

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

**Minutes of 327th Meeting of the
Rural and New Town Planning Committee held at 2:30 p.m. on 2.6.2006**

Present

Director of Planning
Mr. Bosco C.K. Fung

Chairman

Mr. Michael K.C. Lai

Vice-chairman

Ms. Carmen K.M. Chan

Mr. David W.M. Chan

Professor Peter R. Hills

Mr. Tony C.N. Kan

Mr. Edmund K.H. Leung

Dr. C.N. Ng

Mr. Alfred Donald Yap

Ms. Anna S.Y. Kwong

Dr. James C. W. Lau

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Strategic Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr. Lawrence Ngo

Chief Transport Engineer/New Territories East,
Transport Department
Mr. H.L. Cheng

Assistant Director/New Territories, Lands Department
Mr. Francis Ng

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Miss Ophelia Y.S. Wong

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Professor Nora F.Y. Tam

Dr. Lily Chiang

Professor David Dudgeon

Mr. B.W. Chan

Mr. Y.K. Cheng

Assistant Director (2), Home Affairs Department
Miss Linda Law

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Mr. Lau Sing

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms. Paulina L.S. Pun

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 326th RNTPC Meeting held on 19.5.2006

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 326th RNTPC meeting held on 19.5.2006 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

(i) Approval of Outline Zoning Plans

2. The Secretary reported that on 30.5.2006, the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) approved the draft Clear Water Bay Peninsula South Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/SK-CWBS/1 (renumbered S/SK-CWBS/2 upon approval) and the draft Urban Renewal Authority Mallory Street/Burrows Street Development Scheme Plan (DSP) No. S/H5/URA1/1 (renumbered S/H5/URA1/2 upon approval) under section 9(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The approval of the OZP and DSP would be notified in the Gazette on 9.6.2006.

(ii) Reference of Approved OZPs

3. The Secretary reported that on 30.5.2006, the CE in C referred three approved OZPs to the Town Planning Board (the Board) for amendment under section 12(1)(b)(ii) of the Ordinance. They were the Kwun Tung North, Ho Man Tin and Tseung Kwan O OZPs. The reference of the OZPs would be notified in the Gazette on 9.6.2006.

(iii) New Town Planning Appeal Received

Town Planning Appeal No. 9 of 2006 (9/06)

Shop and Services

in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business",

Unit P, G/F., Everest Industrial Centre,

396 Kwun Tong Road, Kwun Tong

(Application No. A/K14/488)

4. The Secretary reported that the Town Planning Appeal Board (TPAB) on 22.5.2006 received an appeal against the decision of the Board on 10.3.2006 to reject on review an application (No. A/K14/488) for shop and services use at a site zoned “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” on the draft Kwun Tong South OZP No. S/K14S/12 on the ground of fire safety. The hearing date was yet to be fixed. The Secretariat would represent the Board to deal with the appeal.

(iv) Appeal Statistics

5. The Secretary said that as at 2.6.2006, 30 cases were yet to be heard by the TPAB. Details of the appeal statistics were as follows :

Allowed	:	16
Dismissed	:	83
Abandoned/Withdrawn/Invalid	:	113
Yet to be Heard	:	30
Decision Outstanding	:	2
Total	:	244

Tuen Mun and Yuen Long District

[Mr. Wilson Y.L. So, District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long (DPO/TMYL), and Mr. Anthony C.Y. Lee, Senior Town Planner/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long (STP/TMYL), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

[Dr. C.N. Ng arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 3

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

- (i) A/TM/348 Proposed Utility Installation

(Cable Tunnel, Portal and Shaft for Underground
Cable Tunnel Ventilation and Maintenance)
in “Green Belt” and “Other Specified Uses” annotated
“Public Recreation and Sports Centre” zones and
an area shown as ‘Road’,
Tuen Mun Town Lot 220,
Government Land in DD 137, 138 and 300,
GLA-TTM 343 and GLA-TM 215
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TM/348)

Presentation and Question Session

6. Mr. Anthony C.Y. Lee, STP/TMYL, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed utility installation (cable tunnel, portal and shaft for underground cable tunnel ventilation and maintenance);
- (c) departmental comments – highlighting that the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) had no objection as the proposal was a Designated Project (DP) under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance and an Environmental Permit had been issued for the construction and operation of the project. No objection from other concerned Government departments was received;
- (d) one public comment was received during the statutory publication period objecting to the application mainly on the grounds of adverse environmental, visual and health impacts, and loss of open space; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application for the reasons detailed in paragraph 11.1 of the Paper. The proposal, which was mainly underground with compensatory planting,

would unlikely cause adverse visual impact. Concerned Government departments, including the EPD, Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department, and Leisure and Cultural Services Department, had no objection to the application. The applicant could be advised to continue the liaison with the commenter to address the concerns raised.

7. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

8. The Chairman remarked that the proposal mainly involved underground structures. The two structures above ground were of small scale. The proposed installation was a DP and an Environmental Permit had already been issued.

9. 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 2.6.2010, 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 finishing materials and colour scheme of the Tuen Mun Shaft building to minimise adverse visual impact and to integrate with the adjacent Wu Shan Recreation Playground to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission of a landscape proposal including a comprehensive tree survey, tree recommendation plan and compensatory planting plan four months before the commencement of construction works, and implementation of the approved landscape proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission of a comprehensive geological assessment, a risk assessment and risk management plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Civil Engineering and Development or of the TPB; and

- (d) the provision of emergency vehicular access, water supply for fire fighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.

10. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to :

- (a) resolve any land issues relating to the development with the concerned owner(s) of the application site;
- (b) note the District Lands Officer/Tuen Mun, Lands Department's comments on the need to apply for a Short Term Tenancy to permit the applied use;
- (c) note the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department's comments that his 'no objection' should not be construed as condoning any authorized building works existing on the site. They were subject to enforcement action under section 24 of the Buildings Ordinance (BO). Formal submission by an authorized person for the proposed development for approval and consent was required under the BO. If the site did not abut on a street of not less than 4.5m wide, the development intensity of the site should be determined by the Building Authority under the Building (Planning) Regulation 19(3) at the building plan submission stage;
- (d) note the Chief Engineer/Development (2), Water Supplies Department's comments that the maximum particle velocity and maximum amplitude of ground movement at the vicinity of those watermains due to blasting or pile driving operations should not exceed 25mm/sec and 0.2mm respectively as measured by a vibrograph. Further, if blasting was necessary, the applicant was required to appoint a licensed shotfirer to carry out test firing on the site and the maximum explosive charge weight per delay period for 4 blasts at a given distance from waterworks installations/structures would have to be imposed on the blasting permit by the Commissioner of Mines;

- (e) note the Head of the Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department's comments that the applicant was reminded to make geotechnical submission to the Buildings Department for approval as required under the provisions of the BO. In particular, a comprehensive geological assessment, a risk assessment and a risk management plan should be included in the submissions for the proposed tunnel works;

- (f) note the Director of Environmental Protection's comments that the applicant should liaise with the Planning Department to work out details of compensatory planting, architectural finishes and chromatic treatment at the design stage, as well as to keep close liaison with District Office/Tuen Mun and the residents affected by the project;

- (g) note the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/New Territories, Transport Department's and the Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department's comments that the applicant should liaise with the Highways Department for the possible construction interface issues with the improvement works for Tuen Tsing Lane;

- (h) note the Director of Fire Services' comments that detailed fire safety requirements would be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans. Furthermore, the Emergency Vehicular Access provision in the site should comply with the standard as stipulated in the Part VI of the Code of Practice for Means of Access for Firefighting and Rescue under the Building (Planning) Regulation 41D; and

- (i) liaise with the Incorporated Owners of Sun Tuen Mun Centre and provide them with relevant information of the proposed development to address their concerns.

