

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 631st Meeting of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee held at 2:30 p.m. on 2.8.2019

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Chairman

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr K.K. Cheung

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Mr K.W. Leung

Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West,
Transport Department
Mr B.K. Chow

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department
Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Strategic Assessment),
Environmental Protection Department
Mr K.H. To

Assistant Director/Regional 3,
Lands Department
Mr Alan K.L. Lo

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr H.W. Cheung

Vice-Chairman

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr L.T. Kwok

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms April K.Y. Kun

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Miss Anissa W.Y. Lai

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Gary T.L. Lam

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 630th RNTPC Meeting held on 19.7.2019

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 630th RNTPC meeting held on 19.7.2019 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

2. The Secretary reported that there were no matters arising.

Sai Kung and Islands District

Agenda Item 3

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/I-LWKS/2 Application for Amendment to the Approved Luk Wu and Keung Shan Outline Zoning Plan S/I-LWKS/2, To Rezone the Application Site from “Government, Institution or Community (1)” to “Government, Institution or Community (2)”, Lot 724 (Part) in D.D. 311 and Adjoining Government Land, Keung Shan, Lantau Island
(RNTPC Paper No. Y/I-LWKS/2)

3. The Secretary reported that the application was for the provision of columbarium. Ramboll (HK) Ltd. (Ramboll) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| Mr H.W. Cheung
(<i>the Vice-chairman</i>) | - | being a member of the Private Columbaria Licensing Board; and |
| Mr Ivan C.S. Fu | - | being a member of the Private Columbaria Appeal Board; and having current business dealings with Ramboll. |

4. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Messrs H.W. Cheung and Ivan C.S. Fu had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

5. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 15.7.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for a period of two months so as to allow time to address the concerns of relevant departments and the public. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

6. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the

applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within three months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Sha Tin, Tai Po and North District

Agenda Item 4

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/TP/28 Application for Amendment to the Approved Tai Po Outline Zoning Plan S/TP/28, To Rezone the Application Site from "Residential (Group C) 10" to "Residential (Group B)11", Various lots in D.D. 34 and D.D. 36 and adjoining Government land, Tsiu Hang, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. Y/TP/28)

7. The Secretary reported that the application was located in Tai Po and was submitted by Ford World Development Ltd., which was a subsidiary of Henderson Land Development Company Ltd. (HLD). MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA), Ramboll (HK) Ltd. (Ramboll) and AECOM Asis Co. Ltd. (AECOM) were three of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|--------------------|---|---|
| Mr Ivan C.S. Fu | - | having current business dealings with HLD, MVA, Ramboll and AECOM; |
| Mr Peter K.T. Yuen | - | being a member of the Board of Governors of the Hong Kong Arts Centre which had received a donation from an Executive Director of HLD before; |

- Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with HLD and the Hong Kong and China Gas Co. Ltd. which was a subsidiary of HLD;
- Dr C.H. Hau - being an employee of the University of Hong Kong which had received a donation from a family member of the Chairman of HLD before, and having current business dealings with AECOM;
- Dr Lawrence K.C. Li - being the Deputy Chairman of the Council of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University which had obtained sponsorship from HLD before;
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having past business dealings with HLD; and
- Mr H.W. Cheung - owning a flat in Tai Po.
(*the Vice-chairman*)

8. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Messrs H.W. Cheung, Ivan C.S. Fu and Dr C.H. Hau had tendered apologies for being unable to join the meeting. As the interest of Messrs Peter K.T. Yuen, Stephen L.H. Liu and Dr Lawrence K.C. Li were indirect and Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

9. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 22.7.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for a period of two months so as to allow time to address the concerns of relevant departments and the public. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

10. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within three months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the

applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 5

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting]

Y/NE-LYT/14 Application for Amendment to the Approved Lung Yeuk Tau & Kwan Tei South Outline Zoning Plan S/NE-LYT/17, To Rezone the Application Site from “Recreation” to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Community/Recreational Facilities and Fanling Bypass with Commercial/Residential Development”, Various Lots in D.D. 51 and Adjoining Government Land, Fanling
(RNTPC Paper No. Y/NE-LYT/14)

11. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 26.7.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for a period of three months so as to allow time to address the concerns of relevant departments and the public. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

12. The Committee noted that under the established practice, a deferment period of two months, instead of three months, would be given for preparation of submission of further information.

13. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant, but a shorter duration of two months, instead of three months, was allowed for preparation of the submission of further information. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within three months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee’s consideration. The Committee

also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Sai Kung and Islands District

[Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, District Planning Officer/Sai Kung and Islands (DPO/SKIs), Mr Timothy T.C. Kau and Ms Jane W.L. Kwan, Senior Town Planners/Sai Kung and Islands (STPs/SKIs), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Items 6 and 7

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/I-TCV/12 Temporary Warehouse and Open Storage of Construction Tools, Construction Machinery and Materials for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lots 1455, 1456 and 1459 in D.D.1 TC, Tung Chung Valley, Lantau Island
(RNTPC Paper No. A/I-TCV/12)

A/I-TCV/13 Temporary Warehouse and Open Storage of Construction Tools, Construction Machinery and Materials for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone and an area shown as ‘Road’, Lots 1411, 1412 and 1414 (Part) in D.D.1 TC, Tung Chung Valley, Lantau Island
(RNTPC Paper No. A/I-TCV/13)

14. The Committee agreed that the two applications for temporary warehouse and open storage of construction tools, construction machinery and materials for a period of three years were similar in nature and the application sites were located in proximity to one another within the same “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone and could be considered together.

Presentation and Question Sessions

15. Mr Timothy T.C. Kau, STP/SKIs, presented the applications and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Papers :

- (a) background to the applications;
- (b) proposed temporary warehouse and open storage of construction tools, construction machinery and materials for a period of 3 years at each of the application sites;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Papers. The Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) did not support the two applications as there were domestic structures in the vicinity of the sites. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) had some reservations on the two applications, as the proposed temporary warehouse and open storage uses were not compatible with the existing landscape character, there had been extensive removal of existing trees/vegetation within the sites and approval of the applications would encourage similar tree/vegetation removal prior to obtaining planning permission, causing significant adverse impact on the landscape resources and landscape character within the area. For application No. A/I-TCV/13, the Head of Sustainable Lantau Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department did not support the application as the site partly fell within the limit of works area of a proposed road and the application period was in conflict with the target implementation of the proposed road project. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the applications;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, five and four public comments were received for applications No. A/I-TCV/12 and

A/I-TCV/13 respectively. All nine comments received from Designing Hong Kong Limited, private individuals and local villagers objected to the two applications. Major grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Papers; and

- (e) the PlanD's views – PlanD did not support the applications based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Papers. The proposed developments were not in line with the general planning intention of Tung Chung Valley and the “V” zone. The proposed developments were not compatible with the surrounding areas and DEP did not support the applications as there were residential dwellings in the surrounding of the sites and the operation might cause nuisance to the residents. CTP/UD&L, PlanD had reservations on the applications, as the proposed uses were not compatible with the existing landscape character and there had been extensive removal of existing trees/vegetation within the sites. There were ten applications for similar uses in Tung Chung Valley area, which were all rejected. The site under application No. A/I-TCV/12 was subject to an enforcement case for unauthorized storage use and enforcement notice had been issued requiring discontinuation of the unauthorized development (UD). Regarding the adverse public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

16. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

17. The Committee noted the two sites located to the immediate south of application No. A/I-TCV/12 were subject to planning enforcement action against UDs and enforcement notices were issued in February 2019 requiring discontinuation of the UDs.

18. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the applications. The reasons were :

Application No. A/I-TCV/12

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of “Village Type Development” zone. There is no strong planning justification in the submission to support a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis;
- (b) the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed development will not have adverse environmental and landscape impacts on the surrounding areas; and
- (c) the approval of the application, even on a temporary basis, would set an undesirable precedent and encourage other applications for similar developments in the surrounding area. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would result in a general degradation of the rural environment and landscape character of the area.”

Application No. A/I-TCV/13

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of “Village Type Development” zone and will frustrate the planning intention for road use. There is no strong planning justification in the submission to support a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis;
- (b) the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed development will not have adverse environmental and landscape impacts on the surrounding areas; and
- (c) the approval of the application, even on a temporary basis, would set an undesirable precedent and encourage other applications for similar developments in the surrounding area. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would result in a general degradation of the rural environment and landscape character of the area.”

