

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 660th Meeting of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee held at 2:30 p.m. on 20.11.2020

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Chairman

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Vice-chairman

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Mr K.K. Cheung

Dr C.H. Hau

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr K.W. Leung

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Dr 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

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

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 Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

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

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 659th RNTPC Meeting held on 6.11.2020

[Open Meeting]

2. The draft minutes of the 659th RNTPC meeting held on 6.11.2020 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matter Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Sha Tin, Tai Po and North District

Agenda Item 3

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/ST/46

Application for Amendment to the Approved Sha Tin Outline Zoning Plan No. S/ST/34, To rezone the application site from “Green Belt” to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Columbarium(1)”, Lots 499 S.A RP (Part), 500 S.A RP (Part), 503, 504 (Part), 505 (Part), 506 (Part) in D.D. 42 and Adjoining Government Land, 110 Chek Nai Ping Village, Tai Po Road, Ma Liu Shui, Sha Tin
(RNTPC Paper No. Y/ST/46)

4. The Committee noted that a replacement page (p.1 of the Paper) rectifying an editorial error had been tabled for Members’ reference.
5. 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.
6. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As the interest of Mr K.K. Cheung was indirect, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.
7. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 4.11.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time to prepare further information to address the comments of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department and Transport Department. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.
8. 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, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 4

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/NE-TK/18

Application for Amendment to the Approved Ting Kok Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-TK/19, To rezone the application site from "Agriculture" and area shown as 'Road' to "Residential (Group C) 1", Lots 321 RP, 322 RP, 383, 384 RP, 385 RP, 388, 390, 393, 394, 395, 396 RP, 420, 422, 426, 427, 428, 429 and 430 in D.D. 17, Lots 321, 322, 323 S.A, 323 S.B, 323 S.C, 324, 1019 RP, 1020 RP, 1022, 1023 S.A, 1023 S.B, 1023 S.C, 1023 S.D, 1023 S.E, 1023 S.F, 1023 S.G, 1023 RP, 1024 S.A, 1024 S.B, 1024 S.C, 1024 S.D, 1024 S.E, 1024 RP, 1025 S.A, 1025 S.B, 1025 RP, 1026, 1027, 1028 S.A, 1028 S.B, 1028 S.C, 1028 S.D, 1028 RP, 1029, 1038, 1040, 1041, 1042, 1043, 1044, 1045, 1046, 1048 S.A, 1048 S.B, 1049, 1050, 1052, 1053, 1057, 1058, 1059, 1060, 1061, 1063, 1095, 1097, 1098 and 1099 in D.D. 29, Ting Kok, Tai Po

(RNTPC Paper No. Y/NE-TK/18A)

9. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 5.11.2020 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 yet to submit further information including relevant technical assessments.

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 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.

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East District

Agenda Item 5

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Y/FSS/15 Application for Amendment to the Approved Fanling/Sheung Shui Outline Zoning Plan No. S/FSS/24, To rezone the application site from "Comprehensive Development Area" to "Comprehensive Development Area (1)", Sheung Shui Lot 2 RP and adjoining Government land
(RNTPC Paper No. Y/FSS/15B)

11. The Committee noted that a replacement page (p.7 of the Paper) rectifying editorial errors had been issued to Members before the meeting.

12. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Fanling and Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with ARUP;
- Dr Lawrence K.C. Li - being a member of the Hong Kong Golf Club, which was located to the south of the application site; and
- Miss Winnie W.M. Ng - being a personal friend of the applicant.

13. The Committee noted that Miss Winnie W.M. Ng had left the meeting temporarily. As the interest of Dr Lawrence K.C. Li was indirect and Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- Miss Winnie B.Y. Lau - District Planning Officer/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (DPO/FSYLE), PlanD
- Mr Patrick M.Y. Fung - Senior Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (STP/FSYLE), PlanD

Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited

- Ms Theresa W.S. Yeung
 - Ms Farica F.Y. Ng
- } Applicant's representatives

15. The Chairman extended a welcome and said that on 19.11.2020, i.e. one day before the meeting, the applicant submitted a letter requesting deferment of consideration of the application for two months in order to allow more time to prepare further information to address the comments from the Social Welfare Department (SWD). The said letter was sent to Members before the meeting and also tabled at the meeting. It was the third time that the

applicant requested deferment of the application. The Chairman said that the Committee would consider the applicant's request for deferment first and the application would be considered by the Committee at the meeting should the Committee decided not to accede to the deferral request. He then invited the applicant to elaborate on the request for deferment.

16. Ms Theresa W.S. Yeung, the applicant's representative, said that the applicant requested the Committee to defer consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time for the applicant to address SWD's comments and to enhance the detailed design and layout of the proposed 100-place residential care home for the elderly (RCHE) cum 30-place day care unit (DCU) in view of the rapidly ageing population in Hong Kong. Arising from that, amendments to the technical reports such as Visual Impact Assessment and Air Ventilation Assessment were required. Hence, more time was required for the applicant to provide an enhanced proposal for the Committee's consideration.

17. In response to the Chairman's enquiry regarding the social welfare facilities requested by SWD, Miss Winnie B.Y. Lau, DPO/FSYLE, said that as stated in paragraph 9.1.6 (a) of the Paper, in view of the acute demand for social welfare facilities, the SWD requested the applicant to explore the feasibility to incorporate (i) a 100-place RCHE cum 30-place DCU; and (ii) a 50-place Day Activity Centre (DAC) cum 50-place Hostel for Severely Mentally Handicapped Persons (HSMH) in the proposed development.

18. In response to the Chairman's enquiry on whether the applicant had agreed to provide the social welfare facilities as requested by SWD, Ms Theresa W.S. Yeung, the applicant's representative, said that the applicant agreed to provide the RCHE cum DCU in the proposed development, but not the DAC cum HSMH. Should the deferral request be acceded to by the Committee, the applicant would further liaise with SWD on whether the DAC cum HSMH could be provided in the proposed development. Ms Yeung confirmed that the reason for the deferral request was to allow more time for the applicant (i) to enhance the detailed design and layout of the proposed RCHE and DCU; and (ii) to liaise with SWD on whether or not to provide the DAC and HSMH.

19. In response to the Chairman's question on the rezoning application, Miss Winnie B.Y. Lau, DPO/FSYLE, said that the current application was for rezoning the application site from "Comprehensive Development Area" ("CDA") to "CDA(1)" which involved an

increase in the maximum plot ratio (PR) from 0.8 to 3 and building height from 3 storeys over one-storey carport to 17 to 23 storeys (excluding basements) to facilitate a comprehensive residential development. The applicant also proposed to set out in the relevant Notes of the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) that any floor space that was constructed or intended for use solely as Government, institution or community (GIC) facilities as required by the Government might be disregarded from PR calculation. Should the rezoning application be agreed to by the Committee, the applicant would be required to submit a Master Layout Plan (MLP) on the proposed development together with the updated technical assessments for the Committee's consideration under a subsequent s.16 planning application.

20. As the applicant's representatives had no further point to raise and there was no further question from Members, the Chairman informed the applicant's representatives that the Committee would deliberate on the request for deferment in their absence and inform them of the Committee's decision after the deliberation session. The PlanD's representatives and the applicant's representatives were invited to leave the meeting temporarily.

[Miss Winnie B.Y. Lau, DPO/FSYLE, Mr Patrick M.Y. Fung, STP/FSYLE, and the applicant's representatives left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Deliberation Session on the Request for Deferment

21. Noting the applicant's claim that more time was required to enhance the detailed design and layout of the social welfare facilities and to liaise with SWD, some Members asked if the detailed design of the proposal, including the design and layout of the social welfare facilities, was crucial at the present stage in Committee's consideration of the subject s.12A rezoning application. In response, the Chairman explained that the current application was to rezone the application site from "CDA" to "CDA(1)" with a higher development intensity and to propose amendments to the relevant Notes of the OZP. The indicative scheme submitted by the applicant under the current rezoning application was for reference only. The detailed design and the layout of the proposed development would be subject to a subsequent s.16 planning application, should the Committee approve the rezoning application.

22. Noting that the lease governing the application site was virtually unrestricted, a Member enquired if the provision of the social welfare facilities should be stipulated in the Notes of the OZP to ensure that such facilities would be provided by the applicant in the proposed development. The Secretary explained that the applicant had proposed to set out in the Notes of the OZP that any floor space for use solely as GIC facilities as required by the Government might be disregarded from PR calculation. The types of facility to be provided were not specified in their proposed amendments to the Notes of the OZP. As any development within the proposed "CDA(1)" zone would require planning permission from the Town Planning Board (TPB) in the form of a MLP, the exact provision and detailed design of the GIC facilities, including those requested by SWD, could be finalised at that stage. The approved MLP would serve as the development control document in scrutinising implementation of the proposed development at the general building plan stage. The Member further asked if SWD's request for more social welfare facilities was relevant in considering the current rezoning application. In response, the Chairman said that SWD's request was relevant, however, the exact provision and detailed design of such facilities needed not be finalised at the present stage. They could be taken care of in the MLP of the subsequent s.16 planning application should the Committee approve the proposed rezoning.

23. In response to a Member's question on whether the proposed PR could be increased at the s.16 planning application stage should the Committee agreed to the current application, the Chairman said that in general, a standard minor relaxation clause would be incorporated in the relevant Notes of the OZP to allow flexibility for development proposals. The application for minor relaxation of development restrictions would be considered by the Committee based on individual merits.

24. The Vice-chairman pointed out that the deferral request was submitted in short notice and considered that the applicant's ground of requiring more time to address SWD's comments and to prepare a more detailed design for the social welfare facilities was not sound.