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

- (ii) A/TM-LTY Y/134 Proposed Flat
in “Residential (Group E)” zone,
Lots 464A1, 464B, 465, 472ARP, 472BRP in DD 130
and Adjoining Government Land, Lam Tei, Tuen Mun
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TM-LTY Y/134)
-

Presentation and Question Session

11. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 8.3.2006 for a deferment of the consideration of the application to allow time to address the concerns raised by the relevant Government departments.

Deliberation Session

12. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of additional information from the applicant. The Committee also agreed that the application should be submitted to the Committee for consideration within two months from the date of receipt of additional information from the applicant. 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.

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

- (iii) A/YL/139 Proposed Comprehensive Commercial/Residential
Development and Proposed Vehicular/Pedestrian Bridge
with Retail Use and Minor Relaxation of
Plot Ratio Restriction to Include the Gross Floor Area of
Transport Interchange and Community Hall
(Proposed Amendments to the Scheme Previously
Approved under Application No. A/YL/131)
in “Comprehensive Development Area” zone
and an area shown as ‘Road’,

Various Lots and Adjoining Government Land in DD 115,
Area 15, Yuen Long New Town
(to be known as Yuen Long Town Lot 507)
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL/139)

13. The application was submitted by the City Success Ltd. which was a subsidiary company of Sun Hung Kai Properties Ltd. (SHKP). Messrs. Alfred Donald Yap and Y.K. Cheng, having current business dealings with SHKP, had declared interests in this item. The Committee noted that Mr. Cheng had tendered his apologies for being unable to join the meeting.

[Mr. Alfred Donald Yap left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Session

14. Mr. Anthony C.Y. Lee, STP/TMYL, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed comprehensive commercial/residential development and proposed vehicular/pedestrian bridge with retail use and minor relaxation of plot ratio restriction to include the gross floor area (GFA) of transport interchange (TI) and community hall (CH);
- (c) departmental comments – no objection from concerned Government departments was received;
- (d) 13 public comments were received during the statutory publication period, 12 of which objected to the application mainly on the grounds of adverse environmental, traffic, hygiene, visual and fung shui impacts. One public comment supported the application on the ground of provision of the TI to alleviate traffic pressure; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application for the reasons detailed in paragraph 10.1 of the Paper in that the application was in line with the planning intention of the “Comprehensive Development Area” zone. As the provision of the TI and CH had both been included in the latest approved scheme under Application No. A/YL/131 for the subject development, the proposed relaxation of non-domestic plot ratio to include these facilities into GFA calculation only involved technical amendments. The development bulk, layout and floor area of the podium and residential component remained unchanged. Local objections on similar grounds had been raised against the last application and had been duly considered by the Committee. Relevant Government departments, including the Transport Department, Environmental Protection Department and the Urban Design and Landscape Section of the PlanD, had no objection to the application. The concerned issues could be addressed by appropriate approval conditions. The applicant could be advised to explain the latest development proposal and implementation progress to the local residents.

[Mr. Tony C.N. Kan left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

15. In response to the Chairman's enquiry on the reasons for the current application, Mr. Wilson Y.L. So, DPO/TMYL, explained that the application site involved a long history of applications. The first scheme (Application No. A/YL/10) was approved in 1993 and it included some transport facilities and a children and youth centre. Throughout the years, the scheme had been modified with amendments to the scale and design of the development. According to the latest scheme (Application No. A/YL/131) approved by the Committee on 29.4.2005, a public TI of about 8,000m² and a CH categorized as government, institution or community (GIC) facility were already incorporated in the Master Layout Plan (MLP).

16. Mr. Wilson Y.L. So continued to say that in accordance with the latest Government policy, facilities like TI and CH could not be exempted from GFA calculations in building plan submission and under the lease. From planning point of view, their inclusion in the GFA calculations would not lead to any adverse impacts on the building bulk, development layout and design as the facilities had already formed part of the MLP that was

previously approved by the Committee. Nonetheless, planning permission for minor relaxation of the plot ratio restriction stipulated under the Notes for the “CDA” zone was required if these facilities were to be included in the total GFA of the development. The current application was similar to the case of minor relaxation of plot ratio for a proposed residential care home for the elderly under Application No. A/YL/131.

Deliberation Session

17. The Chairman remarked that arising from the recent discussion on the Grand Promenade case and in line with the latest Government policies, it was necessary to clearly account for the GFA calculations for public facilities in development projects. As the subject TI and CH were provided for public benefits and had already been included in the previous approved MLP for the development, the proposed minor relaxation of plot ratio under application could be considered as a technical amendment.

18. Mr. Francis Ng said that the Lands Department (LandsD) had no objection to the application. Nonetheless, he reiterated LandsD’s concerns on the maintenance responsibility of the TI, the difficulty of Government enforcement if the agreement for maintenance was violated and the GFA calculation for the proposed 24-hour public passageway. The Chairman noted the concerns and considered that they could be resolved at the implementation stage.

19. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the Master Layout Plan (MLP) and the application, under sections 4A and 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 2.6.2010, 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 a revised MLP to take into account conditions (c), (d), (f), (g) and (j) to (m) to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission and implementation of the Landscape Master Plan including

tree preservation proposals to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;

- (c) the submission of an implementation programme to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (d) the design and provision of the proposed footbridges across Long Yat Road, Road 6/L3 and Castle Peak Road including the proposed vehicular connections, if any, the associated landings, staircases and disabled facilities, and demolition of the existing footbridge across Castle Peak Road, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Director of Highways or of the TPB;
- (e) the provision of improvement measures at Castle Peak Road and Pok Oi Interchange, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (f) the provision of Road 6/L3 and vehicular access arrangement including internal vehicular access and ingress/egress points to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (g) the design and provision of noise mitigation measures to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (h) the implementation of temporary and permanent sewage disposal arrangements depending on the commissioning date of the Au Tau Trunk Sewer (as proposed in the approved Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) for the previous application No. A/YL/83) and the SIA for the current application, to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (i) the submission of a revised drainage impact assessment and the provision of flood mitigation measures proposed therein and necessary drainage facilities to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the

TPB;

- (j) the provision of emergency vehicular access on the podium to the residential blocks, fire fighting arrangement to the Residential Care Home for the Elderly (RCHE), water supplies for fire fighting and fire services installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB;
- (k) the design and provision of a Community Hall with net operation floor area (NOFA) of not less than 593m², and the associated parking facilities to the satisfaction of the Director of Home Affairs or of the TPB;
- (l) the design and provision of RCHE with NOFA of not less than 1,576m² and the associated parking facilities to the satisfaction of the Director of Social Welfare or of the TPB;
- (m) the provision of a 6m wide Waterworks Reserve for the existing fresh water trunk main along the southern boundary of the application site to the satisfaction of the Director of Water Supplies or of the TPB; and
- (n) the provision of car parking and loading/unloading spaces to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB.

20. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to :

- (a) revise the MLP to take into account the conditions of approval imposed by the Board. The approved MLP, together with the set of approval conditions, would be certified by the Chairman of the Board and deposited in the Land Registry in accordance with section 4(A)(3) of the Town Planning Ordinance. Efforts should be made to incorporate the relevant approval conditions into a revised MLP for deposition in the Land Registry as soon as practicable;
- (b) note the Chief Estate Surveyor/Headquarters, Lands Department's

comments in paragraph 8.1.1 of the Paper;

- (c) note the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department's comments in paragraph 8.1.3 of the Paper;
- (d) note the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/New Territories, Transport Department's comments in paragraph 8.1.4, in particular to liaise with the KCRC on the vehicular access to the site via Long Ming Road;
- (e) note the Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department's comments in paragraph 8.1.5 of the Paper;
- (f) note the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department's comments in paragraph 8.1.8 of the Paper, in particular to improve the design of the podium to add interest to the streetscape and to reduce adverse impact on air movement at pedestrian level;
- (g) resubmit a revised scheme for the Board's consideration if the area of the 24-hour public passageway was to be included into the Gross Floor Area (GFA) and plot ratio calculations or the GFA of the proposed vehicular/pedestrian bridge to be exempted was less than 1,500m² as stated in paragraph 10.3 of the Paper; and
- (h) approach the Shap Pat Heung Rural Committee, the Village Representatives of Nam Bin Wai, Tung Tung Tsuen and Tsoi Uk Tsuen and the residents of the Sun Yuen Long Centre to explain the development proposal and implementation progress as stated in paragraph 10.4 of the Paper.

[Mr. Alfred Donald Yap returned to join the meeting at this point.]

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

- (iv) A/YL-HT/451 Temporary Vehicle Workshop and Parking of Tractors/Trailers/Lorries with Ancillary Storage Facilities for a Period of 3 Years in “Undetermined” zone, Lots 1932(Part), 1933(Part), 1934RP(Part), 1936BRP(Part) and 1937RP(Part) in DD 125 and Adjoining Government Land, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long (RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-HT/451)
-

Presentation and Question Session

21. Mr. Anthony C.Y. Lee, STP/TMYL, drew Members’ attention to a replacement page 1 of the Paper to correct a typo error in respect of a lot number in the heading of the Paper.

22. Mr. Anthony C.Y. Lee then presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary vehicle workshop and parking of tractors/trailers/lorries with ancillary storage facilities for a period of 3 years;
- (c) departmental comments – no objection from concerned Government departments was received;
- (d) two public comments were received during the publication period, objecting to the application mainly on the grounds of adverse environmental and traffic impacts; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application for the reasons detailed in paragraph 12.2 of the Paper in that

two previous applications (No. A/YL-HT/97 and 342) for the same uses had been approved by the Committee and there had been no change in planning circumstances since their approval. Concerned Government departments, including the Environmental Protection Department and Transport Department, had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application. Appropriate approval conditions could be incorporated to address the local concerns. Shorter compliance periods were proposed to monitor the situation and fulfilment of conditions.

23. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

24. The Chairman remarked that two previous applications had been approved. The latest approval was revoked due to non-compliance with the condition on provision of drainage facilities. As part of the current application, a drainage impact assessment had been submitted. Shorter compliance periods could be imposed to monitor the situation.

25. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years up to 2.6.2009, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- (a) the setting back of the western boundary of the site from the works limit of the Ping Ha Road Improvement Works project as when required by the Government departments;
- (b) no night-time operation between 11:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. was allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no operation on Sundays or public holidays was allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (d) the landscape planting on the application site should be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;

- (e) the submission of drainage proposals within 3 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 2.9.2006;
- (f) in relation to (e) above, the implementation of the drainage proposals within 6 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 2.12.2006;
- (g) the submission of run-in proposals with 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Highways or of the TPB by 2.9.2006;
- (h) in relation to (f) above, the implementation of the accepted run-in proposals within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Highways or of the TPB by 2.12.2006;
- (i) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c) or (d) was not complied with during the approval period, the approval hereby given should cease to have effect and should be revoked immediately without further notice;
- (j) if any of the above planning conditions (e), (f), (g) or (h) was not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given should cease to have effect and should on the same date be revoked without further notice; and
- (k) upon expiry of the planning permission, the reinstatement of the application site to an amenity area to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.

26. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant :

- (a) that shorter compliance periods had been imposed in order to monitor the situation and the fulfillment of approval conditions;

- (b) to resolve any land issues relating to the development with the concerned owner(s) of the application site;
- (c) to apply to the District Lands Officer/Yuen Long (DLO/YL) for a Short Term Tenancy for occupation of Government land;
- (d) to note the comments of the Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department to consult DLO/YL and to obtain relevant lot owners' consent regarding all the proposed drainage works outside the site boundary, to construct and maintain all proposed drainage facilities at the applicant's own costs, and to properly maintain the drainage facilities and rectify those facilities if they were found inadequate/ineffective during operation. The applicant should be liable for and should indemnify claims and demands arising out of any damage or nuisance caused by a failure of the drainage facilities;
- (e) to follow the environmental mitigation measures as recommended in the "Code of Practice on Handling Environmental Aspects of Temporary Uses and Open Storage Sites" issued by the Director of Environmental Protection in order to minimize the potential environmental impacts on the adjacent area;
- (f) to note the comments of the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/New Territories, Transport Department to clarify the land status and management/maintenance responsibilities of the access road leading to the site and to consult the relevant lands/maintenance authorities;
- (g) to note the comments of the Chief Engineer/Land Works, Civil Engineering and Development Department that the road level of Ping Ha Road might be raised after improvement works. The applicant should be required to carry out necessary modification works at their own expense in future to tie in with the project;
- (h) to note the comments of the Chief Highway Engineer/NT West of

Highways Department (HyD) that the run-in should be constructed in accordance with the latest version of HyD's Standard Drawing Nos. H1113 and H1114 or H5115 and H5116 whichever set as appropriate to suit the type of pavement of adjacent footpath and that his Office did not maintain the access track between the site and Ping Ha Road;

- (i) to note the comments of the Director of Fire Services to approach the Dangerous Goods Division for advice on the licensing of the premises for storage/use of dangerous goods, where necessary; and
- (j) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department that all building works were subject to compliance with the Buildings Ordinance. Authorized Person must be appointed to coordinate all building works. The granting of planning approval should not be construed as an acceptance of the unauthorized structures on site under the Buildings Ordinance. Enforcement action might be taken to effect the removal of all unauthorized works in the future.

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

- (v) A/YL-NSW/167 Proposed Low Density Residential Development in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Comprehensive Development to include Wetland Restoration Area" zone, Lot 3719H1RP in DD 104 and Adjoining Government Land, Tai Sang Wai, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-NSW/167)
-

27. Mr. Anthony C.Y. Lee, STP/TMYL, drew Members' attention that a replacement Plan A-1 of the Paper had been tabled at the meeting.

Presentation and Question Session

28. Mr. Anthony C.Y. Lee then presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed low density residential development;
- (c) departmental comments – highlighting that the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) had reservation on the adequacy of the Ecological Assessment to fully address the possible off-site disturbance impacts on the Wetland Conservation Area. The Environmental Protection Department (EPD) did not support the application due to potential industrial/residential interface problems and lack of technical assessment in addressing the sewage treatment and disposal arrangement. The Transport Department (TD) raised concern on the proposed vehicular access arrangement. No objection from other concerned Government departments was received;
- (d) five public comments were received during the statutory publication period objecting to the application mainly on the grounds of adverse traffic and fung shui impacts. A local objection, which was the same as one of the public comments, was received from the District Officer; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application for the reasons detailed in paragraph 12.3 of the Paper. The submission was inadequate to satisfy the major technical requirements on environmental, ecological, traffic and drainage aspects under the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Comprehensive Development to include Wetland Restoration Area” (“OU(CDWRA)”) zone. There were adverse comments from the AFCD and EPD. Local objections were received. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications and the cumulative effects would result in a general degradation of the local environment and ecological function of the Wetland Buffer Area.

