

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 669<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee held at 2:30 p.m. on 16.4.2021**

#### **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 Lawrence K.C. Li

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr K.W. Leung

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr 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

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

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

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

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Dr C.H. Hau

**In Attendance**

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr Gary T.L. Lam

## **Opening Remarks**

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

## **Agenda Item 1**

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 668<sup>th</sup> RNTPC Meeting held on 26.3.2021

[Open Meeting]

2. The draft minutes of the 668<sup>th</sup> RNTPC meeting held on 26.3.2021 were confirmed without amendments.

## **Agenda Item 2**

Matter Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

**Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East District**

**Agenda Item 3**

**Section 12A Application**

[Open Meeting]

Y/NE-KTS/13            Application for Amendment to the Approved Kwu Tung South Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-KTS/16, To amend the Notes of the “Comprehensive Development Area” Zone, Lots 1124 RP, 1125 RP, 1126 and 1127 RP (Part) in D.D. 92, Lots 343 RP, 344A S.1 RP (Part), 402 S.A RP, 404 RP, 407 S.A RP, 407 S.A ss.1 RP, 408 S.A RP, 408 S.C ss.2 RP, 408 S.D ss.1, 408 S.D RP and 408 RP in D.D. 94 and Adjoining Government Land, Hang Tau Tai Po, Kwu Tung South  
(RNTPC Paper No. Y/NE-KTS/13B)

---

4.            The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Kwu Tung South. LWK & Partners Architects Limited (LWK) and BMT Hong Kong Limited (BMT) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |                     |   |   |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Mr K.K. Cheung      | - | his firm having current business dealings with LWK and BMT;   |
| Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu    | - | having past business dealings with LWK; and   |
| Dr Lawrence K.C. Li | - | being a member of Hong Kong Golf Club, which was in Kwu Tung South and in the vicinity of the application site. |

5.            The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. As the interest of Dr Lawrence K.C. Li was indirect and Messrs Ricky W.Y. Yu and K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

6.            The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 23.3.2021 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 third time that the

applicant requested deferment of the application. The applicant explained that more time was needed to prepare further information with a revised master layout plan to address departmental comments.

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

### **Sai Kung and Islands District**

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

#### **Agenda Item 4**

##### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/I-LI/33                      Proposed Public Utility Installation (Sewage Pumping Station) in  
"Green Belt" Zone, Government Land in D.D. 3 LM, Lamma Island  
(East of Lamma Power Station)  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/I-LI/33)

---

8. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Drainage Services Department (DSD) and AECOM Asia Co. Limited (AECOM) was the consultant of the applicant. Dr C.H. Hau had declared an interest on the item for currently conducting

contract research projects with DSD and having past business dealings with AECOM.

9. The Committee noted that the interest of Dr C.H. Hau was direct but he had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed public utility installation (sewage pumping station);
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, two public comments from Lamma Island (North) Rural Committee (RC) and Hongkong Electric Co. Limited providing views/expressing concerns on the application were received. Major views were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. Although the proposed development was considered not entirely in line with the planning intention of the “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone, the proposed development was an essential infrastructure to provide public sewerage system for seven unsewered village areas in Yung Shue Wan and warranted exceptional consideration. Having comprehensively considered the technical constraints in a site selection exercise, the applicant was of the view that the site was the best suitable land for the proposed development. The proposed development complied with the requirements stipulated in Town Planning Board Guidelines No.10 in that the proposed development was essential and that no alternative sites were available. The proposed development was considered not incompatible with the surrounding

environment. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. The proposed development was supported by Islands District Council, Lamma Island (North) RC, village representatives and local communities. There was a similar application approved for sewage pumping station in Lamma Island (near O Tsai). The nature of the proposed development and planning circumstances of the current application was considered comparable to the similar application. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant and mitigation measures would be implemented to control the possible impacts on the operation of the Lamma Power Station (LPS) and lightings would be installed on the boundary wall of the proposed development.

11. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

12. 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 16.4.2025, 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 provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.”

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

**Agenda Item 5**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/SK-CWBN/63      Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in  
“Green Belt” Zone, Lot 158 S.C RP in D.D. 238, Pan Long Wan, Clear  
Water Bay, Sai Kung  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/SK-CWBN/63)

---

14.            The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 12.4.2021 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.

15.            After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within 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 6**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/SK-HC/316      Proposed Houses with Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction  
in “Residential (Group E)” Zone, Various Lots in D.D. 210 and  
Adjoining Government Land, Ho Chung, Sai Kung  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/SK-HC/316C)

---



16. The Secretary reported that CYS Associates (HK) Limited (CYS) 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 CYS.

17. 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

18. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jane W.L. Kwan, STP/SKIs, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed houses with minor relaxation of building height (BH) restriction;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication periods, a total of 45 public comments were received from Sai Kung Rural Committee, Sai Kung District Councillors, a Sai Kung Area Committee Member, Village Representative, villagers and residents of Ho Chung Village, the Incorporated Owners of Marina Cove, and individuals, including two supporting comments and 43 comments raising concerns on/objection to the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The proposed development was considered in line with the planning intention of the “Residential (Group E)” zone and also compatible with the surrounding predominantly low-rise village developments. The major development parameters were largely the same as the previously approved scheme (No. A/SK-HC/217). As compared to the previously approved

scheme, the proposed absolute BH of the current scheme was increased (from 9m to 10.8m) but the maximum BH in terms of mPD was reduced (from 18.8mPD to 16.8mPD). The proposed increase in absolute BH was to allow for an increase in floor-to-floor height, which was considered not unreasonable and significant adverse impact on the visual character of the vicinity was not anticipated. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. To minimise any possible environmental nuisance and to address the technical requirements of the concerned government departments, appropriate approval conditions were recommended. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng joined the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

19. Some Members raised the following questions:
  - (a) the existing traffic condition of the Hiram's Highway and the progress of the Hiram's Highway Improvement Project;
  - (b) the proposed increase in floor-to-floor height and why the BH in terms of mPD of the current scheme was reduced despite the increase in absolute BH; and
  - (c) whether the carport and the sunken garden were covered.
  
20. In response, Ms Jane W.L. Kwan, STP/SKIs, made the following main points:
  - (a) the Hiram's Highway Improvement Stage 1 Project, which included the section of road abutting the application site (the Site), had been substantially completed and the Commissioner for Transport had no adverse comment on the application;

- (b) as compared with the previously approved scheme, the floor-to-floor height of the carport level of the current scheme was increased from about 2.8m to 3.6m, the ground floor from about 3.2m to 4m and the first floor from about 3m to 3.2m. The BH in terms of mPD of the current scheme was reduced as the site formation level was reduced from 7.46mPD to 9.8mPD in the previously approved scheme to about 6mPD in the current scheme; and
- (c) the carports located under each of the house were covered while the sunken garden (as shown in Drawing A-1 of the Paper) at the centre of the proposed development was open-air.

### Deliberation Session

21. 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 16.4.2025, 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 design and provision of access arrangement, car parking spaces, loading/unloading spaces and lay-bys for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission and implementation of the road improvement proposal of Luk Cheung Road adjacent to the site and junction improvement between Luk Cheung Road and Hiram’s Highway, at the applicant’s own cost as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (c) the provision of traffic signs, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (d) 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;

- (e) the submission of a noise impact assessment and implementation of the noise mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (f) the submission of a land contamination assessment in accordance with the prevailing guidelines and implementation of the remediation measures identified therein prior to the development of the site to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (g) the submission of a revised sewerage impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (h) the submission of a quantitative risk assessment related to the high pressure town gas pipeline in the vicinity of the site and implementation of the mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services or of the TPB; and
- (i) the submission of a quantitative risk assessment related to the LPG storage installation in the vicinity of the site and implementation of the mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services or of the TPB.”

22. 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/SK-HC/325      Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in  
“Agriculture” Zone, Lot 481 S.C in D.D. 244, Ho Chung, Sai Kung  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/SK-HC/325)

---

23. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 12.4.2021 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.

