

Relevant Extracts of Town Planning Board Guidelines for
Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses
under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 13G)

1. On 14.4.2023, the Town Planning Board Guidelines for Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 13G) were promulgated, which set out the following criteria for the various categories of area:
 - (a) Category 1 areas: favourable consideration will normally be given to applications within these areas, subject to no major adverse departmental comments and local objections, or the concerns of the departments and local residents can be addressed through the implementation of approval conditions. Technical assessments should be submitted if the proposed uses may cause significant environmental and traffic concerns;
 - (b) Category 2 areas: planning permission could be granted on a temporary basis up to a maximum period of 3 years, subject to no adverse departmental comments and local objections, or the concerns of the departments and local residents can be addressed through the implementation of approval conditions. Technical assessments, where appropriate, should be submitted to demonstrate that the proposed uses would not have adverse drainage, traffic, visual, landscaping and environmental impacts on the surrounding areas;
 - (c) Category 3 areas: applications would normally not be favourably considered unless the applications are on sites with previous planning approvals (irrespective of whether the application is submitted by the applicant of previous approval or a different applicant). Sympathetic consideration may be given if genuine efforts have been demonstrated in compliance with approval conditions of the previous planning applications and/or relevant technical assessments/proposals have been included in the fresh applications, if required, to demonstrate that the proposed uses would not generate adverse drainage, traffic, visual, landscaping and environmental impacts on the surrounding areas. Planning permission could be granted on a temporary basis up to a maximum period of 3 years, subject to no adverse departmental comments and local objections, or the concerns of the departments and local residents can be addressed through the implementation of approval conditions; and
 - (d) Category 4 areas: applications would normally be rejected except under exceptional circumstances. For applications on sites with previous planning approvals (irrespective of whether the application is submitted by the applicant of previous approval or a different applicant), and subject to no adverse departmental comments and local objections, sympathetic consideration may be given if genuine efforts have been demonstrated in compliance with approval conditions of the previous planning applications and/or relevant technical assessments/proposals have been included in the fresh application, if required, to demonstrate that the proposed uses would not generate adverse drainage, traffic, visual, landscaping and environmental impacts on the surrounding areas. The intention is however to encourage the phasing out of such non-conforming uses as early as possible. A maximum period of 3 years may be allowed for an applicant to identify suitable sites for relocation. Application for renewal of approval will be assessed on its individual merits.

2. In assessing applications for open storage and port back-up uses, the other major relevant assessment criteria are also summarised as follows:
- (a) port back-up sites and those types of open storage generating adverse noise, air pollution, visual intrusion and frequent heavy vehicle traffic should not be located adjacent to sensitive receivers such as residential dwellings, hospitals, schools and other community facilities;
 - (b) port back-up uses are major generators of traffic, with container trailer/tractor parks generating the highest traffic per unit area. In general, port back-up sites should have good access to the strategic road network, or be accessed by means of purpose built roads;
 - (c) adequate screening of sites through landscaping and/or fencing should be considered where sites are located adjacent to public roads or are visible from surrounding residential areas;
 - (d) there is a general presumption against conversion of active or good quality agricultural land and fish ponds to other uses on an ad-hoc basis. For flood prone areas or sites which would obstruct natural drainage channels and overland flow, advice should be sought;
 - (e) for applications involving sites with previous planning approvals, should there be no evidence to demonstrate that the applicants have made any genuine effort to comply with the approval conditions of the previous planning applications, planning permission may be refused notwithstanding other criteria set out in the Guidelines are complied with; and
 - (f) having considered that the open storage and port back-up uses have a role to play in Hong Kong's economy and provide considerable employment opportunities, and the operators/uses affected by resumption and clearance operations of the Government to make way for developments may face difficulties in finding a replacement site, sympathetic consideration could be given to such type of applications, except those involving land in Category 4 area (only minor encroachment may be allowed), if the following criteria are met:
 - (i) policy support is given by the relevant bureau(x) to the application for relocation of the affected uses/operations to the concerned sites; and
 - (ii) no adverse departmental comments and local objections, or the concerns could be addressed by approval conditions.

