

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 795th Meeting of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee held at 2:30 p.m. on 11.9.2026

Present

Director of Planning
Mr C.K. Yip

Chairperson

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Vice-chairperson

Dr C.M. Cheng

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip

Professor B.S. Tang

Mr Simon Y.S. Wong

Mr Eric C.B. Chan

Dr Kelvin K.Y. Leung

Mr Wilson H.K. Shum

Mr Gary X.Y. Zhang

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

Chief Engineer (Works),
Home Affairs Department
Mr Karl K.L. Kwan
Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory North),
Environmental Protection Department

Mr Raymond L.Y. Lai

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

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr K.K. Lee

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Loree L.Y. Duen

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 794th RNTPC Meeting

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 794th RNTPC meeting held on 28.8.2026 were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Deferral Cases

Sections 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Presentation and Question Sessions

3. The Committee noted that there were 24 cases requesting the Town Planning Board to defer consideration of the applications. Details of the requests for deferral, Members' declaration of interests for individual cases and the Committee's views on the declared interests were in **Annex 1**.

Deliberation Session

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

Renewal Cases

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Presentation and Question Sessions

5. The Committee noted that there were four cases for renewal of temporary planning approval and the Planning Department had no objection to the applications for the further 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.

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

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 14 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.

Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East District

Agenda Item 3

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Y/YL-KTN/6 Application for Amendment to the Approved Kam Tin North Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-KTN/11, To rezone application sites from “Residential (Group C) 2” and “Open Space” to “Residential (Group C) 4” (Site 1) and from “Residential (Group C) 2” to “Open Space ” (Site 2) and amend the Notes of the zone applicable to Site 1, Lots 121, 137, 138, 139 S.A, 139 RP (Part), 519 RP (Part) and 520 RP in D.D. 110 and Adjoining Government Land, Shek Kong, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. Y/YL-KTN/6B)

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

Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo	-	District Planning Officer/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (DPO/FSYLE)
Mr Jeffrey P.K. Wong	-	Senior Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (STP/FSYLE)
Ms Andrea W.Y. Yan	-	Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East

Applicants’ Representatives

KTA Planning Limited

Ms Pauline Lam

Ms Camille Lam

Mott MacDonald Hong Kong Limited

Ms Edith Chow

Westwood Hong & Associates Limited

Ms Kit Wong

CTA Consultants Limited

Mr Horace Mak

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, Mr Jeffery P.K Wong, STP/FSYLE, briefed members on the background of the application, the proposed rezoning of the application sites (the Sites) from "Residential (Group C) 2" ("R(C)2") and "Open Space" ("O") to "Residential (Group C) 4" ("R(C)4") (Site 1) and from "R(C)2" to "O" (Site 2) to facilitate a proposed private residential development at Site 1 and the provision of open space by the Government at Site 2, departmental 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 review the land use zoning boundaries and stipulate the appropriate development restrictions in the Notes of the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP).

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

Rezoning Proposal and Previous Application

(a) the rezoning application involved rezoning Site 1 from "R(C)2" and "O" to

‘R(C)4’ subject to maximum domestic gross floor area (GFA) and building height (BH) restrictions, and rezoning Site 2 from “R(C)2” to “O”;

- (b) the Sites were subject to a previous application (No. Y/YL-KTN/4), which was submitted in July 2022 but subsequently withdrawn in February 2025, as the then rezoning proposal involved rezoning a portion of the “O” zone for residential development, resulting in an overall shortage of open space in the OZP. Strong local objections were received as the local paths within the “R(C)2” zone serving the adjoining rural settlements would be detoured. The current proposal, involving the swapping of the “R(C)” and “O” zonings of the Sites, would facilitate a proposed private residential development at Site 1. Site 2 was considered less suitable for residential development given its irregular shape, its lack of a direct frontage to Kam Tin Road and the constraint on vehicular access posed by the mature tree (i.e. *Ficus macrocarpa*) (細葉榕) to the south within the “O” zone, and could be rezoned to “O” for open space development which allowed greater development flexibility. The existing footpaths and watercourse within Site 2 would be unaffected. The integration of the proposed “O” zone between Site 1 and Site 2 with the remaining “O” zone to the west would form an “O” zone of considerable size, covering about 2.6 hectares (ha). Private lots in Site 2 would remain in status quo until the “O” zone was implemented by the Government in the future;

The Site and Its Surroundings

- (c) from a territorial perspective, the Site was located within the Northern Metropolis (NM), which would serve as a new engine for the future development of Hong Kong and would be one of the main sources of future housing supply over the next 20 years. From a district perspective, Site 1 was suitable for low-density suburban township as it was located within a rural settlement in the Kam Tin area and was accessible to the nearby MTR Kam Sheung Road Station (about 1 km away) by franchised bus and minibuses;

- (d) the surrounding areas were suburban in character. To the north of Site 1 was predominantly a low-rise, low-density residential development, namely Seasons Villas, and to the northwest and southwest of Site 2 were rural settlements. Both Site 1 and Site 2 were vacant land covered by vegetation. There were local footpaths providing access to the rural settlements to the northwest of Site 2;

Implementation Programme of the “O” Zone

- (e) there were two major “O” zones on the Kam Tin North OZP with a total land area of about 4.45 ha of which about 65% was private land. There was no implementation programme for the provision of open space in the concerned “O” zone (including the part within Site 1) since the gazettal of the first Kam Tin North OZP in 1994. The swapping proposal under the application could unleash the development potential of land covered by the unimplemented “O” zone, resulting in a net increase of about 0.38 ha of area zoned “O”;

