

**APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT OF PLAN  
 UNDER SECTION 12A OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE**

**APPLICATION NO. Y/I-DB/2**

- Applicant** : Hong Kong Resort Company Limited represented by Masterplan Limited
- Site** : Area 6f, Lot 385 RP & Ext. (Part ) in D.D. 352, Discovery Bay
- Site Area** : 7,623 m<sup>2</sup> (about)
- Lease** : Lot No. 385 R.P. in D.D. 352 and the extensions thereto
- Plan** : Approved Discovery Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/I-DB/4
- Zoning** : "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Staff Quarters(5)" ("OU(Staff Quarters(5))")
- Proposed Amendment** : From "OU(Staff Quarters(5))" to "Residential(Group C)12" ("R(C)12")

**1. The Proposal**

1.1 The applicant proposes to rezone the application site (the Site) (**Plan Z-1a**) from "OU(Staff Quarters(5))" to "R(C)12" with development restrictions of maximum domestic gross floor area (GFA) of 21,600m<sup>2</sup> and maximum building height (BH) of 18 storeys (128mPD). The proposed rezoning is intended to facilitate a medium-density residential development at the Site (**Drawing Z-1**). According to the applicant, a new sub-area under the current "R(C)" zone is proposed to be added to the Notes of the OZP (**Table 1**), with the Remarks reflecting the proposed development parameters. The planning intention of the zone remains the same.

**Table 1**

<u>Sub-area</u>	<u>Maximum GFA (m<sup>2</sup>)</u>	<u>Maximum Building Height</u>		
		Number of Storeys	Meters above Hong Kong Principal Datum (mPD)	Meters (m)
R(C)12	21,600	18	128	--

- 1.2 Based on the applicant's indicative development scheme, the proposed residential development consists of two residential blocks with 476 flats (**Drawings Z-1 and Z-2**). The population is estimated to be about 1,190. Various plans and figures submitted by the applicant including Concept Plan, Section Plan, extract of Sub-Deed of Mutual Covenant (Sub-DMC), Tree Treatment Plan, Landscape Master Plan, a plan showing the water sensitive receivers (WSRs), existing and proposed drainage, sewerage and water supply layout plans, proposed visual mitigation measures and photomontages are in **Drawings Z-1 to Z-10c**. A comparison between the development restrictions under "OU(Staff Quarters(5))" zone in the OZP and the major development parameters of the proposed development are as follows:

	<u>Existing Development Restrictions on OZP</u>	<u>Current Proposal</u>
<b>Site Area</b>	--	about 7,623 m <sup>2</sup>
<b>Plot Ratio (PR)</b>	--	about 2.83
<b>Maximum Domestic GFA</b>	170 m <sup>2</sup>	21,600 m <sup>2</sup>
<b>Site Coverage</b>	--	about 30%
<b>No. of Blocks</b>	--	2
<b>No. of Storeys</b>	3	18
<b>Maximum BH</b>	9m	73m/128mPD (including roof top structure)
<b>No. of Flats</b>	--	476
<b>Average Flat Size (m<sup>2</sup>)</b>	--	45
<b>Estimated Population</b>	--	1,190
<b>No. of Car Parking and Loading/Unloading Spaces</b>	--	golf cart parking spaces and servicing vehicles loading/unloading spaces (the number of provision is not provided by the applicant)
<b>Private open space</b>	--	not less than 1,190 m <sup>2</sup>

- 1.3 In terms of infrastructure provision, the applicant proposes to use the existing Discovery Bay Reservoir and a decommissioned water treatment plant near the reservoir (**Plan Z-2**) to provide fresh water supply to the proposed development. An on-site sewage treatment plant with maximum daily sewage flow rate of about 440 m<sup>3</sup>/day is proposed to be constructed within the Site (**Drawing Z-7**) to serve the future development but the exact location of the plant is not provided. Suitable golf cart parking spaces, servicing vehicles and loading/unloading spaces would be provided. In terms of landscape and open space provision, 118 trees within the Site are proposed to be felled; two tree groups along the western periphery would be

retained and 148 compensatory trees would be planted (**Drawings Z-4a and Z-4b**). A private open space of not less than 1,190 m<sup>2</sup> including water features and landscape furniture would be provided for future residents (**Drawing Z-4a**). The year of completion for the proposed development is not specified.

1.4 On 13.5.2016, the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Town Planning Board (the Board) decided to defer a decision on the application for two months upon the applicant's request in order to allow sufficient time for the applicant to address the comments of relevant departments. On 13.6.2016, the applicant submitted Further Information (**Appendix II**) in response to the relevant departmental and public comments. On 26.8.2016, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application for another two months upon the applicant's request in order to allow sufficient time for the applicant to address further comments of relevant departments. On 27.10.2016, 28.11.2016 and 26.1.2017, the applicant submitted Further Information (**Appendices III to V**) in response to the relevant departmental and public comments.

1.5 In support of the application, the applicant has submitted the following documents:

- (a) Application Form with attachments received on 25.2.2016 (**Appendix I**)
- (b) Planning Statement (**Appendix Ia**)
- (c) Supplementary information received on 15.3.2016 (**Appendix Ib**)
- (d) Further information received on 13.6.2016 providing revised Landscape Master Plan, Traffic Study, Environmental Study and additional photomontages [*accepted but not exempted from publication and recounting requirements*] (**Appendix II**)
- (e) Further information received on 27.10.2016 providing revised Concept Plan, Landscape Proposal, Environmental Study, planning statement and updated photomontages [*accepted but not exempted from publication and recounting requirements*] (**Appendix III**)
- (f) Further information received on 28.11.2016 providing revised Environmental Study and Technical Note on Water Quality [*accepted but not exempted from publication and recounting requirements*] (**Appendix IV**)
- (g) Further information received on 26.1.2017 providing response-to-comment table with revised existing and proposed water supply and sewerage layout plans [*accepted and exempted from publication and recounting requirements*] (**Appendix V**)

## 2. Justifications from the Applicant

The justifications put forth by the applicant in support of the application are detailed in **Appendix I** and the Further Information at **Appendices II to V**. They are summarized as follows:

Consistent with Chief Executive (CE)'s Policy Address and the Strategic Planning of Lantau

- (a) The proposed development helps achieve the objective of the CE's Policy Address in increasing and expediting housing land supply to optimise residential development. The long-term planning for Discovery Bay (including Area 10b) is consistent with the envisaged development at Siu Ho Wan, Sunny Bay and Tung Chung New Town Extension at Lantau.

