

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

TPB Paper No. 11063

**For Consideration by
the Town Planning Board on 12.6.2026**

**REVIEW OF APPLICATION NO. A/SK-TMT/84
UNDER SECTION 17 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE**

**Proposed Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Golf Putting Range) with Ancillary Facilities and
Associated Filling and Excavation of Land
in “Green Belt” Zone**

**Various Lots in D.D. 216,
Long Keng, Sai Kung, New Territories**

REVIEW OF APPLICATION NO. A/SK-TMT/84
UNDER SECTION 17 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

**Proposed Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Golf Putting Range) with
Ancillary Facilities and Associated Filling and Excavation of Land
in “Green Belt” Zone
Various Lots in D.D. 216, Long Keng, Sai Kung, New Territories**

1. Background

- 1.1 On 15.7.2025, the applicant, Mr. Douglas Paul Marshall represented by Ms. Marshall Lam Yui Ming, sought planning permission for proposed place of recreation, sports or culture (golf putting range) with ancillary facilities and associated filling and excavation of land at the application site (the Site) under section 16 (s.16) of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The Site falls within an area zoned “Green Belt” (“GB”) on the approved Tai Mong Tsai and Tsam Chuk Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/SK-TMT/4 (**Plan R-1**).
- 1.2 On 5.12.2025, the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board) decided to reject the application and the reasons were:
- (a) the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the “GB” zone which was 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 was no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention; and
 - (b) the proposed development was not in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 (TPB-PG No. 10) for ‘Application for Development within “GB” Zone’ in that there were no exceptional circumstances or strong planning grounds to justify the application, the proposed development did not comply with the development controls and restrictions of areas designated as water gathering grounds (WGGs) and the applicant failed to demonstrate that the proposed development with excavation and filling of land was compatible with the surrounding area and would not generate adverse water supplies, sewerage, drainage, environmental, traffic and landscape impacts on the application site and the surrounding area.
- 1.3 For Members’ reference, the following documents are attached:
- (a) RNTPC Paper No. A/SK-TMT/84A **(Annex A)**

- (b) Extract of minutes of the RNTPC meeting held on 5.12.2025 (**Annex B**)
- (c) Secretary of the Board's letter dated 19.12.2025 (**Annex C**)

2. Application for Review

2.1 On 5.1.2026, the applicant applied, under section 17(1) of the Ordinance, for a review of the RNTPC's decision to reject the application. Written representations were submitted and received on 5.1.2026 and 7.1.2026 (**Annex D**). Subsequently, the applicant submitted Further Information (FI) received on 25.3.2026* (**Annex E**), 16.4.2026 and 17.4.2026* (**Annex F**) and 28.4.2026 and 29.4.2026* (**Annex G**).

** accepted and exempted from publication and recounting requirements*

2.2 On 20.3.2026, the Board agreed to the applicant's request to defer making a decision on the review application for two months.

3. The Proposal

3.1 Under the s.16 application, the proposed development mainly comprised 12 outdoor golf putting areas of various sizes and 9 roofed-structures (with a total floor area of about 774.8m² and all are of one storey and not more than 4m in height) for indoor golf training and various ancillary facilities including an equipment storage room, resting areas, a reception/guard room, a parking area and toilet facility. No submission was made by the applicant on the sewage arrangement. Car parking spaces on the Site were proposed exclusively for golf instructors, while visitors would primarily arrive on foot or by taxi. Transportation services through a seven-seater vehicle would also be provided for visitors traveling between the Site and Sai Kung Town. The proposed development under the s.16 application involved associated excavation and filling of land of about 3,775m² (equivalent to about 70% of the site area) with depths ranging from 1m to 2m, where parts of the ground surface would be paved with white organic sand and stone to form an undulating terrain with level differences for outdoor golf putting. The layout plan submitted by the applicant is at **Drawing A-1 of Annex A**.

3.2 The applicant submits a revised proposal under the s.17 review application which proposes the use of eco-friendly toilets with regular collection and disposal of sewage by licensed contractor, clarifies the loading/unloading (L/UL) and vehicular access arrangement, and commits that the number of visitors capacity would be kept at 20 to 30 persons, no loudspeaker or public announcement system would be used and there would be no storage/use/discharge of agrochemicals such as fertilizer/pesticide/herbicides.

