

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 778th Meeting of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee held at 2:30 p.m. on 5.12.2025

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

Professor B.S. Tang

Mr Simon Y.S. Wong

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 Frederick W.F. Kong

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

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 Isabel Y. Yiu

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

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 777th RNTPC Meeting held on 21.11.2025

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 777th RNTPC meeting held on 21.11.2025 were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Deferral Cases

Sections 12A and 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Presentation and Question Sessions

3. The Committee noted that there were 30 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 views 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 three cases for renewal of temporary planning approval and the Planning Department had no objection to the applications for the further renewed periods. Details of the planning applications, Member's declaration of interest for a case and the Committee's views 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 16 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, Members' declaration of interests for individual cases and the Committee' views on the declared interests 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

Agenda Item 3

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Y/SK-SKT/4 Re-consideration of Section 12A Application No. Y/SK-SKT/4
Application for Amendment to the Approved Sai Kung Town Outline
Zoning Plan No. S/SK-SKT/6, To rezone the application site from
“Village Type Development” to “Residential (Group B) 6” and to
amend the Notes of the zone applicable to the site, Various Lots in
D.D. 221 and Adjoining Government Land, Sha Ha, Sai Kung
(RNTPC Paper No. Y/SK-SKT/4A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

PlanD

| | | |
|----------------------|---|---|
| Mr Walter W.N. Kwong | - | District Planning Officer/Sai Kung and Islands (DPO/SKIs) |
| Ms Tammy S.N. Kong | - | Senior Town Planner/Sai Kung and Islands (STP/SKIs) |
| Mr Jackin H.Y. Yip | - | Town Planner/Sai Kung and Islands |

Applicants’ Representatives

Wisdom Glory Limited and Salechoice Properties Limited – Applicants

Mr Remus Wong

Mr William Yip

Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited

Ms Theresa Yeung

Ms Catherine Kwong

King & Wood Mallesons

Ms Y.S. Man

Ms P.Y. Cheng

Barristers

Mr Y.H. Lee

Mr Eric Chim

LLA Consultancy Limited

Mr S.L. Ng

10. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the meeting. To ensure smooth and efficient conduct of the meeting, a time limit of 15 minutes was set for presentation of the applicants. He then invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the background of the application.

11. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Tammy S.N. Kong, STP/SKIs, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed rezoning of the application site (with revised site boundary) (the Site) from "Village Type Development" ("V") to "Residential (Group B) 6" ("R(B)6") to facilitate a proposed residential development with a public vehicle park (PVP), departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. While PlanD had no in-principle objection to the application, it was considered more appropriate to stipulate a two-tier building height (BH) control of 3 storeys and 10 storeys both excluding basements in the Notes for the "R(B)6" zone to maintain a stepped BH profile.

[Mr Simon Y.S. Wong joined the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

12. The Chairperson then invited the applicants' representatives to elaborate on the application. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Theresa Yeung, the applicants' representative, made the following main points:

- (a) during the Committee's previous consideration in January 2024 (the previous consideration), the application was rejected. Following the decision, an application for judicial review (JR) against the Committee's decision was lodged by the applicants. The Court of First Instance (CFI) subsequently ordered to quash the Committee's decision in May 2025;
- (b) there was one outstanding Small House (SH) application outside the Site under processing. According to the information provided by the District Lands Officer/Sai Kung of the Lands Department (LandsD), the 10-year SH demand forecast of Sha Ha provided by the indigenous inhabitant representative (IIR) as at 6.1.2014 was 11, with no further update on this figure since then;
- (c) when compared with the original scheme, an area of 1,200m² in the northern part of the Site had been excluded under the revised scheme. This adjustment facilitated the retention of additional land within the "V" zone to address SH demand. Taking into account the excluded area, the other remaining land within the concerned "V" zone outside the Site and that within the adjacent "V" zone to the north of the Site, the total reserved land was sufficient to accommodate 12 SHs, which could meet the total demand for SH (total SH demand), including the outstanding SH application and the 10-year SH demand forecast as provided by the IIR of Sha Ha in 2014;
- (d) the Site had been zoned "V" since the first publication of the Sai Kung Town Outline Zoning Plan in 2005. However, no SH development had been materialised over the years, with the Site instead being used as a temporary PVP. The proposed development could unleash development potential of underutilised land through private initiative and boost private housing supply by providing 147 residential units with the provision of a PVP of 120 car parking spaces;
- (e) the proposed plot ratio of 1.5 was compatible with the surrounding developments, including WM Hotel, a planned development in the

“Comprehensive Development Area (1)” zone, and a completed comprehensive development (i.e. The Mediterranean), which were located to the south, west and further southwest of the Site respectively; and

- (f) the proposed development was technically feasible. Relevant government bureaux/departments consulted had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application.

