

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 587<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee held at 2:30 p.m. on 8.9.2017**

#### **Present**

Director of Planning  
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Chairman

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr H.F. Leung

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Ms Winnie W.M. Ng

Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West,  
Transport Department  
Mr Patrick K.H. Ho

Chief Engineer (Works),  
Home Affairs Department  
Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Strategic Assessment)(Atg.),  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr Johnson M.K. Wong

Assistant Director/Regional 3,  
Lands Department  
Mr Edwin W.K. Chan

Deputy Director of Planning/District  
Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr H.W. Cheung

Vice-chairman

Professor K.C. Chau

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Ms Christina M. Lee

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board  
Ms Fiona S.Y. Lung

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr Kevin C.P. Ng

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Winnie W.Y. Leung

**Agenda Item 1**

**Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 586<sup>th</sup> RNTPC Meeting held on 25.8.2017**

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 586<sup>th</sup> RNTPC meeting held on 25.8.2017 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

**Matters Arising**

[Open Meeting]

2. The Secretary reported that there were no matters arising to be reported.

**Sai Kung and Islands District**

**Agenda Item 3**

**Section 12A Application**

[Open Meeting]

Y/SK-CWBN/8      Application for Amendment to the Approved Clear Water Bay Peninsula North Outline Zoning Plan No. S/SK-CWBN/6 and Draft Tseung Kwan O Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TKO/25, To rezone the application site from “Green Belt” to “Residential (Group C)4”, Lots 71, 72, 75 and 76 in D.D. 243 and Adjoining Government Land, Clear Water Bay, Sai Kung  
(RNTPC Paper No. Y/SK-CWBN/8)

---

3. The Secretary reported that Masterplan Limited (Masterplan) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu      -    having current business dealings with Masterplan

Mr David Y.T. Lui - co-owning with his spouse two houses in Clearwater Bay Area

4. The Committee noted that Mr Ivan C.S. Fu had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. The applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application, as the properties co-owned by Mr David Y.T. Lui and his spouse had a direct view of the site, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion.

5. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 30.8.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for one month so as to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments of relevant government departments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

6. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within three months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that one month was allowed for preparation of the submission of further information and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[Ms Winnie W.M. Ng and Mr Patrick K.H. Ho arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

**Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West District**

**Agenda Item 4**

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/TM/19                      Application for Amendment to the Approved Tuen Mun Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TM/33, To rezone the application site from “Open Space”, “Government, Institution or Community” to “Government, Institution or Community”, Lots 491 (Part), 492 (Part), 495RP (Part), 498RP, 500, 501 (Part), 502RP (Part), 503, 717RP in D.D. 374 and Adjoining Government Land, So Kwun Wat, Tuen Mun  
(RNTPC Paper No. Y/TM/19A)

---

7.                      The Secretary reported that MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA) was one of the consultants of the applicant.    The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu            -    having current business dealings with MVA

Mr Alex T.H. Lai         -    his firm having current business dealings with MVA

8.                      The Committee noted that Messrs Ivan C.S. Fu and Alex T.H. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

9.                      The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 30.8.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for preparation of further information to respond to the departmental comments.    It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

10.                     After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within three months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant.    If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed

within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that a maximum period of two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information. Since it was the second deferment and a total of four months had been allowed for preparation of the submission of further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

### **Sai Kung and Islands District**

[Mr William W.T. Wong, Senior Town Planner/Sai Kung and Islands (STP/SKIs), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

#### **Agenda Item 5**

##### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/SK-HH/72                      Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Private Swimming Pool for a Period of 3 Years in "Village Type Development" Zone, Lots 49 S.A ss.3 (Part) and 49 S.A RP (Part) in D.D. 212, Che Keng Tuk, Sai Kung  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/SK-HH/72)

---

##### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

11.            Mr William W.T. Wong, STP/STN, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) renewal of planning approval for temporary private swimming pool under application No. A/SK-HH/62 for a period of three years;

[Mr H.F. Leung arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, no public comment was received; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the renewal of planning approval for the temporary use for a further period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposal remained unchanged as compared to the previously approved scheme. There was no change in planning circumstances since the approval of the previous application. Although the proposed swimming pool was not in line with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone, given the temporary nature of the proposed swimming pool, the long-term planning intention of the “V” zone would not be jeopardized. In view of the temporary nature and small-scale of the proposed development, significant adverse impacts on the existing landscape, traffic and infrastructural provisions on the surrounding environment were not anticipated. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application.

12. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

13. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years, and be renewed from 13.9.2017 until 12.9.2020, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the submission of fire service installations within 6 months from the date of

commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 13.3.2018;

- (b) in relation to (a) above, the implementation of fire service installations within 9 months from the commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 13.6.2018;
- (c) if any of the above planning conditions (a) or (b) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given should cease to have effect and should on the same date be revoked without further notice; and
- (d) upon expiry of the planning permission, the reinstatement of the application site to an amenity area to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

14. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix IV of the Paper.”

[The Chairman thanked Mr William W.T. Wong, STP/SKIs, for his attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. Mr Wong left the meeting at this point.]

### **Sha Tin, Tai Po and North District**

[Mr Kenny C.H. Lau, Ms Channy C. Yang, Ms Kathy C.L. Chan and Ms Cindy K.F. Wong, Senior Town Planners/Sha Tin, Tai Po and North (STPs/STN), were invited to the meeting at this point.]



**Agenda Item 6**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/MOS/118            Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in  
                                 “Green Belt” Zone, Government land in D.D. 167, Sai O Village, Sai  
                                 Kung North  
                                 (RNTPC Paper No. A/MOS/118)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

15.            Mr Kenny C.H. Lau, STP/STN, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a)    background to the application;
- (b)    the proposed house (New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) – Small House);
- (c)    departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 and Appendix IV of the Paper.    The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) did not support the application as a complaint regarding unauthorized tree felling at the concerned site was received in April 2017.    The Chief Town Planner, Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) objected to the application as vegetation had been cleared within the site and/or outside the site for providing/widening a local track connecting to the site prior to submission of the application, approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent to encourage site modification prior to application.    Cumulative effect of approving such application would result in adverse impact on the landscape resource and character of the area.    Since the footprint of proposed house covered all site area, there was no scope for providing landscaping within the site.    The Commissioner for Transport had reservation on the application as such type of development should be

confined within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone as far as possible but considered that the application involving development of one Small House only could be tolerated. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, four public comments were received from Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation, Designing Hong Kong Limited and members of the public objecting to the application. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and
- (e) PlanD’s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The proposed Small House development was not in line with the planning intention of the “GB” zone and there was a general presumption against development within the zone. There was no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention. It did not comply with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in New Territories in that the proposed development would cause adverse landscape impacts on the surrounding areas. It did not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 in that the proposed development would involve clearance of vegetation and affect the existing natural landscape in the area. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the “GB’ zone. The cumulative impacts of approving such applications would result in a general degradation of the actual environment and landscape quality of the area. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

16. A Member enquired about the differences between the current application and the previously approved Small Houses located nearby. In response, Mr Kenny C.H. Lau, STP/STN, said that although there was a general shortage of land to meet the demand for Small House development in the “V” zone, the current application was different from the approved cases as it did not meet the Interim Criteria in that the proposed development would

cause adverse landscape impacts on the surrounding areas.

### Deliberation Session

17. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application. The reasons were :

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone, which is primarily for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There is a general presumption against development within this zone. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention;
- (b) the proposed development does not comply with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for New Territories Exempted House/ Small House in New Territories in that the proposed development would cause adverse landscape impacts on the surrounding areas;
- (c) the proposed development does not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 for ‘Application for Development within “Green Belt” zone under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’ in that the proposed development would involve clearance of vegetation and affect the existing natural landscape in the area; and
- (d) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the “GB’ zone. The cumulative impacts of approving such applications would result in a general degradation of the actual environment and landscape quality of the area.”

