

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

According to TPB PG-No. 10, the relevant assessment criteria are summarized as follows:

- (a) there is a general presumption against development (other than redevelopment) in “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone. In general the Board will only be prepared to approve applications for development in the context of requests to rezone to an appropriate use;
- (b) an application for new development in “GB” zone will only be considered in exceptional circumstances and must be justified with very strong planning grounds;
- (c) 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;
- (d) 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;
- (e) 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; and
- (f) 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.

Previous s.16 Applications covering the Application Site

Approved Application

No.	Application No.	Use(s)/Development(s)	Date of Consideration (RNTPC)
1.	A/YL-NTM/468*	Proposed Temporary Animal Boarding Establishment with Ancillary Facilities for a Period of 3 Years and associated Filling of Land	1.3.2024 (Revoked on 1.9.2024)

* denotes permission revoked

Rejected Application

No .	Application No.	Use(s)/Development(s)	Date of Consideration (TPB)
1.	A/YL-NTM/405	Proposed Public Utility Installation (Solar Energy System)	19.3.2021 Rejected by TPB on review

Rejection Reasons:

- (1) Not in line with the planning intention of the “Green Belt” zone.
- (2) Not in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for ‘Application for Development within the Green Belt zone under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’ (TPB PG-No. 10) in that the proposed development is incompatible with the surrounding area, and causes adverse visual impact on the surrounding environment.
- (3) Not in line with the assessment criteria for considering applications for solar photovoltaic system in that there are adverse comments from relevant departments on visual aspect, and the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed use would not adversely affect the landscape character of the “GB” zone and jeopardise the integrity of the zone as a buffer.

Government Departments' General Comments

1. Traffic

Comments of the Commissioner for Transport:

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

2. Environment

Comments of the Director of Environmental Protection:

- considering the revised 'Code of Practice on Handling the Environmental Aspects of Temporary Uses and Open Storage Sites', it is noted that the applied use would not involve traffic of heavy vehicle and not involve dusty operations. There are residential premises within 100m from the project boundary. Considering the nature of the application as an animal boarding establishment with dogs, the applicant has proposed the following measures to control the potential environmental nuisance:
 - the animal boarding facilities will be enclosed and constructed with sound-proofing materials;
 - limit the number of dogs (i.e. 25) in the facility;
 - dogs would be staying in covered animal boarding facilities during non-business period;
 - 24-hour ventilation system would be provided in the animal boarding facilities; and
 - no audio amplification system for broadcasting will be used on the Site;
- based on the above, he has no adverse comment on the application from environmental planning perspective, as well as the associated filling of land;
- no environmental complaints relating to the Site were recorded in the past three years; and
- advisory comments are detailed in **Appendix V**.

3. **Drainage**

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

- no in-principle objection to the application from drainage operation and maintenance point of view;
- the applicant shall submit a revised drainage proposal to demonstrate how the rain water falling onto or flowing to the Site will be collected, conveyed and discharged;
- after completion of the required drainage works, a set of record photographs showing the completed drainage works with corresponding photograph locations marked clearly on the approved drainage plan shall be provided to DSD for reference;
- all the proposed drainage facilities should be constructed and maintained by the applicant at his own cost. The applicant should ensure and keep all drainage works on the Site under proper maintenance at all times; and
- advisory comments are detailed in **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 for firefighting being provided to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services; and
- advisory comments are detailed in **Appendix V**.

5. **Landscape**

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 taken in November 2024, the Site was situated in an area of settled valley landscape character comprising temporary structures, open storage sites/warehouses, vacant land and scattered tree groups. The applied use is considered not entirely incompatible with the landscape setting in the proximity;
- with reference to abovementioned aerial photo, site photos taken in and site visit in August 2026, the Site was largely formed. Several temporary structures and a grassed area were found on it. Some common trees including undesirable species (*Leucaena leucocephala*) were observed along the western site boundary. According to the Application Form and the Proposed Layout Plan, no tree felling will be involved and a tree protection zone was proposed for the existing trees;
- in view of the above, significant adverse landscape impact arising from the applied use is not anticipated; and
- advisory comments are detailed in **Appendix V**.

6. Agriculture, Nature Conservation and Animal Management

Comments of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation:

- no comment on the application; and
- advisory comments are detailed in **Appendix V**.

7. Building Matters

Comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department:

- no objection to the application; and
- advisory comments are detailed in **Appendix V**.

8. Other Departments

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

- Chief Engineer/Railway Development 1-1, Railway Development Office, HyD;
- Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department;
- Project Manager (West), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD);
- Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, CEDD;
- Commissioner of Police; and
- District Officer (Yuen Long), Home Affairs Department.