[Mr Ryan M.K. Ip joined the meeting during the presentation of the applicants’ representative.]

13. The Chairperson remarked that during the previous consideration, the Committee’s major concern was whether there would be sufficient land within the “V” zone to accommodate the potential SH demand, rather than the development intensity or technical feasibility of the proposed development. As the presentations of PlanD’s representative and the applicants’ representative had been completed, he invited questions from Members.

Existing Conditions of Sha Ha

14. The Chairperson, the Vice-chairperson and a Member raised the following questions:

- (a) the boundary and population of Sha Ha;
- (b) whether there were other villages with available land to accommodate the possible demand for SH development; and
- (c) whether there was any reason for the limited SH demand in Sha Ha.

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

- (a) Sha Ha mainly encompassed three “V” zones, including the “V” zone where the Site was located, an elongated “V” zone situated to the north of the Site, and the third one located to the further northeast of the Site.

While specific population data for Sha Ha was not readily available, the surrounding area was known to contain about 22 village houses. Assuming an average household size of about 3 persons, the estimated population of Sha Ha would be about 60 to 70 persons;

- (b) the village ‘environs’ of Sha Ha mainly encompassed the three aforementioned “V” zones, with some areas covered by other zonings. Under the prevailing SH Policy, an indigenous villager could apply for SH within his village and in other villages within the same Heung. As Sha Ha was in the Sai Kung Heung, residents of Sha Ha could apply for SH developments in other villages within the Sai Kung Heung, though cross-village applications might attract objections from local villagers; and
- (c) according to the information provided by LandsD, the 10-year SH demand forecast for Sha Ha as reported by the IIR as at 6.1.2014 was 11. This figure had not been updated since 2014, and LandsD was unable to verify its accuracy. At the planning stage, there were no practical means available to confirm the SH demand. The decision of indigenous villagers to develop a SH in Sha Ha might depend on various factors, such as the presence of other residences and whether they would prefer to live in Sha Ha.

Remaining “V” Zones in Sha Ha

16. The Vice-chairperson enquired about the number of SH that could be accommodated within the remaining “V” zones in Sha Ha, noting that the total SH demand would be 12. In response, Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, DPO/SKIs, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that an area of 1,714m² (currently owned by the applicants) would be retained as “V” zones if the Site was rezoned. Based on the normal assumption that 40 SHs could be accommodated on one hectare (ha) of land, a total of 12 SHs could be accommodated within the remaining “V” zones (with an area of about 0.3 ha, including both private land and government land (GL)) in Sha Ha. Hence, the area of the remaining “V” zones in Sha Ha was sufficient to meet the total SH demand (i.e. 12 SHs).

17. Noting that an additional area of 1,200m² to the immediate north of the Site would be retained as “V” zone under the revised scheme, two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether such area was still owned by the applicants upon rezoning; and
- (b) if there would be any proposed use for such area.

18. In response, Ms Theresa Yeung, the applicants’ representative, made the following main points:

- (a) upon rezoning, the area in question would still be owned by the applicants; and
- (b) while the applicants did not yet have a concrete proposal, they committed to providing greening initiatives in the specific area.

Local Consultation

19. Noting that a meeting was convened by the applicants in November 2025 to consult Sha Ha residents on the application (the meeting), the Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions to the applicants’ representatives:

- (a) details of the local consultation, and whether there was any update on the latest figure of the 10-year SH demand forecast for Sha Ha;
- (b) with reference to the meeting record with the IIR and resident representative (RR) of Sha Ha and other villagers (the minutes), which stated that the attendees unanimously expressed agreement that ‘the existing land could meet the 10-year SH demand forecast’, whether the ‘existing land’ referred to the land in the remaining “V” zones of Sha Ha following the rezoning of the Site to “R(B)6”;

- (c) the total number of IIR and RR in Sha Ha, and whether the IIR and RR had further consulted other Sha Ha residents before casting their votes at the meeting; and
- (d) whether the revised scheme had taken into account the villagers' request that the BH of the proposed development fronting Lots 7 and 8 in D.D. 221 should not exceed 3 storeys to minimise the potential visual impact as stated in the minutes.