**Agenda Item 7**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-TT/1                      Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in  
   “Green Belt” zone, Government Land in D.D. 289, Ko Tong, Tai Po  
   (RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TT/1A)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

18.            Ms Channy C. Yang, STP/STN, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a)    background to the application;
  
- (b)    the proposed house (New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) – Small House);

[Ms Janice W.M. Lai arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (c)    departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 11 and Appendix IV of the Paper. The District Lands Officer/Tai Po, Lands Department (DLO/TP, LandsD) had reservation on the application as the site and its adjoining area was subject to ongoing complaints on unauthorized site formation and there was also an unauthorized track which was under land control action by LandsD. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) had reservation on the application as it was more appropriate to allow natural regeneration to take place to facilitate ecological restoration. Approval of the application might set an undesirable precedent for similar illegal acts of environmental damage on government land and encourage further destruction of woodland. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) objected to the application as vegetation clearance had been taken place within the site and approval of the application would set an

undesirable precedent for similar vegetation removal prior to obtaining planning permission. The cumulative effect of approving such application would result in adverse impact on the landscape resource and character of the area. There was no existing proper access serving the site, thus further vegetation clearance arising from construction of the proposed NTEH was anticipated. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, four public comments were received from Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation, The Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong and an individual objecting to the application. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper; and
- (e) PlanD's views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 13 of the Paper. The proposed Small House development was not in line with the planning intention of “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone and there was a general presumption against development within the zone. There was no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention of the “GB” zone. It did not comply with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in New Territories in that the proposed development would cause adverse landscape impact on the surrounding area. As land was still available within the “V” zone of Ko Tong, it was more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within the “V” zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructure and services. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the area. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would result in adverse impacts on the natural environment and landscape character of the area. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

19. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

20. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application. The reasons were :

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone, which is primarily for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There is a general presumption against development within this zone. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention of the “GB” zone;
- (b) the proposed development does not comply with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for New Territories Exempted House/Small House in New Territories in that the proposed development would cause adverse landscape impact on the surrounding area;
- (c) the proposed development does not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 for ‘Application for Development within “GB” zone under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’ in that the proposed development would involve clearance of existing natural vegetation and affect the existing natural landscape; and
- (d) land is still available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Ko Tong which is primarily intended for Small House development. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within “V” zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructure and services; and
- (e) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the area. The cumulative effect of approving such

applications would result in adverse impacts on the natural environment and landscape character of the area.”

### **Agenda Items 8 and 9**

#### **Section 16 Applications**

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-TT/2                      Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in  
“Green Belt” Zone, Lot 483 RP in D.D. 289, Ko Tong, Tai Po  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TT/2)

---

A/NE-TT/3                      Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in  
“Green Belt” Zone, Lot 483 S.A ss. 1 in D.D. 289, Ko Tong, Tai Po  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TT/3)

---

21.            As the two applications were similar in nature (New Territories Exempted Houses (NTEH) – Small Houses) and the application sites were located close to each other within the same “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone, the Committee agreed that the two applications could be considered together.

22.            The Committee noted that the applicants’ representative requested on 29.8.2017 deferment of the consideration of the applications for two months so as to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments of various government departments. It was the first time that the applicants requested deferment of the applications.

23.            After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer decisions on the applications as requested by the applicants pending submission of further information from the applicants. The Committee agreed that the applications should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicants. If the further information submitted by the applicants was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the applications could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee’s consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicants that a

maximum period of two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

**Agenda Item 10**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-LT/611            Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House) in “Agriculture”  
Zone, Lot 207 in D.D. 18, Lung A Pai, Lam Tsuen, Tai Po  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LT/611A)

---

24.            The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 28.8.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments of the Environmental Protection Department. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

25.            After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee’s consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that a maximum period of two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information. Since it was the second deferment and a total of four months had been allowed for preparation of the submission of further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.



**Agenda Item 11**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-LT/616            Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in  
“Agriculture” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lot 408 S.B  
ss.5 in D.D. 10, Chai Kek, Tai Po  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LT/616)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

26.            Ms Kathy C.L. Chan, STP/STN, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed house (New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) – Small House);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 and Appendix IV of the Paper. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) did not support the application as active agricultural activities could be found in the vicinity and the site possessed potential for agricultural uses. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, three public comments from individuals were received objecting to the application. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed Small House development was not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” zone and DAFC did not support the

application. As land was still available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Chai Kek and Wo Liu, it was more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within the “V” zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructure and services. There was another similar application No. A/NE-LT/530 located to the immediate west of the site with similar planning circumstance which was rejected by the Town Planning Board upon review in 2015. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

27. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

28. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application. The reasons were :

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” zone which is primarily to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes and to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention; and
- (b) land is still available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Chai Kek and Wo Liu which is primarily intended for Small House development. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within the “V” zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructure and services.”

**Agenda Item 12**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TP/631                      Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in  
“Green Belt” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lot 495 S.A in  
D.D. 21, Pun Shan Chau, Tai Po  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TP/631)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

29.            Ms Kathy C.L. Chan, STP/STN, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed house (New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) – Small House);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 and Appendix V of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, three public comments were received from Designing Hong Kong Limited and two individuals objecting to the application. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The proposed Small House development was not incompatible with the surrounding areas which were predominantly rural in character. It generally complied with the requirements of the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 in that the proposed development would unlikely cause

adverse traffic, environmental, landscape, drainage, sewerage and geotechnical impacts on the surrounding areas and concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. It also complied with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in the New Territories in that more than 50% of the proposed Small House footprint was located within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Pun Shan Chau village. The site was the subject of a previous application No. A/TP/437 for Small House development approved by the Committee in 2009 and there was no significant change in planning circumstances since the previous approval. Since the processing of the Small House grant by the Lands Department was already at an advanced stage, sympathetic consideration might be given to the application. Six similar applications for Small House developments in the vicinity within the same “GB” zone were approved by the Committee between 2004 and 2009 mainly on the grounds of being in line with the Interim Criteria. Regarding the public comments received, the planning assessments above were relevant.

30. The Chairman and some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) details of the four similar applications for Small House developments rejected by the Committee;
  - (b) major considerations of the current application;
  - (c) the percentage of the proposed Small House footprint that fell within the “V” zone;
  - (d) why the applicant had not erected the Small House since obtaining planning approval from the Committee in 2009; and
  - (e) the differences between the current application and the application No. A/TP/623 which was recently rejected by the Committee in April 2017.

31. Ms Kathy C.L. Chan, STP/STN, made the following responses:
- (a) four similar applications No. A/TP/334, 416, 448 and 623 were rejected by the Committee in 2004, 2009, 2010 and 2017 respectively mainly on the grounds of being not complied with the Interim Criteria in that more than 50% of the sites and footprints were located outside both the village 'environ' and the "V" zone, and/or that the proposed development would have adverse landscape impact on the surrounding areas;
  - (b) 58.2% of the proposed Small House footprint of the current application fell within the "V" zone. Since the site was the subject of a previous application No. A/TP/437 for Small House development approved by the Committee in 2009, sympathetic consideration might be given to the application;
  - (c) based on the advice of District Lands Officer/Tai Po, Lands Department (LandsD), approval to erect Small House was granted to the applicant in 2010, however, the applicant had to fulfil certain requirements before the execution of the Small House Grant. The planning approval for the subject Small House development lapsed in 2013; and
  - (d) as shown in Plan A-2a of the Paper, more than 50% of the proposed small House footprint of application No. A/TP/623 fell outside the "V" zone. Besides, the application was rejected on the considerations that the proposed development would involve clearance of natural vegetation and land was still available within the "V" zone for Small House development.

#### Deliberation Session

32. A Member considered that sympathetic consideration could be given to the application as the site was the subject of a Small House application previously approved by the Committee and the applicant had been trying to fulfil the requirements of LandsD since obtaining the planning approval.

33. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 8.9.2021, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the provision of septic tank, as proposed by the applicant, at a location to the satisfaction of the Director of Lands or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission and implementation of drainage proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (c) the submission and implementation of landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

34. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix VII of the Paper.

### **Agenda Item 13**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TP/632                      Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Green Belt” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lot 947 S.B in D.D. 26 and Adjoining Government Land, Wong Yue Tan, Tai Po  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TP/632)

---

#### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

35. Ms Kathy C.L. Chan, STP/STN, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;

- (b) the proposed house (New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) – Small House);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 and Appendix V of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public comment was received from an individual objecting to the application. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The proposed Small House development was not incompatible with the surrounding areas which were predominantly rural in character. It generally complied with the requirements of the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 in that the proposed development would unlikely cause adverse traffic, environmental, landscape, drainage, sewerage and geotechnical impacts on the surrounding areas and concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. It also complied with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in the New Territories (Interim Criteria) in that more than 50% of the proposed Small House footprint fell within the village ‘environ’ of Wong Yue Tan. The site was the subject of a previously approved application No. A/TP/445 for the same use and there had been no significant change in planning circumstances except minor adjustment on site boundary and footprint of proposed Small House since the previous application was approved in 2010. Since the processing of the Small House grant by the Lands Department was already at an advanced stage, sympathetic consideration might be given to the application. A total of 11 similar applications within the “Green Belt” zone in close proximity of the site were approved by the Committee between 2006 and 2014 mainly on the grounds of being in line with the

Interim Criteria. Regarding the public comments received, the planning assessments above were relevant.

36. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

37. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 8.9.2021, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the provision of septic tank, as proposed by the applicant, at a location to the satisfaction of the Director of Lands or of the TPB; and
- (b) the submission and implementation of drainage proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.”

38. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix VII of the Paper.

