

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-105906-61903

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2458

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 10:59:06

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. Kai Wing

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

我讚成計劃,我見設計圖則顯示附近屋苑與新屋苑有充足距離,景觀沒有受阻。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-103734-92616

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2459

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 10:37:34

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. Susan Lai

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

我同意計劃,引入適量人口可支持本土小商店的營運,為居民提供更多的零售選擇。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-103032-46100

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2460

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 10:30:32

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:

小姐 Miss Fa Wong

意見詳情

Details of the Comment:

同意計劃,可善用土地資源,減輕香港土地不足的問題。

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

160705-111449-18180

Reference Number:**提交限期**

15/07/2016

2461**Deadline for submission:****提交日期及時間**

05/07/2016 11:14:49

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**

小姐 Miss Ka Chu

Name of person making this comment:**意見詳情****Details of the Comment :**

引入新屋苑，可分擔公共設施的維修費用，使周邊的基建設施作出翻新及改善，業主可減省維修保養及相關開支。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-111431-71784

2462

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 11:14:31

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. Wong Hon Chong

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

計劃已考慮基礎設施、視覺、交通方面等因素及社區承擔能力，設計亦與周邊環境及景觀融合。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-105505-66580

2463

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 10:55:05

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. Fish Yu

意見詳情

Details of the Comment:

我讚成新發展會創造更多就業機會，為市民及社會帶來好處及經濟效益。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-112012-42540

2464

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 11:20:12

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. Ho

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

新計劃可支持開辦獨立的巴士路線，令交通更方便快捷。

就撥款申請/撥款提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-11948-0201

2465

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 11:19:48

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:

小姐 Miss Kwok Tin Yu

意見詳情

Details of the Comment:

現時上址欠缺遊樂設施，新發展會美化環境及引入新的休憩設施

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-111914-25200

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2466

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 11:19:14

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:

小姐 Miss TSANG WAI YU

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

現時上址欠缺遊樂設施，新發展會美化環境及引入新的休憩設施

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-111826-98952

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2467

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 11:18:26

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. Man Yee

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

計劃已考慮基礎設施、視覺、交通方面等因素及社區承擔能力，設計亦與周邊環境及景觀融合。

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

參考編號

160705-111612-00700

Reference Number:

2468

提交限期

15/07/2016

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

05/07/2016 11:16:12

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. Sam Law

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment:

現時上址欠缺遊樂設施，新發展會美化環境及引入新的休憩設施。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-112451-98733

2469

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 11:24:51

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. Ming

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

本人支持愉景灣第6f區的發展計劃，原因如下：

1. 6f一直已規劃為居住用途，證明土地適宜建屋。規劃中的地積比亦很低，基建及配套足以容納新增的人口。
2. 計劃已考慮基礎設施、視覺、交通方面等因素及社區承擔能力，設計亦與周邊環境及景觀融合。
3. 新計劃可支持開辦獨立的巴士路線，令交通更方便快捷。
4. 現時上址欠缺遊樂設施，新發展會美化環境及引入新的休憩設施。
5. 設計圖則顯示附近屋苑與新屋苑有充足距離，景觀不會受阻。
6. 引入新屋苑，可分擔公共設施的維修費用，使周邊的基建設施作出翻新及改善，業主可減省維修保養及相關開支。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-111729-78350

2470

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 11:17:29

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. Kan

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

本人支持愉景灣第6f區的發展計劃，原因如下：

- 1) 可善用土地資源，減輕香港土地不足的問題，提供不同類型的房屋選擇。
- 2) 6f一直已規劃為居住用途，證明土地適宜建屋。規劃中的地積比亦很低，基建及配套足以容納新增的人口。
- 3) 計劃已考慮基礎設施、視覺、交通方面等因素及社區承擔能力，設計亦與周邊環境及景觀融合。
- 4) 新計劃可支持開辦獨立的巴士路線，令交通更方便快捷。
- 5) 新發展會創造更多就業機會，為市民及社會帶來好處及經濟效益。
- 6) 設計圖則顯示附近屋苑與新屋苑有充足距離，景觀不會受阻。

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

參考編號

160705-110507-85372

Reference Number:

2472

提交限期

15/07/2016

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

05/07/2016 11:05:07

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

小姐 Miss Grace Mak

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

My reasons for supporting the application of 6f are:

- (1) The plan optimises the land use to alleviate the land shortage issue in HK and provides more housing choices.
- (2) The area is suitable for residential building as it has been designated for staff headquarters which are no longer required. The planned plot ratio is still low that the infrastructure and facilities will be sufficient to accommodate the extra population.
- (3) The optimisation of the land use has given due consideration to various aspects, such as infrastructure, visual, traffic and capacity of the community. The design is sensitive to the adjacent development and natural setting. It has given due regard for the mountain backdrop and the relationship with the existing residents.
- (4) It creates more job opportunities, which will bring in many social and economic benefits to the society.
- (5) The plan brings in suitable amount of population to support the businesses of local shops, in a way to provide more retail choices for residents.

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

參考編號

160705-112003-33429

Reference Number:

2473

提交限期

15/07/2016

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

05/07/2016 11:20:03

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

女士 Ms. Tracey Leung

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

本人支持愉景灣第6f區的發展計劃，原因如下：

- 1) 可善用土地資源，減輕香港土地不足的問題，提供不同類型的房屋選擇。
- 2) 6f一直已規劃為居住用途，證明土地適宜建屋。規劃中的地積比亦很低，基建及配套足以容納新增的人口。
- 3) 新發展會創造更多就業機會，為市民及社會帶來好處及經濟效益。
- 4) 引入適量人口可支持本土小商店的營運，為居民提供更多的零售選擇。

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

參考編號

160705-105823-22930

Reference Number:

提交限期

15/07/2016

2474

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

05/07/2016 10:58:23

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. Samuel

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

本人支持愉景灣第6f區的發展計劃，原因如下：

- a) 6f一直已規劃為居住用途，證明土地適宜建屋。規劃中的地積比亦很低，基建及配套足以容納新增的人口。
- b) 計劃已考慮基礎設施、視覺、交通方面等因素及社區承擔能力，設計亦與周邊環境及景觀融合。
- c) 設計圖則顯示附近屋苑與新屋苑有充足距離，景觀不會受阻。
- d) 現時上址欠缺遊樂設施，新發展會美化環境及引入新的休憩設施。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-105303-53186

2475

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 10:53:03

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. Jackie

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

本人支持愉景灣第6f區的發展計劃，原因如下：

- 1) 新發展會創造更多就業機會，為市民及社會帶來好處及經濟效益。
- 2) 引入適量人口可支持本土小商店的營運，為居民提供更多的零售選擇。
- 3) 現時上址欠缺遊樂設施，新發展會美化環境及引入新的休憩設施。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-112210-67258

2476

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 11:22:10

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. Keith Ho

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

本人支持愉景灣第6f區的發展計劃，原因如下：

- (1) 可善用土地資源，減輕香港土地不足的問題，提供不同類型的房屋選擇。
- (2) 6f一直已規劃為居住用途，證明土地適宜建屋。規劃中的地積比亦很低，基建及配套足以容納新增的人口。
- (3) 計劃已考慮基礎設施、視覺、交通方面等因素及社區承擔能力，設計亦與周邊環境及景觀融合。
- (4) 新發展會創造更多就業機會，為市民及社會帶來好處及經濟效益。
- (5) 引入適量人口可支持本土小商店的營運，為居民提供更多的零售選擇。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-111452-22321

2477

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 11:14:52

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:

女士 Ms. Sophia Lau

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

本人支持愉景灣第6f區的發展計劃，原因如下：

- 1) 6f一直已規劃為居住用途，證明土地適宜建屋。規劃中的地積比亦很低，基建及配套足以容納新增的人口。
- 2) 計劃已考慮基礎設施、視覺、交通方面等因素及社區承擔能力，設計亦與周邊環境及景觀融合。
- 3) 新計劃可支持開辦獨立的巴士路線，令交通更方便快捷。
- 4) 現時上址欠缺遊樂設施，新發展會美化環境及引入新的休憩設施。
- 5) 設計圖則顯示附近屋苑與新屋苑有充足距離，景觀不會受阻。
- 6) 引入新屋苑，可分擔公共設施的維修費用，使周邊的基建設施作出翻新及改善，業主可減省維修保養及相關開支。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-110109-24770

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2478

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 11:01:09

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. MM IP

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

本人支持愉景灣第6f區的發展計劃，原因如下：

1. 可善用土地資源，減輕香港土地不足的問題，提供不同類型的房屋選擇。
2. 6f一直已規劃為居住用途，證明土地適宜建屋。規劃中的地積比亦很低，基建及配套足以容納新增的人口。
3. 計劃已考慮基礎設施、視覺、交通方面等因素及社區承擔能力，設計亦與周邊環境及景觀融合。
4. 新發展會創造更多就業機會，為市民及社會帶來好處及經濟效益。
5. 引入適量人口可支持本土小商店的營運，為居民提供更多的零售選擇。
6. 設計圖則顯示附近屋苑與新屋苑有充足距離，景觀不會受阻。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-105523-08849

2479

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 10:55:23

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. Jacky Ip

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

本人支持愉景灣第6f區的發展計劃，原因如下：

- 1) 計劃已考慮基礎設施、視覺、交通方面等因素及社區承擔能力，設計亦與周邊環境及景觀融合。
- 2) 新計劃可支持開辦獨立的巴士路線，令交通更方便快捷。
- 3) 設計圖則顯示附近屋苑與新屋苑有充足距離，景觀不會受阻。
- 4) 引入新屋苑，可分擔公共設施的維修費用，使周邊的基建設施作出翻新及改善，業主可減省維修保養及相關開支。

就規劃申請/撥移提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號

160705-114815-27299

Reference Number:

提交限期

15/07/2016

2480

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

05/07/2016 11:48:15

Date and time of submission:

有關的規劃申請編號

Y1-IDR/2

The application no. to which the comment relates:

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

女士 Ms. Choy

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment:

本人支持愉景灣第6區的發展計劃，原因如下：

- 1) 可善用土地資源，減輕香港土地不足的問題，提供不同類型的房屋選擇。
- 2) 6f一直已規劃為居住用途，證明土地適宜發展。規劃中的地積比亦很低，基建及配套足以容納新增的人口。
- 3) 新發展會創造更多就業機會，為市民及社會帶來好處及經濟效益。
- 4) 引入適量人口可支持本土小商店的營運，為居民提供更多的零售選擇。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-114300-63007

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2481

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 11:43:00

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. Edmund Lai

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

本人支持愉景灣第6f區的發展計劃，原因如下：

- 1) 6f一直已規劃為居住用途，證明土地適宜建屋。規劃中的地積比亦很低，基建及配套足以容納新增的人口。
- 2) 計劃已考慮基礎設施、視覺、交通方面等因素及社區承擔能力，設計亦與周邊環境及景觀融合。
- 3) 新計劃可支持開辦獨立的巴士路線，令交通更方便快捷。
- 4) 現時上址欠缺遊樂設施，新發展會美化環境及引入新的休憩設施。
- 5) 設計圖則顯示附近屋苑與新屋苑有充足距離，景觀不會受阻。
- 6) 引入新屋苑，可分擔公共設施的維修費用，使周邊的基建設施作出翻新及改善，業主可減省維修保養及相關開支。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-114010-73548

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2482

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 11:40:10

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. Leo Lo

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

本人支持愉景灣第6f區的發展計劃，原因如下：

- 1) 可善用土地資源，減輕香港土地不足的問題，提供不同類型的房屋選擇。
- 2) 6f一直已規劃為居住用途，證明土地適宜建屋。規劃中的地積比亦很低，基建及配套足以容納新增的人口。
- 3) 新發展會創造更多就業機會，為市民及社會帶來好處及經濟效益。
- 4) 引入適量人口可支持本土小商店的營運，為居民提供更多的零售選擇。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-114522-85362

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2483

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 11:45:22

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. Otto Lam

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

本人支持愉景灣第6f區的發展計劃，原因如下：

- 1) 可善用土地資源，減輕香港土地不足的問題，提供不同類型的房屋選擇。
- 2) 6f一直已規劃為居住用途，證明土地適宜建屋。規劃中的地積比亦很低，基建及配套足以容納新增的人口。
- 3) 新發展會創造更多就業機會，為市民及社會帶來好處及經濟效益。
- 4) 引入適量人口可支持本土小商店的營運，為居民提供更多的零售選擇。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-114255-43153

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2484

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 11:42:55

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. Wong

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

6f一直已規劃為居住用途，證明土地適宜建屋。規劃中的地積比亦很低，基建及配套足以容納新增的人口。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-113939-10971

2485

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 11:39:39

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:

先生 Mr. Wong

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

設計圖則顯示附近屋苑與新屋苑有充足距離，景觀不會受阻。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-113206-67714

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2486

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 11:32:06

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:

夫人 Mrs. Ho

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

引入適量人口可支持本土小商店的營運，為居民提供更多的零售選擇。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-120507-87483

2487

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 12:05:07

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. 章子明

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

計劃已考慮基礎設施、視覺、交通方面等因素及社區承擔能力，設計亦與周邊環境及景觀融合。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-113618-83175

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2488

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 11:36:18

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. David Chan

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

現時上址欠缺遊樂設施，新發展會美化環境及引入新的休憩設施。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-112908-12381

2489

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 11:29:08

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. Nick Wong

意見詳情

Details of the Comment:

新發展會創造更多就業機會，為市民及社會帶來好處及經濟效益。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-120803-31687

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2490

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 12:08:03

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. Verna Chung

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

本人支持愉景灣第6f區的發展計劃，原因如下：

- 1) 可善用土地資源，減輕香港土地不足的問題，提供不同類型的房屋選擇。
- 2) 6f一直已規劃為居住用途，證明土地適宜建屋。規劃中的地積比亦很低，基建及配套足以容納新增的人口。
- 3) 新發展會創造更多就業機會，為市民及社會帶來好處及經濟效益。

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

160705-123031-51629

Reference Number:**2491****提交限期**

15/07/2016

Deadline for submission:**提交日期及時間**

05/07/2016 12:30:31

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**

小姐 Miss Lau Shuk Yin

Name of person making this comment:**意見詳情****Details of the Comment :****我覺得呢個發展計劃對愉景灣有益處!!**

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-122320-64829

2492

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 12:23:20

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. Mandy Wong

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

本人支持愉景灣第6f區的發展計劃，原因如下：

- 1) 可善用土地資源，減輕香港土地不足的問題，提供不同類型的房屋選擇。
- 2) 6f一直已規劃為居住用途，證明土地適宜建屋。規劃中的地積比亦很低，基建及配套足以容納新增的人口。
- 3) 計劃已考慮基礎設施、視覺、交通方面等因素及社區承擔能力，設計亦與周邊環境及景觀融合。
- 4) 新計劃可支持開辦獨立的巴士路線，令交通更方便快捷。
- 5) 設計圖則顯示附近屋苑與新屋苑有充足距離，景觀不會受阻。

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

參考編號

160705-121554-72839

Reference Number:

2493

提交限期

15/07/2016

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

05/07/2016 12:15:54

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. Danville Tsang

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

本人支持愉景灣第6f區的發展計劃，原因如下：

- 1) 計劃已考慮基礎設施、視覺、交通方面等因素及社區承擔能力，設計亦與周邊環境及景觀融合。
- 2) 現時上址欠缺遊樂設施，新發展會美化環境及引入新的休憩設施。
- 3) 設計圖則顯示附近屋苑與新屋苑有充足距離，景觀不會受阻。
- 4) 引入新屋苑，可分擔公共設施的維修費用，使周邊的基建設施作出翻新及改善，業主可減省維修保養及相關開支。

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

160705-120813-02991

提交限期**Deadline for submission:**

15/07/2016

2494

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

05/07/2016 12:08:13

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

Y1-DB/2

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

先生 Mr. Chiu Man Wai

意見詳情**Details of the Comment:****Great Support!! I like the development plan.**

Section 1041(b)(1) - Amount of Property Acquired by Recipient

Reference Number: 7-017915-1 2008/04-27/072

2093

Section 1041(b)(2) - Amount of Property Acquired by Recipient

Date and time of contribution: 09/07/2004 12:00:00

The application in which the amount relates: VA 0907

Name of person making this payment: 吳冬 吳 德

Details of the payment:

本人十分喜與他... (The rest of the text in this box is illegible due to heavy noise and low resolution.)