25. Members generally considered that the applicant's justification for the third request for deferment was not sufficient as the provision of additional social welfare facilities and the detailed design of the proposed development, including the proposed social welfare facilities could be dealt with at the subsequent s.16 planning application stage and the

applicant would have sufficient time to liaise with SWD should the current rezoning application be agreed to.

26. After deliberation, the Committee decided not to accede to the request for deferment and to proceed to consider the application at this meeting.

[Miss Winnie B.Y. Lau, DPO/FSYLE, Mr Patrick M.Y. Fung, STP/FSYLE, and the applicant's representatives were invited to return to the meeting at this point.]

27. The Chairman informed the applicant's representatives about the Committee's decision of and reasons for not acceding to their request for deferral, and said that the meeting would proceed to consider the application.

28. In view of the Committee's decisions, Ms Theresa W.S. Yeung, the applicant's representative, said that as instructed by the applicant, they would like to withdraw the application at the meeting.

29. In response to the Chairman's enquiry on the reason for withdrawal, Ms Theresa W.S. Yeung, said that the applicant wished to have more time to refine their proposal. As such, they would like to withdraw the application so as to submit a more mature proposal for the Committee's consideration.

30. The Chairman said that withdrawal of the subject application at such late stage in the meeting without sound and valid reason should not be encouraged as a lot of public resources had already been involved in the processing of the application. As renowned and experienced consultant firm, the applicant's representative should have explained to the applicant that his concern on detailed design of the social welfare facilities was not crucial at the present stage of considering the current s.12A application.

31. The Committee noted that the application was withdrawn by the applicant at the meeting.

[The Chairman thanked Miss Winnie B.Y. Lau, DPO/FSYLE, Mr Patrick M.Y. Fung, STP/FSYLE, and the applicant's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the

meeting at this point.]

Sai Kung and Islands District

[Mr Richard Y.L. Siu and Ms Jane W.L. Kwan, Senior Town Planners/Sai Kung and Islands (STPs/SKIs), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/I-CC/24 Proposed Eating Place (Restaurant) in “Village Type Development” Zone, G/F, 81 Tai San Praya Road, Cheung Chau (Lots 412 RP (Part), 857 & Ext. Thereto (Part), 411 RP (Part), 411 S.C (Part) in D.D. Cheung Chau and Adjoining Government Land

(RNTPC Paper No. A/I-CC/24)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed eating place (restaurant);
- (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 comment was received from a Peng Chau/Cheung Chau/Lamma Area Committee member. 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 building where the premises was located was not a New Territories Exempted House as advised by the Lands Department, it was in the form of a typical village house. The proposed use was considered in line with the planning intention to allow relevant commercial uses on G/F of village houses to serve the needs of the villagers. The proposed use was considered not incompatible with the surrounding developments. The application was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 15A. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. The proposed use would also be subject to control by the licensing authority. Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

33. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

34. 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 20.11.2024, 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 fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

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

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/SK-HC/323 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in
 “Village Type Development” Zone and area shown as ‘Road’, Lot 1798
 in D.D. 244, Ho Chung, Sai Kung
 (RNTPC Paper No. A/SK-HC/323)

Presentation and Question Sessions

36. 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 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, three objecting comments from the Sai Kung Ho Chung Village Committee and two individuals were 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. Whilst the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) had reservation on the application on the consideration that the application site was partly situated within area shown as ‘Road’, both C for T and the Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories East, Highways Department (CHE/NTE, HyD) advised that there was no record of any planned road at the application site. Thus, the application would not jeopardise the implementation of any planned road. Although the Board had adopted a more cautious approach

in approving applications for Small House development in recent years and it was considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone, about 46% of the site and 32% of the footprint of the proposed Small house fell within the “V” zone. In view of its proximity to the village cluster, sympathetic consideration might be given to the application. The proposed development was not incompatible with the surroundings and generally complied with the Interim Criteria. 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.

37. The Chairman and a Member raised the following questions:

- (a) the status of Ho Chung North Road, which was under the Hiram’s Highway Improvement Stage 1 Project, and relevant government departments’ views on the application;
- (b) the planned alignment of Ho Chung North Road on the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) and its actual alignment; and
- (c) land ownership of the vacant land to the south of the application site and whether approval of the current application would set a precedent for similar applications in the vicinity.

38. In response, Ms Jane W.L. Kwan, STP/SKIs, made the following main points:

- (a) with reference to Plans A-3 and A-4b of the Paper, Ho Chung North Road was near completion with some safety barriers placed at the two sides of the road. Moreover, C for T and CHE/NTE, HyD advised that there was no any planned road works at the application site. Relevant government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (b) a larger area might be reserved for a proposed road on the OZP. The

actual road alignment would be subject to refinement, taking into account various factors including minimising its impacts on the surrounding areas; and

- (c) the vacant land to the south of the application site was private land. As the road project had been completed and there was no plan for further road widening, approval of the current application might set a precedent for similar application if the land owner(s) of the vacant land wished to pursue Small House development.

Deliberation Session

39. Members noted that the boundary of the road on the OZP was shown in black line while the limit of the works area for the Ho Chung North Road was shown in purple dashed line on Plan A-2a of the Paper and amendments to the OZP to reflect the as-built situation of the roads would be made when opportunity arose.

40. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr Terence S.W. Tsang, Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment), Environmental Protection Department (EPD) said that the noise impact arising from the new road could be addressed by appropriate mitigation measures. As such, EPD had no objection to the application.

41. A Member opined that similar applications for Small House development in the vicinity of the application site would be confined as it would be subject to the physical constraints of the newly completed Ho Chung North Road.

42. 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 20.11.2024, 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.”

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

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/SLC/164 Proposed Public Utility Installation (Underground Cable) and
Excavation and Filling of Land in “Coastal Protection Area” Zone,
Government Land in Cheung Sha Ha Tsuen, Lantau
(RNTPC Paper No. A/SLC/164)

44. The Secretary reported that the application was withdrawn by the applicant after issuance of the agenda of the meeting.

[The Chairman thanked Mr Richard Y.L. Siu and Ms Jane W.L. Kwan, STPs/SKIs, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

Sha Tin, Tai Po and North District

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

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/ST/990 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Office for a Period of 3 Years in “Industrial” Zone, Workshops 5 and 7, 10/F, Shing Chuen Industrial Building, 25-27 Shing Wan Road, Tai Wai, Sha Tin
(RNTPC Paper No. A/ST/990)

Presentation and Question Sessions

45. Ms Hannah H.N. Yick, 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 office for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) no public comment was received during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The applied use generally complied with the relevant considerations set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 25D and 34C. It would have no adverse impact on the area from various aspects and concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application.

46. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

47. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years and be renewed from 23.12.2020 to 22.12.2023, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board and subject to the following condition:

“the existing fire service installations implemented at the application premises should be maintained in efficient working order at all times.”

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

Agenda Item 10

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-HT/16 Proposed Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Hobby Farm, Barbecue Spot, Play Area, Handicraft Making and Refreshment Kiosk) for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 1091 RP, 1134 S.A and 1134 RP in D.D. 76, Hok Tau, Fanling
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-HT/16)

49. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 9.11.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time to prepare further information to address comments of the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department and Transport Department. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 11

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-LYT/738 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in
"Agriculture" and "Village Type Development" Zones, Lot 1810 S.C
in D.D. 76, Kan Tau Tsuen, Lung Yeuk Tau

(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LYT/738)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed house (New Territories Exempted House - Small House);
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, eight objecting public comments from a member of North District Council, the Chairman, the First Vice-Chairman and the Vice-Chairman of Fanling District Rural Committee, Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation, Designing Hong Kong Limited, Hong Kong Bird Watching Society and an individual; and one public comment from the Chairman of Sheung Shui District Rural Committee indicating no comment on the application 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 development was not in line with the planning intention of “Agriculture” zone. As the application site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation, the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) did not support the application. There was no strong justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention. Although the proposed Small House was not entirely incompatible with the surroundings, it did not comply with the Interim Criteria in that more than 50% of the footprint of the proposed Small House fell outside the village ‘environs’ (‘VE’) and the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Kan Tau Tsuen. The application site was the subject of previous rejected applications for the same use and there were rejected similar applications in the vicinity. There had been no major change in planning circumstances since the rejection of the previous application and the circumstances of the current application were similar to the rejected similar applications. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

52. In response to the Chairman's enquiry on the differences between the current application and the last previous application covering the application site (A/NE-LYT/726) which was rejected by the Committee on 12.6.2020, Mr Tim T.Y. Fung, STP/STN, said that as compared with the last previous application, the major development parameters and layout of the proposed Small House remained unchanged.

Deliberation Session

53. The Committee noted that PlanD had contacted and explained to the applicant that the previous applications were rejected mainly on the grounds that the proposed Small House did not comply with the Interim Criteria in that more than 50% of the footprint fell outside the ‘VE’ and “V” zone of Kan Tau Tsuen and land was still available within the “V”

zone of Kan Tau Tsuen. Re-submission of the same proposal would unlikely be approved by the Committee. However, the applicant decided to pursue the current application.

54. A Member expressed concern that re-submission of the same rejected scheme was a waste of public resources for processing the application and the applicants should be prohibited to do so. The Chairman remarked that while there was currently no provision under the Town Planning Ordinance to restrict the re-submission of a rejected scheme, the Secretariat could explore administrative measures to minimise public resources incurred in processing such applications.

