

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 780<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee held at 2:30 p.m. on 9.1.2026**

#### **Present**

Director of Planning Mr C.K. Yip	Chairperson
Mr Daniel K.S. Lau	Vice-chairperson
Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho	
Mr Timothy K.W. Ma	
Mr Daniel K.W. Chung	
Mr Ryan M.K. Ip	
Mr Rocky L.K. Poon	
Professor B.S. Tang	
Mr Simon Y.S. Wong	
Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West, Transport Department Ms Vilian W.L. Sum	
Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department Mr Bond C.P. Chow	

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory North),  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr William H.K. Lung

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**

Mr K.W. Leung

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Dr C.M. Cheng

**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 Karen K.Y. Tsui

**Agenda Item 1**

Confirmation of Minutes of the 779<sup>th</sup> RNTPC Meeting

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 779<sup>th</sup> RNTPC meeting held on 19.12.2025 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

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

### **Deferral Cases**

#### **Sections 16 Applications**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

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

3. The Committee noted that there were 18 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 two 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 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 15 cases selected for streamlining arrangement and the Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the applications for temporary uses for the applied/recommended periods. Details of the planning applications, Members' declaration of interests for individual cases and the Committee's 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 or the period as recommended by PlanD on the terms of the applications as submitted to the Town Planning Board subject to the approval conditions, if any, stated in the Papers. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicants to note the advisory clauses, if any, as set out in the appendix of the Papers.

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

**Agenda Item 3**

**Section 12A Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Y/YL-KTN/7      Application for Amendment to the Approved Kam Tin North Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-KTN/11, To rezone the application site from “Industrial (Group D)”, “Residential (Group A)” and “Agriculture” to “Residential (Group A)1” and amend the Notes of the zone applicable to the Site, Lots 549 (Part), 550, 551, 552 (Part), 553, 554 S.A & S.B (Part), 556, 557 S.A & S.B, 558, 559 (Part), 560 S.A, 561 S.A, 562 RP, 563 RP, 564, 565 RP and 566 in D.D. 107 and Adjoining Government Land, Fung Kat Heung, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. Y/YL-KTN/7)

---

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

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

[Mr Rico W.K. Tsang, District Planning Officer/Sha Tin, Tai Po and North (DPO/STN), and Mr Louis H.W. Cheung, Senior Town Planner/Sha Tin, Tai Po and North (STP/STN), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

## **Agenda Item 6A**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Sha Tin Outline Zoning Plan No. S/ST/38  
(RNTPC Paper No. 1/26)

---

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

10. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Louis H.W. Cheung, STP/STN, briefed Members on the proposed amendments to the approved Sha Tin Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/ST/38, technical considerations, consultation conducted and departmental comments as detailed in the Paper. Amendment Item A was to take forward a section 12A (s.12A) application No. Y/ST/60 agreed by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Town Planning Board (the Board) on 18.7.2025. The proposed amendments mainly included rezoning of a site located in the eastern foothill fringe of a village cluster at Sheung Wo Che from “Village Type Development” to “Government, Institution or Community (1)”, subject to a maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 1,069m<sup>2</sup>, a maximum building height of 3 storeys and a maximum number of 10,960 niches for columbarium use, to regularise the current religious institution and columbarium uses. There were also amendments to the Notes of the OZP in relation to the above rezoning as well as other amendments including those to align with the latest Master Schedule of Notes to the Statutory Plans.

11. As the presentation of PlanD’s representative had been completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members. Members generally supported the proposed amendments to the OZP and had no questions to raise.

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

13. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

“(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Sha Tin Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/ST/38 as shown on the draft Sha Tin OZP No. S/ST/38A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered as S/ST/39 upon exhibition) and the draft Notes at Attachment III of the Paper are suitable for public exhibition under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance); and

(b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Attachment IV of the Paper for the draft Sha Tin OZP No. S/ST/38A (to be renumbered as S/ST/39 upon exhibition) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Town Planning Board (the Board) for various land use zonings on the OZP and the revised ES will be suitable for exhibition for public inspection together with the OZP.”

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

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

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

## **Agenda Item 8**

### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-KLH/659      Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park with Ancillary Electric Vehicle Charging Facilities and Associated Filling of Land for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 237 S.E RP, 237 S.F RP, 237 S.G RP, 237 S.H, 237 S.I, 237 S.J RP, 237 S.K RP, 237 S.L RP, 237 S.M, 237 S.O RP and 237 S.P RP in D.D. 7, Kau Lung Hang, Tai Po  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-KLH/659A)

---

15.      The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Tai Po. Dr Venus Y.H. Lun had declared an interest for co-owning with spouse a property in the vicinity of the Site. The Committee noted that Dr Venus Y.H. Lun had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

16.      With the aid of some plans, Mr Jeffrey P.K. Wong, 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.

17.      Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the reason for not processing the application under the streamlining arrangement;
- (b) whether the 27 public comments objecting to/expressing concerns about the application were submitted by local residents; and
- (c) whether the Fire Services Department (FSD) had any comments on the application and/or specific requirements on fire service installations (FSI) for electric vehicle (EV) charging facilities.