20. In response, Ms Theresa Yeung, the applicants' representative, with the aid of the minutes, a membership list of executive committee of Sai Kung Rural Committee (SKRC) (2023 – 2027), a list of IIR and RR of Sha Ha (the list) and some plans as shown on the visualiser, made the following main points:

- (a) the meeting was convened on 5.11.2025 and was attended by the Chairman of SKRC (Mr Wong Shui Sang), IIR of Sha Ha (Mr Wong Tin Loy), RR of Sha Ha (Mr Lau Kwok Kee) and five other residents of Sha Ha Village. The purpose of the meeting was to further consult the attendees on the application to rezone the Site from "V" to "R(B)6". During the meeting, it was unanimously agreed that the application for rezoning should be supported, and it was affirmed that the existing land would be sufficient to cater for the 10-year SH demand forecast for Sha Ha. The minutes of the meeting were subsequently signed by the Chairman of the SKRC, IIR, and RR of Sha Ha. During the public consultation periods for the application, no objections were received from the residents of Sha Ha;
- (b) the term 'existing land' referred to the land at the remaining "V" zones in Sha Ha following the rezoning of the Site to "R(B)6";
- (c) according to the list provided, Mr Wong Tin Loy and Mr Lau Kwok Kee were identified as the sole IIR and RR of Sha Ha. The remaining five attendees were notable for their active involvement in local affairs. Given that there were only about 20 SHs in Sha Ha, the meeting, which

was attended by eight individuals, could be regarded as a representative gathering that was likely to have captured the predominant views of the Sha Ha residents; and

- (d) the revised scheme proposed a stepped BH profile, with a 3-storey tower and 3-storey houses along the northern and eastern boundaries of the Site respectively, and a 8-storey tower and a 10-storey tower at the southwestern part of the Site. This design was carefully considered in response to the request from Sha Ha residents, ensuring a balanced and community-sensitive approach to the development.

21. The Chairperson enquired whether the applicants could confirm if the assessment that the remaining “V” zone in Sha Ha would be sufficient to meet the 10-year SH demand forecast for Sha Ha as stated in the minutes was made on the assumption of excluding the Site, and whether this was accurately reflected in the meeting minutes. In response, Ms Theresa Yeung, the applicants’ representative, confirmed so, and that this was accurately reflected in the minutes.

Land Exchange for Private Lots

22. Noting that the Site involved both private land and GL, a land exchange application to the LandsD for implementation was required, the Chairperson and two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the area of GL within the Site and the area of private land to be retained as “V” zone;
- (b) whether the price of the private land within the remaining “V” zone would become unaffordable for SH developments therein; and
- (c) whether there was scope for surrendering the private lots to be retained as “V” zone to the Government in the land administration regime.

23. In response, Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, DPO/SKIs, said that the Site involved

1,995m² of GL. Ms Theresa Yeung, the applicants' representative, with the aid of some plans, made the following main points:

- (a) the applicants' private lots located to the immediate north of the Site, with an area of 1,714m², would be retained as "V" zone. This comprised 514m² as proposed under the original scheme, with an additional 1,200m² incorporated under the revised scheme;
- (b) to facilitate the proposed development, a land exchange application to LandsD was necessary as the Site involved some GL at its centre. Upon approval of the land exchange application, the private lots to be retained as "V" zone after this rezoning could be surrendered to the Government through land exchange and would become GL. Such land would then be available for indigenous villagers to apply for SH developments; and
- (c) such proposal could be further examined during the land exchange stage, which would be assessed by LandsD at its sole discretion in its capacity as the landlord.

24. 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 application had been completed and the Committee would deliberate on the application in their absence and inform the applicants of the Committee's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked PlanD's and the applicants' representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

25. The Chairperson remarked that the development intensity and technical feasibility of the proposed development had been considered acceptable during the previous consideration. As such, Members might focus the consideration on whether sufficient land had been reserved to meet the total SH demand. During the previous consideration, the total SH demand was 12, including one outstanding SH application and 11 SHs from the 10-year SH demand forecast. The applicants had proposed retaining an area of 514m² as "V" zone

for accommodating six SHs. The Committee concluded that the SH demand could not be met under the proposed rezoning, leading to the rejection of the application. In the revised scheme, an additional area of 1,200m² would be retained as “V” upon rezoning. This would result in a total area of 1,714m², which, together with other available land within the “V” zones (including both private land and GL), would be able to meet the total SH demand of 12 in Sha Ha. In addition, the judgment by the CFI regarding the subject JR application emphasised the necessity of incorporating a tangible likelihood of re-application for SH grant by applicants of previously rejected applications, rather than a mere theoretical possibility, into the assessment of ‘potential demand’ for SH, which should be duly acknowledged and respected.

