

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 760th Meeting of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee held at 2:30 p.m. on 28.2.2025

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Chairperson

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Vice- chairperson

Mr K.W. Leung

Dr C.M. Cheng

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

Professor B.S. Tang

Mr Simon Y.S. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories East,
Transport Department
Mr K.L. Wong

Chief Engineer (Works),
Home Affairs Department
Mr Bond C.P. Chow

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory North),
Environmental Protection Department
Ms Clara K.W. U

Assistant Director/Regional 1,
Lands Department
Ms Catherine W.S. Pang

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Ms Donna Y.P. Tam

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Jeff K.C. Ho

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Tommy T.W. Wong

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 759th RNTPC Meeting held on 14.2.2025

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 759th RNTPC meeting held on 14.2.2025 were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Deferral Cases

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Presentation and Question Sessions

3. The Committee noted that there were 15 cases requesting the Town Planning Board to defer consideration of the applications. Details of the requests for deferral, Member's declaration of interest for a case and the Committee's view on the declared interest were in **Annex 1**.

Deliberation Session

4. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer decisions on the applications as requested by the applicants pending submission of further information, as recommended in the Papers.

Renewal Cases

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Presentation and Question Sessions

5. The Committee noted that there were four cases for renewal of temporary planning approval and the Planning Department had no objection to the applications. Details of the planning applications, Member's declaration of interest for a case and the Committee's view on the declared interest were in **Annex 2**.

Deliberation Session

6. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the applications on a temporary basis for the applied renewal periods on the terms of the applications as submitted to the Town Planning Board subject to the approval conditions, if any, stated in the Papers. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicants to note the advisory clauses, if any, as set out in the appendix of the Papers.

Cases for Streamlining Arrangement

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Presentation and Question Sessions

7. The Committee noted that there were 29 cases selected for streamlining arrangement and the Planning Department had no objection to the applications for temporary uses. Details of the planning applications were in **Annex 3**.

Deliberation Session

8. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the applications on a temporary basis for the applied periods on the terms of the applications as submitted to the Town Planning Board subject to the approval conditions, if any, stated in the Papers. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicants to note the advisory clauses, if any, as set out in the appendix of the Papers.

Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East District

Agenda Items 3 and 4

Section 12A Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Y/YL-NSW/8 Application for Amendment to the Draft Nam Sang Wai Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-NSW/9, To rezone the application site from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Comprehensive Development to include Wetland Restoration Area” to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Comprehensive Development to include Wetland Restoration Area 1”, Lots 8 RP (Part), 8 S.A RP, 12, 13, 14 S.B ss.2, 14 S.B RP, 14 S.C RP, 16, 17, 31 S.B RP, 33 RP, 36 RP, 45, 55 S.A and 1740 S.A RP in D.D.107 and Adjoining Government Land, West of Castle Peak Road – Tam Mi, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. Y/YL-NSW/8A)

Y/YL-NSW/9 Application for Amendment to the Draft Nam Sang Wai Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-NSW/9, To rezone the application site from “Industrial (Group D)”, “Open Storage” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “Residential (Group E)”, Lots 1910 RP (Part) and 1743 S.C RP (Part) in D.D. 107 and Adjoining Government Land, West of Castle Peak Road – Tam Mi, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. Y/YL-NSW/9A)

9. The Committee agreed that as the two section 12A (s.12A) applications for proposed comprehensive residential developments with supporting facilities were related and the application sites (the Sites) were located adjacent to each other, they could be considered together.

10. The Secretary reported that the applications were submitted by King Garden Limited (No. Y/YL-NSW/8) and Bright Strong Limited (No. Y/YL-NSW/9), which were subsidiaries of Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (SHK), and AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) was one of the consultants of the applicants. Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho had declared interests on the items for his firm having current business dealings with SHK and

AECOM. The Committee noted that Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

[Ms Clara K.W. U joined the meeting at this point]

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

PlanD

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo | - | District Planning Officer/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (DPO/FSYLE) |
| Mr Alexander W.Y. Mak | - | Senior Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (STP/FSYLE) |
| Mr Gary T.L. Lam | - | Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East |

Applicants' Representatives

Koon Chun Sauce Factory

Mr Daniel Chan

Mr Alan Tam

SHK

Mr Grant Yuen

Mr K.K. Sun

Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Limited

Mr Dickson Hui

Ms Winnie Wu

Mr Man Ho

Arup Hong Kong Limited

Mr Franki Chiu

AECOM

Mr Vic Pun

Ms S.Y. Chu

Ecosystem Limited

Mr Vincent Lai

ESCM Company Limited

Dr Michael Lau

Ramboll Hong Kong Limited

Mr David Yeung

Mr Calvin Chiu

RHT Industries Limited

Ms Cathy Jim

Wong Tung & Partners Limited

Mr Thomas Wong

Mr Nelson Shek

12. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the meeting. He then invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the background of the applications.

13. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Alexander W.Y. Mak, STP/FSYLE, briefed Members on the background of the applications, the proposed rezoning of the Site under application No. Y/YL-NSW/8 (the NSW 8 Site) from "Other Specified Uses" ("OU") annotated "Comprehensive Development to include Wetland Restoration

Area” (“OU(CDWRA)”) to “OU” annotated “Comprehensive Development to include Wetland Restoration Area 1” (“OU(CDWRA)1”) to facilitate a proposed comprehensive residential development with government, institution and community (GIC) and retail facilities as well as a wetland restoration area (WRA), the proposed rezoning of the Site under application No. Y/YL-NSW/9 (the NSW 9 Site) from “Industrial (Group D)” (“I(D)”), “Open Storage” (“OS”) and area shown as ‘Road’ to “Residential (Group E)” (“R(E)”) to facilitate a proposed comprehensive residential development with retail facilities, a privately operated covered public transport interchange (PTI), a proposed primary school and a relocated soy sauce factory, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Papers. While having no in-principle objection to the development proposals under the two applications and the rezoning proposal under application No. Y/YL-NSW/8, PlanD had concerns on the rezoning proposal under application No. Y/YL-NSW/9 as detailed in paragraphs 11.17 and 11.18 of the Paper.

14. The Chairperson then invited the applicants’ representatives to elaborate on the applications. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and a video clip, Mr Man Ho, the applicants’ representative, made the following main points:

- (a) the Government was actively pursuing various developments within the Northern Metropolis (NM), including San Tin Technopole and the Ngau Tam Mei Unitown in proximity to the Sites, to achieve ‘Urban-Rural Integration’ and ‘Co-existence of development and conservation’. The current rezoning applications, with residential and industrial developments, were in line with the industry-driven planning approach in NM;
- (b) the Sites were strategically located in NM. With the commissioning of various transport infrastructures, including the Northern Link – Main Line by 2034 and the NM Highway – San Tin Section by 2036, the enhanced transport capacity would provide an opportunity to optimise the development potential of the Sites;
- (c) the Sites were not greenfield sites. The NSW 8 Site had been formed and used as a temporary quarters for imported labour in construction sector while the NSW 9 Site was occupied by Koon Chun Hing Kee Soy and

Sauce Factory Limited (Koon Chun Sauce Factory (冠珍醬園)) and a temporary container storage yard. There were various existing and committed public and private developments in the vicinity of the Sites, including Park Yoho, Sha Po public housing development, and private and public housing developments under the Land Sharing Pilot Scheme (LSPS) in Tung Shing Lei. Previous approvals had been granted by the Committee for a proposed comprehensive development of an outlet mall with commercial uses (No. A/YL-NSW/241) at the NSW 8 Site and a proposed shopping mall cum 700-room hotel development (No. Y/YL-NSW/3) at the southern part of the NSW 9 Site;

Co-existence of Traditions and Development

- (d) to maintain the reputable traditional industry, upon approval of the applications, Koon Chun Sauce Factory would maintain the operation at the existing location and later be relocated to the new modern factory at the southern portion of the NSW 9 Site upon completion of construction. The existing factory site would then be developed into a residential cum commercial development, thereby achieving co-existence of development and conservation of traditional local industry;

Integration with the Environment

- (e) the proposed developments with the proposed plot ratios (PRs) and building heights (BHs) would blend in well with the surrounding environment, including the planned public and private developments in the area. Under the indicative schemes for the two applications, a stepped BH profile descending from 29 storeys in the east to 15 storeys in the west of the Sites were proposed. Various building separations were also proposed within the Sites to enhance visual and air permeability;
- (f) according to the ecological survey conducted by the applicants, as most of the Sites were developed land, the ecological value of the existing habitat within the Sites was categorised as 'low' or 'very low'. Major flight paths

of birds were observed along Kam Tin River but not within the Sites;

- (g) a WRA of about 2.8 hectares (ha) with a pond of about 1 ha, two marshes of about 1.2 ha and one reedbed of about 0.6 ha were proposed in the northwestern portion of the NSW 8 Site. Various native plant species could be planted to provide a variety of habitats for invertebrates, small birds, waterbirds, insects and amphibian, etc. In addition, the pond within the WRA could store rainwater, which would be discharged to Kam Tin River gradually under gravity. The pond could serve as a buffer for two marshes and a reedbed so that the ecological values of wetland and the flood retention capacity could be enhanced;

Caring for the Community

- (h) a privately operated covered PTI was proposed at the NSW 9 Site to serve the future residents and general public. The proposed subway connection to the planned Au Tau Station, together with road widening with footpath and cycle track connecting to the existing cycle track at Pok Wai South Road, would comprehensively enhance the accessibility of the Sites;
- (i) various social welfare facilities, including a neighbourhood elderly centre and a privately operated 100-place residential care home for the elderly, would be provided at the NSW 8 Site. A site was reserved within the NSW 9 Site for provision of a primary school to cater for the future increase in population arising from the two proposed developments. About 8,850m² commercial/retail facilities (with two kindergartens) would also be provided within the Sites;

Conclusion

- (j) the proposed development at the NSW 9 Site was in line with the Government's policy to promote 'Industry-driven planning approach' and encouraged in-situ retention of existing industry (i.e. Koon Chun Sauce Factory);

- (k) various technical assessments had been conducted and submitted to demonstrate the technical feasibility of the proposed developments. Concerned government bureaux/departments (B/Ds) had no in-principle objection to the proposed developments; and
- (l) upon agreement of the current rezoning applications, applications for planning permission under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (s.16 applications) from the Board would be required for the proposed residential cum commercial developments, school and social welfare facilities and the relocation of Koon Chun Sauce Factory. While the NSW 9 Site had been proposed for rezoning to “R(E)”, the applicants had conducted a planning study which demonstrated that rezoning the area allocated for the relocated Koon Chun Sauce Factory, i.e. the southern part of NSW 9 Site, to “OU” annotated “Industrial” (“OU(I)”) with ‘Industrial Use’ included in Column 2 of the zone was considered appropriate. This would allow relocation of Koon Chun Sauce Factory while maintaining proper planning control via s.16 application at the later stage.

15. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and a video clip, Mr Daniel Chan, the applicants’ representative, made the following main points:

- (a) Koon Chun Sauce Factory was established in 1928 in Kowloon City, and had been resettled at the current location since 1967. It was the only ‘made-in-Hong Kong’ soy sauce brand utilising fermentation under the sun for months according to traditional methods. Its products had been widely adopted by many restaurants and available for sales via retail outlets and small businesses both locally and internationally;
- (b) the unique soy sauce production process involved screening, steaming and first fermentation in the indoor area of the factory, followed by second fermentation as well as extraction of soy sauce and bean paste in an outdoor area. The extract would be further processed and packaged within the indoor area of the factory; and
- (c) state-of-the-art equipment could not be installed in the existing factory due

to limitation of space and headroom. The scattered cooking and packaging areas could be rearranged and centralised at the relocated soy sauce factory, which could help increase productivity.

16. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr David Yeung, the applicants' representative, made the following main points:

- (a) state-of-the-art facilities and equipment would be provided in the relocated soy sauce factory, including installation of a centralised ventilation system with air treatment function for the enclosed fermentation room, kitchen and wastewater treatment plant. The ventilation system was invented by RHT Industries Limited with the technology of the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology and widely adopted in numerous government buildings and multi-storey livestock farms. Exhaust of the ventilation system would face southward away from the proposed residential developments at the Sites; and
- (b) the outdoor sun-drying area would be located at the southern end of the Sites, with 200m distance from the air sensitive uses. A closed pumping system would be used for outdoor collection and conveying of soy sauce.

17. As the presentations of PlanD's representative and the applicants' representatives had been completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

Operation of the Existing Soy Sauce Factory

18. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) if the operation of the existing soy sauce factory received any complaint against the odour impact; and
- (b) in the scenario of maintaining the status quo of the existing soy sauce factory, whether its impact on the proposed residential developments at the Sites had been considered in the technical assessments.

19. In response, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, made the following main points:

- (a) no complaint had been received in the past 5 years according to the information from the Environmental Protection Department (EPD); and
- (b) although applications No. Y/YL-NSW/8 and Y/YL-NSW/9 were two separate applications, their technical assessments were conducted in a comprehensive manner for a holistic spatial re-planning of the Sites. Under the existing zoning of “OU(CDWRA)” at the NSW 8 Site, comprehensive development with a maximum PR of 0.4 was allowed. However, if the existing soy sauce factory at the NSW 9 Site was not relocated, it might pose technical constraints to the adjacent development at the “OU(CDWRA)” zone. Relocation of the soy sauce factory to the south of the NSW 9 Site could facilitate unleashing the development potential of the “OU(CDWRA)” zone at the NSW 8 Site. With the proposed relocation of the existing soy sauce factory to the southern portion, the proposed residential development at the northern portion of the NSW 9 Site would be compatible with that at the NSW 8 Site.

20. In response to the Chairperson’s enquiry on any previous planning application for residential development at the Sites, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, said that an application for a proposed comprehensive development of an outlet mall with commercial uses (including ‘Shop and Services’ and ‘Eating Place’), ‘Agricultural Use (commercial fish pond)’ and excavation and filling of land (No. A/YL-NSW/241) was approved by the Committee in 2017 at the NSW 8 Site. Another application for a proposed shopping mall cum 700-room hotel development (No. Y/YL-NSW/3) was approved by the Committee in 2016 at the NSW 9 Site. There was no planning application submitted or approved for residential development at the Sites.

21. A Member asked whether the operation of the existing soy sauce factory would be terminated if application No. Y/YL-NSW/9 was rejected, hindering the relocation of the soy sauce factory. In response, Ms Winnie Wu, the applicant’s representative, said that as both applications aimed at achieving comprehensive spatial re-planning of the Sites, technical

assessments of application No. Y/YL-NSW/8 were conducted based on the proposal of application No. Y/YL-NSW/9 in that the existing soy sauce factory could be relocated. The existing soy sauce factory was an always permitted use under the existing “I(D)” zone and cessation of operation of the existing soy sauce factory was not considered. Rejecting application No. Y/YL-NSW/9 would jeopardise the relocation of the existing soy sauce factory.

Relocation of the Soy Sauce Factory

22. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether an open-air and at-grade location was the pre-requisite for the outdoor sun-drying area of the relocated soy sauce factory; and whether it was possible to locate it on the rooftop of a building;
- (b) whether it was necessary to retain the existing soy sauce factory within the NSW 9 Site amid various committed public and private residential developments in close proximity of the Sites, and whether off-site relocation of soy sauce factory was considered;
- (c) whether there would be change in site area and scale of production of the soy sauce factory after the relocation;
- (d) whether odour impact arising from the relocated soy sauce factory to nearby residential development, namely Park Yoho, and the proposed Sha Po public housing development had been assessed; and
- (e) any measure to avoid possible contamination of stormwater by the soy sauce factory.

23. In response, Ms Winnie Wu and Mr Daniel Chan, the applicants’ representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) direct exposure to the sunlight was required for the second fermentation to

develop the traditional taste of soy sauce. Due to the high density of soy sauce, loading requirement of buildings would be very high if the sun-drying procedure was conducted on rooftop. In addition, it would be difficult to convey a large amount of soy sauce to the rooftop of buildings. Based on the experience of another two soy sauce factories located in Tai Po and Tseung Kwan O, which resorted to purchase soy sauce products from Koon Chun Sauce Factory, fermentation of soy sauce on rooftop was infeasible. Hence, an open-air and at-grade location was crucial for manufacturing of soy sauce. Upon relocation, the at-grade outdoor sun-drying area would be located at the southern end of the NSW 9 Site. The main building of the relocated soy sauce factory could act as a physical buffer between the at-grade outdoor sun-drying area and the residential development at the northern portion of the proposed developments. Locating the sun-drying area at rooftop would undermine the buffer function of the relocated soy sauce factory. Such design merit had been taken into account when undertaking the Odour Impact Assessment (OIA);

- (b) relevant B/Ds had been approached for off-site relocation of Koon Chun Sauce Factory but in vain mainly due to a large amount of relocation needs of various existing business affected by various new development areas and the technical requirements. Hence, the applicant prepared a feasible proposal of spatial restructuring for in-situ retention of a modernised soy sauce factory and its co-existence with the new residential developments. Koon Chun Sauce Factory also indicated its intention for in-situ relocation within the NSW 9 Site;
- (c) the site area of soy sauce factory after relocation would remain largely the same. As Koon Chun Sauce Factory would continue to operate as a small to medium enterprise, upon relocation, the scale of production would not be altered significantly;
- (d) an OIA, taking into account existing and committed public and private developments, wind direction and temperature, had been conducted and concluded that the proposed relocation of soy sauce factory would not have

any adverse impact on the surrounding environment. EPD had no objection to the submitted OIA; and

- (e) stringent protocols had already been implemented to avoid contamination of stormwater. Upon relocation, a new drainage system would be constructed, which could provide extra protection against contamination.

Planning Intention of “OU(CDWRA)” and Wetland Conservation

24. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) size and location of the existing wetland within the Sites;
- (b) whether the existing Wetland Conservation Area (WCA) was encroached by the NSW 8 Site, and whether its boundary would be altered upon completion of the proposed development;
- (c) whether the site conditions at the time of the first publication of the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) or the current state should be taken into account when assessing whether the “no-net-loss in wetland” principle could be achieved; and
- (d) whether the proposed developments could achieve “no-net-loss in wetland”.

25. In response, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the habitat map submitted by the applicants, only abandoned ponds and nullah occupying a minor part of the NSW 8 Site were observed, while no wetland was observed in the remaining part of the NSW 8 Site. There was currently no wetland within the NSW 9 Site;
- (b) a very minor portion of the WCA (an area of about 370m²) was encroached by the western tip of the NSW 8 Site. Even if the application was

approved, the boundary of WCA under Town Planning Board Guidelines for ‘Application for Developments within Deep Bay Area under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’ (TPB PG-No. 12C) would not be affected;

- (c) both the site conditions at the time of the first publication of the Nam Sang Wai OZP and the current site conditions had been taken into account when assessing whether the “no-net-loss in wetland” principle could be achieved under the proposed development at the NSW 8 Site. Nonetheless, in considering the actual increase/decrease in the size of wetland quantitatively, reference was made to the current site conditions; and
- (d) at the time of the first publication of the Nam Sang Wai OZP, the NSW 8 Site had been mostly formed, with similar size of water bodies comparing with the current site conditions. For the NSW 9 Site, it had all along been zoned “I(D)” and “OS” on the OZP, under which there was no requirement for wetland compensation. All in all, having taken into account the site conditions at the time of the first publication of Nam Sang Wai OZP and the current site conditions, the proposed WRA of not less than 2.8 ha would achieve a net gain in wetland area of about 2.48 ha, thereby fulfilling the “no-net-loss in wetland” principle, as confirmed by the Agricultural, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD).

