Siu Hong, could be considered. Hence, the LRT (Tuen Mun bound) passenger demand of the Proposed Development could be accommodated.</p> <p>In view that the Proposed Development is a small-scale development, the passenger demand generated would have negligible impact to the occupancy of the LRT service; hence, the Proposed Development is considered acceptable.</p>
<p><b>Comments from TONT and BRB, Transport Department Received on 11 November 2024</b></p>		
59.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The occupancy rate of proposed bus routes before the population intake was not indicated in Table 5.9.</li> <li>● It is unreasonable to assume the new population intake generated will only take one/two bus routes to HKI/KLN/NT. Consultant shall provide assessment with assumptions on the modal choice and passengers' preference to bus routes along CPR based on the assumption provided in para 5.18.</li> </ul>	<p>The occupancy rate of the bus routes before and after the population intake is now included in Table 5.10 of revised TIA (<i>Appendix VI</i> refers).</p> <p>The relevant paragraphs have been revised in Chapter 5. The assessment is now assessed with reference to existing service.</p>
60.	<p>Table 5.15 and 5.16 refers. Please advise the calculation of "average dwell time".</p> <p>In addition, only AM peak hour transport demand was forecasted. Please advise the calculation basis for 4 bus trips in PM peak. According to table 5.4, there are fewer number of passengers in PM peak.</p>	<p>The average dwell time is calculated by sum of time of each bus (1) approaching to the bus stop, (2) boarding / alighting at the bus stop, (3) departing from the bus stop, and divided by total number of bus conducted boarding / alighting during peak hours.</p> <p>The road-based public transport demand in AM and PM peaks have been estimated in Table 5.10 in the revised TIA (<i>Appendix V</i> refers). Based on the latest assessment, additional bus trips are proposed for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- KMB 68A outward bound in AM peak;</li> <li>- KMB 63X inward bound in PM peak; and</li> <li>- KMB 63X inward bound in PM peak.</li> </ul>
61.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The occupancy rate [c] in Table B2 shall be revised: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ GMB 42 (to other districts) (AM peak)</li> <li>■ GMB 42 (from other districts) (AM peak)</li> <li>■ GMB 42 (to other districts) (PM peak)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Table B2 has been updated accordingly (<i>Appendix VI</i> refers).</p>

Item	Comments	Responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The direction of Table B1 and B2 shall be revised as “<b>Outward bound</b>” and “<b>Inward bound</b>” instead of “To other districts” and “From other districts”. GMB 42 is provided intra-district services between Tsing Chuen Wai and Tuen Mun Town Centre.</li> </ul>	Tables B1 and B2 have been updated.
	Please show the total of capacities [a] and occupied [b] in both tables according to table 2.5.	Tables 2.5, B1 and B2 have been updated accordingly.
62.	<p>Table 2.4 refers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are only 6 departures for CTB 55 during AM peak on normal weekdays.</li> <li>The frequency of CTB 56 (both bounds) is 20-30 mins.</li> <li>The frequency of CTB 56A is 10-20 mins (Fanling bound) and 15-30 mins (Tuen Mun bound).</li> <li>The frequency of KMB 68A is 12-30 mins.</li> <li>3 departures of KMB 960P (Tuen Mun bound).</li> <li>The frequency of KMB N260 is 30 mins.</li> </ul>	Table 2.4 has been updated accordingly ( <i>Appendix VI</i> refers).
63.	Table 5.4 refers. Please advise the calculation of “Generation” and “Attraction”.	Please refer to our responses-to-comments <b>item 53</b> .
64.	Table 5.9 refers. Notes (3), ...”2 buses routes to be-is providing services...”	The assessment method has been updated and the relevant table has been omitted.
65.	<p>Para 5.38 refers. Please advise the rationale for extending the length of bus stop given the utilization rate stated in table 5.15.</p> <p>Please also review para 7.7.</p>	<p>Based on the latest bus utilization result, the bus laybys would have sufficient capacity in year 2033. Hence, the relevant paragraphs have been omitted.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.7 has been updated (<i>Appendix VI</i> refers).</p>
66.	Figure 5.1 refers. The arrows were incorrect. Please revise.	Figure 5.1 has been revised ( <i>Appendix VI</i> refers).
67.	Table B2 refers. Missing bound under GMB 42’s survey location.	Table B2 has been updated ( <i>Appendix VI</i> refers).

