

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 594th Meeting of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee held at 2:00 p.m. on 22.12.2017

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Chairman

Professor K.C. Chau

Mr H.F. Leung

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr C.H. Hau

Miss 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),
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Raymond W.M. 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

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Ms Christina M. Lee

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Sincere C.S. Kan

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 593rd RNTPC Meeting held on 8.12.2017

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 593rd RNTPC meeting held on 8.12.2017 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Sha Tin, Tai Po and North District

Agenda Item 3

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/ST/34 Application for Amendment to the Draft Sha Tin Outline Zoning Plan No. S/ST/33, To Rezone the Application Site from “Village Type Development” to “Government, Institution or Community (1)”, Lots 63, 296 (Part), 331 RP (Part) and 393 S.B RP (Part) in D.D. 185, Sheung Wo Che, Sha Tin
(RNTPC Paper No. Y/ST/34C)

3. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Sai Lam Temple Foundation Ltd. (SLTFL). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan - having relative's ashes interred in Sai Lam Temple;
and

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

4. The Committee noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting and the Planning Department (PlanD) had requested deferment of consideration of the application. The Committee also agreed that Mr Martin W.C. Kwan could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion as his interest was direct.

5. The Committee noted that the application was originally scheduled for consideration by the Committee at the current meeting. On 22.11.2017, the Government announced new policy initiatives to address the land premium and traffic impact assessment (TIA) issues of pre-cut-off columbaria. As for the latter, the Government had decided to use an empirical evidence approach as the basis for assessing traffic impacts when government departments processed the licence application from a pre-cut-off columbarium, the operation of which only involved the number of niches sold before 30.6.2017. In view of such new policy initiatives, more time was required to assess their implications in the processing of the application before it was ready for submission to the Committee for consideration. PlanD therefore requested the Committee to defer making a decision on the application for two months in order to allow more time to process the application.

6. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by PlanD. The justifications for deferment request met the criteria for deferment as set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 33 on Deferment of Decision on Representations, Comments, Further Representations and Applications made under the Town Planning Ordinance in that more information was required to assess the cumulative impact of private columbaria in the area, the deferment period was not indefinite and the deferment would not affect the interests of other relevant parties. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months.

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

Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East District

Agenda Item 4

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Y/YL-PH/4 Application for Amendment to the Approved Pat Heung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-PH/11, To Rezone the Application Site from “Residential (Group D)” and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “Government, Institution or Community (1)”, Lots 111 and 116 to 119 in D.D. 108 and Adjoining Government Land, Fan Kam Road, Pat Heung
(RNTPC Paper No. Y/YL-PH/4A)

7. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Hunter Properties Ltd., which was a subsidiary of New World Development Co. Ltd. (NWD). The site was located at Pat Heung. Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (Arup), WCWP International Ltd. (WCWP), Ramboll Environ Hong Kong Ltd. (Environ), C.M. Wong & Associates Ltd. (C.M. Wong), MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA) and Black & Veatch Hong Kong Ltd. (B&V) were six 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 NWD, Arup, Environ, C.M. Wong and MVA, and past business dealings with WCWP;

- Ms Janice W.M. Lai - having current business dealings with NWD, Arup and Environ; and her family member owning a property in Leung Uk Tsuen, Pat Heung;

- Dr C.H. Hau - being a principal lecturer and programme director of the University of Hong Kong (HKU). K11 Concept Ltd. of NWD had been sponsoring his student learning projects in HKU since 2009;

Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having current business dealings with Arup and B&V, and past business dealings with The Automall Ltd, which was a subsidiary of NWD; and

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having past business dealings with NWD.

8. The Committee noted that Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Ms Janice W.M. Lai, Mr Alex T.H. Lai and Mr Stephen L.H. Liu had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and agreed that Dr C.H. Hau could stay in the meeting as his interest was indirect.

9. The following representatives from the Planning Department (PlanD) and the representatives of the applicant were invited to the meeting at this point.

Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin - District Planning Officer/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (DPO/FSYLE)

Ms Ivy C.W. Wong - Senior Town Planner/FSYLE

Ms Connie Yiu Wa Ha

Ms Eleanor Kam Yee Ling

Ms Pauline Pang Po Ling

Ms Eva Tang Yee Wah

Ms Theresa Yeung Wing Shan

Ms Natalie Leung Ming Yan

Ms Minnie Law Pui Lam

Mr Wong Matthew Lai

} Applicant's representatives

Presentation and Question Sessions

10. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the hearing. He then invited PlanD's representative to brief Members on the background of the application. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin, DPO/FSYLE, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed rezoning of the site from "Residential (Group D)" ("R(D)") to "Government, Institution or Community (1)" ("G/IC(1)") to facilitate the development of a Residential Care Home for the Elderly (RCHE);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication periods, a total of 185 public comments were received with 174 comments from Hong Kong Cement and Construction Union and members of the general public supporting the application and 11 comments from a Yuen Long District Council member, village representatives of Ta Shek Wu and a general public objecting to the application. Major views and objection grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) PlanD's views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed RCHE which would be funded, operated and managed by a non-profit making organization could meet the need of an increasing aging population for integrated care services. The proposed low-rise RCHE with a plot ratio (PR) of 1.5 and building height (BH) of 3 to 5 storeys was not incompatible with the rural settings of the surrounding areas, and could also help phasing out the existing temporary open storage uses at the site and in the

surrounding areas. The proposed RCHE had no adverse environmental, traffic, sewerage, drainage, landscape and visual impacts. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

11. The Chairman then invited the applicant's representatives to elaborate on the application. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Theresa Yeung, the applicant's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed RCHE was a development project under Chow Tai Fook Charity Foundation founded by NWD with an aim to contributing to the community; and
- (b) given that the proposed sewage treatment plant was considered as an ancillary use to the proposed RCHE, technical amendment to the schedule of uses of the Notes of the proposed "G/IC(1)" zone was recommended by moving 'Utilities Installation for Private Project' use from Column 1 to Column 2.

12. As the presentations of PlanD's representative and the applicant's representative were completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

13. The Chairman asked about the operation of the proposed RCHE. In response, Ms Eleanor Kam Yee Ling, the applicant's representative, said that the proposed RCHE would be privately operated and supported by a professional team comprising social workers, registered nurses, enrolled nurses and physiotherapists. In response to the Chairman's enquiry about the land use compatibility of the proposed RCHE with the surrounding areas, Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin, DPO/FSYLE, said that the site was located within the "R(D)" zone and the "Conservation Area" zone was located to the west of the site. The subject "R(D)" zone, which was intended to phase out the existing temporary structures through development of permanent residential developments, was currently occupied by temporary structures and open storage use. The proposed RCHE, with a PR of 1.5 and BH of 3 to 5 storeys, had taken into account the natural terrain of the site by optimising the development at the lower platforms and was considered compatible with the development intensity and land uses of the

surrounding areas. Moreover, the proposed RCHE would provide a green coverage of not less than 20% of the site. The proposed RCHE would encourage development of similar uses which could facilitate the early phasing-out of the existing temporary structures and open storage use.

14. As the applicant's representatives had no further points to raise and there were no further questions from Members, the Chairman informed the applicant's representatives that the hearing procedure for the application had been completed and the Committee would deliberate on the application in their absence and inform them of the Committee's decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the representatives of PlanD and the applicant's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

15. A Member asked how the operation of the proposed RCHE would be monitored. In response, the Chairman said that the proposed RCHE would be developed as submitted under the application. The applicant was required to apply for a licence for operation of the proposed RCHE from the Social Welfare Department. Should the application be approved, the subject Outline Zoning Plan would need to be amended to reflect the proposed rezoning and the amendments would be submitted for the Committee's consideration prior to gazetting under the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance).

16. The Committee noted that the applicant had submitted technical assessments for the proposed RCHE on the aspects of environment, traffic, sewerage, visual and landscape and geotechnical engineering, and concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application.

17. After deliberation, the Committee decided to agree to the application by rezoning the site from "R(D)" to "G/IC(1)" zone to facilitate the development of the proposed RCHE. PlanD would work out the rezoning boundaries, as well as the development restrictions and schedule of uses to be set out in the Notes for the Committee's agreement prior to gazetting under section 5 of the Ordinance.

[Professor K.C. Chau arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/YL-NTM/2

Application for Amendment to the Approved Ngau Tam Mei Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-NTM/12, To Rezone the Application Site from “Comprehensive Development Area” to “Comprehensive Development Area (1)”, Lots 435 S.A (Part), 436 S.A (Part), 438, 439, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 456 (Part), 457 (Part), 459 (Part), 460, 461 (Part), 462 (Part), 463 (Part), 464 (Part), 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470 (Part), 471, 472, 473, 474, 476, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484 S.A (Part), 485, 486, 492, 493, 494, 495 (Part), 516, 517, 518, 520 (Part), 521 S.A (Part), 522 (Part), 541 S.A (Part), 542 S.A (Part), 543 S.A (Part), 545 S.A (Part), 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 555, 556, 559, 560, 562, 563 (Part), 564 S.A (Part), 572 S.A (Part), 573, 574, 575 S.A (Part), 576 S.A (Part) in D.D. 105 and Adjoining Government Land, Shek Wu Wai, Ngau Tam Mei, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. Y/YL-NTM/2C)

18. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Bonus Plus Co. Ltd. which was a subsidiary of Sun Hung Kai Properties Ltd. (SHK). Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Ltd. (LD), Ramboll Environ Hong Kong Ltd. (Environ), AECOM Asia Co. Ltd. (AECOM), MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA), Ronald Lu & Partners (HK) Ltd. (RLP) and Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (Arup) were six of the consultants of the applicants. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having current business dealings with SHK, Environ, AECOM, MVA and Arup;

Ms Janice W.M. Lai - having current business dealings with SHK, Environ, AECOM and Arup;

- Miss Winnie W.M. Ng - being a Director of the Kowloon Motor Bus (1933) Company Limited (KMB) and SHK was one of the shareholders of KMB;
- Ms Christina M. Lee - being the Secretary-General of the Hong Kong Metropolitan Sports Events Association which had obtained sponsorship from SHK before;
- Dr C.H. Hau - having current business dealings with AECOM;
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having current business dealings with SHK, RLP and Arup; and
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having past business dealings with SHK, LD and RLP.

19. The Committee noted that Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Ms Janice W.M. Lai, Ms Christina M. Lee, Mr Alex T.H. Lai and Mr Stephen L.H. Liu had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Miss Winnie W.M. Ng had not yet arrived to join the meeting. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and agreed that Dr C.H. Hau could stay in the meeting as he had no involvement in the application.

20. The Committee noted that the applicants' representative requested on 14.12.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to address the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department's further comments on the revised Ecological Impact Assessment (EcoIA) and the Planning Department's comments on the Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) Report. It was the fourth time that the applicants requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicants had submitted a revised EcoIA and a revised AVA.

21. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicants pending the submission of further information from the applicants. 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 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. 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.

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Sai Kung and Islands District

[Mr Richard Y.L. Siu, Ms Amy M.Y. Wu and Mr William W.T. Wong, Senior Town Planners/Sai Kung and Islands (STPs/SKIs), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/I-CC/22 Proposed Religious Institution (Temple) and Columbarium (within a Religious Institution) in "Green Belt" Zone, Lot 4 (Part) in D.D. Cheung Chau, Cheung Chau
(RNTPC Paper No. A/I-CC/22A)

22. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (Arup) and AGC Design Ltd. (AGC) 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 Arup and AGC; and
Ms Janice W.M. Lai		

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

23. The Committee noted that Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Ms Janice W.M. Lai and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

24. The Committee noted that two replacement pages in Appendix III of the Paper regarding the public comment received were dispatched to Member before the meeting. The Committee also noted that the Islands District Council (IsDC) submitted a memo with a copy of the minutes of its meeting held on 18.12.2017 to inform the Planning Department (PlanD) that IsDC had passed a motion opposing the application and convey its member's concerns. The memo and its attachment were tabled for Members' reference.

Presentation and Question Sessions

25. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Richard Y.L. Siu, STP/SKIs, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed religious institution (temple) and columbarium (within a religious institution);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD had reservation on the application as approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar developments leading to encroachment onto and degradation of the subject “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone. The Commissioner for Transport considered that the additional passengers generated by the proposed columbarium during the most peak hour period for either Cheung Chau bound or Central bound would certainly cause additional pressure on the ferry service plying between Central and Cheung Chau. The Secretary of Food and Health and the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene pointed out that the

Cheung Chau Columbarium Extension project providing an additional 1,400 niches was scheduled to be completed by Q3 2018 tentatively and considered that the niche supply in Cheung Chau Columbarium could cope with the demand up to 2026. The proposed entrance and access arrangement of the proposed development were not acceptable as all goes must route through the footpath within the boundary of the Cheung Chau Cemetery managed by the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication periods, a total of 933 public comments were received with one public comment providing views on the application. The remaining 932 public comments received from the Cheung Chau Rural Committee, an Island District Council member, members of Wong Wai Tsak Tong, green groups, local concern groups/residents and individuals objected to the application. Major views and objection grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) PlanD's views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the “GB” zone. There was no strong justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention. The application did not comply with relevant criteria as set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 in that the applicant failed to demonstrate that the proposed development was essential and no alternative sites were available. Although the proposed development was considered not incompatible with the adjoining cemetery and other related uses, no strong justification had been provided to support that the site, which was covered with natural vegetation within the “GB” zone, should be developed into religious institution and columbarium uses. The proposed access arrangement, which relied on the existing footpath of the Cheung Chau Cemetery, was unacceptable. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the “GB” zone on the subject Outline Zoning Plan. The

cumulative impacts of approving similar applications would have adverse effect on the integrity of the existing “GB” zone at the southwestern upland area of Cheung Chau and result in degradation of the natural environment and rural landscape character, and overstrain the capacity of public ferry services serving Cheung Chau. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

26. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

27. 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 intended for defining the limits of development areas by natural features and to protect the natural landscape, as well as to provide passive recreational outlets for local population and visitors. There is a general presumption against development within this zone. There are no strong justifications to warrant a departure from this planning intention;
- (b) 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 applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed development at the site is essential and no alternative sites are available;
- (c) the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed access arrangement is acceptable and that the proposed development would not have any adverse impact on public ferry services serving Cheung Chau; and
- (d) approval of the proposed development would set an undesirable precedent

for similar applications within the “GB” zone on the Outline Zoning Plan. The cumulative impact of approving such similar applications would have adverse effect on the integrity of the existing “GB” zone and result in general degradation of the natural environment and rural landscape character and overstrain the capacity of public ferry services serving Cheung Chau.”

