

圖例
NOTATION

ZONES

RESIDENTIAL (GROUP C) R(C)

RESIDENTIAL (GROUP D) R(D)

GOVERNMENT, INSTITUTION OR COMMUNITY GIC

OPEN SPACE O

OTHER SPECIFIED USES OU

GREEN BELT GB

CONSERVATION AREA CA

COASTAL PROTECTION AREA CPA

COUNTRY PARK CP

地帶

住宅（丙類）

住宅（丁類）

政府、機構或社區

休憩用地

其他指定用途

綠化地帶

自然保育區

海岸保護區

郊野公園

COMMUNICATIONS

MAJOR ROAD AND JUNCTION

MISCELLANEOUS

BOUNDARY OF PLANNING SCHEME

交通

主要道路及路口

其他

規劃範圍界線

土地用途及面積一覽表
SCHEDULE OF USES AND AREAS

USES	大約面積及百分比 APPROXIMATE AREA & %		用途
	公頃 HECTARES	% 百分比	
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP C)	103.92	12.80	住宅（丙類）
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP D)	6.86	0.85	住宅（丁類）
GOVERNMENT, INSTITUTION OR COMMUNITY	9.94	1.22	政府、機構或社區
OPEN SPACE	11.29	1.39	休憩用地
OTHER SPECIFIED USES	186.45	22.97	其他指定用途
GREEN BELT	166.95	20.57	綠化地帶
CONSERVATION AREA	240.97	29.69	自然保育區
COASTAL PROTECTION AREA	13.17	1.62	海岸保護區
COUNTRY PARK	62.53	7.70	郊野公園
MAJOR ROAD ETC.	9.67	1.19	主要道路等
TOTAL PLANNING SCHEME AREA	811.75	100.00	規劃範圍總面積

夾附的《註釋》屬這份圖則的一部分，
現經修訂並按照城市規劃條例第 5 條展示。
THE ATTACHED NOTES ALSO FORM PART OF THIS PLAN
AND HAVE BEEN AMENDED FOR EXHIBITION UNDER
SECTION 5 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

核准圖編號 S/I-DB/4 的修訂
AMENDMENTS TO APPROVED PLAN No. S/I-DB/4

AMENDMENTS EXHIBITED UNDER SECTION 5
OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

按照城市規劃條例第 5 條
展示的修訂

AMENDMENT ITEM A 修訂項目 A 項

AMENDMENT ITEM B1 修訂項目 B 1 項

AMENDMENT ITEM B2 修訂項目 B 2 項

AMENDMENT ITEM B3 修訂項目 B 3 項

AMENDMENT ITEM B4 修訂項目 B 4 項

AMENDMENT ITEM B5 修訂項目 B 5 項

AMENDMENT ITEM B6 修訂項目 B 6 項

(參看附表)
(SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)

2024年4月12日 按照城市規劃條例第 5 條展示的
核准圖編號 S/I-DB/4 的修訂
AMENDMENTS TO APPROVED PLAN No. S/I-DB/4 EXHIBITED
UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE ON
12 APRIL 2024

Ms Donna Tam 譚燕萍
SECRETARY 城市規劃委員會秘書
TOWN PLANNING BOARD

香港城市規劃委員會依據城市規劃條例擬備的愉景灣分區計劃大綱圖
TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE, HONG KONG TOWN PLANNING BOARD
DISCOVERY BAY - OUTLINE ZONING PLAN

SCALE 1:7500 比例尺

0 200 400 600 800 1,000 METRES 米

規劃署遵照城市規劃委員會指示擬備
PREPARED BY THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT UNDER
THE DIRECTION OF THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD

圖則編號
PLAN No. **S/I-DB/5**

**SCHEDULE OF AMENDMENTS TO
THE APPROVED DISCOVERY BAY OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/I-DB/4
MADE BY THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD
UNDER THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE (Chapter 131)**

I. Amendments to Matters shown on the Plan

- Item A – Rezoning of a site to the north of Discovery Valley Road from “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Staff Quarters (5)” to “Residential (Group C) 12” (“R(C)12”).
- Item B1 – Incorporation of a sea area in Nim Shue Wan into the planning scheme area and zoning it to “R(C)13”, and rezoning of a site to the south of Discovery Bay Road from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”), “OU” annotated “Staff Quarters (1)”, “Residential (Group D)” and “Green Belt” to “R(C)13”.
- Item B2 – Incorporation of a sea area in Nim Shue Wan into the planning scheme area and zoning it to “R(C)14”, and rezoning of a site near Nim Shue Wan from “OU” annotated “Staff Quarters (1)”, “Service Area”, “Pier (3)” and “Petrol Filling Station” to “R(C)14”.
- Item B3 – Rezoning of a site to the northwest of the marina from “OU” annotated “Sports and Recreation Club (4)” and “R(C)7” to “R(C)15”.
- Item B4 – Rezoning of a site to the south of Discovery Bay Road from “OU” annotated “Staff Quarters (1)”, “Service Area”, “Dangerous Goods Store/Liquefied Petroleum Gas Store”, “Pier (3)” and “Petrol Filling Station”, “G/IC” and “R(C)7” to “OU” annotated “Residential Development With Service Area Below” and stipulating sub-areas on the Plan.
- Item B5 – Incorporation of a sea area in Nim Shue Wan into the planning scheme area and zoning it to “OU” annotated “Sports and Recreation Club (4)” and stipulating as Area B, and rezoning of a site to the west of the marina from “OU” annotated “Service Area”, “Marina” and “Petrol Filling Station” to “OU” annotated “Sports and Recreation Club (4)” and stipulating as Area B.
- Item B6 – Incorporation of a sea area in Nim Shue Wan into the planning scheme area and zoning it to “OU” annotated “Helicopter Landing Pad”.

II. Amendments to the Notes of the Plan

- (a) Revision to “R(C)” zone to incorporate ‘Pier (on land designated “R(C)14” only)’ under Column 1.

- (b) Revision to the Remarks for “R(C)” zone to incorporate “R(C)12”, “R(C)13”, “R(C)14” and “R(C)15” sub-areas with development restrictions.
- (c) Incorporation of a new set of Notes for “OU” annotated “Residential Development with Service Area Below” zone.
- (d) Incorporation of a new set of Notes for “OU” annotated “Helicopter Landing Pad” zone.
- (e) Revision to “OU” annotated “Sports and Recreation Club (4)” zone to incorporate ‘Boat Services Facility’, ‘Marine Fuelling Station’ and ‘Pier’ under Column 1.
- (f) Revision to the Remarks for “OU” annotated “Staff Quarters” zone to delete sub-areas (1) and (5).
- (g) Revision to the Remarks for “OU” annotated “Pier” zone to delete sub-area (3).
- (h) Revision to the Remarks for “OU” annotated “Pier” zone to revise the development restrictions and incorporate ‘Eating Place’ as an ancillary use.
- (i) Deletion of the set of Notes for “OU” annotated “Petrol Filling Station”, “Service Area” and “Dangerous Goods Store/Liquefied Petroleum Gas Store” zones.
- (j) Deletion of ‘Market’ from Column 1 of “OU” annotated “Commercial Complex and Residential Development cum Transport Interchange” and “Commercial and Public Recreation Development cum Transport Interchange” zones.
- (k) Revision of ‘Shop and Services (excluding Motor-Vehicle Showroom)’ to ‘Shop and Services (excluding Motor-Vehicle Showroom) (not elsewhere specified)’ under Column 2 of the Notes for “G/IC” zone.
- (l) Revision to the plot ratio/gross floor area exemption clause to clarify the provision related to caretaker’s quarters in the Remarks for “R(C)”, “OU” annotated “Commercial Complex and Residential Development cum Transport Interchange”, “Public Recreation cum Residential Development” and “Golf Course cum Residential Development” zones.
- (m) Revision to the Remarks for “Conservation Area” (“CA”) and “Coastal Protection Area” zones on filling of land, excavation of land or diversion of stream.
- (n) Revision to “CA” zone to incorporate ‘Country Park’ under Column 1.
- (o) Revision to the covering Notes in accordance with the Revised Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans and to reflect the latest situation.

Town Planning Board

12 April 2024

《愉景灣分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/I-DB/5》
Draft Discovery Bay Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-DB/5

申述人名單
Index of Representations

申述編號 Representation No.	提交編號 Submission No.	申述人名稱 Name of Representer
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R1	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S1	Jinglin Wang
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R2	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S2	Michael Gordon Palmer
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R3	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S3	Peter Alan Crush
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R4	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S8	Edwin George Rainbow
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R5	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S4	Robert Morland Smith
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R6	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S5	Gregory Allan Judd
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R7	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S6	Dylan Gregory Judd
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R8	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S7	Russell John Challoner Harding
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R9	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S38	Andrew Thomas Burns
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R10	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S51	Iza M.M. Rainbow
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R11	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S19	John Rempel
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R12	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S37	Christian Schneid
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R13	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S23	Chris Fraser
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R14	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S9	Brian John Bunker
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R15	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S14	Tham Moo Cheng
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R16	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S13	Renuka Jhuremalani
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R17	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S24	Yasmin Susan Jiwa
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R18	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S33	Florence Tso Chui Han
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R19	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S35	Lele Wang
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R20	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S55	Karine Virginie Latieze
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R21	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S28	Lim Chim Meng
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R22	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S47	胡適存
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R23	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S40	Andrei Nikolaevich Soklakov
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R24	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S40A	Gemma Isabel Soklakov
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R25	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S56	Christopher Gordon Telford
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R26	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S17	Alexander Carsten Uhlmann
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R27	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S46	Jacqueline Ho
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R28	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S50	Mary Mulvihill
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R29	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S22	Wong Chung Ming Darren
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R30	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S57	Amy Yung
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R31	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S41	Feon Sze Hun Yung

申述編號 Representation No.	提交編號 Submission No.	申述人名稱 Name of Representer
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R32	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S44	Carmen Wong Chun Man
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R33	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S36	John Gerard Brennan
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R34	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S16	Gurpreet Bawa
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R35	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S11	Giles Denise Linda
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R36	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S20	Serena Sank
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R37	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S21	Jane Hyde
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R38	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S29	Nicholas Lawton Andrews
	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S34	
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R39	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S31	John C. Antweiler III
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R40	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S18	Flora Fraser
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R41	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S32	Suet Lun Ng
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R42	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S15	Manpreet Singh Chadha
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R43	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S53	Heidi Wing Yan Mattras
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R44	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S54	Fanny Ng Yee Man
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R45	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S30	Annie Tsui Suk Ching
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R46	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S52	Gladys Hiu Ling Mattras
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R47	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S45	Hiroe Ambo
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R48	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S25	Hong Kong Resort Company Limited
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R49	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S26	Discovery Bay Services Management Limited
TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-R50	TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-S27	Discovery Bay Marina Club Limited

公眾可於規劃署的規劃資料查詢處及城市規劃委員會網頁

<https://www.tpb.gov.hk/tc/plan_making/S_I-DB_5.html> 查閱就《愉景灣分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/I-DB/5》提出的申述。

Representations in respect of the Draft Discovery Bay Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-DB/5 are available for public inspection at the Planning Enquiry Counters of the Planning Department and on the Town Planning Board's website at <https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/plan_making/S_I-DB_5.html>.

**Summary of Representations and Government Departmental Responses
in respect of the Draft Discovery Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/I-DB/5**

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
R1 Jinglin Wang	<u>Amendment to the Notes (o)</u> Oppose 'Taxi Rank' to be incorporated in the covering Notes of the OZP for the following reasons: i. Discovery Bay is a car-free development. The amendment to the covering Notes of the OZP is unlawful. ii. There is insufficient transport infrastructure in Discovery Bay to accommodate taxi rank. The increase in taxis will create danger to local residents.	(1) Road traffic and the use of vehicles and roads (including private roads) including whether to allow taxi entering any part of Discovery Bay have been regulating by Commissioner for Transport (C for T) under the Road Traffic Ordinance (Cap. 374) which are outside the scope of the OZP. Taxi access has been allowed to Discovery Bay North since 2011, and a taxi rank is provided in Discovery Bay North. The revision to the covering Notes of the OZP to add 'Taxi Rank' as a use always permitted on land falling within the OZP is to reflect such provision in the planning scheme area of the OZP (the Area) which is also in line with the latest Master Schedule of Notes (MSN) adopted by the Town Planning Board (the Board). While Discovery Bay is primarily a car-free development, any additional taxi rank will be subject to