3.3 The applicant also submits a conceptual diagram for the proposed golf putting range and ancillary facilities for the s.17 review application (**Drawings R-1a and R-1b**), which is largely identical to the proposed layout submitted at the s.16 application. While there are no changes to the proposed number and uses of structures in the Site, the applicant revises the proposed scale of excavation and land filling. The applicant claims in the written submission received on 5.1.2026

(Annex D) that the Site would be paved with highly permeable ecological soil, without indicating the land filling extent and depth. In the FI received on 25.3.2026 (Annex E), the applicant claims that the depth of excavation and filling of land will be approximately 30cm to not more than 1m for site levelling and fixing supporting posts for structures and canopies, and the golf putting area will be laid with artificial turf. According to the FI received on 17.4.2026 (Annex F), the proposed depth of excavation of land is approximately 1m and the proposed excavation and filling works will cover only about 20% of the Site for landscaping and levelling of elevated indoor areas and covered structures, while 80% of the terrain will remain unchanged. The applicant has not submitted any detailed drawing to demonstrate the terrain configuration and exact location of the proposed excavation and filling works in both s.16 planning application and the current s.17 review application. A comparison table of the parameters of excavation and filling of land under the s.16 application and the current review application is set out below.

	s.16 planning application	Current s.17 review application
Excavation and Filling Area	<p>About 3,775m² (about 70% of the site area):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Excavation of land: 1,775m² (about 33% of the site area) - Filling of land: 2,000m² (about 37% of the site area) <p><i>(without detailed layout of excavation and land filling)</i></p>	<p><u>Site levelling:</u> Excavation and land filling of 30cm in depth</p> <p><u>Fixing supporting posts for structures and canopies:</u> For structures: - 1m in depth x 1m in width x 1m in length</p> <p>For canopies: - 30cm in depth</p> <p><u>Landscaping and leveling of elevated indoor areas:</u> About 20% of the site area</p> <p><u>Laying of ecological soil and artificial turf for golf putting:</u> Area and extent not specified</p> <p><i>(all without detailed layout, extent and locations of excavation and land filling)</i></p>

4. **Justifications from the Applicant**

The justifications put forth by the applicant in support of the review application are detailed in the written representation and FI at Annexes D to G. They can be summarised as below:

- (a) the proposed golf putting range is small in scale and carries social value, which is consistent with the objectives of optimising land use and facilitating sports

development. It is noted that various recreational facilities have been allowed in the sub-urban areas;

- (b) the Site has been left idle for years and the adjacent water catchment area was previously overgrown with weeds and deposited with animal waste and debris. The applicant claims to have submitted technical reports to government departments for consideration in the past and has spent effort to clean and maintain the condition of the Site to prevent debris from entering the water catchment. The applicant also undertakes to carry out regular maintenance and implement environment management measures to uphold the environmental quality of the Site and the surrounding areas;
- (c) the Site will be provided with eco-friendly toilets to handle waste in a fully enclosed manner without the need for a septic tank. Sewage will be regularly collected and properly disposed by a licensed operator. The Site would be paved with highly permeable ecological soil to ensure no herbicides, pesticides or fertilisers will be used to prevent chemical substances from entering the soil and water catchment area;
- (d) the putting green area will be laid with artificial turf in line with the existing ground level and no large-scale excavation or earth filling will be carried out. Minor levelling for landscape works will be limited to surface layer to ensure that the existing natural drainage patterns will not be altered and that surface runoff will not be increased, preventing potential flooding;
- (e) tree felling occurred due to inclement weather and lack of management. The proposed development would enhance the site environment through proper planning. No trees with preservation values or protected trees were found in the Site. All existing trees on site will be retained, and no existing trees will be removed;
- (f) golf putting training is a low-volume activity conducted in small groups without public announcement systems or loudspeakers to ensure the proposed use will not generate noise nuisance during operation. Maximum capacity of the Site will be controlled at around 30 persons. Delivery and loading activities of the proposed use will be infrequent, and visitors will be encouraged to use public transport and access the Site on foot. No adverse noise and traffic impact are anticipated; and
- (g) fire-fighting equipment and clear escape route signs will be placed at various locations on-site to enhance fire safety.

