

tpbpd/PLAND

Submission Number:  
TPB/R/S/K14N/16-S2

寄件者: [REDACTED]  
寄件日期: 2025年10月08日星期三 20:45  
收件者: tpbpd/PLAND  
主旨: AMENDMENTS TO THE KWUN TONG (NORTH) OZP NO. S/K14N/15  
類別: Internet Email

## AMENDMENTS TO THE KWUN TONG (NORTH) OZP NO. S/K14N/15

Dear TPB Members,

**Item A** - (about 6.77 ha) Rezoning of a site to the east of Po Tat Estate from "GB" and a site at the north of Po Lam Road from "O" to "OU(Commercial/Res Development cum Public Transport Facilities)" / 27 Towers / 8,984 Units / Commercial Podium / PR 7.6 / 290mPD / 1.650 Vehicle Parking / 24,257sq.m Private OS / 21,200 Public OS / MRT

Dear TPB Members,

2023 Policy Address *"As we have already identified enough land for housing, industry and other developments for the coming 30 years, **the Government has no plan for the time being to further use the "Green Belt" areas for large-scale development.**"*

Ha ha, but then does anyone take these pledges seriously?

As this plan is to facilitate the construction and financing of MRT it will sail through and the trashing of 2,500+ trees and the appropriation of an area intended to provide the growing community with a park area is collateral damage that the community has to suck up, one has to question why the supporting data was provided in a manner that made it inaccessible to many citizens.

I refer to the Attachments, all lumped together in one document of 1,617 pages. Re size as the download failed do not know how many KBs but certainly many hundreds.

On home lap top, the attachments took 8 mins to download but then crashed. Tried many times. Sent message to PlanD suggesting that there was still time to separate the various documents into smaller bites to enable Joe Public to access.

Was fobbed off with a save to pdf.

Tried to download at office – with a dozen IT staff a more sophisticated system than the home laptop. Download was quick but saving to pdf proved impossible. Crashed.

I had brought up this matter at OZP meeting on 29 August but OUR GOVERNMENT ALWAYS KNOWS BEST.

Reasonable suggestions put forward by members of the community are no longer tolerated.

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

**THIS IS NOT A LEGITIMATE PUBLIC CONSULTATION.**

With only the SKPSG chart and sparse data provided in the short MPC paper to go on:

*"The Proposed Development comprises the Main Site (about 45,400m<sup>2</sup>) and the Northern Site (about 18,400m<sup>2</sup>), which are Government land segregated by Po Lam Road (the Sites). The Main Site is a vegetated slope zoned "Green Belt" ("GB") to the east of Po Tat Estate and could be accessed via Po Lam Road. The Northern Site, accessible via On Yu Road, is situated on a formed platform zoned "Open Space" ("O") at the southern fringe of Anderson Road Quarry (ARQ) Development **reserved for provision of district open space.**"*

*"To compensate for **the loss of "O" zone of about 21,200m<sup>2</sup>** from rezoning the Northern Site, the Notional Scheme includes an equivalent reprovisioning of open space for public use"*

Open Space – The DOS is green wash and box ticking. The original planning intention was for a reasonable sized public park but this is now substituted with a series of mostly pocket sized plots with, apart from Children's Playground, will provide no active recreational facilities.

The substitute spaces are convenient only to people living on the new development area. The chances of residents of Po Tat and Anderson Quarry trekking all the way there to enjoy park facilities are low. Commuters using the station are unlikely to hang around. This is effectively local not district OS.

Drawing 14 is not clear, what does the darker shading represent?

WHY NO BIKE PARKING? Surely there should be a comprehensive bike grid as the area is all newly developed. The profile of the residents on the nearby PH estates will be younger and should be encouraged to get around the district by bike.

Fully support Kowloon Greenway R1 plan

*"We hope that the planning department will work with relevant government departments to establish a framework for pedestrian and bicycle connectivity for future MRT operators, landowners, and property developers through applicable instruments such as operating rights clauses, land leases, and dedicated legislative provisions."*

Strong objections to the lack of provision of community services at such a large development that would add 25,000 residents to the district.

*"To help meet the demand for GIC facilities, a 100-places CCC (1,060sq.m) and two 6- classroom kindergartens are included."*

This in a district with substantial deficits in many services. Even with the planned provisions, some of which may not materialize: SEE HKPSG

Child Care - 51%

Community Care - 41%

☐Urgent ☐Return receipt ☐Expand Group ☐Restricted ☐Prevent Copy  
RCHE - 41%

Residential Care Services - 34%

Community Rehabilitation Day Centre - 50%

District Support Centre for Persons with Disabilities – 50%

Mental Health Support - 100% not even listed despite the current crisis in that area

While the goal is to max out on the residential revenue, it is unconscionable that no effort is made to address the above.