29. Members had no question on the application.

[Mr. Tony C.N. Kan returned to join the meeting at this point.]

Deliberation Session

30. The Chairman remarked that the intention of the “OU(CDWRA)” zone was to provide incentive for the restoration of degraded wetlands through comprehensive residential and/or recreational development to include wetland restoration area. However, the proposed fresh water marsh was not considered adequate in terms of scale and function for wetland restoration. There were adverse comments from relevant Government departments on the application.

31. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application and the reasons were :

- (a) the proposed development at the application site, which fell within the Wetland Buffer Area, did not comply with the revised Town Planning Board Guidelines for “Application for Developments within Deep Bay Area” (TPB PG-No. 12B) in that there was insufficient information in the submission to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have negative off-site disturbance impact on the fish ponds and wetland within the Wetland Conservation Area and that there was also insufficient information on the maintenance and management plan, in particular the arrangement of funding and monitoring proposal to ensure the long-term management of the restored wetland; and
- (b) there was insufficient information in the submission to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have adverse ecological, environmental, sewage, traffic and drainage impacts on the surrounding areas.

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

- (vi) A/YL-PH/522 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Site Office for a Period of 3 Years

under Application No. A/YL-PH/434
in “Village Type Development” zone,
Lot 1663RP(Part) in DD 111, Leung Uk Tsuen,
Pat Heung, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-PH/522)

Presentation and Question Session

32. Mr. Anthony C.Y. Lee, STP/TMYL, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed renewal of planning approval for temporary site office for a period of 3 years under Application No. A/YL-PH/434;
- (c) departmental comments – no objection from concerned Government departments was received;
- (d) no public comment was received during the statutory publication period and no local objection was received from the District Officer; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application for the reasons detailed in paragraph 12.1 of the Paper.

33. In response to the Chairman’s enquiry on whether the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13D was relevant to the consideration of the application, Mr. Wilson Y.L. So, DPO/TMYL, clarified that the current application involved a temporary site office. Its nature was different from open storage use and the Guidelines No. 13D for Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses was not applicable to the current application.

Deliberation Session

34. The Chairman said that although the application site fell within an area zoned

“Village Type Development”, the Lands Department (LandsD) had confirmed that there was no Small House application within the site and the approval of the application would not affect any Small House development in the near future.

35. In response to a Member’s enquiry, Mr. Wilson Y.L. So referred to paragraph 10.1.1(c) of the Paper and said that according to the LandsD, a Short Term Waiver had been issued to allow the use of the structures on the application site for office and greenhouse uses. It had been clarified with the applicant that the application was for temporary site office use and no one would be living in the structure under general circumstances.

36. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years up to 2.6.2009, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- (a) the application site should only be used as site office and no repairing works were allowed on site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (b) the existing trees and landscape planting should be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (c) the drainage facilities on the application site should be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (d) the setting back of the boundary of the site from the work limits of the project “Improvement to Kam Tin Road, Stage 2” as when required by the Government departments;
- (e) the submission of Emergency Vehicular Access (EVA), water supplies for fire fighting and fire service installations proposals within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.9.2006;

- (f) in relation to (e) above, the provision of EVA, water supplies for fire fighting and fire service installations as proposed within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.12.2006;
- (g) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c) or (d) was not complied with, the approval hereby given should cease to have effect and should be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (h) if any of the above planning conditions (e) or (f) was not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given should cease to have effect and should on the same date be revoked without further notice; and
- (i) upon the expiry of the planning permission, the reinstatement of the application site to an amenity area to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.

37. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to :

- (a) follow the revised “Code of Practice on Handling the Environmental Aspects of Temporary Uses and Open Storage Sites” issued by the Environmental Protection Department;
- (b) note the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/New Territories, Transport Department’s comments that the land status of the path/track/road leading to the site from Kam Tin Road should be checked with the lands authority. The management and maintenance responsibilities of the same path/track/road should be clarified and the relevant lands and maintenance authorities should also be consulted accordingly;
- (c) note the Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department’s comments that his office did not maintain any existing access connecting the subject lot and Kam Tin Road;

- (d) note the Chief Engineer/Development (2), Water Supplies Department's comments that the applicant should resolve any land matter (such as private lots) associated with the provision of water supply and should be responsible for the construction, operation and maintenance of the inside services within the private lots to the Department's standards;
- (e) note the Director of Fire Services' comments that detailed fire safety requirements would be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans;
- (f) note the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department's comments that the granting of this planning approval should not be construed as condoning any structures existing on the site under the Buildings Ordinance (BO) and the allied regulations. Actions appropriate under the said Ordinance or other enactment might be taken if contravention was found. Formal submission of any proposed new works, including any temporary structure for approval under the BO was required. Use of temporary site office was considered as temporary building and was subject to control under Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R) Part VII. If the site was not abutting on a street having a width of not less than 4.5m, the development intensity should be determined by the Building Authority under B(P)R 19(3) at the building plan submission stage; and
- (g) note the Divisional Commander, Pat Heung Division, the Commissioner of Police's comments that the applicant should give due regard to the security arrangements at the location.

[Mr. Edmund K. H. Leung arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

- (vii) A/YL-PH/523 Temporary Religious Institution (Assembly Hall)
for a Period of 1 Year
in "Village Type Development" zone,
Lots 2018C1B(Part) and 2018B2(Part) in DD 111,

Pat Heung, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-PH/523)

Presentation and Question Session

38. Mr. Anthony C.Y. Lee, STP/TMYL, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary religious institution (assembly hall) for a period of 1 year;
- (c) departmental comments – highlighting that the Lands Department did not support the application as the applicant had no intention to regularize the unauthorized structures erected. No objection from other concerned Government departments was received;
- (d) two public comments were received during the statutory publication period objecting to the application mainly on the grounds of noise nuisance, disturbance to local tranquillity and conflicts with local residents. One local objection was received from the District Officer concerning nuisances, impact on local customs and attraction of strangers; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application for the reasons detailed in paragraph 11.1 of the Paper. The proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” zone which was to provide land for village expansion and reprovisioning of village houses. District Lands Office/Yuen Long advised that there was a small house application under processing located to the north of the application site. While a previous application (No. A/YL-PH/481) for the same use at the application site was approved on review by the Board, the approval was granted to allow time for its relocation. However, the permission was revoked due to

non-compliance with approval conditions. The applicant had not made genuine effort to comply with the conditions or to search for an alternative site for relocation. No information had been submitted to demonstrate that the development would not have adverse drainage and landscape impacts. There were also strong local objections.

39. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

40. Members noted that in the last approval for the proposed development, it had been clearly stated that the approval was to allow time for the applicant to identify alternative site for relocation. Nevertheless, no genuine effort had been taken by the applicant to comply with the approval conditions and the local villagers had strongly objected to the application.

41. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application and the reasons were :

- (a) the development was not in line with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” zone on the Outline Zoning Plan, which was to reflect existing recognized and other villages, and to provide land considered suitable for village expansion and reprovisioning of village houses affected by Government projects. Land within this zone was primarily intended for development of Small Houses by indigenous villagers. It was also intended to concentrate village type development within this zone for a more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services. There was no strong justification in the submission for a departure from such planning intention; and
- (b) there was no information to demonstrate that the development would have no adverse drainage and landscape impacts on the surrounding areas.