5. Background of the Site

The Site is currently not subject to any active planning enforcement action.

6. The Section 16 Application

The Site and its Surrounding Areas (Plans R-1 to R-4d)

- 6.1 The situation of the Site and the surrounding areas at the time of consideration of the s.16 application by the RNTPC were described in paragraphs 8.1 and 8.2 of

Annex A. It can be observed from the site photos taken on 11.5.2026 that vegetation clearance has taken place within the Site as compared to the condition of the Site during s.16 application stage (**Plan R-4d**).

6.2 The Site is:

- (a) a low-lying area located within the WGG and village ‘environs’ (‘VE’) of Long Keng with natural slopes immediately adjoining to its western and southwestern portions. It is relatively flat, currently covered with sparse trees and vegetation, and deposited with metal-framed tents, solar panels and miscellaneous items. A mud track and a grave are found within the Site; and
- (b) accessible via a narrow single-lane local track for two-way traffic which was not formed as a proper vehicular access, leading to Tai Mong Tsai Road about 500m to the south.

6.3 The surrounding areas are predominantly rural in character with woodland and grassland to the north, west and south, and scattered temporary structures and clusters of village houses of Long Keng and Wo Liu to the southeast and further north. An existing stream flows from north to south adjacent to the southwestern boundary of the Site leading to the Long Keng Lowland Raw Water Pumping Station operated by Water Supplies Department (WSD) which is located to the immediate south of the Site.

Planning Intention

6.4 There is no change in planning intention of the “GB” zone as mentioned in paragraph 9.1 of **Annex A**, 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.

6.5 As stated in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP, as filling or excavation of land may cause adverse drainage impacts on the adjacent areas and adverse impacts on the natural environment, permission from the Board is required for such works and related activities in the “GB” zone.

Town Planning Board Guidelines

6.6 TPB-PG No. 10 for ‘Application for Development within “GB” Zone under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’ is relevant to the consideration of the s.16 application and still effective. The relevant assessment criteria are summarised at **Appendix II** of **Annex A**.

Previous Applications

6.7 The Site is the subject of three previous applications submitted by applicants different from the current application for temporary holiday camp and tent camping ground and/or filling of land.

6.8 The southern and southwestern portions of the Site form part of the subject site of

a previous application (No. A/SK-TMT/75) for proposed temporary holiday camp and tent camping ground for a period of three years and associated filling and excavation of land which was approved with conditions by the RNTPC in 2022 mainly on sympathetic considerations that the proposed uses were temporary in nature, the site would be reinstated upon expiry of planning permission as proposed by the applicant, and the proposed uses generally complied with TPB PG-No. 10 in that the proposed design and layout were considered compatible with the surrounding area and all technical issues were addressed by the applicant. The planning permission was revoked on 9.6.2024 due to non-compliance with approval conditions in relation to the implementation of mitigation and preventive measures in the risk assessment report, fire services installations proposal and landscape proposal.

- 6.9 The eastern portion of the Site forms part of two previous applications for filling of land for permitted agricultural use (No. A/SK-TMT/52 and A/SK-TMT/61) which were rejected by the RNTPC in 2016 and by the Board upon review in 2018 respectively mainly on the grounds that the applicants failed to demonstrate that the proposed filling of land would not cause adverse drainage and landscape impacts on the surrounding areas and there was insufficient information to justify the need of the land filling for agricultural use at the sites.
- 6.10 Details of the previous applications are at **Appendix III** of **Annex A** and their locations are shown on **Plan R-1**.

Similar Application

- 6.11 There is no similar application for ‘Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture’ use and excavation and filling of land within the “GB” zone on the OZP.