Indicative Scheme and Technical Assessments

- (f) according to the indicative scheme, the proposed development at Site 1 with a domestic GFA of 8,580m² (equivalent to a plot ratio of 1) comprised six residential towers providing 240 flats. The anticipated completion year was 2031. The proposed BH of 29mPD or six storeys was lower than the highest block of Shek Kong Barracks. Design measures, including a building setback of at least 19m from the southern boundary and 28m from Shek Kong Barracks, podium-free design, a central courtyard design allowing building separation between opposite blocks, an outdoor communal open space and landscape area in the north, a building setback of not less than 5m from site boundaries in all directions with peripheral tree planting to soften the edge, and a 15m building gap between building clusters to allow wind penetration, were proposed to minimise the visual impact on the surrounding areas; and

- (g) in support of the application, technical assessments had been conducted and relevant government departments had no objection to or adverse comment on the application. In terms of traffic mitigation measures, while the provision of an additional franchised minibuss trip per hour was suggested, road improvement works at the junction of Kam Tin Road and Kam Tai Road (including widening Kam Tin Road and adding a right-turn pocket to allow traffic waiting and turning from Kam Tin Road westbound into Kam Tai Road), widening of the northern footpath of Kam Tin Road to at least 2m and provision of a pedestrian crossing near Site 1 would be carried out by the applicants in case of programme mismatch between the proposed development and planned upgrading works at Kam Tin Road by the Government. In terms of visual impact, the photomontages from different viewpoints, such as the bus stop at Kam Tin Road to the southwest and the sitting-out area near the Shek Kong Vegetable Marketing Co-operative Society to the east, demonstrated that the proposed development was compatible with the surrounding environment and would not induce adverse visual impact.

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

The Proposed Development at Site 1

14. A Member enquired about the compatibility of the BH of the proposed development with the surrounding areas which were mainly occupied by low-rise residential developments, such as village houses of not more than 3 storeys and Seasons Villas comprising mainly 2-storey houses, as well as Shek Kong Barracks. In response, Ms Pauline Lam, the applicants' representative, said that in view of the suburban setting around the Sites, such as Shek Kong Barracks with a BH of 11mPD to 40mPD and Seasons Villas with a BH of 16mPD to 25mPD, various design measures, such as peripheral landscape buffer and building setback of about 10m from the closest block of Seasons Villas, were proposed to create a visual buffer. According to the Visual Impact Assessment, significant adverse visual impact arising from the proposed development was not anticipated and the Urban Design and Landscape Section of PlanD had no objection to the application.

15. Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, supplemented that from a district-wide perspective, higher density developments were located in the western part of the Kam Tin North OZP area near the Au Tau Interchange, such as Park Yoho with a BH of not less than 14 storeys. The BHs of the residential developments descended to the east along Kam Tin Road, where most developments were low-rise residential developments and village houses of about 2 to 3 storeys near the proposed development. The BH of 29mPD of the proposed development was not incompatible with the surrounding developments, such as Shek Kong Barracks which consisted of building blocks of more than 30mPD.

16. Another Member asked whether approval of the current application with a BH of 29mPD would set a precedent for similar applications in the area. In response, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that approval of the current application would not set a precedent for future development as each application would be considered on its individual merits. Apart from BH, other factors such as technical feasibility, development intensity and design measures would be assessed to determine whether the development proposal was appropriate from planning perspective. In response to the same Member's enquiry on whether Seasons Villas was developed when Site 1 was zoned "O" on the first Kam Tin North OZP gazetted in 1994, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that the site occupied by Seasons Villas was zoned "R(C)2" on the first Kam Tin North OZP in 1994 and Seasons Villas was subsequently developed in 2003.

Landscape Aspect

17. The Vice-chairperson and a Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the greening of the proposed development could be enhanced, such as by providing rooftop greening, as Site 1 was currently largely vegetated with weeds and trees; and
- (b) noting from the Landscape Master Plan that a BBQ cum entertainment deck and a pocket garden were proposed to the west and east of the landscape

area respectively located at the northern part of the proposed development (Drawing Z-6), whether any consideration had been given to swapping the locations of these two facilities to minimise the possible disturbance to the nearby residents of Seasons Villas.

18. In response, Ms Pauline Lam, the applicants' representative, made the following main points:

- (a) a greenery coverage of not less than 20% was proposed under the current application. Rooftop gardens on the clubhouse and the on-site sewage treatment plant would be provided. The applicants would further liaise with the consultants to enhance the landscape design of the proposed development; and
- (b) the suggestion regarding the disposition of the proposed residents' recreational facilities would be conveyed to the applicants for consideration in detailed design.

19. The Chairperson supplemented that should the application be agreed by the Committee, the public, including residents of Seasons Villas, could make representations during the exhibition of the draft OZP. The applicants might revisit the scheme to minimise potential nuisance to the nearby residents and enhance the landscape provision, such as by providing more at-grade greening along the internal road.

Traffic and Connectivity Aspects

20. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) the timeline for the planned upgrading works for Kam Tin Road by the Government; and
- (b) whether the provision of the right-turn pocket proposed by the applicants could mitigate the potential traffic impacts in the event of a programme mismatch between the proposed development and the planned upgrading works at Kam Tin Road by the Government.

21. In response, Ms Vilian W.L. Sum, Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West (CTE/NTW), Transport Department (TD), made the following main points:

- (a) there was no information at hand about the timeline of the planned upgrading works for Kam Tin Road; and
- (b) the traffic impact arising from the proposed development on the adjacent road network would be acceptable given its low density. As Kam Tin Road was a dual two-lane carriageway, adding a right-turn pocket as proposed by the applicants could allow traffic waiting and turning from Kam Tin Road westbound to Kam Tai Road, which could mitigate the potential traffic impacts.

