

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

**Minutes of 655th Meeting of the
Rural and New Town Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 15.9.2020**

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Chairman

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Vice-chairman

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr C.H. Hau

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Mr K.W. Leung

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr Conrad T.C. Wong

Mr Y.S. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West,
Transport Department
Mr B.K. Chow

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department
Mr Gavin C.T. Tse

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Strategic Assessment),
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Stanley C.F. Lau

Assistant Director/Regional 3,
Lands Department
Mr Alan K.L. Lo

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr L.T. Kwok

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms April K.Y. Kun

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Andrea W.Y. Yan

Opening Remarks

1. The Chairman said that the meeting would be conducted with video conferencing arrangement.

Agenda Item 1

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Sai Kung and Islands District

Agenda Item 2

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/I-LWKS/3

Application for Amendment to the Approved Luk Wu and Keung Shan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-LWKS/2, To rezone the application site from “Government, Institution or Community (1)” to “Government, Institution or Community (2)”, Lot 724 (part) in D.D. 311, Keung Shan, Lantau Island

(RNTPC Paper No. Y/I-LWKS/3A)

3. The Secretary reported that the application was for columbarium use and Mr K.K. Cheung had declared an interest on the item as his firm was the legal advisor of the Private Columbaria Licensing Board.
4. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr K.K. Cheung had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

5. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 13.7.2020 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 second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to address departmental comments.

6. 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 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 3

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/YL-NSW/5 Application for Amendment to the Approved Nam Sang Wai Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-NSW/8, To rezone the application site from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Comprehensive Development to include Wetland Restoration Area” to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Comprehensive Development to include Wetland Restoration Area 1”, Lot 1347 RP in D.D. 115, Nam Sang Wai, Yuen Long

(RNTPC Paper No. Y/YL-NSW/5)

7. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Hong Kong School of Motoring Yuen Long Driving School Limited, which was a subsidiary of Hong Kong School of Motoring Limited (HKSM), and Mott Macdonald Hong Kong Limited (MMHK) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr K.K. Cheung had declared interests on the item for having current business dealings with HKSM and MMHK.

8. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr K.K. Cheung had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

9. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 30.7.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for one month so as to allow time to await departmental comments and prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

Sai Kung and Islands District

[Mr Conrad T.C. Wong joined the meeting at this point.]

[Ms Jane W.L. Kwan, Senior Town Planner/Sai Kung and Islands (STP/SKIs), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 4

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/SK-HH/75 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in
 "Village Type Development" and "Green Belt" Zones, Lot 242 S.O in
 D.D.214, Nam Wai, Sai Kung
 (RNTPC Paper No. A/SK-HH/75)

Presentation and Question Sessions

11. Ms Jane W.L. Kwan, STP/SKIs, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;

- (b) the proposed house (New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) - Small

House);

- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 and Appendix V of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public comment from an individual raising concerns on the application was received. 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 application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. While the proposed Small House development was not in line with the planning intention of “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone, the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation had no comment on the application. Although land available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone was insufficient to fully meet the Small House demand of 167 Small Houses, it was capable to meet the 54 outstanding Small Houses applications. Given the adoption of a more cautious approach in considering applications for Small House development in recent years, 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 infrastructure and services. Nevertheless, majority of the site fell within the “V” zone and the footprint fell entirely within the ‘village environ’ of Nam Wai Village. As there was no change in planning circumstances since the previous application was approved (No. A/SK-HH/64, lapsed on 13.3.2019) and the applicant had applied for a Small House grant, sympathetic consideration might be given to the application. Moreover, the proposed development was not incompatible with the surroundings and relevant government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

12. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

13. 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 15.9.2024, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following condition:

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

14. 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 Jane W.L. Kwan, STP/SKIs, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

Sha Tin, Tai Po and North District

[Mr Tony Y.C. Wu and Mr Tim T.Y. Fung, Senior Town Planners/Shu Tin, Tai Po and North (STPs/STN), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-TK/680 Proposed Public Utility Installation (Solar Energy System) in
“Agriculture” Zone, Lot 637 S.A in D.D. 23, Po Sam Pai Village,
Shuen Wan, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TK/680A)

15. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 26.7.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time to prepare further information to address the departmental comments and liaise with CLP Power Hong Kong Limited under the ‘Renewal Energy Feed-in Tariff Scheme’. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

16. 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 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-KLH/588 Proposed Public Utility Installation (Solar Energy System) in
“Agriculture” Zone, Lots 325 S.B, 325 S.C, 325 S.D, 325 S.E and 325
RP in D.D. 9, Kau Lung Hang, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-KLH/588)

17. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 22.7.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time to modify or update his submission to address the Assessment Criteria for Considering Applications for Solar Photovoltaic System promulgated by the Town Planning Board recently. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

18. 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 (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-SSH/137 Proposed Public Utility Installation (Package Substation and Underground Cables) and Excavation of Land in “Coastal Protection Area” and “Conservation Area” Zones, Lots 686 (part) and 754 (part) in D.D. 209 and Adjoining Government Land, Kei Ling Ha Lo Wai, Shap Sz Heung, Sai Kung
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-SSH/137)

19. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by CLP Power Hong Kong Limited, which was a subsidiary of CLP Holdings Limited (CLP). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng | - | being the Director of the CLP Research Institute of CLP; |
| Mr Conrad T.C. Wong | - | having current business dealings with CLP; and |
| Mr K.K. Cheung | - | his firm having current business dealings with CLP. |

20. The Committee noted that Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng and Mr K.K. Cheung had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interest of Mr Conrad T.C. Wong was direct, the Committee agreed that he should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item.

[Mr Conrad T.C. Wong left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

21. 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 public utility installation (package substation and underground cables and excavation of land);
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one objecting public comment from Designing Hong Kong Limited was received. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 9 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 10 of the Paper. Although the proposed development was not in line with the planning intentions of the “Coastal Protection Area” and “Conservation Area” zones, the application was for the enhancement of the reliability of the electricity supply system to the nearby villages and could be considered as an essential infrastructure project. The development was small in scale and not entirely incompatible with the surroundings. The applicant had also undertaken a site selection exercise to demonstrate that no suitable government land was available in the nearby “Village Type Development” zone, which was technically feasible for the proposed development. In view of the nature and design of the proposed package substation and cables, no adverse impact on the surrounding areas was anticipated and all relevant government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

22. Noting the applicant's claim that the proposed development must fall on government land for meeting certain technical requirements, a Member asked the reason for

such claim. In response, Mr Tony Y.C. Wu, STP/STN, said that in general, such public utility installation on government land would be covered by a block licence, through which the Government could exercise control to ensure that the service provider would comply with the relevant technical requirements.

