

就《葵涌分區計劃大綱圖編號S/KC/31》聯署意見



政府將9年前提及郊野公園邊陲建屋方案，借「綠化帶改劃」還魂，開發郊野公園再次死灰復燃，當中身受其害，仲包括三條有過百年歷史的古村。計劃區內興建最少七幢住宅，估計將帶來2萬人口，有如一條新屋邨，將為本來已經飽和的社區，雪上加霜。

就此我們反對《葵涌分區計劃大綱圖編號S/KC/31》的擬議修訂項A1-A3，把該地由綠化地帶改劃為住宅地帶，以及其相關設施：

姓名 (身份證同名)	身份證頭4號碼 (例:Y123)	聯絡電話	電郵地址	授權石籬改建關注組發言
林嘉佑	小朋友	✓		木
朱少傑 梁謙	小朋友	✓		謙
李	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1700			
羅艷芳	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1701			
鄭林	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1702			
LOU MBI Sam	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1703			
Chan Hok Chuk	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1704			
Chau Y. Yan	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1705			
Ibrahim	小朋友			Ibrahim
wong Chi hi	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1706			wong
Ngai Y.	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1707			ai
Ng mi b	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1708			

就《葵涌分區計劃大綱圖編號S/KC/31》聯署意見



政府將9年前提及郊野公園邊陲建屋方案，借「綠化帶改劃」還魂，開發郊野公園再次死灰復燃，當中身受其害，仲包括三條有過百年歷史的古村。計劃區內興建最少七幢住宅，估計將帶來2萬人口，有如一條新屋邨，將為本來已經飽和的社區，雪上加霜。

就此我們反對《葵涌分區計劃大綱圖編號S/KC/31》的擬議修訂項A1-A3，把該地由綠化地帶改劃為住宅地帶，以及其相關設施：

姓名 (身份證同名)	身份證頭4號碼 (例:Y123)	聯絡電話	電郵地址	授權石籬改建關注組發言
Chen Hok Sun	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1709			
鍾永立	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1710			
黃玉珊	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1711			
董本協	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1712			
陳梓濠				
許子怡	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1713			
卓嘉軒	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1714			
祝妙思	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1715			
洪少英	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1716			
馮桂珍	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1717			
范健民	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1718			
何會	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1719			

1903-1914

就《葵涌分區計劃大綱圖編號S/KC/31》聯署意見



政府將9年前提及郊野公園邊陲建屋方案，借「綠化帶改劃」還魂，開發郊野公園再次死灰復燃，當中身受其害，仲包括三條有過百年歷史的古村。計劃區內興建最少七幢住宅，估計將帶來2萬人口，有如一條新屋邨，將為本來已經飽和的社區，雪上加霜。

就此我們反對《葵涌分區計劃大綱圖編號S/KC/31》的擬議修訂項A1-A3，把該地由綠化地帶改劃為住宅地帶，以及其相關設施：

姓名 (身份證同名)	身份證頭4號碼 (例:Y123)	聯絡電話	電郵地址	授權石籬改建 關注組發言
江秋梅	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1720			
姚錫光	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1721			
許祖鉅	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1722			
鍾志亨	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1723			
何志生	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1724			
呂志輝	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1725			
趙香華	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1726			
羅子桓				
陳偉全	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1727			
Tom Chung	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1728			
黃金良	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1729			
Wing Chan	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1730			

就《葵涌分區計劃大綱圖編號S/KC/31》聯署意見



政府將9年前提及郊野公園邊陲建屋方案，借「綠化帶改劃」還魂，開發郊野公園再次死灰復燃，當中身受其害，仲包括三條有過百年歷史的古村。計劃區內興建最少七幢住宅，估計將帶來2萬人口，有如一條新屋邨，將為本來已經飽和的社區，雪上加霜。

就此我們反對《葵涌分區計劃大綱圖編號S/KC/31》的擬議修訂項A1-A3，把該地由綠化地帶改劃為住宅地帶，以及其相關設施：

姓名 (身份證同名)	身份證頭4號碼 (例:Y123)	聯絡電話	電郵地址	授權石籬改建 關注組發言
劉滿生	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1731	[REDACTED]		[Signature]
叶昌	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1732	[REDACTED]		[Signature]
CHAN CHIN SHAN	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1733	[REDACTED]		[Signature]
Lin Kye	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1734	[REDACTED]		[Signature]
黃傑強	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1735	[REDACTED]		[Signature]
李少芳	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1736	[REDACTED]		[Signature]
Wu Lay Tin	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1737	[REDACTED]		[Signature]
梁桂培	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1738	[REDACTED]		[Signature]
梁冠儒	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1739	[REDACTED]		[Signature]
潘耀輝	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1740	[REDACTED]		[Signature]
黃婉媚	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1741	[REDACTED]		[Signature]
黃惠琴	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1742	[REDACTED]		[Signature]

1927-1938

就《葵涌分區計劃大綱圖編號S/KC/31》聯署意見



政府將9年前提及郊野公園邊陲建屋方案，借「綠化帶改劃」還魂，開發郊野公園再次死灰復燃，當中身受其害，仲包括三條有過百年歷史的古村。計劃區內興建最少七幢住宅，估計將帶來2萬人口，有如一條新屋邨，將為本來已經飽和的社區，雪上加霜。

就此我們反對《葵涌分區計劃大綱圖編號S/KC/31》的擬議修訂項A1-A3，把該地由綠化地帶改劃為住宅地帶，以及其相關設施：

姓名 (身份證同名)	身份證頭4號碼 (例:Y123)	聯絡電話	電郵地址	授權石籬改建 關注組發言
馮蘭芝	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1743			蘭
陳嘉	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1744			嘉
關錦輝	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1745			錦
徐松順	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1746			徐
張國能	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1747			張國能
張淑英	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1748			英
郭妙玲	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1749			玲
周煥榮	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1750			煥
龍結花	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1751			花
鄧輝輝				A
高仲明	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1752			明
梁加加				加加

就《葵涌分區計劃大綱圖編號S/KC/31》聯署意見



政府將9年前提及郊野公園邊陲建屋方案，借「綠化帶改劃」還魂，開發郊野公園再次死灰復燃，當中身受其害，仲包括三條有過百年歷史的古村。計劃區內興建最少七幢住宅，估計將帶來2萬人口，有如一條新屋邨，將為本來已經飽和的社區，雪上加霜。

就此我們反對《葵涌分區計劃大綱圖編號S/KC/31》的擬議修訂項A1-A3，把該地由綠化地帶改劃為住宅地帶，以及其相關設施：

姓名 (身份證同名)	身份證頭4號碼 (例:Y123)	聯絡電話	電郵地址	授權石籬改建 關注組發言
李詩雅	小朋友	/		李詩雅
曾紀亨	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1753			
黃鈺淳	小朋友	/		Chloe
黃丹滄	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1754			黃
王金萍	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1755			王金萍
朱潔凡	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1756			朱潔凡
蘇彩媚	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1757			媚
楊惠紅	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1758			惠
俞小玉	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1759			三
趙潔玲	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1760			
程靜	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1761			靜
黃詠心	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1762			

就《葵涌分區計劃大綱圖編號S/KC/31》聯署意見



政府將9年前提及郊野公園邊陲建屋方案，借「綠化帶改劃」還魂，開發郊野公園再次死灰復燃，當中身受其害，仲包括三條有過百年歷史的古村。計劃區內興建最少七幢住宅，估計將帶來2萬人口，有如一條新屋邨，將為本來已經飽和的社區，雪上加霜。

就此我們反對《葵涌分區計劃大綱圖編號S/KC/31》的擬議修訂項A1-A3，把該地由綠化地帶改劃為住宅地帶，以及其相關設施：

姓名 (身份證同名)	身份證頭4號碼 (例:Y123)	聯絡電話	電郵地址	授權石籬改建 關注組發言
				✓ H
				✓ H
				✓
陳子晴	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1763			✓ C
鍾梓楓	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1764			✓
林子煬	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1765			✓
潘雅丹	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1766			✓
黃煒培	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1767			volcom ✓
譚寶珍	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1768			✓
施欣婷	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1769			✓
毛瀚希	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1770			✓
黃浩輝	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1771			✓
黃建達	TPB/R/S/KC/31- C1772			✓

就草圖的申述提出意見

Comment on Representation Relating to Draft Plan

TPB/R/S/KC/31-
C1773

參考編號

Reference Number:

230315-010940-59538

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

24/03/2023

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

15/03/2023 01:09:40

「提意見人」全名

Full Name of "Commenter":

先生 Mr. Tsang kwok Hung Clarence.

