

就圖則作出申述

Representation Relating to Plan

Submission Number:  
TPB/R/S/K9/29-S107

參考編號  
Reference Number: 251111-152820-07020

提交限期  
Deadline for submission: 12/11/2025

提交日期及時間  
Date and time of submission: 11/11/2025 15:28:20

「申述人」全名  
Full Name of "Representer": 女士 Ms. LO WAI SHEUNG

「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/K9/29

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
A	反對 Oppose	<p>*交通運輸壓力加劇*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 道路擁堵惡化：紅磡土瓜灣小區發展已嚴重增加人口密度，再興建高密度私人住宅令現有道路遠超負荷，造成長期性擁堵。</li> <li>- 公共交通超負荷：現有巴士、地鐵等系統無法即時擴充，居民出行困難，降低生活質素。</li> <li>- 緊急服務延誤風險：交通阻塞會延誤消防、救護及警察等緊急服務，危害公共安全。</li> <li>- 基礎設施擴建成本高昂：為應對新增人口，政府需投入大量公帑改善交通設施，增加財政壓力，得不償失。</li> </ul> <p>*嚴重影響視覺與沿海景觀*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 遮擋公共海景資源：高樓阻擋海岸線，使原本享有海景的公眾空間、低層住宅和行人失去視野，變成「私人壟斷」。</li> <li>- 破壞城市天際線：高層建築突兀地出</li> </ul>

現在自然海岸線上，破壞原有的視覺和景觀協調。

- 影響文化與旅遊價值：海岸景觀常旅遊和地區文化資產，高樓林立削弱吸引力，影響本地經濟，與「東維港」發展背道而馳

**\*空氣流通大幅減弱\***

- 屏風效應：高樓如屏障般阻擋海風進入內陸，導致空氣不流通，形成悶熱、空氣污染積聚的環境。

- 加劇熱島效應：密集高樓吸熱並減少綠地，使區域氣溫上升，對長者、兒童和病患尤為不利。

- 損害整體城市通風廊道：沿海本是自然風的通道，高樓密集會阻隔整個城市的空氣流動路徑，影響範圍不止於沿海。

**\*破壞城市綠化空間\***

- 減少社區綠地：高密度住宅犧牲公園、開放空間，降低居民生活質素與心理健康。

**\*整體環境與可持續發展風險\***

- 加劇氣候變遷風險暴露：沿海地區本身易受海平面上升、風暴潮及颱風影響，高密度住宅將置更多人於高風險地帶。

- 建築施工期間污染嚴重：施工期會製造大量噪音、粉塵、建築廢料，影響居民與海洋生態。

- 與可持續城市發展背道而馳：現代城市規劃強調低碳、綠化，高密度開發與此目標相違。

總括而言，於紅磡土瓜灣小區發展之上再增加高密度私人住宅，對當區人口密度、交通、環境、居民、尤其附近學校的學生的身體健康造成長遠及不可逆轉的嚴重影響。此外在珍貴的沿海資源上興建高密度私人住宅，會嚴重削弱對公眾及遊客的吸引力，與東維港發展計劃背道而馳，最終對香港可持續經濟發展造成負面影響。

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.**

--

**就圖則作出申述**  
**Representation Relating to Plan**

參考編號  
**Reference Number:** 251111-181345-18557

Submission Number:  
TPB/R/S/K9/29-S108

提交限期  
**Deadline for submission:** 12/11/2025

提交日期及時間  
**Date and time of submission:** 11/11/2025 18:13:45

「申述人」全名  
**Full Name of "Representer":** 女士 Ms. Chong chun heung

「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/K9/29

**申述詳情**  
**Details of the Representation:**

<b>有關事項</b> <b>Subject Matters</b>	<b>你支持還是反對有關事項?</b> <b>Are you supporting or opposing the subject matter?</b>	<b>理由</b> <b>Reason</b>
A	反對 Oppose	屏風樓，影響對流

