

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 771st Meeting of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee held at 2:30 p.m. on 15.8.2025

Present

Director of Planning
Mr C.K. Yip

Chairperson

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Vice- chairperson

Mr K.W. Leung

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Dr C.M. Cheng

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

Professor B.S. Tang

Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West,
Transport Department
Ms Vilian W.L. Sum

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

Assistant Director/Regional 3,
Lands Department
Mr Lawrance S.C. Chan

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr Simon Y.S. Wong

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

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Anny P.K. Tang

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Sandy S.Y. Yik

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 770th RNTPC Meeting held on 1.8.2025

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 770th RNTPC meeting held on 1.8.2025 were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Deferral Cases

Sections 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Presentation and Question Sessions

3. The Committee noted that there were 33 cases requesting the Town Planning Board to defer consideration of the applications. Details of the requests for deferral, Members' declaration of interests for individual cases and the Committee's views on the declared interests 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 for the further periods as applied for. 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 17 cases selected for streamlining arrangement and the Planning Department had no objection to the applications for temporary uses for the applied periods. 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.

Sai Kung and Islands District

[Ms Tammy S.N. Kong, Senior Town Planner/Sai Kung and Islands (STP/SKIs), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 3

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/SK-HC/365 Temporary Private Swimming Pool and Garden for a Period of 3 Years
in “Village Type Development” and “Agriculture” Zones, Lot 479 in
D.D. 244, Ho Chung New Village, Sai Kung
(RNTPC Paper No. A/SK-HC/365B)

Presentation and Question Sessions

9. With the aid of some plans, Ms Tammy S.N. Kong, STP/SKIs, briefed Members on the background of the application, the applied use, departmental comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

10. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

11. The Chairperson remarked that given the temporary nature of the current application and the application site being the subject of two previously approved applications for the same/similar uses, approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardise the long-term planning intentions of the two concerned zones.

12. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 15.8.2028, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicants to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

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

Sha Tin, Tai Po and North District

[Mr Ryan C.K. Ho, Ms Ivy C.W. Wong and Mr Jeffrey P.K. Wong, Senior Town Planners/Sha Tin, Tai Po and North (STPs/STN), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-FTA/261 Proposed Temporary Dangerous Goods Godown (Classes 2 to 9 Dangerous Goods) with Ancillary Office and Associated Filling of Land for a Period of 3 Years in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Port Back-up Uses", "Agriculture" and "Green Belt" Zones, Lots 187 S.A (Part) and 188 (Part) in D.D. 52 and Adjoining Government Land, Fu Tei Au, Sheung Shui
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-FTA/261)

Presentation and Question Sessions

13. With the aid of some plans, Mr Ryan C.K. Ho, STP/STN, 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.

14. Noting that the Environmental Protection Department was unable to lend support to the application as the proposed use involved the use of heavy vehicles and domestic structures were located within 100m from the application site (the Site), a Member enquired about the scale of domestic structures and population involved. With reference to Plan A-3 of the Paper, Mr Ryan C.K. Ho, STP/STN, said that there were four New Territories

Exempted Houses located to the south of the Site across the local track in the “Agriculture” zone, which were covered by planning permissions. While sharing the same vehicular access to westbound Man Kam To Road, there was some distance between the Site and the concerned domestic structures.

15. In response to a Member’s concern about the fire safety issues in the vicinity related to the solar photovoltaic panels installed on top of structures to the immediate west and east of the Site, Mr Ryan C.K. Ho, STP/STN, said that should the application be approved, the applicant would need to apply for dangerous goods (DG) licence from the Fire Services Department (FSD) and comply with the relevant fire safety requirements. The Chairperson supplemented that relevant compliance checking would be administered by FSD in DG licensing application based on considerations of the design, classification of the DGs, storage volume, location and operational context. Another Member noted that the proposal, which involved a total storage capacity of not more than 300 tonnes of DG, would be equipped with bromotrifluoromethane systems to address fire safety concerns.

[Mr Ryan M.K. Ip joined the meeting at this point.]

Deliberation Session

16. The Chairperson remarked that the Site was largely zoned “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Port Back-up Uses” which was intended primarily for accommodating cross-boundary freight traffic and other port back-up uses, with ‘Dangerous Goods Godown’ being a Column 2 use requiring planning permission. Should the application be approved, storage of DG at the Site would still be subject to FSD’s monitoring in accordance with the licensing requirements.

17. In response to a Member’s enquiry regarding the objecting public comments about suspected unlawful occupation of government land (GL) and unauthorised tree felling on GL, the Chairperson said that the application should be assessed primarily based on the applicant’s justifications, land use compatibility, impacts on the surrounding areas, etc., while issues relating to GL should be dealt with separately under the land administration regime.

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

temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 15.8.2028, 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 21

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-WKS/21 Proposed Temporary Public Utility Installation (Solar Photovoltaic System) for a Period of 5 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 543 in D.D. 79, Ta Kwu Ling
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-WKS/21)

19. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Nga Yiu Ha and Mr C.K. Yip, the Chairperson, had declared an interest on the item for his close relatives residing near the Site. As the interest of Mr C.K. Yip was considered direct, the Committee agreed that he should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. Mr Daniel K.S. Lau, the Vice-chairperson, took over the Chairmanship of the meeting temporarily for the item.

[Mr C.K. Yip left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

20. With the aid of some plans, Ms Ivy C.W. Wong, 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.

21. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

22. The Vice-chairperson remarked that the application was recommended for approval, taking into account the policy support from relevant government bureau, compliance with the Assessment Criteria for Considering Applications for Solar Photovoltaic System made under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance, and the temporary nature of the application which would not compromise the Site's potential for agricultural rehabilitation in the long term.

23. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years until 15.8.2030, 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.

[Mr C.K. Yip rejoined the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 23

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-TK/838	Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 646 S.K ss.1 and 652 S.C ss.1 in D.D. 15, Shan Liu, Tai Po (RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TK/838)
-------------	---

Presentation and Question Sessions

24. With the aid of some plans, Mr Jeffrey P.K. Wong, 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 (PlanD) did not support the application.

25. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

26. The Chairperson said that the application site was the subject of a previously rejected application, and the recommendation for rejecting the current application was in line with the Committee's previous decision.

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

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” zone, which is primarily to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention; and
- (b) land is still available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Shan Liu 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 infrastructure and services.”

[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

[Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, District Planning Officer/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (DPO/FSYLE), Messrs Alexander W.Y. Mak and Kimson P.H. Chiu, Senior Town Planners/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (STPs/FSYLE), and Ms Andrea W.Y. Yan, Ms Selena Y.N. Sin, Mr Ajyum D. Chan and Ms Jessie S.Y. Lau, Town Planners/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (TPs/FSYLE), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 24

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Nam Sang Wai Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-NSW/10

(RNTPC Paper No. 8/25)

28. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments were to take forward two section 12A (s.12A) applications partially agreed by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Town Planning Board (the Board). Applications No. Y/YL-NSW/8 and 9 were submitted by King Garden Limited and Bright Strong Limited respectively, which were subsidiaries of Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (SHK), and AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) was one of the consultants of the applicants. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho	-	for his firm having current business dealings with SHK and AECOM; and
Mr Ryan M.K. Ip	-	for being the vice-president and executive director of Public Policy Institute of Our Hong Kong which had received donations from SHK.

29. As the interest of Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho was direct, the Committee agreed that he should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily. As Mr Ryan M.K. Ip had no involvement in the project(s) under the sponsorship of SHK in relation to the item, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

[Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

30. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Alexander W.Y. Mak, STP/FSYLE, briefed Members on the background of the proposed amendments to the approved Nam Sang Wai Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL-NSW/10, technical

considerations, consultation conducted and departmental comments as detailed in the Paper. The proposed amendments mainly included:

- (a) Item A1 – rezoning of a site to the west of Castle Peak Road – Tam Mi from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Comprehensive Development to include Wetland Restoration Area” (“OU(CDWRA)”), “Industrial (Group D)” (“I(D)”), “Open Storage” (“OS”) and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “OU(CDWRA)(2)” with designation of Areas (a) and (b), subject to a maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 392,300m² (of which the domestic GFA should not exceed 371,650m² and a GFA not less than 6,400m² should be dedicated for the provision of a public transport terminus), a maximum building height (BH) of 115mPD, provision of a wetland restoration area (WRA) of not less than 28,000m² at the northern part of Area (a), and provision of government, institution and community (GIC) facilities as required by the Government;
- (b) Item A2 – rezoning of a strip of land to the north of the “OU(CDWRA)(2)” zone from “OU(CDWRA)” to “Conservation Area”;
- (c) Item A3 – rezoning of a site to the southwest of the “OU(CDWRA)(2)” zone from “I(D)” and “OS” to “Open Space” (“O”);
- (d) Item B1 – rezoning of a site near the junction of Castle Peak Road – Tam Mi and Pok Wai South Road from “OS” to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Soy Sauce Factory” (“OU(SSF)”) subject to a maximum non-domestic GFA of 13,700m² and a maximum BH of 15mPD; and
- (e) Item B2 – rezoning of a strip of land near the junction of Castle Peak Road – Tam Mi and Pok Wai South Road from “OS” to “O”.

31. There were also amendments to the Notes of the OZP consequential to the amendments to the Plan.

32. As the presentation of Planning Department (PlanD)’s representative had been

completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

Relocation of Soy Sauce Factory and Its Interface Issues

33. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there would be any alternative use of the “OU(SSF)” site if the owner of the soy sauce factory decided not to pursue the relocation proposal and not to operate the factory at the “OU(SSF)” site after rezoning;
- (b) whether the comprehensive residential development at the proposed “OU(CDWRA)(2)” zone could be implemented in phases, leading to the soy sauce factory continuing its operation at the current location, thus causing interface issues with the adjacent residential area; and
- (c) the considerations for not incorporating a requirement for the submission of a layout plan under section 16 (s.16) application in the Notes for the “OU(SSF)” zone as a statutory requirement.

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

- (a) the designation of the “OU(SSF)” zone was to take forward the partially agreed s.12A application (No. Y/YL-NSW/9) with the planning intention primarily for the relocation and redevelopment of an existing soy sauce factory, which was in the “OU(CDWRA)(2)” zone, and uses related and/or ancillary to the operation of the factory. Should the applicant choose not to pursue relocation of the soy sauce factory to the “OU(SSF)” zone, flexibility was allowed for other Column 2 uses in the Notes for the “OU(SSF)” zone, including, but not limited to, eating place, industrial use, shop and services, and wholesale trade, which were subject to approval by the Board on application;
- (b) the applicants of the two s.12A applications (which were the subsidiaries of

the same parent company) owned the majority of private land of the two application sites (i.e. sites of proposed amendment items A1 and B1). The existing soy sauce factory, which was sandwiched between the proposed residential development to the north and the current container storage yard to the south, was owned by another party (i.e. Koon Chun Hing Kee Soy and Sauce Factory Limited). It was the prerequisite to relocate the existing soy sauce factory to the south with a view to facilitating the comprehensive residential development covering the two s.12A application sites. To ensure that the proposed comprehensive residential development at the “OU(CDWRA)(2)” zone would be designed and developed in a co-ordinated manner with the relocated soy sauce factory at the “OU(SSF)” zone and to address any potential interface issues, information on the implementation phasing and programme of each component of the proposed comprehensive development and a layout plan with supporting documents as detailed in the Remarks of the Notes for the “OU(CDWRA)(2)” zone were required under the future s.16 application. Besides, the applicants had indicated their intention to relocate the existing soy sauce factory prior to commencement of the comprehensive residential development. The implementation programmes of the comprehensive residential development and the relocation of the soy sauce factory would be closely monitored; and