18. In response, Jeffrey P.K. Wong, STP/STN, with the aid of some plans, made the following main points:

- (a) one of the selection criteria for streamlining adopted by the Committee was that the streamlined cases should have no previously rejected application for the same/similar use (excluding those with subsequent approval). As all of the previous applications at the Site were for vehicle parking use and were rejected by the Committee, the subject application could not be processed under the streamlining arrangement;
- (b) majority of the public comments were submitted by local residents and villagers of Tai Hang Village to the northwest of the Site. The applicant proposed to erect a 2.5m high solid fence wall and retain existing greenery along the northwestern boundary of the Site as environmental and visual mitigation measures. Moreover, to address comments from the Environmental Protection Department (EPD), the proposed number of coaches/heavy goods vehicles parking spaces was reduced and those parking spaces were relocated from the western portion to the southeastern portion of the Site closer to Tai Wo Service Road West, thereby minimising the potential nuisance to the nearby residential dwellings. EPD had no objection to the application; and
- (c) in consideration of the proposed EV charging facilities and ancillary switch rooms and transformer room at the Site, FSD recommended the imposition of approval conditions requiring the applicant to submit a FSI proposal and implement the FSI to its satisfaction should the application be approved.

#### Deliberation Session

19. The Chairperson remarked that while the Site fell within the “Agriculture” zone, the proposed temporary public vehicle park could meet local demand for parking and EV charging needs, and relevant government departments, except the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department, had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application.

20. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 9.1.2029, 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.

[Post-meeting note: Based on the advice of the Director of Fire Services, advisory clause on fire safety aspect should be incorporated for the application. As such, advisory clause (k) was added in Appendix IV of the Paper.]

## **Agenda Item 9**

### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-SSH/166      Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in  
“Green Belt” Zone, Government Land in D.D. 209, Kei Ling Ha San  
Wai, Sai Kung North  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-SSH/166)

---

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

21. 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.

22. Members had no question on the application.

### **Deliberation Session**

23. The Committee noted that there was sufficient land within the “Village Type Development” zone of Kei Ling Ha San Wai to fully meet the Small House demand (both outstanding Small House applications plus 10-year Small House demand), and hence the application did not comply with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for

New Territories Exempted House/Small House in New Territories. Members agreed with PlanD's recommendation not to approve the application.

24. 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 a general presumption against development within this zone. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention;
- (b) the proposed development does not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 for ‘Application for Development within Green Belt Zone under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’ in that the proposed development would involve extensive clearance of existing natural vegetation; and
- (c) the proposed development does not comply with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for New Territories Exempted House/Small House in New Territories in that there is no general shortage of land in meeting the demand for Small House development in the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Kei Ling Ha San Wai. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within the “V” zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services.”

## **Agenda Items 10, 11 and 12**

### **Section 16 Applications**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-TK/844      Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in  
“Agriculture” Zone, Lot 243 S.A ss.1 in D.D. 23, Ting Kok, Tai Po

A/NE-TK/845      Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in  
“Agriculture” Zone, Lot 243 S.A ss.2 in D.D. 23, Ting Kok, Tai Po

A/NE-TK/846      Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in  
“Agriculture” Zone, Lot 243 S.A RP in D.D. 23, Ting Kok, Tai Po  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TK/844 to 846)

---

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

25.      The Committee agreed that as the three applications each for a proposed house (New Territories Exempted House – Small House) were similar in nature and the application sites were located adjacent to one another within the same “Agriculture” zone, they could be considered together.

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

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

27.      Members had no question on the applications.

### **Deliberation Session**

28.      The Chairperson remarked that the proposed Small House footprints fell entirely outside the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone and the village environs’ of San Tau

Kok, Po Sam Pai and Wai Ha. Members agreed with PlanD's recommendation not to approve the applications.

29. 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. It is also intended 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;
- (b) the proposed development does not comply with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for New Territories Exempted House/Small House in New Territories in that more than 50% of the proposed Small House footprint falls outside the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zones and the village ‘environs’ of any recognised villages; and
- (c) land is still available within the “V” zones of San Tau Kok, Po Sam Pai and Wai Ha 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 more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services.”

