

Similar s.16 Applications within the Same “Agriculture” Zone in the Vicinity of the Site in the Past Five Years

Approved Applications

	Application No.	Use/Development	Date of Consideration
1.	A/YL-KTN/827	Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Private Car Park for Medium Goods Vehicles and Storage of Construction Materials for a Period of Three Years	20.5.2022
2.	A/YL-KTN/888	Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Private Vehicle Park for Light Goods Vehicles for a Period of Three Years	17.3.2023
3.	A/YL-KTN/915	Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Private Vehicle Park for Light Goods Vehicles for a Period of 3 Years	23.6.2023
4.	A/YL-KTN/961	Temporary Private Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicles) for a Period of Three Years and Filling of Land	5.4.2024 [revoked on 5.10.2024]
5.	A/YL-KTN/1025	Proposed Temporary Private Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicle) for a Period of 3 Years and Associated Filling of Land	2.8.2024 [revoked on 2.2.2026]
6.	A/YL-KTN/1077	Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicle) for a Period of Three Years and Associated Filling of Land	2.5.2025
7.	A/YL-KTN/1089	Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicle) for a Period of Three Years and Associated Filling of Land	14.3.2025
8.	A/YL-KTN/1152	Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicles) and Associated Filling of Land and Pond for a Period of Three Years	24.10.2025
9.	A/YL-KTN/1209	Temporary Private Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicle) and Associated Filling of Land and Pond for a Period of Three Years	27.3.2026
10.	A/YL-KTN/1229	Temporary Private Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicle) and Associated Filling of Land and Pond for a Period of Three Years	5.6.2026

	Application No.	Use/Development	Date of Consideration
11.	A/YL-KTN/1242	Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (excluding Container Vehicle) and Associated Filling of Land for a Period of Three Years	24.7.2026

Government Bureau and 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 Lot No. 944 RP in D.D. 109, Lots No. 50 RP and 51 RP in D.D. 110 which are Old Schedule Agricultural Lots held under the Block Government Lease which contains the restriction that no structure is allowed to be erected without the prior approval of the Government; and
- it is noted that no structure is proposed in the application.

2. Traffic

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 at **Appendix IV**.

3. Drainage

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

- no in-principle objection to the application from drainage point of view;
- should the application be approved, approval conditions should be stipulated requiring the submission of a revised drainage proposal and the implementation and maintenance of the proposed drainage facilities to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or the Town Planning Board; and
- advisory comments are at **Appendix IV**.

4. Environment

Comments of the Director of Environmental Protection:

- no objection to the application from environmental planning perspective;
- based on the applicant's submission, the proposed use would not cause traffic of heavy vehicle and dusty operation. According to his review, there are residential structures within 100m from the boundary of the Site;

- there was no environmental complaint received against the Site in the past three years; and
- advisory comments are at **Appendix IV**.

5. **Built Heritage Aspect**

Comments of the Chief Heritage Executive (Antiquities and Monuments) of the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO), Development Bureau:

- while there is no declared monument, graded historic building, new item for drainage assessment or Government historic site identified by AMO located within the Site (**Plan A-2**), please note that Kong Ha Tin Lo (at Nos. 198-199 Tai Kong Po), a Grade 2 historic building (“the Graded Building”), is located in the immediate vicinity of the Site; and
- no comment on the application from the heritage conservation perspective since the applicant confirms that by adjusting the location of some of the parking spaces, proposed use at the Site would not cause any impact on the Graded Building, and that proper protection and monitoring measures will be carried out as necessary;
- advisory comments are at **Appendix IV**.

6. **Landscape Aspect**

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, the Site was situated in an area of rural inland plain landscape character comprising village houses, open storage sites/warehouses, vacant land, scattered tree groups and a river channel. The proposed use is not incompatible with the landscape setting in the proximity;
- with reference to the site photos and aerial photo, the Site was largely formed. Some existing trees of common species were observed along the southwestern and northeastern boundaries of the Site, and overhanging tree crowns were found encroaching onto the Site. According to the applicant’s submission, no tree felling will be involved;
- in view of the above, significant adverse landscape arising from the proposed use is not anticipated; and
- advisory comments are at **Appendix IV**.

7. **District Officer’s Comments**

A/YL-KTN/1273

Comments of the District Officer (Yuen Long), Home Affairs Department:

- his office has not received any comment from the locals on the application and he has no particular comment on the application.

8. Other Departments

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

- Director of Fire Services;
- Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department;
- Project Manager (West), Civil Engineering and Development Department;
- Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department; and
- Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services.