26. At the invitation of the Chairperson, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, supplemented that the “OU(CDWRA)” was intended to provide incentive for the restoration of degraded wetlands adjoining existing fish ponds through comprehensive residential and/or recreational development to include wetland restoration area and to phase out existing sporadic open storage and port back-up uses on degraded wetlands. Various areas on the Nam Sang Wai OZP, including the NSW 8 Site, were zoned “OU(CDWRA)” with the said planning intention. The proposed development at the NSW 8 Site was considered in line with the planning intention of the “OU(CDWRA)” zone given that the proposed WRA of 2.8 ha would result in a net increase of wetland area at the site.

Design and Implementation of WRA

27. The Chairperson, Vice-chairperson and some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the source of water within WRA during dry seasons;
- (b) whether the two marshes would be paved by concrete. If not, whether percolation of water had been considered for maintaining the water level of two marshes and one reedbed during dry seasons;
- (c) whether future residents at the Sites would be responsible for the cost of future maintenance and management of the WRA. If yes, whether they would be informed explicitly;
- (d) existing arrangement for maintenance and management of wetland at Park Yoho, and whether such arrangement would be adopted at the proposed residential development;
- (e) if an injection fund would be set up for large-scale maintenance and repair of the WRA; and
- (f) which B/Ds would be responsible for monitoring the implementation of the WRA.

28. In response, Ms Winnie Wu, Dr Michael Lau and Mr Grant Yuen, the applicants' representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) the WRA consisted of various compartments. Rainwater would be stored during rainy seasons, and water stored would be released to other compartments during dry seasons to maintain the water level of the compartments. Given that the annual rainfall and the annual evaporation of rainwater was about 2,200mm and 1,500mm to 1,700mm respectively, there should be surplus water to be stored at the pond. The annual rainfall

and evaporation of rainfall in Hong Kong had been duly considered in determining the size and depth of the pond and compartments;

- (b) apart from the pond, the two marshes and one reedbed could also retain rainwater. The two marshes would be paved by concrete, with a layer of pond sludge atop the concrete paving. There would be no percolation of water into the ground. Since there would be sufficient rainwater stored at the pond during wet seasons, rainwater within the two marshes and one reedbed could be replenished during dry seasons;
- (c) as the WRA was ancillary to the proposed residential development at the NSW 8 Site, the future maintenance and management cost of the WRA would be borne by the future owners of the proposed residential development at the NSW 8 Site. Various design features, including natural flow of water by gravity and installation of water gates, had been adopted to minimise the future maintenance and management cost;
- (d) according to the experience of Park Yoho, the model of sharing maintenance and management cost of WRA by owners had been successfully adopted. The management fee of \$4.41 per square feet at Park Yoho was comparable to the management fee of \$5 per square feet of other new residential developments without WRA. \$0.04 out of \$4.41 management fee devoted for the maintenance and management of wetland was considered acceptable. Moreover, the residents generally welcomed the provision of wetland, which provided a scenic landscape to the residents. Residents and visitors could gain access to the wetland via visit-by-appointment system, and the guided tours provided were welcomed by the residents. To reduce human disturbance to the wildlife and its habitats therein, it was necessary to control the access of the wetland. The visit-by-appointment system had made reference to the arrangement of Mai Po Nature Reserve;
- (e) with reference to the arrangement at Park Yoho, a sinking fund, extracted from the management fee, would be established for maintenance and

management of the WRA; and

- (f) upon completion of the WRA, a monitoring report would be submitted to AFCD on a quarterly basis.

29. Regarding the future implementation of the WRA, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, supplemented that upon agreement of the two applications, planning permission under s.16 applications from the Board would still be required for the proposed developments at the Sites. Relevant requirements for implementation of WRA would also be incorporated under lease, subject to the scrutiny by the Lands Department (LandsD) and AFCD. As the NSW 8 Site fell within the Deep Bay Buffer Zone, the proposed residential development would constitute a Designated Project under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (Cap. 499) and for which, an environmental impact assessment which would take into account the proposed mitigation/enhancement measures, including the WRA, should be conducted and an environmental permit should be obtained.

Impact of Climate Change

30. Noting that the Sites were situated next to Kam Tin River, a Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there was any data of past water level during storm surge;
- (b) whether the risk of storm surge to the proposed development had been assessed; and
- (c) the reasons for locating the pond at the western part of the NSW 8 Site, given that the pond could not help mitigate the risk arising from large amount of rainwater passing through the proposed development from the East.

31. In response, Ms Winnie Wu and Dr Michael Lau, the applicants' representatives, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) data of the latest climatic factors had been incorporated into the submitted drainage impact assessment (DIA), which had been accepted by the Drainage Services Department. Updated technical assessments, including DIA, would be submitted for B/Ds' scrutiny during the s.16 application stage;
- (b) numerous wetland and fishponds were currently maintained in the Deep Bay area. Together with the wetland within the proposed Sham Po Shue Wetland Conservation Park, an extensive area of wetlands could render protection against sea-level rise and storm surge. When super typhoon Hato hit Hong Kong in 2017, a storm surge of more than 2m was recorded in Tsim Bei Tsui. Coinciding with the high water of the astronomical tide, the aggregated effect resulted in a water level of more than 4m. At that time, no report of flooding in the low-lying area of Kam Tin River had been received due to the flood retention offered by the wetlands in the area; and
- (c) the flood retention design capacity aimed at protecting the low-lying area of Kam Tin River, instead of the proposed development. During heavy rainfall, stormwater could not be discharged into Kam Tin River timely and resulted in flooding at low-lying area. The proposed WRA would increase the wetland area through retaining surface runoff. The stored runoff could be gradually discharged into Kam Tin River after heavy rainfall.

32. A Member shared that while the proposed WRA could alleviate the flooding risk in the low-lying area of Kam Tin River, the presence of wetland could not resist any storm surge which would increase the water level by 2m or more. The easterly wind direction during super typhoon Hato had weakened the damage of the storm surge. If the wind direction of Hato changed, the damage of the storm surge would be magnified. The risk and damage of storm surge would be aggravated by the sea-level rise and coincidence with high water of the astronomical tide. Such risks should be taken into account in the proposed developments.

Maintenance and Management of PTI

33. The Chairperson and Vice-chairperson raised the following questions:
- (a) whether the PTI would serve future residents and visitors of the Sites;
 - (b) whether the proposed PTI would be handed over to the Government for maintenance and management, or its maintenance and management cost would be borne by future residents of the NSW 9 Site; and
 - (c) how future residents of the NSW 8 Site could access transportation if the planning permission for the proposed development with the PTI at the NSW 9 Site were not granted.
34. In response, Mr Grant Yuen and Ms Winnie Wu, the applicants' representatives, made the following main points:
- (a) as the PTI would be served by various modes of public transport including franchised buses, green minibuses and taxis, future residents at the Sites as well as visitors and the general public could use the proposed PTI located at the NSW 9 Site;
 - (b) the PTI would be managed by the future residents of the NSW 9 Site. Similar arrangement had been adopted at Park Yoho; and
 - (c) population intake at the Sites required the timely commissioning of the PTI and completion of the proposed road improvement works. Hence, the proposed development at the NSW 8 Site alone would not be feasible without the PTI and proposed road improvement works at the NSW 9 Site.

Alternative "OU(I)" Zoning for Relocated Soy Sauce Factory

35. Noting that the applicant of application No. Y/YL-NSW/9 proposed to rezone the area allocated for the relocated soy factory to "R(E)" in the submission, but further proposed

a new zoning of “OU(I)” at the meeting, a Member asked the reason for such a change. In response, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that according to original submissions from the applicant, the NSW 9 Site was proposed to be rezoned from “OS”, “I(D)” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “R(E)”. The proposed residential development with school and the proposed soy sauce factory were incorporated as Column 2 uses of Schedule I and Schedule II of the proposed “R(E)” zone respectively. Nevertheless, the planning intention of the “R(E)” zone proposed by the applicant to allow relocation of soy sauce factory within the NSW 9 Site was considered not in line with the general planning intention of “R(E)” zone as stated in the latest Master Schedule of Notes promulgated by the Board. The general planning intention of “R(E)” zone was primarily for phasing out of existing industrial uses through redevelopment for residential use on application to the Board. Whilst existing industrial uses would be tolerated, new industrial developments were not permitted. Subsequently, the applicant submitted further information (FI) with planning study to suggest an alternative zoning of “OU(I)” for the relocated soy sauce factory. According to the Town Planning Board Guidelines for ‘Submission of Further Information in Relation to Applications for Amendment of Plan, Planning Permission and Review’, FI of a rezoning application involving change in the proposed zoning would constitute a material change of the nature of the application and could not be accepted, and a fresh application would be required. To expedite the application process, the applicant decided to proceed the application with the originally proposed “R(E)” zone and submitted FI on alternative zoning proposal as a reference. Although PlanD had no objection in principle to the proposed development scheme at the NSW 9 Site, it was considered not suitable to rezone the factory portion of the NSW 9 Site to “R(E)”. Other appropriate zoning should be considered to facilitate the relocation of the soy sauce factory.

Phasing of Proposed Residential Developments

36. The Chairperson asked if the residential developments under the two applications would be developed together given the assumptions, amongst others, on relocation of soy sauce factory and provision of PTI to serve both applications. In response, Ms Winnie Wu, the applicants’ representative, said that while both projects had been comprehensive designed and considered in the technical assessments, phased implementation of the residential developments would be required given the significant scale of the project.

BH

37. Noting that the proposed BH of residential developments would reach 115mPD, a Member enquired about the BH of the existing buildings at the Sites. In response, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, said that the NSW 8 Site being used as a temporary centralised quarters for imported labours had a maximum BH of 5m. For the NSW 9 Site, there was no BH restriction for the area zoned “OS” while a BH restriction of 13m was stipulated for the “I(D)” zone on the OZP.

Proposed Primary School

38. Noting that the Education Bureau indicated that there was no need to reserve a site for public sector primary school, the Chairperson and a Member raised the following questions:

- (a) the reason for reserving a school site in the Sites; and
- (b) the reason for locating a proposed school next to the relocated soy sauce factory.

