

From: tspd/PLAND/HKSARG
To: enquire@pland.gov.hk
Date: 03/12/2021 17:03
Subject: Fw: Article 12A Application number Y/I-DB/2. Area 6f, Lot RP & Ext (Part) in D.D. Discovery Bay 352

— Forwarded by tspd/PLAND/HKSARG on 03/12/2021 17:03 —

From: MARTIN GERARD CAMPION [REDACTED]
To: tspd@pland.gov.hk
Date: 03/12/2021 16:54
Subject: Article 12A Application number Y/I-DB/2. Area 6f, Lot RP & Ext (Part) in D.D. Discovery Bay 352

Dear Planning Department,

It has come to my attention that a plan has been submitted to construct two high-rise residential buildings on the hillside above the existing Parkvale Village, that includes Coral Court where my wife and I currently live.

We wish to strongly oppose such a development on the following grounds:

Construction noise and air pollution in a quiet residential area.
Excessive traffic both during and after construction.
Destruction of a popular hiking trail for many visitors as well as residents.

寄件者: [REDACTED]
寄件日期: 2021年12月03日星期五 18:17
收件者: tpbpd@pland.gov.hk
主旨: Article 12A Application Number Y/I-DB/2. Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext (Part) in D.D. Discovery Bay 352

To whom it may concerns,

Hi. As a resident of the Woodbury in Parkvale Village, I strongly oppose the development of the area 6f, Lot 385 in Discovery Bay. The opposite reason is as follows.

1. Noise disturbance to home office government workers, banking officer and other home office essential workers.
2. Environmental protection
As discovery bay is popular place for tourist, local family and residents hiking sport. This development would bring a major taint on its natural beauty.
3. Construction phase would bring unwanted crimes and disturbance to the local community.
4. Safety concerns to all over phases.

Yours faithfully,

Calvin Yuen

寄件者: [REDACTED]
寄件日期: 2021年12月03日星期五 19:49
收件者: tpbpd@pland.gov.hk
主旨: Article 12A Application number Y/I-DB/2. Area 6f, Lit 385 RP & Ext(Part) in D.D.Discovery Bay 352

致城市規劃部

本人是愉景灣寶林閣之住戶，有關以上愉景灣地段寶琳閣後的平坦山地，開發建造兩座住宅高樓之計劃，本人雖然是租戶，但極力反對，因為這處無論假日或平日都有很多喜歡大自然的人在這裏行山，請保留這個行山徑，好讓能保持愉景灣獨有的自然環境，屋苑的密度已經非常足夠了，絕對不贊成在開發建造，煩請跟進！

Bella Lee
[REDACTED]

寄件者: [REDACTED]
寄件日期: 2021年12月03日星期五 21:33
收件者: tpbpd@pland.gov.hk
主旨: Article 12A Application number Y/I-DB/2. Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext(Part) in D.D. Discovery Bay 352

Dear Sir,

Section 12A Application No. Y/I-DB/2
Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay

Objection to the Submission by the Applicant:

I refer to the Response to Comments submitted by the consultant of Hong Kong Resort ("HKR"), Masterplan Limited, to address the departmental comments regarding the captioned application on 27.10.2016.

Kindly please note that I strongly object to the submission regarding the proposed development of the Lot. My main reasons of objection on this particular submission are listed as follows:-

1. HKR claims that they are the sole land owner of Area 6f is in doubt, as the lot is now held under the Principal Deed of Mutual Covenant ("PDMC") dated 20.9.1982. Area 6f forms part of either the "City Common Areas" or the "City Retained Areas" as defined in the PDMC. Pursuant to Clause 7 under Section I of the PDMC, every Owner (as defined in the PDMC) has the right and liberty to go pass and repass over and along and use Area 6f for all purposes connected with the proper use and enjoyment of the same subject to the City Rules (as defined in the PDMC). The applicant has failed to consult or seek proper consent from the co-owners of the Lot prior to this unilateral application. The property rights of the existing co-owners, i.e. all property owners of the Lot, should be considered, secured and respected.
2. The disruption, pollution and nuisance caused by the construction to the immediate residents and property owners nearby are substantial, and the submission has not been addressed.
3. There is major change to the development concept of the Lot and a fundamental deviation to the land use of the original approved Master Plans or the approved Outline Zoning Plan in the application, i.e. from staff quarters into residential area, and approval of it would be an undesirable precedent case from environmental perspective and against the interest of all property owners of the district.
4. The original stipulated DB population of 25,000 should be fully respected as the underlying infrastructure capacity could not afford such substantial increase in population by the submission, and all DB property owners would have to suffer and pay for the cost out of this submission in upgrading the surrounding infrastructure so as to provide adequate supply or support to the proposed development, e.g. all required road network and related utilities improvement works arised out of this submission etc. The proponent should consult and liaise with all property owners being affected and undertake the cost and expense of all infrastructure out of this development. Its disruption during construction to other property owners in the vicinity should be properly mitigated and addressed in the submission.
5. The proposed felling of 118 nos. mature trees in Area 6f is an ecological disaster, and poses a substantial environmental impact to the immediate natural setting. The proposal is unacceptable and the proposed tree preservation plan or the tree compensatory proposal are unsatisfactory.
6. The revision of development as indicated in the Revised Concept Plan of Annex A is still unsatisfactory in term of its proposed height, massing and disposition in this revision. The two towers are still sitting too close to each other which may create a wall-effect to the existing rural natural setting, and would pose an undesirable visual impact to the immediate surrounding, especially to those existing towers in the vicinity.

