

**Relevant Extract of the Town Planning Board Guidelines for
Application for Developments within Deep Bay Area
under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance
(TPB PG-No. 12C)**

According to TPB PG-No. 12C, the Site falls within the Wetland Buffer Area (WBA). Extracts of land use concept and development guidelines are summarised as follows:

Wetland Buffer Area

- (a) The intention of the WBA is to protect the ecological integrity of the fish ponds and wetland within the Wetland Conservation Area (WCA) and prevent development that would have a negative off-site disturbance impact on the ecological value of fish ponds.
- (b) Within the WBA, for development or redevelopment which requires planning permission, an ecological impact assessment (EcoIA) would need to be submitted. Some local and minor uses (including temporary uses) are exempted from the requirement of EcoIA.

Appendix A

List of Uses Exempted from Ecological Impact Assessment within the Wetland Buffer Area

For planning applications involving uses/development within the Wetland Buffer Area, the following uses/development are exempted from the requirement of ecological impact assessment as part of the submission to the Board:

- Temporary Uses
- Agricultural Use (except in SSSI Zone)
- Ancestral Hall
- Bank#
- Barbecue Spot
- Barber Shop#
- Beauty Parlour#
- Burial Ground
- Clinic/Polyclinic*
- Electricity Substation of single storey
- Government Refuse Collection Point^
- House (Alteration, modification and/or redevelopment to the existing building bulk only)
- New Territories Exempted Houses
- Off-Course Betting centre#
- On-farm Domestic Structure
- Photographic Studio#
- Playground/Playing Field in “V” and “R(D)” zones
- Police Post/Police Reporting Centre
- Post Office*
- Private Club#
- Public Convenience
- Public Library*
- Public Utility Installation (electricity mast, lamp pole, pipeline and telephone booth only)^
- Pumping Station of single storey
- Refreshment Kiosk
- Retail Shop#
- School*
- Showroom excluding Motor-vehicle Showroom#
- Shrine
- Social Welfare Facility*
- Tent Camping Site

Note:

other than free-standing building

* other than free-standing building exceeding 3 storeys

^ not applicable to the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Eco-lodge” zone on the Ma Tso Lung and Hoo Hok Wai Outline Zoning Plan

Previous s.16 Application covering the Application Site

Rejected Application

No.	Application No.	Proposed Use(s)/Development(s)	Date of Consideration (RNTPC)
1.	A/YL-ST/593	Proposed Temporary Shop and Services for a Period of 3 Years	24.12.2021

Rejection Reasons

- (1) Not in line with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone.
- (2) The scale of the proposed commercial development was considered excessive in serving the local needs.
- (3) Not compatible with the developments in the surrounding areas.

**Similar s.16 Applications within the same “V” zone
on the San Tin Technopole Outline Zoning Plan in the Past Five Years**

Approved Applications

No.	Application No.	Use(s)/Development(s)	Date of Consideration (RNTPC)
1.	A/YL-ST/642	Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicle) and Shop and Services for a Period of 5 Years	31.3.2023
2.	A/STT/33	Proposed Temporary Shop and Services, Eating Place and Public Vehicle Park (excluding Container Vehicle) with Ancillary Facilities and Associated Excavation of Land for a Period of 3 Years	5.6.2026
3.	A/STT/34	Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Private Cars and Light Goods Vehicles) and Eating Place for a Period of 3 Years	5.6.2026

Government Departments' General Comments

1. Land Administration

Comments of the District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department:

- no adverse comment on the application;
- the application site (the Site) comprises Old Schedule Agricultural Lots in D.D. 96 held under the Block Government Lease which contains the restriction that no structures are allowed to be erected without the prior approval of the Government;
- there is no Small House application under processing nor approved at the Site; and
- advisory comments are detailed in **Appendix V**.

2. Traffic

Comments of the Commissioner for Transport:

- no comment on the application from traffic engineering perspective; and
- advisory comments are detailed in **Appendix V**.

Comments of the Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department (HyD):

- no in-principle objection to the application from highways maintenance point of view; and
- advisory comments are detailed in **Appendix V**.

3. Environment

Comments of the Director of Environmental Protection:

- considering the latest 'Code of Practice on Handling the Environmental Aspects of Temporary Uses and Open Storage Sites', it is noted that the proposed use would not involve traffic of heavy vehicle and not involve dusty operations. There are residential premises within 100m from the boundary of the Site. Based on the above, he has no adverse comment on the application from environmental planning perspective;
- no environmental complaints relating to the Site were recorded in the past three years; and
- advisory comments are detailed in **Appendix V**.

4. **Drainage**

Comments of the Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department (DSD):

- no in-principle objection to the application from drainage operation and maintenance point of view;
- the applicant shall submit a drainage submission to demonstrate how the rain water falling onto or flowing to the Site will be collected, conveyed and discharged;
- after completion of the required drainage works, a set of record photographs showing the completed drainage works with corresponding photograph locations marked clearly on the approved drainage plan shall be provided to DSD for reference;
- all the proposed drainage facilities should be constructed and maintained by the applicant at his own cost. The applicant should ensure and keep all drainage works on the Site under proper maintenance at all times; and
- advisory comments are detailed in **Appendix V**.

5. **Water Supply**

Comments of the Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department:

- no objection to the application; and
- existing water mains will be affected (**Plan A-2**), and the applicant should note the advisory comments as detailed in **Appendix V**.

6. **Fire Safety**

Comments of the Director of Fire Services:

- no in-principle objection to the application subject to fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting being provided to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services; and
- advisory comments are detailed in **Appendix V**.

7. **Landscape**

Comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department:

- no adverse comment on the application from landscape planning perspective;
- based on the aerial photo taken in March 2024, the Site was situated in an area of miscellaneous rural fringe landscape character comprising village houses, open storage sites/warehouses, farmlands, vacant land and tree clusters. The proposed temporary use is considered not entirely incompatible with the landscape setting in the proximity;
- with reference to the aerial photos taken in March 2024 and site photos taken in July

2026, the Site was largely formed. Wild plants, vehicles and a temporary structure were found on the Site. No trees were observed within the Site. According to the application form, no tree felling will be involved; and

- in view of the above, significant adverse landscape impact arising from the proposed use is not anticipated.

8. **Building Matters**

Comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department:

- no objection to the application; and
- advisory comments are detailed in **Appendix V**.

9. **Project Interface**

Comments of the Project Manager (North), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD):

- the Site falls outside the project boundary of the San Tin Technopole (the Technopole). However, the Site is in close proximity to the works contract (Contract No. ND/2025/01) of the Technopole and would have potential project interface. The applicant should facilitate the coordination with the responsible project officers regarding the interfacing matters, if any; and
- advisory comments are detailed in **Appendix V**.

10. **Other Departments**

The following government departments have no objection to/no adverse comment/no comment on the application and their advisory comments, if any, are in **Appendix V**:

- Chief Engineer/Railway Development 1-1, Railway Development Office, HyD;
- Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation;
- Project Manager (West), CEDD;
- Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, CEDD;
- Commissioner of Police; and
- District Officer (Yuen Long), Home Affairs Department.

Recommended Advisory Clauses

- (a) To closely liaise with the stakeholders in the surrounding areas (including villagers of Poon Uk Tsuen and Chau Tau) of the application site (the Site) with a view to minimising any potential nuisance during the construction and operation of the proposed use;
- (b) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department (DLO/YL, LandsD) that the lot owner(s) shall apply to his office for a Short Term Waiver (STW) to permit the structure(s) erected within the private lot(s). The application(s) for STW will be considered by the Government in its capacity as a landlord and there is no guarantee that they will be approved. The STW, if approved, will be subject to such terms and conditions including the payment of waiver fee and administrative fee as considered appropriate by LandsD. Besides, given the proposed use is temporary in nature, only erection of temporary structure(s) will be considered;
- (c) to note the comments of the Commissioner for Transport that:
 - (i) sufficient manoeuvring space shall be provided within the Site or its adjacent area;
 - (ii) no vehicles are allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period; and
 - (iii) the local track(s) near the Site is not under the Transport Department's purview. The applicant shall obtain consent of the owners/managing department of the local track(s) for using them as the vehicular accesses to the Site;
- (d) to note the comments of the Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department (HyD) that:
 - (i) HyD shall not be responsible for the maintenance of the proposed access connecting the Site (i.e. Chau Tau West Road, Chau Tau South Road and the local tracks); and
 - (ii) adequate drainage measures shall be provided to prevent surface water running from the Site to nearby public roads and drains;
- (e) to note the comments of the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) that:
 - (i) the latest 'Code of Practice on Handling the Environmental Aspects of Temporary Uses and Open Storage Sites' shall be followed; and
 - (ii) sewage discharge from the Site should be directed to nearby public sewer. In case of unavailability of public sewer, proper sewage collection, treatment and disposal facilities should be provided in accordance with the requirements in Professional Persons Environmental Consultative Committee Practice Note 1/23;
- (f) to note the comments of the Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department (DSD) that:
 - (i) a drainage submission shall be submitted to demonstrate how he will collect, convey and discharge rain water falling onto or flowing to the Site. A clear drainage plan showing full details of the existing drains and the proposed drains (e.g. cover and invert levels of pipes/catchpits/outfalls and ground levels justifying

waterflow etc.) with supporting design calculations and charts should be included. For preparation of the drainage proposal, the Guideline on preparation of the drainage proposal is available in DSD homepage at https://www.dsd.gov.hk/EN/Files/Technical_Manual/dsd_guideline/Drainage_Submission.pdf for reference. Approval of the drainage proposal must be sought prior to the implementation of drainage works on site;