24. 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 8**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/SK-PK/262            Temporary "Eating Place (Outside Seating Accommodation of Restaurant)" for a Period of 3 Years in Area shown as 'Road', Open Area in Front of Shops 10A and 10B, G/F, Po Tung Road, Lot 1827 (Part) in D.D. 221, Sai Kung  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/SK-PK/262)

---

#### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

25. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jane W.L. Kwan, STP/SKIs, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

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

for a period of three years;

- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, two public comments from individuals objecting to the application were received. Major views were set out in paragraph 9 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 10 of the Paper. Although the applied use was not in line with the planning intention of the area shown as 'Road', given the temporary nature of the use, the long-term planning intention of the area shown as 'Road' would not be frustrated. The applied use was considered not incompatible with the surrounding uses. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. The application site (the Site) was the subject of five previously approved applications for the same use and the planning permission of the last approved application (No. A/SK-PK/248) was revoked due to non-compliance with the approval condition on the provision of fire service installations (FSIs) within the required time frame. The applicant had submitted relevant documents on FSIs for the last previous application but was unable to address the outstanding issues within the time limit for compliance of the condition satisfactorily. There were similar approved applications in the vicinity. Approval of the application was consistent with the Committee's previous decisions. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

26. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the reason for revocation of the last approved application;
- (b) whether the existing fences in front of the Site were legally erected and

formed part of the current scheme;

- (c) whether a shorter compliance period would be recommended for monitoring of the progress on compliance with the approval condition on provision of FSIs; and
- (d) the current status of the Hiram's Highway Improvement Stage 2 (HH2) Project.

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

- (a) the last approved application was revoked due to non-compliance with a time-limited approval condition on the provision of FSIs. Upon the granting of planning permission of the last approved application, the applicant had submitted FSIs proposal but was unable to clarify some information in the submission within the specified time limit for compliance of the condition. The information required by the Director of Fire Services was outlined in paragraph 8.1.7(b) of the Paper for the current application;
- (b) the existing fences in front of the Site were located within the private lot but were not indicated in the application;
- (c) the current application was a fresh application. Approval conditions requiring the submission of FSIs proposals within 6 months and provision of FSIs within 9 months were recommended; and
- (d) the HH2 Project was gazetted in January 2020 and the Highways Department was processing the public objections received.

#### Deliberation Session

28. Mr Ken K.K. Yip, Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories East, Transport Department, advised that the public objections received upon gazettal of the HH2 Project

were being processed and the alignment of the HH2 Project had been refined. After authorisation of the project, consultants would be engaged to carry out detailed design for the project and it was expected that construction lasting for about four years would commence after detailed design and funds obtained from Legislative Council. Members also noted that the Site fell outside the boundary of the HH2 Project.

29. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 16.4.2024 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 11:00 p.m. and 11:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 16.10.2021;
- (c) in relation to (b) above, the provision of the 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 16.1.2022;
- (d) if the above planning condition (a) is not complied with at any time during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (e) if the above planning condition (b) or (c) 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.”

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



**Agenda Item 9**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/SK-TMT/69            Proposed House and associated Excavation and Filling of Land in “Green Belt”, “Village Type Development” Zones and area shown as ‘Road’, Lots 65, 96 and 98 RP in D.D. 252 and Adjoining Government Land, Tai Mong Tsai, Sai Kung  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/SK-TMT/69A)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

31.            With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jane W.L. Kwan, STP/SKIs, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed house and the associated excavation and filling of land;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication periods, nine public comments from Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation, World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong, Designing Hong Kong Limited, a Sai Kung District Council member, the resident representative of Tai Mong Tsai, and two individuals 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 did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone and there were no exceptional circumstances or strong planning grounds in the submission for a departure from the planning intention. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and

Landscape, PlanD had reservations on the application from landscape planning perspective. Approval of the application would encourage other similar applications within the vegetated area of the “GB” zone, and the cumulative effect would result in a general degradation of the landscape quality of the surrounding area. The application did not comply with Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10. The potential adverse impacts on landscape resources and the natural stream arising from the proposed drainage path could not be ascertained. There was no justification for using government land for access to serve only the proposed development. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications encroaching onto the “GB” zone. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

[Mr Philip S.L. Kan and Dr Conrad T.C. Wong joined the meeting during PlanD’s presentation.]

32. A Member enquired why the sites to the east and west of the application site (the Site) were zoned “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”) or “Village Type Development” (“V”). In response, Ms Jane W.L. Kwan, STP/SKIs, said that the site to the east was zoned “R(C)” on the Development Permission Area Plan and subsequently on the Outline Zoning Plan to reflect the planned development at the time and the site to the west was zoned “V” to reflect the development in existence when the first OZP was prepared.

33. In response to a Member’s enquiries, Ms Jane W.L. Kwan, STP/SKIs, said that the current application was for a proposed house, and not New Territories Exempted House. With the aid of Plan A-2 of the Paper, Ms Kwan pointed out the boundary of the “GB” zone as well as the minor portions of the Site within the “V” zone and area shown as ‘Road’.

#### Deliberation Session

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

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone which is primarily for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There is a general presumption against development within this zone. The applicant fails to provide strong justifications in the submission for a departure from the planning intention;
  
- (b) the proposed development does not meet the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 for ‘Application for Development within Green Belt Zone’ in that there are no exceptional circumstances for approving the application and the proposed development would affect the existing natural landscape of the area; and
  
- (c) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications encroaching onto the existing “GB” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such similar applications would result in adverse impact on the landscape character of the area.”

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

**Sha Tin, Tai Po and North District**

[Mr Tim T.Y. Fung, Senior Town Planner/Sha Tin, Tai Po and North (STP/STN), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 10**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-LT/688            Proposed Twenty Houses (New Territories Exempted Houses - Small Houses) with an Emergency Vehicular Access in “Agriculture” Zone and an area shown as ‘Road’, Various lots in D.D. 8 and adjoining Government land, Sha Pa Village, Lam Tsuen, Tai Po  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LT/688B)

---

35.            The Committee noted that the applicants’ representative requested on 12.4.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address the comments of the Transport Department (TD). It was the third time that the applicants requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicants had submitted further information to provide responses to TD to further elaborate the intention of the proposed development, the background of the existing traffic and transport situation in the area, as well as the existing car parking areas near the application site.

36.            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 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 third deferment and a total of six months had been allowed for preparation of the submission of further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

**Agenda Item 11**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-KLH/585      Temporary Activity Centre for a Period of 3 Years in “Green Belt”  
Zone, Lot 477 RP in D.D. 9, Nam Wa Po, Tai Po  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-KLH/585D)

---

37.            The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 9.4.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare a water quality risk assessment report to address the comments of the Water Supplies Department. It was the fourth time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to provide responses to address departmental comments.

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

**Agenda Item 12**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-HLH/49            Proposed Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Hobby Farm) for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 629 in D.D. 84, Hung Lung Hang  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-HLH/49A)

---

39.            The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 9.4.2021 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 second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to address the comments from the Transport Department and Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department.

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

**Agenda Item 13**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-TKL/659      Proposed Temporary Wholesale Trade with Ancillary Warehouse for a Period of 5 Years in “Open Storage” Zone and area shown as ‘Road’, Lot 2073 RP (Part) in D.D. 76 and Adjoining Government Land, Ping Che Road, Ping Che  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TKL/659)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

41.      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 wholesale trade with ancillary warehouse for a period of five years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, two public comments, including one from the Chairman of Sheung Shui District Rural Committee who indicated no comment on the application and another from Regency Court Owners’ Committee objecting to the application, were received. Major views were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. Although the proposed use was considered not in line with the planning intention of the “Open Storage” (“OS”) zone, given the temporary nature of the use, approval of the application would not jeopardise the long-term planning intention of the “OS” zone. The proposed use was considered not entirely incompatible with the surrounding 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 was a similar application (No. A/NE-TKL/634) approved within another “OS” zone on the same outline zoning plan. The planning circumstances of the current application were similar to that approved application. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

42. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

43. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years until 16.4.2026 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., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no operation on Sundays and public holidays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no medium or heavy goods vehicles exceeding 5.5 tonnes, including container tractors/trailers, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance, as proposed by the applicant, are allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) 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 16.10.2021;
- (e) in relation to (d) 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 16.1.2022;

- (f) 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 16.10.2021;
- (g) in relation to (f) 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 16.1.2022;
- (h) the implementation of the traffic management measures, as proposed by the applicant, within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB by 16.1.2022;
- (i) if any of the above planning condition (a), (b) or (c) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (j) if any of the above planning condition (d), (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.”