## **Agenda Item 14**

### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-LYT/867      Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in  
“Agriculture” Zone, Lot 1677 RP in D.D. 76, Leng Pei Tsuen, Fanling  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LYT/867)

---

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

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

31.      Members had no question on the application.

### **Deliberation Session**

32.      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 9.1.2030, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

## **Agenda Item 17**

### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-TKL/822      Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in  
“Agriculture” Zone, Lot 896 S.B ss.1 in D.D. 84, Ta Kwu Ling  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TKL/822)

---

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

34. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

35. The Chairperson remarked that land was still available within the “Village Type Development” zone of Sheung Shan Kai Wat to meet the outstanding Small House applications. Members generally agreed with PlanD’s recommendation not to approve the application.

36. 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, 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 Sheung Shan Kai Wat which is primarily intended for Small House development. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within the “V” zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services.”

[The Chairperson thanked PlanD’s representatives for attending the meeting. They left the

meeting at this point.]

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

[Messrs C.K. Fung and Alexander W.Y. Mak, Senior Town Planners/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (STPs/FSYLE), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

#### **Agenda Item 25**

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

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTN/1162      Proposed Temporary Holiday Camp with Ancillary Facilities and Associated Filling of Land for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 822 and 824 in D.D. 109, Kam Tin North, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTN/1162A)

---

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

37.      With the aid of some plans, Mr C.K. Fung, 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.

38.      In response to the Chairperson’s enquiry, Mr C.K. Fung, STP/FSYLE, said that apart from the previous application No. A/YL-KTN/838 covering the Site and other areas to the north of the Site for temporary hobby farm and holiday camp, and a recently approved application No. A/YL-KTN/1155 for temporary holiday camp to the further south of the Site, there was no other planning application in the immediate surroundings of the Site.

##### **Deliberation Session**

39.      The Chairperson recapitulated that the proposed use was considered not incompatible with the surrounding areas which were rural in character with grassland and

woodland. Members generally supported the application.

40. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 9.1.2029, 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 34**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTS/1104      Proposed Houses (New Territories Exempted House) in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots No. 1906A and 1906B in D.D. 106, Yuen Kong San Tsuen, Pat Heung, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTS/1104)

---

#### **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 development, departmental 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 the Vice-Chairperson’s enquiry regarding the two building lots under application, Mr Alexander W.Y. Mak, STP/FSYLE, said that the two subject lots were granted by way of public auction in 1915 for “Building” purpose. According to the lot history in the Land Registry, the Original Grant and Lease Term could not be traced. The subject application was for two proposed New Territories Exempted Houses (NTEHs) (not Small House) development. The NTEHs would be subject to a maximum building height (BH) of 3 storeys (8.23m).

43. Mr Lawrance S.C. Chan, Assistant Director/Regional 3, Lands Department (LandsD) supplemented that although the original land grant document of the lots might not

be available, LandsD would examine other available information to consider whether there were any development restrictions, including but not limited to BH and built-over area. Should planning approval be given to the subject application, the issue would be handled under existing mechanism for processing application for rebuilding of NTEHs.

### Deliberation Session

44. The Chairperson recapitulated that the proposed development of two NTEHs was considered not incompatible with the surrounding areas and the application site had ‘building status’ under the lease, which warranted favourable consideration of the application.

45. 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 9.1.2030, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

### Agenda Item 36

#### Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTS/1106      Temporary Religious Institution with Ancillary Facilities and Associated Filling of Land for a Period of 5 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 777 RP, 778 RP, 779 RP and 926 in D.D. 103, Kam Tin, Yuen Long

(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTS/1106)

---

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

46. With the aid of some plans, Mr Alexander W.Y. Mak, STP/FSYLE, 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.

47. Members had no question on the application.

## Deliberation Session

48. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years until 9.1.2031, 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**

[Messrs Eric C.Y. Chiu and Dino W.L. Tang and Ms Kennie M.F. Liu, Senior Town Planners/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (STPs/TMYLW), and Mr Aiden S.P. Chu, Town Planner/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

## **Agenda Item 42**

## Section 16 Application

## [Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/TM/601      Proposed House in “Recreation” Zone, Tuen Mun Town Lot 550, Area 45, Tuen Mun  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TM/601A)

## Presentation and Question Sessions

49. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Kennie M.F. Liu, 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.

### *Planning Intention and Site History*

50. A Member enquired why the planning intention, which had constituted a ground for rejection in the previous applications for residential development at the application site (the Site), was no longer considered a matter of concern in the current application. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Ms Kennie M.F. Liu, STP/TMYLW, said that according to the Notes of the Tuen Mun Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), ‘House’ was a Column 2 use in the “Recreation” (“REC”) zone. While respecting the planning intention on the OZP, there was statutory provision which allowed application for ‘House’ use in the “REC” zone to be submitted to the Committee for consideration on a case-by-case basis. The proposed development intensity of the current application had also been reduced when compared with the indicative scheme of the last rejected section 12A (s.12A) application No. Y/TM/31. The maximum plot ratio (PR) had been reduced from 0.4 to 0.2, the number of blocks reduced from three to two, and the total gross floor area had been reduced from 739m<sup>2</sup> to 370m<sup>2</sup>. The application complied with the PR restriction of 0.2 for residential development as stipulated in the Notes of the “REC” zone.

