

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 666th Meeting of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee held at 2:30 p.m. on 26.2.2021

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Chairman

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Vice-chairman

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Mr K.K. Cheung

Dr C.H. Hau

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 East,
Transport Department
Mr Ken K.K. Yip

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

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

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 L.C. Cheung

Opening Remarks

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

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 665th RNTPC Meeting held on 5.2.2021

[Open Meeting]

2. The draft minutes of the 665th RNTPC meeting held on 5.2.2021 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matter Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Applicant

Kenneth To & Associates Limited

Mr Kenneth To

Ms Kitty Wong

LLA Consultancy Limited

Mr S.L. Ng

} Applicant's representatives

7. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the meeting. He then invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the background of the application.

8. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed rezoning of the application site (the Site) from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Hotel" ("OU(Hotel)") to "Residential (Group A)12" ("R(A)12") zone subject to a plot ratio (PR) restriction of 7.0 and a building height (BH) restriction of 50mPD on the draft Ma On Shan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/MOS/23 to facilitate residential development in general;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication periods, a total of 164 public comments were received, including five supporting comments from individuals, 158 objecting or adverse comments from the Sha Tin Rural Committee, residents of Marbella (88 in standard format with additional comments) and individuals, and the remaining one providing views not relevant to the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the PlanD's view - PlanD had no in-principle objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. It was the

general practice to provide flexibility in land use zoning through Column 1 and Column 2 of the Notes of the OZP to allow the market to respond to demand, rather than identify particular sites for hotel use under a specific ‘hotel’ zoning. The Commissioner for Tourism did not raise objection to the application and noted that there might be other demands for land in Hong Kong, such as housing needs, and there was a need to make a macro view and weigh among competing demands. The proposed residential use with supporting commercial facilities were not incompatible with the surrounding area. The proposed development restrictions of the “R(A)12” zone were the same as those under the existing “OU(Hotel)” zone. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape of PlanD had no adverse comment on the proposed rezoning from the urban design and visual perspectives. The Director of Environmental Protection indicated that the potential environmental impacts should be properly addressed and mitigated during the detailed design stage and relevant lease conditions requiring the submission of Noise Impact Assessment and Sewerage Impact Assessment would be necessary. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Regarding the public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

9. The Chairman then invited the applicants’ representatives to elaborate on the application. With the aid of a PowerPoint Presentation, Ms Kitty Wong, the applicant’s representative, made the following main points:

- (a) the application site was originally zoned “Government, Institution or Community” on the draft Ma On Shan OZP No. S/MOS/1;
- (b) the Visitor and Tourism Study (the Vistour Study) completed in 1995 indicated that there were insufficient hotel rooms and other accommodations for the potential growth in visitors and thus recommended an action plan for the creation of new nodes for tourism development. Shatin, as one of the new tourism nodes, had been identified as a new node of sporting and leisure activities (including aquatic stadium) and a new

hotel node to act as an intervening accommodation opportunity for visitors from mainland China. The Site was hence rezoned to “OU(Hotel)” for hotel development and the subject hotel was completed in 2002;

- (c) given the changes in tourism planning and limited land resources in Hong Kong, there was a need to strike a balance in land utilization to meet the competing demands for housing;
- (d) the applicant had submitted two indicative schemes for partial or wholesale conversion of the existing hotel, namely the “Residential cum Hotel Scheme” with 637 flats and 194 hotel rooms and the “Full Residential Scheme” with 758 flats. Supporting commercial and recreational facilities were also proposed for both schemes. To comply with the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R), one existing floor would need to be demolished under the “Full Residential Scheme”;
- (e) the proposed development would be in line with the Government’s policy on increasing housing supply and encouraging home ownership;
- (f) the proposed partial or wholesale conversion would speed up the implementation process by two to three years as compared with redevelopment and there would be no increase in the development bulk;
- (g) with good accessibility, the Site was considered suitable for residential use. The proposed residential development was also compatible with the surrounding land uses; and
- (h) the proposed rezoning was technically feasible.

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

11. Some Members raised the following questions to the applicant's representatives:

- (a) occupancy rate and operation mode of the existing hotel;
- (b) whether the future residential units would be for sale or leasing out;
- (c) the reason why the "Full Residential Scheme" and "Residential cum Hotel Scheme" could only achieve a lower PR but not the proposed maximum PR of 7.0 under application; and
- (d) whether the existing hotel with the current floor layout was suitable for conversion to residential use, and whether the applicant would pursue a redevelopment rather than conversion should the application be approved.

12. In response, Mr Kenneth To and Ms Kitty Wong, the applicant's representatives, made the following points:

- (a) the average occupancy rate of the existing hotel was about 95%. Among which, about 99% of the hotel guests were locals while only about 1% were tourists. The hotel rooms were allowed for both long and short stays;
- (b) the future residential units would be for sale;
- (c) the achievable PR of the Site was subject to the maximum PR allowed for Class B site under the B(P)R. Given a BH restriction of 50mPD imposed on the Site, unlike a non-domestic building which could be developed up to a PR of 7.0, the maximum permissible PR for a pure domestic building (i.e. the "Full Residential Scheme") or a composite building (i.e. the "Residential cum Hotel Scheme") could only achieve a PR lower than 7.0; and
- (d) the floor layout of the proposed residential units would be very similar to that of the existing hotel room, which was of about 50 m² in size with living room, bedroom, bathroom and pantry. No major alteration works were

required for the proposed conversion. As such, there might not be much incentive for the applicant to redevelop the Site.

13. Some Members raised the following questions to PlanD's representatives:
 - (a) whether the two proposed indicative schemes had binding effect on the s.12A rezoning application;
 - (b) planning considerations for the current application;
 - (c) the BH restrictions imposed on the surrounding developments, and whether a higher BH should be allowed;
 - (d) the reason for introducing a new "R(A)" sub-zone for the Site;
 - (e) the reason why the proposed PRs for the two indicative schemes were lower than the permissible maximum PR under the "R(A)12" zone; and
 - (f) implementation of the tourism node in Sha Tin as recommended in the Vistour Study.

14. In response, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, made the following main points:
 - (a) the subject application was a s.12A application for rezoning the Site from "OU(Hotel)" to "R(A)12". The two proposed schemes were only for indicative purpose and mainly to demonstrate that the proposed partial or wholesale conversion of the existing hotel was technically feasible. If the rezoning application was approved, the Site under the "R(A)" sub-zone proposed by the applicant would allow 'flat' use as a Column 1 use permitted as of right while 'hotel' would be a Column 2 use requiring planning permission from the Board. In that regard, if the applicant pursued a 'hotel' use at the Site by way of redevelopment, planning permission would be required;

- (b) the relevant planning considerations included land use compatibility, development intensity in terms of PR and BH, technical feasibility, possible impacts, if any, and the additional mitigation measures; and the planning gain such as an increase in housing supply, should be taken into account when considering the current application;
- (c) the stepped BH concept was adopted in the Ma On Shan area, with a descending BH profile from the inner area to the waterfront. The major residential developments in the inner area were subject to a BH restriction of 130mPD, while a BH restriction of 50mPD was imposed for the Site located at the waterfront. The proposed BH restriction of 50mPD as proposed by the applicant for the Site was generally in line with the stepped BH concept of the OZP;
- (d) the “R(A)” zone including its sub-zones would be subject to the same set of Schedule of Uses, i.e. Column 1 and Column 2 uses. For the “R(A)” sub-zones, they were subject to different PR and/or BH restrictions. For instance, the “R(A)” zone on the extant OZP was subject to a maximum domestic/non-domestic PR of 5/9.5 while the currently proposed “R(A)12” zone would be subject to a maximum PR and BH of 7.0 and 50mPD;
- (e) the “Residential cum Hotel Scheme” and the “Full Residential Scheme” could achieve a PR of 6.88 and 6.301 respectively, which were lower than the proposed PR restriction of 7.0 due to the control under B(P)R; and
- (f) there were currently a total of six hotels in operation in Sha Tin and Ma On Shan areas. Three of them were completed after the opening of the subject hotel at the Site. Besides, while Shing Mun River was commonly used for holding boating and canoeing competitions/events, there was no known implementation programme for the aquatic stadium as recommended in the Vistour Study.