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

[The Chairman thanked Mr Tim T.Y. Fung, STP/STN, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left 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 14**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-SK/302          Proposed Public Utility Installation (Solar Energy System) in  
“Agriculture” Zone, Lot 363 S.A in D.D. 112, Shek Kong, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-SK/302)

---

45.            The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 12.4.2021 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.

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

**Agenda Item 15**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTN/721 Proposed Temporary Animal Boarding Establishment (Dog Kennel) for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 207 S.B (Part) and 207 RP (Part) in D.D. 110, Tai Kong Po, Kam Tin, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTN/721B)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary animal boarding establishment (dog kennel) 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 the Village Office of Pat Heung Tai Kong Po Tsuen and Designing Hong Kong Limited 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 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 a period of three years would not jeopardise the long-term planning intention of the “AGR” zone. The proposed use was not incompatible with the surrounding land uses.

Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. To minimise any possible environmental nuisance and to address the technical requirements of the concerned government departments, appropriate approval conditions were recommended. There was a previously approved application for similar use at the site submitted by the same applicant and 41 similar applications approved within the same “AGR” zone. Approval of the application was consistent with the Committee’s previous decisions. Although the last application was revoked in 2019 due to non-compliance with approval conditions on the implementation of landscape and drainage proposals, concerned government departments had no objection to the application with the submitted landscape and drainage proposals and sympathetic consideration could be given to the current application. Shorter compliance periods were proposed to closely monitor the progress of compliance of approval conditions. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

48. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

49. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 16.4.2024 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 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 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 implementation of the accepted drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or the TPB by 16.10.2021;
- (f) in relation to (e) above, the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or the TPB by 16.7.2021;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 16.10.2021;
- (i) the submission of a landscape proposal within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 16.7.2021;
- (j) in relation to (i) above, the implementation of the landscape proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 16.10.2021;
- (k) if any of the above planning condition (a), (b), (c), (d) or (f) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice;
- (l) if any of the above planning condition (e), (g), (h), (i) or (j) is not complied

with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice; and

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

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

### **Agenda Item 16**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-KTN/755 Proposed Temporary Animal Boarding Establishment (Dog Kennel cum Dog Recreation Centre) for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Various Lots in D.D.107, Fung Kat Heung, Kam Tin, Yuen Long (RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTN/755)

---

51. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 12.4.2021 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.

52. 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 17**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTN/756      Proposed Temporary Animal Boarding Establishment for a Period of 3 Years and Land Filling in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 1025 RP in D.D. 109, Kam Tin North, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTN/756)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary animal boarding establishment for a period of three years and land filling;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, six public comments from Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation, Designing Hong Kong Limited, local residents 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 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 (the Site) possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation, approval of the application on a temporary basis for a period of three years would not jeopardise the long-term planning intention of the

“AGR” zone. The proposed use was not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. To minimise any possible environmental nuisance and to address the technical requirements of the concerned government departments, appropriate approval conditions were recommended. There were 42 similar applications for temporary animal boarding establishment and seven similar applications involving filling of land approved within the same “AGR” zone since 2005. Approval of the application was consistent with the Committee’s previous decisions. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

54. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the proposed filling of land would affect the potential for agricultural rehabilitation; and
- (b) the government department(s) that monitored the operation of animal boarding establishments and whether the number of animal boarding establishment applications in the area was disproportional to the market as raised in the public comment.

55. In response, Ms Ivy C.W. Wong, STP/FSYLE, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the applicant, the Site was proposed to be filled with soil, with concrete paving on top. The applicant would remove the concrete paving materials upon expiry of the planning approval and ensure the Site would be reinstated with soil that was suitable for farming. An approval condition was recommended for reinstatement of the Site to an amenity area upon expiry of the planning approval; and
- (b) the operator of a commercial animal boarding establishment had to apply for a Boarding Establishment Licence from the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department, and the licence had to be renewed annually. In



the “AGR” zone on the Kam Tin North Outline Zoning Plan, there were 43 planning applications for animal boarding establishments covering 30 sites, including a rejected application. Only 21 of them were still subject to valid planning permission as some of the approvals had already expired or had been revoked. It was also noted that most of the sites with valid planning approvals were currently not being used for animal boarding establishments or such operation had not yet commenced.

### Deliberation Session

56. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 16.4.2024 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 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 provision of a 2.5m high solid metal wall along the site boundary within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 16.10.2021;
- (f) the submission of a drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of

planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 16.10.2021;

- (g) in relation to (f) above, the implementation of the drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 16.1.2022;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (i) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 16.10.2021;
- (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 16.1.2022;
- (k) if any of the above planning condition (a), (b), (c), (d) or (h) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice;
- (l) if any of the above planning condition (e), (f), (g), (i) or (j) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice; and
- (m) upon expiry of the planning permission, the reinstatement of the site to an amenity area to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

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

**Agenda Item 18**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTS/880      Temporary Open Storage of Vehicles and Vehicle Parts with Ancillary Office for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group D)” Zone, Lot 688 S.B in D.D.106, Shek Kong Airfield Road, Kam Tin, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTS/880)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the temporary open storage of vehicles and vehicle parts with ancillary office for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper;
- (d) 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; 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 “Residential (Group D)” (“R(D)”) zone, there was no known programme for long-term development at the application site (the Site) and approval of the application on a temporary basis for a period of three years would not jeopardise the long-term planning intention of the “R(D)” zone. The applied use was not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. The application was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines

No. 13F in that the Site fell within Category 2 areas 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. There were seven previously approved applications for open storage uses at the Site. Although the last application for the same use submitted by the same applicant was revoked in 2021 due to non-compliance with approval condition on the implementation of drainage proposal, concerned government departments had no objection to the application with the submitted proposals and sympathetic consideration could be given to the current application. Shorter compliance periods were proposed to closely monitor the progress of compliance of approval conditions. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

59. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

60. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 16.4.2024 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 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 between 9:00 a.m. and 10:00 a.m. on Saturdays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no operation on Sundays and public holidays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (d) no dismantling, maintenance, repairing, cleansing, paint spraying or other

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

- (e) no medium or heavy goods vehicles exceeding 5.5 tonnes, including container tractors/trailers, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site 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 maintenance of all existing trees within the site satisfactorily at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) the implementation of the accepted drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 16.10.2021;
- (i) in relation to (h) above, the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (j) the provision of fire extinguisher(s) within 6 weeks from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 28.5.2021;
- (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 16.7.2021;
- (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 16.10.2021;
- (m) if any of the above planning condition (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g) or (i) is

not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and

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

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

### **Agenda Item 19**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-KTS/881 Proposed Temporary Shop and Services (Vehicle Showroom) with Ancillary Workshop and Open Storage of Vehicle for a Period of 3 Years in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Rural Use” Zone, Lots 564, 565 (Part) and 618 S.C (Part) in D.D. 106, Kam Sheung Road, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTS/881)

---

62. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 8.4.2021 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.

63. 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 20**

### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTS/882      Proposed Temporary Animal Boarding Establishment (Dog Kennel cum Dog Recreation Centre) for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 504 RP (Part), 512 S.A-S.B (Part), 513 (Part), 514 and 529 in D.D.113 and Adjoining Government Land, Ma On Kong, Kam Tin, Yuen Long  
  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTS/882)

---

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary 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, four public comments from the Resident Representative (RR) of Ma On Kong Tsuen, Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation, Designing Hong Kong Limited and an individual were received. One of them provided comment and the remaining three objected to the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. 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 (the Site) possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation, approval of the application on a temporary basis for a period of three years would not jeopardise the long-term planning intention of the “AGR” zone. The proposed use was not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. To minimise any possible environmental nuisance and to address the technical requirements of the concerned government departments, appropriate approval conditions were recommended. There were two similar applications approved within the same “AGR” zone. Approval of the application was consistent with the Committee's previous decisions. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

65. A Member enquired the reasons for the Committee's rejection of the previous application for temporary open storage use and the difference in planning circumstances with the current application. In response, Ms Ivy C.W. Wong, STP/FSYLE, said that the previous application (No. A/YL-KTS/853) for temporary open storage of construction machinery, materials, equipment and containers with ancillary office was rejected mainly on the grounds that the application was not in line with the planning intention of the “AGR” zone, and the application did not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses (TPB PG-No. 13F) in that there was no previous approval granted at the Site. In general, the environmental nuisances induced by open storage of construction machinery and materials would be more significant than other types of uses and the TPB PG-No. 13F was applicable to planning application for open storage uses. Animal boarding establishment was a Column 2 use under the Notes of the “AGR” zone, and each application would be considered based on individual planning merits.