Deliberation Session

23. 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 15.9.2024, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following condition:

“the provision of water supplies for firefighting and fire services installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

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

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-TKL/634 Proposed Temporary Wholesale Trade with Ancillary Storage for a Period of 5 Years in “Open Storage” Zone, Lot 1224 (Part) in D.D. 79, Ng Chow Road, Ping Che
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TKL/634A)

25. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Ta Kwu Ling and Mr Conrad T.C. Wong had declared an interest on the item for being the director of Yau Lee Construction Company Limited which owned a piece of land in Ta Kwu Ling.

26. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration

of the application. As the property owned by the company of Mr Conrad T.C. Wong had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

27. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 31.8.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as 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 further information to address departmental comments.

28. 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.

[Mr Stephen L.H. Liu joined the meeting and Mr Conrad T.C. Wong returned to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-TKL/642 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Open Storage of Construction Materials, Equipment and Machineries with Ancillary Storage of Construction Equipment, Machineries, Tools and Site Office for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 1098 (Part), 1099 S.A (Part), 1099 S.B (Part), 1100, 1101 and 1105 S.A RP in D.D. 82 and Adjoining Government Land, Ping Che
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TKL/642)

29. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Ta Kwu Ling and Mr Conrad T.C. Wong had declared an interest on the item for being the director of Yau Lee Construction Company Limited which owned a piece of land in Ta Kwu Ling.

30. As the property owned by the company of Mr Conrad T.C. Wong had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

31. 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 renewal of planning approval for temporary open storage of construction materials, equipment and machineries with ancillary storage of construction equipment, machineries, tools and site office for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, seven public

comments were received. Among them, five comments from individuals supported the application while the Chairman of Sheung Shui District and an individual indicated no comment/provided views 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. While the applied use was not in line with the planning intention of the “Agricultural” (“AGR”) zone, the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation had no strong view against the application. Approval of the application on a temporary basis would not frustrate the long-term planning intention of the “AGR” zone. The application generally complied with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13F and 34C in that there were previous approvals for similar use at the application site, no major adverse departmental comment had been received, there had not been any material change in planning circumstances since the approval of the last application, all the approval conditions for the last application had been complied with and the approval period sought was not unreasonable. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

32. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

33. A Member raised concern on whether the continuation of the temporary open storage use at the application site, which was zoned “AGR”, for a prolonged period was appropriate.

34. The Committee noted that in order to prevent further uncontrolled sprawl of activities and minimise the adverse environmental impacts resulting from the brownfield operations, the TPB PG-No.13F was formulated with a view to channelling such operations to suitable sites. Although the applied use was not in line with the planning intention of the

“AGR” zone, the application site fell within Category 2 area under the TPB PG-No.13F, within which planning permission could be granted on a temporary basis. On the other hand, Members noted that the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department had commissioned a study on Agricultural Priority Area (APAs) to identify quality agricultural land and would make recommendations on the locations and scope of the APAs. The study would take about two to three years to complete. The study results might form the basis for reviewing the zonings of the agricultural land in the New Territories. Members in general considered that the application could be supported.

35. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 15.9.2023, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 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) all vehicles entering and exiting the site during the planning approval period shall be restricted to non-peak hours (i.e. from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. on Mondays to Saturdays (excluding Sundays and Public Holidays)), as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (d) the existing drainage facilities implemented under application No. A/NE-TKL/555 on the site should be maintained properly at all times during the planning approval period;
- (e) the submission of a record of 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 15.12.2020;

- (f) the provision of fire extinguisher(s) within 6 weeks from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 27.10.2020;
- (g) the submission of proposals for water supplies for firefighting and fire service installations within 6 months from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 15.3.2021;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the provision of water supplies for firefighting and fire service installations within 9 months from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 15.6.2021;
- (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.”

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

Agenda Item 10

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/ST/980 Columbarium in “Government, Institution or Community” Zone, No.
221 Pai Tau Village, Sha Tin
(RNTPC Paper No. A/ST/980A)

37. The Secretary reported that the application was for columbarium use and Mr K.K. Cheung had declared an interest on the item as his firm was the legal advisor of the Private Columbaria Licensing Board.

38. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr K.K. Cheung had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

39. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 8.9.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for preparation of further information to address departmental and public comments. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information including revised technical assessments to address departmental comments.

40. 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.

[The Chairman thanked Mr Tony Y.C. Wu and Mr Tim T.Y. Fung, 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 11

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/FSS/276 Proposed House and Social Welfare Facility (Residential Care Home for the Elderly) and Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction in “Village Type Development” Zone, Various Lots in D.D. 51, Fanling
(RNTPC Paper No. A/FSS/276A)

41. The Committee noted that the applicants' representative requested on 24.7.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for preparation of further information to address comments from the Transport Department and Environmental Protection Department. It was the second time that the applicants requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicants had submitted further information to address departmental comments.

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

applicants that 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 12

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/KTN/71 Proposed Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Hobby Farm) for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture(1)” Zone, Lots 1348RP in D.D.95, Kwu Tung North
(RNTPC Paper No. A/KTN/71)

43. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Kwu Tung North and Dr C.H. Hau had declared an interest on the item for owning a property in Kwu Tung North.

44. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Dr C.H. Hau had yet to join the meeting.

45. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 31.8.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time preparation of further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

46. 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 13

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-KTN/678 Proposed Temporary Shop and Services (Retail of Forklift) for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 484 (Part), 486 (Part), 487 (Part), 488, 489 (Part), 490 and 1643 (Part) in D.D. 107, Fung Kat Heung, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTN/678C)

47. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Harvest Hill (Hong Kong) Limited and Mr K.K. Cheung had declared an interest on the item as his firm had current business dealings with Harvest Hill (Hong Kong) Limited.

48. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr K.K. Cheung had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

49. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 18.8.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for preparation of further information to address further comments from the Drainage Services Department. It was the fourth time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to address departmental comments.

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

Agenda Item 14

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-KTN/679 Proposed Temporary Shop and Services (Selling of Hardware Accessories) for a Period of 3 Years in "Agriculture" and "Village Type Development" Zones, Lots 1674 (Part), 1676 (Part), 1680 (Part), 1681, 1682, 1683 and 1684 in D.D.107, Fung Kat Heung, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTN/679C)

51. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Harvest Hill (Hong Kong) Limited and Mr K.K. Cheung had declared an interest on the item as his firm had current business dealings with Harvest Hill (Hong Kong) Limited.

52. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr K.K. Cheung had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

53. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 18.8.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for preparation of further information to address further comments from the Drainage Services Department. It was the fourth time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to address departmental comments.