Consistent with the General Planning Intention of Discovery Bay

- (b) The Concept Plan of the proposed development addresses the general planning intention of Discovery Bay as stated in the Explanatory Statement of the OZP. Considerations have been given to ensure the development proposal is of high quality, compatibility with the natural setting and with existing forms of residential development.

Logical Location for Increased Residential Development Intensity

- (c) The proposed residential blocks are replacement of the originally intended staff quarters which are no longer needed. The Site is a logical location for residential development for it is readily accessible, currently served by public transport and in close proximity to commercial and leisure activities; the proposed building height and footprint are of similar scale to the surrounding existing residential blocks; and the proposed increase in residential units of 476 and population of 1,190 is of very modest development intensity and is in balance with the mountain backdrop setting.

Staff quarters are no longer needed in Discovery Bay

- (d) Since the completion of Discovery Bay Tunnel and the connection between Discovery Bay and other parts of Hong Kong has been improved, staff quarters are no longer needed in Discovery Bay.

Adequate Infrastructure Provision

- (e) The applicant requests Water Supplies Department (WSD) and Environmental Protection Department (EPD) to take into account the proposed development in the future planning for Siu Ho Wan water and sewage treatment facilities, in order to provide extra water supply and sewage treatment capacity for the proposed development. Also, the proposal for the Site is moderate in scale, the demand on the government infrastructure would be insignificant. Subject to improvement works where necessary, the proposed development would be feasible to support the planned population.

No Adverse Environmental, Landscape, Traffic, Geotechnical and Visual Impacts

- (f) The water quality control standard for the proposed local water treatment works (WTW) adopts the same standard as the WSD's WTW. Potable water in Discovery Bay had been sourced from Discovery Bay Reservoir and filtration plant (Plan Z-2) for about 20 years before 2000. Discovery Bay residents were used to this arrangement and there was never any concern raised on water quality.

- (g) A small sewage treatment works will be installed within the Site (**Drawing Z-7**). It will be established, operated and maintained by the applicant. It will be accommodated in a dedicated plant room to be installed with sufficient odour removal measures. Therefore, adverse odour impact is not anticipated. Moreover, construction phase impacts are not anticipated to be significant, site runoff and sewage can be alleviated by implementing good site practice.
- (h) Large portion of the Site has been disturbed or formed, the surrounding vegetation is not of significant conservation value. Hence, development of the Site will not have any direct and indirect ecological impacts. There will not be any adverse impact on the landscape setting in the area. Site formation and vegetation clearance would be minimised as much as possible. The proposal seeks to concentrate development on the platform which has already been formed and the part of the Site without significant vegetation. Removal of the greenery on the slope along the Site boundary would be minimised.
- (i) The submitted Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) confirms that the proposed additional residential units would not generate adverse traffic impact to the ferry services and the critical road links and junctions in Discovery Bay, Tung Chung and Sunny Bay areas. Moreover, the proposed development is unlikely to result in adverse vehicular emissions or traffic noise impacts. In terms of addressing potential terrain hazard, a Geotechnical Planning Review Report (GPRR) in accordance with the advice note will be submitted prior to implementation of the development.
- (j) The siting, disposition and building height of the proposed development have been given careful consideration in that the proposed building height is compatible with that of the adjoining Parkvale Village and is in accordance with the topography of the Site; the view corridors currently enjoyed by the existing residents of Parkvale Village would not be interrupted; the proposed development would comply with the Sustainable Building Guidelines; and a setback from Discovery Valley Road of more than 45m is proposed to minimise its visual impact.

#### Responses to Local Concerns

- (k) With reference to the Sub-DMC for Parkvale Village, the applicant clarifies that the section of Parkvale Drive at the pocket of Parkvale Village is identified as "Passageways". It is not part of "Village Retained Areas" or designated as "Village Common Areas". Also, the section of Parkvale Drive leading from Discovery Valley Road and ending outside the pocket of Parkvale Village does not form part of Parkvale Village (**Drawing Z-3**).
- (l) The applicant has carried out rounds of public consultation in 2016 as a good practice. Open letters were issued to Discovery Bay residential units, dedicated enquiry hotline and email were established; public exhibitions were held and articles were published regarding the details of the subject rezoning proposal.
- (m) The hiking trail designated as "Public Recreation Facilities (PRF)" does not encroach onto the Site.

### 3. Compliance with the "Owner's Consent/Notification" Requirements

The applicant is the sole "current land owner". Detailed information would be deposited at the meeting for Members' inspection.

### 4. Background

#### Development of Discovery Bay

- 4.1 In 1973, the Government granted approval for the Discovery Bay development (the Development) as a "Recreation and Leisure Community". Any proposal to increase the development intensity should be initiated by the owner / developer (i.e. the applicant of the subject application, Hong Kong Resort Company Limited (HKRCL)). The control of the Development has been exercised by means of Master Plan (MP) and Supplementary MPs prepared by the Lands Department under the requirement of the lease. In 1975, MP3.5 was approved to allow "resort accommodation" with a GFA of about 401,340m<sup>2</sup> in the Development. In July 1976, the Executive Council (ExCo) approved the grant of land with a site area of about 649.8 ha to HKRCL under Private Treaty Grant for a holiday resort and residential/commercial development in Discovery Bay, with a wide range of recreational facilities and resort accommodation and some commercial elements to serve the locals and the visitors. In September 1976, the land grant was executed.
- 4.2 According to MP4.0 approved in 1978, the previously allowed "resort accommodation" with a GFA of about 401,340 m<sup>2</sup> was deleted and a domestic GFA of about 524,000 m<sup>2</sup> was added to the MP. The total domestic GFA had become about 524,000 m<sup>2</sup>. Between 1978 and 2000, the domestic GFA was increased four times<sup>1</sup> to 758,365m<sup>2</sup> under the approved MP6.0E1. To effect further development mainly in Discovery Bay North, an additional housing development amounting to a domestic GFA of 17,290m<sup>2</sup> was incorporated in the latest MP6.0E7h(a) (Plan Z-1b) approved in 2016. The maximum domestic GFA permissible under the current MP is now 775,655m<sup>2</sup>.
- 4.3 In 2001, the Government agreed in principle to HKRCL's proposed additional residential GFA of 124,000 m<sup>2</sup> in Discovery Bay North (Plan Z-1a). As the new OZP for Discovery Bay was under preparation at that time, based on the draft MP 6.0E7h(a), allowance was made in the OZP to cater for such increase as well as minor adjustments in other areas. As a result, the total domestic GFA allowed in the OZP is 900,683 m<sup>2</sup>. Comparing with the latest MP6.0E7h(a) with a maximum domestic GFA of 775,655 m<sup>2</sup>, the OZP has an additional GFA of 125,028 m<sup>2</sup> which mainly comprise the undeveloped GFA in sub-areas A, B and C of the "R(C)2" zone in the north (designated as "Potential Housing Development Area" on the MP