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>iii. The cost of repairing and maintenance of the private roads in Discovery Bay due to further taxi access should not be covered by management fees paid by the residents of Discovery Bay.</p>	<p>further consideration by C for T. According to the Transport Department, provision of additional taxi rank and amendment to the restricted area of taxi are subject to their scrutiny with due consideration of traffic capacity and safety aspects.</p> <p>(2) Management fee of residential flats in Discovery Bay and arrangement of the repairing and maintenance costs of private roads in Discovery Bay are outside the scope of the OZP.</p>
<p>R2 Michael Gordon Palmer</p>	<p><u>Amendment to the Notes (o)</u> (a) Oppose 'Taxi Rank' to be incorporated in the covering Notes of the OZP for the following reasons:</p> <p>i. Discovery Bay development is a car-free development. The allowing of 'Taxi Rank' in the Explanatory Statement (ES) is not in line with the planning intention of maintaining the car-free character.</p> <p>ii. Further taxi access to Discovery Bay will increase traffic burden and compromise road safety of the area with lack of traffic control and enforcement.</p> <p><u>Others</u> (b) Hire car services for internal traffic are suggested.</p>	<p>(1) Response (1) to R1 above is relevant.</p> <p>(2) The Hong Kong Police Force (the Police) will continue to perform traffic enforcement including on private roads from time to time with a view to deterring irresponsible behaviour of road users.</p> <p>(3) The views have been referred to</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>clear which area and roads that taxis are permitted to enter in Discovery Bay. It is proposed to revise the wording 'Discovery Bay North' in the ES.</p> <p>(c) It is observed in recent years that there are unlawful uses of goods vehicles for passenger journey. It is crucial to specify that the use of Discovery Bay Tunnel is only for external traffic according to the Gazette Notice (GN) 6093.</p>	<p>(4) Response (1) above is relevant. The views have been referred to relevant departments for consideration.</p>
<p>R4 Rainbow, Edwin George Chairperson of Hillgrove Village Owners' Committee (OC)</p>	<p><u>Amendment to the Notes (o)</u></p> <p>(a) Oppose 'Taxi Rank' to be incorporated in the covering Notes of the OZP for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The Road Traffic Ordinance (Cap. 374) promulgates legislation concerning taxi stands and s.30 of the Road Traffic (Public Service Vehicles) Regulations (Cap. 374D) authorises only C for T to designate the road or area for taxi stands. C for T is granted the power under section 1 of the Road Traffic Ordinance (Cap. 374) to impose controls on any class of vehicle in respect of the roads that may be used or prohibited from using. At present, there is only single authorised taxi drop-off point near Auberge Discovery Bay Hong Kong and there is no other taxi drop-off point in the residential areas of Discovery Bay. The introduction of 'Taxi Rank' on the OZP is beyond the legal authority of the Board. ii. In the City Owners Committee Meeting on 17th January 2024, there was strong and unanimous opposition to taxi entering the residential areas of Discovery Bay. The developer had failed to control the taxi entry to residential areas. 	<p>(1) Response (1) to R1 above is relevant.</p> <p>(2) Response (2) to R2 above is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(b) Oppose the Statement on Land Transport in ES of the OZP for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. There is a conflict for the use of the terminology in ES regarding whether Discovery Bay is ‘generally car-free’ or ‘primarily car-free’ development. It is stated in Chapter 6 of the Audit Commissions Report under the Grant for Discovery Bay and Yi Long Wan that the planning intention is to maintain a car-free environment. The ‘car-free’ concept should be maintained. 	(3) Response (2) to R3 above is relevant.
<p>R5 Robert Morland Smith</p>	<p><u>Amendment to the Notes (o)</u></p> <p>(a) Oppose further taxi access in Discovery Bay for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. There is insufficient transport infrastructure such as parking spaces in Discovery Bay. ii. There are safety concerns for the taxi access. iii. It will damage the private road and bring costs to the owners. iv. It is not in line with car-free character of Discovery Bay. <p>(b) Current arrangement on taxi service is acceptable.</p>	<p>(1) Response (1) to R1 above is relevant.</p> <p>(2) Noted.</p>
<p>R6 Judd, Gregory Allan</p>	<p><u>Amendment to the Notes (o)</u></p> <p>(a) Oppose further taxi access in Discovery Bay for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. There are safety concerns due to the insufficient traffic control. ii. There is insufficient transport infrastructure in Discovery Bay to accommodate taxi rank. iii. The cost of repairing and maintenance of the private roads in Discovery Bay caused by further taxi access will fall on the residents. 	<p>(1) Response (1) to R1 above is relevant.</p> <p>(2) Response (2) to R1 above is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<u>Others</u> (b) Further taxi access to Discovery Bay should not be promoted.	(3) Noted. The views have been referred to relevant departments for consideration.
R7 Dylan Gregory Judd	<u>Amendment to the Notes (o)</u> (a) Oppose further taxi access in Discovery Bay for the following reasons: i. There will be increased noise pollution and traffic congestion. ii. There are safety concerns due to the insufficient traffic control. iii. There is insufficient space to accommodate further taxi ranks. Consequently, both the open space and golf cart parking space will be reduced. iv. The cost of repairing and maintenance of the private roads in Discovery Bay caused by further taxi access will fall on the residents. (b) Further taxi access to Discovery Bay should not be promoted. The tunnel entrance area is currently under-utilized which is suitable for taxi ranks use.	(1) Response (1) to R1 above is relevant. (2) Response (2) to R1 above is relevant. (3) The views have been referred to relevant departments for consideration.
R8 Harding, Russell John Challoner	<u>Amendment to the Notes (o)</u> (a) Oppose 'Taxi Rank' to be incorporated in the covering Notes of the OZP for the following reasons: i. Discovery Bay development is a car-free development. Further taxi access to Discovery Bay will increase traffic burden and compromise road safety of the area. ii. There is insufficient transport infrastructure capacity in Discovery Bay to accommodate the increased traffic flow by taxi. iii. The cost of repairing and maintenance of the private roads plus all the other infrastructure support costs in Discovery Bay	(1) Responses (1) and (2) to R1 above are relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>caused by further taxi access will fall on the residents.</p> <p>iv. The deviation of car-free character of Discovery Bay is against the major reason for local residents choosing to live there.</p> <p>v. The increase in traffic will bring adverse impacts on local environment, which is in terms of pollution, noise, disturbance and danger.</p> <p>(b) Further taxi ranks and taxi access to Discovery Bay should not be promoted.</p>	<p>(2) Noted. Your views have been referred to relevant departments for consideration.</p>
<p>R9 Burns, Andrew Thomas</p>	<p><u>Amendment to the Notes (o)</u></p> <p>(a) Oppose ‘Taxi Rank’ to be incorporated in the covering Notes of the OZP for the following reasons:</p> <p>i. According to the ES of the OZP, Discovery Bay development is a car-free development. The allowing of ‘Taxi Rank’ in the ES is not in line with the planning intention of maintaining the car-free character in Discovery Bay.</p> <p>ii. The allowing of ‘Taxi Rank’ is contrary to G.N. 6095.</p> <p>iii. The residential areas are under sub-deeds of mutual covenant which are not solely owned by the developer. The allowing of ‘Taxi Rank’ in the residential areas without the approval of owners who own the majority of undivided shares is questionable.</p> <p>(b) The term ‘Discovery Bay North’ used in ES is vague which may be misused to allow taxi access to Discovery Bay in the future. The ES should be revised to show the permitted areas of taxi access.</p> <p>(c) The mentioned residential developments in the ES is confusing, as it mixed developments that are “Villages” and those that are part of</p>	<p>(1) Response (1) to R1 above is relevant.</p> <p>(2) Response (1) above is relevant.</p> <p>(3) Noted.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>Village. In addition, it does not include the completed project of Villages Il Picco and Phase 17 and the on-going developments at N1 North.</p> <p>(d) Discovery Bay Tunnel Link is the official name of the tunnel under the Discovery Bay Tunnel Link Ordinance.</p> <p>(e) The planned population in ES has not been updated. Given the significant contribution of temporary hotel residents to the overall population in Discovery Bay, it is crucial to estimate the capacity for day visitors.</p> <p>(f) The concerns raised by Water Supplies Department (WSD) and DSD prior to the approval of the s.12A application of Item A Site by the Town Planning Board is not reflected in the ES. It appears these concerns have not been resolved.</p>	<p>(4) Noted.</p> <p>(5) The planned population of the OZP stated in the ES has been updated. The OZP amendment has already taken into account the population increase arising from the approved schemes and the planned developments. While hotel guest is not included in the said planned total population, the planning of existing and planned provision of government, institution and community (GIC) facilities has taken into account transient population including hotel guest, where appropriate.</p> <p>(6) Items A and B1 to B6 are mainly to take forward the two agreed s.12A applications (No. Y/I-DB/2 and Y/I-DB/4). Technical assessments on various infrastructural aspects including drainage, sewerage and water supply, etc. were conducted in support of the s.12A applications. The assessments concluded that the proposed</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		<p>developments would not cause any insurmountable problems in the provision of supporting infrastructure with implementation of suitable mitigation/improvement measures.</p> <p>Regarding the concerns on water supply and sewerage of the proposed development in Item A Site raised at s.12A application stage, the Study on Drainage, Sewerage and Water Supply Systems in the second s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/4) for Item B Site has taken into account both proposed developments at Items A and B Sites and other planned developments in Discovery Bay. The said study concluded that the projected additional sewage flow from the proposed developments in both sites is within the design capacity of Siu Ho Wan Sewage Treatment Works, and there will be adequate water supply capacity for the proposed developments in both sites after the upgrading of Siu Ho Wan Water Treatment Works and Siu Ho Wan Fresh Water Pumping Station under planning. Government Bureaux and Departments (B/Ds) have no objection to or adverse comment on the</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(g) The content in the ES that are related to the Master Plan is misleading. The Master Plan is subject to revision and approval by Director of Lands. It is also inappropriate to delete the phrase ‘and development programme’ at paragraph 12.2 as approval of a Master Plan is always accompanied by an Approval Letter setting out a development programme.</p> <p>(h) Several changes on the boundary of the development areas under the Master Plans have not been reflected on the OZP.</p> <p>(i) It should be supplemented in the ES that Discovery Bay is under a Deed of Mutual Covenant, and that development is limited by the remaining number of undivided shares held by the developer and available for allocation to any new development.</p>	<p>proposed developments. The exact implementation arrangement will be confirmed in the detailed design and project implementation stages subject to the scrutiny of the concerned government B/Ds.</p> <p>(7) In response to Grounds (g), (h) and (i), the concerned areas are not the subject of any amendment item. It will be further reviewed by relevant government departments. Regarding the Grounds (g) and (h), revision of Master Plan under lease is subject to scrutiny of Lands Department.</p> <p>(8) Noted. Deed of Mutual Covenant fall outside the scope of OZP.</p>
R10 Iza M.M. Rainbow	<p>(a) Oppose further taxi access in Discovery Bay for the following reasons:</p> <p>i. Discovery Bay development is a car-free development. Further taxi access to Discovery Bay will increase traffic burden and compromise road safety of the area with lack of traffic control and enforcement. It will disrupt the living lifestyle in Discovery Bay.</p> <p>ii. The level of occupancy of recent developments in Discovery</p>	<p>For the traffic and road safety, Response (1) to R1 above is relevant. For the traffic enforcement, Response (2) to R2 above is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	Bay North along with its transport demand is questionable.	
R11 John Rempel	<p>(a) Oppose ‘Taxi Rank’ to be incorporated in the covering Notes of the OZP. There is insufficient transport infrastructure in Discovery Bay to accommodate further vehicle access. The bus services have already reached the full capacity in Discovery Bay especially at rush hours. It is not in line with the planning intention of maintaining the car-free character. The developer and management company should address the current transport situation.</p> <p>(b) The proposed developments do not adequately integrate with the surrounding environment of Discovery Bay. There should be spacing between buildings and waterfront promenade.</p> <p>(c) The proposed developments should adopt a lower building height that would not obstruct the view of the existing residential developments.</p>	<p>(1) Response (1) to R1 above is relevant.</p> <p>(2) Items A and B1 to B6 are mainly to take forward the two agreed s.12A applications (No. Y/I-DB/2 and Y/I-DB/4).</p> <p>The proposed residential development in Item A Site comprises two medium-rise residential blocks of 18 storeys (Drawing H-1a) which is considered small in scale. The adjoining area is also mainly occupied by medium-rise residential developments of 15 to 23-storey residential blocks. In the s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/2), the applicant submitted photomontages and proposal of visual mitigation measures.</p> <p>The proposed development in Item B Site consists of a mix of medium and low-rise blocks and houses, with BHs</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		<p>ranging from 1 storey to 18 storeys (about 12mPD to 89mPD, including structure) (Drawing H-2a), which is stepped from the north towards the waterfront to reduce visual obstruction. According to the VIA submitted in the s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/4), the ridgeline of the mountains behind remains intact and the proposed development has the same residential nature as the surrounding residential developments, while it will result in an intensification to the surrounding built environment. With the stepped height profile, building gaps and implementation of proper mitigation measures and landscape treatments, the overall visual impact of the proposed development is considered moderately adverse.</p> <p>Overall, the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) had no adverse comment on the applications. The proposed residential development in Item A Site and the proposed residential development with servicing facilities, sports and recreation facilities and a helipad in Item B Site are considered</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	(d) Felling of trees for the proposed developments is not acceptable.	<p>not incompatible with the surrounding developments as well as the waterfront setting. The current zonings and development restrictions are considered appropriate. The stepped height concept and the possible mitigating treatments for visual relief have also been incorporated in the ES of the OZP for the project proponent to take into account during the detailed design stage.</p> <p>(3) Items A and B1 to B6 are mainly to take forward the two agreed s.12A applications (No. Y/I-DB/2 and Y/I-DB/4). The details on tree felling and compensation arrangement for the proposed developments in Items A and B Sites were assessed in the relevant Landscape Design Proposal at s.12A application stage. According to the submission of relevant s.12A applications, approximately 225 and 720 existing trees of common species are found in Items A and B Sites respectively but without any tree of rare/protected species and/or Old and Valuable Tree. The numbers of trees to be felled are 118 and 178 in Items A and B Sites respectively. As proposed in the</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	(e) There was a fatal accident at Discovery College. It is suggested to impose speed restriction and install speed cameras for police enforcement in Discovery Bay, especially at the school areas.	<p>s.12A applications, a minimum of 125 compensatory trees in Item A Site and 178 compensatory trees in Items B Site would be provided within the sites subject to further review. The ratio of tree compensation reaches to 1:1 in terms of number with reference to Development Bureau Technical Circular (Works) No. 4/2020 – Tree Preservation. CTP/UD&L, PlanD has no adverse comment on the proposed developments from landscape planning perspective. Besides, in view of RNTPC Member's concern on compensatory trees in Item B Site, the ES of the OZP stipulates that, to maintain and enhance landscape quality of the area, the future developer should endeavour to achieve the tree compensation arrangement, as far as practicable, for any tree felling due to the new developments in Discovery Bay.</p> <p>(4) Noted. The views have been referred to relevant departments for consideration. Response (2) to R2 above is also relevant.</p>
R12	(a) Oppose Items B1 and B2 as the new reclaimed area for the proposed	(1) As shown on the Indicative Scheme

