

寄件者: Doug Marshall [REDACTED]
寄件日期: 2025年10月22日星期三 16:12
收件者: [REDACTED]
副本: [REDACTED]
主旨: Urgent 補充: 就申請DD216事宜補充說明及邀請實地會勘
類別: Internet Email

致林小姐

請 補充回以下的信件。因為我們發現西貢沙角尾市中心附近原來 padel sport Centre 可以成功申請建動用途 但我們的申請竟然長期被打壓。十多年來浪費金錢做了無數的報告也不成功。現在他們說出一啲具體情況想也再給常規會考慮 和其他個部門看到事實不公平的現象。

致各部門、特首城規會及申訴專員：

茲就本團體申請在本區興建高爾夫球推桿訓練場一事，補充說明並對現時處理情況表達嚴正關切。請諒解除亦希望各部門申訴原因，因為不公平的處申請已到飽和點。長期被迫做同樣又同樣的專業報告。被迫紙上談兵根本就沒有到過現場看實際情況。長期以來不公平的打壓情況。現在更發現原來在西貢沙角尾，已有私人經營的運動場所（如 Padel 中心 <https://www.padelplus.com.hk/>）能取得使用許可，並設置照明、運動噪音，不可控的設施及常規衛生間；該等地點毗鄰村屋、河道及水閘，然而相關部門仍批准其運作。相比之下，我們需位於遠離市區、但進出入的道路安全和環境不影響當區民生的用地，多年來卻屢遭阻撓，看到所有部門的疑問已經知道將會又是未能獲批設置一個規範、受管理的高爾夫推桿訓練場。這種處理上的明顯差異，令人無法理解，亦令一班資深哥爾夫球教練深感不公。

我們在此提出若干具體陳述與請求：

1. 請各有關部門明確解釋：在評核運動設施申請時，針對用地性質（如是否鄰近水閘、河道、村屋或人群稠密處）及環境影響的標準與依據為何？為何沙角尾的 Padel Sport 運動設施可獲批，亦沒有考量 Chemical？我們的申請上各環保部門常常出現 Chemical 的疑問就算我們承諾用環保物料多年來一直拒絕申請做了很多報告證明也被拒絕，但 Padel Sport Centre 他們更有煮食，而我們十多年來的康樂申請卻屢遭拒絕？我們是外籍人的申請。沒有任何有力的撐腰所以在香港無法接受外國人的申請？一個有益身心扶助在香港運動的項目被看似是一個傷害大自然生態的不公平對待。
2. 我們已承諾若獲批准，會按規定設置合規的照明(加入太陽能)、噪音控制、污水處理及垃圾管理措施，並長期負責場地清潔與環境維護，絕不會造成河道或水閘的污染。實地管理將比現時部分地段更有助於保護周邊環境，避免垃圾流入河道及水閘。
3. 誠如先前說明，本訓練場具備明顯社區及公共利益：推廣全民運動、強化兒童身心健康、減少沉迷電子產品的機會，並可與學校合作，開放予更多市民參與。請在評估時將這些公共利益納入考量。
4. 我們懇請相關部門實地視察、並對比其他已獲批准的運動設施，以便公平、透明地評估我們的申請。若過去因誤解或資訊不足而遭反對，亦請給予我們改進與補充資料的機會。

☐Urgent ☐Return receipt ☐Expand Group ☐Restricted ☐Prevent Copy ☐Confidential

5. 特首的全民運動理念希望得到公平查實和申訴專員及有關監察單位關注本案，調查是否存在程序不公或處理不一致情況，並協助促成公平審議。

十多年來，我們的農地及申請過程一直面對重限制與反覆，主要阻力屢次以「水閘／集水區」及「環保考量」為由，然而實際上當地的環境維護工作並未見到實質改善。若本團體獲准設施，不僅不會加劇問題，反而能主動承擔環境保護責任，長期維護周邊潔淨及水源安全。

特此補充，懇請各部門、城規會及申訴專員審慎查核與回覆，並希望獲得一個公開、公平且具建設性的處理結果。

此致

申請人和教練敬上

Douglas Marshall & Vaug Mason

22 Oct 2025

To: Relevant Departments, the Chief Executive's Town Planning Board and the Office of the Ombudsman

Re: Supplementary Submission and Formal Expression of Concern Regarding Our Application to Establish a Golf Putting Practice Facility in the District

We write on behalf of our organisation to provide supplementary information and to register our serious concerns regarding the current handling of our application to establish a golf putting practice facility in this district. We request clarification of the grounds for refusal and appeal, as we consider the present treatment of our proposal to be unfair and intolerable. Over many years we have been compelled to produce the same specialist reports repeatedly, often in response to objections that appear to be speculative rather than based on site inspections. We believe our application has been subject to persistent and inequitable obstruction.