- (ii) after completion of the required drainage works, a set of record photographs showing the completed drainage works with corresponding photograph locations marked clearly on the approved drainage plan shall be provided to DSD for reference. DSD will inspect the completed drainage works jointly with the applicant with reference to the set of photographs;
 - (iii) all existing flow paths would be properly intercepted and maintained without increasing the flood risk of the adjacent areas;
 - (iv) the proposed drainage proposal/works as well as the Site boundary should not cause encroachment upon areas outside his jurisdiction;
 - (v) no public sewerage maintained by DSD is currently available for connection. For sewage disposal and treatment, agreement from DEP shall be obtained;
 - (vi) DLO/YL, LandsD should be consulted regarding all the proposed drainage works outside the lot boundary to ensure the unobstructed discharge from the Site in future; and
 - (vii) all the proposed drainage facilities should be constructed and maintained by the applicant at his own cost. The applicant should ensure and keep all drainage works on site under proper maintenance at all times;
- (g) to note the comments of the Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department (WSD) that:
- (i) existing water mains will be affected (**Plan A-2**). The cost of any necessary diversion shall be borne by the applicant;
 - (ii) in case it is not feasible to divert the affected water mains, a waterworks reserve within 1.5m from the centre line of the water main shall be provided to WSD. No structure shall be built or materials stored within this waterworks reserve (WWR). Free access shall be made available at all times for staff of the Director of Water Supplies or their contractor to carry out construction, inspection, operation, maintenance and repair works;
 - (iii) no trees or shrubs with penetrating roots may be planted within the WWR or in the vicinity of the water main; and
 - (iv) the Government shall not be liable to any damage whatsoever and howsoever caused arising from burst or leakage of the public water mains within and in close vicinity of the Site;

(h) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services that:

- (i) relevant layout plans incorporated with the proposed fire service installations (FSIs) shall be submitted to his department for approval. The layout plans should be drawn to scale and depicted with dimensions and nature of occupancy. The location of where the proposed FSIs to be installed should be clearly marked on the layout plans. Licensing requirements, if any would be formulated upon receipt of the referral from the relevant licensing authority; and
- (ii) if the proposed structures are required to comply with the Buildings Ordinance (BO) (Cap. 123), detailed fire safety requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans;

(i) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department that:

- (i) it is noted that four structures are proposed in the application. Before any new building works (including containers/open sheds as temporary buildings, demolition and land filling, etc.) are to be carried out on Site, prior approval and consent of the Building Authority (BA) should be obtained, otherwise they are unauthorized building works (UBW) under the BO. An Authorized Person should be appointed as the co-ordinator for the proposed building works in accordance with the BO;
- (ii) the Site shall be provided with means of obtaining access thereto from a street and emergency vehicular access in accordance with Regulations 5 and 41D of the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R) respectively;
- (iii) the Site does not abut on a specified street of not less than 4.5m wide and its permitted development intensity shall be determined under Regulation 19(3) of the B(P)R at building plan submission stage;
- (iv) if the existing Structures (not being a New Territories Exempted House) are erected on leased land without the approval of the BA, they are UBW under the BO and should not be designated for any proposed use under the captioned application;
- (v) for UBW erected on leased land, enforcement action may be taken by the Buildings Department to effect their removal in accordance with the prevailing enforcement policy against UBW as and when necessary. The granting of any planning approval should not be construed as an acceptance of any existing building works or UBW on the Site under the BO;
- (vi) any temporary shelters or converted containers for office, storage, washroom or other uses considered as temporary buildings are subject to the control of Part VII of the B(P)R; and
- (vii) detailed checking under the BO will be carried out at building plan submission stage; and

(j) to note the comments of the Project Manager (North), Civil Engineering and Development Department that the Site falls outside the project boundary of the San Tin Technopole (the Technopole). However, the Site is in close proximity to the works contract (Contract No. ND/2025/01) of the Technopole and would have potential project interface. The applicant

should facilitate the coordination with the responsible project officers regarding the interfacing matters, if any.

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號

260804-170717-17166

Reference Number:

提交限期

25/08/2026

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

04/08/2026 17:07:17

Date and time of submission:

有關的規劃申請編號

A/STT/38

The application no. to which the comment relates:

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

先生 Mr. Philip Poon

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

I refer to the above planning application and wish to lodge my strong objection to the proposal. The proposed development will not bring any meaningful benefit to the local communities of Pun Uk Tsuen and Chau Tau Tsuen. On the contrary, it will create significant adverse impacts. My main objections are as follows:

1. Traffic Impact

The proposed car park for commercial and private vehicles will generate a substantial increase in traffic volume entering Pun Uk Tsuen. This will lead to serious traffic congestion, noise pollution, air pollution from vehicle exhaust, and light pollution, all of which will cause considerable inconvenience to villagers.

2. Security Concerns

The significant influx of non-villagers into the area will adversely affect the safety and security of current residents.

3. Environmental and Nuisance Issues

The proposed eateries will create additional noise pollution, waste pollution, and pest problems (such as rodents and wild pigs). The village is already experiencing increased refuse dumping and pest issues due to the existing eatery on the periphery of Pun Uk Tsuen, where commercial waste is being improperly disposed of at the village's domestic refuse collection point.

This project offers no tangible benefits to the surrounding village communities while introducing numerous environmental, traffic, and security problems.

I do not agree with the applicant's planning statement in clause 1.2 where they state: "The Site is in close proximity to existing village settlements such as Pun Uk Tsuen and Chau Tau Tsuen, where the demand for public parking spaces has been very high. Although public franchised buses and minibus services are provided at Lok Ma Chau Road, surrounding locals and villagers still rely mostly on private cars for commuting due to long walking distance to bus stops, limited destinations and infrequency of such services, as well as their own travelling destinations to other remote villages."

I believe that this is only for the benefit of people outside of the villages who wish to drop their

cars off before going across the border to China. I have noticed this characteristic in a similar application for a car park in our village where the applicant made the same statement. The car is only meaningfully occupied over the weekend when outside cars come to use the car park. This only benefits the car park applicant. There has already been congestion on Lok Ma Cha Road because of this effect and an additional car park will cause nuisance to villagers.

I respectfully urge the Town Planning Board to take my objections into serious consideration and reject this planning application.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review**參考編號**

260806-130951-00348

Reference Number:**提交限期**

25/08/2026

Deadline for submission:**提交日期及時間**

06/08/2026 13:09:51

Date and time of submission:**有關的規劃申請編號**

A/STT/38

The application no. to which the comment relates:**「提意見人」姓名/名稱**

夫人 Mrs. Poon Man Siu Lin

Name of person making this comment:**意見詳情****Details of the Comment :**

本人就上述規劃申請特此提出強烈反對。

上述A/STT/34發展項目不會潘屋村及洲頭村，帶來任何實質益處，反而會造成重大的不利影響。本人的主要反對理由如下：

交通影響

擬議的商業及私人車輛停車場，將會大幅增加進入潘屋村的交通流量，導致嚴重的交通擠塞、噪音污染、車輛廢氣污染及光污染，對村民造成極大不便。

保安問題

大量非村民人士進入該區，將嚴重影響現有居民的人身安全及治安。

環境及滋擾問題

此項目並沒有為周邊村落社區帶來任何實質利益，卻會引入多項環境、交通及保安問題。

本人敬請城市規劃委員會認真考慮本人的反對意見，並否決此項規劃申請。

感謝城市規劃委員會留意此事。

3
就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號

260806-131446-68806

Reference Number:

提交限期

25/08/2026

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

06/08/2026 13:14:46

Date and time of submission:

有關的規劃申請編號

A/STT/38

The application no. to which the comment relates:

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

先生 Mr. Poon Yiu Nam

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

本人就上述規劃申請特此提出強烈反對。

上述A/STT/38發展項目不會潘屋村及洲頭村，帶來任何實質益處，反而會造成重大的不利影響。本人的主要反對理由如下：

交通影響

擬議的商業及私人車輛停車場，將會大幅增加進入潘屋村的交通流量，導致嚴重的交通擠塞、噪音污染、車輛廢氣污染及光污染，對村民造成極大不便。

保安問題

大量非村民人士進入該區，將嚴重影響現有居民的人身安全及治安。

環境及滋擾問題

此項目並沒有為周邊村落社區帶來任何實質利益，卻會引入多項環境、交通及保安問題。

本人敬請城市規劃委員會認真考慮本人的反對意見，並否決此項規劃申請。

感謝城市規劃委員會留意此事。

tpbpd/PLAND

寄件者: [REDACTED]
寄件日期: 2026年08月20日星期四 18:45
收件者: tpbpd/PLAND
主旨: Objection to Planning Application No. A/STT/38
附件: Objection of Application No A_STT_38 in Poon Uk Tusen_1.docx
類別: Internet Email

Dear Sir / Madam,

Please kindly find my objection letter to Planning Application No. A/STT/38 as attached.

Please kindly acknowledge by replying this mail.

Yours

A.D.

20 AUG 2026

To: Town Planning Board
15/F, North Point Government Office
333 Java Road, North Point, Hong Kong
Email: tpbpd@pland.gov.hk

To whom it may concern:

RE: Objection to Planning Application No. A/STT/38 – Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Parking Area for a Period of 5 Years at Various Lots in D.D. 96, Pun Uk Tsuen, San Tin, Yuen Long

I write to lodge an objection to Planning Application No. **A/STT/38** for the proposed temporary public vehicle parking area for a period of 5 years at Various Lots in D.D. 96, Pun Uk Tsuen, San Tin, Yuen Long.