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

Agenda Item 15

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTN/718 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Shop and Services (Wheelchair Accessible Vehicles Showroom) for a Period of 3 Years in "Village Type Development" Zone, Lots 232 S.B ss.9 and 232 S.B RP (Part) in D.D.103, Ko Po Tsuen, Kam Tin, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTN/718)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the renewal of planning approval for temporary shop and services (wheelchair accessible vehicles showroom) for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public comment raising queries on the application from an individual was received. 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 application 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 Lands Department advised that there was no Small House application approved or under processing at the application site. It was considered that temporary approval of the application would not frustrate the long-term planning intention of the “V” zone. The applied use with a single storey structure was considered not incompatible with the surrounding area. The application was in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 34C in that all approval conditions of the last approved application (No. A/YL-KTN/574) had been complied with, the current application was largely the same as the last approved application (except with an increase in building height from 3.5m to 4m (+0.5m/+12.5%) to accommodate a large signboard) and there was no major change in planning circumstances since the last approval. Relevant government departments had no adverse comment on the application. To minimise the possible environmental nuisance, appropriate approval conditions were recommended. Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

56. Noting that there was an existing signboard at the application site, a Member asked whether it was an illuminated signboard which might cause light pollution. With reference to Plan A-4 of the Paper, Ms Ivy C.W. Wong, STP/FSYLE, said that it was unlikely an illuminated signboard.

57. Another Member further asked if there was any control on the use of illuminated signboard. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Stanley C.F. Lau, Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Strategic Assessment), Environmental Protection Department, said that

the Environment Bureau had launched the “Charter on External Lighting” (the Charter) in order to encourage different parties to take measures to minimise light nuisance, but the Charter was not a regulatory instrument.

Deliberation Session

58. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years and be renewed from 23.9.2020 to 22.9.2023, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 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 or heavy goods vehicles exceeding 5.5 tonnes, including container tractors/trailers, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road 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 record 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 23.12.2020;
- (f) the existing fire service installations implemented on the site shall be maintained in efficient working order at all times during the planning approval period;

- (g) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d) 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
- (h) if the above planning condition (e) 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.”

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

Agenda Item 16

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTS/851 Temporary Shop and Services for a Period of 3 Years in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Rural Use” Zone, Lots 565 (Part), 566 (Part), 613 (Part) and 616 RP (Part) in D.D. 106 and Adjoining Government Land, Ng Ka Tsuen, Kam Sheung Road, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTS/851)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the temporary shop and services for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public comment objecting to the application was received from an individual. Major objecting grounds were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The applied use was not entirely in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Rural Use” (“OU(RU)”) zone. Nevertheless, there was no known development programme for the application site. It was considered that the approval of the application on a temporary basis would not frustrate the long-term planning intention of the “OU(RU)” zone. The development was considered not incompatible with the surroundings. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. To minimise the possible environmental nuisance, appropriate approval conditions were recommended. Compared with the last approved application (No. A/YL-KTS/718) at the application site, the current application covered a larger site area. There was also a similar application adjacent to the application site for the same use approved by the Committee. Approval of the application was in line with the Committee's previous decision. Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

61. Noting that all the approval conditions of the last approved application (No. A/YL-KTS/718) had been complied with and the applicant claimed that the current application involved an increase in site area to reflect the existing situation at the application site, a Member enquired whether there was any intensification of use at the application site since the last planning permission lapsed on 24.12.2019. With reference to Plan A-1b of the Paper, Ms Ivy C.W. Wong, STP/FSYLE, said that as compared with the last application, the current application covered a larger site area with an increase in number of structures and floor area, which was submitted by a different applicant to regularise the use at the application site.

Deliberation Session

62. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 15.9.2023, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 9:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no medium or heavy goods vehicles exceeding 5.5 tonnes, including container tractors/trailers, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) 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 15.3.2021;
- (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 15.6.2021;
- (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) 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 15.3.2021;
- (h) in relation to (g) 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 15.6.2021;

- (i) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c) 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
- (j) if any of the above planning conditions (d), (e), (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.”

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

Agenda Item 17

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTS/852 Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Private Cars Only) for a Period of 3 Years and Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 288 RP (Part) in D.D. 106, Kam Po Road, Shek Wu Tong, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTS/852)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary public vehicle park (private cars only) for a period of three years and filling of land;

- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, five objecting public comments from the World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong, Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation, Designing Hong Kong Limited, Hong Kong Bird Watching Society and an individual were received. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed use was not in line with the planning intention of the “Agricultural” (“AGR”) zone, and the Director of Agricultural, Fisheries and Conservation did not support the application as the application site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation. There was no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD considered that the proposed development was not entirely compatible with the landscape character of the area within the “AGR” zone and approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for landscape character alteration, and would encourage other similar developments within the “AGR” zone. There was no previous application at the application site or similar applications within the same “AGR” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would result in a general degradation of the rural environment of the area. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

65. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

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

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone which is primarily to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes. This zone is also intended to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. No strong planning justification has been given in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis; and
- (b) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the “AGR” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would result in a general degradation of the rural environment of the area.”

Agenda Item 18

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-MP/295 Temporary Shop and Services (Real Estate Agency) for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group C)” Zone, Lot 3250 S.B ss.48 in D.D. 104 and Adjoining Government Land, Mai Po, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-MP/295)

67. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Mai Po and Mr K.W. Leung had declared an interest on the item for owning a property in Fairview Park, Mai Po.

68. As the property of Mr K.W. Leung had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

69. 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 shop and services (real estate agency) for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, two objecting public comments from a Yuen Long District Council member and an individual were received. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The 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 as there was no immediate permanent development proposal at the application site. Given the small scale and nature of the applied use, it was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. Although the application site fell within the Wetland Buffer Area of the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 12C, the guidelines also specified that planning applications for temporary uses were exempted from the requirement of ecological impact assessment. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. To minimise the possible environmental nuisance and address the technical requirements of concerned government departments, appropriate approval conditions were recommended. The application site was the subject of a previous approved application for the same use and there were approved similar applications within the same “R(C)” zone. Approval of the application was in line with the Committee’s previous decisions. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments

and planning assessments above were relevant.

70. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

71. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 15.9.2023, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 8:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) only private cars, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance, are allowed to enter/park at the site at all times during the planning approval period;
- (c) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from the site at all times during the planning approval period;
- (d) the provision of boundary fencing 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 15.3.2021;
- (e) 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 15.3.2021;
- (f) in relation to (e) above, the implementation of the drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Service or of the TPB by 15.6.2021;
- (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 a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 15.3.2021;
- (i) in relation to (h) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 15.6.2021;
- (j) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c) 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 (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.”

