

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 620th Meeting of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee held at 2:30 p.m. on 1.2.2019

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Chairman

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Mr K.K. Cheung

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Mr L.T. Kwok

Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories East,
Transport Department
Mr Ken K.K. Yip

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department
Mr Paul Y.K. Au

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment),
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Terence S.W. Tsang

Assistant Director/Regional 3,
Lands Department
Ms Joyce S.Y. Ng

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr H.W. Cheung

Vice-chairman

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Dr C.H. Hau

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Mr K.W. Leung

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

In Attendance

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

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Anita M.Y. Wong

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 619th RNTPC Meeting held on 18.1.2019

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 619th RNTPC meeting held on 18.1.2019 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Sai Kung and Islands District

Agenda Item 3

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Y/SK-CWBN/9 Application for Amendment to the Approved Clear Water Bay Peninsula North Outline Zoning Plan No. S/SK-CWBN/6, To Rezone the Application Site from “Green Belt” to “Village Type Development”, Lot 148 S.A ss.2 in D.D. 225, Sheung Yeung, Sai Kung (RNTPC Paper No. Y/SK-CWBN/9)

Presentation and Question Sessions

3. The application site was located in Clear Water Bay area. Mr David Y.T. Lui had declared an interest on the item as he co-owned with spouse two properties in the Clear Water Bay area. The Committee noted that Mr David Y.T. Lui had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

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

- Ms Donna Y.P. Tam - District Planning Officer/Sai Kung and Islands (DPO/SKIs), PlanD
- Mr William W.T. Wong - Senior Town Planner/Sai Kung and Islands (STP/SKIs), PlanD
- Mr Todd T.W. Wan - Planning Assistant/Sai Kung and Islands, PlanD
- Mr Ng Chi Wai - Applicant's representative

5. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the meeting. He then invited PlanD's representative to brief Members on the background of the application. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr William W.T. Wong, STP/SKIs, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) the background of the application;
- (b) the proposed rezoning of a site from "Green Belt" ("GB") to "Village Type Development" ("V") to facilitate New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) development at the site with a total gross floor area of 194.97m² and a building height of 3 storeys (8.23m);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) had reservation on the application but considered the application involving construction of one Small House could be tolerated. 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, six

comments were received from the World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong, Kadoorie Farm & Botanic Garden Corporation, The Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, Designing Hong Kong Limited and individuals. Amongst them, one supported and five objected to the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper;

- (e) PlanD's views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The applicant failed to provide strong planning justifications to supporting the rezoning of the site. Although a small piece of land to the immediate southwest of the site was zoned “V” on the Outline Zoning Plan, it was so designated to reflect the NTEH approved in 1999 before the gazette of the Clear Water Bay Peninsula North Development Permission Area (DPA) Plan on 22.3.2002. While no adverse landscape, drainage and sewerage impacts were anticipated to be resulted from the proposed development, the proposal would result in piecemeal extension of the “V” zone, affecting the integrity of the “GB” zone. Moreover, land was still available within the “V” zone of Sheung Yeung to meet the outstanding Small House applications. It was considered more appropriate to concentrate the village type development within “V” zone for an orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructure and services. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent and the cumulative effect of approving such similar applications would result in a general degradation of the natural environment. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

[Mr K.K. Cheung arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

6. The Chairman then invited the applicant's representative to elaborate on the application. Mr Ng Chi Wai, the applicant's representative, indicated that he had no additional points to supplement.

7. As the presentations of PlanD's representative and the applicant's representative

were completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

8. In response to the Chairman's enquiry on the background of the existing NTEH in the small "V" zone to the immediate southwest of the application site, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, said that the NTEH was approved in 1999, before the first statutory plan of Clear Water Bay Peninsula North area was gazetted in 2002. To reflect the approved NTEH, the site was zoned "V" on the draft Clear Water Bay Peninsula North DPA Plan No. DPA/SK-CWBN/1.

9. As the applicant's representative 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 his absence and inform the applicant of the Committee's decision in due course. The Chairman thanked PlanD's and the applicant's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

10. Members noted that there was no strong planning justification to support the proposed rezoning of the site from "GB" to "V".

11. After deliberation, the Committee decided not to agree to the application for the following reasons:

- “(a) the application site (the Site) forms an integral part of the “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone serving as amenity buffer separating developments from the roads. The proposal would result in piecemeal extension of the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone, affecting the integrity of the “GB” zone. The applicant fails to provide strong planning justifications in the submission to support the rezoning of the Site from “GB” to “V”;
- (b) land is still available within the “V” zone of Sheung Yeung Village, which is primarily intended for New Territories Exempted House/Small House development. It is more appropriate to concentrate the village type

development within the “V” zone for an orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructure and services; and

- (c) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications within the “GB” zone. The cumulative effect of approving similar applications would result in encroachment of Green Belt area by development and a general degradation of the natural environment.”

Sha Tin, Tai Po and North District

Agenda Item 4

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/ST/40 Application for Amendment to the Approved Sha Tin Outline Zoning Plan No. S/ST/34, To Rezone the Application Site from “Residential (Group B)” and “Green Belt” to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Religious Institution with Columbarium”, Lots 2, 671 and 819 RP in D.D.181, Tai Wai, Sha Tin
(RNTPC Paper No. Y/ST/40A)

12. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Sha Tin and the application was for rezoning the application site from “Residential (Group B)” and “Green Belt” to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Religious Institution with Columbarium”. The following Members had declared interests on this item:

Mr H.W. Cheung - being a member of the Private Columbaria
(Vice-chairman) Licensing Board;

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - being a member of the Private Columbaria
Appeal Board; and

Ms Joyce S.Y. Ng - owning a car parking space and co-owning with spouse two properties in Sha Tin.

13. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr H.W. Cheung had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interests of Mr Ivan C.S. Fu was indirect and the properties owned/co-owned by Ms Joyce S.Y. Ng and her spouse had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

14. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 21.1.2019 deferment of the consideration of the application for a period of two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to address the comments of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department and the Transport 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 sewerage impact assessment to address departmental comments.

15. 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 three months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that 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 including the previous deferment for preparation of submission of further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East District

Agenda Item 5

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/KTN/1 Application for Amendment to the Approved Kwu Tung North Outline Zoning Plan No. S/KTN/2, To Rezone the Application Site from “Comprehensive Development Area” to “Residential (Group B) 1”, Lots 684 RP (Part), 711 RP (Part), 717 (Part), 718 RP (Part), 719 (Part), 721 RP (Part) and 2158 RP (Part) in D.D. 92 and Adjoining Government Land, Kwu Tung North
(RNTPC Paper No. Y/KTN/1C)

16. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Kwu Tung North and ADI Limited (ADI) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on this item:

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having current business dealings with ADI;
and

Dr C.H. Hau - owning a property in Kwu Tung North.

17. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Dr C.H. Hau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As Mr Ivan C.S. Fu had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

18. The Committee noted the applicant’s representative requested on 16.1.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for a period of two months to allow more time to prepare further information in response to further comments of various government departments. It was the fourth time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information including revised development restrictions, revised master layout plan and photomontages, and new and revised technical assessments.

19. 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 three months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information. Since it was the fourth deferment and a total of eight months had been allowed for the preparation of submission of further information, this was the last deferment and no further deferment would be granted.

Sai Kung and Islands District

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/SK-HC/301 Proposed Temporary Private Car Park (Private Cars Only) and Public Utility Installation (Solar Photovoltaic System) for a Period of 3 Years in "Village Type Development" Zone and an area shown as 'Road', Various Lots in D.D.244, Ho Chung, Sai Kung
(RNTPC Paper No. A/SK-HC/301)

20. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 15.1.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for a period of two months so as to allow time to address the concerns of relevant departments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

21. 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 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/SK-TLS/55 Proposed Public Utility Installation (Sewage Pumping Station and Underground Sewers) and Excavation of Land (1.5m to 12m in depth) in "Green Belt" Zone, Lots 586(Part), 587(Part), 588(Part), 589, 590, 591(Part), 592(Part) and 593(Part) in D.D. 253 and Adjoining Government Land, Tseng Lan Shue, Sai Kung
(RNTPC Paper No. A/SK-TLS/55)

22. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Drainage Services Department (DSD) and Black & Veatch Hong Kong Limited (B&V) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared an interest on the item:

Dr C.H. Hau - conducting contract research projects with DSD; and

Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business with B&V.

23. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Dr C.H. Hau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

24. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 23.1.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for a period of 1 month to address the comments of the Transport Department. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

Sha Tin, Tai Po and North District

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-FTA/187 Proposed Temporary Cold Storage for Poultry and Distribution Centre for a Period of 3 Years in "Agriculture" Zone, Lots 471 S.B RP (Part), 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 482 RP, 483, 484, 486 (Part), 487 RP, 497 S.A RP, 500 S.B RP (Part), 501, 502, 504 S.B, 505 and 506 S.B RP in D.D. 89 and Adjoining Government Land, Man Kam To Road, Sha Ling
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-FTA/187A)

26. The Secretary reported that Landes Limited (Landes) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr Ivan C.S. Fu had declared an interest on the item as he was having current business dealings with Landes.

27. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and agreed that as Mr Ivan C.S. Fu had no involvement in the application, he could stay in the meeting.

28. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 18.1.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for a period of two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted revised master layout plan and technical assessments to address the comments of various government departments.

29. 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 submission of further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/ST/947 Columbarium with Ancillary Facility in “Government, Institution or Community” Zone, No. 169 Sheung Wo Che Village, Sha Tin
(RNTPC Paper No. A/ST/947B)

30. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Sha Tin. The application was for columbarium with ancillary facility and Arthur Yung and Associates Company Limited (AYA) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Mr H.W. Cheung
(Vice-chairman) | - being a member of the Private Columbaria Licensing Board; |
| Mr Ivan C.S. Fu | - being a member of the Private Columbaria Appeal Board; |
| Mr K.K. Cheung | - his firm having current business dealings with AYA; and |
| Ms Joyce S.Y. Ng | - owning a car parking space and co-owning with spouse two properties in Sha Tin. |

31. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr H.W. Cheung had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As Messrs Ivan C.S. Fu and K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the application and the properties owned/co-owned by Ms Joyce S.Y. Ng and her spouse had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

32. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 25.1.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for a period of two months so as to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments of relevant government

departments. It was the third time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted revised traffic impact assessment and management plan for the columbarium to address departmental comments.

33. 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 third deferment and a total of six months had been allowed for preparation of submission of further information, this was the last deferment and no further deferment would be granted.

[Messrs Tony Y.C. Wu and 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 10

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-HH/2	Proposed Temporary Excavation of Land (for Bioarchaeological Research) for a Period of 2 Years in "Conservation Area" Zone, Government Land Covering Hoi Ha Lime Kilns in D.D. 283, Sai Kung (RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-HH/2B)
-----------	---

34. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Swire Institute of Marine Science, which was a division of the School of Biological Sciences of the University of Hong Kong (HKU). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Dr C.H. Hau - being an Honorary Associate Professor and Principal Lecturer of the School of Biological Sciences at HKU; and
- Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with HKU.

