

**Relevant Extract of Town Planning Board Guidelines for
Application for Development within Green Belt Zone
under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance
(TPB PG-No. 10)**

The relevant assessment criteria are as follows:

- (a) there is a general presumption against development (other than redevelopment) in a “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone. In general the Town Planning Board will only be prepared to approve applications for development in the context of requests to re-zone to an appropriate use;
- (b) an application for new development in a “GB” zone will only be considered in exceptional circumstances and must be justified with very strong planning grounds. The scale and intensity of the proposed development including the plot ratio, site coverage and building height should be compatible with the character of surrounding areas;
- (c) applications for government/institution/community uses and public utility installations must demonstrate that the proposed development is essential and that no alternative sites are available;
- (d) the design and layout of any proposed development should be compatible with the surrounding areas. The development should not involve extensive clearance of existing natural vegetation, affect the existing natural landscape, or cause any adverse visual impact on the surrounding environment;
- (e) the vehicular access road and parking provision proposed should be appropriate to the scale of the development and comply with relevant standards. Access and parking should not adversely affect existing trees or other natural landscape features. Tree preservation and landscaping proposals should be provided;
- (f) the proposed development should not overstrain the capacity of existing and planned infrastructure such as sewerage, road and water supply. It should not adversely affect drainage or aggravate flooding in the area;
- (g) the proposed development should not be susceptible to adverse environmental effects from pollution sources nearby such as traffic noise, unless adequate mitigating measures are provided, and it should not itself be the source of pollution; and
- (h) any proposed development on a slope or hillside should not adversely affect slope stability.

Government Department's Detailed Comments

1. Environment

Comment of the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP):

- (a) on air quality, the proposed PRS would be accommodating not more than 100 horses and with nearest air sensitive receiver located over 180m from the Project boundary. With the implementation of management measures including clearing waste from stable area twice daily and storing stable wastes in enclosed container with daily collection, and with reference to the odour patrol findings of the existing Sha Tin Racecourse operation (i.e. insignificant odour impact within 100m from a stable area accommodating about 1,100 horses), no adverse odour impact from the proposed PRS is anticipated. The quantitative air quality impact assessment in the EA has also showed that air sensitive uses (such as coach duty rooms, administration buildings and riding areas, etc.) within the proposed PRS would comply with relevant air quality objectives and international standard, therefore would not be adversely affected by the existing leachate treatment plant emission at TKOL II/III. Overall, no adverse air quality impact is therefore anticipated;
- (b) on noise, with the implementation of noise control measures including provision of acoustic louvre/barrier to ventilation exhausts and directing PA system away from noise sensitive receivers outside of the proposed PRS, no adverse noise impact from the proposed PRS is anticipated;
- (c) on water quality and waste management, sewage and cleaning runoff from stable and PRS would be collected and disposed to public sewer in the vicinity of the Site. The SIA has concluded that the public sewer in the vicinity of the Site would have adequate capacity to cater for the additional sewage flow arising from the proposed development. Besides, perimeter drainage would be equipped with sand trap to avoid potential run-off related impact during PRS operation. In addition, stable wastes that are regularly cleared would be stored in the enclosed containers inside the proposed manure handling area before daily collection by licensed waste collector. Collected stable wastes would be delivered to the animal waste composting plant in Ngau Tam Mei for treatment. Overall, no adverse water quality and waste management implication is therefore anticipated;
- (d) on landfill gas hazard, safety measures such as permit-to-work system and restriction of hot works away from open trench or excavation would be adopted during construction of the PRS. With the implementation of landfill gas control measures including installation of gas-proof membrane, mechanical ventilation system, gas detection system, incorporation of fire-resistant material and enhanced ventilation design at the farrier workshop, no unacceptable landfill gas hazard is therefore anticipated. A detailed landfill gas hazard assessment shall be carried out to finalise the proposed landfill gas hazard mitigation measures; and
- (e) on land contamination, given the site formation works would only affect the top soil above the landfill site capping layer, no land contamination implication is therefore anticipated.