[Mr David Y.T. Lui arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/I-TCV/1 Proposed Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Construction Materials for a Period of 5 Years in an area shown as ‘Road’, Lots 2640 and 2641 in D.D. 1 TC, Tung Chung Valley, Lantau Island
(RNTPC Paper No. A/I-TCV/1)

28. The Committee noted that a replacement page in Appendix III of the Paper regarding revision to advisory clause (c) was tabled for Members’ reference.

Presentation and Question Sessions

29. Ms Amy M.Y. Wu, STP/SKIs, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary warehouse for storage of construction materials for a period of five years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Head of the Sustainable Lantau Office,

Civil Engineering and Development Department and the District Lands Officer/Islands, Lands Department did not support the application as the proposed development would affect the land resumption for a road planned under the Tung Chung Study and its construction programme. As land resumption for the road and the adjacent proposed River Park would be carried out in one-go, the land resumption for the River Park might also be affected. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (PlanD) had reservation on the application. The applicant failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not cause adverse landscape and visual impacts on the surrounding areas. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, fifteen public comments were received from Kadoorie Farm & Botanic Garden Corporation, World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong, Designing Hong Kong Limited, Save Lantau Alliance, Green Power and individuals 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 13 of the Paper. The site fell within an area shown as 'Road' which was based on the road network planned under the Tung Chung Study. Approval of the application would frustrate the planning intention of the area for road use. There was no strong planning justification in the submission to support the departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis. The proposed development was not compatible with the surrounding areas which were predominantly rural in nature. Although there were open storage use, vehicle repairing workshops and warehouses in the vicinity of the site, they were either existing uses tolerated under the Town Planning Ordinance or suspected unauthorised developments subject to enforcement action by the Planning Authority, and such uses falling within the boundary of the proposed River Park would be removed for the implementation of the River Park. The

applicant failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not cause adverse landscape and visual impacts on the surrounding areas. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent and encourage other applications for similar developments in the surrounding areas. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would result in a general degradation of the rural environment and landscape character of the area. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

30. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

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

- “(a) the proposed development will frustrate the planning intention of the site for road use. There is no strong planning justification in the submission to support a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis;
- (b) the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed development will not have adverse landscape and visual impacts on the surrounding areas; and
- (c) approval of the application, even on a temporary basis, would set an undesirable precedent and encourage other applications for similar developments in the surrounding areas. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would result in a general degradation of the rural environment and landscape character of the area.”

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/SK-HC/271 Proposed Comprehensive Residential Development in “Residential (Group E)” Zone, Various Lots in D.D. 210 and Adjoining Government Land, Ho Chung, Sai Kung
(RNTPC Paper No. A/SK-HC/271A)

32. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Webster Investments Co. Ltd. and Diamond Faith Co. Ltd., which were subsidiaries of Emperor International Holdings Ltd. (Emperor). T.K. Tsui & Associates Ltd. (T.K. Tsui), Black & Veatch Hong Kong Ltd. (B&V), Ramboll Environ Hong Kong Ltd. (Environ) and Landes Ltd. (Landes) were four of the consultants of the applicants. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having current business dealings with Emperor, Environ and Landes;
- Ms Janice W.M. Lai - having current business dealings with Environ and Landes; and
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having current business dealings with T.K. Tsui and B&V.

33. The Committee noted that Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Ms Janice W.M. Lai and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and the applicants had requested deferment of consideration of the application.

34. The Committee noted that the applicants’ representative requested on 7.12.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for one month in order to allow time to address comments from the Environmental Protection Department. It was the second time that the applicants requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicants had submitted further information with revised technical assessments to address

comments from relevant government departments.

35. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicants pending the 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 one month was allowed for preparation of the submission of further information. Since it was the second deferment and a total of three 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 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/SK-HC/279 Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture for a Period of 3 Years in "Green Belt" and "Village Type Development" Zones, Lots 865 RP, 868 RP, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875 RP and 876 RP in D.D. 244 and Adjoining Government Land, Ho Chung, Sai Kung
(RNTPC Paper No. A/SK-HC/279)

36. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 5.12.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare a traffic impact assessment report to address comments from the Transport Department. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

37. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the 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 10

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/SK-HC/280 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in
"Agriculture" Zone, Lot 677 S.A in D.D. 244, Ho Chung, Sai Kung
(RNTPC Paper No. A/SK-HC/280)

Presentation and Question Sessions

38. Mr William W.T. Wong, STP/SKIs, 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 Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation did not support the application as the site had high potential for agricultural rehabilitation in view of its proximity to road access and irrigation source. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, two public

comments were received from Designing Hong Kong Limited and 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 based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The application generally complied with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in New Territories in that the footprint of the proposed Small House fell entirely within the village 'environs' of Ho Chung and there was a general shortage of land in meeting Small House development in the "Village Type Development" zone. The proposed Small House was not incompatible with the landscape character of the surrounding areas and no significant changes or disturbances to the existing landscape character and resources were anticipated. The proposed Small House was not anticipated to result in adverse drainage, sewerage and environmental impacts on the surrounding areas. The site was the subject of a previously approved application (No. A/SK-HC/201) for the same use. Since the approval of the previous application, there was no change in planning circumstances. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

39. In response to the Chairman's enquiry, Mr William W.T. Wong, STP/SKIs, said that the Lands Department was still processing the concerned Small House grant application at the site although the planning permission of the previously approved application had lapsed.

Deliberation Session

40. 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 22.12.2021, 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 condition:

“the provision of a septic tank, as proposed by the applicant, at a location to the satisfaction of the Director of Lands or of the TPB.”

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

[The Chairman thanked Mr Richard Y.L. Siu, Ms Amy M.Y. Wu and Mr William W.T. Wong, STPs/SKIs, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. Mr Siu, Ms Wu and Mr Wong left the meeting at this point.]

Sha Tin, Tai Po and North District

[Mr Kenny C.H. Lau, Mr Tim T.Y. Fung and Ms Kathy C.L. Chan, Senior Town Planners/Sha Tin, Tai Po and North (STPs/STN), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 11

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/ST/934 Shop and Services (Fast Food Shop) in “Industrial” Zone, Workshop C8, LG/F, Valiant Industrial Centre, 2-12 Au Pui Wan Street, Sha Tin
(RNTPC Paper No. A/ST/934)

Presentation and Question Sessions

42. 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 shop and services (fast food shop);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in

paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments 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 application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The applied use was small in scale and not incompatible with the industrial and industrial-related uses in the subject industrial building and the surrounding developments. The applied use generally complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 25D for Use/Development within “Industrial” Zone including the fire safety and traffic aspects. The previous applications (No. A/ST/748 and A/ST/868) submitted by the same applicant for the same use were revoked due to non-compliance with approval conditions on fire service installations. Shorter compliance period was proposed to monitor the progress of implementation of fire service installations. A temporary approval of three years was recommended in order not to jeopardise the long-term planning intention of industrial use for the premises and to allow the Committee to monitor the supply and demand of industrial floor space in the area.

43. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

44. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 22.12.2020, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 22.3.2018; and

- (b) if the above planning condition (a) 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.”

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

Agenda Item 12

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/ST/937 Proposed Shop and Services (Fast Food Shop) in “Industrial” Zone, Workshop 1 (Part), G/F, Wah Wai Centre, 38-40 Au Pui Wan Street, Fo Tan, Sha Tin
(RNTPC Paper No. A/ST/937)

[Withdrawn]

Agenda Item 13

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/ST/938 Proposed Office (Charitable Institution) in “Industrial” Zone, Room 10, 16/F, Fo Tan Industrial Centre, 26-28 Au Pui Wan Street, Fo Tan, Sha Tin
(RNTPC Paper No. A/ST/938)

Presentation and Question Sessions

46. 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 office (charitable institution);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Director of Fire Services (D of FS) objected to the application because the proposed use with direct provision of customer services within an industrial building was not supported from fire safety point of view. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, a total of two public comments were received from the Chairman of the Owners’ Committee of Fo Tan Industrial Centre and 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 did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed use was not in line with the planning intention of the “Industrial” (“I”) zone. Apart from office administrative works, the premises would be used for conducting interviews, group meeting, counselling activities and workshops. Site inspection revealed that the setting and decoration of the premises was more akin to a religious institution for holding assembly or gatherings. The application was therefore not in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 25D for Use/Development within “I” Zone in that the proposed use would attract a large number of visiting members of the public to the premises which was not supported from fire safety point of view. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

47. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

48. The Committee noted that the application was recommended to be rejected mainly because of the adverse comments from D of FS.

49. 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 “Industrial” (“I”) zone, which is intended primarily for general industrial uses to ensure an adequate supply of industrial floor space to meet demand from production-oriented industries. There is no strong justification given in the submission for a departure from the planning intention; and
- (b) the proposed development does not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 25D for Use/Development within “I” Zone in that it will attract persons who could be exposed to fire risk, which they would neither be aware of nor prepared to face. The proposed use is therefore unacceptable from fire safety point of view.”

Agenda Item 14

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/ST/939 Office in “Industrial” Zone, Workhops 5 and 7, 10/F, Shing Chuen
Industrial Building, 25-27 Shing Wan Road, Tai Wai, Sha Tin
(RNTPC Paper No. A/ST/939)

Presentation and Question Sessions

50. 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 office;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments 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 applied use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The applied use was not incompatible with the industrial and industrial-related uses in the subject industrial building and its vicinity. The applied use generally complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 25D for Use/Development within “Industrial” Zone in that it would have no adverse impact on the area from fire safety, traffic and environmental considerations. A temporary approval of three years was recommended in order not to jeopardise the long-term planning intention of industrial use for the premises and to allow the Committee to monitor the supply and demand of industrial floor space in the area.

51. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

52. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 22.12.2020, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the submission and implementation of the 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 22.6.2018; and

- (b) if the above planning condition (a) 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.”

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

Agenda Item 15

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-HT/8 Proposed Service Reservoir in “Government, Institution or Community” and “Green Belt” Zones, Government Land in D.D. 9 and D.D. 51 (Adjacent to the Existing Tong Hang Fresh Water Service Reservoir), Tong Hang, Fanling
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-HT/8)

Presentation and Question Sessions

54. Mr Tim T.Y. Fung, STP/STN, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed service reservoir;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, three public

comments were received with one from a North District Council member supporting the application and two from the Chairmen of the Sheung Shui District Rural Committee and the Fanling District Rural Committee (FDRC) indicating no comment on the application. The District Officer (North) advised that the Chairman of FDRC and the Resident Representative (RR) of Tong Hang (Upper) had no comment on the application, and the RR of Tong Hang (Lower) and a villager of Tong Hang objected to the application. The District Officer (Tai Po) advised that the village representatives and a Tai Po District Council member had concerns about the proposed service reservoir. Major views and objection grounds were set out in paragraphs 9.1.11, 9.1.12 and 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. The proposed development was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 in that the proposed development was an essential project to cope with the anticipated increase in water demand from new housing developments in the area and no other alternative sites were available that could satisfy the technical requirements of a fresh water service reservoir. The proposed development was not incompatible with the surrounding rural landscape character and would not cause adverse traffic, landscape nor visual impacts and adversely affect the slope stability. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

55. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

56. 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 22.12.2021, 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 submission and implementation of a drainage proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission of an updated traffic assessment and implementation of the traffic improvement measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission and implementation of a tree preservation and landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB; and
- (d) the submission and implementation of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

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

Agenda Item 16

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-LYT/641 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in
“Agriculture” Zone, Lot 586 S.B. ss.3 in D.D. 85, Lau Shui Heung,
Fanling
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LYT/641)

Presentation and Question Sessions

58. Mr Tim T.Y. Fung, 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 – 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 the site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, eight public comments were received. One public comment from a North District Council member supported the application, while two from the Chairmen of the Fanling District Rural Committee and the Sheung Shui District Rural Committee indicated no comment on the application. The remaining five public comments from Designing Hong Kong Limited, World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong, The Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, Kadoorie Farm & Botanic Garden Corporation and an individual objected to the application. Major 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. The proposed Small House was not incompatible with the surrounding areas. Significant adverse landscape impact arising from the proposed Small House was not anticipated. Regarding the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in New Territories, more than 50% of the footprint of the proposed Small House fell within the village ‘environs’ (‘VE’) of Lau Shui Heung Village. Land available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone was insufficient to meet the outstanding Small House applications and the future Small House demand forecast. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

59. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

60. The Committee noted that there were two similar applications (No. A/NE-LYT/569 and 571) for Small House development located to the north of the site and both of them were rejected by the Committee in 2015 mainly on the ground that land was still available within the “V” zone of Lau Shui Heung Village for Small House development at that time, in particular there were only four outstanding Small House applications at the time of consideration. The planning circumstances of the rejected applications were different from the current application as land available within the “V” zone was not able to meet the 26 outstanding Small House applications.

61. According to Plan A-2b, the Committee noted that land circled in blue was land still available within the “V” zone for Small House development and its total area could accommodate 17 Small Houses. Major roads and *fung shui* woodland had already been excluded from the estimation of available land. The area shaded in pink was the 26 outstanding Small House grant applications for Lau Shui Heung Village (i.e. falling within “V”, “Agriculture” (“AGR”) and “Green Belt” zones) currently being processed by the Lands Department (LandsD) but had not yet been approved. Of these, around 16 Small House grant applications fell outside the “V” zone, and planning permission from the Committee was also required. Apart from the subject application and the two previously rejected applications, no section 16 application in the area had been received so far.

62. The Committee noted that the applicant did not own any land within the “V” zone. The piece of land under his ownership, which was the site under the subject application, was located within the “AGR” zone and planning permission for Small House development was required.

63. The Chairman said that the Committee had adopted a more cautious approach in considering applications for Small House development in recent years. If there was sufficient land in the concerned “V” zone to accommodate the outstanding Small House applications being processed by LandsD, the Committee would adopt a more cautious approach and normally not approve the planning applications under such circumstance. For the subject application, as land available within the “V” zone of Lau Shui Heung Village was only able to accommodate 17 Small Houses while the number of outstanding Small House

applications was 26, PlanD had no objection to the subject application. The Committee also noted that the 10-year Small House demand for Lau Shui Heung Village was 100 and 180 in 2015 and 2017 respectively.