51. The Chairperson supplemented that unlike the previous s.12A application (No. Y/TM/31) which sought to rezone the Site from “REC” to “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”), the long-term planning intention of the “REC” zone would remain valid despite the approval of a section 16 (s.16) application at the Site. Moreover, an s.16 approval would allow the land to revert to recreational use envisaged under “REC” zone should market conditions change in the future.

52. In response to two Members’ enquiries about the rationale for the different PR restrictions for recreational and residential developments (i.e. PR 0.4 and 0.2 respectively) within the “REC” zone, and whether this implied differing environmental and traffic impacts, the Chairperson explained that PR 0.4 was stipulated when the Site was rezoned from “Green Belt” (“GB”) to “REC”. The maximum PR of 0.4 applied to any development except residential development, such as the approved holiday camp (under application No. A/TM/469). However, residential development was subject to a maximum PR of 0.2. As the current application was made under the existing “REC” zone, it was therefore bound by the PR restriction of 0.2 for residential use. The distinction between the two PR restrictions was primarily a planning consideration, intended to provide a greater incentive for

developments that aligned with the planning intention of the zone for recreational purposes, rather than a matter of differing technical impacts.

53. The Vice-chairperson enquired about the rationale for including ‘Flat’ and ‘House’ as Column 2 uses in the “REC” zone. In response, the Chairperson said that ‘Flat’ and ‘House’ uses were included in Column 2 of the Notes for the “REC” zone in accordance with the Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans (MSN). This was a standard provision intended to provide flexibility for the use of land in the “REC” zone.

54. The Chairperson and a Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether relevant government departments had any adverse comments on the technical assessments of the previous s.16 and s.12A applications (i.e. No. A/TM/399 and Y/TM/31 respectively) for the proposed residential development;
- (b) noting that the Site was smaller than the “REC” zone, whether the approved s.16 application for a proposed holiday camp covered the entire “REC” zone;
- (c) whether the previous s.12A application No. Y/TM/11 for rezoning from “GB” to “REC” had included the adjoining Lot 34 in D.D. 300; and
- (d) whether there was any known development plan for the adjoining “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Public Recreation and Sports Centre” (“OU(PRSC)”) zone.

55. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Ms Kennie M.F. Liu, STP/TMYLW, made the following points:

- (a) relevant government departments had no adverse comments on the technical assessments of the previous s.16 and s.12A planning applications for residential development at the Site. The only technical concern raised was the potential interface between the proposed access road and the

existing horse trail, which intersected along the northern boundary of the Site;

- (b) the previously approved s.16 application (i.e. No. A/TM/469) for a proposed holiday camp did not cover the entire “REC” zone;
- (c) Lot 34 in D.D. 300 was an Old Schedule Agricultural Lot and was not included in the s.12A application No. Y/TM/11 for rezoning the Site and its adjoining land to the “REC” zone, which was partially agreed by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Town Planning Board in 2013. Subsequently, the Committee agreed to include the residual area of the “GB” zone in the surroundings (including Lot 34 in D.D. 300) into the “REC” zone of the draft Tuen Mun OZP No. S/TM/32, as it had the same character as the site in the said s.12A application; and
- (d) there was no other known development plan for the adjoining “OU(PRSC)” zone apart from the already developed public recreational facilities.

56. The Chairperson supplemented that the previous application No. A/TM/399 was rejected mainly for the reasons that the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the then “GB” zone; and the proposal involved extensive clearance of existing natural vegetation, causing adverse landscape impact on the surrounding areas. As for the previous application No. Y/TM/31, it was considered appropriate to retain the “REC” zoning of the site for recreational developments for the use of the general public. Relevant government departments had no adverse comment on the technical feasibility of both rejected applications.

#### *Land Status*

57. Noting that the subject lot was a New Grant Lot governed by user restriction, a Member enquired whether a building covenant (BC) was imposed, requiring the lot owner to complete the holiday camp development within a specified period. In response, Ms Kennie M.F. Liu, STP/TMYLW, said that the land exchange for the proposed holiday camp at the Site was executed in 2021 and a BC was imposed. Mr Lawrance S.C. Chan, Assistant

Director/Regional 3, Lands Department (LandsD) supplemented that the BC period would expire by March 2026. Non-compliance with the BC would constitute a breach of the lease conditions and would, among other remedies, render the lot liable to re-entry by the Government. Any application for extension of the BC period would be considered by LandsD in accordance with the prevailing practice and arrangement.