Similar s.16 Application within the Same “Agriculture” Zone in the Vicinity of the Application Site in the Past Five Years

Rejected Application

	Application No.	Use/Development	Date of Consideration	Rejection Reasons
1.	A/YL-KTN/1238	Temporary Open Storage of Construction Machineries and Materials with Ancillary Facilities and Associated Filling of Land for a Period of Three Years	24.7.2026	(1) to (3)

- (1) The applied use with associated filling of land is not in line with the planning intention of the “AGR” zone. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis.
- (2) The applied use with associated filling of land is not compatible with the surrounding land uses.
- (3) The applied use with associated filling of land does not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 13G) in that no previous planning approval has been granted to the site and there are adverse departmental comment and public objections.

Government Departments' General Comments

1. Traffic

Comments of the Commissioner for Transport:

- no adverse comment on the application from traffic engineering perspective; and
- advisory comments are at **Appendix V**.

Comments of the Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department (HyD):

- no in-principle objection to the application from highways maintenance point of view; and
- advisory comments are at **Appendix V**.

2. Drainage

Comments of the Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department:

- no in-principle objection to the application from drainage point of view;
- should the application be approved, conditions should be stipulated requiring the submission of a revised drainage proposal and the implementation and maintenance of the drainage facilities identified in the revised drainage proposal for the applied use to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board; and
- advisory comments are at **Appendix V**.

3. Environment

Comments of the Director of Environmental Protection:

- no objection to the application from environmental planning perspective;
- based on the applicant's submission, the applied use would not cause traffic of heavy vehicle and dusty operation. According to his review, there are residential structures within 100m from the boundary of the Site;
- there is one substantiated environmental complaint received against the Site concerning suspected flytipping activities in the past three years; and
- advisory comments are at **Appendix V**.

4. **Fire Safety**

Comments of the Director of Fire Services:

- no in-principle objection to the application subject to fire service installations and water supplies being provided to his satisfaction; and
- advisory comments are at **Appendix V**.

5. **Archaeological Aspect**

Comments of the Executive Secretary (Antiquities and Monuments) 2 of Antiquities and Monuments Office, Development Bureau:

- no in-principle objection to the application;
- the application site falls within Tai Kong Po Site of Archaeological Interest (**Plans A-1 and A-2**). According to the applicant's submission, the proposed drainage works will be carried out within the 400mm thick gravel backfill while some of the catchpits will still encroach the original soil layer and may adversely impact the archaeological resources underneath; and
- advisory comments are at **Appendix V**.

6. **Landscape Aspect**

Comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department:

- no adverse comment on the application from landscape planning perspective;
- based on the aerial photo, the Site was situated in an area of rural inland plain landscape character comprising farmland, open storage sites/warehouses, village houses, vacant land and scattered tree groups. The applied temporary use is considered not incompatible with the landscape setting in the proximity;
- according to the aerial photo and site photos, the Site was largely formed and occupied by vehicles. No tree was observed within the Site. According to the Application Form, no tree felling will be involved; and
- in view of the above, significant adverse landscape impact arising from applied use is not anticipated.

7. **District Officer's Comments**

Comments of the District Officer (Yuen Long), Home Affairs Department:

- his office has not received any comment from the locals on the application and he has no particular comment on the application.

8. **Other Departments**

The following government departments have no objection to/no comment on the application and their advisory comments, if any, are at **Appendix V**:

- Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department;
- Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department;
- Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services; and
- Project Manager (West), Civil Engineering and Development Department.