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.**

**就圖則作出申述**  
**Representation Relating to Plan**

Submission Number:  
 TPB/R/S/K9/29-S109

參考編號  
**Reference Number:** 251111-202922-34443

提交限期  
**Deadline for submission:** 12/11/2025

提交日期及時間  
**Date and time of submission:** 11/11/2025 20:29:22

「申述人」全名  
**Full Name of "Representer":** 先生 Mr. Tang chun kit

「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/K9/29

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
A	反對 Oppose	<p><b>**交通運輸壓力加劇**</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 道路擁堵惡化：紅磡土瓜灣小區發展已嚴重增加人口密度，再興建高密度私人住宅令現有道路遠超負荷，造成長期性擁堵。</li> <li>- 公共交通超負荷：現有巴士、地鐵等系統無法即時擴充，居民出行困難，降低生活質素。</li> <li>- 緊急服務延誤風險：交通阻塞會延誤消防、救護及警察等緊急服務，危害公共安全。</li> <li>- 基礎設施擴建成本高昂：為應對新增人口，政府需投入大量公帑改善交通設施，增加財政壓力，得不償失。</li> </ul> <p><b>**嚴重影響視覺與沿海景觀**</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 遮擋公共海景資源：高樓阻擋海岸線，使原本享有海景的公眾空間、低層住宅和行人失去視野，變成「私人壟斷」。</li> <li>- 破壞城市天際線：高層建築突兀地出</li> </ul>

現在自然海岸線上，破壞原有的視覺和景觀協調。

- 影響文化與旅遊價值：海岸景觀常旅遊和地區文化資產，高樓林立削弱吸引力，影響本地經濟，與「東維港」發展背道而馳

**\*\*空氣流通大幅減弱\*\***

- 屏風效應：高樓如屏障般阻擋海風進入內陸，導致空氣不流通，形成悶熱、空氣污染積聚的環境。

- 加劇熱島效應：密集高樓吸熱並減少綠地，使區域氣溫上升，對長者、兒童和病患尤為不利。

- 損害整體城市通風廊道：沿海本是自然風的通道，高樓密集會阻隔整個城市的空氣流動路徑，影響範圍不止於沿海。

**\*\*破壞城市綠化空間\*\***

- 減少社區綠地：高密度住宅犧牲公園、開放空間，降低居民生活質素與心理健康。

**\*\*整體環境與可持續發展風險\*\***

- 加劇氣候變遷風險暴露：沿海地區本身易受海平面上升、風暴潮及颱風影響，高密度住宅將置更多人於高風險地帶。

- 建築施工期間污染嚴重：施工期會製造大量噪音、粉塵、建築廢料，影響居民與海洋生態。

- 與可持續城市發展背道而馳：現代城市規劃強調低碳、綠化，高密度開發與此目標相違。

總括而言，於紅磡土瓜灣小區發展之上再增加高密度私人住宅，對當區人口密度、交通、環境、居民、尤其附近學校的學生的身體健康造成長遠及不可逆轉的嚴重影響。此外在珍貴的沿海資源上興建高密度私人住宅，會嚴重削弱對公眾及遊客的吸引力，與東維港發展計劃背道而馳，最終對香港可持續經濟發展造成負面影響。