Grounds of Objection

1. **Destruction of Feng Shui, ancestral graves and village well-being:** There are many ancestral graves located next to and around the proposed vehicle parking area. These graves are not only burial places, but also important ancestral and cultural heritage sites that are deeply respected by the villagers and families connected with Chau Tau Tsuen and Pun Uk Tsuen. In traditional village custom, the surrounding environment of ancestral graves should remain quiet, clean and undisturbed, as any major disturbance to the land, traffic flow, noise, dust or human activity nearby may be regarded as damaging to the Feng Shui of the area. The operation of a public vehicle parking area in such close proximity to ancestral graves would therefore be considered highly inappropriate and disrespectful. It may disturb the peace and dignity of the graves, undermine the traditional Feng Shui setting of the village, and cause anxiety and distress to residents who believe that such disturbance could adversely affect the health, harmony and well-being of the village community. Such an outcome would be deeply regrettable and should be avoided.
2. **High resident safety risk at the main village walking trail:** Vehicles entering and leaving the proposed parking area must cross the main pedestrian walking trail used by residents of Pun Uk Tsuen. This walking trail is the primary access route for residents to enter and leave the village on foot, and is used daily by elderly residents, children, families and other pedestrians. Introducing frequent vehicle movements across this essential walking route would create a direct conflict between pedestrians and vehicles, substantially increasing the risk of accidents and injuries. The concern is particularly serious because village footpaths are not designed to safely accommodate repeated crossing movements by private vehicles or larger vehicles. Residents should not be required to face additional danger simply when walking to and from their homes. The proposed parking use would therefore create an unacceptable road safety and pedestrian safety risk to the local community, especially during busy periods, poor weather, evening hours or times when visibility is reduced.
3. **Additional parking provision is unnecessary and would worsen existing impacts:** The application has not provided clear evidence that local residents require an additional

public vehicle parking area. There are already sufficient parking facilities within the Chau Tau Tsuen–Pun Uk Tsuen area for genuine local needs, while the existing parking operation appears to serve non-resident or commercial parking demand. Such externally driven or profit-oriented demand should not be used to justify another parking area within or adjacent to a residential village setting. Approval of the proposed development would likely bring further non-resident activity into the village without meaningful benefit to the local community.

4. **Increased traffic and serious congestion since the existing parking area began operation:** Serious traffic congestion has been observed along Lok Ma Chau Road towards Castle Peak Road since the existing parking area began operating about 2 months earlier. This has not only increased the travel time for residents returning home, but has also worsened congestion in an already busy area, which serves as a main route for public transport travelling to the Lok Ma Chau Control Point. The traffic situation would very likely deteriorate further if another parking area were approved nearby and used the same main access route for non-resident vehicles entering and leaving the area.
5. **Personal and public security risks:** The influx of non-resident vehicles and visitors may increase the likelihood of security issues, including theft, trespassing and other disturbances to the peace of the village community, particularly during evening hours. This concern is especially serious because the proposed vehicle parking area, together with the recently approved parking area under Application No. A/STT/34, is located immediately next to residential areas. The operation of these parking facilities in such close proximity to residents' homes may therefore create additional security risks and adversely affect the quiet and safe living environment of Pun Uk Tsuen.
6. **Environmental and public nuisance impacts:** The proposed development is likely to cause dust, air pollution, noise disturbance and general environmental degradation, all of which would adversely affect nearby residents of Pun Uk Tsuen. Increased vehicle movements and related activities may further worsen the living environment by creating additional nuisance, disturbance and disruption to the quiet village setting.
7. **Drainage, sewage and flooding risks:** The proposed parking area may obstruct or interfere with existing drainage channels and sewage pathways, thereby increasing the risk of flooding during periods of heavy rainfall. Any disruption to the established drainage system could also create additional hygiene and environmental concerns for nearby residents.

These concerns are heightened by the existing parking facility and eating place already operating next to the proposed site. Approval of another nearby parking area would intensify the cumulative impacts on Chau Tau Tsuen and Pun Uk Tsuen, placing further pressure on village access, pedestrian safety, drainage, security and the overall living environment. The proposed development would therefore cause an unacceptable additional burden on residents' safety, tranquillity and well-being.

In addition, it should be noted that, in relation to the previous Application No. A/STT/34, there were several instances where the public notice appeared to have been removed from the notice board. This raises serious concerns about whether public awareness and the opportunity for affected residents to raise objections may have been compromised. Given that the proposed parking area is believed to be operated by the same party, such circumstances further reinforce the concern that

the development is primarily driven by commercial profit rather than the convenience or genuine needs of local residents.

I trust the Town Planning Board will give due weight to the cumulative safety, environmental, drainage, traffic, nuisance and security impacts described above. I therefore urge the Authority to **refuse** the application.

Please acknowledge receipt of this objection. Thank you for your attention.

Yours faithfully,

A.D

tpbpd/PLAND

寄件者: [REDACTED]
寄件日期: 2026年08月25日星期二 8:15
收件者: tpbpd/PLAND
主旨: 強烈反對規劃申請 A/STT/38 (臨時公眾停車場) — 主要出入口首個位置將造成嚴重交通擠塞及危及居民安全

類別: Internet Email

各位城市規劃委員會：

本人現就規劃申請編號：A/STT/38（擬議為臨時公眾停車場（貨櫃車除外）為期5年）強烈反對。

本人反對理由如下：

1. 主要出入口（首個出入口）將導致嚴重交通擠塞

申請場地的車輛進出必然增加路面車流量，尤其是以主要出入口首個出入口作為車輛出入點，會造成車輛長時間排隊、頻繁停停走走，令鄰近路段交通更易擠塞，直接影響附近居民的日常出入。

2. 嚴重危及老人家及小朋友的性命安全

在交通擠塞及車輛頻密出入情況下，行人（尤其是長者及小童）在出入口附近通行的風險大幅上升，包括出現車輛盲點、突然煞停、車輛逼近等情況。這不只是「不便」，而是可能導致意外的真正生命安全風險。本人強烈關注及反對上述風險被忽視。

3. 嚴重騷擾居民，影響生活環境

長時間的車輛活動會帶來噪音、排放及日常滋擾，且當出入口附近需要大量調頭／停泊／等待時，影響會更集中、更難以回避，令居民生活質素受損。

鑑於上述理由，本人懇請城規會： 否決有關申請

敬請將本人的強烈反對意見納入城規會的審議記錄。

此致
城市規劃委員會／相關審議部門

潘先生
2026年08月25日

tpbpd/PLAND

寄件者: [REDACTED]
寄件日期: 2026年08月24日星期一 16:56
收件者: tpbpd/PLAND
主旨: 反對申請編號 A/STT/38 申請
類別: Internet Email

致城規會專員

本人**反對申請編號 A/STT/38 申請**，該申請位置非常接近民居，無論嘈音、空氣污染或交通安全都對村民造成極大影響，以下是反對的重點：

- 道路問題- 洲頭南路和洲頭西路都是單線雙程行車，落馬洲路是禁止車輛駛入洲頭西路，所有車輛必須由洲頭南路入，平日村民已有量車輛，單車和行人使用，有時單車和汽車同時行走已十分危險，單線雙程行車道路不能承受大量車流，進入停車場造成交通擠塞，現時違泊車輛進入停車場(已有車輛停泊)需經行人通道和綠化地，是否可移除行人通道和改變綠化地作車輛通道，危及行人安全

之前申請編號 A/STT/34 未有按合約上安裝設施已開始營運，**每到星期五、六、日必然超出泊車數量而當局都沒有跟進和查辦**，還讓更多鄉郊土地改作停車場，破壞鄉郊土地環境，**還讓更多鄉郊土地改作停車場，破壞鄉郊土地環境**

潘屋村居民上
24-8-2026

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

8

tpbpd/PLAND

寄件者: [REDACTED]
寄件日期: 2026年08月24日星期一 17:35
收件者: tpbpd/PLAND
主旨: 反對興建停車場， application no. A/STT/38

類別: Internet Email

有關在潘屋村再次興建停車場，本人提出不贊成。較早前在村內已獲批了一個停車場，已令村民造成滋擾和不便。在這麼短時間內又再次興建另一停車場，位置也接近民居，有否考慮村民安全，居住環境受到嚴重影響和破壞，不論是空氣質素，噪音，閒雜人等出出入入等等都會影響村內居民，所以應該要慎重考慮。

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

9

tpbpd/PLAND

寄件者: [REDACTED]
寄件日期: 2026年08月24日星期一 17:14
收件者: tpbpd/PLAND
主旨: Objection to application A/STT/38
類別: Internet Email

Good afternoon,

I wanted to email my objection to the following application : A/STT/48.

I am a resident of chau tau village and wanted to voice my concern.

A few reasons for my objection are:

That we the residents don't require more car park spaces. This will end up with more outside people parking in our village causing more traffic and pollution. The parking won't benefit us as residents more for outsiders.

Parking within our village that far in for outsiders, I can see foreseeable conflicts happening between residents and car park customers.

As well the planning estimate of possible traffic has no point as those numbers are non-viable data.

I am not sure about Feng shui, but I don't think it's good to build a carpark in front of our ancestors' gravesite.

I advise to count our concerns in before approving this planned carpark.

Kind regards,
Wai -Sun Man

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

tpbpd/PLAND

寄件者: [REDACTED]
寄件日期: 2026年08月24日星期一 22:26
收件者: tpbpd/PLAND
主旨: Objection application A/STT/38
類別: Internet Email

I am writing to register my absolute, uncompromising rejection of application A/STT/38. As a resident of Chau Tau Village, I firmly oppose this destructive and entirely unjustified expansion. Enough is enough. The adjacent Poon Uk and Chau Tau villages already possess more than enough parking. We will not tolerate our home being turned into a thoroughfare for outside vehicles commuting to Shenzhen.

I demand the immediate rejection of A/STT/38 on the following indisputable grounds:

1. Blatant V-Zone Violation and Fabricated Claims

This site sits within a "V" (Village Type Development) zone. A large-scale commercial car park here is a severe violation of this zoning's intent. The proposal submitted by R-riches Planning Limited is built on outright fabrications. Their claims regarding "limited transport" are entirely false; our public transport is highly efficient, connecting us directly to Shenzhen, Kowloon, and beyond. This application does not serve the community; it exists solely for the financial gain of the applicant, Mr. Michael Wong, an individual who has repeatedly caused disruption in our area.