Recommended Advisory Clauses

- (a) prior planning permission should have been obtained before commencing the applied use at the application site (the Site);
- (b) failure to reinstate the Site as required under the relevant approval condition upon expiry of the planning permission might constitute an unauthorized development under the Town Planning Ordinance and be subject to enforcement and prosecution actions;
- (c) to resolve any land issues relating to the applied use with the concerned owner(s) and/or occupant(s);
- (d) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department (LandsD) that there are unauthorized building works and/or uses on the private lot which are already subject to lease enforcement actions according to case priority. The lot owner(s) should rectify/regularize the lease breaches as demanded by LandsD;
- (e) to note the comments of the Commissioner for Transport that:
 - (i) the Site is connected to the public road network via a section of a local access road which is not managed by the Transport Department. The land status of the local access road should be checked with LandsD. Moreover, the management and maintenance responsibilities of the local access road should be clarified with the relevant lands and maintenance authorities accordingly;
 - (ii) sufficient manoeuvring space shall be provided within the Site; and
 - (iii) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (f) to note the comments of the Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department (HyD) that:
 - (i) the Site is connecting, via local track, to a section of Kong Tai Road which is not maintained by HyD. HyD shall not be responsible for the maintenance of the proposed access connecting the Site, including the adjoining section of Kong Tai Road and local tracks, if any; and
 - (ii) adequate drainage measures shall be provided to prevent surface water running from the Site to the nearby public roads and drains;
- (g) to note the comments of the Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department that:
 - (i) the detailed comments on the drainage proposal previously provided to the applicant shall be taken into account in the revised drainage proposal; and
 - (ii) to encourage a higher quality submission and avoid rounds of comments, thereby shortening the processing time, the applicant shall complete the checklist previously provided in preparing the drainage proposal and include the checklist in the submission. Otherwise, a longer processing time may be required by her office;

- (h) to note the comments of the Director of Environmental Protection that:
 - (i) the applicant shall follow the revised ‘Code of Practice on Handling the Environmental Aspects of Temporary Uses and Open Storage Sites’;
 - (ii) the applicant shall follow the relevant guidelines and requirements in relevant Professional Persons Environmental Consultative Committee Practice Notes (ProPECCPNs), in particular the ProPECCPN 1/23 ‘Drainage Plans subject to Comment by the Environmental Protection Department’;
 - (iii) the applicant shall provide adequate supporting infrastructure/facilities for proper collection, treatment and disposal of waste/wastewater generated from the applied use; and
 - (iv) the applicant shall meet the statutory requirements under relevant environmental legislation;
- (i) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services that:
 - (i) in consideration of the design/nature of the application, the applicant shall submit a Declaration Form for the Compliance of Fire Safety Requirements together with relevant FS 251 certificate for approval;
 - (ii) the submission of a completed Declaration Form alongside valid FS 251 will be considered equivalent to compliance with the relevant approval conditions;
 - (iii) if the applied use will involve erection of enclosed structure(s), the aforesaid Declaration Form will no longer be applicable while the applicant is required to submit relevant layout plans incorporated with proposed fire service installations to his department for approval; and
 - (iv) if any proposed structures are required to comply with the Buildings Ordinance (BO) (Cap. 123), detailed fire services requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans;
- (j) to note the comments the Executive Secretary (Antiquities and Monuments) 2 of Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO), Development Bureau that the applicant shall notify AMO two weeks before the commencement of the drainage works so as to facilitate AMO’s site inspection in the course of excavation; and
- (k) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department (BD) that:
 - (i) it is noted that filling of land and no building structure are proposed in the application. Before any new building works (including containers/open sheds as temporary buildings, demolition and land filling, etc.) are to be carried out on the Site, prior approval and consent of the Building Authority (BA) should be obtained, otherwise they are unauthorized building works (UBW) under the Buildings Ordinance (BO). An Authorized Person should be appointed as the co-ordinator for the proposed building works in accordance with the BO;
 - (ii) the Site shall be provided with means of obtaining access thereto from a street and emergency vehicular access in accordance with Regulations 5 and 41D of the

Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R) respectively;

- (iii) the Site does not abut a specified street of not less than 4.5m wide and its permitted development intensity shall be determined under Regulation 19(3) of B(P)R at building plan submission stage;
- (iv) if the existing structures (not being New Territories Exempted House) are erected on leased land without the approval of the BA, they are UBW under the BO and should not be designated for any applied use under the application;
- (v) for UBW erected on leased land, enforcement action may be taken by BD to effect their removal in accordance with the prevailing enforcement policy against UBW as and when necessary. The granting of any planning approval should not be construed as an acceptance of any existing building works or UBW on the Site under BO;
- (vi) any temporary shelters or converted containers for office, storage, washroom or other uses are considered as temporary buildings are subject to the control of Part VII of B(P)R; and
- (vii) detailed checking under BO will be carried out at building plan submission stage.

