

就圖則作出申述

Representation Relating to Plan

參考編號

Reference Number:

251228-005319-67664

Submission Number:

TPB/R/S/I-TCV/3- S8

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

31/12/2025

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

28/12/2025 00:53:19

「申述人」全名

Full Name of "Representer":

先生 Mr. Chan Ho Yuen stephen

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與申述相關的圖則

Plan to which the representation relates:

S/I-TCV/3

申述詳情

Details of the Representation:

有關事項 Subject Matters	你支持還是反 對有關事項? Are you supporting or opposing the subject matter?	理由 Reason
補充申請 人coral ching limited landholding 一事	支持 Support	<p>鑑於目前「土地持有圖」僅以顏色區分（例如5月2日發布之版本），公眾實難精準了解申請人實際的土地持有比例與交易進度。</p> <p>為此，建議進一步完善圖例與標註方式，包括：</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. 增設「已購待過戶」狀態類別；2. 於相關地塊上明確標示其實際持有百分比。 <p>此舉將有助於提升資訊透明度，使公眾與相關單位能更清楚掌握土地權屬的完整情況。</p>
支持申報 人coral ching limited 改 劃一事	支持 Support	Coral Ching Limited 於東涌谷的改劃申請，已就交通、環境、噪音及保育等範疇作全面評估，並在規劃上作出相應調整。此發展不僅能為東涌西居民提供上流機會、加快公屋流轉，亦因鄰近預計2029年啟用的東涌西站，具備興建私樓的優越條件。綜上所述，本改劃方案實為平衡發展與社區利益的合適選項，值得支持。

對圖則是否有任何擬議修訂？如有的話，請註明詳情。

Any proposed amendments to the plan? If yes, please specify the details.

tpbpd/PLAND

寄件者: EAP KFBG [REDACTED]
寄件日期: 2025年12月29日星期一 21:36
收件者: tpbpd/PLAND
主旨: KFBG's representation relating to draft plan S/I-TCV/3
附件: 251229 KFBG's representation relating to draft plan S_I-TCV_3.pdf
類別: Internet Email

Dear Sir/ Madam,

Attached please see KFBG's representation relating to draft plan S/I-TCV/3.

Representer: Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden

Representer's representative: Mr. NIP Hin Ming

HKID: [REDACTED]

Please do not disclose the above personal particulars to irrelevant persons.

Please do not disclose our email address.

Thank You and Best Regards,

Ecological Advisory Programme
Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden

Email Disclaimer:

The information contained in this e-mail (including any attachments) is confidential and is intended solely for the addressee. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete this e-mail from your system. Any unauthorised use, disclosure, copying, printing, forwarding or dissemination of any part of this information is prohibited. KFBG does not accept responsibility and shall not be liable for the content of any e-mail transmitted by its staff for any reason other than bona fide official purposes. There is no warranty that this e-mail is error or virus free. You should not rely on any information that is not transmitted via secure technology.



嘉道理農場暨植物園公司
Kadoorie Farm & Botanic Garden Corporation

The Secretary,
Town Planning Board,
15/F, North Point Government Offices,
333, Java Road, North Point,
Hong Kong.
(Email: tpbpd@pland.gov.hk)

29th December, 2025.

By email only

Dear Sir/ Madam,

KFBG's representation relating to draft plan S/I-TCV/3

1. We refer to the captioned.
2. We would like to formally convey our support for the proposed amendment ‘Item B1’.
3. Thank you for your attention.

Ecological Advisory Programme
Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden

tpbpd/PLAND

寄件者: mm1947 [REDACTED]
寄件日期: 2025年12月31日星期三 1:40
收件者: tpbpd/PLAND
主旨: AMENDMENTS TO THE TUNG CHUNG VALLEY OZP NO. S/I-TCV/2
類別: Internet Email

AMENDMENTS TO THE TUNG CHUNG VALLEY OZP NO. S/I-TCV/2

Item A – about 3.38 ha. Rezoning a site at the junction of Yu Tung Road and Chung Mun Road from “Res (Group C)2” to “Res (Group B)” (“R(B)”) with stipulation of BHR.

Private land of about 2.66ha (79%) with about 0.72ha of government land (21%)

Y/ITCV/1 partially agreed 2 May 2025

9 Res Towers / 1,783 Units / PR 2.32 (1.00) / 100mPD (20) /OS 5,171sq.m / 3 storey podium
Commercial / Kindergarten / Transport Interchange / 270 Vehicle Parking

PRs of 2.1 and 0.22 respectively and maximum BHs of 50mPD, 80mPD and 100mPD from north to south. Provision of a transport interchange with GFA of not less than 3,150m²

FULLY SUPPORT THE OBJECTIONS OF R6 (S6) GREEN POWER IN THEIR DETAILED OUTLINE OF THE NEGATIVE IMPACT

The planned rezoning to allow a much higher and more dense development than that planned (PR 1 / BHR 20mPD) during the many rounds of consultation effectively overturns the planning intention for the area as detailed “*to conserve the ecologically sensitive areas, to protect the rural and natural character, to maintain the unique landscape character and cultural heritage of the Area*’.