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/SLC/155 Proposed Temporary Holiday Camp (Caravan Holiday Camp) for a Period of 5 Years and Excavation of land (Sewage Facilities) in “Coastal Protection Area” Zone, Lots 626(Part), 627 (Part) 628 to 630, 632, 633 (Part), 634 to 637, 639 to 642, 647 to 650, 710 to 712, 715 RP, 716, 717 and 718 RP in D.D. 316L, Pui O, Lantau Island
(RNTPC Paper No. A/SLC/155)

Presentation and Question Sessions

19. Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) proposed temporary holiday camp (caravan holiday camp) for a period of 5 years and excavation of land (sewerage facilities);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. The Head of Sustainable Lantau Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (H(SLO), CEDD) considered that the applicant must ensure that the proposed development and excavation of land would not result in adverse impact to the wetland habitat, and would encourage the environment be upgraded and the ecology in the area be enhanced. It would also be important to consider if approval of the application might encourage the practice of ‘destroy first’. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) had reservation on the application as the site was in close proximity to the ecologically sensitive Pui O wetland and cast doubt on whether the measures to be implemented by the applicant would be effective in

protecting the adjacent wetland and watercourse(s). The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) had reservation on the application, as there was insufficient information demonstrating that the proposed development would have no adverse landscape impact on the existing tree and the adjacent farmland and vegetated areas, and the potential impact on soil quality due to the probable earthworks could not be ascertained. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, 785 public comments were received from Kadoorie Farm & Botanic Garden Corporation, TrailWatch and Country Parks X, Living Islands Movement, Temple Chambers, Designing Hong Kong Limited, the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, the Conservancy Association, World Wild Fund Hong Kong, Save Lantau Alliance and individuals objecting to the application. Major grounds were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper; and
- (e) the PlanD's views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the “Coastal Protection Area” (“CPA”) zone. The applicant had not provided sufficient information to demonstrate no adverse impact on the wetland habitat and whether the proposed measures would be effective in protecting the adjacent wetland and watercourse(s) which were ecologically sensitive and important respectively. There was also insufficient information to demonstrate no adverse landscape impact on the existing tree and the adjacent areas. Approval of the application, even on a temporary basis, would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications with the “CPA” zone and the cumulative effect would result in a general degradation of the natural environment and landscape of the area. Regarding the adverse public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

20. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

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

- “(a) the application is not in line with the planning intention of the “Coastal Protection Area” (“CPA”) zone which is to conserve, protect and retain the natural coastlines and the sensitive coastal natural environment, including attractive geological features, physical landform or area of high landscape, scenic or ecological value, with a minimum of built development. It is also intended to safeguard the beaches and their immediate hinterland and to prevent haphazard ribbon development along the South Lantau Coast. There is a general presumption against development in this zone. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from such planning intention, even on a temporary basis;
- (b) the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have adverse ecological and landscape impacts on the surrounding areas; and
- (c) approval of the application, even on a temporary basis, would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the “CPA” zone and the cumulative effect of approving such applications would lead to a general degradation of the natural environment of the area.”

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/SK-CWBN/49 Proposed House and the associated Excavation of Land in “Green Belt” Zone and an area shown as ‘Road’, Lots 330, 331 RP (Part), 332 S.B and 333 S.B in D.D. 225, Pak To Avenue, Clear Water Bay, Sai Kung (RNTPC Paper No. A/SK-CWBN/49C)

22. The Secretary reported that the application was located in Clear Water Bay area. Mr David Y.T. Lui had declared interest on the item as he co-owned with his spouse properties in Clear Water Bay. The Committee noted that Mr. David Y.T. Lui had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

23. Ms Jane W.L. Kwan, STP/SKIs, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) proposed house and the associated excavation of land;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The District Lands Officer/Sai Kung, Lands Department (DLO/SK, LandsD) advised that the subject lots falling within the site were demised for agricultural purposes and any buildings or structures were not permitted under the lease. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) had reservation on the application as some existing trees might be affected during construction, the impact of the proposed house development on existing landscape resources could not be fully ascertained. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent and the cumulative effect of approving such similar applications would result in

deterioration of local environment. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) had reservation on the application as the proposed ingress/egress did not meet the design requirement. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, six public comments were received from the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, the World Wide Fund Hong Kong, Designing Hong Kong Limited and individuals objecting to the application. Major grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the PlanD's views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed house development was not in line with the planning intention of the “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone and did not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10. The site did not have building entitlement under the lease and there were no exceptional circumstances nor strong justification the proposed house development. Both CTP/UD&L, PlanD and C for T had reservation on the application. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. Regarding the adverse public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

24. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

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

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Green Belt” (“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 within this zone. The applicants fail to provide strong justifications in the submission for a departure from the planning intention;

- (b) the proposed development does not meet the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 for ‘Application for Development within “GB” Zone’ in that there are no exceptional circumstances for approving the application and the applicants fail to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have adverse traffic and landscape impacts on the surrounding areas; and
- (c) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications encroaching onto the existing “GB” zone. The cumulative effect of approving similar applications would result in deterioration of the local environment and adverse impact on the landscape character of the area.”

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 10

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/SK-CWBS/32 Proposed Utility Installation for Private Project (Septic Tank) and associated Excavation of Land in “Green Belt” Zone, Government Land in D.D. 225, Leung Fai Tin, Clear Water Bay, Sai Kung
(RNTPC Paper No. A/SK-CWBS/32)

26. The Secretary reported that the application was located in Clear Water Bay area. Mr David Y.T. Lui had declared interest on the item as he co-owned with his spouse properties in Clear Water Bay. The Committee noted that Mr. David Y.T. Lui had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

27. Ms Jane W.L. Kwan, STP/SKIs, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) proposed utility installation for private project (septic tank) and associated excavation of land;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, two public comments were received from the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society and Designing Hong Kong objecting to the application. Major grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Although the proposed utility installation was not in line with the planning intention of the “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone, it was located at the fringe of “GB” zone and was considered a needed and essential ancillary facility for the adjacent Small House development approved by the Committee in 2003. Due to the site constraints including level difference and the 15m distance away from natural streamcourse requirement, the site was an appropriate nearby location for the proposed septic tank to serve the approved Small House. The proposed utility installation was considered to be generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 as it would not involve any extensive vegetation clearance or cause disruption to the landscape character, and would unlikely set an undesirable precedent for similar applications. Concerned government departments had no

objection to or no adverse comments on the application. Regarding the adverse public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

28. In response to a Member's question on whether septic tank was provided in the approved Small House application (No. A/DPA/SK-CWBS/3) or other sewage treatment facilities was proposed, Ms Jane W.L. Kwan, STP/SKIs, said that the Small House application was approved in 2003 but the applicant did not indicate the location and provision of the septic tank at that time. The applicant had once proposed to the Lands Department (LandsD) to share the use of a small piece of land to the west of Small House development at D.D. 225 Lot 917 to provide a septic tank for the subject Small House development, however, that piece of land was subsequently found inadequate to provide sewage facilities for both Small House developments. A new location for the septic tank was thus proposed in this application.

29. In response to the Chairman's enquiry on whether the concerned Small House had already been completed, Ms Jane W.L. Kwan responded that the concerned Small House was completed in 2014 but was not occupied as the septic tank had not been provided for the Small House.

Deliberation Session

30. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 2.8.2023, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed.

31. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix IV of the Paper.

Agenda Items 11 to 13

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/SK-HC/312 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 481 S.A ss.5 in D.D.244, Ho Chung, Sai Kung (RNTPC Paper No. A/SK-HC/312 to 314)

A/SK-HC/313 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 481 S.A ss.4 in D.D.244, Ho Chung, Sai Kung (RNTPC Paper No. A/SK-HC/312 to 314)

A/SK-HC/314 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 481 S.A ss.1 in D.D.244, Ho Chung, Sai Kung (RNTPC Paper No. A/SK-HC/312 to 314)

32. The Committee agreed that the three applications for proposed House (New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) – Small House) were similar in nature and the application sites were located in proximity to one another within the same “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone and could be considered together.

Presentation and Question Sessions

33. Ms Jane W.L. Kwan, STP/SKIs, presented the applications and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the applications;
- (b) proposed house (NTEH – Small House) at each of the application sites;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) did not support the three applications as the sites possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) had reservation on the applications but considered that

the applications involving construction of one Small House at each of the application site could be tolerated. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the applications;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, two public comments on each application from individuals were received. A commenter objected to the applications and the other raised concerns regarding the village area. Major grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the applications based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed Small House developments were not in line with the planning intention of the “AGR” zone. DAFC did not support the application as the sites possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. According to the Lands Department, the outstanding Small House application for Ho Chung Village was about 104 while the 10-year Small House demand forecast was 235. According to PlanD's estimate, about 3.13ha of land equivalent to about 125 Small House sites was available in the “Village Type Development” zone of Ho Chung Village. Sympathetic consideration might be given to the three applications as the sites had previous approval for the same use applied by the same applicants. Regarding the adverse public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

34. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

35. After deliberation, the TPB decided to approve the applications, on the terms of the applications as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). Each of the permissions

should be valid until 2.8.2023, and after the said date, the permissions should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the developments permitted were commenced or the permission were renewed. Each of the permissions was subject to the following condition :

“the provision of septic tank, as proposed by the applicant, at location to the satisfaction of the Director of Lands or of the TPB.”

36. The Committee also agreed to advise each of the applicants to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix VII of the Paper.

