

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

R-22

tpbpd/PLAND

寄件者: [REDACTED]
寄件日期: 2026年07月05日星期日 23:59
收件者: tpbpd/PLAND
主旨: Re: A/K1/272 Champagne Court B Block, 16 Kimberley Road, TST
類別: [REDACTED]

Dear TPB Members,

STICK TO YOUR GUNS. The manner in which the Chair tried to push you to approve this plan was an inappropriate demonstration of favouritism when it is the role of the Chair “to set the agenda and runs regular board meetings, keep discussions on track and **ensure fair reviews of zoning plans and public feedback. IN OTHER WORDS, BE IMPARTIAL**

“minor relaxation of PR and BH restrictions might be considered by the Town Planning Board (the Board) based on the individual merits of each proposal”

RELAXATION OF 25% IS NOT MINOR AND THIS DEVELOPMENT HAS ZERO MERITS

*“In the current application, the Site, which was located within the street block **fronting Nathan Road**, shared similar locational characteristics of “C” zones on the YMT and MK OZPs.”*

THE SITE DOES NOT FRONT NATHAN, IT IS ON A NARROW SIDE STREET AND TST IS NOT INCLUDED IN THE CONCESSION APPLICABLE TO YMT AND MKK. WE HAVE BEEN SPARED THE MACHINATIONS OF URA, HALLELUAH.

*“The **voluntary setback of 2.8m along Kimberley Road**. Even under an OZP-compliant scheme with a PR of 12, some form of voluntary setback with canopy could reasonably be expected for the proposed development at the Site.”*

INDEED THERE IS A SIMILAR SET BACK IN FRONT OF MIRA TO ACCOMMODATE DROP OFF OTHERWISE TRAFFIC ON THE STREET WOULD GRIND TO A HALT

It was understood that the applicant had been acquiring ownership of the adjacent site (i.e. Champagne Court Block A).

REALLY, THE OWNERSHIP OF BLOCK A IS NOT STRATA TITLE AND THE LOCAL INTEL WAS THAT THE MAJORITY OWNER REFUSES TO COLLABORATE WITH HENDERSON

“An innovative architectural design would be adopted on the eastern façade to ensure visual compatibility. However, no illustration was provided to demonstrate the effectiveness of such mitigation measures”

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

INDEED, THIS IS NOTHING MORE THAN A RECTANGULAR BLOCK WALL EFFECT. THE NEW TOWERS ON FRANVILLE CIRCUITS AND CAMERON HAVE MORE INNOVATIVE DESIGN FEATURES WHILE ADHERING TO THE OZP.

AS MEMBERS POINTED OUT *"there were insufficient planning and design merits to justify the proposed minor relaxation of PR and BH restrictions."*

2.2.1 Justification One The approval of the current application would set favourable precedent that would act as catalyst for redevelopment of the TST aging core.

RUBBISH, THERE ARE CURRENTLY AROUND A DOZEN TOWERS UNDER DEVELOPMENT OR RECENTLY COMPLETE IN THE DISTRICT.

BUT PLAND D MADE IT CLEAR THAT IT HAS NO INTENTION TO INCREASE THE PERMISSIBLE PR OF COMMERCIAL DEVELOPERS IN TST FROM 12 TO 15.

2.2.2 Justification Two Notable precedents in OZP amendments have exemplified the TPB's demonstrated flexibility in relaxing PR and BH restrictions under appropriate circumstances.

THE COMMUNITY WAS FED THE LINE THAT BOTH THE MASTERPIECE AND THE ONE WOULD BE ICONIC BUILDINGS. THIS IS JUST A RECTANGULAR BLOCK WITH ONE SIDE HAVING A BLANK FAÇADE – NO DOUBT ALL THE BETTER TO INFLICT FURTHER LIGHT POLLUTION ON LONG SUFFERING LOCALS. THE 11PM CUT OFF FOR EXTERNAL LIGHT WAS INTRODUCED IN FACT BECAUSE THE RESIDENTS OF THE MASTERPIECE COMPLAINED ABOUT LIGHT POLLUTION FROM THE ONE.

2.2.3 Justification Three The development delivers clear, proportional, and **highly localised planning gains** that directly fulfil the statutory preamble of the Town Planning Ordinance by enhancing the health, safety, convenience, and general welfare of the community;

LIKE WALL EFFECT, LIGHT POLLUTION, TRAFFIC AND SAFETY ISSUES ON A NARROW STREET WHERE IT IS ALREADY DIFFICULT TO FOR PEDESTRIANS TO CROSS

2.2.4 Justification Four The planning gains—**removing long-standing anti-social activities**, boosting tourism and vertical greening—are substantial and have been undervalued.

THIS IS A JAW DROPPER. IT WAS HENDERSON HENCHMEN WHO INTRODUCED PROSTITUTION TO THE UPPER FLOORS IN ORDER TO DRIVE OUT RESIDENTS. THERE WAS ALWAYS A 'LOVE HOTEL' IN THE BASEMENT, THE DADOL, THAT OPERATED IN HARMONY WITH RESIDENTS AND DID NOT INFRINGE ON THE SAFETY OF FEMALES RESIDING IN THE BUILDING.

THIS DEVELOPER EMPLOYED SIMILAR STRONG ARM TACTICS TO 'PERSUADE' RESIDENTS OF 68 – 72 KIMBERLEY ROAD TO MOVE OUT. SUBSEQUENTLY THE SITE WAS DEVELOPER INTO A COMMERCIAL TOWER TO HOUSE THE ACTIVITIES OF CHEN ZHI, THE CAMBODIAN SCAM KING AND IS CURRENTLY FROZEN BY COURT ORDER. ANOTHER BLOT ON OUR HOOD.

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

2.2.5 Justification Five The proposed development aims to boost Hong Kong's tourism capacity; these merits together provide strong justification for the minor relaxations.

MEANWHILE NWD IS TRYING TO CONVERT ITS TOURISM ORIENTED SUITES TO PRIVATE RESIDENCES. THE SUPPORT OF THE TOURISM COMMISSION FOR BOTH PROJECTS IS AN INDICATION OF ITS ETHICAL STANCE.

This development brings zero benefit to the community.

The rejection was appropriate and should be upheld.

Mary Mulvilhill