All along pledges were made to preserve the rural character of this part of Tung Chung in order to balance and provide relief from the intense and dense high-rise developments at other sections of the district.

August 21, 2015 –

“A spokesman for the Town Planning Board said the general planning intention is to protect the ecologically sensitive areas and the rural and natural character, to maintain the unique landscape character and cultural heritage of the area, and to prevent it from encroachment by unauthorised development and from undesirable change of use”

Deviation from the original vision would fundamentally change the nature of the area and this is underlined by the unacceptable proposal to

Urgent Return receipt Expand Group Restricted Prevent Copy

(ii) ***capture-and-translocation exercise of amphibian species of conservation importance and preservation and/or transplantation of plant species of conservation importance prior to site formation***

This is effectively an admission that the proposed development would cause irreversible damage to the natural ecosystem and is clearly an undesirable change in use.

And as for “rescue excavation/survey-cum-excavation/further survey in area ***within the Sha Tsui Tau Site of Archaeological Interest*** prior to commencement of the works”

If approval is already given to the development, then this would be a futile exercise.

Introducing 5,000+ residents to a sensitive area with the inevitable negative environmental impact on natural drainage, noise and light pollution.

Because of climate change hourly rainfall is poised to increase by up to 40 percent in the next decade and this will increase the amount of deleterious substances that will be washed into our waterways from adjacent developments.

The developer’s statement that “*it was considered opportune to up-zone the Site with a view to optimising its development potential*” should have been questioned by members as **the planning intention for this specific area has not been about development but about conservation**.

It is also alarming that members considered that the location of an MTR station in the vicinity is justification for the rezoning. There is an MTR station on the corner of Kowloon Park. Victoria Park is close to both Causeway Bay and Tin Hau MTR stations. So, these parks and other recreational facilities close to transport links should be redeveloped if this rationale is applied city wide? TPB members are effectively creating a precedent that justifies a change in zoning based on distance to mass transit.

GIC: Contrary to what PlanD states, the district has deficits in the provision of many community services, members should check the HKPSG data. But the only facility to be provided is an 8-class room Kindergarten.

Not only are Kindergartens commercial services, but in view of demographics this service is surplus to demand. 20% of the site is GL and community services are exempt from PR calculation so there is no justification to the lack of facilities.

Trees: 670 to be felled / Only 338 compensation 50%.

This is unacceptable in view of the proximity to both ‘CPA’ and “CA” and that part of the site is within the Sha Tsui Tau SIA.

Urgent Return receipt Expand Group Restricted Prevent Copy

Active Outdoor Recreational Facilities: Only a swimming pool and children's playground provided. A development of this size should include an outdoor court.

The gist of some of the representations is problematic. The following are extractions:

*"At the **May meeting**, the applicant, Coral Ching Limited, stated its goal of completing the project by 2030, but also revealed that it currently only holds about 40% ownership rights, about 20% is government land, and the remaining 40% is still under negotiation.*

If Coral Ching Limited's rezoning application is ultimately approved, will the planning permit include a clear "development period" (i.e., a "sunset clause")? Specifically, will it stipulate that the applicant must complete land consolidation and commence substantive construction works within a specified period (e.g., 3 to 5 years after approval)? If the deadline expires and the project has not yet commenced, will the rezoning permit be reviewed or revoked?

I raise this question because land resources adjacent to railways in Hong Kong are extremely valuable. If a project is successfully rezoned but cannot commence construction for a long period due to land consolidation issues, it would undoubtedly be a waste of scarce public resources. Establishing a development period helps to urge applicants to actively promote the project and, if it cannot be implemented, release land resources for other planning uses, thus protecting the overall public interest.

*Finally, I firmly believe that **transparent information is the foundation for public oversight** and rational discussion. The above-mentioned issues all concern the feasibility of the project and the effective use of public resources. We urge the committee to take these issues seriously and urge the relevant parties to provide substantive responses in order to fulfil their accountability to the public."*

"Given that the applicant, CoralChing Limited, and its affiliated company, Sun Hung Kai Properties, have publicly committed at meetings to completing the project by 2030, and that the rezoning application is currently in a critical phase, the ownership consolidation is far from complete. Before this fundamental issue of land ownership is resolved, any planning and design is merely empty talk.