Recommended Advisory Clauses

- (a) failure to reinstate the application site (the Site) as required under the relevant approval condition upon expiry of the planning permission might constitute an unauthorized development under the Town Planning Ordinance and be subject to enforcement and prosecution actions;
- (b) to resolve any land issues relating to the proposed use with the concerned owner(s) and/or occupant(s);
- (c) to note the comments of the Commissioner for Transport that:
 - (i) the Site is connected to the public road network via a section of a local access road which is not managed by the Transport Department. The land status of the local access road should be checked with LandsD. Moreover, the management and maintenance responsibilities of the local access road should be clarified with the relevant lands and maintenance authorities accordingly;
 - (ii) sufficient manoeuvring space shall be provided within the Site; and
 - (iii) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) to note the comments of the Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department (HyD) that:
 - (i) Kong Tai Road is not maintained by HyD. HyD shall not be responsible for the maintenance of the proposed access connecting the Site, including Kong Tai Road and local tracks, if any; and
 - (ii) adequate drainage measures shall be provided to prevent surface water running from the Site to the nearby public roads and drains;
- (e) to note the comments of the Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department that:
 - (i) the detailed comments on the drainage proposal previously provided to the applicant shall be taken into account in the revised drainage proposal; and
 - (ii) to encourage a higher quality submission and avoid rounds of comments, thereby shortening the processing time, the applicant shall complete the checklist previously provided in preparing the drainage proposal and include the checklist in the submission. Otherwise, a longer processing time may be required;
- (f) to note the comments of the Director of Environmental Protection that:
 - (i) the applicant shall follow the revised ‘Code of Practice on Handling the Environmental Aspects of Temporary Uses and Open Storage Sites’;
 - (ii) the applicant shall follow the relevant guidelines and requirements in relevant Professional Persons Environmental Consultative Committee Practice Notes

(ProPECCPNs), in particular the ProPECCPN 1/23 ‘Drainage Plans subject to Comment by the Environmental Protection Department’;

- (iii) the applicant shall provide adequate supporting infrastructure/facilities for proper collection, treatment and disposal of waste/wastewater generated from the proposed use; and
- (iv) the applicant shall observe the statutory requirements under relevant environmental legislations;
- (g) to note the comments of the Chief Heritage Executive (Antiquities and Monuments) of the Antiquities and Monuments Office, Development Bureau that the applicant shall operate and monitor the proposed use properly so as to avoid any impact on the Grade 2 historic building;
- (h) to note the comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department that approval of the application does not imply approval of tree works such as pruning, transplanting and felling. Application for any tree works should be submitted to relevant departments for approval;
- (i) 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 proposed use;
 - (ii) in case that it is not feasible to divert the affected water mains, a waterworks reserve within 1.5 metres from the centre line of the water mains shall be provided for WSD’s access. No structure shall be built or materials stored within this waterworks reserve. 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 waterworks reserve or in the vicinity of the water mains; 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; and
- (j) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department (BD) that:
 - (i) it is noted that associated filling of land is 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 the Site, prior approval and consent of the Building Authority (BA) should be obtained, otherwise they are unauthorized building works (UBW) under Buildings Ordinance (BO). An Authorized Person should be appointed as the co-ordinator for the proposed building works in accordance with BO;
 - (ii) the Site abut a specified street (Kong Tai Road) of not less than 4.5m wide. Its permitted development intensity shall be determined under the First Schedule of

the B(P)R, where no plot ratio/gross floor area restriction has been stipulated in statutory plans/approved planning application;

- (iii) if the existing structures 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 application;
- (iv) for UBW erected on leased land, enforcement action may be taken by BD 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;
- (v) any temporary shelters or converted containers for office, storage, washroom or other uses are considered as temporary buildings are subject to the control of Part VII of B(P)R; and
- (vi) detailed checking under BO will be carried out at building plan submission stage.