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

NA

與意見相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the comment relates: S/KC/31

意見詳情

Details of the Comments:

申述編號 Representation No:	意見詳情 Details of Comments:
1	本人反對開發石梨坑村為新建屋邨，該村位於綠化地帶，為石梨的後花園，有保留的必要，同時本區人口已經飽和，民生服務及交通配套本已不足應付現有人口，若再增加額外人口，將對石梨帶來災難，因此本人極力反對此發展計劃

就草圖的申述提出意見**Comment on Representation Relating to Draft Plan**TPB/R/S/KC/31-
C1774

參考編號

Reference Number:

230322-093029-48361

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

24/03/2023

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

22/03/2023 09:30:29

「提意見人」全名

Full Name of "Commenter":

先生 Mr. Kwok ming ko

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與意見相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the comment relates: S/KC/31

意見詳情

Details of the Comments:

申述編號 Representation No:	意見詳情 Details of Comments:
01	反對收地建屋，破壞綠化地帶，加劇區內交通負荷

就草圖的申述提出意見**Comment on Representation Relating to Draft Plan**

TPB/R/S/KC/31-

C1775

參考編號

Reference Number:

230321-223054-86147

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

24/03/2023

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

21/03/2023 22:30:54

「提意見人」全名

Full Name of "Commenter":

Lee Ming

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與意見相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the comment relates: S/KC/31

意見詳情

Details of the Comments:

申述編號 Representation No:	意見詳情 Details of Comments:
123456	反對發展綠化地帶，香港人口減少中，根本沒有住屋問題

就草圖的申述提出意見

Comment on Representation Relating to Draft Plan

TPB/R/S/KC/31-
C1776

參考編號

Reference Number:

230323-061742-98369

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

24/03/2023

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

23/03/2023 06:17:42

「提意見人」全名

Full Name of "Commenter":

先生 Mr. AU KWOK KUEN

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與意見相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the comment relates: S/KC/31

意見詳情

Details of the Comments:

申述編號 Representation No:	意見詳情 Details of Comments:
R1-R3	<p>R1-R3 支持位於石排街以東的一塊用地由「綠化地帶」改劃為「住宅(甲類)3」地帶是一個錯誤的示範，同規劃署委託的顧問公司一樣，忽略了德福古廟和七聖宮能保留原因，正正是和有百年歷史的石籬坑村有「點、線和面」的關係，若城規會通過改劃，將導致不可逆轉，人文和歷史價值就此消失。</p> <p>規劃署沒有評估「德福古廟」和「七聖宮」的香火十分鼎盛，上年香港商報便有報導，當公營房屋落成及入伙後，將會有來矛盾和投訴。然後，請委員留意，規劃署沒有這評估和補救，或會有來司法覆核，但我想指出，規劃署保留「德福古廟」和「七聖宮」其實反映了，證明了古廟與石籬坑村和石籬邨等有不可分割的關係。</p> <p>石籬福德古廟已經有50幾年歷史，係由石籬邨第一代嘅居民建立嘅。初時只係一間細細嘅路邊土地廟，但愈拜愈靈，善信嘅捐款又愈拜愈多，廟宇就愈嚟愈大，社區市民參與度也增加。雖然古蹟辦沒有評級，但人文關係真實的存在，香火鼎盛和石籬村民在古廟工作等已是證明，更是該地歷史最重要的一部份。</p> <p>石梨坑村是東北葵僅餘逾百年歷史的古村，自1850年清末年代已有記錄，1940年代起有愈來愈多人遷入，依坑建村，1970年代最高峰時期有約2,000人居住。而拜土地公的「德福古廟」和七姐的「七聖宮」在戰前實已存在，只是沒有之後的規模。本港供奉織女的古廟，分別有</p>

1268

葵涌石籬的七聖宮、西貢十四鄉官坑的七聖古廟、坪洲仙姊廟，這三廟更是香港最重要的歷史、宗教和旅遊價值，而這三廟同樣地和社區不可分割，才能突顯價值。

規劃署委託的顧問公司忽視了廟宇和社區關係和歷史及宗教價值，而R1-R3也不熟識當地歷史，因此城規會應更好把關。否則：

1. 德福古廟、七聖宮和石籬坑村的不可分割關係，以及價值會被消失，也是香港的損失
2. 規劃署並沒有就古廟對未來居民的矛盾，作任何的補救及放棄發展

最後，本人反對R1-R3的申述

就草圖的申述提出意見

Comment on Representation Relating to Draft Plan

TPB/R/S/KC/31-
C1777

參考編號

Reference Number:

230321-234229-09265

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

24/03/2023

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

21/03/2023 23:42:29

「提意見人」全名

Full Name of "Commenter":

先生 Mr. 郭志傑

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與意見相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the comment relates: S/KC/31

意見詳情

Details of the Comments:

申述編號 Representation No:	意見詳情 Details of Comments:
	<p>TPB/R/S/KC/31-516是本人第一輪申述的內容，繼續表達相同的意見，現在再一次加以較詳細的說明，以供參詳。內容同樣是反對整個A項目的改劃：主要是A1、以及相連A2、A3項目。</p> <p>上次提及「政府未有考慮整全規劃，以及交通問題：區內交通現時負荷超載，擴闊道路不可行」。正是由於現有資料有關A1項目的改劃為五座多層公營房屋，對該區目前的社區配套已存在極大問題，造成百上加斤，如何落實改劃建設更多住屋，目前情況的惡化將令人難以設想。本人過去居住在石籬邨周邊(大隴街)，而多年工作的地點亦在安蔭邨與石籬邨之間的區域(安捷街)，對在地生活及日常社區情況有一定的切身了解。</p> <p>其一是由於不屬鐵路網絡，居民及在進入該區上班人士，絕大部分只能倚靠路面公共運輸或的士來流動。過去多年的情況是由於要進入東北葵(包括擬改劃的石排街路段)，必需通過兩條主要道路：包括由外圍的青山公路(葵涌段)或昌榮路、轉入和宜合道，這條道路與相連的打磚坪街，一直是該東北葵地段工貿區的繁忙區域，包括貨物起卸、辦公室上班及作業等，而這些幹道正正是往返東北葵居民的必經之路，故往往造成不獨是繁忙時段而是很多其他時間都擠塞。</p> <p>其二是東北葵區的居住人口已超出負荷，區內如大隴街每天超過5000架次，其他石排街圍西街交界、大白田街的擁擠(我見過救護車停在上班繁忙時石籬東邨路口多時仍無法穿過大白田街，要等三數次燈號才能等到前排車輛開走後，方可穿過道路去執勤)、石籬路人車爭路等，都是人口過多超出現有交通道路所能負荷。</p> <p>是以在石排街興建5座數十層的住宅，加上現有已規劃好重建成多層住宅的原石籬10座、11座徙置中轉屋，已落實增加1600個單位，肯定</p>

已為目前上述情況加劇惡化，如再有A1項目改劃成住宅，這區情況將更不堪設想。看過其中的交通改善文件是將區內各組交通燈作微調，可對改善車輛流量有幫助，以本人居住該區多年，同時有駕駛及作為行人實際經驗是：有不少行人過路設施設於十字路口，燈號短促，行人往只能匆匆走過其中一段，往往要再重新等候才能斷續再過另一路段，無法一次完整過路(其中一個燈位也正是大白田街、安捷街及A1項目的石排街交界)，老人家過路困難可想而知。

而這些行人燈位在沒有人按掣是會停止轉綠燈的，因此本身其實運輸當局已知該區車輛擠塞實情，而犧牲了行人，若再壓縮行人綠燈時間，相信行人違規過路情況會增加，增加交通意外的風險。讓市民安全、舒適在區內生活是城市建置規劃重要的考量的因素，以上這點懇請城規委員認真對待。TPB/R/S/KC/31-9北葵涌交通關注組的申述有更多數據資料解說，值得參詳。

上次申述提及「擴闊道路不可行」，例如石蔭路的擁塞兩旁卻是多層商住樓宇，而正好接壤石排街A1項目的其中一段(梨貝街至圍四街一段)一旁的較闊的行人道，實為公共空間，若改為加闊一條行車線，除了又要過城規改劃，亦變相減少了區民公共空間，拉近車路與民居(石籬邨)的距離，對居民環境造成影響，這兩個例子都可見「擴闊道路」以改善交通的「不可行」之處。

上輪本人的第二點意見是整個A項目(A1,A2,A3)連帶項目改劃綠化帶中的石梨坑村見證石籬變遷，值得保留。留意到「石籬改建關注組」已整理了不少口述歷史，本人亦曾參與過該組的一些活動，遊走石梨坑一二村的導賞團，了解當地的村民生活情況、實地考察自然環境、如細心留意，亦會看到多樣物種如大小鳥類、古樹等自然溪谷等。我看到TPB/R/S/KC/31-7香港觀鳥會及TPB/R/S/KC/31-8長春社的申述，都有不少有價值的考察，值得城規會委員參詳。本人建議城規會各委員可以聯絡關注組，親身實地了解改劃地段的現況，及聆聽村民的聲音，為日後討論提供更豐富全面的第一手資料。