22. Another Member asked whether consideration could be given to connecting the Sites to enhance local connectivity and accessibility as Site 1 and Site 2 were currently separated by an existing nullah and grassland in between. In response, Ms Pauline Lam, the applicants' representative, said that the Member's suggestion on enhancing the connectivity between the Sites would be conveyed to the applicants for consideration as a potential planning gain for local residents.

Local and Departmental Consultations

23. A Member enquired whether consultation about the development proposal had been conducted with the residents of Seasons Villas. In response, Ms Pauline Lam, the applicants' representative, said that no consultation had been conducted with the residents of Seasons Villas. If the application was approved, the applicants would liaise with the residents of Seasons Villas.

24. The Vice-chairperson asked whether the District Officer (Yuen Long) (DO(YL)), Home Affairs Department had consulted the nearby residents, such as those of Seasons Villas, during the processing of the application. In response, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, said that DO(YL) had been consulted. It was advised that DO(YL) had no comment on the application, and no adverse comments were received by DO(YL) during their local

consultation.

25. In response to a Member's enquiry, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, said that while the Security Bureau had not been consulted on the application, other relevant government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed development.

Proposed Open Space at Site 2

26. Given that there was no implementation programme for the planned open space by the Government, a Member enquired whether the applicants were willing to implement part of the proposed open space or provide some small-scale sports and recreational facilities at Site 2 for the use of the nearby residents. In response, Ms Pauline Lam, the applicants' representative, said that after the swapping of the current "R(C)" and "O" zonings of the Sites, there would be an increase of about 247m² of open space as the applicants had surrendered the private land in the current "R(C)2" zone for open space use at Site 2. Considering that the future property owners of Site 1 might have to finance the operation of the open space and there might be difficulty in engaging a property management agent to manage the open space at Site 2 as it was separated from Site 1 and other properties owned by the applicants, it was considered appropriate to maintain the status quo of Site 2, including the local paths serving the nearby rural settlements. Nevertheless, noting the lack of open space provision in the Kam Tin area, the Member's suggestion would be conveyed to the applicants for consideration at the detailed design stage.

27. With respect to the net increase in open space, the Chairperson supplemented that although the total area of Site 2 was larger than that of Site 1, part of Site 2 was Government land (GL) occupied by an existing watercourse which served as a drainage channel. The net increase of 0.38 ha of open space was in Site 2, including both GL and private land. After deducting GL, the areas of private land owned by the applicants at Site 1 and Site 2 were 8,008m² and 8,255m² respectively, and there was a net increase of open space of about 247m² from private land owned by the applicants.

28. The Vice-chairperson enquired how the status quo of Site 2 could be maintained by the applicants. In response, Ms Pauline Lam, the applicants' representative, said that the

private lots in Site 2 should remain in the status quo until the Government had a programme to resume the land in Site 2 for implementation of the public open space (POS) as per advice from the Lands Department. Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, supplemented that there was no programme for the Government to resume the private lots of Site 2 at this stage and a formal application for land exchange would be made in respect of Site 1 only should the current rezoning application be agreed by the Committee.

29. A Member asked whether approval of the current application would set a precedent for development in the “O” zone on Kam Tin North OZP noting that about 30% of the private land within the current “O” zone was owned by third parties. In response, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, said that the swapping between the “O” and “R(C)” zones as proposed by the applicants would not affect the overall area of “O” zone, even with a net increase in “O” zone resulted, which was one of the major favourable considerations of the current application from the perspectives of land use and district planning. The current application involved only the private lots owned by the applicants and no third-party lot was involved. Each planning application would be assessed on its own individual merits having regard to its proposal. Approval of the current application would not have a bearing on future planning applications submitted for the same “O” zone.

30. The Chairperson enquired if there was any plan for residential development at Site 2 (i.e. the proposed “O” zone). In response, Ms Pauline Lam, the applicants’ representative, said that Site 2 would be rezoned to “O” if the application was agreed by the Committee, and the applicants had no plan to develop Site 2 for residential use.

31. 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

32. The Chairperson recapitulated that the application involved the swapping of the

current “O” and “R(C)2” zonings of Site 1 and Site 2, which only involved private lots under the applicants’ ownership and GL. Given that Site 1 was more regular in shape with a direct frontage to Kam Tin Road and adjoined an existing residential development, and there was no implementation programme for the provision of POS since its designation for “O” in 1994, the proposed rezoning involving a private residential development at Site 1 could unleash its development potential. The private lots in Site 2 were detached from the development of Site 1 and would remain in the status quo until the Government had a plan to resume the land for implementation of the POS. The rezoning proposal would result in a net increase of 0.38 ha of POS, most of which comprised GL, while about 247m² was private land owned by the applicants. While the current “O” zone would be separated into two sections after Site 1 was rezoned to “R(C)”, Site 1 was currently already separated from the eastern portion of “O” zone physically by an existing vehicular access leading to Seasons Villas. The proposed “O” zone at Site 2 could integrate with the current “O” zone between the Sites, thereby forming a coherent “O” zone in the area. While the proposed development intensity with a maximum PR of 1 and a maximum BH of 6 storeys and 29mPD in the indicative scheme for the proposed residential development at Site 1 was higher than that of the existing and planned developments in the vicinity, the applicants had submitted relevant technical assessments to demonstrate that there were no insurmountable adverse impacts on the surrounding areas, and relevant government departments, such as TD and the Environmental Protection Department, had no objection to or adverse comment on the application. He then invited views from Members.