Unless and until the applicant is able to provide detailed responses to the comments for further review and comment, the application for Area 6f should be withdrawn.

Bella Lee

8553 P11021

寄件者: [REDACTED]
寄件日期: 2021年12月03日星期五 20:34
收件者: tpbpd@pland.gov.hk
主旨: Article 12A Application number Y/I-DB/2. Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext (Part) in D.D. Discovery Bay 352

Dear Sir,

Section 12A Application No. Y/I-DB/2
Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay

Objection to the Submission by the Applicant:

I refer to the Response to Comments submitted by the consultant of Hong Kong Resort ("HKR"), Masterplan Limited, to address the departmental comments regarding the captioned application on 27.10.2016.

Kindly note that I strongly object to the submission regarding the proposed development of the Lot. My main reasons of objection on this particular submission are listed as follows:-

1. HKR claims that they are the sole land owner of Area 6f is in doubt, as the lot is now held under the Principal Deed of Mutual Covenant ("PDMC") dated 20.9.1982. Area 6f forms part of either the "City Common Areas" or the "City Retained Areas" as defined in the PDMC. Pursuant to Clause 7 under Section I of the PDMC, every Owner (as defined in the PDMC) has the right and liberty to go pass and repass over and along and use Area 6f for all purposes connected with the proper use and enjoyment of the same subject to the City Rules (as defined in the PDMC). The applicant has failed to consult or seek proper consent from the co-owners of the Lot prior to this unilateral application. The property rights of the existing co-owners, i.e. all property owners of the Lot, should be considered, secured and respected.
2. The disruption, pollution and nuisance caused by the construction to the immediate residents and property owners nearby are substantial, and the submission has not been addressed.
3. There is major change to the development concept of the Lot and a fundamental deviation to the land use of the original approved Master Plans or the approved Outline Zoning Plan in the application, i.e. from staff quarters into residential area, and approval of it would be an undesirable precedent case from environmental perspective and against the interest of all property owners of the district.
4. The original stipulated DB population of 25,000 should be fully respected as the underlying infrastructure capacity could not afford such substantial increase in population by the submission, and all DB property owners would have to suffer and pay for the cost out of this submission in upgrading the surrounding infrastructure so as to provide adequate supply or support to the proposed development, e.g. all required road network and related utilities improvement works arised out of this submission etc. The proponent should consult and liaise with all property owners being affected and undertake the cost and expense of all infrastructure out of this development. Its disruption during construction to other property owners in the vicinity should be properly mitigated and addressed in the submission.
5. The proposed felling of 118 nos. mature trees in Area 6f is an ecological disaster, and poses a substantial environmental impact to the immediate natural setting. The proposal is unacceptable and the proposed tree preservation plan or the tree compensatory proposal are unsatisfactory.

6. The revision of development as indicated in the Revised Concept Plan of Annex A is still unsatisfactory in term of its proposed height, massing and disposition in this revision. The two towers are still sitting too close to each other which may create a wall-effect to the existing rural natural setting, and would pose an undesirable visual impact to the immediate surrounding, especially to those existing towers in the vicinity.

Unless and until the applicant is able to provide detailed responses to the comments for further review and comment, the application for Area 6f should be withdrawn.