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
Schneid, Christian	<p>development near Nim Shue Wan will affect the kaito services to Mui Wo and Peng Chau, bringing inconvenience to residents and commuters.</p> <p>(b) Oppose Item B3 as the developer has enough options to expand the marina club or the recreation/sports club under the existing zoning.</p> <p>(c) The maximum BH of the “Residential (Group C) 15” (“R(C)15”) zone under Item B3 should be reduced to 15m.</p>	<p>submitted under s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/4), the ferry pier currently at Nim Shue Wan waterfront affected by the reclamation will be reprovisioned within the “R(C)14” zone about 170m to the southwest of the current location connected with the promenade accessible from Discovery Bay Road. ‘Pier’ is a Column 1 use on land designated for “R(C)14” to facilitate the relocation proposal. C for T has no objection to the reprovisioning proposal while the applicant claimed that the ferry services providers had been consulted and did not raise any objection to the proposed new location of the ferry pier. The exact reprovisioning arrangement of the ferry pier will be confirmed in the implementation stage subject to the scrutiny of the concerned government B/Ds.</p> <p>(2) In response to Grounds (b) and (c), Item B3 Site was previously zoned “OU(SRC)4” reserved for extension of the existing Lantau Yacht Club but it has not been developed. Under the s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/4) for Item B Site, the applicant proposed to relocate</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		<p>this extension to Item B5 Site while Item B3 Site will be developed into four 5-storey residential blocks. Item B5 Site is located to the southern waterfront of the existing Lantau Yacht Club which is zoned “OU(SRC)4” forming the extension part of Lantau Yacht Club to meet its operational needs. The proposed sports and recreation facilities is considered not incompatible with the surrounding developments while various technical assessments carried out in s.12A application stage demonstrated no insurmountable problem from the proposed development. The proposed sports and recreation facilities falling within private development will be privately operated and its operation and management should be a commercial decision. Response (2) to R11 above is also relevant.</p>
<p>R13 Chris Fraser</p>	<p>Oppose Items B1 to B4 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. There are insufficient infrastructural capacities and community facilities in Discovery Bay. The population increase generated by the proposed developments will negatively affect the quality of life of existing residents. 	<p>(1) Regarding the aspects on drainage, sewage and water supply, Response (6) to R9 above is relevant. For the general planning intention of the area, according to the ES of the OZP, the general planning intention of the Area is for</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		<p>conservation of the natural environment and to provide for low-density developments compatible with the surrounding natural setting. 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. In particular, the unique sub-urban low-density and car-free character of the development should be maintained in keeping with the surrounding natural setting.</p> <p>Items A and B1 to B6 are mainly to take forward the two s.12A applications (No. Y/I-DB/2 and Y/I-DB/4) agreed by RNTPC on 14.1.2022 and 11.8.2023 respectively. According to their Indicative Schemes, the proposed development in Item A Site consists of two 18-storey residential blocks with a domestic GFA of about 21,600m², a PR of 2.83 and a BH of 128mPD (including structure), providing 476 flats for an estimated population of 1,190, while the proposed residential development with servicing facilities below, sports and recreation facilities and a helipad in</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>ii. The proposed development will be built above the sanitation and vehicle maintenance facilities, and adjacent to vehicle and marine fueling depots. It raises concerns on public safety, sanitation and hygiene issues.</p>	<p>Item B Site has a total GFA of about 78,030m² (with domestic and non-domestic GFAs of 61,200m² and 16,830m² respectively), a total PR of about 1 (with domestic and non-domestic PRs of 0.78 and 0.22 respectively) and BHs ranging from 12mPD to 89mPD (including structure), providing 858 flats for an estimated population of 2,145, which are considered not incompatible with the waterfront setting as well as the surrounding developments. At the s.12A application stage, technical assessments submitted by the applicant demonstrated the proposed developments were technically feasible, and the concerned government B/Ds had no objection to or no adverse comment on the applications. The proposed developments under Items A and B1 to B6 are considered in line with the general planning intention of the Area on the OZP.</p> <p>(2) According to the Indicative Scheme submitted under s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/4), the 2-storey podium will be used mainly as a service area for reprovisioning of the existing services/</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>iii. Replanting of trees cannot compensate for turning a forested area into a massive block of concrete and pavement.</p> <p>iv. The plan near Nim Shue Wan will affect the kaito services to Mui Wo and Peng Chau, bringing inconvenience to residents and commuters.</p> <p>v. The substantial increase in population would increase the traffic flow in Discovery Bay Road and hence generate noise and road safety issues.</p>	<p>facilities, including bus depot, golf cart parking and repair office and refuse collection chamber, and provision of management office, associated electrical and mechanical services/ facilities and the existing sewage pumping station. The technical assessments submitted by the applicant at the s.12A application stage demonstrated the proposed development was technically feasible, and the concerned government B/Ds had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. The detailed arrangement will be confirmed at building plan stage.</p> <p>(3) Response (3) to R11 above is relevant.</p> <p>(4) Response (1) to R12 above is relevant.</p> <p>(5) For the traffic impact, as stated in the ES of the OZP, Discovery Bay is primarily a car-free development. According to the Indicative Schemes of the s.12A applications (No. Y/I-DB/2 and Y/I-DB/4), there is no private car parking</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		<p>space provided within the proposed residential developments in Items A and B Sites.</p> <p>Items A and B1 to B6 are mainly to take forward the two agreed s.12A applications (No. Y/I-DB/2 and Y/I-DB/4). According to the TIAs under the s.12A applications, the proposed developments including the additional residential units would not generate adverse traffic impact on critical road links and junctions in Discovery Bay and the surrounding area as well as existing ferry services of Discovery Bay. Moreover, the applicant indicated that the current traffic control management, i.e. only authorised vehicles are allowed to access Discovery Bay via Discovery Bay Tunnel such as emergency vehicles, residents' service buses and goods vehicles, would be maintained. C for T advised that the roads in Discovery Bay would have sufficient capacity to handle the additional traffic induced by the proposed developments while the TIAs have assessed the necessary factors, including additional trip rates of shuttle buses induced by the proposed</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		<p>developments. Therefore, she has no adverse comment on the relevant TIAs and considers the proposed developments in Items A and B Sites are acceptable from traffic engineering point of view.</p> <p>(6) For the environmental impacts, as advised by DEP, according to the Environmental Study of the s.12A application of Item A Site, it was anticipated that the relatively low traffic volume on Discovery Valley Road together with its separation distance would neither induce significant cumulative air quality impact nor adverse road traffic noise. On the other hand, the Environmental Study of the s.12A application of Item B Site also concluded that the predicted cumulative air quality and noise impacts on all air sensitive uses would comply with the Air Quality Objectives and relevant assessment criteria. Hence, adverse air quality and noise impacts of the proposed developments are not anticipated. DEP has no objection to the proposed developments from environmental perspective.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>iii. The residents will be facing noise and environmental pollution during the construction period.</p> <p>iv. The influx of construction workers will increase the crime rate in the area.</p>	<p>(3) Construction works should comply with all relevant environmental laws and regulations. As advised by DEP, as a good practice, the dust measures given in the Air Pollution Control (Construction Dust) Regulation (Cap. 311R) should be incorporated by the Contractor to control the dust nuisance. For instance, all construction vehicles will be washed at the exit before leaving the construction sites. Good site practices which can control and reduce the emission from the use of non-road mobile machinery from the projects will also be followed. A construction noise assessment will be conducted once the detailed construction programme and methodology become available during the detailed design stage. Mitigation measures, such as use of quiet construction methods/equipment, will be studied and recommended in the detailed design stage to minimise the construction noise impact.</p> <p>(4) Discovery Bay is a private development and management and security matters should be safeguarded by the developer and management company. Besides, the Police would collaborate with the</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>v. The proposal involves felling of 150 trees will bring adverse environmental impact.</p> <p>vi. The proposal will result in adverse visual impact and blocking the views which will cause a drop in property price.</p>	<p>community to ensure public safety.</p> <p>(5) Response (3) to R11 above is relevant.</p> <p>(6) Response (2) to R11 above is relevant.</p>
<p>R15 Tham Moo Cheng</p>	<p><u>Items B1 to B6</u> Oppose the proposed development for the following reasons:</p> <p>i. The increase in population arising from the development will lead to the overcrowding of leisure and community facilities, and thus affecting the living quality of residents.</p> <p>ii. The public transport services have already reached the full capacity in Discovery Bay</p> <p>iii. The residents will be facing noise and environmental pollution during the construction period.</p> <p>iv. The influx of construction workers will increase the crime rate in the area.</p> <p>v. The proposal involves felling of 150 trees will bring adverse environmental impact.</p> <p>vi. The proposal will result in adverse visual impact and blocking the views which will cause a drop in property price.</p>	<p>(1) Response (1) to R14 above is relevant.</p> <p>(2) Response (5) to R13 above is relevant.</p> <p>(3) Response (3) to R14 above is relevant.</p> <p>(4) Response (4) to R14 above is relevant.</p> <p>(5) Response (3) to R11 above is relevant.</p> <p>(6) Response (2) to R11 above is relevant.</p>
<p>R16 Renuka Jhuremalani</p>	<p><u>Items B1 to B6</u> Oppose the development at Nim Shue Wan for the following reasons:</p> <p>i. There are insufficient infrastructural capacities and services in</p>	<p>(1) For the provision of supporting</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>Discovery Bay to accommodate further population growth. It will increase the crime rate and affect the public safety in the area.</p> <p>ii. The development will create noise and environmental pollution issues.</p> <p>iii. The proposed building will obstruct the views for existing residents.</p>	<p>infrastructure, Response (6) to R9 above is relevant. For the public safety, Response (4) to R14 above is relevant.</p> <p>(2) Response (6) to R13 above is relevant.</p> <p>(3) Response (2) to R11 above is relevant.</p>
<p>R17 Yasmin Susan Jiwa</p>	<p><u>Items B1 to B6</u> Oppose Items B1 to B6 for the following reasons:</p> <p>i. There are insufficient infrastructural capacities and community facilities in Discovery Bay to accommodate further population growth.</p> <p>ii. The development will create noise pollution.</p> <p>iii. Reclamation is not necessary for the proposed development.</p>	<p>(1) For the infrastructural capacities, Response (6) to R9 above is relevant. For the provision of community facilities, Response (1) to R14 above is relevant.</p> <p>(2) Response (6) to R13 above is relevant.</p> <p>(3) Items A and B1 to B6 are mainly to take forward the two agreed s.12A applications (No. Y/I-DB/2 and Y/I-DB/4). Environmental Studies have been carried out for the proposed developments in the s.12A applications.</p> <p>As advised by the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP), according to the Environmental Study of the s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/2)</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		<p>of Item A Site, it was anticipated that the relatively low traffic volume on Discovery Valley Road together with its separation distance would neither induce significant cumulative air quality impact nor adverse road traffic noise. On the other hand, the Environmental Study of the s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/4) of Item B Site also concluded that the predicted cumulative air quality and noise impacts on all air sensitive uses would comply with the Air Quality Objectives and relevant assessment criteria. Hence, adverse air quality and noise impacts of the proposed developments are not anticipated. DEP has no objection to the proposed developments from environmental perspective.</p> <p>Nearshore reclamation (about 1.5ha) near Nim Shue Wan as well as the eastern tip of the marina within the lot of Discovery Bay development is involved in Item B Site under the s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/4). As advised by the District Lands Officer/Islands, Lands Department (DLO/Is, LandsD), the applicant may need to obtain authorisation of the reclamation works</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		<p>for the proposed development under the Foreshore and Sea-bed (Reclamations) Ordinance (Cap. 127). Moreover, the Environmental Study conducted by the applicant at the s.12A application stage covers water quality and other environmental aspects as well as potential impacts on ecology and fisheries of the proposed reclamation. With mitigation measures such as silt curtains and other good site practices, impacts on water quality, marine ecology and fisheries are considered insignificant. The concerned government B/Ds have no adverse comment on the impacts arising from the proposed reclamation in various aspects.</p> <p>The proposed reclamation may be a Designated Project (DP) under the EIA Ordinance (Cap. 499). DEP advises that the applicant should follow the statutory process under the EIA Ordinance for any potential DP once identified at the detailed design stage. Potential environmental impacts evaluated in the Environmental Studies will be revisited in the later statutory EIA for DP, if applicable.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>iv. The proposed development has lack of greening proposal.</p> <p>v. Discovery Bay should remain car-free and restrict the entry of taxi.</p>	<p>(4) Response (3) to R11 above is relevant.</p> <p>(5) Response (1) to R1 above is relevant.</p>
<p>R18 Florence Tso Chui Han</p>	<p><u>Items B1 to B6</u> Oppose the proposed development at Nim Shue Wan for the following reasons: (a) The proposal which involves 54 residential blocks with a building height of 18 storeys in the waterfront area is unacceptable. It will obstruct the views and block the air flow for existing residential developments.</p>	<p>(1) For the visual impact, Response (2) to R11 is relevant. For the air ventilation impact, an Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) has been conducted in the s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/4) for the proposed development in Item B Site with several mitigation measures proposed including three continuous air paths running across the site to facilitate the penetration of southwesterly summer winds into inland areas (Drawing H-4). The three continuous air paths are of 15m in width and align in northeast-southwest direction, of which two are above ground and one is above the 2-storey podium. According to the AVA, the proposed development scheme would not cause any insurmountable problem in air ventilation. The proposed mitigation measures are also incorporated in the ES</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(b) The transport services for internal bus have already reached the full capacity in Discovery Bay especially at rush hours. A local transportation plan is required to resolve the transport issue.</p> <p>(c) The proposed 18-storey buildings zoned “R(C)13” under Item B1 should have lower BH or be removed from the proposal.</p>	<p>of the OZP for the project proponent to take into account in the detailed design stage to alleviate the potential impact of the development.</p> <p>(2) Response (5) to R13 above is relevant.</p> <p>(3) Response (1) above is relevant.</p>
<p>R19 Lele Wang</p>	<p><u>Items B1 to B6</u></p> <p>(a) Oppose the site of the proposed development at Area 10b, Discovery Bay for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The transport infrastructure and services for internal bus have already reached the full capacity in Discovery Bay especially at rush hours. The additional bus services will make the roads overcrowded and compromise the road safety. The road traffic should be within the designated capacity. The estimated planned population is underestimated in technical assessment. There is insufficient provision on public services, such as schools and public recreational facilities in Discovery Bay. The residents need to travel outside Discovery Bay for schooling. More spaces should be reserved for recreational purposes. 	<p>(1) In response to Grounds (a)(i) and (ii), Response (5) to R13 above is relevant.</p> <p>(2) In response to Ground (a)(iii), on the provision of open space, there will be a surplus of 7.14ha of district open space and 1.08ha of local open space in the Area. The overall provision of open space is adequate to meet the demand of the planned population. Moreover, according to the Indicative Schemes of the s.12A applications, open space with</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	iv. The proposed development will affect the existing residential developments.	<p>area of not less than 1,190m² and 2,145m² is proposed in Items A and B Sites respectively including a promenade along Nim Shue Wan waterfront. Response (1) to R14 above and Response (4) to R27 below are also relevant.</p> <p>(3) In response to Ground (a)(iv), Response (2) to R11 above is relevant.</p>
R20 Karine Virginie Latieze	<p>(a) Oppose new project in Nim Shue Wan Ferry Pier as the proposed high-rise buildings look aesthetically unpleasant. It will bring adverse landscape impacts.</p> <p>(b) Support a well-designed and maintained recreation club in Item B5 Site as it would bring great value to Peninsula Village residents who will spend more time and money in the club and enjoy food and other activities.</p>	<p>(1) Responses (2) and (3) to R11 above are relevant.</p> <p>(2) The supportive view is noted.</p>
R21 Lim Chim Meng	<p><u>Items B1 to B6</u></p> <p>Oppose the proposed development with regard to the s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/4):</p> <p>i. The proposed development is considered too dense and are not in keeping with the Discovery Bay's environment. The design of the proposed buildings is lack of urban design concept and sustainable development, where have not taken into account its waterfront location.</p> <p>ii. The proposed high rise blocks under Items B1 and B4 (especially the two 18-storey buildings under Item B1) will</p>	<p>(1) Response (2) to R11 above is relevant.</p> <p>(2) Response (1) to R18 above is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	obstruct the waterfront skyline and create a wall-like effect. As a result, prevailing winds are blocked, which will affect the micro-environment of the area. Drawing provided by R21 in Drawings H-3a to H-3c.	
R22 胡適存	<p><u>Items B1 to B6</u> Oppose the proposed development with regard to the s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/4):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The proposed development is considered too dense and are not in keeping with the Discovery Bay's environment. The design of the proposed buildings is lack of urban design concept and sustainable development, where have not taken into account its waterfront location. ii. The proposed high rise blocks under Items B1 and B4 (especially the two 18-storey buildings under Item B1) will obstruct the waterfront skyline and create a wall-like effect. As a result, prevailing winds are blocked, which will affect the micro-environment of the area. Drawing provided by R21 in Drawings H-3a to H-3c. 	<p>(1) Response (2) to R11 above is relevant.</p> <p>(2) Response (1) to R18 above is relevant.</p>
R23 Soklakov, Andrei Nikolaevich	<p><u>Items B1 to B6</u> (a) Oppose the building project at Nim Shue Wan in Discovery Bay for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. There are insufficient public transport services and school places in Discovery Bay. ii. The development will bring environmental and social impacts 	<p>(1) For the public transport services, Response (5) to R13 above is relevant. For the school places, Response (4) to R27 below is relevant.</p> <p>(2) Response (6) to R13 above is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>to the residents.</p> <p>iii. The proposal will result in adverse visual impact and blocking the views for the residents of Caperidge Drive.</p> <p>(b) The proposed buildings should be in low rise and avoid adding the 18-storey buildings adjacent to the waterfront to minimize the impact on existing residents.</p>	<p>(3) In response to Grounds (a)(iii) and (b), Response (2) to R11 above is relevant.</p>
<p>R24 Soklakov, Gemma Isabel</p>	<p><u>Items B1 to B6</u></p> <p>(a) Oppose the building project at Nim Shue Wan in Discovery Bay for the following reasons:</p> <p>i. There are insufficient public transport services and school places in Discovery Bay.</p> <p>ii. The development will bring environmental and social impacts to the residents.</p> <p>iii. The proposal will result in adverse visual impact and blocking the views for the residents of Caperidge Drive.</p> <p>(b) The proposed buildings should be in low rise and avoid adding the 18-storey buildings adjacent to the waterfront to minimize the impact on existing residents.</p>	<p>(1) For the public transport services, Response (5) to R13 above is relevant. For the school places, Response (4) to R27 below is relevant.</p> <p>(2) Response (6) to R13 above is relevant.</p> <p>(3) In response to Grounds (a)(iii) and (b), Response (2) to R11 above is relevant.</p>
<p>R25 Telford, Christopher Gordon</p>	<p><u>Items B1 to B6</u></p> <p>(a) Oppose the proposed development under s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/4) for the following reasons:</p>	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>i. The proposal will result in adverse visual impact and blocking the views and light. The photomontages provided by the developer do not realistically illustrate the visual impact.</p> <p>ii. The concerns on the scale of the development and visual impacts in the previous application for Item B Site could not be fully addressed. The Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) undertaken in the s.12A application is insufficient to demonstrate no visual impact from the proposed development. The criteria for selecting the visual sensitive receivers (VSRs) is questionable, in which the visual impacts to the recreational and transport users of Discovery Bay Road and in its vicinity are not considered in the VIA. The conclusion on the visual impact is also questionable as the VIA included VSRs locating far away from the proposed development and the travelling VSR with a low sensitivity due to the transient nature of the views. The concerns on the scale of the development and visual impacts in the s.12A application could not be fully addressed.</p>	<p>(1) Response (2) to R11 above is relevant.</p> <p>(2) According to the Town Planning Board Guidelines on submission of VIA for planning applications to the Board (TPB-PG No.41), the assessment area is expected to cover the area of visual influence within which the proposed development is pronouncedly visible from key sensitive viewers. As advised by CTP/UD&L, PlanD, the VIA submitted in the s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/4) for the proposed development in Item B Site has already included the visual impact on the travellers and visitors in Discovery Bay. For comments regarding VSRs of T2 and T3 in sections 6.4.12 and 6.4.15 of the VIA report, it is indicated that the views of the VSRs are ‘transient’ and ‘short in duration’, so both VSRs have ‘low’ sensitivity and ‘moderate’ overall visual impact. CTP/UD&L, PlanD had no adverse comment on the application.</p> <p>Regarding the scale of the proposed development and visual impacts, Response (2) to R11 above is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>iii. There are safety concerns along the coastline for reclamation in Item B Site and the rise of sea level, in particular, the development of house, as the risk of typhoon damage to the waterfront could also be significant.</p>	<p>(3) As advised by the Chief Engineer/Hong Kong & Islands, Drainage Services Department, from the drainage perspective, the impact of climate change has been taken into account when assessing the proposed development in Item B Site at the s.12A application stage. Corrigendum No. 1/2022 of Stormwater Drainage Manual has recently been promulgated to reflect climate change design considerations taken into account the Sixth Assessment Report published by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC AR6) and findings of relevant studies conducted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) and the Hong Kong Observatory, in particular with respect to the forecast for sea level rise and extreme rainfall. Project proponent is required to observe this Corrigendum No. 1/2022 to prepare the planning and design of the stormwater drainage system at detailed design stage.</p> <p>As advised by the Chief Engineer/Port Works, CEDD, given the proximity to</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>iv. There are concerns on population increase, contaminated land, utility capacity, traffic and construction impacts. Industrial uses such as fuel storage and vehicle maintenance previously existed on the sites. Any contaminated land should be remediated. More open space and recreational amenities should be provided.</p>	<p>the coastal area, for structures or facilities situated along the coast, the project proponent will be required to assess the coastal risks arising from sea level rise, storm surge and waves taking into account the effects of climate change and extreme weather, if necessary, with reference to the latest CEDD's Port Works Design Manual and its associated corrigenda. Appropriate climate strategy and mitigation measures should be taken to enhance the resilience of their structures and facilities at detailed design stage.</p> <p>(4) For the traffic impact, Response (5) to R13 above is relevant. For the construction impact, Response (3) to R14 above is relevant. For the utility capacity, Response (6) to R9 above is relevant. For the provision of GIC facilities and open space, Response (1) to R14 and Response (2) to R19 above are relevant.</p> <p>For the potential contamination in Item B Site, as advised by DEP, based on the Initial Land Contamination Appraisal submitted in the s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/4), the depot area and petrol</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>v. A ‘green design’ covered maintenance depot and waste management facility in Item B4 Site with maximum height to be level with ground level of the adjoining residential development Jovial, Haven and Verdant Court is suggested.</p> <p>vi. The existing bus maintenance, bus parking and waste management facilities in Item B Site could be moved to the other side of the Discovery Bay Tunnel next to existing utilities such as Siu Ho Wan Sewage Treatment Plant and bus depots.</p>	<p>filling stations within Item B Site have been identified as potential locations of contamination. A Contamination Assessment Plan is recommended prior to implementation of the project. The Environmental Protection Department (EPD)’s Guidance Note for Contaminated Land Assessment and Remediation has provided guidelines on how site assessments should be conducted and suggested practical remedial measures that can be adopted for the clean-up of a contaminated site.</p> <p>(5) The suggestions of green design as well as provision of open space and recreational facilities can be further explored by the developer at detailed design stage subject to the scrutiny of the concerned government B/Ds.</p> <p>(6) Besides the heavily vegetated hill slopes immediately next to the tunnel portal, the land near the Siu Ho Wan-side portal of Discovery Bay Tunnel is mostly government land zoned “G/IC” and “OU” designated for specified uses and occupied by Siu Ho Wan Sewage Treatment Works, Siu Ho Wan Water Treatment Works and O-PARK1, or</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>vii. Boatyard at Area 22 can be maintained. Access road to the yacht club, boatyard and kaito pier should be provided.</p>	<p>planned for other GIC uses and the extension of such GIC facilities (Plan H-4). It is not suitable for relocation of the existing privately-owned facilities serving Discovery Bay in Item B Site to the location as suggested.</p> <p>(7) According to the Indicative Scheme submitted under s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/4), access road to the sports and recreation club and ferry pier will be provided. The exact design of the access road will be decided at detailed design stage subject to the scrutiny of the concerned government B/Ds.</p>
<p>R26 Alexander Carsten Uhlmann</p>	<p><u>All Items</u> Oppose the proposed developments at Area 6A and a site at Nim Shue Wan in Discovery Bay for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The plans are so large which would not be in the long-term interest of neither the developer nor the Hong Kong's administration. ii. The proposed development contradicts with the unique character of Discovery Bay with low density, calm and green environment that differentiates it from other places. Loss of such environment would get harder to attract more talents back to the city. iii. There should be a way to get the developer to work more openly with the community and actively search for a win-win situation. 	<p>(1) Response (1) to R13 above is relevant.</p> <p>(2) Noted.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
R27 Jacqueline Ho	<u>All Items</u> Oppose the development plans to the north of Discovery Valley Road and at Nim Shue Wan for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Transportation including internal buses to each village, ferries and airport connections are inadequate. The Board is urged to work with the developer to reassess, restore and expand transportation options to ensure adequate support of current needs prior to approving the amendments of OZP. ii. Despite rise in management fees, a noticeable decrease in upkeep, maintenance and general overall landscaping, particularly in older residential phases of the community. A balance allocation of resources is crucial to maintain the overall community standards and ensure all old and new areas receive the attention they deserve. iii. Local businesses including restaurants, stationary stores and retail stores have declined due to exorbitant rental rates set by HKRI. The Board is urged to review commercial rent policies to make commercial spaces more affordable. iv. Additional schooling facilities are crucial to meet the educational needs of the community. Planning for these facilities should be a priority to ensure the community can sustainably accommodate the growing population. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Response (5) to R13 above is relevant. (2) The management of residential flats in Discovery Bay is outside the scope of the OZP. (3) Noted. Rent level of the business in the Area is outside the scope of OZP. (4) Under the established mechanism, the Government would reserve sites for school development having regard to the planned population and the needs for community services in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). In implementing a school building project, Government would take into account various factors

