

Yau Tong Bay Development
Package 1 - Reclamation of Yau Tong Bay
Responses to the Comments from EPD on the Previous EIA Report

Comments	Responses
<p>As explained in the letter attached to this Appendix A, some of the reasons given below relate to a Schedule 3 EIA Report submitted by the same application on 29 August 2000 for approval under section 6(2) of the EIA Ordinance (Application No. EIA-048/2000).</p> <p>1. The possibility of a tunnel alignment option for the proposed Western Coast Road (WCR) project was made known to the public in March 2000, given the strong public objections on the coastal alignment. Despite the uncertainty associated with the alignment, programme and configuration of the WCR project, this EIA Report has failed to reasonably compare the environmental benefits and disbenefits of different reclamation scenarios based on the “coastal” and “tunnel” options of the WCR project. It is noted that in the Schedule 3 EIA Report submitted by the same applicant on 29 August 2000 for the comprehensive residential development at Yau Tong Bay, three different scenarios have been considered. They included one that relates to the coastal option of WCR and two that relate to the tunnel option (with and without Ko Fai Road connections) of WCR. This shows that this EIA Report submitted on 25 July 2000 is not consistent with the Schedule 3 EIA submitted later on 29 August 2000 in terms of scenario assessments.</p>	<p>Due to the existence of two different options on the alignment of WCR, we have developed two different options on the extent of Yau Tong Bay Reclamation – namely Minimised Reclamation and Full Reclamation corresponding to the Tunnel Option and Coastal Option of the WCR.</p> <p>The reclamation layout presented in the previous EIA report is called Full Reclamation option in the revised EIA report. For the Minimised Reclamation option, several reclamation alignments had been studied in terms of engineering and environmental points of view. The results of these studies were presented in the working papers called Yau Tong Bay Redevelopment – Further Studies which had been submitted by David C Lee Surveyors Ltd. to Planning Department on 9 October and 13 November 2000. From the studies results, the current reclamation alignment for Minimised Reclamation option is considered the best among the other proposed, and therefore, is chosen as the reclamation alignment for the WCR – Tunnel Option.</p>
	<p>The environmental impacts generated by the two reclamation options have been assessed. The assessment results are presented in <i>Section 2</i> and <i>Section 4</i> of the EIA Report.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>The EIA Report has not adequately presented the environmental benefits and disbenefits of the different reclamation scenarios. The recommended reclamation needs to avoid the adverse environmental effects caused by reclamation to the maximum practicable extent. The EIA Report should include the pros and cons of other possible alternative reclamation scenarios. This EIA Report did not include assessment in this context. S.12 and S3.5.3 of the Study Brief and S.4.4.2 of the TM have not been met.</p>	<p>In Package 2 EIA Study – Engineering Feasibility Study for the Comprehensive Development at Yau Tong Bay, different development scenarios are developed with respect to the different options of the Yau Tong Bay reclamation limits. In this connection, the Package 1 and Package 2 EIA Reports are consistent in terms of scenario assessment.</p>
<p>2. This EIA Report, including the Schedule 3 EIA Report submitted by the same applicant on 29 August 2000, did not adequately address the cumulative and overall environmental implication of the existing, planned and committed developments on the reclamation. It has failed to adequately assess or provide solutions to remove the possible severe potential industrial/residential interface problems that may be caused to the future residents, in the event that industrial or shipyard operations would co-exist with and be close to housing blocks for a very long period of time. This means that the overall environmental acceptability of the entire project is uncertain. We have provided very detailed comment in this respect under the Rejection Reason No. 1 in Appendix A attached to our separate reply to your application of the Schedule 3 EIA Report submitted on 29 August 2000 (Application No. EIA-048/2000) and in paragraph 4(b)(ii) below. S.1.4, S.2.1 and S.3.2 of the Study brief and S.4.3.3 and S.4.4.2 of the TM have not been met.</p>	<p>This EIA Report has been revised to incorporate the assessment results of the cumulative and overall environmental implications of the existing, planned and committed developments on the reclamation. The potential industrial / residential interface problem will be addressed in <i>Section 3</i> of Package 2 – Engineering Feasibility Study for the Comprehensive Development at Yau Tong Bay EIA Report.