B

反對 Oppose

**\*\*交通運輸壓力加劇\*\***

- 道路擁堵惡化：紅磡土瓜灣小區發展已嚴重增加人口密度，再興建高密度私人住宅令現有道路遠超負荷，造成長期性擁堵。

- 公共交通超負荷：現有巴士、地鐵等

系統無法即時擴充，居民出行困難，降低生活質素。

- 緊急服務延誤風險：交通阻塞會延誤消防、救護及警察等緊急服務，危害公共安全。

- 基礎設施擴建成本高昂：為應對新增人口，政府需投入大量公帑改善交通設施，增加財政壓力，得不償失。

**\*\*嚴重影響視覺與沿海景觀\*\***

- 遮擋公共海景資源：高樓阻擋海岸線，使原本享有海景的公眾空間、低層住宅和行人失去視野，變成「私人壟斷」。

- 破壞城市天際線：高層建築突兀地出現在自然海岸線上，破壞原有的視覺和景觀協調。

- 影響文化與旅遊價值：海岸景觀常旅遊和地區文化資產，高樓林立削弱吸引力，影響本地經濟，與「東維港」發展背道而馳

**\*\*空氣流通大幅減弱\*\***

- 屏風效應：高樓如屏障般阻擋海風進入內陸，導致空氣不流通，形成悶熱、空氣污染積聚的環境。

- 加劇熱島效應：密集高樓吸熱並減少綠地，使區域氣溫上升，對長者、兒童和病患尤為不利。

- 損害整體城市通風廊道：沿海本是自然風的通道，高樓密集會阻隔整個城市的空氣流動路徑，影響範圍不止於沿海。

**\*\*破壞城市綠化空間\*\***

- 減少社區綠地：高密度住宅犧牲公園、開放空間，降低居民生活質素與心理健康。

**\*\*整體環境與可持續發展風險\*\***

- 加劇氣候變遷風險暴露：沿海地區本身易受海平面上升、風暴潮及颱風影響，高密度住宅將置更多人於高風險地帶。

- 建築施工期間污染嚴重：施工期會製造大量噪音、粉塵、建築廢料，影響居民與海洋生態。

- 與可持續城市發展背道而馳：現代城市規劃強調低碳、綠化，高密度開發

	<p>與此目標相違。</p> <p>總括而言，於紅磡土瓜灣小區發展之上再增加高密度私人住宅，對當區人口密度、交通、環境、居民、尤其附近學校的學生的身體健康造成長遠及不可逆轉的嚴重影響。此外在珍貴的沿海資源上興建高密度私人住宅，會嚴重削弱對公眾及遊客的吸引力，與東維港發展計劃背道而馳，最終對香港可持續經濟發展造成負面影響。</p>
C	<p>反對 Oppose</p> <p><b>**交通運輸壓力加劇**</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 道路擁堵惡化：紅磡土瓜灣小區發展已嚴重增加人口密度，再興建高密度私人住宅令現有道路遠超負荷，造成長期性擁堵。</li> <li>- 公共交通超負荷：現有巴士、地鐵等系統無法即時擴充，居民出行困難，降低生活質素。</li> <li>- 緊急服務延誤風險：交通阻塞會延誤消防、救護及警察等緊急服務，危害公共安全。</li> <li>- 基礎設施擴建成本高昂：為應對新增人口，政府需投入大量公帑改善交通設施，增加財政壓力，得不償失。</li> </ul> <p><b>**嚴重影響視覺與沿海景觀**</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 遮擋公共海景資源：高樓阻擋海岸線，使原本享有海景的公眾空間、低層住宅和行人失去視野，變成「私人壟斷」。</li> <li>- 破壞城市天際線：高層建築突兀地出現在自然海岸線上，破壞原有的視覺和景觀協調。</li> <li>- 影響文化與旅遊價值：海岸景觀常旅遊和地區文化資產，高樓林立削弱吸引力，影響本地經濟，與「東維港」發展背道而馳</li> </ul> <p><b>**空氣流通大幅減弱**</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 屏風效應：高樓如屏障般阻擋海風進入內陸，導致空氣不流通，形成悶熱、空氣污染積聚的環境。</li> <li>- 加劇熱島效應：密集高樓吸熱並減少綠地，使區域氣溫上升，對長者、兒童和病患尤為不利。</li> <li>- 損害整體城市通風廊道：沿海本是自然風的通道，高樓密集會阻隔整個城市的空氣流動路徑，影響範圍不止於沿海。</li> </ul>

**\*\*破壞城市綠化空間\*\***

- 減少社區綠地：高密度住宅犧牲公園、開放空間，降低居民生活質素與心理健康。

**\*\*整體環境與可持續發展風險\*\***

- 加劇氣候變遷風險暴露：沿海地區本身易受海平面上升、風暴潮及颱風影響，高密度住宅將置更多人於高風險地帶。

- 建築施工期間污染嚴重：施工期會製造大量噪音、粉塵、建築廢料，影響居民與海洋生態。

- 與可持續城市發展背道而馳：現代城市規劃強調低碳、綠化，高密度開發與此目標相違。

總括而言，於紅磡土瓜灣小區發展之上再增加高密度私人住宅，對當區人口密度、交通、環境、居民、尤其附近學校的學生的身體健康造成長遠及不可逆轉的嚴重影響。此外在珍貴的沿海資源上興建高密度私人住宅，會嚴重削弱對公眾及遊客的吸引力，與東維港發展計劃背道而馳，最終對香港可持續經濟發展造成負面影響。