7. Comments from Relevant Government Bureaux/Departments

- 7.1 Comments on the s.16 application made by relevant government departments are stated in paragraph 10 and **Appendix IV** of **Annex A**. Their advisory comments, if any, are at **Appendix V** of **Annex A** and recapped at **Annex H**.
- 7.2 For the review application, relevant government departments have been further consulted. Chief Engineer/Construction, WSD (CE/C, WSD), Chief Engineer/Mainland South, Drainage Services Department (CE/MS, DSD) and Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) maintain their previous views of having objection to or reservation on the application. Commissioner for Transport (C for T) and Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) have provided updated views of having no objection to the review application. Other relevant government departments¹ maintain their previous views of having no adverse comments on or no objection to the application and/or provide further comments. The views and further comments of the aforementioned government departments on the review

¹ Including Director of Agriculture, Conservation and Fisheries (DAFC), Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories East 2 and Rail, Buildings Department (CBS/NTE2 and Rail, BD), Director of Fire Services (D of FS), District Officer (Sai Kung), Home Affairs Department (DO(SK), HAD), and District Land Officer/Sai Kung, Lands Department (DLO/SK).

application are summarised and/or recapitulated below.

Land Administration

7.2.1 Comments of DLO/SK, LandsD:

- (a) no objection to the application;
- (b) regarding the applicant's claim that technical reports have been submitted for departmental approval, her office is not aware of any proposals for similar uses and/or submissions from the same applicant in recent years;
- (c) there is no designated Emergency Vehicular Access for Long Keng;
- (d) neither excavation permit nor Letter of Approval for erecting structures at the Site has been processed/approved by her office;
- (e) the Site falls within the 'VE' of Long Keng and WGG (**Plan R-1**). The Site may interfere with the Waterworks Reserve relating to WSD's Long Keng Lowland Raw Water Pumping Station (**Plan R-2**); and
- (f) other detailed comments and advisory comments are at **Appendix IV** of **Annex A** and **Annex H**.

Traffic

7.2.2 Comments of C for T:

- (a) no objection to the application;
- (b) it is noted that the applicant has provided information regarding the capacity of the proposed development, the access arrangement, and parking and loading/unloading arrangement for his consideration in the review application;
- (c) not aware of any proposals for similar uses or submissions from the same applicant in recent years;
- (d) the access road leading to the Site is not under Transport Department's management; and
- (e) advisory comments are at **Annex H**.

Water Supplies

7.2.3 Comments of CE/C, WSD:

- (a) objects to the application with a view to safeguarding raw water

quality within WGG;

- (b) the applicant proposes the use of eco-friendly toilets with regular collection and disposal of sewage by licensed contractor and the proposal would involve construction works for artificial turf, canopies, support pillars, container facilities and parking facilities on the Site. However, details about the operation and management of the proposed development and associated activities that would pose high risks of contamination to the WGG have not been mentioned in the review application;
- (c) the applicant should submit a risk assessment on the pollution effect on the existing WGG arising from the proposed use and sewage holding tank during construction and operation phases to demonstrate that there will be no material increase in the pollution effect arising from the proposed development. Information including but not limited to layout plans, site formation plans, estimation of sewage flow generated, design and capacity of sewage holding tank with overflow alarm system and leakage protection system, details of desludging arrangement and frequency and contingency plan as well as associated mitigation measures should be included in the risk assessment. Without the provision of relevant information, the water pollution risks and impacts could not be ascertained;
- (d) it is anticipated that the proposed development would pose high risks of contamination to the WGG due to construction activities, traffic generation, sewage discharge as well as intentional and unintentional contamination from human activities including but not limited to vehicle parking, horticultural and recreational activities. The information submitted by the applicant without technical assessments is considered insufficient to prove and demonstrate that the proposed development would cause no material increase in pollution effect within the WGG;
- (e) a very small portion of the Site at its southern end encroaches onto the Waterworks Reserve for Long Keng Lowland Raw Water Pumping Station (**Plan R-1**);
- (f) no other proposal has been received by WSD from the same applicant; and
- (g) advisory comments are at **Annex H**.

Environment

7.2.4 Comments of DEP:

- (a) according to the FI submitted by the applicant, the outdoor training area would be established in form of artificial turf and would not involve any storage/use/discharge of agrochemicals such as

fertilizer/pesticide/herbicides. Besides, portable toilets with periodic tankering away of sewage by licensed contractor would be provided on-site for collection, handling and disposal of sewage arising from the development. The applicant has clarified that there would be no loudspeaker or public announcement system at the outdoor activities areas to prevent potential noise nuisance to the surroundings;

- (b) in view of the above, no adverse environmental impact under Environmental Protection Department (EPD)'s ambit would be anticipated and he therefore has no objection to the subject review application from environmental planning perspective;
- (c) not aware of any proposals or submissions for similar uses from the same applicant at the Site; and
- (d) advisory comments are at **Annex H**.