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>3. According to the construction programme in Appendix 2A of the EIA Report, the construction period for the Phases 1 and 2 of the reclamation works is scheduled from July 2001 to April 2005, and the programme for the Phase 3 reclamation is missing in the EIA Report. With reference to the construction programme in Figure 2.2 of the Schedule 3 EIA Report entitled “Yau Tong Bay Development – Engineering Feasibility Study for the Comprehensive Development at Yau Tong Bay” submitted on 29t August 2000 under section 6(2) of the EIA Ordinance, the construction period for the foundation/superstructure works is scheduled from October 2002 to March 2015. In the context of what are recommended in these two EIA Reports, the construction period of the reclamation works will overlap with that of the foundation/superstructure works for at least 2½ years (i.e. from October 2002 to April 2005). The overlapping period may even longer than 2 ½ years if the Phase 3 reclamation is to be taken into consideration. However, both EIA Reports fail to identify, predict and evaluate the cumulative impacts of these projects during the above overlapping period.</p>	<p>The provisional programme for Yau Tong Bay reclamation and development are attached as Appendix 2A and Figure 2.3 in Package 1 and Package 2 EIA reports respectively. The commencement dates for reclamation and infrastructure development are January 2004 and October 2005 respectively. The main body of Yau Tong Bay reclamation (Phase 1 and 2 reclamation after filling of surcharge) would be completed in April 2007. Precast concrete decking would be constructed in the precasting yard outside the Site and the construction of its bore piled foundation could be carried out after the completion of Phase 2 bore piled seawall. Therefore, there will have about 1.5 years overlapping between the reclamation and infrastructure development. The cumulative construction impact due to reclamation, infrastructure development and other adjoining housing development has been encountered in the revised EIA report.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>4. Apart from the above, there are other omissions or deficiencies in the EIA Report as described below.</p> <p>(a) <u>No Evaluation of Noise Residual Impact</u></p> <p>(i) The unmitigated noise levels on the schools at the north and south of Yau Tong Estate (i.e. RSCH1 and RSCH2 in the EIA Report) are predicted exceeding the criteria of Annex 5 of the TM. However, there is no evaluation of noise residual impact after taking into account the recommended noise mitigation measures for the schools. The direct mitigation measures should be exhausted prior to considering indirect mitigation measures, and the residual impact should be quantified and compared with the criteria prior to taking into account of indirect mitigation measures. S.3.4.1 of the Study Brief and Annex 5 Section (c) and Annex 13 S.6 of the TM have not been met.</p>	<p>Direct mitigation measures with the proposed use of quiet plants, reduction of plant operating time and use of movable noise barriers for the reclamation and demolition works have been recommended. The mitigated noise levels predicted at all NSRs comply with the criteria. No residual noise impact is achieved.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>(b) <u>Incomplete Information for Contaminated Soil & Groundwater</u></p> <p>(i) There would be chances that some private lots might remain for a very long period of time [YTMLs 73 and 74 (Agincourt Industrial Building); YTMLs 1-5 (Tai Yuen Shipyards) and YTMLs 25-27 (Other 3 shipyards)]. The EIA Report has not addressed the interface problems during reclamation and decontamination works when these users are still in operation. It is also understood that some shipyard owners are legitimate to continue their operations as shipyards or sawmills or timberyards, which will cause serious environmental nuisance in terms of noise and dust emissions. S.1.4, S.2.1 and S.3.2 of the Study Brief and S.4.3.3, S.4.4.2 and S.4.4.3 of the TM have not been met.</p> <p>(ii) The mitigation measures to deal with the contaminated soil and ground water are not included in the Implementation Schedule. S.4.3 of the Study Brief and Annex 11 of the TM have not been met.</p> <p>(iii) The land decontamination requirements are not included in the EM&A programme. S.4.1 of the Study Brief has not been met.</p>	<p>A chapter in the current submission (Chapter 3 of Package 2 EIA report) is dedicated to cover the I/R interface problem.</p> <p>Noted. The mitigation measures for contaminated soil are now included in the implementation schedule. There is no mitigation measures required for the groundwater.</p> <p>Noted. The land decontamination requirements are included in the current EM&A programme.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>(c) <u>Outstanding Construction Dust Monitoring Requirements</u></p> <p>(i) The requirements for construction dust are not included in the Environmental Monitoring & Audit (EM&A) Manual. S.4.1 of the Study Brief has not been met.</p> <p>(d) <u>Outstanding Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</u></p> <p>(i) There is no information relating to the funding, implementation, management and maintenance of the proposed landscape and visual mitigation works. In addition, mitigation measures as recommended in the landscape and visual impact assessment have not been included in the Implementation Schedule. S.4.3 of the Study Brief and Annex 11 of the TM have not been met.