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

- (viii) A/YL-ST/311 Temporary Public Vehicle Park
(including Container Vehicle and Heavy Goods Vehicle)
for a Period of 3 Years
in “Residential (Group D)” zone,
Lots 158, 162RP(Part) and 198B in DD 105
and Adjoining Government Land,
San Tin, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-ST/311)
-

Presentation and Question Session

42. Mr. Anthony C.Y. Lee, STP/TMYL, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary public vehicle park (including container vehicle and heavy goods vehicle) for a period of 3 years;
- (c) departmental comments – highlighting that although there was no complaint received in respect of the application site for the past 3 years, the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) did not support the application due to traffic noise and incompatibility with the nearby residential and village uses. No objection from other concerned Government departments was received;
- (d) no public comment was received during the statutory publication period and no local objection was received from the District Officer; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application for the reasons detailed in paragraph 12.2 of the Paper. Regarding EPD’s concerns, it was considered that previous approvals (Applications No. A/YL-ST/71, 96, 198 and 230) for similar uses on the

application site had been given and there had been no change in planning circumstances. Moreover, there had not been any environmental complaints. The applicant should be advised to follow the “Code of Practice on Handling Environmental Aspects of Temporary Uses and Open Storage Sites” in order to minimize potential environmental impacts on adjacent areas.

43. A Member enquired about the reasons for DEP’s objection to the application despite a lack of environmental complaints, and whether approval conditions would be effective in addressing their concern. In response, Mr. Lawrence Ngo said that although no environmental complaints concerning the application site had been received for the past 3 years, it was EPD’s position that traffic noise generated by heavy vehicles would impose adverse impacts on nearby residential developments. Based on such principle, EPD would not support this kind of applications, despite the absence of environmental complaint. Nonetheless, the EPD would respect the Committee’s decision which would take other factors into consideration.

Deliberation Session

44. The Chairman said that EPD had objected to the application as a matter of general principle. However, the Committee would give consideration on broader terms, including the actual site condition and location situation, departmental comments, past history of the site and applicant’s effort in resolving outstanding issues. For the current application, there had been a number of previous approvals granted. The operation had been conducted for many years and there had not been environmental complaints. Moreover, no local objection was received.

45. A Member commented that EPD might also have raised in-principle objection to the previous applications approved by the Committee. Taking account of other factors mentioned by the Chairman, favourable consideration could be given to the current application.

46. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years up to 2.6.2009, on the terms of the application as

submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- (a) the landscape planting on the application site should be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (b) the drainage facilities on the application site should be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (c) the submission of internal traffic arrangement within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB by 2.12.2006;
- (d) the provision of 9-litre water type/3 kg dry powder fire extinguisher in the site office within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.12.2006;
- (e) if any of the above planning conditions (a) or (b) was not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given should cease to have effect and should be revoked immediately without further notice;
- (f) if any of the above planning conditions (c) or (d) was not complied with by the above specified date, the approval hereby given should cease to have effect and should on the same date be revoked without further notice; and
- (g) upon expiry of the planning permission, the reinstatement of the application site to an amenity area to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.

47. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to :

- (a) resolve any land issues relating to the development with the concerned owner(s) of the application site;

- (b) apply to the District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department for Short Term Wavier and Short Term Tenancy to regularize the unauthorized temporary structures and illegal occupation of Government land;
- (c) address the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/New Territories, Transport Department's comments in submitting the swept path analysis for all proposed parking spaces under the scenario of a fully parked site;
- (d) note the Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department (HyD)'s comments that a run-in should be constructed at the access point in accordance with the latest version of HyD Standard Drawings No. H1113 and H1114 or H5115 and H5116 whichever set as appropriate to match the pavement type of adjacent footpath;
- (e) follow the environmental mitigation measures as recommended in the "Code of Practice on Handling Environmental Aspects of Temporary Uses and Open Storage Sites" issued by the Environmental Protection Department in order to minimize the potential environmental impacts on the adjacent areas; and
- (f) note the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department's comments that the granting of planning approval should not be construed as condoning any structures existing on the site under the Buildings Ordinance and the allied regulations. Actions appropriate under the said Ordinance or other enactment might be taken if contravention was found. Use of containers as offices was considered as temporary buildings and were subject to control under Building (Planning) Regulations Part VII.

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

- (ix) A/YL-ST/312 Temporary Container Vehicle Park,
Container Storage Area, Vehicle Repair and Canteen
for a Period of 3 Years
in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Service Stations" zone,

Lots 372DRP(Part), 743RP(Part) and 744RP(Part) in DD 99
and Adjoining Government Land,
San Tin, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-ST/312)

Presentation and Question Session

48. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 25.5.2006 for a deferment of the consideration of the application to allow time to address concerns raised by relevant Government departments.

Deliberation Session

49. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of additional information from the applicant. The Committee also agreed that the application should be submitted to the Committee for consideration within two months from the date of receipt of additional information from the applicant. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that four weeks were allowed for preparation of the submission of the further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

(x) A/YL-TT/198 Proposed Utility Installation for Private Project
(Package Substation)
in “Village Type Development” zone,
Lot 4901B1A(Part) in DD 116, Tai Tong Road,
Tai Tong, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TT/198)

Presentation and Question Session

50. Mr. Anthony C.Y. Lee, STP/TMYL, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed utility installation for private project (package substation);
- (c) departmental comments – no objection from concerned Government departments was received;
- (d) no public comments was received during the statutory publication period and no local objection was received from the District Officer; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application for the reasons detailed in paragraph 11.1 of the Paper.

51. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

52. 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 2.6.2010, 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 revised landscape proposals to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB; and
- (b) the provision of emergency vehicular access (EVA), water supply for fire-fighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.

53. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note :

- (a) the District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department's comments that

the lot owner should apply for a short term waiver for the erection of the package substation. If the proposal was rejected and any unauthorized structure(s) was erected on the site, his office would consider taking appropriate lease enforcement action against the registered owner;

- (b) the Director of Fire Services' comments that detailed fire safety requirements would be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans. The provision of EVA for the site should comply with the standard as stipulated in Part VI of the Code of Practice for Means of Access for Firefighting and Rescue under the Building (Planning) Regulation (B(P)R) 41D;
- (c) the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department's comments that formal submission of any proposed new works for approval under the Buildings Ordinance was required. If the site was not abutting on a street having a width of not less than 4.5m, the development intensity should be determined under B(P)R 19(3) at the building plan submission stage. The applicant should also pay attention to B(P)R 41D regarding the provision of EVA; and
- (d) the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene's comments that the occupier should handle the waste collection at his own cost.

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

- (xi) A/YL-TYST/318 Proposed Temporary Open Storage of Construction Machinery and Material for a Period of 3 Years in "Undetermined" zone, Lots 2416RP(Part), 2417(Part) and 2418(Part) in DD 120, Tong Yan San Tsuen, Yuen Long (RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/318)
-

Presentation and Question Session

54. Mr. Anthony C.Y. Lee, STP/TMYL, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary open storage of construction machinery and material for a period of 3 years;
- (c) departmental comments – highlighting that although there was no complaint received in respect of the application site for the past 3 years, the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) did not support the application as there were sensitive uses in the vicinity and environmental nuisance was expected. No objection from other concerned Government departments was received;
- (d) one public comment was received during the statutory publication period objecting to the application on the ground of environmental nuisance; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application for the reasons detailed in paragraph 12.2 of the Paper. The application was generally in line with the Town Planning Board (TPB) Guidelines No. 13D for the Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses. Regarding EPD's comments and the local objection received, the applicant had proposed mitigation measures to ameliorate the environmental impacts and appropriate approval conditions could be incorporated to address their concerns. A shorter approval period of 2 years was recommended to monitor the development. Other concerned Government departments had no objection to or no adverse comments on the application.