2. Life-Threatening Flooding and Imminent Liability

Let me be absolutely clear: the land filling already conducted on this site almost cost me my life. My home and ten neighboring properties were submerged under two feet of water, resulting in tens of thousands of pounds in uncompensated damage. I narrowly escaped electrocution. If your department approves this application and ignores the catastrophic drainage impacts, we will hold the Town Planning Board directly and legally liable for any future property destruction, injuries, or loss of life. We are fully prepared to submit our evidence of this damage.

3. Desecration of Sacred Grounds

The proposed site sits directly in front of a major shrine for Chau Tau Village. Approving this application means paving over the very ground where hundreds of villagers gather during the Ching Ming and Chong Yeung festivals to honor our ancestors. We will not allow our sacred spaces to be desecrated, nor will we allow our village's Feng Shui to be destroyed for a redundant parking lot.

4. Ongoing Illegal Operations and Endangerment

This site is already operating illegally as an unauthorized car park. I possess photographic evidence of heavy industrial vehicles (exceeding 5.5 tons and 6 meters) tearing through our village day and night. The applicant is already breaking the law, causing severe noise pollution, and endangering the

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

lives of pedestrians who walk along Chau Tau South and West roads. The consultant's claims that impacts are "not anticipated" are an insult to the reality we are living with.

Conclusion

The villagers of Chau Tau will not bow to private greed or tolerate wrongdoers. Should you approve A/STT/38, we will immediately initiate a judicial review and formally report your department for gross negligence of duty, endangerment of public health, and the facilitation of illegal operations.

Do not ignore the voices of the villagers. Reject this application immediately.

Regards,

Regards,
Miss Lau C
(Resident of Chau Tau Village)

tpbpd/PLAND

寄件者: [REDACTED]
寄件日期: 2026年08月24日星期一 22:22
收件者: tpbpd/PLAND
主旨: Objection application A/STT/38

類別: Internet Email

I strongly object to application A/STT/38 for yet another never-ending expansion of a vehicle parking lot.

The adjacent Poon Uk and Chau Tau villages already have sufficient parking for residents. The site in question serves only outside vehicles heading to and from Shenzhen. The previously and unfortunately approved applications A/STT/33 and A/STT/34 are more than enough to serve such a purpose. Enough is enough. We do not need or demand more parking lots, as there is no local demand with foreseeable conflicts between outsiders and villagers for rights of road.

We, as villagers, will not tolerate yet another expansion. It is entirely out of line with "V" (Village Type Development) zone planning. A large-scale car park simply does not fit between villages, and certainly not within a V-zone. No villagers will benefit from such a facility—only the applicant, Mr. Michael Wong, an unwelcome and infamous figure in the area who causes more destruction than peace. The site sits right in front of a major shrine for Chau Tau Village, where hundreds of people gather during the Ching Ming and Chong Yeung festivals. Where would they stand if this sacred place is turned into a parking lot? Furthermore, it would ruin the Feng Shui, which villagers strongly believe in and uphold. I and many others are deeply disappointed that the Planning Department approved A/STT/33 and A/STT/34, despite numerous objections submitted by villagers and residents regarding the environmental impact and nuisances caused to adjacent communities.

The proposal submitted by R-riches Planning Limited is "well written," "unbiased," and "professionally documented," but they do not live here, nor will they feel the impact that surrounding parking lots impose on us. Their sole aim is financial gain while neglecting the consequences. Does personal profit outweigh the collective well-being and health of surrounding villagers? Do the voices of villagers count for nothing, bowing instead to wrongdoers?

As a matter of fact, my house and ten other neighbouring properties have suffered severe to catastrophic flooding multiple times, caused by land filling on the application site. Our homes were submerged under two feet of water, causing tens of thousands of pounds worth of water damage that remains uncompensated to this day. We are eager to submit evidence if your department wishes to review proof. I narrowly escaped death from electrocution caused by one foot of water inside my house. Had proper precautions been taken, such flooding and water ingress would never have happened. We experience severe anxiety and nervousness during heavy rainfall, typhoons, and monsoons, fearing further floods. We will hold your department responsible for any future flooding and will seek financial compensation for losses incurred.

The claim that the site offers necessary long-distance walking access is false; it is merely a 5-minute

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

walk, and most people book taxis or Ubers nowadays, making additional parking unnecessary. The argument regarding limited destinations and infrequency is another ungrounded and untrue excuse. There are numerous buses and taxis connecting to Shenzhen, Tuen Mun, Chai Wan, Yuen Long, and Sheung Shui. In fact, owning a car is a luxury because public transport is extremely convenient. Our family takes buses to Chai Wan and Kowloon on a daily basis.

Furthermore, the increase in traffic along Chau Tau South Road will endanger pedestrians, including myself, who take morning and evening strolls along Chau Tau South and West roads.

Last but not least, the site in question is already operating secretly as an unauthorized "temporary" car park, and I have photos to prove it. Numerous heavy industrial vehicles over 5.5 tons and longer than 6 meters are seen entering and leaving the premises daily and nightly. This directly contradicts R-riches Planning Limited's proposal. The noise pollution and dangerous conditions are constant. The claims by R-riches Planning Limited that impacts are "denormalised" or "not anticipated" are absolute nonsense, as we live literally next to applications A/STT/33, A/STT/34, and A/STT/38.

Should your department still approve A/STT/38, we will seek a judicial review and report negligence of duty regarding the protection of surrounding villages, public health, and irreversible environmental impacts.

Regards,
Mr. Y Man
(Resident of Chau Tau Village)

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review**參考編號**

260824-152630-01809

Reference Number:**提交限期**

25/08/2026

Deadline for submission:**提交日期及時間**

24/08/2026 15:26:30

Date and time of submission:**有關的規劃申請編號**

A/STT/38

The application no. to which the comment relates:**「提意見人」姓名/名稱**

先生 Mr. Alan Man

Name of person making this comment:**意見詳情****Details of the Comment :**

I strongly object to application A/STT/38 for yet another never-ending expansion of a vehicle parking lot.

The adjacent Poon Uk and Chau Tau villages already have sufficient parking for residents. The site in question serves only outside vehicles heading to and from Shenzhen. The previously and unfortunately approved applications A/STT/33 and A/STT/34 are more than enough to serve such a purpose. Enough is enough. We do not need or demand more parking lots, as there is no local demand.

We, as villagers, will not tolerate yet another expansion. It is entirely out of line with "V" (Village Type Development) zone planning. A large-scale car park simply does not fit between villages, and certainly not within a V-zone. No villagers will benefit from such a facility—only the applicant, Mr. Michael Wong, an unwelcome and infamous figure in the area who causes more destruction than peace.

The site sits right in front of a major shrine for Chau Tau Village, where hundreds of people gather during the Ching Ming and Chong Yeung festivals. Where would they stand if this sacred place is turned into a parking lot? Furthermore, it would ruin the Feng Shui, which villagers strongly believe in and uphold.

I and many others are deeply disappointed that the Planning Department approved A/STT/33 and A/STT/34, despite numerous objections submitted by villagers and residents regarding the environmental impact and nuisances caused to adjacent communities.

The proposal submitted by R-riches Planning Limited is "well written," "unbiased," and "professionally documented," but they do not live here, nor will they feel the impact that surrounding parking lots impose on us. Their sole aim is financial gain while neglecting the consequences. Does personal profit outweigh the collective well-being and health of surrounding villagers? Do the voices of villagers count for nothing, bowing instead to wrongdoers?

As a matter of fact, my house and ten other neighboring properties have suffered severe to catastrophic flooding multiple times, caused by land filling on the application site. Our homes were submerged under two feet of water, causing tens of thousands of pounds worth of water damage th

at remains uncompensated to this day. We are eager to submit evidence if your department wishes to review proof. I narrowly escaped death from electrocution caused by one foot of water inside my house. Had proper precautions been taken, such flooding and water ingress would never have happened. We experience severe anxiety and nervousness during heavy rainfalls, typhoons, and monsoons, fearing further floods. We will hold your department responsible for any future flooding and will seek financial compensation for losses incurred.

The claim that the site offers necessary long-distance walking access is false; it is merely a 5-minute walk, and most people book taxis or Ubers nowadays, making additional parking totally unnecessary. The argument regarding limited destinations and infrequency is another ungrounded and untrue excuse. There are numerous buses and taxis connecting to Shenzhen, Tuen Mun, Chai Wan, Yuen Long, and Sheung Shui. In fact, owning a car is a luxury because public transport is extremely convenient. Our family takes buses to Chai Wan and Kowloon on a daily basis.

Furthermore, the increase in traffic along Chau Tau South Road will endanger pedestrians, including myself, who take morning and evening strolls along Chau Tau South and West roads.

Last but not least, the site in question is already operating secretly as an unauthorized "temporary" car park, and I have photos to prove it. Numerous heavy industrial vehicles over 5.5 tons and longer than 6 meters are seen entering and leaving the premises daily and nightly. This directly contradicts R-riches Planning Limited's proposal. The noise pollution and dangerous conditions are constant. The claims by R-riches Planning Limited that impacts are "denormalised" or "not anticipated" are absolute nonsense, as we live literally next to applications A/STT/33, A/STT/34, and A/STT/38.

Should your department still approve A/STT/38, we will seek a judicial review and report negligence of duty regarding the protection of surrounding villages, public health, and irreversible environmental impacts.

Regards,
Mr. A Man
(Resident of Chau Tau Village)

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號
Reference Number: 260824-155123-34376

提交限期
Deadline for submission: 25/08/2026

提交日期及時間
Date and time of submission: 24/08/2026 15:51:23

有關的規劃申請編號
The application no. to which the comment relates: A/STT/38

「提意見人」姓名/名稱
Name of person making this comment: 先生 Mr. F Man

意見詳情
Details of the Comment :

I strongly object to application A/STT/38 for yet another never-ending expansion of a vehicle parking lot.

The adjacent Poon Uk and Chau Tau villages already have sufficient parking for residents. The site in question serves only outside vehicles heading to and from Shenzhen. The previously and unfortunately approved applications A/STT/33 and A/STT/34 are more than enough to serve such a purpose. Enough is enough. We do not need or demand more parking lots, as there is no local demand.