64. A Member said that Kwan Tei River, to the west of the site, might be of special ecological interest. Given that the boundary of the ‘VE’ of Lau Shui Heung Village was adjacent to the river, the Member was concerned that future Small House developments in the subject “AGR” zone would have adverse impact on the river. A Member further said that a 20m to 30 m wide buffer would normally be reserved between an ecologically important stream (EIS) and developments. The Committee noted that since Kwan Tei River was not an EIS, LandsD would normally require a minimum 3m wide buffer between the river and any Small House development. Should the application be approved, an approval condition on the submission and implementation of the drainage proposal was required. The Member, who was concerned about Kwan Tei River, had reservation on the application as the 3m buffer distance requested by LandsD would not be enough to protect the river, and considered that approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the area and the cumulative impacts would result in pollution to the river.

65. The Chairman said that should the application be approved, it would be the first approved application for Small House development in the subject “AGR” zone. Some Members considered that approval of the application might set an undesirable precedent to encourage other similar applications in the subject “AGR” zone and had reservation on the application.

66. 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 in the Lung Yeuk Tau and Kwan Tei South area 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) approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the area. The cumulative impacts of approving such applications would result in a general degradation of the environment and landscape quality of the area.”

Agenda Item 17

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-LYT/642 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in
“Agriculture” Zone, Lot 1583 S.B in D.D. 76, Kan Tau Tsuen, Fanling
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LYT/642)

Presentation and Question Sessions

67. Mr Tim T.Y. Fung, 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 did not support the application as the site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, five public comments were received with three from a North District Council member and the Chairmen of the Sheung Shui District Rural Committee and the

Fanling District Rural Committee indicating no comment on the application and two from Designing Hong Kong Limited and 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 did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed Small House was not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” zone. The application did not comply with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in New Territories as more than 50% of the footprint of the proposed Small House fell outside the village ‘environs’ and the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Kan Tau Tsuen. Land was still available within the “V” zone to meet the outstanding Small House applications. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

68. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

69. 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 in the Lung Yeuk Tau and Kwan Tei South area 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;
- (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 more than 50% of the footprint of the proposed Small House falls outside the village 'environs' and the "Village Type Development" ("V") zone of Kan Tau Tsuen; and

- (c) land is still available within the "V" zone of Kan Tau Tsuen which is primarily intended for Small House development. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development close to the existing village cluster for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services."

Agenda Item 18

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-MKT/3 Proposed 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/3C)

70. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 6.12.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to address further comments of the Transport Department (TD). It was the fourth time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted a response-to-comment table and the traffic information to respond to TD's comment on the application.

71. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the 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. 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 Items 19 to 22

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-MUP/129 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in "Agriculture" Zone, Lot 58 S.A in D.D. 46, Tai Tong Wu, Sha Tau Kok

A/NE-MUP/130 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in "Agriculture" Zone, Lot 58 S.B in D.D. 46, Tai Tong Wu, Sha Tau Kok

A/NE-MUP/131 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in "Agriculture" Zone, Lot 58 S.C in D.D. 46, Tai Tong Wu, Sha Tau Kok

A/NE-MUP/132 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in "Agriculture" Zone, Lot 58 S.D in D.D. 46, Tai Tong Wu, Sha Tau Kok

(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-MUP/129 to 132)

72. The Committee noted that the four section 16 applications for proposed house (New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) – Small House) were similar in nature and the sites were located in close proximity to one another and within the same "Agriculture" zone, and agreed that they could be considered together.

Presentation and Question Sessions

73. Mr Tim T.Y. Fung, STP/STN, presented the applications and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (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 did not support the applications as the sites were pieces of roadside vacant land with road access and water supply and possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the applications;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, three public comments on each application were received respectively with one from a North District Council member supporting the applications, one from the Chairman of the Sheung Shui District Rural Committee indicating no comment on the applications and one from Designing Hong Kong Limited objecting to the applications. Major 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 11 of the Paper. The proposed Small Houses were not entirely incompatible with the existing rural village environment and no significant landscape resource would be affected arising from the proposed Small Houses. Regarding the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in New Territories, more than 50% of the footprints of the proposed Small Houses fell within the village ‘environs’ of Tai Tong Wu. Although land was still available within the “Village Type Development” zone to meet the

outstanding Small House applications, the sites were in close proximity to the existing village cluster of Tai Tong Wu and there were approved Small House applications in the vicinity, the implementation of which were forming a new village cluster in the locality. Sympathetic considerations could be given to the applications. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

74. Members had no question on the applications.

Deliberation Session

75. After deliberation, the Committee 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 22.12.2021, 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 a 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 a drainage proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (c) the submission and implementation of a landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or the TPB.”

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

Agenda Item 23

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-TKL/564 Proposed Temporary Open Storage of Waste Paper, Waste Plastics and Waste Metal Cans for Recycling and Workshop for Recycling for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 965 RP (Part) and 966 RP in D.D. 82, Ping Che Road, Ping Che
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TKL/564B)

77. The Secretary reported that the site was located at Ta Kwu Ling. Mr Alex T.H. Lai had declared an interest in the item as his father co-owned two land lots in Ping Che, Ta Kwu Ling. The Committee noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

78. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 4.12.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to address the further comments from 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 with revised tables and figures to address TD’s comments.

79. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the 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. 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 Item 24

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-TKL/568 Temporary Vehicle Repair Workshop for Lorry, Coach and Container Vehicle with Ancillary Office & Electricity Transformer Station for a Period of 3 Years in “Open Storage” and “Agriculture” Zones, Lots 783 and 784 in D.D. 77 and Adjoining Government Land, Ping Che (RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TKL/568B)

80. The Secretary reported that the site was located at Ta Kwu Ling. Mr Alex T.H. Lai had declared an interest in the item as his father co-owned two land lots in Ping Che, Ta Kwu Ling. The Committee noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

81. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 7.12.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to address the comments from the Transport Department (TD). It was the third time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the first deferment, a traffic consultant had been commissioned to carry out a traffic impact assessment (TIA) to address the comments of TD. The applicant submitted the TIA on 3.11.2017. Nevertheless, TD had further comments on the TIA and the applicant needed more time to address these comments.

82. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the 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. 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 Item 25

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-TKL/576 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in
“Agriculture” Zone, Lot 982 S.N in D.D. 82, Tong Fong Village, Ta
Kwu Ling
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TKL/576)

83. The Secretary reported that the site was located at Ta Kwu Ling. Mr Alex T.H. Lai had declared an interest in the item as his father co-owned two land lots in Ping Che, Ta Kwu Ling. The Committee noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

84. Mr Tim T.Y. Fung, 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 did not support the application as the site was an abandoned land overgrown with vegetation and had potential for agricultural rehabilitation. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, four public comments were received with two from a North District Council member and the Chairman of the Sheung Shui District Rural Committee indicating no comment on the application, and two from Designing Hong Kong Limited and 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 did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed Small House was not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” zone. Although land available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone was insufficient to fully meet the future Small House demand, land was still available within the “V” zone to meet the outstanding Small House applications. The site was not the subject of any previous planning approval/application. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

85. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

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

- “(a) the proposed Small House development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” zone in the Ping Che and Ta Kwu Ling area 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” zone of Tong

Fong Village where land is primarily intended for Small House development. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development close to the existing village cluster for orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services.”

Agenda Item 26

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-TKL/577 Temporary Warehouse (Storage of Spare Parts and Used Electrical Goods) with Ancillary Workshop for a Period of 3 Years in “Open Storage” Zone and an area shown as ‘Road’, Lots 885 and 1552 S.A ss.3 (Part) in D.D. 77 and Adjoining Government Land, Ping Che
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TKL/577)

87. The Secretary reported that the site was located at Ta Kwu Ling. Mr Alex T.H. Lai had declared an interest in the item as his father co-owned two land lots in Ping Che, Ta Kwu Ling. The Committee noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

88. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 7.12.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to address the comments of the Transport Department. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

89. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the 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 Items 27 and 28

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-TKL/578 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Green Belt” Zone, Lot 1074 RP in D.D. 79, Ping Yeung Village, Ta Kwu Ling

A/NE-TKL/579 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Green Belt” Zone, Lot 1074 S.A in D.D. 79, Ping Yeung Village, Ta Kwu Ling

(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TKL/578 and 579)

90. The Committee noted that the two section 16 applications for proposed house (New Territories Exempted House (NTEH)— Small House) were similar in nature and the sites were located in close proximity to each other and within the same “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone, and agreed that they could be considered together.

91. The Secretary reported that the sites were located at Ta Kwu Ling. Mr Alex T.H. Lai had declared an interest in the items as his father co-owned two land lots in Ping Che, Ta Kwu Ling. The Committee noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

92. Mr Tim T.Y. Fung, STP/STN, presented the applications and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (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 IV of the Paper. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) had reservation on the applications from landscape planning point of view. Approval of the applications would set undesirable precedents to encourage similar use spreading into the “GB” zone, causing potential adverse impact on the landscape resource and character in the area and undermining the intactness of the “GB” zone. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the applications;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, four public comments on each of the applications were received. A North District Council member supported both applications whereas the Chairman of the Sheung Shui District Rural Committee indicated no comment on both applications. The remaining two comments from Designing Hong Kong Limited and an individual objected to the applications. Major views and objection grounds were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and
- (e) PlanD’s views – PlanD had no objection to the applications based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The proposed Small Houses generally 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 ‘environs’ of Ping Yeung Village. The applications generally complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 in that the sites were in close proximity to the existing Ping Yeung Village and were required to meet the demand from indigenous villagers. The proposed Small Houses were not incompatible with the surrounding rural setting, would not have significant adverse environmental, drainage and traffic impacts on the surrounding areas and would not involve extensive clearance of existing natural vegetation. Although CTP/UD&L, PlanD had reservation on the

applications, similar applications for Small House development within the same “GB” zone had been previously approved with conditions by the Committee and the concern on possible adverse impact on the existing landscape resources could be addressed by stipulating an approval condition for application No. A/NE-TKL/578. The sites were the subject of a previously approved application for two Small House developments (with the same indigenous villagers). There was no significant change in planning circumstances since the previous application was approved. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

93. Members had no question on the applications.

Deliberation Session

94. After deliberation, the Committee 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 22.12.2021, 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:

For Application No. A/NE-TKL/578

- “(a) the provision of a 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 a drainage proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (c) the submission and implementation of a landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

For Application No. A/NE-TKL/579

- “(a) the provision of a 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 a drainage proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.”

95. The Committee also agreed to advise each of the applicants to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix VIII of the Paper.

Agenda Items 29 and 30

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-KLH/537 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 312 S.B ss.1, 312 S.C RP and 312 S.K in D.D. 9, Kau Lung Hang, Tai Po

A/NE-KLH/538 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 312 S.C ss.1, 312 S.D RP and 312 S. J in D.D. 9, Kau Lung Hang, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-KLH/537 and 538)

96. The Committee noted that the two section 16 applications for proposed house (New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) – Small House) were similar in nature and the sites were located in close proximity to each other and within the same “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone, and agreed that they could be considered together.

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (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 IV of the Paper. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation did not support the applications as the sites possessed high potential for agricultural rehabilitation. The Commissioner for Transport had reservation on the applications as such type of development should be confined within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone as far as possible. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the applications;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication periods, four public comments were received from Designing Hong Kong Limited, Hong Kong Bird Watching Society and two individuals objecting to application No. A/NE-KLH/537, and three public comments were received from Designing Hong Kong Limited, Hong Kong Bird Watching Society and an individual objecting to application No. A/NE-KLH/538. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD did not support the applications based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The proposed Small House developments were not in line with the planning intention of the “AGR” zone. Although land available within the “V” zone was insufficient to fully meet the future Small House demand, it was capable to meet the outstanding Small House applications. For those similar applications approved in the vicinity of the sites, their circumstances were different from the current applications which were surrounded by abandoned/fallow agricultural land and at a distance away from the existing village clusters, and the sites were not the subject of previously approved applications. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning

assessments above were relevant.

98. Members had no question on the applications.

Deliberation Session

99. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the applications. The reasons for each of the applications were:

- “(a) the proposed Small House 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. It is also intended 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 Yuen Leng and Kau Lung Hang 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 31

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-KLH/539 Proposed Rural Committee/Village Office in “Green Belt” Zone,
Government Land in D.D. 9, Nam Wa Po Village, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-KLH/539)

Presentation and Question Sessions

100. 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 rural committee/village office;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) had reservation on the application because the vegetation on the site and the surrounding “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone had been disturbed by the adjacent drainage works in the past and approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent to encourage site modification, in particular vegetation clearance in the “GB” zone, prior to obtaining planning approvals. The cumulative effect of approving similar applications would result in degradation of landscape character and cause adverse landscape impact on the area. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, two public comments were received from individuals objecting to the application. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and

- (e) PlanD's views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Although the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the “GB” zone, according to the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 for Application for Development within “GB” zone under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance, applications for new development within the “GB” zone could be considered in exceptional circumstances. The proposed development was a needed community facility and gathering place for passive recreational use for the local villagers. It also fell entirely within the village ‘environs’ (‘VE’) of Nam Wa Po and was in close proximity to the existing village. The proposed development would not involve any clearance of existing trees. Although CTP/UD&L, PlanD had reservation on the application, the disturbance to the site and its surrounding “GB” zone was not intended by the applicant. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

101. A Member asked if there was any vacant ancestral hall or school in Nam Wa Po Village. In response, Ms Kathy C.L. Chan, STP/STN, said that a vacant school, falling within the “Government, Institution or Community” zone, could be found uphill located to the northwest of the village.

Deliberation Session

102. A Member said that some villages would utilise the existing Government, Institution and Community facilities for rural committee use, and considered that the vacant school could also be used as a rural committee office. The Committee noted that the vacant school, which was on the list of vacant school premises sites, was small in size and without a vehicular access. Another Member said that the terrain of the vacant school site was not high and the topographical height was below 50m.