#### **Agenda Item 14**

##### Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-LYT/632      Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in  
“Agriculture” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lot 691 S.B in  
D.D. 83, Kwan Tei Village, Fanling  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LYT/632)

---

Presentation and Question Sessions



39. Ms Cindy K.F. Wong, STP/STN, drew Members' attention that there was a typing error in paragraph 11.4 of the Paper and a replacement page had been tabled at the meeting for Members' information. She then presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed house (New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) – Small House);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 and Appendix V of the Paper. The Commissioner for Transport had reservation on the application as such type of development should be confined within the “Village Type Development (“V”) zone as far as possible but considered that the application involving development of one Small House only could be tolerated. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) did not support the application as there were active agricultural activities in the vicinity of the site. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, four public comments on the application were received. A North District Council member supported the application, the Chairmen of the Fanling District Rural Committee and Sheung Shui District Rural Committee indicated no comment on the application, while the Designing Hong Kong Limited objected to the application. Major supportive views and objection grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views –PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Although DAFC did not support the application, the proposed Small House development was near to the existing village houses to the east and west and not incompatible with the surrounding area dominated by village

houses and active/fallow farmland. It complied with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in the New Territories in that more than 50% of the footprint of the proposed Small House fell within the “V” zone of Kwan Tei Village. The site was in close proximity to the existing village proper of Kwan Tei Village. The site was the subject of a previous application (No. A/NE-LYT/510) for Small House development approved by the Committee in July 2013 and there was no significant change in planning circumstances since the previous approval. A total of 16 similar applications in the vicinity of the site were approved by the Committee between 2004 and 2017 mainly on consideration that they complied with the Interim Criteria. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

40. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

41. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 8.9.2021, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the provision of septic tank, as proposed by the applicant, at a location to the satisfaction of the Director of Lands or of the TPB; and
- (b) the submission and implementation of drainage proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.”

42. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix VII of the Paper.

## **Agenda Items 15 and 16**

### **Section 16 Applications**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-LYT/633      Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in  
“Agriculture” and “Green Belt” Zones, Lot 162 S.B ss.10 in D.D. 46,  
Ma Mei Ha Tsuen, Fanling

A/NE-LYT/634      Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in  
“Agriculture” and “Green Belt” Zones, Lot 162 S.B ss.11 in D.D. 46,  
Ma Mei Ha Tsuen, Fanling  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LYT/633 and 634)

---

43.      As the two applications were similar in nature (New Territories Exempted Houses (NTEH) – Small Houses) and the application sites were located close to each other within the same “Agriculture” (“AGR”) and “Green Belt” (“GB”) zones, the Committee agreed that the two applications could be considered together.

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

44.      Ms Cindy K.F. Wong, STP/STN, presented the applications and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Papers :

- (a) background to the applications;
- (b) the proposed house (NTEH - Small House) at each of the sites;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 and Appendix V of the Paper. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) did not support the applications as the sites were occupied as nursery garden and had potential for agricultural rehabilitation. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the applications;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, four public comments for each of the applications were received. A North District Council member supported both applications whereas the Chairmen of Fanling District Rural Committee and Sheung Shui District Rural Committee indicated no comment on the applications. An individual objected to the applications. Major supportive views and objection grounds were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and
  
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the applications based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Papers. The proposed Small House developments were not incompatible with the surrounding land uses which were predominantly occupied by fallow agricultural land and village houses. The proposed developments complied with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in New Territories in that more than 50% of the footprints of the proposed Small Houses fell within the village 'environ' of Ma Mei Ha Tsuen. They also generally comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 in that the sites were in close proximity to the existing Ma Mei Ha Tsuen and were required to meet the demand from indigenous villagers. The proposed developments would not have significant adverse landscape impact on the surrounding areas. The sites were the subject of previous approved planning applications No. A/NE-LYT/459 and 460 each for a Small House which were approved by the Committee in 2012 but their planning permissions lapsed in 2016. The Sites were in close proximity to the existing village proper of Ma Mei Ha Tsuen and there were 16 similar applications within/partly within the "AGR" and "GB" zones in the vicinity approved by the Committee, the implementation of which were forming a new village cluster in the locality. There had not been any major change in planning circumstances of the area since the approval of those similar applications. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

45. Members had no question on the applications.

Deliberation Session

46. After deliberation, the TPB decided to approve the applications, on the terms of the applications as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). Each of the permissions should be valid until 8.9.2021, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. Each of the permissions was subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the provision of septic tank, as proposed by the applicant, at a location to the satisfaction of the Director of Lands or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission and implementation of drainage proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (c) the submission and implementation of landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

47. The Committee also agreed to advise each of the applicants to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix VII of the Papers.

**Agenda Item 17**

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-MKT/3                      Temporary Open Storage of Construction Materials, Equipment and Machineries for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 474, 475 RP, 476 S.A RP, 477 S.A RP (Part) and 518 (Part) in D.D. 90 and Adjoining Government Land, Lin Ma Hang Road, Man Kam To, Sheung Shui  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-MKT/3B)

---

48. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 31.8.2017

deferment of the consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for preparation of further information to address the further comments of the Transport Department (TD). It was the third time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information including a response-to-comment table and supporting information on 21.7.2017 to respond to the comments of TD.

49. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that a further period of two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information. Since it was the third deferment and a total of six months had been allowed for preparation of the submission of further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

### **Agenda Items 18 and 19**

#### **Section 16 Applications**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-PK/124 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in "Agriculture" Zone, Lot 1594 S.D in D.D. 91, Kai Leng Village, Sheung Shui

A/NE-PK/125 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in "Agriculture" Zone, Lot 1511 S.J in D.D. 91, Kai Leng Village, Sheung Shui  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-PK/124 and 125)

---

50. As the two applications were similar in nature (New Territories Exempted

Houses (NTEH) – Small Houses) and the application sites were located close to each other within the same “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone, the Committee agreed that the two applications could be considered together.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

51. Ms Cindy K.F. Wong, STP/STN, presented the applications and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Papers :

- (a) background to the applications;
- (b) the proposed house (NTEH - Small House) at each of the sites;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 and Appendix IV of the Paper. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) did not support the applications as the sites were overgrown with grass and active agricultural activities were found in the vicinity. Since road access and water supply were available, the sites possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the applications;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, four public comments for each of the applications were received. A North District Council member supported both applications whereas the Chairman of Sheung Shui District Rural Committee indicated no comment on the applications. Designing Hong Kong Limited and an individual objected to the applications. Major supportive views and objection grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the applications based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Papers. The proposed Small Houses were not incompatible with the surrounding rural setting dominated by village houses, temporary structures and

vacant/fallow agricultural land. The proposed developments complied with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in New Territories in that more than 50% of the footprints of the proposed Small Houses fell within the village ‘environ’ of Kai Leng Village and land available within the “V” zone was insufficient to meet the outstanding demand and the future demand forecast of Small House. The proposed developments would not have significant adverse landscape impact on the surrounding areas. The sites were in close proximity to the existing village proper of Kai Leng and there were approved Small House applications in the vicinity, the implementation of which were forming a new village cluster in the locality. A total of 93 similar applications within the same “AGR” zone in the vicinity of the sites were approved by the Committee between 2001 and 2017. There had not been any major change in planning circumstances of the area since the approval of those similar applications. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

52. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

53. After deliberation, the TPB decided to approve the applications, on the terms of the applications as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). Each of the permissions should be valid until 8.9.2021, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. Each of the permissions was subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the provision of septic tank, as proposed by the applicant, at a location to the satisfaction of the Director of Lands or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission and implementation of drainage proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and



- (c) the submission and implementation of landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

54. The Committee also agreed to advise each of the applicants to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix VI of the Papers.

[The Chairman thanked Mr Kenny C.H. Lau, Ms Channy C. Yang, Ms Kathy C.L. Chan and Ms Cindy K.F. Wong, STP/STN, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. Mr Lau, Ms Yang, Ms Chan and Ms Wong left the meeting at this point.]

### **Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East District**

#### **Agenda Item 20**

##### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/FLN/14                      Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary “Vehicle Park for Rehabuses” for a Period of 3 Years in “Open Space” Zone and an area shown as ‘Road’, Government Land in D.D. 51, Tin Ping Shan, Sheung Shui  
  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/FLN/14)

---

55. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 28.8.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for one month so as to allow time for preparation of further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

56. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a

shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that one month was allowed for preparation of the submission of further information and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[Ms S.H. Lam and Ms Ivy C.W. Wong, Senior Town Planners/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (STPs/FSYLE), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 21**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-KTS/451      Proposed Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Hobby Farm) with Ancillary Private Car Parking for a Period of 3 Years in "Green Belt" and "Recreation" Zones, Lot 2031 RP in D.D. 92, Kam Tsin Village, Sheung Shui  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-KTS/451A)

---

#### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

57.      Ms S.H. Lam, STP/FSYLE, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary place of recreation, sports or culture (hobby farm) with ancillary private car parking for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, seven public comments were received. Amongst them, there were two comments from the general public, one supported the application and the other one had no comment on the application. The remaining five comments were from Designing Hong Kong Limited, World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong, Hong Kong Bird Watching Society and two members of the general public objecting to the application. Major supportive views and objection grounds were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and
  
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD considered that the temporary use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The proposed hobby farm to provide recreational outlet was considered not entirely in conflict with the planning intention of the “Green Belt” zone. The proposed development did not contravene the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 in that the scale of the proposed use was not incompatible with the surrounding areas and it would not cause adverse impacts on traffic, environment, sewerage, drainage and water supply. As it did not involve site formation, land filling, excavation or extensive clearance of existing natural vegetation, adverse impact on visual, existing trees and natural landscape features, and existing and planned infrastructure was not envisaged. Regarding the public comments received, the planning assessments above were relevant.

