

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

From: Joyce Leung <[REDACTED]>  
Sent: 2025-05-27 星期二 20:04:20  
To: tpbpd/PLAND <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>  
Subject: 大埔分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/TP/31 公眾諮詢  
Attachment: 反對土地共享先導計劃申請編號 LSPS\_001 : .docx

**Submission Number:**

**TPB/R/S/TP/31- S1022**

致：城市規劃委員會

## 反對

「土地共享先導計劃申請編 LSPS/001 位於  
大埔露輝路及汀角路的擬議房屋發展計劃」  
選址：Site A – 汀角路/露輝路（約 1290 個單位）  
Site B – 汀角路/雅景花園（約 460 個單位）

本人 LEUNG SHUK YEE，本人得悉 貴會現就《大埔分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/TP/31》作公眾諮詢。本人對於當中的「土地共享先導計劃申請編號 LSPS/001 位於大埔露輝路及汀角路的擬議房屋發展計劃」表示強烈反對，理由如下：

- 1) 按現時土地共享先導計劃中位於大埔露輝路的公營房屋（Site A）的初步規劃草圖，其屋邨的車輛出入口均設於露輝路。現時，在早上及黃昏的繁忙時間，汀角路及露輝路已經常出現嚴重的交通擠塞。日後，如位於大埔露輝路的公營房屋建成，會有不少居民使用公共交通工具或自駕經露輝路進出新落成公屋，屆時必定會大大加重露輝路的交通壓力，一旦在繁忙時間如車輛未能順暢進出該公營房屋，必定會導致車輛需於露輝路等候進出，從而令露輝路及汀角路大擠塞，除影響露輝路上各屋苑的居民外，亦會影響到汀角路一帶二十多條鄉村、數千位村民的出入。露輝路的屋苑以低密度的發展為主，現時擬興建的大埔露輝路的公營房屋其樓宇高度為不高於主水平基準上 83 米，估計落成的公營房屋樓高約有 20 多層，這會大大破壞現時露輝路的景觀，及容易造成屏風樓效應，除影響露輝路的屋苑現有景觀，亦可能導致空氣不流通。
- 2) 按現時的初步規劃草圖，擬建的公營房屋單位數為 1,290 個，但該屋邨只提供約 160 多個泊車位，車位的數量嚴重不足。根據過往經驗，新屋邨的入伙必定會導致附近的違泊問題加劇，以富蝶邨二期入伙為例，當入伙之後，由於泊車位未能滿足居民需要，不少居民將車違泊到附近的頌雅路，導致現時頌雅路現時的違泊情況嚴重，即使警方加強執法亦未能改善情況。相信露輝路的情況亦一樣，如新入伙的公營房屋車位不足，該邨居民亦會將大量的車輛違泊到露輝路或露屏路一帶，嚴重影響交通。
- 3) 現時，露輝路一帶的公共交通服務已十分不足，巴士、小巴等服務已不足應付現時的需求，一旦有新增的交通需求，只會令露輝路公共交通服務不足的情況雪上加霜。在 Site B 旁有屬於船灣多條原居民鄉村的葬區/墓地，在此發展私人房屋，住者不安，逝者受擾，逝者的後人強烈反對申請編號 LSPS/001。

其他理由：-

這個計劃將會令汀角路一帶造成嚴重交通擠塞，現在汀角路擴闊的可行性不高，現在汀角路三公里由吐露港入口至比華利山屋苑，已經有十多盞紅綠燈，在新界地區來計算這道路已經表示已經非常繁忙，令外計劃興建的屋苑出入口設在路輝路，而露輝路屬於一條下坡的道路，如果發生意

外整條道路或會封閉，會造成露輝路五個屋苑居民出入嚴重影響，另有教育大學返學及放學時間露輝路已經非常繁忙，我們不是反對政府解決房屋問題，只希望政府也考慮興建高密度住宅，交通配套對本區居民的影響！

基於以上所述原因，本人認為上述選址不適合作為公營房屋發展，本人反對「土地共享先導計劃申請編號 LSPS/001 位於大埔汀角路/露輝路及汀角路/雅景花園的擬議房屋發展計劃」，希望 貴會委員能考慮本人疑慮，反對上述的發展計劃。