Agenda Item 14

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/SK-PK/251 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Green Belt” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lots 480RP and 483RP in D.D.222, Pak Kong Village, Sai Kung
(RNTPC Paper No. A/SK-PK/251)

Presentation and Question Sessions

37. Ms Jane W.L. Kwan, STP/SKIs, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) proposed house (New Territories Exempted House – Small House);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) had reservation on the application but considered that the application involving construction of one Small House could be tolerated. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on

the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, two public comments were received from Designing Hong Kong Limited and an individual objecting to the application. Major grounds were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. Although the proposed Small House developments were not in line with the planning intention of the “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone, about 26% of the site fell within “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone which was intended for development of Small Houses. The proposed development was not incompatible with the landscape character of the surrounding environment and significant changes and disturbance to the existing landscape resources were not anticipated. C for T considered that the proposed development could be tolerated. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. According to the Lands Department, the outstanding Small House applications for the Pak Kong Village was 17 while the estimated 10-year Small House demand forecast was 205. According to PlanD's estimate, about 1.3ha of land equivalent to about 51 Small Houses was available within the “V” zone of Pak Kong Village. Sympathetic consideration might be given as the site was the subject of a previous approval for the same use. There was no change in the major development parameters, except reduction in site area. Regarding the adverse public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

38. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

39. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission

should be valid until 2.8.2023, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following condition :

“the provision of septic tank, as proposed by the applicant, at a location to the satisfaction of the Director of Lands or of the TPB.”

40. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix VII of the Paper.

Agenda Item 15

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/SK-SKT/22 Proposed 19 Houses and Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction (from 0.75 to 0.756) in “Residential (Group E)2” and “Green Belt” Zones, Lots 8 S.B, 9 S.A and 9 S.B in D.D. 212 and Adjoining Government Land, 1 Hong Kin Road, Sai Kung
(RNTPC Paper No. A/SK-SKT/22)

41. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 15.7.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for a period of two months so as to allow time to respond to the departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

42. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee’s consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further

information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[The Chairman thanked Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, Mr Timothy T.C. Kau and Ms Jane W.L. Kwan, STPs/SKIs, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 16

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/SK-TLS/56 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Site Coverage and Building Height Restrictions for Permitted Residential Redevelopment in "Residential (Group C) 1" Zone, Lot 1109 RP (Part) in D.D. 253, 8 Ka Shue Road, Sai Kung

43. The Secretary reported that the application was rescheduled.

Sha Tin, Tai Po and North District

[Mr Kenny C.H. Lau, Ms Kathy C.L. Chan and Mr Tim T.Y. Fung, Senior Town Planners/Sha Tin, Tai Po and North (STPs/STN), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 17

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/ST/969 Proposed Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Equine Experience Centre) in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Race Course" Zone, Northwestern Part of Penfold Park, Sha Tin Race Course, Sha Tin (RNTPC Paper No. A/ST/969A)

44. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Hong Kong Jockey Club (HKJC). Masterplan Ltd. (Masterplan), DLN Architects Ltd. (DLN) and MVA Hong Kong Ltd. (MVA) were three of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Dr Lawrence K.C. Li - being a voting member of the HKJC;
- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - being an ordinary member of the HKJC; and having current business dealings with Masterplan and MVA;
- Mr Peter K.T. Yuen - being a full member of HKJC and being a member of the Board of Governors of the Hong Kong Arts Centre which had received a donation from the HKJC before;
- Mr K.K. Cheung - being a full member of the HKJC and his firm having current business dealings with HKJC;
- Dr C.H. Hau - applying for funding from HKJC Charities Trust for his project;
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - being an ordinary member of the HKJC and having past business dealings with DLN;
- Mr David Y. T. Lui]
- Mr. Philip S.L. Kan] being an ordinary member of the HKJC; and
- Miss Winnie W.M. Ng]
- Mr L.T. Kwok - HKJC Charities Trust sponsored some of his projects.

45. The Committee noted that Messrs Ivan C.S. Fu, David Y.T. Lui, Philip S.L. Kan, L.T. Kwok and Dr C.H. Hau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. The Committee agreed that as the interest of Dr Lawrence K.C. Li was direct, he should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for this item. According to the Procedure and Practice of the Town Planning Board, Member or his/her spouse who was an

ordinary/corporate member of a club, association, union or other bodies would not constitute a conflict of direct interest if the Member or his/her spouse was not directly involved in the matter under consideration. As Messrs Peter K.T. Yuen, K.K. Cheung, Stephen L.H. Liu and Miss Winnie W.M. Ng had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they should be allowed to stay in the meeting.

[Dr Lawrence K.C. Li left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

46. Mr Kenny C.H. Lau, STP/STN, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) proposed place of recreation, sports or culture (equine experience centre);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, a total of 14 public comments were received. Four public comments from Sha Tin District Council (STDC) Members and individuals supported the application, and ten comments from Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, a STDC Member and individuals objected to the application. Major grounds were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The proposed equine experience centre to educate and foster equine activity was generally in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Race Course” zone. The proposal, together with the

existing paddocks, would better utilise the Penfold Park during non-race days to serve the visitors and general public. No significant visual and landscape impact was anticipated and the visual amenity had been well compensated and further enhanced by a landscape strategy aiming to minimise tree impact with compensatory tree planting proposal. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation had no adverse comment subject to the provision of a complete mitigation plan by the applicant before the commencement of works. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. The Development and Housing Committee (DHC) of the STDC was consulted and supported the proposal. Regarding the adverse public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

47. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

48. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 2.8.2023, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the submission and implementation of the fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting before the operation of the proposed use to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB; and
- (b) the provision of a complete mitigation plan before the commencement of works to the satisfaction of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation or of the TPB.”

49. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix III of the Paper.

[Dr Lawrence K.C. Li returned to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 18

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/NE-LT/668 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in
“Agriculture” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lot 271 S.A
ss.1 in D.D.10, Pak Ngau Shek Ha Tsuen, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LT/668)

50. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 23.7.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for a period of two months so as to allow time for preparation of further information to support the application. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

51. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee’s consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 19

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-LT/670 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in
 “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 176 in D.D. 8, Shui Wo, Tai Po
 (RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LT/670)

52. The Committee noted that there was an editorial error in paragraph 11.2 of the Paper regarding the amount of land available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of the concerned village. The amount of land should be “about 0.86ha of land (equivalent to about 23 Small House sites)” instead of “about 1.36ha of land (equivalent to about 54 Small House sites)”.

Presentation and Question Sessions

53. Ms Kathy C.L. Chan, STP/STN, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) proposed house (New Territories Exempted House – Small House);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) did not support the application as road access and water source was available, and the site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation. The Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department (CE/C, WSD) and the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) objected/did not support the application as septic tank/soakaway system was proposed as sewage disposal method within the water gathering grounds (WGG). The Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department (CE/MN, DSD) did not support the application as flooding had been recorded in the vicinity and the adjoining area was subject to overland

flows and/or regular flooding. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) had reservation on the application as the proposed Small House footprint was likely in conflict with some existing trees and no information on tree preservation proposal was provided. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) had reservation on the application but considered that the application involving construction of one Small House could be tolerated. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, six public comments were received from the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, Designing Hong Kong Limited, World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong and individuals objecting to the application. Major grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the PlanD's views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed Small House development was not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone. DAFC did not support the application as agricultural infrastructure was available and the site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation. DEP and CE/C, WSD did not support the application as it was not able to be connected to the public sewer. CE/MN, DSD did not support the application as there was record of flooding in the vicinity and the adjoining area was subject to overland flows and/or regular flooding. CTP/UD&L, PlanD had reservation on the application as the applicant failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have adverse landscape impacts on the existing trees and surrounding area. C for T had reservation on the application but considered that the proposed developments could be tolerated. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. The application did not comply with the interim criteria for consideration of application for New Territories Exempted House/Small House in New Territories. There was no general shortage of land in meeting Small

House development in the “V” zone of Shui Wo, and it was considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within the “V” zone for more orderly development pattern. There were nine similar applications for Small House development within the same “AGR” zone in the vicinity and three applications were rejected. The planning circumstances of the current application were similar to those rejected applications. Regarding the adverse public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

54. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

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

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” zone which is primarily to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes. It is also intended to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. There is no strong planning justification in the current submission for a departure from the planning intention;
- (b) the proposed development does not comply with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for New Territories Exempted House/Small House in New Territories in that there is no general shortage of land in meeting the demand for Small House development in the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Shui Wo; the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed development located within water gathering grounds would be able to be connected to the existing or planned sewerage system and would not cause adverse impact on the water quality in the area; and the proposed development would not have adverse landscape and drainage

impacts on the surrounding area; and

- (c) land is still available within the “V” zone of Shui Wo which is primarily intended for Small House development. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within the “V” zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructure and services.”

