

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

Approved Applications

	Application No.	Use/Development	Date of Consideration
1.	A/YL-KTN/827	Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Private Car Park for Medium Goods Vehicles and Storage of Construction Materials for a Period of Three Years	20.5.2022
2.	A/YL-KTN/888	Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Private Vehicle Park for Light Goods Vehicles for a Period of Three Years	17.3.2023
3.	A/YL-KTN/915	Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Private Vehicle Park for Light Goods Vehicles for a Period of 3 Years	23.6.2023
4.	A/YL-KTN/961	Temporary Private Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicles) for a Period of Three Years and Filling of Land	5.4.2024 [revoked on 5.10.2024]
5.	A/YL-KTN/1025	Proposed Temporary Private Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicle) for a Period of 3 Years and Associated Filling of Land	2.8.2024 [revoked on 2.2.2026]
6.	A/YL-KTN/1077	Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicle) for a Period of Three Years and Associated Filling of Land	2.5.2025
7.	A/YL-KTN/1089	Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicle) for a Period of Three Years and Associated Filling of Land	14.3.2025 [revoked on 14.9.2026]
8.	A/YL-KTN/1152	Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicles) and Associated Filling of Land and Pond for a Period of Three Years	24.10.2025
9.	A/YL-KTN/1209	Temporary Private Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicle) and Associated Filling of Land and Pond for a Period of Three Years	27.3.2026
10.	A/YL-KTN/1229	Temporary Private Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicle) and Associated Filling of Land and Pond for a Period of Three Years	5.6.2026

	Application No.	Use/Development	Date of Consideration
11.	A/YL-KTN/1242	Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (excluding Container Vehicle) and Associated Filling of Land for a Period of Three Years	24.7.2026
12.	A/YL-KTN/1273	Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (excluding Container Vehicle) and Associated Filling of Land for a Period of Three Years	9.10.2026

Government Departments' General Comments

1. Land Administration

Comments of the District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department:

- no adverse comment on the application;
- the application site (the Site) comprises Lot No. 178 and 179 RP both in D.D. 110 which are Old Schedule Agricultural Lots held under the Block Government Lease which contains the restriction that no structure is allowed to be erected without the prior approval of the Government; and
- it is noted that no structure is proposed in the application.

2. Traffic

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 IV**.

3. 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, approval conditions should be stipulated requiring the submission of a drainage proposal and the implementation and maintenance of the proposed drainage facilities to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or the Town Planning Board; and
- advisory comments are at **Appendix IV**.

4. 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 was no environmental complaint received against the Site in the past three years; and
- advisory comments are at **Appendix IV**.

5. **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 village houses, open storage sites/warehouses, vacant land and scattered tree groups. The applied use is considered not incompatible with the landscape setting in the proximity;
- with reference to the aerial photo and site photos, the Site was formed and some vehicles were parked on it. According to the applicant's submission, no tree felling will be involved;
- in view of the above, significant adverse landscape arising from the applied use is not anticipated; and
- advisory comments are at **Appendix IV**.

6. **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.

7. **Other Departments**

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

- Director of Fire Services;
- the Chief Engineer/Railway Development 1-1, HyD;
- Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department;
- Project Manager (West), Civil Engineering and Development Department;
- Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department; and
- Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services.

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 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;
- (e) to note the comments of the Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department (HyD) that:
 - (i) the adjoining section of Kong Po Road 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 Po 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;
- (f) to note the comments of the Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department that:
 - (i) the applicant is required to demonstrate in the drainage proposal that the proposed works will not obstruct the overland flow nor cause any adverse drainage impact to the adjacent areas;
 - (ii) the applicant shall be liable for any adverse drainage impact due to the applied use; and
 - (iii) 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;

- (g) 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 observe the statutory requirements under relevant environmental legislations;
- (h) to note the comments of the Chief Engineer/Railway Development 1-1, HyD that the Site falls within the railway protection boundary of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link. With reference to the Development Bureau Technical Circular (Works) No. 1/2019 and/or Practice Notes for Authorized Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers (PNAP) APP-24, the MTR Corporation Limited shall be consulted with respect to the operation, maintenance, safety and any future works required for the existing railways; and
- (i) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department that:
 - (i) it is noted that associated filling of land is 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 should be obtained, otherwise they are unauthorized building works under Buildings Ordinance (BO). An Authorized Person should be appointed as the co-ordinator for the proposed building works in accordance with BO;
 - (ii) 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
 - (iii) detailed checking under BO will be carried out at building plan submission stage.