---

<sup>1</sup> The domestic GFA was further increased by 34,000m<sup>2</sup> under MP5.3 approved in 1987, the maximum domestic GFA being allowed under MP was 558,000m<sup>2</sup>. Subsequently in 1989, an additional domestic GFA of 1,510m<sup>2</sup> was added to the approved MP5.4. The total domestic GFA was increased to 559,510m<sup>2</sup>. The maximum domestic GFA 559,510m<sup>2</sup> were maintained under MP5.5 and MP5.6 approved in 1992 and 1994 respectively. Under MP5.7 approved in 1999, the originally allowed hotel GFA of 25,000m<sup>2</sup> was replaced by the same domestic GFA, increasing the total permissible domestic GFA under MP up to 584,510m<sup>2</sup>. In 2000, the domestic GFA was further increased by 173,855m<sup>2</sup> under the approved MP6.0E1, making the total domestic GFA amount to 758,365m<sup>2</sup>.

(Plan Z-1a)) but is not yet reflected in MP6.0E7h(a)<sup>2</sup>. The GFA permitted under the latest MP6.0E7h(a) approved on 24.6.2016 and the prevailing Discovery Bay OZP No. S/I-DB/4 are compared as follows:

	MP6.0E7h(a)	Discovery Bay OZP No. S/I-DB/4
<b>Domestic GFA (Total Domestic PR)</b>	775,655 m <sup>2</sup> (0.119)	900,683 m <sup>2</sup> (0.139)
<b>Total GFA (Total PR)</b>	1,006,042 m <sup>2</sup> (0.155)	1,047,081 m <sup>2</sup> (0.16)

- 4.4 The land area planned for residential development in Discovery Bay mainly falls within various “R(C)” zones and “OU” zones<sup>3</sup>. The land use zonings and development intensity as incorporated in the Discovery Bay OZP had taken into consideration the development character, availability of infrastructure, the need to conserve the natural environment, the contents of MP as well as the relevant height restrictions set out in the Deed of Restrictive Covenant (DRC) of Hong Kong Disneyland.
- 4.5 In terms of the Site under the current application, it falls within Area 6f in the MP, which has all along been designated as “Staff Quarters” for the provision of staff quarters accommodation (Plan Z-1b).

## 5. Previous Application(s)

There is no previous application at the Site.

## 6. Similar Application(s)

- 6.1 There is no similar application within the boundary of the Discovery Bay OZP.
- 6.2 On 26.2.2016, the applicant submitted another rezoning application concerning Area 10b of Discovery Bay under Application No. Y/I-DB/3 (Plan Z-1a). The applicant proposes to rezone the application site of Application No. Y/I-DB/3 from “OU(Staff Quarters(1))”, “OU(Service Area)”, “OU(Dangerous Goods Store/ LPG Store)”, “OU(Pier(3))”, “OU(PFS)”, “OU(Marina)” and “G/IC” to “R(C)13”, “G/IC”, “OU(Residential Above Service Area)” and “OU(Promenade)” and to extend the OZP boundary beyond the existing seawall and zone it as “R(C)13” and “OU(Promenade)” to facilitate a low to medium-density residential development partly on top of a podium level of service area at the application site.

<sup>2</sup> The 125,028 m<sup>2</sup> additional GFA consists of about 124,000m<sup>2</sup> in the “R(C)2” zone and about 1,000m<sup>2</sup> in the “R(C)7” zone.

<sup>3</sup> The “OU” zones are “OU(Commercial Complex and Residential Development cum Transport Interchange)” zone, “OU(Commercial and Public Recreation Development cum Transport Interchange)” zone, “OU(Public Recreation cum Residential Development)” zone and “OU(Golf Course Cum Residential Development)” zone.

## 7. The Site and its Surrounding Areas (Plans Z-1a to Z-7)

### 7.1 The Site is:

- (a) located on a slope rising from 44mPD to 70mPD, about 600m away from the Discovery Bay Ferry Pier (**Plan Z-1a**);
- (b) currently vacant and covered with grass, scrubs, trees, vegetation, man-made slopes and a formed flat land (**Plans Z-4 to Z-6**); and
- (c) accessible via a footpath connecting to Parkvale Drive to the north of the Site (**Plan Z-2**).

### 7.2 The surrounding areas have the following characteristics:

- (a) the immediate surroundings are natural/manmade vegetated slopes. There is a hiking trail partly within the Site linking Parkvale Village and the uphill area (**Plans Z-1a and Z-3**);
- (b) to the further east and north of the Site are two medium-rise residential developments (15 to 23 storeys) namely Parkvale Village and Midvale Village falling within an area zoned "R(C)4" (**Plan Z-1a**); and
- (c) Discovery Valley Road is located about 50m to the south of the Site (**Plan Z-2**).

## 8. Planning Intentions

### General Planning Intention

- 8.1 The Territorial Development Strategy Review (TDSR) and the South West New Territories Development Strategy Review (SWNTDSR) have laid down the planning and development framework for Lantau Island. Discovery Bay is not identified as one of the Strategic Growth Areas. In line with the strategic planning context provided by the SWNTDSR approved in 2001, the Explanatory Statement of the OZP stipulates that the general planning intention of Discovery Bay is for conservation of the natural environment and to provide for low-density developments compatible with the surrounding natural setting.
- 8.2 Discovery Bay is expected to be developed in accordance with local conditions and the capacities of the existing and planned infrastructure. Based on the approved MP, the existing and planned infrastructural provision as well as the planning intention of maintaining the sub-urban community character of Discovery Bay, the SWNTDSR adopted the planned population of 25,000, upon full development of Discovery Bay.

### Specific Land Use Zoning

- 8.3 The planning intention of the "OU(Staff Quarters(5))" zone is intended to designate land for the provision of staff quarters to serve the Discovery Bay development.