*Proposed Access Road*

58. In view of the extent of tree clearance required for the proposed access road, a Member asked whether the proposed road width was the minimum requirement for emergency vehicular access (EVA). In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Ms Kennie M.F. Liu, STP/TMYLW, said that the proposed 6.1m wide access road (i.e. a 4.5m wide vehicular access with a 1.6m wide footpath) connecting the Site with San Shek Wan Road met the minimum EVA requirement, whereas a width of 7.6m (i.e. a 6m wide vehicular access with a 1.6m wide footpath) was proposed at one section to provide a roadside layby. According to the landscape proposal submitted by the applicant, the trees to be affected along the proposed access road were neither protected species nor 'Old and Valuable Trees', and were generally in poor health. The applicant therefore proposed tree felling and indicated that the road alignment represented the shortest possible route which would minimise the impact on the existing landscape.

59. Ms Vilian W.L. Sum, Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West, Transport Department (TD) supplemented that the proposed width of the access road was required for EVA and having a roadside layby was considered more desirable.

60. In response to the Chairperson's follow-up question on whether the current proposal for the access road and tree compensation were similar to those in the previously approved holiday camp application (No. A/TM/469), Ms Kennie M.F. Liu, STP/TMYLW, said that they were broadly similar. There was no tree located within the Site and the proposed access road would be constructed on government land (GL) outside the Site. The number of trees that would be affected by the proposed access road under the current application was slightly more than that identified in application No. A/TM/469, and correspondingly more trees would be planted within the Site for compensation.

61. Noting that the proposed access road would intersect with the existing horse trail of the Tuen Mun Public Riding School and electronic gates were proposed to be installed at the intersection, a Member enquired about the location of the proposed electronic gates and operational plan to minimise impacts on horses and riders. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Ms Kennie M.F. Liu, STP/TMYLW, said that to ensure safety, two electronic gates would be installed on both sides of the vehicular access at the intersection. A security guard would be stationed to manage the traffic flow by allowing vehicles to proceed to the intersection only when there were no horses/horse riders. Warning signs would also be erected at the intersection for traffic safety.

62. Ms Vilian W.L. Sum, Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West, TD supplemented that should the application be approved and upon submission of more detailed traffic management measures by the applicant, TD would advise the erection of 'Horses Ahead' traffic warning signs to alert drivers that horses/horse riders were likely to be present on or near the access road before the intersecting point.

#### Deliberation Session

63. The Chairperson recapitulated the background and planning history of the Site and its surrounding areas, which were previously zoned "GB" comprising mainly GL and some private lots. On the Government's recommendation to develop the area for recreational use, the surrounding GL of the Site (i.e. excluding the Site and its adjoining Lot 34 in D.D. 300) was rezoned to "OU(PRSC)" for the development of public recreational facilities. The Site was involved in four previous applications submitted by the applicant or its parent company, with the first s.16 application (No. A/TM/399) for residential development rejected in 2010. To align with the planning intention of its surrounding areas, an s.12A application (No. Y/TM/11) for rezoning a larger site (including the Site and its adjoining land) from mainly "GB" to "REC" was submitted, which was partially agreed by the Committee in 2013. The "REC" zoning of the Site had remained unchanged since then. Following the subsequent s.16 application (No. A/TM/469) for a proposed holiday camp at the Site which was approved in 2015, the applicant completed the requisite land exchange and premium payment. However, the applicant later considered the holiday camp proposal financially non-viable. Another s.12A application (No. Y/TM/31) for rezoning the Site from "REC" to "R(C)" to facilitate a residential development with a maximum PR of 0.4 was

submitted, which was not agreed by the Committee in 2024. Subsequently, the current s.16 application for a proposed house development with a PR of 0.2 was submitted. Over the years, the applicant had resolved the technical issues including the interface between the access road and the horse trail, and relevant government departments had no adverse comment on the application. The remaining issue was whether the proposal was considered acceptable in planning terms, taking into account that the proposed house with a PR of 0.2 complied with the development restriction of the “REC” zone for residential development and was considered not incompatible with the surrounding areas. The Chairperson then invited views from Members.

64. In view that ‘Holiday Camp’ and ‘House’ uses were likely to have similar environmental, traffic, visual and landscape impacts, a Member enquired about the rationale for a two-tier PR system (i.e. maximum PR of 0.2 for residential development and 0.4 for other developments) in the “REC” zone. The Secretary said that the maximum PR of 0.2 for residential development in the “REC” zone was a standard provision in accordance with the MSN, while the maximum PR of 0.4 for other developments was initially proposed by the applicant under the s.12A application No. Y/TM/11 and was subsequently adopted in the OZP amendment. The distinction was therefore not based on differing potential technical impacts, but rather on the historical background of the Site and the “REC” zoning.