66. Noting a public comment which objected to the application on grounds that the



Site would continue to be used for open storage instead of the applied use, the same Member asked whether there was information on the number of sites with planning approval for animal boarding establishment but subsequently used for open storage. In response, Ms Ivy C.W. Wong, STP/FSYLE, said that no such information was available at hand but the Central Enforcement and Prosecution Section of the PlanD was responsible for planning enforcement and prosecution against any unauthorised developments, including illegal open storage uses on land zoned “AGR”. In addition, an advisory clause was recommended in Appendix V of the Paper, which stated that the planning permission was given to the developments/uses under application and it did not condone any other developments/uses which currently occurred on the Site but not covered by the application.

### Deliberation Session

67. A Member, while having no objection to the application, shared the concern of the public comment that the Site might continue to be used for open storage instead of the applied use and considered that PlanD should step up enforcement action against unauthorised developments, which did not comply with the approved uses under planning permission.

68. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 16.4.2024 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 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 loudspeaker, any form of 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 16.10.2021;
- (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 16.1.2022;
- (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 16.10.2021;
- (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 16.1.2022;
- (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.”

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

set out at Appendix V of the Paper.

## **Agenda Item 21**

### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-PH/872            Proposed Temporary Private Car Park for a Period of 3 Years in  
                                 “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 761 (Part) in D.D. 111, Sheung  
                                 Che Tsuen, Pat Heung, Yuen Long  
                                 (RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-PH/872A)

---

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary private car park 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 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 considered that the proposed 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 proposed use was not in line with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone, there was no Small House application approved or under processing at the application site and approval of the application on a temporary basis for a period of three years would not jeopardise the long-term planning intention of the “V” zone. The

proposed use was not incompatible with the surrounding land uses and the proposed private car park was to serve the local villagers. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application, except the Director of Environmental Protection who did not support the application as there were sensitive receivers of residential use in the vicinity of the application site and environmental nuisance from the proposed use which involved heavy vehicles was expected. Only one heavy vehicle parking space for coach was proposed to provide convenience for a disabled local villager who was the driver of the coach and sympathetic consideration could be given to the current 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 10 similar approved applications for temporary car park use within the same “V” zone. Approval of the application was consistent with the Committee’s previous decisions. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

71. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

72. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 16.4.2024 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicants, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no vehicle without valid licences issued under the Road Traffic Ordinance is allowed to be parked/stored on the site at any time during the planning approval period;

- (c) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) the submission of a drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 16.10.2021;
- (e) in relation to (d) above, the implementation of the drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 16.1.2022;
- (f) in relation to (e) above, the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 16.10.2021;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 16.1.2022;
- (i) if any of the above planning condition (a), (b), (c) or (f) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (j) if any of the above planning condition (d), (e), (g) or (h) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

**Agenda Item 22**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-PH/877           Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Covered Vehicle Park (Private Cars and Light Goods Vehicles) for a Period of 3 Years in “Open Storage” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lot 1863 RP (Part) in D.D. 111 and Adjoining Government Land, Pat Heung (RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-PH/877)

---

74.           The Committee noted that the application was for renewal of planning approval for temporary covered vehicle park (private cars and light goods vehicles) 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.

75.           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 in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 34C. 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.

76.           After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years and be renewed from 5.5.2021 to 4.5.2024 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., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during planning approval period;
- (b) no operation on Sundays and public holidays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;

- (c) no medium or heavy goods vehicles exceeding 5.5 tonnes, including container tractors/trailers, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no vehicle without valid licences issued under the Road Traffic Ordinance is allowed to be parked/stored on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) a notice should be posted at a prominent location of the site to indicate that no medium or heavy goods vehicles exceeding 5.5 tonnes, including container tractors/trailers, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse 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 submission of a record of the existing drainage facilities on the site within 3 months from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 5.8.2021;
- (i) the existing fire service installations implemented on the site shall be maintained in efficient working order at all times during the planning approval period;
- (j) if any of the above planning condition (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g) or (i) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without

further notice; and

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

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

### **Agenda Item 23**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-NTM/412 Temporary Container Tractor/Trailer Park for a Period of 3 Years in “Open Storage” Zone, Lots 2688 RP (Part) , 2729 (Part) and 2730 RP (Part) in D.D. 102 and Adjoining Government Land, Ngau Tam Mei, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-NTM/412)

---

#### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

78. 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 temporary container tractor/trailer park for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper;
- (d) 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; and



- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The applied use was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Open Storage” (“OS”) zone and was considered compatible with the surrounding land uses. The application was in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13F in that the application site (the Site) fell within Category 1 areas and concerned government departments generally had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. The Director of Environmental Protection did not support the application as there were sensitive receivers of residential use in the vicinity of the Site and environmental nuisance from the applied use was expected. However, there was no environmental complaint concerning the Site in the past three years. To minimise any possible environmental nuisance and to address the technical requirements of the concerned government departments, appropriate approval conditions were recommended. There were six previously approved applications for the same use at the Site and 32 similar applications approved for temporary port back-up uses within the same “OS” zone. Approval of the application was consistent with the Committee’s previous decisions. Regarding the public comment received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

79. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

80. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 16.4.2024 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 7:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. on Monday to Saturday, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;

- (b) no operation on Sundays and public holidays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no cutting, dismantling, melting, cleansing, repairing or other workshop activity is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (d) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reserve onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the existing drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) the 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 16.1.2022;
- (g) if any of the above planning condition (a), (b), (c), (d) or (e) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (h) if the above planning condition (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.”

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

**Agenda Item 24**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-NTM/413 Temporary Shop and Services (Sales Office for Sale of Goods Vehicles) for a Period of 3 Years in “Open Storage” Zone, Lots 2757 RP (Part), 2758 RP (Part), 2759 (Part), 2760, 2761 S.A (Part), 2761 RP (Part) and 2762 (Part) in D.D. 102 and adjoining Government Land, Ngau Tam Mei, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-NTM/413)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

82. 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 temporary shop and services (sales office for sale of goods vehicles) for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper;
- (d) 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; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The applied use with open area used for storage of vehicles was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Open Storage” (“OS”) zone and was considered compatible with the surrounding land uses. The application was in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13F in that the application site (the Site) fell within Category 1 areas and concerned government departments generally had no objection to or no adverse

comment on the application. The Director of Environmental Protection did not support the application as there were sensitive receivers of residential use in the vicinity of the Site and environmental nuisance from the proposed use was expected. However, there was no environmental complaint concerning the Site in the past three years. To minimise any possible environmental nuisance and to address the technical requirements of the concerned government departments, appropriate approval conditions were recommended. There were seven previously approved applications for similar/same uses at the Site. Although the last application was revoked due to non-compliance with approval conditions on the implementation of the drainage proposal, concerned government departments had no objection to the application with the submitted proposals and sympathetic consideration could be given to the current application. Shorter compliance periods were proposed to closely monitor the progress of compliance of conditions. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

83. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

84. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 16.4.2024 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no cutting, dismantling, cleansing, repairing and workshop activity, including container repair and vehicle repair is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no operation between 7:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. on Monday to Saturday, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;

- (c) no operation on Sundays and public holidays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (d) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reserve onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the submission of a revised drainage proposal within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 16.7.2021;
- (f) in relation to (e) above, the implementation of the revised drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 16.10.2021;
- (g) the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 16.7.2021;
- (i) in relation to (h) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 16.10.2021;
- (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; and
- (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.”