35. The Committee noted that Dr C.H. Hau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and agreed that as Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the application, he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

36. Mr Tony Y.C. Wu, STP/STN, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary excavation of land (for bioarchaeological research) for a period of two years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 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 from a Tai Po District Councillor and individuals were received. Amongst them, two supported and one provided comment on the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application on a temporary basis for a period of two years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. Although there was a presumption against development in the “Conservation Area” (“CA”) zone,

the proposed excavation of land was small in scale and temporary in nature, and hence would not jeopardise the planning intention of the “CA” zone. The site encroached upon the Hoi Ha Lime Kilns Site of Archaeological Interest, which was of high archaeological interest. In view of the location of the site, scope of excavation and the archaeological impact assessment conducted by the applicant, the Antiquities and Monuments Office had no objection to the application. Moreover, the applied use would involve only hand-digging using small hand-tools and the equipment would either be hand-carried or moved to the site by small hand-trolleys. There would be no tree felling and the site would be fully reinstated after excavation. It was unlikely that the proposed temporary excavation of land would cause any significant adverse impact on the surrounding areas. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

37. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

38. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 2 years until 1.2.2021, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board.

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

Agenda Item 11

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-LCW/3 Proposed Hotel (Holiday House) use in support of Proposed Hakka Life Experience Village at Lai Chi Wo in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lots 91 (Part), 92 (Part), 93 (Part), 94 (Part), 100, 205, 218, 229 (Part), 236 (Part), 240 & Ext Thereto (Part), 271 (Part), 272, 281, 2201 (Part), Taxlord Lot 286 S.A and Taxlord Lot 286 S.B (Part) in D.D. 145, Lai Chi Wo, Sha Tau Kok
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LCW/3)

40. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Hong Kong Countryside Foundation Limited (HKCFL). The following Members had declared interests on this item:

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - knowing the volunteers of HKCFL involving in the proposed development; and

Dr C.H. Hau - being an employee of the University of Hong Kong, which was involved in another project with HKCFL in Lai Chi Wo.

41. The Committee noted that Dr C.H. Hau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As Mr Ivan C.S. Fu had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

42. The Secretary also reported that a letter from a group of villagers from Lai Chi Wo and its nearby villages was received before the meeting reiterating their support to the application. According to the Town Planning Ordinance, as the letter was submitted after the statutory publication period, it should be treated as not having been made.

Presentation and Question Sessions

43. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Tony Y.C. Wu, STP/STN, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed hotel (holiday house) use;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The District Officer (North), Home Affairs Department conveyed that the Chairman of Sha Tau Kok District Rural Committee (STKDRC), the Indigenous Inhabitant Representative (IIR) and the Resident Representative of Lai Chi Wo supported the proposal, the incumbent North District Councillor provided suggestions, and five objection letters from Lai Chi Wo villagers were received. Major views were set out in paragraph 9.1.17 of the Paper. 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, 419 public comments from Heung Yee Kuk, STKDRC, the incumbent IIR of Lai Chi Wo Village, 荔枝窩原居民關注組, the Kadoorie Farm & Botanic Garden Corporation, World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong, some Lai Chi Wo villagers and individuals were received. Amongst them, 74 supported, 342 objected to, and the remaining three provided views on the application. Major views/ 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 development was phase 2 of the Hakka Life Experience Village@Lai Chi Wo (HLEV@LCW) project and would restore 14 existing houses/structures for adaptive reuse, which would revitalise the

village and would not jeopardise the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” zone. There was no outstanding Small House application in Lai Chi Wo Village. The proposal would restore the existing houses/structures, conserve the Hakka styled architectural characteristics and provide accommodation services, and hence was not incompatible with the surrounding environment. The HLEV@LCW project was one of the projects funded under the Chief Executive’s Community Project List 2016 and it would conserve the architectural, cultural, natural and scenic values through collaboration with local villagers and promote sustainable development in the Lai Chi Wo Village. The Environment Bureau had provided policy support to the HLEC@LCW project and the Tourism Commission in general supported the application. Similar application (Phase 1 of the HLEV@LCW project), which was submitted by the same applicant, was approved by the Committee in 2017 and there were no changes in the planning circumstances. Approval of the application was in line with the Committee’s previous decision. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

44. The Chairman and a Member raised the following questions:
- (a) whether the holiday houses under Phase 1 of the HLEV@LCW project approved under application No. A/NE-LCW/2 were in operation;
 - (b) whether the approval condition on the provision of septic tank under application No. A/NE-LCW/2 had been complied with;
 - (c) the comments of government departments on the sewerage impact of the current application and whether the additional holiday houses proposed under the current application would lead to additional sewerage impact; and
 - (d) whether the approval of the application would affect future Small House application at Lai Chi Wo Village.

45. In response, Mr Tony Y.C. Wu, STP/STN, made the following points:
- (a) the holiday houses under Phase 1 of the HLEV@LCW project were not yet in operation. According to the applicant, they had been liaising with relevant government departments for discharging the approval conditions imposed by the Committee under application No. A/NE-LCW/2, as well as carrying out site clearance and restoration works. Restoration works for two houses were almost completed;
 - (b) the provision of septic tank for Phase 1 of the HLEV@LCW project had not yet been complied with. The applicant was liaising with the Lands Department (LandsD) on the location and dimension of the septic tank;
 - (c) the Director of Environmental Protection had no objection to the application. Should the application be approved, they would liaise with the applicant on sewage treatment matters; and
 - (d) based on the information provided by LandsD, there was currently no outstanding Small House application in the application site and Lai Chi Wo Village. Moreover, the application site was zoned “V” where New Territories Exempted House/Small House was an always permitted use. The approval of the application would not affect future Small House development.

Deliberation Session

46. A Member supported the application in consideration that restoration works of existing village houses had only appeared in recent years and the current proposal would help revitalise the Hakka lifestyle and culture.

47. In view of the public comments received on the application, some Members suggested that the applicant should continue liaising with local villagers on the proposed development. Members noted that an advisory clause to that effect had already been included in the recommended advisory clauses in Appendix V of the Paper.

48. 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 1.2.2023, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the provision of septic tank, as proposed by the applicant, at a location to the satisfaction of the Director of Lands or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission and implementation of a drainage proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (c) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB; and
- (d) the provision of the transport service(s) to cater for the passenger demand generated from the operation of the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB.”

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

Agenda Item 12

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-TT/8 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in
“Green Belt” Zone, Lot 1004 in D.D. 289, Ko Tong, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TT/8)

Presentation and Question Sessions

50. Mr Tony Y.C. Wu, 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 11 and Appendix IV of the Paper. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) objected to the application from the landscape planning perspective as vegetation clearance had been carried out gradually within the site and its immediate surroundings and approval of the application would 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, seven public comments from The Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation, World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong, Friends of Sai Kung and individuals were received objecting to the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper; and
- (e) PlanD's views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 13 of the Paper. Although the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the “Green Belt” zone and did not meet/comply with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in the New Territories (the Interim Criteria) and Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 (TPB PG-No. 10), the District Lands Officer/Tai Po, Lands Department (LandsD) had advised that the subject Small House grant was approved in 2000 and executed in 2002 before the gazetting of the draft Tai Tan, Uk Tau, Ko Tong and Ko Tong Ha Yeung Development Permission Area (DPA) Plan No. DPA/NE-TT/1 on 8.11.2013. Sympathetic consideration could be given

to the application based on its exceptional circumstances in that the implementation of the approved Small House development was already at an advance stage. Whilst CTP/UD&L, PlanD objected to the application as vegetation clearance had been carried out since 2012, permission to enter government land was granted by LandsD in May 2013 for carrying out site formation works for the Small House development. Two similar applications within the same “GB” zone for proposed NTEH-Small House were rejected by the Committee on the grounds that it was not in line with the planning intention of “GB” zone; did not comply with the Interim Criteria and TPB PG-No. 10; land was still available within the “Village Type Development” zone of Ko Tong Village; and setting of an undesirable precedent. The planning circumstance of the current application which involved a Small House approved and executed before the publication of the first DPA plan was different from those rejected similar applications. Owing to the exceptional circumstances of the current application, approval of the current application would not set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

51. A Member enquired whether planning permission for the Small House was obtained when it was approved by LandsD in 2000. In response, Mr Tony Y.C. Wu, STP/STN, said that since the site was not covered by any statutory plan at the time when the Small House grant application was approved by LandsD, there was no planning permission from the TPB.

Deliberation Session

52. With regards to the background of the proposed Small House, Members noted that the applicant of the subject planning application was the same person that was offered a Small House grant at the site by LandsD in 2000, and based on the information available, there were no other approved Small House grants with similar circumstances in the same “GB” zone.

53. With regards to the access to the application site, Members noted that while there was no vehicular access to the site, the site could be accessed by a track leading from Ko Tong Village which was illegally formed and land control action was being carried out by LandsD. As for the footpath adjacent to the Small House shown in Plan A-4a of the Paper, the applicant would need to liaise with LandsD on the access arrangement.

54. In response to a Member's enquiry on the execution of the Small House grant and commencement of the construction work, Ms Joyce S.Y. Ng, Assistant Director/Regional 3 (AD/R3), LandsD, said that after a Small House grant application was approved, an offer of basic terms and conditions would be issued to the applicant. After the applicant had accepted the offer, LandsD would proceed with preparation of the Small House grant document for execution. For the subject application, as time was required for preparation of the Small House grant, it was not executed until 2002. After execution of the grant document, the applicant would have to apply and obtain Certificates of Exemption before works could be commenced on site. Members noted that construction of the proposed Small House only commenced in 2013, after obtaining excavation permit granted by LandsD for carrying out excavation/stabilisation/site formation works on government land for the proposed Small House.

55. As regards to the commencement of development, the Chairman said that for planning permissions approved under the Town Planning Ordinance, there would normally be a specified time limit on the commencement of development. The planning permission would cease to have effect by the specified date unless the development was commenced or the permission was renewed. For Small House grants approved by LandsD, Ms Joyce S.Y. Ng, AD/R3, LandsD, said that a time limit would normally be specified in the Small House grant on the completion of works, but extension of time limit might be allowed with justifications.

56. In response to a Member's enquiry, the Chairman said that according to the Notes of the "GB" zone, 'House (other than rebuilding of NTEH or replacement of existing domestic building by NTEH)' was a Column 2 use, planning permission from the TPB was required. Should the subject application be approved, the site would remain to be zoned "GB".

57. Noting that the applicant had taken about 11 years to implement the Small House development, a Member had some reservations on the application as the application site was located in “GB” zone and the approval of the application might lead to proliferation of Small House applications in the “GB” zone.

58. Notwithstanding the above, Members generally considered that sympathetic consideration could be given as the Small House grant for the site was offered and executed in 2000 and 2002 respectively, and excavation permit for commencement of construction of the Small House was granted by LandsD in May 2013, all of which had occurred before the first statutory plan for the area was gazetted in November 2013.

59. 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 1.2.2023, 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.

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

Agenda Item 13

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-LT/657 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House) in “Agriculture”
Zone, Lot 208 in D.D. 18, Lung A Pai, Lam Tsuen, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LT/657A)

61. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 28.1.2018 deferment of consideration of the application for a period of one month in order to allow time to seek the advice of the Lands Department in respect of the application. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to clarify the floor area of the proposed development.