55. A Member and the Chairman raised the following questions :

- (a) referring to Plan A-2 of the Paper, whether the local objection was raised by residents living in structures within the application site; and
- (b) whether the applicant had obtained owners' consent for the proposed use.

56. Mr. Wilson Y.L. So, DPO/TMYL, made the following points :

- (a) the application had been published for public comments in accordance with the Town Planning Ordinance. Only one public comment from a District Council member was received during the statutory publication period and the comment was attached at Appendix IV of the Paper. No local objection was received by the relevant District Office; and
- (b) the applicant was not a current land owner. However, the applicant had complied with the requirements as set out in the TPB Guidelines No. 31 on Satisfying the "Owner's Consent/Notification" Requirements under Sections 12A and 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance by obtaining the owners' consent.

Deliberation Session

57. The Chairman remarked that the EPD did not support the application based on possible environmental nuisance. However, the application complied with the TPB Guidelines No. 13D in that the application site fell within Category 1 areas and the intention was to concentrate open storage and port back-up uses within such areas in the New Territories. Approval conditions could be incorporated to address EPD's concerns. A shorter approval period of 2 years instead of 3 years was recommended by the PlanD to monitor the development.

58. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 2 years up to 2.6.2008, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- (a) no night-time operation between 7 p.m. and 9 a.m. was allowed on the site,

as proposed by the applicant, during the planning approval period;

- (b) no operation on Sundays and public holidays was allowed on the site, as proposed by the applicant, during the planning approval period;
- (c) no repairing, dismantling and workshop activities should be carried out on the site at any time, as proposed by the applicant, during the planning approval period;
- (d) only light goods vehicles were allowed for the operation of the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the submission of landscape and tree preservation proposals within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 2.9.2006;
- (f) in relation to (e) above, the implementation of landscape and tree preservation proposals within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 2.12.2006;
- (g) the submission of drainage proposals within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 2.9.2006;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implementation of drainage proposals within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 2.12.2006;
- (i) the provision of a 9-litre water type/3kg dry powder fire extinguisher in the site office within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 2.9.2006;
- (j) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c) or (d) was not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given should

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

- (k) if any of the above planning conditions (e), (f), (g), (h) or (i) was not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given should cease to have effect and should on the same date be revoked without further notice; and
- (l) upon the expiry of the planning permission, the reinstatement of the application site to an amenity area to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.

59. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to :

- (a) resolve any land issues relating to the development with the concerned owner(s) of the application site;
- (b) note that a shorter approval period of 2 years and shorter compliance periods were granted so as to monitor the situation of the site and the fulfillment of approval conditions;
- (c) note the District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department's comments that the lot owner concerned should apply for Short Term Waiver (STW) to regularize the irregularities on site. If no STW application was received or approved and the irregularities persist on site, his office would consider taking appropriate lease enforcement action against the registered owner;
- (d) note the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/New Territories, Transport Department's comments that the land status of the road/path/track leading to the site from Kung Um Road should be checked with the lands authority. The management and maintenance responsibilities of the same road/path/track should be clarified and the relevant lands and maintenance authorities should also be consulted accordingly;

- (e) follow the latest ‘Code of Practice on Handling the Environmental Aspects of Temporary Uses and Open Storage Sites’ issued by the Environmental Protection Department;
- (f) note the Chief Engineer/Development (2), Water Supplies Department (WSD)’s comments that for provision of water supply to the development, the applicant might need to extend his/her inside services to the nearest government water mains for connection. The applicant should resolve any land matter (such as private lots) associated with the provision of water supply and should be responsible for the construction, operation and maintenance of the inside services within the private lots to WSD’s standards; and
- (g) note the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department’s comments that all building works were subject to compliance with Buildings Ordinance. Authorized Person must be appointed to coordinate all building works. The granting of planning approval should not be construed as an acceptance of the unauthorized structures on site under the Buildings Ordinance. Enforcement action might be taken to effect the removal of all unauthorized works in the future.

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

- (xii) A/YL-TYST/319 Temporary Vehicle Repair Workshop
for a Period of 3 Years
in “Undetermined” and “Village Type Development” zones,
Lots 1335(Part), 1548(Part), 1550A(Part),
1550B, 1551(Part) and 1552(Part) in DD 119,
Tong Yan San Tsuen, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/319)
-

Presentation and Question Session

- 60. Mr. Anthony C.Y. Lee, STP/TMYL, presented the application and covered the

following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary vehicle repair workshop for a period of 3 years;
- (c) departmental comments – highlighting that the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) did not support the application as there were sensitive uses in the vicinity and environmental nuisance was expected. No objection from other concerned Government departments was received;
- (d) no public comment was received during the statutory publication period and no local objection was received from the District Officer; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application for reasons detailed in paragraph 11.1 of the Paper. The development was not in line with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone and no strong justification had been given for a departure from such intention even on a temporary basis. It was not compatible with the surrounding rural and residential land uses. Previous applications (No. A/YL-TYST/173 and 216) for similar uses were rejected. There was no strong justification to depart from the previous decisions. There was insufficient information to demonstrate that adverse environmental, traffic and drainage impacts would not be generated and EPD did not support the application. Various other approved applications (No. A/YL-TYST/194, 259 and 265) quoted by the applicant were for open storage uses and the current application did not warrant the same consideration.

61. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

62. The Chairman said that about 70% of the application site fell within the “V” zone.

The proposed vehicle repair workshop was not compatible with the surrounding uses.

63. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application and the reasons were :

- (a) the development was not in line with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” zone which was to designate both existing recognized villages and areas of land considered suitable for village expansion. Land within this zone was primarily intended for development of Small Houses by indigenous villagers. It was also intended to concentrate village type development within this zone for a more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services. No strong justification had been given in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis; and
- (b) there was insufficient information in the submission to demonstrate that the development would not generate adverse environmental, drainage and traffic impacts on the surrounding areas.

[The Chairman thanked Mr. Wilson Y.L. So, DPO/TMYL, and Mr. Anthony C.Y. Lee, STP/TMYL, for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. Messrs. So and Lee left the meeting at this point.]

[Ms. Carmen K.M. Chan and Dr. James C.W. Lau left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Sha Tin, Tai Po and North District

[Mr. W.K. Hui, District Planning Officer/Shu Tin, Tai Po and North (DPO/STN), and Dr. Kenneth S.S. Tang, Senior Town Planner/Shu Tin, Tai Po and North (STP/STN), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 4

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

- (i) A/NE-LYT/329 Proposed Public Utility Installation
(Electricity Package Transformer)
in “Village Type Development” zone,
Government Land in DD 83,
Wing Ning Tsuen, Fanling
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LYT/329)
-

Presentation and Question Session

64. Dr. Kenneth S.S. Tang, STP/STN, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed public utility installation (electricity package transformer);
- (c) departmental comments – no objection from concerned Government departments was received;
- (d) one public comment was received during the publication period stating that there was no comment on the application. A local view supporting the application was received from the District Officer; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application for the reasons detailed in paragraph 10.1 of the Paper.

65. Members had no question on the application.

[Ms. Carmen K.M. Chan and Dr. James C.W. Lau returned to join the meeting at this point.]

Deliberation Session

66. In response to the Chairman, the Secretary said that the PlanD Practice Note for Professional Persons on Landscape Treatment and/or Other Measures for Mitigating the Landscape and Visual Impacts of Small-Scale Utility Installations was being finalized. Mr. W.K. Hui, DPO/STN, referred Members to paragraph 8.1.6 of the Paper and said that the Urban Design and Landscape Section of the PlanD had pointed out that the application site was small and there was no room for screen planting.