65. Some Members observed that the applicant had consistently intended to pursue residential development at the Site and had addressed the technical requirements satisfactorily over the years. A Member expressed concern that as the Site had been rezoned from “GB” to “REC” under a previous s.12A application and while residential uses were included in Column 2 of the “REC” zone, the current application, if agreed by the Committee, might set a precedent and have wider implications by encouraging similar strategies of seeking rezoning followed by s.16 application for residential development in other rural areas, which required careful consideration. Another member concurred.

66. A few Members expressed reservation on the application mainly on the ground that the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the “REC” zone. Given that there were a number of public recreational facilities in the surroundings, it was considered more appropriate to retain the Site for recreational use. The applicant’s claim of financial non-viability of the holiday camp was not substantiated with supporting information.

Furthermore, the previous applications for residential developments at the Site were not supported by the Committee. Approval of the current application could also encourage the expansion of residential development to the remaining portion of the “REC” zone.

67. In response to a Member’s enquiry, the Chairperson explained that in the rural areas, many “REC” sites were under private ownership without any government implementation plan and therefore relied on private development initiatives. Applications for uses such as residential development at a reasonable scale on suitable sites would be considered based on the justifications submitted by the applicants and individual merits, taking into account relevant factors including land use compatibility, technical feasibility and the latest planning circumstances, etc. The approval of residential development within “REC” zone was not unprecedented.

68. A Member observed that the Site was small and might be financially difficult to sustain a holiday camp. Another Member said that financial considerations should not be a factor in the consideration of planning applications. The Secretary supplemented that in the previous s.12A application for residential development, one of the applicant’s justifications for not pursuing a recreational use at the Site was also based on financial considerations, which the Committee at that time had not accepted.

69. The Vice-chairperson and some Members expressed support for the application. They were of the view that after the Site was rezoned from “GB” to “REC”, the planning intention had changed from ‘a general presumption against development’ to one permitting development. According to the Notes of the OZP for the “REC” zone, ‘House’ was a Column 2 use, which provided flexibility for considering residential use. The planning circumstances justifying this flexibility remained unchanged. The current application complied with the stipulated development restrictions, i.e. a PR of 0.2 and a building height (BH) of 2 storeys, and would not generate adverse environmental impact. Besides, the Site was situated within an established cluster of public recreational facilities and its unique site context and planning circumstances, including being some remaining private land surrounded by those public recreational facilities, were different from other “REC” zones in the rural areas. Given its small scale, low-rise nature and compliance with the PR restriction, the proposed development was considered not incompatible with the surrounding context. The proposed ‘House’ development could also maximise land utilisation of the Site, which had

remained idle for years.

70. In response to a Member's question as to whether the proposed access road would be included in the land lease if the application was approved, and how this would affect land premium calculation, the Chairperson said that the road fell within GL. Mr Lawrence S.C. Chan, Assistant Director/Regional 3, LandsD supplemented that a right of way had been given to the lot but the alignment appeared to be different from the proposed access road. In general, the land premium for any lease modification would be assessed taking into account the original lease conditions (including the existing right of way) and the conditions to be modified (including any changes to the right of way).

71. The Chairperson summarised that while Members had diverse views on the application, the majority considered that the application could be approved after a thorough and balanced consideration of the unique circumstances of the case. The Site fell within the "REC" zone, which was a development zone subject to a PR restriction of 0.2 and a BH restriction of 2 storeys for residential development upon application as stipulated in the Notes of the OZP. The proposed development complied with the development restrictions, various technical assessments submitted by the applicant demonstrated no adverse impacts, and relevant government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. The proposed house was considered not incompatible with the surrounding context and no significant adverse visual impact was anticipated. Approval of the application could facilitate the optimisation and realisation of the development potential of the Site. Unlike the previous s.12A application (No. Y/TM/31) to rezone the Site from "REC" to "R(C)", the long-term planning intention of the "REC" zone remained relevant despite the approval of the application. Whilst the financial viability of a proposed development was not a factor in determining the approval of a planning application, the practical challenges associated with the implementation of recreational developments at such a small site within the "REC" zones in general were acknowledged.