39. In response, Ms Winnie Wu, the applicants’ representative, made the following main points:

- (a) a primary school site had been reserved with reference to the anticipated population in the area and the requirements stipulated in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. As the implementation would span a long period of time, reserving a school site would allow flexibility in catering possible changes in demography and planning circumstances. Further review would be conducted during the s.16 application stage and detailed design stage; and
- (b) whether the school site was easily accessible and stand-alone were the key considerations. The proposed school site could be accessed directly from the Castle Peak Road – Tam Mi via a newly constructed road. The

proposed location of school had been assessed in the technical assessments, including OIA, which concluded that the relocated soy sauce factory would not result in adverse environmental impact on the proposed school. Relevant B/Ds had no objection to the technical assessments. More detailed technical assessments would be submitted to the Committee for consideration during the s.16 application stage.

Traffic

40. A Member asked whether the cumulative traffic impact of the proposed developments, together with other planned public and private residential developments nearby, had been assessed, in particular the traffic impact before the commissioning of Route 11.

41. In response, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the traffic impact assessments (TIAs) submitted by the applicants had taken into account the existing and planned public and private developments, including Park Yoho, San Tin Technopole, Sha Po public housing development and the LSPS development at Ho Chau Road and private housing development at Tung Shing Lei, etc, to assess the cumulative traffic impact in the area. The applicants had also proposed several road improvement works, including widening of a section of Castle Peak Road – Tam Mi abutting the Sites. It was concluded that all the assessed junctions would be able to cope with the future traffic demand; and
- (b) for the years between the completion of the proposed developments in 2031 and the commissioning of Route 11 anticipated in 2033, the traffic speed at San Tin Highway and Tai Lam Tunnel would be reduced but still be manageable. With the commissioning of Route 11 in 2033, it was anticipated that the traffic condition of the road networks in the vicinity of the Sites would be significantly improved. Relevant B/Ds had no adverse comments on the TIAs.

42. Noting that Pok Wai South Road was situated to the southwest of the NSW 8 Site, a Member asked if an access to Pok Wai South Road could be provided. In response, Ms Winnie Wu, the applicants' representative, said that an access for maintenance and management of the WRA would be required. The access to Pok Wai South Road could be further explored during the detailed design stage.

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

[The meeting was adjourned for a 5-minute break.]

Deliberation Session

44. The Chairperson remarked that the proposed developments under the two applications were assessed comprehensively to facilitate spatial restructuring of a site area of about 20 ha. The implementation of the proposed developments at the Sites was interdependent, particularly concerning the relocation of the existing soy sauce factory to the southern end. While residential development might be considered compatible with the surrounding environment, the presence of the soy sauce factory posed a constraint to residential development within the Sites. Regarding wetland compensation, the proposed development at the NSW 8 Site included a net increase of 2.4 ha in wetland area. The detailed design, maintenance and management of the proposed WRA would be scrutinised at the s.16 application stage. Based on the submitted technical assessments, no insurmountable technical problems were anticipated, and relevant B/Ds had no objection to the proposed developments. Should the proposed developments be considered acceptable, Members might consider whether the "OU(CDWRA)1" and "R(E)" zonings for the NSW 8 Site and NSW 9 Site respectively as proposed by the applicants were appropriate. Members were invited to express views on the applications.

The Soy Sauce Factory and Odour Impact

45. A Member, who supported the proposed developments, noted that the relocated soy sauce factory would be separated from the committed residential developments nearby by existing highways. The Member considered that the odour impact of the relocated soy sauce factory would be limited and its proposed relocation to the southern end of the Sites was acceptable. Another Member concurred and pointed out that with the adoption of new technologies at the relocated soy sauce factory, the odour impact could be effectively mitigated. Maintaining the status quo could potentially cause nuisance to the future residents of the Sha Po public housing development. Given that similar mitigation measures would be required for off-site relocation of the existing soy sauce factory, the Member considered that the location of the relocated soy sauce factory should not be an issue as detailed OIA would be submitted during the s.16 application stage. Relevant B/Ds, including EPD, would scrutinise the submitted OIA, taking into account various factors including sensitive receivers, wind direction and temperature variations, etc.

46. On the other hand, a Member had reservation on the proposals and expressed concern that the technical assessments had not taken into account the scenario of maintaining the status quo of the existing soy sauce factory, rendering them incomplete. In addition, off-site relocation of the existing soy sauce factory could be feasible as the high loading requirements of soy sauce at the rooftop of a building could be met without major technical issues. The Member shared past experiences of odour complaints related to an enclosed sewage treatment plant from residents living 5km to 6km away. While no complaint had been received regarding the existing soy sauce plant, the proposed relocation to the southern end of the Sites would reduce the buffer distance between the soy sauce factory and some existing and committed developments. As such, the Member raised concerns about the odour impact from the open-air portion of the relocated soy sauce factory, particularly during the removal of container lids for soy sauce extraction. Even if the lids were removed briefly, significant odour impact might still occur. The same Member considered that relocating the soy sauce factory within the Sites amid various committed residential developments in the area might not be an optimal solution, and suggested that the applicants should explore off-site relocation options.

47. The Chairperson said that given the high occupancy rate of Hong Kong Science

Park and other InnoParks, relocation of the existing soy sauce factory to those industrial parks might be difficult, if not impossible. Moreover, relocation to other private land might cast uncertainty on the implementation programme of the relocation of existing soy sauce factory and the proposed residential developments at the Sites. The Chairperson further clarified that agreeing to the current applications did not preclude the possibility of an off-site relocation of the existing soy sauce factory. The proposed land use at the southern end of the Sites could be reviewed at the s.16 application stage or upon confirmation of an off-site relocation.

48. In response to the Chairperson's enquiry regarding the odour impact of a soy sauce plant, Ms Clara K.W. U, Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory North), EPD said that pursuant to the provisions of the Air Pollution Control Ordinance (Cap. 311), an air pollution abatement notice could be issued to require cessation of emission of air pollutants or the operation of the polluting process, to reduce the emission of air pollutants or to take other steps to abate the emission of air pollutants. No complaint against the odour impact of the existing soy sauce factory was received in the past 5 years. Should the scenario of maintaining the status quo of the existing soy sauce factory be assessed in the OIA, the assessment results might not be satisfactory for supporting the applications. According to the applicants, removing the lids for soy sauce extraction was necessary in the production process. Nonetheless, upon relocation of the existing soy sauce factory, the proposed mitigation measures, as proposed by the applicants, could mitigate the odour impact, and the submitted OIA was considered acceptable.

Flooding and Storm Surge Risks

49. A Member raised concerns that the risks of storm surge had not been fully assessed and the design of the pond might not effectively mitigate the flooding risk at the NSW 8 Site. Stormwater mitigation facilities should be located upstream (i.e. the eastern part of the NSW 8 Site) as those proposed at the western portion might not perform well. According to historical data, a storm surge could result in an increase of water level by 5m to 7m in Tai Po Kau. Besides, water discharged from Shenzhen Reservoir could further increase the water level within a short period of time. The cumulative risk and the impact on the proposed developments should be carefully assessed as mere compliance with existing regulations might not be sufficient.

BH

50. Regarding the BH, a Member was concerned that the substantial increase in BH from 5m/13m to 115mPD at the Sites might undermine the buffer function of the WBA. As such, the layout and design of the proposed developments should be reviewed and enhanced.

Provision of PTI

51. In response to the Chairperson's enquiry regarding the necessity of a PTI for the proposed developments, Mr K.L. Wong, Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories East, Transport Department said that the PTI and the associated road improvement works should be commissioned prior to the population intake at the Sites.

Zoning Considerations

52. The Chairperson remarked that should the Committee agree to the proposed spatial restructuring of the Sites, the OZP would be amended to incorporate the new zoning(s). Subsequent s.16 applications for the proposed developments would be required, and relevant B/Ds and the Board would scrutinise the detailed design and technical assessments, including the design of the pond and the odour impact of the relocated soy sauce factory. To reflect the inter-dependency of the applications and ensure effective planning control on the overall implementation of the proposed developments, including relocation of the existing soy sauce factory, a single zoning for the Sites could be considered. Members might consider whether to adopt a single zoning or two separate zonings, i.e. "OU(CDWRA)1" and "R(E)" for the NSW 8 Site and the NSW 9 Site respectively as proposed by the applicants. If two separate zonings were to be adopted, Members might also consider whether a more appropriate zoning for the relocated soy sauce factory should be considered, given that the proposed "R(E)" zoning was considered inappropriate in relation to the planning intention.

53. The Secretary supplemented that the planning intention of the existing "OU(CDWRA)" zone was to provide incentive for the restoration of degraded wetlands adjoining existing fish ponds through comprehensive residential and/or recreational development to include wetland restoration area and to phase out existing sporadic open

storage and port back-up uses on degraded wetlands. The planning intention for the restoration of degraded wetlands had not been incorporated in the existing industrial-related zonings, such as “I(D)” and “OS” of the NSW 9 Site. In devising a single zoning covering the Sites, consideration might be given to designating two sub-areas to reflect the different planning intentions for the NSW 8 Site and the NSW 9 Site respectively. In addition, the requirement for submission in form of master layout plan covering the two sub-areas could also be incorporated in the single zoning. Noting Members’ concern on the need for comprehensive planning and development of the two Sites with the relocation of the soy sauce factory, Members might consider whether the applications should be agreed or rejected by the Committee. Should the Committee decide to agree/partially agree to the applications, the proposed amendments to the OZP to achieve the above planning intentions would be worked out in consultation with relevant government departments and submitted for Members’ consideration prior to gazetting under the Town Planning Ordinance.

54. In response to the Chairperson’s enquiry on the land grant arrangement, Ms Catherine W.S. Pang, Assistant Director/Regional 1, LandsD advised that the applicants could apply for two individual or one combined land exchange(s) for the proposed developments at the Sites depending on their proposed development programme.