</p> <p>(ii) The impact on landscape character areas has not been assessed. The visual impacts have not been assessed based on the methodology in paragraph 8.3.2 of the EIA Report. Annex 10 S.1.1 of the TM has not been met.</p>	<p>Requirements for construction dust are included in the current EM&A Manual.</p> <p>The information on funding, implementation, management and maintenance of the proposed mitigation works have been included in paragraph 8.8.8 in the current submission. The implementation schedule will also be included in the final EIA report.</p> <p>Note. The comments have been incorporated in paragraph 8.6.7 to 8.6.26 in the current submission.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>(e) <u>Outstanding Issues with the Reprovisioned Cha Kwo Ling Salt Water Pumping Station</u></p> <p>(i) The location and the implementation agent of the reprovisioned Cha Kwo Ling Salt Water Pumping Station are not stated in the Implementation Schedule. S.4.3 of the Study Brief and Annex 11 of the TM have not been met.</p>	<p>From the results of water quality impact assessment in both Package 1 and Package 2 EIA reports, with the implementation of proper mitigation measures, the water quality at the existing saltwater intake point of Cha Kwo Ling Saltwater Pumping Station is found to be satisfied with the water quality standard of WSD during construction and operational phases. In this connection, it is recommended to retain the saltwater pumping station at its current location. If it is the intention of WSD to relocate their pumping station, the north west corner of the seafront area (formed by reclamation) in the Full Reclamation Option will be a feasible location for reprovisioning of the CKLSPS. The water quality at the recommended location will meet the WSD standards as reflected from the water quality impact assessment.</p>

Yau Tong Bay Development
Package 2 – Engineering Feasibility Study for the Comprehensive Development at Yau Tong Bay
Responses to Comments from EPD on the Previous EIA Report

Comments	Responses
<p>As explained in the letter attached to this Appendix A, some of the reasons given below relate to another EIA Report submitted by the same application on 25 July 2000 for approval under section 6(2) of the EIA Ordinance (Application No. EIA-046/2000).</p> <p>1. Some private lots with operations which are environmentally incompatible with residential uses might remain for a very long period of time. The industrial or shipyard operations [YTMLs 73 & 74 (Agincourt Industrial Building); YTMLs 1-5 (Tai Yuen Shipyards) and YTMLs 25-27 (Other 3 shipyards)] might continue their operations as shipyards or sawmills or timberyards, which will cause serious environmental nuisance in terms of noise and dust emissions. This Schedule 3 EIA Report has ignored the very severe potential industrial/residential (I/R) interface problems that would be extremely difficult to mitigate. Similar severe 'I/R' interface problems were experienced by the former Shipyards at North Tsing Yi close to the Cheung On Estate; and the Hong Kong Cement Plant adjacent to the Greenfield Garden in Tsing Yi. For both cases, there were no practical mitigating solutions to eradicate the environmental problems except for ultimate relocation of the polluting sources. To allow the co-existence of these polluting industrial uses with the future residents of the Yau Tong Bay Comprehensive Development is in fact creating multiple industrial/residential interface problems within a Comprehensive Development Area that might create potentially serious</p>	<p>In accordance with the comments given by EPD regarding the issue of I/R interface problem, additional assessments have been conducted to investigate the environmental impacts generated from the I/R interface to the nearby residents in the CDA. The first working paper on I/R interface problem was included as Annex A of the Supplementary Paper for Yau Tong Bay Development – Further Studies, which was submitted to EPD under the letter (ref:42913/087) of David C Lee Surveyors Ltd. on 13 November 2000. Subsequently, another working paper was submitted on 29 December 2000 under MCAL's letter (ref:TKST:BCC:rl:94697/13-0428). In addition, a series of discussions and meeting were held among EPD, various government departments and consultants on the issue of I/R interface problems such as the assumptions and parameters for the assessment.</p> <p>The assessment results on environmental impacts generated by the I/R interface problem are presented in Section 3 of the Package 2 – Engineering Feasibility Study for the Comprehensive Development EIA report.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of I/R interface problem are not insurmountable and can be reduced to an acceptable level with the implementation of proper mitigation measures.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>environmental concerns, and is therefore considered unacceptable on environmental grounds. This would likely create environmental incompatibility. S.1.4, S.2.1, S.3.5.3 and S.3.6.1 of the Study Brief and S.4.3.3, S.4.4.2 and S.4.4.3 of the TM have not been met.</p>	