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

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” zone which is primarily to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes and to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention; and
- (b) the proposed development does not comply with the Interim Criteria for consideration of application for New Territories Exempted House/Small House in New Territories in that more than 50% of the footprint of the proposed Small House falls outside the village ‘environs’ and “Village Type Development” zone of Kan Tau Tsuen.”

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

Agenda Item 12

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-MUP/155 Temporary Open Storage of Steel Sheet Piles and Ancillary Office for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 49 (Part), 50 (Part) and 52 RP (Part) in D.D. 37 and Adjoining Government Land, Man Uk Pin (RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-MUP/155)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the temporary open storage of steel sheet piles and ancillary office 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, six objecting public comments from a member of the North District Council, the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, the World Wide Fund Nature for Hong Kong, the Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation and two individuals, and one public comment from the Chairman of Sheung Shui Rural Committee indicating no comment on the application 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 applied use was not entirely in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” zone. As the application site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation, the Director of Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation did not support the application. No strong planning

justification had been given in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis. The applied use was considered not compatible with the surroundings. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD had reservation on the application from landscape planning point of view as approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications, the cumulative impact of which would further degrade the landscape quality of the surrounding area. The Commissioner for Transport did not support the application as the applicants failed to demonstrate that the temporary development would not cause adverse traffic impact on the surrounding areas. The application did not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13F in that the application site fell within Category 3 area where applications would normally not be favourably considered unless the applications were on sites with previous planning approvals. The application site was the subject of previous rejected applications and there were rejected similar applications in the vicinity. The circumstances of the current application were similar to the rejected previous applications and rejected similar applications. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

57. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

58. 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” zone, which is primarily to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes and to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. There is no strong justification in the submission for a departure from such planning intention, even on a

temporary basis;

- (b) the applied use does not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13F on Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses in that no previous approval for open storage has been granted for the site and there are adverse departmental comments and local objections; and
- (c) the applicants fail to demonstrate that the applied use would not cause adverse traffic and landscape impacts on the surrounding areas.”

Agenda Item 13

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-KLH/591 Proposed 2 Houses (New Territories Exempted Houses) in “Green Belt” Zone, Lot 784 (Part) in D.D. 9, Kau Lung Hang, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-KLH/591)

59. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 13.11.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time to liaise with the Lands Department and prepare further information to support the application. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

60. 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 14

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-KLH/592 Proposed Temporary Helicopter Landing Pad for a Period of 3 Years in
“Green Belt” Zone, Lot 777 in D.D. 9, Kau Lung Hang, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-KLH/592)

61. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 28.10.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time to consult relevant government departments and prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

62. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending 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 15

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-TK/678 Proposed Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Hobby Farm) with Ancillary Facilities and Canteen for a Period of 5 Years and Partial Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone and area shown as ‘Road’, Lots 605 (Part), 606 (Part), 607, 608 (Part), 610 (Part), 611, 612, 613 (Part), 614 (Part), 622 (Part), 623, 624 S.A (Part), 625 S.A (Part), 626, 627 S.A & S.B, 628 S.A, 628 RP, 629, 630, 631 S.A, 631 RP, 632 S.A, 632 S.B RP, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644 S.A, 644 S.B (Part), 645 (Part), 646 (Part), 656 (Part), 657, 658 (Part), 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667 RP, 668 RP, 669, 690 RP, 1274 RP, 1275, 1276, 1277 RP, 1278, 1343 S.B ss. 1 (Part), 1346 S.A RP, 1346 S.B ss. 1 (Part) and 1347 S.A (Part) in D.D. 17, and Adjoining Government Land, Ting Kok Road, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TK/678B)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary place of recreation, sports or culture (hobby farm) with ancillary facilities and canteen for a period of five years and partial filling of land;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication periods, 42 objecting public comments from the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, Designing Hong Kong Limited, Conservancy Association, villagers from Ting Kok and Ting Kok Village Council and an individual, and one public

comment from an individual supporting the application were 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. While the proposed use was not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone, the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation had no strong view against the application. Approval of the application on a temporary basis would not frustrate the long-term planning intention of “AGR” zone. The proposed use was considered not incompatible with the surroundings. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Technical concerns of the relevant government departments could be addressed by imposing appropriate approval conditions. There were similar applications in the “AGR” zone in the vicinity of the application site, which were all approved by the Committee. The considerations for approving those similar applications were largely applicable to the current application. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

64. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the application site would be reinstated after termination of the temporary use;
- (b) duration of temporary approval; and
- (c) the time required to commence the proposed use.

65. In response, Mr Tony Y.C. Wu, STP/STN, made the following main points:

- (a) the applicant stated in the submission that the application site would be reinstated to make it ready for agricultural purpose upon expiry of the planning permission. An approval condition on the reinstatement of the

application site to an amenity area upon expiry of the planning permission was also recommended (i.e. approval condition (n) under paragraph 12.2 of the Paper);

- (b) for uses which were neither Column 1 nor Column 2 uses under the specific land use zones, there was a provision in the covering Notes of the Outline Zoning Plans for the rural area that the maximum approval period for the temporary uses would be three years. As for the current application, the proposed temporary place of recreation, sports or culture (hobby farm) was a Column 2 use under which an application could be submitted for a permanent development or a temporary use. As for the current application, the applicant applied for a temporary approval for a period of five years; and
- (c) the applicant did not provide in his submission the time required to commence the proposed use. Nevertheless, some time-limited approval conditions had been recommended for compliance by the applicant should the application be approved.

Deliberation Session

66. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years until 20.11.2025, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) part of the site, as proposed by the applicant, shall only be filled up to a depth not exceeding 0.2m;
- (b) no operation between 9:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no public announcement system, portable loudspeaker or any form of audio amplification system is allowed to be used on the site at any time during the planning approval period;

- (d) 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 20.5.2021;
- (e) in relation to (d) above, the implementation of the revised 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 20.8.2021;
- (f) the submission of proposals for water supplies for firefighting and fire service installations within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.5.2021;
- (g) in relation to (f) above, the provision of the water supplies for firefighting and fire service installations within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.8.2021;
- (h) the submission of a run-in/out proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Highways or of the TPB by 20.5.2021;
- (i) in relation to (h) 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 20.8.2021;
- (j) the submission of a pedestrian crossing proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB by 20.5.2021;
- (k) in relation to (j) above, the implementation of the pedestrian crossing proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB by 20.8.2021;

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

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

Agenda Items 16 and 17

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-TK/690 Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Private Cars Only) for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 298 S.B ss.3 in D.D. 23, San Tau Kok, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TK/690)

A/NE-TK/691 Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Private Cars Only) for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 298 S.B ss.27 in D.D. 23, San Tau Kok, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TK/691)

68. The Committee agreed that as the two applications were similar in nature and submitted by the same applicant and the application sites were located in close proximity to each other, they could be considered together.

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the applications;
- (b) the proposed temporary public vehicle park (private cars only) for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Papers;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, two objecting public comments on application No. A/NE-TK/690, with one from two village representatives of San Tau Kok Village and the other from an individual; and one objecting public comment on application No. A/NE-TK/691 from the village representative of San Tau Kok Village were received. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 9 of the Papers; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the applications based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Papers. Whilst the proposed use was not entirely in line with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone, approval of the applications on a temporary basis would not frustrate the long-term planning intention of the “V” zone, and the Lands Department had no objection to the applications. However, the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) did not support the applications as the applicants failed to demonstrate that there were sufficient spaces for vehicles to manoeuvre when entering and leaving the application sites, and it was doubtful whether there was enough space for the proposed number of parking spaces. Although there were approved similar applications, the planning circumstances under the current applications were different from the approved applications as there would be adverse traffic impact. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse

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

70. In response to the Chairman's enquiry on the objection from C for T, Ms Kathy C.L. Chan, STP/STN, said that C for T did not support the applications as the applicant failed to demonstrate that there were sufficient spaces for vehicles to manoeuvre when entering and leaving the application sites, and it was doubtful whether there was enough space for the proposed number of parking spaces.

Deliberation Session

71. The Committee noted that for entering and leaving the parking lots No. 1 to 3 under application No. A/NE-TK/690, the drivers had to drive on a pedestrian footpath to the south-west of the application site as shown in Drawing A-1 of the Paper.

72. Mr B.K. Chow, Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West, Transport Department (TD), supplemented that TD had advised the applicant to reduce the proposed number of parking spaces so as to provide sufficient area for each parking space for manoeuvring of the vehicles. However, no further information was received from the applicant.

73. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the applications. The reason for each of the applications was:

“the applicant fails to demonstrate in the submission that the proposed car park layout is feasible from traffic engineering point of view.”

Agenda Item 18

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-TK/692 Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Private Cars Only) for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lots 768 RP (Part), 770 (Part), 771 S.A (Part), 771 S.B ss.1, 771 S.B RP, 771 S.C (Part), 771 S.D, 771 RP, 776 S.B ss.1 (Part), 776 S.D ss.2 (Part), and 776 S.D RP (Part) in D.D. 29, Ting Kok, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TK/692)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary public vehicle park (private cars only) for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 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 9 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 10 of the Paper. Whilst the proposed use was not entirely in line with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone, approval of the application on a temporary basis would not frustrate the long-term planning intention of the “V” zone, and the Lands Department had no objection to the application. However, the Commissioner for Transport did not support the application in considering that the applicant failed to demonstrate that there were

sufficient spaces for vehicles to manoeuvre when entering and leaving the application site, and it was doubtful whether there was enough space for the proposed number of parking spaces. Other concerned 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.

75. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

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

“the applicant fails to demonstrate in the submission that the proposed car park layout is feasible from traffic engineering point of view.”

Agenda Item 19

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-TK/693 Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Private Cars Only) for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 687 S.E, 687 S.F ss.4, 687 S.G RP and 688 in D.D. 29, Ting Kok, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TK/693)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary public vehicle park (private cars only) for a period

of three years;

- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, two objecting public comments from Hong Kong Bird Watching Society and an individual were received. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 9 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 10 of the Paper. The proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation did not support the application as the application site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation. The applicant had not provided any strong planning justifications in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department had reservation on the application and considered that there were direct conflicts between the proposed car parking spaces and the existing tree within the application site. Although the proposed development was considered not entirely incompatible with its landscape character, approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications, the cumulative impact of which would degrade the landscape quality of the environment. The Commissioner for Transport did not support the application as the applicant failed to demonstrate that there were sufficient spaces for vehicles to manoeuvre when entering and leaving the application site, and it was doubtful whether there was enough space for the proposed number of parking spaces. There were rejected similar applications, and the circumstances of the current application were similar to those rejected applications. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

78. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

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

- “(a) the proposed use is not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone which is primarily to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes, and to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis;
- (b) the applicant fails to demonstrate in the submission that the proposed car park layout is feasible from traffic engineering point of view;
- (c) the applicant fails to demonstrate in the submission that the proposed development would not result in adverse landscape impact on the area; and
- (d) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications in the “AGR” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such similar applications would result in a general degradation of the landscape character of the area.”

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

Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East District

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

Agenda Item 20

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-SK/290 Proposed Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Hobby Farm) for a Period of 5 Years and Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 1640 S.B in D.D. 114, Shek Kong, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-SK/290)

Presentation and Question Sessions

80. Mr Patrick M.Y. Fung, STP/FSYLE, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary place of recreation, sports or culture (hobby farm) for a period of five years and filling of land;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, 170 objecting public comments from a member of Yuen Long District Council, Pat Heung Rural Committee, two Indigenous Inhabitant Representatives and Resident Representative of Sheung Tsuen, Chairperson and Vice-chairperson of Sheung Tsuen Village Committee and 159 local residents, World Wide Fund For Nature Hong Kong, the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, Designing Hong Kong Limited and one individual were 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. The proposed use was generally not in conflict with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone, and the majority of the application site (about 80.5%) would not involve filling of land and would remain unpaved. Approval of the application on a temporary basis would not frustrate the long-term planning intention of the “AGR” zone. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. To mitigate the potential environmental impacts and to address the technical requirement from the relevant government departments, appropriate approval conditions were recommended. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

81. Noting the public concern on the adverse traffic impacts arising from the proposed development, a Member enquired about the comments of the Commissioner for Transport (C for T). In response, Mr Patrick M.Y. Fung, STP/FSYLE, said that C for T had no comment on the application from traffic engineering perspective. He further added that the application site was accessible via a local track to its northwest from Kam Sheung Road, and two private car parking spaces for visitors by appointment only would be provided at the application site.

Deliberation Session

82. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years until 20.11.2025, 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. to 9:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at

any time during the planning approval period;

- (c) the 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 20.5.2021;
- (d) in relation to (c) 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 20.8.2021;
- (e) in relation to (d) above, the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.5.2021;
- (g) in relation to (f) above, the implementation of fire service installations proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.8.2021;
- (h) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b) or (e) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked without further notice;
- (i) if any of the above planning conditions (c), (d), (f) or (g) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice; and
- (j) upon expiry of the planning permission, the reinstatement of the site to an amenity area to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

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

Agenda Item 21

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-SK/291 Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Hobby Farm) and Animal Hospice Services Establishment for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 383 (Part), 384 S.C-S.D, 385 S.A-S.C (Part) and 386 (Part) in D.D. 112, Kam Sheung Road, Shek Kong, Yuen Long (RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-SK/291)

Presentation and Question Sessions

84. Mr Patrick M.Y. Fung, STP/FSYLE, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the temporary place of recreation, sports or culture (hobby farm) and animal hospice services establishment 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 objecting public comments from a member of Yuen Long District Council, Pat Heung Rural Committee, Indigenous Inhabitant Representatives and Resident Representative of Lin Fa Tei Village, World Wide Fund For Nature Hong Kong, the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, Kadoorie Farm & Botanic Garden Corporation 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. While the proposed hobby farm use was generally not in conflict with the

planning intention of the “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone, the applied animal hospice services establishment use was considered not in line with the said planning intention and was not supported by the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation as the application site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation and the applied use was not directly related to agricultural activities. The applicant had not provided strong planning justification in the submission to merit a departure from the planning intention of the “AGR” zone, even on a temporary basis. The animal hospice services establishment use with cremation of animal bodies was considered incompatible with the surroundings. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Part of the application site was the subject of a previous application (No. A/YL-SK/263) for temporary animal boarding establishment with hospice services which was rejected upon review by the Town Planning Board (TPB) on 22.5.2020. There was also a similar application which was rejected by the Committee. The Committee’s considerations on the above rejected applications were generally applicable to the current application. Rejecting the subject 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.

85. The Chairman and a Member raised the following questions:

- (a) noting that the previous application No. A/YL-SK/263 was rejected upon review by TPB in May 2020 on the consideration, among others, that the concerns on the environmental impact of the incinerator had not been addressed, what the comments of the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) on the current application were; and
- (b) EPD’s view on the environmental impact of the incinerator even though the operating capacity did not exceed the exempted capacity under Air Pollution Control Ordinance (APCO).

86. In response, Mr Patrick M.Y. Fung, STP/FSYLE, made the following main points:

- (a) EPD's comments on the current application were similar to those on the previous rejected application. The applicant was not required to obtain a specified process licence from EPD as the operating capacity of the incinerator of the applied use did not exceed the exempted capacity of Specified Process – Incinerators under APCO, i.e. 0.5 tonne/hour. In view of that, EPD had no objection to the current application; and
- (b) as stated in paragraph 9.1.5 of the Paper, the applicant was strongly advised by EPD to properly design and maintain the facilities to minimise any potential environmental nuisance, for example, the provision of a 24-hour mechanical ventilation and air-conditioning system, etc..

Deliberation Session

87. The Chairman recapitulated that the current application was a re-submission of a previously rejected application No. A/YL-SK/263 in May 2020 for temporary animal boarding establishment with animal hospice services for a period of three years, and the major difference between the rejected application and the current application was the inclusion of the new northern portion of the application site for hobby farm use under the current application, which also resulted in an increase in the application site by about 2,581m² (+159%). The Chairman then invited Members' views on the application.

88. In response to a Member's enquiry on the Specified Process Licence under APCO, Mr Terence S.W. Tsang, Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment), EPD said that apart from the control on the operating capacity of the incinerator under APCO, there was control on the types and rate of fuel being consumed in the burning activities. In view of the small scale of the incinerators and the frequency of the furnace operation (1–10 times per week on average), significant environmental impact arising from the operation of the incinerators was not anticipated.

89. The Committee noted that there was currently no licensing requirement for

animal cremation in Hong Kong. However, animal cremation would still need to comply with the relevant legislations and requirements, including the Public Health and Municipal Services Ordinance (PHMSO) concerning sanitary nuisances under the ambit of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department, APCO concerning air and environmental pollution under the ambit of EPD, etc.

90. Noting that there was currently no licensing requirement for animal cremation in Hong Kong, a Member raised concern on the adverse impacts on public health arising from the burning of animal remains and considered that the possible adverse impacts on human health should be taken into consideration when assessing applications for animal hospice services establishments.

91. A Member noted that there was a growing demand for animal boarding and cremation services as more and more people owned pets in Hong Kong and opined that such services should be provided to meet the pressing need. The Chairman said that while there was a need to provide animal cremation services to meet the public demand, such facilities should be placed at a suitable location. Based on PlanD's assessment, the applied use at the application site was considered incompatible with the surrounding areas. As such, the application was recommended for rejection.

92. While not supporting the application, some Members shared the view that there was a pressing need for animal cremation services and opined that relevant government policy/regulation for animal hospice services should be drawn up.

93. A Member concurred with PlanD's assessment that rejecting the subject application was in line with the Committee's previous decisions. The Member also considered that it might worth examining whether the "AGR" zone in general was suitable for accommodating animal boarding establishments.

94. The Chairman concluded that Members generally considered that the application could not be supported while some Members were of the view that some sort of assessment criteria for animal boarding establishment within "AGR" zone should be drawn up and government policies/regulations on cremation services should be considered. In response, the Chairman suggested (i) to request PlanD to compile suitable assessment criteria for

consideration of applications for animal boarding establishments based on the consideration of similar past applications for Members' reference; and (ii) to convey Members' views on animal cremation services to relevant government bureaux/departments for their consideration. Members agreed with the Chairman's suggestions.

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

- “(a) the applied animal hospice services establishment use is not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone which is primarily intended to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes, and to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. There are no strong planning justifications in the submission to merit a departure from the planning intention of “AGR” zone, even on a temporary basis;
- (b) the applied animal hospice services establishment use with cremation of animal bodies is incompatible with the surrounding areas which are rural in character with clusters of residential structures/dwellings and active/fallow agricultural land; and
- (c) approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the “AGR” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such similar applications would result in a general degradation of the rural environment of the area.”