Agenda Item 20

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-TK/666 Proposed Temporary Shop and Services (Store) for a Period of 3 Years
in “Recreation” Zone, Lot 1366 in D.D. 17, Lo Tsz Tin, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TK/666A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

56. Ms Kathy C.L. Chan, STP/STN, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) proposed temporary shop and services (store) for a period of 3 years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public comment was received from an individual objecting to the application. Major grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Although the proposed temporary shop and services (store) was not in line with the planning intention of the “Recreation” (“REC”) zone, it was intended to serve the visitors in the vicinity and was on a temporary basis for three years. It was not expected to jeopardize the long-term planning intention of the “REC” zone. The proposed temporary use was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses, and would not cause significant adverse traffic, sewerage, drainage and landscape impacts on the surrounding areas. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. Eight similar applications within the same “REC” zone in the vicinity were approved by the Committee, and one was rejected based on different planning circumstances. The circumstances of the current application were similar to those approved cases. Regarding the adverse public comment received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

57. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

58. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 2.8.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) no operation between 8:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) the proposed development should maintain a clearance of 3m from the top of the embankment of the existing natural stream course at all times during the planning approval period;
- (c) the submission of drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of

planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 2.2.2020;

- (d) in relation to (c) above, the implementation of drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 2.5.2020;
- (e) the submission of fire service installations and water supplies for fire-fighting proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.2.2020;
- (f) in relation to (e) above, the implementation of fire service installations and water supplies for fire-fighting proposal within 9 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.5.2020;
- (g) if approval conditions (a) or (b) is not complied with during the planning approval, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (h) if any of the above planning conditions (c), (d), (e) or (f) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

59. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix V of the Paper.

Agenda Item 21

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-TK/672 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Eating Place (Outside Seating Accommodation of a Restaurant) for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Government Land adjoining Lot 882 in D.D. 28, Tai Mei Tuk, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TK/672)

Presentation and Question Sessions

60. Ms Kathy C.L. Chan, STP/STN, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the renewal of planning approval for temporary eating place (outdoor seating accommodation of a restaurant) for a period of 3 years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) no public comment was received during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application on a temporary basis for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Although the applied use was not in line with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone, there was no Small House application at the site. The applied use on a temporary basis for three years would neither frustrate the long-term planning intention of the subject “V” zone nor adversely

affect the land availability for village type development. There had been no material change in the planning circumstances in the area since the previous temporary approval was granted. No environmental complaint had been received in the past three years. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. The application was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 34C (TPB PG-No. 34C) for renewal of planning approval and TPB PG-No. 15A for eating place within the “V” zone. Five previous applications for the same use and 19 similar applications in the vicinity were approved. Approval of the current application was in line with the Committee’s previous decisions.

61. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

62. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years from 25.8.2019 to 24.8.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) no operation between 11:00 pm and 11:00 am, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the application site during the planning approval period;
- (b) the setback of the development by 1.6m from the existing village road to its south shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (c) the drainage connection works completed on site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (d) the existing fire service installations implemented on site shall be maintained in efficient working order at all times during the planning approval period; and

- (e) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c) or (d) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice.”

63. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix VI of the Paper.

Agenda Item 22

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/TP/657 Columbarium in “Government, Institution or Community” Zone, Lot 1006 RP in D.D.5, No. 2, Mui Shue Hang Village, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TP/657B)

64. The Secretary reported that the application was located in Tai Po and the application was for columbarium use. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| Mr H.W. Cheung
(<i>the Vice-chairman</i>) | - | being a member of the Private Columbaria Licensing Board and owning a flat in Tai Po; and |
| Mr Ivan C.S. Fu | - | being a member of the Private Columbaria Appeal Board. |

65. The Committee noted that Messrs H.W. Cheung and Ivan C.S. Fu had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

66. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 17.7.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for a period of two months so as to allow time to address the comments of relevant departments. It was the third time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had

submitted revised reports including quantitative risk assessment and traffic and crowd management plan.

67. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information. Since it was the third deferment and a total of six months had been allowed for preparation of submission of further information, it was the last deferment and no further deferment would be granted.

Agenda Items 23 to 25

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-LYT/700 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in "Agriculture" Zone, Lot 1850 S.K in D.D. 76, Kan Tau Tsuen, Fanling

(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LYT/700 to 702)

A/NE-LYT/701 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in "Agriculture" Zone, Lots 1846 S.A ss.12 and 1850 S.M in D.D. 76, Kan Tau Tsuen, Fanling

(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LYT/700 to 702)

A/NE-LYT/702 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in "Agriculture" Zone, Lots 1850 S.F RP and 1850 S.I ss.1 in D.D. 76, Kan Tau Tsuen, Fanling

(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LYT/700 to 702)

68. The Committee agreed that the three applications for proposed House (New

Territories Exempted House (NTEH) – Small House) were similar in nature and the application sites were located in proximity to one another within the same “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone and could be considered together.

Presentation and Question Sessions

69. Mr Tim T.Y. Fung, STP/STN, presented the applications and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the applications;
- (b) proposed house (NTEH – Small House) at each of the application sites;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) did not support the three applications as agricultural infrastructures such as road access and water sources were available and the sites possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) had reservation on the applications but considered that the applications involving construction of only three Small Houses could be tolerated. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the applications. Local views conveyed by the District Officer (North), Home Affairs Department were set out in paragraph 9.1 of the Paper;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, two public comments for each of the applications were received from the Chairman of Sheung Shui District Rural Committee (SSDRC) and an individual. The Chairman of SSDRC indicated no comment on the applications and the individual objected to the applications. Major grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the applications based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper.

The proposed Small House developments were not in line with the planning intention of the “AGR” zone. DAFC did not support the applications from the agricultural development point of view as the sites possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation. C for T had reservation on the applications but considered that the proposed developments could be tolerated. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. Land was still available within the “V” zone to meet the number of outstanding Small House applications and it was considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House developments within the “V” zone for more orderly development pattern. Nevertheless, sympathetic consideration might be given to the applications as the sites were the subject of previous applications approved in 2011 for the same use applied by the same applicants and the Small House grants were approved in-principle pending execution. There were 16 similar applications for Small House developments in the vicinity and five of them were approved. The circumstances of the current applications were similar to those approved cases in the vicinity. Regarding the adverse public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

70. Members had no question on the applications.

Deliberation Session

71. After deliberation, the TPB decided to approve the applications, on the terms of the applications as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). Each of the permissions should be valid until 2.8.2023, and after the said date, the permissions should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the developments permitted were commenced or the permission were renewed. Each of the permissions was subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the provision of septic tank, as proposed by the applicant, at a location to the satisfaction of the Director of Lands or of the TPB; and

- (b) the submission and implementation of drainage proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.”

72. The Committee also agreed to advise each of the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix VII of the Paper.

Agenda Item 26

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-LYT/703 Proposed 11 Houses (New Territories Exempted Houses - Small Houses) in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 1749 S.L, S.M, S.N, S.O, S.P, S.Q, S.R, S.S, S.T, S.U, S.V, S.W and RP (Part) in D.D. 76, Leng Pei Tsuen, Fanling
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LYT/703)

Presentation and Question Sessions

73. Mr Tim T.Y. Fung, STP/STN, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) proposed 11 Houses (New Territories Exempted Houses - Small Houses);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) did not support the application as the agricultural activities in the vicinity were active, agricultural infrastructures such as road access and water sources were available and the site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) had reservation on the application but considered that the application involving construction of eleven Small Houses could be

tolerated. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, four public comments were received from the Chairman of Sheung Shui District Rural Committee (SSDRC), World Wide Fund For Nature Hong Kong, Designing Hong Kong Limited and an individual. The Chairman of SSDRC indicated no comment on the applications and the remaining comments objected to the application. Major grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the applications based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed Small House developments were not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” zone. DAFC did not support the application from the agricultural development point of view as the site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation. C for T had reservation on the application but considered that the proposed developments could be tolerated. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. The application generally complied with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for New Territories Exempted House/Small House in New Territories as there was a general shortage of land in meeting Small House development in the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Ma Mei Ha Leng Tsui and Leng Pei Tsuen Village. As land available within the “V” zone was insufficient to meet even the outstanding Small House applications, sympathetic consideration might be given to the application. A previous application for the same use and 9 similar applications for Small House developments in the vicinity were approved. The circumstances of the current applications were similar to those previous approved applications and similar cases in the vicinity. Regarding the adverse public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

74. In response to a Member's question on whether the applicants had proposed to revise the sewage facility as stated in paragraph 1.5 of the Paper. Mr Tim T.Y. Fung, STP/STN, said that the applicants in the current application proposed to connect the proposed Small Houses to public sewer instead of using septic tank for sewage disposal as in the previous approved application. A public sewer would be provided by the Drainage Services Department (DSD) to serve the area, and thus the applicants were requested to propose the connection to the public sewer for the proposed Small Houses in the application.

Deliberation Session

75. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 2.8.2023, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the submission and implementation of drainage proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (b) the submission and implementation of sewerage proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.”

76. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix VII of the Paper.