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

參考編號

160705-120402-48008

Reference Number

提交限期

15/07/2016

2496

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

05/07/2016 12:04:02

Date and time of submission:

有關的規劃申請編號

Y1-DB/2

The application no. to which the comment relates:

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

女士 Ms. Yvonne Law

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment:

本人支持愉景灣第6f區的發展計劃，原因如下：

- 1) 可善用土地资源，減輕香港土地不足的問題，提供不同類型的房屋選擇。
- 2) 6f一直已規劃為居住用途，證明土地適宜建屋，規劃中的地積比亦很低，基建及配套足以容納新增的人口。
- 3) 新發展會創造更多就業機會，為市民及社會帶來好處及經濟效益。
- 4) 引入適量人口可支持本土小商店的營運，為居民提供更多的零售選擇。
- 5) 計劃已考慮基礎設施、視覺、交通方面等因素及社區承擔能力，設計亦與周邊環境及景觀融合。
- 6) 新計劃可支持開辦獨立的巴士路線，令交通更方便快捷。
- 7) 現時上址欠缺遊樂設施，新發展會美化環境及引入新的休憩設施。
- 8) 設計圖則顯示附新屋苑與新屋苑有充足距離，景觀不會受阻。
- 9) 引入新屋苑，可分擔公共設施的維修費用，使周邊的基礎設施作出翻新及改善，業主可減省維修保養及相關開支。

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

參考編號

160705-120402-48008

Reference Number:

提交日期

15/07/2016

2496

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

05/07/2016 12:04:02

Date and time of submission:

有關的規劃申請編號

Y1-DB/2

The application no. to which the comment relates:

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

女士 Ms. Yvonne Law

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment:

本人支持愉景灣第6區的發展計劃，原因如下：

- 1) 可善用土地資源，減輕香港土地不足的問題，提供不同類型的房屋選擇。
- 2) 6區一直已規劃為居住用途，證明土地適宜發展，規劃中的地積比亦很低，基礎及配套足以容納新增的人口。
- 3) 新發展會創造更多就業機會，為市民及社會帶來好處及經濟效益。
- 4) 引入適量人口可支持本土小商店的營運，為居民提供更多的零售選擇。
- 5) 計劃已考慮基礎設施、視覺、交通方面等因素及社區承擔能力，設計亦與周邊環境及景觀融合。
- 6) 新計劃可支持開辦獨立的巴士路線，令交通更方便快捷。
- 7) 現時上址欠缺遊樂設施，新發展會美化環境及引入新的休憩設施。
- 8) 設計圖則顯示新屋苑與新屋苑有充足距離，景觀不會受阻。
- 9) 引入新屋苑，可分擔公共設施的維修費用，使周邊的基礎設施作出翻新及改善，業主可減省維修保養及相關開支。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-121347-19454

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2497

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 12:13:47

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. Ernest Wong

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

本人支持愉景灣第6f區的發展計劃，原因如下：

- 1) 可善用土地資源，減輕香港土地不足的問題，提供不同類型的房屋選擇。
- 2) 6f一直已規劃為居住用途，證明土地適宜建屋。規劃中的地積比亦很低，基建及配套足以容納新增的人口。
- 3) 計劃已考慮基礎設施、視覺、交通方面等因素及社區承擔能力，設計亦與周邊環境及景觀融合。
- 4) 新計劃可支持開辦獨立的巴士路線，令交通更方便快捷。
- 5) 設計圖則顯示附近屋苑與新屋苑有充足距離，景觀不會受阻。
- 6) 引入新屋苑，可分擔公共設施的維修費用，使周邊的基建設施作出翻新及改善，業主可減省維修保養及相關開支。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-115043-03880

2498

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 11:50:43

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. Wilson Chu

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

本人支持愉景灣第6f區的發展計劃，原因如下：

- 1) 6f一直已規劃為居住用途，證明土地適宜建屋。規劃中的地積比亦很低，基建及配套足以容納新增的人口。
- 2) 計劃已考慮基礎設施、視覺、交通方面等因素及社區承擔能力，設計亦與周邊環境及景觀融合。
- 3) 新計劃可支持開辦獨立的巴士路線，令交通更方便快捷。
- 4) 設計圖則顯示附近屋苑與新屋苑有充足距離，景觀不會受阻。
- 5) 引入新屋苑，可分擔公共設施的維修費用，使周邊的基建設施作出翻新及改善，業主可減省維修保養及相關開支。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-124951-02611

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2499

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 12:49:51

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. Leung

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

 I fully support the proposed development plan.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-130221-02122

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2500

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 13:02:21

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. Jeffery

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Support

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-125951-29586

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2501

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 12:59:51

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:

小姐 Miss Wong

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

The plan echoes with the future development at Lantau Island.

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

參考編號

160705-125540-49415

Reference Number:

2502

提交限期

15/07/2016

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

05/07/2016 12:55:40

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. Wilson

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment:

本人十分支持及認同有關發展計劃

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

160705-130309-05010

提交限期**Deadline for submission:**

15/07/2016

2503**提交日期及時間****Date and time of submission:**

05/07/2016 13:03:09

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

Y1-DB/2

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

先生 Mr. Leung

意見詳情**Details of the Comment :**

The new plan will create more job opportunities, which will bring in many social and economic benefits to the society and citizens.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-142348-47975

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2504

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 14:23:48

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. Li

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

It keeps DB competitive through the continuous development and facilities upgrade.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-143913-99831

2505

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 14:39:13

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. William IP

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

I support.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-143812-25188

2506

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 14:38:12

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:

小姐 Miss Belinda Yeung

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

I support.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-143154-97691

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2507

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 14:31:54

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. Martin Hiu

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

I am sporty. Unfortunately, Discovery Bay is lack of in-house recreation facilities. Having the new development and more people to live in Discovery Bay, HKSAR Government and LCSD will need to explain why still not proceed with the in-house recreation facility built next to Discovery Bay Community Hall.

I support to have the new development.

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

160705-142735-63905

提交限期**Deadline for submission:**

15/07/2016

2509**提交日期及時間****Date and time of submission:**

05/07/2016 14:27:35

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. Lily Li

意見詳情**Details of the Comment :****More leisure space will be created for residents to enjoy.**

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-143654-51996

2510

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 14:36:54

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. 胡

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

我支持發展，因為可以提供更多土地解決居住問題

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-142252-35313

2511

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 14:22:52

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:

夫人 Mrs. Wong

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

I buy the new development which can provide more residential units in Discovery Bay. Hong Kongers can have more chances to live in this nice environment and local people can move to more comfortable homes.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-141510-67064

2512

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 14:15:10

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. Figo

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Increase the property value of nearby areas.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-141432-27680

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2513

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 14:14:32

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. Dickson

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

I look forward to the new development because more residents means more recreation club members in Discovery Bay and it can force the club to reduce charges and to defer increment of charges.

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

160705-144007-49410

2514**提交限期****Deadline for submission:**

15/07/2016

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

05/07/2016 14:40:07

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:**

女士 Ms. Yau

意見詳情**Details of the Comment :**

Recently, I have visited my friend who moved from Taikoo Shing to Discovery Bay five years ago. The place is wonderful. I have been told new development is going on. I like the new development.

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

參考編號

160705-150759-68047

Reference Number:

提交限期

15/07/2016

2515

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

05/07/2016 15:07:59

Date and time of submission:

有關的規劃申請編號

Y/A-DB/2

The application no. to which the comment relates:

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

先生 Mr. Peter Chan

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Support the submission and its amendment is fine. We need development to enhance and upgrade our community.

關於申請人陳志強先生之申請之附屬意見 (Comments on Planning Application No. 100-100)

參考編號
Reference Number

100/100-100

2518

提交日期
Date of submission

15/7/78

提交日期及時間
Date and time of submission

15/7/78 10:30 AM

有關的申請申請編號
The application no. to which the comment relates

VA 100/2

「投票人」姓名/名稱
Name of person making this comment

本人 Mrs CC

意見詳情
Details of the comment:

I am writing in support of the application because the plan optimizes the land use to alleviate the land shortage issue in Hong Kong & provides more housing choices also creates more job opportunities, which will bring in many social and economic benefits to the society.

25

Reference Number

提交日期

15/07/2016

Deadline for submission

提交日期及時間

05/07/2016 16:53:32

Date and time of submission

有關的規劃申請編號

Y1-DB/2

The application no. to which the comment relates:

「樓上見人」 姓名/名稱

夫人 Mrs. Sue Pasquin

Name of person making this comment

意見詳情

Details of the comment

To
Secretary of the Town Planning Board
tpbpd@pland.gov.hk
Re
Application Y1-DB/2, Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay
To rezone the application site from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (5)" to "Residential (Group C) 12"

Dear Sir,

Herewith we call on the Town Planning Board

"To reject the application Y1-DB/2 to rezone Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (5)" to "Residential (Group C) 12" "

My reasons for objecting to the application are:

In the Government comments on HKR's application to develop areas 6f and 10b, EPD made comments to HKR for suggesting that sewage from the 6f and 10b developments could be treated at the Sai Ho Wan Sewage Treatment Works (SHWSTW). Here is EPD's comment:

"The Discovery Bay further development shall provide its own sewage treatment facilities to meet the WPCO standards before discharge into the receiving waters. In this connection, the Applicant should delete all the incorrect and misleading statements, e.g. "SHWSTW requires upgrade works to cater for the existing and concurrent developments, irrespective of the proposed developments. The upgrade works could cater for the sewerage increase as a result of the proposal, which accounts around 0.8% of the treatment flow" and other similar text in the submission as they are factually incorrect."

In its letter circulated to all DB residents on 23 April, 2016, titled "Further Elaborations on DB Latest Development Plans", HKR was still making the misleading claim that sewage could be treated at the SHWSTW. The idea that it could not was a "misconception"

Worse, in its latest submission to the TPB HKR has merely acknowledged that that untreated sewage cannot be routed to the SHWSTW. It has not provided a proper update for its alternative proposals, which had assumed that the EPD would allow treated sewage to be sent to the SHWSTW for disposal. Note above that EPD has clearly stated that HKR is responsible for treating sewage to WPCO standards for discharge into the receiving waters.

2317

In its original submission to the TPB, HKR provided two alternative solutions if the option to use SHWSTW was ruled out:

- 6f sewage treated on-site; 10b sewage treated in a new sewage treatment works facing La Costa before pumping to SHWSTW.-
- 6f sewage connected to the existing DB sewage system at the pumping station between Beach Village and the tennis courts; sewage volume equivalent to 6f and 10b treated in a new sewage treatment works facing La Costa. Treated effluent sent to SHWSTW.

Now that discharge to the SHWSTW is not an option, HKR states:

"The applicant will undertake the design, construction and implementation of an on-site sewage treatment plant (STP) adequate for proper treatment of the sewage arising to meeting the permissible effluent standards for discharging into the receiving waters. ... Other detailed design parameters such as the treatment level, treatment technology, discharge location, effluent standards will be properly addressed at detail design stage subsequent to the approval of this rezoning application."

In other words, there is no detail on how the sewage will be treated, or where it will be discharged into the waters around DB. The locations of the sewage treatment plants and marine outfall shown in the updated Environmental Impact Assessment are "indicative only".

There are no details of the STP, and given the small size of the lot and the proximity to existing residential developments, there is no assessment on what impact a sewage treatment plant has on the immediate environment.

EPD's comments make it clear that the sewerage systems for 6f and 10b must be kept separate from the existing sewage infrastructure in DB, so that there is no possibility of discharge of sewage from the new developments to SHWSTW.

Further, while HKR states that the sewage treatment plant(s) will be maintained at the cost of the owners of the 6f and 10b developments (ref. DSD's comments, SIA (d)), it ignores maintenance responsibility for the connecting pipeline systems and the marine outfall.

Provision of sewerage infrastructure is a basic requirement. How can HKR be allowed to proceed without providing basic information on sewage treatment and disposal?

I object to the above-mentioned development application.

Regards, Sue Basquin

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

參考編號
 Reference Number: 160705-105801-37651
 2518
 提交限期
 Deadline for submission: 15/07/2016
 提交日期及時間
 Date and time of submission: 05/07/2016 10:58:01
 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: 夫人 Mrs. Sue Basquin

意見詳情
 Details of the Comment :

To:
 Secretary of the Town Planning Board
 tpbpd@pland.gov.hk
 Re:
 Application Y/I-DB/2, Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext. (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay
 To rezone the application site from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (5)" to "Residential (Group C) 12"

Dear Sirs,

Herewith we call on the Town Planning Board:

"To reject the application Y/I-DB/2 to rezone Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext. (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (5)" to "Residential (Group C) 12" "

My reasons for objecting to the application are:

During the first round of public consultation on the Area 6f proposals, the topic that attracted the greatest number of objections was HKR's proposal to use the brick roadway at the Woods as the main access route to the new tower blocks.

The submissions pointed out that Parkvale owners have been paying for maintenance of this roadway for the past 28 years. Therefore, the road must be Village Common Area, and HKR has no right to provide access through Parkvale to Area 6f.

HKR replied that it has not designated the road as Village Common Area, and therefore it retains "ownership" of the road. As such, it has the right to grant a right of way over the road in favour of Area 6f.

This defies logic.

HKR cannot simply claim "ownership" of any part of DB at will. Rights over a piece of land or a facility or unit in DB are always based on possession of undivided shares, and are subject to the Land Grant, the DMC and any relevant Sub-DMC.

According to the Land Grant, HKR must allocate undivided shares to the roads within DB in the DMC. However, all undivided shares in DB are bound to certain uses, as described in this earlier post. Therefore, when allocating undivided shares, HKR must allocate a certain type of share. Only two types of undivided shares are appropriate: Retained Area shares, by which HKR remains responsible for the area; and Common Area shares, by which all owners are responsible for the area.

HKR admitted in its submission that the Passageways are not part of the Village Retained Area. The Parkvale sub-DMC allocates Retained Area Undivided Shares to the Village Retained Area, but no undivided shares to the Passageways. Hence, HKR does not "own" the Passageways by virtue of the Sub-DMC.

HKR may argue that it has allocated City Retained Area Undivided Shares. However, if this is the case, there is no provision under either the DMC or the Sub-DMC that would allow the Manager, City Management, to charge the owners of Parkvale Village for the maintenance of the Passageways, as it has done for the past 28 years.

HKR has three choices:

Declare the Passageways to be City Retained Area and allocate the appropriate number of City Retained Area undivided shares. HKR will then need to take over maintenance responsibility for all Passageways in DB, and compensate all villages for all past expenditure for maintaining HKR's passageways. HKR may then grant right of way through Parkvale Village to Area 6f.

Declare the Passageways to be City Common Area. HKR will need to pay its portion of the City expenses for maintaining all Passageways in DB, and compensate all villages for past expenditure. Area 6f will have automatic right of access through the City Common Area.

Maintain the status quo, whereby the Passageways are treated as Village Common Area. Area 6f will have no right of access through the Parkvale Passageway. It could easily be argued that this is established practice; HKR has allowed the practice to continue uninterrupted for more than 30 years across DB.

The Town Planning Board must exercise extreme caution when dealing with matters concerning the control of any area in DB, especially those village areas for which no undivided shares have been allocated in the Sub-DMC. A clear understanding of the operation of the share regime at Discovery Bay is essential to avoid making mistakes. Naturally, any decisions by the TPB that ignore the share regime and established practice would be subject to judicial review.