58. A Member enquired about the differences between hobby farm and non-hobby farm and the planning considerations and implications of the proposed hobby farm. In response, Ms S.H. Lam, STP/FSYLE, said that hobby farm was mainly for recreational purpose, whereas non-hobby farm which generally involved the growing of crops, was regarded as agricultural use according to the Definitions of Terms Used in Statutory Plans. In terms of traffic implications, hobby farm would generally create more traffic. However, for the subject application, users and vehicular trips per day would not be more than five and four respectively according to the applicant. The Commissioner for Transport considered that the proposed development could be tolerated taking into account the information provided by the applicant. Other relevant government departments consulted had no

adverse comment on the application.

### Deliberation Session

59. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 8.9.2020, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) no land filling is allowed on the Site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no operation between 7:30 p.m. and 9:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the Site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from village track at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no vehicle other than private car, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed to/from the Site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the submission of proposals of fire service installations and water supplies for fire fighting within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 8.3.2018;
- (f) in relation to (e) above, the implementation of proposals of fire service installations and water supplies for fire fighting within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 8.6.2018;
- (g) the submission of drainage proposals within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Drainage Services Department or of the TPB by 8.3.2018;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implementation of drainage proposals within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the

Drainage Services Department or of the TPB by 8.6.2018;

- (i) the submission of landscape proposals within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 8.3.2018;
- (j) in relation to (i) above, the implementation of landscape proposals within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 8.6.2018;
- (k) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c) and (d) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice;
- (l) if any of the above planning conditions (e), (f), (g), (h), (i) and (j) is not complied with by the above specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice; and
- (m) upon expiry of the planning permission, the reinstatement of the application site to an amenity area to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

60. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix III of the Paper.

**Agenda Item 22**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-KTN/570      Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Electric Power Radio Control Car Track and Ancillary Facilities) for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 956 RP (Part) in D.D. 109, Kam Tin, Yuen Long  
  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTN/570)

---

61.            The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 22.8.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for preparation of further information to respond to government departments’ comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

62.            After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee’s consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

**Agenda Item 23**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTN/571      Proposed Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Hobby Farm) for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 3 S.D and 8 S.K in D.D. 110, Tai Kong Po, Pat Heung, Yuen Long  
  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTN/571)

---

Presentation and Question Sessions

63. Ms Ivy C.W. Wong, STP/FSYLE, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary place of recreation, sports or culture (hobby farm) for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, five public comments were received from The Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, Designing Hong Kong Limited and three members of the general public objecting to the application. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD considered that the temporary use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed temporary hobby farm was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone. It was not incompatible with the surrounding land uses which were predominated by cultivated agricultural land, residential structures/dwellings, hobby farm, and vacant/unused land. In view of the small scale and nature, it would unlikely cause significant adverse traffic, environmental or drainage impacts and concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Seven similar applications for hobby farm use had been approved by the Committee in the same “AGR” zone. Regarding the public comments received, the planning assessments above were relevant.

64. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

65. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 8.9.2020, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) no operation from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicants, is allowed on the Site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no public announcement system, portable loudspeaker or any form of audio amplification system is allowed to be used on the Site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) no vehicles is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) the submission of drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 8.3.2018;
- (e) in relation to (d) above, the provision of drainage facilities within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 8.6.2018;
- (f) the submission of fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 8.3.2018;
- (g) in relation to (f) above, the provision of fire service installations within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 8.6.2018;



- (h) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b) or (c) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice;
- (i) if any of the above planning conditions (d), (e), (f) or (g) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice; and
- (j) upon expiry of the planning permission, the reinstatement of the Site to an amenity area to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

66. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix V of the Paper.

#### **Agenda Item 24**

##### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTN/572      Proposed Temporary Shop and Services (Book Shop) for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 283 S.A RP (Part) in D.D. 109, Kam Tin, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTN/572)

---

##### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

67. Ms Ivy C.W. Wong, STP/FSYLE, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary shop and services (book shop) for a period of three years;

- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, no public comment was received; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD considered that the temporary use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. In view of the nature and scale of the development, the proposed book shop was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses which were predominated by residential structures/dwellings with scattered temporary uses and vacant/unused land. The proposed development would unlikely generate significant environmental nuisance and concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Approval of the application on a temporary basis for a period of three years would not jeopardize the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” zone. Seven similar applications for temporary shop and services uses located on the southwest of the site were approved by the Committee.

68. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

69. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 8.9.2020, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) no operation between 7:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the Site during the planning approval period;
- (b) the submission of fire service installations proposal within 6 months from

the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 8.3.2018;

- (c) in relation to (b) above, the provision of fire service installations within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 8.6.2018;
- (d) if the above planning condition (a) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice;
- (e) if any of the above planning conditions (b) or (c) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice; and
- (f) upon expiry of the planning permission, the reinstatement of the Site to an amenity area to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

70. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix III of the Paper.

### **Agenda Item 25**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-KTS/705 Proposed Residential Development (Houses) in “Comprehensive Development Area” Zone, Lots No. 547 RP (Part) and 2160 RP in D.D. 106 and Adjoining Government Land, Kam Tin South, Yuen Long (RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTS/705C)

---

71. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Super Asset Development Limited which was a subsidiary of Henderson Land Development Company Limited (HLD). MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA) and Mott MacDonald Hong Kong

Limited (MMHK) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having current business dealings with HLD, MVA and MMHK
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having current business dealings with HLD, MVA and MMHK
- Ms Janice W.M. Lai - having current business dealings with HLD and her family member owning a house at Cheung Po Tsuen, Kam Tin South
- Professor K.C. Chau - being an employee of the Chinese University of Hong Kong which had received a donation from a family member of the Chairman of HLD before
- Dr C.H. Hau ] being an employee of the University of Hong Kong  
] which had received a donation from a family
- Mr H.F. Leung ] member of the Chairman of HLD before
- Ms Christina M. Lee - being the Secretary-General of the Hong Kong Metropolitan Sports Events Association which had obtained sponsorship from HLD before
- Mr Peter K.T. Yuen - being a member of the Board of Governors of the Hong Kong Arts Centre which had received a donation from an Executive Director of HLD before
- Dr Lawrence K.C. Li - being the Treasurer of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University which had obtained sponsorship from HLD before
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having past business dealings with HLD

72. The Committee noted that Messrs Ivan C.S. Fu and Alex T.H. Lai, Professor K.C. Chau, Ms Christina M. Lee and Dr C.H. Hau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and the Members mentioned above had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting but Ms Janice W.M. Lai should refrain from participating in the discussion.

73. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 30.8.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for the applicant to further clarify, respond and address the comments of the Director of Environmental Protection. It was fourth first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information on 20.4.2017, 1.6.2017, 14.7.2017 and 22.8.2017 to address department comments.

74. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that a further period of two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information. Since it was the fourth deferment and a total of eight months had been allowed for preparation of the submission of further information, this was the last deferment and no further deferment would be granted.

**Agenda Item 26**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTS/743      Proposed Temporary Vehicle Repair Workshop for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 355 RP (Part), 356 RP, 356 S.B (Part), 359 RP, 360 RP (Part), 361, 362 (Part), 363 and 364 (Part) in D.D. 103 and Adjoining Government Land, Kam Tin Road, Kam Tin, Yuen Long (RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTS/743A)

---

75.            The Secretary reported that Ms Janice W.M. Lai had declared an interest on the item as her family member owned a house at Cheung Po Tsuen, Kam Tin South. As the property owned by Ms Janice W.M. Lai’s family member did not have a direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that she could stay in the meeting.