Agenda Item 27

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-TKL/619 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Agriculture” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lot 241 S.A in D.D. 79, Ping Yeung Village, Ta Kwu Ling
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TKL/619)

77. The Secretary reported that CK Lau Surveyors Ltd. (CKL) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Member had declared interest on the item:

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having past business dealings with CKL.

78. As Mr Stephen L.H. Liu had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

79. Mr Tim T.Y. Fung, STP/STN, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) did not support the application as agricultural infrastructures such as road access and water source were available, and the site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) had reservation on the applications but considered that the application involving construction of one Small House could be tolerated. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, five public comments were received from the Chairman of Sheung Shui District Rural Committee (SSDRC), a North District Council (NDC) Member, the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, Designing Hong Kong Limited and an individual. The Chairman of SSDRC and NDC Member indicated no comment/supported the application respectively and the remaining

comments objected to the application. Major grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed Small House development was not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone. DAFC did not support the application from the agricultural development point of view as the site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation. C for T had reservation on the applications but considered that the proposed developments could be tolerated. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. As land was still available within the “Village Type Development” zone of Ping Yeung to meet the number of outstanding Small House applications, it was considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within the “V” zone for more orderly development pattern. Though there were two similar applications approved for Small House development within/partly within the “AGR” zone in the vicinity, they were considered before the adoption of a more cautious approach by the Town Planning Board. The circumstances of the current application were different from the approved similar cases in the vicinity. Regarding the adverse public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

80. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

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

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” zone in the Ping Che and Ta Kwu Ling area which is primarily to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish

ponds for agricultural purposes and to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention; and

- (b) land is still available within the “Village Type Development” zone of Ping Yeung where land is primarily intended for Small House development. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development close to the existing village cluster for orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services.”

[The Chairman thanked Mr Kenny C.H. Lau, Ms Kathy C.L. Chan and Mr Tim T.Y. Fung, STPs/STN, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East District

Agenda Item 28

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-SK/258 Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Hobby Farm) for a Period of 5 Years (with Filling of Land by 0.2m) in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 1645 RP (Part) in D.D.112, Shui Tsan Tin, Shek Kong, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-SK/258)

82. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 18.7.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for a period of two months so as to allow time for preparation of further information to address public comments and revised proposals. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

83. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[Ms S.H. Lam, Ms Ivy C.W. Wong, Senior Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (STPs/FSYLE), and Mr Billy Au Yeung, Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (TP/FSYLE), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 29

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-KTS/474 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Private Swimming Pool Ancillary to a Permitted House for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lots 1304 RP and 2598 RP (Part) in D.D. 92, Kam Tsin, Kwu Tung South, Sheung Shui
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-KTS/474)

Presentation and Question Sessions

84. Ms S.H. Lam, STP/FSYLE, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the renewal of planning approval for temporary private swimming pool

ancillary to a permitted house for a period of 3 years;

- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public comment was received from an individual providing comment on the application. Major ground was set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD considered that the temporary use could be tolerated for a further period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. Although the site fell within “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone, there was no Small House application at the site. The applied use on a temporary basis for three years would not jeopardize the long-term planning intention of the subject “V” zone. There had been no material change in the planning circumstances in the area since the previous temporary approval was granted in 2016. The temporary swimming pool would unlikely cause adverse traffic, environmental, drainage and landscape impacts on the surrounding areas and concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. Relevant approval conditions had been recommended to address the technical concerns of other concerned government departments. The application was in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 34C (TPB PG-No. 34C) for renewal of planning approval. Regarding the adverse public comment received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

85. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

86. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a

temporary basis for a period of 3 years from 17.8.2019 to 16.8.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the submission of a condition record of the existing drainage facilities implemented on the application site and review the adequacy of the existing drainage system, including the arrangement of discharge from the swimming pool within 3 months from the date of commencement of renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 17.11.2019;
- (b) the submission of proposal of fire service installations within 6 months from the date of commencement of renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 17.2.2020;
- (c) in relation to (b) above, the implementation of proposal of fire service installations within 9 months from the date of commencement of renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 17.5.2020; and
- (d) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b) or (c) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

87. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix IV of the Paper.

Agenda Item 30

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTN/656 Proposed Temporary Shop and Services (Retail of Tail Lift) for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” and “Industrial (Group D)” Zones, Lots 471, 472 and 473 in D.D. 107, Fung Kat Heung, Kam Tin, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTN/656A)

88. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Harvest Hill (Hong Kong) Ltd. (HHL). The following Member had declared interest on the item:

Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with HHL.

89. As Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

90. Ms Ivy C.W. Wong, STP/FSYLE, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) proposed temporary shop and services (retail of tail lift) for a period of 3 years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) did not support the application as agricultural infrastructures such as road access and water source were available, and the site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on

the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, five public comments were received from a Yuen Long District Councillor, Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation, Designing Hong Kong Limited and individuals objecting the application. Major grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD considered that the temporary use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Although the proposed temporary shop and services was not in line with the planning intentions of “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone and “Industrial (Group D)” (“I(D)”) zone, and DAFC did not support the application as the site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation, it was considered that approval of the application on a temporary basis for three years would not jeopardize the long-term planning intention of the subject “AGR” and “I(D)” zone. The site was located in the fringe of the “AGR” zone with a portion within the “I(D)” zone to serve the industrial/warehouse use in the “I(D)” zone. The proposed temporary use was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses which were predominated by open storage yards, warehouse, parking of vehicles/trailers, residential dwelling/structure and vacant/unused land. The proposed temporary use would unlikely cause adverse traffic and drainage impacts on and environmental nuisance to the surrounding areas. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. Relevant approval conditions had been recommended to minimise possible environmental nuisance and address the technical requirements. Although a previous application and three similar applications in the vicinity were rejected, the circumstances were different as it was located at the fringe of the “AGR” zone. Regarding the adverse public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

91. In response to a Member's question, Ms Ivy C.W. Wong, STP/FSYLE, said that the tail lift was a mechanical device installed on the rear of a vehicle to facilitate the handling of goods from ground level to the vehicle.

Deliberation Session

92. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 2.8.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) no operation between 7:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no operation on Sundays and public holidays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no medium or heavy goods vehicles exceeding 5.5 tonnes, including container tractors/trailers, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no dismantling, maintenance, repairing, cleansing, paint spraying or other workshop activities shall be carried out on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (f) the submission of drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 2.2.2020;
- (g) in relation to (f) above, the implementation of drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the

Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 2.5.2020;

- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (i) the submission of fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.2.2020;
- (j) in relation to (i) above, the implementation of fire service installations proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.5.2020;
- (k) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) or (h) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice;
- (l) if any of the above planning conditions (f), (g), (i) or (j) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice; and
- (m) upon the expiry of the planning permission, the reinstatement of the site to an amenity area to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

93. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix VI of the Paper.

Agenda Item 31

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-KTN/669 Proposed Temporary Animal Boarding Establishment (Cattery) for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 3 S.E (Part) and 8 S.L in D.D. 110, Tai Kong Po, Kam Tin, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTN/669)

Presentation and Question Sessions

94. Ms Ivy C.W. Wong, STP/FSYLE, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) proposed temporary animal boarding establishment (cattery) for a period of 3 years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) did not support the application as agricultural infrastructures such as road access and water source were available, and the site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, three public comments were received from the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, Designing Hong Kong Limited and an individual objecting the application. Major grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application on a temporary basis for a period of three years based on the

assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Although the proposed temporary animal boarding establishment was not entirely in line with the planning intention of “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone and DAFC did not support the application as the site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation, it was considered that approval of the application on a temporary basis would not jeopardize the long-term planning intention of the subject “AGR” zone. The proposed temporary use was not incompatible with the surrounding uses, which were rural in character predominated by residential structures/dwellings, hobby farms, an animal boarding establishment, open storage yards and vacant/unused land. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. Relevant approval conditions had been recommended to minimise possible environmental nuisance and address the technical requirements. 27 of the 28 similar applications within the same “AGR” zone were approved by the Committee, the circumstances of the current application were similar to those approved similar cases in the vicinity and approval of the application was in line with the Committee’s previous decisions. Regarding the adverse public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

95. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

96. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 2.8.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) no operation between 7:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) all animals shall be kept inside the enclosed animal boarding establishment on the site, as proposed by the applicant, at all times during the planning

approval period;

- (c) no public announcement system, portable loud speaker, or any form of audio amplification system is allowed to be used on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the submission of a record of the existing drainage facilities on the site within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 2.11.2019;
- (f) the implementation of the accepted drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 2.2.2020;
- (g) in relation to (f) above, the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) the submission of fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.2.2020;
- (i) in relation to (h) above, the implementation of fire service installations proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.5.2020;
- (j) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d) or (g) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice;
- (k) if any of the above planning conditions (e), (f), (h) or (i) is not complied

with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice; and

- (l) upon expiry of the planning permission, the reinstatement of the site to an amenity area to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.”

97. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix V of the Paper.