REGARDS, SUE BASQUIN

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

參考編號

160705-094244-55557

Reference Number:

2519

提交限期

15/07/2016

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

05/07/2016 09:42:44

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. W Wong

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

To:

Secretary of the Town Planning Board
tpbpd@pland.gov.hk

Re:

Application Y/I-DB/2, Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext. (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay
To rezone the application site from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (5)" to "Residential (Group C) 12"

Dear Sirs,

Herewith we call on the Town Planning Board:

To reject the application Y/I-DB/2 to rezone Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext. (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (5)" to "Residential (Group C) 12"

My reasons for objecting to the application are:

During the first round of public consultation on the Area 6f proposals, the topic that attracted the greatest number of objections was HKR's proposal to use the brick roadway at the Woods as the main access route to the new tower blocks.

The submissions pointed out that Parkvale owners have been paying for maintenance of this roadway for the past 28 years. Therefore, the road must be Village Common Area, and HKR has no right to provide access through Parkvale to Area 6f.

HKR replied that it has not designated the road as Village Common Area, and therefore it retains "ownership" of the road. As such, it has the right to grant a right of way over the road in favour of Area 6f.

This defies logic.

2519

HKR cannot simply claim "ownership" of any part of DB at will. Rights over a piece of land or a facility or unit in DB are always based on possession of undivided shares, and are subject to the Land Grant, the DMC and any relevant Sub-DMC.

According to the Land Grant, HKR must allocate undivided shares to the roads within DB in the DMC. However, all undivided shares in DB are bound to certain uses, as described in this earlier post. Therefore, when allocating undivided shares, HKR must allocate a certain type of share. Only two types of undivided shares are appropriate: Retained Area shares, by which HKR remains responsible for the area; and Common Area shares, by which all owners are responsible for the area.

HKR admitted in its submission that the Passageways are not part of the Village Retained Area. The Parkvale sub-DMC allocates Retained Area Undivided Shares to the Village Retained Area, but no undivided shares to the Passageways. Hence, HKR does not "own" the Passageways by virtue of the Sub-DMC.

HKR may argue that it has allocated City Retained Area Undivided Shares. However, if this is the case, there is no provision under either the DMC or the Sub-DMC that would allow the Manager, City Management, to charge the owners of Parkvale Village for the maintenance of the Passageways, as it has done for the past 28 years.

The Town Planning Board must exercise extreme caution when dealing with matters concerning the control of any area in DB, especially those village areas for which no undivided shares have been allocated in the Sub-DMC. A clear understanding of the operation of the share regime at Discovery Bay is essential to avoid making mistakes. Naturally, any decisions by the TPB that ignore the share regime and established practice would be subject to judicial review.

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

參考編號 Reference Number:	160705-094108-03415 2520
提交限期 Deadline for submission:	15/07/2016
提交日期及時間 Date and time of submission:	05/07/2016 09:41:08
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. J Chau

意見詳情

Details of the Comment:

During the first round of public consultation on the Area 6f proposals, the topic that attracted the greatest number of objections was HKR's proposal to use the brick roadway at the Woods as the main access route to the new tower blocks.

The submissions pointed out that Parkvale owners have been paying for maintenance of this roadway for the past 28 years. Therefore, the road must be Village Common Area, and HKR has no right to provide access through Parkvale to Area 6f.

HKR replied that it has not designated the road as Village Common Area, and therefore it retains "ownership" of the road. As such, it has the right to grant a right of way over the road in favour of Area 6f.

This defies logic.

HKR cannot simply claim "ownership" of any part of DB at will. Rights over a piece of land or a facility or unit in DB are always based on possession of undivided shares, and are subject to the Land Grant, the DMC and any relevant Sub-DMC.

According to the Land Grant, HKR must allocate undivided shares to the roads within DB in the DMC. However, all undivided shares in DB are bound to certain uses, as described in this earlier post. Therefore, when allocating undivided shares, HKR must allocate a certain type of share. Only two types of undivided shares are appropriate: Retained Area shares, by which HKR remains responsible for the area; and Common Area shares, by which all owners are responsible for the area.

HKR admitted in its submission that the Passageways are not part of the Village Retained Area. The Parkvale sub-DMC allocates Retained Area Undivided Shares to the Village Retained Areas, but no undivided shares to the Passageways. Hence, HKR does not "own" the Passageways by virtue of the Sub-DMC.

HKR may argue that it has allocated City Retained Area Undivided Shares. However, if this is the case, there is no provision under either the DMC or the Sub-DMC that would allow the Mana

2520

ger, City Management, to charge the owners of Parkvale Village for the maintenance of the Passageways, as it has done for the past 28 years.

The Town Planning Board must exercise extreme caution when dealing with matters concerning the control of any area in DB, especially those village areas for which no undivided shares have been allocated in the Sub-DMC. A clear understanding of the operation of the share regime at Discovery Bay is essential to avoid making mistakes. Naturally, any decisions by the TPB that ignore the share regime and established practice would be subject to judicial review.

參考編號

160705-093216-31246

Reference Number:

2521

提交限期

15/07/2016

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

05/07/2016 09:32:16

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. M.Fairley

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

I again voice my protest to the application to change the use of this area from staff quarters to residential development for a number of reasons. I request that the cap on residents in Discovery Bay is strictly maintained at the agreed 25000, to preserve the character of the area and its infrastructure. The government needs to establish a trustworthy census of residents of DB, to establish a credible number of persons per unit ratio for planning purposes.

Roads, transport, services, refuse, sewage and water supply are not capable of supporting the proposed increase in the number of units/residents in DB, by HKRI. Notwithstanding this, the entire nature and character of Discovery Bay is being changed by incessant 'development', causing residents to re-consider their future in Hong Kong as a whole. As a permanent resident and tax-payer of Hong Kong, I firmly ask that government protect the rights of citizens of Discovery Bay, and stop HKRI from its devious attempts to exploit the area and its residents for its own financial gain and greed.

In addition, I submit the following:

Herewith we call on the Town Planning Board:

"To reject the application Y/I-DB/2 to rezone Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext. (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (5)" to "Residential (Group C) 12" "

My reasons for objecting to the application are:

In the Government comments on HKR's application to develop areas 6f and 10b. EPD made comments to HKR for suggesting that sewage from the 6f and 10b developments could be treated at the Siu Ho Wan Sewage Treatment Works (SHWSTW). Here is EPD's comment:

"The Discovery Bay further development shall provide its own sewage treatment facilities to meet the WPCO standards before discharge into the receiving waters. In this connection, the Applicant should delete all the incorrect and misleading statements, e.g. "SHWSTW requires upgrade works to cater for the existing and concurrent developments, irrespective of the proposed developments. The upgrade works could cater for the sewerage increase as a result of the proposal, which accounts around 0.8% of the treatment flow" and other similar text in the submission as they are factually incorrect."

In its letter circulated to all DB residents on 23 April, 2016, titled "Further Elaborations on DB

Latest Development Plans", HKR was still making the misleading claim that sewage could be treated at the SHWSTW. The idea that it could not was a "misconception"

Worse, in its latest submission to the TPB HKR has merely acknowledged that that untreated sewage cannot be routed to the SHWSTW. It has not provided a proper update for its alternative proposals, which had assumed that the EPD would allow treated sewage to be sent to the SHWSTW for disposal. Note above that EPD has clearly stated that HKR is responsible for treating sewage to WPCO standards for discharge into the receiving waters.

In its original submission to the TPB, HKR provided two alternative solutions if the option to use SHWSTW was ruled out:

- 6f sewage treated on-site; 10b sewage treated in a new sewage treatment works facing La Costa before pumping to SHWSTW.-

- 6f sewage connected to the existing DB sewage system at the pumping station between Beach Village and the tennis courts; sewage volume equivalent to 6f and 10b treated in a new sewage treatment works facing La Costa. Treated effluent sent to SHWSTW.

Now that discharge to the SHWSTW is not an option, HKR states:

"The applicant will undertake the design, construction and implementation of an on-site sewage treatment plant (STP) adequate for proper treatment of the sewage arising to meeting the permissible effluent standards for discharging into the receiving waters. ... Other detailed design parameter such as the treatment level, treatment technology, discharge location, effluent standards will be properly addressed at detail design stage subsequent to the approval of this rezoning application."

In other words, there is no detail on how the sewage will be treated, or where it will be discharged into the waters around DB. The locations of the sewage treatment plants and marine outfall shown in the updated Environmental Impact Assessment are "indicative only".

There are no details of the STP, and given the small size of the lot and the proximity to existing residential developments, there is no assessment on what impact a sewage treatment plant has on the immediate environment.

EPD's comments make it clear that the sewerage systems for 6f and 10b must be kept separate from the existing sewerage infrastructure in DB, so that there is no possibility of discharge of sewage from the new developments to SHWSTW.

Further, while HKR states that the sewage treatment plant(s) will be maintained at the cost of the owners of the 6f and 10b developments (ref. DSD's comments, SIA (d)), it ignores maintenance responsibility for the connecting pipeline systems and the marine outfall.

Provision of sewerage infrastructure is a basic requirement. How can HKR be allowed to proceed without providing basic information on sewage treatment and disposal?

Unless and until my demands are acceded to and my concerns are addressed I object to the above-mentioned development application.

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見

Reference Number:

160705-071754-04314

2522

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 07:17:54

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:

夫人 Mrs. Megan McIntyre

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

To:

Secretary of the Town Planning Board
tpbpd@pland.gov.hk

Re:

Application Y/I-DB/2, Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext. (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay
To rezone the application site from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (5)" to "Residential (Group C) 12"

Dear Sirs,

Herewith we call on the Town Planning Board:

"To reject the application Y/I-DB/2 to rezone Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext. (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (5)" to "Residential (Group C) 12" "

My reasons for objecting to the application are:

In the Government comments on HKR's application to develop areas 6f and 10b. EPD made comments to HKR for suggesting that sewage from the 6f and 10b developments could be treated at the Siu Ho Wan Sewage Treatment Works (SHWSTW). Here is EPD's comment:

"The Discovery Bay further development shall provide its own sewage treatment facilities to meet the WPCO standards before discharge into the receiving waters. In this connection, the Applicant should delete all the incorrect and misleading statements, e.g. "SHWSTW requires upgrade works to cater for the existing and concurrent developments, irrespective of the proposed developments. The upgrade works could cater for the sewerage increase as a result of the proposal, which accounts around 0.8% of the treatment flow" and other similar text in the submission as they

2522

are factually incorrect."

In its letter circulated to all DB residents on 23 April, 2016, titled "Further Elaborations on DB Latest Development Plans", HKR was still making the misleading claim that sewage could be treated at the SHWSTW. The idea that it could not was a "misconception"

Worse, in its latest submission to the TPB HKR has merely acknowledged that that untreated sewage cannot be routed to the SHWSTW. It has not provided a proper update for its alternative proposals, which had assumed that the EPD would allow treated sewage to be sent to the SHWSTW for disposal. Note above that EPD has clearly stated that HKR is responsible for treating sewage to WPCO standards for discharge into the receiving waters.

In its original submission to the TPB, HKR provided two alternative solutions if the option to use SHWSTW was ruled out:

- 6f sewage treated on-site; 10b sewage treated in a new sewage treatment works facing La Costa before pumping to SHWSTW.-
- 6f sewage connected to the existing DB sewage system at the pumping station between Beach Village and the tennis courts; sewage volume equivalent to 6f and 10b treated in a new sewage treatment works facing La Costa. Treated effluent sent to SHWSTW.

Now that discharge to the SHWSTW is not an option, HKR states:

"The applicant will undertake the design, construction and implementation of an on-site sewage treatment plant (STP) adequate for proper treatment of the sewage arising to meeting the permissible effluent standards for discharging into the receiving waters. ... Other detailed design parameter such as the treatment level, treatment technology, discharge location, effluent standards will be properly addressed at detail design stage subsequent to the approval of this rezoning application."

In other words, there is no detail on how the sewage will be treated, or where it will be discharged into the waters around DB. The locations of the sewage treatment plants and marine outfall shown in the updated Environmental Impact Assessment are "indicative only".

There are no details of the STP, and given the small size of the lot and the proximity to existing residential developments, there is no assessment on what impact a sewage treatment plant has on the immediate environment.

EPD's comments make it clear that the sewerage systems for 6f and 10b must be kept separate from the existing sewage infrastructure in DB, so that there is no possibility of discharge of sewage from the new developments to SHWSTW.

Further, while HKR states that the sewage treatment plant(s) will be maintained at the cost of the owners of the 6f and 10b developments (ref. DSD's comments, SIA (d)), it ignores maintenance responsibility for the connecting pipeline systems and the marine outfall.

Provision of sewerage infrastructure is a basic requirement. How can HKR be allowed to proceed without providing basic information on sewage treatment and disposal?

Unless and until my demands are acceded to and my concerns are addressed I object to the above-mentioned development application.

參考編號

Reference Number:

160704-222039-75753

2523

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

04/07/2016 22:20:39

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:

小姐 Miss Amanda Ng

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Dear Sirs,

Herewith we call on the Town Planning Board:

"To reject the application Y/I-DB/2 to rezone Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext. (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (5)" to "Residential (Group C) 12" "

My reasons for objecting to the application are:

In the Government comments on HKR's application to develop areas 6f and 10b. EPD made comments to HKR for suggesting that sewage from the 6f and 10b developments could be treated at the Siu Ho Wan Sewage Treatment Works (SHWSTW). Here is EPD's comment:

"The Discovery Bay further development shall provide its own sewage treatment facilities to meet the WPCO standards before discharge into the receiving waters. In this connection, the Applicant should delete all the incorrect and misleading statements, e.g. "SHWSTW requires upgrade works to cater for the existing and concurrent developments, irrespective of the proposed developments. The upgrade works could cater for the sewerage increase as a result of the proposal, which accounts around 0.8% of the treatment flow" and other similar text in the submission as they are factually incorrect."

In its letter circulated to all DB residents on 23 April, 2016, titled "Further Elaborations on DB Latest Development Plans", HKR was still making the misleading claim that sewage could be treated at the SHWSTW. The idea that it could not was a "misconception"

Worse, in its latest submission to the TPB HKR has merely acknowledged that that untreated sewage cannot be routed to the SHWSTW. It has not provided a proper update for its alternative proposals, which had assumed that the EPD would allow treated sewage to be sent to the SHWSTW for disposal. Note above that EPD has clearly stated that HKR is responsible for treating sewage to WPCO standards for discharge into the receiving waters.

2523

In its original submission to the TPB, HKR provided two alternative solutions if the option to use SHWSTW was ruled out:

- 6f sewage treated on-site; 10b sewage treated in a new sewage treatment works facing La Costa before pumping to SHWSTW.-
- 6f sewage connected to the existing DB sewage system at the pumping station between Beach Village and the tennis courts; sewage volume equivalent to 6f and 10b treated in a new sewage treatment works facing La Costa. Treated effluent sent to SHWSTW.

Now that discharge to the SHWSTW is not an option, HKR states:

"The applicant will undertake the design, construction and implementation of an on-site sewage treatment plant (STP) adequate for proper treatment of the sewage arising to meeting the permissible effluent standards for discharging into the receiving waters. ... Other detailed design parameter such as the treatment level, treatment technology, discharge location, effluent standards will be properly addressed at detail design stage subsequent to the approval of this rezoning application."

In other words, there is no detail on how the sewage will be treated, or where it will be discharged into the waters around DB. The locations of the sewage treatment plants and marine outfall shown in the updated Environmental Impact Assessment are "indicative only".

There are no details of the STP, and given the small size of the lot and the proximity to existing residential developments, there is no assessment on what impact a sewage treatment plant has on the immediate environment.

EPD's comments make it clear that the sewerage systems for 6f and 10b must be kept separate from the existing sewage infrastructure in DB, so that there is no possibility of discharge of sewage from the new developments to SHWSTW.

Further, while HKR states that the sewage treatment plant(s) will be maintained at the cost of the owners of the 6f and 10b developments (ref. DSD's comments, SIA (d)), it ignores maintenance responsibility for the connecting pipeline systems and the marine outfall.