- (c) regarding the relocation of the existing soy sauce factory to the “OU(SSF)” site, according to the Notes for the “OU(SSF)” zone, submission of a s.16 application for such relocation was required. While submission of a layout plan was not specified as a statutory requirement under the Notes for the “OU(SSF)” zone, relevant information, including but not limited to the development layout plan of the relocated soy sauce factory and technical assessments to demonstrate that there would be no interface issue between the relocated soy sauce factory and the comprehensive residential development, should be included in the s.16 application and would form the basis for the planning assessment. Submission of layout plan was stipulated for the “OU(CDWRA)(2)” zone given the ecological value of the land and the requirement on the provision of a WRA under this zoning,

which was not comparable with the “OU(SSF)” zone.

Stipulation in Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP

35. In response to the Vice-chairperson’s question on whether the development parameters in terms of GFA were stipulated for domestic and non-domestic uses but not for GIC facilities in the Notes for the “OU(CDWRA)(2)” zone, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, said that GIC facilities should be provided in the comprehensive residential development as advised by the Social Welfare Department, and therefore such provision was stipulated in the Notes for the “OU(CDWRA)(2)” zone. To allow flexibility, the type and size of the GIC facilities were not stipulated in the Notes, but specified in the ES, as such details were subject to further liaison between the applicants and relevant government department(s) at the detailed design stage.

36. With regard to the Vice-chairperson’s enquiry about the mention of the Joint Practice Note No. 4 on Development Control Parameters – Plot Ratio (PR) and GFA (JPN4) in the ES for the two concerned zones, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, said that JPN4 was jointly promulgated by the Lands Department, Planning Department and Buildings Department on the streamlined arrangements on determination of maximum PR/GFA restrictions on development and such standard clause concerning JPN4 was commonly incorporated when updating the ES of OZPs for consistency and easy reference.

37. The Chairperson remarked that the proposed amendments to the OZP were mainly to take forward two s.12A applications partially agreed by the Committee. The statutory planning controls on the “OU(CDWRA)(2)” and “OU(SSF)” zones were to ensure that a comprehensive planning approach would be adopted for the two sites, aiming to address conservation concerns on the provision of WRA and potential interface issues between the proposed comprehensive residential development and the relocated soy sauce factory. Subsequent s.16 applications for both developments would be required, and the relocation proposal of the soy sauce factory at the “OU(SSF)” zone would need to be confirmed first, followed by the comprehensive residential development at the “OU(CDWRA)(2)” zone, thereby ensuring balanced and compatible development proposals as specified in the ES of the OZP. 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.

38. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Nam Sang Wai Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL-NSW/10 and that the draft Nam Sang Wai OZP S/YL-NSW/10A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered as S/YL-NSW/11 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of the Paper are suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance (the Ordinance); and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Attachment IV of the Paper for the draft Nam Sang Wai OZP No. S/YL-NSW/10A (to be renumbered as S/YL-NSW/11 upon exhibition) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Town Planning Board (the Board) for various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES will be published together with the OZP.”

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

[Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho rejoined the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 25

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-NSW/337 Proposed Temporary Warehouse for Storage of New Vehicles with Ancillary Facilities for a Period of 3 Years and Associated Filling of Land in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Comprehensive Development to include Wetland Restoration Area” and “Residential (Group D)” Zones, Lot 3719 S.C RP (Part) in D.D. 104, Pok Wai, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-NSW/337B)

40. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located near Mai Po and Mr K.W. Leung had declared an interest on the item for owning a property in Mai Po. As the property owned by Mr K.W. Leung had no direct view of the Site, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

41. 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.

42. In response to a Member’s enquiry regarding an objecting public comment that the Site was not under Category 2 of the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13G on Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 13G), Mr Alexander W.Y. Mak, STP/FSYLE, clarified that TPB PG-No. 13G was applicable to open storage use involving storage use to be carried out on a site where generally more than 50% of the site area was uncovered. Nevertheless, as the current application was for warehouse use with enclosed structures, TPB PG-No. 13G was not applicable.

Deliberation Session

43. The Chairperson remarked that policy support was given to the application and relevant government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application.

44. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 15.8.2028, 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 31

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTN/1074 Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture and Animal Boarding Establishment with Ancillary Facilities for a Period of 3 Years and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 1499 (Part), 1500 (Part), 1504 S.A and 1504 RP in D.D. 107, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTN/1074B)

Presentation and Question Sessions

45. With the aid of some plans, Ms Andrea W.Y. Yan, TP/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 (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

46. With regard to the operation of the applied use, some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) noting that no food and beverage would be provided during social events (e.g. wedding), whether self-catering services would be permitted should the application be approved; and

- (b) whether the “no overnight boarding service” was a material planning consideration for animal boarding establishment (ABE), and the reason for such proposal, and how it would be regulated and enforced.