72. 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 9.1.2030, 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 condition 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 Timothy K.W. Ma left the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 43**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-HTF/1202      Proposed Temporary Godown for Electronic Product Recycling with Ancillary Office and Associated Filling of Land for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 384 RP in D.D. 128, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-HTF/1202)

---

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

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

74.      Members had no question on the application.

#### **Deliberation Session**

75.      After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 9.1.2029, 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 45**

### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-PS/765      Proposed Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Hobby Farm) for a Period of 3 Years in “Green Belt” Zone, Lots 914, 915, 916 (Part) and 917 (Part) in D.D. 122, Ping Shan, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-PS/765)

---

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

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

77.      Members had no question on the application.

### **Deliberation Session**

78.      After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 9.1.2029, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board and subject to the approval conditions stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

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

## **Agenda Item 51**

### **Any Other Business**

[Open Meeting]

79.      There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 4:30 p.m.

**Minutes of 780<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee  
(held on 9.1.2026)**

**Deferral Cases**

Requests for Deferment by Applicant for 2 Months

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.*</b>	<b>Times of Deferment</b>
5	A/SLC/197	1 <sup>st</sup>
6	A/SLC/198	1 <sup>st</sup>
15	A/NE-MKT/57	1 <sup>st</sup>
15A	A/NE-MUP/219	2 <sup>nd</sup> ^
19	A/NE-TKLN/109	2 <sup>nd</sup> ^
21	A/NE-TKLN/113	1 <sup>st</sup>
22	A/YL-MP/394	2 <sup>nd</sup> ^
26	A/YL-KTN/1168	2 <sup>nd</sup> ^
27	A/YL-KTN/1181	1 <sup>st</sup>
28	A/YL-KTN/1184	1 <sup>st</sup>
31	A/YL-KTS/1088	2 <sup>nd</sup> ^
32	A/YL-KTS/1101	1 <sup>st</sup>
33	A/YL-KTS/1102	1 <sup>st</sup>
35	A/YL-KTS/1105	1 <sup>st</sup>
37	A/YL-KTS/1107	1 <sup>st</sup>
39	A/YL-SK/435	1 <sup>st</sup>
46	A/YL-TYST/1327	2 <sup>nd</sup> ^
49	A/YL-TT/750	1 <sup>st</sup>

Note:

<sup>^</sup> The 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 Interests**

The Committee noted the following declaration of interests:

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Members' Declared Interests</b>	
5 & 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The applications were submitted by CLP Power Hong Kong Limited (CLP).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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</li> </ul>
22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The application site was located in Mai Po.</li> <li>- The application was submitted by Profit Point Enterprises Limited, a subsidiary of Henderson Land Development Company Limited (HLD).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mr K.W. Leung for owning a property in Mai Po</li> <li>- Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho for having current business dealings with HLD</li> <li>- 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 Henderson Group</li> </ul>

The Committee noted that Mr K.W. Leung had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As Mr Ryan M.K. Ip had no involvement in the projects under the sponsorship of CLP and Henderson Group in relation to Items 5 and 6 and Item 22 respectively, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting. As the interest of Vincent K.Y. Ho was considered direct, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion for Item 22.

*\* Refer to the agenda at [https://www\(tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/RNTPC/Agenda/780\\_rnt\\_agenda.html](https://www(tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/RNTPC/Agenda/780_rnt_agenda.html) for details of the planning applications.*

**Minutes of 780<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee  
(held on 9.1.2026)**

**Renewal Cases**

Applications for renewal of temporary approval for 3 years

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Renewal Application</b>	<b>Renewal Period</b>
18	A/NE-TKL/823	Temporary Private Car Park in “Agriculture” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lot 365 S.C (Part) in D.D. 84, Tai Po Tin Village, Ping Che	12.3.2026 to 11.3.2029
24	A/STT/30	Temporary Eating Place (Outside Seating Accommodation of a Restaurant) in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 673 S.C (Part) in D.D. 99 and Adjoining Government Land, San Tin, Yuen Long	14.1.2026 to 13.1.2029

**Minutes of 780<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee  
(held on 9.1.2026)**

**Cases for Streamlining Arrangement**

(a) Applications approved on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 9.1.2029

