

Table A: Responses-to-Comments (5.1.2024)

Departmental Comments		Applicant’s Responses
A. Drainage Services Department (received on 24.11.2023)		
A. Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) Report		
1.	Please advise the hydraulic calculations checking for internal peripheral drains.	Noted. Appendix 2.4 has been amended accordingly.
2.	Appendix 2.3 - Please advise if 10% reduction of deposition of sediment is applied in the utilization check, according to SDM.	The original scheme to discharge following the existing drain ditch to the west has been removed and the original Appendix 2.3 has been removed accordingly. The 10% reduction of deposition of sediment is now applied in the utilization check in Appendix 2.3 of current revised DIA report.
3.	Figure 3.1 - Please advise the maintenance responsibility of the proposed upgraded ditch.	The project proponent will confirm ownership and responsibility of existing drainage ditch to the west in detailed design stage. For the time being, the original scheme to upgrade and discharge to the existing drain ditch to the west has been removed. A proposed drainage system along public road, has been presented instead.
4.	Figure 3.2 – The terminal manhole should be located at the most downstream of the site. Please review.	Figure 3.2 now reads Figure 3.1. Internal flow direction of the site is supplemented in Figure 3.1. The terminal manhole is now located at the most downstream of the site.
5.	Figure 3.2 – The proposed 1600mm dia. drains along Kam Pok Road East appears in conflict with existing/ proposed drainage facilities. Please provide a detailed cross section for reference.	Figure 3.2 now reads Figure 3.1. Based on the current proposed MLP and less number of proposed houses, the proposed drainage system has been reviewed and updated accordingly. Detailed cross section for reference is supplemented in Figures 3.2 and 3.4. Detail alignment will be reserved to later design stage.

Departmental Comments	Applicant’s Responses
B. Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA report)	
<p>1. Table 2-2 – Please review the UFF adopted for restaurant/catering service (i.e. should be 1.58 m³/day/person according to EPD’s GESF).</p>	<p>Kindly note the UFF of 1.58 m³/day/person has already been adopted in the revised SIA report (R8934 v4.0) submitted to TPB under FI 6 in Nov., 2023.</p> <p>Compared to the original MLP scheme, the present revised MLP scheme has reduced a total of 24 residential units. As such, the original sewerage system has been reviewed and updated accordingly. A revised SIA is provided in this FI submission.</p>
<p>2. Section 2.5.6 – Please include the mitigation measures if the programme of the planned twin gravity sewers cannot match with the subject development.</p>	<p>The current revised sewerage system forms part of the proposed development and will be constructed at the same time. If required, there will be no population intake until the proposed sewerage system is available.</p>
B. Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (received on 30.11.2023)	
<p>1. <u>Feasibility of two-fold increase in ecological value</u></p> <p>It is mentioned that other projects or studies with intensive management measures such as pond drain-down and restocking of trash fish have been reviewed and it was targeting to achieve a two-fold increase in the total abundance of waterbirds. Please specify what intensive management measures would be implemented in the proposed WRA, and provide details to demonstrate how these measures could be implemented effectively given that the proposed WRA would be much smaller in size and would consist of one compartment only as compared with the ponds in the examples.</p>	<p>In the latest layout plan, the proposed WRA has been further expanded up to 2.47 ha covering over 48.4% of the Application Site.</p> <p>WRA with ecological enhancement and active management including regular fish stocking and large areas of year-round shallow water zone could compensate the loss of the wetland due to the residential portion.</p> <p>As the existing abandoned fish ponds are relatively deep in nature (i.e. 2m), which are not favored for the non-dabbling waterbirds, the design of the Wetland Restoration Area will provide much larger shallow water areas for the waterbirds to roost and feeding, and also to include areas with different water depths as well as in order to provide more micro-habitable conditions for the waterbirds.</p>