誠然拆卸人口較少村落，興建更大型的住宅項目，表面看來是合乎數字上的道理的舉措。然而根據現有已進行的城規的程序，有關當局並沒有好好向受影響的居民作出解說，詳細講解整個程序村民可能面對的情況，我明白到城規會的主要職能是「擬備規劃圖則整理及聆聽各界申述後，交行政長官會同行政會議處理」。這次改劃涉及及原住在該地段的居民，規劃署是城規會是的夥伴協作部門，大可與之作為橋樑，協調政府部門及相關官吏例如地政署，建議先進行以上步驟，並才重新進行諮詢、申述意見等。這樣做會較為符合程序公義、以及為弱勢的而且是最能直接與相關的持分者(改劃綠化帶內長年居住的人士)，提供最能讓他們能認識及了整個計劃的內容以及對他們未來所造成的影響。

本人這個建議是希望為免造成日後爭議，這個原意或是為興建公屋滿足市民居住的需求，計劃未見其利，卻傷害了另一些住民，令他們受若，這是規劃成員及政府部門要正視面對的。如經過溝通了解後，權衡利害，保留村落，改以另一些已平整的「棕地」閒置地(根據石籬改建關注組facebook專頁表示，同區已有三至四幅相約面積)，既可以避免第一點提及的東北葵未來可能交通癱瘓的風險，同時又可減去拆去全村，對長住有四代的村民造成的傷害。

作為綠化帶，政府文件上已說明不宜發展，除了是影響上述石梨坑村民的生活居住外，這亦是由於這種區域是郊野公園與城市之間的緩衝地帶。A1連著A2、A3項目的發展，令郊野公園與城市的邊界距離少於100米，肯定會令人類與其他物種之間的衝突加劇。現有情況是金山郊野公園及城門水塘的猴子會在綠化帶出沒，有時甚至進入安蔭邨

TPB/R/S/KC/31-51
6, TPB/R/S/KC/31-
7, TPB/R/S/KC/31-
8,
TPB/R/S/KC/31-9,
TPB/R/S/KC/31-10,
TPB/R/S/KC/31-11,
TPB/R/S/KC/31-12,
TPB/R/S/KC/31-13,
TPB/R/S/KC/31-14,
TPB/R/S/KC/31-15

附近安捷街足球場附近的公園樹木間，估計是誤闖覓食。如果A1改劃將一大部分綠化帶取消，將郊野公園與城市的範圍貼到毗連，問題的嚴重性會增加很多。第一次申述中，幾個環保及NGO (TPB/R/S/KC/31-7, TPB/R/S/KC/31-8, TPB/R/S/KC/31-10, TPB/R/S/KC/31-11, TPB/R/S/KC/31-12, TPB/R/S/KC/31-14, TPB/R/S/KC/31-15)，已就此等發放考察的資料，亟欲委員們正視。

是次A1改劃，綠化地帶除了作為其他動物與城市的緩衝區域外，其實對東北葵居區民，同樣具有作為補足城鎮發展社區配套不及的一個補足的功能。如城規委員邀約石籬改建關注組成員帶領，往A1綠化帶遊走，會發現有不少由地政建設供市民散步的步道及休憩涼亭座椅，亦有由民間建設的一些座椅及木造子亭，雖然後者或許屬違章建置，但觀乎這地段，及與同區居民談論(指東北葵各公共屋邨及私樓)，這綠化帶是不少居民閒暇時休憩的地方，該區正是因為人口比例與社區設施的失衡，(例如原供作康樂設施的地段已改為住屋石歡樓)，正好是非完全人為建設造成的一個半天然的社區休憩空間，這往往亦較人為建置的設施更有彈性及自由，讓居民可以容易咫尺親近自然，這區域對居民的作用，無法以其他建築代替，是以如作A1的改劃，石梨坑村一帶的小橋流水失去，將令居民失去了這一獨特的安舒、優質自然休憩空間。

A2改劃為GIC用地，將規劃建設校舍，本人過去十多年皆在東北葵學校任職，一直對這區的學生來源及適齡學童的數字有關注，見證這區學校整體開班數字一直有下降趨勢，現有硬件學校的已足夠容納就算兒童人口的增加的學額，加上香港過去幾年來出生訊持續下降，興建學校已不是首要考慮，以免造成資源錯配，多舉一例，毗連的梨木樹區已有一學校改建成供居住用途，是以葵青區的學舍一直供應多於需求，並不適宜開山開劈石作出改劃。

最後，本人留意到第一輪申述只有三個名義上為支持，實則論據乏善可陳的意見。其餘855份意見，皆為反對改劃A1,2,3項目綠化帶的意見，當中有環保組織等NGO、亦有觀鳥會等生態團體，提供補足了一般人以至政府部門亦未必可以專門有足夠專業知識能涉獵的資料研究，極為值得城規會各成員去參考作為考量。而由石梨坑村村民組成的「石籬改建關注組」(石梨坑村改建關注會)，則以改劃最直接受影響一群持分者，提出很全面因改劃而造成的各項問題，予人反思。

抱歉由於本身城規會的改劃程序雖經歷了一些改進，然而對於一般市民，尤其是年長，亦有對於網絡電腦資訊科技不善長的人士，有頗大的障礙影響他們去表達意見。除了網上申述是一種較困難高門檻的方法，而其他替代如郵寄、傳真方式，同樣是以文字形式去申述，對不善長以文字的人士，其實就每一次改劃對年紀較大的村民一定是不友善的方法。是以我留意到石籬改建關注組在技術的協助，正好補足了城規申述網站目前無法與時並進，去便利市民參與提供意見，為自己居住的地區提出對自己及鄰居切身影響的事，(這只是順帶一提，我想城規會要詳加考慮如何減少阻礙，鼓勵市民參與意見外上下功夫。)

不諱言有不少意見是利用關注組的網站協助，然而關注組亦同時整理了自己收集的口述文字歷史文獻、各團體的生態環境社區交通的研究資料，供同區及其他公眾參考，並帶領多場實地田野考察導賞，我們應該欣賞她們的努力令這個規劃的意見增加了，大大增加了這個改劃的公眾參與度，接下來便是命為城規會職分的委員能否聆聽市民及持分者的聲音，各種專業的整理的理據事實，然後獨立作出為個體為社區，有情有理的討論及處理。感謝。

我稍加理解分析TPB/R/S/KC/31-1的意見，其實沒有合理理據支持改劃A項目，但卻有全篇指出若改劃A項目會加劇現有該區的各種問

<p>TPB/R/S/KC/31-1</p>	<p>題可以說是全篇充斥著反對改劃的理據。所以亦是沒有一些論據去支持在A項目該區域改劃建屋。(要留意是文中第一段只是「大方向贊成」建屋紓援市民住劏房東等不適合住屋的壓力，卻沒有指出日A項目是合適理想的地方。</p> <p>此意見申述表面支持改劃，但實際內容全屬認為目前尚沒有完成規劃石排街及東北葵的各項交通、社區設施配套，目前不應作出改劃(即實質等同反對)。由於提出意見組織為區議會等地區工作，有較充足的直接資訊及當區市民的實際意見，其一是本身現有的社區整體設施滯後於居民人口的比例；其二是交通目前已飽和(公共交通的不敷、道路擠塞、泊車不足等)；</p> <p>這意見只是贊成大方向增加公營房屋，內容卻並非贊成在東北葵(石排街綠化帶建屋)，因為從沒有指出任何理據贊成在改劃的A1區域建屋，但卻列舉大量原因指出在該區域建屋會造成極大的社區問題(故實際是反對)，內裡所反映的意願建議有關規劃當局實應物飾更適合的地方替代現有這個綠化帶改劃，以免帶出更多的問題。</p> <p>因此這申述的立論含糊，沒有指明支持A項目改劃，卻充斥著反對改劃A項目的理由，內容首尾相悖、自相矛盾，所以「反對有關申述的意見」，亦請城規會委員不要理會這個邏輯令人搞不清的意見。</p>
<p>TPB/R/S/KC/31-2, TPB/R/S/KC/31-3</p>	<p>本人反對TPB/R/S/KC/31-2趙文鳳女士有關申述：內容空泛，此申述支持改劃理由是興建5座大廈「可增加房屋供應」。然而整個香港、甚或葵青區也有不少閒置地、已平整的棕地，可興建大廈，同樣可增加房屋供應，而選取這個發展後無法還原的綠化地帶、這區域仍有人居住等因素，並沒有考慮顧及，這個申述空疏，完全沒有理據支持其支持這個改劃，可說是沒有價值可言，城規會各委員請不用參考此沒有用處的申述。</p> <p>另外，本人亦反對TPB/R/S/KC/31-3有關申述：此申述支持改劃的理由是「增加年輕人口比例，活化老區」。然而這是個完全站不住腳的假設。改劃後興建大廈，容納更多人口，但人口比例不一定年輕人較多，也可以是老人較多，其中因素是香港人口老齡化已持續上升。另外該擬改劃的綠化地帶，有石梨坑村，村民有老亦有年青的，並不全是老人，所以此申述的理由是欠缺理據及對該地區認知不足。活化老區這個詞語語意不明確，常識所謂「活化」是保留該區的建築物，然後作出修葺、改頭換面(例如外牆翻新、配合時代的設計)，並且將這些建築物賦予新的功能用途，例子如美荷樓、PMQ等)，如果這申述的理由是可活化老區，那麼便應該是「反對」改劃，而不是「支持」改劃用途了，因為綠化帶的村屋，會全數拆卸，重新建設住宅，而非保留。這申述的理由由於概念不清，以至認知錯誤及矛盾，加上假設「年輕人比例增加」亦不一定正確。是以剔除活化、老化等所謂原因，等如沒有任何合理支持的理由，城規會各委員亦請不用考慮此申述了。</p>