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

Agenda Item 19

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-NTM/405 Proposed Public Utility Installation (Solar Energy System) in “Green Belt” Zone, Lots 2161 and 2163 (Part) in D.D. 102, Ngau Tam Mei, Yuen Long

(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-NTM/405)

Presentation and Question Sessions

73. 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 public utility installation (solar energy system);
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, six objecting public comments from the San Tin Rural Committee, Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation, Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong, Designing Hong Kong Limited and an individual were received. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 12 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 13 of the Paper. The proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone and no strong justification had been given in the submission for a departure from the planning intention. The proposed development with 338 solar panels covering about 50% of the application site was rather massive in scale and was considered not compatible with the scale of the development in the surroundings. The application was not in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 (TPB PG-No. 10) in that the proposed development would affect the existing natural landscape and cause adverse visual impact on the surrounding environment. The proposed use was not in line with the assessment criteria for considering applications for solar photovoltaic system in that the applicant had not yet obtained CLP Power Hong Kong Limited (CLP)'s Acknowledgement Letter to demonstrate the technical feasibility of the scheme, there were adverse comments from relevant government departments on visual and landscape aspects and the applicant failed to demonstrate that the proposed use would not adversely affect the landscape character/resources of the “GB” zone and jeopardise the integrity of the “GB” zone as a buffer.

There was no similar application for the solar energy system within the “GB” zone on the concerned Outline Zoning Plan. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

74. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

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

- “(a) the development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone, which is to define the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There is a general presumption against development within this zone. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention;
- (b) the development is not in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 on ‘Application for Development within the Green Belt zone under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’ in that the proposed development is incompatible with the surrounding area and would affect the existing natural landscape and causes adverse visual impact on the surrounding environment; and
- (c) the proposed use is not in line with the assessment criteria for considering applications for solar photovoltaic system in that the applicant has yet to obtain CLP Power Hong Kong Limited’s acknowledgement letter, there are adverse comments from relevant government departments on visual and landscape aspects, and the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed use would not adversely affect the landscape character/resources of the “GB” zone and jeopardise the integrity of the zone as a buffer.”

Agenda Item 20

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-ST/575 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Vehicle Park (including Container Vehicles), Container Storage Area, Storage of New Unlicensed Container Tractors, Storage of Construction Materials, Tyre Repair, Shop and Services (Sale of Container Vehicles and the Related Parts/Accessories), Vehicle Repair and Services, and Ancillary Offices for a Period of 3 Years in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Service Stations” Zone, Lots 372 S.D RP (Part), 743 RP (Part) and 744 RP (Part) in D.D. 99 and Adjoining Government Land, San Tin, Yuen Long

(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-ST/575)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the renewal of planning approval for temporary vehicle park (including container vehicles), container storage area, storage of new unlicensed container tractors, storage of construction materials, tyre repair, shop and services (sale of container vehicles and the related parts/accessories), vehicle repair and services, and ancillary offices for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, two objecting public comments from the San Tin Rural Committee and an individual were received. Major objection grounds were set out in

paragraph 11 of the Paper; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD considered that the applied use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The supporting facilities to the cross-boundary activities at Lok Ma Chau was in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Service Stations” (“OU(SS)”) zone. As there was no immediate proposal for a permanent development at the concerned part of the “OU(SS)” zone, approval of the application on a temporary basis could be tolerated and would not frustrate the long-term planning intention of the “OU(SS)” zone. Besides, the applied use was not incompatible with the surroundings. The application was in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 34C and 13F. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. To mitigate any potential environmental nuisance and address the technical requirements of concerned government departments, appropriate approval conditions were recommended. Approval of the application was in line with the Committee's previous decisions. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

77. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

78. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 15.9.2023, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 11:00 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 between 8:00 a.m. and 10:00 a.m. and between 5:00 p.m. and

11:00pm on Sundays and public holidays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;

- (c) the containers stacked within 5m of the periphery of the site shall not exceed the height of the boundary fence at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) the stacking height of containers stored at any other location within the site shall not exceed 8 units at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the existing boundary fencing and paving on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) a vehicular access/run-in between the site and Tun Yu Road shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (h) the existing trees and vegetation on the site should 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 an as-built drainage plan and photographic records of the existing drainage facilities 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 15.12.2020;
- (k) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 15.3.2021;

- (l) in relation to (k) above, the implementation of the 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 15.6.2021;
- (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.”

79. 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

[Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, Ms Stella Y. Ng and Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, Senior Town Planners/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (STPs/TMYLW) and Mr Kris W.K. Leung, Town Planner/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (TP/TMYLW), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 21

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/TM-LTY Y/402 Temporary Storage of Vehicle Parts and Accessories for a Period of 3 Years in “Green Belt” Zone, Lot 2407 S.B in D.D. 130, Tsoi Yuen Tsuen, Tat Fuk Road, Nai Wai, Tuen Mun
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TM-LTY Y/402)

80. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 16.7.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for preparation of further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

81. 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 22

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/HSK/233 Proposed Temporary Shops and Services for a Period of 3 Years in
“Government, Institution or Community” and “Village Type
Development” Zones, Lot 121 (Part) in D.D. 128, Ha Tsuen, Yuen
Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/HSK/233)

Presentation and Question Sessions

82. Mr Kris W.K. Leung, TP/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 for period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public comment from an individual providing views on the application was received. 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 based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Whilst the applied development was not in line with the planning intentions of the “Village Type Development” (“V”) and “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zones, the implementation programme for the concerned part of the New Development Area was still being formulated, and the Project Manager (West), Civil Engineering and Development Department had no objection to the temporary use at the application site. The District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department advised that

there was no Small House application approved or under processing for the application site. In that regard, approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardise the long-term development of the application site. While the proposed development was not entirely compatible with the surroundings, it was of small scale. Significant environmental impacts on the surrounding area were not anticipated. There had not been any environmental complaint pertaining to the application site in the past three years and concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Relevant approval conditions had been recommended to address the possible environmental nuisances and the technical requirements of concerned government departments. Whilst one similar application within the same “G/IC” zone was rejected by the Committee, the subject application site fell mainly within the “V” zone and the proposed development was of small scale and could serve the needs of the nearby villagers. Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

83. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

84. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 15.9.2023, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 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 workshop activity, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;

- (d) 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 15.3.2021;
- (e) in relation to (d) 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 15.6.2021;
- (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) 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 15.3.2021;
- (h) in relation to (g) 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 15.6.2021;
- (i) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c) 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
- (j) if any of the above planning conditions (d), (e), (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.”

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

Agenda Item 23

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TM/545 Proposed Columbarium in “Government, Institution or Community”
Zone, Lot 513 in D.D. 131, Tsing Shan Tsuen, Tuen Mun
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TM/545D)

86. The Secretary reported that the application was for columbarium use and Mr K.K. Cheung had declared an interest on the item as his firm was the legal advisor of the Private Columbaria Licensing Board.