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>v. The proposed 18-storey walled building proposed for the Nim Shue Wan Pier water development which was previously rejected by the Board still raises significant concerns. This location is acceptable but in its current form will disrupt natural</p>	<p>including the development plan of the area concerned, the school-age population projections, the actual number of existing students, the number of school places available at different grade levels, the prevailing education policies, etc.</p> <p>For Discovery Bay, a school site has been reserved in Discovery Bay Road, while the implementation programme is subject to confirmation by the Education Bureau. Based on the latest demand and supply of school place, the Secretary for Education (S for E) anticipates public sector primary school places and secondary school places in relevant school net and district of Discovery Bay will be able to meet the needs of the area concerned. S for E will closely monitor the supply and demand of school places and make necessary arrangements to ensure an adequate supply of school places if appropriate.</p> <p>(5) For the visual impact, Response (2) to R11 above is relevant. For the air ventilation impact, Response (1) to R18</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>airflow that cools and clears the air in the bay area. Revisiting recommendations for building designs that include breaks for airflow and an open promenade along the waterfront is essential.</p> <p>vi. The planned destruction of mature trees for the development is deeply concerning. Preserving these trees or incorporating green spaces within the development should be a priority to maintain ecological balance and enhance the area's aesthetic appeal.</p> <p>vii. The recent addition of taxi / taxi ranks in the Notes degenerates traditionally 'car-free' community further eroding the trust that may have existed between residents and HKRI. With growing disconnection between HKRI and the residents, promoting transparency and open dialogue with residents is essential and necessary to rebuild trust to successfully restore, grow and sustain the unique vibrant community in Discovery Bay.</p>	<p>is relevant.</p> <p>(6) Response (3) to R11 above is relevant.</p> <p>(7) Response (1) to R1 above is relevant.</p>
<p>R28 Mary Mulvihill</p>	<p><u>Item A</u></p> <p>(a) Oppose Item A for the following reasons:</p> <p>i. The development is contrary to the original purpose of the community for low-rise residential development with extensive public recreational amenities.</p> <p>ii. Converting the low-rise staff quarters to high rise towers in Item A Site will greatly diminish the green background to the enclave and particularly affect those residents in nearby buildings. The tree issues raised by a RNTPC Member in s.12A application has not been addressed.</p> <p>iii. There are no details on how many trees to be felled in Item B</p>	<p>(1) Response (1) to R13 above is relevant.</p> <p>(2) In response to (a)(ii) and (iii), Response (2) to R11 above is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>Site.</p> <p>iv. In view of general lack of affordable recreational facilities, particularly for the younger members of the community, any development at this site should be devoted to the provision of such.</p> <p>v. There is a lack of appropriate traffic arrangements and road safety measures to address the road safety issue arising from increasing in heavy/construction vehicles during the construction stage of the proposed development. Absence of regular road traffic can induce a false sense of road safety that would be endangered if more vehicles like taxis, etc. are allowed to use the internal roads.</p> <p>vi. There is obviously a need to house staff on site for an adequate response to emergency situations.</p> <p><u>Items B1 to B6</u></p> <p>(b) Oppose Items B1 to B6 for the following reasons:</p> <p>i. The plans are incompatible with the planning intention of Discovery Bay to allow compatible low-density development and maintaining car-free and low-density environment. It is contrary to the original intention of the area to function as a 'resort' not only for residents but also for the general public. It is not justified for the proposal of developing additional units.</p>	<p>(3) Response (3) to R11 above is relevant.</p> <p>(4) Response (1) to R1 above is relevant.</p> <p>(5) For Grounds (a)(vi), (c) and (d), according to the applicant of s.12A application, as the demand of staff quarters has decreased and there is still two staff quarters in Discovery Bay, reprovisioning of the affected staff quarters is not required.</p> <p>(6) Response (2) to R11 above is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>ii. Given the scale of the reclamation and its potential consequences, it is imperative that a comprehensive EIA should be undertaken. However, there are no details on reclamation.</p>	<p>(7) Items B1 to B6 are mainly to take forward an agreed s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/4). Environmental Study has been carried out for the proposed developments in the s.12A application.</p> <p>As advised by the DEP, the Environmental Study of the s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/4) of Item B Site also concluded that the predicted cumulative air quality and noise impacts on all air sensitive uses would comply with the Air Quality Objectives and relevant assessment criteria. Hence, adverse air quality and noise impact of the proposed development is not anticipated. DEP has no objection to the proposed development from environmental perspective.</p> <p>Nearshore reclamation (about 1.5ha) near Nim Shue Wan as well as the eastern tip of the marina within the lot of Discovery Bay development is involved in Item B Site under the s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/4). As advised by the District Lands Officer/Islands, Lands Department (DLO/Is, LandsD), the applicant may need to obtain authorisation of the reclamation works</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		<p>for the proposed development under the Foreshore and Sea-bed (Reclamations) Ordinance (Cap. 127). Moreover, the Environmental Study conducted by the applicant at the s.12A application stage covers water quality and other environmental aspects as well as potential impacts on ecology and fisheries of the proposed reclamation. With mitigation measures such as silt curtains and other good site practices, impacts on water quality, marine ecology and fisheries are considered insignificant. The concerned government B/Ds have no adverse comment on the impacts arising from the proposed reclamation in various aspects.</p> <p>The proposed reclamation may be a Designated Project (DP) under the EIA Ordinance (Cap. 499). DEP advises that the applicant should follow the statutory process under the EIA Ordinance for any potential DP once identified at the detailed design stage. Potential environmental impacts evaluated in the Environmental Studies will be revisited in the later statutory EIA for DP, if applicable.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>iii. There is no impact assessment demonstrating there is no adverse ecological effect on land filling and stripping of vegetation arising from the proposed development in Item B Site.</p> <p>iv. The development is not dedicated to the general community without community benefit. It is questioned why the developer can be exempted from the policy that 5% of GFA be devoted to community facilities. Residential Care Homes for the Elderly (RCHE) should be provided in the proposed developments.</p>	<p>(8) According to the Environmental Study of the agreed s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/4), the existing area of Item B Site is mostly developed and subject to anthropogenic disturbance. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) advises that adverse ecological impact is not expected.</p> <p>(9) As announced in 2020 Policy Address, about 5% of the GFA can be set aside in future public housing projects for the provision of social welfare facilities. As advised by the Director of Social Welfare (DSW), the Government has all along been adopting a multi-pronged approach to increase the provision of welfare service facilities in the territory. Besides reserving suitable sites for GIC uses in accordance with HKPSG, there are other strategies to identify suitable sites or premises including ‘Special Scheme on Privately Owned Sites for Welfare Uses’, ‘Incentive Scheme to Encourage Provision of RCHE Premises in New Private Developments’ and purchasing premises in the private property market.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>v. Public access to the waterfront will be reduced to a narrow footpath along the waterfront.</p> <p>vi. There is already shortage of school places and social services and community facilities in Discovery Bay.</p> <p>(c) It would be prudent to retain part of the site to accommodate for another Covid-like scenario.</p> <p>(d) It would be prudent that facilities be provided for staff to stay overnight when it is dangerous to venture out.</p>	<p>(10) According to the Indicative Scheme, access road to the sports and recreation club and ferry pier will be provided. The exact width of the access road to the waterfront can be further explored by the developer at detailed design stage.</p> <p>(11) Response (4) to R27 above is relevant.</p> <p>(12) Response (5) above is relevant.</p>
<p>R29 Wong Chung Ming Darren</p>	<p><u>Items A and B1 to B6</u> Oppose the amendment items and raise the following concerns:</p> <p>i. By making reference to the judicial review's judgement in August 2020 related to the Area 6f (i.e. application No. Y/I-DB/2 and Y/I-DB/4), the applicant had indicated no intention to rezone the other five sites for staff quarters use and further application beyond would be harder to meet the existing infrastructure and environmental capacities. Especially considering that the population capacity will be at a much higher 28,300 compared to 26,190 (in the application No. Y/I-DB/2).</p> <p>ii. The environmental capacities shared much more densely for the</p>	<p>(1) Response (1) to R13 above is relevant.</p> <p>(2) Response (6) to R13 above is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>existing population (development expansion in such a small area, with narrow roads and pavements, and no traffic lights) with significant construction and landscaping involved that has major environmental impact compared to rezoning of Area 6F.</p> <p>iii. Referring to the Notes of the draft Discovery Bay OZP No. S/I-DB/5, the new proposed plan is in contrary of the low density, planned open spaces and public recreation facilities.</p> <p><u>Items B1 to B4</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Traffic and pollution problems not been adequately assessed and addressed ii. Bus No 4 serving the concerned rezoning area is at max capacity at peak hour times (7:45 to 8:15am). Residents sometimes cannot get onto the buses as only a single decker operates for this bus route. The situation will worsen for new developments under construction and population intake. iii. For Discovery Bay South Plaza bus terminals, residents are already over flowing out of the bus terminal (e.g. standing on the roads) for bus routes 4A and 9A due to the bus stops being too small. Any more people adding to this area causes safety concerns during peak hours. <p><u>Item B3</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. It is unreasonable to rezone the area under Item B3 given there are no other “Sports and Recreation Club” zones available (other than Lantau Yacht Club, which is an exclusive luxury club not readily available to residents) in Peninsula Village. While the area is not available for further development by Lantau Yacht Club, HKRI should take the responsibility to enhance this area 	<p>(3) Response (1) to R13 above is relevant.</p> <p>(4) For the traffic impact, Responses (5) to R13 above is relevant. For the environmental impact, Responses (6) to R13 above is relevant.</p> <p>(5) Response (2) to R12 above is relevant. For the overall provision of open space and GIC facilities, Response (1) to R14 and Response (2) to R19 above are also relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	to offer more sports and recreation facilities to local residents to be in line with the previous general planning.	
R30 Amy YUNG Chairperson of Beach Village OC and Member of Discovery Bay City OC	<u>All Amendment Items</u> Oppose the new developments for the following reasons: i. With more new developments and bringing in of taxis and private cars, the car-free concept of Discovery Bay has been undermined for the developer's pursuit of profit. ii. The proposed development with taxi ranks will destroy the original planning concept. iii. There is insufficient space and infrastructure in the vicinity of Discovery Bay South Plaza for a taxi rank. iv. The 'wall' of buildings of high-rise and medium high-rise buildings will block the views of existing residents and free flow of air. v. The proposed development will destroy more than 178 mature trees which is very much against the environment friendly concept.	(1) Response (1) to R1 above is relevant. (2) For the visual impact, Response (2) to R11 above is relevant. For the air ventilation impact, Response (1) to R18 above are relevant. (3) Response (3) to R11 above is relevant.
R31 Feon Sze Hun Yung Chairperson of La Vista and La Serene OC	<u>All Amendment Items</u> Oppose to building 858 units in Discovery Bay since the traffic cannot support and there is pollution issue.	Responses (5) and (6) to R13 above are relevant.
R32 Carmen Wong Chun Man	<u>All amendment items</u> (a) Oppose the amendments for the following reasons: i. The current transport infrastructure and operations in Discovery	Response (5) to R13 above is relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>Bay is not adequate to cope with the current demand of population and much less with the addition of the proposed development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. The Traffic Impact Assessment was not properly conducted due to incorrect assumptions about the behaviours and needs of Discovery Bay community in terms of the density of people and assumption on peak hours for internal buses. iii. It is suggested that PlanD should carry out a re-assessment of the transportation demand to- and from- and within Discovery Bay is suggested, secure commitment from the applicant to address current transportation bottlenecks, and ensure that the applicant commits to minimum capacity and service levels, as a condition for approval of the application. 	
<p>R33 Brennan, John Gerard</p>	<p><u>All Amendment Items</u> Oppose the draft Plan No. S/I-DB/5 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The sports facilities on the plan are for Yatch Club members and not for public use. ii. There is no new play area provision for children despite population increase. Children will either have to play only at home or on the road that bisects the development. iii. Bus is overcrowded during peak hours and the services are inadequate. Further development will severely exacerbate the problem. 	<p>(1) Response (5) to R29 above is relevant.</p> <p>(2) Response (1) to R14 above is relevant.</p> <p>(3) Response (5) to R13 above is relevant.</p>
<p>R34 Gurpeet Bawa</p>	<p><u>All Amendment Items</u> Oppose the draft Plan No. S/I-DB/5 and raise the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Internal bus has not gone back to full timetable, and what will the timetable be when the developments are finished. 	<p>(1) Response (5) to R13 above is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>ii. Whether the recreational area open to the public or just Lantau Club with invitation only.</p> <p>iii. How the trucks for construction will be managed.</p>	<p>(2) Response (2) to R19 and Response (5) to R29 above are relevant.</p> <p>(3) Response (3) to R14 above is relevant.</p>
<p>R35 Giles Denise Linda</p>	<p><u>All Amendment Items</u> Oppose the amendments to the Plan No. S/I-DB/4 for the following reasons:</p> <p>i. The proposed amendments do not conform the goal of town planning to balance the needs of communities, the environment and the economy in order to create liveable and sustainable communities.</p> <p>ii. The photomontages provided by the developer were either from Nim Shu Wan or Peng Chau, which do not realistically illustrate the visual impact.</p> <p>iii. Current bus services is inadequate, and buses are so overcrowded that it is impossible to board in many instances at peak times.</p>	<p>(1) Response (1) to R13 above is relevant.</p> <p>(2) Response (2) to R11 above is relevant.</p> <p>(3) Response (5) to R13 above is relevant.</p>
<p>R36 Serena Sank</p>	<p><u>All Amendment Items</u> Oppose the proposed developments on the Plan No. S/I-DB/5 since the community is already suffering from a severe lack of infrastructure which will only be exasperated with more units including regular ferries and buses, cancellation of overnight ferries, lack of any transport options in case of emergency, unsuitable transportation transfer hub which is regularly closed for heavy-duty repairs and unsanitary refuse disposal facilities (with rat infestation) which have been 'covered' up by a line of trees being planted by the developer.</p>	<p>(1) For the provision of supporting infrastructure, Response (6) to R9 above is relevant. For the traffic impact, Response (5) to R13 above is relevant.</p> <p>(2) For the provision of GIC facilities, Response (1) to R14 and Response (4) to R27 above are relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
R37 Jane Hyde	<u>All amendment items</u> Oppose the proposed developments on the Plan No. S/I-DB/5 for the following reasons: i. Supply of apartments is over the current demand with many new housing developments not being populated. ii. The road infrastructure cannot cope with the increase in population. The number of ferries and buses serving Discovery Bay have been reduced since 2020. It is unacceptable to Discovery Bay that there are not enough buses to serve the current population and further increase in population. iii. More unnecessary building works are ruining the countryside and clean living in Discovery Bay. Not only does it destroy natural habitat of many animals including barking deer, but it also causes a lot of disruption of noise and building works.	(1) Response (1) to R13 above is relevant. (2) Response (5) to R13 above is relevant. (3) For the noise impact, Response (3) to R14 above is relevant. For the ecological impact, Response (8) to R28 above is relevant.
R38 Nicholas Lawton Andrews	<u>All amendment items</u> (a) Oppose to the draft Plan No. S/I-DB/5 and raise the following concerns: i. The large increase in population will put significant stress on local infrastructure and public services. Bus transport infrastructure is already at capacity especially at rush hour time. School buses will also be required to cope with increased demand for schooling from the increased population. Discovery Bay road network does not have the capacity to cope with the additional number of buses. Adding more buses will increase the dangers for road users especially pedestrians, cyclists and buggies.	(1) Response (5) to R13 above is relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>ii. Schools are already oversubscribed despite many kids going to schools outside of Discovery Bay such as in Tung Chung and Hong Kong Island. The Nim Shue Wan development should not go ahead without additional schools planning and construction.</p> <p>iii. There is limited playing field space in Discovery Bay and no sports fields in South Discovery Bay for playing football, basketball or other sports. Additional recreational space is for private club and will not benefit to Discovery Bay residents. More space for outdoor activities is required.</p> <p>(b) The OZP No. S/I-DB/5 should be reduced in size to limit the impact on Discovery Bay's road infrastructure, protect road safety and ensure sufficient public services provision.</p> <p>(c) The scale of housing should be decreased to cut population. Low rise buildings should be reduced by at least one storey; high rise buildings lowered and more space between the new buildings should be added.</p>	<p>(2) Response (4) to R27 above is relevant.</p> <p>(3) For the provision of GIC facilities and open space, Response (1) to R14 and Response (2) to R19 above are relevant. For the Lantau Yacht club, Response (2) to R12 above is relevant.</p> <p>(4) For the impact on road infrastructure, Response (5) to R13 above is relevant. For the provision of public services, Response (2) to R19 above is relevant.</p> <p>(5) Response (2) to R11 above is relevant.</p>
<p>R39 John C. Antweiler III</p>	<p><u>All amendment items</u> Oppose the draft Plan No. S/I-DB/5 for the following reasons:</p> <p>i. The infrastructure supporting Discovery Bay is already near capacity with stress on water, sewerage, roads and sidewalks, security, schools and social services. Discovery Bay cannot absorb the additional expected residents without a major investment in infrastructure. All the creaking infrastructure has to be upgraded to support new developments.</p>	<p>(1) For the transport infrastructure, Response (5) to R13 above is relevant. For other infrastructures, Response (6) to R9 above is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>ii. The proposed residential development will result in additional vehicular traffic and congestion. The roads are already packed and there is poor management in Discovery Bay leading to illegal activities such as illegal scooters, speeding trucks and cars, unauthorized parking, driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs. Enforcement should be ensured to address the serious congestion and traffic issues.</p> <p>iii. The natural environment is being degraded, eroded, and lost by the continual expansion of residential construction. Peaceful parks and beaches, hiking trails are overrun and often lined with trash, and insufficient public toilets result in the fouling of the landscape. Robust safeguards have to be established and enforced to protect the precious natural environment for further expansion.</p>	<p>(2) For the traffic impact, Response (5) to R13 above is relevant. For the traffic enforcement, Response (2) to R2 above is relevant.</p> <p>(3) For the landscape impact, Response (3) to R11 above is relevant. For the environmental impact, Response (6) to R13 above is relevant.</p>
<p>R40 Flora Fraser</p>	<p><u>All amendment items</u> Oppose projects on the Plan No. S/I-DB/5 for the following reasons:</p> <p>i. There are problems on insufficient public transportation, narrow main roads with no room for expansion, lacking and overcrowded local and airport bus services, insufficient parking spaces for golf carts, repeatedly increasing fares for ferries yet reducing service, insufficient school buses, planned schools put on hold, insufficient public recreational facilities for teenagers and old children playground. The supporting facilities and services in Discovery Bay have not been improved with damaging quality of life of the population.</p> <p>ii. Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the development has not been carried out despite serious impact on marine life and nearby residents and large number of construction trucks,</p>	<p>(1) For the provision of GIC facilities, Response (1) to R14 above is relevant. For the traffic impact, Response (5) to R13 above is relevant.</p> <p>(2) Response (3) to R17 above is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>cranes, cement trucks and heavy machinery entering and exiting Discovery Bay. Inconvenience, sanitary noise and safety hazards to residents will be caused.</p> <p>iii. The proposed development will result in significant impact on the residents who were not consulted on such large-scale construction development.</p>	<p>(3) For the environmental impact during construction period, Response (3) to R14 above is relevant.</p> <p>For the public consultation, the established practices for both statutory and administrative public consultation for s.12A application and statutory plan have been duly followed. In processing the two s.12A applications relating to Items A and B1 to B6, public consultations were conducted in accordance with the provisions under the pre-amended Town Planning Ordinance¹ and the public comments received were duly considered by RNTPC. On 12.4.2024, the draft OZP were published for public inspection for two months under s.5 of the Ordinance. Members of the public are invited to submit representation. Moreover, IsDC's DIDPC was consulted on 30.4.2024 on the draft OZP while PlanD's representatives also attended a meeting organised by an IsDC Member</p>