We, as villagers, will not tolerate yet another expansion. It is entirely out of line with "V" (Village Type Development) zone planning. A large-scale car park simply does not fit between villages, and certainly not within a V-zone. No villagers will benefit from such a facility—only the applicant, Mr. Michael Wong, an unwelcome and infamous figure in the area who causes more destruction than peace.

The site sits right in front of a major shrine for Chau Tau Village, where hundreds of people gather during the Ching Ming and Chong Yeung festivals. Where would they stand if this sacred place is turned into a parking lot? Furthermore, it would ruin the Feng Shui, which villagers strongly believe in and uphold.

I and many others are deeply disappointed that the Planning Department approved A/STT/33 and A/STT/34, despite numerous objections submitted by villagers and residents regarding the environmental impact and nuisances caused to adjacent communities.

The proposal submitted by R-riches Planning Limited is "well written," "unbiased," and "professionally documented," but they do not live here, nor will they feel the impact that surrounding parking lots impose on us. Their sole aim is financial gain while neglecting the consequences. Does personal profit outweigh the collective well-being and health of surrounding villagers? Do the voices of villagers count for nothing, bowing instead to wrongdoers?

As a matter of fact, my house and ten other neighboring properties have suffered severe to catastrophic flooding multiple times, caused by land filling on the application site. Our homes were submerged under two feet of water, causing tens of thousands of pounds worth of water damage to

at remains uncompensated to this day. We are eager to submit evidence if your department wishes to review proof. I narrowly escaped death from electrocution caused by one foot of water inside my house. Had proper precautions been taken, such flooding and water ingress would never have happened. We experience severe anxiety and nervousness during heavy rainfalls, typhoons, and monsoons, fearing further floods. We will hold your department responsible for any future flooding and will seek financial compensation for losses incurred.

The claim that the site offers necessary long-distance walking access is false; it is merely a 5-minute walk, and most people book taxis or Ubers nowadays, making additional parking totally unnecessary. The argument regarding limited destinations and infrequency is another ungrounded and untrue excuse. There are numerous buses and taxis connecting to Shenzhen, Tuen Mun, Chai Wan, Yuen Long, and Sheung Shui. In fact, owning a car is a luxury because public transport is extremely convenient. Our family takes buses to Chai Wan and Kowloon on a daily basis.

Furthermore, the increase in traffic along Chau Tau South Road will endanger pedestrians, including myself, who take morning and evening strolls along Chau Tau South and West roads.

Last but not least, the site in question is already operating secretly as an unauthorized "temporary" car park, and I have photos to prove it. Numerous heavy industrial vehicles over 5.5 tons and longer than 6 meters are seen entering and leaving the premises daily and nightly. This directly contradicts R-riches Planning Limited's proposal. The noise pollution and dangerous conditions are constant. The claims by R-riches Planning Limited that impacts are "denormalised" or "not anticipated" are absolute nonsense, as we live literally next to applications A/STT/33, A/STT/34, and A/STT/38.

Should your department still approve A/STT/38, we will seek a judicial review and report negligence of duty regarding the protection of surrounding villages, public health, and irreversible environmental impacts.

Regards,
Mr. F Man
(Resident of Chau Tau Village)

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號
Reference Number: 260824-162914-11585

提交限期
Deadline for submission: 25/08/2026

提交日期及時間
Date and time of submission: 24/08/2026 16:29:14

有關的規劃申請編號
The application no. to which the comment relates: A/STT/38

「提意見人」姓名/名稱
Name of person making this comment: 先生 Mr. L Man

意見詳情
Details of the Comment :

I strongly object to application A/STT/38 for yet another never-ending expansion of a vehicle parking lot.

The adjacent Poon Uk and Chau Tau villages already have sufficient parking for residents. The site in question serves only outside vehicles heading to and from Shenzhen. The previously and unfortunately approved applications A/STT/33 and A/STT/34 are more than enough to serve such a purpose. Enough is enough. We do not need or demand more parking lots, as there is no local demand.

We, as villagers, will not tolerate yet another expansion. It is entirely out of line with "V" (Village Type Development) zone planning. A large-scale car park simply does not fit between villages, and certainly not within a V-zone. No villagers will benefit from such a facility—only the applicant, Mr. Michael Wong, an unwelcome and infamous figure in the area who causes more destruction than peace.

The site sits right in front of a major shrine for Chau Tau Village, where hundreds of people gather during the Ching Ming and Chong Yeung festivals. Where would they stand if this sacred place is turned into a parking lot? Furthermore, it would ruin the Feng Shui, which villagers strongly believe in and uphold.

I and many others are deeply disappointed that the Planning Department approved A/STT/33 and A/STT/34, despite numerous objections submitted by villagers and residents regarding the environmental impact and nuisances caused to adjacent communities.

The proposal submitted by R-riches Planning Limited is "well written," "unbiased," and "professionally documented," but they do not live here, nor will they feel the impact that surrounding parking lots impose on us. Their sole aim is financial gain while neglecting the consequences. Does personal profit outweigh the collective well-being and health of surrounding villagers? Do the voices of villagers count for nothing, bowing instead to wrongdoers?

As a matter of fact, my house and ten other neighboring properties have suffered severe to catastrophic flooding multiple times, caused by land filling on the application site. Our homes were submerged under two feet of water, causing tens of thousands of pounds worth of water damage to

at remains uncompensated to this day. We are eager to submit evidence if your department wishes to review proof. I narrowly escaped death from electrocution caused by one foot of water inside my house. Had proper precautions been taken, such flooding and water ingress would never have happened. We experience severe anxiety and nervousness during heavy rainfalls, typhoons, and monsoons, fearing further floods. We will hold your department responsible for any future flooding and will seek financial compensation for losses incurred.

The claim that the site offers necessary long-distance walking access is false; it is merely a 5-minute walk, and most people book taxis or Ubers nowadays, making additional parking totally unnecessary. The argument regarding limited destinations and infrequency is another ungrounded and untrue excuse. There are numerous buses and taxis connecting to Shenzhen, Tuen Mun, Chai Wan, Yuen Long, and Sheung Shui. In fact, owning a car is a luxury because public transport is extremely convenient. Our family takes buses to Chai Wan and Kowloon on a daily basis.

Furthermore, the increase in traffic along Chau Tau South Road will endanger pedestrians, including myself, who take morning and evening strolls along Chau Tau South and West roads.

Last but not least, the site in question is already operating secretly as an unauthorized "temporary" car park, and I have photos to prove it. Numerous heavy industrial vehicles over 5.5 tons and longer than 6 meters are seen entering and leaving the premises daily and nightly. This directly contradicts R-riches Planning Limited's proposal. The noise pollution and dangerous conditions are constant. The claims by R-riches Planning Limited that impacts are "denormalised" or "not anticipated" are absolute nonsense, as we live literally next to applications A/STT/33, A/STT/34, and A/STT/38.

Should your department still approve A/STT/38, we will seek a judicial review and report negligence of duty regarding the protection of surrounding villages, public health, and irreversible environmental impacts.

Regards,
Mr. L Man
(Resident of Chau Tau Village)

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號
Reference Number: 260824-163233-09535

提交限期
Deadline for submission: 25/08/2026

提交日期及時間
Date and time of submission: 24/08/2026 16:32:33

有關的規劃申請編號
The application no. to which the comment relates: A/STT/38

「提意見人」姓名/名稱
Name of person making this comment: 先生 Mr. Mr C Man

意見詳情
Details of the Comment :

I strongly object to application A/STT/38 for yet another never-ending expansion of a vehicle parking lot.

The adjacent Poon Uk and Chau Tau villages already have sufficient parking for residents. The site in question serves only outside vehicles heading to and from Shenzhen. The previously and unfortunately approved applications A/STT/33 and A/STT/34 are more than enough to serve such a purpose. Enough is enough. We do not need or demand more parking lots, as there is no local demand.

We, as villagers, will not tolerate yet another expansion. It is entirely out of line with "V" (Village Type Development) zone planning. A large-scale car park simply does not fit between villages, and certainly not within a V-zone. No villagers will benefit from such a facility—only the applicant, Mr. Michael Wong, an unwelcome and infamous figure in the area who causes more destruction than peace.

The site sits right in front of a major shrine for Chau Tau Village, where hundreds of people gather during the Ching Ming and Chong Yeung festivals. Where would they stand if this sacred place is turned into a parking lot? Furthermore, it would ruin the Feng Shui, which villagers strongly believe in and uphold.

I and many others are deeply disappointed that the Planning Department approved A/STT/33 and A/STT/34, despite numerous objections submitted by villagers and residents regarding the environmental impact and nuisances caused to adjacent communities.

The proposal submitted by R-riches Planning Limited is "well written," "unbiased," and "professionally documented," but they do not live here, nor will they feel the impact that surrounding parking lots impose on us. Their sole aim is financial gain while neglecting the consequences. Does personal profit outweigh the collective well-being and health of surrounding villagers? Do the voices of villagers count for nothing, bowing instead to wrongdoers?

As a matter of fact, my house and ten other neighboring properties have suffered severe to catastrophic flooding multiple times, caused by land filling on the application site. Our homes were submerged under two feet of water, causing tens of thousands of pounds worth of water damage to

at remains uncompensated to this day. We are eager to submit evidence if your department wishes to review proof. I narrowly escaped death from electrocution caused by one foot of water inside my house. Had proper precautions been taken, such flooding and water ingress would never have happened. We experience severe anxiety and nervousness during heavy rainfalls, typhoons, and monsoons, fearing further floods. We will hold your department responsible for any future flooding and will seek financial compensation for losses incurred.

The claim that the site offers necessary long-distance walking access is false; it is merely a 5-minute walk, and most people book taxis or Ubers nowadays, making additional parking totally unnecessary. The argument regarding limited destinations and infrequency is another ungrounded and untrue excuse. There are numerous buses and taxis connecting to Shenzhen, Tuen Mun, Chai Wan, Yuen Long, and Sheung Shui. In fact, owning a car is a luxury because public transport is extremely convenient. Our family takes buses to Chai Wan and Kowloon on a daily basis.