62. 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. Since it was the second deferment and a total of three months had been allowed for preparation of submission of further information and consultation with relevant government departments, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 14

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-LYT/685 Proposed Temporary Open Storage of Wooden Materials, Metal and
Miscellaneous Objects for a Period of 3 Years in "Agriculture" Zone,
Lot 1242 RP (Part) in D.D. 76, Tan Chuk Hang, Fanling
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LYT/685)

Presentation and Question Sessions

63. 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 temporary open storage of wooden materials, metal and miscellaneous objects for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in

paragraph 10 of the Paper. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) did not support the application as no estimated traffic flow and number of car parking and loading/unloading spaces were provided. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) did not support the application as the site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation. The District Officer (North), Home Affairs Department conveyed that the Chairman of Fanling District Rural Committee had no comment on the application, whereas the incumbent North District Council member of Queen's Hill Constituency cum the Indigenous Inhabitant Representative (IIR) of Lung Yeuk Tau, the IIR and Resident Representative of Tan Chuk Hang objected to the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 10.1.10 of the Paper. 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, 33 public comments from the Chairman of Sheung Shui District Rural Committee, the Kadoorie Fram and Botanic Garden Corporation, the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, Sze Tau Leung Village Representative and individuals were received. Amongst them, 32 objected to the application and one had no comment on the application. 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 application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The proposed use was not in line with the planning intention of the "Agriculture" ("AGR") zone. Both DAFC and C for T did not support the application. The application was not in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13E in that the site fell within Category 3 areas. The site was not subject of any previous planning approval for similar open storage use, there was no special circumstance that justified sympathetic consideration, and there were adverse departmental comments and location objections to the application. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the "AGR" zone, the cumulative effect of approving such similar applications would result in a

general degradation of the environment of the area. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

64. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

65. 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” (“AGR”) zone for 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, even on a temporary basis;
- (b) the application does not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for ‘Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’ in that no previous approval has been granted at the site and there are adverse departmental comments and local objections on the application;
- (c) there is no information in the submission to demonstrate that the development would not cause adverse traffic impact on the surrounding areas; and
- (d) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the “AGR” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such similar applications would result in a general degradation of the rural environment of the area.”

Agenda Item 15

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-PK/134 Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Hobby Farm and Ancillary Barbecue Site) for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” and “Green Belt” Zones, Lots 2120, 2122 S.A and 2122 S.B in D.D. 91 and Adjoining Government Land, Tai Lung Hang Village, Ping Kong, Sheung Shui

(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-PK/134)

Presentation and Question Sessions

66. 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 temporary place of recreation, sports or culture (hobby farm and ancillary barbecue site) for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The District Officer (North), Home Affairs Department conveyed that the Chairman of Sheung Shui District Rural Committee (SSDRC), the incumbent North District Council (NDC) members of Yu Tai and Sheung Shui Rural Constituencies, the Indigenous Inhabitant Representative and the Resident Representative of Ping Kong had no comment on the application, whereas the Chairman of “Association of Ping Kong Area Residents” objected to the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 10.1.11 of the Paper. 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, 214 public comments from a NDC member, Chairman of SSDRC, Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation, World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong, The Hong Kong Bird Watching Society and individuals were received. Amongst them, 204 supported, five objected, three gave views and two had no comment on the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the temporary use for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. Since a substantial area of the site was zoned “Agriculture” (“AGR”) and used directly for agriculture and related education purposes, with only a minor portion falling within the area zoned “GB”, approval of the application on a temporary basis would not frustrate the long-term planning intentions of “AGR” and “GB” zones. Part of the site was subject of a previous application for the same use submitted by the same applicant which was rejected by the Committee mainly on the consideration that the coach and car parking area was not in line with the planning intention of “GB” zone. Compared with the previous application, the site area under the current application was reduced by excluding the coach and car parking area while the layout of the hobby farm remain unchanged. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

67. The Chairman raised the following questions:

- (a) the difference between the previous application (No. A/NE-PK/121) and the current application; and

- (b) the traffic arrangements proposed under the current application.

68. In response, Mr Tim T.Y. Fung, STP/STN, made the following points:

- (a) the previous application (No. A/NE-PK/121) had included an area south of the application site, which was zoned “GB”, for coach and car parking area, and was rejected by the Committee in August 2018 mainly on the consideration that the coach and car parking area was not in line with the planning intention of “GB” zone and Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10, and the approval would set an undesirable precedent. In the current application, the applicant had excluded the coach and car parking area in the “GB” zone from the application site; and

- (b) according to the applicant, the proposed development would mainly be visited by schools and the children should arrive by coach. As the vehicular access leading to the application site was too narrow for coaches to manoeuvre, coaches would drop off visitors at a local track near the site and visitors would need to walk about 50m to 80m to reach the main entrance. The coach would leave once it had dropped off all the visitors. Traffic wardens would be provided to direct traffic along the local track to ensure smooth traffic and pedestrian safety.

Deliberation Session

69. A Member had no objection to the application and considered that the temporary approval would allow the Committee to monitor the situation.

70. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 1.2.2022, 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 10:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the Site during the planning approval period;

- (b) no operation between 5:00 p.m. and 10:30 p.m. on weekdays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the Site during the planning approval period;

- (c) the receiving and departure time of the visitors is restricted to non-peak hours (10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.) on Mondays to Fridays, as proposed by the applicant, during the planning approval period, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (d) the implementation of accepted traffic management measures, as proposed by the applicant, during the planning approval period, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (e) the submission of drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 1.8.2019;
- (f) in relation to (e) above, the provision of drainage facilities within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 1.11.2019;
- (g) the submission of proposals for fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 1.8.2019;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implementation of proposals for fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 1.11.2019;
- (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 expiry of the planning permission, the reinstatement of the Site to an amenity area to the satisfaction of Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

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

Agenda Item 16

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-STK/15 Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Coaches and Private Cars Only) for a Period of 3 Years in “Recreation” Zone, Lots 437 RP (Part), 441 S.B RP (Part), 477 RP (Part) and 478 RP (Part) in D.D. 41, Lots 42 RP (Part), 43, 44 S.B (Part), 44 S.C RP and 45 RP (Part) in D.D. 73 and Adjoining Government Land, Sha Tau Kok
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-STK/15)

72. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 18.1.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for a period of two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to address the comments of government departments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

73. 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 17

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-TKL/600 Temporary Vehicle Repair Workshop with Ancillary Site Office for Contractor Vehicles serving Public Works for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 1 (Part) in D.D. 84, Ping Che, Ta Kwu Ling (RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TKL/600B)

Presentation and Question Sessions

74. 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 temporary vehicle repair workshop with ancillary site office for contractor vehicles serving public works for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) did not support the application as the site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation. The District Officer (North), Home Affairs Department conveyed that the Chairman and Vice-chairman of Ta Kwu Ling District Rural Committee, the Indigenous Inhabitant Representative (IIR) and Resident Representative (RR) of Lei Uk supported the application while the incumbent North District Council (NDC) member of the subject constituency and the IIR and RR of of Tai Po Tan had no comments on the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 9.1.13 of the Paper. 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, seven public comments from the Chairman of Sheung Shui District Rural Committee, NDC members, the Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation, World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong, The Hong Kong Bird Watching Society and an individual were received. Amongst them, one supported, four objected and two indicated no comment on the application. Major views 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 applied use was not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone and DAFC did not support the application. No strong planning justification had been given in the submission to justify for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the “AGR” zone, the cumulative effect of which would result in a general degradation of the environment of the area. No previous approval had been granted for the site and two similar applications within the same “AGR” zone were also rejected by the Committee. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

75. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

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

- “(a) the development under the application is not in line with the planning intention of “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone in the Ping Che and Ta Kwu Ling area 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. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis; and

- (b) the approval of the application will set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the same “AGR” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would result in a general degradation of the environment of the area.”

Agenda Item 18

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-TKL/607 Proposed Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Hobby farm) for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 520 (Part) and 522 RP (Part) in D.D. 77, Ping Che, Ta Kwu Ling
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TKL/607)

77. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 16.1.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for a period of two months in order to allow time to prepare further information on the development scheme. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

78. 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 19

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-TKLN/16 Proposed Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Hobby Farm and Ancillary Barbecue Site) and Land Filling in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 305 in D.D. 78, Tsung Yuen Ha, Ta Kwu Ling North
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TKLN/16)

79. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 18.1.2019 deferment of the application for a period of two months in order to allow time to prepare further information to address the comments of government departments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

80. 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 Items 20 and 21

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-LT/659 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Agriculture” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lots 348 S.A ss.1 S.A and 348 S.A ss.2 S.A in D.D. 19, Hang Ha Po Tsuen, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LT/659 and 660)

A/NE-LT/660 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Agriculture” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lots 348 S.A ss.1 RP, 348 S.A ss.2 RP and 353 RP in D.D. 19, Hang Ha Po Tsuen, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LT/659 and 660)

81. The Committee noted that the two section 16 applications for New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) – Small House were similar in nature and the sites were adjoining one another and falling within the same “Agriculture” (“AGR”) and “Village Type Development” (“V”) zones, and agreed that they could be considered together.

Presentation and Question Sessions

82. 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) 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 Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department did not support the applications as the footprints of the proposed Small Houses were located less than 3m from the stream course and the proposed Small Houses might be eroded and flooded. 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, one public comment from an individual was received objecting to the applications. Major grounds of objection were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the applications based on the assessment set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed developments were not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” zone. Regarding the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in the New Territories, the proposed developments would cause adverse drainage impact to the surrounding areas in view of their close proximity to the stream course. Besides, land was available in the “V” zone to meet the 36 outstanding Small House applications. It was considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House developments within the “V” zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services. Although the Committee had approved four similar applications between 2006 and 2012 and rejected three similar applications between 2002 and 2005, the circumstances of the current applications were different from the above rejected or approved similar applications. Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

83. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

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

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” zone which is primarily to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes. 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 there is no information in the submission to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have adverse drainage impact on the surrounding area; and
- (c) land is still available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Hang Ha Po, San Uk Pai and Kau Liu Ha 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 22

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-TK/651 Temporary Storage Area for Barbecue Site for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 422 (Part), 423 (Part), 426 (Part), 427 (Part), 428 (Part) and 429 (Part) in D.D. 17, Ting Kok, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TK/651A)

85. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 17.1.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for a period of two months so as to allow more time for preparation of further information to support the application. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information providing responses to departmental comments.

86. 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 submission of further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 23

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-TK/653 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) and associated Site Formation in "Green Belt" and "Village Type Development" Zones, Lot 998 in D.D. 28 and Adjoining Government Land, Lung Mei Village, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TK/653A)

87. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 23.1.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for a period of two months to allow time for preparation of further information to respond to departmental comments. It was the second time that the application requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to address departmental comments.