¹ The "pre-amended Town Planning Ordinance" refers to the Town Planning Ordinance as in force immediately before 1.9.2023.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	iv. Facilities including waste treatment and transfer, bus maintenance, golf cart maintenance, vehicle and vessel refueling facilities, etc. will cause public health and safety risks. This is careless to relocate the helipad, but the access road needs to be built on the breakwater.	on 10.6.2024 with about 60 local residents and relevant stakeholders of Discovery Bay attended. (4) For the safety risk of reclamation, Response (3) to R25 above is relevant. For the interface with the servicing facilities, Response (2) to R13 above is relevant.
R41 Suet Lun Ng	<u>All amendment items</u> Oppose the draft Plan No. S/I-DB/5 for the following reasons: i. The infrastructure in Discovery Bay is insufficient to support more developments with problems on water, sewerage and public services. ii. The developer and management company are not able to manage the traffic condition in Discovery Bay with speeding trucks, rogue taxis, illegal electric vehicles driven by teenagers and overcrowded buses. iii. The increase in population will result in noise pollution, traffic pollution, shrinking of natural spaces and degradation of the countryside.	(1) Response (6) to R9 and Response (4) to R27 above are relevant. (2) Response (1) to R1 above is relevant. (3) Response (6) to R13 above is relevant.
R42 Manpreet Singh Chadha	<u>All amendment items</u> (a) Oppose the proposed amendments to the draft Plan No. S/I-DB/4 for the following reasons: i. The proposed amendments, particularly the reclamation projects, will have significant adverse impacts on the local marine environment. The method of reclamation, which	(1) Response (3) to R17 above is relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>involves decking over piles, still requires excavation and could disturb the seabed, leading to potential ecological damage to marine life and habitats. The nearby Nim Shue Wan beach could be adversely affected by the proposed developments.</p> <p>ii. Given the scale of the reclamation and its potential consequences, it is imperative that a comprehensive EIA be undertaken and publicly reviewed before any further steps are taken.</p> <p>iii. The proposed rezoning for residential and other specified uses will put additional strain on Discovery Bay's existing infrastructure and services. The current transport infrastructure, social services, and community facilities are already stretched thin. Further development without significant upgrades to these services will degrade the quality of life for current residents.</p> <p>iv. There has been procedural irregularities and insufficient consultation with local residents and stakeholders in the s.12A application stage and plan-making process. The decision-making process appears to have ignored and overlooked the voices and concerns of the community, raising questions about the transparency.</p> <p><u>Others</u></p> <p>(b) Raise the following concerns regarding the 738th RNTPC Meeting on the proposed amendments to the Approved Discovery Bay OZP No. S/I-DB/4 dated 15.3.2024:</p> <p>i. There are procedural irregularities. For instance, the Vice-chairman took over the Chairmanship due to the Chairman's absence, and the abrupt joining of Dr. Conrad T.C. Wong during the meeting raised questions about the quorum and the</p>	<p>(2) For the transport infrastructure, Response (5) to R13 above is relevant. For the provision of community facilities, Response (1) to R14 and response (4) to R27 above are relevant.</p> <p>(3) Response (3) to R40 above is relevant.</p> <p>(4) RNTPC's consideration of the proposed amendments to the approved Discovery Bay Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-DB/4 on 15.3.2024 follows the established procedures of the Board and the provision under Town Planning Ordinance and relevant TPB Guidelines.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>integrity of the decision-making process.</p> <p>ii. A lack of decisive action for the meeting noting numerous deferrals (34 cases) and renewal cases shows inefficiency within the committee, potentially delaying critical planning decisions and undermining public trust in the planning process.</p> <p>iii. The letter from Legislative Council Member Hon. Michael Tien Puk-sun, which raised valid concerns regarding application No. A/YL/316, was dismissed on technical grounds. This reflects poorly on the committee's commitment to democratic and inclusive decision making.</p> <p>(c) The Board is urged to reconsider the proposed amendments to the Discovery Bay OZP and to address the procedural issues highlighted in the 738th RNTPC meeting. It is crucial that the planning process be transparent, inclusive, and environmentally responsible to ensure the sustainable development of Discovery Bay.</p>	
<p>R43 Heidi Wing Yan Mattras</p>	<p><u>Items B1 to B6</u> Oppose the proposed development of Application No. Y/I-DB/4 for the following reasons:</p> <p>i. Transportation will be a major issue for people going to school given that the kindergartens, primary and secondary schools in the district are limited and over 2,000 households would relocate with the implementation of the project.</p> <p>ii. There will be more traffic in Discovery Bay and therefore the volume of traffic could pose a major issue, especially during busy hours. The present bus terminal size, bus frequency, and bus captain are insufficient to suit the demands of this population. The bus and ferry services are inadequate especially</p>	<p>(1) Response (5) to R13 above is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>during peak hours, while the price will be too pricey if it increases again.</p> <p>iii. The lack of facilities in the neighborhood may cause inflation. When the population grows, supermarkets may also decide to raise their prices to meet the increased demand which would cause additional financial burdens to the original Discovery Bay residents.</p> <p>iv. The developer ignores the right of residents and makes as many profits as possible. For example, the costs for building the bus terminal and the mall are from the management fee. The bus terminal which always has technical issues and construction works which causes inconvenience to Discovery Bay residents due to the relocation of the bus stations over the time.</p>	<p>(2) For the provision of GIC facilities, Response (1) to R14 above is relevant. The inflation issue is outside the scope of the OZP.</p> <p>(3) The management of residential flats in Discovery Bay is outside the scope of the OZP. Any related improvement or relocation proposal for the bus terminal is subject to the scrutiny of relevant government B/Ds.</p>
<p>R44 Fanny Ng Yee Man</p>	<p><u>Items B1 to B6</u> Oppose the proposed development of Application No. Y/I-DB/4 for the following reasons:</p> <p>i. Transportation will be a major issue for people going to school given that the kindergartens, primary and secondary schools in the district are limited and over 2,000 households would relocate with the implementation of the project.</p> <p>ii. There will be more traffic in Discovery Bay and therefore the volume of traffic could pose a major issue, especially during busy hours. The present bus terminal size, bus frequency, and bus captain are insufficient to suit the demands of this population. The bus and ferry services are inadequate especially during peak hours, while the price will be too pricey if it increases again.</p> <p>iii. The lack of facilities in the neighborhood may cause inflation. When the population grows, supermarkets may also decide to</p>	<p>(1) Response (5) to R13 above is relevant.</p> <p>(2) For the provision of GIC facilities, Response (1) to R14 above is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>raise their prices to meet the increased demand which would cause additional financial burdens to the original Discovery Bay residents.</p> <p>iv. The developer ignores the right of residents and makes as many profits as possible. For example, the costs for building the bus terminal and the mall are from the management fee. The bus terminal which always has technical issues and construction works which causes inconvenience to Discovery Bay residents due to the relocation of the bus stations over the time.</p>	<p>The inflation issue is outside the scope of the OZP.</p> <p>(3) The management of residential flats in Discovery Bay is outside the scope of the OZP. Response (3) to R43 above is relevant.</p>
<p>R45 Annie Tsui Suk Ching</p>	<p><u>All amendment items</u> Oppose the draft Plan No. S/I-DB/5 for the following reasons:</p> <p>i. The construction sites are too close to the nearby residents, and the noise and dust produced by the conduction sites are detrimental to the environment.</p> <p>ii. The high rise blocks will totally block the seaview.</p> <p>iii. There are safety concerns along the coastline for reclamation in Item B Site and the rise of sea level especially monsoon or rising tide at Nim Shue Wan.</p> <p>iv. Residents are extremely concerned about the adequacy of transportation arrangement. The current bus services are already overloaded (e.g. No. 4 and 4A).</p> <p>v. There is concern on the execution capability of HKR International Limited (HKRI) for the long construction period of the development such as sudden closure of bus terminus, road maintenance and improper design and built of the bus terminus and the roads.</p> <p>vi. There is alternative land for development in Discovery Bay and</p>	<p>(1) Response (3) to R14 above is relevant.</p> <p>(2) Response (2) to R11 above is relevant.</p> <p>(3) Response (3) to R25 above is relevant.</p> <p>(4) Response (5) to R13 above is relevant.</p> <p>(5) Noted. The implementation of the development will be subject to the scrutiny of the concerned government departments.</p> <p>(6) Response (3) to R17 above is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	it is not necessary to do reclamation for the development project.	
R46 Gladys Hiu Ling Mattras	<u>Items B1 to B6</u> Oppose the proposed development of Application No. Y/I-DB/4 for the following reasons: i. The transportation in Discovery Bay cannot support 2,000 more residents. There has been a lack of manpower in terms of bus drivers and ferry personnel leading to a decrease in the regularity of buses. ii. With the population increased as well as having tourists, the threshold of all current infrastructures will be well over its capacity leading to even more inconvenience to all residents, including plaza, restaurants, clubs and supermarket, etc. iii. The land reclamation and deforestation will have to take place. Land reclamation has been known to negatively impact biodiversity. iv. Many trees in area 10A will have to be cut down. Trees are essential for the health of the environment and the greenery has attracted many Discovery Bay residents. v. During typhoons, the sea level rise would be extreme which has completely flooded the path along Nim Shue Wan until the bus terminus. Thus, building infrastructure on reclaimed land does not seem like a sound idea. vi. Noise, light and air pollution created by the construction would be detrimental to residents.	(1) Response (5) to R13 above is relevant. (2) For the provision of GIC facilities, Response (6) to R9 above is relevant. For the transport infrastructure, Response (1) to R14 above is relevant. (3) Response (3) to R17 above is relevant. (4) Response (3) to R11 above is relevant. (5) Response (3) to R25 above is relevant. (6) Response (3) to R14 above is relevant.
R47 Ambo, Hiroe	<u>All amendment items</u> Oppose the draft Plan No. S/I-DB/5 and raise the following concerns: i. Around 3,000 people will be living in the area in addition to the	(1) Response (1) to R13 above is relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>current residents. High density is contradicting to the spacious and relaxing resort-style concept of Discovery Bay, which is raised by the developer to attract people to live in Discovery Bay. Many residents who are also owners of the properties will face dropping in prices of their properties due to living environment gets worse after the development. The relevant government authority has approved to develop Discovery Bay based on this concept at the beginning. This concept should be maintained.</p> <p>ii. The Discovery Bus Terminal is already fully occupied, and no space left to make a terminal for the new route.</p> <p>iii. It is not convinced that the developer would provide sufficient infrastructure, e.g. fresh water supply, electricity supply and sewerage facilities to the relevant area for the additional residents. It is not clearly mentioned in the draft OZP.</p> <p>iv. It is not bearable for the residents to live in the environment with poor air quality, less ventilation, construction noises, dusts, and heavier traffic by working vehicles during the development of the affected area for long time.</p> <p>v. The security of the area is worrying. Many construction workers may increase crime rate in the area.</p> <p>vi. Felling down around 150 trees will impact the environment and make the area expose to sunshine which cannot protect residents from heat.</p>	<p>(2) Response (5) to R13 above is relevant.</p> <p>(3) Response (6) to R9 above is relevant.</p> <p>(4) Response (3) to R14 above is relevant.</p> <p>(5) Response (4) to R14 above is relevant.</p> <p>(6) Response (3) to R11 above is relevant.</p>
R48 Hong Kong Resort Company Limited	<u>Support All Items with Adverse Views on Individual Amendments to the Notes</u> (a) Support all amendment items and the amendments to the Notes (a) to (m) and (o) as they generally reflect the two agreed s.12A applications (No. Y/I-DB/2 and Y/I-DB/4). For the amendments to	(1) The supportive views are noted. With regard to the amendments to the Notes (b) and (c) of the BH restriction being in