67. The Chairman said that based on Plan A-3 of the Paper, the application site was located next to a car park and some existing trees would already screen off the proposed use. Based on the consideration of such special circumstances and site characteristics, additional landscaping did not appear necessary. Members agreed.

68. 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 2.6.2010, 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.

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

(ii) A/NE-SSH/53 Proposed Temporary Refreshment Kiosk
with Ancillary Facilities
for a Period of 3 Years
in “Coastal Protection Area” zone,
Lot 100 in DD 218 and Adjoining Government Land,
Shap Sz Heung, Sai Kung North
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-SSH/53)

69. Mr. David W.M. Chan said that he previously owned a property in the Nai Chung area close to the application site but the property had already been sold. Members agreed that Mr. Chan had no interest involved in the current application.

Presentation and Question Session

70. Dr. Kenneth S.S. Tang, STP/STN, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed temporary refreshment kiosk with ancillary facilities for a period of 3 years;
- (c) departmental comments – highlighting that the Urban Design and Landscape Section of the Planning Department (PlanD) did not support the application as the proposed development would likely lead to a degradation in the quality of the existing landscape. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent, increasing development pressure along the coast in the “Coastal Protection Area” (“CPA”) zone. No objection from other concerned Government departments was received;
- (d) no public comment was received during the statutory publication period. Local objections were received as advised by the District Officer; and
- (e) the PlanD’s views – PlanD did not support the application for the reasons detailed in paragraph 11.1 of the Paper. The proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the “CPA” zone to conserve, protect and retain the natural coastlines and coastal natural environment. There was no strong justification for a departure from such intention even on a temporary basis. There was insufficient information to demonstrate that adverse visual and landscape impacts would not be generated. The proposed use would likely have an impact on the landscape resources and landscape character of the area. The approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent.

71. The Chairman and a Member and raised the following questions :

- (a) whether the application site only involved the small area as shown on Plan A-4;
- (b) what were the grounds of local objection; and
- (c) whether there were other similar kiosks in the Nai Chung Village.

72. Dr. Kenneth S.S. Tang made the following points :

- (a) the application site involved the area as shown in Plan A-4 only. Another application (No. A/NE-SSH/38) involving a small area to the south of the application site was rejected on review by the Town Planning Board (the Board) in February 2005. An appeal had been filed against the Board's decision and the hearing was scheduled for mid June 2006. The intention behind such piecemeal application was not known. It could be related to the problem of obtaining owner's consent;
- (b) local objections were submitted by a Tai Po District Council member, the Chairman of the Sai Kung North Rural Committee, the Indigenous Inhabitant Representative and Resident Representative of Nai Chung Village. No grounds of objection had been specified. However, it was understood from local villagers that they were concerned about the use of the access road through Nai Chung Village for transportation of goods to the application site and the noise nuisance that would be generated; and
- (c) there were other kiosks in the Nai Chung Village. The facilities at the application site were mainly intended to serve tourists and visitors to the area.

Deliberation Session

73. The Chairman remarked that there was an appeal case concerning a similar application nearby. He also said that tourists and visitors to the area could patron the local shops or kiosks in the Nai Chung Village, and the proposed development in close vicinity of

the coastal protection area was not compatible with the intention for conservation of the natural environment in the area.

74. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application and the reasons were :

- (a) the application site fell within the “Coastal Protection Area” zone which was 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. There was a general presumption against development in this zone. In general, only developments that were needed to support the conservation of the existing natural landscape or scenic quality of the area or the development was an essential infrastructure project with overriding public interest might be permitted. No strong justification had been provided in the submission for a departure from this planning intention, even on a temporary basis;
- (b) there was insufficient information in the submission to demonstrate that the proposed development would have no adverse visual and landscape impacts on the surrounding natural environment of good landscape quality; and
- (c) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications. The cumulative impacts of approving such applications would result in a general degradation of the environment in the area.

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

- (iii) A/ST/634 Proposed Religious Institution (Church)
in “Residential (Group A)” zone,
Portion B on 1/F (former Cinema B) and Ancillary Portions
of G/F, 2/F and 3/F, Sha Tin Fun City, 7 Lek Yuen Street,

Sha Tin

(RNTPC Paper No. A/ST/634)

75. Mr. Tony C.N. Kan declared an interest in this item as he had been consulted on the application as a Sha Tin District Council member by the District Office. However, he had reserved his views during the consultation and had no commercial interest involved. The Committee agreed that Mr. Kan could stay in the meeting and participate in the deliberation of this item.

Presentation and Question Session

76. Dr. Kenneth S.S. Tang, STP/STN, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed religious institution (church);
- (c) departmental comments – no objection from concerned Government departments was received;
- (d) one public comment was received during the statutory publication period stating that there was no comment on the proposed development; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application for the reasons detailed in paragraph 10.1 of the Paper.

[Dr. C.N. Ng left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

77. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

78. A Member supported the application as the proposed development, which was a

more suitable use than the entertainment uses within the Sha Tin Fun City, would provide the needed services for the local community.

79. The Chairman said that there had been other similar cases involving the conversion of old cinemas to church and other religious institution use. Such uses within non-domestic buildings would not cause adverse impacts and were considered appropriate.

80. 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 2.6.2010, 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 condition of the provision of fire services installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board.

81. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to :

- (a) resolve any land issues relating to the development with the concerned owner(s) of the application site;
- (b) apply to the District Lands Officer/Shah Tin, Lands Department for lease modification to permit the applied use; and
- (c) liaise with the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories East, Buildings Department regarding the alteration and addition works for the application premises, and that some unauthorized building works had been carried out at the application premises which might be subject to enforcement actions under the Buildings Ordinance.

[Dr. C.N. Ng returned to join the meeting at this point.]

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

(iv) A/TP/369 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House) (NTEH)

in “Village Type Development” and
“Comprehensive Development Area (1)” zones,
Lots 628RP and 629C(Part) in DD 11, Lau Hang Village,
Fung Yuen, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TP/369)

(v) A/TP/370 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House) (NTEH)
(Small House) in “Village Type Development” and
“Comprehensive Development Area (1)” zones,
Lot 631B in DD 11, Lau Hang Village,
Fung Yuen, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TP/370)

(vi) A/TP/371 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House) (NTEH)
(Small House) in “Village Type Development” and
“Comprehensive Development Area (1)” zones,
Lot 208B4 in DD 11, Lau Hang Village,
Fung Yuen, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TP/371)

(vii) A/TP/372 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House) (NTEH)
(Small House) in “Village Type Development” and
“Comprehensive Development Area (1)” zones,
Lot 628B and 629A1 in DD 11, Lau Hang Village,
Fung Yuen, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TP/372)

(viii) A/TP/373 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House) (NTEH)
(Small House) in “Village Type Development” and
“Comprehensive Development Area (1)” zones,
Lot 631RP in DD 11, Lau Hang Village,
Fung Yuen, Tai Po
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TP/373)

82. Noting that the Applications No. A/TP/369 to 373 were similar in nature and the application sites were located in close proximity to each other, the Committee agreed to consider the 5 applications together.