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

參考編號
Reference Number: 260901-163837-91402

提交限期
Deadline for submission: 08/09/2026

提交日期及時間
Date and time of submission: 01/09/2026 16:38:37

有關的規劃申請編號
The application no. to which the comment relates: A/YL-KTN/1273

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

意見詳情
Details of the Comment :

本人是住在元朗八鄉大江埔村超過 50 年的居民。就貴會正在審理的規劃申請編號 A/YL-KTN/1273，本人在此表達最嚴正的強烈反對，並特別促請城規會嚴格遵守「先申請批准、後進行規劃」的法定原則，堅決拒絕是次申請！以下為反對的幾大重點事由：

一、嚴正抗議「先破壞、後申請」，申請人指控嚴重失實

* 違例填土在先：申請人於提交文件中聲稱場地填土工程「已在多年前完成」及「厚度僅約 0.1 米」。然而事實是，該地段已在本年（2026 年）1 月上旬，在未未經城市規劃委員會申請批准下，已預先違例進行大規模填土工程。

* 填土深度遠超聲稱：現場實際填土高度超過 60 厘米高（遠高於申請人所指的 0.1 米），且使用了不透水的瀝青混凝土結構。這種「先違例破壞、後申請規範化」的做法嚴重違背規劃精神，貴會絕不可縱容此風，否則將大開「先斬後奏」惡例。

二、非法填土堵塞渠務，釀成 50 年未見之嚴重水浸

* 渠道嚴重堵塞：該地段非法填土時，大量的沙石直接堵塞了沙井 B 渠道的原有疏水功能。

* 居民損失慘重：本人在此居住半世紀，遇到大雨時從未試過如此恐怖的水浸。自從該地段非法填土後，雨水無法順利排出，導致鄰近低窪地區居民遭受極嚴重水浸，水深一度高達 40 厘米，大量家居電器及設備毀於一旦，損失慘重。

* 水文設施失效：申請人於圖則中聲稱會設立新沙井 A 及使用現有沙井 B 作排水。但事實是，現有的沙井 B 早已因該地段違例填土而遭到嚴重淤塞，下大雨時長期有大量雨水掩浸着整段江大路，完全失去疏導雨水的功能。本人已多次向渠務處提出要求改善沙井 B 的淤塞，雖然得到回覆會安排處理，但至今情況未有任何改善。

三、江大路配套欠佳，車流量增加嚴重威脅村民安全

* 交通承载力不足：申請地點擬設 25 個私家車/客貨車位及 2 個輕型貨車位。一旦申請獲批，整段江大路的車流量必然大幅增加。

* 道路設計欠維修：現時村內的交通設計嚴重欠缺維修保養，且屬狹窄的「單線雙程」行

車。村內有大量村民及長者平日習慣踏單車出入家園。在如此狹窄且缺乏維護的單線道路上增加汽車流量，將直接危及村民及單車出入者的生命安全。

基於上述「先破壞後申請」、「非法填土釀成嚴重水浸」及「威脅村民道路安全」等事實，本人懇請城市規劃委員會審慎處理並堅決拒絕這項規劃申請，以保障大江埔村民的生命財產安全！

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

260901-204102-73965

Reference Number:**提交限期**

08/09/2026

Deadline for submission:**提交日期及時間**

01/09/2026 20:41:02

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

A/YL-KTN/1273

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

先生 Mr. Mr Wong

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

現時大江埔村道路設計，欠缺完善，再加上政府欠缺維修道路多處損壞，如果當局批准該地段建設停車場只會令本村車流量增加令村民出入更加困難，懇請當局申請批核前和相關部門去現場勘察一下現時大江埔路段嘅情況

tpbpd/PLAND

寄件者: [REDACTED]
寄件日期: 2026年09月02日星期三 15:19
收件者: dloylsol@landsd.gov.hk; e-Enquiry Counter/LAO/LANDSD; tpbpd/PLAND;
enquire1/PLAND
主旨: 強烈反對規劃申請編號: A/YL-KTN/1273 (新界元朗八鄉大江埔 DD109 Lot No. 944
RP (部份)、DD110 Lot No. 50 RP (部份) 及 51 RP (部份) 擬議臨時公眾停車場及相
關填土工程)
類別: Internet Email

致: 城市規劃委員會主席及委員

本人為居住在大江埔村逾 30 多年的居民。現就上述擬將「農業」地帶改為「擬議臨時公眾停車場（貨櫃車除外）及相關填土工程」的申請，提出最嚴厲的強烈反對！

反對理據如下：

一、嚴厲譴責「先破壞、後申請」，促請城規會恪守規劃原則 該地段在今年（2026 年）1 月上旬，在完全未獲城規會批准的情況下，已預先違規進行填土，填土高度更超過 80 厘米。申請人聲稱「填土厚度僅 0.1 米」完全屬不實之詞。這種「先破壞、後申請」的既成事實手段嚴重破壞制度，若貴會批准此申請，等同變相鼓勵違規發展。懇請城規會嚴格遵守「先申請批准、後進行規劃」的基本原則，果斷拒絕此類違規申請！

