

**TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

**Minutes of 369th Meeting of the  
Rural and New Town Planning Committee held at 2:30 p.m. on 28.3.2008**

**Present**

Director of Planning  
Mrs. Ava S.Y. Ng

Chairperson

Mr. Michael K.C. Lai

Vice-chairman

Ms. Carmen K.M. Chan

Professor Nora F.Y. Tam

Mr. David W.M. Chan

Mr. Edmund K.H. Leung

Dr. C.N. Ng

Mr. Alfred Donald Yap

Mr. B.W. Chan

Mr. Y.K. Cheng

Ms. Anna S.Y. Kwong

Dr. James C. W. Lau

Chief Engineer/Traffic Engineering (New Territories West),  
Transport Department  
Mr. Y.M. Lee

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment),

Environmental Protection Department  
Mr. Simon Y.M. Hui

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

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Dr. Lily Chiang

Professor David Dudgeon

Professor Peter R. Hills

Mr. Tony C.N. Kan

Assistant Director/New Territories, Lands Department  
Mr. C.S. Mills

Assistant Director (2), Home Affairs Department  
Ms. Margaret Hsia

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board  
Mr. Lau Sing

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms. Christine K.C. Tse

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Miss Rowena M.F. Lee

**Agenda Item 1**

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 368th RNTPC Meeting held on 7.3.2008

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 368th RNTPC meeting held on 7.3.2008 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

2. The Secretary reported that on 11.3.2008, the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) approved the draft Tai Mong Tsai and Tsam Chuk Wan OZP No. S/SK-TMT/3A (renumbered as S/SK-TMT/4) under section 9(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). Approval of the OZP was notified in the Gazette on 20.3.2008.

[Professor Nora F.Y. Tam and Mr. Y.M. Lee arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 3**

Review of Sites Designated “Comprehensive Development Area”  
on Statutory Plans in the New Territories for the Year 2007/2008  
(RNTPC Paper No. 4/08)

---

3. Mr. Charles Yum, STP/NTHQ, said that the Board agreed in May 1999 that an annual review of “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) sites designated for more than 3 years should be conducted. The review would assist the Committee in considering the rezoning of suitable sites to other appropriate zonings, and monitoring the progress of “CDA” developments. The Paper was to brief Members on the results of the latest review. He then presented the review as detailed in the Paper highlighting the following :

- (a) there were 64 “CDA” sites in the New Territories, including 3 which had been designated for less than 3 years. Of the 61 sites which had been designated for more than 3 years and covered by the review, 23 of them

had no approved Master Layout Plan (MLP).

“CDA” Sites with No Approved MLP

- (b) of the 23 “CDA” sites with no approved MLP, 19 of them were proposed for retention mainly because they were either programmed for land disposal, under planning studies/reviews, recorded with some progress in implementation, or with outstanding concerns such as traffic, environmental and visual impacts that needed to be addressed. Detailed justifications for their retention were provided in Appendix I of the Paper;
- (c) the remaining 4 “CDA” sites (NTW 10 to 13) were previously agreed to be rezoned by the Committee. However, the rezoning was held back due to the reactivation of Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area as announced in the Policy Address 2007. A feasibility study would be conducted by Planning Department and Civil Engineering and Development Department to provide housing land and meeting other land use requirements in the future. Details of these sites were provided in Appendix II of the Paper;

“CDA” Sites with Approved MLP

- (d) of the 38 sites with approved MLPs, 33 were proposed for retention. Detailed justifications for their retention were provided in Appendix III of the Paper;
- (e) 3 other sites had previously been agreed by the Committee for rezoning. As the proposed amendments for 2 of them (NTW 20 and YL-A1) were technical in nature and there was no immediate urgency for the rezoning, the proposed amendments could be gazetted together with other amendments to be made to the Yuen Long Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) in due course. For the remaining site (NTW 32B), the proposed zoning was being reviewed in the context of the Tuen Mun OZP review. Details of the progress of these sites were provided in Appendix IV;

- (f) 2 sites were considered to have potential for rezoning. Development at the “CDA” site at the junction of Fuk Hang Tsuen Road and Lam Tei Main Street, Tuen Mun (NTW 29) was completed and occupied and the planning conditions had been discharged. It was suitable for rezoning subject to designation of appropriate land use and development intensity to the remaining area of the “CDA” zone. Another site to the north-east of Lingnan University Main Campus at Fu Tei, Tuen Mun (NTW 32A) covered two phases. The Phase I residential development which covered TMTL 399 had been completed and was suitable for rezoning. However, the land exchange application for Phase II was yet to be submitted and the “CDA” zoning for the Phase II area should be retained pending the full completion of the whole development.