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

76.            Ms Ivy C.W. Wong, STP/FSYLE, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) proposed temporary vehicle repair workshop for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) did not support the application as there were sensitive receivers, i.e. residential dwellings/structures, in the vicinity of the site (the nearest of which was about 20 m from the site), and environmental nuisance was expected. The site was the subject of five substantiated environmental complaints related to noise and waste aspects. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public was received from an individual objecting to the application. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD considered that the temporary use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Although the proposed use was not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone, the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation had no strong view on the application as the site had been paved and the potential for agricultural rehabilitation was low. Temporary approval of the application would not frustrate the long-term planning intention of the “AGR” zone. Although DEP did not support the application, the environmental concern of DEP could be addressed by the imposition of relevant approval conditions. The site was the subject of nine previous applications for various temporary open storage, vehicle repair workshop and hardware recycling centre uses, five of them submitted by different applicants for the same applied use as the current application were approved with conditions by the Committee from 2000 to 2013. Regarding the public comment received, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

77. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

78. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 8.9.2020, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) no operation between 6:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the Site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no operation on Sundays and public holidays, as proposed by the applicant,

is allowed on the Site during the planning approval period;

- (c) no car washing or paint spraying, as proposed by the applicant, shall be carried out on the Site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no medium and heavy goods vehicles exceeding 5.5 tonnes, including container tractors/trailers, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the Site, as proposed by the applicant, at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the existing boundary fencing on the Site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (g) the submission of tree preservation and landscape proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 8.3.2018;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implementation of tree preservation and landscape proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 8.6.2018;
- (i) the submission of drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 8.3.2018;
- (j) in relation to (i) above, the provision of drainage facilities within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 8.6.2018;
- (k) in relation to (j) above, the implemented drainage facilities on the Site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;



- (l) the submission of fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 8.3.2018;
- (m) in relation to (l) above, the provision of fire service installations within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 8.6.2018;
- (n) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f) or (k) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice;
- (o) if any of the above planning conditions (g), (h), (i), (j), (l) or (m) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice;  
and
- (p) upon expiry of the planning permission, the reinstatement of the application site to an amenity area to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

79. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix VI of the Paper.

**Agenda Item 27**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-KTS/749           Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary “Shop and Services (Real Estate Agency)” for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 1486 S.C (Part) in D.D 106 and Adjoining Government Land, Kam Sheung Road, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTS/749)

---

80.           The Secretary reported that Ms Janice W.M. Lai had declared an interest on the item as her family member owned a house at Cheung Po Tsuen, Kam Tin South. As the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and the property owned by Ms Janice W.M. Lai’s family member did not have a direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that she could stay in the meeting.

81.           The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 24.8.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for preparation of further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

82.           After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee’s consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

**Agenda Item 28**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-MP/264 Temporary Shop and Services (Metalware Retail Shop) for a Period of 3 Years in “Open Space” Zone, Lots 2907 S.C RP, 2908 RP (Part), 2910 (Part) and 2911 RP (Part) in D.D. 104 and Adjoining Government Land, Castle Peak Road - Mai Po, Mai Po, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-MP/264)

---

83. The Secretary reported that Dr Lawrence K.C. Li had declared an interest on the item as he co-owned with his spouse a house at Palm Springs, Mai Po, Yuen Long. As the property co-owned by Dr Lawrence K.C. Li and his spouse did not have a direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

84. The Committee noted that the applicant’s agent requested on 1.9.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for preparation of further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

85. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee’s consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[The Chairman thanked Ms S.H. Lam and Ms Ivy C.W. Wong, STP/FSYLE, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. Ms Lam and Ms Wong left the meeting at this point.]

**Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West District**

**Agenda Item 29**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved

Tong Yan San Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-TYST/10

(RNTPC Paper No. 7/17)

---

86. The Secretary reported that two of the proposed amendment items to the Approved Tong Yan San Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) were to facilitate two proposed public housing developments by the Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee - being a member of the Strategic Planning  
(Chairman) Committee (SPC) and the Building Committee  
*as the Director of Planning* (BC) of HKHA

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan, - being an alternate member of the Director of  
*as the Chief Engineer* Home Affairs who was a member of SPC and  
*(Works) of the Home* the Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA  
*Affairs Department*

Ms Janice W.M. Lai ]  
] having current business dealings with HKHA

Dr C.H. Hau ]

Mr H.F. Leung - being a member of the Tender Committee of  
HKHA

Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having current business dealings with  
MVA

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu ]  
] having past business dealings with HKHA  
Mr Stephen L.H. Liu ]

87. The Committee noted that Messrs Ivan C.S. Fu and Alex T.H. Lai and Dr C.H. Hau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

88. The Secretary reported that according to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board (the Board), as the proposed public housing development was the subject of amendments to the OZP proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the interests of the Chairman and Members mentioned above on the item only needed to be recorded and they could stay in the meeting.

#### Presentation and Question Session

89. The following representatives from PlanD, the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) and the consultants were invited to the meeting:

Mr David C.M. Lam - District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (DPO/TMYLW), PlanD

Mr Alan Y.L. Au - Senior Town Planners/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (STP/TMYLW), PlanD

Mr Edward C.W. Chan - Chief Engineer (CE)/Housing Projects 2, CEDD

Mr Clarence K.L. Chan ]  
] Senior Engineer (SE), CEDD

Mr Vincent S.H. Chow ]

Mr Ray S.W. Tang ]  
] Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup)

Miss Winnie Lee ]

- Mr Lee Pui Hung - MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA)
- Mr Tony C.M. Cheng - Ramboll Environ Hong Kong Limited (Environ)
- Mr Edwin C.H. Lo - Black & Veatch Hong Kong Limited

90. Mr David C.M. Lam, DPO/TMYLW, drew Members' attention that a replacement page of the Paper and the extract of minutes for meeting with Yuen Long District Council (YLDC) on 27.6.2017 were tabled at the meeting for Members' information. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Lam then presented the proposed amendments as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

*Background of the Proposed Amendments*

- (a) the Government had continued reviewing various land uses and rezoning appropriate sites, where the original intended use was no longer required, for housing development. A site to the west of Long Tin Road and to the north of the Tong Yan San Tsuen Interchange (Long Bin Site) and another site to the south of Tan Kwai Tsuen South Fresh Water Service Reservoir (Tan Kwai Tsuen Site) had been identified for public housing developments;

*Proposed Amendments to Matters shown on the Plan*

- (b) Amendment Item A1 – to rezone the Long Bin Site (about 10 ha) from mainly “Open Space” (“O”) and “Residential (Group B)1” (“R(B)1”) to “R(A)1” to facilitate a proposed public housing development with a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 6.5 and a maximum building height (BH) of 155 mPD. The proposed public housing development could provide about 11,700 residential units for an estimated population of about 32,900. Phases 1 and 2 would be completed in 2024/25 and 2028/29 respectively;
- (c) Amendment Item A2 – to rezone a small area of about 310 sq.m from “O” to “R(B)1” for minor boundary adjustment to reflect the existing residential development (Villa Sunshine);

- (d) Amendment Item B – to rezone Tan Kwai Tsuen Site (about 10.6 ha) from “Green Belt” (“GB”) and “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “R(A)2” to facilitate a proposed public housing development with a maximum PR of 6.5 and a maximum BH of 205mPD. The proposed public housing development could provide about 7,400 residential units for an estimated population of about 20,600. It would be completed in 2028/29;
- (e) Amendment Items C and D – opportunities were taken to rezone two sites, which were the subject of two s.12A planning applications (No. Y/YL-TYST/5 and Y/YL-TYST/6) previously agreed by the Committee (i.e. one site at Sha Tseng Road and one site comprising two portions to the south of Park Villa) from “G/IC” to “R(B)1”;

Technical Assessments

- (f) CEDD had undertaken two feasibility studies to ascertain the technical feasibility, namely Site Formation and Infrastructural Works for the Development at Long Bin, Yuen Long-Feasibility Study (LB Study) and Site Formation and Infrastructural Works for the Development near Tan Kwai Tsuen, Yuen Long-Feasibility Study (TKT Study). The proposed public housing developments, with suitable improvement and mitigation measures, would not have insurmountable traffic, environmental, infrastructural, geotechnical, landscape and visual, and air ventilation impacts on the surrounding areas;

Proposed Amendments to the Notes of the OZP

- (g) the Notes of the “R(A)” zone was amended to include remarks for sub-zones “R(A)1” and “R(A)2”, to reflect the PR restriction of 6.5 and BH restrictions of 155mPD and 205mPD respectively for the proposed public housing developments respectively;

- (h) the Remarks of the Notes of the “Comprehensive Development Area”, “R(A)”, “R(B)”, “R(C)” and “R(D)” zones were amended for the exemption clause for PR or site coverage calculation in relation to caretaker’s quarters to tally with the Master Schedule of Notes;

Departmental Consultation

- (i) relevant bureaux and departments consulted had no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed amendments;

Public Consultation

- (j) the Ping Shan Rural Committee (PSRC) was consulted on the proposed amendments on 24.5.2017. PSRC members generally objected to the proposed public housing developments from the traffic and transport point of view. The affected villagers of Tan Kwai Tsuen requested to exclude the existing village dwellings located at the northwestern part of the Tan Kwai Tsuen Site from the proposed public housing development;
- (k) YLDC was consulted on 21.2.2017 and 27.6.2017 regarding the proposed amendments. YLDC members generally objected to the proposed public housing developments of Long Bin Site and Tan Kwai Tsuen Site mainly on the grounds that the increase in population would aggravate the existing traffic congestion problem, “GB” zone was not suitable for housing development, and no rehousing/compensation package was provided for discussion; and
- (l) PlanD, CEDD, HD and the Lands Department (LandsD) participated in a consultation meeting with villagers of Tan Kawi Tsuen on 23.6.2017. The villagers had no objection to increase the supply of public housing to relieve the housing shortage in Hong Kong on condition that it would not affect the grassroots and there would be “no removal no clearance”. The affected villagers requested to exclude the existing village dwellings located at the northwestern part of the Tan Kwai Tsuen Site from the proposed housing



development.