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>the Notes (b) and (c), they are supported as the restrictions of the new zonings are in line with the Joint Practice Notes (JPN) No. 5 ‘Development Control Parameters Building Height Restriction’ in that maximum BH is only expressed in mPD.</p> <p>(b) Some of the uses indicated in the s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/4) are not explicitly included in the Column 1 of the “OU (Residential Development with Service Area Below)” zone under Item B4 and the “OU(SRC)4” zone under Item B5. Column 1 use of ‘Transport Terminus and Station’ under the “OU (Residential Development with Service Area Below)” zone should be amended as ‘Transport Terminus and Station (including Transport Office and Transport Staff Rest Area)’ to allow transport office and staff rest area. Besides, ‘Utility Installation for Private Project’ should be transferred from Column 2 to Column 1 in the “OU(SRC)4” zone.</p> <p>Clarification on whether other uses to support the management of Discovery Bay development indicated in the s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/4) can be considered as ancillary uses permitted in the respective zones is required</p>	<p>line with JPN No. 5, Response (3) below is relevant.</p> <p>(2) The “OU(Residential Development with Service Area Below)” and “OU(SRC)4” zones under Items B4 and B5 are to reflect the agreed s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/4). Upon PlanD’s review, it is considered appropriate that the Notes including the Schedules of Uses of the two zonings should make reference to the latest MSN adopted by the Board and other existing zonings of the Discovery Bay OZP. For the “OU(Residential Development with Service Area Below)” zone, reference has been made to the “OU(Commercial Complex and Residential Development cum Transport Interchange)” zone with due consideration of the applicant’s proposals (Annex IX) in the s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/4). To avoid possible conflict/adverse impact with the residential development above and meet the needs of the local residents, visitors and users of the service area, suitable modifications are made to the</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		<p>Schedules of Uses of the zone and the annotation of the “OU” zone is changed to “Residential Development with Service Area Below” to better reflect such planning intention. There is no change of ‘Utility Installation for Private Project’ as Column 2 use in the “OU(SRC)4” zone. Implementation of the Indicative Scheme under the agreed s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/4) will not be adversely affected by the Schedules of Uses of the two zones.</p> <p>The covering Notes of the OZP states that the uses directly related and ancillary to the permitted uses and developments within the same zone are always permitted. Whether a use serving the whole Discovery Bay development but not directly related and ancillary to a permitted use within the “OU(Residential Development with Service Area Below)” zone is allowed will depend on the provision on the OZP. For example, ‘City Management Office’ mentioned by R48 which is an ‘office’ use may be permitted upon section 16 application. PlanD’s comments on whether a specific use can be considered as ancillary use will be</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(c) The wording ‘including structure’ in the BHR clause of the Remarks for “R(C)” and “OU(Residential Development with Service Area Below)” zones under Items A and B1 to B4 should be deleted to tally with JPN No. 5 in that only BHR in that only building height restrictions (BHRs) in mPD are imposed.</p>	<p>provided at later stage (e.g. building plan submission, issuance of Occupation Permit, etc.).</p> <p>(3) The formation of BHRs of the Discovery Bay OZP had taken into consideration the specific circumstances of each land use zone including sensitivity of the concerned location, compatibility with the wider building profile, visual intrusion to Hong Kong Disneyland Resort and surrounding natural setting, etc. Discovery Bay is the only large-scale development involving large waterfront site at the eastern part of Lantau Island and mostly surrounded by Lantau North (Extension) Country Park. To preserve the existing amenity and character, almost all of the development zones on the OZP are subject to a maximum absolute BH including the height of roof-top structures. The BHR clauses of the “R(C)”, “OU(SRC)4” and “OU(Residential Development with Service Area Below)” zones under Items A and B1 to B5 follows the practice of other zonings in Discovery Bay development. According to JPN No. 5, while the highest level of the</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(d) The ‘number of storey’ restriction of the BHRs of “R(C)1” to “R(C)11” zones should be deleted to tally with the “R(C)12” to “R(C)15” zones under Items A and B1 to B3 and conform to JPN No. 5 in that only BHRs in mPD are imposed.</p> <p>(e) The bus and ferry shelters in Discovery Bay are provided by the developer due to Discovery Bay’s unique situation, however they are GFA accountable. The Remarks for the “R(C)” and “OU(Residential Development with Service Area Below)” zones under Items A and B1 to B4 should be amended to exempt GFA for such facilities so as not to reduce the achievable GFA of the agreed residential developments.</p> <p>(f) Some facilities to be provided in the “OU(Residential Development with Service Area Below)” zone (e.g. transport office, transport staff</p>	<p>main roof is usually used in determining BH in BHR, explicit specifications on the OZP could also be for serving special purposes for which the total BH including the roof-top structures should not exceed the stipulated BHR. As the BHRs on the OZP follow the BHRs proposed by the applicant in the s.12A applications (No. Y/I-DB/2 and Y/I-DB/4) which include the roof-top structures in calculating the maximum BH, implementation of the Indicative Schemes under the two agreed s.12A applications will not be adversely affected by the BHRs.</p> <p>(4) The “R(C)1” to “R(C)11” zones are not the subject of any amendment item.</p> <p>(5) The GFA exemption clauses for the “R(C)” and “OU(Residential Development with Service Area Below)” zones follow the clauses of other existing zonings of the Discovery Bay OZP as well as other prevailing OZPs in Hong Kong.</p> <p>The GFA exemption clause proposed by the applicant for the “OU(Service Area</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>rest area, management office and workshop or management staff rest area) under Item B4 are ancillary and directly related to the management of whole Discovery Bay. The function and scale of these facilities are different with other ancillary facilities (e.g. caretakers' office) listed in the GFA exemption clause of the Notes of the OZP which serves the development itself. Granting GFA concession through the provisions under Buildings Ordinance may not be applicable. Therefore, a clause should be added in the Remarks for the "OU (Residential Development with Service Area Below)" zone so that such facilities can be disregarded from GFA calculation under OZP.</p> <p>(g) A new minor relaxation clause on GFA and BH restrictions through s.16 application should be added under the Remarks for the "R(C)" and "OU(Residential Development with Service Area Below)" zones under Items A and B1 to B4 to tally with the current practices and promote the Green and Innovative Buildings incentives set out in relevant JPNs.</p>	<p>with Residential Development Above)" zone under the s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/4) is only to exempt the GFA of the facilities ancillary and directly related to the development within the respective zones (Annex IX). Besides, there is also no such suggestion in both s.12A applications (No. Y/I-DB/2 and Y/I-DB/4) to exempt bus and pier shelters from GFA calculation under the OZP. The suggestion is not in line with the agreed s.12A applications submitted by R48. Moreover, as these facilities are not serving the development within the respective zones, it is not appropriate to exempt the floor area of these facilities from GFA calculation under the OZP.</p> <p>(6) During the consideration of the objections to the draft Discovery Bay OZP No. S/I-DB/1, the Board deliberated on whether to include minor relaxation clause for the GFA and BH restrictions. It was agreed that non-inclusion of minor relaxation clause in the Notes of the OZP is appropriate to maintain the existing character and the intended scale of development in Discovery Bay, to avoid overtaxing the</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p><u>Oppose Amendments to the Notes (n)</u></p> <p>(h) All of the land within the “CA” zone is privately owned. ‘Country Park’ should not be incorporated under Column 1 of the “CA” zone under Amendments to the Notes (n). The representer is not aware</p>	<p>limited infrastructure provision, and to safeguard against visual intrusion to the surrounding developments including Hong Kong Disneyland Resort. The non-inclusion of minor relaxation clause for “R(C)” and “OU(Residential Development with Service Area Below)” zones follow other existing zonings of the Discovery Bay OZP.</p> <p>In any case, the GFAs and BHs of the proposed developments in the “R(C)”, “OU(SRC)4” and “OU(Residential Development with Service Area Below)” zones under the Indicative Schemes fall within the relevant restrictions, and implementation of the Indicative Schemes under s.12A applications (No. Y/I-DB/2 and Y/I-DB/4) will not be adversely affected without minor relaxation clauses. There is no minor relaxation clause in the zonings proposed by the applicant under both s.12A applications, and R48’s suggestion is not in line with the agreed s.12A applications submitted by itself.</p> <p>(7) In response to Grounds (h) and (i), as a minor part of Lantau North (Extension) Country Park falls within the “CA”</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>of any proposal for further expansion of Country Park.</p> <p>(i) 'Country Park' should be deleted from Column 1 of the "CA" zone.</p> <p><u>Others</u></p> <p>(j) The planned population stated in the ES should be updated. Given that there are no longer any exceptional infrastructural constraints, relevant paragraph of the ES should also be revised.</p>	<p>zone, it is appropriate to incorporate 'Country Park' as a Column 1 use for the "CA" zone. Such minor part of country park is on government land.</p> <p>(8) The planned population stated in the ES has been updated taking into account the two agreed s.12A applications (No. Y/I-DB/2 and Y/I-DB/4). According to the ES of the OZP, having regard to the character of the Area, environmental considerations and the existing and planned infrastructure provision, in particular the limited capacity of external links, the OZP was originally provided for a planned total population of about 25,000 persons for the Discovery Bay development. The planned total population for the Discovery Bay development has been increased to about 28,300 taking into account the two proposed developments in Items A and B Sites. However, any further increase in population would still have to be considered in the context of the general planning intention for the Area and subject to detailed feasibility investigations on infrastructure and environmental capacities.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	(k) The general planning intention of the Area in the ES should be amended to include more relevant references to recent strategic studies undertaken by Government.	(9) The contents in the “Sustainable Lantau Blueprint”, “Recreation & Tourism Development Strategy for Lantau” and “Hong Kong 2030+” are not directly related to Items A and B1 to B6 and the general planning intention of the Area.
R49 Discovery Bay Services Management Limited	<u>Support Item B4 with Adverse Views on Amendment to the Notes</u> (a) Support Item B4 and amendment to the Notes (c) to reflect the agreed s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/4). (b) Some facilities to be provided in the “OU(Residential Development with Service Area Below)” zone (e.g. transport office, transport staff rest area, management office and workshop or management staff rest area) under Item B4 is ancillary and directly related to the management of whole Discovery Bay. The function and scale of these facilities are different with other ancillary facilities (e.g. caretakers’ office) listed in the GFA exemption clause of the Notes of the OZP which serves the development itself. Granting GFA concession through the provisions under Buildings Ordinance may not be applicable. Therefore, a clause should be added in the Remarks for the “OU (Residential Development with Service Area Below)” zone so that such facilities can be disregarded from GFA calculation under OZP.	(1) The supportive view is noted. (2) Responses (2) and (5) to R48 above are relevant.
R50 Discovery Bay Marina Club Limited	<u>Support Item B5 with Adverse Views on Amendment to Notes (e)</u> (a) Support Item B5 and amendment to the Notes (e) to reflect the agreed s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/4) which allows expansion of Lantau Yacht Club.	(1) The supportive view is noted.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/I-DB/5-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(b) Some of the uses indicated in the s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/4) are not explicitly included in the Column 1 of the “OU(SRC)4” zone under Item B5.</p> <p>Clarification on whether other uses to support the management of Discovery Bay development indicated in the s.12A application (No. Y/I-DB/4) can be considered as ancillary uses permitted in the respective zone is required.</p>	<p>(2) Response (2) to R48 above is relevant.</p>

Extract of the Minutes of the RNTPC Meeting held on 15.3.2024

~~applied periods. Details of those planning applications, a Member's declaration of interests for individual cases and the Committee's view on the declared interests were in Annex 3.~~

Deliberation Session

10. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the applications on a temporary basis for the applied periods on the terms of the applications as submitted to the Town Planning Board subject to the approval conditions stated in the Papers. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicants to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Papers.

Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East District

Agenda Item 3

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/YL-PH/6

Application for Amendment to the Approved Pat Heung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-PH/11, To rezone the application site from "Open Storage" to "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Columbarium (1)", Lot 403 (Part) in D.D. 114, Sheung Tsuen, Pat Heung, Yuen Long

~~11. The Secretary reported that the application was withdrawn by the applicant.~~

Sai Kung and Islands District

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Discovery Bay Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-DB/4 (RNTPC Paper No. 1/24)

Presentation and Question Sessions

12. The following representatives from the Planning Department (PlanD) were invited to the meeting at this point:

PlanD

Mr Walter W.N. Kwong	- District Planning Officer/Sai Kung and Islands (DPO/SKIs)
Mr Sunny K.Y. Tang	- Senior Town Planner/Sai Kung and Islands
Ms Kennie M.F. Liu	- Town Planner/Sai Kung and Islands (TP/SKIs)

13. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Kennie M.F. Liu, TP/SKIs, briefed Members on the background of the proposed amendments to the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), technical considerations, consultation conducted and departmental comments as detailed in the Paper. The proposed amendments included:

- (a) Amendment Item A – rezoning a site to the north of Discovery Valley Road from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Staff Quarters (5)” to “Residential (Group C) 12” (“R(C)12”);
- (b) Amendment Item B1 – incorporating a sea area in Nim Shue Wan into the planning scheme area and zoning it as “R(C)13”, and rezoning a site to the south of Discovery Bay Road from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”), “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Staff Quarters (1)” (“OU(Staff Quarters)1”), “Residential (Group D)” and “Green Belt” to “R(C)13”;
- (c) Amendment Item B2 – incorporating a sea area in Nim Shue Wan into the planning scheme area and zoning it as “R(C)14”, and rezoning a site near Nim Shue Wan from “OU(Staff Quarters)1”, “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Service Area” (“OU(Service Area)”), “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Pier (3)” (“OU(Pier)3”) and “Other Specified Uses” annotated

“Petrol Filling Station” (“OU(PFS)”) to “R(C)14”;

- (d) Amendment Item B3 – rezoning a site to the northwest of the marina from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Sports and Recreation Club (4)” (“OU(SRC)4”) and “R(C)7” to “R(C)15”;
- (e) Amendment Item B4 – rezoning a site to the south of Discovery Bay Road from “OU(Staff Quarters)1”, “OU(Service Area)”, “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Dangerous Goods Store/LPG Store”, “OU(Pier)3”, “OU(PFS)”, “G/IC” and “R(C)7” to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Residential Development with Service Area Below” (“OU(RDSAB)”) and stipulating sub-areas for it;
- (f) Amendment Item B5 – incorporating a sea area in Nim Shue Wan into the planning scheme area and zoning it as “OU(SRC)4” and stipulating as Area B, and rezoning a site to the west of the marina from “OU(Service Area)”, “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Marina” and “OU(PFS)” to “OU(SRC)4” and stipulating it as Area B; and
- (g) Amendment Item B6 - incorporating a sea area in Nim Shue Wan into the planning scheme area and zoning it as “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Helicopter Landing Pad”.

14. As the presentation by PlanD’s representative had been completed, the Vice-chairman remarked that the amendment items were to take forward the Committee’s decisions to agree two section 12A applications (s.12A applications) No. Y/I-DB/2 and Y/I-DB/4. The Vice-chairman asked that as compared with the agreed s.12A applications, whether there were any changes in development controls under the current proposed amendments to take into account Members’ previous comments.

15. In response, Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, DPO/SKIs, said that to address some Members’ concerns on the building height along Nim Shue Wan during the consideration of the agreed s.12A application No. Y/I-DB/4, the proposed “OU(RDSAB)” zone under Amendment Item B4 was sub-divided into three sub-areas with building height restrictions

descending from the north towards the waterfront to provide statutory control on the stepped building height profile. Besides, suitable modifications had been made to the Notes of the “OU(RDSAB)” zone, where ‘Bus Depot’, ‘Recyclable Collection Centre’, ‘Refuse Disposal Installation’, ‘Transport Terminus or Station’, ‘Vehicle and Golf Cart Depot’ and ‘Vehicle Repair Workshop’ uses would be restricted at the lowest two floors of the future development to avoid possible conflict with/adverse impact on the proposed residential development above. Except for the above, the development controls under the current proposed amendments were generally in line with the agreed s.12A applications.

16. The Vice-chairman then invited questions from Members. Some Members raised the following questions on the proposed reclamation in relation to Amendment Items B1 to B6:

- (a) details of the proposed reclamation and whether the newly reclaimed land would be subject to a land premium;
- (b) whether there was any other reclamation project in Hong Kong adopting similar construction method;
- (c) whether the nearby Nim Shue Wan beach would be affected by the proposed reclamation;
- (d) noting from the section plans in Drawings 2c and 2d of the Paper that some portions of the existing/proposed seawalls fell outside the planning scheme boundary of the OZP, whether there would be any statutory control for the construction/reclamation works to be undertaken at these areas;
- (e) whether an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) would be required for the proposed reclamation; and
- (f) whether the helipad (Amendment Item B6) would be formed via reclamation, and the future operation of the reprovisioned helipad.

17. In response, Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, DPO/SKIs, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides and plans, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the applicant of the relevant s.12A application No. Y/I-DB/4, the reclamation would be carried out in the form of decking over piles, as the depth of the concerned water area was relatively shallow. However, excavation might still be required if there were large rocks within the reclamation area where metal pillars were required as supporting structures. The details of the proposed reclamation would be subject to detailed design at a later stage. As the proposed reclamation area fell within a private lot, the costs of the reclamation works would be borne by the lot owner. Before the implementation of the proposed developments under the amendment items (including the proposed reclamation), the lot owner was required to apply to the Lands Department for amendment to the Master Layout Plan (MLP) under the lease, which might be subject to premium consideration;
- (b) according to the applicant of the s.12A application, part of the shopping area near the existing DB Plaza was reclaimed by similar construction method;
- (c) Nim Shue Wan beach would not be affected by the proposed reclamation under the amendment items;
- (d) for the areas outside the planning scheme boundary of the OZP, the proposed developments/works would be governed by other relevant legislations, e.g. the Foreshore and Sea-bed (Reclamations) Ordinance for reclamation works and the Buildings Ordinance for building works;
- (e) the applicant had submitted an Environmental Study to support the relevant s.12A application. While the applicant claimed that the proposed reclamation should be exempted from the provisions of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Ordinance (EIAO) as the reclamation had been authorised under the Foreshore and Sea-bed

(Reclamations) Ordinance before EIAO came into effect in 1998, the Lands Department advised that the authorised reclamation was for a leisure and resort centre rather than residential development and hence, authorisation of the proposed reclamation might need to obtain subject to further legal advice. Therefore, the submission of an EIA for the proposed reclamation might still be required. The scope and details of the EIA submission would be confirmed at detailed design stage; and

- (f) the proposed helicopter landing pad under Amendment Item B6, which would be created through reclamation, was for reprovisioning the existing helipad near Lantau Yacht Club office within Amendment Item B5 site. The existing helipad was provided by the lot owner and was required to make available for Government use at all times under the lease. While no details were given by the applicant, it was envisaged that the operation of the reprovisioned helicopter landing pad under Amendment Item B6 would be similar to that of the existing helipad.

18. A Member asked about the details of the proposed tree compensation and considered that both the number and size of trees should be taken into account in the compensation proposal. In response, Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, DPO/SKIs, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that according to the applicant of the relevant s.12A applications, the majority of the trees at the amendment sites would be either retained or transplanted whilst most of the mature trees would be preserved in-situ. The felled trees (118 out of 225 trees at Amendment Item A site and 178 out of 720 trees at Amendment Items B1 to B5 site) would be compensated within the amendment sites at a ratio exceeding 1:1 in terms of number. The applicant had also committed to exploring opportunities to provide additional compensatory trees at suitable locations outside the amendment sites.

19. The Secretary supplemented that according to the Development Bureau (DEVB) Technical Circular (Works) No. 4/2020 – Tree Preservation (the Technical Circular), compensatory tree planting should be of a ratio not less than 1:1 in terms of number as far as practicable. If sufficient growing space could be identified, the compensatory tree planting ratio of 1:1 in terms of aggregated diameter at breast height should be achieved. The Member further stated that while the requirements set out in the Technical Circular were well

noted, given the presence of ample space within Discovery Bay which was under the sole ownership of the applicant, there was potential for planting more compensatory trees. Another Member echoed, and they suggested that the applicant's commitment to explore opportunities for additional compensatory trees should be reflected in the OZP to ensure better tree compensation.

20. In response to a Member's query on the possibility of imposing such requirement in the OZP at the current proposed amendment stage, the Secretary said that it was feasible to incorporate such requirement in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP to clearly reflect the views of the Town Planning Board (the Board), which would serve as guidance for the relevant government departments when processing future land documents, MLP, etc. The Vice-chairman suggested and Members agreed that the relevant paragraph in the ES of the OZP at Attachment IV of the Paper should be revised to reflect Members' concerns. The Secretary remarked that the Secretariat of the Board would follow up on the revision to the ES to take into account Members' views on tree compensation.

21. After deliberation, subject to the revision of the ES to address Members' concerns on tree compensation, the Committee decided to:

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Discovery Bay OZP No. S/I-DB/4 as shown on the draft Discovery Bay OZP No. S/I-DB/4A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered as S/I-DB/5 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of the Paper were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance); and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Attachment IV of the Paper with the revision on tree compensation for the draft Discovery Bay OZP No. S/I-DB/4A (to be renumbered as S/I-DB/5) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for the various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES would be published together with the OZP.

22. Members noted that as a general practice, the Secretariat of the Board would undertake detailed checking and refinement of the draft OZP including the Notes and ES, if

appropriate, before their publication under the Ordinance. Any major revisions would be submitted for the Board's consideration.

[Post-meeting Note: the following statement was added to the end of paragraph 7.3 of the ES: "To maintain and enhance the landscape quality of the area, the developer(s) should endeavour to achieve enhanced tree compensation arrangement, as far as practicable, for any tree felling due to new developments in Discovery Bay."]

~~[Ms Tammy S.N. Kong, Senior Town Planner/Sai Kung and Islands (STP/SKIs), and Mr Matthew L.M. Tai, Town Planner/Sai Kung and Islands (TP/SKIs), were invited to the meeting at this point.]~~

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/SK-HC/348	Temporary Private Garden for a Period of 3 Years in "Village Type Development" Zone and area shown as 'Road', Lots 1067 S.D and 1074 S.B (Part) in D.D. 244 and Adjoining Government Land, Ho Chung New Village, Sai Kung (RNTPC Paper No. A/SK-HC/348)
-------------	--

Presentation and Question Sessions

23. With the aid of some plans, Mr Matthew L.M. Tai, TP/SKIs, briefed Members on the background of the application, the applied use, departmental comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department considered that the temporary use could be tolerated for a period of three years.

24. Noting that part of the application site (the Site) was government land (GL), a Member enquired whether the GL could be used for Small House development by eligible indigenous villagers. In response, Mr Matthew L.M. Tai, TP/SKIs, said that the GL portion of the Site mainly fell within an area shown as 'Road' on the Outline Zoning Plan and Small House development was not in line with the planning intention of area shown as 'Road'.

Extract of the Minutes of the DIDPC of the IsDC Meeting held on 30.4.2024

II. 《愉景灣分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/I-DB/5》所收納的修訂項目
(地區基建及發展規劃委員會文件第 4／2024 號)

3. 副主席請與會者參閱地區基建及發展規劃委員會文件第 4／2024 號。
4. 廖美芳女士利用電腦投影片簡介文件內容。
5. 委員提出意見如下：
 - (a) 委員關注題述修訂項目會否對愉景灣的環境造成影響以及加重區內的交通負擔。委員亦詢問新的會所是否開放予一般市民或只限特定人士使用。
 - (b) 委員關注街渡碼頭移至海旁位置後，會否影響街渡的運作以及增加居民的步行距離。委員表示規劃署必須確保題述修訂項目不會影響往來坪洲的交通，並建議署方在巴士總站提供往來街渡碼頭的交通選擇，例如發展商提供穿梭車服務。
 - (c) 委員詢問在有其他土地可供選擇的情況下，為何要透過填海造地興建直升機升降坪。
6. 副主席表示城市規劃委員會(城規會)曾於 2017 年拒絕香港興業有限公司(香港興業)提出的一項土地發展申請，理由是愉景灣屬於低密度住宅區，只能容納約 25 000 人口。他詢問題述修訂項目包括興建 5 座樓高 18 層的住宅，會否偏離愉景灣原本低密度住宅區的發展概念。
7. 鄭弘毅先生綜合回應如下：
 - (a) 題述修訂源自兩宗由香港興業向城規會提出申請並已獲批准的項目。規劃署因應准許發展而修訂大綱圖，並提交本委員會諮詢委員意見。制定分區計劃大綱圖的主要目的是把區內的發展和重建計劃納入法定規劃管制之內。

- (b) 發展商表示遷移街渡碼頭的方案已初步獲得街渡營運公司的同意。儘管新碼頭會移至新的海旁位置，估計額外步行時間只需約兩分鐘。
- (c) 發展商計劃在水面架設平台進行填海工程，相比傳統填海需要挖掘淤泥的方式，可更有效地減少影響水質。在進行填海工程前，發展商須根據環境保護署的意見提交一份環境影響評估報告，證實海洋生態和水質等不會因填海工程而受影響。
- (d) 愉景灣的社區配套、商場及交通設施等均由發展商發展，而區內的渡輪及巴士服務則受相關部門規管。
- (e) 發展商已完成環境評估及交通影響評估等研究工作，評估報告指出有關發展不會對區內的環境及交通造成重大影響，有關基礎設施的容量和環境的承受能力是可以接受。愉景灣現時規劃人口為 25 000 人。兩個新住宅發展項目落成後，區內人口將增加約 3 000 人，增長幅度約為 10%。由於愉景灣是一個私人發展項目，署方相信發展商會因應區內人口增長而提升交通及相關社區設施。總括而言，愉景灣的整體規劃意向仍然是低密度住宅發展，且保留沒有汽車行走的發展特色。

8. 委員提出意見如下：

- (a) 委員建議地政總署就題述修訂項目徵收補償地價時，考慮要求發展商提供一筆撥備款項，用於改善渡輪及接駁巴士服務，例如向坪洲居民提供街渡／渡輪船費或接駁巴士車費優惠。有關撥備款項亦可用於補貼愉景灣居民往來市區的昂貴船費，從而穩定票價。
- (b) 委員建議在遷移街渡碼頭後，為新碼頭至巴士總站的行人通道加設上蓋，避免居民日曬雨淋。
- (c) 隨着人口增長，愉景灣的交通配套應相應改善，特別是為有需要的居民提供足夠的接駁巴士服務。相關部門應考慮區內的交通配套是否足夠。

9. 副主席提出意見如下：

- (a) 由於人力短缺問題及車長人手不足的關係，目前愉景灣的巴士服務僅維持在可接受的水平。他質疑發展商提交的交通影響評估報告的可信性，並希望規劃署關注現有交通設施能否應付區內人口增長。
- (b) 署方在與發展商商討時，可為居民爭取合理的社區設施，例如要求開放擬興建的體育及康樂會所予一般市民使用。
- (c) 愉景灣航運服務有限公司正向運輸署提出持牌渡輪服務票價調整申請，要求將往來市區的渡輪的票價提高 60%。上述的渡輪公司為香港興業的附屬機構。他詢問署方如何就發展商的加價申請把關。

10. 鄭弘毅先生綜合回應如下：

- (a) 發展商沒有詳細交代體育及康樂會所的營運模式，但相信有關會所將會維持以私人營運模式運作。
- (b) 大綱圖中擬建體育及康樂會所的地點，發展商曾解釋現時在山上的部分會所用地仍未發展，而因為地勢問題，在山上擴建會所對日常運作上不是太理想，因此本次修訂把一幅同屬該發展商的沿海土地改劃為會所用地，而把在山上的會所用地改作住宅發展，兩塊土地面積基本上相同。
- (c) 不論是在填海地或是在現有土地上進行發展，如不符合地契，發展商均須修訂地契並向政府補地價。現時政府並無既定機制以地價資助改善渡輪及接駁巴士服務。署方相信運輸署會繼續透過有效機制監察愉景灣的渡輪及巴士票價。
- (d) 署方會把委員的意見轉達發展商，包括如何美化海濱環境以及為新街渡碼頭至巴士總站的行人通道加設上蓋。
- (e) 倘若施工影響現有設施，例如影響街渡碼頭的運作，發展商在落實發展時必須與相關部門磋商及提交解決方案。

11. 委員提出意見如下：

- (a) 委員建議部門於補償地價條款中加入附帶條件，包括要求發展商提供遮蔭設施及考慮遷移街渡碼頭至較近的位置。
- (b) 委員關注題述修訂項目會否影響稔樹灣村，特別是當填海工程進行時，村民日常出入的通道會否受影響；以及署方能否在地契條款中加入稔樹灣村民食水問題的解決方案。

12. 鄭弘毅先生綜合回應如下：

- (a) 一般而言，部門會首先向發展商轉介委員的意見，使發展商能優化及改善發展項目。另外，部門亦會繼續根據相關機制把關，在必要時部門亦會考慮將相關要求納入地契條款之中。地政總署於訂立地契條款的過程中，會諮詢各部門的意見，並考慮應否將部門的要求納入地契條款中。
- (b) 題述修訂項目不會影響稔樹灣村。發展商的發展建議現時仍屬初步規劃階段，當項目正式展開時，相關部門會根據監管機制並透過審批發展商提交的詳細發展計劃，確保工程不會對鄰近村民構成影響。

13. 副主席表示新一屆區議會要做到「上情下達，下情上報」。規劃署已逐一回應委員的查詢，亦會積極轉達委員的意見予發展商，部門亦會在相關機制上把關。此外，委員亦可就愉景灣社區事宜舉辦居民大會，以聆聽和蒐集市民的意見。

~~III. 有關在東涌興建政府合署的提問
(地區基建及發展規劃委員會文件第 5／2024 號)~~

~~IV. 有關在東涌增設綜合市政大樓的提問
(地區基建及發展規劃委員會文件第 6／2024 號)~~

~~14. 副主席歡迎出席回應提問的嘉賓。政府產業署、規劃署、入境事務處、運輸署和勞工處的書面回覆已於會前送交各委員參閱。~~

**Summary of Views Expressed at Meeting
with Local Residents and Relevant Stakeholders in Discovery Bay on 10.6.2024**

General Planning Issues

- The estimated population of the two proposed developments appears unrealistic. An expected persons per flat of 2.5 does not accurately reflect the existing average household size in Discovery Bay, which typically consists of larger families. It would be more appropriate to estimate based on floor area instead of the number of units.