☐Urgent ☐Return receipt ☐Expand Group ☐Restricted ☐Prevent Copy

tpbpd/PLAND

寄件者: [REDACTED]
寄件日期: 2026年07月24日星期五 23:40
收件者: tpbpd/PLAND
主旨: A/YL-KTN/1254 DD 109 Yuen Long ABE
類別: Internet Email

A/YL-KTN/1254
Lots 1047 S.A (Part) and 1049 S.B RP (Part) in D.D. 109, Yuen Long
Site area: About 1,756sq.m
Zoning: "Agriculture"
Applied use: Open Storage Second Hand Cars / 56 Vehicle Parking / **Filling of Land**

Dear TPB Members,

So FAKE ABE application withdrawn, hopefully AFCD is finally showing some teeth with regard to abuse of this type of application.

Now back with the real deal, open storage.

There is genuine farming activity being carried out in the district. There is no justification to losing yet more fertile land close to a water source to brownfield.

The application should be rejected. Old cars can be stored in industrial premises on platforms.

Mary Mulvihill

From: [REDACTED]
To: tpbpd <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>
Date: Friday, 20 June 2025 12:12 PM HKT
Subject: A/YL-KTN/1120 DD 109 Yuen Long ABE

Apologies for typo. Should read A/YL-KTN/1120

From: [REDACTED]
To: tpbpd <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>
Date: Thursday, 19 June 2025 3:02 AM HKT
Subject: A/YL-KTN/1020 DD 109 Yuen Long ABE

A/YL-KTN/1020 (typo should read 1120)

Lots 1047 S.A (Part) and 1049 S.B RP (Part) in D.D. 109, Yuen Long

☐Urgent ☐Return receipt ☐Expand Group ☐Restricted ☐Prevent Copy

Site area : About 1,600sq.m

Zoning: "Agriculture"

Applied use: Animal Boarding Establishment / 4 Vehicle Parking / **5 Years / Filling of Land**

Dear TPB Members,

STRONG OBJECTIONS. Previous comments applicable and upheld.

887 FAKE Hobby Farm was withdrawn and site was the incorporated into a large 1012 Warehouse application that has also been withdrawn.

So its back to manipulating the brownfield operation via a series of applications for smaller sites. The Applicant proposes filling in the entire site.

As with the FAKE Hobby Farm, members should also question the issue of supply and demand for ABE. They also have a duty to consider that 95% of applications for this purpose are REVOKED because they are FAKE in nature.

There is extensive genuine agricultural activity in the district. It is not Cat 2 so not compatible with the obvious intention to use for brownfield operations..

There is no justification to approve the application.

And in view of the number of revocations allowing approval periods of 5 years for this activity is a travesty.

Mary Mulvihill

From: [REDACTED]
To: tpbpd <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>
Date: Tuesday, 14 February 2023 2:50 AM HKT
Subject: A/YL-KTN/887 and A/YL-KTN/891 DD 109 Yuen Long

A/YL-KTN/887

Lot 1049 S.B RP (Part) in D.D. 109, Yuen Long

Site area : About 1,233sq.m

Zoning: "Agriculture"

☐Urgent ☐Return receipt ☐Expand Group ☐Restricted ☐Prevent Copy

Applied use: Hobby Farm / 3 Vehicle Parking / **5 Years / Filling of Land**

A/YL-KTN/891

Lot 1047 RP, 1049 S.A and 1049 RP (Part) in D.D. 109, Yuen Long

Site area : About 6,831sq.m

Zoning: "Agriculture"

Applied use: Hobby Farm / 13 Vehicle Parking / **5 Years / Filling of Land**

Dear TPB Members,

These two applications should be considered together as they are adjoining sites and the combined 8,000sq.m of farm land has already been stripped of vegetation.

The lots are next to a large parking/open storage operation. The intention is obviously Destroy to Build.