88. 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 submission of further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 24

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-TK/661 Temporary Barbecue Site and Car Park for a Period of 3 Years in "Agriculture" Zone and an area shown as 'Road', Lots 396 RP (Part) and 398 (Part) in D.D. 17, Lots 1015 RP, 1016 RP, 1030 (Part), 1031, 1032, 1034, 1035, 1037 S.A, 1037 S.B, 1038, 1039 (Part), 1045 (Part), 1046, 1047, 1048 S.B (Part), 1049 (Part), 1050 (Part) and 1056 in D.D. 29, Ting Kok Road, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TK/661)

Presentation and Question Sessions

89. 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 temporary barbecue site and car park for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 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, one public comment from an individual was received objecting 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 temporary use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Although the applied use was not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone and DAFC did not support the application, the applied use was temporary in nature and the approval of the application on a temporary basis would not frustrate the long-term planning intention of the “AGR” zone. The applied use was considered not incompatible with the surrounding areas. Previous approvals for the same use covering part of the site and similar applications for temporary barbecue use within the same “AGR” zone had been approved by the Committee. Approval of the application was in line with the Committee's previous decisions. Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

90. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

91. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 1.2.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 11:00 p.m. and 11:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the application site during the planning approval period;
- (b) the existing trees and vegetation on the application site shall be maintained

at all times during the planning approval period;

- (c) the submission of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 1.8.2019;
- (d) in relation to condition (c) above, the implementation of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting 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 1.11.2019;
- (e) the submission of sewerage impact assessment (SIA) within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB by 1.8.2019;
- (f) in relation to condition (e) above, the implementation of sewerage facilities identified in the SIA within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB by 1.11.2019;
- (g) the submission of drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 1.8.2019;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implementation of 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 1.11.2019;
- (i) 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;
- (j) if any of the above planning conditions (c), (d), (e), (f), (g) or (h) is not complied with within the specified time limit, the approval hereby given

shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and

- (k) upon the expiry of the planning permission, the reinstatement of the application site to an amenity area to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

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

Agenda Item 25

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-TK/662 Proposed Temporary Shop and Services (Real Estate Agency) for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 1092 S.B RP (Part) in D.D. 23, Po Sam Pai Village, Ting Kok, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TK/662)

93. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 17.1.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for a period of two months so as to allow time for preparation of further information to address departmental and public comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

94. 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.

[The Chairman thanked Messrs Tony Y.C. Wu and Tim T.Y. Fung and Ms Kathy C.L. Chan, STPs/STN, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East District

[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 26

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTN/638 Proposed Temporary Animal Boarding Establishment for a Period of 5
Years in "Agriculture" Zone, Lot 1218 RP (Part) in D.D. 109, Tai
Kong Po, Kam Tin, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTN/638)

Presentation and Question Sessions

95. 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 animal boarding establishment for a period of five years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and

Conservation (DAFC) did not support the application as 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, two public comments from individuals were received objecting to the application. Major grounds of objection were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the temporary use for a period of five 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 “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone and DAFC did not support the application, approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardise the long-term planning intention of the “AGR” zone. The proposed development was not incompatible with the surrounding areas. Concerned governments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. Relevant approval conditions were recommended to address the technical concerns of concerned departments. Previous applications at the site and similar applications within the same “AGR” had been approved by the Committee. While the last approved application (No. A/YL-KTN/590) was revoked due to non-compliance with approval conditions in relation to submission of drainage, fire service installations and tree preservation and landscape proposals, the applicant had submitted relevant proposals in the current application. In this regard, shorter compliance periods were recommended to monitor the progress of compliance. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

96. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

97. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years until 1.2.2024, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions with shorter compliance periods:

- “(a) no operation between 5:00 p.m. and 10:00 a.m. (except overnight animal boarding establishment), as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) all animals shall be kept inside the enclosed animal boarding establishment on the site, as proposed by the applicant, at all times during the planning approval period;
- (c) no public announcement system, whistle blowing, portable loud speaker, or any form of audio amplification system, 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) existing trees on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) the submission of 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 1.5.2019;
- (g) in relation to (f) above, the implementation of drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 1.8.2019;
- (h) the submission of 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 1.5.2019;

- (i) in relation to (h) above, the implementation 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 1.8.2019;
- (j) 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;
- (k) if any of the above planning conditions (f), (g), (h) or (i) 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
- (l) 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.”

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

Agenda Item 27

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTN/639 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary “Animal Boarding Establishment with Ancillary Facilities” for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 1486 (Part), 1489 (Part), 1493 (Part) and House Lot Block (Part) in D.D.107 and Adjoining Government Land, Kam Tin, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTN/639)

Presentation and Question Sessions

99. Ms Ivy C.W. Wong, STP/FSYLE, drew Members' attention that one replacement page (page 11 of the Paper), rectifying editorial error of the Paper, was tabled at the meeting for Members' reference. She then 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 animal boarding establishment with ancillary facilities 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) no public comment was received during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the renewal of the planning approval for a further period of three 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 "Agriculture" ("AGR") zone, the approval of the application on a temporary basis would not frustrate the long-term planning intention of the "AGR" zone. The development was also considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. The application was in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 34B in that previous approvals for the same applied use were granted, all approval conditions under the last application had been complied with, and there was no major change in planning circumstances since the last approval. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. Approval of the application was in line with the Committee's previous

decisions.

100. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

101. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years, and be renewed from 6.2.2019 until 5.2.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 7:00p.m. and 9:00a.m. (except for the overnight kennel), as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) all dog shall be kept inside the enclosed animal boarding establishments on the site between 7:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, at all times during the planning approval period;
- (c) no public announcement system, portable loud speaker, or any form of audio amplification system, and whistle blowing, is allowed to be used 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) the existing trees within the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) the submission of records of the existing drainage facilities on the 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 6.5.2019;

- (h) the implementation of the accepted 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 6.8.2019;
- (i) the submission of proposal on appropriate mitigation measures to avoid disturbance/contamination to the fish ponds nearby within 6 months from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation or of the TPB by 6.8.2019;
- (j) in relation to (i) above, the implementation of proposal on appropriate mitigation measures to avoid disturbance/contamination to the fish ponds nearby within 9 months from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation or of the TPB by 6.11.2019;
- (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 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.”

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

set out at Appendix VI of the Paper.

Agenda Items 28 and 29

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTS/802 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in
“Agriculture” Zone, Lot 1540 S.C in D.D. 106, Yuen Kong Tsuen,
Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTS/802 and 803A)

A/YL-KTS/803 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in
“Agriculture” Zone, Lots 1540 S.E and 1871 S.E in D.D. 106, Yuen
Kong Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTS/802 and 803A)

103. The Secretary reported that the applications had been withdrawn by the applicants.

Agenda Item 30

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-MP/277 Proposed Temporary Agricultural Use (Farming) for a Period of 3
Years in “Conservation Area” Zone, Lot 47RP (Part) in D.D. 101, Mai
Po, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-MP/277)

104. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Mai Po and Mr K.W. Leung had declared an interest on the item as he owned a property in Fairview Park. The Committee noted that Mr K.W. Leung had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

105. 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 proposed temporary agricultural use (farming) 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, three public comments from a Yuen Long District Councillor, The Hong Kong Bird Watching Society and an individual were received. Amongst them, one supported the application while the remaining two objected 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 temporary use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The application site was currently partly used for the applied use approved under application No. A/YL-MP/252 and partly vacant. The proposed use was considered not entirely in conflict with the planning intention of the “Conservation Area” (“CA”) zone, and not incompatible with the surrounding developments. The application generally complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 12C in that the proposed temporary use would not involve any land/pond filling, excavation, site formation, stream diversion or tree felling works, and the existing watercourse at the northern portion of the application site would not be disturbed. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application

and approval conditions were recommended to address the technical concerns/requirements of government departments. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

106. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the condition of the application site and the location of the agricultural use approved by the Committee under application No. A/YL-MP/252; and
- (b) whether there was any approved application for permanent development in the “CA” zone.

107. In response, Ms Emily P.W. Tong, STP/FSYLE, made the following responses:

- (a) with reference to Plan A-3 of the Paper, the southern portion of the application site was currently used for agricultural use covered by a previous application (No. A/YL-MP/252) approved by the Committee in 2017. The northern part of the site was currently vacant and covered with grass/trees. A stream was found at the northernmost part of the site; and
- (b) there was one application (No. A/YL-MP/116) for reprovisioning of two Hong Kong Police Force Watch Towers at the northern fringe of the “CA” zone which was approved by the Committee in 2003.

Deliberation Session

108. A Member noted the current application was an extension of the previous application (No. A/YL-MP/252) approved by the Committee in 2017. Based on the site photos, it did not appear that the previous application, had contributed positively to enhance the value of the “CA” zone. As such, this Member had reservation on the application.

109. Noting that the area to the west of the application site was comprised of fish ponds and a permanent residential development was approved to the south of the site, a

Member considered that the application was acceptable as the proposed agricultural use would not have significant adverse impact on the overall planning and development of the area. Another Member shared similar views and considered that the application could be approved as the proposed use was not incompatible with the surrounding.

110. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 1.2.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no vehicle is allowed to access the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) the existing trees within the site shall be maintained in healthy condition at all times during the approval period;
- (c) no farming activity shall be undertaken outside the proposed farming area at the northern part of the site covering the existing watercourse at all times during the approval period;
- (d) no paving of land on the site shall be undertaken at all times during the approval period;
- (e) the submission of water supplies for firefighting and 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 1.8.2019;
- (f) in relation to (e) above, the implementation of water supplies for firefighting and 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 1.11.2019;
- (g) the submission of drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 1.8.2019;

- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implementation of 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 1.11.2019;
- (i) if the above planning condition (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 above 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 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.”

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

Agenda Item 31

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-NTM/372 Proposed Houses in “Residential (Group D)” Zone, Lots 1217 S.A RP and 1217 S.B RP in D.D. 104 and Adjoining Government Land, Ngau Tam Mei, Yuen Long

(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-NTM/372A)

112. The Committee noted that the applicants’ representative requested on 30.1.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for a period of one month in order to allow time to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the second time that the applicants requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the

applicants had submitted further information in response to the comments of various government departments.

113. 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 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 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 the further information. Since it was the second deferment and a total of three months had been allowed for preparation of submission of further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 32

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-NTM/380 Temporary Container Vehicle Park with Ancillary Facilities (Including Site Offices and Staff Rest Rooms) for a Period of 3 Years in "Open Storage" Zone, Lots 2790 (Part), 2798 RP (Part), 2799 (Part), 2800, 2801 and Adjoining Government Land in D.D. 102, Kwu Tung Road, Ngau Tam Mei, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-NTM/380)

Presentation and Question Sessions

114. 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 container vehicle park with ancillary facilities (including site offices and staff rest rooms) 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 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, one public comment from a Yuen Long District Council member was received objecting to the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the temporary use for a 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 planning intention of the “Open Storage” zone and was 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 1 areas, and the technical concerns of relevant government departments could be addressed through the implementation of approval conditions. Although DEP did not support the application, no environmental complaint concerning the site was received in the past three years. To address the concerns of DEP, relevant approval conditions were recommended to address the possible environmental nuisances. Previous approval for the same applied use had been granted to the site and similar applications had been approved in the vicinity of the site. Approval of the current application was considered in line with the Committee’s previous decisions. As the last approved application was revoked due to non-compliance with approval conditions related to the implementation requirement, shorter compliance periods were recommended for close monitoring of the progress of compliance with approval conditions.

Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

115. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

116. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 1.2.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 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 vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no cutting, dismantling, cleaning, repairing, compacting and workshop activity, including container repair and vehicle repair, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (e) the existing trees on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) the existing fencing on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) the submission of a 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 1.5.2019;

- (h) in relation to (g) 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 1.8.2019;
- (i) the submission of landscape proposal within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 1.5.2019;
- (j) in relation to (i) above, the implementation of the landscape proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 1.8.2019;
- (k) the submission of 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 1.5.2019;
- (l) in relation to (k) above, the provision of fire service installations within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 1.8.2019;
- (m) 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; and
- (n) if any of the above planning conditions (g), (h), (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.”