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

### **Agenda Item 25**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-NTM/415 Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Private Cars and Light Goods Vehicles Only) for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group D)” Zone, Lots 2448 (Part), 2455 (Part) and 2459 (Part) in D.D. 104, Ngau Tam Mei, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-NTM/415)

---

#### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

86. 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 temporary public vehicle park (private cars and light goods vehicles only) 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 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 “Residential (Group D)” (“R(D)”) zone, it could provide vehicle parking spaces to meet the local demand and serve the local residents in the

area. There was no known long-term development at the application site (the Site) and approval of the application on a temporary basis for a period of three years would not frustrate the long-term planning intention of the 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. There were two previously approved applications for the same use at the Site. Approval of the application was consistent with the Committee's previous decisions. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

87. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

88. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 16.4.2024 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 licence issued under the Road Traffic Ordinance is allowed to be parked/stored on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (b) only private cars and light goods vehicles not exceeding 5.5 tonnes as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are allowed to park 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 and light goods vehicles as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are allowed to park on the site at any time during the planning approval period;

- (d) no car washing, vehicles repair, dismantling, paint spraying or other workshop activities is allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (f) all existing trees within the site shall be maintained 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 records of the existing drainage facilities on the site within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 16.7.2021;
- (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 16.10.2021;
- (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 16.1.2022;
- (k) 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
- (l) if any of the above planning condition (h), (i) or (j) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”



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

**Agenda Item 26**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-NTM/416      Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Private Cars and Container Vehicles), Vehicle Repair Workshop, Open Storage of Construction Materials and Ancillary Offices for a Period of 3 Years in “Open Storage” Zone, Lots 826 RP (Part), 827, 828 and 829 in D.D. 102, Lots 296, 297 RP, 298 RP, 299 RP, 396 RP (Part) and 397 (Part) in D.D. 105 and Adjoining Government Land, Ngau Tam Mei, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-NTM/416)

---

90. The Committee noted that the application was for renewal of planning approval for temporary public vehicle park (private cars and container vehicles), vehicle repair workshop, open storage of construction materials and ancillary offices 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.

91. 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 in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 34C. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application, except the Director of Environmental Protection who did not support the application as there were sensitive receivers of residential use in the vicinity of the application site (the Site) and environmental nuisance from the applied use was expected. However, there was no environmental complaint concerning the Site in the past three years. To minimise any possible environmental nuisance and to address the technical requirements of the concerned government departments, appropriate approval conditions were recommended.

92. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years and be renewed from 5.5.2021 to 4.5.2024 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no night-time operation between 11:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. from Monday to Saturday, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no night-time operation between 6:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. on Sundays and public holidays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no storage of cement, sand, chemical products and dangerous goods, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed 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 during the planning approval period;
- (e) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (f) the existing trees within the site shall be maintained 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 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 5.8.2021;

- (i) the provision of fire extinguisher(s) within 6 weeks from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 16.6.2021;
- (j) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 5.11.2021;
- (k) in relation to (j) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 9 months from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 5.2.2022;
- (l) 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
- (m) if any of the above planning condition (h), (i), (j) or (k) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

**Agenda Item 27**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-NTM/417 Proposed Temporary Shop and Services (Convenience Store) for a Period of 5 Years in “Recreation” Zone, Lot 343 (Part) in D.D. 104, Ngau Tam Mei, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-NTM/417)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

94. 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 shop and services (convenience store) for a period of five years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, 34 public comments from 攸潭美村委 and individuals 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 proposed use was not entirely in line with the planning intention of the “Recreation” (“REC”) zone, there was no known long-term development at the application site (the Site) and approval of the application on a temporary basis for a period of five years would not jeopardise the long-term planning intention of the Site. The proposed use was 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, appropriate approval conditions were recommended. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant and the land ownership issues should be sorted out by the applicant with concerned land owner(s) separately.

95. In response to a Member's questions on land ownership issues raised in public comments and information of the nearby developments, Ms Irene W.S. Lai, STP/FSYLE, said that although the applicant was not the current land owner of the Site, the requirements as set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 31A on satisfying the "Owner's Consent/ Notification" requirements had been fully complied with. The applicant should liaise with the land owner(s) separately on the land ownership issue for implementation of the proposed use. There was an existing permitted privately-operated holiday camp within the same "REC" zone to the south and some dwellings to the east of the Site.

#### Deliberation Session

96. A Member said that there did not appear to be good business case for the proposed convenience store in the locality and considered that the Planning Authority should monitor future use on the Site to ensure that it conformed with the use permitted under the planning approval.

97. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years until 16.4.2026 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 7:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reserve onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) the submission of a drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of

planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 16.10.2021;

- (d) in relation to (c) above, the implementation of the drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 16.1.2022;
- (e) in relation to (d) above, the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 16.10.2021;
- (g) in relation to (f) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 16.1.2022;
- (h) if any of the above planning condition (a), (b) or (e) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (i) if any of the above planning condition (c), (d), (f) or (g) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

**Agenda Item 28**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-ST/585            Proposed Temporary Shop and Services (Real Estate and Travel Service Agency) for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 219 RP (Part) in D.D.102, San Tin, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-ST/585)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

99.            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 shop and services (real estate and travel service agency) 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 views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed use was not incompatible with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone as it could provide real estate and travel service agency services to the local community. There was no Small House application approved or under processing at the application site, approval of the application on a temporary basis for a period of three years would not frustrate the long-term planning intention of the “V” zone. The proposed use was 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 six similar applications approved for temporary shop and services use within the same “V” zone. Approval of the application was consistent with the Committee’s previous decisions. Regarding the public comment received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

100. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

101. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 16.4.2024 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 7:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m. from Monday to Saturday, 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 catering services, warehouse or open storage use, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the submission of a run-in/out proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport and



the Director of Highways or of the TPB by 16.10.2021;

- (f) in relation to (e) 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 the Director of Highways or of the TPB by 16.1.2022;
- (g) the submission of a drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 16.10.2021;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implementation of the drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 16.1.2022;
- (i) in relation to (h) above, the implemented drainage facilities shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (j) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 16.10.2021;
- (k) in relation to (j) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 16.1.2022;
- (l) if any of the above planning condition (a), (b), (c), (d) or (i) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (m) if any of the above planning condition (e), (f), (g), (h), (j) or (k) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further

notice.”

102. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix IV 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**

#### **Agenda Item 29**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Ping Shan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL-PS/18

(RNTPC Paper No. 3/21)

---

103. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments involved various sites in Ping Shan, including two public housing sites to be developed by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) which were supported by Engineering Feasibility Studies (the Studies) conducted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) where Black & Veatch Hong Kong Limited (B&V) and AECOM Asia Co. Limited (AECOM) were the consultants of the Studies. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| Mr Gavin C.T. Tse<br><i>(as Chief Engineer<br/>(Works), Home Affairs<br/>Department)</i> | - | being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and Subsidised Housing Committee of the HKHA; |
| Mr K.K. Cheung   | - | his firm having current business dealings with HKHA and B&V;  |
| Mr Y.S. Wong   | - | being a member of Fund Management Sub-committee of the HKHA;  |

- Dr Conrad T.C. Wong - having current business dealings with HKHA;
- Dr C.H. Hau - currently conducting contract research project with CEDD and having past business dealings with AECOM;
- Mr L.T. Kwok - his employing organization was operating social service teams supported by HKHA and openly bid funding from HKHA; and
- Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu - his firm having a project in Ping Shan scheduled for the Committee's consideration.

104. The Committee noted that Dr C.H. Hau had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. The Committee noted that according to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board, as the proposed amendments, including those for public housing developments, were the subject of amendments to the OZP proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the interests of Members in relation to HKHA on the item would only need to be recorded. As the interest of Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu was indirect and Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in relation to the Studies, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

105. The following government representatives and the consultant were invited to the meeting at this point:

##### PlanD

Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen - District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (DPO/TMYLW)

Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee - Senior Town Planner/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (STP/TMYLW)

##### CEDD

Mr F.S. Sit - Chief Engineer/Housing Project 3 (CE/HP3)

Ms Kennie M.Y. Chan - Senior Engineer 2/ Housing Project 3 (SE2/HP3)

Ms Iris S.F. Leung - Senior Engineer 1/Housing Project 2 (SE1/HP2)

The Consultant

Mr Allen W.H. Lee - AECOM

106. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee, STP/TMYLW, presented the proposed amendments as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

Background

- (a) a piece of land at Wang Chau was identified through review of “Green Belt” (“GB”) sites for housing development conducted by PlanD in 2011. The Government decided to carry out the public housing development in phases, with amendments to the Ping Shan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) for the Wang Chau Phase 1 Public Housing Development exhibited in 2014 while Item A under the current round of amendment was for the Wang Chau Remaining Phases public housing development (WCRP);
- (b) another site at Ping Shan North near Tin Tsz Road was jointly identified by PlanD and other relevant government departments to meet the policy objective for ten-year housing supply target announced in the 2015 Policy Address. Item B was for a proposed public housing development at Ping Shan North and Item C was for its supporting infrastructural facilities (including a sewage pumping station, a floodwater pumping station and a floodwater retention tank);