Item	Comments	Responses
68.	<p><b>Additional Comment from BRB</b>            Para. 5.11 - 5.19 refers. It should take into account the service level and occupancy rate of the existing bus routes and assess whether they could absorb the demand generated by the new population intake. If the additional demand can be catered by existing service, it might not be reasonable to deploy additional trip to cater for the new population intake exclusively.</p>	<p>The relevant paragraphs have been revised in Chapter 5. The assessment is now assessed with reference to existing service.</p>
<p><b>Comments of Drainage Services Department            Received on 8 November 2024</b></p>		
69.	<p>Please find our comments on the DIA as follows:            B1 – Noted. No further comment.</p>	<p>The no further comment is noted.</p>
70.	<p>B2 – Please clarify the mechanism of stormwater storage tank and whether pumping equipment is required. It seems that the tank is 4m in depth which would be possible submerged if pumps are not equipped.</p>	<p>Pumping equipment will be provided for the stormwater storage tank</p>
<p><b>Comments of Home Affairs Department            Received on 7 November 2024</b></p>		
71.	<p>Without possessing necessary technical knowledge, this office does not have specific comments on the planning proposal, provided that the proposed 24/7 public access is barrier-free, has adequate road utilities (e.g. street light and trash bin). The public access should also be maintained by the applicant.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p><b>Further Comments from the Environmental Protection Department            Received on 15 November 2024</b></p>		
72.	<p>Section 5.5.3. Please add "adverse" before "cumulative" in line 6.</p>	<p>Section 5.5.3 has been revised (<i>Appendix V</i> refers).</p>
73.	<p>Section 5.5.4. Please make reference to the assessment results of other project with similar nature of STP as support to confirm no adverse odour impact on the nearby ASRs including the air-sensitive uses of the proposed development since it is a STP. Please also provide the nearest separation distance between the exhaust and ASRs.</p>	<p>The location of the exhaust will be located at the southwestern side of the Development Site boundary as shown in a newly added Figure 5.9. The shortest separation distance (~18m) to the nearby planned ASRs within the Proposed Development and existing ASRs is shown in Figure 5.9.</p> <p>The available reference of STP odour assessment results is from a project with less population and therefore the capacity of the STP is substantially smaller than the one for the Proposed Development, which is therefore not suitable for</p>

Item	Comments	Responses
		<p>reference. Instead, odour assessment results from sewage treatment works with larger treatment capacity have been quoted for reference.</p> <p>With reference to Table 3.3 of the Approved EIA report “Expansion of Sha Tau Kok Sewage Treatment Works (AEIAR-207/2017)”, the shortest separation distance between the nearest ASR (i.e. A8) and site boundary of the sewage treatment works with a design ADWF of 5000m<sup>3</sup>/day is 20m. The predicted 5-second odour concentrations at the ASR A8 would be in the range of 0.03OU to 0.13OU at the heights of 1.5m to 10.5m above ground as stated in Table 3.7 of the approved EIA report AEIAR-207/2017, which is well below the odour criterion of 5OU.</p> <p>With reference to Table 3.4 of the approved EIA report “Outlying Island Sewerage Stage 2 - Upgrading of Cheung Chau Sewage Collection, Treatment and Disposal Facilities (AEIAR-181/2013)”, the separation distance between the downwind location (i.e. ASR CCSTW_DW) at Cheung Chau Sewage Treatment Works with a design ADWF of 9800 m<sup>3</sup>/day and the works area is 18m. The predicted 5-second odour concentrations at the downwind location would be in the range of 1.2OU to 3.5OU at the heights of 1.5m to 25m above ground as stated in Table 3.12 of the approved EIA report AEIAR-181/2013, which is also well below the odour criterion of 5OU.</p> <p>The design ADWF of STKSTW is 5000m<sup>3</sup>/day and the design ADWF of Cheung Chau STW is 9800 m<sup>3</sup>/day, which are ~4 times and ~9 times of the proposed STP (i.e. 1131 m<sup>3</sup>/day) respectively. Therefore, it is considered as a conservative approach to review the potential odour impacts due to the proposed STP by making reference to the odour impact assessment findings of the above approved EIA reports concerning STKSTW and Cheung Chau STW. Given i) both STWs are of similar treatment design to the proposed STP (i.e. MBR treatment), ii) the proposed STP will be located underground, iii) comparatively lower sewage generation of the proposed STP and iv) similar separation distances between the proposed STP and nearby ASRs, the potential odour impact at the nearby ASRs is expected to be conservatively comparable to those predicted at the ASRs A8 and CCSTW-DW in the two approved EIA, i.e. well below the odour criterion of 5OU. Deodorisation equipment to remove at least 99% (for H<sub>2</sub>S) of odour from the ventilation</p>