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

Deliberation Session

16. The Chairman recapitulated for Members' consideration that the current application was for amendment to the OZP and the two indicative schemes submitted by the applicant were for illustration purpose and had no binding effect upon rezoning of the Site. Should the application be approved, the development scheme to be implemented by the applicant might be subject to change provided it complied with the restrictions on the OZP. Members noted that the proposed use and development intensity were considered not incompatible with the surrounding developments, relevant technical assessments had been conducted and concerned government departments had no adverse comment on the application.

17. Members in general considered that the application could be supported as the existing hotel had been leased out to the locals for long or short stay in response to the market demand. After conversion, the residential units would be for sale rather than leasing out, which implied merely a change in the operation mode. Noting that the floor layout of the existing hotel was akin to a residential unit, no substantial conversion works would be involved. The resultant building bulk and BH of the proposed development would remain unchanged and the proposed residential use was generally in line with the planning intention of the Ma On Shan area.

18. After deliberation, the Committee decided to agree to the application for rezoning the Site from "OU (Hotel)" to "R(A)12" with a maximum plot ratio of 7.0 and a maximum building height of 50mPD. Amendments to the draft Ma On Shan OZP No. S/MOS/23 would be submitted to the Committee for consideration prior to gazetting under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance upon reference back of the OZP.

Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West District

Agenda Item 4

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/YL-LFS/11 Application for Amendment to the Approved Lau Fau Shan & Tsim Bei Tsui Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-LFS/9, To rezone the application site from “Recreation” to “Government, Institution or Community (1)”, Lots 1966 S.A, 1966 RP, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1975 RP, 2024 RP (Part) in D.D. 129 and adjoining Government Land, Lau Fau Shan, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. Y/YL-LFS/11B)

19. The Secretary reported that the application was for columbarium use. ERM Hong Kong Limited (ERM) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr K.K. Cheung had declared an interest on the item for his firm having current business dealings with ERM and being the legal advisor of the Private Columbaria Licensing Board (PCLB).

20. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As the interest of Mr K.K. Cheung’s firm being the legal advisor of PCLB was indirect and he had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

21. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 1.2.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address departmental and public comments. It was the third time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information including revised sewerage impact assessment, revised traffic management plan, amended archaeological impact assessment, updated information on land contamination issue, and responses to departmental and public comments.

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

Sai Kung and Islands District

[Mr Raymond H.F. Au, Senior Town Planner/Sai Kung and Islands (STP/SKIs), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/I-TCV/17 Temporary Shop and Services (Vegetable and Grocery Store) with Ancillary Office and Storage Uses for a Period of 3 Years in "Village Type Development" and "Residential (Group C) 2" Zones, Lots 1304 S.A and 1304 RP in D.D.1 TC, Tung Chung Valley, Lantau Island
(RNTPC Paper No. A/I-TCV/17A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

23. Mr Raymond H.F. Au, STP/SKIs, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;

- (b) the temporary shop and services (vegetable and grocery store) with ancillary office and storage uses for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, one public comment from an individual objecting to the application was 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 temporary use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Although the applied use was not entirely in line with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” (“V”) and the “Residential (Group C) 2” (“R(C)2”) zones, it was considered not incompatible with the surrounding environment and land uses, and it could serve the needs of the local villagers and residential neighbourhood. The Lands Department advised that there was no Small House application approved or under processing at the site. Approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardise the long-term planning intentions of the area. Relevant government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. 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.

24. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the applied use was not in line with the general planning intention of the Tung Chung Valley (TCV) Area as alleged by the objecting public comment;
- (b) information on the previously rejected application at the site (No. A/I-TCV/14);

- (c) the business nature of the applied use under the current application; and
- (d) whether heavy goods vehicles would enter/exit the site to support the applied use under the current application.

25. In response, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, STP/SKIs, made the following main points:

- (a) the general planning intention of the TCV Area was to conserve the ecologically sensitive areas, to protect the rural and natural character, and to maintain the unique landscape character and cultural heritage. Land had also been reserved at suitable locations for Small House development by indigenous villagers and low-rise low-density residential development. The application site straddled the “V” and “R(C)2” zones. While the “V” zone was primarily intended for development of Small Houses by indigenous villagers, some selected commercial and community uses such as shop and services serving the needs of the villagers and in support of the village development were always permitted on the ground floor of a New Territories Exempted House and other commercial uses might be permitted on application. The planning intention of “R(C)2” zone was primarily for low-rise, low-density residential developments where commercial uses serving the residential neighbourhood might be permitted on planning application. As such, the shop and services use under application was considered not in conflict with the general planning of the TCV area and the two concerned zones;
- (b) the previously rejected application at the site (No. A/I-TCV/14) was for temporary wholesale trade (wholesale vegetable market) under which heavy vehicles of 5.5 tonnes and 9 tonnes would be used for transporting vegetable and other products to the site, which would likely generate traffic noise and air nuisance to the nearby residential dwellings. Besides, no information on wastewater management was submitted under that application. In that regard, the applicants of the previous application had failed to demonstrate that there were no adverse environmental and

sewerage impacts on the surrounding areas;

- (c) the applied use under the current application was for retail of vegetables, groceries and daily necessities to serve the needs of the local villagers; and
- (d) according to the applicants, as no car parking or loading/unloading space would be provided and no vehicles would be allowed to enter the site, vegetables and groceries would be unloaded at the public car park in Mun Tung Estate (about 530m away) and transported to the site via trolleys. There would be no vehicular traffic and heavy vehicles for loading/unloading at/near the site.

Deliberation Session

26. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 26.2.2024 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 8:00 a.m. daily, as proposed by the applicants, 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 the design of septic tank and soakaway system, as proposed by the applicants, within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Lands or of the TPB by 26.8.2021;
- (d) in relation to (c) above, the provision of septic tank and soakaway system, as proposed by the applicants, within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Lands or of the TPB by 26.11.2021;

- (e) the submission of a drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 26.8.2021;
- (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 26.11.2021;
- (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 and water supplies proposal for firefighting within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 26.8.2021;
- (i) in relation to (h) above, the implementation of the fire service installations and water supplies proposal for firefighting within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 26.11.2021;
- (j) if any of the above planning condition (a), (b), 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 condition (c), (d), (e), (f), (h) or (i) is not complied with by the specified date, the planning approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

[The Chairman thanked Mr Raymond H.F. Au, STP/SKIs, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

Sha Tin, Tai Po and North District

[Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, District Planning Officer/Shan Tin, Tai Po and North (DPO/STN), Mr Tony Y.C. Wu and Mr Tim T.Y. Fung, Senior Town Planners/Shan Tin, Tai Po and North (STPs/STN), and Mr Dino W.L. TANG, Town Planner/Shan Tin, Tai Po and North (TP/STN), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-LT/695 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Private Car Park (Private Cars and Light Goods Vehicles) for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lots 408 S.B ss.2, 408 S.B ss.3, 408 S.B ss.4, 408 S.B ss.5 and 408 S.B RP (Part) in D.D. 10, Chai Kek Village, Lam Tsuen, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LT/695)

28. The Committee noted that the application was for renewal of planning approval for temporary private car park (private cars and light goods vehicles) for a period of three years. During the statutory publication period, no public comment was received.

29. The Committee noted that the Planning Department had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The application was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 34C and 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 approved conditions were recommended.

30. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years and be renewed from 3.3.2021 to 2.3.2024 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no medium or heavy goods vehicle exceeding 5.5 tonnes including container tractors/trailers, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance, is allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (b) no reversing of vehicles into or out from the site is allowed at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) the preventive measures against water pollution to the upper indirect water gathering ground should be properly maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (d) the development should not cause any water pollution to the upper indirect water gathering ground at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the submission of a condition record of the existing drainage facilities within 3 months from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 3.6.2021;
- (f) if any of the above planning condition (a), (b), (c) or (d) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice;
- (g) if the above planning condition (e) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice; and
- (h) 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.”