103. Noting that the site, falling within the “GB” zone, was located within the ‘VE’ of Nam Wa Po, a Member asked if approval of the application would have any implication on consideration of Small House application in the subject “GB” zone. In response, the

Chairman said that the subject application was to seek planning permission for a proposed rural committee office, and consideration on whether planning permission for Small House development within the subject “GB” zone would be granted should depend on the individual merits of each application. The Committee also noted that the condition of the subject “GB” zone had been altered by the construction works of the public sewerage, and there was no application for Small House development in the subject “GB” zone in recent years.

104. The Committee noted that there was an application for a rural committee in Ting Kok, with 95% of its site falling within the “GB” zone and 5% falling within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone, approved by the Committee in 2012. In response to a Member’s enquiry, the Chairman said that according to Plan A-4 of the Paper, the site was now currently overgrown with grasses. The Member considered that approval of the application would not set a precedent to encourage applications for Small House development in the subject “GB” zone in the future and sympathetic consideration could be given to the application.

105. The Committee noted that most of the villages normally had their own rural committee located within the “V” zone. As to the subject application, the site fell within the “GB” zone but it was located at the entrance of the village which was relatively convenient to the villagers, and land within the “V” zone of Nam Wa Po could be reserved for Small House developments.

106. The Committee noted that land available within the “V” zone of Nam Wa Po could accommodate around 112 Small House sites in March 2014. The outstanding Small House applications for Nam Wa Po were 21 while the 10-year Small House demand forecast for the same village was 220 at that time. The Chairman said that under such circumstance, a more cautious approach would normally be adopted in considering planning application in the “GB” zone if it was for Small House development. Given that there was sufficient land available within the “V” zone, some Members had reservation on the application.

107. In order to preserve the integrity of the subject “GB” zone, a Member also had reservation on the application and considered that the proposed rural committee office should be located within the “V” zone or should utilise the vacant school site.

108. 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 for the area, which is to define 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. The applicant fails to provide information in the submission to justify a departure from this planning intention;
- (b) land is still available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Nam Wa Po. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed development within the “V” zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructure and services; and
- (c) approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications within the “GB” zone in the area.”

Agenda Item 32

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-KLH/540 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Agriculture” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lot 346 S.B in D.D. 9, Yuen Leng Village, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-KLH/540)

Presentation and Question Sessions

109. 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 there were active agricultural activities in the vicinity and the site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments 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 based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed Small House was not incompatible with the surrounding areas and significant adverse landscape impact arising from the proposed Small House was not anticipated. Regarding the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in New Territories, more than 50% of the footprint of the proposed Small House fell within the village ‘environs’ of Yuen Leng, Kau Lung Hang San Wai and Kau Lung Hang Lo Wai and the proposed development would be able to be connected to the public sewerage system. Land available within the “Village Type Development” zone was insufficient to meet the outstanding Small House applications and the future Small House demand forecast. Regarding the adverse public comment, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

110. In response to a Member’s enquiry on the Kau Lung Hang Ecologically Important Stream (EIS) to the south of the site, Ms Kathy C.L. Chan, STP/STN, said that

DAFC had advised the applicant to implement necessary precautionary measures to minimise impacts on the EIS should the application be approved by the Committee.

Deliberation Session

111. A Member raised objection to the application due to the potential impact on the EIS. The Committee noted that similar applications in the vicinity of the site were approved by the Committee and their planning circumstances were similar to those of the current application. The applicant would be advised to implement precautionary measures to minimise impact on the EIS.

112. 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 22.12.2021, 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 submission and implementation of a drainage proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (b) the connection of the foul water drainage system to the public sewers to the satisfaction of the Director of Water Supplies or of the TPB; and
- (c) no pollution or siltation occurs to the water gathering grounds to the satisfaction of the Director of Water Supplies or of the TPB.”

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

Agenda Item 33

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-LT/621 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in
 “Agriculture” Zone, Government Land in D.D. 19, Chung Uk Tsuen,
 Tai Po

 (RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LT/621)

Presentation and Question Sessions

114. 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 did not support the application as agricultural infrastructure was available and the site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (PlanD) had reservation on the application as the proposed Small House would inevitably involve site formation and/or slope works which would have adverse impact on the health of the adjacent trees, and approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent to encourage similar applications. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments 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 did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed Small House was not in line with the planning intention of “Agriculture” zone. Regarding the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in New Territories (the Interim Criteria), although more than 50% of the proposed Small House footprint falls within the village ‘environs’ of Chung Uk Tsuen, the proposed Small House did not comply with the Interim Criteria in that it would cause adverse landscape impacts on the surrounding areas. Notwithstanding that land available within the “Village Type Development” zone of Chung Uk Tsuen, Fong Ma Po, Tong Min Tsuen and San Uk Tsai for Small House development was insufficient to fully meet the future Small House demand, it was capable to meet the outstanding Small House applications.

115. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

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

- “(a) the proposed Small House 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. It is also intended 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;
- (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 it would cause adverse landscape impact on the surrounding areas; and

- (c) land is still available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Chung Uk Tsuen, Fong Ma Po, Tong Min Tsuen and San Uk Tsai 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 34

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-LT/622 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Agriculture” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lot 1324 S.B ss.1 in D.D. 19, Chuen Shui Tseng Village, Lam Tsuen, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LT/622)

Presentation and Question Sessions

117. 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 did not support the application as there were active agricultural activities in the vicinity and the site had potential for rehabilitation of agricultural activities. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, three public comments were received from individuals 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 based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed Small House was not incompatible with the surrounding environment which was rural in character. Regarding the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in New Territories (the Interim Criteria), more than 50% of the footprint of the proposed Small House fell within the village 'environs' of Chuen Shui Tseng and the proposed Small House would be able to be connected to the public sewerage system. However, as there was sufficient land within the "Village Type Development" ("V") zone to meet the future Small House demand, the proposed development did not comply with the Interim Criteria in that there was no general shortage of land in meeting the demand for Small House development in the "V" zone. Nevertheless, given that the site was situated to the immediate northwest of the village cluster of Chuen Shui Tseng with existing Small Houses and approved applications to its immediate south and west, and about 84% of the footprint of the proposed Small House fell within the "V" zone, sympathetic consideration might be given to the application. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

118. In response to a Member's enquiry, Ms Kathy C.L. Chan, STP/STN, said that the site covered an existing footpath which fell within the private land owned by the applicant.

Deliberation Session

119. 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 22.12.2021, 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 submission and implementation of a drainage proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (b) the connection of the foul water drainage system to the public sewers to the satisfaction of the Director of Water Supplies or of the TPB; and
- (c) the provision of protective measures to ensure no pollution or siltation occurs to the water gathering grounds to the satisfaction of the Director of Water Supplies or of the TPB.”

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

Agenda Item 35

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-LT/623 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in
“Agriculture” Zone, Lot 1525 RP in D.D. 19, Tin Liu Ha Village, Lam
Tsuen, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LT/623)

121. The Committee noted that a replacement page (Plan A-2b of the Paper) regarding revision to the cluster of land available for Small House development was dispatched for Members’ reference before the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

122. 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 did not support the application as agricultural infrastructure was available and the site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, three public comments from Designing Hong Kong Limited, Hong Kong Bird Watching Society and an individual 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 was not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” zone. As there was sufficient land within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone to meet the future Small House demand, the proposed Small House did not comply with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in New Territories in that there was no general shortage of land in meeting the demand for Small House development in the “V” zone. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

123. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

124. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application. The reasons

were:

- “(a) the proposed Small House 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. It is also intended to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. There is no strong planning justification in the current submission for a departure from the planning intention;

- (b) the proposed Small House development does not comply with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for New Territories Exempted House/Small House in New Territories in that there is no general shortage of land in meeting the demand for Small House development in the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Ha Tin Liu Ha, Sheung Tin Liu Ha and Ko Tin Hom; and

- (c) land is still available within the “V” zone of Ha Tin Liu Ha, Sheung Tin Liu Ha and Ko Tin Hom 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 36

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-LT/624 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in
“Agriculture” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lot 1323 S.A
ss.2 S.A in D.D. 8, San Tong Tsuen, Lam Tsuen, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LT/624)

Presentation and Question Sessions

125. 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 did not support the application as there were active agricultural activities in its vicinity and the site possessed high potential for agricultural rehabilitation. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments 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 based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed Small House was not incompatible with the surrounding

areas which were predominantly rural in character. Regarding the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in New Territories (the Interim Criteria), although more than 50% of the proposed Small House footprint fell within the village ‘environs’ of San Tong and Lam Tsuen San Tsuen and the proposed Small House would be able to be connected to the public sewerage system, the proposed Small House development did not comply with the Interim Criteria in that there was no general shortage of land in meeting the demand for Small House development in the “Village Type Development” zone. Nevertheless, the site was the subject of a previously approved application submitted by the same applicant with no change to the development proposal and there had been no significant change in planning circumstances since the previous application was approved. Furthermore, existing village houses were found to the immediate south and west of the site. Sympathetic consideration could be given to the application. Regarding the adverse public comment, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

126. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

127. 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 22.12.2021, 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 submission and implementation of a drainage proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (b) the connection of the foul water drainage system to the public sewers to the satisfaction of the Director of Water Supplies or of the TPB; and

- (c) the provision of protective measures to ensure no pollution or siltation occurs to the water gathering grounds to the satisfaction of the Director of Water Supplies or of the TPB.”

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

Agenda Item 37

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-LT/625 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in
“Agriculture” Zone, Government Land in D.D. 19, Chuen Shui Tseng
Village, Lam Tsuen, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LT/625)

129. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 14.12.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information on the sewerage connection proposal. 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 the 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/NE-LT/626 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in
“Agriculture” Zone, Government Land in D.D. 19, Chuen Shui Tseng
Village, Lam Tsuen, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LT/626)

131. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 14.12.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information on the sewerage connection proposal. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

132. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the 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 Items 39 and 40

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-SSH/112 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Green Belt” Zone, Government Land in D.D. 209, Kei Ling Ha San Wai, Sai Kung North

A/NE-SSH/113 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Green Belt” Zone, Government Land in D.D. 209, Kei Ling Ha San Wai, Sai Kung North
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-SSH/112 and 113)

133. The Committee noted that the two section 16 applications for proposed house (New Territories Exempted House – Small House) were similar in nature and the sites were located in close proximity to each other and within the same “Green Belt” zone, and agreed that they could be considered together.

134. The Committee noted that the applicants’ representative requested on 14.12.2017 deferment of the consideration of the applications for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to address the Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department’s comments on the Geotechnical Planning Review Report. It was the first time that the applicants requested deferment of the applications.

135. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the applications as requested by the applicants pending the 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 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 41

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-SSH/114 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Golf Driving Range for a Period of 3 Years in “Comprehensive Development Area” Zone and an area shown as ‘Road’, Tai Po Town Lot 157 (Part) and Adjoining Government Land, Shap Sz Heung, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-SSH/114)

Presentation and Question Sessions

136. 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 renewal of planning approval for temporary golf driving range 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 comments 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 golf driving range could be tolerated for a further period of three years. The temporary golf driving range was not incompatible with the surrounding uses in the area. It had been granted approvals in 2004, 2009, 2012 and 2015, and the applicant had complied with all the approval conditions. Compared with the previous temporary approval, no change in layout and development parameters had been proposed under the

application, and there had been no material change in planning circumstances since the granting of the previous approval. As such, the subject application was considered in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 34B for Renewal of Planning Approval and Extension of Time for Compliance with Planning Conditions for Temporary Use or Development. The subject site formed part of the site covered by a valid planning approval for comprehensive residential and recreational development, and the applicant advised that the temporary golf driving range would cease once the comprehensive development commenced. As such, the temporary golf driving range would not jeopardise the future implementation of the comprehensive development.

137. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

138. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years from 24.1.2018 to 23.1.2021, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board.

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

Agenda Item 42

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/TP/638 Columbarium in “Government, Institution or Community” Zone, Lot 1006 RP in D.D. 5, 2 Mui Shue Hang Village, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TP/638)

140. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 5.12.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to

prepare further information to address the comments of relevant government departments, respond to the public comments and take account of the Government's policy initiatives related to the traffic impact assessment of pre-cut-off columbaria. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

141. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the 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 43

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TP/639 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in
"Green Belt" and "Village Type Development" Zones, Lots 117 S.B
and 117 S.C in D.D. 32, Sheung Wong Yi Au Village, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TP/639)

Presentation and Question Sessions

142. 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 III of the Paper. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (PlanD) had reservation on the application from the landscape planning perspective as significant adverse impact on landscape resources was anticipated. Moreover, the proposed Small House would inevitably involve site formation and/or slope works and the impact from the proposed Small House on the mature trees within and adjacent to the site could not be ascertained. Approval of the application would encourage similar development in the area, which would cause adverse landscape impact on and degradation of landscape character in the area. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, four public comments were received from Kadoorie Farm & Botanic Garden Corporation, World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong, Green Sense 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 Small House was not in line with the planning intention of “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone. The application did not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 in that the proposed Small House would involve extensive clearance of natural vegetation affecting the existing natural landscape. The applicant failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would have no adverse landscape impact on the surrounding areas. The proposed Small House did not comply with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in the New Territories in that the proposed Small House would have adverse landscape impact on the surrounding areas. Whilst land available within

the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone for Small House development was insufficient to fully meet the future Small House demand, it was capable to meet the outstanding Small House applications. Approval of the application would encourage similar developments in the area, which would cause adverse landscape impact on and degradation of landscape character in the area. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

143. A Member was concerned that the subject “V” zone covered a large piece of vegetated area.

Deliberation Session

144. The Committee noted that Sheung Wong Yi Au was a recognised village and the application was a cross-village application. The Chairman said that there was no previously approved application in the area and land was still available for Small House development in the “V” zone of Sheung Wong Yi Au.

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

- “(a) the proposed Small House 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 to justify a departure from the planning intention;
- (b) the proposed Small House 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 extensive clearance of natural

vegetation affecting the existing natural landscape in the area. The applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would have no adverse landscape impact on the surrounding areas;

- (c) the proposed Small House development does not comply with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for New Territories Exempted House/Small House in the New Territories in that the proposed development would have adverse landscape impact on the surrounding areas;
- (d) land is still available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Sheung Wong Yi Au 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; and
- (e) approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the “GB” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would result in a general degradation of the natural environment in the area.”