<p>2. According to the construction programme in Figure 2.2 of the EIA Report, the construction period for the superstructures is scheduled from October 2002 to March 2015. With reference to the construction programme in Appendix 2A of another EIA Report entitled “Yau Tong Bay Development – Reclamation of Yau Tong Bay” submitted on 25 July 2000 under section 6(2) of the EIA Ordinance, the construction period for the Phases 1 and 2 of the reclamation works is scheduled from July 2001 to April 2005, and the programme for the Phase 3 reclamation is missing in that EIA Report. In the context of what are recorded in these two EIA Reports, the construction period of the foundation/superstructure works will appear to overlap with that of the reclamation works for at least 2 ½years (i.e. from October 2002 to April 2005). The overlapping period may even be longer than 2 ½years if the Phase 3 reclamation is to be taken into consideration. However, both EIA Reports, including this Schedule 3 EIA Report, fail to identify, predict and evaluate the overall cumulative impacts of all the construction activities that will take place during the above overlapping period.</p>	<p>The provisional programme for Yau Tong Bay reclamation and development are attached as Appendix 2B and Figure 2.3 in Package 1 and Package 2 EIA reports respectively. The commencement dates for reclamation and infrastructure development are January 2004 and October 2005 respectively. The main body of Yau Tong Bay reclamation (Phase 1 and 2 reclamation after filling of surcharge) would be completed in April 2007. Precast concrete decking would be constructed in the precasting yard outside the Site and the construction of its bore piled foundation could be carried out after the completion of Phase 2 bore piled seawall. Therefore, there will have about 1.5 years overlapping between the reclamation and infrastructure development.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>In addition, the cumulative construction impacts have to take into account other concurrent construction activities (existing, planned and committed developments) in the vicinity of the project, such as the Yau Tong Estate redevelopment, the East Harbour Crossing Housing Estates and the Western Coast Road (WCR). Dependent on the timing of the various population intakes in the respective housing sites/schools, a maximum population of approaching 50,000 people could be adversely affected by the cumulative impacts of such works. Again, both EIA Reports, including this Schedule 3 EIA Report, fail to make reasonable attempts to predict and evaluate the overall cumulative impacts due to other concurrent major construction activities. S.1.4, S.2.1, S.3.4 and S.3.6 of the Study Brief and S.4.3.3 and S.4.4.2 of the TM have not been met.</p> <p>3. This EIA Report proposed a comprehensive development that comprises high-rise residential towers with building height ranging from about 125m to 160m, and with two commercial towers with building height reaching to about 200m. These high-rise buildings will well exceed the height band of 125m as recommended under the Central and East Kowloon Development Statement and in breach of the ridgeline for the Kowloon hills. As illustrated by the photomontages in Figures 8.13 to 8.16 of the EIA Report, the adverse visual impact of the Yau Tong Bay Comprehensive Development on the visually sensitive receivers at the surroundings such as Hong Pak Court and the committed/planned developments at Cha Kwo Ling and Yau Tong Industrial Area will be severe and irreversible. This EIA Report fails to provide alternative designs to reduce the visual impacts of the project. S.3.10.5 of the Study</p>	<p>The cumulative construction impact due to reclamation, infrastructure development and other adjoining housing development has been encountered in the revised EIA report.</p> <p>With reference to the information collected from HKHA on the proposed building height of residential towers at Yau Tong Estate Redevelopment, EHC Site Development, Ko Chiu Road Estate Redevelopment, Lei Yue Mun Development, the top level of the building varies from about 145m P.D. to 181m P.D. Moreover, the proposed residential redevelopment at Yau Tong Industrial Area which approved by TPB are also ranged from 35 storeys to 45 storeys. As shown on Fig. 9.29, the ridgeline for Kowloon hills will be breached by these developments in future.</p> <p>As review from the photographs taken recently from Hong Pak Court fig. 9.14 to 9.18. The views from Hong Pak Court, Hong Shui Court, Ko Yee Estate, Ko Chun Estate .etc toward Yau Tong Bay, will soon be completely blocked by the housing blocks of Yau Tong Estate Redevelopment and EHC Site Development, while the proposed development at Yau Tong Bay will have relatively less effect to these existing visually sensitive receivers. (Fig.9.19)</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>Brief and Annex 10 S.1.1 of the TM have not been met.</p>	<p>The proposed setback of the residential towers and office tower at Cha Kwo Ling Road and Ko Fai Road have increased the spatial distance of these towers from the adjacent development which helped to reduce the visual impact of the project. While the proposed varying height of the residential towers from waterfront toward inland will form a stepping effect which help to create an interesting artificial landform as compare to the dull 'flat-top' development. (fig. 9.21 and 9.22)</p>