Provision of sewerage infrastructure is a basic requirement. How can HKR be allowed to proceed without providing basic information on sewage treatment and disposal?

Unless and until my demands are acceded to and my concerns are addressed I object to the above-mentioned development application.

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

參考編號

160704-223052-38719

Reference Number:

2524

提交限期

15/07/2016

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

04/07/2016 22:30:52

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. Lin

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

To:

Secretary of the Town Planning Board

tpbpd@pland.gov.hk

Re:

Application Y/I-DB/2, Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext. (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay

To rezone the application site from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (5)" to "Residential (Group C) 12"

Dear Sirs,

Herewith we call on the Town Planning Board:

"To reject the application Y/I-DB/2 to rezone Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext. (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (5)" to "Residential (Group C) 12" "

My reasons for objecting to the application are:

In the Government comments on HKR's application to develop areas 6f and 10b. EPD made comments to HKR for suggesting that sewage from the 6f and 10b developments could be treated at the Siu Ho Wan Sewage Treatment Works (SHWSTW). Here is EPD's comment:

"The Discovery Bay further development shall provide its own sewage treatment facilities to meet the WPCO standards before discharge into the receiving waters. In this connection, the Applicant should delete all the incorrect and misleading statements, e.g. "SHWSTW requires upgrade works to cater for the existing and concurrent developments, irrespective of the proposed developments. The upgrade works could cater for the sewerage increase as a result of the proposal, which accounts around 0.8% of the treatment flow" and other similar text in the submission as they are factually incorrect."

In its letter circulated to all DB residents on 23 April, 2016, titled "Further Elaborations on DB Latest Development Plans", HKR was still making the misleading claim that sewage could be treated at the SHWSTW. The idea that it could not was a "misconception"

Worse, in its latest submission to the TPB HKR has merely acknowledged that that untreated sewage cannot be routed to the SHWSTW. It has not provided a proper update for its alternative proposals, which had assumed that the EPD would allow treated sewage to be sent to the SHWSTW for disposal. Note above that EPD has clearly stated that HKR is responsible for treating sewage to WPCO standards for discharge into the receiving waters.

In its original submission to the TPB, HKR provided two alternative solutions if the option to use SHWSTW was ruled out:

- 6f sewage treated on-site; 10b sewage treated in a new sewage treatment works facing La Costa before pumping to SHWSTW.-
- 6f sewage connected to the existing DB sewage system at the pumping station between Beach Village and the tennis courts; sewage volume equivalent to 6f and 10b treated in a new sewage treatment works facing La Costa. Treated effluent sent to SHWSTW.

Now that discharge to the SHWSTW is not an option, HKR states:

"The applicant will undertake the design, construction and implementation of an on-site sewage treatment plant (STP) adequate for proper treatment of the sewage arising to meeting the permissible effluent standards for discharging into the receiving waters. ... Other detailed design parameters such as the treatment level, treatment technology, discharge location, effluent standards will be properly addressed at detail design stage subsequent to the approval of this rezoning application."

In other words, there is no detail on how the sewage will be treated, or where it will be discharged into the waters around DB. The locations of the sewage treatment plants and marine outfall shown in the updated Environmental Impact Assessment are "indicative only".

There are no details of the STP, and given the small size of the lot and the proximity to existing residential developments, there is no assessment on what impact a sewage treatment plant has on the immediate environment.

EPD's comments make it clear that the sewerage systems for 6f and 10b must be kept separate from the existing sewage infrastructure in DB, so that there is no possibility of discharge of sewage from the new developments to SHWSTW.

Further, while HKR states that the sewage treatment plant(s) will be maintained at the cost of the owners of the 6f and 10b developments (ref. DSD's comments, SIA (d)), it ignores maintenance responsibility for the connecting pipeline systems and the marine outfall.

Provision of sewerage infrastructure is a basic requirement. How can HKR be allowed to proceed without providing basic information on sewage treatment and disposal?

Unless and until my demands are acceded to and my concerns are addressed I object to the above-mentioned development application.

參考編號

Reference Number:

160704-215817-54976

2525

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

04/07/2016 23:58:17

有關的規劃申請編號

The application no. to which the comment relates:

Y1-DB/2

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

Name of person making this comment:

Ms. Lee pui ki

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Do you want to lose the green lawn areas behind Woodland Court and replaced by a SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT?

Object the planning application NOW!

[p.s. You don't need to be an owner to send objection]

Fill in the online form before midnight Friday, 15th July, 2016 in 3 simple steps.

To:

Secretary of the Town Planning Board
tpbpd@pland.gov.hk

Re:

Application Y1-DB/2, Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext. (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay
To rezone the application site from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (5)" to "Residential (Group C) 12"

Dear Sirs,

Herewith we call on the Town Planning Board:

"To reject the application Y1-DB/2 to rezone Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext. (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (5)" to "Residential (Group C) 12" "

My reasons for objecting to the application are:

In the Government comments on HKR's application to develop areas 6f and 10b. EPD made comments to HKR for suggesting that sewage from the 6f and 10b developments could be treated at the Siu Ho Wan Sewage Treatment Works (SHWSTW). Here is EPD's comment:

"The Discovery Bay further development shall provide its own sewage treatment facilities to meet the WPCO standards before discharge into the receiving waters. In this connection, the Applicant should delete all the incorrect and misleading statements, e.g. "SHWSTW requires upgrade works to cater for the existing and concurrent developments, irrespective of the proposed developments. The upgrade works could cater for the sewerage increase as a result of the proposal, which accounts around 0.8% of the treatment flow" and other similar text in the submission as they are factually incorrect."

In its letter circulated to all DB residents on 23 April, 2016, titled "Further Elaborations on DB Latest Development Plans", HKR was still making the misleading claim that sewage could be treated at the SHWSTW. The idea that it could not was a "misconception"

Worse, in its latest submission to the TPB HKR has merely acknowledged that that untreated sewage cannot be routed to the SHWSTW. It has not provided a proper update for its alternative proposals, which had assumed that the EPD would allow treated sewage to be sent to the SHWSTW for disposal. Note above that EPD has clearly stated that HKR is responsible for treating sewage to WPCO standards for discharge into the receiving waters.

In its original submission to the TPB, HKR provided two alternative solutions if the option to use SHWSTW was ruled out:

- 6f sewage treated on-site; 10b sewage treated in a new sewage treatment works facing La Costa before pumping to SHWSTW.-
- 6f sewage connected to the existing DB sewage system at the pumping station between Beach Village and the tennis courts; sewage volume equivalent to 6f and 10b treated in a new sewage treatment works facing La Costa. Treated effluent sent to SHWSTW.

Now that discharge to the SHWSTW is not an option, HKR states:

"The applicant will undertake the design, construction and implementation of an on-site sewage treatment plant (STP) adequate for proper treatment of the sewage arising to meeting the permissible effluent standards for discharging into the receiving waters. ... Other detailed design parameter such as the treatment level, treatment technology, discharge location, effluent standards will be properly addressed at detail design stage subsequent to the approval of this rezoning application."

In other words, there is no detail on how the sewage will be treated, or where it will be discharged into the waters around DB. The locations of the sewage treatment plants and marine outfall shown in the updated Environmental Impact Assessment are "indicative only".

There are no details of the STP, and given the small size of the lot and the proximity to existing residential developments, there is no assessment on what impact a sewage treatment plant has on the immediate environment.

EPD's comments make it clear that the sewerage systems for 6f and 10b must be kept separate from the existing sewage infrastructure in DB, so that there is no possibility of discharge of sewage from the new developments to SHWSTW.

Further, while HKR states that the sewage treatment plant(s) will be maintained at the cost of the owners of the 6f and 10b developments (ref. DSD's comments, SIA (d)), it ignores maintenance responsibility for the connecting pipeline systems and the marine outfall.

2.525

Provision of sewerage infrastructure is a basic requirement. How can HKR be allowed to proceed without providing basic information on sewage treatment and disposal?

Unless and until my demands are acceded to and my concerns are addressed I object to the above-mentioned development application.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160704-210047-49119

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2526

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

04/07/2016 21:00:47

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:

Kris

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

To:

Secretary of the Town Planning Board
tpbpd@pland.gov.hk

Re:

Application Y/I-DB/2, Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext. (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay
To rezone the application site from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (5)" to "Residential (Group C) 12"

Dear Sirs,

Herewith we call on the Town Planning Board:

"To reject the application Y/I-DB/2 to rezone Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext. (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (5)" to "Residential (Group C) 12" "

My reasons for objecting to the application are:

In the Government comments on HKR's application to develop areas 6f and 10b. EPD made comments to HKR for suggesting that sewage from the 6f and 10b developments could be treated at the Siu Ho Wan Sewage Treatment Works (SHWSTW). Here is EPD's comment:

"The Discovery Bay further development shall provide its own sewage treatment facilities to meet the WPCO standards before discharge into the receiving waters. In this connection, the Applicant should delete all the incorrect and misleading statements, e.g. "SHWSTW requires upgrade works to cater for the existing and concurrent developments, irrespective of the proposed developments. The upgrade works could cater for the sewerage increase as a result of the proposal, which accounts around 0.8% of the treatment flow" and other similar text in the submission as they

are factually incorrect.""

2526

In its letter circulated to all DB residents on 23 April, 2016, titled "Further Elaborations on DB Latest Development Plans", HKR was still making the misleading claim that sewage could be treated at the SHWSTW. The idea that it could not was a "misconception"

Worse, in its latest submission to the TPB HKR has merely acknowledged that that untreated sewage cannot be routed to the SHWSTW. It has not provided a proper update for its alternative proposals, which had assumed that the EPD would allow treated sewage to be sent to the SHWSTW for disposal. Note above that EPD has clearly stated that HKR is responsible for treating sewage to WPCO standards for discharge into the receiving waters.

In its original submission to the TPB, HKR provided two alternative solutions if the option to use the SHWSTW was ruled out:

- 6f sewage treated on-site; 10b sewage treated in a new sewage treatment works facing La Costa before pumping to SHWSTW.-
- 6f sewage connected to the existing DB sewage system at the pumping station between Beach Village and the tennis courts; sewage volume equivalent to 6f and 10b treated in a new sewage treatment works facing La Costa. Treated effluent sent to SHWSTW.

Now that discharge to the SHWSTW is not an option, HKR states:

"The applicant will undertake the design, construction and implementation of an on-site sewage treatment plant (STP) adequate for proper treatment of the sewage arising to meeting the permissible effluent standards for discharging into the receiving waters. ... Other detailed design parameters such as the treatment level, treatment technology, discharge location, effluent standards will be properly addressed at detail design stage subsequent to the approval of this rezoning application."

In other words, there is no detail on how the sewage will be treated, or where it will be discharged into the waters around DB. The locations of the sewage treatment plants and marine outfall shown in the updated Environmental Impact Assessment are "indicative only".

There are no details of the STP, and given the small size of the lot and the proximity to existing residential developments, there is no assessment on what impact a sewage treatment plant has on the immediate environment.

EPD's comments make it clear that the sewerage systems for 6f and 10b must be kept separate from the existing sewage infrastructure in DB, so that there is no possibility of discharge of sewage from the new developments to SHWSTW.

Further, while HKR states that the sewage treatment plant(s) will be maintained at the cost of the owners of the 6f and 10b developments (ref. DSD's comments, SIA (d)), it ignores maintenance responsibility for the connecting pipeline systems and the marine outfall.

Provision of sewerage infrastructure is a basic requirement. How can HKR be allowed to proceed without providing basic information on sewage treatment and disposal?

Unless and until my demands are acceded to and my concerns are addressed I object to the above-mentioned development application.

參考編號

160704-212205-33694

Reference Number:

2527

提交限期

15/07/2016

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

04/07/2016 21:22:05

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

小姐 Miss Gita Go

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

To:

Secretary of the Town Planning Board
tpbpd@pland.gov.hk

Re:

Application Y/I-DB/2, Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext. (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay
To rezone the application site from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (5)" to "Residential (Group C) 12"

Dear Sirs,

Herewith we call on the Town Planning Board:

To reject the application Y/I-DB/2 to rezone Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext. (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (5)" to "Residential (Group C) 12"

My reasons for objecting to the application are:

1. HKRI must follow the Deed of Mutual Covenant. The road to the Woods is Village Common Area, owned and maintained by the owners of Parkvale Village for almost 30 years. HKR has no means or right under the DMC to convert this road into City Common Area for use by the new development at Area 6f.
2. Original proposed site use allowed for 170sqm, at a scale of 3 stories at 9m maximum height, designated for living quarters for staff serving the Discovery Bay development. The application aims to increase this to 2160sqm of private residential development. This is over 127 times the original proposed development scale. The application also proposes nearly the same the number of units currently existing in the tower cluster of Coral, Crystal, Woodland, Woodgreen and Woo

2527

Woodbury combined, vastly increasing the unit density in the area.

3. The end of Parkvale Road feeding into the proposed site (running along Woodbury, Woodgreen and Woodland Court) is in a narrow, tightly curved, cul-de-sac arrangement, with a very narrow width at the top behind Woodbury Court, and is already very heavily used by logistics and utility vehicles and buses serving the current population density. The volume of vehicles already causes danger to the residents, as recognized by the Developer as evident in the addition of speed bumps to the section in recent years. Construction vehicles and delivery of heavy machinery, and increase in logistics, utilities and transport vehicles to support the additional population will cause considerable danger and nuisance to the residents in an area already busy with large vehicles.
4. No. "2/3" bus serving the R(C)4 area is already frequently overcrowded with the current population density. Adding 476 units, nearly doubling the current cluster unit count, to the area will excessively strain the buses; the option of adding additional bus lines will not be an option as multiple bus lines will also be very problematic for the aforementioned constrained feeder road into the application site.
5. The proposal will replace an area of existing natural open green lawn heavily used by the residents' children and pets, as an escape from the traffic on the road which makes up the majority of the open areas surrounding the existing towers. The application will in fact reduce the area of natural green space for residents and replace it with hard landscaped garden features.
6. The application erroneously claims to respond to the 2015 Policy Address. In the 2015 Policy address the CE notes "according to the latest projection in December 2014, the housing supply from the first-hand private residential property market for the coming three to four years is approximately 74 000 units, which is the highest on record.... the private sector will, on average, produce about 14 600 flats each year in the next five years, representing an increase of about 30%." The address did not advocate for additional private housing supply; it called for "private sector's capacity to assist in increasing and accelerating the supply of subsidised sale flats" which the application fails to respond.
7. Current sites zoned under this land use is currently used by the management company for the 'provision of staff quarters to serve the Discovery Bay development', that is staff of the resort management. It is not, as stated in the application, for staff 'required by the general residences'.
8. Staffing quarters provide an affordable resident space for the indispensable staff that is necessary to serve the resort of Discovery Bay, and is an important relief on the public or private housing pressures especially for the working levels across Hong Kong. In addition, given the lack of affordable housing within Discovery Bay for staff serving the resort, many are driven to seek accommodation elsewhere, adding to the pressures on the limited public transport options connecting Discovery Bay and the rest of Hong Kong.
9. Given the increased areas of development in Discovery Bay already planned, there should be an increase of staffing quarters in Discovery Bay to keep up with the increased workload and demand.
10. Very limited (and last minute) open consultation with the existing residents have taken place, there are no details of the development design available in the presentation materials given to the residents. No traffic assessments of internal public transport to demonstrate impact by increase of population can be supported discussed with residents.
11. The application site should be retained for the use of "Staffing Quarters (5)" "at the original d

ensity. 2527

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

參考編號

160704-191342-66663

Reference Number:

2528

提交限期

15/07/2016

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

04/07/2016 19:13:42

Date and time of submission:

有關的規劃申請編號

Y1-DB/2

The application no. to which the comment relates:

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

夫人 Mrs. R Williams

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment:

To:

Secretary of the Town Planning Board
tpbpd@pland.gov.hk

Re:

Application Y1-DB/2, Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext. (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay
To rezone the application site from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (5)" to "Residential (Group C) 12"

Dear Sirs,

Herewith we call on the Town Planning Board:

"To reject the application Y1-DB/2 to rezone Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext. (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (5)" to "Residential (Group C) 12" "

My reasons for objecting to the application are:

In the Government comments on HKR's application to develop areas 6f and 10b. EPD made comments to HKR for suggesting that sewage from the 6f and 10b developments could be treated at the Siu Ho Wan Sewage Treatment Works (SHWSTW). Here is EPD's comment:

"The Discovery Bay further development shall provide its own sewage treatment facilities to meet the WPCO standards before discharge into the receiving waters. In this connection, the Applicant should delete all the incorrect and misleading statements, e.g. "SHWSTW requires upgrade works to cater for the existing and concurrent developments, irrespective of the proposed developments. The upgrade works could cater for the sewerage increase as a result of the proposal, which accounts around 0.8% of the treatment flow" and other similar text in the submission as they

In its letter circulated to all DB residents on 23 April, 2016, titled "Further Elaborations on DB Latest Development Plans", HKR was still making the misleading claim that sewage could be treated at the SHWSTW. The idea that it could not was a "misconception"

Worse, in its latest submission to the TPB HKR has merely acknowledged that that untreated sewage cannot be routed to the SHWSTW. It has not provided a proper update for its alternative proposals, which had assumed that the EPD would allow treated sewage to be sent to the SHWSTW for disposal. Note above that EPD has clearly stated that HKR is responsible for treating sewage to WPCO standards for discharge into the receiving waters.