Recommended Advisory Clauses

- (a) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/Sai Kung, Lands Department that the applicant, as the prospective licensee of EPD for the Site, should communicate with EPD to ensure that all the Engineering Conditions of the Temporary Government Land Allocation (TGLA) are complied with, including but not limited to the term of the TGLA;
- (b) to note the comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department that:
 - (i) approval of the application does not imply approval of tree works such as pruning, transplanting and felling. Application for any tree works should be submitted to relevant departments for approval;
 - (ii) for compliance of site coverage of greenery requirements under PNAP APP-152, submission should be made to the Buildings Department for comments and approval;
 - (iii) the applicant is suggested to review the feasibility of retaining the mature tree by adjusting the general layout of the proposed development; and
 - (iv) in order to further enhance the landscape quality of tree plantings, the applicant is suggested to adopt standard-size, instead of whip-size as shown in Compensation Planting Plan, where appropriate;
- (c) to note the comment of the Director of Fire Services (D of FS) that detailed fire services requirements will be formulated upon receipt of a formal submission of STT/STW, general building plans or referral of application via relevant licensing authority. Furthermore, the EVA provision in the captioned work shall comply with the requirements as stipulated in Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011, which is administered by the Building Authority; and
- (d) to note the comments of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) that in accordance with legislation Cap.139J, the Public Health (Animals) (Riding Establishment) Regulations requires all persons who keep horses to let them out on hire for riding or use them to provide instruction in riding in return for payment to apply for a Riding Establishment Licence issued by AFCD. Additionally, any person who exhibits animals or birds in return for a fee paid by the public admitted to enter the venue for the exhibition, must obtain an Exhibition Licence/a Temporary Exhibition Permit from the AFCD as stipulated in the Public Health (Animals and Birds) (Exhibitions) Regulations, Cap. 139F.

Urgent Return receipt Expand Group Restricted Prevent Copy Confidential

tpbpd/PLAND

寄件者: [REDACTED]
寄件日期: 2026年03月06日星期五 4:15
收件者: tpbpd/PLAND
主旨: A/TKO/134 Stage II/III Landfill, Area 105, Tseung Kwan O HKJC
類別: Internet Email

A/TKO/134

Stage II/III Landfill, Area 105, Tseung Kwan O

Site area: About 46,500sq.m Government Land

Zoning: "Open Space", "Green Belt" and "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Industrial Estate"

Applied development: Riding School / 92 Vehicle Parking

Dear TPB Members,

Strong Objections. There is no justification in approving the dedication of such a large area of public land intended to serve community recreational needs to an elite organization like the Jockey Club.

Horse riding is an expensive sport, the facility would serve only those with deep pockets. Of course JC will pledge various concessions to serve the community, like the Golf Club has suddenly launched some initiatives to justify its footprint. But the community is not fooled, this is nothing more than social-wash.

The Layout is problematic, instead of a compact development the facility would be situated on three separate locations some distance from each other that would entail significant vehicular movements between the nodes. This would effectively impact the provision of alternative recreational facilities at the location.

The development would also whittle away the green barrier backdrop promised residents in exchange for living close to a large landfill. All the trees on the site would be felled even though they are part of the compensatory planting of native species intended to create a mix of grassland, shrubland, and woodland habitats.

It is a sad indictment of the priorities of the administration that the only recreational activity planned for this large area is an 'elite' sport with no provision of low-cost recreational facilities to serve the general community. This in a district where the development of Area 13 with 50,000 units will add an additional 140,000 residents.

Urgent Return receipt Expand Group Restricted Prevent Copy Confidential

But, as we well know, HKJC is a cash cow for the government and is called on to underwrite ventures that might otherwise face funding issues so the plan will no doubt be approved as a quid pro quo arrangement.

Mary Mulvihill