55. Majority of Members generally had no in-principle objection to the proposed developments as the proposals could strike a balance between conservation and development, and the proposed development parameters and the technical aspects of the proposed developments were considered acceptable while facilitating the relocation of the soy sauce factory to the southern end of the Sites with no significant adverse odour impact anticipated. The proposed maintenance and management arrangements of the WRA, similar to those of Park Yoho, were considered acceptable. That said, Members considered that appropriate zoning should be designated to facilitate comprehensive planning and development of the Sites with suitable planning controls in a co-ordinated manner such that the provision of public/community facilities such as PTI and relocation of the soy sauce factory could be implemented timely to tie in with the population intake. Members also considered that a single zoning for the Sites could help address the interface issues between the residential developments and the soy sauce factory, and hence ensure effective implementation of the proposed developments.

56. After deliberation, the Committee decided to partially agree to each of the application, with appropriate zoning and planning controls covering the application sites of both applications. The relevant proposed amendments to the Nam Sang Wai Outline Zoning Plan, together with the revised Notes and Explanatory Statement, would be worked out in consultation with relevant government departments and submitted to the Committee for consideration prior to gazetting under the Town Planning Ordinance.

Sai Kung and Islands District

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Cheung Chau Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-CC/9
(RNTPC Paper No. 1/25)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

PlanD

- | | |
|----------------------|---|
| Mr Walter W.N. Kwong | - District Planning Officer/Sai Kung and Islands (DPO/SKIs) |
| Mr Sunny K.Y. Tang | - Senior Town Planner/Sai Kung and Islands (STP/SKIs) |
| Mr Derek H.M. Tam | - Assistant Town Planner/Sai Kung and Islands |

58. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Sunny K.Y. Tang, STP/SKIs, briefed Members on the background of the proposed amendments to the approved Cheung Chau Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/I-CC/9, technical considerations, consultation conducted and departmental comments as detailed in the Paper. The proposed amendments

mainly included rezoning of a site at Fa Peng from “Residential (Group C) 6” to “Residential (Group C) 9” subject to a maximum plot ratio of 1.58 and a maximum building height (BH) of 3 storeys (8.23m) to take forward a section 12A (s.12A) application (No. Y/I-CC/7) agreed by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Town Planning Board (the Board).

59. As the presentation of PlanD’s representative had been completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

60. Noting that ‘Flat’ was proposed to be added as a Column 2 use in the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone and there were no recognised villages in Cheung Chau, a Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the nature of the ‘Flat’ use in the “V” zone was comparable to that of New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) in the New Territories; and
- (b) whether building plan submission to the Buildings Department (BD) was not required for the ‘Flat’ use, similar to the exemption granted for the construction of an NTEH.

61. In response, Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, DPO/SKIs, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans, ‘House (NTEH only)’ and ‘House (not elsewhere specified)’ were uses under Column 1 and Column 2 in the “V” zone respectively, while ‘Flat’ could be added as a Column 2 use where appropriate. With the proposed incorporation of ‘Flat’ as a Column 2 use in the “V” zone of the Cheung Chau OZP, planning permission from the Board for ‘Flat’ use subject to a maximum BH of 3 storeys (8.23m) would be required; and
- (b) if an applicant intended to construct an NTEH in compliance with the exemption criteria stipulated under the Buildings Ordinance (Application to the New Territories) Ordinance (Cap. 121), no building plan submission to BD would normally be required. Otherwise, the applicant was required to

submit building plan for BD's approval.

62. The Chairperson remarked that the proposed amendments to the OZP were mainly to take forward a s.12A application previously agreed by the Committee. Should the Committee agree with the proposed amendments, the draft OZP would be gazetted for public inspection for 2 months and the representations received, if any, would be submitted to the Board for consideration.

63. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Cheung Chau Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) and that the draft OZP No. S/I-CC/9A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered as S/I-CC/10 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of the Paper are suitable for public exhibition under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance); and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Attachment IV of the Paper for the draft Cheung Chau OZP No. S/I-CC/9A (to be renumbered as S/I-CC/10 upon exhibition) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Town Planning Board (the Board) for various land use zonings on the OZP and the revised ES will be published together with the OZP.”

64. 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.

[The Chairperson thanked PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.]

Sha Tin, Tai Po and North District

Agenda Item 8

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Tai Po Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TP/30

(RNTPC Paper No. 2/25)

65. The Secretary reported that proposed amendments to the approved Tai Po OZP No. S/TP/30 for the planning area of Tai Po mainly involved rezoning of two sites at Lo Fai Road and Ting Kok Road in Tai Po (the LSPS Sites) for the Land Sharing Pilot Scheme (LSPS) development for public and private housing developments (Amendment Items A1 and A2) and rezoning of a site to the north of Shek Kwu Lung in Tai Po for regularising the existing religious and columbarium uses under the name of Ever Rest Temple. The public housing development of LSPS would be developed by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). Kam Luk Investment Company Limited, a subsidiary of Nan Fung Development Limited which was a subsidiary of Nan Fung Group, was the project proponent of the LSPS development. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Bond C.P. Chow - being a representative of the Director of Home
(as *Chief Engineer* Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning
(Works), Home Affairs Committee and the Subsidised Housing Committee
Department) of HKHA;

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip - being the vice-president cum co-head of Public Policy
Institute of Our Hong Kong Foundation which had
received donations from Nan Fung Group; and

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau] co-owning with spouse a property in Tai Po.

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun]

66. The Committee noted that Mr Ryan M.K. Ip and Dr Venus Y.H. Lun had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. According to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board (the Board), as the proposed amendment for public housing development was the subject of amendment to the OZP proposed by the

Planning Department (PlanD), the interest of the Member in relation to HKHA on the item only needed to be recorded and the Member could stay in the meeting. As the property co-owned by Mr Daniel K.S. Lau with spouse had no direct view of the amendment items, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

67. The following government representatives and consultants were invited to the meeting at this point:

Development Bureau (DEVB)

Mr Mann M.H. Chow	-	Head of Land Sharing Office (H of LSO)
Mr Lawrence C.M. Hui	-	Assistant Secretary (Planning & Lands)
Mr Raymond Y.B. Leong	-	Senior Engineer (Planning & Lands)
Mr Walter T.W. Poon	-	Senior Engineer (Planning & Lands)
Mr Kanic C.K. Kwok	-	Town Planner (Planning & Lands)

PlanD

Mr Rico W.K. Tsang	-	District Planning Officer/Shu Tin, Tai Po and North (DPO/STN)
Mr Jeffrey P.K. Wong	-	Senior Town Planner/Shu Tin, Tai Po and North (STP/STN)
Mr Kevin K.W. Lau	-	STP/STN
Ms Charlotte T.W. Wun	-	Assistant Town Planner/Shu Tin, Tai Po and North

Mr Tim T.Y. Fung - Senior Town Planner/New Territories
Headquarter 2

Mr Horman H.M. Cheung - Town Planner/New Territories
Headquarter 3

Consultants

Colliers International (Hong Kong) Limited

Mr Jason Kwong

MVA Hong Kong Limited

Mr William Hung

KTA Planning Limited

Mr David Fok

Mr Faith Lai

Ramboll Hong Kong Limited

Dr Calvin Chiu

Ecosystem Limited

Mr Vincent Lai

Mr Oscar So

Earthasia Limited

Ms Kitty Yuen

68. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Jeffrey P.K. Wong, STP/STN, PlanD, briefed Members on the background of the proposed amendments to the OZP, technical considerations, consultation conducted and departmental comments as detailed in the Paper. Items A1 to A2 were related to the LSPS development while Item B was to take forward a s.12A application agreed by the Committee of the Board (No. Y/TP/36). Items C1 to C4 were to reflect as-built road alignment of Ting Kok Road section to the north of the

former Shuen Wan Landfill and Fortune Garden. The proposed amendments included:

- (a) Item A1 – rezoning a site at the junction of Lo Fai Road and Ting Kok Road (the LSPS Site A) from “Green Belt” (“GB”) and area shown as ‘Road’ to “Residential (Group A) 11” subject to a maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 65,522m² and a maximum building height (BH) of 83mPD;
- (b) Item A2 – rezoning a site at Ting Kok Road to the north of Fortune Garden (the LSPS Site B) from “GB” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “Residential (Group A) 12” subject to a maximum GFA of 23,000m² and a maximum BH of 80mPD;
- (c) Item B – rezoning a site to the north of Shek Kwu Lung from “Open Space to “Government, Institution or Community (3)” subject to a maximum BH of 2 storeys and a maximum number of niches for columbarium of 763;
- (d) Item C1 – rezoning two parcels of land adjoining the LSPS Site A and Site B along Ting Kok Road from area shown as ‘Road’ to “GB”;
- (e) Item C2 – rezoning a strip of land to the east of the LSPS Site B along Ting Kok Road from “GB” to area shown as ‘Road’;
- (f) Item C3 – rezoning two parcels of land to the north of Fortune Garden along Ting Kok Road from “Residential (Group C)1” (“R(C)1”) to area shown as ‘Road’; and
- (g) Item C4 – rezoning a parcel of land to the north of Fortune Garden along Ting Kok Road from area shown as ‘Road’ to “R(C)1”.

69. As the presentation of PlanD’s representative had been completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members. Members raised questions relating to the LSPS development under Items A1 and A2.

70. Noting that not less than 70% of the increased domestic GFA should be set aside for public housing under the LSPS, a Member enquired whether the LSPS Site A and Site B were for public and private housing developments respectively and whether the public/private housing ratio of 70:30 could be achieved under the LSPS development. In response, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, H of LSO, DEVB, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that the LSPS Site A would be developed for public housing while the LSPS Site B was for private housing development. Under an LSPS application, 70% and 30% of the increased domestic GFA derived from the private land would be allocated for public housing development and private housing development respectively. According to the LSPS application, 53,667m², equivalent to 70% of the increased domestic GFA, would be allocated to the LSPS Site A, and 23,000m², equivalent to 30% of the increased domestic GFA, would be allocated to the LSPS Site B. To optimise land resources, a piece of adjoining government land (GL) of about 3,797m² was amalgamated as part of the LSPS Site A for public housing development, which resulted in an additional domestic GFA of 10,855m². As a result, a total domestic GFA of 64,522m² would be developed for public housing at the LSPS Site A. The 70:30 public/private ratio remained applicable only to the additional domestic GFA derived from the private land under the LSPS application, and did not include GFA achieved through the amalgamation of the GL.