Recommended Advisory Clauses

- (a) prior planning permission should have been obtained before commencing the applied use at the application site (the Site);
- (b) should the applicant fail to comply with any of the approval conditions again resulting in revocation of the planning permission, sympathetic consideration may not be given by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee/Town Planning Board to any further application;
- (c) 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;
- (d) the Site falls within the boundary of Phase 2 Development of the San Tin Technopole (the Technopole). The Site may be resumed by the Government and the applied use at the Site may be terminated at any time during the planning approval period for implementation of Government projects;
- (e) to note the comments of the Project Manager (North), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) that the Site falls within the boundary of Phase 2 Development of the Technopole and the estimated departure schedule for the Site is between Q3 2028 and Q4 2031. Close liaison should be kept with CEDD in this regard;
- (f) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department (DLO/YL, LandsD) that:
 - (i) the pre-clearance survey for the project “Resumption of Land for the Development of San Tin Technopole (Phase 2)” has been conducted for the Site, DLO/YL will not process either regularisation or new application for short term waiver/short term tenancy; and
 - (ii) there is/are unauthorized structure(s) on the Lot 2161 in D.D. 102 which is already subject to lease enforcement actions according to case priority. The lot owner(s) should rectify the lease breaches as demanded by LandsD;
- (g) to note the comments of the Commissioner for Transport that:
 - (i) sufficient manoeuvring space shall be provided within the Site or its adjacent area;
 - (ii) no vehicles are allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period; and
 - (iii) the land near the Site is not under the Transport Department’s purview. Consent of the owners/managing department of the land shall be obtained for using it as the vehicular access to the Site;
- (h) to note the comments of the Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department (HyD) that:
 - (i) HyD shall not be responsible for the maintenance of the proposed access connecting the Site and Kwu Tung Road (i.e. Ki Lun Tsuen Road and the local track); and

- (ii) adequate drainage measures shall be provided to prevent surface water running from the Site to nearby public roads and drains;
- (i) to note the comments of the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) that:
- (i) the 'Code of Practice on Handling the Environmental Aspects of Temporary Uses and Open Storage Sites' shall be followed;
 - (ii) from noise perspective, the following design measures to minimise the potential nuisance to nearby sensitive receivers shall be adopted:
 - the ventilation system should be properly designed to minimise noise impact and facing away from sensitive receivers in vicinity; and
 - staff member (s) to handling complaint/enquiry from the public should be provided;
 - (iii) on sewage disposal, sewage discharge from the Site should be directed to nearby public sewer. In case of unavailability of public sewer, the applicant is reminded that proper sewage collection, treatment and disposal facilities should be provided in accordance with the requirements in Professional Persons Environmental Consultative Committee Practice Note 1/23; and
 - (iv) all relevant pollution control ordinances, particularly on waste management and disposal shall be strictly observed, and necessary precautionary/pollution control measures shall be put in place to prevent any pollution/nuisance to nearby sensitive receivers as a result of the construction/operation activities;
- (j) to note the comments of the Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department (DSD) that:
- (i) a revised drainage proposal shall be submitted to demonstrate how he will collect, convey and discharge rain water falling onto or flowing to the Site. A clear drainage plan showing full details of the existing drains and the proposed drains (e.g. cover and invert levels of pipes/catchpits/outfalls and ground levels justifying waterflow etc.) with supporting design calculations and charts should be included. For preparation of the drainage proposal, the Guideline on preparation of the drainage proposal is available in DSD homepage at https://www.dsd.gov.hk/EN/Files/Technical_Manual/dsd_guideline/Drainage_Submission.pdf for reference. Approval of the drainage proposal must be sought prior to the implementation of drainage works on Site;
 - (ii) after completion of the required drainage works, a set of record photographs showing the completed drainage works with corresponding photograph locations marked clearly on the approved drainage plan shall be provided to DSD for reference. DSD will inspect the completed drainage works jointly with the applicant with reference to the set of photographs;
 - (iii) all existing flow paths would be properly intercepted and maintained without increasing the flood risk of the adjacent areas;