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.**

--



**就圖則作出申述**  
**Representation Relating to Plan**

Submission Number:  
 TPB/R/S/K9/29-S110

參考編號  
 Reference Number: 251111-223234-59252

提交限期  
 Deadline for submission: 12/11/2025

提交日期及時間  
 Date and time of submission: 11/11/2025 22:32:34

「申述人」全名  
 Full Name of "Representer": 女士 Ms. ting pui lam

「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/K9/29

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
A	反對 Oppose	<p><b>**交通運輸壓力加劇**</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 道路擁堵惡化：紅磡土瓜灣小區發展已嚴重增加人口密度，再興建高密度私人住宅令現有道路遠超負荷，造成長期性擁堵。</li> <li>- 公共交通超負荷：現有巴士、地鐵等系統無法即時擴充，居民出行困難，降低生活質素。</li> <li>- 緊急服務延誤風險：交通阻塞會延誤消防、救護及警察等緊急服務，危害公共安全。</li> <li>- 基礎設施擴建成本高昂：為應對新增人口，政府需投入大量公帑改善交通設施，增加財政壓力，得不償失。</li> </ul> <p><b>**嚴重影響視覺與沿海景觀**</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 遮擋公共海景資源：高樓阻擋海岸線，使原本享有海景的公眾空間、低層住宅和行人失去視野，變成「私人壟斷」。</li> <li>- 破壞城市天際線：高層建築突兀地出</li> </ul>

現在自然海岸線上，破壞原有的視覺和景觀協調。

- 影響文化與旅遊價值：海岸景觀常旅遊和地區文化資產，高樓林立削弱吸引力，影響本地經濟，與「東維港」發展背道而馳

**\*\*空氣流通大幅減弱\*\***

- 屏風效應：高樓如屏障般阻擋海風進入內陸，導致空氣不流通，形成悶熱、空氣污染積聚的環境。

- 加劇熱島效應：密集高樓吸熱並減少綠地，使區域氣溫上升，對長者、兒童和病患尤為不利。

- 損害整體城市通風廊道：沿海本是自然風的通道，高樓密集會阻隔整個城市的空氣流動路徑，影響範圍不止於沿海。

**\*\*破壞城市綠化空間\*\***

- 減少社區綠地：高密度住宅犧牲公園、開放空間，降低居民生活質素與心理健康。

**\*\*整體環境與可持續發展風險\*\***

- 加劇氣候變遷風險暴露：沿海地區本身易受海平面上升、風暴潮及颱風影響，高密度住宅將置更多人於高風險地帶。

- 建築施工期間污染嚴重：施工期會製造大量噪音、粉塵、建築廢料，影響居民與海洋生態。

- 與可持續城市發展背道而馳：現代城市規劃強調低碳、綠化，高密度開發與此目標相違。

總括而言，於紅磡土瓜灣小區發展之上再增加高密度私人住宅，對當區人口密度、交通、環境、居民、尤其附近學校的學生的身體健康造成長遠及不可逆轉的嚴重影響。此外在珍貴的沿海資源上興建高密度私人住宅，會嚴重削弱對公眾及遊客的吸引力，與東維港發展計劃背道而馳，最終對香港可持續經濟發展造成負面影響。

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.**

--

**就圖則作出申述****Representation Relating to Plan**Submission Number:  
TPB/R/S/K9/29-S111

參考編號  
Reference Number: 251111-225319-66994

提交限期  
Deadline for submission: 12/11/2025

提交日期及時間  
Date and time of submission: 11/11/2025 22:53:19

「申述人」全名  
Full Name of "Representer": 女士 Ms. LEE KA LAI

「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/K9/29

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
A	反對 Oppose	<p>反對《紅磡分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/K9/28》擬議修訂——將庇利街地段改劃為住宅用途</p> <p>本人對城市規劃委員會擬將紅磡庇利街地段由「政府、機構或社區」地帶改劃為「住宅（甲類）9」地帶，以供市區重建局興建私人住宅項目，表示強烈反對。反對理由如下：</p> <p>一、削弱社區公共設施供應 該地段原為教育局預留作學校用途，雖因人口結構改變而未有落實，但仍屬珍貴的社區用地。改作私人住宅將永久失去為社區提供公共設施的機會，影響長遠社區發展。</p> <p>二、加劇交通擠塞與基建負荷 庇利街鄰近多條主要幹道，新增逾千個住宅單位將進一步加重交通壓力，對現有道路、公共交通及基建造成負擔。以區內食肆招待旅行團為例，旅遊巴士泊滿街道，旅行團穿梭庇利街購物，經常阻礙道路使用者，嚴重影響居民生活。</p>