Departmental Comments	Applicant’s Responses
	<p>The proposed restoration of wetland habitats will create more shallow water areas than the present conditions. Thus, the provision of more shallow water regions could compensate the loss of abandoned fishponds, resulting “no-net-loss in wetland” in terms of enhanced ecological functions and provide more microhabitats that are favorable for waterbirds.</p> <p>To ensure an adequate food source for waterbirds during the dry season, fish stocking will be conducted at least once prior to the onset of the dry season. This proactive measure aims to guarantee that there is a sufficient supply of fish available within the WRA to sustain the waterbird population during this period when natural food sources may be limited. Additionally, monitoring of the fish stocks within the WRA will be carried out throughout the dry season as well as wet season, which helps to assess the availability and abundance of fish, ensuring that the waterbirds have access to a continuous food supply and enabling any necessary interventions or adjustments to be made if needed to support the ecological balance within the WRA. The usefulness of fish stocks for birds is maximized in the way that most fishes are of suitable size to be eaten by the different types of waterbird species.</p>
<p>2. <u>Wetland loss to be covered by the two-fold increase</u></p> <p>Even though a two-fold increase in ecological value could be achieved, given that the size of the proposed WRA (2.02 ha) is smaller than the area of permanent wetland loss to be caused by the proposed development (2.88 ha), the proposed WRA is not adequate in compensating the wetland loss within the Application Site, not to mention the potential permanent loss in wetland function of the remaining portion of ponds lying along the boundary of the Application Site. The applicant is advised to increase the "WRA to development footprint" ratio for adequate wetland compensation.</p>	<p>In the latest layout plan, the proposed WRA has been further expanded up to 2.47 ha covering over 48.4% of the Application Site.</p> <p>More importantly, the entire northern part of the Application Site would be included as part of the WRA, and therefore after the implementation of the present development, the adjacent ponds outside the Application Site would still be adjacent to wetland (i.e. the WRA).</p> <p>As stipulated in S8.2.6 of the EcoIA, for each of the ponds lying on the Application Site boundary, they will be divided by sheet piling along the site boundary, and then only the portion of ponds within the Application</p>

Departmental Comments	Applicant’s Responses
	<p>Site will be drained for construction, while the portions outside the Application Sites will retain unchanged. A series of vertical concrete walls (of smaller width than the existing earth pond bunds in the ponds of Pok Wai) will be built immediately behind the sheet piling within the Application Site. So that, the temporary loss of the portions of the abandoned ponds outside the Application Site (~0.72 ha) is not anticipated.</p> <p>Furthermore, WRA with ecological enhancement and active management including regular fish stocking and large areas of year-round shallow water zone could compensate the loss of the wetland due to the residential portion.</p> <p>Experience from LMC Spur Line wetland and the Management Agreement in Northwest fishponds by HKBWS well demonstrated that significant increase of wetland function for waterbirds (i.e. two-fold increase in LMC Spur Line project and up to 6 times increase in HKBWS MA project) is practically feasible. Particularly in the HKBWS MA project where the ponds joining the project are mostly traditional fishponds and some of them have the sizes similar with or smaller than the proposed WRA.</p>
<p>3. <u>Action level and contingency measures</u></p> <p>Examples of action level and contingency measures from other projects have been quoted. Please beef up the WRA as appropriate for our further comments.</p>	<p>Action levels (covering target species and habitat conditions such as vegetation conditions, water quality, water depth, stocked fish, etc) and corresponding contingency measures have been provided in Table 7.1 of the revised WRP.</p>
<p>4. <u>Works programme</u></p> <p>For clarity, please expand Table 15 to cover the timeline for Phase One (WRA) to Final Phase of the project (to be read together with the figure</p>	<p>Table 15 of the revised EcoIA has been expanded to cover the timeline of the full construction programme of the present project (from Phase I to Phase IV). Figure 6 of the revised EcoIA has illustrated the locations of each phase.</p>

Application No. A/YL-NSW/314 Proposed Residential Development with Wetland Habitat, and associated Filling of Ponds and Excavation of Land in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Comprehensive Development to include Wetland Restoration Area” Zone, Various Lots in D.D.104, Pok Wai, Yuen Long

Departmental Comments	Applicant’s Responses
<p>showing the construction phasing). Please indicate in the table and figure which construction works phase/ items would avoid winter.</p>	<p>Piling works for piled foundations are the major noise sources in many construction projects. In the present Project, however, given the low-rise nature of the residential buildings, pile foundation are not required and thus has been completely avoided. Sheet piling for temporary dividing the adjacent ponds during construction would be installed by non-percussive method. Therefore, the majority of noise impact due to construction has been avoided in the present project.</p>