姓名全名：LEUNG SHUK YEE

香港身份證（首 4 個字母數字）：

簽名：梁淑儀

地址：

或聯絡電話：

或聯絡電郵：

2025 年 5 月 27 日

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

From: joyce joyce [REDACTED]  
Sent: 2025-05-27 星期二 20:16:04  
To: tpbpd/PLAND <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>  
Subject:  
Attachment: 反對土地共享先導計劃申請編號 LSPS\_001 : .docx

<b>Submission Number:</b> TPB/R/S/TP/31- S1023
---



致：城市規劃委員會

## 反對

「土地共享先導計劃申請編號 LSPS/001 位於  
大埔露輝路及汀角路的擬議房屋發展計劃」  
選址：Site A – 汀角路/露輝路（約 1290 個單位）  
Site B – 汀角路/雅景花園（約 460 個單位）

本人 PANG KIN WING，本人得悉 貴會現就《大埔分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/TP/31》作公眾諮詢。本人對於當中的「土地共享先導計劃申請編號 LSPS/001 位於大埔露輝路及汀角路的擬議房屋發展計劃」表示強烈反對，理由如下：

- 1) 按現時土地共享先導計劃中位於大埔露輝路的公營房屋（Site A）的初步規劃草圖，其屋邨的車輛出入口均設於露輝路。現時，在早上及黃昏的繁忙時間，汀角路及露輝路已經常出現嚴重的交通擠塞。日後，如位於大埔露輝路的公營房屋建成，會有不少居民使用公共交通工具或自駕經露輝路進出新落成公屋，屆時必定會大大加重露輝路的交通壓力，一旦在繁忙時間如車輛未能順暢進出該公營房屋，必定會導致車輛需於露輝路等候進出，從而令露輝路及汀角路大擠塞，除影響露輝路上各屋苑的居民外，亦會影響到汀角路一帶二十多條鄉村、數千位村民的出入。露輝路的屋苑以低密度的發展為主，現時擬興建的大埔露輝路的公營房屋其樓宇高度為不高於主水平基準上 83 米，估計落成的公營房屋樓高約有 20 多層，這會大大破壞現時露輝路的景觀，及容易造成屏風樓效應，除影響露輝路的屋苑現有景觀，亦可能導致空氣不流通。
- 2) 按現時的初步規劃草圖，擬建的公營房屋單位數為 1,290 個，但該屋邨只提供約 160 多個泊車位，車位的數量嚴重不足。根據過往經驗，新屋邨的入伙必定會導致附近的違泊問題加劇，以富蝶邨二期入伙為例，當入伙之後，由於泊車位未能滿足居民需要，不少居民將車違泊到附近的頌雅路，導致現時頌雅路現時的違泊情況嚴重，即使警方加強執法亦未能改善情況。相信露輝路的情況亦一樣，如新入伙的公營房屋車位不足，該邨居民亦會將大量的車輛違泊到露輝路或露屏路一帶，嚴重影響交通。
- 3) 現時，露輝路一帶的公共交通服務已十分不足，巴士、小巴等服務已不足應付現時的需求，一旦有新增的交通需求，只會令露輝路公共交通服務不足的情況雪上加霜。在 Site B 旁有屬於船灣多條原居民鄉村的葬區/墓地，在此發展私人房屋，住者不安，逝者受擾，逝者的後人強烈反對申請編號 LSPS/001。

其他理由：-

這個計劃將會令汀角路一帶造成嚴重交通擠塞，現在汀角路擴闊的可行性不高，現在汀角路三公里由吐露港入口至比華利山屋苑，已經有十多盞紅綠燈，表示已經非常繁忙，令外計劃興建的屋苑出入口設在露輝路，而露輝路屬於一條下坡的道路，會造成露輝路五個屋苑居民出入嚴重交通

繁忙的影響，另有教育大學返學及放學時間露輝路已經非常繁忙！我們不是反對政府解決房屋問題，只希望政府也考慮興建高密度住宅，交通配套對本區居民出入的影響！

基於以上所述原因，本人認為上述選址不適合作為公營房屋發展，本人反對「土地共享先導計劃申請編號 LSPS/001 位於大埔汀角路/露輝路及汀角路/雅景花園的擬議房屋發展計劃」，希望 貴會委員能考慮本人疑慮，反對上述的發展計劃。