<p>4. Apart from the above, there are other omissions or deficiencies in the EIA Report as described below.</p> <p>(a) <u>Outstanding Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</u></p> <p>We note the following omissions and errors in the visual and landscape impact assessment. S.3.10.4 of the Study Brief and Annex 10 S.1.1 of the TM have not been met :</p> <p>(i) The assessment on the visual impacts of the proposed development against the representative groups of visually sensitive receivers (VSRs) is incomprehensive. Some VSRs on the committed and planned developments at Yau Tong Industrial Areas and Cha Kwo Ling development have not been adequately assessed.</p>	<p>The assessment on the visual impacts of the proposed development to the visually sensitive receivers on the committed and planned developments at Yau Tong Industrial Areas and Cha Kwo Ling development have been included in this submission.</p>
<p>(ii) The assessment by graphic illustrations of the visual impacts on the existing VSRs is inadequate, and the actual visual impacts on the public and private developments fronting the proposed development are under-estimated.</p>	<p>Additional photographs on current view of the existing VSRs are added for assessment of the visual impact. Considered the distance of proposed development from the adjacent development are more than 80m, the visual impact not great.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>(iii) There is no alternative design as mitigation measures against the breach of ridgeline of Kowloon hills.</p>	<p>Alternative design on different building height are studied and shown on Fig. 9.21 to 9.23. The ridgeline of Kowloon hills will be breached upon completion of housing development at Yau Tong Estate Redevelopment, EHC site Development, Ko Chiu Road Estate Redevelopment and Lei Yue Mun Development in year 2006. The proposed development at Yau Tong Bay instead create an stepping artificial landform effect to compensate the breach of ridgelines by adjacent housing development.</p>
<p>(iv) There is no information relating to the funding, implementation, management and maintenance of the proposed landscape and visual mitigation works. In addition, mitigation measures as recommended in the landscape and visual impact assessment have not been included in the Implementation Schedule. For example, the mitigation measures at the operation phase are missing.</p>	<p>The information relating to the funding, implementation, management and maintenance of the proposed mitigation works have been included in EM&A Report. The implementation Schedule has been included in this EIA Report and EM&A Report.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>(b) <u>Traffic Noise Impact on the Residential Blocks</u></p> <p>(i) The traffic noise impacts from Cha Kwo Ling Road on residential blocks 11, 25 and 43 will exceed the 70dB(A) traffic noise criterion, but there is no consideration in the EIA Report to further setback the blocks from Cha Kwo Ling Road or to provide alternative uses to avoid the traffic noise impacts. In accordance with TM Annex 13 S.6.1, the direct mitigation measures including setback should be exhausted prior to consider indirect technical remedies. S.3.6.1 of the Study Brief and Annex 13 S.6.1 of the TM have not been met.</p> <p>(ii) The residential blocks along Ko Fai Road will also exceed the 70dB(A) traffic noise criterion. The recommended 2m high podium edge noise barrier for Tunnel Option of the WCR (without Ko Fai Road connection) is inadequate, as 5m high podium edge noise barrier is recommended at the same location in the WCR (coastal option). S.3.6.1 of the study Brief and Annex 13 S.6.1 of the TM has not been met.</p>	<p>The residential blocks 23 and 33 (previous nos. 25 and 43) have incorporated the maximum feasible setback distance of 30m from Cha Kwo Ling Road. Blocks 9 (previous no. 11) and 10 are provisionally indicated on the remaining lot belonging to a non-consenting owner.</p> <p>With the recommended 3.5m high podium edge noise barrier for WCR Tunnel Option and 5m for WCR Coastal Option, the predicted noise levels at the residential blocks along Ko Fai Road will fully comply with the 70dB(A) traffic noise criterion.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>(c) <u>Data and Methods in the Air Quality Impact Assessment</u></p> <p>We note the following omissions and errors in the air quality impact assessment. S.3.5.3 of the Study Brief and S.4.4.2 of the TM have not been met :</p> <p>(i) The EIA Report has studied two WCR tunnel options (with and without Ko Fai Road connection), but there is only one set of traffic emission impact assessment result provided in the report. Hence, the assessment is incomplete. In addition, some key assumptions are missing in this traffic emission impact assessment, e.g. location of exhaust of the tunnel of the WCR.