

TPB/R/S/NE-FTA/17-R1

就草圖作出申述

Representation Relating to Draft Plan

參考編號

Reference Number:

230627-014912-68202

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

28/06/2023

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

27/06/2023 01:49:12

「申述人」全名

Full Name of "Representer":

先生 Mr. 石湖新村(河北段)街坊會

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

Leung Tat Tung

與申述相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the representation relates:

S/NE-FTA/17

申述的性質及理由

Nature of and reasons for the representation:

有關事項 Subject Matters	性質 Nature	理由 Reason
反對華山公屋群	反對 Oppose	<p>若真的要發展，工程、收地、住屋等等問題，對政府、對我們有著十分多影響，綠色鄉郊地方減少了、政府要提供地方容納我們、兩項工程同時影響著一些街坊引來十分不便。十分多車輛出入、塵土飛揚、噪音、去水、道路交通等等的問題</p> <p>前期工程的問題影響著街坊，住屋有問題影響，我們只有自行維修，在啞口無言下，吞聲忍氣、因投訴無門等難題下、受害的就是受影響的街坊、我們只有一個簡單我願望，就是保留現在的居所。過著一向適合自己居住的居所，在石湖新村(河北段)地方上的公屋群，是命名為華山公屋，是可有可無不合情理？</p> <p>1. 此計劃起於2022年的10月，為何我們完全沒有知事之下，迄今強行接受這意見安排；這計劃的起源，我們完成不知；香港還有很多地方比這地方更為適合，使用更適當的地方更為重</p>

0601

要，如皇后山一帶，會否更理想。

2. 暫時有粉北前、後期工程影響下，交通會有嚴重加大的而且嚴重超出道路的負荷影響，長者和嬰孩更甚；牽涉到不少墳墓，對陰宅、對先人、(麵包山)，對風水有一定的影響；

3. 地方與大嶺靶場的距離接近只有數百米，對靶場的運作及居民有相當的影響；

4. 會否安排適當及清楚事件的官員可以抽空到村，向我們村民街坊徵詢意見，好讓我們有清楚情況及有安排的準備

5. 鳥類，很多時因航道有障礙物，使牠們不知道而撞死

6. 在一遍平原上加上很多高樓之下，加重了地殼負擔，有機會使地殼變形。

對草圖的建議修訂(如有的話)

Proposed Amendments to Draft Plan(if any):

就草圖作出申述

Representation Relating to Draft Plan

參考編號

Reference Number:

230627-184253-58178

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

28/06/2023

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

27/06/2023 18:42:53

「申述人」全名

Full Name of "Representer":

先生 Mr. 毛善良 Mo Sin Leung

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與申述相關的草圖

Draft plan to which the representation relates:

S/NE-FTA/17

申述的性質及理由

Nature of and reasons for the representation:

有關事項 Subject Matters	性質 Nature	理由 Reason
修訂項目A1及A2	反對 Oppose	在粉嶺北發展規劃中 梧桐河與其北岸一帶 由始至終都是被規劃為 河畔公園 及 通風長廊；發展區的整體佈局 是把所有高樓集中在 梧桐河以南 而且 建築物高度 由地區中心 為最高 然後 向河畔遞減。因為梧桐河北岸山崗 山脊線高度偏低 (普遍在100 米以下) 所以梧桐河北岸 縱有物業發展 都要嚴格 控制其高度與坐向，以免破壞預期的 景觀與通風效果。作為修訂項目A1及 A2 選址背景的多個華山山峰，最高的 亦只不過80米左右，所以 在該地構建 任何有相當高度的建築物 都會對整體 景觀與通風 帶來一定負面影響 更遑論 修訂項目A1及A2 中建議的170米住宅 大樓。這項發展不但與週邊環境格格 不入 更無視發展區原先的設計意念。

對草圖的建議修訂(如有的話)

Proposed Amendments to Draft Plan(if any):

擬議樓宇高度 減為與背景華山山脊線較匹配的 50米。

0603

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



28/06/2023 04:09

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

AMENDMENTS TO THE APPROVED FU TEI AU AND SHA LING OZP NO. S/NE-FTA/16

Items A1 and A2: (about 3.7ha) Rezoning of a site in Wa Shan, Sheung Shui from "AGR" and "GB" zones to "R(A)" zone, subject to a total maximum PR of 6.7 and maximum BH of 170mPD for PH development.

4 blocks / 4,200 units / Population (about) 12,000

1 Public Transport Terminus with ancillary carparking storeys atop)

Kindergarten / Retail Facilities / Social Welfare Facilities

Item B: about 0.1ha Rezoning from "AGR" to "G/IC" for reprovisioning of the RCP and PT currently located in the western part of Item A

Dear TPB Members,

While the plan will certainly be approved, members must take a good look at the details because the proposed lay out and bulk is unacceptable. The proposed location, size and visual impact of the PTI block is shocking. This when we are being told that the community going forward will enjoy better conditions.

The paper admits this:

Although the overall visual impact of the proposed development to some VPs is considered as 'substantially adverse' (i.e. VPs 2, 3, 4 and 9) (Plans 9a, 9b and 9e) and that it will inevitably alter the existing visual context and visual amenity of its locality

But then tries to excuse it under the Suck It Up routine:

"the proposed development, when materialized, is expected to form as the extension of the urban context of FSS New Town in the wider context "

"According to the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), visual impact could be relieved by adopting visual mitigation measures where feasible, such as variation in building height profile (from 50mPD to 167mPD), sufficient spacing

0002

between high-rise buildings (minimum 15m), building setback from the site boundary (about 20m wide from the south), and careful design and façade treatment of buildings to enhance visual permeability ”

SO WHY ONLY 15M SPACE BETWEEN THE BUILDINGS? WHY ALWAYS THE MINIMUM AND NOT WHAT WOULD MAKE FOR A MORE HEALTHY AND ATTRACTIVE ENVIRONMENT?

THE PTI BUILDING IS A MONSTER. WHY NOT PARKING UNDERGROUND? IS THIS TO SAVE \$\$\$\$\$\$?

Not only is it of exceptional bulk, it also blocks ventilation at the lower levels and members should note that the community facilities are placed right behind it, clearly impacting any chance of penetration of natural light and ventilation. Block 1 is almost stuck like glue to the PTI

That there should be such bad ventilation in what was once countryside is unacceptable.

The development is inefficient use of space. Why so many roads and EVA? With better layout there would be no need for all that asphalt on the right side of the development.

Trees – as usual not important and there will be 1:1. However most of them are packed into one corner or in military rows along the periphery

And again “**noise mitigation measures such as acoustic fin/windows, fixed glazing window** and enhanced acoustic balcony will be adopted for those residential blocks vulnerable to noise exceedance.

SO NO LESSONS LEARNED FROM COVID WITH REGARD TO THE IMPORTANCE OF NATURAL VENTILATION AND LETS NOT GO INTO THE ISSUE OF TENANTS HAVING TO RUN AIR CON 24/7. GLOBAL WARMING IS IGNORED IN HK

And “no less than 5% of the domestic GFA of the proposed public housing development will be provided”

NO LONG SUFFICIENT WITH AN AGEING POPULATION.

No mention of including a certain number of units that would be elderly friendly. This should be mandatory in all PH developments going forward.

While members are under pressure to approve all plans, they can still play a part in achieving improvements to them.

Mary Mulviill