## 9. Comments from Relevant Government Departments

9.1 The following government departments have been consulted and their views on the application are summarized as follows:

### Land Administration

9.1.1 Comments of the District Lands Officer/Islands, Lands Department (DLO/Is, LandsD):

#### Master Plan

- (a) The Site falls on private lot known as Lot No. 385 R.P. in D.D. 352 & the Extensions thereto (the Lot) and is held under New Grant No. 6122 as extended by three Extension Letters in 1979, 1980 and 1981 (the New Grant). Pursuant to S.C. (6) of the New Grant, the Lot shall be developed in accordance with the MP approved by the then Secretary for the New Territories (now being exercised by D of Lands) under lease.
- (b) According to the prevailing MP 6.0E7h(a) approved under S.C. (6) of the New Grant, Area 6f, having a gross site area of about 8,300 m<sup>2</sup>, is designated as "Staff Quarters" (**Plan Z-1b**) with maximum Gross Building Area (GBA) of 170m<sup>2</sup> and PR of 0.02.
- (c) The proposed residential development with maximum GFA of 21,600m<sup>2</sup> and PR of 2.83 does not conform with the approved MP 6.0E7h(a).
- (d) The applicant is required to provide various public recreation facilities in Discovery Bay under MP 6.0E7h(a), which include hiking trails with a total length of 3,770m. It is noted that the existing hiking trail (**Plan Z-1a**) for public use passes through the Site and would be affected by the proposal. Besides, the proposed formation of new access road connecting to Parkvale Drive would cut and extinguish part of the existing hiking trail. The applicant shall revise its scheme to avoid affecting the existing hiking trail.

#### Right of Development

- (e) The Principal Deed of Mutual Covenant (PDMC) dated 30.9.1982 has notionally divided the Lot into 250,000 undivided shares. The applicant shall prove that there are sufficient undivided shares retained by them for allocation to the proposed development.
- (f) Area 6f is designated for staff quarters under the Section "Public Works" in the approved MP 6.0E7h(a). The applicant is required to clarify if "staff quarters" in the approved MP 6.0E7h(a) forms part of either the "City Common Areas" or the "City Retained Areas" in the PDMC. Pursuant to Clause 7 under Section I of the PDMC, every Owner (as defined in the PDMC) has the right and liberty to go pass

and repass over and along and use the "City Common Areas" for all purposes connected with the proper use and enjoyment of the same subject to the City Rules (as defined in the PDMC). The applicant is required to substantiate its right and capacity under the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) to develop the site. Should the Board approve the re-zoning application, the applicant will have to apply to LandsD for approval to amend the MP, and amongst others, prove that they are the legal owner of the application site and have the capacity to execute the approval letter with the Government.

#### Building Height Restriction

- (g) The Lot is subject to the height control restriction stipulated in the DRC dated 10.12.1999 entered into between the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and Hong Kong International Theme Parks Limited. Any proposed development shall comply with the DRC. Detailed examination will be conducted upon receipt of formal application (if any) with relevant site co-ordinates for revision of MP.

#### ExCo's Endorsement

- (h) The Audit Commission in 2004 recommended that the D of Lands should seek ExCo's endorsement before approving any major changes to the concept of a development if the concept has been approved by ExCo when approving the land grant.
- (i) Should the Board approve the subject rezoning application and the proposed amendment to the OZP has successfully gone through the usual town planning procedures, then the owner of the Site will have to apply to LandsD for approval to amend the MP so as to implement the proposed development. Upon receipt of such application, LandsD will process the application according to the established practice and seek necessary approvals, including endorsement of ExCo if it is decided that the proposal would result in a change of the development concept of the Lot. The applicant is required to prove that they are the legal owner of the application site and has the capacity to execute the approval letter with the Government. The proposed approval, if approved by LandsD acting in the capacity as the landlord at its discretion, will be subject to such terms and conditions, including payment of premium and administrative fee, as imposed by LandsD.

#### Others

- (j) The revised alignment of the sewer main in the present submission accords with our tenancy records, but minor discrepancy is still found in the alignment of the water main. The applicant shall further review its alignment.

### Traffic

#### 9.1.2 Comments of the Commissioner for Transport:

He has no comment on the application from the traffic engineering viewpoint.

### Environment

#### 9.1.3 Comments of the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP):

- (a) Based on the applicant's latest submission (**Appendix V**), DEP expresses reservation on the acceptability of the proposed development under the subject rezoning application from water quality assessment perspective as the applicant has not demonstrated that all practicable mitigation measures reducing the pollution loading on Total Inorganic Nitrogen (TIN) level to the surrounding receiving water body are exhausted. In terms of air quality, DEP considers that the proposed odour control measures can adequately control the odour emissions from the proposed sewage treatment works to the surrounding air sensitive receivers. He has no adverse comment on the proposed development under the subject rezoning application from the air quality planning point of view.
- (b) However, there are technical discrepancies or deficiency in the revised Environmental Study. The applicant should rectify the discrepancies/deficiency and provide a rectified Environmental Study, particularly on the adverse impacts on water quality arising from the proposed sewage treatment. The applicant should review and supplement if there is cumulative impact on the WSRs from the discharge of treated effluent for the development of Area 10b under Application No. Y/I-DB/3. DEP's specific comments on the submitted Environmental Study are in **Appendix VI**.

### Sewerage

#### 9.1.4 Comments of the DEP:

- (a) Siu Ho Wan Sewage Treatment Works (SHWSTW) has no spare capacity to cater for sewage arising from the proposed developments in Discovery Bay. The applicant should clearly indicate that the developer shall make his own provision to treat the sewage arising from the development.
- (b) For the design of the sewerage system, the applicant should consider the total flow in accordance with "Guidelines for Estimating Sewage Flows" published by EPD.

### Urban Design and Visual

9.1.5 Comments of the Chief Architect, Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department (CA/CMD2, ArchSD):

It is noted that the previous comments on provision of more viewpoints and demarcation of private and public zones have been addressed; and the comment regarding the issue of west-facing flats will be considered in detailed design stage. He has no further comment.

9.1.6 Comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD):

- (a) The proposal is unlikely to cause significant adverse visual impact to the surrounding area.
- (b) The Site is a piece of formed land with vegetated slope located on a hill slope and at the south-western edge of the existing residential development cluster falling within sub-area A of the "R(C)4" zone, which is intended primarily for medium-density residential development with building height not exceeding 22 storeys and 120mPD. As shown in the photomontages (**Drawings Z-10a to Z-10c**), the proposed development is similar in scale and height to the neighbouring buildings within the "R(C)4" zone.

### Landscape

9.1.7 Comments of the CTP/UD&L, PlanD:

- (a) The proposed development under the subject rezoning application is not incompatible with the surrounding environment from the landscape planning perspective and is unlikely to cause significant adverse landscape impact.
- (b) However, the proposed 148 nos. compensatory trees are not clearly indicated in the Landscape Master Plan (**Drawing Z-4a**). An insufficient planting space is also noted on the Landscape Master Plan. There is doubt if the Site could accommodate such large number of compensatory trees. The applicant should critically review the total number of compensatory tree planting within the Site.
- (c) According to the applicant, part of the Site was previously formed. Together with slopes at the west and northeast periphery, the Site is occupied by grassland and existing trees. Tree felling is necessary for the proposed development, but slope cutting is minimised. No trees of protected species or potential registrable old and valuable trees are identified in the tree survey. The impact on existing trees is based on the assumption that no slope work is necessary. As the western slopes are quite steep, should the risk factor change due to residential development and render slope work necessary, the scope of works and impact on trees should be re-visited.