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

參考編號

260908-161326-11298

Reference Number:

提交限期

22/09/2026

Deadline for submission:

提交日期及時間

08/09/2026 16:13:26

Date and time of submission:

有關的規劃申請編號

A/YL-KTN/1274

The application no. to which the comment relates:

「提意見人」姓名/名稱

小姐 Miss Wong

Name of person making this comment:

意見詳情

Details of the Comment :

城規會主席及各位委員：

本人為在新界元朗錦田大江埔村居住超過40年的原住鄰近村民。就申請人（夏佩娟）提呈關於新界元朗錦田大江埔第110約地段第178號(部分)及第179號餘段(部分)（申請編號：A/YL-KTN/1274）之規劃申請，本人在此表達最嚴正、最強烈的反對！

涉事地段在《錦田北分區計劃大綱核准圖編號 S/YL-KTN/11》中被劃為「農業」地帶 (AGR)，地盤面積約 1,876.64 平方米。身為在此生根數十載的村民，本人見證了該區鄉郊環境的演變，亦飽受近年違規發展帶來的苦果。今次申請不僅嚴重影響村民日常生活，更對交通安全及防洪構成巨大隱患，理由如下：

一、嚴正抨擊「先破壞、後申請」，堅決反對將違規填土合法化

申請人於文件中聲稱土地「已在多年前鋪上厚度約0.2米的混凝土平整土地，因此不會額外填土，只規範化」。此等說法完全是倒果為因、強詞奪理！

未經城規會許可，擅自在「農業」地帶上鋪設厚達 0.2 米的混凝土，本身已屬於非法改變土地用途及違規填土破壞行為。

申請人試圖以「已鋪混凝土多年」為由要求「規範化」，是典型的「先破壞、後申請」策略。若城規會批准此申請，無異於向社會發放「違規破壞可獲補辦手續合法化」的不良訊息，嚴重損害本港規劃制度的公信力與尊嚴。

二、唯一的村內主幹道無法承受，大量車輛出入必致交通癱瘓及安全危機

根據申請圖則，該地段的車路出入口僅約 4.5 米寬，且唯一連接江埔路之通道，乃是周邊無數村民每日出入居住環境的唯一主要通道。

擬議項目打算設立多達 42 個泊車位（包括 30 個私家車位及 12 個輕型貨車位），並實行 24 小時運作。

申請人宣稱每日僅約 44 車次出入且分散時段，此說法完全低估了實際車流量及泊車流轉率。村內通道狹窄（部分路段為單線雙程），根本沒有足夠的避車處與行人路。每日大量私家車及輕型貨車頻繁進出，必將造成嚴重的交通擠塞與人車爭路情況。

對於村內每天需要經過該唯一通道出入的長者和學童而言，交通安全受到極大威脅；更

嚴重的是，一旦發生交通堵塞，救護車、消防車等緊急救援車輛將無法及時進入村內，人命關天，後果不堪設想！

三、混凝土平整切斷天然排水，誘發嚴重水浸與淹水災難

大江埔及鄰近一帶地勢低窪，每逢大雨或颱風季節，排水系統本已承受極高壓力。申請地點達 1,876.64 平方米的土地被鋪上 0.2 米厚的混凝土平整，徹底切斷了原本泥土土地的天然滲透力與吸水功能。暴雨期間，大量雨水無法下滲，將形成大量地表徑流，迅速湧向周邊的村路及鄰近民居。申請人並未提供具體而完善的排水影響評估，強行「規範化」此填土工程，無異於將嚴重的水浸風險轉嫁給鄰近數十戶村民，極度不負責任！

四、24小時運作嚴重擾民，摧毀鄉郊居住環境

擬議停車場申請 24 小時營運。深宵及清晨時分，車輛出入的引擎聲、關門聲、煞車聲以及車燈照射，將全天候干擾周邊居民的休息與睡眠。

頻繁的車輛廢氣污染及噪音，徹底破壞了原本寧靜安詳的鄉郊生活環境，與「農業」地帶設有的規劃意向完全背道而馳。

結語與訴求

本人身為在該地段鄰近居住 40 多年的原住村民，懇請城市規劃委員會各位委員設身處地，體恤村民長期面對的交通與水浸隱憂。

本人嚴正要求城市規劃委員會：

1. 堅決否決規劃申請編號：A/YL-KTN/1274；
2. 促請規劃署及地政總署等相關部門執行執法行動，要求業主清理涉事地段違規鋪設的混凝土及填土，還原土地為真正的農業用途，還村民一個安全、寧靜的生活環境。

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

參考編號
Reference Number: 260915-203808-84376

提交限期
Deadline for submission: 22/09/2026

提交日期及時間
Date and time of submission: 15/09/2026 20:38:08

有關的規劃申請編號
The application no. to which the comment relates: A/YL-KTN/1274

「提意見人」姓名/名稱
Name of person making this comment: 小姐 Miss wong

意見詳情 Details of the Comment :

城規會主席及各位委員：

本人為在新界元朗錦田大江埔村居住超過40年的原住鄰近村民。就申請人（夏佩娟）提呈關於新界元朗錦田大江埔第110約地段第178號(部分)及第179號餘段(部分)（申請編號：A/YL-KTN/1274）之規劃申請，本人在此表達最嚴正、最強烈的反對！