In its original submission to the TPB, HKR provided two alternative solutions if the option to use SHWSTW was ruled out:

- 6f sewage treated on-site; 10b sewage treated in a new sewage treatment works facing La Costa before pumping to SHWSTW. - 6f sewage connected to the existing DB sewage system at the pumping station between Beach Village and the tennis courts; sewage volume equivalent to 6f and 10b treated in a new sewage treatment works facing La Costa. Treated effluent sent to SHWSTW.

Now that discharge to the SHWSTW is not an option, HKR states:

"The applicant will undertake the design, construction and implementation of an on-site sewage treatment plant (STP) adequate for proper treatment of the sewage arising to meeting the permissible effluent standards for discharging into the receiving waters. ... Other detailed design parameter such as the treatment level, treatment technology, discharge location, effluent standards will be properly addressed at detail design stage subsequent to the approval of this rezoning application."

In other words, there is no detail on how the sewage will be treated, or where it will be discharged into the waters around DB. The locations of the sewage treatment plants and marine outfall shown in the updated Environmental Impact Assessment are "indicative only".

There are no details of the STP, and given the small size of the lot and the proximity to existing residential developments, there is no assessment on what impact a sewage treatment plant has on the immediate environment.

EPD's comments make it clear that the sewerage systems for 6f and 10b must be kept separate from the existing sewage infrastructure in DB, so that there is no possibility of discharge of sewage from the new developments to SHWSTW.

Further, while HKR states that the sewage treatment plant(s) will be maintained at the cost of the owners of the 6f and 10b developments (ref. DSD's comments, SIA (d)), it ignores maintenance responsibility for the connecting pipeline systems and the marine outfall.

Provision of sewerage infrastructure is a basic requirement. How can HKR be allowed to proceed without providing basic information on sewage treatment and disposal?

Unless and until my demands are acceded to and my concerns are addressed I object to the above-mentioned.

Regards
R Williams

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160704-162605-40967

2529

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

04/07/2016 16:26:05

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. Georges Hung

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

To:

Secretary of the Town Planning Board
tpbpd@pland.gov.hk

Re:

Application Y/I-DB/2, Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext. (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay
To rezone the application site from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (5)" to "Residential (Group C) 12"

Dear Sirs,

Herewith we call on the Town Planning Board:

"To reject the application Y/I-DB/2 to rezone Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext. (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (5)" to "Residential (Group C) 12" "

My reasons for objecting to the application are:

In the Government comments on HKR's application to develop areas 6f and 10b. EPD made comments to HKR for suggesting that sewage from the 6f and 10b developments could be treated at the Siu Ho Wan Sewage Treatment Works (SHWSTW). Here is EPD's comment:

"The Discovery Bay further development shall provide its own sewage treatment facilities to meet the WPCO standards before discharge into the receiving waters. In this connection, the Applicant should delete all the incorrect and misleading statements, e.g. "SHWSTW requires upgrade works to cater for the existing and concurrent developments, irrespective of the proposed developments. The upgrade works could cater for the sewerage increase as a result of the proposal, which accounts around 0.8% of the treatment flow" and other similar text in the submission as they are factually incorrect."

In its letter circulated to all DB residents on 23 April, 2016, titled "Further Elaborations on DB Latest Development Plans", HKR was still making the misleading claim that sewage could be treated at the SHWSTW. The idea that it could not was a "misconception"

Worse, in its latest submission to the TPB HKR has merely acknowledged that that untreated sewage cannot be routed to the SHWSTW. It has not provided a proper update for its alternative proposals, which had assumed that the EPD would allow treated sewage to be sent to the SHWSTW for disposal. Note above that EPD has clearly stated that HKR is responsible for treating sewage to WPCO standards for discharge into the receiving waters.

In its original submission to the TPB, HKR provided two alternative solutions if the option to use SHWSTW was ruled out:

- 6f sewage treated on-site; 10b sewage treated in a new sewage treatment works facing La Costa before pumping to SHWSTW.-
- 6f sewage connected to the existing DB sewage system at the pumping station between Beach Village and the tennis courts; sewage volume equivalent to 6f and 10b treated in a new sewage treatment works facing La Costa. Treated effluent sent to SHWSTW.

Now that discharge to the SHWSTW is not an option, HKR states:

"The applicant will undertake the design, construction and implementation of an on-site sewage treatment plant (STP) adequate for proper treatment of the sewage arising to meeting the permissible effluent standards for discharging into the receiving waters. ... Other detailed design parameter such as the treatment level, treatment technology, discharge location, effluent standards will be properly addressed at detail design stage subsequent to the approval of this rezoning application."

In other words, there is no detail on how the sewage will be treated, or where it will be discharged into the waters around DB. The locations of the sewage treatment plants and marine outfall shown in the updated Environmental Impact Assessment are "indicative only".

There are no details of the STP, and given the small size of the lot and the proximity to existing residential developments, there is no assessment on what impact a sewage treatment plant has on the immediate environment.

EPD's comments make it clear that the sewerage systems for 6f and 10b must be kept separate from the existing sewerage infrastructure in DB, so that there is no possibility of discharge of sewage from the new developments to SHWSTW.

Further, while HKR states that the sewage treatment plant(s) will be maintained at the cost of the owners of the 6f and 10b developments (ref. DSD's comments, SIA (d)), it ignores maintenance responsibility for the connecting pipeline systems and the marine outfall.

Provision of sewerage infrastructure is a basic requirement. How can HKR be allowed to proceed without providing basic information on sewage treatment and disposal?

Unless and until my demands are acceded to and my concerns are addressed I object to the above-mentioned development application.

參考編號

Reference Number:

160704-165611-77704

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2530

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

04/07/2016 16:56:11

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. Dan

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

To:

Secretary of the Town Planning Board
tpbpd@pland.gov.hk

Re:

Application Y/I-DB/2, Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext. (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay
To rezone the application site from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (5)" to "Residential (Group C) 12"

Dear Sirs,

Herewith we call on the Town Planning Board:

"To reject the application Y/I-DB/2 to rezone Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext. (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (5)" to "Residential (Group C) 12" "

My reasons for objecting to the application are:

In the Government comments on HKR's application to develop areas 6f and 10b. EPD made comments to HKR for suggesting that sewage from the 6f and 10b developments could be treated at the Siu Ho Wan Sewage Treatment Works (SHWSTW). Here is EPD's comment:

"The Discovery Bay further development shall provide its own sewage treatment facilities to meet the WPCO standards before discharge into the receiving waters. In this connection, the Applicant should delete all the incorrect and misleading statements, e.g. "SHWSTW requires upgrade works to cater for the existing and concurrent developments, irrespective of the proposed developments. The upgrade works could cater for the sewerage increase as a result of the proposal, which accounts around 0.8% of the treatment flow" and other similar text in the submission as they are factually incorrect." "

In its letter circulated to all DB residents on 23 April, 2016, titled "Further Elaborations on DB Latest Development Plans", HKR was still making the misleading claim that sewage could be treated at the SHWSTW. The idea that it could not was a "misconception"

Worse, in its latest submission to the TPB HKR has merely acknowledged that that untreated sewage cannot be routed to the SHWSTW. It has not provided a proper update for its alternative proposals, which had assumed that the EPD would allow treated sewage to be sent to the SHWSTW for disposal. Note above that EPD has clearly stated that HKR is responsible for treating sewage to WPCO standards for discharge into the receiving waters.

In its original submission to the TPB, HKR provided two alternative solutions if the option to use SHWSTW was ruled out:

- 6f sewage treated on-site; 10b sewage treated in a new sewage treatment works facing La Costa before pumping to SHWSTW.-
- 6f sewage connected to the existing DB sewage system at the pumping station between Beach Village and the tennis courts; sewage volume equivalent to 6f and 10b treated in a new sewage treatment works facing La Costa. Treated effluent sent to SHWSTW.

Now that discharge to the SHWSTW is not an option, HKR states:

"The applicant will undertake the design, construction and implementation of an on-site sewage treatment plant (STP) adequate for proper treatment of the sewage arising to meeting the permissible effluent standards for discharging into the receiving waters. ... Other detailed design parameter such as the treatment level, treatment technology, discharge location, effluent standards will be properly addressed at detail design stage subsequent to the approval of this rezoning application."

In other words, there is no detail on how the sewage will be treated, or where it will be discharged into the waters around DB. The locations of the sewage treatment plants and marine outfall shown in the updated Environmental Impact Assessment are "indicative only".

There are no details of the STP, and given the small size of the lot and the proximity to existing residential developments, there is no assessment on what impact a sewage treatment plant has on the immediate environment.

EPD's comments make it clear that the sewerage systems for 6f and 10b must be kept separate from the existing sewage infrastructure in DB, so that there is no possibility of discharge of sewage from the new developments to SHWSTW.

Further, while HKR states that the sewage treatment plant(s) will be maintained at the cost of the owners of the 6f and 10b developments (ref. DSD's comments, SIA (d)), it ignores maintenance responsibility for the connecting pipeline systems and the marine outfall.

Provision of sewerage infrastructure is a basic requirement. How can HKR be allowed to proceed without providing basic information on sewage treatment and disposal?

Unless and until my demands are acceded to and my concerns are addressed I object to the above-mentioned development application.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160704-170410-23386

2531

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

04/07/2016 17:04:10

有關的規劃申請編號

The application no. to which the comment relates:

Y1-DB/2

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

Name of person making this comment:

先生 Mr. Wong Hiu Hei

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

To:

Secretary of the Town Planning Board
tpbpd@pland.gov.hk

Re:

Application Y1-DB/2, Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext. (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay
To rezone the application site from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (5)" to "Residential (Group C) 12"

Dear Sirs,

Herewith we call on the Town Planning Board:

"To reject the application Y1-DB/2 to rezone Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext. (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (5)" to "Residential (Group C) 12" "

My reasons for objecting to the application are:

In the Government comments on HKR's application to develop areas 6f and 10b. EPD made comments to HKR for suggesting that sewage from the 6f and 10b developments could be treated at the Siu Ho Wan Sewage Treatment Works (SHWSTW). Here is EPD's comment:

"The Discovery Bay further development shall provide its own sewage treatment facilities to meet the WPCO standards before discharge into the receiving waters. In this connection, the Applicant should delete all the incorrect and misleading statements, e.g. "SHWSTW requires upgrade works to cater for the existing and concurrent developments, irrespective of the proposed developments. The upgrade works could cater for the sewerage increase as a result of the proposal, which accounts around 0.8% of the treatment flow" and other similar text in the submission as they are factually incorrect."

In its letter circulated to all DB residents on 23 April, 2016, titled "Further Elaborations on DB Latest Development Plans", HKR was still making the misleading claim that sewage could be treated at the SHWSTW. The idea that it could not was a "misconception"

2531

Worse, in its latest submission to the TPB HKR has merely acknowledged that that untreated sewage cannot be routed to the SHWSTW. It has not provided a proper update for its alternative proposals, which had assumed that the EPD would allow treated sewage to be sent to the SHWSTW for disposal. Note above that EPD has clearly stated that HKR is responsible for treating sewage to WPCO standards for discharge into the receiving waters.

In its original submission to the TPB, HKR provided two alternative solutions if the option to use SHWSTW was ruled out:

- 6f sewage treated on-site; 10b sewage treated in a new sewage treatment works facing La Costa before pumping to SHWSTW.
- 6f sewage connected to the existing DB sewage system at the pumping station between Beach Village and the tennis courts; sewage volume equivalent to 6f and 10b treated in a new sewage treatment works facing La Costa. Treated effluent sent to SHWSTW.

Now that discharge to the SHWSTW is not an option, HKR states:

"The applicant will undertake the design, construction and implementation of an on-site sewage treatment plant (STP) adequate for proper treatment of the sewage arising to meeting the permissible effluent standards for discharging into the receiving waters. ... Other detailed design parameters such as the treatment level, treatment technology, discharge location, effluent standards will be properly addressed at detail design stage subsequent to the approval of this rezoning application."

In other words, there is no detail on how the sewage will be treated, or where it will be discharged into the waters around DB. The locations of the sewage treatment plants and marine outfall shown in the updated Environmental Impact Assessment are "indicative only".

There are no details of the STP, and given the small size of the lot and the proximity to existing residential developments, there is no assessment on what impact a sewage treatment plant has on the immediate environment.

EPD's comments make it clear that the sewerage systems for 6f and 10b must be kept separate from the existing sewage infrastructure in DB, so that there is no possibility of discharge of sewage from the new developments to SHWSTW.

Further, while HKR states that the sewage treatment plant(s) will be maintained at the cost of the owners of the 6f and 10b developments (ref. DSD's comments, SIA (d)), it ignores maintenance responsibility for the connecting pipeline systems and the marine outfall.

Provision of sewerage infrastructure is a basic requirement. How can HKR be allowed to proceed without providing basic information on sewage treatment and disposal?

Unless and until my demands are acceded to and my concerns are addressed I object to the above-mentioned development application.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-154923-59017

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2532

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 15:49:23

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. Sam

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

I support the project. The traffic is very busy at this moment. Sometime, it causes danger to residents . By rebuilding/relocating the bus stop, it could solve the current problem.

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

參考編號

160705-154425-23208

Reference Number:

2533

提交限期

15/07/2016

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

05/07/2016 15:44:25

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

夫人 Mrs. Anita Woo

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Support

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

參考編號

160705-152845-55998

Reference Number:

2534

提交限期

15/07/2016

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

05/07/2016 15:28:45

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. Kent

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Support

We need a balance, and increase our supply of housing. It would solve out the housing problem in 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:

160705-154706-38932

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2535

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 15:47:06

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. Balmores

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Support.

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

160705-154610-32517

Reference Number:**提交限期**

15/07/2016

Deadline for submission:**2536****提交日期及時間**

05/07/2016 15:46:10

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**

小姐 Miss Nasita Mamoh

Name of person making this comment:**意見詳情****Details of the Comment :**

I writing in support of the application, for the reasons is the mountain view of most Crystal and Coral units will not be blocked due to the sufficient distance between the buildings.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-154554-71495

2537

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 15:45:54

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. JOE KWAN

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Support.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-153151-32790

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2538

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 15:31:51

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:

小姐 Miss Takasi Annzai

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

I am writing in support of the application, the mountain view of most Crystal and Coral units will not be blocked due to the sufficient distance between the buildings.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-155432-74344

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2539

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 15:54:32

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:

夫人 Mrs. Rebecca Ip

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Support.