就草圖的申述提出意見

Comment on Representation Relating to Draft Plan

TPB/R/S/KC/31-
C1778

參考編號

Reference Number:

230314-120333-48389

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

24/03/2023

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

14/03/2023 12:03:33

「提意見人」全名

Full Name of "Commenter":

先生 Mr. Lau Ka Yeung

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與意見相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the comment relates: S/KC/31

意見詳情

Details of the Comments:

申述編號 Representation No:	意見詳情 Details of Comments:
R001及R004	反對 R001，因為撰寫申述者並非陳恆鎮本人，而是其團隊，資料有誤。同時其申述內容有衝突，一方面說區內交通、配套有問題，一方面卻支持修訂項目A1； 反對 R004，因為申述理由是反對修訂項目A1，卻「支持」修訂項目A1，應是手文之誤選擇錯誤立場。
R4-R802 & R804-R859	申述人皆有力指出規劃修訂項目A1的問題，例如交通、生態、社區配套、村莊歷史文化等問題，然而當局沒有回應到相關問題，而疫情回復後交通問題再一步惡化，當展呈交的交通評估已不合時宜。

就草圖的申述提出意見

Comment on Representation Relating to Draft Plan

參考編號

Reference Number:

230324-234109-61743

TPB/R/S/KC/31-
C1779

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

24/03/2023

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

24/03/2023 23:41:09

「提意見人」全名

Full Name of "Commenter":

先生 Mr. KONG TIN LONG

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與意見相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the comment relates: S/KC/31

意見詳情

Details of the Comments:

申述編號 Representation No:	意見詳情 Details of Comments:
TPB/R/S/KC/31-2 興建五座大廈—支持：增加房屋供應	Oppose to captioned representation. Developing 5 buildings in the urban fringe at the cost of destruction of a century old village, dislocation of residents, irrevocable ecological impacts, loss of urban back garden for recreation, negative traffic impacts to existing residents, does not justify the development as in the benefits of Hong Kong. The green belts should maintain an assumption against development. Instead, the government should point its eye to the abundant brownfields located in the flatlands of Yuen Long/Northern District as a part of its "Northern Metropolis plan", which provides better facilities and comprehensive area planning than 5 buildings pinned in the hills.
TPB/R/S/KC/31-3 A項-支持：增加區內年輕人口比例，活化老區	Oppose to relevant representation. This gentleman has completely wrong concepts about population. Adding 5 buildings bring new population, but without comprehensive planning there would be no integration with the existing areas. Shek Lei area is already suffering in traffic congestions, lack of recreational facilities (Government promised recreation complex/sports centre at current site of Shek Foon House, but plans already forgone), and now even adding more population to compete for community resources with existing residents? Instead of comprehensive traffic planning such as constructing the "Kwai Chung Circumferential Road" as detailed in the Kwai Chung OZP, the government committed to only doing just minimal modifications at road junctions which are already fully over-capacity at the moment. Highway Department claims that after these modification work, traffic volume is at an acceptable level, but if one person, anyone in this Town Planning Board would go to the area to inspect on a typical work day morning, will

I find hundreds of metres of queues of cars in the narrow streets of Shek Le
i.

All and all, in no way is the new development bringing advantages to the c
ommunity. It is bringing turbulence to existing community, competeing for
resources, leading to worsening living quality for both old and new resident
s, thus I cannot see how the new community would blend with the existing
to be more harmonious, liveable or lively.

就草圖的申述提出意見

Comment on Representation Relating to Draft Plan

TPB/R/S/KC/31-
C1780

參考編號

Reference Number:

230323-110839-10077

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

24/03/2023

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

23/03/2023 11:08:39

「提意見人」全名

Full Name of "Commenter":

先生 Mr. Kwok Ching Laam

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與意見相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the comment relates: S/KC/31

意見詳情

Details of the Comments:

申述編號 Representation No:	意見詳情 Details of Comments:
	<p>I totally support the Representation Nos. 7-15.</p> <p>Alongside the professional comments from the above representations, I am writing to object the proposed amendment item A1 – A3 by auguring about the procedural impropriety of conducting the preliminary landscape and visual impact assessment (PLVIA).</p> <p>While I understand that the report for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has not fully been disclosed from the public, the PLVIA in the attachment 5 - Interim Report on Viability of the Development (IPVD) was oversimplified and NOT conducted in accordance with the TPB PG-No. 41 - Guidelines on submissions of Visual Impact Assessment for Planning Applications to the Town Planning Board.</p> <p>Here is the summary of the guideline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Town Planning Board (TPB) guideline for conducting visual impact assessment (VIA) in Hong Kong provides a framework for assessing the potential visual impacts of proposed developments on the surrounding landscape and built environment. It aims to ensure that proposed developments are assessed in a transparent and rigorous manner, and that the potential visual impacts on the surrounding environment and community are carefully considered and addressed. • It outlines the key principles and methodology for conducting a VIA, including defining the visual assessment area (i.e. zone of visual influence), t

1270

support the Representation Nos. 7-15	<p>the identification of key viewpoints, appraisal of visual changes by four factors (namely visual composition, visual obstruction, effect on public viewers and effect on visual resources), and the use of visual illustrations to assess the potential impacts of a proposed development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The guideline also provides guidance on the preparation of VIA reports, including the content and format of the report to facilitate public consultation and stakeholder engagement. <p>However, the above PLVIA in the attachment 5 was clearly in contrary to the TPB guideline as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The methodologies of the PLVIA for assessing the visual impact has not been clearly stated. • While the PLVIA is reported that key visual sensitive receivers (VSRs) have been identified, it did not properly mention who are the VSRs being apprised in the whole report. • The zone of visual influence or visual envelope has not been clearly defined. The authority did not provide any figures to supplement it. • The PLVIA did not give any elaborations or descriptions to justify the results given in the summary table 7.1 in the attachment 5. It is doubt whether the report has been assessed properly based on the four factors (namely visual composition, visual obstruction, effect on public viewers and effect on visual resources). <p>In light of the above, it is evident that the PLVIA failed to provide a comprehensive assessment in accordance with the TPB guideline. This constitutes malpractice and was conducted in an unprofessional manner. I urge the subject offices of UD&L and DPO in the Planning Department to critically re-examine the above substandard assessment mentioned above. I suggest the officers may wish to refer to the recent PLVIAs conducted during the amendment of OZPs such as the Kam Tin North Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-KTN/9. Based on the above, I respectfully request the Board to accept my comments and withdraw the proposed Amendment Item A1-A3. Thank you for your attention.</p>

就草圖的申述提出意見

Comment on Representation Relating to Draft Plan

參考編號

Reference Number:

230323-110839-10077

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

24/03/2023

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

23/03/2023 11:08:39

「提意見人」全名

Full Name of "Commenter":

先生 Mr. Kwok Ching Laam

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與意見相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the comment relates: S/KC/31

意見詳情

Details of the Comments:

申述編號 Representation No:	意見詳情 Details of Comments:
	<p>I totally support the Representation Nos. 7-15.</p> <p>Alongside the professional comments from the above representations, I am writing to object the proposed amendment item A1 – A3 by auguring about the procedural impropriety of conducting the preliminary landscape and visual impact assessment (PLVIA).</p> <p>While I understand that the report for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has not fully been disclosed from the public, the PLVIA in the attachment 5 - Interim Report on Viability of the Development (IPVD) was oversimplified and NOT conducted in accordance with the TPB PG-No. 41 - Guidelines on submissions of Visual Impact Assessment for Planning Applications to the Town Planning Board.</p> <p>Here is the summary of the guideline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Town Planning Board (TPB) guideline for conducting visual impact assessment (VIA) in Hong Kong provides a framework for assessing the potential visual impacts of proposed developments on the surrounding landscape and built environment. It aims to ensure that proposed developments are assessed in a transparent and rigorous manner, and that the potential visual impacts on the surrounding environment and community are carefully considered and addressed. • It outlines the key principles and methodology for conducting a VIA, including defining the visual assessment area (i.e. zone of visual influence), t

support the Representation Nos. 7-15

the identification of key viewpoints, appraisal of visual changes by four factors (namely visual composition, visual obstruction, effect on public viewers and effect on visual resources), and the use of visual illustrations to assess the potential impacts of a proposed development.

