Responses-to-Comments Table

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
28.8.2023	Drainage Services Department (DSD) CE/MN of DSD (Contact Person: Mr. Samuel Wang; Tel: 2300 1135)	1. It is shown that catchment runoff from subcatchment C1, although is to be captured by an existing channel at the north of the site, is inevitably through the proposed site as it converges to the existing streamcourse. With the available structural layout (section Y-Y) provided, the decking of the existing streamcourse would suggest that the streamcourse would become more like a pipe flow, rather than an open channel flow where the floodplain adjoining the channel may be utilised in case of small scale overflow. Inadequacy of the section of such channel would potentially lead to flooding at the immediate upstream of the system. However, no hydraulic check has been provided in terms of the natural streamcourse section with the site. Please provide further elaboration on the respective hydraulic performance to ease any concern and suspicion of the flood risk related to the proposed development.	We aim to clarify and expound upon the proposed development to ensure absolute clarity and avoid any potential confusion. Please refer to the cover letter and the Appendices for details. We are aware that the subcatchment C1 runoff will likely flow to the watercourse adjacent to the Site Boundary and eventually flow to the watercourse within the site. The watercourse within the site is not like a pipe flow as it is not a full water flow in a closed conduits or circular cross section. It is remained no change as an open channel. As shown in the Section drawing (see **Appendix 2**), there is void space as deck over area, not covering or restricting the watercourse like a pipe. A typical section is provided for easy reference (see **Appendix 2**). As shown, watercourses within and adjacent to the Site are able to flow as its existing condition, no changes had been made to the watercourse due to the development as all the additional runoff due to the development are stored in the underground storage tank. There are also perimeter U-channels all along the boundary of the site which had been designed with additional capacity that can cater additional flow, such as overland flow if any, and they will be leading

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
			into the underground storage tank. The storage tank has also been sized with 15% additional buffer storage for contingency. No adverse drainage impact is anticipated. The capacity of the existing stream within the site area is checked. (see **Appendix 3**) The runoff from Catchment A, part of the Catchment C1 and Catchment C2 is considered in the capacity checking of the existing stream within the site. With reference to the estimation under 50 years return period calculated to our best estimation based on the available information, the utilization rate of the existing channel under existing situation and after the proposed development is 45.6% to 92.6% and 42.7% to 90.3% respectively. The above calculation has taken into account the 10% sedimentation. No adverse flooding risk is anticipated upon the completion of the proposed works. Considering that the existing topography would remain almost the same with the proposed temporary structure and no adverse flooding risk is anticipated upon the completion of the proposed works as supported by the technical assessment. Being the operator/user of the proposed development, the applicant is also committed to taking all necessary measures to prevent any potential flooding issues to ensure the smooth and safe operation of the proposed use.

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
		2. It is noted from the existing topography in Appendix 2 and formation level in Figure 3-2 that the site formation level would be altered to be equivalent or higher than the adjacent areas including areas in catchment C3 and C1 after proposed development. Further to your RtC, please advise how the overland flow could follow the existing flow path to the existing watercourse within the site area. Please also clarify if the flow path of the tributary from the northwest of the site to the watercourse within the site would be affected under the site formation level proposal.	The site formation level is only higher than adjacent areas locally within the site area, but there is no change to the level of the watercourses. The building is decked over as shown in the typical section attached. There is no change to the flow path for the runoff from subcatchment C3 and C1 before and after the proposed development. In fact overland flow from Subcatchment C1 will flow from catchment C1 flow to the watercourse adjacent to the Site boundary and eventually flow to the watercourse inside the site following existing flow path. If any runoff not captured, it will flow into the perimeter drain within the site, the levels are same as existing ground level. No change from existing condition. Overland flow from C3 is about 0.132m^3/s, if any will be collected into perimeter drain section CP11 to CP14 and they are shown to have more than 0.132m^3/s capacity in each of the U-channel segments.
		3. Appendix F – Please advise if adequate headroom is reserved for future maintenance of the existing watercourse within the site.	As shown in the typical section drawing (see **Appendix 2**), adequate headroom which is essentially the deck over area. The detailed design will be subject to scrutiny during GBP submission, with consultation with DSD as deemed necessary.

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
19.9.2023	Drainage Services Department (DSD) CE/MN of DSD (Contact Person: Mr. Samuel Wang; Tel: 2300 1135)	1. It is noted from the hydraulic checking that some parts (e.g. 1a to 1; 1 to 2; 2 to 3) were not included in the submission. Please supplement as appropriate.	Updated. The hydraulic checking of parts 1a to 1, 1 to 2 and 2 to 3 are included in the submission (see **Appendix 3**).
		2. Please advise the actual condition of the existing stream. One of the assumptions is that the bedding material is taken as trapezoidal shotcreted channel. Please justify, with site photo if possible.	Site photos (Photo 1 to 7) taken in 2022 showing the actual conditions are attached in the hydraulic checking document for reference. The photos also show the trapezoidal channel appeared to be concrete-lined (see **Appendix 3**).
		3. Runoff from sub-catchment B is not adopted in the calculation. Please advise the respective flow path and confirm if it should be considered.	Runoff from sub-catchment B is not adopted in the calculation because it does not flow into the sections of watercourse involved in the hydraulic checking. Flow path of sub-catchment B is indicated in Figure 1.1. As shown in Photo 8 to 10, there is an existing drainage channel to collect the runoff along sub-catchment B separately (see **Appendix 3**).

Date	Department	Comments	Responses
1.8.2023	Transport Department (TD)	• Section 3.2.2. - The applicant shall justify why no traffic survey was conducted but to apply a growth factor to 2018 surveyed data to obtain the base-line traffic flow condition. • Table 3.2 - The DFC for Po Shek Wu Road Interchange (i.e. Tai Tau Leng Roundabout) in year 2022 seems to be on the high side. Please review. • Figure 2.4 - It seems that the existing street furniture, e.g beam barrier, type II railing, etc. will obstruct the proposed ingress and egress on Lo Wu Station Road. Please indicate any required modification works on the drawing and confirm these modification works are technically feasible. Please also check if the proposed ingress / egress would affect any existing access. 1. Please be informed that the design year of the TIA should be 3 years after the planned completion of the development. The TIA should be updated if the planned completion date is revised.	• Please refer to **Section 3.2** of the revised TIA report for the justification of using 2018 surveyed data with growth factor applied to obtain the base-line traffic flow condition (See **Appendix 5**). • DFC for Po Shek Wu Road Interchange (Junction RC) has been reviewed and revised, please refer to Table 3.3 and **Table 4.4** of the revised TIA report for details (See **Appendix 5**). • Please refer to **Section 2.4.9** and **Figure 2.6** of the revised TIA report for modification works of existing street furniture, including beam barrier and type II railing, for the opening of site access (See **Appendix 5**). Please note that the existing staircase access to maintenance area would be maintained, and related staff could enter via the ramp of the site for maintenance when necessary (See **Appendix 5**). • Please note that the design year is revised to 2027, please refer to **Table 3.3** and **Table 4.4** of the revised TIA report for details of assessments (See **Appendix 5**).