三、缺乏透明諮詢與民意參與  
項目未有充分諮詢區內居民及持份者，公眾對項目詳情、規模、影響等資訊掌握不足，違反良好規劃程序應有的透明度與參與性。

四、破壞海濱城市景觀與空間  
庇利街地段鄰近海濱，興建高密度住宅將遮擋視野、影響通風及光線，削弱市民享有開放空間的權利，明顯違背發展東維港海濱計劃，亦不利於打造宜居社區。

五、未有配套社區設施及綠化空間  
項目未見有足夠社區設施（如學校、診所、康樂設施）及綠化空間配套，將導致居民生活質素下降，與可持續發展原則背道而馳。

基於以上理由，懇請城市規劃委員會拒絕該項目修訂申請，保留庇利街地段作社區用途，並重新檢視該地段的規劃方向，以回應市民需要及促進社區福祉。

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.**

--

**就圖則作出申述****Representation Relating to Plan**Submission Number:  
TPB/R/S/K9/29-S112參考編號  
Reference Number: 251112-092046-66663提交限期  
Deadline for submission: 12/11/2025提交日期及時間  
Date and time of submission: 12/11/2025 09:20:46「申述人」全名  
Full Name of "Representer": 女士 Ms. Chung Kim Ha「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/K9/29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
A	反對 Oppose	可綠化或改建現有停車場，增加休憩空間及使用率。但不宜興建住宅和商業樓宇，一來屏風樓，二來交通配套不足。

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.

--

**就圖則作出申述**  
**Representation Relating to Plan**

Submission Number:  
 TPB/R/S/K9/29-S113

參考編號  
**Reference Number:** 251112-111618-48387

提交限期  
**Deadline for submission:** 12/11/2025

提交日期及時間  
**Date and time of submission:** 12/11/2025 11:16:18

「申述人」全名  
**Full Name of "Representer":** 先生 Mr. HUI KWOK CHUEN

「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/K9/29

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
A	反對 Oppose	<p>反對庇利街用地改作住宅用途，建議應該維持原本的低密度建築，同時將海濱及政府用地還給市民，為社區提供更好的生活環境和公共空間。</p> <p>從西九文化區的規劃項目來看，該區海邊用地僅以2.08倍的地積比發展住宅項目，這顯示出合理的密度和良好的生活質素。與此相比，鰂魚涌海裕街的臨海地皮擬以總地積比率4.63倍發展，用地密度仍在可接受範圍內。然而，庇利街海邊用地卻計劃用盡9倍地積比發展住宅，這樣的高密度開發明顯違反了階梯式建築的前低後高概念，樓高達110米，卻比後排的樓還要高，這將對整個社區造成嚴重的視覺影響和生活質素的下降。</p> <p>除了規劃密度問題，現有的修訂方案還存在許多重大問題。這種設計完全是屏風樓，不僅影響日光照射，還會加劇熱島效應。高樓大廈堆疊在一起，將使周圍的環境變得更加悶熱。更令人擔憂的是，15米的通風走廊被認為是改善風流的措施，但事實上這</p>

樣的設計完全不足以有效改善居住環境的通風條件。居民在這樣的環境中生活，無法獲得必要的空氣流通和陽光照射，生活質量必然大打折扣。

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.**

對庇利街用地擬議修訂的修訂方案

保持低密度建築：建議將庇利街海邊用地的地積比限制在低密度範圍內（原規劃為8層高大廈），以維持社區的生活質素和可持續性。

規劃前低後高建築：遵循階梯式建築設計理念，確保前方建築較低，後方建築較高，以減少對周圍環境的視覺擠壓，並提升陽光和空氣流通。

改善通風設計：重新評估通風走廊的設計，因為15米寬度完全不足夠。建議增加通風走廊的寬度，以確保居民能夠獲得足夠的空氣流通，減少熱島效應。

**就圖則作出申述****Representation Relating to Plan**Submission Number:  
TPB/R/S/K9/29-S114

參考編號  
**Reference Number:** 251112-125144-66434

提交限期  
**Deadline for submission:** 12/11/2025

提交日期及時間  
**Date and time of submission:** 12/11/2025 12:51:44

「申述人」全名  
**Full Name of "Representer":** 先生 Mr. yip yun pang

「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/K9/29

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
A	反對 Oppose	理應持原定規劃，興建政府設施或學校等社區公共設施。若按當前規劃興建新樓宇，屏風樓，造成熱島效應，對附近居民造成大大影響