We note with dismay that private sports facilities in the Sai Kung Sha Kok Mei area (for example Padel centres: <https://www.padelplus.com.hk/>) have been granted permission to operate with lighting, sports-related noise, sanitary facilities and other infrastructure, notwithstanding their proximity to village houses, watercourses and sluices. By contrast, our proposed facility—located well away from the urban area on land whose access and safety have no adverse impact on local residents—has repeatedly encountered obstruction. The pattern of enquiries from various departments has led us to anticipate that our application will again be refused despite our intention to provide a properly regulated and managed putting practice facility. This apparent inconsistency in decision-making is hard to understand and is felt keenly by the experienced golf coaches supporting this project.

Accordingly, we set out the following specific statements and requests:

1. Please set out clearly the standards and criteria applied when assessing applications for sports facilities, in particular how considerations relating to the nature of the land (for example proximity to sluices, watercourses, village houses or densely populated areas) and environmental impacts are weighed and evidenced. Why was the Padel sports facility at Sha Kok Mei approved notwithstanding those site characteristics? Our application has repeatedly been met with questions regarding chemical contamination, despite our assurances and commitments to use environmentally friendly materials and despite numerous professional reports we have submitted. By contrast, the Padel facility apparently includes cooking facilities. Why have our leisure-oriented proposals been so frequently refused? We wish to know whether our status as foreign applicants has affected the outcome; we are concerned that there may be an unexplained bias that prevents overseas applicants from being treated fairly in Hong Kong. It is disheartening that a project which would promote health and well-being should be treated as though it were environmentally harmful.

☐Urgent ☐Return receipt ☐Expand Group ☐Restricted ☐Prevent Copy ☐Confidential

2. Should permission be granted, we undertake to install fully compliant lighting (including solar-powered systems), noise-control measures, sewage treatment and waste-management arrangements, and to assume long-term responsibility for site cleanliness and environmental maintenance. We will ensure that there is no risk of contamination to watercourses or sluices. Indeed, active on-site management would better protect the surrounding environment and help to prevent refuse from entering nearby waterways.

3. As previously explained, the proposed facility offers clear community and public benefits: promotion of active participation in sport, enhancement of children's physical and mental wellbeing, reduction in screen time and related harms, and the opportunity to cooperate with local schools and make the facility available to a wider section of the public. We ask that such public-interest considerations be taken into account in your assessment.

4. We respectfully request that the relevant departments conduct a site visit and compare our proposal with other sports facilities that have been granted approval, so that our application may be assessed fairly and transparently. If the objections previously raised stem from misunderstanding or insufficient information, we ask for an opportunity to provide clarifications and supplementary materials.

5. We request that the Chief Executive's policy on "Sport for All" be applied in a fair manner and that the Office of the Ombudsman and other relevant oversight bodies examine this case to determine whether there has been procedural unfairness or inconsistent treatment. We ask for their assistance in securing an equitable review.

For more than a decade our agricultural land and application process have encountered repeated restrictions and reversals, on the grounds of "sluice/collecting area" and "environmental considerations". Yet we have not seen meaningful improvements in local environmental management. Were our organisation to be permitted to proceed, we would not exacerbate existing problems; on the contrary, we would assume proactive responsibility for environmental protection and long-term upkeep of the surrounding area and water resources.

We therefore request that the departments, the Town Planning Board and the Office of the Ombudsman examine this matter carefully and reply in due course. We seek an open, fair and constructive resolution.

Yours faithfully,

Douglas Marshall & Vaug Mason
On behalf of the applicant and coaching team

22 October 2025