Agenda Item 22

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTN/715 Proposed Temporary Site Office and Plant Nursery with Ancillary Open Storage of Building Materials, Tools and Equipment, Landscaping Equipment and Hardware and Ancillary Staff Car Park for a Period of 3 Years in “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” Zone, Lots 1555 S.A (Part), 1555 S.B RP (Part), 1557 RP (Part), 1558 (Part) and 1559 (Part) in D.D. 107, Cheung Chun San Tsuen, Kam Tin, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTN/715A)

96. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Bright Strong Limited, which was a subsidiary of Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (SHK). 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; and |
| Dr Conrad T.C. Wong | - | having current business dealings with SHK. |

97. As the interests of Miss Winnie W.M. Ng and Dr Conrad T.C. Wong were direct, the Committee agreed that they should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. As Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

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

Presentation and Question Sessions

98. 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 site office and plant nursery with ancillary open storage of building materials, tools and equipment, landscaping equipment and hardware and ancillary staff car park 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 periods, three objecting public comments from a member of Yuen Long District Council and two individuals were received. Major objection grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD considered that the proposed use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Although the applied site office and ancillary open storage and car park were not in line with the planning intention of the “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) zone, the application site fell within the later phase of the approved comprehensive private residential development at the whole “CDA(1)” zone. Approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardise the implementation of the approved comprehensive residential development. The proposed use was considered not incompatible with the surrounding areas. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. To minimise the possible environmental nuisance and to address the technical requirements of the concerned government departments, relevant approval conditions were recommended. The application site was the subject of a previous approved application for similar use which was subsequently revoked due to non-compliance with the approval conditions. Compared with the

previous application, the current application was for similar use with reduction in the number of structures, floor area and parking spaces. Sympathetic consideration could be given to the current application. Shorter compliance periods were recommended for the concerned application in order to closely monitor the progress on compliance with the associated approval conditions. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

99. In response to a Member's enquiry as to why Town Planning Board Guidelines No.13F on Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses (TPB PG-No. 13F) was not applicable to the current application, Ms Ivy C.W. Wong, STP/FSYLE said that according to TPB PG-No. 13F, "Open Storage" uses were related to activities carried out on a site for which the greater part of the site (i.e. generally assumed to be more than 50%) was uncovered and used for storage, repair or breaking other than container-related uses. For the current application, the proposed open storage use was an ancillary use only and occupied less than 50% of the application site (i.e. about 11.5%). As such, TPB PG-No. 13F was not applicable to the current application.

Deliberation Session

100. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 20.11.2023, 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 8:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no operation on Sundays and public holidays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no medium or heavy goods vehicles exceeding 5.5 tonnes, including container tractor/trailer, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance, are allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site at any time during the

planning approval period;

- (d) no dismantling, maintenance, repairing, cleansing, paint spraying or other workshop activities are allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (f) the submission of an updated drainage proposal within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 20.2.2021;
- (g) in relation to (f) above, the implementation of the updated 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 20.5.2021;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (i) the provision of fire extinguisher(s) with a valid fire certificate (FS 251) within 6 weeks from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 1.1.2021;
- (j) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.2.2021;
- (k) in relation to (j) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.5.2021;
- (l) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) or (h) is not

complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and

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

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

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng and Dr Conrad T.C. Wong returned to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 23

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTN/716 Proposed Temporary Animal Boarding Establishment for a Period of 3 Years and Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 1093 in D.D. 107, Kam Tin North, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTN/716A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary animal boarding establishment for a period of three years and filling of land;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, four objecting public comments from Kadoorie Farm and Botanical Garden Corporation, Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, Designing Hong Kong Limited 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 had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Whilst the proposed use was not entirely in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone and the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation did not support the application in considering that the application site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation, approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardise the long-term planning intention of the “AGR” zone. The proposed use was considered not entirely incompatible with the surroundings. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. To minimise any possible environmental nuisance and to address the technical requirements of the concerned government departments, relevant approval conditions were recommended. There were similar applications within the same “AGR” zone, and the circumstances of the only rejected application were different from those of the current application. Approval of the current applications was in line with the Committee's previous decisions. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

103. In response to the Chairman's question, Ms Ivy C.W. Wong, STP/FSYLE, by referring to Plan A-4 of the Paper, said that the application site was currently vacant and covered by vegetation.

Deliberation Session

104. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 20.11.2023, 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. (except overnight animal boarding), as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) all animals shall be kept inside the enclosed animal boarding establishment on the site between 6:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, during the planning approval period;
- (c) no public announcement system, portable loudspeaker, any form of audio amplification system, or whistle blowing is allowed to be used on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the 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 20.5.2021;
- (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 Services or of the TPB by 20.8.2021;
- (g) in relation to (f) above, the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.5.2021;
- (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 20.8.2021;

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

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

Agenda Item 24

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTN/729 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Open Storage of Vehicles and Vehicle Parts for Export for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 422 S.B ss.1 (Part), 422 S.B RP (Part), 422 S.C RP (Part) and 422 RP (Part) in D.D. 110, Pat Heung, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTN/729)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;

- (b) the renewal of planning approval for temporary open storage of vehicles and vehicles parts for export for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper;
- (d) no public comment was received during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD considered that the proposed use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The application was in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 34C and 13F in that all the approval conditions under the last approved applications had been complied with. To minimise any possible environmental nuisance and to address the technical requirements of the concerned government departments, relevant approval conditions were recommended.

107. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

108. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years, and be renewed from 23.12.2020 to 22.12.2023, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 6:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no operation on Sundays and public holidays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no medium or heavy goods vehicles exceeding 5.5 tonnes, including container tractors/trailers, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are

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

- (d) no dismantling, maintenance, repairing, cleansing, paint spraying or other workshop activity is allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (f) the existing drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) the submission of the record of the existing drainage facilities on the site within 3 months from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 23.3.2021;
- (h) the existing fire services installations implemented on the site shall be maintained in efficient working order at all times during the planning approval period;
- (i) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f) 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;
- (j) if the above planning condition (g) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice; and
- (k) upon expiry of the planning permission, the reinstatement of the site to an amenity area to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

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

Agenda Item 25

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTN/730 Proposed Temporary Animal Boarding Establishment for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 1103 (Part) in D.D. 107, Kam Tin North, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTN/730)

110. The Committee noted that two replacement pages (p.11 and p.12 of the Paper) in relation to inclusion of an additional approval condition were tabled at the meeting for Members’ reference.

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary animal boarding establishment for a period of 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, six objecting public comments from the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, Kadoorie Farm & Botanic Garden Corporation, World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong and individuals were 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 use was not entirely in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone and the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation did not support the application in considering that the application site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation, approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardise the long-term planning intention of the “AGR” zone. The proposed use was considered not incompatible with the surroundings. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. While expressing concern on the cumulative impact of approval of similar applications, the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD considered that significant adverse impacts arising from the proposed use on the existing landscape resources was not anticipated. To minimise any possible environmental nuisance and to address the technical requirements of the concerned government departments, relevant approval conditions were recommended. There were similar applications within the same “AGR” zone, and the circumstances of the only rejected application were different from those of the current application. Approval of the current applications was in line with the Committee's previous decisions. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

112. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

113. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 20.11.2023, 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. (except overnight animal boarding), as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the

planning approval period;

- (b) all animals shall be kept inside the enclosed animal boarding establishment on the site between 6:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, during the planning approval period;
- (c) no public announcement system, portable loudspeaker, any form of audio amplification system, or whistle blowing is allowed to be used on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the 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 20.5.2021;
- (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 Services or of the TPB by 20.8.2021;
- (g) in relation to (f) above, the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.5.2021;
- (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 20.8.2021;
- (j) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d) or (g) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby

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

- (k) if any of the above planning conditions (e), (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; and
- (l) upon expiry of the planning permission, the reinstatement of the site to an amenity area to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

114. 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]

A/YL-KTN/731 Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Hobby Farm and Caravan Holiday Camp) with Ancillary Eating Place for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 926 RP, 957 S.A to S.Z, 957 S.AA to S.AC and 957 RP in D.D. 107, Fung Kat Heung, Kam Tin, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTN/731)

115. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 11.11.2020 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 first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

116. 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 27

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-PH/850 Temporary Shop and Services (Car Beauty Services) for a Period of 3 Years in "Village Type Development" Zone, Lot 582 S.B and 582 S.C in D.D. 111 and Adjoining Government Land, Fan Kam Road, Pat Heung, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-PH/850A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

117. 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 (car beauty services) 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.

The proposed use was not entirely in line with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone. The Lands Department (LandsD) advised that there was no approved Small House at the application site, and one Small House application was currently 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 proposed use was considered not incompatible with the surroundings. In view of the nature, scale and location of the proposed use, it was unlikely that it would generate significant adverse impacts and environmental nuisance on the surroundings. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. To minimise any possible environmental nuisance and to address the technical requirements of the concerned departments, relevant approval conditions were recommended. As similar applications within the same “V” zone were all approved by the Committee, approval of the application was consistent with the Committee’s previous decisions. Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

118. Noting that there was one Small House application at the application site currently under processing by LandsD, a Member enquired whether the proposed use would be in conflict with the Small House development should the Small House grant application be approved by LandsD. In response, Ms Ivy C.W. Wong, STP/FSYLE, said that LandsD advised that the concerned Small House application was at the preliminary stage and still under processing. Moreover, the applicant of the subject application was not the land owner(s) of the application site. Should the current application be approved by the Committee, the applicant would need to liaise with the land owner(s) on the use of the land.

Deliberation Session

119. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 20.11.2023, 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 dismantling, maintenance, repairing, car washing, paint spraying or other workshop activities shall be carried out on 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 planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 20.5.2021;
- (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 20.8.2021;
- (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 20.5.2021;
- (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 20.8.2021;
- (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.”