Therefore, based on the public's absolute right to know and their urgent concern about the project's feasibility, I hereby solemnly request that the applicant, CoralChing Limited, and its affiliated company, Sun Hung Kai Properties, provide the public with a clear and detailed binding ownership consolidation plan, including a specific timetable, phased objectives, and contingency plans, to demonstrate the feasibility of their plan."

The comments made are specific and demonstrate a degree of knowledge and perhaps some hidden agenda. They also underline the negative impact of depriving the community of making comments at the Sec 12 stage. They refer to a May meeting but there is no information provided on who organized the meeting, who attended, the purpose of the meeting, etc. Public participation at Sec 12 stage would have introduced the issues highlighted to the general community at an earlier stage in the so called 'consultation'. With the almost 100% approval of OZP, comments made at the late stage have a negligible recognition rate.

Urgent Return receipt Expand Group Restricted Prevent Copy

The references to the connection to SHK highlight an issue that should be dealt with, the lack of transparency with regard to who is behind these developments. The manner in which developers hide their identity behind shell companies is deplorable. Recent changes to access to information have made tracking down the identity of the interested parties more difficult and have deprived the community of the right to know who is moving in on their district. Transparency is inadequate and hinders citizens from making informed decisions.

As the developer in this case is SHK, there is certainly substance to the issue of timely development. SHK is very devious when it comes to the development of approved plans. Initial approval is just the first stage. **This is always followed by a series of applications to increase the PR and BHR.** The request that there be a time frame for the development is legitimate. In fact, this should be a condition for all developments in order to ensure timely implementation.

Hopefully members will address the issue raised. 20% of the site is GL.

Members should also reflect that they development potential should not be the only consideration when evaluating rezoning guidelines that had been agreed on only a few years previously after considerable debate and public consultation.

Several strips of residual land shown as 'Road' but no longer required for the road works. It is proposed to rezone these areas to suitable land use zonings to combine with the adjoining zonings and rationalise the zoning boundary

Item B1 – about 0.19 ha. Rezoning of six strips of land near Hau Wong Temple, Ngau Au and Shek Mun Kap from area shown as 'Road' to "Comm(2)", "Open Space" "G/IC", "VTD", "Green Belt", "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Polder" and "Conservation Area".

HOUSEKEEPING

Item B2 – about .0047ha. Rezoning of a small piece of land near Hau Wong Temple from "G/IC" to "O".

SUPPORT

Item B3 – (about 0.0015 ha. Revision of the stipulated BHR of a small piece of land to the south of Hau Wong Temple zoned "G/IC" from 4 storeys to 1 storey.

SUPPORT

Amendments to the Notes of the Plan

(d) Incorporation of 'Government Refuse Collection Point' and 'Public Convenience' under Col 1 of the Notes for "V" zone; and corresponding deletion of 'Government Refuse Collection Point' and 'Public Convenience' under Col 2 of the Notes for "V" zone.

Urgent Return receipt Expand Group Restricted Prevent Copy

OBJECT. COL 2 ENSURES THAT THE UTILITY IS SUBJECT TO PUBLIC SCRUTINY AND THAT LOCATION AND DESIGN ARE NOT INTRUSIVE, TOO BULKY OR AN EYE SORE

(e) Incorporation of 'Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre' under Col 2 of the Notes for "V" zone

OBJECT. THE PLANNING INTENTION OF "V" ZONE IS TO PROVIDE FAMILY HOMES FOR INDIGENOUS VILLAGERS. THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS ENCOURAGE THE ALREADY RAMPANT ABUSE OF THE NTEH POLICY THAT HAS RESULTED IN MOST OF THE RECENT DEVELOPMENTS BEING ACTUALLY UNITS FOR SALE TO OUTSIDERS

Mary Mulvihill



Urgent Return receipt Expand Group Restricted Prevent Copy Confidential

tpbpd/PLAND

寄件者: tonyfung2 [REDACTED]
寄件日期: 2025年12月31日星期三 16:15
收件者: tpbpd/PLAND
主旨: S/I-TCV/3 (東涌谷分區計劃大綱圖修訂申述)
類別: Internet Email

Submission Number:
TPB/R/S/I-TCV/3- S11

敬啟者

本人反對東涌谷分區計劃大綱圖的A項修訂，原因如下：

是項修訂變相闖割法定環境影響評估程序（包括環評報告的公眾審視、環境諮詢委員會的決定），突破是項東涌谷地帶的發展參數限制及建築物排列的規範，法定環境影響評估程序淪為裝飾。整個分區計劃大綱圖覆蓋範圍的環境狀態從環評報告通過當日至今，究竟是向好還是向壞？當局沒有提出充分說明。

申述人姓名 Fung Kam Lam (先生)

身份證首四個字符: [REDACTED]

31/12/2025