33. The Committee generally supported the application and noted that upon swapping the current “O” and “R(C)2” zonings of the Sites, there would be a net increase in the area of the “O” zone, and the proposed residential development was not incompatible with the surrounding developments, including Shek Kong Barracks.

34. The Committee noted that land exchange would only be applicable to Site 1, which would be rezoned to “R(C)4” if the application was agreed. The private lots in Site 2 would remain in the status quo and were pending resumption by the Government. The applicants would need to approach the Lands Department to make a formal application for land exchange for Site 1.

35. While supporting the application, the Vice-chairperson and two Members had the

following observations and suggestions:

- (a) the status quo of Site 2, including the existing vegetation, nullah and local paths serving the nearby rural settlements, should be maintained until the implementation of the “O” zone by the Government in the future, as committed by the applicants;
- (b) the applicants should explore the possibility of providing recreational and leisure facilities at Site 2 as there was no programme for the Government to resume the land for implementation of the POS; and
- (c) the proposed development could serve as a high-quality residential development within NM, and planning gains, such as increasing the greenery coverage, should be provided to enhance the living environment.

36. The Chairperson concurred with Members’ suggestions that the applicants should explore the provision of planning gains within and outside Site 1, such as enhancing greening, providing more building separation from Seasons Villas, and improving the local access to the surrounding rural settlements and POS, to benefit the local community. The Chairperson proposed and the Committee agreed that PlanD would convey the suggestions to the applicants for consideration and follow-up, as appropriate.

37. After deliberation, the Committee decided to partially agree to the application for swapping of zonings to facilitate the proposed development at Site 1. The appropriate zoning boundaries, development restrictions and other requirements would be worked out by the Planning Department in consultation with relevant government bureaux/departments. The relevant proposed amendments to the Kam Tin North Outline Zoning Plan, together with the revised Notes and Explanatory Statement, would be submitted to the Committee for consideration prior to gazetting under the Town Planning Ordinance.

[Professor B.S. Tang joined the meeting at this point.]

Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West District

Agenda Item 4

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Y/YL-TYST/12 Application for Amendment to the Approved Tong Yan San Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-TYST/14, To rezone the application site from “Comprehensive Development Area” and “Green Belt” to “Residential (Group A) 4” and to amend the Notes of the zone applicable to the site, Lots 398 RP and 2188 in D.D. 121, Tai Tao Tsuen, Hung Shui Kiu, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. Y/YL-TYST/12A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

PlanD

Mr Raymond H.F. Au	-	District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (DPO/TMYLW)
Mr Dino W.L. Tang	-	Senior Town Planner/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (STP/TMYLW)
Mr Jethro K.L. Fung	-	Town Planner/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West

Applicant’s Representatives

Right Fortune Investment Limited - Applicant

Mr Wai Che Hong

Mr Wai Chi Ho

LCH Planning & Development Consultants Limited

Mr Joseph Junior Ho

Ms Haze N.H. Tsang

Ms Winnie H.Y. Guan

LanDes Limited

Mr Ted K.L. Lam

EnviroSolutions & Consulting Limited

Mr Dominic C.Y. Lai

Mr Alex H.Y. Wong

OZZO Technology (Hong Kong) Limited

Ms Lily S.Y. Lin

Ho Tin & Associates Consulting Engineers limited

Mr Lee Kwok Cheung

39. 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 applicant. He then invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the background of the application.

40. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Dino W.L. Tang, STP/TMYLW, briefed members on the background of the application, the proposed rezoning of the application site (the Site) from "Comprehensive Development Area" ("CDA") and "Green Belt" ("GB") to "Residential (Group A) 4" ("R(A)4") to facilitate a proposed private residential-cum-social welfare facility (residential care home for the elderly (RCHE)) development, departmental 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 review the zoning amendments and stipulate appropriate development restrictions in the Notes of the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP).

41. The Chairperson then invited the applicant's representatives to elaborate on the application. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Joseph Junior Ho, the applicant's representative, made the following main points:

The Proposed Development

- (a) the Site fell mainly within an area zoned "CDA" with a portion in the east falling within an area zoned "GB". The Site, currently vacant and fenced off, was the subject of a previously approved application (No. A/YL-TYST/870) for a proposed social welfare facility (RCHE) in 2018, and the land exchange in relation to the proposed RCHE was completed in 2022. In light of the "Incentive Scheme to Encourage Provision of RCHE Premises in New Private Developments" promulgated by the Government, the proposed rezoning was intended to provide more elderly accommodation and care facilities and to optimise land resources by providing private residential units in support of the Government's objective of stabilising private housing supply;
- (b) the current "CDA" and "GB" zones were proposed to be rezoned to "R(A)4" with 'Flat' and 'Social Welfare Facility' as Column 1 uses that were always permitted. Technical assessments had been submitted and relevant government departments had no adverse comment on the proposed development;

The Site and its Surroundings

- (c) the adjoining residential-cum-kindergarten development, known as Uptown, within the same "CDA" zone was subject to a maximum BH of 77mPD. The proposed development with a BH of not more than 60mPD and a plot ratio (PR) of 4.91 (including a domestic PR of 1.65 and a non-domestic PR of 3.26 for the RCHE) was compatible with the surrounding context;
- (d) the Site was strategically located in proximity to the Hung Shui Kiu/Ha Tsuen New Development Area and was well served by existing public

transport facilities. It was expected to be served by the future Smart and Green Mass Transit System. In light of the ongoing ageing population and to address the shortfall in RCHE beds in the Yuen Long District, the proposal was intended to meet a genuine social need;