87. The Committee noted that Mr K.K. Cheung had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

88. With the aid of the PowerPoint presentation, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, STP/TMYLW, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed columbarium;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication periods, a total of 190 public comments were received. Among them, 184 comments from three former/current Tuen Mun District Council members, Incorporated Owners of Riche House, village representative (VR) of Tsing Shan Tsuen, the Alliance for the Concern over Columbarium Policy, residents of Lung Mun Oasis and individuals objected to the application. The remaining six comments from the VR of Yeung Siu Hang Tsuen and individuals

expressed concerns on the application or did not specify any views or comments. Major views 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. Whilst the proposed columbarium use was not incompatible with the religious uses and government, institution or community facilities in the surrounding areas, the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) considered that the cumulative traffic impact had not been properly assessed and the feasibility of the shuttle bus services proposed by the applicant was in doubt. In that regard, C for T did not agree with the conclusion of the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) that the proposed columbarium would not have adverse traffic impact on the surrounding road network. The Commissioner of Police also raised queries on the details of the proposed shuttle bus services. Besides, the proposed columbarium did not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 16 in that the applicant failed to demonstrate the proposed development would not cause adverse impact on the surroundings and failed to provide adequate vehicular access arrangement. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

[Dr C.H. Hau joined the meeting at this point.]

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

Traffic Aspect

- (a) the difference between the current application and the approved similar applications in the vicinity in terms of traffic impacts;
- (b) the existing condition of the local road connecting the application site and Wan Shan Road;

- (c) noting that the proposed number of niches was 3,066, why the proposed traffic/crowd management measures were not feasible;
- (d) noting that C for T was doubtful on the feasibility of operating the shuttle bus services on the narrow local track, whether it would be feasible to use shuttle buses with smaller size;
- (e) whether the comments from C for T had been sent to the applicant and whether the applicant had been given a chance to address C for T's comments;

Surrounding Columbarium Developments

- (f) whether the religious institutions namely 大雄精舍, 圓融精舍, 妙宗寺 and the temple and columbarium development to the west and south-west of the application site (Plan A-2 of the Paper) were the subjects of previous planning applications for columbarium use;
- (g) the approved/rejected/under-processing applications for columbarium use in the vicinity of the application site;
- (h) the main rejection ground of the three rejected applications (No. A/TM/434, 465 and 531);

Others

- (i) whether other concerned departments had adverse comments on the application; and
- (j) without a planning approval, whether the proposed columbarium use could obtain a licence under the Private Columbaria Ordinance (PCO).

90. In response, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, made the following main points:

Traffic Aspect

- (a) to the east of the application site were two columbaria namely Filial Park (思親公園) (applications No. A/TM/373 and 527) and Sha Law Ching Shea (娑羅精舍) (application No. A/TM/537), which were accessible via Yeung Tsing Road. During the course of processing the planning applications, C for T had no objection to those applications as their TIAs submitted had taken into account the cumulative traffic impacts arising from the approved and planned columbaria in the vicinity and appropriate mitigation measures had been proposed by the applicants to address the potential traffic impacts. As for the current application, the application site was only accessible by a local road (with some sections of 2m to 3m wide only) connecting to Wan Shan Road and the cumulative traffic impacts had not been properly assessed;
- (b) as shown on site photos No. 7 and 8 on Plan A-4b of the Paper, the local road including its junction with Wan Shan Road was narrow;
- (c) one of the proposed traffic management measures proposed by the applicant was the shuttle bus services. C for T advised that some sections of Wan Shan Road and the local road connecting to the application site were sub-standard and cast doubt on its feasibility to support the two-way shuttle bus services, which would pose traffic and pedestrian safety concerns;
- (d) both C for T and C of P raised queries on the details of the shuttle bus services, such as the number/frequency of shuttle buses, shuttle bus routes and location of pick-up/drop-off points. However, the applicant did not provide the required information for their consideration;
- (e) the comments from C for T had been sent to the applicant. In response, the applicant had submitted further information including revised TIA with a view to addressing the traffic concerns;

Surrounding Columbarium Developments

- (f) 大雄精舍, 圓融精舍, 妙宗寺 were not the subjects of any planning applications for columbarium use while the temple and columbarium development (namely Lin Chi Ching Yuen (蓮池淨苑)), being located to the further southwest of the application site, was the subject of a rejected application (No. A/TM/465) and a new application (No. A/TM/541) which was being processed;
- (g) there were five approved columbaria (Filial Park ((思親公園)) (applications No. A/TM/255, 306, 316, 373 and 527 for additional niches), Fat Yuen Ching Shea (佛緣精舍) (application No. A/TM/398), Shan Yuan (善緣) (applications No. A/TM/387 and 437), Shan Guo (善果) (application No. A/TM/441) and Sha Law Ching Shea (娑羅精舍) (application No. A/TM/537)); three rejected columbaria (Sin Sum Tong (善心堂) (application No. A/TM/434), Lin Chi Ching Yuen (蓮池淨苑) (application No. A/TM/465) and a site located to the east of Yeung Ching Road (application No. A/TM/531)); and an application for columbarium use (a new application for Lin Chi Ching Yuen (蓮池淨苑) (No. A/TM/541)) which was under processing;
- (h) the three applications (No. A/TM/434, 465 and 531) were rejected mainly on the ground that the applicants failed to demonstrate that the pedestrian and vehicular traffic impacts could be satisfactorily addressed;

Others

- (i) other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application; and
- (j) under the PCO, any private columbarium which applied for a licence must comply with the planning-related requirements and other requirements prescribed in the PCO.

91. Regarding the local road leading to the application site, Mr B.K. Chow, Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West, Transport Department (CTE/NTW, TD), supplemented that the local single track road was narrow in width and with steep gradient, in particular for the section near the application site. Besides, the local road was shared by vehicles and pedestrians, in which there would be traffic and pedestrian safety concern for operation of the shuttle bus services.

Deliberation Session

92. The Committee noted that there were a total of 15 planning applications for columbarium use within the same “Government, Institution or Community” zone of the current application. Amongst the applications, ten of them relating to five columbaria were approved; four of them were rejected and the remaining one was being processed. The Secretary said that after the enactment of PCO on 30.6.2017, 19 s.12A applications (12 nos. being processed and 7 nos. rejected) and 14 s.16 applications (6 nos. being processed; 4 nos. approved and 4 nos. rejected) for columbarium uses were received.

93. Noting that PlanD did not support the application based on the reason that the applicant failed to demonstrate that the proposed columbarium development would not result in adverse impacts on traffic and pedestrian circulation safety, a Member opined that sympathetic consideration should be given to the application if the traffic issues could be resolved through the implementation of appropriate mitigation/management measures. If the provision of shuttle bus services was not feasible, the applicant could propose other appropriate mitigation/management measures.

94. Given that the proposed development could help relieve the urgent demand for columbarium niches in Hong Kong and the potential traffic impacts could probably be addressed by appropriate mitigation/management measures such as use of smaller shuttle buses, two Members shared the view that sympathetic consideration could be given to the application.