Item	Comments	Responses
74.	Sections 5.5.10 and 5.6.20, Appendix 5.6 (remarks 1 and 8). Please carry out an updated site survey for the two bus termini since the last survey was conducted about a year ago.	<p>exhaust will also be provided, therefore no adverse odour impact on the nearby ASRs including the ASRs of the Proposed Development is expected.</p> <p>Section 5.5.10 has been reordered as Section 5.5.14.</p> <p>A site survey has been conducted in Nov 2024 to verify the findings. Sections 5.5.14, 5.6.20 and 5.6.24 have been revised.</p>
75.	Sections 5.5.12 and 5.6.26. Please check if more updated information is available now for the Lam Tei Underground Quarry project for assessment. On the other hand, the consultant may review if there is any direct impact on the proposed development owing to the terrain and high rise buildings in between.	<p>Section 5.5.12 has been reordered as Section 5.5.16.</p> <p>The most updated and best available information for Lam Tei Underground Quarry project is still its Project Profile (PP-669/2024) and SPL information (SP Licence no. L-15-041(2)) from SAMP v2.0 and the online SP Licence register on CED. No notable terrain and high-rise buildings are identified in between the Proposed Development and the Lam Tei Underground Quarry site.</p> <p>Section 5.5.16 has been revised.</p>
76.	Section 5.6.4 and R-t-c 5. Please follow up to obtain TD's endorsement of the traffic data. Other than the increase in traffic, please also confirm if there is no alternation/demolition of roads close to the proposed development before Year 2033 owing to the new road network to be implemented in Year 2033.	<p>TD's endorsement of the traffic data will be provided once available. As confirmed by the traffic consultant, there are no alternation/demolition of roads close to the proposed development before Year 2033 owing to the new road network to be implemented in Year 2033.</p>
77.	<p>Section 5.6.4 and R-t-c 6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please confirm and add "and TD" after "confirmed by the traffic consultant" in Line 12</li> </ul>	<p>Section 5.6.4 has been revised.</p>
78.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Line 15-17). Please clarify whether Route 11 and Tuen Mun Bypass would have an overall effect of drawing away traffic from the assessment area is valid for all years from 2033 to 2045 hence excluding traffic from the Route 11 and Tuen Mun Bypass for year 2037 and 2045 is a conservative approach</li> </ul>	<p>The overall effect of drawing away traffic from the assessment area due to Route 11 and Tuen Mun Bypass is valid for traffic data of Year 2033, Year 2033 and Year 2045, therefore excluding traffic from the Route 11 and Tuen Mun Bypass for Years 2037 and 2045 is a conservative approach. Section 5.6.4 has been revised.</p>

Item	Comments	Responses
79.	Table 5.9. The FSP emission burden should not be higher than the RSP emission burden. Please check whether this is correct.	The typo in Table 5.9 has been revised.
80.	Section 5.7.1. Please present the contour plots of the annual NO <sub>2</sub> at the worst hit level to ensure that the air-sensitive uses of the proposed development will not be subject to adverse air quality impact. If this project will need to follow the new AQOs, the annual FSP contour plot at the worst hit level shall also be presented. <u>Comment on Air Modelling</u>	The contour plots at the worst hit level (6.7mPD +1.5mAG) for annual NO <sub>2</sub> and annual FSP have been presented in Figures 5.7 to 5.8.
81.	Section 5.6.31 - Please revise the typo “[NO <sub>2</sub> ] predicted vehicle” to “[NO <sub>2</sub> ] predicted” in the equation.	The typo has been revised.
82.	Appendix 5.3 Inventory of Open Roads for 2030 EMFAC x 2033 Traffic – The presented values of modelled width for Index 39 – 41, 44 - 45 still do not match the values in the model. Please revise.	Noted and reviewed. The presented values now match with the values in the model.

**Encl.:****Appendix I** – Updated Indicative Architectural Drawings**Appendix II** – Updated Landscape Master Plan**Appendix III** – Replacement pages of the Visual Impact Assessment**Appendix IV** – Replacement pages of the Supporting Planning Statement**Appendix V** – Revised Environmental Assessment**Appendix VI** – Revised Traffic Impact Assessment

Compiled by: KTA Planning Limited

Date: 20 November 2024

File Ref: 20241028\_S3088\_RtoC\_FI(6)