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.**



**就圖則作出申述**  
**Representation Relating to Plan**

Submission Number:  
TPB/R/S/K9/29-S115

參考編號  
**Reference Number:** 251112-144955-38960

提交限期  
**Deadline for submission:** 12/11/2025

提交日期及時間  
**Date and time of submission:** 12/11/2025 14:49:55

「申述人」全名  
**Full Name of "Representer":** 先生 Mr. Cheung Kin Chung

「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/K9/29

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
A項	支持 Support	支持城規會修訂紅磡分區計劃大綱圖，希望庇利街用地改劃後，促使市建局落實項目，提供多元化活動空間、帶動人流和配合構建「東維港灣區」。

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.**

Urgent Return receipt Expand Group Restricted Prevent Copy

**tpbpd/PLAND**

---

寄件者: [REDACTED]  
寄件日期: 2025年11月12日星期三 3:54  
收件者: tpbpd/PLAND  
主旨: AMENDMENTS TO THE HUNG HOM OZP NO. S/K9/28  
類別: Internet Email

Submission Number: TPB/R/S/K9/29-S116
------------------------------------------

**AMENDMENTS TO THE HUNG HOM OZP NO. S/K9/28 / URA BAILEY STREET / CHI KIANG STREET PROJECT**

Dear TPB Members,

**Item A** – 0.76ha. Rezoning of a site at the junction of Bailey Street and Chi Kiang Street from “G/IC” and “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Sewage Treatment Plant” to “Res (Group A)9 with BHR

2 Towers – 1,218 Units / PR 9 / 110mPD / 3,100sq.m -100-place RCHE cum 30-place day care unit / OS 2,924sq.m + 760 POS / 354 Vehicle Parking / 15 Coach Parking

**STRONG OBJECTIONS**

So, because the URA manages to lose money on its development projects yet another site intended for community use is to be gifted to it at a nominal land premium. In comparison our property developers, apart from a few cases when dramatic changes in the economy were not anticipated, manage to reap healthy profits.

But instead of launching an investigation into why the URA fails where private developers succeed, the administration approves the take over of public parks, recreational facilities and sites designated for community use.

In this case a site designated for educational facilities.

This at a time that our universities are scrambling to find sites to accommodate their expansion plans as the same administration is pushing HK as an education HUB. Clearly the site could and should be used to address the shortfall in land available for this purpose?

The Site is located near the harbourfront and surrounded by a cluster of “G/IC” zones with building height restrictions (BHR) ranging from 3 to 10 storeys

The images show that the proposed wall effect on the water front would have a strong negative visual impact from a number of angles. Moreover, no image has been provided of the most profound effect, that from Bailey Street. Members should check out Plan 4a and then visualize that it would look like with a 110sq.m wall inserted into the current low-rise panorama.

The wall effect would block natural light and ventilation to the schools behind and their recreational facilities.

Urgent Return receipt Expand Group Restricted Prevent Copy

In addition, the proposed height makes a mockery of the stepped height concept that is supposed to underpin the planning provisions for harbour front locations. That it is government led developments that continually apply for greater than the permitted heights underline the 'Do as I say, not as I do' policies that effectively undermine the intention of the OZP process.

A low-rise educational focus development would be compatible with the both the original planning intention for the area and preserve the benefits to the community of the waterfront location.

Note no provision for bicycle parking when the aspiration of the community is that in time it will be possible to bike along the waterfront.

As usual URA and/or its consultants have generated supporting comments, R8 – R25. It is high time that members question the validity of these representations. They never indicate or quote that they are residents of local developments, unlike the opposing representations. The construction of the remarks is brief and similar.

Note in contrast the diversity of the opinions expressed by R27 73 Upper East residents – only 2 in support.