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

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/ST/993 Proposed Service Reservoir in “Green Belt” Zone, Government Land
next to Pok Chuen Street at Shui Chuen O, Sha Tin
(RNTPC Paper No. A/ST/993)

32. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Water Supplies Department (WSD) and Mr K.K. Cheung had declared an interest on the item for his firm having current business dealings with WSD. As Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

33. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr Dino W.L. TANG, TP/STN, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed service reservoir;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, two public comments from the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society and an individual objecting to 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. The application was for a proposed salt water service reservoir (SWSR) on government land located on a sloping site within the “Green Belt” zone. According to the applicant, the proposed SWSR was required to meet the

needs of the area. The applicant had demonstrated that the application site was the most suitable one which could meet the technical and operational requirements and no alternative sites were available. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. The proposed development was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 in that the proposed SWSR was an essential project, not incompatible with the surrounding landscape character and would not cause adverse impacts. Regarding the local concerns raised, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

34. A Member asked whether the reservoir structure could be further set back from Pok Chuen Street so that more trees could be planted to minimise the potential visual impact. In response, Mr Dino W.L. TANG, TP/STN, said that any further setback for tree planting purpose would be subject to site constraints and might not meet the operational requirements of the SWSR. Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, supplemented that in addition to tree planning, other mitigation measures such as shrubs and climbers along the periphery of the site and green roof were also proposed by the applicant. The concern on visual impact would be conveyed to the applicant for their consideration.

Deliberation Session

35. The Chairman said that given the site constraints and operational requirements of the proposed SWSR, there might be limited scope for allowing further setback of the SWSR for tree planting. However, the applicant, i.e. WSD, could be advised to enhance the landscaping provision so as to address the concern on possible visual impact. PlanD would convey the Committee's concern to WSD so that they could improve the landscape proposal at the detailed design stage.

36. 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 26.2.2025, 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 submission and implementation of proposals for water supplies for firefighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

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

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-PK/146 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in
“Agriculture” Zone, Lot 1574 S.C RP in D.D. 91, Kai Leng, Sheung
Shui
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-PK/146)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed house (New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) – Small House);
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, two public comments, with one from Designing Hong Kong Limited objecting to the application and the other from an individual indicating no comment, 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 development was not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” zone and the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation did not support the application as the application site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation, the proposed Small House was considered not incompatible with the surrounding rural setting. Other concerned government departments had no adverse comment on or no objection to the application. The application generally complied with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in New Territories in that the footprint of the proposed Small House fell entirely within the village ‘environs’ and there was a general shortage of land within the “Village Type Development” zone to meet the Small House demand. The application site was the subject of a previously approved application for Small House development submitted by the same applicant and the processing of Small House grant application at the site was at an advanced stage. Sympathetic consideration could be given to the application. The circumstances of the current application were largely the same as those of the approved similar applications in the vicinity. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

39. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

40. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 26.2.2025, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the provision of septic tank, as proposed by the applicant, at a location to the satisfaction of the Director of Lands or of the TPB;

- (b) the submission and implementation of proposal for water mains diversion before commencement of works to the satisfaction of the Director of Water Supplies or of the TPB; and
- (c) the submission and implementation of drainage proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.”

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

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-LK/136 Proposed Temporary Private Car Park (Private Car and Light Goods Vehicle) for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 1548 (Part) in D.D. 39, Ma Tseuk Leng, Sha Tau Kok
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LK/136)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary private car park (private car and light goods vehicle) for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, one public comment from the Chairman of Sheung Shui District Rural Committee indicating no comment on the application was received; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. Although the proposed use was not entirely in line with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” zone, the Lands Department advised that there was no Small House application received for the application site. Approval of the application on a temporary basis of three years would not jeopardise the long-term planning intention of the area. Given the small scale of the development, the proposed use was considered not incompatible with the surrounding village setting. Relevant government departments had no adverse comment on or no objection to the application. To minimise any possible environmental nuisance and to address the technical requirements of the concerned government departments, appropriate approval conditions were recommended.

43. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

44. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 26.2.2024 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 11:30 p.m. and 6:30 a.m., as proposed by the applicants, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no vehicle without valid licence issued under the Road Traffic (Registration and Licensing of Vehicles) Regulations is allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) only private cars and light goods vehicles as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site at any time during the planning approval period;

- (d) a notice shall be posted at a prominent location of the site to indicate that only private cars and light goods vehicles as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the submission of a 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 26.8.2021;
- (f) in relation to (e) above, the provision of the drainage facilities within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 26.11.2021;
- (g) the submission of proposals for water supplies for fire-fighting 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 26.8.2021;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implementation of the proposals for water supplies for fire-fighting 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 26.11.2021;
- (i) if any of the above planning condition (a), (b), (c) or (d) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (j) if any of the above planning condition (e), (f), (g) or (h) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

Agenda Item 10

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-TKL/655 Proposed Temporary Warehouse and Open Storage of Construction Materials for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 1504 S.B, 1505, 1506, 1509 RP and 1510 RP in D.D. 76 and adjoining Government Land, Ta Kwu Ling
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TKL/655)

46. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Ta Kwu Ling and Dr Conrad T.C. Wong had declared an interest on the item for being the director of a company which owned a piece of land in Ta Kwu Ling.

47. The Committee noted that the applicant’ representative had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As the property owned by Dr Conrad T.C. Wong’s company had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

48. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 18.2.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address the departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

Agenda Item 11

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-TKLN/38 Proposed Public Utility Installation (Sewage Pumping Station) in
“Recreation” Zone, Government Land in D.D. 82, Ping Che Road,
Tong Fong, Ta Kwu Ling
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TKLN/38)

50. The application was submitted by the Drainage Services Department (DSD). Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP) was the consultant of the applicant. The following Members have declared interests on the item:

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

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

51. As the interest of Dr C.H. Hau was direct, the Committee agreed that he should be invited to leave the meeting temporary for the item. As Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

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

Presentation and Question Sessions

52. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, 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 public utility installation (sewage pumping station);
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper;

- (d) during the statutory publication period, three public comments, with two from Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden and an individual expressing concerns on the application and one from a North District Council member indicating no comment, 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 sewage pumping station (SPS) was not entirely in line with the planning intention of the “Recreation” (“REC”) zone, it was of small scale located at the periphery of the “REC” zone with minimal impact on the nearby village settlements. Having comprehensively considered the technical constraints, the applicant considered that the application site was the only piece of suitable government land of adequate size to develop the SPS. There was an existing SPS on the application site, which was within the sewerage catchment network. The application site was at a low topographical level for effective sewage collection by gravity and was equipped with a proper maintenance access. The proposed SPS was considered not incompatible with the surrounding areas. The proposal was supported by the North District Council and Ta Kwu Ling District Rural Committee in May 2018 and February 2021 respectively. Relevant government departments had no objection to or no comment on the application. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

53. A Member asked about the details of the proposed boundary wall design and planting arrangement as illustrated in Drawing A-10 of the Paper. In response, Mr Tim T.Y. Fung, STP/STN, said that under the proposal, the boundary wall of artificial timber fins would be set up at the periphery of the application site and climber plantings would be placed behind the boundary wall. Such design was to facilitate the future management and maintenance of the plantings and to blend in with the surrounding environment.

Deliberation Session

54. Whilst noting that some climber plantings might grow through the timber fins, a Member opined that it might not be desirable to place the climber plantings mainly behind the boundary wall. The Chairman suggested that PlanD could convey the Member's concern to the applicant, i.e. DSD, for enhancing the planting arrangement. Members agreed.

55. 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 26.2.2025, 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 submission and implementation of proposals for water supplies for fire-fighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

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

[The Chairman thanked Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, Mr Tony Y.C. Wu and Mr Tim T.Y. Fung, STPs/STN, and Mr Dino W.L. TANG, TP/STN, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

[Dr C.H. Hau returned to join the meeting at this point.]

Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East District

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

Agenda Item 12

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/FLN/22

Proposed Temporary Shop and Services, Place of Entertainment, Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Barbecue Site) and Public Vehicle Park (excluding container vehicle) for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture”, “Government, Institution or Community”, “Open Space”, “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Sewage Pumping Station”, “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Amenity Area” Zones and area shown as ‘Road’, Lots 517 RP, 518 RP, 521 RP, 522, 523 RP, 524 RP, 525, 526, 527 RP, 532 RP (Part), 533 RP (Part), 534 RP (Part), 539 (Part), 540 (Part), 541 (Part), 542 (Part), 543 (Part), 544, 545, 547 (Part), 548 (Part), 551 (Part), 552 and 553 in D.D. 51 and Adjoining Government Land, Sheung Shui
(RNTPC Paper No. A/FLN/22C)

57. The Committee noted that the applicants’ representative requested on 18.2.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address comments from the Transport Department (TD). It was the fourth time that the applicants requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicants had been liaising with TD to resolve the traffic issues.