[Mr H.F. Leung left the meeting at this point.]

91. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Edward C.W. Chan, CE/CEDD and Mr Clarence K.L. Chan, SE/CEDD, made the following main points on the traffic aspect:

Long Bin Site

- (a) to cater for the public housing development, a number of improvement works to the existing infrastructure were proposed, including two new slip roads, i.e. one from Tong Yan San Tsuen Interchange to Ma Fung Ling Road and the other one from Ma Fung Ling Road to Long Tin Road; conversion from give-way line to merging lane for U-turning under the flyover of Long Tin Road; and a Public Transport Interchange (PTI) with a capacity for parking of eight taxi and nine buses;
- (b) ingress and egress routes for heading to Yuen Long Town Centre, Tuen Mun, Kowloon through Long Tin Road, Castle Peak Road, Yuen Long Highway (Tong Yan San Tsuen Interchange and Pok Oi Interchange) for Phases 1 and 2 of the Long Bin public housing development were introduced;

Tan Kwai Tsuen Site

- (c) to cater for the public housing development, a new PTI at the Tan Kwai Tsuen Site was proposed;
- (d) a new vehicular access running along the south side of Yuen Long Highway was proposed to connect the public housing development to the existing road network at Shun Tat Street to the west and Tin Shui Wai West Interchange to the east and pedestrian accesses would be provided between the public housing development and the surrounding areas; and

- (e) improvement works at the junction of Shun Tat Street and Castle Peak Road – Hung Shui Kiu Section were proposed, in which a right turning movement would be allowed for the vehicles from Shun Tat Street (northbound) to Castle Peak Road;

*Both Public Housing Development Sites*

- (f) volume to capacity ratio (v/c ratio) for major roads on the road network in future with both public housing developments were shown to indicate that the full capacity of most of these major roads had not been reached;
- (g) walking time and travelling time by feeder bus from the proposed public housing developments to the Light Rail and West Rail stations were summarized to demonstrate the accessibility to the railway station.

92. The Chairman and some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) existing conditions of the sites, existing uses around the sites and the compatibility of the proposed public housing developments with the surrounding developments;
- (b) planning considerations/implications of the proposed public housing developments, in particular the environmental, noise and visual impacts on the surrounding areas;
- (c) whether there would be provision of market facilities in the proposed public housing developments;
- (d) whether the cumulative traffic impacts of other planned and committed developments in Yuen Long South had been taken into account in the Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment (TTIA) conducted by the consultant; and
- (e) the proposed traffic arrangement including improvement to the existing road network and enhancement of the public transport services and capacity to

meet the additional demand generated by the new population of the proposed public housing developments.

93. Mr David C.M. Lam, DPO/TMYLW made the following responses:

- (a) Phase 1 of the proposed Long Bin public housing development was situated on the site currently occupied by the Long Bin Interim Housing while Phase 2 was largely situated on a brownfield site currently occupied by temporary structures mainly for workshop purposes with scattered residential dwellings. As regards the scattered dwellings found within the site, LandsD advised that there was no record of a recognised village in the site;
- (b) it was stated in the 2014 Policy Address that the maximum domestic PR currently permitted for the residential developments could be increased by around 20% as appropriate to meet the pressing housing demand and the maximum domestic PR in density zone 1 of new towns could be up to 6. As the site was located adjacent to the new town and it was important to make efficient use of the limited land resources, the proposed domestic PR of 6 for the proposed public housing developments were considered appropriate;
- (c) the existing developments in the “R(B)” zone near Yuen Long town centre was mainly occupied by residential buildings subject to BH restriction of 25 storeys while the area to the immediate west of the Long Bin Site was zoned “R(B)1” occupied by low-density residential developments of four to five storeys. The proposed BHs of the public housing development at the Long Bin Site which ranged from 40 to 49 storeys were higher than those in the surrounding areas. Nevertheless, by adopting suitable mitigation measures, visual impact of the proposed Long Bin public housing development was slightly adverse but considered acceptable;
- (d) as for the proposed public housing development at Tan Kwai Tsuen Site, there was a high mountain acting as a natural backdrop for the proposed development. Although the proposed BH was higher than the surrounding

developments, photomontages viewing from various public vantage points demonstrated that the visual impact of the proposed Tan Kwai Tsuen public housing development was slightly adverse but considered acceptable with mitigation measures;

- (e) the technical assessments were conducted based on the indicative layouts for the proposed public housing developments prepared by HD. According to the Preliminary Environmental Review, there would be no insurmountable environmental impact with suitable mitigation measures. Regarding the noise impact, HD would carry out the Environmental Assessment Study (EAS) for planning of building layout and adopt appropriate building design to ensure compliance with relevant requirements of the Environmental Protection Department; and
- (f) shopping facilities including markets would be provided in the proposed public housing developments as appropriate and the level of provision would be subject to the detailed design by HD. Besides, there were existing markets in other nearby areas, e.g. Hung Fuk Estate and Yuen Long New Town, that served the local residents.

94. Mr Edward C.W. Chan, CE/CEDD, Mr Vincent S.H. Chow and Mr Clarence K.L. Chan, SEs/CEDD, also made the following responses:

- (a) regarding the existing conditions of the sites, based on site survey, there were about 100 structures within the Long Bin Site and most of them were temporary in nature with existing uses characterised by industrial operations. On the other hand, the Tan Kwai Tsuen Site fell entirely within the government land and was partially occupied by some structures for residential uses of the existing Tan Kwai Tsuen. There were about 20 dwellings as claimed by the villagers of Tan Kwai Tsuen at the PSRC meeting on 24.5.2017;
- (b) an Air Ventilation Assessment (Expert Evaluation) was conducted, air ventilation mitigation measures including setback from Yuen Long Highway,

as a major wind corridor, for the Tan Kwai Tsuen Site and appropriate building separations were recommended to be incorporated into the detailed design of the proposed public housing developments;

- (c) the TTIA had already taken into consideration all the planned and committed public developments as well as the committed private developments in the district;
- (d) the carrying capacity of the West Rail would be gradually increased by 60% by increasing the number of train compartments from seven to eight, upgrading the railway signal system, increasing the frequency of trains from 21 to 28 per hour during peaking hours, and better crowd control and management. It was estimated that the additional demand generated by the new population of the two public housing developments only accounted for 3% of the increased carrying capacity of the West Rail. Therefore, the West Rail would have sufficient capacity to meet the future demand generated from the proposed public housing developments and other planned/committed developments in the North West New Territories. As for the Light Rail, the Transport and Housing Bureau had been liaising with relevant departments to consider the proposal for diverting one bound of the existing light rail tracks in Yuen Long town centre with a view to free up more space for road-based traffic; and
- (e) people living in the New Territories generally preferred point-to-point road-based transport. Upon completion of the proposed Tuen Mun West Bypass and Route 11 tentatively in 2026 and 2031 respectively, it was expected that more bus services to the urban areas would be provided for the Yuen Long South area. Besides, the Transport Department would continue to liaise with the public transport operators in order to enhance the future public transport services.

#### Long Bin Site

95. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) the pedestrian and vehicular connectivity between the site and the Yuen Long town centre;
- (b) whether the proposed PTI and Phase 2 of the proposed development would share the same ingress and egress, making the PTI more congested; and
- (c) whether there would be grade separation for the proposed cycle track and road traffic.

96. Mr Clarence K.L. Chan, SE/CEDD, made the following responses:

- (a) to enhance vehicular connectivity between the site and the Yuen Long town centre, separated ingress and egress points were proposed for Phases 1 and 2 of the proposed public housing development in Long Bin. The ingress and egress of Phase 1 would be located at Castle Peak Road – Ping Shan Section, linking up with Castle Peak Road – Yuen Long Section to the Yuen Long town centre. On the other hand, vehicles from Phase 2 could use the ingress and egress at Long Tin Road to reach Yuen Long town centre via Castle Peak Road – Yuen Long Section; and
- (b) as for pedestrian connectivity, two elevated footbridges, i.e. across Castle Peak Road – Ping Shan Section and across Long Tin Road, and an at-grade footbridge from Long Tin Road to Shan Ha Road (across Yuen Long West Nullah) were proposed. A continuous cycle track network would also be provided.

97. Mr Ray S.W. Tang, Arup, also made the following responses:

- (a) despite the fact that the proposed ingress and egress points of the PTI and Phase 2 would be co-located at Long Tin Road, separated lanes would be provided for the PTI and the proposed public housing development; and

- (b) the proposed cycle track would not be grade-separated and cyclists would be required to get off their bikes when crossing the ingress and egress of the PTI.

Tan Kwai Tsuen Site

98. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the level differences between the various platforms of the proposed public housing development and whether escalators/lifts would be provided;
- (b) construction cost of the vehicular access roads; and
- (c) whether the site formation and construction costs would be much higher than those of other public housing projects given the site was situated on slope and extensive site formation work would be required.