- (d) 3,500m<sup>2</sup> of greenery area and 1,190m<sup>2</sup> of communal open space are proposed for the design population of 1,190. Based on the Landscape Master Plan (**Drawing Z-4a**), the proposed greenery area and communal open space is achievable.

### **Buildings Matter**

#### 9.1.8 Comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories East 1 and Licensing, Buildings Department (CBS/NTE1&L, BD):

- (a) If the existing structures are erected on leased land without approval of the BD (not being New Territories Exempted Houses), they are unauthorized under the Buildings Ordinance (BO) and should not be designated for any use under the application.
- (b) Before any new building works (including containers/open sheds as temporary buildings) are to be carried out on the Site, the prior approval and consent of BD should be obtained, otherwise they are Unauthorized Building Works (UBW). An Authorized Person should be appointed as the coordinator for the proposed building works in accordance with the BO.
- (c) For UBW erected on leased land, enforcement action may be taken by the BD to effect their removal in accordance with BD's enforcement policy against UBW as and when necessary. The granting of any planning approval should not be construed as an acceptance of any existing building works or UBW on the Site under the BO.
- (d) If the Site does not abut a "Specified Street" of not less than 4.5m wide, the development intensity of the proposal should be subject to determination under Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R) 19(3) by the Building Authority upon formal submission of building plan for any proposed new buildings. B(P)R 18A refers.
- (e) Access to the Site should be provided under Regulation 5 of B(P)R. The land status of the adjoining lands, footpath, street, etc. should be clarified upon formal building plan submission stage.
- (f) The proposal should be provided with Emergency Vehicular Access (EVA), Site Access and Means of Escape to street, and may need to be resolved with FSD and LandsD upon formal building plan submission stage.
- (g) Detailed comments under the BO on individual sites for private developments such as permissible plot ratio, site coverage, EVA, private streets and/or access roads, open space, barrier free access and facilities, compliance with the sustainable building design guidelines, etc. will be formulated at formal building plan submission stage.

### **Nature Conservation**

#### 9.1.9 Comments of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC):

- (a) Regarding the newly proposed sewage treatment works, the applicant should elaborate on the ecological baseline information on the effluent discharge point (e.g. site description, types of habitat affected such as artificial seawall and coastal waters, evaluation of ecological value of each type of habitat affected, any species of conservation importance recorded there, etc.), and whether there would be any unacceptable ecological impacts on the affected habitats during operation phase in the Environmental Study.
- (b) The applicant should also elaborate on the potential fisheries impact during the construction and operation phases of the proposed sewage treatment works.
- (c) It is noted that 148 numbers of trees will be planted within the proposed development boundary to compensate for the loss of 118 numbers of trees due to direct conflict with the proposed development under the subject rezoning application (**Drawing Z-4b**). He has no further comment on the application from the tree preservation point of view.
- (d) He also concurs with DEP's comment that the applicant should exhaustively explore and provide all practicable mitigation measures to minimize the residual impact from the sewage discharge (e.g. adoption of more advanced treatment technology, review the discharge location, etc.) and update the relevant assessment findings.

### **Fire Safety**

#### 9.1.10 Comments of the Director of Fire Services (D of FS):

- (a) He has no specific comment on the proposed rezoning. Detailed fire safety requirement will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans.
- (b) The arrangement of EVA shall comply with Section 6. Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 which is administered by BD.

### **Water Supply**

#### 9.1.11 Comments of the Chief Engineer/Development (2), WSD (CE/Dev(2), WSD):

- (a) It is noted that the subject rezoning application involving Area 6f is related to another rezoning application involving Area 10b (i.e. Application No. Y/I-DB/3). The current application proposes an addition of 476 flats (1,190 residents), while Application No. Y/I-DB/3

proposes an addition of 1,125 flats (2,813 residents). Apparently, the applicant has adopted a figure of 2.5 persons per flat. Nevertheless, according to DLO's letter dated 11.9.2014 to the applicant commenting on the proposed Discovery Bay MP7.0B, it was stated that "based on the latest information of 2011 Census, the average household size is 2.7 in Discovery Bay". The applicant should justify the assumption of 2.5 persons per flat in this case. This issue needs to be addressed, as the household size affects the population figure and thus the estimation of demands on infrastructure. If the average household size is 2.7, even the 10,000 flats previously proposed in the draft Discovery Bay MP7.0E will mean a population of 27,000, which will already exceed the maximum population of 25,000 in the Discovery Bay OZP.

- (b) It should be noted that the existing water supply system is based on a maximum population of 25,000 in Discovery Bay, which is the population ceiling in the Discovery Bay OZP currently in force.
- (c) Based on the applicant's proposals, it is obvious that the applicant's intention is to exceed the 25,000 population by an addition of 4,003 persons (1,190 in the subject application + 2,813 in Application No. Y/I-DB/3), and the water demand by an addition of 1,722 cu.m./day (512 in the subject application + 1,210 in Application No. Y/I-DB/3).
- (d) It is noted that the general planning intention of the approved OZP is for a total population of 25,000 persons for the Discovery Bay development, and infrastructural capacities are considerations. Whilst the applicant has proposed an alternative water supply arrangement to provide private water supply by using the raw water stored in the private Discovery Bay Reservoir and using a private water treatment works (**Drawing Z-8** and **Plan Z-2**) to make a private water supply exclusively to the additional 4,000 persons in their rezoning areas, he has reservation on the rationality of this arrangement in the context of public perception, water quality control, etc. considering that the existing and planned residents (25,000) in Discovery Bay are provided with WSD's fresh water supply.
- (e) WSD has reservation to the proposal if water is supplied for the additional residents by Discovery Bay's own water treatment works and discharged to the existing water supply networks (i.e. their treated water mixed with WSD's treated water). As WSD has no authority and responsibility to monitor their water treatment works and the quality of the treated water, it would be quite difficult to identify and determine the responsibility of which party's fault if there is any contamination of water affecting the consumers. If the option is adopted, the new water supply network and the existing one must be segregated to avoid cross-contamination. The applicant is required to submit further information on this alternative water supply arrangement for consideration.