姓名全名：PANG KIN WING

香港身份證（首 4 個字母數字）

簽名：彭健榮

地址：

或聯絡電話

或聯絡電郵

2025 年 5 月 27 日

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

**From:** Philip chun [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 2025-05-28 星期三 11:33:54  
**To:** tpbpd/PLAND <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>  
**Subject:** 大埔露輝路擬議房屋發展計劃 LSPS/001 意見  
**Attachment:** IMG\_0604.jpeg; IMG\_0605.jpeg; IMG\_0603.jpeg

致：城規會各委員

附上有關「土地共享先導計劃 LSPS/001 位於大埔露輝路及汀角路的擬議房屋發展計劃」意見。

如果收悉，請覆，謝謝！

Philip Chun

**Submission Number:**  
**TPB/R/S/TP/31- S1024**



For Official Use Only 請勿填寫此欄	Reference No. 檔案編號	
	Date Received 收到日期	

- The further representation should be made to the Town Planning Board (the Board) before the expiry of the specified plan exhibition period. The completed form and supporting documents (if any) should be sent to the Secretary, Town Planning Board, 15/F, North Point Government Offices, 333 Java Road, North Point, Hong Kong.  
進一步申述必須於指定的圖則展示期限屆滿前向城市規劃委員會（下稱「委員會」）提出，填妥的表格及支持有關進一步申述的文件（倘有），必須送交香港北角道第 333 號北角政府合署 15 樓城市規劃委員會秘書收。
- Please read the "Town Planning Board Guidelines on Submission and Processing of Representations and Further Representations" before you fill in this form. The Guidelines can be obtained from the Secretariat of the Board (15/F., North Point Government Offices, 333 Java Road, North Point, Hong Kong - Tel.: 2231 4810 or 2231 4835) and the Planning Enquiry Counters (PECs) of the Planning Department (Hotline: 2231 5000) (17/F., North Point Government Offices, 333 Java Road, North Point, Hong Kong and 14/F., Sha Tin Government Offices, 1 Sheung Wo Che Road, Sha Tin, New Territories), or downloaded from the Board's website at <http://www.tpb.gov.hk/>.  
填寫此表格之前，請先細閱有關「根據城市規劃條例提交及處理申述及進一步申述」的城市規劃委員會規劃指引。這份指引可向委員會秘書處（香港北角道第 333 號北角政府合署 15 樓，電話：2231 4810 或 2231 4835 及規劃署的規劃資料查詢處（熱線：2231 5000）（香港北角道第 333 號北角政府合署 17 樓及新界沙田上禾輦路 1 號沙田政府合署 14 樓）索取，亦可從委員會的網頁下載（網址：<http://www.tpb.gov.hk/>）。
- This form can be downloaded from the Board's website, and obtained from the Secretariat of the Board and the PECs of the Planning Department. The form should be typed or completed in block letters, preferably in both English and Chinese. The further representation may be treated as not having been made if the required information is not provided.  
此表格可從委員會的網頁下載，亦可向委員會秘書處及規劃署的規劃資料查詢處索取。提出進一步申述的人士須以打印方式或以正楷填寫表格，填寫的資料宜中英文兼備。倘若未能提供所需資料，則委員會可把有關進一步申述視為不曾提出論。
- In accordance with the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance), the Board will make available all further representations received for public inspection as soon as reasonably practicable at the Board's website and the PECs. The further representations will be available for public inspection until the Chief Executive in Council has made a decision on the plan in question under section 9 of the Ordinance.  
根據《城市規劃條例》（下稱「條例」），委員會會在合理地切實可行的情況下，盡快將所有收到的進一步申述上載至委員會的網頁及存放於規劃資料查詢處供公眾查閱，直至行政長官會同行政會議根據條例第 9 條就有關圖則作出決定為止。

### 1. Person Making this Further Representation (known as "Further Representer" hereafter) 提出此宗進一步申述的人士（下稱「進一步申述人」）

Full Name 姓名 / 名稱 (Mr./Ms./Company/Organization\* 先生/女士/公司/機構\*)

CHUN MAN TACK PHILIP

(秦 氏 德)

(Note: for submission by person, full name shown on Hong Kong Identity card/Passport must be provided)  
(注意：若個人提交，須填上與香港身份證／護照所載的全名)

### 2. Authorized Agent (if applicable) 獲授權代理人(如適用)

Full Name 姓名 / 名稱 (Mr./ Ms./Company/Organization\* 先生/女士/公司/機構\*)