99. Mr Edward C.W. Chan, CE/CEDD made the following responses:

- (a) the proposed development would have three platforms at different levels which ranged from about 40mPD to 80mPD. Provision of escalators/lifts within the housing development would be considered in the detailed design stage by HD;
- (b) the new vehicular access would mainly be an at-grade road with only a small portion to be built on elevated structures. The construction cost for the vehicular access roads would be similar to that of other public works projects. While it would be connected with Shun Tat Street at its western end, it would also be connected to the Tin Shui Wai West Interchange at its eastern end such that the traffic from/to the public housing development would not be interrupted in cases of any blockage of the vehicular access; and
- (c) the site formation cost comprised mainly the slope cutting and was considered essential given the specific site condition. It was estimated that

the construction cost for each residential unit would be similar to that of other public housing projects.

[Dr F.C. Chan left the meeting at this point.]

100. The Chairman drew Members' attention that YLDC had raised objection to the proposed amendments due to concerns on the traffic congestion problem arising from the proposed public housing developments. Similar concerns on the traffic impacts generated by the proposed public housing developments were raised by some Members during the discussion, Members' concerns on the compatibility of the developments, planning implications as well as the various impacts on environmental, traffic and visual aspects had been addressed.

101. In view of YLDC's objection, some Members further made the following responses/suggestions:

- (a) meeting the pressing housing demand was of utmost importance while the traffic concerns could be addressed through better transport planning and various mitigation measures;
- (b) new ideals/technologies should be explored to help resolving the traffic problem; and
- (c) non-franchised buses (邨巴) and public transport services should be enhanced to better serve the future residents.

102. The Chairman said that Members' suggestions above should be referred to PlanD and CEDD for further consideration.

#### Other Amendment Items

103. In response to the Chairman's queries, Mr David C.M. Lam, said that Amendment Item C was to rezone a site at Sha Tseng Road, which was the subject of a s.12A application No. Y/YL-TYST/5 approved by the Committee in 2015, from "G/IC" to "R(B)1" to facilitate a residential development; while Amendment Item D was to rezone a site



comprising two portions to the south of Park Villa, which was the subject of a s.12A application No. Y/YL-TYST/6 approved by the Committee in 2016, from “G/IC” to “R(B)1”. Members generally had no particular comment on the two proposed amendment items.

104. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Tong Yan San Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL-TYST/10 and that the draft Tong Yan San Tsuen OZP No. S/YL-TYST/10A (to be renumbered as S/YL/TYST/11) and its Notes are suitable for exhibition for public inspection under section 5 of the Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft Tong Yan San Tsuen OZP No. S/YL-TYST/10A (to be renumbered as S/YL/TYST/11) as an expression of the planning intention and objectives of the Town Planning Board for various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES will be published together with the draft OZP.”

[The meeting adjourned for a 5-minute break.]

[Ms Janice W.M. Lai and Mr Edwin W.K. Chan left the meeting and Mr Martin W.C. Kwan left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

[Ms Stella Y. Ng, Senior Town Planners/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (STP/TMYLW), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 30**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TM-LTY Y/341 Proposed Temporary Bike Hire and Maintenance Workshop for a Period of 1 Year in “Green Belt” Zone, Lot 2407 S.B in D.D. 130, Tsoi Yuen Tsuen, Tat Fuk Road, Nai Wai, Tuen Mun  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TM-LTY Y/341)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

105. Ms Stella Y. Ng, STP/TMYLW, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary bike hire and maintenance workshop for a period of one year;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape (CTP/UD&L), PlanD had reservation on the application as the site was mostly hard paved with a temporary structure. Tree planting was observed generally along the site boundary. Although some temporary structures could be found in the vicinity, many of them were suspected unauthorised developments (UDs). Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent attracting more incompatible uses encroaching into the “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone that would further deteriorate the landscape quality and undermine the intactness of the “GB” zone. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, three public comments were received from Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden

Corporation, Designing Hong Kong Limited and an individual objecting to the application. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and

- (e) PlanD's views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the “GB” zone and there was a general presumption against development within the zone. There was no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis. There were suspected UDs at the site which would be subject to planning enforcement action. The proposed development involving maintenance workshop activities was not compatible with the surrounding land uses. The last two planning applications No. A/TM-LTYT/254 and A/TM-LTYT/262 for temporary vehicle park (private cars and light goods vehicles) on the site were rejected by the Committee on 8.2.2013 and 24.1.2014 respectively. The Committee had not approved any similar applications or applications for any use within the subject “GB” zone. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications. The cumulative effect would result in a general degradation of the landscape quality and undermine the intactness of the “GB” zone. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

106. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

107. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application. The reasons were :

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone which is primarily for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain

urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets and there is a general presumption against development within this zone. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis; and

- (b) the approval of the application, even on a temporary basis, would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the “GB” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such similar applications would result in a general degradation of the landscape quality of the green belt.”

### **Agenda Item 31**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-PN/49

Proposed Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Hobby Farm) for a Period of 3 Years in “Coastal Protection Area” Zone, Lots 11 (Part), 14 and 15 in D.D. 135 and Adjoining Government Land, Sheung Pak Nai, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-PN/49)

---

108. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 21.8.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments of relevant government departments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

109. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee’s consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information and no further deferment

would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

**Agenda Item 32**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-PN/50                      Temporary Recreation Use (Fishing Ground) for a Period of 3 Years in  
“Coastal Protection Area” Zone and an area shown as ‘Road’, Lot 19 in  
D.D. 135 and Adjoining Government land, Pak Nai, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-PN/50)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

110.            Ms Stella Y. Ng, STP/TMYLW, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the temporary recreation use (fishing ground) for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public comment was received from an individual objecting to the application. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD considered that the temporary use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Although the development was not entirely in line with the planning intention of the “Coastal Protection Area” (“CPA”) zone, the existing fish pond at the site

would not be adversely affected by the development and the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation had no objection to the application. Temporary approval of the application for a period of three years would not frustrate the long term planning intention of the “CPA” zone. It was not incompatible with the surrounding land uses characterised mainly by fish ponds, cultivated land, a greenhouse, orchard, unused land and residential dwellings. Three previous applications (Nos. A/YL-PN/16, 28 and 39) covering the site for the same use were approved by the Committee since 2008. All the time-specific approval conditions of those approved applications were complied with. There were three approved applications for the same temporary recreation use (fishing ground) within the same “CPA” zone, approval of the current application was in line with previous decisions of the Committee. Regarding the public comment received, the planning assessments above were relevant.

111. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

112. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 8.9.2020, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) no operation between 9:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the Site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) the provision of a waterworks reserve within 1.5m from the centreline of the affected water mains within the Site at all times during the planning approval period;
- (d) the maintenance of existing drainage facilities on the Site at all times

during the planning approval period;

- (e) the submission of a condition record of existing drainage facilities on site within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 8.12.2017;
- (f) the implementation of accepted landscape and tree preservation proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 8.3.2018;
- (g) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 8.3.2018;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 9 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 8.6.2018;
- (i) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c) or (d) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (j) if any of the above planning conditions (e), (f), (g) or (h) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

113. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix V of the Paper.

**Agenda Item 33**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-PS/543            Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Private Cars and Light Goods Vehicles) for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lots 406 RP (Part), 407 (Part) and 408 (Part) in D.D. 122, Sheung Cheung Wai, Ping Shan, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-PS/543)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

114.        Ms Stella Y. Ng, STP/TMYLW, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a)    background to the application;
- (b)    temporary public vehicle park (private cars and light goods vehicles) for a period of three years;
- (c)    departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d)    during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public comment was received from an individual objecting to the application. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e)    the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application on a temporary basis for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Although the development was not entirely in line with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone, it could provide vehicle parking spaces to meet the demand in the area. The Lands Department advised



that there was no Small House application approved or under processing within the site. Approval of the application on a temporary basis would not frustrate the planning intention of the “V” zone. The applied use was not incompatible with the surrounding land uses and would unlikely create significant adverse traffic, environmental and landscape impacts to the surrounding areas. There were three previous approved applications (No. A/YL-PS/310, 395 and 498) covering the site for the same use since 2009 and there were 24 approved applications for temporary public vehicle park use within the same “V” zone. Approval of the current applications was in line with the previous decisions of the Committee. The applicant had submitted fire service installation proposal, landscape and tree preservation proposal and fencing plan, concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Regarding the public comment received, the planning assessments above were relevant.

115. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

116. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 8.9.2020, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) no operation between 11:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the Site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no medium and heavy goods vehicles exceeding 5.5 tonnes, including container tractors/trailers, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the Site, as proposed by the applicant, at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) a notice shall be posted at a prominent location of the Site to indicate that no medium and heavy goods vehicles exceeding 5.5 tonnes, including container tractors/trailers, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are

allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the Site at any time during the planning approval period;

- (d) a notice shall be posted at a prominent location of the Site to remind drivers on pedestrian safety on the access road to the Site at all time during the planning approval period;
- (e) no vehicle without valid licence issued under the Road Traffic Ordinance is allowed to be parked/stored on the Site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (f) no vehicle washing, vehicle repair, dismantling, paint spraying or other workshop activity is allowed on the Site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (g) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (h) a minimum of 3.5m set back from the northern, eastern and southern boundaries to minimise the noise impacts to the nearby residential dwellings shall be maintained at all time during the planning approval period;
- (i) the existing drainage facilities on Site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (j) the submission of a condition record of existing drainage facilities within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 8.12.2017;
- (k) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 8.3.2018;

- (l) in relation to (k) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 8.6.2018;
- (m) the implementation of the accepted tree preservation and landscape proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 8.3.2018;
- (n) the provision of boundary fencing within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 8.3.2018;
- (o) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h) or (i) is not complied with during the approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice;
- (p) if any of the above planning conditions (j), (k), (l), (m) or (n) is not complied with by the above specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice; and
- (q) upon the expiry of the planning permission, the reinstatement of the Site to an amenity area to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

117. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix V of the Paper.

**Agenda Item 34**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TT/409            Proposed Temporary Construction Machinery Workshop and Construction Materials Warehouse with Ancillary Office for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 3578 RP in D.D. 116, Tong Tau Po Tsuen, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TT/409)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

118.        Mr Alan Y.L. Au, STP/TMYLW, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary construction machinery workshop and construction materials warehouse with ancillary office for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) did not support the application as there were sensitive receivers of residential use in the vicinity (with the nearest one located about 20m to its northwest) and along the access road, and environmental nuisance was expected. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, four public comments were received from a village representative of Tong Tau Po Tsuen, a Yuen Long District Council member and two members of the public objecting to or raising concern on the application. Major objection grounds and concerns were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed development for workshop and warehouse use was not in line with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone and there was no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis. DEP did not support the application and the applicant failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not cause adverse environmental impact on the surrounding areas. Two previous planning applications (No. A/YL-TT/29 and 148) for open storage and vehicle park uses covering the site were rejected by the Town Planning Board on review. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent and the cumulative effect of approving such application would result in a general degradation of the environment of the area. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

119. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

120. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application. The reasons were :

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone, which is primarily to designate both existing recognized villages and areas of land considered suitable for village expansion. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis;
- (b) the proposed development, which is industrial in nature, is not compatible with the land uses in the surrounding areas with mainly residential dwellings, fallow/cultivated agricultural land and vacant land, and the

applicant fails to demonstrate that the development would not generate adverse environmental impact on the surrounding uses; and

- (c) the approval of the application, even on a temporary basis, would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the “V” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such application would result in a general degradation of the environment of the area.”

### **Agenda Item 35**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-TT/410            Proposed Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Vehicle Parts for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 1739 RP (Part) and 1740 (Part) in D.D. 118 and Adjoining Government Land, Tong Tau Po Tsuen, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TT/410)

---

121.            The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 29.8.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for preparation of further information to respond to the comments of government departments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

122.            After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee’s consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[Mr Martin W.C. Kwan returned to join the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 36**

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TYST/849      Temporary Open Storage of Construction Machinery and Containers with Ancillary Dismantling, Cleansing, Repairing and Workshop Activities for a Period of 3 Years in “Undetermined” Zone, Lots 1935, 1936, 1937 (Part), 1938, 1940 and 1950 in D.D. 117, Kung Um Road, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/849)

---

Presentation and Question Sessions

123.      Mr Alan Y.L. Au, STP/TMYLW, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) temporary open storage of construction machinery and containers with ancillary dismantling, cleansing, repairing and workshop activities for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) did not support the application as there were sensitive receivers of residential use in the vicinity (with the nearest one located about 40m to the northwest of the site), and environmental nuisance was expected. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, no public comment was received; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD considered that the temporary use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The application was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13E in that the site fell within Category 1 areas which were considered suitable for open storage and port back-up use; relevant proposals had been submitted to demonstrate that the applied use would not generate adverse impacts; and the technical concerns of relevant government departments could be addressed through the implementation of approval conditions. The applied use was not in conflict with the planning intention of the “Undetermined” zone which was generally intended for open storage use, approval of the application on a temporary basis would not frustrate the long-term development of the area. Although DEP did not support the application, no environmental complaint was received in the past three years and the environmental concern could be addressed by the imposition of relevant approval conditions. Four similar applications covering the site and 93 similar applications in the vicinity of the site were approved by the Committee, approval of the subject application was in line with the Committee's previous decisions.

124. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

125. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 8.9.2020, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) no operation between 6:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the Site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no operation on Sundays and public holidays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the Site during the planning approval period;



- (c) no heavy goods vehicles exceeding 24 tonnes, including container tractors/trailers, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the Site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the existing boundary fence on the Site should be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) the existing trees and landscape plantings on the Site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) the existing drainage facilities on the Site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) the submission of records of the existing drainage facilities on the Site within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 8.12.2017;
- (i) the provision of fire extinguisher(s) with valid fire certificate (FS 251) within 6 weeks from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.10.2017;
- (j) the implementation of the accepted fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 8.3.2018;
- (k) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f) or (g) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice;

- (l) if any of the above planning conditions (h), (i) or (j) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice; and
- (m) upon the expiry of the planning permission, the reinstatement of the Site to an amenity area to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

126. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix VI of the Paper.

### **Agenda Item 37**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-TYST/850 Social Welfare Facility (Residential Care Home for the Elderly) in “Undetermined” Zone, Lots 720 RP, 740 RP, 742 RP and 743 RP in D.D. 117, Pak Sha Tsuen, Kung Um Road, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/850)

---

127. The Secretary reported that MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having current business dealings with MVA

Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having current business dealings with MVA

128. The Committee noted that Messrs Ivan C.S. Fu and Alex T.H. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

129. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 28.8.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for

preparation of further information to respond to the comments of the Transport Department, the Urban Design and Landscape Section, Planning Department and the Drainage Services Department. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

130. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

### **Agenda Item 38**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-TYST/851      Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Furniture with Ancillary Office for a Period of 3 Years in "Undetermined" Zone, Lot 961 S.C (Part) in D.D. 119, Pak Sha Tsuen, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/851)

---

131. The Committee noted that the applicants requested on 24.8.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for preparation of further information to respond to the comments of the Drainage Services Department and the Fire Services Department. It was the first time that the applicants requested deferment of the application.

132. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicants pending submission of further information from the applicants. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicants. If the

further information submitted by the applicants was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicants that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

**Agenda Item 39**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/YL/231 Proposed Flat, Shop and Services, Eating Place and Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction in "Residential (Group E)1" Zone, 21 Wang Yip Street West, Yuen Long (Yuen Long Town Lot No. 461)  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL/231)

---

133. The Secretary reported that Landes Limited (Landes), Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) and Ramboll Environ Hong Kong Limited (Environ) were three of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu	]	having current business dealings with Landes, Arup and Environ
Ms Janice W.M. Lai	]	
Mr Alex T.H. Lai	-	his firm having current business dealings with Arup

134. The Committee noted that Messrs Ivan C.S. Fu and Alex T.H. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Ms Janice W.M. Lai had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that she could stay in the meeting.

135. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 23.8.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for one month so as to allow time for preparation of further information and clarifications in response to departmental comments.

It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

136. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that one month was allowed for preparation of the submission of further information and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[The Chairman thanked Mr David C.M. Lam, DPO/TMYLW, Mr Alan Y.L. Au and Ms Stella Y. Ng, STP/TMYLW, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. Mr Lam, Mr Au and Ms Ng left the meeting at this point.]

#### **Agenda Item 40**

##### Any Other Business

(i) Section 16A Application

[Open Meeting]

A/FLN/9-3	Application for Extension of Time (EOT) for Compliance with Planning Conditions, Lots 168 RP (Part), 170 RP (Part) and 181 RP (Part) in D.D. 52 and Adjoining Government land, Wa Shan, Sheung Shui, New Territories
-----------	--

---

137. The Secretary reported that the application was approved with conditions by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee on 9.12.2016. The deadline for compliance with approval conditions (c), (d), (e), (f) and (g) was 9.9.2017.

138. The Committee noted that an application for EOT for compliance with approval conditions (c), (d), (e), (f) and (g) for three months up till 9.12.2017 was received by the Town Planning Board on 29.8.2017, which was only nine working days before the expiry of the specified time limit for the approval conditions (c), (d), (e), (f) and (g). The Committee noted that it was recommended not to consider the application as there was insufficient time to process the application before the expiry of the specified time limit for compliance with the conditions (c), (d), (e), (f) and (g) which was essential for the consideration of the application.

139. Members agreed that the Committee could not consider the section 16A application as there was insufficient time to process the application before the expiry of the specified time limit for compliance with the conditions mentioned above.

140. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 5:30 p.m..