Drainage and Sewerage

7.2.5 Comments of CE/MS, DSD:

Drainage

- (a) while there is no flooding complaint or case reported in the vicinity of the Site, it is noted that the Site is situated at local low-lying areas with natural slopes to its north and west. During inclement weather, it is envisaged that a large amount of surface runoff received from these natural slopes might flow down to the Site, causing flooding;
- (b) based on the drainage record, there is no DSD's drainage facility found within the Site. Hence, it is doubtful if sufficient drainage measures have been / would be implemented to deal with such a large amount of surface runoff received from the Site and its upstream catchments;
- (c) in view of potential change of topography due to the proposed development, the applicant should provide a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) for his further review, and clarify whether the Site will be paved and how surface runoff can be collected after the proposed development. The proponent of a private project (i.e. the applicant) is responsible for implementing all measures necessary to mitigate adverse drainage impacts identified by the DIA;
- (d) the applicant has not provided information on whether there are drainage mitigation measures being implemented surrounding the Site or if underground drainage system has been installed underneath the Site to deal with the surface runoff during inclement weather. Hence, his office could not conclude whether there are potential flooding risks to surrounding areas and whether such activities are considered acceptable or not from drainage perspective;

- (e) the applicant should provide proposed formation plan(s) and plan(s) showing drainage path, etc. to substantiate his claim in the review application that the minor earthworks are for landscape levelling only and will not alter existing natural drainage patterns, increase surface runoff, or cause flooding or siltation;
- (f) not aware of any proposals for similar uses and/or submissions from the same applicant in recent years; and

Sewerage

- (g) the application needs to meet the full satisfaction of EPD, the planning authority of sewerage infrastructure. DSD's views on sewerage aspect are subject to views and agreement of EPD.

Urban Design, Visual and Landscape

7.2.6 Comments of CTP/UD&L, PlanD:

Urban Design and Visual

- (a) it is noted that the height of the proposed nine structures will be around 4m. As the proposed structures are relatively small scale in nature, significant adverse visual impact is not anticipated. As such, she has no adverse comment on the proposal from urban design and visual impact perspectives;

Landscape

- (b) reservation on the review application from landscape planning perspective;
- (c) the Site is zoned "GB" which is considered 'distinctive landscape resources'. The applicant has not provided any landscape assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposed development on the distinctive landscape character/ resources;
- (d) with reference to the aerial photo taken in 2025 (**Plan R-3**), the Site is situated in an area of settled valley landscape character predominated by woodland, grassland, scattered village houses and temporary structures. It is observed that the Site is largely covered by vegetation and tree clusters;
- (e) by comparing the aerial photos of July 2025 and May 2026 (**Plan R-4d**), it can be observed that tree felling within the Site has taken place;
- (f) in view of the above, there is insufficient information to demonstrate that the proposed development would not induce adverse landscape impact on the area;
- (g) not aware of any proposals for similar uses and/or submissions from the same applicant in recent years; and

- (h) advisory comments are at **Annex H**.

Nature Conservation

7.2.7 Comments of the DAFC:

- (a) no comment on the application that in view that the Site is covered with common plant species; and
- (b) not aware of any proposals for similar uses and/or submissions from the same applicant in recent years.

Building Matters

7.2.8 Comments of the CBS/NTE2 and Rail, BD:

- (a) not aware of any submission of technical reports or proposals from the applicant;
- (b) no comment under the Buildings Ordinance (BO) on the review application;
- (c) there is no outstanding statutory orders issued requiring removal of unauthorized building works in the Site; and
- (d) other detailed comments are at **Appendix IV** of **Annex A**.