This is unacceptable as there is extensive genuine agricultural activity in the district.

Reminders:

Unless with strong justifications, proposals involving extensive site formation, vegetation clearance/tree felling, excavation or filling of land/pond are generally not supported.

Planning application other use in the "AGR" zone is generally not supported except those on land with no active farming activities and low agricultural rehabilitation potential.

Moreover TPB has a duty to question what is the genuine demand for 'hobby farming'? Can it support the numerous applications for such use?

Now that people are free to travel again there will be a significant reduced demand for distractions like hobby farming. This is a trend already visible at West Kowloon waterfront where there has been a decline in the number of private cars with families bringing large amounts of camping equipment to the waterfront.

Mary Mulvihill

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號

260724-232813-85752

Reference Number:

提交限期

24/07/2026

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

24/07/2026 23:28:13

Date and time of submission:

有關的規劃申請編號

A/YL-KTN/1254

The application no. to which the comment relates:

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

先生 Mr. Tang Nam

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

致：城市規劃委員會秘書處

強烈反對規劃申請（擬議臨時露天存放二手待售私家車及相關填土工程（為期3年））
本人 / 我們為元朗錦田北及江大路一帶的受影響居民及村民，現就規劃申請編號 A/YL-KTN/1254（涉及元朗錦田北丈量約份第109約地段第1047號A分段及第1049號B分段餘段（部份））提出最強烈的反對。

申請人擬於上述地盤面積達 1,756 平方米的「農業」用途土地上，設立擁有 56 個私家車位的露天存放場，並進行面積達 880 平方米、厚度 0.15 米的填土及鋪石仔工程。此項申請將對附近村民的日常生活造成嚴重破壞，理由如下：

一、嚴重加劇江大路交通擠塞，威脅村民唯一出入通道安全

1. 村民唯一通道：江大路為附近村民及居民通往居住環境的唯一主要道路。該路段路面狹窄，日常雙向交會已甚為緊迫。

2. 大型拖車及頻繁車流衝擊：雖然申請書聲稱僅存放私家車，但二手車的運送、進出及搬運必然涉及大型拖車（Car Carrier）或重型車輛接載。申請地點擬設 56 個車位，車輛頻繁進出必將引發嚴重交通癱瘓，徹底堵塞村民唯一的出入要道，甚至阻礙消防車及救護車等緊急救援車輛進入，極度威脅居民生命財產安全。

二、填土工程改變地形，大幅增加周邊水浸威脅

1. 破壞自然吸水能力：申請人擬於地盤進行高達 880 平方米、厚 0.15 米的填土及鋪石仔工程。原本具有吸水及緩衝功能的農地被填平及硬化後，地表逕流量將大幅激增。

2. 加重排水系統負擔：錦田北一帶在暴雨期間本已面對極大排水壓力。地盤填土後，雨水將無法自然滲入地下，進一步加劇周邊低窪村落及鄰近渠道（Existing Drainage）的負擔，在豪雨期間極易引發嚴重水浸，直接威脅居民家園。

三、嚴重破壞鄉郊居住環境及生活質素

1. 規劃意向違背：申請地點位於「農業」地帶，本應保留作農業生產及維護鄉郊生態。轉作商業性質的車場及進行填土，與周邊鄉郊環境完全不協調。

2. 日常生活受嚴重滋擾：車場營運（包括試車、車輛進出、光害及噪音）將徹底打破原

本寧靜的居住環境，產生大量灰塵與廢氣，嚴重損害附近居民的身體健康與生活質素。

☐Urgent ☐Return receipt ☐Expand Group ☐Restricted ☐Prevent Copy ☐Confidential

Seq 3

3

tpbpd/PLAND

寄件者: [REDACTED]
寄件日期: 2026年09月06日星期日 23:03
收件者: tpbpd/PLAND
主旨: Re: A/YL-KTN/1254 DD 109 Yuen Long ABE
類別: Internet Email

Dear TPB Members,

" The application site ("the Site") falls within Tai Kong Po Site of Archaeological Interest (SAI). According to the submission, ground excavation for catchpits and 300-375mm u-channels will be carried out along the site periphery. According to the previous archaeological works at the Site, archaeological remains from Song, Ming and Qing dynasties were unearthed underneath a shallow topsoil about 10-15 cm thick. Considering the archaeological significance of the SAI and the presence of findings immediately under ground level, AMO has concerns on the possible impact from the proposed works on the SAI.