(Note: for submission by person, full name shown on Hong Kong Identity card/Passport must be provided)  
(注意：若個人提交，須填上與香港身份證／護照所載的全名)

\* Delete as appropriate 請刪去不適用者

Please fill in "NA" for not applicable item 請在不適用的項目填寫「不適用」



3. Details of the Further Representation (use separate sheet if necessary)\*  
進一步申述詳情(如有需要,請另頁說明)\*Plan to which the further representation relates (please specify the name and number of the plan to which the proposed amendments is made)  
與進一步申述相關的圖則(請註明建議修訂的圖則名稱及編號)大埔區計劃大綱草圖  
S/TP/31

Nature of and reasons for the further representation 進一步申述的性質及理由

Subject matters 有關事項*	Are you supporting or opposing the subject matter? 你支持還是反對有關事項?	Reason 理由*
1. 露輝路公營房屋(Site A) 選址問題	<input type="checkbox"/> support 支持 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> oppose 反對	選址: 露輝路是山上屋苑和 教育大學出入唯一道路, 在 路口建接道容納 4000 人的 屋苑對露輝路的交通 必造成嚴重擠塞(教育 大學師生人數超過 10000 還有 5 個屋苑)
2. 露輝路公營房屋(Site A) 出入口設計問題	<input type="checkbox"/> support 支持 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> oppose 反對	設計方面: 汀角路左轉入露輝路 後, 隨即右轉入屋苑入口, 沒有空 間消化等候轉入屋苑的車龍, 必會造成汀角路出現樽頸位 成為汀角路的交通黑點(現 時繁忙時間, 露輝路和汀角路交界已擠塞)
3. 露輝路公營房屋(Site A) 環境問題	<input type="checkbox"/> support 支持 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> oppose 反對	現時是植被覆蓋的山坡, 不 是平地, 建屋需要平山坡砍伐大 量樹木; 而且較平地建屋增加 經濟和環境成本, 質疑為何 一定要捨易取難, 不在平地建屋?
4. 露輝路公營房屋(Site A) (補充上述三項)	<input type="checkbox"/> support 支持 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> oppose 反對	就算一定要在路口要道旁插 屋苑, 出入口同在露輝路是 嚴重錯誤, 為何入口不設在 汀角路, 由露輝路出??

\* If the further representation contains more than 20 pages, or any page larger than A4 size, 4 hard copies and 1 soft copy are required to be provided for the submission. Provision of email address is also required.  
若進一步申述超過 20 頁或有任何一頁大小超過 A4, 則須提交硬複本一式四份和一份軟複本, 另須提供電郵地址。(Chinese translation to be updated)\* Please specify the amendment item number provided in the Schedule of Amendments.  
請註明在修訂項目附表內的修訂項目編號。

\* Please also note that section 6D(3)(3B) of the Ordinance provides that any further representation received under section 6D(1) may be treated as not having been made if, in the opinion of the Board that, the reason for the further representation is a reason concerning compensation or assistance, relating to, or arising from resumption/acquisition/clearance/obtaining vacant possession of any land by the Government. The above matters should be dealt with in accordance with the relevant statutory provisions on compensation and/or promulgated policy on compensation. Should you have any views on compensation or assistance matters, you may separately raise your views to the Director of Lands or the relevant authority. 請注意, 條例第 6D(3)(3B)條訂明, 如委員會認為根據第 6D(1)條收到的任何進一步申述所提出的理由是與政府收回/徵用/清理/取得任何土地的空置管有權而引起的補償或援助有關, 則有關進一步申述可被視為不曾提出。上述事項應按照相關補償的法律條文和/或已公布的補償政策處理。如對補償或援助事宜有意見, 可另行向地政總署署長或有關當局提出。

Please fill "NA" for not applicable item 請在不適用的項目填寫「不適用」  
at the appropriate box 請在適當的方格內加上 ☐ 號

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

From:

Sent:

To:

Subject:

2025-05-28 星期三 12:59:26

tpbpd/PLAND <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>

AMENDMENTS TO THE APPROVED TAI PO OZP NO. S/TP/30

Submission Number:

TPB/R/S/TP/31- S1025

## AMENDMENTS TO THE APPROVED TAI PO OZP NO. S/TP/30

Dear TPB Members,

**Item A1** – about 2.03 ha. Rezoning of a site at the junction of Lo Fai Road and Ting Kok Road from **"Green Belt"** and an area shown as 'Road' to "Res (Group A)11" with

Public Housing / 5 Towers / 1,290 Units / PR 3.18 / BHR 83mPD / 1,000sq.m Retail / 5% GIC / 3,612sq.m OS / 193 Vehicle Parking

*Domestic GFA of about 10,855m<sup>2</sup> generated from inclusion of additional government land (about 3,797m<sup>2</sup>) in Site A for enlarged public housing development is not included.*

Indicating that the GL is not included in the rezoning?

**Item A2** – about 0.70 ha. Rezoning of a site at Ting Kok Road to the north of Fortune Garden from "Green Belt" and an area shown as 'Road' to "Res (Group A)12".

Private Housing / 1 Tower / 460 Units / PR 4.14 / BHR 80mPD / 1,288sq.m OS / 144 Vehicle Parking

## STRONG OBJECTIONS TO BOTH ITEMS

On **6.12.2023**, the Steering Committee on Land and Housing Supply chaired by the Financial Secretary under the delegated authority from the CE in C endorsed in-principle the Land Sharing Pilot Scheme (LSPS) Application for sites at Lo Fai Road and Ting Kok Road in Tai Po

### Oct 25 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. Nonetheless, we will consider using some of the sites for recreational and tourism purposes."**

Effectively the LSPS was approved after the Policy Address pledge that no more GB would be annexed for residential.

*Both LSPS Sites are situated in an area of residential urban fringe landscape comprising dense vegetation, low-density residential developments and village houses in adjacent "V" zone. The proposed residential development of 18 to 21 storeys high **would bring forth changes to the landscape character of the surrounding areas.***

NOT TO MENTION THAT THERE WILL BE APPLICATIONS TO SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASE BOTH PR AND BHR IF THE DEVELOPMENTS ARE APPROVED



A/TP/700 Government Land at Chung Nga Road West, Tai Po

Applied development: MR of PR and BHR / 1 Block 1,292 Units / PR 6.9 (6) / 172mPD (140)

APPROVED 25 OCT 2024. NOTE THE SAME NUMBER OF UNITS

Every approved PH development in recent years has subsequently been granted an increase of up to 30% in both height and PR. Private developments have followed the trend.

Members have a duty to consider that the dimensions provided are not those of the eventual plans that will be almost double the PR and much taller.

### **Inappropriate location for PH**

The provision of PH is of course merely a ploy to justify development on GB. However, members have a duty to consider whether the site is appropriate for a PH estate, and a small one at that.

I record representatives of HA at OZP meeting some time ago mentioning that they are not in favour of the development of isolated PH as they lack the supporting facilities usually available to tenants. And that was a site in Sha Tin within walking distance of MTR, while this location is among villages and private residential estates with no town centre nearby.

Not only is the PH site isolated, almost half of it is cut slopes meaning that there would be limited space to provide space for playgrounds and exercise.

No mention of the location and capacity of local schools. Because of priority given to young families, expectations would be that there would be hundreds of school agers. Primary school should be within a safe walking distance of homes.

Then there is the issue of isolation, lack of affordable options. The area is organized to cater for Nob Hill folk not grass roots. Tenants would be forced to relocate from bustling inner city urban to an estate with no entertainment options.

Mental stress is now a major issue, particularly for teens and elderly with time on their hands and nothing to do.

Manipulation of the provision of PH in order to open up GB to private development is unethical and undermines the needs of the average PH tenant.

The long overdue crack down on abuse of PH has resulted in the repossessioning of thousands of units and will have an impact on the number of potential abusers and young people applying for PH.

There is a strong possibility that in due course there will be an oversupply of PH units, particularly if the current trend of falling prices continues.

There is absolutely no need for the private development as there is a growing pool of unsold units and a weak market.



### Traffic:

Substantial impact in view of the multiple road adjustments proposed. No indication of the additional impact on traffic to be generated via the planned Clover Cove Golf Club?

<https://pcgc.com/> The proposed developments will certainly impact the panorama surrounding the club and plans to make it an exclusive venue to attract all those high earners the government is constantly trying to attract.

### Trees

The developments would not only result in the felling of over 1,300 trees, the eco system of the GB would be disrupted and a precedent set that would open the entire GB to further development.

