



**Section 16 Application for Proposed House Development and Excavation
of Land in “Residential (Group D)” Zone at Lot 182 S.B in D.D. 128, Ha
Tsuen, Yuen Long, New Territories**

Planning Application No. A/YL-HTF/1145

Further Information 2

FEBRUARY 2023
Reference : PPC-PLG-10082

Responses-to-Comments

Item	Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
1.	Comments from Environmental Protection Department received on 16.1.2023 (EPD Officer: Ms Hyde MAK Tel: 2835 1123)	
1)	Please see our comments on air quality below. Please also note that we have no comment on waste and land contamination issues. For noise and water quality, we are still reviewing the relevant technical assessments.	Noted.
	<u>Comments on Air Quality</u> Section 1.1: Please revise "access" to "assess" in the third paragraph.	Noted and revised.
	Section 1.2: Please revise "users" to "uses" in the bullet point 3.	Noted and revised.
	Section 3.2: The prevailing AQOs have been in force since 1 Jan 2022. Please revise.	Noted and revised.
	Table 3.1: Notes [i], [ii] and [iii] are missing. Please supplement.	Noted and revised.
	Section 3.3: - Air sensitive receivers (ASRs) close to the project site are subject to potential adverse air quality impact during the construction phase. Please identify and show the nearby ASRs in a map and indicate the corresponding separation distances from the project site boundary. - Please specify the size of site formation or excavation area, amount of excavated materials to be handled, number of dump trucks and mechanical equipment to be used on-site to justify whether significant air quality impact is anticipated during the construction phase. Any concurrent projects in the surrounding shall be identified and their cumulative air quality impact shall be addressed. - Please consider providing electric power supply for on-site machinery as far as practicable. Diesel generators and machinery shall be avoided to minimize the gaseous and PM emissions.	Noted and updated. Please refer to Section 3.3 of Annex 1 . Noted and updated. Please refer to the 1 st paragraph of Section 3.4 of Annex 1 . Noted and revised. Please refer to the last items of the 2 nd paragraph of Section 3.4 of Annex 1 .

Item	Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
	<p>Section 3.4:</p> <p>The proposed development is considered to be an air sensitive use. The cumulative air quality impact on the proposed development arising from various emission sources in the surrounding (e.g. road traffic, industrial activities, odour emissions) shall be addressed and whether there are sufficient buffer distances in accordance with the HKPSG's requirements for roads, chimneys and odour sources shall be assessed.</p>	<p>Noted and updated. It is clarified that there is no vehicular emission impact since the Deep Bay Road is about 250m from the proposed development. Also, no chimneys and odour sources are found within 300m of the proposed development. Please refer to Section 3.5 of Annex 1.</p>
	<p>Section 3.5:</p> <p>Please consider conducting a more updated survey on the industrial chimneys and be reminded that it is the responsibility of the applicant and their consultants to ensure the validity of the chimney data by their own site surveys. Should the information of industrial chimneys be subsequently found to be incorrect, the assessment result presented in the planning application would be invalid.</p> <p>Please address the potential odour impact arising from the surrounding environment including but not limited to the warehouses, recyclable collection centers and factories. Please provide more details about the proposed septic tank, address its potential odour impact (e.g. whether it is fully enclosed, the separation distance between the septic tank and the nearby ASRs) and recommend proper mitigation measures if necessary.</p>	<p>Noted and updated. It is clarified that there are no chimneys found within 300m of the project site.</p> <p>Noted and updated. It is clarified that there is no odour impact arising from the surrounding environment. Also, the proposed septic tank would be fully enclosed and the distance between the proposed septic tank to ASR 1 is about 305m. Please refer to Section 3.5 of Annex 1.</p>
<p>2. Comments from Food and Environmental Hygiene Department received on 16.1.2023 (FEHD Officer: Mr. Raymond CHAN Tel: 3141 1231)</p>		
<p>1)</p>	<p>Please be informed that FEHD has no adverse comments on the planning application. Some general comments are provided below:</p> <p>(a) No Food and Environmental Hygiene Department's (FEHD) facilities will be affected and such work and operation shall not cause any environmental nuisance, pest infestation and obstruction to the surrounding.</p> <p>(b) It is noted that a swimming pool would be provided in the proposed</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Item	Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
	<p>development. Under the Swimming Pools Regulation (Cap 132 sub. leg.), private swimming pools which serve more than 20 residential units and which are accessible to the public require a swimming pool licence from FEHD. The applicant should be reminded that no person shall take any part in the management of a swimming pool and the establishment or maintenance of which has not been licensed . However, the Regulation does NOT apply to any swimming pool which serves not more than 20 residential units and to which the public have no access.</p> <p>(c) No environmental nuisance should be generated to the surroundings. Also, for any waste generated from the operations and works, the project proponent should arrange its disposal properly at their own expenses.</p>	
<p>3. Comments from Transport Department received on 19.1.2023 (TD Officer: Mr Victor MA Tel: 2399 2422)</p>		
1)	<p>In view of the large domestic gross floor area of the proposed development (i.e. 508m²), the applicant shall review the proposed parking provision and provide additional parking spaces where appropriate.</p>	<p>Noted. The proposed provision of 2 car parking spaces can meet the high-side of the HKPSG requirement and is considered acceptable. Additional provision will be GFA countable subjected to other department's comment.</p>
<p>4. Comments from Environmental Protection Department received on 20.1.2023 (EPD Officer: Ms Hyde MAK Tel: 2835 1123/ Ms Ming HE Tel: 2835 2390)</p>		
1)	<p>Please be advised that we have no comment on the SIA.</p> <p>We have no comment on water quality issues. Please find our comments on noise issues below.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
2)	<p><u>Noise</u> The noise chapter in the EA report only consisted of qualitative fixed noise and construction noise impact assessment. For the purpose of supporting the s.16 application, the EA report is considered incomplete and has yet to demonstrate the proposed villa/house would comply with the noise criteria of HKPSG. Please find our comments below and revise them in the next submission.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Item	Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
	<p>1. It is noted that Deep Bay Road is located approximately 150m to the north of the site, and a number of access roads are within the 300m study area. Road traffic noise impact assessment should be required, and appropriate noise mitigation measures should be implemented to alleviate the traffic noise impact to the planned NSRs if necessary.</p> <p>2. Please document TD's agreement on the traffic forecast data in the report once available. In case TD has no comment on the methodology for traffic forecast only, the consultant should provide written confirmation from the respective competent party (e.g. traffic consultant) that TD's endorsed methodology has been strictly adopted in preparing the traffic forecast data, and hence the validity of traffic data can be confirmed.</p> <p>3. Table 4.1 – Please include the Acceptable Noise Level of night-time (2300-0700) for fixed noise source in the table. Please also correct the typos "Acceptance Noise Level" to "Acceptable Noise Level" in Table 4.1, Table 4.2 as well as in the main text. Please clarify if there is any night-time operation from the nearby warehouse, open storages, recyclable collection centre, etc.</p> <p>4. S.4.3 – Please use L90 for the background noise level.</p> <p>5. S.4.5 – (i) Please confirm if there are no NSRs within the 300m study area and if the planned fixed noise sources within the proposed villa/house would comply with the relevant noise criteria. (ii) Based on the desktop review, the open storage area, godowns and workshops are at the east and south of the site. Please provide further information that there are no existing fixed noise sources within the 300m study area. Please supplement.</p>	<p>Noted and updated. The road traffic noise assessment is conducted based on noise prediction as stipulated in Chapter 9 of HKPSG. Please refer to Section 4.5 of Annex 1.</p> <p>It is clarified that the road traffic assessment is conducted based on noise prediction as stipulated in Chapter 9 of HKPSG. Also, the annual average daily flow of Deep Bay Road is based on the Annual Traffic Census 2021 published by Transport Department. Therefore, TD's agreement on the traffic forecast shall not be required.</p> <p>Noted and revised. It is clarified that the nearby warehouse, open storages and recyclable collection centre will not operate in night-time.</p> <p>Noted and updated. L90 is adopted for background noise level.</p> <p>(i) It is clarified that there is 1 NSR (i.e. Wing Jun Church) within 300m of the study area. Furthermore, the planned fixed plant noise from the proposed development would strictly comply with the noise criteria as stated in Table 4.2. Please refer to Section 4.7 of Annex 1.</p> <p>(ii). Noted and revised. Please refer to Appendix B for the photos of existing surrounding environment and Section 4.7 of Annex 1.</p>