Proposed Amendments to Matters shown on the OZP, Notes and Explanatory Statement (ES)

- (c) Item A: rezoning an area (about 12.09ha) to the west of Fuk Hi Street in Wang Chau from “GB” and “Open Storage” to “Residential (Group A)5” (“R(A)5”) for the WCRP with stipulation of a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 6.5 and maximum building height (BH) of 135mPD;

- (d) Item B: rezoning of an area (about 9.23ha) to the east of Tin Shui Wai (TSW) New Town across Tin Tsz Road from “Recreation” (“REC”) to “R(A)6” for the Ping Shan North public housing development with stipulation of a maximum PR of 6.7 and maximum BH of 160mPD;
- (e) Item C: rezoning of an area (about 0.5ha) to the north of Ha Mei San Tsuen from “REC” to “Government, Institution or Community”;
- (f) corresponding revisions to the Notes and ES to take into account the proposed amendments. A clause was proposed for the “R(A)5” and “R(A)6” zones to disregard the floor space for public vehicle parks, public transport facilities and Government, institution and community facilities as required by the Government from PR calculation. Amendments were also made to the Notes of various zones to accord with the latest Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans promulgated by the Board;

Technical Assessments

- (g) the Studies with technical assessments had been conducted by CEDD for the two proposed public housing developments on traffic, environment, water supply, drainage, sewerage, landscape, visual, air ventilation and other aspects. The Studies concluded that there was no insurmountable technical problem for the proposed developments;

Departmental Comments

- (h) relevant government bureaux and departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed OZP amendments;

Consultation

- (i) the Housing, Town Planning and Development Committee of Yuen Long District Council (HTPDC of YLDC) had been consulted on the proposed

amendments on 17.3.2021. The HTPDC members had some reservations on the proposed developments mainly due to the concerns on compensation and rehousing, traffic impact on road network, provision of public transport and cycle track as well as provision of market, retail facilities and social welfare facilities; and

- (j) the Ping Shan Rural Committee (PSRC) had been consulted on the proposed amendments on 9.4.2021. The PSRC strongly objected to the proposed public housing developments and raised concerns mainly on compensation and rehousing, local employment, over-population, traffic impact on road network and fung shui aspects. The PSRC counter-proposed to develop the Fung Lok Wai area for public housing development.

107. As the presentation by PlanD's representative had been completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

108. The Chairman, Vice-chairman and some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the reason for proposing different PRs and BHs for the two public housing developments and their compatibility with the surroundings;
- (b) the potential environmental impacts from the chimneys in Yuen Long Industrial Estate on the WCRP;
- (c) the concerns of the HTPDC and PSRC on traffic impact on road network and the proposed traffic improvement measures;
- (d) provision of car parking and loading/unloading facilities within the two proposed public housing developments and the accessibility to public transport services;
- (e) the concern of the PSRC on local employment; and

- (f) the suspected inferred faults at the Ping Shan North site and the possible geotechnical impacts.

109. In response, Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen, DPO/TMYLW, PlanD, Mr F.S. Sit, CE/HP3, CEDD and Ms Iris S.F. Leung, SE1/HP2, CEDD, made the following main points:

- (a) with regard to the maximum PR proposed, the domestic and non-domestic PRs at WCRP were 6.0 and 0.5 respectively, while the domestic and non-domestic PRs at the Ping Shan North development were 6.5 and 0.2 respectively. The Study for WCRP commenced in 2017 when a maximum domestic PR of 6.0 was commonly adopted for public housing developments. Following the policy initiative to enhance development intensity of public housing sites announced in late 2018, a domestic PR of 6.5 was adopted as the basis for technical assessments for the Ping Shan North site. However, as the Study for WCRP was already in an advanced stage in late 2018, the domestic PR of 6.0 had not been adjusted. The proposed development intensities of the two public housing developments were compatible with domestic PRs of around 5 to 6 in the surrounding developments in Yuen Long Town, public housing development at Wang Chau Phase 1, TSW New Town and Long Ping Estate. The Studies also concluded that there were no insurmountable technical problems for the proposed public housing developments;
- (b) according to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKSPG), a buffer distance of 200m was recommended between industrial chimneys and high-rise buildings. Although one existing chimney was located within 200m of the WCRP site, suitable layout design would be adopted so that all sensitive receivers in the future development would be at least 200m away from the existing chimneys. According to the Preliminary Environmental Review, there would be no adverse air quality impacts on sensitive receivers in WCRP;
- (c) preliminary Traffic and Transport Impact Assessments (TTIAs) had been

conducted to assess the traffic and transport impacts arising from the proposed public housing developments. The TTIA indicated that the capacity of some existing road junctions/links would be operated over their capacities. Road improvement works for these critical road junctions/links, including road widening, alteration from existing priority-control to signalized-control and junction improvement works (including the junction at Tin Wah Road/Tin Tsz Road) were recommended. With the implementation of the improvement measures, the proposed public housing developments would be acceptable from traffic point of view;

- (d) provision of car parking and loading/unloading facilities was proposed in the TTIA in accordance with the requirements in the HKPSG and the requirements of the Transport Department. Public vehicle park was also assumed in the development scheme for WCRP and the actual provision was subject to further assessments and comments of concerned government departments in the detailed design stage. Both public housing developments were about 10 to 15 minutes' walk from the nearest West Rail/Light Rail stations, and public transport interchanges had been proposed in both developments to allow better public transport services to serve the future residents;
- (e) some employment opportunities would be provided by commercial uses, social welfare facilities and estate management within the proposed public housing developments. Besides, local employment opportunities would be provided in various new/potential development areas in Yuen Long and north-west New Territories, including Hung Shui Kiu/Ha Tsuen New Development Area (about 150,000 jobs), San Tin/Lok Ma Chau Development Node (about 64,000 jobs) and Yuen Long South Development (about 13,600 jobs); and
- (f) based on the current available information, suspected inferred faults were mapped at the Ping Shan North site as shown on Plan 7 of the Paper. However, there would not be insurmountable geotechnical impact. At this preliminary planning stage, lower building blocks were assumed to be



located in the inferred faults area. Further ground investigation works would be carried out to verify the geotechnical constraints.

110. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Ping Shan OZP No. S/YL-PS/18 as shown on the draft Ping Shan OZP No. S/YL-PS/18A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered as S/YL-PS/19 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of the Paper were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance); and
- (b) adopt the revised ES at Attachment IV of the Paper for the draft Ping Shan OZP No. S/YL-PS/18A (to be renumbered as S/YL-PS/19) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land use zonings on the OZP and agree that the revised ES was suitable for exhibition together with the OZP.

111. Members noted that, as a general practice, the Secretariat of the Board would undertake detailed checking and refinement of the draft OZP including the Notes and ES, if appropriate, before their publication under the Ordinance. Any major revisions would be submitted for the Board's consideration.

[Mr Peter K.T. Yuen left the meeting at this point.]

[The Chairman thanked the government representatives and the consultant for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 30**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Lau Fau Shan & Tsim Bei Tsui Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-LFS/9 and the Approved Tin Shui Wai Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TSW/14  
(RNTPC Paper No. 4/21)

---

112. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments involved a site in Tin Shui Wai for public housing development to be developed by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) which was supported by the Engineering Feasibility Study (the Study) conducted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) where Black & Veatch Hong Kong Limited (B&V) was one of the consultants of the Study. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| Mr Gavin C.T. Tse<br><i>(as Chief Engineer<br/>(Works), Home Affairs<br/>Department)</i> | - being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and Subsidised Housing Committee of the HKHA;     |
| Mr K.K. Cheung   | - his firm having current business dealings with HKHA and B&V;  |
| Mr Y.S. Wong   | - being a member of Fund Management Sub-committee of the HKHA;  |
| Dr Conrad T.C. Wong  | - having current business dealings with HKHA;   |
| Dr C.H. Hau  | - currently conducting contract research project with CEDD;   |
| Mr L.T. Kwok   | - his employing organization was operating social service teams supported by HKHA (including an unit at Tin Ching Estate) and openly bid funding from HKHA; and |
| Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu   | - his firm having a project in Ping Shan (immediate south of Tin Shui Wai) scheduled for the Committee's consideration.   |