71. A Member enquired about the rationale for rezoning “GB” sites for residential development. In response, Mr Rico C.K. Tsang, DPO/STN, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, explained that the Government had adopted a multi-pronged approach to increase land and housing supply in the short-to-medium term. Three stages of review on “GB” had been conducted by the Government, and various “GB” sites had been rezoned for residential developments, taking into account various factors including land use compatibility, provision of infrastructure and impact on the surrounding environment, etc. Under the current LSPS application, various technical assessments had been conducted, which concluded that the proposed residential developments at the two LSPS Sites would be compatible with the surrounding land uses and no insurmountable technical problems were anticipated. Suitable mitigation measures had been proposed to mitigate any adverse impact on the surrounding environment.

72. In response to the Chairperson’s enquiry on the details of the landscape proposal under the current LSPS application, Mr Rico C.K. Tsang, DPO/STN, PlanD, with the aid of

some PowerPoint slides, said that for the LSPS Site A, two compensatory planting areas for a total of 584 whip trees were proposed. Other landscape treatments including vertical greenery on retaining wall/retaining slope profile were also proposed. Subject to further review by relevant government department(s) at the detailed design stage, provision of more heavy standard trees and/or whip trees within the LSPS Site A could be explored. For the LSPS Site B, a compensatory planting area for 142 whip trees was proposed. An additional 19 heavy standard compensatory trees were proposed mainly around the periphery of the roundabout and along Ting Kok Road.

73. While it was desirable to achieve a tree compensation ratio of 1:1, especially for developments within “GB”, the Vice-chairperson considered that various site constraints including small site area and the presence of sloping area within the LSPS Sites posed difficulty in achieving such ratio. Given that the LSPS Sites were situated in an area of low-rise to medium-rise residential developments, further greening opportunities would be explored to mitigate the landscape impact of the proposed developments on the surrounding environment.

[Mr Rocky L.K. Poon left the meeting during the question and answer session.]

74. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- “(a) agree the proposed amendments to the approved Tai Po Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) and that the draft Tai Po OZP No. S/TP/30A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered as S/TP/31 upon exhibition) and the draft Notes at Attachment III of the Paper are suitable for public exhibition under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance); and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Attachment IV of the Paper for the draft Tai Po OZP No. S/TP/30A (to be renumbered as S/TP/31 upon exhibition) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Town Planning Board (the Board) for various land use zonings on the OZP and the revised ES will be published together with the OZP.”

75. 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.

[The Chairperson thanked the government representatives and the consultants for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Bond C.P. Chow and Ms Clara K.W. U left the meeting at this point.]

[Messrs Ryan C.K. Ho and Jeffrey P.K. Wong and Ms Elizabeth Ng, STPs/STN, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/ST/1036	Proposed Utility Installation for Private Project (Pump Station for Salt and Fresh Water System) in "Government, Institution or Community" Zone, Government Land in D.D. 186, Tung Lo Wan Hill Road, Sha Tin (RNTPC Paper No. A/ST/1036)
-----------	--

76. The Secretary reported that AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho had declared an interest on the item for his firm having current business dealings with AECOM. The Committee noted that Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

77. With the aid of some plans, Ms Elizabeth Ng, STP/STN, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed installation, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

78. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

79. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board. The permission should be valid until 28.2.2029, 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 Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

Agenda Item 12

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-LYT/843 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in
“Agriculture” Zone, Lot 1772 S.A in D.D. 76, Leng Pei Tsuen, Fanling
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LYT/843)

Presentation and Question Sessions

80. With the aid of some plans, Mr Ryan C.K. Ho, STP/STN, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed development, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

81. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

82. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board. The permission should be valid until 28.2.2029, 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 Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

Agenda Item 14

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-KLH/650 Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Exhibition Equipment for a Period of 3 Years in “Green Belt” Zone, Lots 617 S.B ss.1 and 618 S.B RP (Part) in D.D. 9 and Adjoining Government Land, Nam Wa Po, Kau Lung Hang, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-KLH/650)

Presentation and Question Sessions

83. With the aid of some plans, Mr Jeffrey P.K. Wong, STP/STN, briefed Members on the background of the application, the applied use, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

84. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

85. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 28.2.2028, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board and subject to the approval conditions stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

Agenda Item 15

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-TK/800 Temporary Private Vehicle Park (Private Cars and Light Goods Vehicles Only) for a Period of 3 Years and Associated Filling of Land in “Green Belt” and “Village Type Development” Zones and area shown as ‘Road’, Various Lots in D.D. 26, Shuen Wan Chim Uk, Ting Kok, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TK/800B)

Presentation and Question Sessions

86. With the aid of some plans, Mr Jeffrey P.K. Wong, STP/STN, briefed Members on the background of the application, the applied use, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department (PlanD) did not support the application.

87. A Member enquired the reasons for the presence of village houses to the south of the application site (the Site) within the same “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone. In response, Mr Jeffrey P.K. Wong, STP/STN, with the aid of some plans, said that the village houses were the subject of previously approved applications by the Committee between 2008 and 2011 before the Board had formally adopted a more cautious approach in 2015 when considering applications for Small House development.

Deliberation Session

88. While noting the general presumption against development within the “GB” zone, a Member enquired whether sympathetic consideration could be given to the proposed temporary ‘private vehicle park’ use at the Site, taking into account the circumstances of the Site, including the infill nature of the Site resulted from approval of a s.16 application for temporary transitional housing development (No. A/NE-TK/702) to the north and approvals of s.16 applications for village houses to the south within the same “GB” zone, the fact that the Site was already filled and partly hard paved, and the pressing demand for vehicle parking in the nearby villages. Should the application be approved, an approval condition requiring

the reinstatement of the Site could be imposed to ensure that the buffer function of the “GB” zone would be restored upon expiry of the planning approval.

89. Other Members did not support the application, considering that the “GB” zone, where the Site was located, served as a buffer to the “Conservation Area” in Wong Yue Tan and Ha Tei Ha to the north of the Site. While an s.16 application had been approved for temporary transitional housing development, an approval condition on reinstatement had been imposed, requiring the project proponent to reinstate the site to an amenity area to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Board. The buffer function of the “GB” zone in the long term would not be undermined by the approval of the s.16 application for the temporary transitional housing development. As such, the Site could not be considered as an infill site in the long term.

90. The Committee noted that if the current application was approved, the approval would remain valid until 2028 while the planning permission for the temporary transitional housing development would expire in 2026. The reinstatement works required for the temporary transitional housing project would be subject to scrutiny by the Housing Bureau. In that regard, approval of the current application might hinder the early resumption of buffer function of the “GB” zone.

91. The Vice-chairperson enquired about the site conditions of the temporary transitional housing site prior to the commencement of construction works. The Committee noted that the area had remained largely vegetated since 1990 until construction works for the transitional housing development commenced in 2023.

92. Referring to an application for a temporary public vehicle park in “GB” zone under item 56 (Application No. A/YL-LFS/533) in which PlanD raised no objection, a Member expressed concern as to whether a consistent approach had been adopted in assessing planning applications for temporary uses within “GB” zone. The Chairperson explained that previous approval had been granted for the application site under application No. A/YL-LFS/533, whereas the Site under the current application was not the subject of any previous approval. The Vice-chairperson added that applications within “GB” zone would only be approved in exceptional circumstances, such as where previous approval had been granted for the site. A Member considered that shortage of car parking spaces was not

uncommon in rural villages, which did not warrant special consideration to deviate from the presumption against development within the “GB” zone. Rejection of the current application could convey a clear message to deter ‘destroy first, build later’ activities.

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

“the applied use with associated filling of land is not in line with the planning intention of the “Green Belt” 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, and the Town Planning Board Guidelines for ‘Application for Development within Green Belt Zone under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’ (TPB PG-No. 10). There is a general presumption against development within this zone. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from such planning intention.”

[The Chairperson thanked PlanD’s representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.]

Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East District

[Messrs Alexander W.Y. Mak and Kimson P.H. Chiu, Ms Lucille L.S. Leung, STPs/FSYLE, and Mr Gary T.L. Lam, Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 35

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTS/1011 Proposed Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Hobby Farm and Fishing Ground), Barbecue Site and Education Centre with Ancillary Eating Place for a Period of 3 Years and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 1013, 1014 RP (Part), 1015 S.A, 1015 S.B, 1015 RP (Part), 1018 (Part) and 1035 (Part) in D.D.113, Kam Tin, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTS/1011B)

Presentation and Question Sessions

94. With the aid of some plans, Mr Alexander W.Y. Mak, STP/FSYLE, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed use, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

95. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

96. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 28.2.2028, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board and subject to the approval conditions stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

Agenda Item 36

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTS/1037 Proposed Filling of Land for Permitted Agricultural Use in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 1764 S.B ss.1 (Part), 1764 S.B ss.2, 1764 S.B ss.3, 1764 S.B ss.4 and 1764 S.B RP in D.D. 106, Kam Tin, Yuen Long (RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTS/1037A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

97. With the aid of some plans, Mr Alexander W.Y. Mak, STP/FSYLE, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed works, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

98. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

99. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board. The permission should be valid until 28.2.2029, 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 approval conditions stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

Agenda Item 40

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-NSW/314 Proposed Residential Development with Wetland Habitat and Filling of Ponds/Land and Excavation of Land in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Comprehensive Development to include Wetland Restoration Area” Zone, Various Lots in D.D. 104, North of Kam Pok Road East, Pok Wai, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-NSW/314B)

Presentation and Question Sessions

100. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Alexander W.Y. Mak, STP/FSYLE, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed development, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

Definition of ‘Abandoned Ponds’

101. With reference to paragraph of 10.1.4(b) of the Paper, a Member enquired about the meaning of the term ‘abandoned ponds’ and whether the loss of ‘abandoned ponds’ constituted a loss of wetland. In response, Mr Alexander W.Y. Mak, STP/FSYLE, said that ‘abandoned ponds’ in the current application referred to ponds where water bodies could be observed but the practice of aquaculture had been abandoned. According to the ecological impact assessment submitted by the applicant, those abandoned ponds were of low-to-medium ecological value. The loss of abandoned ponds could therefore be regarded as a loss of wetland.