Agenda Item 32

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-KTS/824 Proposed Religious Institution (Retreat Centre) in “Agriculture” Zone,
Lot 287 in D.D.106, Tin Sum Tsuen, Kam Tin, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTS/824)

98. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 25.7.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for a period of two months so as to allow time for preparation of further information in response to departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

99. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee’s consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 33

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-MP/282 Proposed Temporary Field Study Centre and Organic Farm for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, a site in D.D.104, Ha Chuk Yuen Tsuen, Mai Po, Yuen Long (Former Chuk Hing Public School)

(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-MP/282A)

100. The Secretary reported that the application was located in Mai Po. Mr K.W. Leung had declared interest on the item as he owned a property in Mai Po. As the property of Mr. K.W. Leung had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

101. Mr Billy Au Yeung, TP/FSYLE, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) proposed temporary field study centre and organic farm for a period of 3 years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The Secretary of Development (SDEV) supported the application as it was consistent with the Government’s policy to make gainful use of scarce land resources. The District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department advised that there was no Small House application received/being processed at the site. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, three public comments were received from the village representative of Chuk Yuen Tsuen and individuals raising concerns on the application. Major grounds were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD considered that the proposed use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. Although the proposed temporary field study centre and organic farm was not in line with the planning intentions of “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone, there was no Small House application at the site and it was considered that approval of the application on a temporary basis for three years would not jeopardize the long-term planning intention of the subject “V” zone. The proposed temporary use accommodated within vacated school buildings was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses and would unlikely cause adverse impacts on the surrounding areas. SDEV supported the application and other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. Relevant approval conditions had been recommended to mitigate potential environmental impacts and address the technical requirements. Whilst the previous planning permission for the same use submitted by the same applicant was revoked due to non-compliance with approval conditions, the applicant had committed to have a dedicated volunteer to handle compliance with approval conditions and was preparing the submission. Sympathetic consideration might be given to the subject application but shorter compliance periods were recommended for closely monitoring of the progress on compliance. Approval of the application was in line with the Committee's previous decisions of three previous applications at the site of similar nature. Regarding the adverse public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

102. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

103. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 2.8.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) no operation between 6:00 p.m. and 10:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no operation on Mondays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) the maintenance of the existing drainage facilities on the site at all times during the planning approval period;
- (e) the submission of records of the existing drainage facilities on the site within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 2.11.2019;
- (f) the submission of water supplies for firefighting and fire service installations proposal within 3 months to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.11.2019;
- (g) in relation to (f) above, the provision of water supplies for firefighting and fire service installations within 6 months to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.2.2020;
- (h) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c) or (d) is not complied with, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and

- (i) if any of the above planning conditions (e), (f) or (g) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

104. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix IV of the Paper.

Agenda Item 34

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-NTM/388 Temporary Vehicle Repair Workshop for a Period of 3 Years in “Green Belt” Zone, Lots 2269 (Part), 2273 (Part), 2277 and 2278 (Part) in D.D. 102, and Adjoining Government Land, Ngau Tam Mei, Yuen Long (RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-NTM/388A)

105. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 16.7.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for a period of two months so as to allow time to address the concerns of relevant departments. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had not yet submitted further information in response to the departmental comments. It was noted that the applicant needed more time to prepare further information to address departmental comments on site layout, traffic impact and arrangements.

106. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee’s consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further

information. Since it was the second deferment and a total of four months had been allowed for preparation of submission of further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 35

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-NTM/390 Proposed Temporary Vehicle Repair Workshop with Ancillary Vehicle Stripping Yard for a Period of 3 Years in “Open Storage” Zone, Lots 396 S.A RP (Part), 433 (Part), 434 (Part), 435 (Part), 436 (Part), 437 (Part), 438 (Part) and 444 in D.D. 102, and Adjoining Government Land, Ngau Tam Mei, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-NTM/390)

Presentation and Question Sessions

107. Mr Billy Au Yeung, TP/FSYLE, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) proposed temporary vehicle repair workshop with ancillary vehicle stripping yard for a period of 3 years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) did not support the application as there were sensitive receivers in the vicinity of the site. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public comment was received from an individual raising concerns on the

application. Major grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed temporary vehicle repair workshop with ancillary vehicle stripping yard was generally in line with the planning intention of “Open Storage” (“OS”) zone, and not incompatible with the surrounding land uses which were mostly open storage/storage yards, vehicle parks, warehouses and workshops. DEP did not support the application as there were sensitive receivers in the vicinity of the site and environmental nuisance was expected, but there was no environmental complaint against the site in the past three years. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. Relevant approval conditions had been recommended to mitigate potential environmental impacts and address the technical requirements. Approval of the application was in line with the Committee's previous decisions of three previous applications and 14 similar applications for the same use within the same “OS” zone. Regarding the adverse public comment received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

108. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

109. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 2.8.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) no operation between 5:00 p.m. and 10:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no operation on Sundays and public holidays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;

- (c) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) only hand tools will be used for vehicle stripping, and no stripping or compaction machine shall be used on Site at all times during the planning approval period;
- (e) the existing fencing on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) the submission of a drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 2.2.2020;
- (g) in relation to (f) above, the implementation of the drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 2.5.2020;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (i) the submission of fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.2.2020;
- (j) in relation to (i) above, the provision of fire service installations within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.5.2020;
- (k) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) or (h) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and

- (l) if any of the above planning conditions (f), (g), (i) or (j) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

110. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix V of the Paper.

Agenda Item 36

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-ST/553 Temporary Container Vehicle Park with Ancillary Site Office and Storage Uses for a Period of 3 Years in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Comprehensive Development to include Wetland Restoration Area” Zone, Lot 769 RP (Part) in D.D. 99, San Tin, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-ST/553)

111. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 24.7.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for a period of two months so as to allow time for the applicant to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

112. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee’s consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special

circumstances.

Agenda Item 37

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-ST/554 Temporary Container Vehicle Park and Open Storage of Construction Materials with Ancillary Tyre Repair Area, Site Office and Storage Uses for a Period of 3 Years in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Comprehensive Development to include Wetland Restoration Area” Zone, Lot 769 RP (Part) in D.D. 99, San Tin, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-ST/554)

113. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 24.7.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for a period of two months so as to allow time for the applicant to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

114. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee’s consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[The Chairman thanked Ms S.H. Lam, Ms Ivy C.W. Wong, STPs/FSYLE, and Mr Billy Au Yeung, TP/FSYLE, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West District

Agenda Item 38

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/TM/537 Columbarium Use in “Government, Institution or Community” Zone, Lots 501 and 533 in D.D. 131 and Adjoining Government Land, Tsing Shan Tsuen, Tuen Mun
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TM/537A)

115. The Secretary reported that the application was located in Tuen Mun and the application was for columbarium use. MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| Mr H.W. Cheung
(<i>the Vice-chairman</i>) | - | being a member of the Private Columbaria Licensing Board; |
| Mr Ivan C.S. Fu | - | being a member of the Private Columbaria Appeal Board, and having current business dealings with MVA; and |
| Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng | - | co-owning with spouse a flat in Tuen Mun. |

116. The Committee noted that Messrs H.W. Cheung, Ivan C.S. Fu and Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

117. The Committee noted that the applicants’ representative requested on 16.7.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for a period of two months so as to allow time to address comments of relevant departments. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information, including revised Traffic Impact Assessment and responses to comment. The applicants needed more time to prepare further information to address

further comments from concerned departments.

118. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information. Since it was the second deferment and a total of four months had been allowed for preparation of submission of further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee, Mr Simon P.H. Chan and Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, Senior Town Planners/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (STPs/TMYLW), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 39

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-LFS/344 Proposed Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Fishing Ground) for a Period of 3 Years in "Green Belt" Zone, Lots 1563 (Part) and 1564 RP (Part) in D.D. 129 and Adjoining Government Land, Lau Fau Shan, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-LFS/344)

Presentation and Question Sessions

119. Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee, STP/TMYLW, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) proposed temporary place of recreation, sports or culture (fishing ground) for a period of 3 years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) raised concerns on the application as it appeared that the proposed floating platforms for fishing would not comply with the “no-net-loss-in-wetland” principle as stipulated in the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 12C (TPB PG-No.12C), the proposed development might affect the same pond which was not covered by the application, the proposed vehicular access might cause disturbance to the pond within the site and the proposed mitigation measure was undesirable from ecological perspective. The ecological integrity of the existing fish pond would be affected. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) had reservation on the application, as the site formation and pond filling appeared to have taken place and the proposed use seemed to be in operation and landscape impact had taken place, approval of the application might set an undesirable precedent to encourage other similar application to form the site prior to obtaining the planning approval. The cumulative impact of which would lead to the general degradation of rural landscape character and the integrity of the “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, five public comments were received from Kadoorie Farm & Botanic Garden Corporation, Designing Hong Kong Limited, Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, villagers of Mong Tseng Wai and an individual objecting to the application. Major grounds were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and
- (e) the PlanD’s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the

assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The proposed temporary place of recreation, sports or culture was not in line with the planning intention of the “GB” zone and there was no strong planning justification given in the submission for such a departure, even on a temporary basis. CTP/UD&L, PlanD had reservation on the application as the landscape impact had taken place and it was not in line with the TPB PG-No. 10. DAFC raised concerns as the proposed development might affect the northeastern portion of the same pond which was not covered by the application, the proposed mitigation measure was undesirable from ecological perspective, proposed vehicular access might cause disturbance to the pond within the site, and the proposed floating platforms would not comply with the TPB PG-No.12C. The ecological integrity of the existing fish pond would be affected. Although the last previous application for temporary hobby farm was approved, three previous applications for similar or other uses were rejected within the same “GB” zone. Rejecting the current application was in line with the Committee’s previous decisions. Regarding the adverse public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

120. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

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

- “(a) the applied use is not in line with the planning intention of the “Green Belt” (“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 within this zone. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis;

- (b) the applied use is not in line with the Town Planning Board (TPB) Guidelines No. 10 for Application for Developments within the “Green Belt” Zone in that the applied use would affect the natural landscape; and
- (c) the applied use is not in line with the TPB Guidelines No. 12C for Application for Development within Deep Bay Area in that it will affect the ecological integrity of the existing fish pond.”