涉事地段在《錦田北分區計劃大綱核准圖編號 S/YL-KTN/11》中被劃為「農業」地帶 (A GR)，地盤面積約 1,876.64 平方米。身為在此生根數十載的村民，本人見證了該區鄉郊環境的演變，亦飽受近年違規發展帶來的苦果。今次申請不僅嚴重影響村民日常生活，更對交通安全及防洪構成巨大隱患，理由如下：

一、嚴正抨擊「先破壞、後申請」，堅決反對將違規填土合法化

申請人於文件中聲稱土地「已在多年前鋪上厚度約0.2米的混凝土平整土地，因此不會額外填土，只規範化」。此等說法完全是倒果為因、強詞奪理！

未經城規會許可，擅自在「農業」地帶上鋪設厚達 0.2 米的混凝土，本身已屬於非法改變土地用途及違規填土破壞行為。

申請人試圖以「已鋪混凝土多年」為由要求「規範化」，是典型的「先破壞、後申請」策略。若城規會批准此申請，無異於向社會發放「違規破壞可獲補辦手續合法化」的不良訊息，嚴重損害本港規劃制度的公信力與尊嚴。

二、唯一的村內主幹道無法承受，大量車輛出入必致交通癱瘓及安全危機

根據申請圖則，該地段的車路出入口僅約 4.5 米寬，且唯一連接江埔路之通道，乃是周邊無數村民每日出入居住環境的唯一主要通道。

擬議項目打算設立多達 42 個泊車位（包括 30 個私家車位及 12 個輕型貨車位），並實行 24 小時運作。

申請人宣稱每日僅約 44 車次出入且分散時段，此說法完全低估了實際車流量及泊車流轉率。村內通道狹窄（部分路段為單線雙程），根本沒有足夠的避車處與行人路。每日大量私家車及輕型貨車頻繁進出，必將造成嚴重的交通擠塞與人車爭路情況。

對於村內每天需要經過該唯一通道出入的長者和學童而言，交通安全受到極大威脅；更

嚴重的是，一旦發生交通堵塞，救護車、消防車等緊急救援車輛將無法及時進入村內，人命關天，後果不堪設想！

三、混凝土平整切斷天然排水，誘發嚴重水浸與淹水災難

大江埔及鄰近一帶地勢低窪，每逢大雨或颱風季節，排水系統本已承受極高壓力。申請地點達 1,876.64 平方米的土地被鋪上 0.2 米厚的混凝土平整，徹底切斷了原本泥土土地的天然滲透力與吸水功能。暴雨期間，大量雨水無法下滲，將形成大量地表徑流，迅速湧向周邊的村路及鄰近民居。申請人並未提供具體而完善的排水影響評估，強行「規範化」此填土工程，無異於將嚴重的水浸風險轉嫁給鄰近數十戶村民，極度不負責任！

四、24小時運作嚴重擾民，摧毀鄉郊居住環境

擬議停車場申請 24 小時營運。深宵及清晨時分，車輛出入的引擎聲、關門聲、煞車聲以及車燈照射，將全天候干擾周邊居民的休息與睡眠。

頻繁的車輛廢氣污染及噪音，徹底破壞了原本寧靜安詳的鄉郊生活環境，與「農業」地帶設有的規劃意向完全背道而馳。

訴求：

本人身為在該地段鄰近居住40多年的原住村民，懇請城市規劃委員會各位委員設身處地，體恤村民長期面對的交通與水浸隱憂。

本人嚴正要求城市規劃委員會：

1. 堅決否決規劃申請編號：A/YL-KTN/1274；
2. 促請規劃署及地政總署等相關部門執行執法行動，要求業主清理涉事地段違規鋪設的混凝土及填土，還原土地為真正的農業用途，還村民一個安全、寧靜的生活環境。

tpbpd/PLAND

寄件者: [REDACTED]
寄件日期: 2026年09月20日星期日 0:22
收件者: tpbpd/PLAND
主旨: A/YL-KTN/1274 DD 110 near Tsat Sing Kong, Kam Tin North
類別: Internet Email

A/YL-KTN/1274
Lots 178 (Part) and 179 RP (Part) in D.D. 110, near Tsat Sing Kong, Kam Tin North
Site area: About 1,876.64sq.m
Zoning: "Agriculture"
Applied use: 42 Public Vehicle Park / **Filling of Land**

Dear TPB Members,

Strong Objections. No history of approvals. The site has been filled in without approval, was any enforcement action taken?

The location is some distance from Tsat Sing Kong Village and there are few residences in the district. The warehouses nearby should provide adequate parking for their operations.

The application should be rejected.

Mary Mulvihill