*"Ecological survey with 6-month duration including dry and wet seasons between 2023 and 2024 was conducted. According to the EcolA, the LSPS Sites are not identified as any recognised site of conservation importance or habitat of conservation interest, with records of low abundance of wildlife and low overall ecological values."*

THE USUAL DEROGATORY STATEMENTS. HOW CONVENIENT – NO MENTION OF IMPACT ON THE OVERALL ECOLOGY OF THE GB DUE IF BARRIERS TO FREE MOVEMENT OF FLORA AND FAUNA ARE CREATED BY DEVELOPMENT

Of course, as usual the impact on the habitat has not been addressed. Even those trees that are usually preserved are to be felled with convenient references to their 'poor' condition.

However the very fact that a mere 26 trees are considered to be 'undesirable species' underlines the fact that this GB is full of healthy mature trees.

***"A total of 1,065 and 351 trees (excluding 12 and 14 undesirable species) have been identified within the tree survey boundaries for the LSPS Site A and Site B respectively."***

NOTE NO MENTION OF THE TREES ON THE GL THAT MUST ALSO BE CURRENTLY ZONED GB?

***A total of 1,048 and 286 trees (excluding undesirable species) are proposed to be felled, while 17 and 65 trees are proposed to be retained within the tree survey boundaries for the LSPS Site A and Site B respectively. Three of the Aquilaria sinensis (土沉香) (two in LSPS Site A, one in LSPS Site B) are proposed to be felled due to poor form/health/structural conditions and/or low amenity value with difficulties in transplantation, and the remaining one without conflict with the development at the LSPS Site B is proposed to be retained. The Lagerstroemia speciosa (大花紫薇) with fair health/structural condition is proposed to be felled as the tree is located on slope with limited and difficult accessibility for transplant works. One of the said mature trees (i.e. T1732) is in poor form and heavily tangled by climbers, while another one (i.e. T1399) is located on slope and will require***



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

*intensive pruning of tree crown and rootball for transportation to receptor site, resulting in low survival rate after transplantation. As such, both mature trees are proposed to be felled.*

Areas of about 1,142m<sup>2</sup> and 295m<sup>2</sup> for planting **584 and 142 whip trees** are proposed within the LSPS Site A and Site B respectively

NO DATA ON SPECIES BUT THIS INDICATES THAT THE REPLACEMENT TREES WILL BE ORNAMENTAL IN NATURE

For the LSPS Site B, additional 19 heavy standard compensatory trees are proposed to be planted mainly around the periphery of the roundabout and along Ting Kok Road (Drawings 1b and 4b). **The tree compensatory ratio (new tree:fell) for both LSPS Sites are about 0.56:1**

This is unacceptable when it has been announced that there is no need for further erosion of GB.

## Visual Impact

Even the paper concedes that the visual impacts will be considerable. When the consultants are forced to admit that they "**are moderately to significantly adverse**" indicates that there would be strong negative impact.

All the residential nodes in the district are limited to 3 to 5 storeys in height. The towers of 80++ mts would destroy the rural ambiance and are totally incongruous with the planning intention of the area.

But as usual mitigation measures are trotted out DESIGN MEASURES - *aesthetically pleasing building design*. Like what? What is pleasing about your average HK cement tower block? And these are not luxury units as the average size of the private block is a mere 50sq.mt so functional would be the criteria.

## Ventilation

*The proposed LSPS development may result in some wind blockage impact to downwind areas under the prevailing winds.*

But mo man tai, a few tweaks to the plans and all is well.

Traffic noise along Ting Kok Road is the dominant noise source, and therefore noise mitigation measures (e.g. blank wall/fixed glazing, acoustic window (baffle type) and enhanced acoustic balcony (baffle type)) are proposed.

For vehicular emission, since a small portion of residential tower at the LSPS Site B falls within the buffer area of 10m from Ting Kok Road, blank façade/fixed glazing (with/without maintenance windows) is proposed for the concerned portion

SURELY EXPECTATION WOULD BE THAT FOLK LIVING IN THE COUNTRYSIDE WOULD ENJOY BETTER CROSS VENTILATION THAN MONGKOK?