Design, Implementation and Management of Wetland Restoration Area (WRA)

102. The Vice-chairperson asked the rationale for erecting a solid wall with wooden trellis ranging from 2.5m to 5m high along the boundary of WRA and whether occupants could gain access to the WRA. In response, Mr Alexander W.Y. Mak, STP/FSYLE, said that the erection of a solid wall with wooden trellis could alleviate human disturbance to the

wetland habitat and wildlife in the WRA. While the applicant did not provide details regarding access arrangements of the WRA, a visit-by-appointment system was commonly implemented for residential developments with re-provision of wetlands, and visitors would usually be advised to minimise the disturbance to wildlife in the wetland during their visits.

103. The Vice-chairperson sought details on the long-term management of the proposed WRA, including annual maintenance cost, the arrangement of the independent fund, and whether the proposed annual allocation of HK\$3 million would be sufficient to cover the maintenance cost of the WRA. In response, Mr Alexander W.Y. Mak, STP/FSYLE, said that the applicant committed to allocating an approximate amount of HK\$3 million per annum to set up an independent fund managed by an investment bank to cover the annual maintenance cost of the proposed WRA. According to the applicant, the management and maintenance liability of the WRA would not be transferred to future individual owners of the residential portion. As a reference, an average annual budget of about HK\$4 to \$5 million between financial year 2013/14 and 2022/23 was required to maintain and conserve the wetland (about 60 ha) in the Hong Kong Wetland Park. Given the size of the proposed WRA of 2.47 ha under the current application, an annual injection of HK\$3 million should be adequate for its maintenance and management.

104. In response to the Chairperson's enquiry regarding the approving authority overseeing the implementation of the WRA and other design measures such as switchable glasses, Mr Alexander W.Y. Mak, STP/FSYLE, said that approval conditions requiring the submission of a revised ecological impact assessment and the implementation of the mitigation measures identified therein (condition (f)) and submission and implementation of a revised wetland restoration proposal (condition (g)) to the satisfaction of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation or of the Board had been recommended should the current application be approved. In addition, a detailed long-term management and maintenance plan (such as a habitat creation and management plan) would be submitted for approval by relevant government departments to ensure the long-term operation of the WRA during the land administration process. Furthermore, as the site fell within the Deep Bay Buffer Zone, the proposed residential development would constitute a Designated Project under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (Cap. 499), and an environmental impact assessment which would take into account the proposed mitigation/enhancement measures, including the WRA, should be conducted and an environmental permit should be

obtained. The implementation of the WRA and other design and mitigation measures could be scrutinised through the aforementioned mechanisms.

Deliberation Session

105. A Member expressed support for the application as the scale of residential development was reduced while the size of WRA increased when compared with the previously rejected application (No. A/YL-NSW/290). The design of the WRA and the proposed injection of HK \$3 million per annum to an independent fund for its maintenance and management were also supported.

106. The Chairperson noted that when compared with the previously rejected application (No. A/YL-NSW/290), the average flat size increased from about 179m² to about 227m². As there was no change in gross floor area, the number of units was reduced. The Committee noted that the design of the residential development might be further revised during the detailed design stage. Any change could be processed in accordance with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for 'Class A and Class B Amendments to Approved Development Proposals' (TPB PG-No. 36C). The implementation of the WRA and other design measures would be monitored under the established mechanism.

107. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board. The permission should be valid until 28.2.2029, 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 approval conditions stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

Agenda Item 45

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-SK/404 Temporary Shop and Services with Ancillary Workshop for a Period of
3 Years and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 288
RP (Part) in D.D. 112, Shek Kong, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-SK/404)

Presentation and Question Sessions

108. With the aid of some plans, Mr Kimson P.H. Chiu, STP/FSYLE, briefed Members on the background of the application, the applied use, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

109. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

110. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 28.2.2028, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board and subject to the approval conditions stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

Agenda Items 47 and 48

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-SK/387 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in
“Residential (Group D)” Zone, Lot 847 S.B ss.5 in D.D. 112, Lin Fa
Tei, Shek Kong, Yuen Long

A/YL-SK/388 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Residential (Group D)” and “Agriculture” Zones, Lot 847 S.B ss.4 in D.D. 112, Lin Fa Tei, Shek Kong, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-SK/387A and 388A)

111. The Committee agreed that as the two applications for proposed house (New Territories Exempted House – Small House) were similar in nature and the application sites were located in close proximity to each other within the same “Residential (Group D)” zone, they could be considered together.

Presentation and Question Sessions

112. With the aid of some plans, Ms Lucille L.S. Leung, STP/FSYLE, briefed Members on the background of the applications, the proposed developments, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department (PlanD) did not support the applications.

113. Members had no question on the applications.

Deliberation Session

114. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject each of the application. The reason was:

“the proposed development does not comply with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for New Territories Exempted House/Small House in New Territories in that more than 50% of the proposed Small House footprint falls outside the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone and the village ‘environs’ of any recognised villages and land is still available within the “V” zone covering Lin Fa Tei, Ngau Keng, Shau Tsan Tin and Shui Lau Tin which is primarily intended for Small House development. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within the “V” zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services.”

[The Chairperson thanked PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.]

Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West District

[Ms L.C. Cheung and Mr Eric C.Y. Chiu, Senior Town Planners/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (STPs/TMYLW), and Ms Jessie M.H. Kwok, Town Planner/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 52

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TM-SKW/127 Proposed Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Hobby Farm) for a Period of 3 Years and associated Excavation of Land in "Green Belt" Zone, Lot 1393 RP in D.D.375, So Kwun Wat, Tuen Mun (RNTPC Paper No. A/TM-SKW/127B)

Presentation and Question Sessions

115. With the aid of some plans, Ms L.C. Cheung, STP/TMYLW, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed use, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

116. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

117. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 28.2.2028, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board and subject to the approval conditions stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set

out in the appendix of the Paper.

Agenda Item 53

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TM/595 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Educational Institution Use in “Government, Institution or Community” Zone, 8 Castle Peak Road - Lingnan (Part), Tuen Mun
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TM/595)

Presentation and Question Sessions

118. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms L.C. Cheung, STP/TMYLW, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed development, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

119. While the application involved a minor relaxation of building height (BH) restriction from four storeys to seven storeys, the Vice-chairperson considered that the potential impact of the proposed relaxation was insignificant as the surrounding buildings within the University campus were generally of BHs ranging from one to 11 storeys.

120. The Chairperson asked if the Lingnan University had any other plan for campus expansion. In response, Ms L.C. Cheung, STP/TMYLW, said that while the Lingnan University had formulated several strategic plans, the proposed minor relaxation of BH restriction was the only concrete plan of campus expansion at the moment. As the newly established School of Data Science only occupied a floor of an existing building, which could not accommodate the increasing demand for academic and research activities, there was an urgent need to provide additional floor space.

Deliberation Session

121. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the

terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board. The permission should be valid until 28.2.2029, 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 Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

Agenda Item 54

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-HTF/1183 Proposed Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Construction Materials and Machineries, Parking of Special Purpose Vehicles and Rural Workshop with Ancillary Facilities for a Period of 3 Years and Associated Filling of Land and Pond and Excavation of Land in “Green Belt” Zone and area shown as ‘Road’, Various Lots in D.D. 125 and Adjoining Government Land, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-HTF/1183)

Presentation and Question Sessions

122. With the aid of some plans, Mr Eric C.Y. Chiu, STP/TMYLW, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed use, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

123. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

124. As the application site (the Site) mainly fell within the “GB” zone, a Member considered that approval might not be granted without policy support from the Development Bureau to facilitate the relocation of brownfield operations affected by the Hung Shui Kiu/Ha Tsuen New Development Area. The Committee noted that the future land use of the Site

was being reviewed under the ‘Developments at Lau Fau Shan, Tsim Bei Tsui and Pak Nai Areas – Investigation’ jointly commissioned by the Civil Engineering and Development Department and PlanD.

125. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 28.2.2028, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board and subject to the approval conditions stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

Agenda Item 56

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-LFS/533 Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Private Cars, Light Goods Vehicles and Medium Goods Vehicles) for a Period of 3 Years and Associated Filling of Land in “Green Belt”, “Village Type Development” and “Open Space (1)” Zones, Lots 2749, 2750, 2751, 2752 (Part), 2762 RP, 2764 RP (Part), 2765 RP (Part), 2766 RP (Part), 2768 (Part), 2770 (Part), 2771, 2772, 2773, 2779 (Part) and 2780 (Part) in D.D.129, Lau Fau Shan, Yuen Long (RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-LFS/533A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

126. With the aid of some plans, Mr Eric C.Y. Chiu, STP/TMYLW, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed use, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

127. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

128. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 28.2.2028, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board and subject to the approval conditions stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

Agenda Item 58

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-LFS/547 Proposed Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Hobby Farm) for a Period of 3 Years in “Green Belt” Zone, Lots 280 (Part), 281 (Part), 283 (Part), 286 (Part) in D.D. 129 and Adjoining Government Land, Lau Fau Shan
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-LFS/547)

Presentation and Question Sessions

129. With the aid of some plans, Mr Eric C.Y. Chiu, STP/TMYLW, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed use, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

130. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

131. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 28.2.2028, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board and subject to the approval conditions stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set

out in the appendix of the Paper.

[The Chairperson thanked PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 70

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

132. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 7:45 p.m.