[The Chairman thanked Mr Kenny C.H. Lau, Mr Tim T.Y. Fung and Ms Kathy C.L. Chan, STPs/STN, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. Mr Lau, Mr Fung and Ms Chan left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 44

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/TP/640 Religious Institution and Columbarium Uses with Ancillary Quarters in
“Green Belt” Zone, Lot 1171 in D.D. 6 and Adjoining Government
Land, Shek Lin Road, Shek Kwu Lung, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TP/640)

146. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 4.12.2017 and 5.12.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to address the comments of the Geotechnical Engineering Office of the Civil Engineering and Development Department. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

147. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the 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 45

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/TP/641 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in
“Green Belt” Zone, Lots 83 S.C ss.1, 83 S.D and 470 S.E in D.D. 21,
San Uk Ka Village, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TP/641)

148. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 11.12.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to address the comments of the Geotechnical Engineering Office of the Civil Engineering and Development Department. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

149. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the 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 Items 46 and 47

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting]

A/TP/642 Proposed House in “Green Belt” Zone, Lot 20 in D.D. 12, Ha Hang Village, Tai Po

A/TP/643 Proposed House in “Green Belt” Zone, Lot 24 S.C in D.D. 12, Ha Hang Village, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TP/642 and A/TP/643)

150. The Committee noted that the two section 16 applications for proposed house were similar in nature and the sites were located in close proximity to each other and within the same “Green Belt” zone, and agreed that they could be considered together.

151. The Committee noted that the applicants’ representative requested on 7.12.2017 deferment of the consideration of the applications for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicants requested deferment of the applications.

152. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the applications as requested by the applicants pending the 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 two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East District

Agenda Item 48

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/FLN/16 Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Including Container Vehicle) and Goods Distribution and Storage Use for a Period of 3 Years in “Government, Institution or Community” and “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Port Back-up Uses” Zone and an area shown as ‘Road’, Lots 164 (Part), 167 RP, 167 S.B and 176 RP (Part) in D.D. 52, Sheung Shui Wa Shan, Fu Tei Au, Sheung Shui
(RNTPC Paper No. A/FLN/16)

153. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 4.12.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

154. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the 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 49

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/KTN/40

Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Vehicle Repair Workshop (including Container Vehicle Repair Yard) for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group A) 1”, “Residential (Group A) 3” and “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business and Technology Park” Zones and an area shown as ‘Road’, Lots 759 S.A, 759 RP (Part), 761 S.A, 761 S.C (Part), 762 S.A and 762 S.C (Part) in D.D. 95 and Adjoining Government Land, Ho Sheung Heung Road, Kwu Tung, Sheung Shui

(RNTPC Paper No. A/KTN/40)

155. The Secretary reported that the site was located at Kwu Tung North. Dr C.H. Hau had declared an interest on the item as he owned a property in Kwu Tung North.

156. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application, and agreed that Dr C.H. Hau could stay in the meeting as his property had no direct view of the site.

157. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 14.12.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for one month in order to allow time to prepare response to address comments of the Transport Department. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

158. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the 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.

Agenda Item 50

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-KTN/567 Proposed Flat in “Residential (Group E)1” Zone, Lots 111 RP, 112 RP, 114 RP, 115 RP, 116 RP, 120 RP, 261 RP (Part), 264 S. (A to D) RP and 264 S. (E to H) RP in D.D. 109, and Adjoining Government Land, Kam Tin North, Yuen Long

(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTN/567A)

159. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Delight World Ltd., which was a subsidiary of CK Hutchison Holdings Ltd. (CKHH). Westwood Hong & Associates Ltd. (Westwood), Ramboll Environ Hong Kong Ltd. (Environ) and ADI Ltd. (ADI) 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 CKHH, Westwood , Environ and ADI;

- Ms Janice W.M. Lai - having current business dealings with Environ and ADI; and

- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having past business dealings with CKHH.

160. The Committee noted that Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Ms Janice W.M. Lai and Mr Stephen L.H. Liu had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application.

161. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 14.12.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information in response to departments' comments. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicants had submitted further information to address departmental comments.

162. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the 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. 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 51

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/570A)

163. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 12.12.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information in response to further comments from the Environmental Protection Department. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicants had submitted further information to

address departmental comments.

164. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the 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. 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.

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

Agenda Item 52

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTN/578 Temporary Open Storage of Vehicles and Vehicle Parts for Export for a Period of 3 Years in "Agriculture" Zone, Lots 422 S.B ss.1 (Part), 422 S.B RP (Part), 422 S.C RP (Part) and 422 RP (Part) in D.D. 110, Pat Heung, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTN/578)

165. The Secretary reported that the site was located at Pat Heung. Ms Janice W.M. Lai had declared an interest on the item as her family member owned a property at Leung Uk Tsuen, Pat Heung.

166. The Committee noted that Ms Janice W.M. Lai had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

167. 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 temporary open storage of vehicles and vehicle parts for export 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 of the site and environmental nuisance was expected. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) did not support the application as the site fell within “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone and it had high potential for agricultural rehabilitation. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, no public comment was received; and
- (e) the PlanD’s views – PlanD considered that the applied use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. Although the applied use was not in line with the planning intention of “AGR” zone, the approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardize the long-term development of the site. The applied use was also not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. The applied use was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13E in that the site fell within Category 2 areas; previous approvals had been granted; the planning conditions of the last approvals had been complied with; technical concerns of relevant government departments could be addressed through implementation of approval

conditions. Although DEP did not support the application, there was no substantiated environmental complaint pertaining to the site in the past three years. Relevant approval conditions had been recommended to address the concerns on the possible environmental nuisances.

168. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

169. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 22.12.2020, 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 medium or 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) no dismantling, maintenance, repairing, cleansing, paint spraying or other workshop activity is allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (f) the existing drainage facilities on the site should be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;

- (g) the submission of the record 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 22.3.2018;
- (h) the provision of fire extinguisher(s) within 6 weeks with a valid fire certificate (FS 251) from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.2.2018;
- (i) 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 22.6.2018;
- (j) in relation to (i) 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 22.9.2018;
- (k) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) or (f) 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 (g), (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 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.”

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

Agenda Item 53

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTN/579 Proposed Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Hobby Farm) for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 1466(Part), 1467 (Part) and 1485 (Part) in D.D. 107, Shui Mei Tsuen, Kam Tin, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTN/579)

Presentation and Question Sessions

171. 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. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) had reservations to the application as the approval of the application might encourage similar site modification prior to application, thus resulting in piecemeal development which was not desirable if the agricultural land was to be safeguarded. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, four public comments were received from World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong, Designing Hong Kong, Kam Tin Green Sense and an individual objecting to the application. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and

- (e) the PlanD's views – PlanD considered that the proposed development could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed use was considered generally in line with the planning intention of “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone. The approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardize the long-term development of the site. The proposed development was also not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. While CTP/UD&L, PlanD had reservations on the application, relevant approval conditions on the submission and implementation of landscape proposal had been recommended. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

172. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

173. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 22.12.2020, 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 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 vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse into/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no medium or 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;

- (e) the submission of a landscape proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 22.6.2018;
- (f) in relation to (e) above, the implementation of the landscape proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 22.9.2018;
- (g) the submission of a 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 22.6.2018;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implementation of the drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 22.9.2018;
- (i) 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 22.6.2018;
- (j) in relation to (i) 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 22.9.2018;
- (k) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c) or (d) is not complied with during planning approval, 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) 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 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.”

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

Agenda Item 54

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-KTN/580 Temporary Open Storage of Vehicles (Lorries, Vans and Private Cars) for Sale for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group D)” Zone, Lots 666 S.B (Part) and 667 (Part) in D.D. 110, Kam Tin Road, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTN/580)

175. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 15.12.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for one month in order to allow time to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

176. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the 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 the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 55

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-KTS/751 Temporary Open Storage of Freezer Vehicles, Air-conditioned Compartments and Spare Parts of Cooling Machinery Components for Vehicles for Sale, and Installation and Maintenance Workshop for Freezer Vehicles for a Period of 3 Years in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Rural Use” Zone, Lots 401 (Part), 404 (Part), 405 RP (Part), 406 RP, 408 RP (Part), 409 and 410 (Part) in D.D. 106, Kam Sheung Road, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTS/751)

177. The Secretary reported that the site was located at Kam Tin South. 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.

178. The Committee noted that Ms Janice W.M. Lai had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

179. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 12.12.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to prepare further information to address further comments from the Transport Department (TD). It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to address TD’s comments.

180. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the 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 the 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 56

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTS/752 Temporary Training Centre for Construction Industry for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Government Land in D.D. 106, Yuen Kong Tsuen, Pat Heung, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTS/752)

181. The Secretary reported that the site was located at Kam Tin South. 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.

182. The Committee noted that Ms Janice W.M. Lai had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

183. 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 temporary training centre for construction industry 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 comments 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 applied use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The applied use was to make use of the existing vacant ex-Yuen Kong Public School which had been closed down since 2009. The District Land Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department advised that there was no Small House application approved or under processing at the site. The approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardize the long-term development of the site. In view of its scale and nature, the applied use was unlikely to cause adverse impacts on the surrounding areas. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Previous applications for the applied use at the site had been approved by the Committee. Approval of the application was in line with the Committee's previous decisions. However, since the last approval was revoked due to non-compliance with approval conditions, shorter compliance periods were recommended to closely monitor the progress of compliance with approval conditions.

184. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

185. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 22.12.2020, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 5:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no operation on Saturdays, Sundays and public holidays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;

- (c) no noisy activities such as drilling or ground breaking, as proposed by the applicant, should be carried out on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) the existing drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (e) the submission of a tree preservation proposal within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 22.3.2018;
- (f) in relation to (e) above, the implementation of the 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 22.6.2018;
- (g) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 22.3.2018;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implementation of the 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 22.6.2018;
- (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;
- (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; and
- (k) 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.”

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

Agenda Item 57

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTS/758 Proposed Temporary Shop and Services (Real Estate Agency) for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 363 S.D (Part) in D.D. 109, Kam Tin, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTS/758)

187. The Secretary reported that the site was located at Kam Tin South. 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.

188. The Committee noted that Ms Janice W.M. Lai had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

189. 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 (real estate agency) 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 comments 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 proposed use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department advised that there was no Small House application approved or under processing at the site. The approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardize the long-term development of the site. The proposed use was also not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. In view of its nature and scale, it was unlikely that the proposed use would cause significant environmental nuisance to the nearby residential structures/dwelling. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application.

190. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

191. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 22.12.2020, 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 a 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 22.6.2018;
- (c) in relation to (b) above, the implementation of the drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the

Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 22.9.2018;

- (d) in relation to (c) above, the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (e) 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 22.6.2018;
- (f) in relation to (e) 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 22.9.2018;
- (g) if any of the above planning conditions (a) or (d) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked without further notice;
- (h) if any of the above planning conditions (b), (c), (e) or (f) 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
- (i) 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.”

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

Agenda Items 58 to 60

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTS/759 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 191 S.B ss.2 and 192 S.E ss.1 in D.D. 113, Cheung Po, Kam Tin, Yuen Long

A/YL-KTS/760 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 191 S.B ss.3 in D.D. 113, Cheung Po, Kam Tin, Yuen Long

A/YL-KTS/761 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 191 S.B ss.4 and 191 S.C ss.1 in D.D. 113, Cheung Po, Kam Tin, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTS/759 to 761)

193. The Secretary reported that the sites were located at Kam Tin South. Ms Janice W.M. Lai had declared an interest on the items as her family member owned a house at Cheung Po Tsuen, Kam Tin South.

194. The Committee noted that Ms Janice W.M. Lai had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

195. The Committee noted that the three section 16 applications for proposed house (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) were similar in nature and the sites were located in close proximity to one another and within the same “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone, and agreed that they could be considered together.

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the applications;

- (b) the proposed house (New Territories Exempted House - 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 Chief Town Planner/Urban Design & Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) had reservations on the applications. Given that there was a modified watercourse running along the eastern boundary of the sites, potential land filling due to the proposed developments was necessary and adverse landscape impact arising from the proposed land filling was expected. The proposed house for application No. A/YL-KTS/759 was in direct conflict with the existing tree and tree felling was necessary. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the applications;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, six public comments for each application were received from Kadoorie Farm & Botanic Garden Corporation, Designing Hong Kong Limited, Green Sense and individuals objecting to the applications. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and
- (e) PlanD’s views – PlanD did not support the applications based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The proposed Small House developments were not in line with the planning intention of the “AGR” zone and no strong justifications had been given in the submission for the proposed Small House developments in the “AGR” zone. CTP/UD&L, PlanD had reservations on the applications as potential land filling due to the proposed developments were necessary and there would be adverse landscape impact arising from the proposed land filling. Although there was insufficient land in the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Cheung Po and Tai Wo to fully meet the total demand of Small Houses in the long run, there was still land available within the subject “V” zone to meet the outstanding Small House demand. It was considered more appropriate to concentrate Small House developments

within the “V” zone for orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services. The approval of the proposed developments would result in further proliferation of Small House developments in the “AGR” zone. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

197. Members had no question on the applications.

Deliberation Session

198. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the applications. The reasons for each of the applications were:

- “(a) the proposed Small House developments are not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” zone which is to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land for agricultural purposes. It is also intended 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” zone of Cheung Po and Tai Wo which is primarily intended for Small House development. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development close to the existing village cluster for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services.”

Agenda Item 61

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTS/763 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Open Storage of Metal and Construction Materials with Ancillary Office for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group D)” Zone, Lot 702 S.C in D.D. 106, Kam Tin, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTS/763)

199. The Secretary reported that the site was located at Kam Tin South. 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.

200. The Committee noted that Ms Janice W.M. Lai had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

201. The Committee noted that two replacement pages (pages 7 and 8 of Main Paper) regarding comments from the District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department were dispatched to Members before the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

202. 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 renewal of planning approval for temporary open storage of metal and construction materials with ancillary office 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 of the site and environmental nuisance was expected. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments 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 applied use could be tolerated for a further period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. Though the applied use was not in line with the planning intention of the “Residential (Group D)” (“R(D)”) zone, there was no immediate development proposal for the site. The approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardize the long-term development of the site. The applied use was also not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. The application was in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13E in that the site fell within Category 3 areas and previous approvals had been granted. Though DEP did not support the application, there was no substantiated environmental complaint concerning the site in the past three years and relevant approval conditions had been recommended to minimise any potential environmental nuisances. The application was also in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 34B in that there had been no major change in planning circumstances since the last approval and all approval conditions under the previous approval had been complied with; and the three-year planning approval period sought was the same time as the previous approval.

203. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

204. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years from 3.1.2018 until 2.1.2021, 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 8:00 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 medium or 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) no dismantling, maintenance, repairing, cleansing, paint spraying or other workshop activities are allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the existing boundary fencing at 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 existing landscape plantings within the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) the existing drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (i) the submission of the records of the existing drainage facilities on site within 3 months from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 3.4.2018;

- (j) the provision of fire extinguisher(s) within a valid fire certificate (FS 251) within 6 weeks from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 14.2.2018;
- (k) the submission of a fire service installations proposal 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 3.7.2018;
- (l) in relation to (k) above, the provision of fire service installations within 9 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 3.10.2018;
- (m) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g) or (h) 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;
- (n) if any of the above planning conditions (i), (j), (k) or (l) 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
- (o) 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.”

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

Agenda Item 62

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-PH/762 Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Private Car) for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lots 208 (Part), 209 S.D, 209 S.E, 209 S.F, 209 S.G (Part) and 209 RP (Part) in D.D. 111, Sheung Che, Pat Heung, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-PH/762)

206. The Secretary reported that the site was located at Pat Heung. Ms Janice W.M. Lai had declared an interest on the item as her family member owned a property at Leung Uk Tsuen, Pat Heung.

207. The Committee noted that Ms Janice W.M. Lai had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

208. 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 public vehicle park (private car) 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 comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, six public comments were received from individuals 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 proposed use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department advised that there was no Small House application approved or under processing at the site. Although the proposed use was not in line with the planning intention of “Village Type Development” zone, the approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardize the long-term development of the site. The proposed use was also not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. Relevant approval conditions had been recommended to address the concerns on the possible environmental nuisances and the technical requirements of the relevant government departments. Previous application for temporary vehicle park at part of the site and similar applications in the vicinity of the site had been approved by the Committee. Approval of the application was in line with the Committee's previous decisions. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

209. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

210. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 22.12.2020, 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 vehicles without valid licences issued under the Road Traffic (Registration and Licensing of Vehicles) Regulations are allowed to be parked/stored on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) no dismantling, maintenance, repairing, cleansing, paint spraying or other

workshop activities shall be carried out on the site at any time during the planning approval period;

- (d) no medium or 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;
- (e) a notice should be posted at a prominent location of the site to indicate that no medium or 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 all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse into/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (g) the provision of the boundary fence for the site within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 22.6.2018;
- (h) the submission of a 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 22.6.2018;
- (i) in relation to (h) above, the implementation of the drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 22.9.2018;
- (j) 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 22.6.2018;
- (k) in relation to (j) 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 22.9.2018;

- (l) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) or (f) 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;
- (m) if any of the above planning conditions (g), (h), (i), (j) or (k) 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
- (n) 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.”

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

Agenda Item 63

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-PH/763 Proposed Temporary Warehouse for Construction Materials for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” and “Agriculture” Zones, Lots 1895 (Part) and 1913 (Part) in D.D. 111 and Adjoining Government Land, Leung Uk Tsuen, Pat Heung, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-PH/763)

212. The Secretary reported that the site was located at Pat Heung. Ms Janice W.M. Lai had declared an interest on the item as her family member owned a property at Leung Uk Tsuen, Pat Heung.

213. The Committee noted that Ms Janice W.M. Lai had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

214. 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 warehouse for construction materials 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 of the site and environmental nuisance was expected. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, two public comments were received from individuals 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 proposed use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department advised that there was no Small House application approved or under processing at the site and the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation had no strong view against the application. The approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardize the long-term planning intention of the “Village Type Development” and “Agriculture” zones. The proposed use was also not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. Although DEP did not

support the application, there was no substantiated environmental complaint pertaining to the site in the past three years. Relevant approval conditions had been recommended to address the concerns on the possible environmental nuisances and the technical requirements of relevant government departments. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

215. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

216. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 22.12.2020, 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 dismantling, maintenance, repairing, cleansing, paint spraying or other workshop activities, 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, as proposed by the applicant, are allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse into/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;

- (f) the submission of a 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 22.6.2018;
- (g) in relation to (f) above, the implementation of the drainage proposal for the development within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 22.9.2018;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (i) the submission of fire service installations proposals within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 22.6.2018;
- (j) in relation to (i) 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 22.9.2018;
- (k) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) or (h) 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 (f), (g), (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 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.”

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

Agenda Item 64

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-SK/231 Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (private car only) for a Period of 5 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 1286 RP (Part) in D.D. 114, Kam Sheung Road, Shek Kong, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-SK/231)

218. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 13.12.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

219. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the 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 the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 65

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-MP/266 School (Tutorial School) in “Residential (Group C)” Zone, Shop 137, 1/F, Palm Springs Commercial Centre, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-MP/266)

220. The Secretary reported that the site was located at Mai Po. Dr Lawrence K.C.

Li had declared an interest on the item as he co-owned with his spouse a house in Palm Springs, Mai Po.

221. The Committee noted that Dr Lawrence K.C. Li had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

222. The Committee noted that two replacement pages (pages 10 and 11 of Main Paper) regarding revisions to the approval conditions were tabled.

Presentation and Question Sessions

223. Ms Emily P.W. Tong, STP/FSYLE, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the school (tutorial school);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments 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 application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The tutorial school was within the commercial centre of the existing Palm Springs which could provide educational services to the residents of Palm Springs and the neighbourhood. The applied use was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Residential (Group C)” zone. The application was also considered in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 40 for Application for Tutorial School in that the applied use was situated on the first floor of a commercial centre where commercial

uses were located at the same floor of the building. The subject school was small in scale which would not cause any significant adverse impacts on the surroundings. Though the site was located in the Wetland Buffer Area of the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 12C, the guidelines specified that planning applications for school use (other than free-standing building exceeding three storeys) were exempted from the requirement of the Ecological Impact Assessment. Previous applications for school at the site and similar applications in the vicinity of the site had been approved by the Committee. Approval of the application was in line with the Committee's previous decisions.

224. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

225. 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 was subject to the following conditions:

- (a) the submission of proposals for 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 22.6.2018;
- (b) in relation to (a) above, the provision 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 22.9.2018; and
- (c) if any of the above planning condition (a) or (b) 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.

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

Agenda Items 66, 67, 69 and 70

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-NTM/350 Proposed Temporary Vehicle Repair Workshop for a Period of 3 Years in “Recreation” Zone, Lots 715 (Part), 716 (Part) and 717 (Part) in D.D. 104 and Adjoining Government Land, Ngau Tam Mei, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-NTM/350)

A/YL-NTM/351 Proposed Temporary Open Storage of Construction Material for a Period of 3 Years in “Recreation” Zone, Lots 713 S.A & S.B (Part), 714 (Part), 715 (Part) and 716 (Part) in D.D. 104, Ngau Tam Mei, Yeun Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-NTM/351)

A/YL-NTM/353 Proposed Temporary Metal Welding Inspection Centre for a Period of 3 Years in “Recreation” Zone, Lots 716 (Part), 717 (Part), 718 (Part), 719 (Part) and 720 (Part) in D.D. 104, Ngau Tam Mei, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-NTM/353)

A/YL-NTM/354 Proposed Temporary Open Storage of Construction Materials with Ancillary Site Office and Storage Area for a Period of 3 Years in “Comprehensive Development Area” and “Recreation” Zones, Lots 721 S.A, 721 RP (Part) and 730 in D.D. 104, Ngau Tam Mei, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-NTM/354)

227. The Committee noted that the four section 16 applications for proposed temporary industrial-related uses were similar in nature and the sites were located in close proximity to one another and within the same “Recreation” (“REC”) zone, with one of them mainly falling within the adjacent “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) zone and agreed that they could be considered together.

Presentation and Question Sessions

228. Ms Emily P.W. Tong, STP/FSYLE, presented the applications and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the applications;
- (b) the proposed temporary vehicle repair workshop for application No. A/YL-NTM/350, the proposed temporary open storage of construction material for application No. A/YL-NTM/351, the proposed temporary metal welding inspection centre for application No. A/YL-NTM/353, and the proposed temporary open storage of construction materials with ancillary site office and storage area for application No. A/YL-NTM/354;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of each of the Papers. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) did not support the applications as vehicles longer than 7m were prohibited from entering Ngau Tam Mei Road from San Tin Road and there were local objections on the noise nuisance and traffic congestion caused by the long vehicles. The proposed industrial-related uses would involve long vehicles for delivery of vehicles or transportation of materials. The Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) did not support the applications as there were sensitive receivers of residential use in the vicinity of the sites and environmental nuisance was expected. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) had reservations on the applications as the sites were previously covered with vegetation but they had already been formed. Approval of the applications would encourage similar site modification prior to applications and set an undesirable precedent for similar applications for temporary open storage/workshop uses in the “REC” and “CDA” zones, resulting in piecemeal development destroying the tranquil nature of the rural area and the general deterioration of rural landscape resources;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, five public comments were received from Green Sense, a landowner of adjacent lots and individuals objecting to application No. A/YL-NTM/350; four public comments were received from Green Sense and individuals objecting to application No. A/YL-NTW/351; three public comments were received from a landowner of adjacent lots and individuals objecting to application No. A/YL-NTM/353; and three public comments were received from individuals objecting to application No. A/YL-NTM/354. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 11 of the respective Papers; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the applications based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of each of the Paper. The sites under applications No. A/YL-NTM/350, 351 and 353, were located within the “REC” zone; while the major portion of the site under application No. A/YL-NTM/354 fell within the adjacent “CDA” zone with a minor portion falling within the said “REC” zone. All the proposed uses were not in line with the planning intentions of the concerned zonings. There was no strong justification in the submissions for a departure from the planning intentions of the “REC” and “CDA” zones, even on a temporary basis. All the proposed uses were not in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13E in that no previous approval had been granted at the sites. There were adverse comments from concerned departments including C for T, DEP and CTP/UD&L, PlanD, and the applicants had not submitted any technical assessments/proposals to demonstrate the applied uses would not have adverse impacts on the surrounding areas. Previous applications and similar applications for temporary open storage or repair workshop uses in the area were rejected. Approval of the applications would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the “REC” and/or “CDA” zones, and cumulative effect of approving such applications would result in a general degradation of the rural environment of the area. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

229. Members had no question on the applications.

Deliberation Session

230. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the applications. The reasons were:

For Applications No. A/YL-NTM/350, 351 and 353

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Recreation” (“REC”) zone, which is primarily for recreational development for the use of the general public. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from such planning intention, even on a temporary basis;
- (b) the proposed development is not in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13E for Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses in that no previous approval has been granted for the site, there are adverse departmental comments on the traffic, environmental and landscape aspects and the proposed development would have adverse traffic, environmental and landscape impacts on the surrounding areas; and
- (c) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the “REC” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such application would result in general degradation of the environment of the area.”

For Application No. A/YL-NTM/354

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) zone, which is primarily for comprehensive development/redevelopment of the area for residential use with commercial, open space and other supporting facilities. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from such

planning intention, even on a temporary basis;

- (b) the proposed development is not in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13E for Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses in that no previous approval has been granted for the site, there are adverse departmental comments on the traffic, environmental and landscape aspects and the proposed development would have adverse traffic, environmental and landscape impacts on the surrounding areas; and
- (c) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the “CDA” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such application would result in general degradation of the environment of the area.”

Agenda Item 68

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-NTM/352 Proposed Temporary Shop and Services (Vehicle Parts Retail Store) for a Period of 3 Years in “Open Storage” Zone, Lots 946 (Part) and 951 (Part) in D.D. 102 and Adjoining Government Land, Ngau Tam Mei, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-NTM/352)

231. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 1.12.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

232. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the 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 the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 71

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-ST/513 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Public Vehicle Park
(Excluding Container Vehicle) for a Period of 3 Years in
"Undetermined" Zone, Lot 244 S.B RP (Part) in D.D. 99 and Adjoining
Government Land, San Tin, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-ST/513)

Presentation and Question Sessions

233. Ms Emily P.W. Tong, STP/FSYLE, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the renewal of planning approval for temporary public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle) 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 comments 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 applied use could be tolerated for a further period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The applied use was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No.13E in that the site fell within Category 1 areas where favourable consideration would be given, and was located in the vicinity of the cross-boundary bus terminus in San Tin and the Lok Ma Chau Control Point. The approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardize the long-term development of the site. The applied use was also considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses which were mostly vehicle parks, open storage yards and vehicle repair workshops. Apart from meeting some parking demand of local villagers/residents, the applied use could satisfy some of the parking demand for cross-boundary travellers. The application was also in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 34B in that there had been no major change in planning circumstances since the last approval and all approval conditions under the previous approval had been complied with; and the three-year planning approval period sought was the same time as the previous approval. Although the site fell within the Wetland Buffer Area of the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 12C, the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation had no strong view on the application which involved continuation of the applied use previously approved at the site. Previous applications and similar applications within the same “Undetermined” zone had been approved by the Committee and approval of the application was in line with the Committee’s previous decisions.

234. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

235. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years from 24.1.2018 to 23.1.2021, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) 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;
- (b) no medium or heavy vehicle goods vehicle (i.e. exceeding 5.5 tonnes) including container trailer/tractor as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance is allowed to be parked/stored on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) a notice should be posted at a prominent location of the site to indicate that no medium or heavy goods vehicle (i.e. exceeding 5.5 tonnes) including container trailers/tractors as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance is allowed to be parked/stored on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no car washing, vehicle repair, dismantling, paint spraying or other workshop activity is allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the paving and boundary fencing on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) the trees and landscape plantings on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) no queuing and no reverse movement of vehicles is allowed on public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (h) the existing run-in connecting Lok Ma Chau Road on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (i) the submission of a layout plan of the vehicle park within 6 months from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB by 24.7.2018;

- (j) in relation to (i) above, the implementation of the layout plan of the vehicle park within 9 months from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB by 24.10.2018;
- (k) the submission of a drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 24.7.2018;
- (l) in relation to (k) above, the implementation of the drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 24.10.2018;
- (m) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the commencement of renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or to the TPB by 24.7.2018;
- (n) in relation to (m) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 9 months from the commencement of renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or to the TPB by 24.10.2018;
- (o) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g) or (h) 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;
- (p) if any of the above planning conditions (i), (j), (k), (l), (m) or (n) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately 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.”