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

Agenda Item 33

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-ST/532 Proposed Temporary Eco Bike Riding Depot for a Period of 3 Years in
“Conservation Area” Zone, Lots 2 (Part), 3 (Part) and 4 (Part) in D.D.
99, Ha Wan Tsuen, San Tin, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-ST/532A)

118. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 18.1.2019 deferment of the consideration of the application for a period of two months to allow time for preparation of further information and technical assessment 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 sought comments from environmental consultants on the proposed development.

119. 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 submission of further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 34

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-ST/536 Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Private Cars only) for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lots 733 S.D ss.1(Part) and 733 S.D ss.2(Part) in D.D. 99, San Tin, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-ST/536)

Presentation and Question Sessions

120. 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 (private cars only) 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, two public comments from the Village Representative of Yan Sau Wai and an individual were received objecting to the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the temporary use for a period of three 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 Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department advised that there was no Small House application received/being processed within

the site. Approval of the application on a temporary basis would not frustrate the long-term planning intention of the “V” zone. The proposed use was not incompatible with the surrounding uses which were comprised mainly of residential dwellings, vehicle parks and a temporary cross-boundary shopping centre. The site fell within the Wetland Buffer Area of Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 12C which specified that planning applications for temporary uses were exempted from the requirement of Ecological Impact Assessment. The application was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13E, in that previous applications for similar temporary public car park use and similar applications within the same “V” zone had been approved by the Committee. Approval of the current application was in line with the Committee’s previous decisions. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

121. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

122. Noting from the aerial photo in Plan A-3 of the Paper that a large area to the immediate west of the application was paved, a Member enquired whether it was the site of a similar application previously approved by the Committee. Members noted that the site of a similar application (No. A/YL-ST/531) was located at the eastern boundary of Tung Chan Wai. The paved area to the immediate west of the application site was currently vacant and the area to the north of the application site was the temporary Cross-boundary Shopping Centre approved under application No. A/YL-ST/529.

123. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 1.2.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no vehicle other than private car is allowed to access the site at all times during the planning approval period;

- (b) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to public road or reverse onto/from the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) the existing trees within the site shall be maintained in healthy condition at all times during the approval period;
- (d) 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 1.8.2019;
- (e) the submission of drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 1.8.2019;
- (f) in relation to (e) above, the implementation of 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 1.11.2019;
- (g) in relation to (f) above, the implemented drainage facilities shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) 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 1.8.2019;
- (i) in relation to (h) above, the implementation 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 1.11.2019;
- (j) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c) or (g) or 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

- (k) if any of the above planning conditions (d), (e), (f), (h) or (i) 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.”

124. 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. They left the meeting at this point.]

Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West District

Agenda Item 35

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/TM/531 Proposed Columbarium in “Government, Institution or Community” Zone, Lots 813 RP and 814 RP in D.D. 131 and Adjoining Government Land, Tuen Mun
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TM/531A)

125. The application was for columbarium use and Landes Limited (Landes) and Arthur Yung and Associates Company Limited (AYA) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on this item:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Mr H.W. Cheung
(Vice-chairman) | - being a member of the Private Columbaria Licensing Board; |
| Mr Ivan C.S. Fu | - being a member of the Private Columbaria Appeal Board and having current business |

dealings with Landes; and

Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with AYA.

126. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr H.W. Cheung had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As Messrs Ivan C.S. Fu and K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

127. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 14.1.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for a period of two months in order to address further comments from government departments. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted a revised traffic impact assessment and a response to comments table to respond to comments of government departments.

128. 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 submission of further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 36

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/TM/532

Proposed Comprehensive Residential Development in “Comprehensive Development Area (3)” Zone, Lots 398 RP, 406 RP, 407, 408 RP, 409, 410 RP, 411 RP, 412 S.B, 412 RP, 413, 442 RP, 443 RP, 444, 445 S.A, 445 RP, 446 S.A, 446 RP, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 453(part), 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459(part), 462(part), 464 RP, 466 RP in D.D. 374 and Lots 248 RP, 249 S.A RP, 249 S.B, 250 RP, 251, 253(part), 255 RP(part) in D.D. 375 and Adjoining Government land, So Kwun Wat, Area 56, Tuen Mun

(RNTPC Paper No. A/TM/532A)

129. The application was submitted by Full Year Limited, a subsidiary of Sun Hung Kai Properties Ltd. (SHK). Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Limited (LD), Black & Veatch Hong Kong Limited (B&V), LWK & Partners (Hong Kong) Ltd. (LWK) and MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA) were four of the consultants of the applicants. The following Members had declared interests on this item:

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| Mr Ivan C.S. Fu | - being a shareholder and a director of LWK and having current business dealings with SHK and MVA; |
| Mr K.K. Cheung | - his firm having current business dealings with SHK and B&V; |
| Mr Stephen L.H. Liu | - having past business dealings with SHK, LD and LWK; |
| Miss Winnie W.M. Ng | - being a Director of the Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Ltd. (KMB) and SHK is one of the shareholders of KMB; and |

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu - his firm having current business dealings with LD.

130. The Committee noted that the applicants had requested deferment of consideration of the application and that Messrs Stephen L.H. Liu and Ricky W.Y. Yu had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interests of Mr Ivan C.S. Fu and Miss Winnie W.M. Ng were direct, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion. As Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

131. The Committee noted that the applicants' representative requested on 15.1.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for a period of two months so as to allow time to address the departmental comments received. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of consideration 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 the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[Ms Stella Y. Ng, Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee and Messrs Steven Y.H. Siu and Simon P.H. Chan, Senior Town Planners/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (STPs/TMYLW), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 37

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TM-LTY Y/364 Proposed House and Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio and Building Height Restrictions in “Residential (Group C)” and “Residential (Group D)” Zones, Lot 1150 RP in D.D. 130 and Adjoining Government Land, Wong Kong Wai Road, Lam Tei, Tuen Mun
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TM-LTY Y/364)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed house and minor relaxation of plot ratio (PR) and building height (BH) restrictions;
- (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, 14 public comments from a Tuen Mun District Council member, local villagers, nearby residents and individuals were received. Amongst them, one supported and 13 objected to the application. Major views 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 application site straddled “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”) and “Residential (Group D)” (“R(D)”) zones, which were intended for low-rise,

low-density residential developments and subject to a maximum PR of 0.4 and 0.2 respectively. As stated in the Remarks of the Notes of the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) for the “R(C)” and “R(D)” zones, ancillary car park might be disregarded for determining the maximum PR. Should the gross floor area (GFA) of the car park be exempted, the PR of the whole development (about 0.3728) would still exceed the PR of 0.2, which should be the basis to assess the minor relaxation of PR for the development on the site as a whole. Besides, about 26% of the site area were government land and if the government land was excluded from PR calculation, the PR for the proposed development (about 0.733) was considered excessive. No strong planning justification had been provided for inclusion of the government land into the site. According to the applicant, the proposed minor relaxation of PR restriction was to fully utilise the land to meet the housing demand in Hong Kong. However, the proposed minor relaxation to cater for one single housing unit was not considered a planning merit. No similar application had been approved within the planning scheme area. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

134. The Chairman and some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) the BH of the proposed development under application and the BH and PR restrictions stipulated on the OZP; and
 - (b) noting that about 26% of the site was government land, what was the maximum permissible GFA would be if the government land was excluded from the application site;
135. In response, Ms Stella Y. Ng, STP/TMYLW, made the following points:
- (a) the BH of the proposed development was three storeys (9m). The application site straddled “R(C)” and “R(D)” zones. The BH and PR restrictions stipulated on the OZP were three storeys (9m) and 0.4 for the “R(C)” zone and two storeys (6m) and 0.2 for the “R(D)” zone; and

- (b) with regards to the maximum permissible GFA of the site if government land was excluded, no information was available at hand.

Deliberation Session

136. A Member did not support the application as the proposed minor relaxation of BH and PR restrictions was only for one single housing unit and would not contribute to increasing the housing supply in the territory.

137. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application. The reason was:

“there is no strong planning justification in the submission for minor relaxation of the plot ratio and building height restrictions.”

Agenda Item 38

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-LFS/331 Proposed Temporary Barbecue Area and Camp Site with Ancillary Office for a Period of 3 Years in “Coastal Protection Area” Zone, Lots 181, 207 S.B and 207 RP in D.D. 129 and Adjoining Government Land, Lau Fau Shan, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-LFS/331)

138. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 14.1.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for a period of two months to allow time to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

139. 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 39

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-LFS/332 Proposed Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Scrap Metal for a Period of 3 Years in "Recreation" Zone, Lots 1973 (Part), 1974 (Part), 2028 RP (Part), 2029, 2030 (Part), 2031 (Part), 2032 RP (Part) & 2033 RP (Part) in D.D. 129 and Adjoining Government Land, Lau Fau Shan, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-LFS/332)

Presentation and Question Sessions

140. Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee, 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 scrap metal for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) did not support the application as the proposed development would generate additional traffic flow of medium/heavy goods vehicles to be accessed

through Deep Bay Road which was a single-lane carriageway with passing bays. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) had reservation on the application as the proposed use was not entirely compatible with the surrounding environment and the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent encouraging other incompatible use in the vicinity, the cumulative impact of which would lead to the degradation of the integrity of the “Recreation” (“REC”) zone and rural landscape character in general. 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 from an individual was received objecting to the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the 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 “REC” zone and there was no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis. C for T did not support the application and CTP/UD&L, PlanD had reservation on the application. No previous planning approval had been granted for the site and three similar applications for warehouse use in the vicinity were also rejected by the Committee. Although the Committee had approved a similar application (No. A/YL-LFS/320) for temporary warehouse for storage of documents, sympathetic consideration was given in view that the applied use only involved warehouse for storage of documents and there were no adverse departmental comments. For the current application, the proposed warehouse involved storage of scrap metal and there were adverse comments on traffic aspect. Rejecting the current application was in line with the Committee’s previous decisions. Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

141. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

142. 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 “Recreation” (“REC”) zone which is intended primarily for recreational developments for the use of the general public and encourages the development of active and/or passive recreation and tourism/eco-tourism. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from such planning intention, even on a temporary basis;
- (b) the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would not generate adverse traffic impact on the surrounding areas; and
- (c) approval of the application, even on a temporary basis, would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications for other departments within the “REC” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such application would result in a general degradation of the environment of the area.”