- The guideline also provides guidance on the preparation of VIA reports, including the content and format of the report to facilitate public consultation and stakeholder engagement.

However, the above PLVIA in the attachment 5 was clearly in contrary to the TPB guideline as follows:

- The methodologies of the PLVIA for assessing the visual impact has not been clearly stated.

- While the PLVIA is reported that key visual sensitive receivers (VSRs) have been identified, it did not properly mention who are the VSRs being apprised in the whole report.

- The zone of visual influence or visual envelope has not been clearly defined. The authority did not provide any figures to supplement it.

- The PLVIA did not give any elaborations or descriptions to justify the results given in the summary table 7.1 in the attachment 5. It is doubt whether the report has been assessed properly based on the four factors (namely visual composition, visual obstruction, effect on public viewers and effect on visual resources).

In light of the above, it is evident that the PLVIA failed to provide a comprehensive assessment in accordance with the TPB guideline. This constitutes malpractice and was conducted in an unprofessional manner. I urge the subject offices of UD&L and DPO in the Planning Department to critically re-examine the above substandard assessment mentioned above. I suggest the officers may wish to refer to the recent PLVIAs conducted during the amendment of OZPs such as the Kam Tin North Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-KTN/9. Based on the above, I respectfully request the Board to accept my comments and withdraw the proposed Amendment Item A1-A3. Thank you for your attention.

就草圖的申述提出意見

Comment on Representation Relating to Draft Plan

TPB/R/S/KC/31-
C1781

參考編號

Reference Number:

230324-005303-80246

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

24/03/2023

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

24/03/2023 00:53:03

「提意見人」全名

Full Name of "Commenter":

先生 Mr. Au Yeung Yat

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與意見相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the comment relates: S/KC/31

意見詳情

Details of the Comments:

申述編號 Representation No:	意見詳情 Details of Comments:
	<p>I support the relevant Representation(s) and object to the proposed amendments in S/KC/31 to rezone sites from "GB" to other uses (Items A1 – A3).</p> <p>High Ecological Value of the Sites The sites under consideration are presently designated as "Green Belt" zone s and are abundantly vegetated with natural streams. As highlighted in the EcoIA report submitted in conjunction with the proposed amendments, species of conservation interest have been recorded within the Project Area and they are either protected locally or in the mainland China, or listed in the IUCN Red List and the latest Red List of China. It is important to note, however, that the baseline study covered only the wet season, the biodiversity of the dry season was largely ignored. Further site visits conducted by HK BWF during the dry season have revealed additional species of conservation interest. Without a complete baseline survey encompassing both the dry and wet seasons, it is possible that the results of the EcoIA may not provide a comprehensive and impartial view of the ecological value of the sites.</p> <p>In view of the proximity of the sites to the nearby Kam Shan Country Park, the sites shall be treated as an integral part of the green area in the district. With reference to the 1252nd Meeting of the Town Planning Board, a majority of the members of the Board expressed concerns over the Proposed Amendment Item G, it was said that the rezoning for residential development would affect the integrity and the buffer function of the entire stretch of "GB" zone adjacent to the popular Ma On Shan Country Park, and would affect a stream within the site. The situation for S/KC/31 mirrors this case closely. The green belt area serves as a vital buffer area between the developed area and Kam Shan Country Park and the proposed rezoning of the green belt area into high-rise residential buildings would result in permanent loss i</p>

TPB/R/S/KC/31-7;
 TPB/R/S/KC/31-8;
 TPB/R/S/KC/31-10;
 TPB/R/S/KC/31-11;
 TPB/R/S/KC/31-12;
 TPB/R/S/KC/31-14;
 TPB/R/S/KC/31-15;
 TPB/R/S/KC/31-97;
 TPB/R/S/KC/31-24

3

in the natural habitats and jeopardize its buffer function. The Board shall provide sound evidence and justification to persuade the public and all the stakeholders that the situation in S/KC/31 is notably different from that in S/MOS/23 should the proposed amendments are to be approved eventually.

The proposed amendments also violate the planning intention of "GB" as laid out in the OZP, which is to safeguard the existing natural environment from encroachment by urban type development. The proposed rezoning from "GB" to residential uses is undoubtedly a clear example of encroachment into the existing natural environment by urban type development which clearly contravenes the general presumption of the OZP.

■ Alternatives sites for public housing

As highlighted in several relevant Representations, there are alternative sites within and outside the District that could be utilized for public housing in short and medium-term. The proposed residential buildings in Amendment Item A1 are not scheduled for completion until 2034, raising doubts as to whether this site can effectively address the housing shortage in the near future, particularly when there are large-scale development projects such as Northern Metropolis in similar time frame to provide plenty of land for development. It is worth noting that a Planning Application (Y/TY/2) has been proposed recently, which could provide over 15,000 housing units. The site for the proposed public housing in Y/TY/2 is basically a sizable flat and idle land which could be converted to construction sites immediately, presenting a potentially more cost-effective and efficient alternative to develop public housing units there as an alternative without the need to destroy the green belt areas in Amendment Items A1 – A3.

■ Maintaining and cherishing the existing lifestyles of villagers and residents nearby

The villagers of Shek Lei Hang Village and other affected villages have persevered and maintained their original lifestyles in the face of countless challenges over the course of several decades. The rightful needs of the villagers shall also be acknowledged and respected. They are deeply connected to the land here and their homes are basically their roots. I implore the members of the Board to read the interviews with the villagers and scholars like Prof. M.K. Ng, e.g. the ones published by Ming Pao Weekly at <https://www.mingpao.com/culture/社會/石梨坑村-採集百年務農建村史-辦導賞團、許願/>, in order to understand their stories and also the expectations on the people-oriented town planning process by the public and scholars. We all share the same aspiration, which is to build a better Hong Kong for the current and future generations by bringing about a better organized, efficient and desirable place to live and work.

Given there are alternatives available which could significantly reduce the impact on the existing residents without compromising land supply in the short and medium term, I sincerely hope that the members of the Board could reconsider if there is a pressing and overriding need to rezone the GB area in S/KC/31 and uproot the existing settlements and natural environment for the time being. Instead, we should explore to strive to preserve these areas for the benefit of future generations, so that they too can experience the beauty and tranquility of this land that has been cherished for so long by those who call it home.

就草圖的申述提出意見

Comment on Representation Relating to Draft Plan

TPB/R/S/KC/31-
C1782

參考編號

Reference Number:

230320-220700-63898

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

24/03/2023

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

20/03/2023 22:07:00

「提意見人」全名

Full Name of "Commenter":

女士 Ms. Siu Wai Yuen

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與意見相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the comment relates: S/KC/31

意見詳情

Details of the Comments:

申述編號 Representation No:	意見詳情 Details of Comments:
R16	<p>我反對!!!</p> <p>反對原因 Reason for objection</p> <p>* 政府未有考慮整全規劃 缺社區配套：多年來石籬一直欠缺社區設施，增加人口只會加劇問題 交通問題：區內交通現時負荷超載，擴闊道路不可行 歷史價值：石梨坑村見證石籬變遷，值得保留 環境影響：綠化地帶功能將會喪失 環境影響：對鄰近金山郊野公園造成影響 休憩空間：石梨坑村為附近居民提供優質自然休憩空間 休憩空間：影響行山人士使用山徑 浪費資源：葵青區的學舍一直供應多於需求，再興建學校不適宜</p>

就草圖的申述提出意見

Comment on Representation Relating to Draft Plan

TPB/R/S/KC/31-
C1783

參考編號

Reference Number:

230315-232626-66654

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

24/03/2023

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

15/03/2023 23:26:26

「提意見人」全名

Full Name of "Commenter":

女士 Ms. Chan Sze Wan Wendy

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與意見相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the comment relates: S/KC/31

意見詳情

Details of the Comments:

申述編號	意見詳情
Representation No:	Details of Comments:
R97	歷史價值：石梨坑村見證石籬變遷，值得保留
R97	環境影響：綠化地帶功能將會喪失；此外，對鄰近金山郊野公園環境和動物造成影響
R97	休憩空間：石梨坑村為附近居民提供優質自然休憩空間

就草圖的申述提出意見**Comment on Representation Relating to Draft Plan**

參考編號

Reference Number:

230323-173838-18185

TPB/R/S/KC/31-

C1784

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

24/03/2023

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

23/03/2023 17:38:38

「提意見人」全名

Full Name of "Commenter":

先生 Mr. 何家豪

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與意見相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the comment relates: S/KC/31

意見詳情

Details of the Comments:

申述編號 Representation No:	意見詳情 Details of Comments:
R796	反對改劃。開發項目將會剷平山頭，嚴重影響自然生態。大興土木，建屋時間長達10年，根本不能應對逼切房屋問題，而且香港仍有很多閒置棕地未被使用。

就草圖的申述提出意見

Comment on Representation Relating to Draft Plan

參考編號

Reference Number:

230324-121857-43952

TPB/R/S/KC/31-
C1785

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

24/03/2023

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

24/03/2023 12:18:57

「提意見人」全名

Full Name of "Commenter":

先生 Mr. 張嘉麟

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與意見相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the comment relates: S/KC/31

意見詳情

Details of the Comments:

申述編號 Representation No:	意見詳情 Details of Comments:
A1項 — 把位於石排街以東的一塊用地由「綠化地帶」改劃為「住宅(甲類)3」地帶，並訂明建築物高度限制為主水平基準以上260米。	反對。本年3月16日晚上發生的供電設施爆炸事件，已經說明高壓電塔附近不宜建屋，如果同樣事件發生在石排街，恐怕會造成山火，波及民居，危害居民性命財產。正如上輪申述(R831)所列明，此處若建樓宇平日會有來自廟宇的煙霧廢氣及噪音滋擾，居民出行會受交通擠塞及巴士路線迂迴受極大阻礙，基本安全與生活配套都成疑，生活質素會極差，絕不適合建屋。何況區內「住宅(甲類)3」地帶，例如石蔭東邨西陞、梨木樹邨與象山邨之間的山地等，加上附近過渡性房屋用地，根本未有善用現有「住宅(甲類)3」地帶土地資源。
A2項 — 把位於梨貝街以東的一塊用地由「綠化地帶」改劃為「政府、機構或社區」地帶。	反對。該處非常近梨貝街卻不可達，假若安足街/石排街路口或擬建道路發生交通意外，緊急車輛及校車/可通達車輛便不能到達，設計不實用且非常危險。區內學位其實過剩，根本不需要更多學校。而且石籬天主教小學舊址已經為「政府、機構或社區」地帶，卻沒有好好運用。應該於10座、11座舊址興建文娛康樂社福綜合大樓，以補償區內設施不足問題。
A3項 — 把位於安足街以東的一塊用地由「綠化地帶」改劃為「政府、機構或社區」地帶。	反對。假若安足街/石排街路口或擬建道路發生交通意外，緊急車輛便不能到達，設計不實用且非常危險；附近已經有北葵涌診所及安蔭邨內社會福利設施，功能有重疊；該處地勢陡峭，加上平日會有來自廟宇的煙霧廢氣及噪音滋擾，不適合長者、長期病人、傷健人士或/可通達車輛往返。石籬天主教小學舊址已經為「政府、機構或社區」地帶，卻沒有好好運用。應該於10座、11座舊址興建文娛康樂社福綜合大樓，以補償區內設施不足問題。

就草圖的申述提出意見

Comment on Representation Relating to Draft Plan

參考編號

Reference Number:

230324-235940-83390

TPB/R/S/KC/31-

C1786

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

24/03/2023

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

24/03/2023 23:59:40

「提意見人」全名

Full Name of "Commenter":

先生 Mr. LEUNG PO HANG

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與意見相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the comment relates: S/KC/31

意見詳情

Details of the Comments:

申述編號 Representation No:	意見詳情 Details of Comments:
TPB/R/S/KC/31-838	<p>本人堅決反對A1, A2, A3 項改劃，反對石排街公營房屋發展計劃！請城規會不要往錯誤方向愈走愈遠，懸崖勒馬，取消改劃重回正軌。</p> <p>1. 2018年土地供應諮詢，即「土地大辯論」，已有明楚民意表達不接受在郊野公園邊陲建屋，這就是民心所向！</p> <p>前土地供應專責小組主席黃遠輝出席環境諮詢委員會後接受傳媒訪問，指出2018年該小組「土地大辯論」的報告顯示主流民意並未支持郊野公園邊陲建屋，因此相關方案優先次序排在較後位置。</p> <p>但正如黃遠輝所言，三年前「土地大辯論」收集了逾120萬則對土地供應的公眾意見，當中有兩成以上是關於發展郊野公園邊陲地帶，並且以反對意見佔極大比數。</p> <p>原文網址: 土地大辯論翻炒再炒 議而不行無法解決問題 香港01 https://www.hk01.com/01觀點/635463/土地大辯論翻炒再炒-議而不行無法解決問題?utm_source=01articlecopy&utm_medium=referral</p> <p>2. 石澗樓前身為9H 用地，原本規劃為體育館，政府走數，一直欠了北葵涌居民康體設施，當年官員為政府護航，話係最後一次在石籬區域起樓，現在不單止沒有遷居民康體設施，更連後山的天然綠化地帶也拿走來起樓，不能接受。</p> <p>3. 5座大樓包圍住古廟建屋係咩玩法？古廟燒香拜神，不適合在旁邊起樓。</p>
	1251



☐ Urgent ☐ Return Receipt Requested ☐ Sign ☐ Encrypt ☐ Mark Subject Restricted ☐ Expand personal&publi



KWAI CHUNG OZP NO. S/KC/31
24/03/2023 21:56

From: [REDACTED]
To: tpbpd <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>
File Ref:

KWAI CHUNG OZP NO. S/KC/31

Dear TPB Members,

The Green groups have provided significant additional data that debunks the Ecological Impact Assessment and other reports. Of course these reports commissioned by the developer are designed to undermine the ecological importance of a chosen site to justify the proposed development.

Members have a duty to carefully study and take into consideration the issues raised.

Most relevant information is collated in the first batch of material.

QUESTION THE JUSTIFICATION FOR DEVELOPING SO MANY UNITS

Abuse of PH units has not been addressed. While there are hundreds of officers investigating NS no dedicated team has been set up to look into this issue that would free up probably thousands of units.

Most HK people know folk living in PH who own properties and have cash stashed away or invested elsewhere. Many units are used for storage or as accommodation for domestic helpers.

Recent revelations brought to light by the recent 'murder for property' case have focused attention on the lack of supervision with regard to the income level of tenants. Once folk have got their knees under the PH table they are set up for life, regardless of improvements in their income levels.

The population is SHRINKING both here and on the mainland

There are thousands of empty units on the mainland – even in GBA developers have unfinished projects. Many of the developers in financial difficulties are Guangdong base, Country Garden, Evergrande, Vanke, etc

Emigration is growing

Interest rates are rising and the economy is slowing down. Property as an

investment is no longer an attractive proposition

Twenty years ago we had a similar situation that led to the sale of assisted housing units to private developers. We should learn lessons from history.

Formerly called Hung Hom Peninsula (紅灣半島) and built on the reclaimed land of Hung Hom Bay, it was an HOS estate comprising 2,470 flats completed by the Hong Kong government in 2002.

Since the government decided to suspend the scheme, Hung Hom Peninsula was sold to Sun Hung Kai Properties and New World Development in Feb 2004.

The decision to negotiate with the developer on a lease modification to allow sale of flats in the open market should not be viewed in isolation, but should be considered as part and parcel of the re-positioned housing policy announced in Nov 2002 amidst the then unstable property market which was hard hit by the serious imbalance between flat demand and supply and the negative equity.

IN VIEW OF THE CONSTANT CALLS TO INTEGRATE WITH GBA THE HK ADMINISTRATION SHOULD CONSIDER TAKING OVER SOME OF THE DISTRESSED GBA PROJECTS TO HOUSE SOME OF THE 150 PER DAY ONE WAY PERMIT HOLDERS WHO COULD GAIN HK CITIZENSHIP BUT CONTINUE TO LIVE AND WORK ON THE MAINLAND.

RETIREEES WHO PREFER TO LIVE ON THE MAINLAND COULD SWAP THEIR UNITS HERE FOR ONE ON A DEDICATED HK MANAGED ESTATE COMPLETE WITH THE FACILITIES THAT CAN BE FOUND ON A PH ESTATE HERE.

NOT ONLY WOULD THIS PROVIDE A SWIFT SOLUTION, IT WOULD ALSO BE COST EFFICIENT AS THE DEVELOPERS WOULD LIQUIDATE AT COST. IT WOULD ALSO BE AN ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY SOLUTION, INSTEAD OF DESTROYING HABITAT AND CHOPPING DOWN TREES IT WOULD UTILIZE TOWERS ALREADY UNDER CONSTRUCTION THAT COULD BE DEMOLISHED IF NO USE IS FOUND FOR THEM. THIS IS TOTALLY COMPATIBLE WITH THE PLEDGES MADE BY BOTH THE CENTRAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO REDUCE WASTE AND CLEAN UP THE ENVIRONMENT.