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

Agenda Item 13

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-KTS/493 Temporary Storage of Detergent Packaging and Construction Materials with Ancillary Office for a Period of 3 Years in “Recreation” Zone, Lots 1618 (Part), 1619 and 1620 (Part) in D.D. 100 and Adjoining Government Land, Ying Pun, Kwu Tung South, Sheung Shui
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-KTS/493)

59. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Kwu Tung South and in the vicinity of Hong Kong Golf Club (HKGC). Dr Lawrence K.C. Li had declared an interest on the item for being a member of the HKGC.

60. The Committee noted that the applicants had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Dr Lawrence K.C. Li had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

61. The Committee noted that the applicants requested on 17.2.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address comments of the Transport Department. It was the first time that the applicants requested deferment of the application.

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

Agenda Item 14

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTN/725 Proposed Temporary Animal Boarding Establishment (Dog Kennel cum Dog Recreation Centre) for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 1376 RP (Part) in D.D.109, Tai Kong Po, Kam Tin, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTN/725A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the temporary animal boarding establishment (dog kennel cum dog recreation centre) for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, five public comments were received, including four objecting comments from Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation, World Wide Fund for Nature (Hong Kong), Hong Kong Bird Watching Society and an individual and the remaining comment from an individual indicating no in-principle objection to the application but asking for some information. Major views are 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 as the application site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation, approval of the application on a temporary basis for three years would not jeopardise the long-term planning intention of the “AGR” zone. The proposed development was considered not incompatible with the surrounding areas. Other relevant government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. The technical requirements of the concerned government departments could be addressed by the appropriate approval conditions. There were 40 similar applications within the same “AGR” zone and only one was rejected. The circumstances of the only rejected similar application were different from those of the current application. Regarding the public comments received, the comments from concerned government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

64. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

65. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 26.2.2024 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) all animals shall be kept inside the enclosed structures on the site, as proposed by the applicant, at all times during the planning approval period;
- (c) no public announcement system, portable loud speaker, 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 26.8.2021;
- (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 26.11.2021;
- (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 26.8.2021;
- (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 26.11.2021;
- (j) if any of the above planning condition (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 condition (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.”

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

Agenda Item 15

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTN/747 Temporary Animal Boarding Establishment for a Period of 5 Years in
“Agriculture” Zone, Lot 178 (Part) in D.D. 110, Kam Tin
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTN/747)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) temporary animal boarding establishment for a period of five years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, three public comments from Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation, Designing Hong Kong Limited and an individual objecting to 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. Although the applied 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 as the application site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation, approval

of the application on a temporary basis for five years would not jeopardise the long-term planning intention of the “AGR” zone. The applied use was considered not incompatible with the surrounding areas. Other relevant 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. There were 40 similar applications within the same “AGR” zone and only one was rejected. The circumstances of the only rejected similar application was different from those of the current application. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

68. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

69. The Committee noted that the application site was currently used as an animal boarding establishment for dogs without planning permission. The applicant was to regularise the current use at the application site.

70. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years until 26.2.2026 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 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, at all times 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 26.8.2021;
- (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 26.11.2021;
- (g) in relation to (f) above, the implemented the 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 26.8.2021;
- (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 26.11.2021;
- (j) if any of the above planning condition (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 condition (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.”

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

Agenda Item 15A

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTS/875 Temporary Site Office and Service Depot for Drainage and Sewerage Works for a Period of 3 Years in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Rural Use” Zone, Lot 455 RP (Part) in D.D. 106, Kam Sheung Road, Kam Tin, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTS/875)

Presentation and Question Sessions

72. 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 site office and service depot for drainage and sewerage works;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, one public comment from an individual raising objection to 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 temporary use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the

assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. Although the applied use was not in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Rural Use” (“OU(RU)”) zone, there was no known programme for long-term development at the application site. Approval of the application on a temporary basis would not frustrate the long-term planning intention of the “OU(RU)”) zone. The development was considered not incompatible with the surrounding areas. Relevant government departments, except the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP), had no adverse comment on the application. DEP did not support the application as there were sensitive receivers in the vicinity and environmental nuisance was expected. However, there had not been any environmental complaint received by DEP in the past three years. To address the concerns on the possible environmental nuisances or the technical requirements of other concerned government departments, relevant approval conditions had been recommended. Compared with the last approved application, the current application was subject to a similar layout and scale. There was no major change in planning circumstances since the last approval. It was considered that sympathetic consideration could be given to the current application. Regarding the public comment received, the comments from concerned government departments and the planning assessments above were relevant.

73. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

74. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 26.2.2024 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;

- (b) no operation on Sundays and public holidays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no dismantling, maintenance, repairing, cleansing, paint spraying or other workshop activities are allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no heavy goods vehicle exceeding 24 tonnes, including container tractors/trailers, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance 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 maintenance of all existing trees within the site satisfactorily 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 run-in/out proposal at Kam Sheung 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 26.5.2021;
- (i) in relation to (h) above, the implementation of the run-in/out proposal at Kam Sheung 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 26.8.2021;
- (j) the submission of a record of the existing drainage facilities on site within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 26.5.2021;

- (k) 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 26.5.2021;
- (l) in relation to (k) 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 26.8.2021;
- (m) if any of the above planning condition (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f) or (g) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (n) if any of the above planning condition (h), (i), (j), (k) or (l) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

Agenda Item 16

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-PH/874 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Shop and Services
(Sales of Vehicle Parts) for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone,
Lot 303 (Part) in D.D. 110, Pat Heung, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-PH/874)

76. The Committee noted that the application was for renewal of planning approval for temporary shop and services (sales of vehicle parts) for a period of three years. During the statutory publication period, two public comments from individuals objecting to the application were received. Major views were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper.

77. The Committee noted that the Planning Department considered that the temporary use could be tolerated for a further period of 3 years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The application was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 34C and 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.

78. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years and be renewed from 3.3.2021 to 2.3.2024 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 vehicle exceeding 5.5 tonnes, including container tractors/trailers, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance is allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the existing trees within the site shall be maintained satisfactorily 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 records of the existing drainage facilities on the site within 3 months from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 3.6.2021;
- (h) the existing fire service 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 condition (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.”

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

Agenda Item 17

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-PH/875 Proposed Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Hobby Farm) for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 986 (Part), 987, 988, 1221 S.A (Part), 1221 RP (Part) and 1230 (Part) in D.D. 111, Pat Heung, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-PH/875)

80. The Committee noted that the applicants’ representative requested on 19.2.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address the departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicants requested deferment of the application.

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

Agenda Item 18

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-NSW/274 Proposed Residential (Flat) and Community Hub (Shop and Services, Eating Place, School, Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture, Social Welfare Facility and Transport Layby) Development in “Undetermined” Zone, Lots 592 S.C ss.1 S.A, 592 S.C ss.4 and 1252 S.C in D.D. 115, Nam Sang Wai, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-NSW/274B)

82. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Richduty Development Limited, which was an affiliate company of Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (SHK). Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Limited (LD), Archiplus International (Hong Kong) Limited (Archiplus), AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM), Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP) and Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui Welfare Council Limited (SKHWC) were five of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

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

83. The Committee noted that Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interests of Miss Winnie W.M. Ng and Dr Conrad T.C. Wong were direct, the Committee agreed that they should not participate in the Q&A and deliberation sessions. As Mr K.K. Cheung and Dr C.H. Hau had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

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

Presentation and Question Sessions

84. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Irene W.S. Lai, STP/FSYLE, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed residential (flat) and community hub (shop and services, eating place, school, place of recreation, sports or culture, social welfare facility and transport layby) development;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication periods, a total of 2,535 public comments were received, including 1,425 supporting comments from Shap Pat Heung Rural Committee and individuals and 1,110 objecting comments from two Yuen Long District Council members, village representatives of Shan Pui Tsuen and Shap Pat Heung Tung Tau Tsuen, Tung Shing Lane Village Residents' Welfare Association and Grand YOHO Owners' Committee, green groups (World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong, The Conservancy Association, Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation, Hong Kong Wild Bird Conservation Concern Group and Green Sense), Designing Hong Kong Limited and individuals. Major views were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The application site (the Site) was the subject of three previously approved applications with lower development intensities. The proposed development was considered not entirely out of context comparing with the surrounding developments. The Site fell within the Wetland Buffer Area

(WBA). The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) considered that the application was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 12C (TPB PG-No. 12C) as the Site did not possess significant ecological value and the off-site disturbance impact arising from the proposed development would be acceptable after implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, but pointed out that the design of the Landscape Area with Natural Habitat and Water Feature under the previously approved schemes should be retained. While the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape of PlanD pointed out that as compared with the latest approved scheme under application No. A/YL-NSW/233, the visual impact of the proposed development would be slightly adverse in overall terms, the applicant had proposed some visual mitigation measures. The proposed Special Child Care Centre was supported by the Director of Social Welfare and the other supporting facilities within the development would also serve the neighbourhood, which could be considered as planning merits. Other relevant government departments had no objection to or adverse comments 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 received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

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

Ecological Impact

85. The Chairman and two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the application in line with the “no net loss in wetland” principle of the TPB PG-No. 12C;
- (b) the major ecological concerns raised in the public comments and relevant government department’s views that a 12-month survey was not conducted

by the applicant in the ecological impact assessment (EcoIA) under the current application; and

- (c) how the concern raised by DAFC for retaining the previous design of the Landscaped Area with Natural Habitat and Water Feature (in the previously approved schemes) could be addressed.