Agenda Item 40

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-LFS/333 Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park for Private Cars, Light Goods Vehicles and Medium Goods Vehicles for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group C)” Zone, Lots 2847 (Part), 2849, 2850 & 2857 (Part) in D.D. 129, Lau Fau Shan, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-LFS/333)

Presentation and Question Sessions

143. Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee, STP/TMYLW, drew Members' attention that two replacement pages (pages 7 and 11 of the Paper) making revisions to departmental comments were tabled at the meeting for Members' information. She then presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the temporary public vehicle park for private cars, light goods vehicles and medium goods vehicles 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 in the vicinity of the application 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, one public comment from an individual was received objecting to the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the temporary use for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Although the proposed development was not entirely in line with the planning intention of the “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”) zone, the proposed use could provide parking spaces to serve any such demand in the area. Approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardise the long-term planning intention of the “R(C)” zone. The proposed development was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. Although DEP did not support the application, no environmental complaint concerning the site was received in the past three years. Relevant approval conditions were recommended to mitigate any potential environmental impacts. Although the last planning approval

(No. A/YL-LFS/284) for the same use by the same applicant was revoked due to non-compliance with approval conditions on the landscape aspect, the applicant had submitted a landscape and tree preservation proposal in support of the application. Shorter compliance periods were therefore recommended in order to closely monitor the progress on compliance with associated condition. Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

144. Noting that a number of similar applications in the vicinity of the application site was revoked, a Member enquired what the reason of their revocation was. In response, Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee, STP/TMYLW, said that those applications were revoked due to non-compliance with approval conditions in relation to submission and implementation aspects of drainage, sewage, landscape, noise mitigation and parking of heavy vehicles.

Deliberation Session

145. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 1.2.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation from 11:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no vehicle repairing, dismantling or other workshop activities, as proposed by the applicant, are allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) no heavy goods vehicle exceeding 24 tonnes, including container trailer/tractor, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance, is allowed to be parked/stored on the site, as proposed by the applicant, at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) a notice should be posted at a prominent location of the site to indicate that

no heavy goods vehicle exceeding 24 tonnes, including container trailer/tractor, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance is allowed to be parked/stored on the site at all times during the planning approval period;

- (e) no vehicle without valid license issued under the Road Traffic Ordinance is allowed to be parked/stored on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (f) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (g) the existing drainage facilities on-site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) the submission of a 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 1.5.2019;
- (i) the implementation of the accepted landscape proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 1.8.2019;
- (j) the submission of 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 1.5.2019;
- (k) in relation to (j) above, the implementation 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 1.8.2019;
- (l) the provision of fencing within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 1.5.2019;

- (m) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f) or (g) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (n) if any of the above planning conditions (h), (i), (j), (k) or (l) 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.”

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

Agenda Item 41

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-HTF/1093 Temporary Plastic Bottle Recycling Centre with Workshop and Ancillary Office for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” and “Residential (Group D)” Zones, Lots 130, 131, 132 (Part), 260 (Part), 261, 262, 263, 264 and 268 in D.D.128 and Adjoining Government Land, Lau Fau Shan, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-HTF/1093)

Presentation and Question Sessions

147. Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee, STP/TMYLW, drew Members’ attention that three replacement pages (pages 6, 10 and 11 of the Paper) making revisions to departmental comments and rejection reason were tabled at the meeting for Members’ information. She then presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the temporary plastic bottle recycling centre with workshop and ancillary

office for a period of three years;

- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) did not support the application as it would cause additional traffic flow of medium goods vehicles to Deep Bay Road and the Director Environmental Protection did not support the application as there were sensitive receivers in the vicinity and environmental nuisance was expected. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) did not support the application as the site had high potential for agricultural rehabilitation and the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) had reservation on the application from landscape planning 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, three comments from the Kadoorie Farm & Botanic Garden Corporation, the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society and an individual were received objecting to the application. Major views 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 intentions of the “AGR” and “Residential (Group D)” (“R(D)”) zones. No strong justifications were provided in the submission for a departure from the planning intention of “AGR” and “R(D)” zones, even on a temporary basis. C for T and DAFC did not support the application and CTP/UD&L, PlanD had reservation on the application. DEP also did not support the application as there were three substantiated air pollution complaints concerning the site received in the past three years. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

148. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

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

- “(a) the development is not in line with the planning intentions of the “Agriculture” (“AGR”) and “Residential (Group D)” (“R(D)”) zones. The planning intention of the “AGR” zone is to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes, and also to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. The planning intention of the “R(D)” zone is intended primarily for improvement and upgrading of existing temporary structures within the rural areas through redevelopment of existing temporary structures into permanent buildings. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from such planning intentions, even on a temporary basis;
- (b) the applicant fails to demonstrate that the development would not generate adverse traffic and environmental impacts on the surrounding areas; and
- (c) approval of the application, even on a temporary basis, would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications for other developments within the “AGR” zone, the cumulative effect of which will result in a general degradation of the rural environment.”

Agenda Item 42

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TT/454 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary “Wholesale Centre of Auto Parts and Car Sales Centre” for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group C)” Zone, Lots 1012 S.A RP, 1037(A) & (B), 1038, 1039, 1040, 1041 and 1042 in D.D. 115, Au Tau, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TT/454)

Presentation and Question Sessions

150. Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/TMYLW, 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 wholesale centre of auto parts and car sales 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 public comment was received from an individual objecting 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 temporary use could be tolerated for a further 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 “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”) zone, approval of the application on a temporary basis would not frustrate the long-term planning intention of the

“R(C)” zone. The proposed use was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. The application was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 34B in that there had been no material change in planning circumstances of the application site since the previous planning approval, all approval conditions of the previous application had been complied with, and the three-year approval period sought was the same duration as the previous approval. Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and the planning assessment above were relevant.

151. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

152. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years from 19.3.2019 to 18.3.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) no operation between 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 dismantling, maintenance, repairing, cleansing, paint spraying, car washing or other workshop activities, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) no medium or heavy goods vehicles exceeding 5.5 tonnes, including container tractor/trailer, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance, is allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site, as proposed by the applicant, at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;

- (e) the existing drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) the submission of records of the existing drainage facilities on the 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 19.6.2019;
- (g) all existing trees and landscape plantings within the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) the submission of 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 19.9.2019;
- (i) in relation to (h) above, the implementation of fire service installation proposal 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 19.12.2019;
- (j) 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; and
- (k) if any of the above planning conditions (f), (h) or (i) 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.”

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

Agenda Item 43

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TT/455 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary “Shop and Services (Real Estate Agency)” for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 4888 RP (Part) in D.D.116 and Adjoining Government Land, Tai Tong, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TT/455)

Presentation and Question Sessions

154. Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/TMYLW, 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 shop and services (real estate agency) for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. Concerned government departments have 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 individuals objecting to the application were received. Major views were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD considered that the temporary use could be tolerated for a further period of three 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, it could provide real estate service to meet any such demand in the area. The applied use was

considered not incompatible with the surrounding uses and continuation of the applied use for a further period of three years would not frustrate the long-term planning intention of the area. The application was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 34B in that there had been no material change in the planning circumstances since the previous approval, all approval conditions had been complied with, and the three-year approval period sought was the same duration as the previous approval. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

155. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

156. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years from 16.3.2019 to 15.3.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) no operation between 8:00 p.m. and 10:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no parking of vehicles, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) the submission of 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 16.9.2019;
- (d) in relation to (c) above, the implementation of fire service installations proposal 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 16.12.2019;

- (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.”

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

Agenda Item 44

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TYST/930 Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park for Private Car for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group B) 2” Zone, Lot 294 S.C RP in D.D. 127, Hung Shui Kiu, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/930A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

158. Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/TMYLW, 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 for 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, two public comments were received with one objecting comment from the Incorporated Owners of The Woodside and another from an individual expressing concerns. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application on a temporary basis for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Although the proposed use was not entirely in line with the planning intention of the “Residential (Group B)2” (“R(B)2”) zone, there was currently no known programme for long-term development on the site. Approval of the application on a temporary basis would not frustrate the planning intention of the “R(B)2” zone. The proposed use was considered not entirely incompatible with the surrounding land uses. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application and relevant approval conditions had been recommended to address the technical requirements of concerned government departments. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

159. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

160. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 1.2.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) only private cars, 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;

- (b) no vehicle without valid licences issued under the Road Traffic (Registration and Licensing of Vehicles) Regulations is allowed to be parked/stored on the site at any time 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, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site during the planning approval period;
- (d) no vehicle repairing, dismantling, car beauty, car washing or other workshop activity, 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) all existing trees and landscape plantings within the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) 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 1.8.2019;
- (h) the submission of run-in/run-out proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Highways and Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB by 1.8.2019;
- (i) in relation to (h) above, the implementation of run-in/run-out proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Highways and Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB by 1.11.2019;
- (j) 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 1.8.2019;

- (k) in relation to (j) above, the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (l) the submission of 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 1.8.2019;
- (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 1.11.2019;
- (n) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), or (k) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice;
- (o) if any of the above planning conditions (g), (h), (i), (j), (l) or (m) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice;
and
- (p) upon expiry of the planning permission, the reinstatement of the modified footpath, cycle track and its associated traffic facilities to its original state to the satisfaction of the Director of Highways and Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB.”

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

Agenda Item 45

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TYST/938 Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Household Products for a Period of 3 Years in “Undetermined” Zone, Lots 1493 S.A (Part), 1494 S.A (Part) and 1494 RP (Part) in D.D. 119, Kung Um Road, Yuen Long (RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/938)

Presentation and Question Sessions

162. Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, 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 household products 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 in the vicinity of the application 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, one public comment was received from an individual expressing concerns on 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 temporary 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 in conflict with the planning intention of the “Undetermined” (“U”) zone

and was not incompatible with the surrounding uses. Whilst the site fell within an area zoned “District Open Space” on the Recommended Outline Development Plan of Yuen Long South, the Chief Engineer/Cross-boundary Infrastructure and Development, PlanD and the Project Manager (West), Civil Engineering and Development Department had no objection to the application and approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardise the long-term development of the area. Although DEP did not support the application, there had been no environmental complaint concerning the site received in the past three years. Relevant approval conditions had been recommended to address the concerns of possible environmental nuisances and the technical concerns of other relevant government departments. Similar applications for warehouse use had been approved in this part of the “U” zone. Approval of the current application was in line with the Committee’s previous decisions. The application site was the subject of a previous approved application submitted by the same applicant for the same applied use, for which the planning permission was revoked due to non-compliance with approval conditions. While sympathetic consideration might be given to the current application, shorter compliance periods were recommended to closely monitor the progress on compliance with the approval conditions. Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

163. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

164. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 1.2.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 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 workshop activities, as proposed by the applicant, shall be carried out on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no heavy goods vehicles exceeding 24 tonnes, including container tractors/trailers, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site, as proposed by the applicant, at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (f) all existing trees and landscape plantings within the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) 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 1.5.2019;
- (h) in relation to (g) 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 1.8.2019;
- (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 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 1.5.2019;
- (k) in relation to (j) 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 1.8.2019;

- (l) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f) 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; and

- (m) if any of the above planning conditions (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.”