二、違規填土及瀝青結構引致嚴重水浸，居民財產損失慘重 該地段非法填土後，填土物及瀝青混凝土結構徹底阻塞了原本自然的疏水渠道。本人在此居住 30 多年，過去經歷多次暴雨從未遇過如此恐怖的水浸。自從該處違規填土後，大雨期間洪水無法排出，導致鄰近低窪地區嚴重水浸，水深高達 1 米，多戶居民的家居及電器設備嚴重浸毀，損失慘重。倘若批准其運作，水浸隱患將永久化，嚴重威脅居民生命財產安全。

三、道路設計欠缺維修保養，車流量暴增嚴重威脅村民安全 現時村內主要的江大路為單線雙程行車，且長期欠缺維修保養，路面狀況極佳不佳。村內日常有大量老幼及村民以單車或步行出入。若此處獲批經營擁有 27 個泊位的停車場，整段江大路的車流量將會暴增，在狹窄且維修不足的道路上，汽車與單車及行人爭路，極易引發嚴重交通意外，直接危及村民的生命安全。

綜上所述，該申請不僅破壞規劃秩序，更對大江埔村的水利排水及交通安全帶來不可逆轉的災難性影響。懇請城市規劃委員會深切體恤民艱，嚴格把關，拒絕這項規劃申請！





tpbpd/PLAND

寄件者: [REDACTED]
寄件日期: 2026年09月02日星期三 15:12
收件者: tpbpd/PLAND; enquire1/PLAND
主旨: 強烈反對規劃申請編號: A/YL-KTN/1273 (新界元朗八鄉大江埔 DD109 Lot No. 944 RP (部份)、DD110 Lot No. 50 RP (部份) 及 51 RP (部份) 擬議臨時公眾停車場及相關填土工程)
類別: Internet Email

致城市規劃委員會主席及委員:

本人為大江埔居住超過四十年的當地居民，就上述規劃申請，本人強烈反對該宗申請獲得批准，具體反對理據如下：

一、申請屬典型「先破壞、後申請」，嚴重違反「先申請批准、後進行規劃工程」的核心原則

有關地段早於本年 1 月上旬，在未取得城規會任何規劃許可的情況下，申請人已經擅自展開填土工程。現場填土高度超過 80 厘米，屬未經批准的非法填土行為。

申請人現在才提交規劃申請，企圖透過規劃程序，將已經完工的非法填土行為「合法化」。此做法完全顛倒規劃制度的邏輯。倘若城規會接納此種先施工、後補申請的模式，會立下極壞先例，鼓勵郊野土地肆意先破壞土地狀態，再尋求事後追認批准，損害整個城規制度的尊嚴。本人特別促請城規會嚴格恪守先申請批准，後落實規劃工程的重要原則，不應對已經違規完成的填土給予規範化批准。

二、非法填土改變地勢，堵塞原有疏水渠道，引發嚴重水浸災害，危害鄰近居民性命財產安全

該地段未經批准填土之後，地勢被人為抬高，直接阻塞該地原本的天然疏水渠道。加上填土採用瀝青混凝土硬面結構，地面雨水完全無法下滲，暴雨時地表徑流急劇增加，將雨水壓向周邊低窪民居。

作為居住四十多年的在地居民，過往歷次暴雨，從未出現如此嚴重水患；自從該地非法填土完成後，遇上暴雨，鄰近低窪地區出現水深達一米的嚴重水浸，大量家居電器、家當被浸壞，居民蒙受重大財物損失，水浸場面令人恐怖。

申請文件聲稱填土厚度只有 0.1 米，與現場實況有重大出入。就算申請建議加設排水明渠，亦無法補救因為人為抬高地盤、封閉原有自然排水路徑所帶來的根本性水浸風險。一旦申請獲批，維持現有抬高的瀝青鋪面，日後每逢暴雨，鄰近居民會持續承受水浸威脅。

三、江大路交通條件不足，現有村內道路欠缺維修保養，批准停車場會直接威脅村民出行安全連接該地點的江大路屬鄉村道路，為單線雙程行車，路面本身已經欠缺維修保養，道路空間狹窄。村內大量村民日常踏單車、步行出入家園。

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

若是次臨時停車場申請獲批，設置合共 27 個車位，會帶來大量新增車輛進出江大路，車流量明顯上升。在道路條件沒有改善、沒有足夠行人及單車安全設施的前提下，機動車輛增加，會大大提升人車爭路的風險，極容易引發交通意外，直接威脅村民，尤其長者、兒童、騎單車村民的人身安全。申請人提交的交通評估低估鄉村道路的實際風險。