86. In response, Ms Irene W.S. Lai, STP/FSYLE, made the following main points:

- (a) no wetland habitat was identified within the Site and DAFC considered that the application was generally in line with the TPB PG-No. 12C as off-site disturbance impacts arising from the proposed residential development would be acceptable after implementation of the appropriate mitigation measures;
- (b) the main ecological concerns raised in the public comments were about insufficient duration of the field survey and off-site disturbance impacts on bird flight paths, firefly habitat and cormorant roosts, and no wetland restoration. Regarding the field survey period, given that the current application was based on a previously approved scheme with similar footprint, DAFC confirmed that the undertaking of verification surveys was considered adequate for impact assessment purpose. For off-site disturbance impact, the Site was at a considerable distance from the areas of relatively higher ecological value. The applicant had proposed a building-free Landscape Area and further building setback of the two nearest residential blocks with lower building height to minimise obstruction to the birds' flight paths. Besides, a light simulation exercise was conducted, which showed that the impact of the increased light intensity due to the proposed development on the firefly habitat and cormorant roost would be negligible. To minimise any potential glare impact, any external flood light at the Site should be oriented away from the two habitats in Nam Sang Wai and such mitigation measure would be stipulated in the Deed of Mutual Covenant of the development for the future flat owners and property manager to follow; and

- (c) an approval condition requiring the design and provision of Landscape Area with Natural Habitat and Water Feature to the satisfaction of DAFC was recommended to address his concern.

87. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr Terence S.W. Tsang, Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment), Environmental Protection Department (AD(EA), EPD) said that the proposed development was not a designated project under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO).

88. In response to the same Member's enquiry, Ms Irene W.S. Lai, STP/FSYLE, said that the applicant had not indicated whether to adopt BEAM Plus Neighbourhood requirement in the design of the proposed development.

Traffic

89. The Chairman and a Member enquired about the findings of the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) submitted by the applicant and whether the applicant had proposed any traffic arrangement/improvement works to alleviate the traffic congestion problem, in particular for Pok Oi Interchange, and to cater for the future traffic demand in the area. In response, Ms Irene W.S. Lai, STP/FSYLE, said that according to the TIA submitted by the applicant, road widening works at Ho Chau Road from a single-track assess road to a single 2-lane 2-way carriageway with provision of a 38m-long Bus/Green Minibus bay along the widened Ho Chau Road, widening of the section of Nam Sang Wai Road near the junction with Castle Peak Road – Tam Mi, and junction improvement works of Castle Peak Road – Tam Mi/San Tam Road and Au Tau Interchange were proposed. The Commissioner for Transport had no adverse comment on the TIA, the proposed access arrangements and road improvement works. While there was no particular proposal in respect of Pok Oi Interchange under the current application, the Civil Engineering and Development Department had plans to improve the Pok Oi Interchange.

Proposed Ho Chau Road Widening Works

90. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the road widening works would be implemented by the applicant;
- (b) whether an Environmental Assessment (EA) had been conducted to assess the likely environmental impacts of the proposed road widening works; and
- (c) whether the proposed road widening works constituted a designated project.

91. In response, Ms Irene W.S. Lai, STP/FSYLE, and Mr Terence S.W. Tsang, AD(EA), EPD made the following main points:

- (a) the road widening works would be implemented by the applicant;
- (b) there was no information on the proposed road widening works in the EA; and
- (c) based on the available information, the proposed road widening works would unlikely constitute a designated project under the EIAO. However, depending on the actual scope of works, an environmental permit would be required for the construction and operation of the roadworks if any part of the works constituted a designated project under the EIAO, e.g. encroachment upon sensitive areas.

92. The same Member enquired how the potential environmental impacts, if any, induced by the proposed road widening works could be dealt with, given the absence of an EA submission in the application. The Chairman said that implementation of the road widening works would be subject to the relevant statutory and administrative control of the relevant government regulations and requirements, such as road gazetting.

93. Regarding any future change to the proposed road improvement works, Mr Ken K.K. Yip, Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories East, Transport Department (TD) supplemented that significant change in the implementation of road improvement works as proposed in the TIA would require re-submission and approval from TD. Should the applicant fail to implement the proposed road widening works, the relevant approval

condition would be considered as not being complied with.

Deliberation Session

94. The Chairman recapitulated the background and key issues of the subject application to facilitate Members' consideration. The Site was the subject of three previously approved applications and the current application was for a proposed residential development and community hub with social welfare facilities, commercial uses and transport laybys. As compared to the latest approved scheme, the current application involved an increase in total plot ratio from 0.74 to 2.29 and building height ranging from 6-10 storeys to 6-19 storeys (both excluding basement). Various technical assessments had been conducted and no significant adverse impact was anticipated. Relevant government departments had no objection to the application. Taking into account the above circumstances, Members in general had no objection to the application.

95. Regarding a Member's concern on any potential flooding risk at the Site, Members noted that the runoff within the Site would be collected and stored in two underground stormwater detention tanks and discharged to the Yuen Long Bypass Floodway, and the Drainage Services Department had no objection to such proposal.

96. A Member expressed concern on the potential ecological impact arising from the proposed Ho Chau Road widening works, which fell partly within WBA and partly within Wetland Conservation Area. Given its close proximity to the Tung Shing Lei Egretty and Yuen Long Bypass Floodway with compensatory wetlands implemented under the latter project, the Member opined that an EcoIA should be conducted to ensure that no adverse ecological impact would be caused by the proposed road widening works. This would allow the concerned government departments to scrutinise the impact of the road widening works.

97. The Chairman explained that in considering an application, the Town Planning Board (the Board) could grant planning permission with appropriate approval conditions. Such conditions, which fell within the planning ambit, were generally related to the development on the Site for which the permission was granted. For some technical requirements falling outside the Site or the purview of the Board, the Board would mainly rely on the relevant authorities to exercise control under the respective legislation and

government requirements.

98. The Secretary supplemented that if the application only involved improvement works for an existing access road, the concerned access road would normally not form part of the application site. On the contrary, if the application involved proposal for construction of a new access road serving a particular development, such proposed access road would normally be included in the application site. Nevertheless, each case should be considered on its own circumstances.

99. As to the possible ecological impact that might be brought about by the proposed Ho Chau Road widening works, the Chairman noted that concerned departments had not raised any comments in this regard. That said, to address the Members' concerns, the Chairman proposed and Members agreed that the approval condition (e) should be suitably amended to include the submission of an EcoIA, if deemed required. Members also agreed to add an additional advisory clause to advise the applicant to observe BEAM Plus Neighbourhood requirement in the detailed design of the proposed development.

100. 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 26.2.2025, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the submission and implementation of a revised Master Layout Plan to incorporate where appropriate the approval conditions (b), (c), (d), (f), (h), (j) and (k) below, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission and implementation of a Landscape Proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (c) the design and provision of vehicular access to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport and the Director of Highways or of the TPB;

- (d) the design and provision of car parking, loading/unloading and public transport facilities for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (e) the design and implementation of road improvement works, as proposed in the Traffic Impact Assessment, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport and the Director of Highways or of the TPB; and in relation to the proposed Ho Chau Road widening works, if deemed required, the submission of an Ecological Impact Assessment for the proposed works and the implementation of mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation or of the TPB;
- (f) the design and provision of a Special Child Care Centre to the satisfaction of the Director of Social Welfare or of the TPB;
- (g) the provision of water supplies for fire fighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB;
- (h) the design and provision of Landscape Area with Natural Habitat and Water Feature to the satisfaction of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation or of the TPB;
- (i) the submission of a report on the methodology and programme of the construction works with details on any piling works no later than 3 months prior to the commencement of construction to the satisfaction of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation or of the TPB;
- (j) the submission of a revised Environmental Assessment (EA) and the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the EA to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;

- (k) the submission and implementation of the detailed storm water drainage design to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (l) the submission of a detailed schedule of maintenance of the two proposed detention tanks and the associated pumping system to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (m) no filling and excavation of land on site prior to implementation of the flood relief mitigation measures accepted by the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (n) the design and provision of sewer connecting the proposed development to the Au Tau Sewage Pumping Station to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (o) the design and provision of fresh water connection point and salt water connection point to the satisfaction of the Director of Water Supplies or of the TPB.”

101. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix VII of the Paper and the additional advisory clause as below:

“to observe BEAM Plus Neighbourhood requirement in the detailed design of the proposed development.”

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

Agenda Item 19

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-NSW/285 Proposed Temporary Vehicle Maintenance Workshop, Retail Shop for Car Components/Accessories and Convenience Store with Ancillary Uses for a Period of 3 Years in “Undetermined” Zone, Lots 766 S.A (Part), 766 S.C (Part), 767 (Part), 768 (Part), 789 (Part), 790 S.A (Part) and 791 (Part) in D.D. 115, Au Tau, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-NSW/285)

Presentation and Question Sessions

102. Ms Irene W.S. Lai, STP/FSYLE, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary vehicle maintenance workshop, retail shop for car components/accessories and convenience store with ancillary uses for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, 83 public comments from individuals, with 80 supporting comments (in standard format) and three opposing comments, 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 long-term use of the “Undetermined” (“U”) zone was subject to further study, approval of the application on a temporary basis of three years would not jeopardise the long-term land use planning for the area. The proposed use was considered not incompatible with the surrounding

developments. 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. There were two approved similar applications in the same “U” zone and approval of the current application was in line with the previous decisions of the Committee. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

103. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

104. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 26.2.2024 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (b) the submission of a 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 26.8.2021;
- (c) in relation to (b) above, the implementation of the drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 26.11.2021;
- (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 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 26.8.2021;
- (f) in relation to (e) 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 26.11.2021;
- (g) if any of the above planning condition (a) or (d) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (h) if any of the above planning condition (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.”

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

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

Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West District

[Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee, Mr Alexander W.Y. Mak, Mr Simon P.H. Chan 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 20

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/TM/559 Shop and Services in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business”
Zone, Unit 1A, G/F, Hang Wai Industrial Centre, 6 Kin Tai Street,
Tuen Mun
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TM/559)

106. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 18.2.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address the departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

Agenda Item 21

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/TM/560 Columbarium in “Government, Institution or Community” Zone, Lot 792 in D.D. 131 and Adjacent Government Land, Tsing Shan Tsuen, Tuen Mun
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TM/560)

108. The Secretary reported that the application was for columbarium use. Centaline Surveyors Limited (CSL) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr K.K. Cheung had declared an interest on the item for his firm having current business dealings with CSL and being the legal advisor of the Private Columbaria Licensing Board (PCLB).

109. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As the interest of Mr K.K. Cheung’s firm being the legal advisor of PCLB was indirect and he had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

110. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 8.2.2021 deferment of consideration of the applications for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address the departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

[Mr Y.S. Wong left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 22

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-LFS/367 Temporary Private Vehicle Park (Private Cars) for a Period of 3 Years and Filling of Land in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lots 1210 S.B ss.1, 1210 S.B ss.2, 1210 S.B ss.3, 1210 S.B ss.4, 1210 S.B ss.5, 1210 S.B ss.6, 1210 S.B ss.7 and 1210 S.B RP in D.D. 129 and adjoining Government Land, Lau Fau Shan, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-LFS/367B)

Presentation and Question Sessions

112. 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 temporary private vehicle park (private cars) for a period of three years and filling of land;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, eight objecting comments from individuals were received. Major objection reasons were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD considered that the temporary use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. Although the applied use was not entirely in line with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone, the Lands Department advised that there was no Small House application approved or under processing at the application

site. Approval of the application on a temporary basis of three years would not jeopardise the long-term planning intention of the “V” zone. The applied use was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land use. Although the application site fell within Wetland Buffer Area (WBA) of the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 12C (TPB PG-No. 12C), the guidelines specified that planning applications for temporary uses were exempted from the requirement of ecological impact assessment (EcoIA). Relevant 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. There were six approved similar applications within “V” zone of the same Outline Zoning Plan and approval of the subject application was in line with the previous decisions of the Committee. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

113. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

114. Noting that planning applications for temporary uses within the WBA were exempted from the requirement of EcoIA in accordance with the TPB PG-No. 12C, a Member was concerned that repetitive permissions for temporary use were tantamount to permanent use in the long run, and enquired whether there was a record system for repeated applications at the same site. The Chairman said that for each planning application, the relevant background information including the previous applications covering the application site would be included in the Paper for Members’ reference.

115. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 26.2.2024 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no additional filling of land, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed to be carried out at the site;
- (b) only private cars as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are allowed to be parked on or enter/exit the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) a notice shall be posted at a prominent location of the site at all times to indicate that only private cars as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are allowed to be parked on or enter/exit the site during the planning approval period;
- (d) no vehicle without valid licence issued under the Road Traffic Ordinance is allowed to be parked/stored on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (f) the submission of a revised drainage proposal including flood mitigation measures within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 26.8.2021;
- (g) in relation to (f) above, the implementation of the revised drainage proposal including flood mitigation measures within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 26.11.2021;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implemented drainage facilities shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;

- (i) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 26.8.2021;
- (j) in relation to (i) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 26.11.2021;
- (k) if any of the above planning condition (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
- (l) if any of the above planning condition (f), (g), (i) or (j) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

Agenda Item 23

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-PS/626 Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Private Cars) for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lots 44 (Part), 72 (Part) and 73 (Part) in D.D. 122 and Adjoining Government Land, Ha Mei San Tsuen, Ping Shan, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-PS/626)

Presentation and Question Sessions

117. 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 temporary public vehicle park (private cars) for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, two objecting comments from individuals 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. Although the applied use was not entirely in line with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone, the Lands Department advised that there was no Small House application received or approved within the application site. Approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardise the long-term planning intention of the “V” zone. The applied use was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. To minimise any possible environmental nuisance and to address the technical requirements of the concerned government departments, appropriate approval conditions were recommended. There were three previously approved applications for the same/similar uses concerning the application site and five approved similar applications within the same “V” zone. Approval of the application was in line with the previous decisions of the Committee. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

118. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

119. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a

temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 26.2.2024 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 11:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) only private cars as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are allowed to enter/be parked on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) a notice should be posted at a prominent location of the site to indicate that only private cars as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are allowed to enter/be parked on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no vehicle without valid licence issued under the Road Traffic Ordinance is allowed to be parked/stored on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) no vehicle washing, vehicle repair, dismantling, paint spraying or other workshop activity, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (f) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (g) the existing landscape planting on the site shall be maintained at all times during the approval period;
- (h) the existing drainage facilities shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (i) the existing boundary fencing on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;

- (j) the submission of a condition record of the existing drainage facilities within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 26.5.2021;
- (k) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 26.8.2021;
- (l) in relation to (k) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal with 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 26.11.2021;
- (m) if any of the above planning condition (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h) or (i) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (n) if any of the above planning condition (j), (k) or (l) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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 24

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-PS/627 Proposed Temporary Shop and Services (Car Beauty) and Public Vehicle Park (Private Car) for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group B) 1” Zone, Lots 114 (Part) and 115 RP (Part) in D.D. 121, Ping Shan, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-PS/627)

Presentation and Question Sessions

121. 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 beauty) and public vehicle park (private car) for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, two objecting comments from individuals 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. Whilst the applied use was not entirely in line with the planning intention of the “Residential (Group B)” (“R(B)”) zone, there was no known development proposal to implement the zoned use at the application site. Approval of the application on a temporary basis would not frustrate the long-term planning intention of the “R(B)” zone. The applied use could provide shop and services use to meet such demand in the area. The applied use was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses.