THAT THE FTU, A PARTY THAT COULD NEVER BE ACCUSED OF HAVING ITS FINGER ON THE PULSE OF SOCIETY, HAS RECENTLY SUPPORTED THIS PROPOSAL IS AN INDICATION THAT IT SHOULD BE CONSIDERED

PlanD and Housing Authority continue to insist that "Government has been increasing housing land supply through a multi-pronged approach". However the only approach evident so far is the easy solution **REZONE REZONE REZONE.**

There has not been a single initiative put forward other than Rezone. Regrettably there is no incentive to explore other solutions now that the administration can ram through whatever plans it wants as TPB will not dare to overturn the applications and Legco will rubber stamp the expenditure without question. It is appalling that no

member of the Finance Panel attends meetings on developments that will cost billions of dollars.

Members of the board have a duty to the community that has been underlined by a number of JR decisions to 'look onto matters' and provide an independent outcome.

Mary Mulvihill



就草圖的申述提出意見

Comment on Representation Relating to Draft Plan

參考編號

Reference Number:

230322-130823-80502

TPB/R/S/KC/31-

C1788

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

24/03/2023

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

22/03/2023 13:08:23

「提意見人」全名

Full Name of "Commenter":

LAU CHING YAN

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與意見相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the comment relates: S/KC/31

意見詳情

Details of the Comments:

申述編號 Representation No:	意見詳情 Details of Comments:
NA	<p>反對 TPB/R/S/KC/31 A1, A2, A3項改劃</p> <p>1. 綠化帶功能喪失，影響自然環境延續性，對綠化帶中的豐富生態帶來破壞，亦對鄰近金山郊野公園造成長遠影響</p> <p>2. 當區交通及社區配套已不勝負荷，發展會加劇問題。發展範圍是當區居民的休憩地方，改劃會令居民失去選擇，新居民亦不會得到優良生活環境</p> <p>3. 發展計劃範圍為區內通風走廊，發展會影響區內空氣流通</p>

就草圖的申述提出意見

Comment on Representation Relating to Draft Plan

參考編號

Reference Number:

230314-190232-73049

TPB/R/S/KC/31-

C1789

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

24/03/2023

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

14/03/2023 19:02:32

「提意見人」全名

Full Name of "Commenter":

女士 Ms. CHAN CHI WING

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與意見相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the comment relates: S/KC/31

意見詳情

Details of the Comments:

申述編號 Representation No:	意見詳情 Details of Comments:
修訂項目A1-A3	反對。該綠化帶不只是城市與郊野之間的緩衝，更是石梨坑村村民的居所。村民在村內更是以耕作為生，過自給自足的生活，改建計劃後令村民失去家園以外，更是直接失業。 再者，石籬(一)邨、石籬(二)邨及安蔭邨的公共屋邨及人口密度已經非常高，單單是葵芳地鐵站的31M巴士站，每日的繁忙時間都排著幾百人，交通不但是飽和，而是不勝負荷。即將清拆的中轉屋位置還會再起幾幢公屋，人口還會繼續膨脹，可見北葵涌已經再沒有發展空間。另外，此綠化帶的陡峭山坡亦增加施工難度，除了要大量砍伐樹木，更要花數年時間進行平整工程，時間及金錢成本效益較使用市區荒廢用地高數十倍。因此，發展該綠化帶實在弊大於利。

就草圖的申述提出意見

Comment on Representation Relating to Draft Plan

參考編號

Reference Number:

230324-212029-73647

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

24/03/2023

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

24/03/2023 21:20:29

「提意見人」全名

Full Name of "Commenter":

女士 Ms. Tam Kit Yung

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與意見相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the comment relates: S/KC/31

意見詳情

Details of the Comments:

申述編號 Representation No:	意見詳情 Details of Comments:
NA	反對 A1, A2, A3 項。 政府未有考慮整全規劃 1. 缺社區配套：多年來石籬一直欠缺社區設施，增加人口只會加劇問題 2. 交通問題：區內交通現時負荷超載（放工時間每班雙層巴士全部爆滿）擴闊道路不可行
NA	3. 歷史價值：石梨坑村見證石籬變遷，值得保留 4. 環境影響：綠化地帶功能將會喪失，對鄰近金山郊野公園造成影響，環評做漏乾旱季節調查，研究不完整欠公信力，大大低估石梨坑村作為綠化帶的價值
NA	5. 休憩空間：石梨坑村為附近居民提供優質自然休憩空間，拆掉就失去與自然和融的空間 6. 休憩空間：影響行山人士使用山徑 7. 浪費資源：葵青區的學舍一直供應多於需求，再興建學校不適宜

就草圖的申述提出意見

Comment on Representation Relating to Draft Plan

參考編號

Reference Number:

230323-233253-48507

TPB/R/S/KC/31-
C1791

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

24/03/2023

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

23/03/2023 23:32:53

「提意見人」全名

Full Name of "Commenter":

先生 Mr. CHEUNG SIU HEI

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與意見相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the comment relates: S/KC/31

意見詳情

Details of the Comments:

申述編號 Representation No:	意見詳情 Details of Comments:
修訂項目A1 Amendment Item A 1 把位於石排街以東 的一塊用地由「綠 化地帶」 改劃為「住宅(甲 類)3」地帶，並訂 明建築物高 度限制為主水平基 準以上260米。	反對 石籬社區人口多，社區設施不足，交通擁擠，難以再應付更多居民。
修訂項目A2 Amendment Item A 2 把位於梨貝街以東 的一塊用地由「綠 化地帶」 改劃為「政府、機 構或社區」地帶。 Rezoning of a site to the east of Lei Pui S treet from "GB" to "Gov ernment, Institution or Community" ("G/IC ").	反對 綠化地帶有大量野生生態，也是石籬居民的休憩地方，居民經常到這 裡行山，親近大自然，呼吸新鮮空氣，改為其他用途便損失了這片有 很大意義而多年歷史的自然地帶。

1254

修訂項目A3

Amendment Item A

3

把位於安足街以東
的一塊用地由「綠
化地帶」

改劃為「政府、機
構或社區」地帶。

Rezoning of a site to
the east of On Chuk
Street

from "GB" to "G/IC

"

反對

綠化地帶有大量野生生態，也是石籬居民的休憩地方，居民經常到這
裡行山，親近大自然，呼吸新鮮空氣，改為其他用途便損失了這片有
很大意義而多年歷史的自然地帶。

就草圖的申述提出意見

Comment on Representation Relating to Draft Plan

參考編號

Reference Number:

230324-012526-18551

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

24/03/2023

TPB/R/S/KC/31-

C1792

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

24/03/2023 01:25:26

「提意見人」全名

Full Name of "Commenter":

WONG, Chun Man

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與意見相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the comment relates: S/KC/31

意見詳情

Details of the Comments:

申述編號 Representation No:	意見詳情 Details of Comments:
NA	<p>反對 TPB/R/S/KC/31 A1, A2, A3項改劃</p> <p>1. 綠化帶功能喪失，影響自然環境延續性，對綠化帶中的豐富生態帶來破壞，亦對鄰近金山郊野公園造成長遠影響</p> <p>2. 當區交通及社區配套已不勝負荷，發展會加劇問題。發展範圍是當區居民的休憩地方，改劃會令居民失去選擇，新居民亦不會得到優良生活環境</p> <p>3. 發展計劃範圍為區內通風走廊，發展會影響區內空氣流通</p>

就草圖的申述提出意見

Comment on Representation Relating to Draft Plan

參考編號

Reference Number:

230324-184449-40478

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

24/03/2023

TPB/R/S/KC/31-

C1793

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

24/03/2023 18:44:49

「提意見人」全名

Full Name of "Commenter":

先生 Mr. Ling Yuet Fung

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與意見相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the comment relates: S/KC/31

意見詳情

Details of the Comments:

申述編號 Representation No:	意見詳情 Details of Comments:
A1-A3, B, C, D	<p>反對</p> <p>我是香港大學生物科學學院生態系及生物多樣性系研究員，我們的研究團隊在2022年11月於是次分區計劃修訂範圍附近的金山郊野公園內，發現紫斑蝶谷重要蝴蝶生境 (見 https://www.instagram.com/p/CnbSIPnvmEx/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link)。相關修訂容許建設高樓，可能會對越冬紫斑蝶生態有影響，所以本人希望當局撤回修訂。這發現亦代表早前就此建屋計劃進行的環境生態評估有重大缺失，未能在合適的季節記錄到越冬紫斑蝶這季節性的重要生態現象。</p> <p>斑蝶屬蝴蝶一群體，全球已知某些物種冬季有特別的聚集和遷徙習性，例如北美洲的帝王斑蝶(monarch butterfly)，秋季會集體南遷至墨西哥中部和美國加州沿岸聚集過冬，群集蝴蝶數量數以百萬計，是自然界最壯麗的景象之一。可是，遷徙物種容易受各地生境破壞、氣候轉變的影響，遷徙帝王斑蝶因而已被列為瀕危物種。香港的斑蝶也有聚集遷徙習性，當中紫斑蝶會在11至1月聚集在一些林蔭河谷停棲，數量可達幾萬隻，蔚為壯觀。紫斑蝶對聚集地的要求非常高，首要條件是地理位置和地形，牠們只在位處西南的河谷聚集，而且需要高大茂密的樹林生境擋風，以助牠們抵禦寒冬，所以香港只有幾個紫斑蝶谷的紀錄。香港一些已知的紫斑蝶聚集地已受重視而得到保育，例如小冷水、深水灣等，但由於研究有限，其他聚集地未受保育、已受破壞，甚至是未被發現。</p> <p>香港大學生態系的斑蝶研究團隊在2022年11月在金山郊野公園一個河谷發現大量紫斑蝶聚集，數量估計最少達幾千隻，而附近街坊亦表示此地每年秋季皆如是，所以此處可能是一直未被注視的紫斑蝶谷重要生境。雖然河谷位處郊野公園範圍內，但靠近郊野公園邊界，相關河谷生境與分區計劃修訂範圍北部最近距離只有約150米，將來部分建</p>

築物更可能位處同一河谷下游。如果高樓最終落實興建，可能會阻擋紫斑蝶冬季遷飛路線，相關的顯著生境改變亦可能令樹冠層變薄，影響河谷的風速、光線、溫度等微氣候，可能減低河谷對斑蝶的宜棲度。

雖然只有實際建屋範圍才有毀滅性的生態影響，但相關工程、建築物和新增人口都會對鄰近生態環境有間接影響，如城市熱島效應令溫度上升，改變濕度、風速風向、陽光照射等，所以環境生態評估要求檢視發展範圍周邊500米的可能生態影響。金山郊野公園的紫斑蝶谷正正位於發展範圍約200米附近，有機會受發展影響。而且，環境生態評估集中在5月至10月進行，完全忽略秋、冬、春季的生態價值，例如僅在11至12月出現的越冬斑蝶現象。所以，環境生態評估設計有重大缺失，可能大大忽略修訂範圍周邊的生態價值。

就草圖的申述提出意見

Comment on Representation Relating to Draft Plan

參考編號

Reference Number:

230323-165833-45046

TPB/R/S/KC/31-
C1794

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

24/03/2023

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

23/03/2023 16:58:33

「提意見人」全名

Full Name of "Commenter":

女士 Ms. Melanie Ann Moore

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與意見相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the comment relates: S/KC/31

意見詳情

Details of the Comments:

申述編號 Representation No:	意見詳情 Details of Comments:
Items A1-3, B, C & D	I object to all proposed amendments. Rezoning the site from GB to residential is not within the planning intention and would lead to an irreversible loss of high ecological value habitat with over 2,500 trees, woodland and natural streams. This Green Belt zone buffers the country park from urban sprawl and provides a passive enjoyment area for the public. Please refer to the many detailed objections of environmental concern groups and NGO's that have been submitted in response to the application.

就草圖的申述提出意見

Comment on Representation Relating to Draft Plan

TPB/R/S/KC/31-
C1795

參考編號

Reference Number:

230316-084346-22947

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

24/03/2023

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

16/03/2023 08:43:46

「提意見人」全名

Full Name of "Commenter":

女士 Ms. Wong Yu Ling

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與意見相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the comment relates: S/KC/31

意見詳情

Details of the Comments:

申述編號 Representation No:	意見詳情 Details of Comments:
A2, A3	It is a greenfield site of ecological value near the Kam Shan Country Park and the villages. The proposed development will adversely pose impacts on wildlife and natural environment, as well as the local residents living in the village. It will also lead to social displacement and affect the amenity of community as a whole.
B, C	The high-rise buildings is detrimental to the surrounding air flows, quality and dispersion patterns. The proposed development will worsen the problem of poor air circulation in the whole estate. On the other hand, during the construction of the buildings, it will cause noise and air pollutions, which will definitely affect the health of existing residents nearby. The new residential buildings will also aggravate the traffic pressure to the neighbourhood, which is nearly full of capacity.
D	Shek Lei Hang Village is a high historical value buildings in the neighbourhood. The residents need more recreational space but not demolish the "home" they are living. The proposed development will cause overlooking and overbearing effects on the community and the surroundings, and thus harm the residential amenity function.

就草圖的申述提出意見

Comment on Representation Relating to Draft Plan

參考編號

Reference Number:

230324-232339-37115

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

24/03/2023

TPB/R/S/KC/31-
C1796

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

24/03/2023 23:23:39

「提意見人」全名

Full Name of "Commenter":

女士 Ms. 羅正靖

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與意見相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the comment relates: S/KC/31

意見詳情

Details of the Comments:

申述編號 Representation No:	意見詳情 Details of Comments:
N/A	<p>我反對石排街建公屋，反對改劃綠化帶，反對清拆石梨坑村，原因如下：</p> <p>政府未有考慮整全規劃</p> <p>缺社區配套：多年來石籬一直欠缺社區設施，增加人口只會加劇問題</p> <p>交通問題：區內交通現時負荷超載，擴闊道路不可行</p> <p>歷史價值：石梨坑村見證石籬變遷，值得保留</p> <p>環境影響：綠化地帶功能將會喪失</p> <p>環境影響：對鄰近金山郊野公園造成負面影響</p> <p>休憩空間：石梨坑村為附近居民提供優質自然休憩空間</p> <p>休憩空間：影響行山人士使用山徑</p> <p>浪費資源：葵青區的學舍一直供應多於需求，再興建學校不適宜</p> <p>宗教原因：開發可能影響附近廟宇營運</p>

就草圖的申述提出意見**Comment on Representation Relating to Draft Plan**

參考編號

Reference Number:

230324-234750-62867

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

24/03/2023

TPB/R/S/KC/31-

C1797

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

24/03/2023 23:47:50

「提意見人」全名

Full Name of "Commenter":

女士 Ms. Chan Hoi Shan

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與意見相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the comment relates: S/KC/31

意見詳情

Details of the Comments:

申述編號 Representation No:	意見詳情 Details of Comments:
反對改劃：之前休閒設施變公屋話最後一座，違反承諾；選止太接近電塔及骨灰塔，不宜居住，騷擾先人。	反對改劃：破壞綠化帶環境，剝奪葵涌北居民休息晨運散步靜思呼吸清新空氣的空間，摧毀石梨坑村居民、動物如狗候子雀鳥及昆蟲的家園，破壞金山郊野公園入口，說壞香港故事，應先用踪地。

就草圖的申述提出意見

Comment on Representation Relating to Draft Plan

TPB/R/S/KC/31-
C1798

參考編號

Reference Number:

230303-220018-25373

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

24/03/2023

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

03/03/2023 22:00:18

「提意見人」全名

Full Name of "Commenter":

女士 Ms. 區婉柔

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與意見相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the comment relates: S/KC/31

意見詳情

Details of the Comments:

申述編號	意見詳情
Representation No:	Details of Comments:
TPB/R/S/KC/31	我認為石離坑村有獨特的人文特色，展示了城鄉共融的居住方式，兼具生態多樣性，不應該透過拆遷改變這些特色

就草圖的申述提出意見

Comment on Representation Relating to Draft Plan

TPB/R/S/KC/31-
C1799

參考編號

Reference Number:

230305-183839-74370

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

24/03/2023

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

05/03/2023 18:38:39

「提意見人」全名

Full Name of "Commenter":

先生 Mr. Ho Chun Ki jacky

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與意見相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the comment relates: S/KC/31

意見詳情

Details of the Comments:

申述編號 Representation No:	意見詳情 Details of Comments:
保育綠化帶	石籬坑村是一條擁有很長遠歷史的村 是這一區居民的共同的歷史。同時，綠化區內都有大量的野生動物，並不會有所謂的效野公園邊的概念
康體設施的缺乏	在葵涌區缺少一些大型的康樂設施故石籬坑村附近變成了一眾居民所選的休閒地方

就草圖的申述提出意見

Comment on Representation Relating to Draft Plan

TPB/R/S/KC/31-
C1800

參考編號

Reference Number:

230306-115358-82322

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

24/03/2023

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

06/03/2023 11:53:58

「提意見人」全名

Full Name of "Commenter":

女士 Ms. Ng Hing Wah

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與意見相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the comment relates: S/KC/31

意見詳情

Details of the Comments:

申述編號	意見詳情
Representation No:	Details of Comments:
S/KC/31	十分支持規劃草圖