‘Car-free’ Concept in Discovery Bay

- The Explanatory Statement of the draft Discovery Bay Outline Zoning Plan (the OZP) No. S/I-DB/5 describes Discovery Bay as a ‘generally car-free environment’ instead of ‘primarily car-free’, which slowly erodes the ‘car-free’ concept.
- The introduction of ‘taxi rank’ as an always permitted use on land falling within the boundaries of the OZP goes against the rationale of being ‘car-free’.
- Discovery Bay could not support more vehicles without transport infrastructure monitoring (e.g. traffic lights, police patrolling), which draws concerns over road safety.

Traffic Impact

- Long queues are frequently observed at bus stops in Discovery Bay. Due to limited space for passengers to line up, queues often extend onto the road surface, raising safety concerns. The current level of service of residents' service buses is inadequate to meet the public transport demand of existing residents and visitors.
- Given a large increase in the estimated population, there is doubt over the Traffic Impact Assessments submitted by the applicant, which concludes that the proposals would not have insurmountable adverse impacts on Discovery Bay's traffic conditions.

Opposition to the Proposed Scheme of Planning Application No. Y/I-DB/4 (related to Items B1 to B6)

- The proposed residential development of 18-storeys high along the coastline would lead to ‘wall effect’, which blocks air flow into inner areas, thereby causing adverse impact on air ventilation.
- There is doubt about the building height restriction imposed on areas zoned “Sports & Recreation Club (4)” on the OZP being too lenient. The current maximum building height of 8 storeys (25m) for Area A and 5 storeys (15m) for Area B allows excessive development of private clubs, whose sports and recreational facilities are not open to the public.
- The developer stands to make a profit at the expense of public enjoyment and quality of life.

- The Visual Impact Assessment submitted by the Applicant does not adequately account for the potential visual impacts on the surrounding areas. It fails to provide a clear visualisation of the proposed development once completion. The photomontages are insufficient for a holistic assessment of the scale, massing, and extent of the proposed development from prominent visually sensitive receivers.
- The tree planting proposal is inadequate to compensate for the trees that will be felled due to the proposed development.

Public Engagement

- There is disappointment over the draft OZP No. S/I-DB/5 and the decisions made by the Rural and New Territories Planning Committee of the Town Planning Board on planning applications No. Y/I-DB/2 and Y/I-DB/4. The two s.12A planning applications were agreed without any changes to the proposals despite receiving significant opposing comments from the public.
- Discovery Bay residents were not well-informed and consulted about the two s.12A planning applications and the on-going plan making process. The current practice of newspaper and website publication is not effective in providing timely information to the target audience.

Provision of Major Community Facilities and Open Space in Discovery Bay

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population)	Provision		Surplus/ Shortfall (against planned provision)
			Existing Provision	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision)	
District Open Space	10 ha per 100,000 persons [#]	2.73 ha	8.41ha	9.87ha	+7.14ha
Local Open Space	10 ha per 100,000 persons [#]	2.73 ha	2.54ha	3.81ha	+1.08ha
Sports Centre	1 per 50,000 to 65,000 persons [#] (assessed on a district basis)	0	0	1	+1
Sports Ground/Sports Complex	1 per 200,000 to 250,000 persons [#] (assessed on a district basis)	0	1	1	+1
Swimming Pool Complex – standard	1 complex per 287,000 persons [#] (assessed on a district basis)	0	0	0	0
District Police Station	1 per 200,000 to 500,000 persons (assessed on a regional basis)	0	0	0	0
Divisional Police Station	1 per 100,000 to 200,000 persons (assessed on a regional basis)	0	0	0	0
Magistracy (with 8 courtrooms)	1 per 660,000 persons (assessed on a regional basis)	0	0	0	0
Community Hall	No set standard	NA	1	1	NA
Library	1 district library for every 200,000 persons (assessed on a district basis)	0	0	0	0

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population)	Provision		Surplus/ Shortfall (against planned provision)
			Existing Provision	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision)	
Kindergarten / Nursery	34 classrooms for 1,000 children aged 3 to under 6 [#]	3 classrooms	35 classrooms	35 classrooms	+32 classrooms
Primary School	1 whole-day classroom for 25.5 persons aged 6-11 [#] (assessed by Education Bureau (EDB) on a district/school network basis)	17 classrooms	18 classrooms	30 classrooms	+13 classrooms
Secondary School	1 whole-day classroom for 40 persons aged 12-17 [#] (assessed by EDB on a territorial-wide basis)	21 classrooms	0 classrooms	18 classrooms	-3 classrooms~
Hospital	5.5 beds per 1,000 persons (assessed by Hospital Authority on a regional/cluster basis)	157 beds	0	0	-157 beds^
Clinic/Health Centre	1 per 100,000 persons (assessed on a district basis)	0	0	0	0
Child Care Centre	100 aided places per 25,000 persons [#] (assessed by Social Welfare Department (SWD) on a local basis)	110 places	0	0	-110 places [@] (a long-term target assessed on a wider spatial context by SWD [@])
Integrated Children and Youth Services Centre	1 for 12,000 persons aged 6-24 [#] (assessed by SWD on a local basis)	0	0	0	0

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population)	Provision		Surplus/ Shortfall (against planned provision)
			Existing Provision	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision)	
Integrated Family Services Centres	1 per 100,000 to 150,000 persons [#] (assessed by SWD on a service boundary basis)	0	0	0	0
District Elderly Community Centre	One in each new development area with a population of around 170,000 or above [#] (assessed by SWD)	N/A	0	0	N/A
Neighbourhood Elderly Centres	One in a cluster of new and redeveloped housing areas with a population of around 15,000 to 20,000 persons, including both public and private housing [#] (assessed by SWD)	N/A	0	0	N/A
Community Care Services (CCS) Facilities	17.2 subsidised places per 1,000 elderly persons aged 65 or above ^{#*} (assessed by SWD on a district basis)	170 places	0	0	-170 places [@] (a long-term target assessed on a wider spatial context by SWD [@])
Residential Care Homes for the Elderly	21.3 subsidised beds per 1,000 elderly persons aged 65 or above [#] (assessed by SWD on a cluster basis)	201 beds	0	0	-201 beds [@] (a long-term target assessed on a wider spatial context by SWD [@])
Pre-school Rehabilitation Services	23 subvented places per 1000 children aged 0-6 [#] (assessed by SWD on a district basis)	5 places	0	0	-5 places

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population)	Provision		Surplus/ Shortfall (against planned provision)
			Existing Provision	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision)	
Day Rehabilitation Services	23 subvented places per 10000 persons aged 15 or above [#] (assessed by SWD on a district basis)	48 places	0	0	-48 places [@] (a long-term target assessed on a wider spatial context by SWD [@])
Residential Care Services	36 subvented places per 10000 persons aged 15 or above [#] (assessed by SWD on a cluster basis)	75 places	0	0	-75 places [@] (a long-term target assessed on a wider spatial context by SWD [@])
Community Rehabilitation Day Centre	1 centre per 420,000 persons or above [#] (assessed by SWD on a district basis)	0	0	0	0
District Support Centre for Persons with Disabilities	1 centre per 280,000 persons or above [#] (assessed by SWD on a district basis)	0	0	0	0
Integrated Community Centre for Mental Wellness	1 standard scale centre per 310,000 persons or above [#] (assessed by SWD on a district basis)	0	0	0	0

Note:

The planned resident population is about 26,300. If including transients, the overall planned population is about 28,500. All population figures have been adjusted to the nearest hundred.

The requirements exclude planned population of transients.

~ For educational facilities, the international schools (viz. Discovery College and Discovery Bay International School) are excluded in the assessment.

^ The provision of hospital beds is to be assessed by the Hospital Authority on a regional basis. The deficit in provision is based on the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) planned population while the Hospital Authority plans its services on a cluster basis, and takes into account a number of factors in planning and developing various public healthcare services. The Kowloon West Cluster (KWC) provides services for residents in Sham Shui Po, Kwai Tsing, Tsuen Wan and Lantau Island. There are a number of hospital redevelopment

projects planned in the First and Second Ten-Year Hospital Development Plans (HDPs), which will provide additional beds for serving the population in KWC. The project service demand will be catered for in the First and Second Ten-year HDPs.

- @ The deficit in provision is based on the OZP planned population while the SWD adopts a wider spatial context/cluster in the assessment of provision for such facility. In applying the population-based planning standards, the distribution of welfare facilities, supply in different districts, service demand as a result of the population growth and demographic changes as well as the provision of different welfare facilities have to be considered. As the HKPSG requirements for these facilities are a long-term goal, the actual provision will be subject to consideration of the SWD in the planning and development process as appropriate. The Government has been adopting a multi-pronged approach with long-, medium- and short-term strategies to identify suitable sites or premises for the provision of more welfare services which are in acute demand.
- * Consisting of 40% centre-based CCS and 60% home-based CCS.

SEPTEMBER 2024

OTHER SPECIFIED USES (Cont'd)

Column 1 Uses always permitted	Column 2 Uses that may be permitted with or without conditions on application to the Town Planning Board
<u>For "Service Area with Residential Development Above"</u>	
Bus Depot	Government Use
Flat	Warehouse (excluding Dangerous
House	Goods Godown)
Petrol Filling Station	
Public Utility Installation	
Recyclable Collection Centre	
Refuse Disposal Installation	
Transport Terminus or Station	
Utility Installation for Private Project	
Vehicle and Golf Cart Depot	
Vehicle Repair Workshop	

Planning Intention

This zone is intended primarily for residential complex, with Service Area to serve the development and surrounding area.

Remarks

- (a) No new development, or addition, alteration and/or modification to or redevelopment of an existing building (including structure) shall result in a total development and/or redevelopment in excess of a maximum domestic gross floor area (GFA) of 36,100m², non-domestic GFA of 11,330m², and a maximum building height for residential building of 18 storeys not exceeding 89mPD (excluding maximum 2 storeys podium for plant rooms, ancillary facilities and/or other non-domestic uses permitted in this zone directly related to the development or redevelopment), or the GFA, site coverage and height of the existing building, whichever is the greater.
- (b) In determining the maximum GFA for the purposes of paragraph (a) above, any floor space that is constructed or intended for use solely as plant room, caretaker/management staff's office, rest area, storage space, provided such uses and facilities are ancillary and directly related to the development or redevelopment, may be disregarded.

RESIDENTIAL (GROUP C)

Column 1 Uses always permitted	Column 2 Uses that may be permitted with or without conditions on application to the Town Planning Board
Flat	Eating Place
Government Use (Police Reporting Centre only)	Educational Institution
House	Government Refuse Collection Point
Utility Installation for Private Project	Government Use (not elsewhere specified)
→ Pier	Institutional Use (not elsewhere specified)
	Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture
	Private Club
	Public Convenience
	Public Utility Installation
	Recyclable Collection Centre
	Religious Institution
	Residential Institution
	School
	Shop and Services
	Social Welfare Facility

Planning Intention

This zone is intended primarily for low-density residential developments.

Remarks

- (a) No new development, or addition, alteration and/or modification to or redevelopment of an existing building (including structure) shall result in a total development and/or redevelopment in excess of the maximum gross floor area (GFA) and building height specified below, or the GFA, site coverage and height of the existing building (including structure), whichever is the greater, and provided that (insofar as is applicable) addition, alteration and/or modification to or redevelopment of an existing building (including structure) to the same height of the existing building (including structure) shall only be allowed if the existing GFA of the building (including structure) is not exceeded :

(please see next page)

RESIDENTIAL (GROUP C) (Cont'd)

Remarks (Cont'd)

Sub-area	Maximum GFA (m ²)	Maximum Building Height		
			Number of Storeys	Metres above Hong Kong Principal Datum (mPD) Metres (m)
R(C)1	117,438	Area A	25	114
		Area B	25	102
		Area C	24	116
		Area D	20	99
R(C)2	157,100	Area A	25	132
		Area B	15	95
		Area C	5	60
		Area D	18	94
R(C)3	30,643		22	112
R(C)4	110,784	Area A	22	120
		Area B	5	64
R(C)5	158,178	Area A	25	129
		Area B	25	123
		Area C	25	114
		Area D	18	103
		Area E	18	101
		Area F	13	65
		Area G	7	60
		Area H	2	38
R(C)6	24,319	Area A	19	74
		Area B	6	35
		Area C	2	20
R(C)7	135,684	Area A	18	75
		Area B	6	65
R(C)8	60,369	Area A	5	62
		Area B	5	40
		Area C	3	31
R(C)9	33,715	Area A	14	104
		Area B	6	74
R(C)10	49,543		3	64
R(C)11	5,000		2	9
R(C)13	14,100		18*	89
R(C)14	6,500		2	17
R(C)15	4,500		5	38

(please see next page)

RESIDENTIAL (GROUP C) (Cont'd)

Remarks (Cont'd)

➔ *excluding maximum 2 storeys podium for plant rooms, ancillary facilities and/or other non-domestic uses permitted in this zone directly related to the development or redevelopment.

- (b) In determining the relevant maximum GFA for the purposes of paragraph (a) above, any floor space that is constructed or intended for use solely as plant room, caretakers' office and caretakers' quarters, or recreational facilities for the use and benefit of all the owners or occupiers of the domestic building or domestic part of the building, provided such uses and facilities are ancillary and directly related to the development or redevelopment, may be disregarded.

OTHER SPECIFIED USES (Cont'd)

Column 1 Uses always permitted	Column 2 Uses that may be permitted with or without conditions on application to the Town Planning Board
<u>For "Sports and Recreation Club" Only</u>	
Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture	Dangerous Goods Godown (Liquefied
Private Club	Petroleum Gas Store only)
→ Marine Fuelling Station	Eating Place
Boat Services Facilities	Government Refuse Collection Point
Pier	Government Use (not elsewhere specified)
	Religious Institution
	Shop and Services
	Social Welfare Facility
	Utility Installation for Private Project

Planning Intention

This zone is intended to designate land for sports and recreation club development.

Remarks


- (a) No new development, or addition, alteration and/or modification to or redevelopment of an existing building (including structure) shall result in a total development and/or redevelopment in excess of the maximum gross floor area (GFA) and building height specified below, or the GFA, site coverage and height of the existing building (including structure), whichever is the greater:

<u>Sub-area</u>	<u>Maximum GFA</u> (m ²)	<u>Maximum Building Height</u>	
		Number of Storeys	Metres (m)
Sports and Recreation Club (1)	5,500	2	13
Sports and Recreation Club (2)	6,000	2	13
Sports and Recreation Club (3)	5,500	2	9
Sports and Recreation Club (4)	5,500 Area A	8	25
	Area B	5	15

- (b) In determining the relevant maximum GFA for the purposes of paragraph (a) above, any floor space that is constructed or intended for use solely as plant room and caretakers' office, provided such uses and facilities are ancillary and directly related to the development or redevelopment, may be disregarded.

(please see next page)

OTHER SPECIFIED USES (Cont'd)

Column 1 Uses always permitted	Column 2 Uses that may be permitted with or without conditions on application to the Town Planning Board
<u>For "Marina" Only</u>	
 <div style="border: 2px dashed red; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;"> Marina Helicopter Landing Pad </div>	Government Use Public Utility Installation Utility Installation for Private Project

Planning Intention

This zone is intended for a marina for the berthing of pleasure vessels.

Remarks

No new development, or addition, alteration and/or modification to or redevelopment of an existing building (including structure) shall result in a total development and/or redevelopment in excess of a maximum building height of 6m, or the height of the existing building (including structure), whichever is the greater.

(please see next page)