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

參考編號

160705-154853-03121

Reference Number:

提交限期

15/07/2016

Deadline for submission:

2540

提交日期及時間

05/07/2016 15:48:53

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. Yip Hong

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

I support the plan,the surrounding area of the proposed development will be beautified and bring in new leisure facilities.

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

參考編號

160705-154813-06179

Reference Number:

提交限期

15/07/2016

2541

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

05/07/2016 15:48:13

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

女士 Ms. Balmores

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Support.

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

參考編號

160705-154904-67833

Reference Number:

提交限期

15/07/2016

2542

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

05/07/2016 15:49:04

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. JOEY KWAN

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Support.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-161151-76472

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2543

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 16:11:51

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. Sing

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Government is subsidizing most outlying island ferry services, except that for Discovery Bay. Should more new development be done in Discovery Bay, government won't be able to find excuse not to provide such subsidy. I vote yes for the new development.

跟蹤新申請/舊修修中意見 Making Comments on Planning Applications Review

參考編號

Reference Number

100706/2014/0000

提交日期

Deadline for submission

15/07/2014

2511

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission

04/07/2014 17:28:22

有關的規劃申請編號

The application no. to which the comment relates

Y4-1852

提交人姓名/名稱

Name of person making this comment

小姐 Miss Coby Cho

意見詳情

Details of the comment

I want more varieties of shop in (D). The selection is simply too narrow in (B). The development over the plaza could definitely help for the residents as well as the community.

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

160705-173108-83376

Reference Number:**提交限期**

15/07/2016

2545**Deadline for submission:****提交日期及時間**

05/07/2016 17:31:08

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. matt chan

Name of person making this comment:**意見詳情****Details of the Comment :**

引入新屋苑，可分擔公共設施的維修費用，使周邊的基建設施作出翻新及改善，業主可減省維修保養及相關開支。

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

參考編號

160705-171904-72561

Reference Number:

提交限期

15/07/2016

2546

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

05/07/2016 17:19:04

Date and time of submission:

有關的規劃申請編號

Y/1-DB/2

The application no. to which the comment relates:

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

女士 Ms. Vera

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

I support

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-173447-62858

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2547

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 17:34:47

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:

小姐 Miss Law

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

現時上址欠缺遊樂設施，新發展會美化環境及引入新的休憩設施

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-172816-11241

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2548

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 17:28:16

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. Jos John

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

計劃已考慮基礎設施、視覺、交通方面等因素及社區承擔能力，設計亦與周邊環境及景觀融合

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-171237-88306

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2549

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 17:12:37

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. jos chow

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

可善用土地資源，減輕香港土地不足的問題，提供不同類型的房屋選擇。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-174950-38664

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2550

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 17:49:50

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. D Yau

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

HK government need to serve the residents in Discovery Bay better when more development in Discovery Bay being made, or at least as same as those in other places of Hong Kong. Water supply and drainage service are public utilities and the government should provide these to Discovery Bay without charging short term tenancy premium for the en-route of the utilities.

I support the new development and the government should stop such premium charge.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-174221-44876

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2551

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 17:42:21

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:

小姐 Miss G Wong

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

HK Government should chase Discovery Bay developer to build the public transport interchange at Discovery Bay North according to the approved master layout plan. It is the right time to give more pressure to the developer for the same since a new development is waiting for TPB's approval.

I am looking forward to see the new development and the public transport interchange.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-175737-83418

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2552

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 17:57:37

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. Lam

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Transportation in HK is so convinient and staff quarter is seldom provided by employers. Converting staff quarter site to residential development is good for utilizing land use. I support the new development.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-215544-19301

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2553

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 21:55:44

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. Sam Wong

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

I very support this plan.

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

160705-221104-64325

提交限期**Deadline for submission:**

15/07/2016

2554**提交日期及時間****Date and time of submission:**

05/07/2016 22:11:04

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:**

夫人 Mrs. Chan

意見詳情**Details of the Comment :****現址欠缺遊樂設施，新發展能美化環境。**

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-220524-49913

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2555

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 22:05:24

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. Wong

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

新計劃可支持開辦獨立巴士路線，令交通更方便。

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

160705-215010-93380

提交限期**Deadline for submission:**

15/07/2016

2556

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

05/07/2016 21:50:10

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. Chan Mei Fong

意見詳情**Details of the Comment :**

The area is suitable for residential building as it has been designated for staff headquarters which are no longer required. The planned plot ratio is still low that the infrastructure and facilities will be sufficient to accommodate the extra population.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-230644-29779

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2557

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 23:06:44

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. Chan Chun Kin

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

能提供更多遊樂設施

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-232255-50195

2558

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 23:22:55

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:

小姐 Miss Toby Chui

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

The plan optimises the land use to alleviate the land shortage issue in Hong Kong and provides more housing choices.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160705-230253-92870

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2559

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/07/2016 23:02:53

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. Chan Chi Chuen

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

引入新屋苑可分擔公共設施的維修費用，業主可減省維修費開支。

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

參考編號

160705-225619-95640

Reference Number:

提交限期

15/07/2016

2560

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

05/07/2016 22:56:19

Date and time of submission:

有關的規劃申請編號

Y1-DB/2

The application no. to which the comment relates:

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

小姐 Miss Chan Hiu Yeung

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment:

可減輕香港土地不足的問題，提供不同類型的房屋選擇。

參考編號

160706-001839-39500

Reference Number:

提交限期

15/07/2016

2561

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

06/07/2016 00:18:39

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. liao

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

It creates more job opportunities, which will bring in many social and economic benefits to the society.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-001400-11038

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2562

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 00:14:00

有關的規劃申請編號

The application no. to which the comment relates:

Y1-DB/2

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

Name of person making this comment:

夫人 Mrs. MA

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

The area is suitable for residential building as it has been designated for staff headquarters which are no longer required. The planned plot ratio is still low that the infrastructure and facilities will be sufficient to accommodate the extra population.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-111951-94637

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2563

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 11:19:51

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. Danny Cheung

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Upgrade overall environment of areas concerned.

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

參考編號

160706-112310-64558

Reference Number:

提交限期

15/07/2016

2564

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

06/07/2016 11:23:10

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. Kitto Siu

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

It contributes to the housing market, and the future development at Lantau Island.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-114554-57824

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2565

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 11:45:54

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. Terry Ng

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Upgrade overall environment of areas concerned.

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

參考編號

160706-113923-83362

Reference Number:

提交限期

15/07/2016

2566

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

06/07/2016 11:39:23

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

女士 Ms. Ting Wong

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

It is in extension to the existing residential development, at a site of minimal natural conservation value. It is a logical site for development.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-113749-44281

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2567

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 11:37:49

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. Nigel Chau

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Upgrade overall environment of areas concerned.

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

參考編號

160706-113058-24490

Reference Number:

提交限期

15/07/2016

2568

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

06/07/2016 11:30:58

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. Lok Wong

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

It makes use of the land designated for staff quarters which are no longer required.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-113250-34371

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2569

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 11:32:50

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. Tony Man

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

It optimises the land use at Area 6f in Discovery Bay.

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

參考編號

160706-112622-16776

Reference Number:

提交限期

15/07/2016

2570

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

06/07/2016 11:26:22

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

小姐 Miss Sue Chan

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

The plan has given due regard for the mountain backdrop and the relationship with the existing, and is in harmony with the adjacent land uses such as the residential areas.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-115005-90364

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2571

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 11:50:05

有關的規劃申請編號

The application no. to which the comment relates:

Y/A-DB/2

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

Name of person making this comment:

先生 Mr. Chau Lay

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

The plan has given due regard for the mountain backdrop and the relationship with the existing, and is in harmony with the adjacent land uses such as the residential areas.

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

160706-114307-37033

提交限期**Deadline for submission:**

15/07/2016

2572**提交日期及時間****Date and time of submission:**

06/07/2016 11:43:07

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. Eric Wong

意見詳情**Details of the Comment :**

It is in extension to the existing residential development, at a site of minimal natural conservation value. It is a logical site for development

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

參考編號

160706-123559-26427

Reference Number:

提交限期

15/07/2016

2573

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

06/07/2016 12:35:59

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. Bill

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

I like to get a licence allowing me to own a golf cart in Discovery Bay. Upsetting me, management company has advised that Transport Department hasn't issued more licence. I hope the new development and more residents can make TD to change mind and grant more licence. I am looking forward to the new development and golf cart licence.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-122352-99149

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2574

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 12:23:52

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. Wah Chi

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

My friend tells me that we can visit Discovery Bay because there are public open spaces. More open spaces will be built under the new development and we can visit more. I put my thumb up to support the new development.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-121423-40860

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2575

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 12:14:23

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. Jun

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

The new development will have public open space which can be visited by the public. I like it and support the new development.

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

參考編號

160706-121740-77850

Reference Number:

提交限期

15/07/2016

2576

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

06/07/2016 12:17:40

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. Warren

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Bring in more people can help support the businesses of local shops and retails, in a way to provide more retail choices for the residents. Supported.

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

參考編號

160706-121728-45862

Reference Number:

提交限期

15/07/2016

2577

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

06/07/2016 12:17:28

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

小姐 Miss Viva

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

新發展會創造更多就業機會，為市民及社會帶來好處及經濟效益

就規劃申請/遷移提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-123233-27077

2578

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 12:32:33

有關的規劃申請編號

The application no. to which the comment relates:

Y1-DB/2

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

Name of person making this comment:

女士 Ms. Tyson

意見詳情

Details of the Comment:

Please please please do not develop this area!

This region of Lantau is so beautiful and mostly unspoilt - any further development as planned would be catastrophic to all the communities and wildlife of Lantau - more people, more housing, more litter, more noise and less quality of life for all concerned. The whole reason people - locals, expats, whoever, choose to move to Discovery Bay and Lantau Island in general is because of the more peaceful, quality driven lifestyle. More is definitely less!

Please do not develop.

Thank you very much.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-142233-77310

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2579

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 14:22:33

有關的規劃申請編號

The application no. to which the comment relates:

Y/A-DB/2

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

Name of person making this comment:

先生 Mr. John Ivan

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

The optimisation of the land use has given due consideration to various aspects, such as infrastructure, visual, traffic and capacity of the community. The design is sensitive to the adjacent development and natural setting. It has given due regard for the mountain backdrop and the relationship with the existing residents.

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

參考編號

160706-141013-18588

Reference Number:

提交限期

15/07/2016

2580

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

06/07/2016 14:10:13

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

小姐 Miss Arup

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

The plan optimises the land use to alleviate the land shortage issue in HK and provides more housing choices

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

參考編號

160706-140815-38599

Reference Number:

提交限期

15/07/2016

Deadline for submission:

2581

提交日期及時間

06/07/2016 14:08:15

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

小姐 Miss N K Cheung

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

支持這發展。因為可善用土地資源，減輕香港土地不足的問題，提供不同類型的房屋選擇。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-140204-85431

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2582

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 14:02:04

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. 張小姐

意見詳情

Details of the Comment:

支持這計劃。它可善用土地資源，減輕香港土地不足的問題，提供不同類型的房屋選擇。6f一直已規劃為居住用途，證明土地適宜建屋。規劃中的地積比亦很低，基建及配套足以容納新增的人口。計劃已考慮基礎設施、視覺、交通方面等因素及社區承擔能力，設計亦與周邊環境及景觀融合。新計劃可支持開辦獨立的巴士路線，令交通更方便快捷。新發展會創造更多就業機會，為市民及社會帶來好處及經濟效益。

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

參考編號

160706-140147-33261

Reference Number:

提交限期

15/07/2016

2583

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

06/07/2016 14:01:47

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. Gary

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

引入新屋苑，可分擔公共設施的維修費用，使周邊的基建設施作出翻新及改善，業主可減省維修保養及相關開支

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

參考編號

160706-143925-60093

Reference Number:

2584

提交限期

15/07/2016

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

06/07/2016 14:39:25

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

夫人 Mrs. Catherine Mackinn
on

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

I object to this Planning Application for the following reasons:

- (1) Water and sewerage resources are already limited for a max population of 25,000 under the current Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). These Applications seek to increase that number to 29,000 which will be unsustainable without huge additional infrastructure and operational costs, much of which will have to be borne by existing residents. The population cap of 25,000 should be preserved, so as not to breach the Land Grant.
- (2) The Application states that HKR is the sole owner of the Lot, which is untrue. There are presently over 8,300 assignees who co-own the Lot together with Hong Kong Resorts. HKR should withdraw the Application and make revisions to recognize the co-owners.
- (3) The Master Plan forms part of the Land Grant at Discovery Bay, yet the current Master Plan (6.0E1) and the current OZP are not aligned. The Master Plan and OZP should be updated to ensure they are properly aligned, before considering any amendments to the OZP.

參考編號

160706-135635-86619

Reference Number:

提交限期

15/07/2016

2585

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

06/07/2016 13:56:35

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

小姐 Miss Kannie Cheung

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

我支持這發展項目。因它可善用土地資源，減輕香港土地不足的問題，提供不同類型的房屋選擇。6f一直已規劃為居住用途，證明土地適宜建屋。規劃中的地積比亦很低，基建及配套足以容納新增的人口。計劃已考慮基礎設施、視覺、交通方面等因素及社區承擔能力，設計亦與周邊環境及景觀融合。新計劃可支持開辦獨立的巴士路線，令交通更方便快捷。新發展會創造更多就業機會，為市民及社會帶來好處及經濟效益。引入適量人口可支持本土小商店的營運，為居民提供更多的零售選擇。現時上址欠缺遊樂設施，新發展會美化環境及引入新的休憩設施。

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

參考編號

160706-141955-01853

Reference Number:

2586

提交限期

15/07/2016

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

06/07/2016 14:19:55

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. Yip

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

現時上址欠缺遊樂設施，新發展會美化環境及引入新的休憩設施。

參考編號

160706-140618-97873

Reference Number:

提交限期

15/07/2016

2587

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

06/07/2016 14:06:18

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. Tim

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

計劃已考慮基礎設施、視覺、交通方面等因素及社區承擔能力，設計亦與周邊環境及景觀融合

就規劃申請/遷移提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號

160706-135957-97952

Reference Number:

提交限期

15/07/2016

2588

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

06/07/2016 13:59:57

Date and time of submission:

有關的規劃申請編號

Y1-DB/2

The application no. to which the comment relates:

提意見人，姓名/名稱

小姐 Miss Shraon

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment:

6f一直已規劃為居住用途，證明土地適宜樓宇，規劃中的地積比亦很低，基建及配套足以容納新增的人口

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-144642-40655

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2589

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 14:46:42

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. Roy Cobb

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Area 6f. I object to this Planning Application for the following reasons:

- (1) Water and sewerage resources are already limited for a max population of 25,000 under the current Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). These Applications seek to increase that number to 29,000 which will be unsustainable without huge additional infrastructure and operational costs, much of which will have to be borne by existing residents. The population cap of 25,000 should be preserved, so as not to breach the Land Grant.
- (2) The Application states that HKR is the sole owner of the Lot, which is untrue. There are presently over 8,300 assignees who co-own the Lot together with Hong Kong Resorts. HKR should withdraw the Application and make revisions to recognize the co-owners.
- (3) The Master Plan forms part of the Land Grant at Discovery Bay, yet the current Master Plan (6.0E1) and the current OZP are not aligned. The Master Plan and OZP should be updated to ensure they are properly aligned, before considering any amendments to the OZP.

Thank you for considering these important objections.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-144926-37416

2590

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 14:49:26

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:

夫人 Mrs. Jacque Cobb

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Area 6f. I object to this Planning Application for the following reasons:

(1) Water and sewerage resources are already limited for a max population of 25,000 under the current Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). These Applications seek to increase that number to 29,000 which will be unsustainable without huge additional infrastructure and operational costs, much of which will have to be borne by existing residents. The population cap of 25,000 should be preserved, so as not to breach the Land Grant.