4. Members had no question on the paper.

5. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) note the findings of the review of the sites designated “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) on statutory plans in the New Territories;
- (b) note the agreement of the Committee to rezone the sites mentioned in paragraphs 4.1.2 and 4.2.3 and detailed at Appendices II and IV; and
- (c) note the sites with potential for rezoning in paragraph 4.2.4 and detailed at Appendix V; and
- (d) support the retention of the “CDA” designation for the sites mentioned in paragraphs 4.1.1 and 4.2.2 and detailed at Appendices I and III.

## **Sai Kung and Islands District**

### **Agenda Item 4**

#### **Section 12A Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Y/SK-HC/1                      Application for Amendment to the Approved Ho Chung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/SK-HC/9 from “Road” to “Village Type Development” zone, Lots 774 RP(Part), 775RP(Part), 775ARP, 775A2, 775A3, 775B(Part), 776A(Part), 776D(Part), 798H(Part), 799H(Part), 799K, 800RP, 800A, 800D(Part), 802L, 805RP(Part), 805E(Part), and 1950(Part) in DD 244 and Adjoining Government land, Ho Chung, Sai Kung  
(RNTPC Paper No. Y/SK-HC/1)

---

#### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

6.                      The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 18.3.2008 for a deferment of the consideration of the application to allow time for the preparation of further information to address the outstanding technical concerns raised by the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/New Territories and the District Lands Officer/Sai Kung.

#### **Deliberation Session**

7.                      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 agreed that the application should be submitted to the Committee for consideration within three months from the date of receipt of additional information from the applicant. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that three months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[Ms. Maggie M.Y. Chin, Senior Town Planner/Sai Kung and Islands (STP/SKIs), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 5**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/I-CC/4                      Proposed Restaurant (2 Storeys)  
   in “Village Type Development” zone,  
   Lot 749 in DD Cheung Chau, Cheung Chau  
   (RNTPC Paper No. A/I-CC/4)

---

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

8.            Ms. Maggie M.Y. Chin, STP/SKIs, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed restaurant (2 storeys);
- (c) departmental comments – no objection or no adverse comment from concerned Government departments was received;
- (d) three public comments were received during the statutory publication period raising concern on traffic, pedestrian circulation, fire safety and land use compatibility aspects; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The application was for the redevelopment of an old building into a new building of the same size and height for restaurant use. It was located in a prime commercial site in Cheung Chau opposite the ferry pier. It was suitable for retail use to serve the local community and visitors and compatible with the general commercial cum residential uses in the neighbourhood. Although there were public comments raising concern on traffic, pedestrian circulation and land use compatibility aspects, the redevelopment was small in scale and would not have significant adverse

impact. Concerned Government departments, including the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/New Territories and the Director of Fire Services had no objection or no adverse comment on the pedestrian circulation and access for emergency vehicles aspects.

9. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

10. Members considered the in-situ redevelopment for restaurant use acceptable.

11. 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 28.3.2012, 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 that the provision of fire fighting water supplies and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.

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

- (a) apply to District Lands Officer/Islands with details of redevelopment proposal for the proposed development;
- (b) the proposed development should make proper sewer connection to the public sewerage system for discharging the wastewater generated from the lot;
- (c) the provisions of fire service installations should be in accordance with paragraph 4.14 "Commercial Building – Low Rise" of the latest version of the Codes of Practice for Minimum Fire Service Installations and Equipment. The requirements of major fire service installations might include a sprinkler system to cover all parts of the building including staircases, common corridors and toilets; and



- (d) the arrangement on emergency vehicular access should comply with Part VI of the Code of Practice for Means of Access for Firefighting and Rescue which was administrated by Buildings Department.

[The Chairperson thanked Ms. Maggie M.Y. Chin, STP/SKIs, for her attendance to answer Members' enquires. Ms. Chin left the meeting at this point.]

### **Sha Tin, Tai Po and North District**

[Mr. W.K. Hui, District Planning Officer/Shan Tin, Tai Po and North (DPO/STN), Ms. Stephanie P.H. Lai and Dr. Kenneth S.S. Tang, Senior Town Planners/Shan Tin, Tai Po and North (STPs/STN), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 6**

#### **Section 12A Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

- (i) Y/NE-TKL/1 Application for Amendment to the Approved Ping Che and Ta Kwu Ling Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-TKL/12 from "Agriculture" to "Government, Institution or Community", Various Lots in DD 76 and Adjoining Government Land, Ping Che, Fanling  
(RNTPC Paper No. Y/NE-TKL/1)
- 

#### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

13. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 11.3.2008 for a deferment of the consideration of the application to allow time for the preparation of further information to address departmental comments.