*In addition, given the former Shuen Wan Landfill being located to the south of the LSPS Sites, a preliminary landfill gas hazard assessment has been conducted, in which active control measures (e.g. mechanical ventilation), passive control measures (e.g. impermeable lining for envelope in touch with ground and sealing for penetration for utilities entry), detective system, safe design and working practice for landfill gas are proposed to mitigate potential hazards during construction and operation stages.*

INSUFFICIENT ATTENTION GIVEN TO THE DESIRABILITY OF LOCATING RESIDENCES SO CLOSE TO LARGE QUANTITIES OF BURIED GARBAGE.

NO MENTION OF THE POSSIBLE RELEASE OF TOXINS DUE TO CHANGES IN WEATHER PATTERNS.

And amazingly: **Members of TPRC, TPDC and TPNAC expressed considerable concerns on the proposed LSPS development**

**They share views expressed above re inappropriate site, transport, impact on the local environment, etc**

**MEMBERS HAVE A DUTY TO STUDY AND TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION ADVERSE VIEWS FROM THESE PARTIES AND HOPEFULLY SOME DC MEMBERS WILL FULFILL THEIR DUTY BY TAKING PART IN THE OZP PROCESS**

**Item B** – about 0.04 ha. Rezoning of a site to the north of Shek Kwu Lung from “Open Space” to “G/IC(3)” with BHR.

Y/TP/36 approved 10.11.2023 to regularise the existing religious and columbarium uses under the name of “Ever Rest Temple”.

The Committee agreed to put ‘Columbarium’ under always permitted Col 1 use subject to a maximum BH of two storeys **and a maximum number of 763 niches.**

The applicant proposed to stipulate ‘Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre’ as Col 1 use under the section 12A application

**INDICATING PLANS TO INITIATE FURTHER DEVELOPMENT ON THE SITE**

Members should remember that Y/TP/36 was for 3,507 Niches. According to the paper 2,744 Niches in a separate building were to be sealed off.

**THERE IS NO MENTION IN THE PAPER THAT THIS OPERATION HAS BEEN EXECUTED.**

Item B cannot be approved if the additional niches are still in place.



**Item C1** – about 0.69 ha. Rezoning of two parcels of land adjoining Items A1 and A2 along Ting Kok Road from areas shown as 'Road' to "GB".

**Item C2** – about 0.86 ha. Rezoning of a strip of land to the east of Item A2 along Ting Kok Road from "GB" to an area shown as 'Road'.

**Item C3** – about 0.61 ha. Rezoning of two parcels of land to the north of Fortune Garden along Ting Kok Road from "Res (Group C)1" ("R(C)1") to areas shown as 'Road'.

**Item C4** – about 0.03 ha. Rezoning of a parcel of land to the north of Fortune Garden along Ting Kok Road from an area shown as 'Road' to "R(C)1".

Technical amendments to reflect the as-built road alignment of Ting Kok Road section to the north of the former Shuen Wan Landfill and Fortune Garden

#### HOUSEKEEPING

However, C4 is questionable as it appears to make the road narrower and out of alignment with the adjoining C3? In view of proximity to access to the Golf Club this appears to be a negative adjustment.

#### Amendments to the Notes of the Plan

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

**OBJECT – DEPRIVES THE COMMUNITY OF HAVING A SAY IN BOTH THE LOCATION AND DESIGN OF THESE FACILITIES**

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

**OBJECT – THE INTENTION OF V ZONE IS TO PROVIDE HOUSING. THE PROPOSED USES CAN BE EXPLOITED TO PROVIDE A FRONT FOR COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS**

(f) Revision to the Remarks of the Notes for "Site of Special Scientific Interest" zone on filling or excavation of land

**STRONGEST OBJECTIONS – THIS ALLOWS UNFETTERED EXCAVATION OF**

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

---

LAND ON BOTH ZONES. UNDER THIS EXEMPTION GOVERNMENT DEPTS CAN DEVELOP WHATEVER THEY WISH ON WHAT ARE SUPPOSED TO BE PROTECTED SENSITIVE ECOLOGICAL AND CULTURAL SITES.

BY APPROVING ELIMINATION OF THESE PROTECTIVE CLAUSES, THE BOARD IS EFFECTIVELY RELINQUISHING ITS ROLE IN MONITORING DEVELOPMENTS THAT CAN HAVE DEVASTATING IMPACT ON THE LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES.

Mary Mulvihill