113. The Committee noted that Dr C.H. Hau had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. The Committee noted that according to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board, as the proposed amendments, including those for public housing development, were the subject of amendments to the OZP proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the interests of Members in relation to HKHA on the item would only need to be recorded. As the interest of Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu was indirect and Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in relation to the Study, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

114. The following government representatives and the consultant were invited to the meeting at this point:

##### PlanD

Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen - District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (DPO/TMYLW)

Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee - Senior Town Planner/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (STP/TMYLW)

##### CEDD

Mr John C.L. Chan - Senior Engineer 2/ Housing Project 2 (SE2/HP2)

##### The Consultant

Mr Edwin C.H. Lo - Binnies Hong Kong Limited  
[formerly Black & Veatch Hong Kong Limited (B&V)]

115. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee, STP/TMYLW, presented the proposed amendments as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

##### Background

- (a) The site at Tin Wah Road was jointly identified by PlanD and other relevant government departments to meet the policy objective for ten-year

housing supply target announced in the 2015 Policy Address. The proposed public housing development at the site would be implemented in two phases, with phase 1 mainly in an area covered by the Approved Tin Shui Wai Outline Zoning Plan (TSW OZP) and phase 2 mainly in an area covered by the Approved Lau Fau Shan and Tsim Bei Tsui Outline Zoning Plan (LFS OZP);

Proposed Amendments to Matters shown on the OZPs, the Notes and Explanatory Statements (ESs)

*LFS OZP*

- (b) Item A: rezoning of an area (about 2.82ha) near the junction of Tin Wah Road and Man Tak Road from “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”) and “Green Belt” to “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) for the phase 2 public housing development with stipulation of a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 6.9 and maximum building height (BH) of 165mPD;

*TSW OZP*

- (c) Item A: rezoning of an area (about 1.13ha) near the junction of Tin Wah Road and Tin Ying Road from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “R(A)1” for the phase 1 public housing development with stipulation of a maximum PR of 6.9 and maximum BH of 165mPD;
- (d) Item B: rezoning of an area at the junction of Tin Wing Road and Tin Yan Road in the centre of Tin Shui Wai (TSW) New Town from “Undetermined” to “Residential (Group B)2” to reflect the existing private residential development of Central Park Towers completed in 2010;
- (e) Items C1 and C2: rezoning of a strip of land to the north of Tin Yip Road from an area shown as ‘Road’ to “G/IC” and rezoning of a strip of land to the south of Tin Yip Road from “G/IC” to an area shown as ‘Road’ to reflect the existing alignment of Tin Yip Road;
- (f) corresponding revisions to the Notes and ESs to take into account the

proposed amendments. A clause was proposed for the “R(A)” and “R(A)1” zones to disregard the floor space for public vehicle parks, public transport facilities and Government, institution and community facilities as required by the Government from PR calculation. Amendments were also made to the Notes of various zones to accord with the latest Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans promulgated by the Board;

Technical Assessments

- (g) the Study with technical assessments had been conducted by CEDD for the proposed public housing development on traffic, environment, water supply, drainage, sewerage, landscape, visual, air ventilation and other aspects. The Study concluded that there was no insurmountable technical problem for the proposed development;

Departmental Comments

- (h) relevant government bureaux and departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed OZP amendments;

Consultation

- (i) the Housing, Town Planning and Development Committee of Yuen Long District Council (HTPDC of YLDC) had been consulted on the proposed amendments on 17.3.2021. The HTPDC members had some reservations on the proposed development mainly due to the concerns on compensation and rehousing, traffic impact on road network, provision of public transport and cycle track as well as provision of market, retail facilities and social welfare facilities; and
- (j) the Ping Shan Rural Committee (PSRC) had been consulted on the proposed amendments on 9.4.2021. The PSRC strongly objected to the proposed public housing development and raised concerns mainly on feng shui, loss of place for holding religious activities, land use compatibility

with Sha Kong Wai Tsuen, air ventilation and traffic impact on road network. The PSRC counter-proposed to develop the Fung Lok Wai (FLW) area for public housing.

116. As the presentation by PlanD's representative had been completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

117. The Chairman, Vice-Chairman and some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the details of the proposed junction improvement works at Tin Wah Road/Ping Ha Road/Lau Fau Shan Road;
- (b) the feasibility of the counter-proposal of the PSRC to develop the FLW area for public housing development;
- (c) whether the development intensity of the proposed public housing development had reached the upper limit of those in the area and its compatibility with the surroundings;
- (d) the reason for proposing a roundabout at the south-western part of the Tin Wah Road site;
- (e) whether the 5% of gross floor area (GFA) for social welfare facilities as mentioned in the 2020 Policy Address would be provided in the proposed public housing development; and
- (f) the concern of the PSRC on loss of place for holding religious activities.

118. In response, Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen, DPO/TMYLW, made the following main points:

- (a) the preliminary Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment had indicated that all the key road junctions/links were operating within capacities except for

the junction at Tin Wah Road/Ping Ha Road/Lau Fau Shan Road. The recommended improvement works mainly included converting that junction from a priority junction to a roundabout and widening a section of Tin Wah Road;

- (b) the FLW area mainly comprising privately-owned fish ponds was located within the Deep Bay Wetland Conservation Area and zoned “Other Specified Use” annotated “Comprehensive Development and Wetland Enhancement Area” on the LFS OZP. A section 16 application covering the major part of the FLW area was approved by the Committee for a low-density residential development, but the case was currently subject to a judicial review. The planning intention for FLW was to retain the fish ponds and to allow very low density residential development at areas without fish ponds. Given the site context and planning intention for the FLW area, it was considered not suitable for high-density public housing development;
- (c) the development intensity of the proposed public housing development at Tin Wah Road was comparable to that proposed at Ping Shan North, with the same domestic PR of 6.5. The non-domestic PR of Tin Wah Road development was slightly higher at 0.4 due to the need for provision of retail facilities and kindergarten(s) uses on a comparatively smaller site. The proposed total PR of 6.9 and BH of 165mPD were compatible with the developments at the Hung Shui Kiu/Ha Tsuen New Development Area (NDA) to the immediate south (for example, a “R(A)3” site with maximum PR of 5.5 and maximum BH of 140mPD) and the adjacent TSW New Town (for example, the Central Park Towers with existing PR of about 5.1 and BH of about 160mPD and Tin Wah Estate with existing PR of about 6.1 and BH of about 120mPD). Also, each site had different site context and limitations, and there were examples of existing developments in TSW New Town with PR of about 7.0 and proposed developments in Hung Shui Kiu/Ha Tsuen NDA with maximum BH of 200mPD. The Study also concluded that there were no insurmountable technical problems for the proposed public housing development;

- (d) to allow vehicular access to the proposed non-domestic block at the south-western portion of the Tin Wah Road public housing site, a roundabout was proposed to connect to Tin Wah Road via the existing Man Tak Road. The proposed non-domestic block and roundabout were subject to further assessments and comments of concerned government departments in the detailed design stage;
- (e) according to the 2020 Policy Address, the HKHA, together with the Development Bureau, would explore to set aside about 5% of GFA of future public housing projects for the provision of social welfare facilities, as far as practicable. A remark was proposed in the draft Notes of the OZPs for the “R(A)”/”R(A)1” zones that floor spaces for Government, institution and community facilities as required by the Government might be disregarded from PR calculation. The preliminary assessment of CEDD and Housing Department (HD) was that such additional GFA could be accommodated within the proposed maximum BH of 165mPD. HD would further ascertain with the Social Welfare Department on the type of facilities to be incorporated in the detailed design stage and these could be set out in the planning brief for the proposed public housing development; and
- (f) the public housing site would involve some Tso Tong land owned by villagers of Sha Kong Wai Tsuen. The Tso Tong land affected by the development was currently zoned “R(C)” on the LFS OZP. The PSRC considered that some religious activities, for example the six-yearly ‘Da Jiu’, which would be held on the Tso Tong land might be affected.