26. Members generally supported the application, noting the applicants’ proposal to retain an additional 1,200m² area as “V” zone under the revised scheme. This area, together with the original 514m² of land and other available land within the “V” zones, was sufficient to meet the total SH demand of 12 SHs, as confirmed by the IIR and RR at their meeting with the applicants in November 2025 and the information provided by LandsD. The proposal to surrender the private land owned by the applicants to the Government for retention as “V” zone would be assessed in the land exchange stage by LandsD. Moreover, through the surrender and regrant process during the land exchange application, the area to be retained for SH development to the north of the Site would allow a more efficient layout for SH developments, as compared with the elongated shape GL located at the centre of the Site. Furthermore, the proposed development was expected to enhance the supply of parking spaces by providing a PVP with 120 car parking spaces within the Site.

27. Two Members sought clarification on the following issues:

- (a) whether the CFI’s interpretation of SH policy would have any implication for the Committee or the Board in the consideration of SH applications;
- (b) whether it was possible for an indigenous villager to sell his land and apply for SH development again after execution of the right for SH grant;
- (c) whether there was any restriction on SH alienation; and

- (d) whether the applicants of 12 SH grant applications rejected by LandsD had applied to LandsD for removal of the alienation restriction.

28. The Chairperson said that CFI's interpretation was that the right of an indigenous villager for SH was considered as exercised once a SH grant was given, i.e. if an applicant had been granted permission to erect a SH on a piece of land he owned, then he had to "use it or lose it". This interpretation was noted to deviate from that of LandsD. Upon invitation of the Chairperson, Mr Frederick W.F. Kong, Assistant Director/Regional 3, LandsD, made the following main points:

- (a) under the prevailing practice of LandsD, the right to apply for SH development was exercised when land documents(s) for grant/licence/exchange was/were executed and registered in the Land Registry (LR). LandsD was currently evaluating whether this practice should be explicitly mentioned in any public document to ensure clarity and transparency;
- (b) once the land document(s) was/were executed and registered in LR, an indigenous villager was considered to have exercised his one-in-a-lifetime right to a SH grant and was no longer entitled to any further SH grants. This meant that the indigenous villager could not apply for SH development again;
- (c) a SH on private lot(s) involving a free building licence was subject to a 5-year alienation restriction, i.e. the indigenous villager concerned could not alienate his SH within five years after the issue of the Certificate of Compliance. After the 5-year period, the indigenous villager could at liberty sell his SH in the market. The alienation restriction was perpetual for SH on GL granted by way of private treaty grant. If the indigenous villager wished to transfer the ownership of his SH within the alienation restriction period, he might apply to LandsD for removal of the relevant alienation restriction clause, subject to payment of an additional premium to be assessed by LandsD, along with an administrative fee; and

- (d) for the 12 SH applications rejected by LandsD in 2021, there were no land documents executed and registered in LR. Therefore, the 12 SH applicants, even after alienating their land, had not used their rights for SH grants and remained eligible under the SH Policy to re-apply for SH grants again.

[Mr Timothy K.W. Ma left the meeting during deliberation.]

29. After deliberation, the Committee decided to partially agree to the application to rezone the application site to “Residential (Group B) 6” with stipulation of stepped building height restrictions and the provision of public vehicle park in the Notes of the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). The relevant proposed amendments to the Sai Kung Town OZP, 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.

[Ms Tammy S.N. Kong and Ms S.H. Lau, Senior Town Planners/Sai Kung and Islands (STPs/SKIs), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

| | |
|-------------|---|
| A/SK-TMT/84 | Proposed Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Golf Putting Range) with Ancillary Facilities and Associated Filling and Excavation of Land in “Green Belt” Zone, Various Lots in D.D. 216, Long Keng, Sai Kung (RNTPC Paper No. A/SK-TMT/84A) |
|-------------|---|

Presentation and Question Sessions

30. With the aid of some plans, Ms Tammy S.N. Kong, STP/SKIs, 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 did not support the application.

31. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

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

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Green Belt” zone which is primarily for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention; and
- (b) the proposed development is not in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 for ‘Application for Development within Green Belt Zone’ in that there are no exceptional circumstances or strong planning grounds to justify the application, the proposed development does not comply with the development controls and restrictions of areas designated as water gathering grounds and the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed development with excavation and filling of land is compatible with the surrounding area and would not generate adverse water supplies, sewerage, drainage, environmental, traffic and landscape impacts on the application site and the surrounding area.”

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/I-LI/37 Proposed House (Redevelopment) with Filling and Excavation of Land
in “Conservation Area” Zone, Lot 5 in D.D. 7 Lamma Island, Mo Tat,
Lamma Island
(RNTPC Paper No. A/I-LI/37A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

33. With the aid of some plans, Ms S.H. Lau, STP/SKIs, 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) had no objection to the application.