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. There were one previous application and 10 similar applications for public vehicle park use at the application site and within the same “R(B)1” zone respectively. Approval of the current application was in line with the previous decisions of the Committee. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

122. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

123. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 26.2.2024 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation for shop and services (car beauty) between 11:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no car repairing, paint spraying, dismantling or other workshop activities, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) only private cars as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are allowed to enter/be parked on the site at all times during the planning approval period;
- (d) a notice shall be posted at a prominent location of the site at all times to indicate that only private cars as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are allowed to enter/be parked on the site during the planning approval period;

- (e) no vehicle without valid licence issued under the Road Traffic Ordinance is allowed to be parked/stored on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (f) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (g) the existing boundary fencing shall be maintained in good condition at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) the submission of a drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 26.8.2021;
- (i) in relation to (h) above, the implementation of the accepted drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 26.11.2021;
- (j) in relation to (i) above, the implemented drainage facilities shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (k) 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 26.8.2021;
- (l) in relation to (k) 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 26.11.2021;
- (m) the submission of a road connection or run-in/out proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Highways and Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB by 26.8.2021;

- (n) in relation to (m) above, the provision of road connection or run-in/out proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Highways and Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB by 26.11.2021;
- (o) if any of the above planning condition (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g) or (j) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (p) if any of the above planning condition (h), (i), (k), (l), (m) or (n) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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 25

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-PS/628 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Public Vehicle Park for Private Cars for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lots 387 S.C ss.3 RP (Part), 387 S.C ss.4, 387 S.C ss.5, 387 S.C ss.6 (Part), 387 S.C ss.7 (Part) & 387 S.C RP in D.D. 122, Sheung Cheung Wai, Ping Shan, Yuen Long

(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-PS/628)

125. The Committee noted that the application was for renewal of planning approval for temporary public vehicle park for private cars for a period of three years. During the statutory publication period, two objecting public comments from individuals were received. Major views were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper.

126. The Committee noted that the Planning Department had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The application was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 34C and concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. To minimise any possible environmental nuisances and to address the technical requirements of the concerned government departments, appropriate approval conditions were recommended.

127. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years, and be renewed from 3.3.2021 until 2.3.2024 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 11:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) only private cars as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are allowed to enter/be parked on the site, as proposed by the applicant, at all times during the planning approval period;
- (c) a notice shall be posted at a prominent location of the site at all times to indicate that only private cars as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are allowed to enter/be parked on the site during the planning approval period;
- (d) no vehicle without valid licence issued under the Road Traffic Ordinance is allowed to be parked/stored on the site, as proposed by the applicant, at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) no vehicle washing, vehicle repair, dismantling, paint spraying or other workshop activity is allowed on the site, as proposed by the applicant, at any time during the planning approval period;
- (f) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;

- (g) the existing drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) the existing trees within the site shall be maintained in good condition at all times during the planning approval period;
- (i) the submission of a condition record of the existing drainage facilities within 3 months from the date of the commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 3.6.2021;
- (j) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of the commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 3.9.2021;
- (k) in relation to (j) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 9 months from the date of the commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 3.12.2021;
- (l) if any of the above planning condition (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 condition (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.”

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 26

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-PS/629 Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park for Light Goods Vehicle and Medium Goods Vehicle for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lots 270 RP, 271 RP, 272 RP, 272 S.B, 272 S.C, 272 S.D, 272 S.E, 272 S.F, 272 S.G and 273 RP in D.D. 122, Ping Shan, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-PS/629)

129. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 18.2.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more 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 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/HSK/275 Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Private Cars) for a Period of 3 Years
in “Residential (Group A) 4” Zone, Lot 2329 RP (Part) in D.D. 124,
Hung Shui Kiu, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/HSK/275A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

131. 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 public vehicle park (private cars) for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, two public comments from individuals were received, with one objecting to and the other raising concerns on the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Whilst the applied use was not in line with the planning intention of the “Residential (Group A)” zone, it could provide vehicle parking spaces to meet such demand in the area. Approval of the application on a temporary basis would not frustrate the long-term planning intention for the application site. The applied use was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. 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. Three previous applications for temporary vehicle park use covering the application site were approved. Approval of the application was in line with the Committee's previous decisions. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

132. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

133. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 26.2.2024 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 11:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) only private cars as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are allowed to enter/be parked on the site, at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) a notice shall be posted at a prominent location of the site to indicate that only private cars as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are allowed to enter/be parked on the site at all times during the planning approval period;
- (d) no vehicle without valid licence issued under the Road Traffic Ordinance is allowed to be parked/stored on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) no vehicle washing, vehicle repair, dismantling, paint spraying or other workshop activity is allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;

- (f) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (g) the existing trees on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) the existing drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (i) the submission of a condition record of the existing drainage facilities within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Board by 26.5.2021;
- (j) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 26.8.2021;
- (k) in relation to (j) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Board by 26.11.2021;
- (l) if any of the above planning condition (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 condition (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.”

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

Agenda Item 28

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/HSK/286 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Private Car and Light Goods Vehicle) for a Period of 3 Years in “Open Space” Zone, Lot 908 RP in D.D.125, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long (RNTPC Paper No. A/HSK/286)

135. The Committee noted that the application was for renewal of planning approval for temporary public vehicle park (private car and light goods vehicle) for a period of three years. During the statutory publication period, two public comments from individuals objecting to/raising concerns on the application were received. Major views were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper.

136. The Committee noted that the Planning Department had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The application was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 34C and 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.

137. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years and be renewed from 7.4.2021 to 6.4.2024 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation from 11:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;

- (b) no vehicles without valid licenses issued under the Road Traffic Ordinance, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed to be parked/stored on the site at any time during the planning approval period;

- (c) no medium or heavy goods vehicle (i.e. exceeding 5.5 tonnes), including container trailers/tractors, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) a notice shall be posted at a prominent location of the site at any time to indicate that no medium or heavy goods vehicle (i.e. exceeding 5.5 tonnes), including container trailers/tractors, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance, is allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site 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 shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) the existing trees and landscape planting on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) the existing boundary fencing on site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (i) the existing fire service installations shall be maintained in efficient working order at all times during the planning approval period;
- (j) the submission of a condition record of the existing drainage facilities on site within 3 months from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 7.7.2021;
- (k) if any of the above planning condition (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h) or (i) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately

without further notice; and

- (l) if the above planning condition (j) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

Agenda Item 29

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/HSK/287 Shop and Services (Fast Food Shop) in “Residential (Group B) 3”
Zone, Shop 16, G/F, Tak Cheung Building, No.1 Hung Shui Kiu Main
Street, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/HSK/287)

Presentation and Question Sessions

139. 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 shop and services (fast food shop);
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, one objecting comment from an individual was received. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The applied use serving the local area including the nearby residents was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Residential (Group B)” zone and was considered not incompatible with the existing uses of the subject building and the surrounding area. The applied use was small in scale and would unlikely cause any significant adverse impacts on the surroundings. Relevant government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Regarding the public comment received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

140. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

141. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the submission and implementation 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 26.8.2021; and
- (b) if the above condition (a) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

Agenda Item 30

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/HSK/288 Temporary Shop and Services (Fast Food Shop) for a Period of 3 Years
in “Residential (Group B) 3” Zone, Shop 10, G/F, Tak Cheung
Building, No.1 Hung Shui Kiu Main Street, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/HSK/288)

Presentation and Question Sessions

143. 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 shop and services (fast food shop) for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, one objecting comment from an individual was received. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The applied use serving the local area including the nearby residents was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Residential (Group B)” zone and was considered not incompatible with the existing uses of the subject building and the surrounding area. The applied use was small in scale and would unlikely cause any significant adverse impacts on the surroundings. Relevant government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. Regarding the public comment received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

144. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

145. Members generally had no objection to the application. The Secretary pointed out that the application involved a premises on the ground floor of an existing building. It was the general practice of the Town Planning Board not to impose approval conditions restricting operation hours or prohibiting operation on certain days. The Chairman proposed and Members agreed that the concerned approval conditions should be removed.

146. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 26.2.2024 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) 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 26.8.2021;
- (b) in relation to (a) 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 26.11.2021; and
- (c) if any of the above planning condition (a) or (b) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

Agenda Item 31

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL/272

Proposed Temporary Shop and Services (Vehicle Showroom) with Ancillary Vehicle Repair Workshop for a Period of 6 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lots 1315 (Part) and 1316 RP in D.D. 122 and Adjoining Government Land, Yuen Long

(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL/272)

148. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 17.2.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address the departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

Agenda Item 32

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TT/509 Proposed Temporary Private Vehicle Park and Shop and Services for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 3307 in D.D. 120 and Adjoining Government Land, Tai Tong, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TT/509)

150. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP) was the consultant of the applicant. Mr K.K. Cheung had declared an interest on the item for his firm having current business dealings with ARUP. As Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary private vehicle park and shop and services for a period of 3 years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, nine public comments were received including two from two village representatives of Shung Ching San Tsuen supporting the application, six from a Yuen Long District Council member and individuals objecting to the application, and the remaining one from an individual providing views. 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.