Regards,
Shuk Ping Wu

Get Outlook for iOS

寄件者: [REDACTED]
寄件日期: 2021年12月03日星期五 22:53
收件者: tpbpd@pland.gov.hk
副本: parkvalevillage@gmail.com
主旨: Article 12A Application number Y/I-DB/2.Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext (Part)in D.D. Discovery Bay 352

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am a resident of Crystal Court. I realized that there would be a plan for the development of two high-rise residential buildings on the hillside behind the Woods, Crystal Court and Coral Court which I strongly opposed because it would cause extreme danger over the existing narrow traffic roads by the big construction vehicles and noise disruption to our community. It is my opinion that the developers have other better choices of sites for their development in DB.

Regards,
Jimmy NG
Tel: [REDACTED]

(reply is instant)

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號

Reference Number:

211203-155857-96839

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

03/12/2021

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

03/12/2021 15:58:57

有關的規劃申請編號

The application no. to which the comment relates:

Y/I-DB/2

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

Name of person making this comment:

女士 Ms. 劉淑嫻

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

重建增加地積比例，能增加房屋整體數量及選擇，期望當中亦能增加社區服務及設施，更優化居民的生活需要。

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review**參考編號****Reference Number:**

211203-162246-05747

提交限期**Deadline for submission:**

03/12/2021

提交日期及時間**Date and time of submission:**

03/12/2021 16:22:46

有關的規劃申請編號**The application no. to which the comment relates:**

Y/I-DB/2

「提意見人」姓名/名稱**Name of person making this comment:**

女士 Ms. Lai

意見詳情**Details of the Comment :**

能增加房屋整體數量及選擇，期望當中亦能增加社區服務及設施，更優化居民的生活需要

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號
Reference Number: 211203-173039-88631

提交限期
Deadline for submission: 03/12/2021

提交日期及時間
Date and time of submission: 03/12/2021 17:30:39

有關的規劃申請編號
The application no. to which the comment relates: Y/I-DB/2

「提意見人」姓名/名稱
Name of person making this comment: 女士 Ms. LAM MEI BO

意見詳情
Details of the Comment :

本人支持題述申請，因為計劃有助增加優質及多元化私人樓宇的供應，為市民提供更多住屋選擇，從而提升生活質素。
我認為計劃有利持續優化愉景灣的整體建設及設施，改善社區環境之餘，亦同時為物業增值，因此我十分支持這項申請。

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號

Reference Number:

211203-191559-55591

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

03/12/2021

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

03/12/2021 19:15:59

有關的規劃申請編號

The application no. to which the comment relates:

Y/I-DB/2

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

Name of person making this comment:

女士 Ms. Edna Cheung

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

愉景灣的生活環境與外地來港專才移民生活相近，有助吸引各個專業範疇來港工作和生活，為本港發展提出貢獻，而且能讓愉景灣具持續發展的機會，本人十分贊成。

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號

211203-213811-98782

Reference Number:

提交限期

03/12/2021

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

03/12/2021 21:38:11

Date and time of submission:

有關的規劃申請編號

Y/I-DB/2

The application no. to which the comment relates:

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

先生 Mr. Keld Soerensen

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

I object to the application

The area in question is not suitable for development. The infrastructure is insufficient. As an example Parkvale Drive which is the road which leads to the development is a narrow road unsuitable for any traffic larger than cars. While the road is not that trafficked there are frequently incidents between eg busses and other vehicles - most not reported - but there was a severe traffic incident 2 weeks ago where 5 people got injured. Furthermore, the developer offers no transparency - not involving the community/inviting for townhall etc to address any previous concerns raised in previous applications over the past 5 years. There are already plenty of available flats available in Discovery Bay. The proposed development may not offer any benefit to Discovery Bay or Hong Kong.

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review**參考編號****Reference Number:**

211203-225607-30229

提交限期**Deadline for submission:**

03/12/2021

提交日期及時間**Date and time of submission:**

03/12/2021 22:56:07

有關的規劃申請編號**The application no. to which the comment relates:**

Y/I-DB/2

「提意見人」姓名/名稱**Name of person making this comment:**

先生 Mr. Ko

意見詳情**Details of the Comment :**

支持題述申請，因為計劃有助增加優質及多元化私人樓宇的供應，為市民提供更多住屋選擇，從而提升生活質素。

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號

Reference Number:

211203-231852-20943

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

03/12/2021

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

03/12/2021 23:18:52

有關的規劃申請編號

The application no. to which the comment relates:

Y/I-DB/2

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

Name of person making this comment:

先生 Mr. Cheng

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

我認為計劃有利持續優化愉景灣的整體建設及設施，改善社區環境之餘，亦同時為物業增值，因此我十分支持這項申請。

作為商戶，我十分支持這項申請。因為新發展計劃將吸引更多人口遷入愉景灣，以及在愉景灣消費，增加生意商機，帶來更多經濟效益。