AMO is a toothless tiger, it never fights to protect sites of historical, cultural or archaeological interest.

That the work and the movement generated could impact buried objects is very likely. Contaminants could leak into the soil. Second hand cars have little value, the interest generated at the Palace Museum in historical artefacts underline the value of preserving and protecting any items that could shed more light on the lives of people who lived here centuries ago.

There is no justification to approve the application.

Mary Mulvihill

From: [REDACTED]
To: tpbpd <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>
Date: Friday, 24 July 2026 11:39 PM HKT
Subject: A/YL-KTN/1254 DD 109 Yuen Long ABE

A/YL-KTN/1254
Lots 1047 S.A (Part) and 1049 S.B RP (Part) in D.D. 109, Yuen Long
Site area: About 1,756sq.m
Zoning: "Agriculture"
Applied use: Open Storage Second Hand Cars / 56 Vehicle Parking / **Filling of Land**

Dear TPB Members,

So FAKE ABE application withdrawn, hopefully AFCD is finally showing some teeth with regard to abuse of this type of application.

☐Urgent ☐Return receipt ☐Expand Group ☐Restricted ☐Prevent Copy ☐Confidential

Now back with the real deal, open storage.

There is genuine farming activity being carried out in the district. There is no justification to losing yet more fertile land close to a water source to brownfield.

The application should be rejected. Old cars can be stored in industrial premises on platforms.

Mary Mulvihill

From: [REDACTED]
To: tpbpd <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>
Date: Friday, 20 June 2025 12:12 PM HKT
Subject: A/YL-KTN/1120 DD 109 Yuen Long ABE

Apologies for typo. Should read A/YL-KTN/1120

From: [REDACTED]
To: tpbpd <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>
Date: Thursday, 19 June 2025 3:02 AM HKT
Subject: A/YL-KTN/1020 DD 109 Yuen Long ABE

A/YL-KTN/1020 (typo should read 1120)

Lots 1047 S.A (Part) and 1049 S.B RP (Part) in D.D. 109, Yuen Long

Site area : About 1,600sq.m

Zoning: "Agriculture"

Applied use: Animal Boarding Establishment / 4 Vehicle Parking / **5 Years / Filling of Land**

Dear TPB Members,

STRONG OBJECTIONS. Previous comments applicable and upheld.

887 FAKE Hobby Farm was withdrawn and site was the incorporated into a large 1012 Warehouse application that has also been withdrawn.

So its back to manipulating the brownfield operation via a series of applications for smaller sites. The Applicant proposes filling in the entire site.

As with the FAKE Hobby Farm, members should also question the issue of supply and demand for ABE. They also have a duty to consider that 95% of applications for this purpose are REVOKED because they are FAKE in nature.

☐Urgent ☐Return receipt ☐Expand Group ☐Restricted ☐Prevent Copy ☐Confidential

There is extensive genuine agricultural activity in the district. It is not Cat 2 so not compatible with the obvious intention to use for brownfield operations..

There is no justification to approve the application.

And in view of the number of revocations allowing approval periods of 5 years for this activity is a travesty.

Mary Mulvihill

From: [REDACTED]
To: tpbpd <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>
Date: Tuesday, 14 February 2023 2:50 AM HKT
Subject: A/YL-KTN/887 and A/YL-KTN/891 DD 109 Yuen Long

A/YL-KTN/887

Lot 1049 S.B RP (Part) in D.D. 109, Yuen Long

Site area : About 1,233sq.m

Zoning: "Agriculture"

Applied use: Hobby Farm / 3 Vehicle Parking / **5 Years / Filling of Land**

A/YL-KTN/891

Lot 1047 RP, 1049 S.A and 1049 RP (Part) in D.D. 109, Yuen Long

Site area : About 6,831sq.m

Zoning: "Agriculture"

Applied use: Hobby Farm / 13 Vehicle Parking / **5 Years / Filling of Land**

Dear TPB Members,

These two applications should be considered together as they are adjoining sites and the combined 8,000sq.m of farm land has already been stripped of vegetation.