Redevelopment of an Existing House

34. The Chairperson and two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the ruins found to the west of the application site (the Site) were mainly located on government land (GL);
- (b) whether there was any information regarding the existing houses at the Site and Lot 23 in D.D. 7 Lamma Island; and
- (c) the basis for applying redevelopment of an existing house, noting that most of the ruins were located outside the Site.

35. In response, Ms S.H. Lau, STP/SKIs, made the following main points:

- (a) the ruins were mainly located on GL adjacent to the Site, with a minor portion at the western corner of the Site;
- (b) according to the applicant, the ruins mainly on GL adjacent to the Site

were remnants of a former house that should have been erected within the subject lot i.e. the Site. The misalignment between the location of the ruins and the Site could be attributed to inaccuracies in land surveying and on-site measurements during the construction stage. There was no available information regarding the existing house on Lot 23 in D.D. 7 Lamma Island; and

- (c) the Site comprised an old schedule lot held under Block Government Lease demised for 'House' and 'Dry Cultivation' uses. In processing the current application for redevelopment, the lease entitlement of the Site, the site conditions and the information provided by the applicant had all been taken into account.

36. The Chairperson supplemented that as outlined in the Notes for the "Conservation Area" ("CA") zone on the approved Lamma Island Outline Zoning Plan, 'House (Redevelopment only)' was a Column 2 use that required planning permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board). There was no provision for development of a new house within this zone.

Redevelopment of an Existing House

37. Noting that the Site formed part of the application site of a previous application (No. A/I-LI/30) (the previous application), a Member asked whether there was any other private land with development rights owned by the applicant. In response, Ms S.H. Lau, STP/SKIs, with the aid of some plans, said that the previous application involved the redevelopment of two houses, one previously on Lot 5 and the other previously on Lot 23, both within D.D. 7 on Lamma Island and owned by the same registered owner. The proposal under the previous application was to transfer the redevelopment rights of the house on Lot 5 to Lot 23, thereby allowing for the development of two houses on Lot 23. The current application solely involved redevelopment of the house on Lot 5 in D.D. 7.

Footpath

38. With reference to Plan A-2b, a Member enquired whether the Site possessed any

exclusive rights to the footpath leading to the Mo Tat Wan (North) Pier (the pier). In response, Ms S.H. Lau, STP/SKIs, with the aid of some plans, said that the footpath depicted merely indicated the access route from the pier to the Site. It did not imply any exclusive right to such access under the lease of the Site.

Deliberation Session

39. The Chairperson recapitulated that the redevelopment of an existing house within the “CA” zone required planning permission from the Board. In the application, consideration should be given to both the lease entitlement of the Site and the presence of ruins mainly on GL adjacent to the Site. Each application for the redevelopment of an existing house within the “CA” zone would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

40. 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 5.12.2029, 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.

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

Sha Tin, Tai Po and North District

[Mr Ryan C.K. Ho and Ms Ivy C.W. Wong, Senior Town Planners/Shan Tin, Tai Po and North (STPs/STN), Mr Timothy W.P. Wu, Town Planner/Shan Tin, Tai Po and North (TP/STN), and Mr Peter P.L. Ngan, Assistant Town Planner/Shan Tin, Tai Po and North (ATP/STN), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Items 11 and 12

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-LYT/862 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in
“Agriculture” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lot 691 S.D in
D.D. 83, Kwan Tei Village, Fanling

A/NE-LYT/863 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in
“Agriculture” Zone, Lot 691 S.E in D.D. 83, Kwan Tei Village,
Fanling
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LYT/862 and 863)

41. The Committee agreed that as the two applications each for a proposed house (New Territories Exempted Houses (NTEH) – Small Houses (SH)) were similar in nature and the application sites (the Sites) were located adjacent to each other within the same “Agriculture” zone, they could be considered together.

Presentation and Question Sessions

42. With the aid of some plans, Mr Ryan C.K. Ho, STP/STN, 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 did not support the applications.

43. Noting that there were existing SHs and SH grant/NTEH redevelopment applications approved by the Lands Department (LandsD) in the vicinity of the Sites as

shown on Plans A-2a and A-4 of the Paper, a Member enquired about the rationale for not regarding the Sites as infill sites, and whether the application site of application No. A/NE-LYT/863 would be considered an infill site if application No. A/NE-LYT/862 had been approved.