Item	Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
5. Comments from Drainage Services Department received on 26.1.2023 (EPD Officer: Ms Vicky SY Tel: 2300 1347 / Mr Victus KWAN Tel: 2300 1235)		
1)	<p>I have the following comments on the submitted drainage impact assessment:</p> <p>(i) Please indicate how the runoff (the flow direction) within the site would discharged to the proposed u-channel. Surface runoff from existing natural terrain (northern bound of the site) should also be taken into account.</p> <p>(ii) Appendix B to Annex 3 of the Further Information 1 refers, please note that existing u-channel E1 collects surface runoff not only from catchments A-K but also from the vicinity area downstream. Please revisit the hydraulic calculation to ensure the capacity of existing u-channel E1 is capable for additional runoff generated from the application site.</p> <p>(iii) Appendix C to Annex 3 of the Further Information 1 refers, please note that the photo provided for existing natural stream (ultimate discharge point) is not sufficient. Only 1 small channel was observed in the photo given. Please provide more photos to demonstrate its presence and existing condition.</p> <p>(iv) The development should neither obstruct overland flow nor adversely affect existing natural streams, village drains, ditches and the adjacent areas, etc.</p>	<p>(i) Noted and updated. It is clarified that the surface runoff from Catchment A-F will flow along the site boundary. Proposed underground manholes will be provided at the corner of the site boundary where walls are erected to collect the surface runoff from catchment A-F. Please refer to Annex 3's Appendix A for the location of the proposed manholes, Figure 3.1 for the flow direction and Figure 3.2 for the section of the proposed manhole.</p> <p>(ii) Noted and updated. It is clarified that the vicinity area downstream has been included in the hydraulic calculation. Please refer to Appendix B and Figure 3.1 of Annex 3.</p> <p>(iii) Noted and updated. Please refer to Appendix C for the photo of existing natural stream of Annex 3.</p> <p>(iv) Noted. The development would not obstruct overland flow and adversely affect existing natural streams, village drains, ditches and the adjacent areas.</p>
2)	<p>I have the following comments on the submitted sewerage impact assessment:</p> <p>(i) The applicant should demonstrate how the proposed soakaway system could cater for the sewage retained in the septic tank.</p>	<p>(v) It is clarified that a soakaway pit with a capacity of 8.7 m³/day can handle the sewage retained in the septic tank (approximately 7.96 m³/day). Please refer to paragraph 4 in Section 3.2 and Appendix B of Annex 2 for detailed calculations. Moreover, it is recommended to remove the STS sludge regularly to ensure the continuous operation and performance of the STS. Please refer to Section 4 for detailed continuous operation measurements of Annex 2.</p>

Item	Departmental Comments	Applicant's Responses
	(ii) Please clarify whether there would be emergency measure for the sewerage retention or conveyance in case the soakaway system failed to perform.	(i) Noted and revised. It is clarified there would be emergency measure for the sewerage retention or conveyance in case the soakaway system failed to perform. Please refer to Section 3.3 of Annex 2 .