☐Urgent ☐Return receipt ☐Expand Group ☐Restricted ☐Prevent Copy ☐Confidential

The lots are next to a large parking/open storage operation. The intention is obviously Destroy to Build.

This is unacceptable as there is extensive genuine agricultural activity in the district.

Reminders:

Unless with strong justifications, proposals involving extensive site formation, vegetation clearance/tree felling, excavation or filling of land/pond are generally not supported.

Planning application other use in the "AGR" zone is generally not supported except those on land with no active farming activities and low agricultural rehabilitation potential.

Moreover TPB has a duty to question what is the genuine demand for 'hobby farming'? Can it support the numerous applications for such use?

Now that people are free to travel again there will be a significant reduced demand for distractions like hobby farming. This is a trend already visible at West Kowloon waterfront where there has been a decline in the number of private cars with families bringing large amounts of camping equipment to the waterfront.

Mary Mulvihill

tpbpd/PLAND

寄件者: [REDACTED]
寄件日期: 2026年09月05日星期六 11:43
收件者: e-Enquiry Counter/LAO/LANDSD; tpbpd/PLAND; enquire1/PLAND;
dloylsol@landsd.gov.hk
主旨: 規劃申請編號 A/YL-KTN/1254 (涉及元朗錦田北丈量約份第109約地段第1047號A分段及第1049號B分段餘段 (部份)) 提出最強烈的反對
類別: Internet Email

本人是一名在上述肇事地段鄰近社區居住超過 30 年的原住村民。本人代表家人及附近受影響居民，謹以此信向城市規劃委員會（城規會）表達對規劃申請 A/YL-KTN/1254 的最強烈反對與抗議！

申請人擬於面積約 1,756 平方米劃為「農業」用途的地段上，鋪設 880 平方米（厚度 0.15 米）的石仔泥土進行填土工程，並容納多達 56 個私家車泊位。此項擬議發展將嚴重破壞我們建立數十年的安居環境，對交通、水浸風險及日常生活帶來災難性影響。以下為本人的極力反對理由：

一、違背「農業」劃區意向，嚴懲先破壞後申請

1. 申請地點於《錦田北分區計劃大綱核准圖》上明確劃為「農業」用途。規劃意向本應保護良好農地及鄉郊景觀，但申請人卻擬將其變為露天車場及進行鋪石填土，完全破壞鄉郊生態與自然環境。
2. 填土面積高達 880 平方米，對原本的自然土地結構造成不可逆轉的破壞。城規會不應鼓勵此等假借「臨時」之名、實則破壞鄉郊土地的商業發展。

二、唯一的「生命通道」將陷入嚴重交通癱瘓，威脅村民安全

1. 唯一主要通道：申請地點僅靠江太路進出。江太路道路狹窄，是我們鄰近村民每日出行、長者往返及學童上學唯一的日常主要通道。
2. 交通負荷過重：場內擬設高達 56 個私家車泊位。二手車買賣涉及大量頻繁的試車、進出、看車客戶及工作人員車輛流量。狹窄的江太路根本無法承受如此龐大的車流量。
3. 安全與救援風險：江太路欠缺完善的人車分道設施，大量車輛頻繁進出將極易引發交通意外，威脅行人安全。更嚴重的是，一旦發生緊急事故，頻繁進出的車輛將堵塞這條「唯一的通路」，導致消防車及救護車無法及時進入救援，後果不堪設想！

三、填土工程加劇水浸威脅，危及生命財產安全

1. 喪失天然吸水能力：申請場地涉及 880 平方米的填土及鋪石工程。原本可吸納雨水的泥地被硬化後，地表徑流將劇增。

☐Urgent ☐Return receipt ☐Expand Group ☐Restricted ☐Prevent Copy ☐Confidential

2. 極易造成水浸暴發：錦田一帶在暴雨季節本已面臨排水壓力。申請人雖提出排水建議，但將大量額外地表水排入周邊現有渠網，極易造成泥沙堵塞及溢流，直接淹沒附近低窪地區的村民家園，嚴重威脅我們居住 30 多年的家園安全。