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

Agenda Item 46

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TYST/940 Temporary Carpet Shop and Wholesale of Carpet for a Period of 3 Years in “Government, Institution or Community” and “Residential (Group B) 1” Zones, Lots 1140 S.D RP, 1141 S.C, 1141 S.D ss. 2, 1141 S.D RP, 1142 S.G, 1142 S.H, 1142 S.I, 1142 S.K (Part) and 1152 S.C RP in D.D. 121 and Adjoining Government Land, Tong Yan San Tsuen Road, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/940)

Presentation and Question Sessions

166. Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/TMYLW, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;

- (b) the temporary carpet shop and wholesale of carpet 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 public comment from an individual was received objecting to the application. Major grounds of objection were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application on a temporary basis for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The site straddled “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) and “Residential (Group B)1” (“R(B)1”) zones. While the major component of the applied wholesale trade use was always permitted in the “G/IC” zone, the minor component of the applied carpet shop use was not entirely in line with the planning intention of the “R(B)1” zone. Whilst the “G/IC” zone covering part of the site was reserved for the provision of a primary school, there was no programme for the school development and the Secretary for Education had no comment on the application. Moreover, there was no current proposal for residential development on the part of the site falling within “R(B)1” zone. The site fell within an area zoned “Residential-Zone 5” on the Recommended Outline Development Plan of Yuen Long South. However, the Chief Engineer/Cross-boundary and Infrastructure Development, PlanD and Project Manager(West), Civil Engineering and Development Department had no objection to the application. Approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardise the long-term development of the area. The applied use was considered not incompatible with the surrounding areas. Concerned government had no objection to or adverse comments on the application and relevant approval conditions were recommended to address the technical requirements of

concerned government departments. Previous approvals for the same applied use had been granted to the site and similar applications had been approved in the same “R(B)1” zone. Approval of the current application was in line with the Committee’s previous decisions. Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

167. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

168. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 1.2.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 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 medium and heavy goods vehicles exceeding 5.5 tonnes, including container tractors/trailers, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance, is allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site, as proposed by the applicant, at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road, as proposed by the applicant, 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 condition 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 1.5.2019;
- (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 1.8.2019;

- (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 1.11.2019;
- (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; and
- (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.”

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

Agenda Item 47

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TYST/941 Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Construction Materials, Food Provisions and Electronic Products for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group C)” and “Undetermined” Zones, Lots 1265 (Part), 1266 (Part), 1269 (Part), 1270 (Part), 1271 (Part), 1272 (Part), 1273 (Part), 1275 RP (Part), 1276 (Part), 1277 S.A, 1277 RP (Part), 1279 S.B ss. 1 S.F, 1279 S.B ss.2 (Part), 1279 S.B ss.3 in D.D. 119 and Adjoining Government Land, Pak Sha Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/941)

Presentation and Question Sessions

170. Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, 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 construction materials, food provisions and electronic products 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 public comment was received from an individual objecting to the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD considered the temporary use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The applied use was not in conflict with the planning intention of the “Undetermined” (“U”) zone and was not incompatible with the surrounding uses. Whilst the site largely fell within areas zoned “Residential- Zone 2 (Subsidised Sale Flats with Commercial)” and an area shown as ‘Road’ on the Recommended Outline Development Plan of Yuen Long South, the Chief Engineer/Cross-boundary Infrastructure and Development, PlanD and Project Manager (West), Civil Engineering and Development Department had no objection to the application. Approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardise the long-term development of the area. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application and relevant approval conditions had been recommended to address the technical concerns of government departments. Previous approvals for similar warehouse use had been granted to the site and similar applications had been approved in this part of

the “U” zone. Approval of the current application was in line with the Committee’s previous decisions. Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

171. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

172. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 1.2.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 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, cleaning or other workshop activities, as proposed by the applicant, are allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no open storage activities are allowed on the site, as proposed by the applicant, at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) no storage or handling (including loading and unloading) of electrical appliances, computer/ electronic parts (including cathode-ray tubes) or any other types of electronic waste are allowed on the site, as proposed by the applicant, at any time during the planning approval period;
- (f) 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, as proposed by the

applicant, at any time during the planning approval period;

- (g) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road, as proposed by the applicant, at any time during the planning approval period;
- (h) all existing trees and landscape plantings within the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (i) the existing drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (j) the submission of a condition 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 1.5.2019;
- (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 1.8.2019;
- (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 1.11.2019;
- (m) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h) 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; and
- (n) if any of the above planning conditions (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.”

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

Agenda Item 48

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TYST/942 Proposed Temporary Open Storage of Construction Materials for a Period of 3 Years in “Undetermined” Zone, Lots 2684 S.A (Part), 2684 S.B (Part), 2684 S.C (Part), 2684 S.D, 2684 S.E, 2684 S.F, 2684 S.G (Part), 2684 S.H (Part), 2684 S.I (Part), 2684 S.J (Part), 2684 S.K (Part), 2684 S.L (Part), 2684 S.M (Part), 2684 S.N, 2684 S.O, 2684 RP (Part), 2686 (Part) and 2687 (Part) in D.D. 120, Shan Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/942)

Presentation and Question Sessions

174. Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/TMYLW, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary open storage of construction materials 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 in the vicinity 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, one public comment from a Yuen Long District Councillor was received objecting to the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper;

and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD considered that the temporary use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The applied use was not in conflict with the planning intention of the “Undetermined” (“U”) zone and was not incompatible with the surrounding uses. Whilst the site fell within an area zoned as “Local Open Space” on the Recommended Outline Development Plan of Yuen Long South, the Chief Engineer/Cross-boundary Infrastructure and Development, PlanD and the Project Manager (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 application was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13E in that the site fell within Category 1 areas and the technical concerns of relevant government departments could be addressed through the implementation of approval conditions. Although DEP did not support the application, no environmental complaint concerning the site was received in the past three years. To address the concerns of DEP, relevant approval conditions were recommended to address the possible environmental nuisances. Previous approvals for similar temporary open storage uses had been granted to the site and similar applications had been approved in the vicinity of the site, approval of the current application was considered in line with the Committee's previous decisions. Although the site had been the subject of three revocations for previously approved applications for open storage uses in the past, the site was currently vacant and the last two applications were submitted by different applicants. As such, sympathetic consideration could be given to the current application. Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

175. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

176. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 1.2.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 5:00 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 temporary structure, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed to be erected on the site during the planning approval period;
- (d) no workshop activities, storage, handling and loading and unloading of used electrical appliances, electronic and computer wastes, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) 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, 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 existing boundary fencing on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) 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 1.8.2019;

- (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 1.11.2019;
- (j) in relation to (i) above, the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (k) the provision of fire extinguisher(s) with a valid fire certificate (FS 251) within 6 weeks from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 15.3.2019;
- (l) the submission of fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 1.8.2019;
- (m) in relation to (l) above, the implementation of 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 1.11.2019;
- (n) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g) or (j) 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
- (o) if any of the above planning conditions (h), (i), (k), (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.”

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

Agenda Item 49

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TYST/943 Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Construction Materials for a Period of 3 Years in “Undetermined” Zone, Lots 1258 (Part) and 1267 (Part) in D.D. 119, Pak Sha Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/943)

Presentation and Question Sessions

178. Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, 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 construction materials 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 public comment was received objecting to the application. Major views 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. Although the applied use was not incompatible with surrounding uses in the area and concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application, the site was the subject of four previously revoked planning permissions (No. A/YL-TYST/450, 580, 719 and 797) for warehouse use covering different extent of areas, of which the

latter two applications (No. A/YL-TYST/719 and 797) were submitted by the same applicant as the current application. The applicant was unable to comply with approval conditions regarding the implementation of drainage and/or fire service installations (FSIs) proposals within the specified time limits repeatedly since the granting of the first planning approval at the site (No. A/YL-TYST/719) in 2015. Since the revocation of the last application (No. A/YL-TYST/797) on 15.10.2018, the structures on site remain unchanged and the site had not been cleared before this application was made. No FSIs proposal was submitted in the current application to demonstrate the potential fire risk would be adequately mitigated. Approval of the application with repeated non-compliances with approval conditions would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications, thus nullifying the statutory planning control mechanism. Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

179. In response to a Member's enquiry, the Chairman said that if the applicant was aggrieved by the Committee's decision, he could submit an application for a review of the Committee's decision under section 17 of the Town Planning Ordinance. The review application would then be considered by the Town Planning Board.

180. Another Member enquired whether PlanD's recommendation of not supporting the application was mainly due to the four previously revoked planning permissions at the site, or the last two revoked applications submitted by the same applicant as the current application. In response, Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/TMYLW, said that reason for not supporting the application was mainly due to the latter as the last two applications at the site were submitted by the same applicant for similar uses. The planning permissions for both applications were subsequently revoked due to non-compliance with approval conditions. The applicant had not sincerely demonstrated that he would comply with the approval conditions if the current application was approved.

Deliberation Session

181. A Member did not support the application and opined that consideration on

approving or rejecting an application with previous approvals should also include whether the site had multiple revocations even if the application was not made by the same applicant.

182. The Chairman said that although the Committee had approved a number of similar applications in the area, the overall objective was to contain those uses to avoid proliferation.

183. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application. The reason was :

“four previous planning permissions granted on the site by the Town Planning Board were revoked due to non-compliance of the approval conditions, two of which were submitted by the same applicant as the current application. Approval of the application with repeated non-compliances with approval conditions would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications, thus nullifying the statutory planning control mechanism.”

[Mr Philip S.L. Kan left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 50

Section 16 Application

A/HSK/102 Temporary Public Vehicle Park (excluding Container Vehicle) for a Period of 3 Years in “Open Space” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lots 63 (Part), 64 (Part), 67 (Part), 68 (Part), 69 (Part), 70 (Part) and 1246 (Part) in D.D.124, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/HSK/102A)

184. The Secretary reported that the application had been withdrawn by the applicant.

Agenda Item 51

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/HSK/106 Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Private Cars and Light Goods Vehicles Not Exceeding 5.5 Tonnes) with Ancillary Shroff for a Period of 3 Years in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Sewage Pumping Station”, “Residential (Group A) 2” and “Open Space” Zones and an area shown as ‘Road’, Lot 1768 RP in D.D. 130 and Adjoining Government Land, Tsing Yick Road, Yick Yuen Tsuen, Hung Shui Kiu, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/HSK/106A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

185. Mr Simon P.H. Chan, STP/TMYLW, 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 cars and light goods vehicles not exceeding 5.5 tonnes) and ancillary shroff 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. A Tuen Mun District Council member supported the application while an individual objected 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

temporary use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Whilst the proposed development at the site was not in line with the planning intention of “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Sewage Pumping Station” and “Residential (Group A)2” zones, the implementation programme for this part of the Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area was still being formulated. Approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardise the long-term development of the site. The applied use was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses and concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. Approval conditions were recommended to address the technical requirements of concerned departments. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

186. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

187. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 1.2.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 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 vehicle without valid license issued under the Road Traffic Ordinance is allowed to be parked/stored on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) 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;

- (d) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the submission of a 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 1.8.2019;
- (f) in relation to (e) above, the implementation of the drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 1.11.2019;
- (g) in relation to (f) above, the implemented drainage facilities shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) all screen planting including trees and shrubs within the site shall be maintained in good condition during the planning approval period;
- (i) 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 1.8.2019;
- (j) in relation to (i) 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 1.11.2019;
- (k) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (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; and
- (l) if any of the above planning conditions (e), (f), (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.”