Justification for the Rezoning Proposal

- (e) in the “CDA” Review exercise, the Committee had agreed that the subject “CDA” zone should be rezoned to other appropriate zoning(s) to reflect the as-built conditions. The portion zoned “GB”, which was owned by the applicant, accounted for only 0.28% of the subject “GB” zone and was physically segregated from the remaining portion of the “GB” zone by an existing footpath and nullah. As such, the proposed rezoning of the minor portion of the “GB” zone would unlikely affect the integrity and function of the “GB” zone;

Technical Aspects

- (f) regarding the proposed access arrangement, separate entrances were proposed for the residential portion and the RCHE. The existing emergency vehicular access (EVA) connecting Castle Peak Road - Hung Shui Kiu and Fui Sha Wai South Road would be used for vehicular access during the construction stage. During the operation stage, a section of Fui Sha Wai South Road would be widened from the existing single-lane access road to a single dual-lane carriageway with a footpath on one side by the applicant at its own cost to serve as vehicular and pedestrian access. Sufficient space for EVA would also be reserved for the third-party lot (i.e. Lot 403 in D.D. 121) adjacent to the Site; and
- (g) the proposed development included the provision of building setbacks from the site boundary to Uptown, building separation of about 14.5m between the two proposed towers, and elderly-friendly building design. A minimum of 20% green coverage and sufficient private open space and tree compensation would be provided.

42. As the presentations of PlanD's representative and the applicant's representative had been completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

Development Restriction

43. A Member enquired about the reason of adopting a BH of 13 storeys for the proposed development which was lower than the permitted BH of 17 storeys for the "CDA" zone. In response, Mr Joseph Junior Ho, the applicant's representative, said that the development was proposed with a PR of not more than 4.91 with RCHE as its major component having considered its compatibility with the surrounding developments. According to Regulation 21 of the Residential Care Homes (Persons with Disabilities) Regulation (Cap. 613A), no part of an RCHE should be situated at a height of more than 24m above the street level. As such, there was a design constraint on further increasing the BH of the proposed development.

Operation of the RCHE

44. The Vice-chairperson and a Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the proposed RCHE would be self-financed or subsidised by government funding; and
- (b) the operational arrangement of the RCHE.

45. In response, Messrs Wai Chi Hong and Joseph Junior Ho, the applicant's representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed RCHE would be self-financed and privately operated in accordance with the regulations and requirement by the Social Welfare Department (SWD); and
- (b) the applicant had liaised with various operators and organisations in Hong Kong and Chinese Mainland which were interested in providing elderly

services. The applicant would collaborate with suitable operators to operate the proposed RCHE.

46. In response to a Member's question on whether there was a legal obligation for the applicant if the RCHE could not proceed, in particular after the flats of the proposed residential development were sold, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, said that PlanD would review and formulate appropriate zoning amendments, including the details of the relevant development restrictions, such as the maximum PR/gross floor area (GFA) for the domestic portion and the non-domestic portion, to be set out in the Notes and/or the Explanatory Statement of the OZP should the application be agreed by the Committee. The applicant should follow the development restrictions as stipulated in the OZP when proceeding with its development proposal. The applicant had to follow the maximum PR of 1.65 for the domestic portion if stipulated on OZP, even if the RCHE did not eventually proceed. If the RCHE could no longer continue its operation after the proposed development was realised, there was basically no mechanism to require the applicant to keep providing an RCHE at the Site under the planning regime. The Chairperson supplemented that the applicant would need to comply with the requirements on the land lease, such as the user and GFA restrictions and the building covenant period.

Traffic Aspect

47. Noting that seven private car parking spaces was proposed for 72 flats in the proposed development, a Member enquired whether the parking provision was sufficient to serve the residents and complied with the requirements under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). In response, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, said that the Transport Department (TD) had no adverse comment on the application including its parking provision, which complied with the requirements set out in HKPSG. Mr Joseph Junior Ho, the applicant's representative, also explained that although there was no standard stipulated in HKPSG in relation to the parking provision for RCHEs, reference had been made to the parking provision of other RCHEs in different districts to serve their operational needs. Upon discussion with the relevant government departments, it was considered that the parking provision for the proposed development was sufficient and complied with the requirements of HKPSG. The applicant would review the parking provision during the detailed design stage.

48. Ms Vilian W.L. Sum, Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West, TD remarked that the provision of five private car parking spaces for the RCHE was considered acceptable as the Site was in proximity to public transport facilities and there were private car parks nearby. For the carpark proposed for the private residential development, the provision complied with the requirements of HKPSG based on the adoption of a lower-end parking provision. TD would review the car parking provision, including the distance between the proposed development and the nearby railway station, during the general building plan (GBP) submission stage to ensure the provision of sufficient car parking spaces for the proposed development.

49. In terms of the carparking requirement under HKPSG, the Chairperson remarked that the general standard of parking spaces for private housing developments was one car parking space per four to seven flats, with adjustment based on some other factors, including the number and size of flats, development densities and the distance between the development and the railway station.

Air Ventilation and Visual Impacts

50. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there were any mitigation measures for the visual impacts induced on the surrounding residential developments, such as Uptown; and
- (b) whether there was any air ventilation impact on the RCHE, which was located at the lower 7 floors and close to the building block (i.e. Tower 8) of Uptown to its south with only a building separation of about 2.8m.