Fire Safety

7.2.9 Comments of the D of FS:

- (a) no in-principle objection to the application subject to fire services installations and water supplies for firefighting being provided to the satisfaction of the D of FS;
- (b) the proposed vehicular access cannot accommodate the passage of major fire appliances for firefighting and rescue services and there is no available vehicular access for major fire appliances within 30m of the Site. In this regard, additional fire safety measures shall be imposed to enhance fire safety;
- (c) other detailed comments are at **Appendix IV** of **Annex A** and advisory comments are at **Annex H**; and
- (d) not aware of any proposals for similar uses and/or submissions from the same applicant in recent years.

DO's Comments

7.2.10 Comments of DO (SK), HAD:

- (a) no comment on the application;
- (b) it is noted that the applicant has gained support on the s.16 application from two Sai Kung District Council members including Mr. Chan Kuen-kwan, MH and Mr. Li Tin-chi, and Ms. Wong Shin-yee, a Resident Representative of Long Keng Village and a member of the Sai Kung Area Committee. The relevant public members have reaffirmed their support for the review application; and
- (c) no technical reports/proposals related to the application have been received in recent years.

7.2.11 The following government departments maintains their previous views on the s.16 application of having no objection to or no comment on the application as stated in paragraph 10.2 of **Annex A**:

- (a) Project Manager (East), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD);
- (b) Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office (H(GEO)), CEDD;
- (c) Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services (DEMS); and
- (d) Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene.

8. Public Comments Received During Statutory Publication Period

- 8.1 On 16.1.2026, the application was published for public inspection. During the statutory public inspection period, three public comments were received, including two objecting to and one providing views on the application (**Annex J**). Amongst the two public comments raising objection, one is from the registered owners of the private lots within the Site (i.e. Lots 420, 426 RP and 428 in D.D. 216) objecting to the application mainly on the grounds that consent was not given to the applicant to proceed with the planning application and approval of the proposed development would jeopardize the development rights of the concerned lots; and another is from Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation objecting to the application mainly on the grounds that the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of "GB" zone. The remaining comment providing views on the application is from an individual indicating that the proposed use within the "GB" zone is commercial in nature, and therefore not comparable to other examples of public recreational uses quoted by the applicant in the written representation.
- 8.2 At the s.16 application stage, four public comments were received and are set out in paragraph 11 of **Annex A**.

9. Planning Considerations and Assessments

9.1 The application is for a review of the RNTPC's decision on 5.12.2025 to reject the s.16 application for proposed place of recreation, sports or culture (golf putting range) with ancillary facilities and associated filling and excavation of land within an area zoned "GB" on the OZP (**Plan R-1**) with the reasons detailed in paragraph 1.2 above. To support the review application, the applicant puts forward the justifications as set out in paragraph 4 above which can be summarized into the followings: the proposed development is a small-scale development which will optimise land use and facilitate sports development alike other similar recreational uses in the sub-urban areas; the applicant claims to have spent efforts in cleaning, maintaining the Site and nearby catchment area as well as submitting technical reports to government departments for consideration in the past; proposed use of eco-friendly toilets with regular collection and disposal of sewage by licensed contractor; minimal excavation or earth filling is involved in the current proposal; no tree felling; and no adverse environmental, traffic and fire safety impacts are anticipated arising from the low impact nature of golf putting. Having considered the revised proposal, written representation and the FI, the planning considerations and assessments on the review application are detailed below.

Planning Intention of the "GB" Zone

9.2 The Site falls within an area zoned "GB" where place of recreation, sports or culture and filling and excavation of land require permission from the Board. The proposed golf putting range with ancillary facilities and associated filling and excavation of land is not in line with the planning intention of the "GB" 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 in this zone. Although the applicant claims that the current proposal involves minimal excavation or earth filling, the applicant has not provided clear, detailed and consistent information to demonstrate the scope and necessity of the excavation and filling of land and substantiated his claim that existing terrain of the Site will remain unchanged under the current proposal. In response to the applicant's claim that technical reports have been submitted previously to government departments for consideration, the relevant government departments consulted indicate that no similar or previous proposals have been received from the applicant. Regarding the applicant's claim that various recreational uses have been allowed in other suburban areas, it should be noted that each development or planning application would be considered on its planning circumstances and individual merits. There are no exceptional circumstances or strong planning justifications in the submission for a departure from the planning intention of the "GB" zone.