47. In response, Ms Andrea W.Y. Yan, TP/FSYLE, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the applicant’s submission, no food and beverage would be provided during social events, but self-catering services would not be restricted at the application site (the Site). Should any food business be operated at the Site, a food business licence issued by the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) would be required. FEHD had no objection to the application; and
- (b) provision of overnight boarding service for ABE was not uncommon, depending on the mode of operation proposed by the applicant, and PlanD in general would not have particular comment on the operation mode. Normally, ABE with overnight boarding service should be equipped with enclosed structures with soundproofing materials and air-conditioning system to minimise potential environmental nuisance on the surrounding areas. Noise from ABE was regulated by the relevant environmental ordinances and enforcement action would be undertaken by the Environmental Protection Department as appropriate. The current application, albeit no overnight boarding service being proposed, was equipped with enclosed structures and air conditioning, which met the requirements for ABE with overnight boarding service.

48. The Chairperson supplemented that the detailed operation mode of the ABE would be subject to the applicant’s decision. From planning perspective, the key consideration was not the provision of overnight boarding service, but whether the associated noise nuisance, if any, was adequately addressed by the applicant. The application was primarily assessed based on the major development parameters such as intensity and scale of the applied use and its compatibility with the surrounding environment. The imposition of an approval condition to regulate the overnight boarding service was considered not necessary for this application.

49. Noting the range of operational details proposed in the applicant's submission, a Member enquired about the criteria for determining whether approval conditions should be imposed to regulate the major components of applied use should the application be approved, and how compliance with the relevant approval conditions would be monitored. The Chairperson said that the planning permission, if granted, would be scheme-based, and the applicant was obligated to take forward the approved scheme as submitted. Besides, some major components, such as mitigation measures required to address departmental or public concerns, would be regulated through the imposition of approval conditions, if required. Planning permission would be revoked in case of non-compliance with any of the approval conditions. Approval conditions imposed should be necessary, implementable and reasonably related to the proposed use. In general, operational details provided in an application could serve as reference for assessing its impacts on the surroundings. The details would become material planning considerations if they were found to have potential significant impact on the community, such as traffic congestion or noise nuisance. The Chairperson remarked that details of the operation mode would unlikely be required to be regulated through approval conditions for the current application, unless Members considered them to be critical considerations for the Committee in approving the application, in which case relevant conditions could be imposed. A Member cautioned that over-regulating the specific operational details through approval conditions might infringe upon the applicant's private business model.

Deliberation Session

50. A Member was concerned about the monitoring of the use at the Site, as there were past instances where approved ABEs had been unlawfully used for residential purposes. In response, the Chairperson said that PlanD would monitor the Site and take enforcement action against any unauthorised change of use as appropriate.

51. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 15.8.2028, 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 41

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-MP/384 Proposed Social Welfare Facility (Residential Care Home for the Elderly), Shop and Services (Medical Clinic and Consulting Room) and Public Vehicle Park (Private Cars Only) in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lots 76 S.G (Part) and 76 S.H (Part) in D.D. 101 and Adjoining Government Land, Mai Po, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-MP/384B)

52. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Mai Po and Mr K.W. Leung had declared an interest on the item for owning a property in Mai Po. As the property owned by Mr K.W. Leung had no direct view of the Site, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

53. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Kimson P.H. Chiu, 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.

Background of the Application

54. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) given the permanent nature of the application and the scale of the proposed development, in particular the 9-storey building at the southwestern portion of the Site which deviated from the building height (BH) restriction of 3 storeys for the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone, the reasons for submitting the current section 16 (s.16) application instead of a section 12A (s.12A) rezoning application; and

- (b) noting the public concerns on the proposed development being not in line with the conservation objectives for the Deep Bay Area, the applicability of the Town Planning Board Planning Guidelines for Application for Developments within Deep Bay Area under s.16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 12C) to this application and the justifications for compliance with TPB PG-No. 12C.

55. In response, Mr Kimson P.H. Chiu, STP/FSYLE, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the Notes for the “V” zone on the Mai Po and Fairview Park Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), ‘Social Welfare Facility’ was a Column 2 use requiring planning permission from the Board. The Remarks also stipulated that the BH restriction of 3 storeys (or 8.23m) did not apply to some of the Column 2 uses including the proposed residential care home for the elderly (RCHE), which was regarded as ‘Social Welfare Facility’ use under the current application. Nevertheless, the applicants were required to submit relevant assessments to support the application in terms of technical acceptability. In that regard, the applicants had conducted various technical assessments including visual impact assessment, ecological impact assessment (EcoIA) and landscape design and tree preservation proposal (TPP) to demonstrate its feasibility and land use compatibility with the surrounding areas; and
- (b) the Site was located within the wetland buffer area of the Deep Bay area and thus TPB PG-No. 12C was applicable to the application. According to the submitted EcoIA, the Site mostly consisted of developed areas of very low ecological value, and no wetland habitat was located within the Site. To provide adequate buffer area from the Wetland Conservation Area (WCA) directly abutting the Site in the north and taking into account its close proximity to the visitor zone of the proposed Sam Po Shue Wetland Conservation Park (SPS WCP), a number of mitigation measures were proposed, including a building setback of about 10m with planting of

heavy standard trees as buffer area along the northwestern boundary of the Site, landscape pond, periphery tree planting and preservation, and designation of height restriction zone. The EcoIA concluded that the proposed development would not result in a net loss in wetland function or cause significant disturbance to the adjoining WCA. The Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) had no adverse comment on the application, taking into account the proposed mitigation measures. The proposed development was therefore considered generally in line with TPB PG-No. 12C.

56. Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, supplemented that the applicants were eligible to apply for permanent use given that there was provision under Column 2 in the Notes for the “V” zone. For the current application, the development scale and design intent of the proposed development, which mainly involved a RCHE, did not significantly deviate from the development restriction and planning intention of the “V” zone. Seeking the Board’s approval on the proposed development via s.16 application was considered not inappropriate, whereas s.12A rezoning application was normally submitted for development proposal with major deviation from the intention of the concerned zoning and/or substantial increase in development restrictions of the site.

57. With regard to the nature of planning application, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, explained that the assessment criteria and planning considerations would vary according to the permanent or temporary nature of the proposed use. According to the covering Notes of the OZP in rural area, development proposals, which were neither Column 1 nor Column 2 uses, would only be allowed on a temporary basis for a period not exceeding 3 years. For better utilisation of land resources in a short term, sympathetic consideration might be given to application on a temporary basis provided that no significant impact on the surrounding areas was anticipated. On the contrary, more stringent requirements, in addition to technical feasibility, would be adopted to assess a development proposal for permanent use, including land use compatibility with the surrounding planned and existing development context, no insurmountable technical problems in the long term and no significant implications for achieving the planning intention of the zone concerned.

58. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the height of tree groups within the Mai Po Village Egrettry (MPVE) and whether the BH (i.e. 10.8m) of the two proposed buildings at the northeastern portion of the Site near such tree groups would cause disruption to birds' flight paths and uplift conditions, as a steep climb rate over a short distance could pose a burden to the birds;
- (b) noting that the rooftop structures at 19.4mPD of the two proposed 3-storey buildings appeared to result in 4 storeys, whether the proposed BH was an acceptable departure from the BH restriction of the "V" zone, which was of 3 storeys; and whether the BH should be co-ordinated with the BH restriction of the adjacent AFCD's Wetland Conservation Park Management Office, which was of 2 storeys;
- (c) noting that sensitive building design features, including internal blinds, window film and shades, would be adopted for the proposed development, whether a condition to restrict the use of glass curtain walls or reflective film in the subsequent detailed building plan submissions would be imposed to prevent potential glare impact on birds; and
- (d) whether consideration should be given to opening the proposed landscape garden for public enjoyment, given the Site's proximity to the planned SPS WCP so as to create a better connection.

59. In response, Mr Kimson P.H. Chiu, STP/FSYLE, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the submitted landscape design and TPP, all five retained trees within MPVE were about 10m to 15m in height. A height restriction zone with only low-rise buildings below 15m at the northeastern portion of the Site was proposed, taking into account the birds' flight paths recorded in the ardeid flight zone under the submitted EcoIA. The strategic

positioning of the two 3-storey buildings of 15.2mPD or 10.8m at main roof within the above-mentioned height restriction zone would minimise the disturbance to birds' flight paths to an acceptable level, as long-distance migratory birds' flight heights were largely recorded at levels ranging from about 15m to 20m. With reference to Drawing A-3 of the Paper, the rooftop structures at 19.4mPD (or BH of about 15m above ground) of the 3-storey buildings were intended to accommodate mechanical, electrical and plumbing equipment, occupying only a small portion of the overall flat roof at 15.2mPD (or BH of about 10.8m above ground). In other words, significant disturbance to birds' flight paths and issues of steep climb were not anticipated. AFCD has no objection to the proposed height restriction zone and the birds' flight paths;

- (b) with regard to compatibility with adjacent planned developments, the area was expected to experience changing planning circumstances brought about by the development of San Tin Technopole (STT) with a maximum BH up to 105mPD to the north and northeast of the Site, and the planned SPS WCP and its visitor zone to the north and northwest of the Site. Besides, the stepped BH profile of the proposed development of 3 to 9 storeys (or 15.2mPD to 34.55mPD at main roof) from northeast to southwest was considered not out of keeping with the existing and planned BH profile of the neighbourhood, and might form a gradual transition between the future high-rise and high-density developments at STT and the existing low-rise and low-density village settlements and wetlands;
- (c) should the application be approved, an approval condition on the submission of a revised EcoIA and the implementation of the mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation would be imposed. The revised EcoIA under the current application would take into account associated impacts holistically, including light and glare impact, impact on birds' flight paths and adjacent habitat, etc. Reference could also be made to relevant guidelines, including the Bird-friendly Design Guidelines to be formulated for the STT development under the relevant approval condition of the

Environmental Impact Assessment; and

- (d) the at-grade landscape garden, which was intended to serve as a buffer from MPVE, would not be open to the public. Visitors to the landscape garden would not be encouraged, taking into account its close proximity to MPVE and the associated human disturbance to the adjacent habitat.

Drainage Impact and Storm Surge

60. In response to a Member's enquiry on the site formation level and the level of the ingress/egress of the basement carpark, Mr Kimson P.H. Chiu, STP/FSYLE, said that the mean street level of the ingress/egress of the basement carpark and the surrounding areas was about 4.4mPD. The submitted Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) demonstrated that the proposed development, with a drainage design capable of withstanding rainstorms of up to a 50-year return period, would not cause adverse drainage impact. An approval condition on the submission of a revised DIA was recommended and the applicants would be advised to observe the Stormwater Drainage Manual in devising drainage facilities at the detailed design stage.

Deliberation Session

61. The Chairperson remarked that the application was supported by technical assessments, including EcoIA with appropriate mitigation measures proposed. Should the application be approved, relevant approval conditions would be imposed to ensure that the proposed mitigation measures would be duly implemented. Relevant government departments, including AFCD, had no objection to or adverse comment on the submitted technical assessments and the application.

62. Members had no in-principle objection to the application. The Vice-chairperson and a Member said that the Site was considered suitable for the proposed development to meet the acute community demand for quality RCHE and to cater for the need for more choices in the market for social welfare facilities. The Committee noted that the proposed development would provide a privately-operated RCHE that was neither subvented nor contracted.