51. In response, Messrs Wai Che Hong and Joseph Junior Ho, the applicant's representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) building separation of about 14.5m between the two proposed residential blocks and about 2.8m between the lower floors of the proposed development and the Tower 8 of Uptown to its south would be provided.

According to site inspection, the proposed development would not result in direct visual obstruction to Tower 8 of Uptown as the dining rooms and bedrooms of the residential block were not directly facing the proposed development. The internal layout of the RCHE would be carefully designed. The RCHE area fronting Uptown would be used for back-of-house facilities to reduce nuisance to nearby residents. The applicant would continue to liaise with the management office of Uptown to address the concerns of the residents; and

- (b) as the total area of the Site was larger after including the “GB” portion, there was more design flexibility to allow for wider building separation between the proposed development and Uptown in the current scheme as compared with the approved GBP for the previously approved planning application (No. A/YL-TYST/870). Landscape measures, such as edge planting, would be provided. The proposed development could integrate with Uptown in terms of design and layout.

52. In response to the Chairperson’s enquiry about the building block layout under the previously approved application No. A/YL-TYST/870, Mr Joseph Junior Ho, the applicant’s representative, said that the layout of the RCHE development under the planning scheme approved in 2022 and the subsequent GBP submission approved in 2026 was similar to the current scheme. As the current application involved a larger site area, a wider building separation could be allowed between the proposed development and Tower 8 of Uptown to its south.

53. As the applicant’s representatives had no further points to raise and there were no further questions from Members, the Chairperson informed the applicant’s 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 applicant of the Committee’s decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked PlanD’s and the applicant’s representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[Mr Gary X.Y. Zhang left the meeting during the Q&A session.]

Deliberation Session

54. The Chairperson recapitulated that the subject “CDA” zone, intended for comprehensive development/redevelopment of the area for residential use, was subject to a maximum GFA of 69,000m² and a maximum BH of 17 storeys, with the existing residential-cum-kindergarten development, i.e. Uptown, accounting for a major portion of the GFA, with residual GFA for the remaining area of the “CDA” zone. In terms of development intensity and BH, the maximum BH of 13 storeys (not more than 60mPD) for the proposed development was lower than that of Uptown with a BH of up to 17 storeys (about 77mPD). As compared with the previously approved application No. A/YL-TYST/870, the proposed development, involving 72 flats and 450 RCHE beds, provided additional 150 RCHE beds. The proposed rezoning of the Site was considered compatible with the surrounding developments in terms of development intensity. Relevant government departments consulted had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. The “GB” portion of the Site was minor and situated at the fringe of the larger “GB” zone. The proposed rezoning of part of the “GB” zone would unlikely adversely affect the integrity and function of the “GB” zone. He then invited views from Members.

55. The Committee generally supported the application, and two Members had the following observations and suggestions:

- (a) the applicant would need to consider the financial viability of the proposed RCHE as there was another site at Lam Tei donated to Pok Oi Hospital to develop a large RCHE and there were sufficient RCHE beds planned by SWD in the Yuen Long District; and
- (b) given the large scale of the RCHE relative to the residential portion at the Site, the applicant was advised to provide sufficient supporting and ancillary facilities and avoid adverse visual impact on the residents of the adjacent Uptown.

56. The Chairperson remarked that the proposed RCHE would need to comply with the design and construction requirements under the relevant legislation and the licensing requirements of SWD. A Member expressed concern about the bulk of the podium given

that the proposed scheme comprised two residential blocks atop a 7-storey podium for the RCHE, which was uncommon in rural developments. The Vice-chairperson opined that a large footprint for providing sufficient RCHE beds on each floor could enhance operational efficiency and achieve economies of scale. The same Member suggested that consideration could be given to reviewing the podium design, such as subdividing the podium into separate blocks, to mitigate the adverse impact on the nearby residents. The Chairperson proposed and the Committee agreed that PlanD would convey the suggestion to the applicant for consideration and follow-up, as appropriate.

57. After deliberation, the Committee decided to partially agree to the application to facilitate the proposed development at the application site. The appropriate zoning with stipulation of appropriate development restrictions and other requirements would be worked out by the Planning Department in consultation with relevant government bureaux/departments. The relevant proposed amendments to the Tong Yan San Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan, together with the revised Notes and Explanatory Statement, would be submitted to the Committee for consideration prior to gazetting under the Town Planning Ordinance.

[Mr Ryan M.K. Ip 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), and Mr William S.T. Wong, Town Planner/Shan Tin, Tai Po and North (TP/STN), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-HLH/93 Proposed Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Hardware and Construction Materials and Associated Filling of Land for a Period of 3 Years in “Green Belt” and “Agriculture” Zones, Lots 169, 173, 174 and 177 in D.D. 86, Lots 306 and 307 in D.D. 87 and Adjoining Government Land, Hung Lung Hang
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-HLH/93)

Presentation and Question Sessions

58. With the aid of some plans, Mr Ryan C.K. Ho, STP/STN, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed use, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department did not support the application.

59. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

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

- “(a) the proposed use with associated filling of land is not in line with the planning intention of the “Green Belt” zone, which is primarily for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There is a

general presumption against development within this zone. It is also 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 such planning intentions, even on a temporary basis; and

- (b) the proposed use with associated filling of land is not in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for ‘Application for Development within the Green Belt Zone under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’ (TPB PG-No. 10) in that it is considered not compatible with the surrounding areas, and the applicant fails to demonstrate that it would not have significant adverse landscape impact on the surrounding areas.”