Impacts on WGG

9.3 The Site is located within WGG and is close to a stream leading to WSD's raw water pumping station. Although the applicant proposes the use of eco-friendly toilets with regular collection and disposal of sewage by licensed contractor in response to the comments of CE/C, WSD on the potential risks of contamination to the WGG arising from the proposed development, details about the operation and management of the proposed development and the associated activities that

would pose high risks of contamination to the WGG have not been mentioned in the submission. The applicant has not submitted the required risk assessment and information including but not limited to layout plans, site formation plans, estimation of sewage flow generated, design and capacity of sewage holding tank with overflow detection system and seepage protection system, details of desludging operation and contingency plan as well as associated mitigation measures in the submission. Considering that the applicant has not submitted the required risk assessment to demonstrate that the proposed development would cause no material increase in pollution effect within the WGG, the water pollution risks and impacts could not be ascertained. CE/C, WSD maintains his previous views of having objection to the application with a view to safeguarding raw water quality within WGG.

Drainage Impact

- 9.4 The Site is a low-lying area which is not served by the public drainage system and adjoins natural slopes to the north and west. According to the ES of the OZP, excavation and filling of land within the “GB” zone requires planning permission from the Board as it may cause adverse drainage impact on the adjacent areas. The applicant has not provided information on whether there are drainage mitigation measures being implemented surrounding the Site or if underground drainage system has been installed underneath the Site to deal with the surface runoff during the inclement weather. Hence, CE/MS, DSD cannot conclude whether there are potential flooding risks to surrounding areas and whether the proposed development is considered acceptable or not from drainage perspective. Given that the applicant has not provided the required DIA, proposed formation plan(s), plan(s) showing drainage path, etc. to demonstrate that the proposed works will not alter existing natural drainage patterns, increase surface runoff, or cause flooding or siltation, CE/MS, DSD maintains his view that the applicant has not provided justification on the drainage impact for the proposed development in the review application nor demonstrated that sufficient drainage measures have been/will be implemented for his office to assess the potential flooding risks to surrounding areas and the drainage acceptability of the proposed development.

Landscape Impact

- 9.5 The Site was largely covered by vegetation and tree clusters at the time of consideration of s.16 application by the RNTPC and its surrounding areas are mainly a rural area predominated by woodland, grassland, scattered village houses and temporary structures. As advised by CTP/UD&L, PlanD, the “GB” zone where the Site located in is considered ‘distinctive landscape resources’. Although the applicant claims that no trees will be felled, the comparison of the aerial photos of July 2025 and May 2026 (**Plan R-4d**) reveals that tree felling within the Site has taken place. The applicant has not provided any landscape assessment to demonstrate the impact of the proposed development on the distinctive landscape character/ resources in the “GB” zone. In view of the above, CTP/UD&L, PlanD considers that there is insufficient information to demonstrate that the proposed development would not induce adverse landscape impact on the area and maintains her previous views of having reservation on the review application from landscape planning perspective.

Environmental, Traffic and Other Technical Aspects

- 9.6 In view that the Site would be equipped with portable toilets for collection, handling and disposal of sewage by a licensed contractor, and that the Site will be laid with artificial turf without storage/use/discharge of agrochemicals or use of loudspeaker/public announcement system, DEP considers that no adverse environmental impact would be anticipated and has no objection to the subject review application from environmental planning perspective. Having considered the applicant's written representation and FI regarding the capacity of the proposed development, the access arrangement, and parking and loading/unloading arrangement, C for T has no objection to the review application from traffic perspective. Other concerned government departments including D of FS, H(GEO), CEDD and DEMS maintain their previous views of having no objection to or no comment on the review application from fire safety, geotechnical and electricity supply safety aspects respectively.

TPB PG-No. 10

- 9.7 According to TPB PG-No. 10, application in the "GB" zone should comply with the development controls and restrictions of areas designated as WGGs and should not adversely affect the natural landscape, drainage, overstrain infrastructure and aggravate flooding in the area. The applicant has not provided the required information including risk assessment on WGG, information on existing vegetation, and drainage assessment to demonstrate no adverse impact from water supplies, landscape and drainage aspects would be induced by the proposed development. The application is not in line with TPB PG-No. 10 and there are no exceptional circumstances or strong planning justifications in the submission for a departure from the planning intention of the "GB" zone as discussed in paragraph 9.2 above.