(2) The Application states that HKR is the sole owner of the Lot, which is untrue. There are presently over 8,300 assignees who co-own the Lot together with Hong Kong Resorts. HKR should withdraw the Application and make revisions to recognize the co-owners.

(3) The Master Plan forms part of the Land Grant at Discovery Bay, yet the current Master Plan (6.0E1) and the current OZP are not aligned. The Master Plan and OZP should be updated to ensure they are properly aligned, before considering any amendments to the OZP.

Thank you for considering these important objections.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-144759-20745

2591

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 14:47:59

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:

先生 Mr. James Fernie

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Existing Hiking Trail.

Under departmental comments concerning this application, CA/CMD2 & ArchSD departments noted: "an existing hiking trail leading from the hilltop to Discovery Bay around the site for public enjoyment. The applicant should demarcate the private and public zone in the development for further comment."

The applicant replied, "The existing hiking trail does not cross the site at any point. As such, there is no need to demarcate any private or public zone at the site."

In fact, while the existing hiking trail does not cross the site, it follows the boundary of the site on 3 sides and would most definitely be affected by this development. As such, the CA/CMD2 & ArchSD reservations are correct, and demarcation of private and public zones should be made clear so that public access though or around the site is ensured.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-144159-37338

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2592

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 14:41:59

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:

夫人 Mrs. Another Dutt

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Do you want to lose the green lawn areas behind Woodland Court and replaced by a SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT?

Object the planning application NOW!

Use the online form before midnight Friday, 15th July, 2016 in 3 simple steps.

[p.s. You don't need to be an owner to send objection]

1. Go here: http://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/plan_application/Y_I-DB_2.html
2. Click on 'Make New Comments'
3. COPY and PASTE text BELOW (provided by dbconfidential.com) into the box, edit / add your own.
4. Tell your neighbours to do the same.
5. Repeat.

To:

Secretary of the Town Planning Board

tpbpd@pland.gov.hk

Re:

Application Y/I-DB/2, Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext. (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay

To rezone the application site from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (5)" to "Residential (Group C) 12"

Dear Sirs,

Herewith we call on the Town Planning Board:

To reject the application Y/I-DB/2 to rezone Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext. (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (5)" to "Residential (Group C) 12"

My reasons for objecting to the application are:

In the Government comments on HKR's application to develop areas 6f and 10b, EPD made comments to HKR for suggesting that sewage from the 6f and 10b developments could be treated at the Siu Ho Wan Sewage Treatment Works (SHWSTW). Here is EPD's comment:

"The Discovery Bay further development shall provide its own sewage treatment facilities to meet the WPCO standards before discharge into the receiving waters. In this connection, the Applicant should delete all the incorrect and misleading statements, e.g. "SHWSTW requires upgrade works to cater for the existing and concurrent developments, irrespective of the proposed developments. The upgrade works could cater for the sewerage increase as a result of the proposal, which accounts around 0.8% of the treatment flow" and other similar text in the submission as they are factually incorrect."

In its letter circulated to all DB residents on 23 April, 2016, titled "Further Elaborations on DB Latest Development Plans", HKR was still making the misleading claim that sewage could be treated at the SHWSTW. The idea that it could not was a "misconception"

Worse, in its latest submission to the TPB HKR has merely acknowledged that that untreated sewage cannot be routed to the SHWSTW. It has not provided a proper update for its alternative proposals, which had assumed that the EPD would allow treated sewage to be sent to the SHWSTW for disposal. Note above that EPD has clearly stated that HKR is responsible for treating sewage to WPCO standards for discharge into the receiving waters.

In its original submission to the TPB, HKR provided two alternative solutions if the option to use SHWSTW was ruled out:

- 6f sewage treated on-site; 10b sewage treated in a new sewage treatment works facing La Costa before pumping to SHWSTW.-
- 6f sewage connected to the existing DB sewage system at the pumping station between Beach Village and the tennis courts; sewage volume equivalent to 6f and 10b treated in a new sewage treatment works facing La Costa. Treated effluent sent to SHWSTW.

Now that discharge to the SHWSTW is not an option, HKR states:

"The applicant will undertake the design, construction and implementation of an on-site sewage treatment plant (STP) adequate for proper treatment of the sewage arising to meeting the permissible effluent standards for discharging into the receiving waters. ... Other detailed design parameter such as the treatment level, treatment technology, discharge location, effluent standards will be properly addressed at detail design stage subsequent to the approval of this rezoning application."

In other words, there is no detail on how the sewage will be treated, or where it will be discharged into the waters around DB. The locations of the sewage treatment plants and marine outfall shown in the updated Environmental Impact Assessment are "indicative only".

There are no details of the STP, and given the small size of the lot and the proximity to existing residential developments, there is no assessment on what impact a sewage treatment plant has on the immediate environment.

EPD's comments make it clear that the sewerage systems for 6f and 10b must be kept separate fr

2592

om the existing sewage infrastructure in DB, so that there is no possibility of discharge of sewage from the new developments to SHWSTW.

Further, while HKR states that the sewage treatment plant(s) will be maintained at the cost of the owners of the 6f and 10b developments (ref. DSD's comments, SIA (d)), it ignores maintenance responsibility for the connecting pipeline systems and the marine outfall.

Provision of sewerage infrastructure is a basic requirement. How can HKR be allowed to proceed without providing basic information on sewage treatment and disposal?

Unless and until my demands are acceded to and my concerns are addressed I object to the above-mentioned development application.

就新申請/審核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號

Reference Number

160706-142756-08423

2593

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 14:27:56

有關的規劃申請編號

The application no. to which the comment relates:

Y1-DB/2

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

Name of person making this comment:

先生 Mr James Fernie

意見詳情

Details of the Comment:

Area 6f. I object to this Planning Application for the following reasons:

- (1) Water and sewerage resources are already limited for a max population of 25,000 under the current Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). Current Applications seek to increase that number to 29,000 which will be unsustainable without huge additional infrastructure and operational costs, much of which will have to be borne by existing residents. The population cap of 25,000 should be preserved, so as not to breach the Land Grant.
- (2) The Application states that HKR is the sole owner of the Lot, which is untrue. There are presently over 8,300 assignees who co-own the Lot together with Hong Kong Resorts. HKR should make revisions to recognize the co-owners.
- (3) The Master Plan forms part of the Land Grant at Discovery Bay, yet the current Master Plan (6.0E1) and the current OZP are not aligned. The Master Plan and OZP should be updated to ensure they are properly aligned, before considering any amendments to the OZP.

Thank you for considering these important objections.

參考編號

160706-123619-63331

Reference Number:

2594

提交限期

15/07/2016

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

06/07/2016 12:36:19

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

Mr Mount

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Area 6f. I object to this Planning Application for the following reasons:

(1) Water and sewerage resources are already limited for a max population of 25,000 under the current Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). These Applications seek to increase that number to 29,000 which will be unsustainable without huge additional infrastructure and operational costs, much of which will have to be borne by existing residents. The population cap of 25,000 should be preserved, so as not to breach the Land Grant.

(2) The Application states that HKR is the sole owner of the Lot, which is untrue. There are presently over 8,300 assignees who co-own the Lot together with Hong Kong Resorts. HKR should withdraw the Application and make revisions to recognize the co-owners.

(3) The Master Plan forms part of the Land Grant at Discovery Bay, yet the current Master Plan (6.0E1) and the current OZP are not aligned. The Master Plan and OZP should be updated to ensure they are properly aligned, before considering any amendments to the OZP.

Thank you for considering these important objections.

Area 10b. I object to this Planning Application for the following reasons:

(1) Water and sewerage resources are already limited for a max population of 25,000 under the current Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). These Applications seek to increase that number to 29,000 which will be unsustainable without huge additional infrastructure and operational costs, much of which will have to be borne by existing residents. The population cap of 25,000 should be preserved, so as not to breach the Land Grant.

(2) The Application states that HKR is the sole owner of the Lot, which is untrue. There are presently over 8,300 assignees who co-own the Lot together with Hong Kong Resorts. HKR should withdraw the Application and make revisions to recognize the co-owners.

(3) The Master Plan forms part of the Land Grant at Discovery Bay, yet the current Master Plan

(6.0E1) and the current OZP are not aligned. The Master Plan and OZP should be updated to ensure they are properly aligned, before considering any amendments to the OZP.

(4) The Schedule of Uses for the Promenade at Area 10b states that "This zone is intended primarily for the provision of outdoor open-air space... serving the needs of the local residents and visitors." Under the Deed of Mutual Covenant, there is no provision to allow public access to the Lot, nor is there any requirement for the residential owners to pay for the maintenance of public areas. Since public access is only allowed if an area is declared to be for Public Recreation on the Master Plan, this reference to 'visitors' should be removed or the Master Plan will need to be revised, with HKR undertaking the cost of management & maintenance of public areas.

Thank you for considering these important objections.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-145812-26000

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

~~2595~~

2595

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 14:58:12

有關的規劃申請編號

The application no. to which the comment relates:

Y1-DB/2

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

Name of person making this comment:

先生 Mr Ming Mo

意見詳情

Details of the Comment:

新計劃可支持開辦獨立的巴士路線，令交通更方便快捷

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-145533-39026

~~2596~~

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2596

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 14:55:33

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. Matt Benson

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

It creates more job opportunities, which will bring in many social and economic benefits to the society.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-163613-31483

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

~~2434~~

2537

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 16:36:13

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:

夫人 Mrs. Thornton

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Area 6f. I object to this Planning Application for the following reasons:

(1) Water and sewerage resources are already limited for a max population of 25,000 under the current Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). These Applications seek to increase that number to 29,000 which will be unsustainable without huge additional infrastructure and operational costs, much of which will have to be borne by existing residents. The population cap of 25,000 should be preserved, so as not to breach the Land Grant.

(2) The Application states that HKR is the sole owner of the Lot, which is untrue. There are presently over 8,300 assignees who co-own the Lot together with Hong Kong Resorts. HKR should withdraw the Application and make revisions to recognize the co-owners.

(3) The Master Plan forms part of the Land Grant at Discovery Bay, yet the current Master Plan (6.0E1) and the current OZP are not aligned. The Master Plan and OZP should be updated to ensure they are properly aligned, before considering any amendments to the OZP.

Thank you for considering these important objections.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-165345-54060

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

~~2225~~

2598

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 16:53:45

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. Jeff Ho

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Upgrade overall environment of areas concerned.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-164600-30960

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

~~2596~~

2599

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 16:46:00

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. Kathy Cheung

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

It makes use of the land designated for staff quarters which are no longer required.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-170955-89256

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

~~23:29~~

2600

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 17:09:55

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:

小姐 Miss Cherry Lau

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Support

參考編號

Reference Number

160706-165450-00230

提交限期

Deadline for submission

15/07/2011

2020

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission

16/07/2011 10:16:57

2601

有關的規劃申請編號

The application no. to which the comment relates:

Y1-DB/2

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

Name of person making this comment:

2.4 Mr. Ian Leung

意見詳情

Details of the Comment:

It makes use of the land designated for staff quarters which are no longer required

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-164718-81762

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

~~24/08~~

2602

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 16:47:18

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. Martin Hung

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

It optimises the land use at Area 6f in Discovery Bay.

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

參考編號

160706-171110-10773

Reference Number:

提交限期

15/07/2016

Deadline for submission:

~~2730~~

2603

提交日期及時間

06/07/2016 17:11:10

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. Andy Wan

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

I support.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-164938-35541

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

~~2016~~

2604

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 16:49:38

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. Ip Man

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

It makes use of the land designated for staff quarters which are no longer required.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-164202-06435

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

~~2602~~

2605

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 16:42:02

有關的規劃申請編號

The application no. to which the comment relates:

Y1-DB/2

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

Name of person making this comment:

先生 Mr. Leslie Siu

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

It contributes to the housing market, and the future development at Lantau Island.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-165107-38827

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

~~2606~~
2606

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 16:51:07

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:

小姐 Miss Gigi Chow

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

It is in extension to the existing residential development, at a site of minimal natural conservation value. It is a logical site for development.

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-164315-86393

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

~~2724~~

2607

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 16:43:15

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. Billy Ng

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

The plan has given due regard for the mountain backdrop and the relationship with the existing, and is in harmony with the adjacent land uses such as the residential areas.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-165231-66413

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

~~2435~~

2608

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 16:52:31

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. Eric Shum

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

The plan has given due regard for the mountain backdrop and the relationship with the existing, and is in harmony with the adjacent land uses such as the residential areas.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-164437-55817

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

~~2436~~

2609

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 16:44:37

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. Kit Chan

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Upgrade overall environment of areas concerned.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-163707-05904

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

~~24/07~~
2610

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 16:37:07

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. Gordon S Thornon

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Area 6f. I object to this Planning Application for the following reasons:

- (1) Water and sewerage resources are already limited for a max population of 25,000 under the current Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). These Applications seek to increase that number to 29,000 which will be unsustainable without huge additional infrastructure and operational costs, much of which will have to be borne by existing residents. The population cap of 25,000 should be preserved, so as not to breach the Land Grant.
- (2) The Application states that HKR is the sole owner of the Lot, which is untrue. There are presently over 8,300 assignees who co-own the Lot together with Hong Kong Resorts. HKR should withdraw the Application and make revisions to recognize the co-owners.
- (3) The Master Plan forms part of the Land Grant at Discovery Bay, yet the current Master Plan (6.0E1) and the current OZP are not aligned. The Master Plan and OZP should be updated to ensure they are properly aligned, before considering any amendments to the OZP.

Thank you for considering these important objections.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-172135-21448

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

~~2611~~

2611

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 17:21:35

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:

小姐 Miss Sue

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

設計圖則顯示附近屋苑與新屋苑有充足距離，景觀不會受阻。本人支持是次申請。

參考編號
Reference Number

2000
2612

提交日期
Date and time of submission

提交日期及時間
Date and time of submission

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

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

意見詳情
Details of the comment

To
Secretary of the Town Planning Board
tphpd@pland.gov.hk

Re
Application Y1-DB/2, Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext. (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay
To rezone the application site from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (S)" to "Residential (Group C) 12"

Dear Sir,

Herewith we call on the Town Planning Board.

"To reject the application Y1-DB/2 to rezone Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext. (Part) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters (S)" to "Residential (Group C) 12"

My reasons for objecting to the application are:

In the Government comments on HKR's application to develop areas 6f and 10b, EPD made comments to HKR for suggesting that sewage from the 6f and 10b developments could be treated at the Siu Ho Wan Sewage Treatment Works (SHWSTW). Here is EPD's comment:

"The Discovery Bay further development shall provide its own sewage treatment facilities to meet the WPCO standards before discharge into the receiving waters. In this connection, the Applicant should delete all the incorrect and misleading statements, e.g. "SHWSTW requires upgrade works to cater for the existing and concurrent developments, irrespective of the proposed developments. The upgrade works could cater for the sewerage increase as a result of the proposal, which accounts around 0.8% of the treatment flow" and other similar text in the submission as they are factually incorrect."

In its letter circulated to all DB residents on 23 April, 2016, titled "Further Elaborations on DB Latest Development Plans", HKR was still making the misleading claim that sewage could be treated at the SHWSTW. The idea that it could not was a "misconception"

Worse, in its latest submission to the TPB HKR has merely acknowledged that that untreated sewage cannot be routed to the SHWSTW. It has not provided a proper update for its alternative proposals, which had assumed that the EPD would allow treated sewage to be sent to the SHWSTW for disposal. Note above that EPD has clearly stated that HKR is responsible for treating sewage to WPCO standards for discharge into the receiving waters.

In its original submission to the TPB, HKR provided two alternative solutions if the option to use the SHWSTW was ruled out:

- 6f sewage treated on-site; 10b sewage treated in a new sewage treatment works facing La Costa before pumping to SHWSTW.-
- 6f sewage connected to the existing DB sewage system at the pumping station between Beach Village and the tennis courts; sewage volume equivalent to 6f and 10b treated in a new sewage treatment works facing La Costa. Treated effluent sent to SHWSTW.