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

Agenda Item 52

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/HSK/121 Proposed Temporary Open Storage of Construction Machinery and Construction Material for a Period of 3 Years in “Open Space” and “Residential (Group A) 2” Zones, Lots 111 (Part), 112 (Part), 113 (Part), 114 (Part), 132 (Part), 133 (Part) and 134 (Part) in D.D. 125, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/HSK/121)

Presentation and Question Sessions

189. Mr Simon P.H. Chan, STP/TMYLW, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary open storage of construction machinery and construction material 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 users immediately adjoining the site to the northeast 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, one public

comment from an individual was received objecting to the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD considered that the temporary use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. Whilst the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the “Residential (Group A)2” (“R(A)2”) and “Open Space” (“O”) zones, the implementation programme for this part of the Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area was still being formulated. Approval of the application for a period of three years would not jeopardise the long-term development of the site. The proposed use was also not incompatible with the surrounding land uses which were predominantly used for open storages, logistic centres and workshops. The applied use was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13E in that the site fell within Category 1 areas. Although DEP did not support the application, there was no substantive environmental complaint pertaining to the site in the past three years. Relevant approval conditions were recommended to mitigate any potential environmental impacts. Previous applications for similar open storage uses and similar applications within the same “R(A)2” and “O” zones were previously approved by the Committee. Approval of the current application was in line with the Committee's previous decisions. Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

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 1.2.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 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 or public holidays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no cutting, dismantling, cleansing, melting or any other workshop activity, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no vehicle is allowed queue back to public road or reverse onto/from the public road at all times during the planning approval period;
- (e) the existing fencing on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) the existing trees and landscape plants on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) no storage or stacking of materials within 1m of any tree at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) the submission of a condition record of existing drainage facilities within 3 months to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 1.5.2019;
- (i) the existing drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (j) the provision of the fire extinguisher(s) and the submission of a valid fire certificate (FS 251) within 6 weeks from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 15.3.2019;
- (k) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months to

the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 1.8.2019;

- (l) in relation to (k) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 9 months to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 1.11.2019;
- (m) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g) 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; and
- (n) if any of the above planning conditions (h), (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.”

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

Agenda Item 53

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/HSK/122 Temporary Open Storage of Construction Machinery and Materials, Scrap Metal and Used Electrical/Electronic Appliances and Parts with Ancillary Packaging Activities for a Period of 3 Years in “Government, Institution or Community”, “Open Space”, “Residential (Group A) 3” and “Residential (Group A) 4” Zones and an area shown as ‘Road’, Various Lots in D.D.125 and adjoining Government Land, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/HSK/122)

Presentation and Question Sessions

193. Mr Simon P.H. Chan, 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 construction machinery and materials, scrap metal and used electrical/electronic appliances and parts with ancillary packaging activities for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) did not support the application as there were sensitive receivers in the vicinity of the site. 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 views were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD considered that the temporary use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. Whilst the development was not in line with the planning intention of the “Residential (Group A)3” (“R(A)3”), “R(A)4”, “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) and “Open Space” (“O”) zones, the implementation programme for this part of the Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area was still being formulated. Approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardise the long-term development of the site. The proposed use was also not incompatible with the surrounding land uses which were predominantly used for open storage yards and workshops. The applied use was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13E in that the site fell within Category 1 areas. Although DEP did not support the application, there was no substantive environmental complaint pertaining to the site in the past three years. Relevant approval conditions

were recommended to mitigate any potential environmental impacts. Previous applications for the same applied use and similar applications within the same “R(A)3”, “R(A)4”, “G/IC” and “O” zones were previously approved by the Committee. Approval of the application was in line with the Committee’s previous decisions. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

194. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

195. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 1.2.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 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 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 the public road at all times during the planning approval period;
- (d) the existing fencing on the site should be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (e) all existing trees and landscape plants on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) no storage or stacking of materials within 1m of any tree at all times during the planning approval period;

- (g) 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 1.5.2019;
- (h) the existing drainage facilities shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (i) the provision of fire extinguisher(s) and the submission of a valid fire certificate (FS251) within 6 weeks from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 15.3.2019;
- (j) 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 1.8.2019;
- (k) in relation to (j) above, the implementation of 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 1.11.2019;
- (l) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f) or (h) is not complied with during the approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (m) if any of the above planning conditions (g), (i), (j) or (k) 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.”

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

Agenda Item 54

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/HSK/123 Temporary Open Storage of Construction Material and Ancillary Site Office for a Period of 3 Years in “Open Space” and “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Logistics Facility” Zones and an area shown as ‘Road’, Lots 1141 RP (Part), 1143 RP (Part), 1144 S.E (Part), 1144 S.F, 1144 RP (Part), 1145 (Part), 1146 (Part), 1149 (Part), 1152, 1153 (Part), 1155 (Part), 1156 (Part), 1157 (Part), 1158 (Part), 1159 (Part), 1160 (Part), 1161 (Part), 1162 (Part), 1163 (Part), 1164 (Part), 1197 (Part), 1198 (Part), 1199 S.B (Part), 1200 and 1201 (Part) in D.D.125, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/HSK/123)

Presentation and Question Sessions

197. Mr Simon P.H. Chan, 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 construction material and ancillary site 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 uses 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) no public comment was received during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD considered the temporary use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The site straddled “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Logistics Facility” (“OU(LF)”) and “Open Space” (“O”) zones and an area shown as ‘Road’. ‘Open Storage (not elsewhere specified)’ was an always permitted use in the “OU(LF)” zone whereas planning permission was required for such use in “O” zone and area shown as ‘Road’. Whilst the proposed use was not in line with the planning intention of the “O” zone, the implementation programme for this part of the Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area was still being formulated. Approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardise the long-term development of the site. The proposed use was also not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. The applied use was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guideline No. 13E in that the site fell mainly within Category 2 and partly within Category 1 areas. Although DEP did not support the application, there had not been any substantiated environmental complaint against the site over the past three years. Relevant approval conditions were recommended to mitigate any potential environmental impacts. Previous applications for open storage and port back-up uses at the site and similar applications within the same “OU(LF)” and “O” zones were previously approved by the Committee. Approval of the application was in line with the Committee’s previous decisions.

198. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

199. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 1.2.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 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) no cutting, dismantling, cleaning, repairing, compacting, vehicle repair or other workshop activity, 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 the public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the existing trees and landscape planting on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) the existing fencing on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) 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 1.5.2019;
- (h) the existing drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (i) 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 15.3.2019;
- (j) 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 1.8.2019;
- (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 1.11.2019;

- (l) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f) or (h) is not complied with during the approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (m) if any of the above planning conditions (g), (i), (j) or (k) 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.”

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

Agenda Item 55

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/HSK/124	Proposed Temporary Shop and Services (Retail Shop for Hardware Groceries) for a Period of 3 Years in “Government, Institution or Community” and “Residential (Group B) 3” Zones, Lots 2267(Part), 2268(Part), 2270 S.A RP(Part) and 4314(Part) in D.D.124, Hung Shui Kiu, Yuen Long (RNTPC Paper No. A/HSK/124)
-----------	--

Presentation and Question Sessions

201. Mr Simon P.H. Chan, 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 (retail shop for hardware groceries) 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, one public comment from an individual was received objecting to the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application on a temporary basis for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The site fell mostly within “Residential (Group B)3” (“R(B)3”) zone which was mainly to reflect the existing residential development in the area, with minor encroachment onto “Government, Institution or Community” zone. Approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardise the planning intention of the “R(B)3” zone. The proposed use and the development scale were not incompatible with the surrounding area which was predominantly residential use intermixed with a church, vacant land and some workshop/storage use. Concerned government departments had no objection to or adverse comments on the application. Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

202. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

203. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 1.2.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (b) 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 1.8.2019;
- (c) in relation to (b) 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 1.11.2019;
- (d) 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 1.8.2019;
- (e) in relation to (d) 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 1.11.2019;
- (f) in relation to (e) above, the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) if any of the above planning conditions (a) or (f) is not complied with during the approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (h) if any of the above planning conditions (b), (c), (d) or (e) 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.”

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

Agenda Item 56

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/HSK/126 Temporary Open Storage of Vehicles (Private Cars and Light Goods Vehicles), Container Vehicles and Trailers for a Period of 3 Years in “Government, Institution or Community” and “Open Space” and “Residential (Group A) 4” Zones, Lots 1922 RP (Part), 1923 (Part), 1925 (Part), 1926 (Part), 1928 (Part), 1929 (Part), 1930 (Part), 1931 RP (Part), 1932 (Part) and 1933 (Part) in D.D.125, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long (RNTPC Paper No. A/HSK/126)

Presentation and Question Sessions

205. Mr Simon P.H. Chan, 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 vehicles (private cars and light goods vehicles), container vehicles and trailers 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, one public comment from an individual was received objecting to the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD considered that the temporary use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. Whilst the applied use was not in line with the planning intention of “Residential (Group A)4”

("R(A)4"), "Open Space" ("O") and "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") zones, the implementation programme for this part of the Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area was still being formulated. Approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardise the long-term development of the site. The applied use was also not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. The proposed development was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13E in that the site fell within Category 1 areas. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application and approval conditions were recommended to address the technical concerns of relevant government departments. The Committee had approved previous planning applications for similar open storage uses at the site and similar applications in the same "R(A)4", "O" and "G/IC" zones. Approval of the application was in line with the Committee's previous decisions. Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

206. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

207. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 1.2.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) no operation from 8:00 p.m. to 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 cutting, dismantling, cleansing, repairing, paint-spraying and/or workshop activities, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed at any times

on the site during the planning approval period;

- (d) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from the public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the existing fencing on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) all existing trees and landscape plants on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) 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 1.5.2019;
- (h) the existing drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (i) 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 15.3.2019;
- (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 1.8.2019;
- (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 1.11.2019;
- (l) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f) or (h) is not complied with during the approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and

- (m) if any of the above planning conditions (g), (i), (j) or (k) 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.”

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

Agenda Item 57

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/HSK/127 Temporary Open Storage of Private Car and Ancillary Inspection Centre for a Period of 3 Years in “Open Space” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lots 2420 RP (Part), 2422 RP (Part), 2442 (Part) and 2443 RP (Part) in D.D.129 and Adjoining Government Land, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/HSK/127)

Presentation and Question Sessions

209. Mr Simon P.H. Chan, 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 private car and ancillary inspection centre 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 uses 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, one public comment from an individual was received objecting to the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD considered that the temporary use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. Whilst the applied use was not in line with the planning intentions of the “Open Space” (“O”) and “Village Type Development” (“V”) zones, the implementation programme for this part of the Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area was still being formulated. According to the District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, there was no small house application received/under processing at the site and in its vicinity. Approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardise the long-term development of the site. The applied use was not incompatible with the surrounding area predominantly occupied by open storage yards and logistics centres. The applied use was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13E in that a major portion of the site fell within Category 1 areas. For the portion that fell within Category 4 areas, there were previous planning approvals and all approval conditions had been complied with. Although DEP did not support the application, there was no substantiated environmental complaints pertaining to the site in the past three years. Approval conditions were recommended to minimise any potential environmental nuisances. The Committee had approved previous applications on the site and one similar application within the same “O” and “V” zones. Approval of the application was in line with the Committee's previous decisions. Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

210. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

211. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 1.2.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 7:00 p.m. to 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 stripping, cutting, cleansing, melting, dismantling works or other workshop activity, 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 the public road at any times during the planning approval period;
- (e) the existing fencing on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) the existing trees and landscape plants on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) 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 1.5.2019;
- (h) the existing drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (i) 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 15.3.2019;

- (j) 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 1.8.2019;
- (k) in relation to (j), the implementation of fire service installations proposals within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 1.11.2019;
- (l) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f) or (h) is not complied with during the approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (m) if any of the above planning conditions (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.”

212. 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 Ms Stella Y. Ng, Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee, Messrs Steven Y.H. Siu and Simon P.H. Chan, STPs/TMYLW, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 58

Any Other Business

213. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 5:15 p.m..