**One of the 27 towers should be allocated to “GIC”use. The project should provide the same ratio of community services as a PH estate. This is GL.**

**5% of the residential GFA is 22,500sq.mts.**

In addition, there is the urgent need for Sports facilities. How can this be tolerated at a time that the administration has declared that its *‘aim to build a strong sporting culture, increase public participation, and elevate Hong Kong’s status in the international sports arena.’*

Sports Centres - 1 (0.6ha)

Sports Ground - 2 (3ha)

Swimming Pool - 1 (2ha)

This is not only a large site, but also the MRT will make it very convenient for both locals and outsiders to access community services and sports facilities.

While the focus is currently on the finances, **“the property development rights associated with the proposed topside development at the Station-cum-depot site would be the major funding support for the Project”**, as there will not be another site of this size available in the district, the long-term interests of the community should take precedence. Mistakes made in the past when short term expediency was allowed to prevail cannot be repeated.

Moreover, when it comes to vanity projects like the, fortunately now binned, \$700m Wanchai exhibition hall and the many patriotic and tourism projects currently under development, money is no object. But when it comes to essential community services fiscal prudence is trotted out. That \$450,000 was squandered on extending a section of pavement in Kennedy Town for the convenience of visitors is a telling example.

There is no information available on how much the many additional services required to handle the ever-increasing numbers of low-value visitors is costing. Nor is there any annual evaluation as to whether the end result is positive in fiscal terms.

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

The administration has a 5-year term, Legislative Council 4-years. It is therefore the duty of TPB members to consider the plan with a long-term vision and to ensure that this unique location is developed as a genuine 'town square'.

Fiscal priority should not be the defining factor in determining whether the plan in it's current form is in the best interests of the community.

Mary Mulvihill

---

**From:** tpbpd <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Friday, 3 October 2025 5:30 PM HKT  
**Subject:** Re: KWUN TONG NORTH OZP DENIAL OF ACCESS TO ATTACHMENT LINK

Dear Mary,

I refer to your emails dated 26.9.2025.

Please be advised that the file sizes of the documents uploaded to the Town Planning Board website would be optimised as much as possible to shorten the loading time. For your convenience, you may also download the relevant PDFs to the local drive in your computer for easier viewing.

As requested, the table regarding the Open Space and Major Government, Institution and Community Facilities in Kwun Tong District, found in Attachment VI of the Metro Planning Committee Paper No. 6/25 for Proposed Amendments to the Approved Kwun Tong (North) Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K14N/15, is extracted below for your reference.

*[See attachment "S\_K14N\_15\_Attachment VI of MPC Paper No. 6\_25.pdf"]*

Town Planning Board Secretariat

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 26, 2025 3:23 AM  
**To:** tpbpd/PLAND <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>  
**Subject:** Re: KWUN TONG NORTH OZP DENIAL OF ACCESS TO ATTACHMENT LINK

[https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/TPB/Minutes/m1344tpb\\_e.pdf](https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/TPB/Minutes/m1344tpb_e.pdf)

SEE ITEM 10 NOT ADDRESSED IN THE MINUTES

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

**From:** [REDACTED]

**To:** tpbpd <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>

**Date:** Friday, 26 September 2025 1:35 AM HKT

**Subject:** KWUN TONG NORTH OZP DENIAL OF ACCESS TO ATTACHMENT LINK

Dear Secretariat,

At a recent OZP meeting I requested that the attachment to the plans be divided into segments in order to make it easier for members of the public to work their way through the material.

The Kwun Tong OZP, deadline 8 Oct, is a good example of the problems we encounter when trying to understand the plans.

**1,600+ PAGES ON A SINGLE DOCUMENT, MANY PAGES OF DIFFERENT SIZES, FONTS AND FORMATS. TAKES TIME TO LOAD.**

This is impossible to access on a domestic lap top. I tried to open it on the office system, much more powerful. But that failed also, at a certain point it crashed and I got the sad face logo.

There is still time to rectify this and provide the material in an accessible format. If members of the public cannot access the information then this is not a legitimate public consultation.

In the meantime pls forward me the HKPSG table that I cannot download.

Regards

Mary