44. In response, Mr Ryan C.K. Ho, STP/STN, with the aid of some plans and the Interim Criteria for consideration of application for NTEH/SH in the New Territories (the Interim Criteria), explained that according to criterion (d) of the Interim Criteria, an application for NTEH/SH with previous planning permission lapsed would be assessed on its own merits. In general, proposed developments which were not in line with the criteria would normally not be allowed. However, sympathetic consideration might be granted if there were specific circumstances to justify the cases, such as the site being an infill site among existing NTEHs/SHs or the processing of SH grant being at an advance stage. For application No. A/NE-LYT/862, a domestic structure and a vacant site (the application site of application No. A/NE-LYT/863) could be observed to its immediate north and south respectively. For application No. A/NE-LYT/863, vacant sites were observed to its immediate north, west and south. The northern site was the application site of application No. A/NE-LYT/862, while the western and southern sites were the subjects of two previously approved applications (No. A/NE-LYT/858 and 832 respectively), with SH grant applications being processed by LandsD and remaining vacant at the time. Hence, the Sites could not be regarded as infill sites. As there were no existing NTEHs/SHs to the immediate west and south of the application site of application No. A/NE-LYT/863, it could not be regarded as an infill site even if the proposed NTEH/SH of application No. A/NE-LYT/862 to its north was built. Each application for NTEH/SH would be considered individually, taking into account the latest planning circumstances including the most recent developments in the surrounding area.

Deliberation Session

45. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject each of the applications. The reasons were:

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” zone which is primarily to retain and safeguard good quality

agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes and to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention; and

- (b) land is still available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Kwan Tei which is primarily intended for Small House development. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House developments within the “V” zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services.”

Agenda Items 13 and 14

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-LYT/864 Proposed Five Houses (New Territories Exempted Houses - Small Houses) in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 966 S.A, 966 S.B, 966 S.C, 967 S.A and 967 S.B in D.D. 83, Tung Kok Wai, Lung Yeuk Tau, Fanling (RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LYT/864)

A/NE-LYT/865 Proposed Two Houses (New Territories Exempted Houses - Small Houses) in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 978 S.A and 978 S.B in D.D. 83, Tung Kok Wai, Lung Yeuk Tau, Fanling
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LYT/865)

46. The Committee agreed that as the two applications for proposed five houses (New Territories Exempted Houses (NTEHs) – Small Houses (SHs)) (No. A/NE-LYT/864) and proposed two houses (NTEHs – SHs) (No. A/NE-LYT/865) were similar in nature and the application sites were located adjacent to each other within the same “Agriculture” zone, they could be considered together.

Presentation and Question Sessions

47. With the aid of some plans, Mr Peter P.L. Ngan, ATP/STN, 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 Papers. The Planning Department did not support the applications.

48. Members had no question on the applications.

Deliberation Session

49. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the applications. The reasons for each application were:

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” zone which is primarily to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes and to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention; and
- (b) land is still available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zones of Lung Yeuk Tau village cluster which are primarily intended for Small House development. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within the “V” zones for a more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services.”

Agenda Items 22 and 23

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-TKLN/105 Proposed Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Construction Materials for a Period of 3 Years in “Recreation” Zone, Lots 489 and 490 (Part) in D.D. 80 and Adjoining Government Land, Ta Kwu Ling North (RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TKLN/105A)

A/NE-TKLN/107 Proposed Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Construction Materials for a Period of 3 Years in “Recreation” Zone, Lots 488 and 576 in D.D. 80 and Adjoining Government Land, Ta Kwu Ling North (RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TKLN/107A)

50. The Committee agreed that as the two applications each for proposed temporary warehouse for storage of construction materials for a period of 3 years submitted by the same applicant were similar in nature and the application sites were located adjacent to each other within the same “Recreation” zone, they could be considered together.

Presentation and Question Sessions

51. With the aid of some plans, Mr Timothy W.P. Wu, TP/STN, briefed Members on the background of the applications, the proposed uses, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Papers. The Planning Department had no objection to the applications.

52. Members had no question on the applications.

Deliberation Session

53. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the applications on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 5.12.2028, on the terms of the applications as submitted to the Town Planning Board and subject to the approval conditions stated in the Papers. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Papers.

Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East District

[Mr Adrian Y.G. To, Senior Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (STP/FSYLE), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 42

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-PH/1058 Temporary Religious Institution (Mosque) with Ancillary Facilities and Associated Filling of Land for a Period of 5 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 2813 (Part), 2875 (Part), 2876 (Part), 2878 (Part) and 2879 (Part) in D.D. 111 and Adjoining Government Land, Pat Heung, Yuen Long

(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-PH/1058B)

Presentation and Question Sessions

54. With the aid of some plans, Mr Adrian Y.G. To, 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.

55. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

56. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years until 5.12.2030, 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.