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

Agenda Item 28

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-PH/858 Proposed Temporary Wholesale Trade (Food) for a Period of 5 Years
in “Open Storage” Zone, Lots 2404, 2405, 2409 S.B RP and 2410 RP
in D.D. 111 and Adjoining Government Land, Fan Kam Road, Pat
Heung, Yuen Long

(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-PH/858)

Presentation and Question Sessions

121. 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 wholesale trade (food) for a period of five years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, two objecting public comments from the local residents 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 had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. While the proposed use was not entirely in line with the planning intention of the “Open Storage” (“OS”) zone, it was not incompatible with the intended use in the zone. Approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardise the long-term planning intention of the “OS” zone. The proposed use was 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 and to address the technical requirements of the concerned departments, relevant approval conditions were recommended. The application site was the subject of seven previous applications. The last approved application (No. A/YL-PH/773) submitted by the same applicant for the same use was revoked due to non-compliance with the approval conditions. As there was no major change in planning circumstance since the last approval, sympathetic consideration could be given to the current application. Shorter compliance periods were recommended for the concerned application in order to closely monitor the progress on compliance with the associated approval conditions. 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 5 years until 20.11.2025, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

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

is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;

- (c) no medium or heavy goods vehicles exceeding 5.5 tonnes, including container tractors/trailers, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance, are allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the submission of a run-in/out proposal at Fan Kam Road within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Highways and the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB by 20.2.2021;
- (f) in relation to (e) above, the implementation of the run-in/out proposal at Fan Kam Road within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Highways and the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB by 20.5.2021;
- (g) the submission of a landscape proposal within 3 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or the TPB by 20.2.2021;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implementation of the landscape proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or the TPB by 20.5.2021;
- (i) the submission of a revised drainage proposal within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 20.2.2021;
- (j) in relation to (i) above, the implementation of the 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 20.5.2021;

- (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 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.2.2021;
- (m) in relation to (l) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.5.2021;
- (n) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d) 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 (e), (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.”

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

Agenda Item 29

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-PH/859 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) and
Excavation of Land (about 1.2m in depth) in “Village Type
Development” and “Residential (Group D)” Zones, Lot 187 S.K ss.3 in
D.D. 108, Ta Shek Wu, Pat Heung, Yuen Long

(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-PH/859)

Presentation and Question Sessions

125. 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 house (New Territories Exempted House - Small House);
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 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 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 development was generally in line with the planning intentions of the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone and the “Residential (Group D)” zone. The proposed development was considered not incompatible with the surroundings. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. As the Town Planning Board had adopted a more cautious approach in approving applications for Small House development in recent years, it was considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House

development within the “V” zone for a more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of the infrastructures and services. Nevertheless, the application site was the subject of a previous application (No. A/YL-PH/730) for Small House development submitted by the same applicant. Compared with the previous approved application, there was no change to the Small House footprint and major development parameters. Lands Department also advised that the Small House application at the application site had been approved pending execution of Building Licence. Hence, sympathetic consideration could be given to the current application. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

126. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

127. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 20.11.2024, 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 provision of septic tank, as proposed by the applicant, at a location to the satisfaction of the Director of Lands or of the TPB; and
- (b) the submission and implementation of drainage proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.”

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

Agenda Item 30

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-ST/579 Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicle) for a Period of 5 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 1 (Part) in D.D. 102, San Tin, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-ST/579)

129. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 5.11.2020 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 first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

[The Chairman thanked Mr Patrick M.Y. Fung and Ms Ivy C.W. Wong, STPs/FSYLE, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West District

[Mr Alexander W.Y. Mak, Mr Simon P.H. Chan, Ms Carol K.L. Kan, Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee and Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, Senior Town Planners/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (STPs/TMYLW), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 31

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/TM-LTY Y/406 Proposed Temporary Shop and Services for a Period of 5 Years in
“Residential (Group B) 2” Zone, Lot 3055 in D.D. 124, Wo Ping San
Tsuen, Hung Shui Kiu, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TM-LTY Y/406)

131. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 2.11.2020 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 first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

Agenda Item 32

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-PS/618 Proposed Temporary Shop and Services (Car Showroom) and Car Testing Centre with Ancillary Office for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development”, “Government, Institution or Community” and “Residential (Group B) 1” Zones, Lots 31 RP and 32 RP in D.D. 121, Ping Shan, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-PS/618)

Presentation and Question Sessions

133. Mr Alexander W.Y. Mak, STP/TMYLW, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary shop and services (car showroom) and car testing centre with ancillary office for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) no public comment was received during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD considered that the proposed use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Whilst the proposed use was not in line with the planning intentions of the “Government, Institution or Community” zone, “Residential (Group B)1” zone and “Village Type Development” zone, there was no known programme/intention to implement the zoned uses on the application site for the time being and approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardise the long-term planning intentions of the zones. The proposed use was not

incompatible with the surroundings. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. To minimise any possible environmental nuisance and to address the technical requirements of the concerned government departments, appropriate approval conditions were recommended. The application site was the subject of seven previous applications for various temporary uses, with four approved by the Committee including the last application for similar use. Approval of the current application was in line with the Committee's previous decisions.

134. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

135. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 20.11.2023, 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 medium and heavy goods vehicles exceeding 5.5 tonnes, including container tractors/trailers, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance, are allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site, as proposed by the applicant, at all times during the planning approval period;
- (d) no vehicle washing, vehicle repair, dismantling, paint spraying or other workshop activity, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) any openings of the structures including the ventilation systems of the car

testing structures shall be directed away from the nearby sensitive uses at all times during the planning approval period;

- (f) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (g) the existing fencing of the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) the existing drainage facilities shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (i) the submission of a condition record of the existing drainage facilities within 3 months to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 20.2.2021;
- (j) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.5.2021;
- (k) in relation to (j) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 9 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.8.2021;
- (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.”

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

set out at Appendix III of the Paper.

Agenda Item 33

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/HSK/255 Proposed Temporary Wholesale Trade and Shop and Services for a Period of 5 Years in “Government, Institution or Community” Zone, Lots 108 S.A (Part), 108 S.B ss.1 (Part), 108 S.B ss.2, 108 S.B ss.3 (Part), 110 (Part) and 112 (Part) in D.D. 128 , Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long (RNTPC Paper No. A/HSK/255)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary wholesale trade and shop and services for a period of five years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public comment from an individual raising concern 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 did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed use was considered not in line with the planning intention of the “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zone and there was no strong planning justification given in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis. Although there

were open storage yards and workshops in the vicinity of the application site, they were either suspected unauthorised developments or within the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Port Back-up, Storage and Workshop Uses” zone, where such uses were always permitted. The proposed use were not compatible with the surroundings. In addition, the open area within the application site constituting to 87% of the site area (about 1,635m²) and intended for circulation, manoeuvring and parking purposes was considered not commensurate in scale with the proposed development with a total floor area of about 307.5m². Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. The application site was related to two previously rejected applications for similar uses. Rejecting the current application was in line with the Committee’s previous decisions. Although there was an approved similar application partly within the same “G/IC” zone, it 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.

138. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

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

- “(a) the proposed use is not in line with the planning intention of the “Government, Institution or Community” zone which is intended primarily for the provision of Government, institution or community facilities serving the needs of the local residents and/or a wider district, region or the territory. No strong planning justification has been given in the submission for a departure from such planning intention, even on a temporary basis; and
- (b) the proposed use is not compatible with the surrounding land uses which are predominantly residential in nature.”

Agenda Item 34

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/HSK/256 Proposed Temporary Shop and Services (Display and Sale of Vehicle) for a Period of 5 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone and area shown as ‘Road’, Lot 13 S.A RP (Part) in D.D. 124 and Lot 1558 S.B (Part) in D.D.125, Ha Tsuen Road, Hung Shui Kiu, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/HSK/256)

140. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 5.11.2020 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 first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

Agenda Item 35

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/HSK/257

Temporary Logistics Centre with Ancillary Office and Parking of Vehicles for a Period of 3 Years in “Government, Institution or Community”, “Open Space” Zones and area shown as ‘Road’, Various Lots in D.D. 125 and D.D. 129 and Adjoining Government Land, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long

(RNTPC Paper No. A/HSK/257)

142. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 13.11.2020 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 first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

143. 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 36

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/HSK/258 Temporary Open Storage and Godown (for Ceramic Tableware) for a Period of 3 Years in “Open Space”, “Residential (Group A) 2” Zones and area shown as ‘Road’, Lots 107 (Part), 110 (Part) and 115 S.A (Part) in D.D.125, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/HSK/258)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the temporary open storage and godown (for ceramic tableware) 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 from an individual raising concern 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 considered that the applied use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. Whilst the applied use was not in line with the planning intentions of the “Residential (Group A)2” and “Open Space” zones, the Project Manager (West), Civil Engineering and Development Department and the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services had no objection to the application. In that regard, approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardise the long-term development of the applications site. The applied use was generally not

incompatible with the surroundings. The application was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No.13F. The application site was subject to a previously approved application, which was revoked due to non-compliance with an approval condition on the implementation of fire service installations (FSIs) proposal. For the current application, the applicant had submitted relevant FSIs proposal and the Director of Fire Services had no objection to the application, and thus sympathetic consideration might be given to the application. Shorter compliance periods were recommended for the concerned application in order to closely monitor the progress on compliance with the associated approval conditions. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. To address the concerns on the possible environmental nuisance and the technical requirements of the concerned government departments, relevant approval conditions were recommended. There were previous and similar applications approved by the Committee. Approval of the subject application was in line with the Committee's previous decisions. Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

145. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

146. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 20.11.2023, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation from 8:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no operation on Sundays and public holidays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no cutting, cleansing, melting, dismantling or any other workshop activity,

as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;

- (d) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from the public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the existing drainage facilities shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) the submission of a condition record of the existing drainage facilities on site within 3 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 20.2.2021;
- (g) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.2.2021;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.5.2021;
- (i) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d) or (e) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (j) if any of the above planning conditions (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.”