63. The Vice-chairperson was concerned about the scale of the basement carpark, with 48 parking spaces for the social welfare facility and 19 for public use, which might be considered excessive. Some parking spaces could be relocated at-grade to minimise the flood risk associated with the basement as well as to reduce construction cost. In response, Ms Vilian W.L. Sum, Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West, Transport Department (TD) said that there was no specific standard for the provision of parking spaces related to RCHEs. Nevertheless, it was noted that 48 parking spaces were allocated to the social welfare facility and staff use on a shared basis. Given the sizeable scale of the proposed RCHE with 716 bedspaces and its market positioning, the provision was considered commensurate. While TD had no comment on the design of at-grade parking spaces, the proposed basement carpark would be taken forward in a more orderly manner, achieving optimisation of land resources. A Member concurred and said that the proposed parking provision, representing a small proportion of the total bed spaces (less than 5%), was a reasonable allocation. The proposed number of parking spaces would encourage family members to make more frequent visits, which was essential given the Site's remote location and the development's focus on providing high-quality care.

64. Some Members had the following views/suggestions:

- (a) given the increasing frequency of storm surges and extreme weather, the current low-lying area with a mean street level of 4.4mPD might not be sufficient to cope with flash flood caused by rapid increase in sea level and storm surges. Mitigation measures from drainage planning perspective might not be effective in addressing coastal flood risk. More robust preventive measures, such as locating the back-up power generator on upper levels, erecting flood barriers along the flood-prone area and installing a floodgate at the basement carpark entrance, should be explored and incorporated at the detailed design stage; and
- (b) the proposed basement carpark was considered a practical solution to accommodate the parking requirements without further increasing the building bulk and height, thereby minimising visual impact and disruption to birds' flight paths, notwithstanding the storm surge inundation risk

inherent to the low-lying site.

65. Noting Members' concerns about the flood risk associated with storm surges and extreme weather, the Chairperson said that an additional advisory clause requesting the applicants to explore more preventive measures to cope with storm surges at the detailed design stage could be imposed.

66. A Member said that the "V" zone was characterised by 3-storey developments, and the 9-storey building proposed at the southwestern part of the Site would inevitably affect birds' flight paths. In response, the Chairperson said that an advisory clause could be incorporated, recommending the applicants to further improve the building profile of the development and the design of the proposed rooftop structures, taking into account the mitigation measures in the revised EcoIA to minimise disturbance to birds' flight paths.

67. 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 15.8.2029, 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 applicants to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper and the following additional advisory clauses:

“- to explore more preventive measures to cope with storm surges at the detailed design stage; and

- to further improve the building profile of the development and design of the rooftop structures, taking into account the mitigation measures in the revised Ecological Impact Assessment, to minimise disturbance to birds' flight paths.”

Agenda Item 42

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-MP/392 Temporary Shop and Services with Ancillary Facilities for a Period of 3 Years in “Commercial/Residential” and “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Comprehensive Development to include Wetland Restoration Area” Zones, Lot 3250 S.B ss.45 in D.D. 104, Mai Po, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-MP/392)

68. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Mai Po and Mr K.W. Leung had declared an interest on the item for owning a property in Mai Po. As the property owned by Mr K.W. Leung had no direct view of the Site, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

69. With the aid of some plans, Ms Jessie S.Y. Lau, TP/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.

70. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

71. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 15.8.2028, 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 43

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/STT/27 Temporary Rural Workshop (Recycling and Recovery of Plastic Products) for a Period of 3 Years in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Cultural And Community Uses With Supporting Uses And Facilities” Zone, Lot 464 (Part) in D.D. 102, Siu Hum Tsuen, Ngau Tam Mei, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/STT/27)

Presentation and Question Sessions

72. 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 (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

73. Noting that the application site (the Site) fell within the boundary of Phase 2 Development of the San Tin Technopole (STT), the Vice-chairperson highlighted that the applied use might be terminated and the Site might be resumed during the approval period for implementation of development project in the coming years, and asked whether any compensation would be given to the affected applicant under the terms and conditions of Short Term Waiver. In response, Mr Lawrance S.C. Chan, Assistant Director/Regional 3, Lands Department said that the entitlements to compensation would depend on individual circumstances of each case, such as records of pre-clearance survey.

Deliberation Session

74. The Chairperson remarked that land resources could be optimised for temporary use prior to land clearance and acquisition for implementation of the STT development.

75. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 15.8.2028, 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.]

Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West District

[Mr Raymond H.F. Au, District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (DPO/TMYLW), Ms Carman C.Y. Cheung, Senior Town Planner/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (STP/TMYLW), and Ms Charlotte C.Y. Lam and Mr Edwin W.S. Yeung, Town Planners/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (TPs/TMYLW), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 50

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/HSK/573	Proposed Minor Relaxation of Domestic Plot Ratio Restriction (From 4.5 to 5) for Mixed Use Development in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Mixed Use” Zone, Government Land at Planning Areas 28A and 28B of Hung Shui Kiu/Ha Tsuen New Development Area (RNTPC Paper No. A/HSK/573)
-----------	--

Presentation and Question Sessions

76. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Carman C.Y. 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.

77. Noting that the application site, which adjoined the planned Tuen Ma Line Hung

Shui Kiu (HSK) Station, was considered highly suitable for the development of a vertiport, a Member asked whether the building height restrictions imposed under the OZP had taken into account the future development of low-altitude economy (LAE) initiative, such as vertiport infrastructure and associated flight paths. In response, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, said that the LAE initiative had not yet been promoted at the time when the draft statutory plan was gazetted. The HSK area was not included in the Sandbox pilot projects. The land and space requirements relevant to LAE should not constitute material considerations in assessing the current application for minor relaxation of domestic plot ratio (PR) restriction.

