

**城市規劃委員會**

香港北角渣華道三百三十三號  
北角政府合署十五樓

**TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

15/F., North Point Government Offices  
333 Java Road, North Point,  
Hong Kong.

傳 真 Fax: 2877 0245 / 2522 8426

By Email

電 話 Tel: 2231 4810

junior@lchgroup.com

來函檔號 Your Reference:

覆函請註明本會檔號

In reply please quote this ref.: TPB/A/NE-TKLN/96

2 May 2025

LCH Planning & Development Consultants Ltd.  
17/F, Champion Building  
287-291 Des Vouex Road Central  
Hong Kong  
(Attn.: Junior Ho)

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Temporary Holiday Camp for a Period of 3 Years  
in “Green Belt” Zone, Lots 20 RP (Part), 21 (Part), 22 (Part),  
23 (Part) and 25 (Part) in D.D. 80, Ta Kwu Ling North**

I refer to my letter to you dated 3.4.2025.

After giving consideration to the application, the Town Planning Board (TPB) decided to reject the application and the reason is :

- the applied use 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 with this zone. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis.

A copy of the TPB Paper in respect of the application is available at TPB website at this link ([https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/RNTPC/Agenda/763\\_rnt\\_agenda.html](https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/RNTPC/Agenda/763_rnt_agenda.html)). The relevant extract of minutes of the TPB meeting held on 11.4.2025 is enclosed herewith for your reference.

Under section 17(1) and 17(1A) of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance), an applicant aggrieved by a decision of the TPB may apply to the TPB for a review of the decision. The application must be in writing and must set out the grounds for the review. If you wish to seek a review, you should inform me and provide the grounds for review within 21 days from the date of this letter (on or before 23.5.2025). I will then contact you to arrange a hearing before the TPB which you and/or your authorized representative will be invited to attend. The TPB is required to consider a review application within three months of receipt of the application for review. Please note that any review application will be published for three weeks for public comments.

Under the Ordinance, the TPB can only reconsider at the review hearing the original application in the light of further written and/or oral representations. Should you decide at this stage to materially modify the original proposal, such proposal should be submitted to the TPB in the form of a fresh application under section 16 of the Ordinance.

If you wish to seek further clarifications/information on matters relating to the above decision, please feel free to contact Ms. Ivy Wong of the Sha Tin, Tai Po & North District Planning Office at 2158 6237.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Leticia LEUNG', written over the printed name.

( Leticia LEUNG )

for Secretary, Town Planning Board

LL/CN/cl

**Extracted from Confirmed Minutes of 763<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of RNTPC held on 11.4.2025**

**Agenda Item 22**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-TKLN/96      Temporary Holiday Camp for a Period of 3 Years in “Green Belt”  
Zone, Lots 20 RP (Part), 21 (Part), 22 (Part), 23 (Part) and 25 (Part) in  
D.D. 80, Ta Kwu Ling North  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TKLN/96)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

35.            With the aid of some plans, Mr Timothy W.P. Wu, ATP/STN, briefed Members on the background of the application, the applied use, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department (PlanD) did not support the application.

36.            In response to a Member’s enquiry on the current use of the application site (the Site), Ms Ivy C.W. Wong, STP/STN, with the aid of some photos, said that seven and five caravans were accommodated at the eastern and western portions of the Site respectively. According to the information submitted by the applicant and available online, the subject holiday camp was currently in operation. From the site photos, the same Member pointed out that there was still space available to accommodate the caravans in the camp site on the land falling within the adjoining “Recreation” (“REC”) zone, where holiday camp use was always permitted and no planning permission was required. The subject application might be seen as an enlargement of the existing holiday camp that encroached onto the Site zoned “Green Belt” (“GB”) so that more caravans might be placed in the camp site. Ms Ivy C.W. Wong, STP/STN, supplemented that if the application was approved, the implementation of the applied use should be in accordance with the scheme submitted to the Board under the application.

**Deliberation Session**

37.            Two Members concurred with PlanD’s recommendation and opined that there was space within the existing holiday camp site zoned “REC” for locating those caravans

proposed at the Site and the intrusion of “GB” zone for expanding the business operation should be discouraged. One of them further expressed concerns that the applicant might take advantage of the intangible physical boundary between the “REC” and “GB” zones to extend his business operation into the “GB” zone. The Vice-chairperson remarked that approval of the application might alter the landscape character and would further degrade the landscape quality of the “GB” zone.

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

“the applied use 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 with this zone. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis.”