- (f) In relation to paragraph 9.1.11 (e) above, the applicant has not submitted any drawing in the latest Further Information submission (**Appendix V**) to show the applicant's proposed alternative water supply arrangement that involves a private water treatment works and a private fresh water supply network for supplying Area 6f and Area 10b that should be segregated from the existing network supplying WSD fresh water.

### **Electricity**

#### 9.1.12 Comments of the Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services (DEMS):

- (a) He has no comment on the application from the regulatory services perspective.
- (b) The applicant shall approach the electricity supplier for the requisition of cable plans (and overhead line alignments drawings, where applicable) to find out whether there is any underground cable (and/or overhead line) within or in the vicinity of the Site. Based on the cable plans and the relevant drawings obtained, if there is underground cable (and/or overhead line) within or in the vicinity of the Site, the applicant shall carry out the following measures:
- i. for site within the preferred working corridor of high voltage overhead lines at transmission voltage level 132kV and above as stipulated in the HKPSG, prior consultation and arrangement with the electricity supplier is necessary;
  - ii. prior to establishing any structure within the Site, the applicant and/or his contractors shall liaise with the electricity supplier and, if necessary, ask the electricity supplier to divert the underground cable (and/or overhead line) away from the vicinity of the proposed structure; and
  - iii. the "Code of Practice on Working near Electricity Supply Lines" established under the Electricity Supply Lines (Protection) Regulation shall be observed by the applicant and his contractors when carrying out works in the vicinity of the electricity supply lines.

### **Geotechnical**

#### 9.1.13 Comments of the Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (H(GEO), CEDD):

- (a) The proposed development is overlooked by steep natural hillside and meets the Alert Criteria requiring a Natural Terrain Hazard Study (NTHS). It will also affect or be affected by man-made features. The applicant should submit a GPRR. The GPRR should include a preliminary geotechnical review of the man-made features as well as the natural terrain hazards, and where necessary, indicate the recommended

extent of study area for NTHS and a commitment to undertake the NTHS and to carry out any necessary mitigation measures as part of the proposed development. Other essential contents of a GPRR are given in the GEO Advice Note for Planning Applications under Town Planning Ordinance (Cap. 131) (**Appendix VII**).

- (b) It is noted that the applicant proposes to submit the GPRR subsequent to approval of the subject rezoning application and prior to implementation of the proposed development. However, the GPRR shall be submitted in support of the application according to the GEO Advice Note for Planning Applications under Town Planning Ordinance (Cap. 131). The applicant has not submitted a GPRR to assess the geotechnical feasibility of the proposed development.

### **Aviation**

#### 9.1.14 Comments of the Director-General of Civil Aviation (DG of CA):

He has no comment on the proposal as all the proposed BH are below the "restricted height" prescribed under the Hong Kong Airport (Control of Obstructions) Ordinance (Cap. 301).

### **Housing Supply**

#### 9.1.15 Comments of the Secretary for Development (SDEV):

It is noted that Applications No. Y/I-DB/2 and Y/I-DB/3 would facilitate the provision of an additional 1,601 flats, which is in line with the Government's initiative to increase housing supply. That said, the proposed developments should be subject to no adverse departmental comments and should not cause insurmountable problems to the area.

### **District Officer's Comments**

#### 9.1.16 Comments of the District Officer /Islands, Home Affairs Department (DO/Is, HAD):

- (a) He has no comment on the application.
- (b) It is noted that the Islands District Council Members for Discovery Bay and some Discovery Bay residents expressed views/adverse comments vide their written submissions to the Board.

#### 9.2 The following government departments have no comment on the application:

- (a) Chief Engineer/Consultant Management, Drainage Services Department;
- (b) Chief Engineer/Hong Kong & Islands, Drainage Services Department;
- (c) Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands, Civil Engineering and Development Department;
- (d) Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories East, Highways Department;
- (e) Controller of Government Flying Services;

- (f) Commissioner of Police; and
- (g) Director of Leisure and Cultural Services.

## **10. Public Comments Received During Statutory Publication Period**

10.1 The application and its further information (**Appendices II, III and IV**) were published for public inspection on 18.3.2016, 24.6.2016, 18.11.2016 and 9.12.2016 respectively. A total of 5,886 public comments were received. They are summarised in the following table:

	<b>Support</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>Comment/ Concerns</b>	<b>Total</b>
First submission of application	1,396	562	299	2,257
Further Information received on 13.6.2016	1,751	313	170	2,234
Further Information received on 27.10.2016	725	194	0	919
Further Information received on 28.11.2016	377	99	0	476
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,249</b> (about 72%)	<b>1,168</b> (about 20%)	<b>469</b> (about 8%)	<b>5,886</b> (100%)

10.2 A full set of the public comments received is deposited at the Board's Secretariat and contained in a DVD for Members' reference (**Appendix VIII**). The major views are summarized in the following paragraphs.

10.3 The supporting views are mainly from the Islands District Councillor (Mr. WONG Hon Kuen), the local residents of Discovery Bay, owners/residents of Parkvale Village, staff working in Discovery Bay, business operators of Discovery Bay, a non-government organisation and individual members of the public (sample of the comments are extracted at **Appendices IXa to IXj** for reference). They support the application mainly on the following grounds:

- (a) the proposed residential development would increase the housing supply in Hong Kong. It would also provide more options in the housing market. The proposal will balance the needs of the society and the neighbourhoods;
- (b) the proposed development with a relatively low PR is compatible with the surroundings and Discovery Bay which is dominated by low-density developments. The proposal has given due regard to the mountain backdrop and the existing environment, and is in harmony with the adjacent residential uses;
- (c) the site was originally planned for domestic use and is suitable for housing development. The Site has already been formed and vacant for more than 30 years. The proposal renders good utilisation of the vacant land;

- (d) the proposal would enhance the community and improve the living environment of Discovery Bay in that it would provide more facility and greening to the area; existing infrastructure would be upgraded; and create a new focal point in Discovery Bay. The proposal would also improve the visual, odour and hygienic problems caused by dogs fouling found at the Site;
- (e) the proposal would increase the property value in Discovery Bay and enhance the competitiveness of Discovery Bay by making the area more attractive. It also echoes the future development of Lantau;
- (f) the proposal helps Discovery Bay to reinforce its European style architectural design and helps boost its international and diversified image. The sustainable building design of the proposed development is also supported;
- (g) the proposal would create more job opportunities, boost local economy, increase the shop varieties and upgrade the momentum of Discovery Bay;
- (h) the proposed development would help speed up the improvement works of the existing staff quarters in other areas in Discovery Bay which will be beneficial to the staff working in Discovery Bay. Besides, the existing infrastructure would be upgraded which would help reduce the maintenance cost;
- (i) increased population means more balanced voices in Discovery Bay on the local matters;
- (j) the maintenance expense of communal facilities could be shared due to increase of population and the proposed development would justify for a new bus route which would be beneficial to the local residents; and
- (k) with increasing population and new families, there will be additional resources and better opportunity to outreach and serve a wider community. Besides, additional open space and facilities would contribute to more venue options for organising community activities.