Furthermore, the increase in traffic along Chau Tau South Road will endanger pedestrians, including myself, who take morning and evening strolls along Chau Tau South and West roads.

Last but not least, the site in question is already operating secretly as an unauthorized "temporary" car park, and I have photos to prove it. Numerous heavy industrial vehicles over 5.5 tons and longer than 6 meters are seen entering and leaving the premises daily and nightly. This directly contradicts R-riches Planning Limited's proposal. The noise pollution and dangerous conditions are constant. The claims by R-riches Planning Limited that impacts are "denormalised" or "not anticipated" are absolute nonsense, as we live literally next to applications A/STT/33, A/STT/34, and A/STT/38.

Should your department still approve A/STT/38, we will seek a judicial review and report negligence of duty regarding the protection of surrounding villages, public health, and irreversible environmental impacts.

Regards,
Mr. C Man
(Resident of Chau Tau Village)

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號
Reference Number: 260825-023011-18253

提交限期
Deadline for submission: 25/08/2026

提交日期及時間
Date and time of submission: 25/08/2026 02:30:11

有關的規劃申請編號
The application no. to which the comment relates: A/STT/38

「提意見人」姓名/名稱
Name of person making this comment: 先生 Mr. H Man

意見詳情 Details of the Comment :

H Man
Chau Tau Village, San Tin, Yuen Long
Email [REDACTED]

Secretary of the Board
Town Planning Board
15th Floor, North Point Government Offices,
333 Java Road, North Point
Email - tpbpd@pland.gov.hk

Date: 25th August 2026

Dear Sir and Madame,
I refer to the Application No. A/STT/38 for the Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Private Cars and Light Goods Vehicles) and 4 structures for a Period of 5 Years at Lot 188 (Part), 189 (Part), 192 (Part), 193, 194, 195, 196, 199 (Part) and 200 (Part) in D.D.96, Pun Uk Tsuen, San Tin, Yuen Long.

The residents and indigenous villagers of Chau Tau Village and Pun Uk Tsuen at the application site strongly object to the development due to the reasons as follows:

1. "The proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the "Village Type Development" ("V") zone, which is to designate both existing recognised villages and areas of land considered suitable for village expansion. Land within "V" zone is primarily intended for development of Small Houses by indigenous villagers. The scale of the proposed commercial development is considered excessive in serving the local needs and is not compatible with the developments in the surrounding areas. No strong planning justification has been given in the submission to justify the proposed scale and operation of the commercial development in the "V" zone and a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis."
2. Vehicular access to The Site from Chau Tau West Road was previously not possible until the government land near the ingress/egress have been illegally land filled and surfaced with concrete

without planning permission .

3. The application site was previously agricultural land, but it has been illegally land filled and surfaced with tarmac without planning permission. This development has lead to contamination of the water course and flooding during heavy rainstorm to neighbouring agricultural lands.

4. The site is repeatedly trying to apply for planning permission for various usages; fortunately, the response from The Town Planning Board was always refusal.

The residents and indigenous villagers urge the Town Planning Board to refuse planning permission and to preserve the precious "Village Type Development" ("V") zone for development of Small Houses and to acknowledge that illegal land filling by force to obtain vehicular access is not acceptable to the Town Planning Board.

Kind regards,
H Man

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號

260825-102239-70900

Reference Number:

提交限期

25/08/2026

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

25/08/2026 10:22:39

Date and time of submission:

有關的規劃申請編號

A/STT/38

The application no. to which the comment relates:

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

小姐 Miss Rachel Siu

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

本人為潘屋村居民，想就

申請編號Application No. A/STT/38 提出反對

A. 交通安全與行人路衝突

- 現時唯一通道為行人路，並非行車道路，寬度、路面承重、視線距離均不適合車輛進出。
- 若車輛每日經行人路出入，將對長者、兒童、推嬰兒車居民構成直接危險。
- 缺乏人車分流設計，違反運輸署《香港規劃標準與準則》中有關行人安全的原則。

B. 道路容量與消防風險

- 村內道路狹窄，車輛進出可能阻塞緊急車輛通道（消防車、救護車）。
- 停車場若無足夠迴旋空間，倒車入出會增加意外風險。
- 建議參考消防處對緊急車輛通道的最低要求（通常需不少於3.5米闊及4.5米高淨空），現有行人路明顯不達標。

C. 環境與噪音滋擾

- 車輛每日進出產生廢氣、引擎噪音，影響鄰近住宅的空氣質素及寧靜環境。
- 停車場可能引致光污染（夜間照明）及熱島效應（大面積硬地化）。
- 若無排水系統，地面油污及輪胎沉積物可能隨雨水流入村內渠道。

D. 與現有土地用途不協調

- 該地段屬鄉村式發展（V Zone）或低密度住宅地帶，原意為低強度居住用途，停車場屬非住宅用途，與周邊環境不協調。
- 若獲批，可能成為先例，引發更多同類申請，進一步破壞鄉村景觀及生活質素。

E. 缺乏配套設施

- 申請範圍無獨立行車出入口，必須依賴行人路，規劃上不完整。
- 無提供足夠的渠務、消防、景觀及泊位數量評估，申請資料未足以支持審批。

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號
Reference Number: 260825-102830-82106

提交限期
Deadline for submission: 25/08/2026

提交日期及時間
Date and time of submission: 25/08/2026 10:28:30

有關的規劃申請編號
The application no. to which the comment relates: A/STT/38

「提意見人」姓名/名稱
Name of person making this comment: 小姐 Miss Daisy Siu

意見詳情
Details of the Comment :

反對 A/STT/38 申請停車場

交通安全與人車爭路：地塊僅有一條行人路連接，顯示該處道路狹窄或未設計車輛進出通道。若興建停車場，車輛頻繁進出將與行人（包括長者和學童）爭路，極易引發交通意外。

道路負荷過大：單一狹窄行人路根本無法承受汽車流量，會導致車輛阻塞、倒灌，嚴重影響區內居民日常出入。

環境滋擾與污染：停車場帶來的汽車廢氣、噪音及夜間燈光，會嚴重破壞住宅區的寧靜與居住環境質素。

與規劃意向不符：該地塊位於住宅範圍內，引入車流量大的停車場設施，違背了住宅地帶以居住為主及確保優良居住環境的規劃原意。

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號
Reference Number: 260825-103621-99744

提交限期
Deadline for submission: 25/08/2026

提交日期及時間
Date and time of submission: 25/08/2026 10:36:21

有關的規劃申請編號
The application no. to which the comment relates: A/STT/38

「提意見人」姓名/名稱
Name of person making this comment: 女士 Ms. Koyuenmei

意見詳情
Details of the Comment :

本人居住潘屋村 反對A/STT/38申請

若地塊僅有一條行人路連接卻申請興建停車場，車輛進出必須與行人爭路，對居民會造成多方面的影響：

1. 行人安全風險大增人車爭路：車輛頻繁出入唯一的行人路，大大增加行人（尤其是長者和學童）被碰撞的機會。視線受阻：車輛轉彎或進出時，狹窄的通道可能造成死角，司機與行人互相不易察覺。
2. 行人路權與空間受損通道被佔用：車輛出入可能需要擴闊路口或壓碎行人路邊界，導致行人實際可步行空間變窄。排隊等候車流：車輛在入口排隊或等候開機時，會阻擋行人正常通行。

該地皮只有一條狹窄行人路，若然若然申請成為停車場車，會對居民造成多大的不便，村內多為長者，出入都是依靠這條行人路，很容易造成人命傷亡，請慎重考慮，並不接納申請。

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號

260825-104603-51541

Reference Number:

提交限期

25/08/2026

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

25/08/2026 10:46:03

Date and time of submission:

有關的規劃申請編號

A/STT/38

The application no. to which the comment relates:

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

小姐 Miss Hay chui

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

反對 A/STT/38 申請

我們一致要求：

- 否決有關停車場申請；
- 維護村內行人路只供行人使用的原則；
- 要求政府部門嚴格把關，保障鄉村居民權益。

1. 唯一通道為行人路，不具備行車條件

擬建停車場的唯一連接通道為一條行人路，路面狹窄，僅足夠行人通過，無法容納車輛安全進出。若車輛強行使用該行人路，將直接威脅行人，尤其是長者、幼童及推嬰兒車的居民。

2. 缺乏人車分流設計

根據運輸署《香港規劃標準與準則》，住宅區內的行人通道應與行車通道分隔。然而該申請並未提供任何人車分流方案，車輛與行人共用入路，極易發生意外。

3. 視線受阻，倒車風險高

擬建停車場出入口視線受建築物及圍牆遮擋，駕駛者難以觀察路面行人情況。若車輛需倒車進入或離開，風險更高。

4. 影響緊急救援

一旦發生火警或醫療事故，狹窄行人路無法讓消防車或救護車通過，延誤救援時間，危及全村居民生命安全。

5. 與鄉村式發展地帶用途不符

該地段位於「鄉村式發展（V Zone）」地帶，規劃意向為低密度住宅及鄉村環境保育。在私人住宅範圍內興建停車場，屬於商業／非住宅用途擴展，與分區計劃大綱圖的規劃意向不符。