</p> <p>(ii) The height of the volume sources which is used to simulate the portal emission from the Eastern Harbour Crossing should be 5.8m high (vertical dimension of the cross-section of the portal) instead of 10m.</p> <p>(iii) Volume sources have been used in simulating the impact of emission from the vehicles in the toll plaza region. As the emissions from idling vehicles is close to the ground level (about 0.5m above ground) and there is no initial plume dispersion due to mechanical turbulence generated by the vehicles, area sources should be used instead.</p>	<p>Traffic emission impact assessment results presented in the current submission contain contours overlaid on representative schemes which will present to the reader all impact scenarios.</p> <p>Portal emission from EHC has been amended to 5.8m.</p> <p>Area sources have been used in the current submission.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>(iv) S.3.8.13 of the report indicates that only two categories of the vehicle types have been considered in the assessment. However, according to Table 3.5 and Appendix 3C, there are other vehicle types which have also been included in estimating the portal and vent-shaft emissions from tunnels.</p>	<p>The inconsistencies have been amended in the current submission.</p>
<p>(v) There are discrepancies in the traffic flow figures for the traffic emission and traffic noise impact assessments. In the traffic emission impact assessment, the traffic flow and vehicle composition for all roads remain the same for both tunnel options (with and without the connection to Ko Fai Road) except for Cha Kwo Ling Road. However, in the traffic noise impact assessment (Tables 4.10 and 4.11), the traffic flows on Ko Fai Road are different from the two tunnel options.</p>	<p>Noted. The data used in the current submission has been synchronised.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>(d) <u>Impacts on the Sewerage System</u></p> <p>(i) The EIA Report has tried to cater for the shortfall of the existing East Kowloon sewerage capacity due to the comprehensive residential development. However, a number of the important assumptions in the sewerage impact assessment are either too optimistic or outdated. These include the timely implementation of SSDS Stage III/IV, and the upgrading of the Kwun Tong Preliminary Treatment Works and the Yau Tong Sewerage Pumping Station. In fact, according to the latest review studies (including the Interim Report (December 1999) of the Review of Central and East Kowloon Sewerage Master Plans), some of the works are uncertain at this stage. The EIA Report has not catered for the worst case scenario that all the above works may be delayed. Hence, the size of the temporary sewerage holding tank may need to be increased, and the location, the housing layout plan may need to be adjusted for its accommodation. If the housing layout plan is amended, the traffic noise and traffic emission impact assessments will also need to be revised. S.3.8.2 of the Study Brief and Annex 14 S.6.5 of the TM have not been met.</p>	<p>It is suggested in para. 7.5.21 that the exact size of the retention tank to be further reviewed in detailed design stage when the infrastructure improvement programme including the upgrading of the Kwun Tong Preliminary Treatment Works and the Yau Tong Sewerage Pumping Station are available from the Review of Central and East Kowloon Sewerage Master Plans Final Report. The worst case scenario is to increase the size of the retention tank to cater for the full Yau Tong Bay Development. The position and the increased plan area of the retention tank could be manipulated within the 30m set back strip along Ko Fai Road.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>(ii) The population figures adopted in the sewerage impact assessment in the EIA Report are under-estimated. The project proponent could make reference to the population data adopted in the Study entitled “Review of Central and East Kowloon Sewerage Master Plans”. Annex 14 S.6.5 of the TM has not been met.</p>	<p>Ultimate population figures of Yau Tong Urban Restructuring Scheme obtained from Planning Department were adopted in the sewerage impact assessment. These population figures have been compared with the “detailed planning data, most likely scenario, 2016-East Kowloon” as presented in the Technical Note No. 2 Population and Land Use (Revised) of the Review of Central and East Kowloon Sewerage Master Plans, and are found to be conservative. A copy of the comparison table is attached to this Responses to Comments for reference.</p>
<p>(e) <u>Summary of Key Environmental Outcomes</u></p>	
<p>(i) The EIA has not summarized the key environmental outcomes. S.3.11 of the Study Brief has not been met.</p>	<p>Noted and to be included in the EIA report.</p>
<p>(f) <u>Electronic Copies of the EIA Report</u></p>	
<p>(i) The electronic copies of the EIA Report and the Executive Summary have not been submitted. S.6.3 and S.6.4 of the Study Brief have not been met.</p>	<p>Electronic copies of the EIA Report and the Executive Summary are submitted herewith.</p>