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

119. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Lau Fau Shan and Tsim



Bei Tsui OZP No. S/YL-LFS/9 as shown on the draft Lau Fau Shan and Tsim Bei Tsui OZP No. S/YL-LFS/9A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered as S/YL-LFS/10 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of the Paper were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance);

- (b) adopt the revised ES at Attachment IV of the Paper for the draft Lau Fau Shan and Tsim Bei Tsui OZP No. S/YL-LFS/9A (to be renumbered as S/YL-LFS/10) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land use zonings on the OZP and agree that the revised ES was suitable for exhibition together with the OZP;
- (c) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Tin Shui Wai OZP No. S/TSW/14 as shown on the draft Tin Shui Wai OZP No. S/TSW/14A at Attachment VI of the Paper (to be renumbered as S/TSW/15 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment VII of the Paper were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance; and
- (d) adopt the revised ES at Attachment VIII of the Paper for the draft Tin Shui Wai OZP No. S/TSW/14A (to be renumbered as S/TSW/15) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land use zonings on the OZP and agree that the revised ES was suitable for exhibition together with the OZP.

120. Members noted that, as a general practice, the Secretariat of the Board would undertake detailed checking and refinement of the draft OZPs including the Notes and ESs, if appropriate, before their publication under the Ordinance. Any major revisions would be submitted for the Board's consideration.

[The Chairman thanked the government representatives and the consultant for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

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

### **Agenda Item 31**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-LFS/388      Temporary Public Vehicle Park for Private Cars for a Period of 3 Years and Filling of Land in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lots 2530 (Part), 2531 (Part) and 2918 (Part) in D.D.129, Lau Fau Shan, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-LFS/388)

---

#### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary public vehicle park for private cars for a period of three years and filling of land;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, 11 public comments from villagers and individuals were received, with one supporting and ten objecting to the application. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application 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, it could meet the local car

parking needs. There was no Small House application approved or under processing at the application site (the Site) and approval of the application on a temporary basis for a period of three years would not jeopardise the long-term planning intention of the “V” zone. The applied use was 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 six similar applications approved for temporary public/private vehicle park use without involving filling of land within the same “V” zone and one similar application approved for temporary private vehicle park with filling of land in another “V” zone on the same Outline Zoning Plan. Approval of the application was consistent with the Committee’s previous decisions. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

122. In response to a Member’s enquiries, Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee, STP/TMYLW, said that the ‘develop first, apply later’ issue was raised in the public comments as the applicant had already hard-paved and used the Site for car parking before applying for the proposed use. There were similar applications approved within the same “V” zone but there was no previous application at the Site.

#### Deliberation Session

123. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 16.4.2024 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) only private cars as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance, as proposed by the applicant, 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 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 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 16.10.2021;
- (f) in relation to (e) 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 16.1.2022;
- (g) in relation to (f) above, the implemented drainage facilities shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) the implementation of the accepted fire service installations proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 16.1.2022;
- (i) if any of the above planning condition (a), (b), (c), (d) or (g) is not complied with during the approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (j) if any of the above planning condition (e), (f) or (h) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

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

**Agenda Item 32**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-PS/632 Temporary Warehouse (Storage of Water Filters and Documents) for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 159 S.B ss.1 RP in D.D.123, Ping Shan, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-PS/632)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

125. 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 warehouse (storage of water filters and documents) for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, 14 public comments from local villagers and individuals objecting to the application were received. Major views were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The applied use was not in line with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone and there was no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention,

even on a temporary basis. The applied use was not entirely compatible with the surrounding land uses. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. There had not been any planning approval for temporary warehouse or storage use in the same “V” zone. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications with the “V” zone, causing degradation to the environment of the area. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

126. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

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

“the applied use is not in line with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” zone which is primarily intended for development of Small Houses by indigenous villagers. No strong planning justification has been given in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis.”

**Agenda Item 33**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-PS/633            Temporary Logistics Centre and Vehicle Park (Container Tractors, Container Trailers and Lorries (Medium/Heavy Goods Vehicles)) for a Period of 3 Years in “Comprehensive Development Area” Zone, Lot 105 RP (Part), 107 (Part), 108 (Part), 111 (Part), 112, 113, 114 (Part), 115, 116, 118, 119 (Part), 120 (Part), 124 (Part), 127 (Part), 128 and 158 (Part) in D.D.122 and adjoining Government Land, Ping Shan, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-PS/633)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

128.            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 temporary logistics centre and vehicle park (container tractors, container trailers and lorries (medium/heavy goods vehicles)) for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper;
- (d) 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; 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 “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) zone, there was no known development

proposal to implement the zoned use and approval of the application on a temporary basis for a period of three years would not jeopardise the long-term planning intention of the “CDA” zone. The applied use was not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. The application was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13F in that the application site (the Site) fell within Category 2 areas and concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application, except the Director of Environmental Protection who did not support the application as there were sensitive receivers of residential use in the vicinity of the Site and environmental nuisance from the applied use was expected. However, there was no environmental complaint concerning the Site in the past three years. To minimise any possible environmental nuisance and to address the technical requirements of the concerned government departments, appropriate approval conditions were recommended. There were nine previously approved applications for similar uses at the Site and four similar approved applications within the same “CDA” zone. Approval of the application was consistent with the Committee’s previous decisions. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

129. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

130. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 16.4.2024 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 11:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no operation on Sundays and public holidays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;



- (c) no vehicle 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;
- (d) no vehicle washing, repairing, dismantling, car beauty and other workshop activity is allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (f) the existing drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) the existing boundary fencing shall be maintained during the planning approval period;
- (h) the submission of a landscape proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 16.10.2021;
- (i) in relation to (h) above, the implementation of the landscape proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 16.1.2022;
- (j) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 16.10.2021;
- (k) in relation to (j) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 9 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 16.1.2022;

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

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

### **Agenda Item 34**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/HSK/298                      Proposed Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Electronic Goods for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group A) 2” Zone, Lots 625, 626 (Part), 627 and 628 in D.D. 124 and Adjoining Government Land, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/HSK/298)

---

#### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

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

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary warehouse for storage of electronic goods for a period of three years;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;

- (d) during the statutory publication period, two public comments from individuals raising concerns/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 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 proposed use was not in line with the planning intention of the “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) zone, the implementation programme for that part of Hung Shui Kiu/Ha Tsuen New Development Area was still being formulated and approval of the application on a temporary basis for a period of three years would not jeopardise the long-term planning intention of the application site (the Site). The proposed use was not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application, except the Director of Environmental Protection who did not support the application as there were sensitive receivers of residential use in the vicinity of the Site and environmental nuisance from the proposed use was expected. To minimise any possible environmental nuisance and to address the technical requirements of the concerned government departments, appropriate approval conditions were recommended. There was a previously approved application for open storage and workshop use at the Site when it was zoned “Open Storage” on the then Outline Zoning Plan and three similar applications approved for warehouse use falling entirely/partly within the same “R(A)2” zone. Approval of the application was consistent with the Committee’s previous decisions. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

133. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

134. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 16.4.2024 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 operation on Sundays and public holidays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) the 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 16.1.2022;
- (e) in relation to (d) above, the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 16.10.2021;
- (g) in relation to (f) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 16.1.2022;
- (h) if any of the above planning condition (a), (b), (c) or (e) is not complied with during the approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (i) if any of the above planning condition (d), (f) or (g) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

135. 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-TT/505 Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Hobby Farm) for a Period of 3 Years and Filling of Land in “Agriculture”, “Green Belt” and “Open Storage” Zones, Various Lots in D.D. 117 and Adjoining Government Land, Tai Tong, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TT/505B)

---

136. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 8.4.2021 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 third time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to address departmental comments.

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

**Agenda Item 36**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-TYST/1082 Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Home Furniture with Ancillary Office for a Period of 3 Years in “Undetermined” Zone, Lots 961 S.C (Part) and 962 (Part) in D.D. 119, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/1082)

---

138. The Committee noted that the applicants requested on 5.4.2021 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 applicants requested deferment of the application.

139. 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 37**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-TYST/1084 Temporary Driving School for a Period of 3 Years in “Open Storage” Zone, Lot 2620 RP (Part) in D.D. 120, Shan Ha Road, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/1084)

---

140. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 13.4.2021 deferment of

consideration of the application for one month 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.

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

### **Agenda Item 38**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-TYST/1086 Proposed Public Utility Installation (Sewage Pumping Station) in  
"Residential (Group A) 1" Zone, Government Land in D.D. 122, Long  
Bin, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/1086)

---

142. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) and 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.           |

143. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application. The Committee noted that the interest of Dr C.H. Hau was direct but he had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

144. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 12.4.2021 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.

145. 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.

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

### **Agenda Item 39**

#### **Any Other Business**

146. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 5:20 p.m..