6. 2. 行人路屬公共空間，不應被私人車輛佔用

該行人路是村內居民日常出入的唯一通道，亦是兒童上學、長者晨運的必經之路。若被車輛佔用，等同犧牲全體居民的安全與便利，以滿足個別業主的私人利益。

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review**參考編號**

260825-113752-85019

Reference Number:**提交限期**

25/08/2026

Deadline for submission:**提交日期及時間**

25/08/2026 11:37:52

Date and time of submission:**有關的規劃申請編號**

A/STT/38

The application no. to which the comment relates:**「提意見人」姓名/名稱**

女士 Ms. Apple Tai

Name of person making this comment:**意見詳情****Details of the Comment :**

本人強烈反對 A/STT/38 興建停車場一事

理由如下

1. 行人路並非行車通道，使用性質不符

擬建停車場唯一連接通道為村內行人路，其原本設計、鋪設物料及闊度均只為行人使用。申請人擬將行人路改作車輛通道，變相改變通道用途，並未獲得村民同意或相關部門批准。

2. 長者行動緩慢，難以避讓車輛

本村有不少長者居住，他們行動較慢，部分需要使用拐杖或輪椅。若車輛與行人共用狹窄通道，長者難以即時避讓，風險極高。

3. 缺乏行人退避空間

行人路兩旁多為圍牆或排水明渠，根本沒有足夠空間讓行人退避。當車輛通過時，行人將被迫緊貼牆身或站在渠邊，情況危險。

4. 未有模擬最壞情況

若停車場全滿，車輛同時進出，行人路會出現什麼情況？申請人完全沒有提供任何模擬或預測。

申請地期屬於村內居民居住，而且單程行車只有一條行人路，嚴重影響居民出入及生命安全，請慎重考慮

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號
Reference Number: 260825-114822-83558

提交限期
Deadline for submission: 25/08/2026

提交日期及時間
Date and time of submission: 25/08/2026 11:48:22

有關的規劃申請編號
The application no. to which the comment relates: A/STT/38

「提意見人」姓名/名稱
Name of person making this comment: 小姐 Miss Tai Yu ping

意見詳情 Details of the Comment :

強烈反對該地皮申請成為停車場
反對原因如下

1. 行人安全直接受威脅

- 村內道路原本以行人為本，居民日常步行、晨運、接送子女上學均依賴行人路。
- 車輛進出停車場時，行人需貼牆或站在渠邊避讓，對長者、兒童、孕婦及行動不便者尤其危險。
- 村內兒童往往在行人路上玩耍或騎單車，駕駛者視線受限，容易發生碰撞。

2. 缺乏人車分流

- 村內通道狹窄，無法做到人車分隔。車輛與行人共用同一通道，任何時段都可能發生意外。
- 夜間照明不足時，駕駛者更難察覺行人，風險倍增。

3. 緊急救援受阻

- 停車場出入口若被車輛堵塞或排隊進出，可能阻礙救護車、消防車進入村內。
- 一旦發生火警或醫療緊急事故，延誤救援的後果不堪設想。

二、健康與環境影響

1. 空氣污染加劇

- 車輛每日進出排放廢氣，包括一氧化碳、氮氧化物及懸浮粒子，直接影響鄰近住宅的通風及空氣質素。
- 長期吸入有害氣體，對患有哮喘、心臟病或呼吸系統疾病的居民構成健康風險。

2. 噪音滋擾

- 車輛引擎聲、關門聲、防盜系統誤鳴、倒車警號等噪音，尤其在清晨及深夜時段，嚴重影響居民休息。
- 村屋密度雖低，但聲音在鄉村環境中傳播明顯，夜間更為突出。

3. 治安憂慮

- 停車場出入人流增加，陌生人可藉詞進入村內，增加盜竊或其他罪案的風險。
- 夜間停車場可能成為閒雜人等聚集的地點。

該處更為單程行車

只有一條路進出村內位置，嚴重影響居民生活及生命安全。

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號
Reference Number: 260825-115602-02872

提交限期
Deadline for submission: 25/08/2026

提交日期及時間
Date and time of submission: 25/08/2026 11:56:02

有關的規劃申請編號
The application no. to which the comment relates: A/STT/38

「提意見人」姓名/名稱
Name of person making this comment: 先生 Mr. Rocky

意見詳情
Details of the Comment :

本人居住村內，每日必經申請之地上下班。
對於申請非常反對

- 1.嚴重影響居民生活
- 2.只有一條單程路進出該位置，試問如何讓居民可以安心進出？
3. 聚集很多陌生人進出村內，影響村內居民安全
4. 該地更有先人墓地，影響先人休息
5. 村內很多長者小童，嚴重影響生命安全

希望可以平衡居民生活，不接納申請。

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號
Reference Number: 260825-120311-14860

提交限期
Deadline for submission: 25/08/2026

提交日期及時間
Date and time of submission: 25/08/2026 12:03:11

有關的規劃申請編號
The application no. to which the comment relates: A/STT/38

「提意見人」姓名/名稱
Name of person making this comment: 小姐 Miss Kam

意見詳情 Details of the Comment :

本人就A/STT/38申請提出強烈反對

1. 唯一通道為行人路，不具備行車條件

擬建停車場的唯一連接通道為一條行人路，其闊度、路面鋪設及設計均只適合行人使用。車輛若強行使用此通道，行人將被迫與車輛爭路，情況極度危險。

2. 長者及兒童面對最高風險

本村有不少長者及兒童居住。長者行動緩慢，部分需要使用拐杖或輪椅；兒童身材矮小，駕駛者視線容易忽略。當車輛在狹窄行人路上進出時，這些弱勢社群根本無法及時避讓。

3. 缺乏行人退避空間

行人路兩旁多為圍牆、欄杆或排水明渠，沒有足夠空間讓行人退避。當車輛通過時，行人被迫緊貼牆身或站在渠邊，稍一不慎便可能發生意外。

4. 倒車及視線盲點風險

停車場出入口的視線可能受建築物、圍牆或植物遮擋。駕駛者倒車進出時，難以察覺行人路上的兒童或寵物，碰撞風險極高。

二、交通安全隱患

1. 人車爭路，意外頻生

該行人路是村內居民日常出入的必經之路，包括上學、上班、買餸及晨運。一旦車輛獲准使用，人車爭路將成為常態，意外只是時間問題。

2. 缺乏交通管制措施

村內通道沒有交通燈、斑馬線、減速壘或行人優先標誌。在缺乏任何管制措施下，行人安全完全沒有保障。

3. 駕駛者不熟悉村內環境

停車場使用者可能並非本村居民，對村內行人路的狹窄程度、行人流量及盲點位置不熟悉，容易誤判情況，增加意外風險。

三、消防安全及緊急救援風險

1. 阻塞緊急車輛通道

根據消防處指引，緊急車輛通道須保持不少於3.5米闊及4.5米高淨空。現有行人路明顯未能符合此要求。若停車場車輛排隊進出或停泊在通道上，將完全阻塞消防車及救護車的通道。

2. 火警時疏散困難

一旦村內發生火警，居民需要迅速逃離。若狹窄通道被車輛佔用，居民逃生路線將受阻，後果不堪設想。

3. 停車場本身構成火警風險

停車場集中停放多輛汽車，車內燃油及電池均有火警風險。若其中一輛起火，火勢可能迅速蔓延，而狹窄通道將阻礙消防員灌救。

4. 救護車無法直達

對於需要緊急醫療救援的居民，每一分鐘都至關重要。若救護車因通道受阻而無法直達，延誤救援時間，可能危及生命。

生命無價，安全不容妥協。該停車場計劃對全村居民的人身安全構成重大而具體的威脅，而申請人完全未能提出任何有效的緩解措施或專業評估。本人懇請城市規劃委員會 / 地政總署 / 運輸署：

1. 否決有關停車場申請，以保障村民生命安全；
2. 若申請人將來重新提交申請，必須先提供全面的交通安全評估、消防風險評估及緊急應變計劃；
3. 維持該行人路只供行人使用的原則，明確拒絕任何將行人路改作行車通道的要求。

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號

260825-210337-03263

Reference Number:

提交限期

25/08/2026

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

25/08/2026 21:03:37

Date and time of submission:

有關的規劃申請編號

A/STT/38

The application no. to which the comment relates:

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

小姐 Miss Apple

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

本人就係A/STT/38作出強烈反對
原因如下

1. 唯一通道為行人路，不具備行車條件

擬建停車場的唯一連接通道為一條行人路，其闊度、路面鋪設及設計均只適合行人使用。車輛若強行使用此通道，行人將被迫與車輛爭路，情況極度危險。

2. 長者及兒童面對最高風險

本村有不少長者及兒童居住。長者行動緩慢，部分需要使用拐杖或輪椅；兒童身材矮小，駕駛者視線容易忽略。當車輛在狹窄行人路上進出時，這些弱勢社群根本無法及時避讓。

3. 缺乏行人退避空間

行人路兩旁多為圍牆、欄杆或排水明渠，沒有足夠空間讓行人退避。當車輛通過時，行人被迫緊貼牆身或站在渠邊，稍一不慎便可能發生意外。

4. 倒車及視線盲點風險

停車場出入口的視線可能受建築物、圍牆或植物遮擋。駕駛者倒車進出時，難以察覺行人路上的兒童或寵物，碰撞風險極高。

二、交通安全隱患

1. 人車爭路，意外頻生

該行人路是村內居民日常出入的必經之路，包括上學、上班、買餸及晨運。一旦車輛獲准使用，人車爭路將成為常態，意外只是時間問題。

2. 缺乏交通管制措施

村內通道沒有交通燈、斑馬線、減速壘或行人優先標誌。在缺乏任何管制措施下，行人安全完全沒有保障。

3. 駕駛者不熟悉村內環境

停車場使用者可能並非本村居民，對村內行人路的狹窄程度、行人流量及盲點位置不熟悉，容易誤判情況，增加意外風險。

生命無價，安全不容妥協。該停車場計劃對全村居民的人身安全構成重大而具體的威脅，而申請人完全未能提出任何有效的緩解措施或專業評估。本人懇請城市規劃委員會 / 地政總署 / 運輸署：

1. 否決有關停車場申請，以保障村民生命安全；
2. 若申請人將來重新提交申請，必須先提供全面的交通安全評估、消防風險評估及緊急應變計劃；
3. 維持該行人路只供行人使用的原則，明確拒絕任何將行人路改作行車通道的要求。

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號

Reference Number:

260825-211614-77632

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

25/08/2026

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

25/08/2026 21:16:14

有關的規劃申請編號

The application no. to which the comment relates:

A/STT/38

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

Name of person making this comment:

小姐 Miss Kam siu wah

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

本人想就申請作出反對

1. 陌生人出入增加治安風險

停車場使用者可能並非本村居民，任何人士皆可藉詞泊車進入村內。住戶無法分辨來者是否善意，對家居防盜及家人安全構成憂慮。

2. 夜間停車場成為治安盲點

停車場夜間人流稀疏，若缺乏足夠照明及閉路電視，可能成為閒雜人等聚集或匿藏的地點，直接威脅附近住戶的安全。

3. 兒童在門前玩耍不再安全

村屋住戶習慣讓兒童在門前空地玩耍。停車場啟用後，車輛在附近進出，住戶將不敢再讓兒童獨自外出，剝奪了兒童的自由活動空間。

4. 火警風險直接威脅家居

停車場與住宅距離過近，一旦車輛起火，火勢及濃煙可能波及附近住宅。住戶的生命及財產安全受到直接威脅。

5. 門前行人路被車輛佔用

住戶每日出入家門必須行經該行人路。一旦車輛獲准使用，行人路將變相成為行車通道，住戶出入時需時刻提防車輛，生活壓力大增。

家是每個人最基本的避風港。本人以住戶身份強烈反對該停車場計劃，因其對本人及家

人的日常生活、健康、安全及物業價值構成直接而深遠的負面影響。本人懇請城市規劃委員會 / 地政總署 / 運輸署：

1. 否決有關停車場申請，保障住戶的基本居住權益；
2. 明確維持該行人路只供行人使用的原則；
3. 若申請人將來重新提交申請，必須先諮詢直接受影響住戶，並提交噪音、空氣質素、治安及消防的全面評估報告；
4. 在未有任何有效緩解措施前，不應批准任何形式之停車場用途。

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號

Reference Number:

260825-212208-07805

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

25/08/2026

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

25/08/2026 21:22:08

有關的規劃申請編號

The application no. to which the comment relates:

A/STT/38

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

Name of person making this comment:

先生 Mr. Jason

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF A PRIVATE CAR PARK WITHIN THE VILLAGE

1. Direct Threat to Pedestrian Safety

1.1 The only access is a footpath, not a carriageway

The proposed car park is accessible only via a narrow pedestrian footpath. The path was neither designed nor constructed to accommodate vehicular traffic. Allowing vehicles to use this path would force pedestrians and vehicles to share the same narrow space, creating an unacceptable safety hazard.

1.2 Elderly residents and children face the highest risk

The village is home to many elderly residents and young children. Elderly pedestrians often move slowly, and some rely on walking aids or wheelchairs. Children are small in stature and easily overlooked by drivers. In such a confined space, these vulnerable groups would have no time or room to avoid an approaching vehicle.

1.3 No space for pedestrians to take refuge

The footpath is flanked by walls, fences, or open drains on both sides. There is no verge or recess where a pedestrian can step aside. When a vehicle passes, pedestrians would be forced to press themselves against a wall or stand precariously close to a drain.

1.4 Reversing vehicles and blind spots

The proposed entrance and exit are likely to suffer from restricted visibility due to surrounding walls or vegetation. A driver reversing into or out of the car park would have great difficulty seeing small children or pets on the footpath, substantially increasing the risk of a collision.

1.5 Increased presence of strangers

Users of the car park may not be village residents. Allowing the car park to operate would make it easier for unknown individuals to enter the village under the pretext of parking. Residents would have no way of distinguishing legitimate users from those with malicious intent.

28

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號

Reference Number:

260825-213453-92327

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

25/08/2026

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

25/08/2026 21:34:53

有關的規劃申請編號

The application no. to which the comment relates:

A/STT/38

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

Name of person making this comment:

先生 Mr. Wong

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

強烈反對——擬建停車場僅有一條行人路連接，完全不符合基本安全要求

本人為潘屋村居民，現就上述規劃申請提出正式反對。該申請擬在村內私人土地興建停車場，惟其唯一連接通道為一條行人路，完全無法滿足行車安全、行人保障及消防救援的基本要求。本人基於以下理由，懇請有關當局否決有關申請。

一、唯一通道僅為行人路，根本不具備行車條件

1. 行人路闊度不足

該行人路闊度僅約_____米，只足夠行人單向或雙向通過。車輛根本無法在該通道上安全行駛，更遑論同時容納行人及車輛。

2. 路面設計不適合車輛行駛

行人路的路面鋪設、路基結構及承重能力均以行人為標準，並非為承受車輛重量而建。若車輛長期行駛，路面勢必迅速損毀，甚至出現下陷。

3. 缺乏行人退避空間

行人路兩旁為_____（圍牆 / 欄杆 / 排水明渠），行人面對車輛時完全沒有退避空間。當車輛通過時，行人將被迫緊貼牆身或站在渠邊，情況極度危險。

二、行人安全受到直接威脅

1. 人車爭路，意外必然發生

該行人路是村內居民唯一的日常出入通道，包括長者晨運、兒童上學、家庭主婦買餸均須行經此路。一旦車輛獲准使用，人車爭路將成為每日常態，意外只是時間問題。

2. 長者與兒童最為脆弱

本村有大量長者及兒童居住。長者行動遲緩，部分需要拐杖輔助；兒童身形矮小，容易進入駕駛者視線盲點。在如此狹窄的通道上，這些弱勢社群根本無法及時避讓。

一條行人路，根本不可能同時承載行人的安全與車輛的進出。該申請從根本上缺乏可行性，對全村居民的生命安全構成直接而嚴重的威脅。

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review**參考編號**

260825-214041-48898

Reference Number:**提交限期**

25/08/2026

Deadline for submission:**提交日期及時間**

25/08/2026 21:40:41

Date and time of submission:**有關的規劃申請編號**

A/STT/38

The application no. to which the comment relates:**「提意見人」姓名/名稱**

先生 Mr. Jason

Name of person making this comment:**意見詳情****Details of the Comment :**

本人居住於村內，育有3名孩子，就上述申請作出強烈反對

1. 行人安全直接受威脅

- 村內道路原本以行人為本，居民日常步行、晨運、接送子女上學均依賴行人路。
- 車輛進出停車場時，行人需貼牆或站在渠邊避讓，對長者、兒童、孕婦及行動不便者尤其危險。
- 村內兒童往往在行人路上玩耍或騎單車，駕駛者視線受限，容易發生碰撞。

2. 缺乏人車分流

- 村內通道狹窄，無法做到人車分隔。車輛與行人共用同一通道，任何時段都可能發生意外。
- 夜間照明不足時，駕駛者更難察覺行人，風險倍增。

3. 治安憂慮

停車場出入人流增加，陌生人可藉詞進入村內，增加盜竊或其他罪案的風險。夜間停車場可能成為閒雜人等聚集的地點。

4. 道路加速損耗

- 村內行人路及通道原本設計只供行人使用，車輛長期輾壓會令路面龜裂、下陷，增加維修開支。
- 維修費用最終可能由全村居民分擔，對村民不公平。

請貴處作出慎重考慮，以上嚴重影響居民生活。

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

5

tpbpd/PLAND

寄件者: [REDACTED]
寄件日期: 2026年08月24日星期一 0:55
收件者: tpbpd/PLAND
主旨: A/STT/38 DD 96 Chau Tau / Pun Uk Tsuen, San Tin

類別: Internet Email

A/STT/38

Lots 188 (Part), 189 (Part), 192 (Part), 193, 194, 195, 196, 199 (Part) and 200 (Part) in D.D. 96, Pun Uk Tsuen, San Tin, Yuen Long

Site area: About 2,976sq.m

Zoning: "VTD"

Applied use: 47 Vehicle Park / **5 Years**

Dear TPB Members,

Fake Hobby Farm 641 also withdrawn. Finally, we get the real deal.

The covered area is for 'luxury cars', but there is no mention of EV recharging. However, many of the luxury vehicles on our streets are EVs.

Once again with govt policy pushing for the elimination of fuel-propelled vehicles both PlanD and TPB members are neglecting their duty to question why so many parking facilities do not provide this service.

It should be mandatory that all parking lots of a certain size provide a quota of EV charging stations.

Mary Mulvihill

From: [REDACTED]
To: tpbpd <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>
Date: Wednesday, 15 February 2023 2:50 AM HKT
Subject: A/YL-ST/641 DD 96 Chau Tau / Pun Uk Tsuen, San Tin GB

A/YL-ST/641

Lots 187, 188 (Part), 189 (Part), 190, 192 (Part), 193 (Part), 194 (Part), 195 (Part) and 196 in D.D. 96, Pun Uk Tsuen, San Tin, Yuen Long

Site area: About 1,806sq.m

Zoning: "VTD" and "Green Belt"

Applied use: Hobby Farm / **5 Years / Fillin of Land / 1 Vehicle Parking**

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

Dear TPB Members,

632 withdrawn. A lot of vegetation and trees have been removed. No data provided on trees.

As there was an application 593 for a large 'store' on adjoining lots, this has the appearance of a 'Destroy to Build'.

Members should request aerial images and detailed information on the condition of the lots.

Mary Mulvihill

From: [REDACTED]
To: tpbpd <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>
Date: Tuesday, 8 November 2022 3:30 AM CST
Subject: A/YL-ST/632 DD 96 Chau Tau Tsuen, San Tin GB

A/YL-ST/632

Lots 187, 188, 189, 190, 192, 193, 194, 195 and 196 in D.D. 96, Chau Tau Tsuen, San Tin, Yuen Long

Site area: About 2,174sq.m

Zoning: "VTD" and "Green Belt"

Applied use: Hobby Farm / **5 Years / Filling of Land** / 2 Vehicle Parking

Dear TPB Members,

With reference to GB, about 30% of the site, there is no information with regard to the number of trees to be felled?

Mary Mulvihill