Presentation and Question Session

83. Dr. Kenneth S.S. Tang, STP/STN, presented the applications and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Papers :

- (a) background to the applications;
- (b) the proposed house (NTEH) at the application site of Application No. A/TP/369 and the proposed house (NTEH)(Small House) at each of the application sites of Applications No. A/TP/370 to 373;

[Mr. Tony C.N. Kan left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

- (c) departmental comments – highlighting that the Transport Department stated that unplanned access onto Fung Yuen Road was not supported. No objection from other concerned Government departments on the applications was received;
- (d) four public comments each on Applications No. A/TP/369, 370, 372 and 373 were received during the statutory publication period objecting to the applications on adverse traffic, environmental, sewerage and fung shui impacts. No public comment on Application No. A/TP/371 was received; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the applications for the reasons detailed in paragraph 10.1 of the Paper of Application No. A/TP/369 and paragraph 11.1 of the Papers of Applications No. A/TP/370 to 373 in that the proposed developments were generally compatible with the surrounding rural and village environment. They would not overstrain the existing and planned infrastructure.

Application No. A/TP/369 involved the rebuilding of an existing house on a lot with building entitlement of 840ft² and the proposed development would not exceed the limit. For the other four applications, the proposed NTEHs (Small Houses) generally complied with the interim criteria for assessing planning applications for NTEH/Small House. Regarding the public comments, the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department had indicated that the application sites were far away from the Fung Yuen Butterfly Reserve and adverse impacts from the proposed developments were unlikely. Other concerned Government departments, including the Transport Department and Environmental Protection Department, did not object to the applications.

84. The Chairman said that while Application No. A/TP/369 involved a proposed redevelopment of an existing building, the other applications were for the development of NTEHs (Small Houses). He enquired whether the NTEH development proposed within the site of Application No. A/TP/369 would be permitted under the lease. Dr. Kenneth S.S. Tang responded that a building licence was granted for erection of a building not exceeding 840ft² on part of the application site on Lot 628 in D.D. 11. The current application involved the redevelopment of an existing dilapidated 2-storey building at the application site to a 3-storey NTEH taking up about 700ft² of land area. The applicant would be required to apply to the Lands Department for land exchange subject to premium calculation.

[Mr. Tony C. N. Kan returned to join the meeting at this point.]

Deliberation Session

Application No. A/TP/369

85. The Secretary reported that on 12.5.2006, the Town Planning Board rejected an application (No. A/YL/126) on review for proposed houses within the “Village Type Development” zone involving rebuilding of previous buildings. That application was rejected because the proposed development with a total gross floor area of 807m² was considered excessive compared to the bulk of the previous buildings on the site at about 3,200ft² and the application was not supported by the District Land Officer/Yuen Long. The

current application No. A/TP/369 was however different as the building bulk proposed was not excessive compared with the previous building.

86. 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 2.6.2010, 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 landscaping proposals to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB; and
- (b) the provision of drainage facilities to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.

87. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicants to :

- (a) note that water mains in the vicinity of the application site could not provide the standard fire-fighting flow;
- (b) liaise with the Lands Department regarding the issues of an anomaly of co-existence of another Lot 629C which was under separate ownership to the south of the application site and was outside the subject application scheme (note: Lot 629C comprises two parts, one part was located at the subject site while another part was outside), the existing building (bearing Housing No.69) as stated in the application form was built off-site, straddling the southern boundary of Lot 628RP and application for an in-situ exchange might be required;
- (c) consult the Environmental Protection Department regarding the sewage treatment/disposal method for the proposed development;
- (d) liaise with the Civil Engineering and Development Department regarding the Geotechnical Planning Review Report;

- (e) clarify whether any parts of the proposed access were on private land, in which case, consent from the relevant land owners should be solicited and detailed in the applicants' submission; and
- (f) observe the "Code of Practice on Working near Electricity Supply Lines" when carrying out works in the vicinity of electricity supply lines. Prior to establishing any structure within the above site, the applicants and their contractors should liaise with CLP Power Hong Kong Limited to divert the existing low voltage underground cables and overhead lines away from the vicinity of the proposed development.

Applications No. A/TP/370

88. 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 2.6.2010, 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 landscaping proposals to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission and implementation of drainage facilities to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (c) the provision of an emergency vehicular access or the incorporation of residential sprinkler system to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.

89. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant :

- (a) that he might need to extend his inside services to the nearest Government water mains for connection, and to resolve the land matters associated with

the provision of water supply and should be responsible for the construction, operation and maintenance of the inside services within the private lots to Water Supplies Department's standards;

- (b) to note that water mains in the vicinity of the application site could not provide the standard fire-fighting flow;
- (c) to consult the Environmental Protection Department regarding the sewage treatment/disposal method for the proposed development; and
- (d) to resolve the issues with Fung King Villa regarding their concerns on any possible encroachment on lot boundaries and on Fung King Villa's sewage treatment system.

Application No. A/TP/371

90. 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 2.6.2010, 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 landscaping proposals to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission and implementation of drainage facilities to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (c) the provision of an emergency vehicular access with street fire hydrants/incorporation of residential sprinkler system to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.

91. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant :

- (a) that he might need to extend the inside services to the nearest Government water mains for connection, and to resolve the land matters associated with the provision of water supply and should be responsible for the construction, operation and maintenance of the inside services within the private lots to Water Supplies Department's standards;
- (b) the applicant should observe the "Code of Practice on Working near Electricity Supply Lines" when carrying out works in the vicinity of electricity supply lines. Prior to establishing any structure within the application site, the applicant should consult CLP Power Hong Kong Ltd. to divert the existing high voltage overhead line or have it replaced by underground cables in respect of the safety clearances required for activities near the overhead line;
- (c) the applicant should note that water mains in the vicinity of the application site could not provide the standard fire-fighting flow; and
- (d) the applicant should consult the Environmental Protection Department regarding the sewage treatment/disposal method for the proposed development.

Application No. A/TP/372

92. 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 2.6.2010, 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 landscaping proposals to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB; and
- (b) the provision of drainage facilities to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB.

93. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to :

- (a) note that water mains in the vicinity of the application site could not provide the standard fire-fighting flow;
- (b) consult the Environmental Protection Department regarding the sewage treatment/disposal method for the proposed development;
- (c) liaise with the Civil Engineering and Development Department regarding the Geotechnical Planning Review Report;
- (d) consult the Transport Department to clarify whether any parts of the proposed access were on private land, in which case, consent from the relevant land owners should be solicited; and
- (e) observe the “Code of Practice on Working near Electricity Supply Lines” when carrying out works in the vicinity of electricity supply lines. Prior to establishing any structure within the site, the applicant and his contractors should liaise with CLP Power Hong Kong Limited to divert the existing low voltage underground cables and overhead lines away from the vicinity of the proposed development.

Application No. A/TP/373

94. 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 2.6.2010, 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 landscaping proposals to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;

- (b) the submission and implementation of drainage facilities to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (c) the provision of an emergency vehicular access or the incorporation of residential sprinkler system to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.

95. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant :

- (a) that he might need to extend his inside services to the nearest Government water mains for connection, and to resolve the land matters associated with the provision of water supply and should be responsible for the construction, operation and maintenance of the inside services within the private lots to Water Supplies Department's standards;
- (b) to note that water mains in the vicinity of the application site could not provide the standard fire-fighting flow;
- (c) to consult the Environmental Protection Department regarding the sewage treatment/disposal method for the proposed development; and
- (d) to resolve the issues with Fung King Villa regarding their concerns on any possible encroachment on lot boundaries and on Fung King Villa's sewage treatment system.

[The Chairman thanked Mr. W.K. Hui, DPO/STN, and Dr. Kenneth S.S. Tang, STP/STN, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. Mr. Hui and Dr. Tang left the meeting at this point.]

Remarks

The Chairman said that the remaining items in the Agenda would not be open for public viewing since they were in respect of applications submitted before the commencement of the Town Planning (Amendment) Ordinance 2004.