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Planning Application</b>
4	A/SK-PK/314	Temporary Shop and Services with Ancillary Office in “Recreation” Zone, Lots 767, 769 and 770 (Part) in D.D. 217, Tai Chung Hau Road Track, Sai Kung
13	A/NE-LT/783	Temporary Private Vehicle Park (Private Cars Only) in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lots 1036 S.A, 1156, 1157 S.A, 1168 S.A and 1169 S.A in D.D. 19, Lam Tsuen San Tsuen, Tai Po
16	A/NE-MUP/220	Temporary Logistics Centre and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 25 S.A, 26 S.A and 27 (Part) in DD. 38, Lots 804 (Part), 806, 807, 808, 809, 811, 812, 813, 823 S.B RP, 824 S.B RP, 825, 826 (Part), 827, 828 S.B RP in D.D. 46 and Adjoining Government Land, Sha Tau Kok
23	A/YL-MP/402	Proposed Temporary Shop and Services in “Residential (Group D)” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lot 3250 S.B ss.43 S.A (Part) in D.D. 104, Mai Po, Yuen Long
29	A/YL-KTN/1185	Temporary Site Office and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 84 (Part), 85 S.A RP (Part), 85 S.C (Part), 86 RP (Part) and 113 (Part) in D.D. 110, Kam Tin, Yuen Long
30	A/YL-KTN/1186	Proposed Temporary Open Storage with Ancillary Facilities and Associated Filling of in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 1397 (Part) in D.D. 107, Kam Tin North, Yuen Long
38	A/YL-NSW/359	Temporary Open Storage of Construction Equipment and Materials with Ancillary Vehicle Park, Office and Storage Facilities in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Comprehensive Development To Include Wetland Restoration Area (2)”, “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Soy Sauce Factory” and “Open Space” Zones, Lot 1743 S.C RP (Part) in D.D. 107, Castle Peak Road, Sha Po, Yuen Long
41	A/HSK/590	Proposed Temporary Open Storage of Construction Materials, Machinery and Vehicles with Ancillary Facilities in “Open Space” and “Residential (Group A) 3” Zones, Lots 1824 S.B RP (Part) and 1824 S.C (Part) in D.D. 125, Hung Shui Kiu, Yuen Long
44	A/YL-PS/764	Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Private Cars) and Open Storage of Construction Machinery and Construction Materials and Associated Filling of Land in “Recreation” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lots 106 (Part), 107 (Part), 289 (Part), 293 (Part), 294 (Part), 295 (Part), 301 (Part), 302 (Part) and 319 (Part) in D.D. 126, Fung Ka Wai, Ping Shan, Yuen Long
48	A/YL-TT/747	Temporary Eating Place (Outside Seating Accommodation of a Restaurant) in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lots 1187 S.N (Part) and 1187 RP (Part) in D.D. 117, Tai Tong Shan Road, Yuen Long

Item No.	Application No.	Planning Application
50	A/YL-TT/752	Proposed Temporary Warehouse (Excluding Dangerous Goods Godown) and Open Storage of Construction Materials and Vehicles (Private Cars and Light Goods Vehicles) with Ancillary Office in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Rural Use” Zone, Lots 839 S.A (Part) and 840 (Part) in D.D. 117, Tai Tong, Yuen Long

(b) Applications approved on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years until 9.1.2031

Item No.	Application No.	Planning Application
7	A/ST/1043	Shop and Services (Fast Food Shop) in “Industrial” Zone, Unit A01a, Portion of Unit A, G/F, Unison Industrial Centre, 27-31 Au Pui Wan Street, Fo Tan, Sha Tin
20	A/NE-TKLN/112	Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicle) and Shop and Services in “Recreation” Zone, Lots 35 RP, 36, 42 RP, 43, 44, 45 RP, 59 RP and 64 S.B RP in D.D. 80 and Adjoining Government Land, Lin Ma Hang Road, Ta Kwu Ling North
40	A/HSK/589	Temporary Shop and Services in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 1583 RP (Part) in D.D. 125, Tin Ha Road, Hung Shui Kiu, Yuen Long
47	A/YL-TYST/1341	Temporary Eating Place (Restaurant with Ancillary Outside Seating Accommodation) in “Residential (Group B) 1” Zone, Lots 1355 RP and 1356 RP (Part) in D.D. 121, Tong Yan San Tsuen, Yuen Long

### **Declaration of Interests**

The Committee noted the following declaration of interests:

Item No.	Members' Declared Interests	
7	The application premises was located in Fo Tan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mr Daniel K.W. Chung for co-owning with spouse a property and a car parking space in Fo Tan</li> <li>- Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho for co-owning with spouse a property in Fo Tan</li> <li>- Mr Lawrence S.C. Chan for co-owning with spouse a property in Fo Tan</li> <li>- Ms Vilian W.L. Sum for her spouse owning a property in Fo Tan</li> </ul>
13	The application site was located in Lam Tsuen.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau for his spouse being one of the owners of a property in Lam Tsuen</li> </ul>
23	The application site was located in Mai Po.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mr K.W. Leung for owning a property in Mai Po</li> </ul>

The Committee noted that Mr K.W. Leung had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As the properties co-owned by Messrs Daniel K.W. Chung, Vincent K.Y. Ho and Lawrence S.C. Chan with their spouses and the property owned by the spouse of Ms Vilian W.L. Sum were not in the vicinity of the application premises under Item 7, and the property of Mr Daniel K.S. Lau's spouse had no direct view of the application site under Item 13, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.