#### **Deliberation Session**

14. 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 agreed that the application should be submitted to the Committee for consideration within three 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 further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

- (ii) Y/NE-TK/3 Application for Amendment to the Draft Ting Kok Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-TK/13 from “Agriculture” and “Green Belt” to “Other Specified Uses (Spa Resort Hotel)”, Various Lots in DD 17 and Adjoining Government Land, Ting Kok, Tai Po  
(RNTPC Paper No. Y/NE-TK/3)
- 

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

15. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 6.3.2008 for a deferment of the consideration of the application to allow time for the preparation of further information to address departmental comments.

#### Deliberation Session

16. 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 agreed that the application should be submitted to the Committee for consideration within three 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 further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[Anna S.Y. Kwong arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 7**

**Section 16 Applications**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

- (i) A/NE-FTA/83 Proposed Government Refuse Collection Point  
in “Agriculture” zone,  
Government Land in DD 89, Lo Wu Station Road,  
Fu Tei Au  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-FTA/83)
- 

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

17. Ms. Stephanie P.H. Lai, STP/STN, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed Government Refuse Collection Point;
- (c) departmental comments – the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) did not favour the application from agricultural development point of view as the agricultural activities in the area were active. Other Government departments consulted had no objection or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) two public comments were received during the statutory publication period raising concerns on potential impact on water wells and the nearby residential uses and adverse traffic impacts; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The proposed refuse collection point (RCP) was to replace the existing RCP which would need to be relocated due to the widening of the Lo Wu Station Road in mid-2008. Although DAFC did not favour the application,

the small scale of the proposed RCP would unlikely affect the nearby agricultural activities or cause adverse impacts on the surrounding areas. The applicant indicated that the site was the only feasible replacement site as it was a piece of Government land in the vicinity of the existing RCP. Although there were some local concerns, concerned Government departments consulted, including Assistant Commissioner for Transport/New Territories had no objection or adverse comments on the application. A 5-metre wide vehicular access road would be constructed as part of the 'Widening of Lo Wu Station Road' project. An underground cesspool would be provided underneath the proposed RCP to contain waste water and therefore water pollution was unlikely.

18. In response to a Member's enquiry on the agricultural activities in the area, Ms. Stephanie P.H. Lai explained that the application site was a piece of Government land and had been illegally occupied. As illustrated in Drawing A-2, the proposed RCP would be located on the roadside of the widened access road from Lo Wu Station Road.

#### Deliberation Session

19. 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 28.3.2012, 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 that the submission and implementation of a landscaping proposal to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.

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

- (a) take precautions, such as temporary fencing to ensure the existing trees and farmland in the vicinity were not encroached upon or damaged during construction works; and

- (b) note the Chief Engineer/Development(2), Water Supplies Department (WSD)'s comments that for provision of water supply to the proposed development, the applicant might need to extend his inside services to the nearest suitable 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.

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

- (ii) A/NE-HLH/14 Proposed Temporary Open Storage of Construction Equipment for a Period of 3 Years in "Agriculture" zone, Lot 325(Part) in DD 87, Hung Lung Hang, Ta Kwu Ling (RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-HLH/14)
- 

Presentation and Question Sessions

21. Ms. Stephanie P.H. Lai, STP/STN, 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 equipment for a period of 3 years;
- (c) departmental comments – the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/New Territories, Transport Department (AC for T/NT, TD) had reservation as the access road which connected the application site with Kong Nga Po Road/Ping Che Road was narrow, winding and sub-standard (without footpath). The Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) did not support the application as there were sensitive uses in the vicinity of the site and environmental nuisance was expected. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L)

raised objection from landscape planning point of view. Although the site had been formed with no significant vegetation, it was adjacent to a wooded knoll zoned “Green Belt” (“GB”). The general environment was natural and green in character with many existing trees and tree groups along the outside boundaries on the eastern and western sides of the site. Although open storage uses were found in the adjoining area, some of them were suspected unauthorised developments. The proposed open storage use was not compatible with the surrounding natural environment and would lead to significant adverse landscape impact. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar developments in the area which would further deteriorate the landscape quality of the vicinity.