Agenda Item 40

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/HSK/166 Proposed Temporary Open Storage of Recyclable Materials (Metal and Plastic) for a Period of 3 Years and Filling of Pond in “Government, Institution or Community” Zone and an area shown as ‘Road’, Lots 244 (Part), 246, 249, 250 (Part), 251 (Part), 252 (Part), 253 (Part), 254 (Part) and 255 (Part) in D.D. 125, San Wai, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/HSK/166)

Presentation and Question Sessions

122. Mr Simon P.H. Chan, STP/TMYLW, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) proposed temporary open storage of recyclable materials (metal and plastic) for a period of 3 years and filling of pond;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) did not support the application as there were sensitive receivers in the vicinity of the site and environmental nuisance was expected. Other

concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;

- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, two public comments were received from a Yuen Long District Council Member and an individual. The former advised that the residents of Tin Shui Wai objected to the application and the latter also objected to the application. Major grounds were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD considered that the proposed temporary use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. Although the proposed temporary open storage of recyclable materials was not in line with the planning intention of “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zone and an area shown as ‘Road’, the implementation programme for that part of New Development Area was still being formulated and approval of the application on a temporary basis of three years would not jeopardize the long-term development of the site. The proposed temporary use was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses which were predominantly occupied by open storages, warehouses and logistic centre. The application was generally not in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13E in that majority of the site fell within Category 4 area where applications would normally be rejected. However, the planning circumstances of the area had been changed and taking into account the specific circumstances pertaining to the current application as mentioned in paragraph 12.4 of the Paper, sympathetic consideration might be given. Although DEP did not support the application, there was no substantial environmental complaint concerning the site received in the past three years. Relevant approval conditions had been recommended to minimise possible environmental nuisance and address the technical requirements. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. Regarding the adverse public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above

were relevant.

123. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

124. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 2.8.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) no operation between 7:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no operation on Sundays and public holidays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no workshop activity, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no heavy goods vehicle exceeding 24 tonnes, including container trailer/tractor, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from the public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (f) the submission of a revised drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 2.2.2020;
- (g) in relations to (f) above, the implementation of the revised drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 2.5.2020;

- (h) in relations to (g) above, the implemented drainage facilities on Site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (i) the provision of fire extinguisher(s) and the submission of a valid fire certificate (FS 251) within 6 weeks from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 13.9.2019;
- (j) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.2.2020;
- (k) in relation to (j) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 9 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.5.2020;
- (l) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) or (h) is not complied with during the approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (m) if any of the above planning conditions (f), (g), (i), (j) or (k) is not complied with by the above specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

125. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix VI of the Paper.

Agenda Item 41

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/HSK/167 Proposed Temporary Eating Place (Canteen) for a Period of 3 Years in “Open Space” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lots 67 (Part), 68 (Part) and 69 (Part) in D.D. 124, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/HSK/167)

Presentation and Question Sessions

126. Mr Simon P.H. Chan, STP/TMYLW, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) proposed temporary eating place (canteen) for a period of 3 years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department advised that there was no Small House application approved/under processing within the site and in its vicinity. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public comment was received from an individual raising concerns on the application. Major grounds were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. Although the proposed temporary eating place was not in line with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” (“V”) and “Open Space” zone, it could provide catering service to meet any such demand in

the area and there was no Small House application within the site and in its vicinity, and approval of the application would not jeopardize the long-term development of the site. The site was located in the fringe of the “V” zone and the applied use was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. The application was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 15A and it was also not anticipated to cause significant adverse impacts on the surrounding areas. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. Relevant approval conditions had been recommended to minimise possible nuisance and address the technical requirements. Regarding the adverse public comment received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

127. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

128. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 2.8.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from the public road at any times during the planning approval period;
- (b) the submission of a drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 2.2.2020;
- (c) in relation to (b) above, the implementation of the drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 2.5.2020;
- (d) in relation to (c) above, the implemented drainage facilities shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;

- (e) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.2.2020;
- (f) in relation to (e) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.5.2020;
- (g) if any of the above planning conditions (a) or (d) is not complied with during the approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (h) if any of the above planning conditions (b), (c), (e) or (f) is not complied with by the above specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

129. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix V of the Paper.

Agenda Item 42

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/HSK/169 Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Private Car & Light Goods Vehicle)
for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 1007
RP (Part) in D.D. 125 and Adjoining Government Land, Ha Tsuen,
Yuen Long

(RNTPC Paper No. A/HSK/169)

Presentation and Question Sessions

130. Mr Simon P.H. Chan, STP/TMYLW, presented the application and covered the

following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) temporary public vehicle park (private car & light goods vehicle) for a period of 3 years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department advised that there was no Small House application approved/under processing within the site. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) no public comment was received during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Although the temporary public vehicle park for private car and light goods vehicles was not in line with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” zone, it could provide parking facilities to meet any such demand in the area. There was no Small House application within the site, and approval of the application would not jeopardize the long-term development of the site. The site was located in the fringe of the “V” zone and the applied use was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. Relevant approval conditions had been recommended to minimise possible environmental nuisance and address the technical requirements. A previous application for similar use and four similar applications within the same “V” zone were approved. Approval of the current application was in line with the Committee’s previous decisions.

131. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

132. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 2.8.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) no cutting, dismantling, cleaning, repairing, compacting, vehicle repair and workshop activity, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (b) no vehicle without valid license issued under the Road Traffic Ordinance, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed to be parked/stored on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) no medium and heavy goods vehicles exceeding 5.5 tonnes, including container tractors/trailers, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance, as proposed by the applicant, are allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) a notice shall be posted at a prominent location of the site at all times to indicate that only private cars and light goods vehicles not exceeding 5.5 tonnes as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance, as proposed by the applicant, are allowed to enter/be parked on the site during the planning approval period;
- (e) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (f) all existing trees within the site shall be maintained in good condition at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) the submission of the condition record of the existing drainage facilities on

the site within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 2.11.2019;

- (h) in relation to (g) above, the existing drainage facilities shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (i) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.2.2020;
- (j) in relation to (i) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 9 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.5.2020;
- (k) the provision of fencing of the site within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 2.2.2020;
- (l) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f) or (h) is not complied with during the approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (m) if any of the above planning conditions (g), (i), (j) or (k) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

133. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix IV of the Paper.

Agenda Item 43

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TT/463 Temporary Public Vehicle Park for Private Cars and Van-type Light Goods Vehicles for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group D)” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lots 3338, 3339 S.H ss. 1 to ss. 4, 3339 S.H. ss. 5 (Part), 3339 S.H RP (Part), 3339 S.I ss. 1 to ss. 4, 3339 S.I ss. 5 (Part), 3339 S.I ss. 6 to ss. 9, 3339 S.I ss. 10(Part), 3339 S.I RP (Part), 3339 S.J ss. 1 to ss. 8, 3339 S.J ss. 9 (Part), 3339 S.J RP (Part), 3339 S.K ss. 1 to ss. 2, 3339 S.K ss. 3 (Part), 3339 S.K ss. 4, 3339 S.K ss. 5 (Part), 3339 S.K ss. 6 to ss. 11, 3339 S.K RP (Part), 3339 S.L ss. 3 to ss. 8 and 3339 S.L RP (Part) in D.D. 116, Nga Yiu Tau, Yuen Long (RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TT/463A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

134. Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/TMYLW, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) temporary public vehicle park for private cars and van-type light goods vehicles for a period of 3 years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, six public comments were received. The Yuen Long District Council Member indicated that he had no comment and the remaining five comments from individuals raised concerns/objected to the application. Major grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Although the temporary public vehicle park for private cars and van-type light goods vehicles was not in line with the planning intention of the “Residential (Group D)” zone, it could provide parking facilities to meet any such demand in the area. An application for four proposed houses was approved with conditions by the Committee on 18.1.2019. As the land exchange to implement the houses would take several years to complete, the subject proposed temporary use was to make use of the available land during the interim. Approval of such temporary use for three years would not frustrate the long-term planning intention of the area. The applied use was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses which was generally rural residential. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. Relevant approval conditions had been recommended to minimise possible environmental nuisance and address the technical requirements. A previous application for the same use was approved, approval of the current application was in line with the Committee's previous decisions. Regarding the adverse public comment received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

135. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

136. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 2.8.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) only private cars and light goods vehicles not exceeding 5.5 tonnes, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are allowed to enter/be parked on the site, as proposed by the applicant, at all times during the planning approval period;

- (b) no vehicle without valid licences issued under the Road Traffic (Registration and Licensing of Vehicles) Regulations is allowed to be parked/stored on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) a notice should be posted at a prominent location of the site at all times to indicate that only private cars and light goods vehicles not exceeding 5.5 tonnes, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are allowed to be parked/stored on the site, as proposed by the applicant, during the planning approval period;
- (d) no vehicle repairing, dismantling, commercial car beauty/car washing or other workshop activities, as proposed by the applicant, are allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (f) all existing trees within the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) the existing drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) the submission of records of the existing drainage facilities on the site within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 2.11.2019;
- (i) the submission of fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.2.2020;
- (j) in relation to (i) above, the implementation of fire service installations proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the

satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.5.2020;

- (k) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f) or (g) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (l) if any of the above planning conditions (h), (i) or (j) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

137. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix IV of the Paper.

Agenda Item 44

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-TT/473 Proposed Temporary Warehouse (including Cold Storage) for a Period of 3 Years in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Rural Use” Zone, Lot 1211 RP (Part) in D.D. 118, Tai Tong, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TT/473)

138. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 16.7.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for a period of two months so as to allow time to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

139. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and

could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 45

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/YL-TT/474 Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (excluding container vehicle) for a Period of 3 Years in "Village Type Development" Zone, Government Land in D.D. 117, Kiu Hing Road, Tai Tong, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TT/474)

140. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 16.7.2019 deferment of consideration of the application for a period of two months so as to allow time to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the application.

141. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 46

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TYST/969 Proposed Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Stage Equipment for a Period of 3 Years in “Undetermined” Zone, Lots 1415 RP, 1416 RP, 1426 (Part) and 1427 (Part) in D.D. 119 and Adjoining Government Land, Shan Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/969)

Presentation and Question Sessions

142. Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/TMYLW, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) proposed temporary warehouse for storage of stage equipment for a period of 3 years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, two public comments were received. A village representative of Shan Ha Tsuen objected to the application and an individual raised concerns on the application. Major grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD considered that the temporary use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The temporary warehouse for storage of stage equipment was not in conflict with the planning intention of the “Undetermined” (“U”) zone. Approval of such

temporary use for three years would not jeopardize the long-term development of the area. The applied use was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. Relevant approval conditions had been recommended to address the public concerns and the technical requirements of the concerned government departments. Two previous applications for similar use and 45 approved similar applications in this part of the “U” zone were approved since the promulgation of the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13E, approval of the current application was in line with the Committee’s previous decisions. Regarding the adverse public comment received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

143. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

144. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 2.8.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) no operation between 7:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no operation on Sundays and public holidays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no medium or heavy goods vehicles exceeding 5.5 tonnes, including container tractor/trailers, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site, as proposed by the applicant, at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;

- (e) no open storage, repairing, dismantling, spraying, cleaning or other workshop activities, and handling of used electrical appliances, computer/electronic parts (including cathode-ray tubes) and electronic waste, as proposed by the applicant, are allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (f) the existing boundary fencing on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) all existing trees within the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) the submission of a revised drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 2.2.2020;
- (i) in relation to (h) above, the implementation of drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 2.5.2020;
- (j) in relation to (i) above, the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (k) the submission of fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.2.2020;
- (l) in relation to (k) above, the implementation of fire service installations proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.5.2020;
- (m) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g) or (j) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby

given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and

- (n) if any of the above planning conditions (h), (i), (k) or (l) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

145. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix V of the Paper.

Agenda Item 47

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TYST/971 Proposed Temporary Warehouses for Storage of Paper Products and Electronic Goods for a Period of 3 Years in “Undetermined” Zone, Lots 747 (Part), 748, 749 (Part), 753 (Part), 754 (Part), 757 (Part), 758 (Part), 759 (Part), 760 S.A (Part), 760 S.B (Part), 761, 762, 763, 764 S.A (Part), 771 (Part), 793 (Part), 794, 795, 796, 797, 798 and 804 RP (Part) in D.D. 117 and Adjoining Government Land, Kung Um Road, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/971)

146. The Committee noted that replacement pages (Page 6 of the Main Paper and Page 1 of Appendix V of the Paper) rectifying the comment of District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department were dispatched to Members before the Meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

147. Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/TMYLW, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;

- (b) proposed temporary warehouses for storage of paper products and electronic goods for a period of 3 years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. The Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) did not support the application as there were sensitive receivers of residential use in the vicinity and environmental nuisance was expected. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period, one public comment was received from an individual raising concerns on the application. Major grounds were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD considered that the temporary use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed temporary warehouse for storage of paper products and electronic goods was not in conflict with the planning intention of the “Undetermined” (“U”) zone. Approval of such temporary use for three years would not jeopardize the long-term development of the area. The applied use was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses which were predominately open storages and workshops. Although DEP did not support the application due to environmental nuisance, there was no substantiated environmental complaint concerning the site received in the past three years. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. Relevant approval conditions had been recommended to address the environmental concerns and the technical requirements. Seven previous applications for similar use and 101 similar applications in this part of the “U” zone were approved since the promulgation of the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13E, approval of the current application was in line with the Committee’s previous decisions. Regarding the adverse public comment

received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

148. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

149. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 2.8.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) no operation between 9:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no operation on Sundays and public holidays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no open storage, repairing, dismantling, recycling, cleaning, assembling, other workshop activities and handling of cathode-ray tubes, as proposed by the applicant, shall be carried out on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) all existing trees within the site shall be maintained at all times, as proposed by the applicant, during the planning approval period;
- (f) the submission of a run-in/out proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Highways or of the TPB by 2.2.2020;
- (g) in relation to (f) above, the implementation of run-in/out proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the

Director of Highways or of the TPB by 2.5.2020;

- (h) the submission of a drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 2.2.2020;
- (i) in relation to (h) above, the implementation of the drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 2.5.2020;
- (j) in relation to (i) above, the implemented drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (k) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.2.2020;
- (l) in relation to (k) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.5.2020;
- (m) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) or (j) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (n) if any of the above planning conditions (f), (g), (h), (i), (k) or (l) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

150. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix V of the Paper.

Agenda Item 48

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TYST/972 Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Construction Materials for a Period of 3 Years in “Undetermined” Zone, Lots 1255 (Part), 1256 (Part), 1258 (Part) and 1259 (Part) in D.D. 119, Pak Sha Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/972)

Presentation and Question Sessions

151. Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/TMYLW, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) temporary warehouse for storage of construction materials for a period of 3 years;
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) no public comment was received during the first three weeks of the statutory publication period; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD considered that the temporary use could be tolerated for a period of three years based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed temporary warehouse for storage of construction materials was not in conflict with the planning intention of the “Undetermined” (“U”) zone. Approval of such temporary use for three years would not jeopardize the

long-term development of the area. The applied use was considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses which were mainly warehouses and open storage uses. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. Relevant approval conditions had been recommended to minimise potential environmental nuisance and address the technical requirements of the concerned government departments. Six previous applications for similar use and 100 similar applications in this part of the “U” zone were approved since the promulgation of the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13E, approval of the current application was in line with the Committee’s previous decisions.

152. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

153. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 2.8.2022, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) no operation between 7:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no operation on Sundays and public holidays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no repairing, dismantling, spraying, cleaning, other workshop activities and handling of electrical appliances and computer/electronic parts (including cathode-ray tubes), as proposed by the applicant, shall be carried out on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no medium or heavy goods vehicles exceeding 5.5 tonnes, including container tractors/trailers, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance are allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site, as proposed by the

applicant, at any time during the planning approval period;

- (e) no vehicle is allowed to queue back to or reverse onto/from public road at any time during the planning approval period;
- (f) all existing trees within the site shall be maintained at all times, as proposed by the applicant, during the planning approval period;
- (g) the existing drainage facilities on the site shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) the submission of a condition record of the existing drainage facilities on the site within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 2.11.2019;
- (i) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.2.2020;
- (j) in relation to (i) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.5.2020;
- (k) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f) or (g) is not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (l) if any of the above planning conditions (h), (i) or (j) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

154. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as

set out at Appendix IV of the Paper.

[The Chairman thanked Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee, Mr Simon P.H. Chan and Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STPs/TMYLW, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 49

Any Other Business

155. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 4:04 p.m..