**Minutes of 760th Rural and New Town Planning Committee
(held on 28.2.2025)**

Deferral Cases

Requests for Deferment by Applicant for 2 Months

Item No.	Application No.*	Times of Deferment
6	A/SK-CWBS/51	1 st
7	A/SK-HC/365	1 st
10	A/NE-FTA/258	1 st
13	A/NE-MTL/11	2 nd [^]
16	A/NE-TK/832	1 st
23	A/YL-KTN/1049	2 nd [^]
24	A/YL-KTN/1074	1 st
29	A/YL-KTN/1084	1 st
34	A/YL-PH/1045	1 st
37	A/YL-KTS/1052	1 st
38	A/YL-KTS/1053	1 st
46	A/YL-SK/406	1 st
50	A/HSK/543	1 st
65	A/YL-TYST/1300	1 st
69	A/YL/324	1 st

Note:

[^] The 2nd Deferment was the last deferment and no further deferment would be granted unless under special circumstances and supported with strong justifications.

Declaration of Interest

The Committee noted the following declaration of interest:

Item No.	Member's Declared Interest	
6	CLP Power Hong Kong Limited (CLP) was the applicant of the application.	- Mr Ryan M.K. Ip for being the vice-president cum co-head of Public Policy Institute of Our Hong Kong Foundation which had received donations from CLP

The Committee noted that Mr Ryan M.K. Ip had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

* Refer to the agenda at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/RNTPC/Agenda/760_rnt_agenda.html for details of the planning applications.

**Minutes of 760th Rural and New Town Planning Committee
(held on 28.2.2025)**

Renewal Cases

(a) Applications for renewal of temporary approval for 3 years

Item No.	Application No.	Renewal Application	Renewal Period
31	A/YL-KTN/1087	Temporary Open Storage of Private Cars in “Open Space” and “Residential (Group D)” Zones, Lot 529 S.B (Part) in D.D. 109, Lot 644 S.A RP (Part) in D.D. 110 and Adjoining Government Land, Kam Tin Road, Kam Tin, Yuen Long	9.3.2025 to 8.3.2028
44	A/YL-MP/386	Temporary Sales Office (for Real Estate and Furniture) and Furniture Showrooms in “Open Space” Zone, Lots 11 (Part) and 12 (Part) in D.D. 101, Mai Po, Yuen Long	23.4.2025 to 22.4.2028

(b) Applications for renewal of temporary approval for 5 years

Item No.	Application No.	Renewal Application	Renewal Period
39	A/YL-KTS/1054	Temporary Social Welfare Facility (Youth Development Centre) in “Village Type Development” and “Residential (Group C)” Zones, Lot 1689 S.A in D.D. 109 and Adjoining Government Land, Yuen Long	7.3.2025 to 6.3.2030
41	A/YL-NSW/338	Temporary Container Storage Yard in “Open Storage” Zone, Lot 1743 S.C RP in D.D. 107, Castle Peak Road, Sha Po, Yuen Long	21.3.2025 to 20.3.2030

Declaration of Interest

The Committee noted the following declaration of interest:

Item No.	Member’s Declared Interest	
41	The application was submitted by Team Harvest Limited, which was a subsidiary of Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited.	- Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho for his firm having current business dealings with Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited

The Committee noted that Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

**Minutes of 760th Rural and New Town Planning Committee
(held on 28.2.2025)**

Cases for Streamlining Arrangement

(a) Applications approved on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 28.2.2028

Item No.	Application No.	Planning Application
11	A/NE-HLH/78	Proposed Temporary Private Vehicle Park (Private Cars Only) in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 223 RP (Part) in D.D. 83, Siu Hang Tsuen, Fanling
17	A/NE-TKL/777	Proposed Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Hobby Farm) and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 1902 S.A RP in D.D. 76, Leng Tsai Tsuen, Ta Kwu Ling
18	A/NE-TKLN/90	Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicle), Eating Place and Shop and Services (Local Provision Store) with Ancillary Office and Store Room in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 356 in D.D. 78, Tsung Yuen Ha, Ta Kwu Ling North
19	A/NE-TKLN/93	Proposed Temporary Warehouse (excluding Dangerous Goods Godown) with Ancillary Facilities in “Recreation” Zone, Lot 87 RP (Part) in D.D. 82, Lin Ma Hang Road, Ta Kwu Ling North
20	A/NE-MUP/211	Proposed Temporary Logistic Centre and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 815 and 816 S.B RP in D.D. 46, Sha Tau Kok
22	A/YL-KTN/1018	Temporary Open Storage of Construction Machineries and Materials and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 1247 (Part), 1248 (Part), 1249 (Part), 1252 (Part) and 1253 (Part) in D.D. 107, Kam Tin North, Yuen Long
25	A/YL-KTN/1079	Proposed Temporary Eating Place (Outside Seating Accommodation of a Restaurant) in “Village Type Development” Zone, Government Land in D.D. 109, Kam Tin, Yuen Long
26	A/YL-KTN/1081	Proposed Temporary Warehouse (excluding Dangerous Goods Godown) and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 945 (Part), 946 S.A (Part), 946 S.B, 946 S.C, 946 S.D, 946 S.E (Part), 946 S.F, 946 S.G, 946 S.H, 946 S.I, 946 S.J (Part), 946 RP (Part), 947, 948 and 1120 (Part) in D.D. 107, Fung Kat Heung, Kam Tin, Yuen Long
27	A/YL-KTN/1082	Proposed Temporary Warehouse (excluding Dangerous Goods Godown) and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 207 S.A (Part) and 207 S.B (Part) in D.D. 110, Kam Tin, Yuen Long
28	A/YL-KTN/1083	Proposed Temporary Warehouse (excluding Dangerous Goods Godown) and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 1222 S.A (Part) and 1224 S.B in D.D. 107, Fung Kat Heung, Kam Tin, Yuen Long
32	A/YL-PH/1044	Proposed Temporary Private Vehicle Park (Private Cars Only) and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 2827 S.B. (Part) and 2827 S.C. (Part) in D.D. 111, Pat Heung, Yuen Long
33	A/YL-PH/1046	Proposed Temporary Private Vehicle Park (Private Cars Only) and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 2827 S.C. (Part), 2852 (Part) and 2853 (Part) in D.D. 111, Pat Heung, Yuen Long
42	A/STT/17	Temporary Shop and Services (Sales Office for Sale of Goods Vehicles) in “Government, Institution or Community” Zone and area shown as ‘Road’, Lots 2757 RP (Part), 2758 RP (Part), 2759 (Part) and 2760 in D.D. 102 and Adjoining Government Land, Ngau Tam Mei, Yuen Long
51	A/HSK/544	Proposed Temporary Open Storage of Medium Goods Vehicles and Heavy Goods Vehicles in “Residential (Group A) 3” Zone, Lots 1842 (Part), 1844 (Part), 1845 (Part), 1846 (Part) and 1849 (Part) in D.D. 125 and Adjoining Government Land, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long
55	A/YL-HTF/1184	Proposed Temporary Open Storage of Construction Materials and Metal in “Residential (Group D)” Zone, Lots 182 S.A RP (Part), 185 S.A, 185 S.B (Part) and 185 S.C in D.D. 128, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long
57	A/YL-LFS/535	Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Private Cars) and Associated 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

Item No.	Application No.	Planning Application
59	A/YL-PS/734	Temporary Public Vehicle Park with Electric Charging Device in “Residential (Group E)2” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lots 591 (Part), 592 (Part), 593 (Part) and 618 (Part) in D.D. 122, Ping Shan, Yuen Long
61	A/YL-TYST/1279	Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Electronic Parts, Construction Materials and Vehicle Parts in “Undetermined” Zone, Lots 773 (Part) and 774 (Part) in D.D. 119 and Adjoining Government Land, Pak Sha Tsuen, Yuen Long
62	A/YL-TYST/1293	Proposed Temporary Warehouse for Storage of General Goods in “Undetermined” Zone, Lots 1198 S.C (Part) and 1198 S.F (Part) in D.D. 119, Pak Sha Tsuen, Yuen Long
63	A/YL-TYST/1298	Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Construction Materials in “Undetermined” Zone, Lot 1190 (Part) in D.D. 119, Pak Sha Tsuen, Yuen Long
64	A/YL-TYST/1299	Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Non-staple Food in “Undetermined” Zone, Lots 1220 RP (Part) and 1223 RP (Part) in D.D. 119 and Adjoining Government Land, Kung Um Road, Shap Pat Heung, Yuen Long
66	A/YL-TYST/1301	Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Vehicle Parts and General Goods in “Undetermined” Zone, Lots 1544 (Part), 1545 (Part), 1547, 1548, 1574 (Part), 1575 (Part) and 1576 (Part) in D.D. 119 and Adjoining Government Land, Pak Sha Tsuen, Yuen Long
68	A/YL-TT/693	Proposed Temporary Shop and Services in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lots 1775 RP (Part), 1775 S.C (Part), 1775 S.D, 1775 S.E, 1775 S.F, 1775 S.I (Part), 1775 S.J (Part), 1775 S.K (Part), 1777 S.A and 1777 S.B in D.D. 119, Yuen Long

(b) Applications approved on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years until 28.2.2030

Item No.	Application No.	Planning Application
21	A/FSS/300	Proposed Temporary Shop and Services in “Village Type Development” Zone, G/F, No. 20D 1st Lane, Po Sheung Tsuen, Sheung Shui
30	A/YL-KTN/1086	Temporary Shop and Services (Wheelchair Accessible Vehicles Showroom) in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lots 232 S.B ss.9 and 232 S.B RP (Part) in D.D. 103, Ko Po Tsuen, Kam Tin, Yuen Long
43	A/YL-MP/385	Temporary Shop and Services (Wooden Ware Retail Shop) in “Open Space” Zone, Lots 2907 S.C RP, 2908 RP (Part), 2910 (Part) and 2911 RP (Part) in D.D. 104 and Adjoining Government Land, Mai Po, Yuen Long
49	A/YL-SK/405	Temporary Shop and Services (Solar Power System Shop) and Associated Filling of Land in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 591 RP (Part) in D.D. 112, Shek Kong, Yuen Long
60	A/YL-PS/745	Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Private Cars, Light Goods Vehicles and Light Buses) and Associated Filling of Land in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 449 RP (Part) in D.D. 122, Hang Mei Tsuen, Ping Shan, Yuen Long
67	A/YL-TT/666	Proposed Temporary Animal Boarding Establishment with Ancillary Facilities and Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 578 in D.D. 117, Tai Tong, Yuen Long