10.4 The strong objections (sample of the comments are extracted at **Appendices Xa to Xj** for reference) are mainly from the Islands District Councillor (Ms. Amy YUNG Wing-sheung), concern/green groups (Designing Hong Kong Limited and Kadoorie Farm & Botanic Garden Corporation), Parkvale Village Owners' Committee, Hillgrove Village Owners' Committee, owners/residents of Parkvale Village/Serene Village/Woodland Court/Woodgreen Court, etc., local residents of Discovery Bay, and individual members of the public. The major grounds of objections are as follows:

- (a) the scale of the proposed development is excessive compared with the original intended staff quarters. The proposed development would vastly increase the development density in the area. Besides, the proposal fails to respond to 2015 Policy Address in which the Chief Executive advocated for increasing "the supply of subsidised sale flats";

- (b) the largest area for staff quarters use in Discovery Bay is lost. The proposal contravenes the intended staff quarters use and the Site should be retained for such use. The proposed development also deviates from the original planning intention for Discovery Bay as a tranquil, resort-like area. The lack of staff quarters would also add pressure on the limited public transport option connecting Discovery Bay and the rest of Hong Kong;
- (c) There are concerns on the water and sewage capacities resulting from the increasing population as well as potable water supply problem during drought weather. The population cap of 25,000 for Discovery Bay should be maintained. Besides the TIA has ignored the road safety issues arising from the increasing traffic and golf carts. Also, the anticipated increase in heavy/construction vehicles using Parkvale Drive would pose danger to the residents. There is no information on provision of vehicle parking within the Site;
- (d) the applicant holds no/limited consultation with the existing residents to gauge their views on the proposed development and no detailed development design is available for the residents' information;
- (e) the applicant is not the sole owner of the Site. Also, the applicant has no right under the DMC to convert the access road for use by the proposed development. The proposal clearly violates the DMC. The access road is deemed under the DMC/sub-DMC as "Passageways" and "Village Retained Areas" and is privately owned by the 'owners' of the village. Besides, no consent has been given by the undivided shareholders. There is also unresolved issues of encroachment onto the government land;
- (f) the proposal would destroy the peaceful and quiet ambience of the area for the developer's own profit. The proposed development will create burden and adversely affect the residents' daily lives as there are inadequate community facilities in Discovery Bay, e.g. hospital, police force, library, swimming pools, bus services, etc.. The proposal would also eliminate green/open space; create nuisance during construction phase; affect the property value and drive out small local businesses due to high rent;
- (g) the applicant has not submitted any plan on the management of the existing recreational facilities and public spaces; no impact analysis on the facilities and no information regarding proper and safe access for the residents and emergency vehicles have been submitted; and
- (h) the applicant should ensure the development is in compliance with relevant law, regulations and land contract, etc.

10.5 Some commenters raise concerns/give comments on the application, the major concerns/comments raised are summarised as follows:

- (a) the applicant should pay more attention to the pollution problem during construction of the proposed development. More greening should be provided to compensate the loss of the open space. It is suggested to

improve the facilities that are already existed in Discovery Bay instead of building new housing;

- (b) Hong Kong lack housing land supply, the land resources should not be wasted and the proposal can lower the overall housing prices in Hong Kong;
- (c) a pet garden/dog park is suggested to be provided in the area. Moreover, the existing transport service should be improved and more golf cart parking provision should be provided; and
- (d) Discovery Bay has potential for more development due to its good air quality, low population density and good transport link, and the area is also suitable for retired persons. The development on Lantau could also help Hong Kong Disneyland and Hong Kong tourism industry.

## **11. Planning Considerations and Assessments**

11.1 The application is for rezoning of the Site from "OU(Staff Quarters(5))" to "R(C)12" with development restrictions of maximum domestic GFA of 21,600m<sup>2</sup> and maximum BH of 18 storeys (128mPD) to facilitate a medium-density residential development at the Site.

### **Planning Intention of Discovery Bay**

- 11.2 In terms of strategic planning context, according to the Revised Lantau Concept Plan 2007, Discovery Bay area was not recommended for further development. Recently, the Lantau Development Advisory Committee recommends North Lantau Corridor for strategic economic and housing development, North-eastern Lantau Node for leisure, entertainment and tourism development and East Lantau Metropolis as a long-term strategic growth area. Discovery Bay is not recommended as a strategic growth area under planning at this stage.
- 11.3 As highlighted in paragraphs 4.1 to 4.5 above, Discovery Bay is intended for a holiday resort and residential/commercial development with a total planned population of 25,000 and a total domestic GFA of 900,683m<sup>2</sup> upon full development. The general planning intention of Discovery Bay is for conservation of the natural environment and to provide for low-density developments compatible with surrounding settings. Any further increase in population would have to be considered in the context of the general planning intention for the area and subject to detailed feasibility investigation on infrastructure and environmental capacities.
- 11.4 In terms of site specific planning context, the Site is currently zoned "OU(Staff Quarters(5))" under the current OZP subject to maximum domestic GFA of 170m<sup>2</sup> and maximum BH of 9m (3 storeys) and is intended for the provision of staff quarters to serve the Discovery Bay development. Although the proposed pure residential development has a similar domestic nature with other residential developments in Discovery Bay, the proposed medium-rise development, which has a domestic GFA of 21,600m<sup>2</sup> and maximum BH of 18 storeys (128mPD) should be justified in the context of the development concept of Discovery Bay which is intended for a holiday resort and residential/commercial development. The current application, if

approved, would set an undesirable precedent for similar rezoning applications. Given there are five "OU(Staff Quarters)" zones on the OZP (**Plan Z-7**) with a total area of 26,789 m<sup>2</sup>, the accumulative effect of developing those land with increase in population would further depart from the original development concept of Discovery Bay and overstrain the existing infrastructure capacities.

- 11.5 It should also be noted that there are some 124,000m<sup>2</sup> domestic GFA allowed in the "R(C)2" zone (**Plan Z-1a**) of the Discovery Bay OZP which have not been incorporated in the prevailing MP and yet to be implemented under the lease. In other words, there is scope for further residential development within the planned residential area without resorting to rezone the Site. No justification has been provided by the applicant on this aspect.