78. The Chairperson supplemented that the Working Group on Developing LAE had been established to formulate development strategies for promoting LAE and implementing Sandbox pilot projects. Various locational factors, such as spaciousness and uninhabited area, were preferred for conducting trials, in addition to considerations of technical stability, privacy, public and aviation safety, and noise control. The strategic location of the area in connection with the Tuen Ma Line would be favourable for integrating terrestrial and aerial transportation. The commercial sites in new development areas like HSK, with spacious rooftops, could provide scope and flexibility for driving the development and application of low-altitude technology in the long term. Upon accumulating more experiences from the Sandbox pilot projects and the enactment of relevant amended legislative regulations for unmanned aircraft, there was scope for these new development areas, under phased planning and construction, to provide the necessary land to support the promotion of LAE in the coming years.

Deliberation Session

79. The Chairperson said that the application only involved adjustment of domestic and non-domestic PRs, without any change in the total PR and building height restrictions as stipulated in the relevant outline zoning plan. A number of design merits, including building setbacks and retail terrace frontage, and relevant requirements under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines, had been incorporated in the indicative scheme.

80. 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 15.8.2029, 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.

[Mr Timothy K.W. Ma left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 67

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TYST/1321 Proposed Temporary Social Welfare Facility (Social Service Centre)
for a Period of 5 Years in “Residential (Group B) 1” Zone, Lot 1354
RP in D.D. 121 and Adjoining Government Land, Tong Yan San
Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/1321)

Presentation and Question Sessions

81. With the aid of some plans, Mr Edwin W.S. Yeung, TP/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.

82. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

83. The Chairperson said that given that the application site was an abandoned primary school and was the subject of four previous planning approvals, approval of the current application on a temporary basis would better utilise land resources and was generally in line with the Committee’s previous decisions.

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

temporary basis for a period of 5 years until 15.8.2030, 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 69

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-TYST/1323 Proposed Temporary Vehicle Repair Workshop and Open Storage of Construction Machinery and Materials with Ancillary Facilities for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group D)” Zone, Lots 978 RP, 980, 981 RP, 982 RP, 983 S.B, 983 RP and 984 RP (Part) in D.D. 121, Tong Yan San Tsuen, Yuen Long

85. The Secretary reported that consideration of the application had been rescheduled.

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

Agenda Item 70

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

86. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 5:15 p.m.

**Minutes of 771st Rural and New Town Planning Committee
(held on 15.8.2025)**

Deferral Cases

Requests for Deferment by Applicant for 2 Months

Item No.	Application No.*	Times of Deferment
4	A/SK-HH/84	1 st
5	A/I-TCV/28	1 st
6	A/I-TOF/6	1 st
7	A/SLC/191	1 st
8	A/NE-LT/782	1 st
10	A/NE-FTA/262	1 st
11	A/NE-LYT/853	1 st
12	A/NE-MKT/45	2 nd ^
15	A/NE-TKL/804	1 st
17	A/NE-TKL/806	1 st
18	A/NE-TKL/807	1 st
19	A/NE-TKLN/97	2 nd ^
20	A/NE-TKLN/99	1 st
22	A/NE-TK/837	1 st
27	A/YL-KTS/1078	1 st
28	A/YL-KTS/1079	1 st
29	A/YL-KTS/1080	1 st
33	A/YL-KTN/1135	1 st
34	A/YL-KTN/1136	1 st
35	A/YL-KTN/1137	1 st
37	A/YL-KTN/1139	1 st
38	A/YL-KTN/1140	1 st
39	A/YL-SK/420	1 st
40	A/KTN/107	1 st
44	A/YL-PH/1055	2 nd ^
45	A/YL-PH/1058	2 nd ^
46	A/YL-PH/1075	1 st
48	A/HSK/568	1 st
55	A/YL-TT/708	2 nd ^
56	A/YL-TT/713	1 st

Item No.	Application No.*	Times of Deferment
60	A/YL-HTF/1189	2 nd [^]
63	A/YL-PS/749	2 nd [^]
65	A/YL-TYST/1318	1 st
Note: [^] <i>The 2nd Deferment was the last deferment and no further deferment would be granted unless under special circumstances and supported with strong justifications.</i>		

Declaration of Interests

The Committee noted the following declaration of interests:

Item No.	Members' Declared Interests	
6	The application was submitted by CLP Power Hong Kong Limited (CLP).	- Mr Ryan M.K. Ip for being the vice-president and executive director of Public Policy Institute of Our Hong Kong Foundation which had received donations from CLP
8	The application site was located in Lam Tsuen.	- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau's spouse for being one of the owners of a property in Lam Tsuen

The Committee noted that Mr Ryan M.K. Ip had not joined the meeting yet. As the property of Mr Daniel K.S. Lau's spouse had no direct view of the application site under item 8, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

* Refer to the agenda at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/RNTPC/Agenda/771_rnt_agenda.html for details of the planning applications.