Although the proposed use was not entirely in line with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone, the Lands Department advised that there was currently no Small House application approved or under processing at the application site. Approval of the application on a temporary basis of three years would not frustrate the long-term planning intention of the “V” zone. The proposed use was generally considered not incompatible with the surrounding uses. Relevant government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. To minimise any possible environmental nuisance and to address the local concerns and technical requirements of the concerned government departments, appropriate approval conditions were recommended. There were five approved similar applications within the subject “V” zone. Approval of the application was generally in line with the Committee’s previous decisions. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

152. A Member enquired the small house demand in the concerned “V” zone. In response, Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/TMYLW, said that the concerned “V” zone covered Sham Chung Tsuen and Tin Liu Tsuen and the land available was capable to meet the 77 outstanding Small House applications.

Deliberation Session

153. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 26.2.2024 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no vehicle without valid licences issued under the Road Traffic Ordinance, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed to be parked/stored on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (b) 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;

- (c) a notice shall be posted at a prominent location of the site at all times to indicate that no medium or heavy goods vehicle exceeding 5.5 tonnes, including container tractor/trailer, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site during the planning approval period;
- (d) no open storage, vehicle repairing, dismantling or other workshop activities, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (f) the provision of boundary fencing on the site within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 26.8.2021;
- (g) the submission of a run-in/out proposal within 6 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport and Director of Highways or of the TPB by 26.8.2021;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implementation of the run-in/out proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport and Director of Highways or of the TPB by 26.11.2021;
- (i) the submission of a drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 26.8.2021;

- (j) in relation to (i) above, the implementation of the drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 26.11.2021;
- (k) the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (l) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 26.8.2021;
- (m) in relation to (l) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 26.11.2021;
- (n) if any of the above planning condition (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) or (k) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (o) if any of the above planning condition (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.”

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

[Mr Stephen L.H. Liu left the meeting at this point]

Agenda Item 33

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TT/513 Temporary Vehicle Repair Workshop for a Period of 3 Years and Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 1028 (Part) in D.D. 117, Tai Tong, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TT/513)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the temporary vehicle repair workshop for a period of three years and filling of land;
- (c) departments comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, six public comments were received, including five from Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation, Designing Hong Kong Limited, World Wild Fund for Nature Hong Kong and individuals objecting to the application, and the remaining one from an individual raising concerns on the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The applied use was not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone and the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation did not support the application as there was agricultural infrastructure (such as road access) in the vicinity and the application site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation. There was no strong

justifications in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis. The applicant also failed to justify the need for land filling to facilitate the applied use. Although the applied use was considered not incompatible with the uses in the vicinity, most of those uses were suspected unauthorized developments. There was no previous approval granted to the application site and no similar application within the subject “AGR” zone. Approval of the current application would set an undesirable precedent. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD considered that the cumulative effect of approving such similar applications, even on a temporary basis, would result in further degradation of the landscape quality of the surrounding area. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

156. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

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

“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. No strong planning justification has been given in the submission to justify a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis. The applicant also fails to justify the need for land filling.”

Agenda Item 34

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TYST/1055 Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Exhibition Materials for a Period of 3 Years in “Open Space” and “Residential (Group A) 3” Zones, Lot 1495 (Part) in D.D. 119 and Adjoining Government Land, Kung Um Road, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/1055A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the temporary warehouse for storage of exhibition materials for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, two public comments from individuals, with one objecting to the application and the other providing views, were received. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD considered that the applied use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Although the applied use was not in line with the planning intention of the “Open Space” (“O”) zone, the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services and Project Manager (West), Civil Engineering and Development Department had no objection to the application. Approval of the application on a temporary basis of three years would not jeopardise the long-term development of the

application site. The applied use was generally considered not incompatible with the surrounding uses. The Director of Environmental Protection did not support the application as there were sensitive receivers of residential use in the vicinity. However, there was no environmental complaint received in the past three years. Other relevant government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. To minimise any possible environmental nuisance and to address the local concerns and technical requirements of the concerned government departments, appropriate approval conditions were recommended. The last approved application (No. A/YL-TYST/902) for the same use with a similar site layout at the same application site was revoked due to non-compliance with the approval conditions on fire service installations (FSIs). Given that the applicant had submitted FSIs proposal for the current application of which the Director of Fire Services considered acceptable, sympathetic consideration might be given to the current application. There were six previous approvals granted to the application site and 11 approved similar applications within the two concerned zones. Approval of the application was generally in line with the Committee's previous decisions. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

159. In response to a Member's enquiry on the rejection reasons for the two previous applications (No. A/YL-TYST/134 and 234) covering the application site, Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/TMYLW, with reference to Appendix II of the Paper, said that the two applications were rejected mainly on the grounds that there were potential adverse environmental and/or drainage impacts; and the proposal did not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13C (for application No. A/YL-TYST/234 only).

Deliberation Session

160. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 26.2.2024 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 workshop activities, as proposed by the applicant, are allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no heavy goods vehicle exceeding 24 tonnes, including container tractors/trailers, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance is allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site, as proposed by the applicant, at any time during the planning approval period;
- (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 on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) the existing boundary fencing on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) the existing drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (i) the submission of a condition record of the existing drainage facilities on the site within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 26.5.2021;

- (j) the implementation of the accepted fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 26.8.2021;
- (k) if any of the above planning condition (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
- (l) if any of the above planning condition (i) or (j) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

Agenda Item 35

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-TYST/1070 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Construction Materials for a Period of 3 Years in “Undetermined” Zone, Lot 1198 S.E (Part) in D.D. 119, Tong Yan San Tsuen, Yuen Long

(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/1070)

162. The Committee noted that the application was for renewal of planning approval for temporary warehouse for storage of construction materials for a period of three years. During the statutory publication period, one public comment from an individual objecting to the application was received. Major views were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper.

163. The Committee noted that the Planning Department considered that the temporary use could be tolerated for a further period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The application was generally in line with the Town

Planning Board Guidelines No. 34C and concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. To address the local concern and the technical requirements of the concerned government departments, appropriate approval conditions were recommended.

164. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years and be renewed from 21.4.2021 to 20.4.2024 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 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 boundary fencing on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) the existing drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;

- (h) the existing fire service installations implemented on the site shall be maintained in efficient working order at all times during the planning approval period;
- (i) the submission of a condition record of the existing drainage facilities on the site within 3 months from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 21.7.2021;
- (j) if any of the above planning condition (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
- (k) if the above planning condition (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.”

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

Agenda Item 36

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-TYST/1071 Proposed Temporary Car Washing Centre for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group D)” Zone, Lots 964 (Part), 965 (Part) and 969 (Part) in D.D. 121, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/1071)

166. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 18.2.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address the departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

Agenda Item 37

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-TYST/1072 Proposed Temporary Dangerous Godown for a Period of 3 Years in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Storage and Workshop Use" Zone, Lot 1105 RP (Part) in D.D.121, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/1072)

168. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 17.2.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address the departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

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

Agenda Item 38

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-TYST/1073 Proposed Temporary Dog Kennel, Dog Salon and Dog Recreation Centre for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group D)” Zone, Lots 955 S.B (Part), 961 (Part), 962 (Part), 963 (Part), 964 (Part), 965 (Part) and 969 (Part) in D.D. 121, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/1073)

170. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 18.2.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address the departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

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

Agenda Item 39

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-TYST/1074 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height and Plot Ratio Restrictions for Permitted Public Housing Development in “Residential (Group A) 1” Zone, Various Lots in D.D. 120, D.D. 121 and D.D. 122 and Adjoining Government Land, Long Bin, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/1074)

172. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD). Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP) was the consultant of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

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

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

173. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As the interest of Dr C.H. Hau was direct, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting but should refrain from discussion of the item. As Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

174. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 22.2.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for one month so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address the departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

175. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its

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

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

Agenda Item 40

Any Other Business

176. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 5:55 p.m.