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-MKT/68 Proposed Temporary Training Centre for Construction Industry with Ancillary Office and Associated Filling of Land for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 97, 98, 99 and 101 in D.D. 86, Man Kam To

(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-MKT/68)

Presentation and Question Sessions

61. With the aid of some plans, Mr Ryan C.K. Ho, STP/STN, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed use, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department did not support the application.

62. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

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

“ the proposed use with associated filling of land 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, even on a temporary basis.”

Agenda Item 11

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-STK/32 Proposed Temporary Holiday Camp, Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Hobby Farm), Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre and Public Vehicle Park (excluding Container Vehicle) for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” and “Recreation (1)” Zones and area shown as ‘Road’, Various Lots in D.D. 41 and Adjoining Government Land, Sha Tau Kok
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-STK/32B)

Presentation and Question Sessions

64. With the aid of some plans, Mr William S.T. Wong, TP/STN, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed uses, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department did not support the application.

65. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

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

- “(a) the proposed uses are not in line with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” zone which is to provide land primarily for development of Small House by indigenous villagers. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis; and
- (b) the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed uses will not cause adverse traffic impact on the surrounding areas.”

Agenda Item 12

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-STK/33 Proposed Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Hobby Farm) for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” and “Green Belt” Zones, Lot 1 in D.D. 40 and Adjoining Government Land, Sheung Tam Shui Hang, Sha Tau Kok
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-STK/33A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

67. With the aid of some plans, Mr William S.T. Wong, TP/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.

68. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

69. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 11.9.2029, 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 13

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-STK/36 Proposed Temporary Drone Training Centre with Ancillary Facilities
for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” and
“Recreation” Zones, Various Lots in D.D. 41 and Adjoining
Government Land, Tong To, Sha Tau Kok
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-STK/36)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

71. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

72. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 11.9.2029, 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.]

Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East District

[Mr Jeffrey P.K. Wong, Senior Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (STP/FSYLE), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 25

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTN/1265 Proposed Temporary Government Use (Maintenance Depot) for a
Period of 10 Years in "Residential (Group D)" Zone, Government Land
in D.D. 103, Au Tau, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTN/1265)

Presentation and Question Sessions

73. With the aid of some plans, Mr Jeffrey P.K. Wong, STP/FSYLE, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed use, departmental and public comment, 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 ten years until 11.9.2036, 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 53

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

76. Noting that the consideration and rejection of application No. A/NE-HLH/93 for proposed temporary warehouse for storage of hardware and construction materials and associated filling of land in "Green Belt" and "Agriculture" zones under Agenda Item 5 and application No. A/NE-MKT/68 for proposed temporary training centre for construction industry with ancillary office and associated filling of land in "Agriculture" zone under Agenda Item 9, both of which involved ongoing planning enforcement action against unauthorized development (UD), were relatively straightforward, a Member suggested that similar rejected cases involving planning enforcement actions and "destroy first, apply later" activities could be selected for streamlined arrangement.

77. In response, the Chairperson said that as the applicant of a rejected application could apply for a review of the Committee's decision under section 17 of the Town Planning Ordinance, the presentation session by PlanD was necessary to ensure procedural fairness and enable Members to comprehend the case before making a decision. The Secretary supplemented that each application would be considered on its own merits, and an application subject to planning enforcement action against UD might not necessarily be recommended for rejection after taking into account other relevant planning considerations.

78. The same Member suggested and some other Members concurred that PlanD's presentation for the straightforward applications could be more concise, focusing on the key issues. The Chairperson said that the Committee's suggestion would be conveyed to PlanD.

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

**Minutes of 795th Meeting of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee
(held on 11.9.2026)**

Deferral Cases

Requests for Deferment by Applicant for 2 Months

Item No.	Application No.*	Times of Deferment
6	A/NE-KLH/664	1 st
7	A/NE-LYT/875	2 nd [^]
10	A/NE-MKT/69	1 st
17	A/NE-TK/866	1 st
18	A/NE-TK/867	1 st
19	A/NE-TK/868	1 st
20	A/NE-KTS/576	2 nd [^]
21	A/STT/36	1 st
22	A/YL-KTN/1262	1 st
23	A/YL-KTN/1263	1 st
24	A/YL-KTN/1264	1 st
28	A/YL-KTS/1145	1 st
30	A/YL-KTS/1147	1 st
31	A/YL-NSW/368	2 nd [^]
32	A/YL-NSW/373	1 st
37	A/YL-PH/1116	2 nd [^]
38	A/YL-PH/1127	1 st
42	A/HSK/606	2 nd [^]
44	A/YL-LFS/622	1 st
46	A/YL-PN/93	1 st
47	A/YL-PS/789	1 st
48	A/YL-PS/790	1 st
50	A/YL-TT/797	1 st
52	A/YL/334	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 Interests

The Committee noted the following declaration of interests:

Item No.	Members' Declared Interests	
44	The application site was located in Lau Fau Shan.	- Mr Rocky L.K. Poon for being one of the owners of a property in Lau Fau Shan

Item No.	Members' Declared Interests	
48	The application was submitted by Mr Tang Chi Hok.	- Mr Wilson H.K. Shum for his company having current business dealings with the applicant
52	The application site was located near Yuen Long town centre.	- Mr Wilson H.K. Shum for owning a property in Yuen Long town centre

The Committee noted that Mr Rocky L.K. Poon had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As the property owned by Mr Wilson H.K. Shum had no direct view of the application site under Item 52, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting and participate in the discussion on the item. For Item 48, as the interest of Mr Wilson H.K. Shum was considered direct, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion on the item.