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

Agenda Item 72

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-ST/514 Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicle) for a Period of 2 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lots 3071 S.A, 3071 RP, 3072, 3073 and 3076 in D.D. 102 and Adjoining Government Land, San Tin, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-ST/514)

Presentation and Question Sessions

237. Ms Emily P.W. Tong, STP/FSYLE, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the temporary public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle) for a period of two 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 comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, a 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 considered that the applied use could be tolerated for a period of two years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. Though the applied use was not entirely in line with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone, the District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department advised that five Building Licences were granted to the lots within the Site for small house developments. Nevertheless, the concerned landowners would not commence construction of small houses within two years. The approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardize the long-term development of the site. The applied use was in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13E. The site was located in the vicinity of the cross-boundary bus terminus in San Tin and the Lok Ma Chau Control Point. Apart from meeting some parking demand of local villagers/residents, the applied use could satisfy some of the parking demand for cross-boundary travellers. Although the site fell within the Wetland Buffer Area of the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 12C, the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation had no comment on the application as the site involved continuation of the applied use at the site that was approved previously. Previous applications for the applied use at the site and similar applications in the vicinity of the site had been approved by the Committee. Approval of the application was in line with the Committee's previous decisions. Regarding the adverse public comment, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

238. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

239. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 2 years until 22.12.2019, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) 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;

- (b) no medium or heavy goods vehicle (i.e. exceeding 5.5 tonnes) including container trailer/tractor as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance is allowed to be parked/stored on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) a notice should be posted at a prominent location of the site to indicate that no medium or heavy goods vehicle (i.e. exceeding 5.5 tonnes) including container trailers/tractors as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance is allowed to be parked/stored on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no car washing, vehicle repair, dismantling, paint spraying or other workshop activity is allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the existing trees and vegetation on-site should be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) 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 22.6.2018;
- (g) the submission of a car parking plan designating a buffer zone right after the entrance of the site within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB by 22.6.2018;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implementation of the buffer zone within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB by 22.9.2018;

- (i) the submission of a 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 22.6.2018;
- (j) in relation to (i) above, the implementation of the drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 22.9.2018;
- (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 22.6.2018;
- (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 22.9.2018;
- (m) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d) or (e) 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;
- (n) if any of the above planning conditions (f), (g), (h), (i), (j) (k) and (l) 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
- (o) 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.”

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

[The Chairman thanked Ms Ivy C.W. Wong and Ms Emily P.W. Tong, STPs/FSYLE, for

their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. Ms Wong and Ms Tong left the meeting at this point.]

[The meeting was adjourned for a five-minute break.]

Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West District

[Mr Vincent T.K. Lai, Ms Stella Y. Ng and Mr Alan Y.L. Au, Senior Town Planners/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (STPs/TMYLW), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 73

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/HSK/30 Temporary Open Storage of Recyclable Materials (Plastic, Paper and Metal) with Ancillary Workshop for a Period of 3 Years in "Government, Institution or Community", "Residential (Group A) 3" and "Residential (Group A) 4" Zones and an area shown as 'Road', Short Term Tenancy No. 1869 (Part), Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/HSK/30)

241. The Secretary reported that the site was located in Ha Tsuen. Ms Janice W.M. Lai had declared an interest on the item as her spouse was a shareholder of a company which owned two pieces of land in Ha Tsuen.

242. The Committee noted that Ms Janice W.M. Lai had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

243. The Committee noted that two replacement pages (page 5 of Main Paper and page 1 of Appendix VI) regarding comments from the District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department and advisory clause (c) were dispatched to Members before the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

244. Mr Vincent T.K. Lai, STP/TMYLW, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the temporary open storage of recyclable materials (plastic, paper and metal) with ancillary workshop 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 comments 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 applied use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. Whilst the applied use was not in line with the planning intentions of the “Government, Institution or Community”, “Residential (Group 3)” and “Residential (Group 4)” zones, the implementation programme for this part of the Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area was still being formulated and the Project Manager (New Territories West), Civil Engineering and Development Department had no objection to the temporary use of the site for three years. Approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardize the long-term development of the site. The applied use was also not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. The application was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No.13E in that the site fell within Category 1 areas where favourable consideration would be given. There was no adverse departmental comment and there had been no environmental complaint pertaining to the site in the past three years.

245. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

246. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 22.12.2020, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 8:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no operation on Sundays and public holidays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) the existing fencing on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (d) no vehicle queuing back to public road and reverse onto/from the public road is allowed at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the existing drainage facilities shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) the submission of a condition record of the 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 22.3.2018;
- (g) the landscape planting on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) the provision of fire extinguisher(s) and the submission of a valid fire certificate (FS251) within 6 weeks from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.2.2018;

- (i) 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 22.6.2018;
- (j) in relation to (i) 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 22.9.2018;
- (k) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) 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 (f), (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 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.”

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

Agenda Item 74

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/HSK/31 Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Spare Parts and Adblue for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group A) 3”, “Residential (Group A) 4” and “Open Space” Zones, Lots 1827 S.B (Part), 1827 S.B ss.1, 1828 (Part), 1843 (Part), 1844 (Part), 1845 (Part), 1846 (Part), 1848 and 1849 (Part) in D.D. 125 and Adjoining Government Land, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long

(RNTPC Paper No. A/HSK/31)

248. The Secretary reported that the site was located in Ha Tsuen. Ms Janice W.M. Lai had declared an interest on the item as her spouse was a shareholder of a company which owned two pieces of land in Ha Tsuen.

249. The Committee noted that Ms Janice W.M. Lai had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

250. Mr Vincent T.K. Lai, STP/TMYLW, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the temporary warehouse for storage of spare parts and adblue 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 comments 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 applied use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Whilst the applied use was not in line with the planning intentions of the “Residential (Group 3)”, “Residential (Group 4)” and “Open Space” zones, the implementation programme for this part of the Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area was still being formulated and the Project Manager (New Territories West), Civil Engineering and Development Department had no objection to the temporary use of the site for three years. The approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardize the long-term development of the site. The applied use was also not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. There was no adverse departmental comment and there had been no environmental complaint pertaining the site received in the past three years.

251. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

252. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 22.12.2020, 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 7:00 a.m. on Mondays to Saturdays, 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) the existing fencing on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;

- (d) no vehicle queuing back to public road and reverse onto/from the public road is allowed at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the submission of a condition record of existing drainage facilities within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 22.3.2018;
- (f) in relation to (e) above, the existing drainage facilities shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) the landscape planting on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) 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 22.6.2018;
- (i) in relation to (h) 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 22.9.2018;
- (j) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (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;
- (k) if any of the above planning conditions (e), (h) or (i) 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
- (l) 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.”

253. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as

set out at Appendix III of the Paper.

Agenda Item 75

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TM-LTYYY/342 Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Private Cars only) for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 581 (Part) in D.D. 130, To Yuen Wai, Lam Tei, Tuen Mun
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TM-LTYYY/342)

Presentation and Question Sessions

254. 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 public vehicle park (private cars only) 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 comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, two public comments were received with one comment from a Tuen Mun District Council member supporting the application and one comment from an individual objecting to the application. Major views and objection grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD considered that the applied use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the

assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Although the applied use was not entirely in line with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” zone, the District Land Officer/Tuen Mun, Lands Department advised that there was no Small House application covering the site and the applied use could provide car parking spaces to serve such demand in the area. The approval of the application on a temporary basis for three years would not jeopardize the long-term development of the site. The applied use was also not incompatible with the surrounding land uses predominantly occupied by village type developments. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Relevant approval conditions had been recommended to minimize any potential environmental nuisances. Since the last approval was revoked due to non-compliance with approval conditions, shorter compliance periods were recommended to closely monitor the progress of compliance with approval conditions. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

255. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

256. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 22.12.2020, 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) only private cars as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance and its subsidiary regulations, as proposed by the applicant, are allowed to enter/be parked on the site at all times during the planning approval period;
- (c) a notice shall be posted at a prominent location of the site at all times to

indicate that only private cars as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance and its subsidiary regulations are allowed to enter/be parked on the site during the planning approval period;

- (d) 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;
- (e) no vehicle washing, vehicle repair, dismantling, paint spraying or other workshop activity is allowed on the site, as proposed by the applicant, at any time during the planning approval period;
- (f) the provision of boundary fencing within 6 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 22.6.2018;
- (g) the implementation of the accepted drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 22.6.2018;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implemented drainage facilities shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (i) the implementation of the accepted 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 22.6.2018;
- (j) the submission of a revised tree preservation and landscape proposal within 3 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 22.3.2018;
- (k) in relation to (j) above, the implementation of the revised tree preservation and landscape proposal within 6 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by

22.6.2018;

- (l) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) or (h) 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;
- (m) if any of the above planning conditions (f), (g), (i), (j) or (k) 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
- (n) 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.”

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

Agenda Item 76

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TM-LTY Y/343 Temporary Eating Place (Restaurant) for a Period of 5 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, G/F, 1/F and Part of Flat Roof above 1/F, 57 Lam Tei Main Street, Lan Ti Lot 4 in D.D. 130 and Adjoining Government Land, Lam Tei, Tuen Mun
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TM-LTY Y/343)

Presentation and Question Sessions

258. 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 eating place (restaurant) for a period of five 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 comments 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 applied use could be tolerated for a period of five years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. Although the applied use was not entirely in line with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone, the District Land Officer/Tuen Mun, Lands Department advised that there was no Small House or rebuilding application covering the site and the applied use could provide eating place to serve such demand in the area. The approval of the application on a temporary basis for five years would not jeopardize the long-term development of the site. The applied use was also not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. The application did not contravene the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 15A for Application for Eating Place within “V” Zone in Rural Areas in that the proposal would not have adverse traffic, drainage, sewerage or fire safety impacts on its surrounding areas. Previous applications for temporary eating place at the site and similar applications in the vicinity of the site had been approved by the Committee. Approval of the application was in line with the Committee's previous decisions.

259. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

260. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years until 22.12.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 10:30 p.m. and 6:30 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) the implemented drainage facilities shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (c) 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 22.6.2018;
- (d) in relation to (c) 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 22.9.2018;
- (e) if any of the above planning conditions (a) or (b) 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
- (f) if any of the above planning conditions (c) or (d) 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.”

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

Agenda Item 77

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TT/410 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/410A)

262. The Committee noted that a replacement page (page 1 of the Paper) regarding the address of the site was dispatched for Members’ reference before the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

263. 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 temporary warehouse for storage of vehicle parts 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 of the site and environmental nuisance was expected. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) did not support the application as the site might still be suitable for agricultural uses. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (PlanD) had reservation on the application as the “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone acted as a buffer between the “Conservation Area” (“CA”) and “Open Storage” zones and the approval of the application might likely set an undesirable precedent attracting other

similar incompatible uses to the “AGR” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would result in general degradation of the landscape character of the area and diminishing the buffer to the “CA” zone. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, three public comments were received from Kadoorie Farm & Botanic Garden Corporation, World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong and an individual objecting to the application. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) PlanD’s views – PlanD did not support the applied use based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The applied use was not in line with the planning intention of the “AGR” zone and there was no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis. The applied use was also considered incompatible with the surrounding land uses. The cumulative effect of approving similar applications would result in general degradation of the rural environment of the area. The applicant failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have adverse environmental and landscape impacts on the surrounding areas. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

264. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

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

- “(a) the applied development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” (“AGR”) 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, even on a temporary basis;

- (b) the applicant fails to demonstrate that the applied development would not generate adverse environmental and landscape impacts on the surrounding areas; and
- (c) the approval of the application, even on a temporary basis, would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the “AGR” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would result in general degradation of the rural environment of the area.”

Agenda Item 78

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TT/415 Proposed Temporary Shop and Services (Vehicle Parts Retail Shop) for a Period of 3 Years in “Open Space” Zone, Lot 4219 (Part) in D.D. 116, Tai Tong, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TT/415)

Presentation and Question Sessions

266. 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 shop and services (vehicle parts retail shop) for a period of three years;

- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (PlanD) had reservation on the application as the site was originally vegetated within a number of trees but only one tree was observed remaining within the site. Adverse landscape impact was observed. 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, two public comments objecting to the application were received from individuals. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) PlanD's views – PlanD considered that the proposed 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 entirely in line with the planning intention of the “Open Space” zone, the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services advised that the site was not on the priority list for development agreed by the Yuen Long District Council and there was no plan to develop the site into public open space at present. The approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardize the long-term development of the site. The proposed use was also not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. While CTP/UD&L, PlanD had reservation on the application, relevant approval conditions on submission and implementation of tree preservation proposal were recommended to address the landscape concerns. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

267. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

268. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 22.12.2020, 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) no operation on Sundays and public holidays, 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 public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no dismantling, repairing, cleansing, paint-spraying or other workshop activities, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the submission of a 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 22.6.2018;
- (f) in relation to (e) above, the implementation of the tree preservation proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 22.9.2018;
- (g) the submission of a 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 22.6.2018;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implementation of the drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 22.9.2018;
- (i) in relation to (h) above, the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;

- (j) 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 22.6.2018;
- (k) in relation to (j) 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 22.9.2018;
- (l) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d) or (i) 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;
- (m) if any of the above planning conditions (e), (f), (g), (h), (j) or (k) 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
- (n) 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.”

