
Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East District

[Messrs Kimson P.H. Chiu and Alexander W.Y. Mak, Senior Town Planners/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (STPs/FSYLE), Mr Ajjum D. Chan and Ms Karen K.Y. Chan, Town Planners/ Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (TPs/FSYLE), and Ms Selena Y.N. Sin, Assistant Town Planner/ Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Extracted from Confirmed Minutes of 784th Meeting of RNTPC on 13.3.2026

Agenda Item 17

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/STT/26 Proposed Filling of Ponds for Permitted Innovation and Technology Hub (including Permitted Cargo Handling and Forwarding Facilities, Creative Industries, Eating Place, Flat (Staff Quarters only), Industrial Use, Information Technology and Telecommunications Industries, Office, Public Utility Installation, Research, Design and Development Centre, Shop and Services and Warehouse (excluding Dangerous Goods Godown)) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Innovation and Technology” Zone, Lot 764 RP (Part) in D.D. 99, San Tin, Yuen Long (RNTPC Paper No. A/STT/26B)

Presentation and Question Sessions

41. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Kimson P.H. Chiu, STP/FSYLE, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed works, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The application site (the Site) fell within the project boundary of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report submitted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) in support of the development of the San Tin Technopole (the Technopole), which was approved with conditions in 2024, with one of the conditions stipulating that no pond filling works would be allowed prior to commencement of construction of the ecologically enhanced fishponds at the planned Sam Po Shue Wetland Conservation Park (SPS WCP). The application, being a piecemeal development by private initiative, was not in line with the

“park-led” model under the Government’s policy of developing the Technopole in a coordinated and holistic manner. The Planning Department (PlanD) did not support the application.

42. A Member asked whether it was mandatory to coordinate and implement the pond filling works for the Technopole by the Government. In response, Mr Kimson P.H. Chiu, STP/FSYLE, explained that the project proponent (i.e. CEDD) was required to comply with the approval conditions of the approved EIA Report, including the condition prohibiting pond filling works prior to commencement of construction of the ecologically enhanced fishponds at the planned SPS WCP as mentioned above. CEDD considered that despite the applicant’s commitment to adhering to the approval conditions and recommendations of the approved EIA Report, the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of the implementation of the relevant requirements/mitigation measures and approval conditions in the approved EIA Report at the Site could not be ascertained should the proposed pond filling works be taken forward under private initiative without coordination by the Government.

43. The Chairperson supplemented that the development of the Technopole was a government-led project. Based on the approved EIA Report, its development necessitated systematic and cross-disciplinary coordination, including but not limited to land resumption and site clearance for site formation and infrastructural works to ensure that the development of the Technopole was implemented in a coordinated and holistic manner, and the relevant approval conditions of the approved EIA Report were duly complied with. There was no intention for the development to be carried out by private initiative without coordination by the Government.

44. In response to two Members’ enquiries, Mr Kimson P.H. Chiu, STP/FSYLE, said that the Site only comprised a private lot, which was not owned by the applicant and subject to land resumption by the Government.

Deliberation Session

45. The Chairperson recapitulated that the application was for the proposed filling of ponds, while the proposed Innovation and Technology Hub was a permitted use. The Site fell within the project boundary of the Technopole which was supported by various technical

assessments, including an EIA approved with conditions under the EIA Ordinance. It was the intention of the Government to implement the Technopole in a coordinated and holistic manner, and any piecemeal development would jeopardise such intention. Moreover, no ecological impact assessment was submitted by the applicant to ascertain the ecological acceptability of the proposed pond filling works.

46. A Member, while concurring with PlanD's recommendation, was concerned whether the general public was aware of the implementation programme of the Technopole under the Government's initiatives. In response, the Chairperson said that the Government had announced to the public the implementation and phased development programme of the Technopole, as well as the consideration of establishing a dedicated company to take forward the development of the Technopole in collaboration with the market. The applicant would have the opportunity to participate in the development at the tendering stage.

47. Another Member expressed the potential difficulties in implementing the Technopole under private initiatives without the coordination of the Government. Should the application be approved, a number of clauses with details for implementation of the approval conditions and recommendations of the approved EIA Report would have to be incorporated into the contract of the applicant with the contractor, and it would be most difficult, if not impossible, for the Government to vet the contract and ascertain that it could adhere to the said approval conditions and recommendations. In that connection, it was not the intention to allow the private sector to carry out the works without the Government's coordination, otherwise, there would be risk of non-compliance with the approval conditions and recommendations, and hence disputes with the applicant. As such, the application should not be approved.

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

- “(a) the proposed filling of ponds is not in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for ‘Application for Developments within Deep Bay Area under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’ (TPB PG-No. 12C) in that there is no ecological impact assessment in the submission to demonstrate that the proposed development would not result in a net loss in wetland function and

negative disturbance impact; and

- (b) there is no strong justification for the proposed filling of ponds to be carried out by the applicant for the proposed Innovation and Technology (I&T) Hub as the proposed I&T Hub is not in line with the Government's development policy of comprehensive planning and implementation including the site formation and pond filling works of the Technopole coordinated by the Government."

~~**Agenda Item 18**~~

~~**Section 16 Application**~~

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

~~A/STT/31 Temporary Vehicle Repair Workshop with Ancillary Open Storage for a Period of 3 Years in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Cultural and Community Uses with Supporting Uses and Facilities" Zone, Lots 461 and 3373 (Part) in D.D. 102 and Adjoining Government Land, San Tin, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/STT/31)~~

~~**Presentation and Question Sessions**~~

~~49. With the aid of some plans, Ms Karen K.Y. Chan, TP/FSYLE, 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 had no objection to the application.~~

~~50. Members had no question on the application.~~

~~**Deliberation Session**~~

~~51. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 13.3.2029, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board and subject to the approval conditions stated in the~~