**Minutes of 771st Rural and New Town Planning Committee
(held on 15.8.2025)**

Renewal Cases

Applications for renewal of temporary approval for 3 years

Item No.	Application No.	Renewal Application	Renewal Period
26	A/YL-NSW/350	Temporary First Aid Post in “Conservation Area” Zone, Government Land in D.D. 123, Nam Sang Wai, Yuen Long	27.8.2025 to 26.8.2028
30	A/YL-KTS/1082	Temporary Open Storage of Electricity Generators, Compressors and Construction Machinery in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Rural Use” Zone, Lots 391 RP (Part) and 392 RP in D.D. 106, Shek Wu Tong, Kam Tin, Yuen Long	15.10.2025 to 14.10.2028
62	A/YL-LFS/562	Temporary Public Vehicle Park for Private Cars and Light Goods Vehicles in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lots 2888 RP (Part) and 2889 RP (Part) in D.D. 129, Sha Kong Wai, Yuen Long	17.8.2025 to 16.8.2028
68	A/YL-TYST/1322	Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Construction Material with Ancillary Site Office in “Undetermined” Zone, Lots 1229 (Part), 1237 (Part), 1238 (Part) and 1252 (Part) in D.D. 119, Pak Sha Tsuen, Yuen Long	19.10.2025 to 18.10.2028

Declaration of Interest

The Committee noted the following declaration of interest:

Item No.	Member’s Declared Interest	
26	The application was located near Mai Po.	- Mr K.W. Leung for owning a property in Mai Po

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

**Minutes of 771st Rural and New Town Planning Committee
(held on 15.8.2025)**

Cases for Streamlining Arrangement

(a) Applications approved on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 15.8.2028

Item No.	Application No.	Planning Application
13	A/NE-MKT/48	Proposed Temporary Warehouse (Excluding Dangerous Goods Godown) with Ancillary Facilities in “Recreation” Zone, Lots 963 S.A RP (Part) and 963 S.B RP (Part) in D.D. 82, Ta Kwu Ling
14	A/NE-MUP/217	Proposed Temporary Private Vehicle Park (Private Cars Only) and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 757 S.B ss.2 S.A in D.D. 46, Loi Tung, Sha Tau Kok
16	A/NE-TKL/805	Temporary Open Storage of Construction Machinery and Construction Materials and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 217 (Part) in D.D. 84, Ping Che
32	A/YL-KTN/1133	Proposed Temporary Shop and Services (Vehicle Showroom, Sales of Second-hand Private Car, Vehicle Parts and Accessories) with Ancillary Facilities in “Comprehensive Development Area” Zone, Lot 4202 RP (Part) in D.D. 104, Long Ha, Yuen Long
36	A/YL-KTN/1138	Proposed Temporary Open Storage with Ancillary Facilities and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 1211 in D.D. 107, Kam Tin North, Yuen Long
49	A/HSK/572	Temporary Logistics Centre with Ancillary Office and Canteen in “Government, Institution or Community”, “Residential (Group B) 2” and “Open Space” Zones and area shown as ‘Road’, Various Lots in D.D. 129 and Adjoining Government Land, Lau Fau Shan, Yuen Long
53	A/TM-SKW/135	Proposed Temporary Storage (For the Use of Village Office and Ancestral Hall) in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 966 RP in D.D. 375, So Kwun Wat Tsuen, Tuen Mun
54	A/YL-TT/706	Proposed Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Hobby Farm) and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 1468, 1472, 1474, 1475, 1478, 1479, 1486 and 1599 in D.D. 116 and Adjoining Government Land, Shek Tong Tsuen, Tai Tong, Yuen Long
57	A/YL-TT/714	Temporary Shop and Services in “Open Space” Zone, Lot 3100 (Part) in D.D. 116, Tai Kei Leng, Yuen Long
61	A/YL-HTF/1190	Proposed Temporary Warehouse (Storage of Construction Materials, Metal and Electronic Parts) and Open Storage ¹ of Construction Materials with Ancillary Office and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 126 (Part) and 128 in D.D. 128, Yuen Long

¹ A small portion of the application site (about 9.4%) would be used for open storage of construction materials, which would be considered ancillary to the warehouse use.

64	A/YL-PS/758	Temporary Shop and Services (Retail Shop for Selling Construction Materials) and Wholesale of Construction Materials in “Village Type Development”, “Government, Institution or Community” and “Green Belt” ² Zones, Lots 257 RP (Part) and 258 S.A (Part) in D.D. 122, Ping Shan, Yuen Long
66	A/YL-TYST/1320	Proposed Temporary Warehouse for Storage of General Goods in “Residential (Group C)” Zone, Lot 1322 (Part) in D.D 119, Pak Sha Tsuen, Yuen Long

(b) Applications approved on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years until 15.8.2030

Item No.	Application No.	Planning Application
47	A/YL-PH/1076	Proposed Temporary Shop and Services (Product Showroom) with Ancillary Facilities in “Open Storage” Zone, Lot 1584 S.A ss.2 (Part) in D.D. 111, Pat Heung, Yuen Long
51	A/HSK/574	Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicle) and Associated Filling of Land in “Village Type Development” Zone, Various Lots in D.D. 124, Yuen Long
52	A/TM-LTTY/493	Proposed Temporary Shop and Services and Eating Place in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lots 515 and 516 RP in D.D. 130 and Adjoining Government Land, San Hing Tsuen, Lam Tei, Tuen Mun
58	A/YL-TT/715	Temporary Shop and Services in “Residential (Group C)” Zone, Lots 1012 S.A RP, 1037(A)&(B), 1038, 1039, 1040, 1041 and 1042 in D.D. 115, Au Tau, Yuen Long

(c) Application approved on a temporary basis for a period of 6 years until 15.8.2031

Item No.	Application No.	Planning Application
59	A/YL/328	Temporary Shop and Services (Motor Vehicle Showroom) with Ancillary Office in “Village Type Development” and “Open Space” Zones, Lot 104 RP (Part) in D.D. 115, Yuen Long

² A minor portion zoned “Green Belt” (about 1.2%) would be considered as minor boundary adjustment in accordance with the covering Notes of the relevant Outline Zoning Plan.