- (iv) the proposed drainage proposal/works as well as the Site boundary should not cause encroachment upon areas outside his jurisdiction;
 - (v) no public sewerage maintained by DSD is currently available for connection. For sewage disposal and treatment, agreement from DEP shall be obtained;
 - (vi) DLO/YL, LandsD should be consulted regarding all the proposed drainage works outside the lot boundary to ensure the unobstructed discharge from the Site in future; and
 - (vii) all the proposed drainage facilities should be constructed and maintained by the applicant at his own cost. The applicant should ensure and keep all drainage works on site under proper maintenance at all times;
- (k) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services (D of FS) that:
- (i) relevant layout plans incorporated with the proposed fire service installations (FSIs) shall be submitted to his department for approval. The layout plans should be drawn to scale and depicted with dimensions and nature of occupancy. The location of where the proposed FSIs to be installed should be clearly marked on the layout plans; and
 - (ii) if the proposed structures are required to comply with the Buildings Ordinance (BO) (Cap. 123), detailed fire safety requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans;
- (l) to note the comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department that approval of the application does not imply approval of tree works such as crown and root pruning, transplanting and felling. Application for any tree works should be submitted to relevant departments for approval;
- (m) to note the comments of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation that:
- (i) the Site has one licensed Animal Boarding Establishment granted by Animal Business Regulatory Section under Cap. 139I. Under the Public Health (Animals) (Boarding Establishment) Regulations (Cap. 139I), any person who provides food and accommodation for animals in return for a fee paid by the owner must apply for a Boarding Establishment Licence from his department. Detailed information and requirement on Animal Boarding Establishment will be provided when the applicant submits licence application to his department;
 - (ii) the setting up and running of an Animal Shelters for stray/homeless animals (which does not involve providing animal accommodation in return for a fee) is out of the purview of Cap. 139I, and further advice should be sought from Animal Management (Operation) Division for relevant information as applicable; and
 - (iii) as the Site is adjacent to a wooded area zoned “Green Belt”, the applicant shall avoid causing damages and disturbance to the wooded area adjacent to the south-western boundary of the Site; and
- (n) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department (BD) that:

- (i) it is noted that six structures and associated filling of land 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 Site, prior approval and consent of the Building Authority (BA) should be obtained, otherwise they are unauthorized building works (UBW) under the 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 on a specified street of not less than 4.5m wide and its permitted development intensity shall be determined under Regulation 19(3) of the B(P)R at building plan submission stage;
- (iv) if the existing structures (not being a 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 captioned application;
- (v) for UBW erected on leased land, enforcement action may be taken by the Buildings Department 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 the BO;
- (vi) any temporary shelters or converted containers for office, storage, washroom or other uses considered as temporary buildings are subject to the control of Part VII of the B(P)R;
- (vii) if the applied use under application is subject to issue of a licence, any existing structures on the Site intended to be used for such purposes are required to comply with the building safety and other relevant requirements as may be imposed by the licensing authority; and
- (viii) detailed checking under the 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08月18日星期二 0:16
收件者: tpbpd/PLAND
主旨: Re: A/STT/37 DD 102 Pang Loon Tei, Ngau Tam Mei
類別: Internet Email

Err in subject line

From: [REDACTED]
To: tpbpd <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>
Date: Tuesday, 18 August 2026 12:15 AM HKT
Subject: A/STT/437 DD 102 Pang Loon Tei, Ngau Tam Mei

A/STT/37
Lots 2161 and 2163 (Part) in D.D. 102, Ngau Tam Mei, Yuen Long
Site area: About 1,489.7sq.m
Zoning: "Green Belt" and "Area shown as Road"
Applied use: Animal Boarding Establishment / 2 Vehicle Parking / **Filling of Land**

Dear TPB Members,

468 for FAKE ABS approved 1 Mar 2024. Revoked 6 months later. Back again because an application for warehouse or open storage would not be considered.

Approval despite

"5.2 The Site is subject to active planning enforcement action (No. E/YL-NTM/404). Reinstatement Notice (RN) was issued on 31.5.2023 for the land filling and requiring reinstatement of the concerned land. As the Site has not been reinstated upon expiry of the RN, prosecution action may be followed.

As the Site falls within the boundary of the Technopole with the Revised RODP published in Feb 2024 and new draft OZP to be gazetted soon, and site formation works to commence in phases tentatively by 2024, it is considered that the planning circumstances of the current application is different from those previous and similar applications.

So the lots have been rezoned to ST Technopole. Suggest members take a look at the images. So this is what a HK Technopole will look like. Looks familiar, indeed brownfield operations surrounded by soon to be rusty metal panels.

Way to go. So much for the glossy images of an advanced technopole district that were displayed at the OZP.

But then many in the community were not convinced in the first place.

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

From: [REDACTED]
To: tpbpd <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>
Date: Tuesday, 5 December 2023 3:20 AM HKT
Subject: A/YL-NTM/468 DD 102 Pang Loon Tei, Ngau Tam Mei GB

Dear TPB Members,

464 withdrawn. Previous objections relevant and upheld.

There are dozens of approved ABE applications - many times more than any possible demand for this service.

The intention is to use the lot for brownfield.

Members must again reject application.