* Refer to the agenda at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/RNTPC/Agenda/795_rnt_agenda.html for details of the planning applications.

**Minutes of 795th Meeting of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee
(held on 11.9.2026)**

Renewal Cases

(a) Application for renewal of temporary approval until 30.3.2029

Item No.	Application No.	Renewal Application	Renewal Period
34	A/YL-NSW/375	Temporary Transitional Housing and Ancillary Uses in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Comprehensive Development to include Wetland Restoration Area” Zone, Lots 1212 S.B RP (Part) and 1212 S.C ss.3 RP in D.D. 115 and Adjoining Government Land in Tung Tau, Yuen Long	24.10.2026 to 30.3.2029

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

Item No.	Application No.	Renewal Application	Renewal Period
8	A/NE-LYT/880	Temporary Warehouses (excluding Dangerous Goods Godown) in “Residential (Group C)” and “Agriculture” Zones, Various Lots in D.D. 83, No. 31A Ma Liu Shui San Tsuen, Fanling	28.10.2026 to 27.10.2029
33	A/YL-NSW/374	Temporary Shop and Services (Convenience Store and Showroom), Eating Place and Storage Use for Traffic Information Technology System Facilities with Ancillary Site Office and Solar Panels in “Undetermined” Zone, Lots 999 S.E (Part), 1001 S.A RP (Part), 1002 S.A RP (Part) and 1327 RP (Part) in D.D. 115 and Adjoining Government Land, Au Tau, Yuen Long	23.9.2026 to 22.9.2029
40	A/YL-PH/1129	Temporary Shop and Services (Motor-vehicle Showroom) and Associated Filling of Land in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 2794 (Part) in D.D. 111, Wang Toi Shan Shan Tsuen, Pat Heung, Yuen Long	14.10.2026 to 13.10.2029

**Minutes of 795th Meeting of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee
(held on 11.9.2026)**

Cases for Streamlining Arrangement

(a) Applications approved on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 11.9.2029

Item No.	Application No.	Planning Application
14	A/NE-TKL/837	Temporary Open Storage of Recycling Materials and Metalware with Ancillary Facilities and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” and “Open Storage” Zones, Lots 86 (Part), 87 and 89 in D.D. 83 and Adjoining Government Land, Kwan Tei North, Fanling
15	A/NE-TKL/846	Temporary Warehouse and Open Storage of Metal and Construction Materials and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 172 and 174 RP (Part) in D.D. 84 and Adjoining Government Land, Ping Che, Ta Kwu Ling
16	A/NE-TK/862	Temporary Warehouse (Hardware Accessories) in “Recreation” Zone, Lot 1672 (Part) in D.D. 17, Ting Kok, Tai Po
26	A/YL-KTN/1266	Proposed Temporary Warehouse (Excluding Dangerous Goods Godown) with Ancillary Facilities and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Various Lots in D.D. 107, Fung Kat Heung, Kam Tin North, Yuen Long
27	A/YL-KTS/1130	Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Construction Materials and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 1016 (Part), 1017, 1028 S.A (Part), 1029 (Part), 1030 (Part), 1031, 1032 and 1033 (Part) in D.D. 113, Kam Tin South, Yuen Long
35	A/YL-SK/458	Proposed Temporary Shop and Services with Ancillary Facilities and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 1639 S.A (Part) in D.D. 114, Shek Kong, Yuen Long
36	A/YL-SK/461	Proposed Temporary Eating Place, Shop and Services and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 627 (Part) in D.D. 112, Shek Kong, Yuen Long
41	A/YL-PH/1130	Temporary Private Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicle) and Associated Filling of Land in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 761 (Part) in D.D. 111, Sheung Che Tsuen, Pat Heung
45	A/YL-LFS/623	Proposed Temporary Warehouse (Excluding Dangerous Goods Godown) in “Residential (Group E)” Zone, Lots 1694 (Part), 1697 (Part) and 1698 in D.D. 129, Lau Fau Shan, Yuen Long
49	A/YL-TYST/1368	Temporary Shop and Services in “Residential (Group B) 1” Zone, Lot 3927 S.A ss.4 (Part) in D.D. 124, Tan Kwai Tsuen, Hung Shui Kiu, Yuen Long
51	A/YL-TT/799	Proposed Temporary Animal Boarding Establishment and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Various Lots in D.D. 116 and Adjoining Government Land, Yuen Long

(b) Applications approved on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years until 11.9.2031

Item No.	Application No.	Planning Application
29	A/YL-KTS/1146	Proposed Temporary Animal Boarding Establishment and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 393 (Part), 394 (Part), 399, 400 S.A, 400 RP, 401 and 403 in D.D. 113, Ma On Kong, Kam Tin South, Yuen Long
39	A/YL-PH/1128	Proposed Temporary Animal Boarding Establishment with Ancillary Facilities and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zones, Government Land in D.D. 114, Kei Ling, Pat Heung
43	A/HSK/624	Temporary Shop and Services (Real Estate Agency) with Ancillary Facilities in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 1580 RP (Part) in D.D. 125, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long

Declaration of Interests

The Committee noted the following declaration of interests:

Item No.	Members’ Declared Interests	
45	The application site was located in Lau Fau Shan.	- Mr Rocky L.K. Poon for being one of the owners of a property in Lau Fau Shan
51	The application was submitted by 鄭邦權.	- Mr Wilson H.K. Shum for his company having current business dealings with the applicant

The Committee noted that Mr Rocky L.K. Poon had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. For Item 51, as the interest of Mr Wilson H.K. Shum was considered direct, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion on the item.