I ran the comments through Google Translate and support particularly the following:

“Regarding the proposed conversion of the original community facilities site on Dee Lee Street for residential use, my opinion is as follows:

1. With the redevelopment of To Kwa Wan, new workshops will be added in the coming years, and the population of residents of all ages will inevitably increase. To Kwa Wan is currently lacking recreational and sports facilities. Looking at the area near the Wing Kwong Street redevelopment zone, there are only two recreational facilities: the small park opposite McDonald's and Hoi Shan Park. During after-school hours, Saturdays, and Sundays, the playgrounds are packed with children, almost all of whom are young. Even older residents find it difficult to find a seat. Therefore, given the anticipated increase in population in the Wing Kwong Street redevelopment zone, recreational and children's play facilities will face a severe shortage. The land is close to the waterfront promenade. With careful consideration, it could be used to expand the promenade and the Hoi Shan Park, increasing recreational facilities and children's play areas. Further, it could be used to create a seaside promenade and Hoi Shan Park, enhancing the living environment and happiness of residents. Moreover, it could become a new landmark attracting tourists.
2. Currently, Kowloon City only has four indoor sports venues. However, To Kwa Wan and Hung Hom are densely populated with numerous schools, and only two indoor sports venues are open to the public. Competition among sports enthusiasts and school teams makes booking extremely difficult. Furthermore, the prospect of opening indoor venues to the public further exacerbates the competition, making bookings even more challenging for residents and students. Adding to this, rumours suggest that the To Kwa Wan Sports Centre may be converted into a fencing venue, making bookings even more difficult. Looking at the nearby Wong Tai Sin district... There are 7 and 9 sports venues in Kwun Tong District respectively. Therefore, building another large indoor sports stadium on "this land" is not an excessive idea. If it includes a permanent fencing stadium, returning the To Kwa Wan Sports Centre to the general public would be an excellent choice.

Urgent Return receipt Expand Group Restricted Prevent Copy

3. As for environmental planning, harmony with the surrounding buildings is essential. This land is close to the waterfront promenade. Buildings of 23 stories or more would inevitably disrupt the harmony of the surrounding area, creating a wind effect that would negatively impact the air circulation in the densely populated Ma Tau Wai Road area, severely affecting the quality of life of residents. Based on the above points, I do not believe that changing the "use" of this land is the best choice for residential purposes. The use of "this land" should be prioritized. The land is intended for the construction of community facilities in To Kwa Wan and Hung Hom that are currently and foreseeably lacking in the future. If the Chief Executive only seeks for the URA to use land designated for rare or unique community facilities in To Kwa Wan and Hung Hom, thereby depriving residents of their due welfare and reducing the overall financial situation, he should prioritize selecting a plot of existing residential land in any area, rather than choosing a plot of land designated for recreational use. The Chief Executive should dedicate this land in the best possible way to improve the quality of life and well-being of the general public."

In addition, another representative took the time to conduct a Data Analysis Report on Public Opinion on the Conversion of Bailey Street Land to Residential Use

400 interviewed

"Regarding public opinion, data shows that a staggering 94.5% of residents explicitly oppose any changes to their neighbourhood, primarily concerned about a deteriorating living environment and increasing traffic congestion.

Some citizens hope that the land on Pili Street will be converted into public facilities, including parks, construction facilities, and sports fields. The facilities are primarily intended to serve affected residents, such as those in Bailey Garden, Ronghui Garden, and the surrounding core areas of Upper East.

Members have a duty to consider the views of legitimate residents with an understanding of local conditions.

Decisions re land use that will impact the community for decades to come should not be based on the finances of the URA.

**Item B** – 0.32ha. Rezoning of a site abutting the waterfront at Bailey Street from "G/IC" and "OU(STP)" to "Open Space". Extension of Hoi Shan Park.

SUPPORT

**Item C** – Rezoning of a site to the north of Sung Ping Street from "OU(STP)" to "G/IC" with stipulation of BHR. To reflect the as-built To Kwa Wan Pigging Station

DO NOT SEE ANY NEED TO REZONE AS 'OU' AS THIS IS EFFECTIVELY A SERVICE FACILITY LIKE THE SEWERAGE PLANT

Mary Mulvihill  
[REDACTED]