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

Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West District

[Mr Dino W.L. Tang, Senior Town Planner/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (STP/TMYLW), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 57

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TYST/1323 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 (Part), 981 RP (Part), 982 RP (Part), 983 S.B (Part), 983 RP and 984 RP (Part) in D.D. 121, Tong Yan San Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/1323A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

57. With the aid of some plans, Mr Dino W.L. Tang, STP/TMYLW, 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.

58. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

59. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 5.12.2028, 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 representative for attending the meeting. He left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 64

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

60. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 4:35 p.m.

**Minutes of 778th Rural and New Town Planning Committee
(held on 5.12.2025)**

Deferral Cases

Requests for Deferment by Applicant for 2 Months

| Item No. | Application No.* | Times of Deferment |
|-----------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| 4 | Y/NE-KLH/4 | 1 st |
| 6 | A/I-TCV/28 | 2 nd [^] |
| 8 | A/NE-FTA/262 | 2 nd [^] |
| 9 | A/NE-FTA/264 | 2 nd [^] |
| 10 | A/NE-LYT/853 | 2 nd [^] |
| 16 | A/NE-TK/837 | 2 nd [^] |
| 18 | A/NE-LK/164 | 1 st |
| 19 | A/NE-LK/165 | 1 st |
| 24 | A/NE-TKLN/110 | 1 st |
| 25 | A/NE-TKLN/111 | 1 st |
| 27 | A/YL-KTN/1160 | 1 st |
| 29 | A/YL-KTN/1174 | 1 st |
| 31 | A/YL-KTN/1176 | 1 st |
| 33 | A/YL-KTN/1180 | 1 st |
| 34 | A/YL-KTS/1079 | 2 nd [^] |
| 36 | A/YL-SK/422 | 2 nd [^] |
| 39 | A/YL-SK/437 | 1 st |
| 43 | A/YL-PH/1075 | 2 nd [^] |
| 44 | A/YL-PH/1077 | 2 nd [^] |
| 45 | A/YL-PH/1090 | 1 st |
| 46 | A/YL-PH/1091 | 1 st |
| 47 | A/YL-PH/1092 | 1 st |
| 48 | A/YL-PH/1093 | 1 st |
| 49 | A/HSK/586 | 1 st |
| 50 | A/HSK/588 | 1 st |
| 51 | A/YL-LFS/563 | 2 nd [^] |
| 53 | A/YL-LFS/576 | 1 st |
| 54 | A/YL-LFS/577 | 1 st |
| 56 | A/YL-TYST/1318 | 2 nd [^] |
| 63 | A/YL-TT/742 | 1 st |

Note:

[^] The 2nd Deferment as requested by the applicant(s) 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 | |
|-----------------|---|--|
| 4 | The application site was located near Tai Wo. | - Dr Venus Y.H. Lun for co-owning with spouse a property in the vicinity of the application site |

The Committee noted that Dr Venus Y.H. Lun 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/778_rnt_agenda.html for details of the planning applications.

**Minutes of 778th Rural and New Town Planning Committee
(held on 5.12.2025)**

Renewal Cases

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

| Item No. | Application No. | Renewal Application | Renewal Period |
|-----------------|------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| 41 | A/YL-MP/400 | Temporary Car Trading Use in “Commercial/Residential” and “Residential (Group D)” Zones, Lot 3250 S.B ss.44 (Part) in D.D. 104, Mai Po, Yuen Long | 14.12.2025 to 13.12.2028 |
| 60 | A/YL-TYST/1340 | Temporary Shop and Services (Motor-vehicle Showroom) in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 1543 (Part) in D.D. 121, Shan Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long | 10.12.2025 to 9.12.2028 |

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

| Item No. | Application No. | Renewal Application | Renewal Period |
|-----------------|------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| 35 | A/YL-KTS/1103 | Temporary Animal Boarding Establishment and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Government Land in D.D. 103, Ko Po San Tsuen, Kam Tin, Yuen Long | 19.12.2025 to 18.12.2030 |

Declaration of Interest

The Committee noted the following declaration of interest:

| Item No. | Member’s Declared Interest | |
|-----------------|---|---|
| 41 | The application site was located in 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 under Item 41, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