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

Agenda Item 37

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/HSK/259 Proposed Temporary Shop and Services (Vehicle Decoration and Maintenance Materials) for a Period of 3 Years in “Open Space” Zone and area shown as ‘Road’, Lot 1169 RP in D.D.124, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/HSK/259)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary shop and services (vehicle decoration and maintenance materials) for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication, one public comment from an individual raising concerns on the application was received. Major views were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. Whilst the proposed use was not in line with the planning intention of the “Open Space” zone, the Project Manager (West), Civil Engineering and Development Department and the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services had no objection to the application. In that regard, approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardise the long-term development of the applications site. The applied use was considered not

incompatible with the surroundings. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. To minimise any possible environmental nuisance and to address the technical requirements of the concerned government departments, appropriate approval conditions were recommended. Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

149. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

150. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 20.11.2023, 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 during the planning approval period;
- (d) the submission of a drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 20.5.2021;
- (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 20.8.2021;
- (f) 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 20.5.2021;
- (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 20.8.2021;
- (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.”

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

Agenda Item 38

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL/265

Proposed Temporary Shop and Services for a Period of 6 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lots 1865 S.C. and 1865 RP in D.D. 120 and Adjoining Government Land, Tai Shu Ha Road East, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL/265A)

152. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 4.11.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time to prepare

further information to address the comments from the Transport Department. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information including responses to departmental comments, estimated traffic generation and swept path analysis.

153. 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 39

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL/266 Proposed Temporary Eating Place with Outside Seating
Accommodation and Private Vehicle Park for a Period of 6 Years in
"Open Space" Zone, Lot No. 2473 RP in D.D. 120, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL/266)

Presentation and Question Sessions

154. Ms Carol K.L. Kan, STP/TMYLW, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary eating place with outside seating accommodation

and ancillary private vehicle park for a period of six years;

- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication periods, 35 public comments, with 15 supporting, 6 objecting to and 14 expressing views on the application, from individuals were received. Major views were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. Although the proposed use was not entirely in line with the planning intention of the “Open Space” zone, the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services advised that there was no plan to develop the application site into public open space at present. The proposed use could also provide dining services to meet any such demand in the area. As such, approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardise the long-term planning intention of the zone. The proposed use in such a development scale was not incompatible with the surroundings. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. To minimise any possible environmental nuisance and to address the technical requirements of the concerned government departments, appropriate approval conditions were recommended. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

155. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

156. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 6 years until 20.11.2026, 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 vehicle is allowed to queue back to and reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) the submission of a drainage and sewerage 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 20.5.2021;
- (d) in relation to (c) above, the implementation of the drainage and sewerage proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 20.8.2021;
- (e) in relation to (d) above, the implemented drainage and sewerage facilities shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.5.2021;
- (g) in relation to (f) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.8.2021;
- (h) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b) or (e) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (i) if any of the above planning conditions (c), (d), (f), or (g) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

Agenda Item 40

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL/267 Temporary Shop and Services for a Period of 6 Years in “Open Space”
Zone, Lot 4747 S.A RP (Part) in D.D. 116, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL/267)

Presentation and Question Sessions

158. Ms Carol K.L. Kan, STP/TMYLW, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the temporary shop and service for a period of six years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper;
- (d) no public comment was received during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The applied use was not entirely in line with the planning intention of the “Open Space” zone. However, the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services advised that there was no plan to develop the application site into public open space at present. The applied use could provide retail services to meet any such demand in the area. As such, approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardise the long-term planning intention of the zone. The applied use was not incompatible with the surroundings.

Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. To minimise any possible environmental nuisance and to address the technical requirements of the concerned government departments, appropriate approval conditions were recommended.

159. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

160. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 6 years until 20.11.2026, 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 vehicle is allowed to queue back to and reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) 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 20.5.2021;
- (d) in relation to (c) 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 20.8.2021;
- (e) in relation to (d) above, the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.5.2021;

- (g) in relation to (f) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.8.2021;
- (h) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b) or (e) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (i) if any of the above planning conditions (c), (d), (f) or (g) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

Agenda Item 41

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL/268 Proposed Temporary Eating Place and Outdoor Seating Accommodation of a Restaurant for a Period of 6 Years in “Residential (Group B)” Zone, Lot 2497 RP (Part) in D.D. 120, Shap Pat Heung Road, Yuen Long

(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL/268)

162. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 4.11.2020 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 first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

163. 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 42

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-LFS/373 Proposed Temporary Open Storage of Vehicle Parts for a Period of 3 Years in "Green Belt" Zone and area shown as 'Road', Lots 148-151, 152 RP, 153 RP and 156 RP in D.D. 129, Lau Fau Shan, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-LFS/373)

Presentation and Question Sessions

164. Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee, STP/TMYLW, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary open storage of vehicle parts 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, six public comments were received. Among them, one public comment from an individual indicated no in-principle objection to the application while the remaining five public comments from Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation, World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong, Hong Kong Bird

Watching Society, the village representatives of Sha Kiu Tsuen and an individual objected to the application. 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. The proposed use was not in line with the planning intention of the “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone and there was no strong planning justification given in the submission for a departure from such planning intention, even on a temporary basis. While other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application, the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD had reservation on the application from landscape planning perspective as the proposed use was considered not compatible with the surroundings and approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent to encourage similar developments in the area. The cumulative impact of approving such similar application would result in a further degradation of the landscape quality of the surrounding environment and undermine the planning intention of the “GB” zone. The application was not in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 and 13F. There were seven similar applications within the same “GB” zone, which were all rejected by the Committee. As such, rejecting the current 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.

165. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

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

- “(a) the proposed use is not in line with the planning intention of the “Green

Belt” (“GB”) zone, which is primarily for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl, as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There is a general presumption against development within this zone. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis;

- (b) the proposed use is not in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 on Application for Developments within the Green Belt Zone in that the proposed use is incompatible with the surrounding areas and would have adverse landscape impact;
- (c) the proposed use is not in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13F on Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses in that there are adverse departmental comments on landscape aspect and local objections; and
- (d) approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the “GB” zone, the cumulative effect of which would result in a general degradation of the environment in the area.”

Agenda Item 43

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-LFS/374 Proposed Temporary Shop and Services (Retail of Family Goods) with Ancillary Office for a Period of 3 Years in “Recreation” Zone, Lot 2093 (Part) in D.D. 129, Lau Fau Shan, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-LFS/374)

Presentation and Question Sessions

167. Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee, STP/TMYLW, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary shop and services (retail of family goods) with ancillary 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, 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 use was not in line with the planning intention of the “Recreation” (“REC”) zone, there was no known implementation programme for the zoned use at the application site and approval of the application on temporary basis would not frustrate the long-term planning intention of the zone. The proposed use was considered not incompatible with the surroundings. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. To minimise any possible environmental impacts and nuisance and to address the technical requirements of the concerned government departments, relevant approval conditions were recommended. Given that one previous approval had been granted for the same use at the application site and two similar applications were approved within the same “REC” zone, approval of the current application was in line with the Committee's previous decisions. Although the planning permission of the previous application was revoked due to non-compliance with the approval conditions on drainage aspect, the applicant had submitted a drainage proposal in support of the current application and concerned government department had no in-principle objection to the application. In view of that, sympathetic consideration might be given to the application. Shorter compliance periods were recommended for the concerned application in order to closely monitor the progress on compliance with the associated approval conditions.

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

168. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

169. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 20.11.2023, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 7:30 p.m. and 9:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) the submission of a revised drainage proposal within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 20.2.2021;
- (c) in relation to (b) above, the implementation of the 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 20.5.2021;
- (d) in relation to (c) above, the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (e) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.2.2021;
- (f) in relation to (e) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.5.2021;
- (g) the existing trees within the site shall be maintained in good condition at all

times during the planning approval period;

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

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

Agenda Item 44

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TT/507 Proposed Temporary Shop and Services for a Period of 3 Years in
“Other Specified Uses” annotated “Rural Use” Zone, Lots 1005 S.B
(Part) and 1019 (Part) in D.D. 118, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TT/507)

Presentation and Question Sessions

171. 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) proposed 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 from an individual raising concern 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. Although the proposed use was not entirely in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Rural Use” zone, the proposed use could serve any such demand in the area. 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. The application was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 38. To minimise any possible environmental nuisance and to address the technical requirements of the concerned government departments, relevant approval conditions were recommended. The application site was the subject of a previously approved application which was revoked due to non-compliance with approval conditions on landscape and drainage aspects. The applicant had submitted relevant technical proposals in support of the application and concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. In view of the above, sympathetic consideration might be given to the application. Shorter compliance periods were recommended for the concerned application in order to closely monitor the progress on compliance with the associated approval conditions. Given that there was one previous approval granted for the same use at the application site and seven similar approvals within the subject zone, approval of the application was generally in line with the Committee's previous decisions. Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

172. Members had no question on the application.

173. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 20.11.2023, 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 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 tractor/trailers, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance, are allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site, as proposed by the applicant, at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) 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 revised landscape proposal within 3 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 20.2.2021;
- (e) in relation to (d) above, the implementation of the revised landscape proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 20.5.2021;
- (f) the implementation of the accepted drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 20.5.2021;
- (g) the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.2.2021;

- (i) in relation to (h) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.5.2021;
- (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.”