Mary Mulvihill

From: [REDACTED]
To: tpbpd <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>
Date: Thursday, 27 July 2023 2:47 AM HKT
Subject: A/YL-NTM/464 DD 102 Pang Loon Tei, Ngau Tam Mei GB

A/YL-NTM/464

Lots 2161 and 2163 (Part) in D.D. 102, Ngau Tam Mei, Yuen Long

Site area: About 1,489.7sq.m

Zoning: "Green Belt"

Applied use: Animal Boarding Establishment / 2 Vehicle Parking / **Filling of Land**

Dear TPB Members,

Strong Objections, this is trash GB via another PlanD always supports fake uses:

Members should ask to see an aerial image of the site to identify condition.

405 - 1241st TPB MEETING ON 19.03.2021

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

After deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application on review for the following reasons: With parking 60% of site would be covered

“(a) the **development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Green Belt” (“GB”)** zone, which is to define 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. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention;

(b) the development is not in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for ‘Application for Development within the Green Belt zone under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’ in that **the design and layout of the proposed development is incompatible with the surrounding area, and causes adverse visual impact on the surrounding environment;**

There is no approved development in the immediate area. The previous reasons for rejection remain valid.

Mary Mulvihill

From: [REDACTED]
To: tpbpd <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>
Cc: mtchu <mtchu@clp.com.hk>
Date: Thursday, 4 February 2021 3:25 AM CST
Subject: Re: A/YL-NTM/405 DD 102 Pang Loon Tei, Ngau Tam Mei GB

Dear TPB Members,

Reducing the number of panels to 243 is irrelevant. This is Green Belt, planning intention to protect the flora and fauna from exploitation.

Shame on CLP for its role in encouraging destruction of natural habitat.

Mary Mulvihill

From: [REDACTED]
To: "tpbpd" <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>
Cc: "mtchu" <mtchu@clp.com.hk>
Sent: Friday, November 27, 2020 2:36:59 AM
Subject: Re: A/YL-NTM/405 DD 102 Pang Loon Tei, Ngau Tam Mei GB

Dear TPB Members,

Apart from the issue of trashing GB, I would remind members that the FiT scheme approved by Legco made no mention of commercial solar farms.

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

The CLP customers were never informed that they would be expected to subsidize commercial exploitation.

Any applications under FiT must comply with the parameters of the scheme as presented to Legco.

Mary Mulvihill

From: [REDACTED]
To: "tpbpd" <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>
Cc: "mtchu" <mtchu@clp.com.hk>
Sent: Thursday, July 9, 2020 3:46:06 AM
Subject: A/YL-NTM/405 DD 102 Pang Loon Tei, Ngau Tam Mei GB

A/YL-NTM/405
Lots 2161 and 2163 (Part) in D.D. 102, Ngau Tam Mei
Site area : About 1,490sq.m
Zoning : "Green Belt"
Applied use : 338 Solar Panels / **NO TERM MENTIONED**

Dear TPB Members,

Zoning is GREEN BELT not BLUE BELT, note images.

This is clearly an area of GB buffer, Conservation and natural environment.

It is unacceptable that any plans to turn precious land resources into solar panel farms should be nipped in the bud. This kind of green initiative is only appropriate for regions with vast expanses of spare land. TPB should send out a clear message that this type of 'green wash' will not succeed. The applicant shows produce growing UNDER the panels, consuming much of the energy generated.

The planning intention of this zone 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.

Not only is the objective in conflict with the zoning intention, the Renewable Energy Feed-in Tariff was conceived to encourage home and building owners to set up solar panel on their roofs. The monetary return greatly exceeds the value of the energy produced and is ultimately not financially viable if it is exploited. In essence other users will end up footing the bill via increased fees.

TPB reject this application and CLP should also make it quite clear that the initiative will not be extended to commercial enterprises like this. CLP customers, including committed greenies like me who do not even have air con in their homes, will not tolerate that they have to pay more for their power supply in order to subsidize lining the pockets of cunning operators.

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

Moreover it should be made clear to applicants that commercial operations like this are fully taxable, exemption is only for residential roof top panels. Unlike the usual brownfield operations, solar panels feeding into the grid will be calculated. The operation must have a business licence and Inland Revenue can demand a full accounting of the revenue remitted by CLP.

TPB discussed this issue on 3 July but Minutes are not yet posted. It appears that only the impact on Agriculture land was outlined. Moreover the very important issue of consumers' willingness or more probably lack of, to subsidize commercial abuse of the FiT Scheme was not mentioned.

Green Belt is for trees and vegetation. The distortion of what should be a worthy initiative should be nipped in the bud. The current health crisis should focus minds on the disastrous impacts of over development in rural areas.

Mary Mulvihill