Previous Applications

- 9.8 The planning circumstances of the current application are largely similar to those of the two previous rejected applications as mentioned in paragraph 6.9 above in that the applicant has not demonstrated that the proposed use would not cause adverse impacts on the surrounding areas and there is insufficient information to justify the need of the proposed use at the Site. Rejection of the current application is in line with the RNTPC's previous decisions.

Public Comments

- 9.9 Regarding the three public comments objecting to and providing views on the application as detailed in paragraph 8 above, the government departments' comments in paragraph 7 and planning assessments in paragraphs 9.1 to 9.8 above are relevant. As for the public comment objecting to the application on the ground that some land owners of the private lots on the Site did not provide consent to the applicant to proceed with the planning application, it should be noted that the applicant took reasonable steps to notify all the land owners of the private lots at the Site in accordance to the requirements set out in the TPB Guidelines by publishing newspaper notices and sending notice to the Sai Kung Rural Committee at the s.16 planning application stage.

10. Planning Department's Views

10.1 Based on the assessments made in paragraph 9, having taken into account the public comments in paragraph 8, and given that there is no material change in the planning circumstances since the consideration of the subject application by the RNTPC, the Planning Department maintains its previous view of not supporting the application for the following reasons:

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

10.2 Alternatively, should the Board decide to approve the application, it is suggested that the permission shall be valid until 12.6.2030, and after the said date, the permission shall cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted is commenced or the permission is renewed. The following conditions of approval and advisory clauses are suggested for Members' reference:

Approval Conditions

- (a) the submission of a risk assessment report to prove and demonstrate no material increase in pollution effect resulting from the proposal before the commencement of construction works to the satisfaction of the Director of Water Supplies or of the Town Planning Board;
- (b) in relation to (a) above, the implementation of the mitigation and preventive measures identified in the risk assessment report before the commencement of operation to the satisfaction of the Director of Water Supplies or of the Town Planning Board;
- (c) the submission of a fire service installations proposal before the commencement of construction works to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board;
- (d) in relation to (c) above, the implementation of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting before the commencement of operation to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board;

- (e) the submission of a drainage impact assessment before the commencement of construction works to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board;
- (f) in relation to (e) above, the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the drainage impact assessment before the commencement of operation to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board;
- (g) the submission and implementation of a landscape proposal before the commencement of operation to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board;
- (h) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (c) or (e) is not complied with before the commencement of construction works, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice; and
- (i) if any of the above planning conditions (b), (d), (f) or (g) is not complied with before the commencement of operation, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.

Recommended Advisory Clauses

The recommended advisory clauses are attached at **Annex H**.

11. Decision Sought

- 11.1 The Board is invited to consider the application for a review of the RNTPC's decision and decide whether to accede to the application.
- 11.2 Should the Board decide to reject the review application, Members are invited to advise what reason(s) for rejection should be given to the applicant.
- 11.3 Alternatively, should the Board decide to approve the review application, Members are invited to consider the approval condition(s) and advisory clause(s), if any, to be attached to the permission, and the date when the validity of the permission should expire.

12. Attachments

Annex A	RNTPC Paper No. A/SK-TMT/84A
Annex B	Extract of minutes of the RNTPC meeting held on 5.12.2025
Annex C	Secretary of the Board's letter dated 19.12.2025
Annex D	Applicant's email dated 5.1.2026 applying for review and supplementary information via email dated 7.1.2026
Annex E	FI received on 25.3.2026

Annex F	FI received on 16.4.2026 and 17.4.2026
Annex G	FI received on 28.4.2026 and 29.4.2026
Annex H	Recommended Advisory Clauses
Annex J	Public Comments
Drawings R-1a and R-1b	Conceptual Diagram of the Proposed Development
Plan R-1	Location Plan
Plan R-2	Site Plan
Plan R-3	Aerial Photo
Plans R-4a to R-4d	Site Photos

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT
JUNE 2026**