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

Agenda Items 45, 46 and 47

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TYST/1000 Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Construction Materials and Household Materials with Ancillary Office for a Period of 3 Years in “Undetermined” Zone, Lot 1162 RP (Part) in D.D. 119 and Adjoining Government Land, Kung Um Road, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/1000C)

A/YL-TYST/1019 Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Construction Materials and Exhibition Materials for a Period of 3 Years in “Undetermined” Zone, Lots 1170 S.B ss.2 (Part), 1170 S.B ss.3 (Part), 1170 S.B ss.4 S.A, 1170 S.B ss.4 RP, 1170 S.B ss.5 (Part), 1170 S.B RP (Part), 1173 (Part), 1175 (Part), 1176 (Part) and 1196 (Part) in D.D. 119, Pak Sha Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/1019B)

A/YL-TYST/1053 Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Construction Materials, Carpets and Porcelains with Ancillary Office for a Period of 3 Years in “Undetermined” Zone, Lot 1241 (Part) in D.D. 119, Tong Yan San Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/1053)

175. The Committee agreed that as the three applications were similar in nature and the application sites fell within the same “Undetermined” (“U”) zone, they could be considered together.

Presentation and Question Sessions

176. 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 temporary warehouse for storage of construction materials and household materials with ancillary office for a period of three years under application No. A/YL-TYST/1000, the temporary warehouse for storage of construction materials and exhibition materials for a period of three years under application No. A/YL-TYST/1019, and the temporary warehouse for storage of construction materials, carpets and porcelains with ancillary office for a period of three years under application No. A/YL-TYST/1053;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Papers;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public comment from an individual raising concern on the application was received for each application. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 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 11 of the Papers. The applied uses were not in conflict with the planning intention of the “U” zone. Whilst the application sites fell within various zonings on the Revised Recommended Outline Development Plan of Yuen Long South, the Chief Engineer/Cross-Boundary Infrastructure and Development, PlanD and the Project Manager (West), Civil Engineering and Development Department had no objection to the applications. Approval of the applications on a temporary basis would not jeopardise the long-term development of the area. While there were residential structures in the vicinity, the applied uses were generally not incompatible with the surroundings. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the applications, except the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) (on applications No. A/YL-TYST/1000 and 1053 only). DEP did not support the two applications as there were sensitive receivers of residential use in the vicinity of the application sites, and the applied uses would cause traffic of heavy vehicles and environmental nuisance was expected. However, there was no environmental complaint concerning the application sites

received in the past three years. To minimise any possible environmental nuisance and to address the technical requirements of the concerned government departments, appropriate approval conditions were recommended. Shorter compliance periods were recommended for the concerned application in order to closely monitor the progress on compliance with the associated approval conditions. Given that previous approvals for warehouse use had been granted to the application sites and similar applications had been approved in the “U” zone, approval of the applications 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.

177. Members had no question on the applications.

Deliberation Session

For Application No A/YL-TYST/1000

178. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 20.11.2023, 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 vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) the existing trees on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;

- (e) the implementation of the accepted drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 20.5.2021;
- (f) in relation to (e) above, the implemented drainage facilities shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) the implementation of the accepted fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.5.2021;
- (h) 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
- (i) if any of the above planning conditions (e) or (g) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

For Application No A/YL-TYST/1019

180. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 20.11.2023, 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 medium or heavy goods vehicles exceeding 5.5 tonnes, including container tractors/trailers, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the Site, as proposed by the applicant, at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the existing trees on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) the implementation of the accepted drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 20.5.2021;
- (g) in relation to (f) above, the implemented drainage facilities shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) the implementation of the accepted fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.5.2021;
- (i) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) or (g) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (j) if any of the above planning conditions (f) 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.”

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

For Application No A/YL-TYST/1053

182. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 20.11.2023, 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 heavy goods vehicles exceeding 24 tonnes, including container tractors/trailers, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site, as proposed by the applicant, at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the existing trees on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) the existing drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) the submission of a condition record of the existing drainage facilities on the site within 3 months from the date of commencement of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 20.2.2021;
- (h) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire

Services or of the TPB by 20.2.2021;

- (i) in relation to (h) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.5.2021;
- (j) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) or (f) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (k) if any of the above planning conditions (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.”

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

Agenda Items 48 and 49

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TYST/1032 Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Construction Materials and Electronic Goods for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group A)3” Zone and an area shown as ‘Road’, Lots 2720 RP (Part), 2722 RP (Part), 2723 (Part), 2724 (Part), 2725, 2726, 2727 (Part), 2735 (Part) and 2736 RP (Part) in D.D. 120, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/1032A)

A/YL-TYST/1034 Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Construction Materials and Electronic Goods for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (GroupA)3” Zone and an area shown as ‘Road’, Lot 1368 (Part) in D.D. 119 and Adjoining Government Land, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/1034A)

184. The Committee agreed that as the two applications were similar in nature and submitted by the same applicant and the application sites fell within the same zoning, they could be considered together.

Presentation and Question Sessions

185. 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 temporary warehouses for storage of construction materials and electronic goods for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Papers;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public comment on application No. A/YL-TYST/1032 from an individual raising

concern, and three public comments on application No. A/YL-TYST/1034, with two objecting comments from a member of Yuen Long District Council and a village representative of Muk Kiu Tau Tsuen and one raising concern from an individual were received. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 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 11 of the Papers. Whilst the applied uses were not in line with the planning intention of the “Residential (Group A) 3” (“R(A)3”) zone and area shown as ‘Road’ on the Revised Recommended Outline Development Plan of Yuen Long South (YLS), 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. While there were residential structures in the vicinity, the applied uses were generally not incompatible with the surroundings. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the applications, except the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP). DEP did not support the applications as there were sensitive receivers of residential use in the vicinity of the application sites, and the applied uses would cause traffic of heavy vehicles and environmental nuisance was expected. However, no environmental complaint concerning the application sites was received in the past three years. To minimise any possible environmental nuisance and to address the technical requirements of the concerned government departments, appropriate approval conditions were recommended. Shorter compliance periods were recommended for the concerned applications in order to closely monitor the progress on compliance with the associated approval conditions. Given that previous approvals for warehouse use had been granted to the application sites and similar applications had been approved in the “R(A)3” zone, approval of the applications 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.

186. Members had no question on the applications.

Deliberation Session

187. The Committee noted that the application sites fell within the boundary of YLS development. The application site of application No. A/YL-TYST/1032 fell within the boundary of Stage 1 development with the planned land clearance to commence in mid 2022 at the earliest, while the application site of application No. A/YL-TYST/1034 fell within the boundary of Stage 2 Phase 1 and Stage 2 Phase 2 development with the planned land clearance to commence from mid 2022 onwards at the earliest. Although the approval period of three years might be in conflict with the planned land clearance in mid 2022 should the application be approved, the applicants would be advised to note the relevant advisory clause in Appendix V of the Papers that the land resumption for the implementation of the YLS development might take place at any time before the expiry of the temporary planning permission.

For Application No A/YL-TYST/1032

188. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 20.11.2023, 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 vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) the existing trees on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;

- (e) the existing drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) the submission of 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 20.2.2021;
- (g) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.2.2021;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.5.2021;
- (i) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d) or (e) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (j) if any of the above planning conditions (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.”

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

For Application No A/YL-TYST/1034

190. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 20.11.2023, 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 vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) the existing trees on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (e) the existing drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) the submission of 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 20.2.2021;
- (g) the implementation of the accepted fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 20.5.2021;
- (h) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d) or (e) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (i) if any of the above planning conditions (f) or (g) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

Agenda Item 50

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-TYST/1046 Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Exhibition Materials, Furniture, Construction Materials, Vehicle Parts and Electronic Parts for a Period of 3 Years in “Undetermined” Zone, Lots 980 (Part), 981 and 999 (Part) in D.D. 119, Pak Sha Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/1046A)

192. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 5.11.2020 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow time to implement the fire service installation (FSIs) proposal and drainage proposal. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted a FSIs proposal.

193. 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 51

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TYST/1054 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Documents and Office Supplies for a Period of 3 Years in “Undetermined” Zone, Lots 1544 (Part) and 1545 (Part) in D.D.119, Pak Sha Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/1054)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the renewal of planning approval for temporary warehouse for storage of documents and office supplies 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 from an individual providing views 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 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. Approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardise the long-term development of the area. The application was generally in line with Town Planning Board Guidelines 34C. To address the local concerns and technical requirements of the concerned government departments, appropriate approval conditions were recommended. Regarding the public comment, the comments of government departments and planning

assessments above were relevant.

195. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

196. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years and be renewed from 25.11.2020 to 24.11.2023, 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 activities, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no medium or heavy goods vehicle exceeding 5.5 tonnes, including container tractors/trailers, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (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 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 25.2.2021;
- (i) the existing fire service installations implemented on the site should be maintained in efficient working order at all times during the planning approval period;
- (j) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g) or (i) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (k) if the above planning condition (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.”

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

[The Chairman thanked Mr Alexander W.Y. Mak, Mr Simon P.H. Chan, Ms Carol K.L. Kan, Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee and Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STPs/TMYLW, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 52

Any Other Business

198. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 5:05 p.m.