總結及懇求：

綜合以上，該申請源於未經批准的非法填土，造成真實、已經發生的水浸災害；批准申請會縱容「先破壞後申請」的不良先例，同時會加劇鄉村道路交通安全隱患，對附近居民的財產、生命安全構成持續威脅。

tpbpd/PLAND

寄件者: [REDACTED]
寄件日期: 2026年09月06日星期日 23:23
收件者: tpbpd/PLAND
主旨: A/YL-KTN/1273 DD 109, Tai Kong Po
類別: Internet Email

A/YL-KTN/1273

Lot 944 RP (Part) in D.D. 109, and Lots 50 RP (Part) and 51 RP (Part) in D.D. 110, Tai Kong Po, Pat Heung

Site area: About 1,338sq.m

Zoning: "Agriculture"

Applied use: 27 Public Vehicle Park / **Filling of Land**

Dear TPB Members,

Another village parking scam goes legit.

3. Clarification: The primary service recipients of the application site are the villagers of near the application site.

4. Clarification: The application site will not charge fees or require user registration.

This raises questions of who will pay for maintenance, etc and if outsiders visiting the village would be allowed to park at the facility.

Members, questions please.

Mary Mulvihill

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

參考編號

260908-145846-63848

Reference Number:

提交限期

08/09/2026

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

08/09/2026 14:58:46

Date and time of submission:

有關的規劃申請編號

A/YL-KTN/1273

The application no. to which the comment relates:

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

小姐 Miss 黃

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

本人為大江埔居住超過四十年的當地居民，就上述規劃申請，本人強烈反對該宗申請獲得批准，具體反對理據如下：

一、申請屬典型「先破壞、後申請」，嚴重違反「先申請批准、後進行規劃工程」的核心原則

有關地段早於本年1月上旬，在未取得城規會任何規劃許可的情況下，申請人已經擅自展開填土工程。現場填土高度超過70厘米，屬未經批准的非法填土行為。

申請人現在才提交規劃申請，企圖透過規劃程序，將已經完工的非法填土行為「合法化」。此做法完全顛倒規劃制度的邏輯。倘若城規會接納此種先施工、後補申請的模式，會立下極壞先例，鼓勵郊野土地肆意先破壞土地狀態，再尋求事後追認批准，損害整個城規制度的尊嚴。本人特別促請城規會嚴格恪守先申請批准，後落實規劃工程的重要原則，不應對已經違規完成的填土給予規範化批准。

二、非法填土改變地勢，堵塞原有疏水渠道，引發嚴重水浸災害，危害鄰近居民性命財產安全

該地段未經批准填土之後，地勢被人為抬高，直接阻塞該地原本的天然疏水渠道。加上填土採用瀝青混凝土硬面結構，地面雨水完全無法下滲，暴雨時地表徑流急劇增加，將雨水壓向周邊低窪民居。

作為居住四十多年的在地居民，過往歷次暴雨，從未出現如此嚴重水患；自從該地非法填土完成後，遇上暴雨，鄰近低窪地區出現水深達一米的嚴重水浸，大量家居電器、家當被浸壞，居民蒙受重大財物損失，水浸場面令人恐怖。

申請文件聲稱填土厚度只有0.1米，與現場實況有重大出入。就算申請建議加設排水明渠，亦無法補救因為人為抬高地盤、封閉原有自然排水路徑所帶來的根本性水浸風險。

一旦申請獲批，維持現有抬高的瀝青鋪面，日後每逢暴雨，鄰近居民會持續承受水浸威脅。

三、江大路交通條件不足，現有村內道路欠缺維修保養，批准停車場會直接威脅村民出行安全連接該地點的江大路屬鄉村道路，為單線雙程行車，路面本身已經欠缺維修保養，道路空間狹窄。村內大量村民日常踏單車、步行出入家園。

若是次臨時停車場申請獲批，設置合共27個車位，會帶來大量新增車輛進出江大路，車流量明顯上升。在道路條件沒有改善、沒有足夠行人及單車安全設施的前提下，機動車輛增加，會大大提升人車爭路的風險，極容易引發交通意外，直接威脅村民，尤其長者、兒童、騎單車村民的人身安全。申請人提交的交通評估低估鄉村道路的實際風險。

總結：

綜合以上，該申請源於未經批准的非法填土，造成真實、已經發生的水浸災害；批准申請會縱容「先破壞後申請」的不良先例，同時會加劇鄉村道路交通安全隱患，對附近居民的財產、生命安全構成持續威脅。