95. The Chairman drew Members’ attention to that (i) the current application was for a new columbarium; and (ii) the approved columbaria in the vicinity of the application site

were accessible via Yeung Tsing Road but the proposed columbarium under the current application was only accessible via a sub-standard local road with some narrow sections.

96. Some Members considered that the application should not be supported as the traffic impacts arising from the proposed development had not been satisfactorily addressed. A Member also pointed out that approval of the current application was not in line with the Committee's previous decisions as planning permission would generally be granted only for those applications subject to no adverse departmental comment or outstanding technical/management issues could be addressed through imposition of approval conditions. Besides, if the Committee decided to reject the application, the applicant could apply for a review under s.17 of the Town Planning Ordinance or submit a fresh application with a revised TIA to address TD's comments by assessing the cumulative traffic impact of the approved/planned columbaria in the vicinity and proposing practical traffic management measures. Mr B.K. Chow, CTE/NTW, TD, supplemented that, as a general practice, applicants could always submit revised TIAs to address their concerns during the course of processing planning applications.

97. While not supporting the application, a few Members considered that if the outstanding traffic issues arising from the proposed development could be satisfactorily addressed, approval could be granted to meet the surging demand for columbarium niches. The message could be conveyed to the applicant.

98. Although there were similar applications in the vicinity of the application site which were approved by the Committee, some Members considered that the circumstances of the approved applications were different from those of the current application as the sites of the approved applications could be accessible via a standard road and TD had no adverse comment on the applications.

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

“the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed columbarium development would not result in adverse impacts on traffic and pedestrian circulation as well as pedestrian safety in the area.”

Agenda Item 24

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TM-SKW/106 Proposed Excavation of Land (for Ground Investigation Works for Natural Terrain Hazard Study) in “Green Belt” Zone, Government Land in Tai Lam Chung, Tuen Mun
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TM-SKW/106A)

100. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Host Duty Limited, which was a subsidiary of Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (SHK). Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Limited (LD) and AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) were the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Miss Winnie W.M. Ng | - | being a Director of the Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited (KMB) and SHK was one of the shareholders of KMB; |
| Mr K.K. Cheung | - | his firm having current business dealings with SHK; |
| Mr Conrad T.C. Wong | - | having current business dealings with SHK; |
| Dr C.H. Hau | - | having past business dealings with AECOM; and |
| Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu | - | having past business dealings with LD. |

101. The Committee noted that Messrs K.K. Cheung and Ricky W.Y. Yu had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interests of Miss Winnie W.M. Ng and Mr Conrad T.C. Wong were direct, the Committee agreed that they should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. As Dr C.H. Hau had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng and Mr Conrad T.C. Wong left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

102. Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, STP/TMYLW, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed excavation of land (for ground investigation works for natural terrain hazard study);
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, seven public comments from the Tuen Mun Rural Committee, village representatives of Tai Lam Chung Tsuen, Hong Kong Bird Watching Society and an individual objecting to or expressing concerns on the application were received. 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 application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The proposed excavation of land for ground investigation works in relation to an approved comprehensive residential development to the west of the application site was not in conflict with the planning intention of “Green Belt” zone and the Head of the Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department had no adverse comment on the application from geotechnical point of view. Moreover, only minor vegetation clearance and trimming might be required and the applicant would backfill the excavated area and reinstate the land with replanting with shrub species. In that regard, the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD had no objection to the application. While the application site was in close proximity to the Tai Lam Country Park and the

Permitted Burial Ground, the applicant had confirmed that all the ground investigation works fell outside the boundary of the above-mentioned areas. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

103. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

104. 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 15.9.2024, 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.

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

Agenda Item 25

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL/261	Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Social Welfare Facilities (Residential Care Home for the Elderly) in “Government, Institution or Community (1)” Zone, Lot 1846 RP (Part) in D.D. 120 and Adjoining Government Land, Ma Tin Pok, Yuen Long (RNTPC Paper No. A/YL/261A)
----------	---

Presentation and Question Sessions

106. 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 minor relaxation of building height (BH) restriction for permitted social welfare facility (residential care home for the elderly (RCHE));
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication periods, a total of 31 public comments were received. Among them, 23 comments from individuals supported the application while the remaining eight comments from the Ma Tin Pok Tsuen Mutual Aid Committee, Shap Pat Heung Rural Committee, village representatives of Ma Tin Tsuen and Lung Tin Tsuen, villagers of Ma Tin Pok Tsuen and individuals objected 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 based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed RCHE was in line with the planning intention of the “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zone and not incompatible with the surrounding areas. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD considered that the applicant had demonstrated design merits to justify the proposed BH which included green building design concepts and oval-shaped building form, landscape treatment at different levels of the proposed development and setback aiming to minimise building hardlines and enhance visual amenity. The proposed development generally complied with the criteria for consideration of BH relaxation in the Explanatory Statement of the concerned Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments

and planning assessments above were relevant.

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng and Mr Conrad T.C. Wong returned to join the meeting during the presentation.]

107. Three Members raised the following questions:

- (a) noting the applicant's claim that without the relaxation of BH restriction from 3 storeys to 5 storeys, the RCHE development would not be viable from financial and long-term operation and management terms, whether the applicant had provided any information to substantiate such claim;
- (b) the difference between the OZP compliance scheme and the current scheme in terms of number of RCHE beds;
- (c) the scale of the developments in the vicinity of the application site;
- (d) the scale of the proposed development as shown in the photomontage submitted by the applicant (Drawing A-16 of the Paper);
- (e) whether there was any restriction on the gross floor area (GFA)/plot ratio (PR) in the subject "G/IC(1)" zone; and
- (f) whether there were any criteria in determining the extent of minor relaxation of BH restriction.

108. In response, Ms Stella Y. Ng, STP/TMYLW, made the following main points:

- (a) the applicant did not provide detailed information on why the OZP compliance scheme was not viable from financial and long-term operation and management terms in the submission;
- (b) based on the information provided by the applicant, the OZP compliance scheme with a total GFA of about 2,053m² would provide about 97 beds

while the proposed scheme with a total GFA of about 3,584m² would provide 219 beds involving additional 122 beds;

- (c) to the immediate west of the application site was a planned youth hostel falling within “G/IC(5)” zone with a PR of about 5.53 and a BH of 26 storey over 1 level of basement (91.6mPD), which would provide about 1,248 hostel units, and to its further east were some medium-rise residential developments namely Sereno Verde and The Reach with a BH ranging from 14 storeys to 25 storeys (51mPD to 90mPD);
- (d) the photomontage submitted by the applicant was to show the visual relationship between the planned youth hostel and the proposed development. Having considered the BH of the youth hostel development and the developments in the vicinity of the application site, the proposed development was considered not incompatible;
- (e) according to the Notes of the OZP, the subject “G/IC(1)” zone was restricted to a maximum BH of 3 storeys (or 8 storeys for ‘School’ and ‘Hospital’) excluding basement(s). There was no restriction on the maximum GFA/PR; and
- (f) there was no absolute figure adopted by the Town Planning Board (the Board) in determining whether the proposed relaxation of BH restriction could be considered as ‘minor’.