四、嚴重干擾居民日常生活，破壞寧靜居住環境

1. 我們在此生活數十年，重視的是鄉郊的寧靜與安全。露天車場運作期間，車輛頻繁發動、廢氣排放、噪音及燈光強光干擾，將徹底摧毀居民的日常休息品質。

2. 此外，車場運作亦帶來治安隱患，令村民尤其是長者與幼童每日生活在焦慮與不安之中。

五、申請人未經批准規劃存放及擺放車輛用途，已經大量擺放汽車，請問貴處會怎樣處理該問題？！

訴求：

作為深耕此地 30 多年的原住村民，我們絕不能接受以犧牲村民生活權益、道路安全及生命財產為代價的商業規劃！

本申請嚴重的交通堵塞問題、水浸風險及土地用途不符，完全不符合城規會指引。因此，本人嚴正要求城市規劃委員會貫徹保護鄉郊與居民權益的職責，否決規劃申請 A/YL-KTN/1254！

希望委員會能切實傾聽基層村民的心聲，還我們一個安全、寧靜的家園！



IMG_0741.png



IMG_0740.png



IMG_9965.jpeg

就規劃申請/覆核提出意見 Making Comment on Planning Application / Review

參考編號

260905-004633-54957

Reference Number:

提交限期

08/09/2026

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

05/09/2026 00:46:33

Date and time of submission:

有關的規劃申請編號

A/YL-KTN/1254

The application no. to which the comment relates:

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

先生 Mr. Lee

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

本人為元朗錦田北及江大路一帶的受影響居民及村民，現就規劃申請編號 A/YL-KTN/1254 (涉及元朗錦田北丈量約份第109約地段第1047號A分段及第1049號B分段餘段(部份)) 提出最強烈的反對。

申請人擬於上述地盤面積達 1,756 平方米的「農業」用途土地上，設立擁有 56 個私家車位的露天存放場，並進行面積達 880 平方米、厚度 0.15 米的填土及鋪石仔工程。此項申請將對附近村民的日常生活造成嚴重破壞，理由如下：

一、嚴重加劇江大路交通擠塞，威脅村民唯一出入通道安全

1. 村民唯一通道：江大路為附近村民及居民通往居住環境的唯一主要道路。該路段路面狹窄，日常雙向交會已甚為緊迫。

2. 大型拖車及頻繁車流衝擊：雖然申請書聲稱僅存放私家車，但二手車的運送、進出及搬運必然涉及大型拖車或重型車輛接載。申請地點擬設 56 個車位，車輛頻繁進出必將引發嚴重交通癱瘓，徹底堵塞村民唯一的出入要道，甚至阻礙消防車及救護車等緊急救援車輛進入，極度威脅居民生命財產安全。

二、填土工程改變地形，大幅增加周邊水浸威脅

1. 破壞自然吸水能力：申請人擬於地盤進行高達 880 平方米、厚 0.15 米的填土及鋪石仔工程。原本具有吸水及緩衝功能的農地被填平及硬化後，地表逕流量將大幅激增。

2. 加重排水系統負擔：錦田北一帶在暴雨期間本已面對極大排水壓力。地盤填土後，雨水將無法自然滲入地下，進一步加劇周邊低窪村落及鄰近渠道的負擔，在豪雨期間極易引發嚴重水浸，直接威脅居民家園。

三、嚴重破壞鄉郊居住環境及生活質素

1. 規劃意向違背：申請地點位於「農業」地帶，本應保留作農業生產及維護鄉郊生態。轉作商業性質的車場及進行填土，與周邊鄉郊環境完全不協調。

2. 日常生活受嚴重滋擾：車場營運(包括試車、車輛進出、光害及噪音)將徹底打破原本寧靜的居住環境，產生大量灰塵與廢氣，嚴重損害附近居民的身體健康與生活質素。