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

Agenda Item 79

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TT/416 Temporary Storage of Shelves, Forklifts, Tools and Iron Ware
Materials with Ancillary Workshop for a Period of 3 Years in
“Agriculture” Zone, Lot 1815 in D.D. 118, Tai Tong, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TT/416)

Presentation and Question Sessions

270. 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 temporary storage of shelves, forklifts, tools and iron ware materials with ancillary 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 of residential use in the vicinity of the site and environmental nuisance was expected. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation did not support the application as agricultural activities could be found in its vicinity and the site possessed potential for agricultural uses. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (PlanD) had reservation on the application as the approval of the application might set an undesirable precedent which might likely encourage other similar unauthorized activities to clear and form the site prior to planning permission was obtained. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, a total of

four public comments were received from Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation, the World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong and individuals raising objection to the application. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and

- (e) PlanD's views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The applied use was not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” zone. The current application was a “Destroy First, Build Later” case and should not be assessed based on the “destroyed” state of the site. The applied use was also not compatible with the surrounding land uses. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications and the cumulative effect of approving such applications would result in a general degradation of the environment in the area. Previous application at part of the site and similar applications for various temporary open storage or warehouse uses in the area were rejected. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

271. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

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

- “(a) the applied development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone which is intended 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. No strong planning justification has been given in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis;

- (b) the applicants fail to demonstrate that the applied development would not generate adverse environmental and landscape impacts on the surrounding areas; and
- (c) the approval of the application, even on a temporary basis, would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the “AGR” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would result in a general degradation of the rural environment of the area.”

Agenda Item 80

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/850A)

273. The Secretary reported that the MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr Ivan C.S. Fu had declared an interest on this item as he was having current business dealings with MVA.

274. The Committee noted that Mr Ivan C.S. Fu had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

275. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 12.12.2017 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time to address the comments of the Environmental Protection Department. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information including a revised Traffic Impact Assessment, a revised Drainage Impact Assessment and replacement pages of the Visual Impact Assessment.

276. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the 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 the 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 Items 81, 82 and 84

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

- 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/851A)
- A/YL-TYST/865 Proposed Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Home Appliance and Furniture for a Period of 3 Years in "Undetermined" Zone, Lots 1937 (Part), 1945 (Part), 1946 (Part), 1947 (Part), 1948, 1954 (Part), 1955, 1956 (Part) and 1957 (Part) in D.D. 117 and Adjoining Government Land, Tong Yan San Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/865)
- A/YL-TYST/867 Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Construction Material for a Period of 3 Years in "Undetermined" Zone, Lots 1167 S.A RP and 1172 in D.D. 119 and Adjoining Government Land, Pak Sha Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/867)
-

277. The Committee noted that the three section 16 applications for proposed temporary warehouse were similar in nature and the sites were located in close proximity to one another and within the same “Undetermined” (“U”) zone, and agreed that they could be considered together.

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the applications;
- (b) the proposed temporary warehouse for a period of three years at each of the sites;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of each of the Papers. The Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) did not support the applications as there were sensitive receivers of residential use in the vicinity of the sites and environmental nuisance was expected. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the applications;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication periods, one public comment was received from an individual objecting to application No. A/YL-TYST/851; two public comments were received from Green Sense and an individual objecting to application No. A/YL-TYST/865; and one public comment was received from an individual objecting to application No. A/YL-TYST/867. Major objection views were set out in paragraph 10 of respective Papers; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD considered that the applied uses could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of each of the Papers. The applied uses were not in conflict with the planning intention of the “U” zone which

was generally intended for open storage use that could not be accommodated in conventional godown premises. Whilst the land use of the area was being reviewed under the Planning and Engineering Study for Housing Sites in Yuen Long South, the Chief Engineer/Cross-boundary Infrastructure and Development, PlanD and the Project Manager (New Territories West), Civil Engineering and Development Department had no objection to the applications. The approval of the applications on a temporary basis would not jeopardize the long-term development of the sites. The applied uses were also not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. Though DEP did not support the applications, there was no substantiated environmental complaint concerning each of the sites in the past three years and relevant approval conditions had been recommended to minimise any potential environmental nuisances. Since application No. A/YL-TYST/851 was revoked due to non-compliance with approval conditions, shorter compliance periods were proposed to closely monitor the progress of compliance with approval conditions. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

279. Members had no question on the applications.

Deliberation Session

280. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the applications on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 22.12.2020, on the terms of the applications as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). Each of the permissions was subject to the following conditions:

For Application No. A/YL-TYST/851

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

is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;

- (c) no packaging, repairing or maintenance activities, as proposed by the applicants, shall be carried out on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no heavy goods vehicle exceeding 24 tonnes, including container tractor/trailer, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance, as proposed by the applicants, is allowed to enter/exit the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period ;
- (f) the submission of a revised drainage proposal within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 22.3.2018;
- (g) in relation to (f) above, the implementation of the 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 22.6.2018;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (i) the submission of a revised fire service installations proposal within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 22.3.2018;
- (j) in relation to (i) above, the implementation of the 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 22.6.2018;
- (k) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) or (h) 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 (f), (g), (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.”

For Application No. A/YL-TYST/865

- “(a) no operation between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no operation on Sundays and public holidays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no repairing, dismantling, spraying or other workshop activities, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no open storage activities, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (f) the provision of boundary fence on the site within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 22.6.2018;

- (g) the submission of a revised 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 22.6.2018;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implementation of the landscape and tree preservation proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 22.9.2018;
- (i) the submission of a revised 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 22.6.2018;
- (j) in relation to (i) above, the implementation of the drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 22.9.2018;
- (k) in relation to (j) above, the implemented drainage facilities shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (l) 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 22.6.2018;
- (m) in relation to (l) 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 22.9.2018;
- (n) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) 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 (f), (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 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.”

For Application No. A/YL-TYST/867

- “(a) no operation between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no operation on Sundays and public holidays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no repairing, dismantling, cleansing, other workshop activities, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no medium or heavy goods vehicles exceeding 5.5 tonnes, including container tractor/trailer, 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;
- (e) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time 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 fencing on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) the existing drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times

during the planning approval period;

- (i) the submission of records of the 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 22.3.2018;
- (j) 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 22.6.2018;
- (k) in relation to (j) 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 22.9.2018;
- (l) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g) or (h) 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;
- (m) if any of the above planning conditions (i), (j) or (k) 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
- (n) 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.”

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

Agenda Item 83

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TYST/866 Temporary Social Welfare Facility (Social Service Centre) for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group B) 1” Zone, Lot 1354 RP in D.D. 121 and Adjoining Government Land, Tong Yan San Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/866)

Presentation and Question Sessions

282. 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 temporary social welfare facility (social service centre) 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 comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one comment was received from an individual providing views to the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD considered that the applied use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Although the applied use was not in line with the planning intention of the “Residential (Group B)1” zone, the site was recommended for residential use under the Review of Vacant School Premises Sites and there was no known programme for

residential development at the site. The approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardize the long-term development of the site. The applied use was also not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. Relevant government departments had no adverse comments on the application. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

283. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

284. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 22.12.2020, 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 vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) the existing trees and landscape planting on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (d) the existing drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (e) 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 22.3.2018;
- (f) 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 22.6.2018;

- (g) in relation to (f) 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 22.9.2018;
- (h) 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;
- (i) if any of the above planning conditions (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 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.”

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

Agenda Item 85

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TYST/868 Proposed Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Construction Materials for a Period of 3 Years in “Undetermined” Zone, Lots 1343 (Part), 1344 (Part), 1345 (Part), 1349 (Part), 1351 (Part), 1353 (Part) in D.D. 119 and Adjoining Government Land, Tong Yan San Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/868)

Presentation and Question Sessions

286. 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 warehouse for storage of construction materials 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 of the site and environmental nuisance was expected. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments 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 proposed use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed use was

not in conflict with the planning intention of the “Undetermined” zone which was generally intended for open storage use. Whilst the use of the area was being reviewed under the Planning and Engineering Study for Housing Sites in Yuen Long South, the Chief Engineer/Cross-boundary Infrastructure and Development, PlanD and the Project Manager (New Territories West), Civil Engineering and Development Department had no objection to the application. The approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardize the long-term development of the site. The proposed use was also not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. Though DEP did not support the application, there was no substantiated environmental complaint concerning the site in the past three years and relevant approval conditions had been recommended to minimise any potential environmental nuisances.

287. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

288. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 22.12.2020, 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 7:00 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 repairing, dismantling, spraying, cleansing or workshop activities, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on 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) all existing trees and plantings within the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) the submission of a revised 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 22.6.2018;
- (g) in relation to (f) above, the implementation of the drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 22.9.2018;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (i) 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 22.6.2018;
- (j) in relation to (i) 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 22.9.2018;
- (k) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) or (h) 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 (f), (g), (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.”

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

Agenda Item 86

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TYST/869 Proposed Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Construction Materials for a Period of 3 Years in “Industrial (Group D)” and “Government, Institution or Community” Zones, Lot 1117 S.A (Part) in D.D. 121 and Adjoining Government Land, Tong Yan San Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/869)

Presentation and Question Sessions

290. 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 workshop for storage of construction materials 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 of the site and environmental nuisance was expected. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) had reservations on the application as the site had already been formed with a raised platform and significant adverse impact on existing landscape resources had already been taken place. Apart from the disturbance on the environment caused by the completed site formation, any potential or further effect on the

surrounding natural habitat was unknown. The approval of the application might set an undesirable precedent. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one comment was received from an individual objecting to the application. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) PlanD's views – PlanD considered that the proposed use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed use fell in “Industrial (Group D)” (“I(D)”) and “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zones. Although the site was partly designated as “Local Open Space” on the Layout Plan, the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services advised that there was no current programme to develop the site into public open space at present. Whilst the use of the area was being reviewed under the Planning and Engineering Study for Housing Sites in Yuen Long South, the Chief Engineer/Cross-boundary Infrastructure and Development, PlanD and the Project Manager (New Territories West), Civil Engineering and Development Department had no objection to the application. Approval of the application on a temporary basis would not frustrate the long-term development of the area. The proposed use was also not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. Although CTP/UD&L, PlanD had reservation on the application, the site was zoned “I(D)” and “G/IC” intended for development purpose. Though DEP did not support the application, there was no substantiated environmental complaint concerning the site in the past three years and relevant approval conditions had been recommended to minimise any potential environmental nuisances. Regarding the adverse public comment, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

291. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

292. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 22.12.2020, 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) no operation on Sundays and public holidays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no repairing, dismantling, spraying or other workshop activities, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no open storage activities is allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) no vehicles exceeding 16 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;
- (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 a landscape proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 22.6.2018;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implementation of the landscape proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 22.9.2018;

- (i) the submission of a revised 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 22.6.2018;
- (j) in relation to (i) above, the implementation of the drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 22.9.2018;
- (k) in relation to (j) above, the implemented drainage facilities shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (l) the provision of boundary fence on the site within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 22.6.2018;
- (m) 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 22.6.2018;
- (n) in relation to (m) above, the implementation of 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 22.9.2018;
- (o) 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;
- (p) if any of the above planning conditions (g), (h), (i), (j), (l), (m) or (n) 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
- (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.”

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

Agenda Item 87

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL/240 Proposed Temporary School (Outdoor Activity Space) for a Period of 6 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Government Land Adjoining Nam Pin Wai Lot 239 in D.D. 115, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL/240)

Presentation and Question Sessions

294. 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 school (outdoor activity space) for a period of six years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, a total of two public comments were received from the village representatives of Nam Pin Wai Tsuen and a Tong named “南溪福德堂” 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 proposed use could be tolerated for a period of six 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 “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone, the District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department advised that there was currently no Small House application approved or under processing at the site. The approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardize the long-term development of the site. The proposed use was also not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. Relevant approval condition had been recommended to minimize any possible environmental nuisances. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

295. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

296. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 6 years until 22.12.2023, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) the implementation of the accepted 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 22.6.2018;
- (c) in relation to (b) above, the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;

- (d) if any of the above planning conditions (a) 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;
- (e) if the above planning condition (b) 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 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.”

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

[The Chairman thanked Mr Vincent T.K. Lai, Ms Stella Y. Ng and Mr Alan Y.L. Au, STPs/TMYLW, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. Mr Lai, Ms Ng and Mr Au left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 88

Any Other Business

(i) Section 16A Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-KTN/558-1 Application for Extension of Time (EOT) for Compliance with Planning Conditions, Lots 3513 (Part), 3841 S.B, 3842 S.A, 3843 S.A, 3847 S.A (Part), 3874, 3875, 3876, 3877, 3878 (Part) and 3884 (Part) in D.D. 104 and Adjoining Government Land, Kam Tin, Yuen Long

298. The Secretary reported that the application was approved with conditions by the Committee on 9.6.2017. The deadline for compliance with approval condition (j) was 9.12.2017. An application for extension of time for compliance with approval condition (j)

for two months up till 9.2.2018 was received by the Town Planning Board on 8.12.2017, which was the last working day before the expiry of the specified time limit for approval condition (j). It was recommended not to consider the application as the deadline for compliance with approval condition (j) had already expired on 10.12.2017, and the planning approval for the subject application had ceased to have effect and had on the same date been revoked.

299. After deliberation, the Committee agreed not to consider the section 16A application as the planning permission was no longer valid at the time of consideration.

(ii) Section 16A Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-KTN/543-3 Application for Extension of Time (EOT) for Compliance with Planning Conditions, Lots 1 S.C, 1 S.D, and 1 S.E in D.D. 110, Tai Kong Po, Kam Tin, Yuen Long

300. The Secretary reported that the application was approved with conditions by the Committee on 23.12.2016. The deadline for compliance with approval conditions (d), (e), (f), (g) and (i) was 23.12.2017. An application for extension of time for compliance with approval conditions (d), (e), (f), (g) and (i) for three months up till 23.3.2018 was received by the Town Planning Board on 11.12.2017, which was only 10 working days before the expiry of the specified time limit for the approval conditions (d), (e), (f), (g) and (i). 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 approval conditions (d), (e), (f), (g) and (i).

301. After deliberation, the Committee agreed not to 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.

(iii) Section 16A Application

[Open Meeting]

A/ST/921-1 Application for Extension of Time (EOT) for Compliance with Planning Conditions, Room 08, 10/F, Shing Chuen Industrial Building, No. 25-27 Shing Wan Road, Sha Tin

302. The Secretary reported that the application was approved with conditions by the Committee on 23.6.2017. The deadline for compliance with approval condition (a) was 23.12.2017. An application for extension of time for compliance with approval condition (a) for three months up till 23.3.2018 was received by the Town Planning Board on 13.12.2017, which was less than 10 working days before the expiry of the specified time limit for the approval condition (a). 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 approval condition (a).

303. After deliberation, the Committee agreed not to 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 condition mentioned above.

304. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 5:10 p.m..