109. Regarding the definition of ‘minor relaxation’ of BH restriction in planning terms, the Secretary supplemented that according to legal advice sought, the extent of ‘minor relaxation’ of development restriction would be a matter of ‘fact and degree’ and each application should be considered on a case-by-case basis. According to past practice, the Board had taken a flexible approach in considering applications for minor relaxation of BH restriction, especially for cases concerning restriction on number of storeys for low-rise developments.

110. Noting that the applicant was a private organisation, a Member asked whether GIC facilities to be operated by profit-making organisations were permitted in the “G/IC” zone. In response, the Secretary said that in general, the land use zonings were to regulate the land uses in the area but not the operation mode of the facilities. As for the current application, the proposed RCHE would be subject to the licensing requirements for RCHE administrated by the Social Welfare Department.

111. Some Members supported the application as the proposed development would help meet the pressing demand of elderly facilities and significant visual impact arising from the proposed RCHE was not anticipated. While supporting the application, a Member opined that as part of the application site (about 25%) fell on government land, and there was no GFA/PR restriction on the subject “G/IC(1)” zone, the application site could have been better utilised by a further increase in the BH noting that the BH of the planned development to its immediate west and some existing developments in the area were relatively high. Other Members in general considered that the proposed BH was appropriate, taking into account the local context and potential visual impact.

112. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 15.9.2024, 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 design and associated construction works of the roadwork modification, vehicular access and run-in/out proposal, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Director of Highways and the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission of an updated noise impact assessment report and provision of noise mitigation measures to the satisfaction of Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (c) the provision of fire services installations and water supplies for firefighting

to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB; and

- (d) the submission and implementation of a detailed drainage proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.”

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

Agenda Item 26

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TT/500 Proposed Temporary Open Storage of Construction Materials and Ancillary Car Park for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 1680 in D. D. 118, Tai Tong, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TT/500)

Presentation and Question Sessions

114. 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 and ancillary car park for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, ten public comments objecting to the application from the World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong, Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation, Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, Designing Hong Kong Limited and

individuals were received. 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 development was not in line with the planning intention of the “Agricultural” (“AGR”) zone and the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) did not support the application as the application site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation and could be used for agricultural activities. No strong planning justification had been provided in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis. Whilst the proposed development was not entirely incompatible with the surroundings, the application was not in line with Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13F in that no previous approval for similar uses had been granted to the application site, there were insufficient information that the proposed development would not cause adverse traffic impact on the surroundings, and there were adverse comments from DAFC and reservation from the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD. There was one previous application at the application site and nine similar applications in the same “AGR” zone which were all rejected by the Committee. Rejecting the current application was generally in line with Committee's previous decisions. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

115. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

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

- “(a) the applied use is not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone which is intended primarily to retain and

safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes, and to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. No strong planning justification has been given in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis;

- (b) the development is not in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13F on “Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses” in that no previous approval has been granted to the site and there are adverse departmental comments and local objections; and
- (c) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the “AGR” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would result in a general degradation of the rural environment of the area.”

Agenda Item 27

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TT/501 Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (excluding container vehicle) for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group C)” Zone, Lots 953 and 959 in D. D. 115, Castle Peak Road, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TT/501)

Presentation and Question Sessions

117. 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 (excluding container vehicle)

for a period of three years;

- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one objecting public comment from an individual was received. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Although the proposed development was not entirely in line with the planning intention of “Residential (Group C)” zone, it could help meet the demand for parking in the area. As there was no known development programme concerning the application site, approval of the application on a temporary basis would not frustrate the long-term planning intention of the area. The proposed use was considered not incompatible with the surroundings. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Relevant approval conditions were recommended to address the technical requirements of concerned government departments. Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

118. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

119. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 15.9.2023, 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, are allowed to enter/be parked on the site, as proposed by the applicant, at any time during the planning approval period;

- (b) a notice should 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, are allowed to be parked on the site, as proposed by the applicant, at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) no vehicle without valid licences issued under the Road Traffic Ordinance is allowed to be parked/stored on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no open storage, 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;
- (e) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (f) the provision of boundary fencing 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 15.3.2021;
- (g) the submission of a run-in/out proposal within 6 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Highways or of the TPB by 15.3.2021;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implementation of the run-in/out proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Highways or of the TPB by 15.6.2021;
- (i) the submission of a drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 15.3.2021;
- (j) in relation to (i) above, the implementation of the drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the

Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 15.6.2021;

- (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 15.3.2021;
- (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 15.6.2021;
- (n) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) or (k) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (o) if any of the above planning conditions (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (l) or (m) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

Agenda Item 28

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TT/502 Temporary Eating Place (Outside Seating Accommodation of a Restaurant) for a Period of 3 Year in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lots 1186 (Part), 1187 S.M, 1298 RP (Part) and 2146 in D.D. 117 and Adjoining Government Land, Tai Tong Shan Road, Tai Tong, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TT/502)

Presentation and Question Sessions

121. 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 eating place (outside seating accommodation (OSA) of a restaurant) for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, 258 public comments were received. Among them, 257 comments from the Shap Pat Heung Rural Committee, Shap Pat Heung District Resident Association, Yuen Long Tai Tong District Residents’ Association, Tai Tong Village Youth Association, Ecopark Association, Hong Kong Excellent Youth of Agriculture and Fisheries Development Association, New Territories Warehouse and Logistic Business Association and individuals supported the application while the remaining one comment from an individual raised concerns 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 application 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 catering services to serve any such demand in the area. The subject OSA was an extension of a licenced restaurant on the G/F of a New Territories Exempted House (NETH). Apart from the existing NTEH, there was no other Small House application approved or under processing at the application site. As such, approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardise the long-term planning intention of the “V” zone. Moreover, the applied use was not incompatible with the surrounding uses and was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 15A in that the eating place was located at the fringe of Tai Tong Tsuen and abutted the main road of Tai Tong Shan Road. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Relevant approval conditions were recommended to address the technical requirements of concerned government departments. Given that three previous approvals for similar eating place use had been granted to the application site and nine other similar applications had been approved within or straddling the subject “V” zone, approval of the subject application was generally in line with the Committee's previous decisions. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

122. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

123. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 15.9.2023, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 10:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;