#### Compatibility with the Surroundings

- 11.6 The proposed development consists of two medium-rise residential blocks of 18 storeys adjoining medium-rise residential developments of 15 to 23-storey residential blocks. CTP/UD&L of PlanD is of the view that the proposed development is similar in scale and building height to the neighbouring buildings. It is considered that the proposed development is not incompatible with the surroundings in terms of land use and development intensity. However, as advised by DLO/Is, LandsD, the existing hiking trail would be affected by the proposal (**Plan Z-1a**); and the proposed new access road connecting to Parkvale Drive would cut and extinguish part of the existing hiking trail. In this regard, the applicant fails to address DLO/Is, LandsD's comments to avoid affecting the existing hiking trail.

#### Impact Assessments of the Proposed Scheme

- 11.7 The applicant fails to demonstrate the infrastructural feasibility and environmental acceptability of the proposed development although he has submitted relevant technical assessments in support of the rezoning proposal. DEP advises that there are various technical discrepancies/deficiencies in the submitted Environmental Study. The applicant proposes to provide an on-site sewage treatment plant as an alternative to treat the additional sewage arising from the proposed development. In this regard, DEP is concerned on the adverse impact on water quality as well as the cumulative impact from the discharge for the development of Area 10b under Application No. Y/I-DB/3. In particular, DEP has reservation on the acceptability of the proposed development from the water quality assessment perspective.
- 11.8 In terms of water supply, the applicant proposes to provide water supply by using the raw water stored in the private Discovery Bay Reservoir and an existing private water treatment works (**Plan Z-2**). CE/Dev(2), WSD has reservation on the rationality of the proposed private water supply arrangement from water quality control and public perception perspectives as the existing and planned residents in Discovery Bay are provided with WSD's fresh water supply. Moreover, H(GEO), CEDD considers that the applicant fails to submit a GPPR to assess the geotechnical feasibility of the proposed development in support of the rezoning application.
- 11.9 Although the applicant proposes to provide an on-site sewage treatment plant and private water supply system as alternatives, he considers that EPD and WSD should take into account the proposed development in future expansion plan of Siu Ho Wan

Sewerage and Water Treatment facilities. In this regard, DEP advises that Siu Ho Wan STW has no spare capacity to cater for sewage arising from the proposed development and the applicant should make his own provision for sewage treatment; and CE/Dev(2), WSD advises that the existing water supply system is based on a maximum population of 25,000 which is the population ceiling in the Discovery Bay OZP currently in force.

### Public Comments

11.10 The total number of 5,886 public comments received in respect of the application and the FI submissions respectively are noted. 4,249 commenters support the application, 1,168 comments object to the application and 469 commenters express comments/concerns on the application. While C for T has no comment on the inclusion of the existing access road, the major public concerns on the design population of Discovery Bay and insufficient water and sewerage infrastructural capacities amongst others are generally agreed with as indicated in the planning assessments outlined in the above paragraphs. As regards the right under the PDMC to convert the access road for use by the proposed development, DLO/Is, LandsD considers that the applicant should substantiate his right/capacity to develop the Site without prejudicing the provisions in the PDMC.

## **12. Planning Department's Views**

12.1 Based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 and having taken into account the public comments mentioned in paragraph 10, the Planning Department does not support the application for the following reasons:

- (a) the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed rezoning would not generate adverse infrastructural, environmental and geotechnical impacts on the surrounding areas; and
- (b) approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for other similar rezoning applications, the accumulative impact of which would overstrain the existing and planned infrastructure capacities for the area.

12.2 Alternatively, should the Committee decide to agree/partially agree to the application, the Chief Executive in Council would be requested to refer the approved Discovery Bay OZP No. S/I-DB/4 to the Board for amendment. An amendment to the approved Discovery Bay OZP No. S/I-DB/4 would be submitted to the Committee for approval prior to gazetting under the provisions of the Ordinance.

## **13. Decision Sought**

13.1 The Committee is invited to consider the application and decide whether to agree, partially agree, or not to agree to the application.

13.2 Should the Committee decide not to agree to the application, Members are invited to advise what reasons for the decision should be given to the applicant.

**14. Attachments**

<b>Appendix I</b>	Application Form received on 25.2.2016
<b>Appendix Ia</b>	Planning Statement
<b>Appendix Ib</b>	Supplementary information received on 15.3.2016
<b>Appendix II</b>	Further information received on 13.6.2016 providing revised Landscape Master Plan, Traffic Study, Environmental Study and additional photomontages
<b>Appendix III</b>	Further information received on 27.10.2016 providing revised Master Plan, Landscape Proposal, Environmental Study, planning statement, updated photomontages and other supplementary information
<b>Appendix IV</b>	Further information received on 28.11.2016 providing revised Environmental Study and Technical Note on Water Quality
<b>Appendix V</b>	Further information received on 26.1.2017 providing response-to-comment table with revised existing and proposed water supply and sewerage layout plans
<b>Appendix VI</b>	EPD's Specific Comments on Environmental Study
<b>Appendix VII</b>	GEO Advice Note for Planning Applications under Town Planning Ordinance (Cap. 131)
<b>Appendix VIII</b>	DVD containing all public comments received
<b>Appendices IXa to IXj</b>	Sample of supporting public comments
<b>Appendices Xa to Xj</b>	Sample of objecting public comments
<b>Appendix XI</b>	Extract of the Notes of the OZP for "R(C)" zone
<b>Drawing Z-1</b>	Concept Plan
<b>Drawing Z-2</b>	Section Plans
<b>Drawing Z-3</b>	Demarcation of "Passage Way" and "Village Retained Area" designated on Sub-DMC
<b>Drawing Z-4a</b>	Landscape Master Plan
<b>Drawing Z-4b</b>	Tree Treatment Plan
<b>Drawing Z-5</b>	Water Quality Sensitive Receivers
<b>Drawing Z-6</b>	Existing and Proposed Drainage Layout Plan
<b>Drawing Z-7</b>	Existing and Proposed Sewerage Layout Plan
<b>Drawing Z-8</b>	Existing and Proposed Water Supply Layout Plan
<b>Drawing Z-9</b>	Visual Mitigation Measures
<b>Drawings Z-10a to Z-10c</b>	Photomontage
<b>Plan Z-1a</b>	Location Plan
<b>Plan Z-1b</b>	Extract of Discovery Bay Master Plan 6.0E7h(a)
<b>Plan Z-2</b>	Site Plan
<b>Plan Z-3</b>	Aerial Photo
<b>Plans Z-4 to Z-6</b>	Site Photos
<b>Plan Z-7</b>	Location Plan of "OU(Staff Quarters)" zones on the OZP