Now that discharge to the SHWSTW is not an option, HKR states:

"The applicant will undertake the design, construction and implementation of an on-site sewage treatment plant (STP) adequate for proper treatment of the sewage arising to meeting the permissible effluent standards for discharging into the receiving waters. ... Other detailed design parameters such as the treatment level, treatment technology, discharge location, effluent standards will be properly addressed at detail design stage subsequent to the approval of this rezoning application."

In other words, there is no detail on how the sewage will be treated, or where it will be discharged into the waters around DB. The locations of the sewage treatment plants and marine outfall shown in the updated Environmental Impact Assessment are "indicative only".

There are no details of the STP, and given the small size of the lot and the proximity to existing residential developments, there is no assessment on what impact a sewage treatment plant has on the immediate environment.

EPD's comments make it clear that the sewerage systems for 6f and 10b must be kept separate from the existing sewage infrastructure in DB, so that there is no possibility of discharge of sewage from the new developments to SHWSTW.

Further, while HKR states that the sewage treatment plant(s) will be maintained at the cost of the owners of the 6f and 10b developments (ref. DSD's comments, SIA (d)), it ignores maintenance responsibility for the connecting pipeline systems and the marine outfall.

Provision of sewerage infrastructure is a basic requirement. How can HKR be allowed to proceed without providing basic information on sewage treatment and disposal?

Unless and until my demands are acceded to and my concerns are addressed I object to the above-mentioned development application.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160706-180633-79661

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

~~2016~~

2613

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/07/2016 18:06:33

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. Cedric LO

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Increase and create job opportunities.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-082201-09413

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

~~2614~~
2614

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 08:22:01

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. Mark

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

With one more village, the cost of sharing the maintenance expense of communal facilities can be reduced which will benefit all owners.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-091331-36225

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

~~3612~~

2615

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission

07/07/2016 09:13:31

有關的規劃申請編號

The application no. to which the comment relates:

Y1-DB/2

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

Name of person making this comment:

女士 Ms. Wendy

意見詳情

Details of the Comment:

The surrounding area of the proposed development will be beautified and bring in new leisure facilities.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-091640-00135

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

~~2016~~

2616

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 09:16:40

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. Matt Ken

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

I support.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-091546-75835

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

~~2016~~
2617

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 09:15:46

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:

先生 Mr. Dick Yeung

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Support.

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

參考編號

160707-091441-21302

Reference Number:

提交限期

15/07/2016

Deadline for submission:

~~2618~~
2618

提交日期及時間

07/07/2016 09:14:41

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

女士 Ms. Wendy

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Support.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-094427-64610

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

~~2619~~

2619

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 09:44:27

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. Bali

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

The plan brings in suitable amount of population to support the businesses of local shops, in a way to provide more retail choices for residents.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-093738-73032

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2620

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 09:37:38

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. Mark

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

計劃已考慮基礎設施、視覺、交通方面等因素及社區承擔能力，設計亦與周邊環境及景觀融合新計劃可支持開辦獨立的巴士路線，令交通更方便快捷。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-111208-28037

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

~~2508~~
2621

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 11:12:08

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. 方忠偉

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

引入新屋苑，可分擔公共設施的維修費用，使周邊的基建設施作出翻新及改善，業主可減省維修保養及相關開支。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-105548-66114

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

~~22/07~~
2622

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 10:55:48

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. Carmen Li

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

I fully support the idea to optimize DB's land use. The plan can contribute to alleviate the land shortage issue in HK and provides more housing choices. DB is a nice place and suitable for residential buildings. Given the planned plot ratio is still low, the transportation and public facilities should be very sufficient to accommodate the extra population in the community.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-120810-33275

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

~~2424~~

2623

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 12:08:10

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:

夫人 Mrs. Emma Panina

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

我讚成此計劃,有更多綠化空間能減低碳排放,提升空氣質素,生活環境就更好。

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

參考編號
Reference Number: 160707-120420-78791

提交限期
Deadline for submission: 15/07/2016 ~~2016~~ 2624

提交日期及時間
Date and time of submission: 07/07/2016 12:04:20

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. Pak Wing Kwan

意見詳情
Details of the Comment :

我同意,創造全新的社區集結點,會有更多公眾休閒空間。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-115003-60317

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

~~2625~~
2625

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 11:50:03

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. Baldwin

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

There seems to be an incompatibility of land use. I fail to see how HKRI can provide the existing services at the waterfront and construct the development.

There will be inadequate air ventilation (there is a wall of development that would not permit adequate through ventilation. The continuous building length i.e. buildings with no break in between them would not allow through ventilation and would create a wall of development that is not consistent with best practice as advocated by the prevailing sustainable building guidelines.

The extent and width of footpaths would be totally inadequate to meet likely and required levels of service and would not be of adequate width to sustain the sort of levels of tree planting along roads advocated by Development Bureau.

The planning statement is PR hogwash and should be ignored or HKRI should be held to account. HKRI are not contributing to alleviating housing shortage. There is no affordable housing in the scheme. They are simply a developer exploiting a piece of land to the maximum. At least make sure they are honest in their intentions.

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

參考編號

160707-121537-99166

Reference Number:

提交限期

15/07/2016

Deadline for submission:

~~2123~~
2626

提交日期及時間

07/07/2016 12:15:37

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. Seve Yiu

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

我讚成新發展,可創造更多就業機會,為市民及社會帶來好處及經濟效益。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-122517-94965

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

~~2627~~
2627

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 12:25:17

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. Chek Man Kwok

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

我同意,引入更多人口,可支持小商店的營運,提供更多選擇。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-135546-36700

~~2628~~
2628

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 13:55:46

有關的規劃申請編號

The application no. to which the comment relates:

Y1-DB/2

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

Name of person making this comment:

小姐 Miss W Y Lee

意見詳情

Details of the Comment:

I support the captioned proposal as the new plan will create more job opportunities, which will bring in many social and economic benefits to the society and citizens.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-135114-78908

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

~~2629~~

2629

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 13:51:14

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. Yam

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

I agreed with the proposal due to the fact that the plan echoes with the future development at Lantau Island and keeps DB competitive through the continuous development and facilities upgrade.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-145850-25638

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

~~2630~~
2630

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 14:58:50

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. Ralph Gunthorpe

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

I object to the proposed development creating 4000 new residents into Discovery Bay for a number of reasons some of which are listed below:

1. Where is the new school required by the DB Master Plan (1984)?
2. The infrastructure of DB i.e. public transport, waste disposal, viable shopping access (on a per capita basis) are all now operating to a maximum & are barely coping. In some cases questionably not coping at all. Where are the plans to rectify these shortcomings?
3. During the development, how are the construction teams going to have access to the site? If it is the existing single access road, it will create significant disruption to the lifestyle of the current residents of Parkvale, particularly those in the "Woods", not to mention a heightened level of danger to children & animals of the existing residents.
4. The proposed area currently gets significant recreational utilisation by a broad spectrum of the DB community for hiking access & pet exercise. There will be negative lifestyle impacts associated with these plans.
5. On a broader basis, the tranquility that was a key element of living in DB has been significantly eroded over the last 10-15 years with the existing development. It is now at a stage where it is in danger of becoming "just" another part of HK with little to set it apart in terms of quality of lifestyle.

Regards,

Ralph Gunthorpe.

參考編號

160707-144106-33442

Reference Number:

提交限期

15/07/2016

~~2631~~ 2631

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

07/07/2016 14:41:06

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. Donald CHEUNG

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

(1) Transport, facilities, water and sewerage resources are already limited for a max population of 25,000 under the current Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). These Applications seek to increase that number to 29,000 which will be unsustainable without huge additional infrastructure and operational costs, much of which will have to be borne by existing residents. The population cap of 25,000 should be preserved, so as not to breach the Land Grant.

(2) The Application states that HKR is the sole owner of the Lot, which is untrue. There are presently over 8,300 assignees who co-own the Lot together with Hong Kong Resorts. HKR should withdraw the Application and make revisions to recognize the co-owners.

(3) DB is a low density residential area. With more and more buildings had been constructed recently, it had been overcrowded and would the Government to limit HKR's development.

(4) All resident have the owner and right for the development of DB, please let us choose for future development and no more favour to the developer.

Thank you for considering these important objections.

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-144200-05256

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

~~2632~~
2632

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 14:42:00

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:

小姐 Miss Carol LAW

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

(1) DB is a low density residential area. With more and more buildings had been constructed recently, it had been overcrowded and would the Government to limit HKR's development.

(2) All resident have the owner and right for the development of DB, please let us choose for future development and no more favour to the developer.

(3) We need fresh air and no more construction for earning money. Please let us choose for future development and no more favour to the developer.

Thank you for considering these important objections.

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-153632-35318

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2633

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 15:36:32

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:

小姐 Miss NG

意見詳情

Details of the Comment:

引入適量人口可支持本土小商店的營運，為居民提供更多的零售選擇

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

參考編號

160707-154748-06111

Reference Number:

提交限期

15/07/2016

Deadline for submission:

~~2634~~

2634

提交日期及時間

07/07/2016 15:47:48

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. WONG

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

新建的海濱長廊、提升的交通配套、優化的街渡及碼頭設施，令出入更方便

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-154033-53739

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

~~2635~~
2635

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 15:40:33

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. WONG

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

新發展會創造更多就業機會，為市民及社會帶來好處及經濟效益

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-154406-67216

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2636

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 15:44:06

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:

夫人 Mrs. CHENG

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

創造全新的社區集結點，大眾可享用更多公眾休閒空間

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-160935-41965

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2637

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 16:09:35

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:

小姐 Miss YUNG

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

The area is suitable for residential building as it has been designated for staff headquarters which are no longer required. The planned plot ratio is still low that the infrastructure and facilities will be sufficient to accommodate the extra population.

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

160707-160356-73230

提交限期**Deadline for submission:**

15/07/2016

2638

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

07/07/2016 16:03:56

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. CK

意見詳情**Details of the Comment :**

With one more village, the cost of sharing the maintenance expense of communal facilities can be reduced which will benefit all owners.

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

參考編號

160707-161139-03882

Reference Number:

提交限期

15/07/2016

2639

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

07/07/2016 16:11:39

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

小姐 Miss AMY YUNG

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

Support the application to provide more housing choices.

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

參考編號

160707-155723-87830

Reference Number:

2640

提交限期

15/07/2016

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

07/07/2016 15:57:23

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. TAM

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment:

引入新屋苑，可分擔公共設施的維修費用，業主可減省維修保養及相關開支，讓成發展！

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-155250-74261

2641

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 15:52:50

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. LAI

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

本發展項目可善用土地資源，減輕香港土地不足的問題，提供不同類型的房屋選擇。

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-161732-32042

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2642

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 16:17:32

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. LEUNG

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

It creates more job opportunities, which will bring in many social and economic benefits to the society.

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

160707-161036-66498

Reference Number:**2643****提交限期**

15/07/2016

Deadline for submission:**提交日期及時間**

07/07/2016 16:10:36

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**

女士 Ms. LI

Name of person making this comment:**意見詳情****Details of the Comment :****更多的綠化空間有助減低碳排放，提升空氣質素，提供更佳工作及生活環境**

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-160356-89350

2641

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 16:03:56

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:

小姐 Miss WU

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

更多的綠化空間有助減低碳排放，提升空氣質素，提供更佳工作及生活環境

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-155541-05762

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2645

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 15:55:41

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. WONG

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

可善用土地資源，減輕香港土地不足的問題，提供不同類型的房屋選擇，提升生活質素

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-161415-54275

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2646

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 16:14:15

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:

小姐 Miss WONG

意見詳情

Details of the Comment:

更多的綠化空間有助減低碳排放，提升空氣質素，提供更佳工作及生活環境

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-160721-53344

2647

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 16:07:21

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:

小姐 Miss WANG

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

更多的綠化空間有助減低碳排放，提升空氣質素，提供更佳工作及生活環境

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-155957-87308

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2648

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 15:59:57

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:

小姐 Miss WANG

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :**可善用土地資源，減輕香港土地不足的問題，提供不同類型的房屋選擇，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:

160707-155128-59324

2649

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 15:51:28

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:

夫人 Mrs. pong

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

新建的海濱長廊、提升的交通配套、優化的街渡及碼頭設施，令出入更方便

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-164932-96711

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2650

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 16:49:32

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. Cheung Fung Kuen

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

我支持這計劃。它可善用土地資源，減輕香港土地不足的問題，提供不同類型的房屋選擇。6f一直已規劃為居住用途，證明土地適宜建屋。規劃中的地積比亦很低，基建及配套足以容納新增的人口。計劃已考慮基礎設施、視覺、交通方面等因素及社區承擔能力，設計亦與周邊環境及景觀融合。

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

160707-163007-60493

提交限期**Deadline for submission:**

15/07/2016

2651

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

07/07/2016 16:30:07

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. MOK

意見詳情**Details of the Comment :**

發展有利提供更多建造業的就業機會，替勞工階層解決收入及開工不足之情況。讚成有關之發展！

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-165255-75648

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2652

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 16:52:55

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. JACK CHAN

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

•可善用土地資源，減輕香港土地不足的問題，提供不同類型的房屋選擇。新發展會創造更多就業機會，為市民及社會帶來好處及經濟效益，讚同!

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-164808-68314

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2653

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 16:48:08

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:

小姐 Miss IVY LEUNG

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

此項目有利愉景灣長遠發展，不但提供更多休憩及服務設施，亦提供不少住宅單位供應，對整個香港的土地供應及居住環境都有著正面的提昇。再者，發展亦有利提供更多建造業的就業機會，替勞工階層解決收入及開工不足之情況。總而言之，讚成有關之發展！

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

參考編號

Reference Number:

160707-163402-70748

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2654

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

07/07/2016 16:34:02

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. K Chan

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

我支持這計劃。因為可善用土地資源，減輕香港土地不足的問題，提供不同類型的房屋選擇。6f一直已規劃為居住用途，證明土地適宜建屋。規劃中的地積比亦很低，基建及配套足以容納新增的人口。計劃已考慮基礎設施、視覺、交通方面等因素及社區承擔能力，設計亦與周邊環境及景觀融合。新計劃可支持開辦獨立的巴士路線，令交通更方便快捷。新發展會創造更多就業機會，為市民及社會帶來好處及經濟效益。引入適量人口可支持本土小商店的營運，為居民提供更多的零售選擇。現時上址欠缺遊樂設施，新發展會美化環境及引入新的休憩設施。設計圖則顯示附近屋苑與新屋苑有充足距離，景觀不會受阻。引入新屋苑，可分擔公共設施的維修費用，使周邊的基建設施作出翻新及改善，業主可減省維修保養及相關開支。

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

160707-162724-98953

提交限期**Deadline for submission:**

15/07/2016

2655**提交日期及時間****Date and time of submission:**

07/07/2016 16:27:24

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:**

小姐 Miss AMY YUNG

意見詳情**Details of the Comment :**

此項目有利愉景灣長遠發展，不但提供更多休憩及服務設施，亦提供不少住宅單位供應，對整個香港的土地供應及居住環境都有著正面的提昇。再者，發展亦有利提供更多建造業的就業機會，替勞工階層解決收入及開工不足之情況。總而言之，讚成有關之發展！

就規劃申請/遷移提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號

Reference Number:

160767-165040-42963

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

15/07/2016

2656

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission

07/07/2016 16:50:40

有關的規劃申請編號

The application no. to which the comment relates:

Y1-DB/2

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

Name of person making this comment:

先生 Mr. 駱德輝

意見詳情

Details of the Comment:

設計圖則顯示附近厚苑與新屋苑有充足距離，景觀不會受阻。

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

參考編號

160707-172133-27866

Reference Number:

2657

提交限期

15/07/2016

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

07/07/2016 17:21:33

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. EDWARD LAI

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment:

該6F區一直已規劃為居住用途，證明土地適宜建屋。規劃中的地積比亦很低，基建及配套足以容納新增的人口。新發展會創造更多就業機會，為市民及社會帶來好處及經濟效益。