- (b) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) all existing trees within the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (d) the submission of a run-in/out proposal within 6 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Highways or of the TPB by 15.3.2021;
- (e) in relation to (d) above, the implementation of the run-in/out proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Highways or of the TPB by 15.6.2021;
- (f) the existing drainage facilities on the site should be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) 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 15.12.2020;
- (h) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 15.3.2021;
- (i) in relation to (h) 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 15.6.2021;
- (j) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c) 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

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

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

Agenda Items 29 and 30

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TYST/1017 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Open Storage of Construction Materials, Equipment and Machinery and Container Site Offices with Ancillary Repair Activities for a Period of 3 Years in “Open Space” and “Undetermined” Zones and Area shown as ‘Road’, Lots 348 RP (Part), 353 S.A RP (Part), 353 S.B (Part), 354 RP (Part), 355 (Part), 356, 357 (Part), 358 (Part) and 359 in D.D. 119, Tong Yan San Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/1017)

A/YL-TYST/1039 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Open Storage of Scrap Metal for Recycling, Construction Materials, Equipments and Machinery and Container Site Offices with Ancillary Repair Activities for a Period of 3 Years in “Open Space” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lots 329 S.A ss.1 (Part), 329 S.A ss.2 (Part), 329 S.A ss.3 (Part), 329 RP, 330, 331 S.A, 331 S.B, 331 RP, 332 S.A, 332 S.B, 332 S.C, 332 S.D, 332 S.E, 332 RP and 333 in D.D. 119 and Adjoining Government Land, Shan Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/1039)

125. The Committee agreed that as the two applications for renewal of planning

approval for temporary open storage, container site offices with ancillary repair activities were submitted by the same applicant, similar in nature and the application sites were located in close proximity to each other, they could be considered together.

Presentation and Question Sessions

126. Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/TMYLW, presented the applications and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Papers:

- (a) background to the applications;
- (b) the renewal of planning approval for temporary open storage of construction materials, equipment and machinery and container site offices with ancillary repair activities for a period of three years under application No. A/YL-TYST/1017, and the renewal of planning approval for temporary open storage of scrap metal for recycling, construction materials, equipment and machinery and container site offices with ancillary repair activities for a period of three years under application No. A/YL-TYST/1039;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Papers;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication periods, two public comments from an individual raising concerns on application No. A/YL-TYST/1017 and one public comment from an individual raising concerns on application No. A/YL-TYST/1039 were received. Major views were set out in paragraph 11 of the Papers; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD considered that the applied uses could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Papers. Although applied uses were not in line with the planning intentions of the concerned zonings, the Project Manager (West), Civil Engineering and Development Department had no objection to the applications. Approval of the applications on a temporary basis would not jeopardise the long-term development of the

area. Although there were residential structures in the vicinity, the developments were generally not incompatible with the surrounding uses. The applied uses were generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No.13F and 34C. There was no adverse comment on the applications from concerned government departments, except the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP). DEP did not support the applications as environmental nuisance arising from the traffic of the heavy vehicles was expected. However, there had been no environmental complaint concerning the application sites received in the past three years. Furthermore, relevant approval conditions were recommended to minimise any potential environmental nuisance and address the technical requirements of concerned government departments. Given that previous approvals for open storage uses had been granted to the application sites and similar applications had been approved within the concerning zonings, approval of the applications was in line within the Committee's previous decisions. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

127. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

For Application No. A/YL-TYST/1017

128. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 15.9.2023, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 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 dismantling or other workshop activities, except ancillary repairing and maintenance activities, as proposed by the applicant, are allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no heavy goods vehicle exceeding 24 tonnes, including container tractor/trailer, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (f) the existing trees within the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) the existing boundary fence on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) the existing drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (i) the submission of a condition record 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 15.12.2020;
- (j) the provision of fire extinguisher(s) with valid fire certificate (FS 251) within 6 weeks from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 27.10.2020;
- (k) 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

15.3.2021;

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

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

For Application No. A/YL-TYST/1039

130. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 15.9.2023, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 6:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no operation on Sundays and public holidays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no dismantling, vehicle repairing, other workshop activities (except ancillary repairing or maintenance activities) and storage of used electrical appliances, computer/electronic parts or electronic waste, 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) the existing boundary fencing on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) the existing trees within the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) the existing drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) the submission of a condition record 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 15.12.2020;
- (i) the provision of fire extinguisher(s) with valid fire certificate (FS 251) within 6 weeks from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 27.10.2020;
- (j) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 15.3.2021;
- (k) in relation to (j) above, the implementation of the 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 15.6.2021;
- (l) 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

- (m) if any of the above planning conditions (h), (i), (j) or (k) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

Agenda Item 31

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TYST/1040 Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Electronic Goods for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group A)3” and “Open Space” Zones and Area shown as ‘Road’, Lots 1401 S.A & S.B & S.C & S.D (Part), 1402 (Part) and 1489 (Part) in D.D. 119, Kung Um Road, Yuen Long (RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/1040)

Presentation and Question Sessions

132. 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 electronic goods for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one objecting public comment from a village representative of Muk Kiu Tau Tsuen and one comment from an individual raising concerns on the application were received. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD considered that the applied use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Although the development was within the Yuen Long South Development and mainly fell within an area shown as 'Road', the Chief Engineer/Cross-Boundary Infrastructure and Development, PlanD and Project Manager (West), Civil Engineering and Development Department had no objection to the application as the application site was not expected to be resumed within the next three years for the Yuen Long South Development. Approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardise the long-term development of the area. Although there were residential structures in the vicinity, the development was generally not incompatible with the surroundings. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Relevant approval conditionals were recommended to address the local concerns and the technical requirements of concerned government departments. Given that similar applications had been approved within/straddling the subject "Residential (Group A)3" zone, approval of the subject application was in line with the Committee's previous decisions. The previously rejected application at the application site was for a different use. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

133. Noting that 17 similar application were approved by the Committee since 2015 whilst the previous application (No. A/YL-TYST/257) at the application site was rejected by the Town Planning Board (the Board) upon review, a Member asked whether there was a change in planning circumstances. In response, Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/TMYLW, said that the previous application was for temporary vehicle repair workshop use, which was rejected mainly on the grounds that the development was considered not compatible with the surroundings and there were potential adverse environmental, drainage and landscape impacts. The current application was for storage use.

134. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 15.9.2023, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 5:00 p.m. and 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, shall be carried out on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no medium or heavy goods vehicle exceeding 5.5 tonnes, including container tractors/trailers, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance, are allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site, as proposed by the applicant, at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) 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 within the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) 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 15.3.2021;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implementation of the drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 15.6.2021;

- (i) in relation to (h) above, the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (j) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 15.3.2021;
- (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 15.6.2021;
- (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.”

135. 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 Janet K.K. Cheung, Ms Stella Y. Ng and Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STPs/TMYLW and Mr Kris W.K. Leung, TP/TMYLW, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 32

Any Other Business

136. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 11:25 a.m.