**Minutes of 778th Rural and New Town Planning Committee
(held on 5.12.2025)**

Cases for Streamlining Arrangement

(a) Applications approved on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 5.12.2028

| Item No. | Application No. | Planning Application |
|-----------------|------------------------|---|
| 15 | A/NE-KLH/658 | Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicle) and Associated Filling of Land in “Village Type Development” and “Agriculture” Zones, Various Lots in D.D. 9, Yuen Leng, Tai Po |
| 17 | A/NE-LT/785 | Temporary Private Vehicle Park (Private Cars Only) in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 276 S.B RP in D.D. 8, Tai Yeung Che, Lam Tsuen, Tai Po |
| 21 | A/NE-TKL/821 | Temporary Open Storage of Construction Materials and Machinery, Containers and Vehicles and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 1344 (Part) and 1345 (Part) in D.D. 82, Ping Che, Ta Kwu Ling |
| 26 | A/YL-KTN/1145 | Proposed Temporary Open Storage of Construction Materials and Machineries and Associated Filling of Land and Pond in “Agriculture” Zone, Various Lots in D.D. 107, Kam Tin, Yuen Long |
| 28 | A/YL-KTN/1165 | Temporary Open Storage with Ancillary Facilities and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 1257 (Part) in D.D. 107, Kam Tin North, Yuen Long |
| 30 | A/YL-KTN/1175 | Proposed Temporary Warehouse (Excluding Dangerous Goods Godown) with Ancillary Facilities and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 1151 in D.D. 107, Fung Kat Heung, Kam Tin, Yuen Long |
| 32 | A/YL-KTN/1178 | Temporary Warehouse (Excluding Dangerous Goods Godown) with Ancillary Facilities and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 1222 S.B, 1224 S.C and 1225 S.A in D.D. 107, Fung Kat Heung, Kam Tin, Yuen Long |
| 37 | A/YL-SK/430 | Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicle) and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 1054 S.B and 1056 S.B (Part) in D.D. 106 and Adjoining Government Land, Shek Kong, Yuen Long |
| 40 | A/YL-MP/399 | Proposed Temporary Shop and Services (Sale of Electric Goods Vehicles) and Electric Goods Vehicle Charging Station and Associated Filling of Land in “Recreation” Zone, Lots 2942 S.A RP (Part), 2952 and 2953 in D.D. 104, Mai Po, Yuen Long |
| 52 | A/YL-LFS/575 | Temporary Eating Place in “Recreation” Zone, Lots 2098, 2099, 2100 (Part), 2101 S.A (Part), 2101 S.B (Part) and 2116 (Part) in D.D. 129, Lau Fau Shan, Yuen Long |

| Item No. | Application No. | Planning Application |
|----------|-----------------|--|
| 58 | A/YL-TYST/1337 | Temporary Warehouse and Open Storage of Construction Machinery and Construction Materials in “Residential (Group C)” Zone, Lots 1319, 1320 S.A, 1320 RP, 1321 S.A, 1321 S.B and 1322 (Part) in D.D. 119, Tong Yan San Tsuen, Yuen Long |
| 59 | A/YL-TYST/1339 | Proposed Temporary Warehouse (Non-Dangerous Goods) in “Undetermined” Zone, Lots 835 S.A, 835 S.B (Part), 836 (Part) and 837 (Part) in D.D. 119, Pak Sha Tsuen, Yuen Long |
| 61 | A/YL-TT/723 | Proposed Temporary Shop and Services in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 1562 S.B ss.2 S.E RP in D.D. 119, Tai Tong, Yuen Long |
| 62 | A/YL-TT/740 | Proposed Temporary Shop and Services in “Residential (Group D)” Zone, Lots 4055, 4056 (Part) and 4057 in D.D. 116 and Adjoining Government Land, Tai Kei Leng, Yuen Long |

(b) Applications approved on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years until 5.12.2030

| Item No. | Application No. | Planning Application |
|----------|-----------------|--|
| 20 | A/NE-TKL/820 | Temporary Animal Boarding Establishment with Ancillary Facilities and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 137 in D.D. 79, Ping Che |
| 38 | A/YL-SK/436 | Temporary Shop and Services (Real Estate Agency) with Ancillary Office in “Residential (Group C)” Zone, Lot 291 S.B in D.D. 112 and Adjoining Government Land, Yuen Long |

Declaration of Interests

The Committee noted the following declaration of interests:

| Item No. | Members’ Declared Interests | |
|----------|--|--|
| 15 | The application site was located near Yuen Leng. | - Dr Venus Y.H. Lun for co-owning with spouse a property in the vicinity of the application site |
| 40 | The application site was located in Mai Po. | - Mr K.W. Leung for owning a property in Mai Po |

The Committee noted that Dr Venus Y.H. Lun had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As the property owned by Mr K.W. Leung had no direct view of the application site under Item 40, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.