- (d) one public comment was received during the statutory publication period from a North District Councillor who commented that the right of the residents in the surrounding areas should be catered for; and
  
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The application site fell within Category 3 areas under the Town Planning Board Guidelines for ‘Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses’ (TPB-PG No. 13D) and the application did not comply with the TPB-PG NO. 13D in that no previous planning approval had been granted to the application site and there were adverse departmental comments, including those from AC for T/NT on the narrow, winding and sub-standard access, DEP on the adverse environmental impacts on the sensitive uses including domestic structures in the vicinity of the application site, and CTP/UD&L on the adverse landscape impacts on the natural environment of the area adjoining the site which included land zoned “GB”. Insufficient information had been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed use would not generate adverse environmental, traffic and landscape impacts on the surrounding areas.

22. In response to the Chairperson's enquiry, Ms. Stephanie P.H. Lai advised that the open storage uses to the north and west of the application site were suspected unauthorized development.

#### Deliberation Session

23. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application and the reason was the application did not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for 'Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses' (TPB-PG No. 13D) in that no previous planning approval had been granted to the application site and there were adverse departmental comments on the application. Insufficient information had been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed use would not generate adverse environmental, traffic and landscape impacts on the surrounding areas.

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

- (iii) A/NE-KTS/260 Proposed House with Ancillary Swimming Pool  
in "Green Belt" and 'Road' zones,  
Lot 760B and 760C in DD 98, Kwu Tung South,  
Sheung Shui  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-KTS/260)
- 

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

24. Ms. Stephanie P.H. Lai, STP/STN, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed house with ancillary swimming pool;
- (c) departmental comments – the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/New Territories (AC for T/NT) had reservation on the application. Although traffic associated with the proposed development was not expected to be significant, such development if permitted would set an undesirable

precedent for similar applications in the future. The resulting cumulative adverse traffic impact could be substantial and the nearby road infrastructure was not designed to cater for such traffic. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape (CTP/UD&L) objected to the application from landscape planning point of view. The site abutted a densely wooded slope toe in the “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone with many large trees/tree groups in the surrounding area. The landscape setting was green and placid of a natural and tranquil character. The site was largely hard paved. The vegetated slope to its west had recently been disturbed by geotechnical works and installation of concrete retaining walls and some of the existing trees on the slope had been removed. There were significant adverse visual and landscape impact on the vegetated slope. The scale of the proposed house was considered excessive when compared with the existing developments in the adjacent lots. Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar developments in the area which would further deteriorate the landscape quality of the area and disturb the “GB” zone;

- (d) no public comment was received during the statutory publication period and two local objections from the Chairman of Sheung Shui District Rural Committee and Residents’ Representative of Kwu Tung (South) were received by the District Officer (North) raising concern on sewage discharge from the proposed swimming pool; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The proposed residential development was not in line with the planning intention of “GB” zone and there was no strong justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention. It did not meet the TPB Guidelines for Application for Development within “GB” zone in that there were no exceptional circumstances to warrant the approval of the application. The approval of this application would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications within the “GB” zone.



25. In response to the Chairperson's enquiry, Ms. Stephanie P.H. Lai replied that structures found on site were claimed to have existed before 1990s.

#### Deliberation Session

26. The Chairperson and a Member noted that part of the site was shown as 'Road' (about 12% of the site area) and hence the proposed house and swimming pool development would affect future road widening. Mr. W.K. Hui said that there was no programme for road widening works. Ms. Stephanie P.H. Lai added that this part of the site had been reserved as a non-building area in the proposed development.

27. The Chairperson added and Members agreed that the technical concerns from AC for T/NT and CTP/UD&L should be included as reasons for rejection.

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

- (a) the residential development was not in line with the planning intention of the "Green Belt" ("GB") zone which was primarily for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There was a general presumption against development within this zone. There was no strong justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention;
- (b) the proposed residential development did not meet the Town Planning Board Guidelines for Application for Development within "GB" Zone (TPB-PG No. 10) in that applications would only be considered in exceptional circumstances and must be justified with very strong planning grounds. There were no exceptional circumstances to warrant the approval of this application; and
- (c) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications within the "GB" zone. The cumulative impacts of

approving such similar applications would further deteriorate the landscape quality of the area and affect the intactness of the green belt. The cumulative traffic impact on the nearby road network would also be substantial.

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

- (iv) A/NE-TK/245 Proposed Public Utility Installation (Mobile Communication Radio Base Station and Antenna) in “Agriculture” zone, Government Land in DD 17, Junction of Ting Kok Road and Shan Liu Road, Tai Po (RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TK/245)
- 

Presentation and Question Sessions

29. 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 (mobile communication radio base station and antenna);
- (c) departmental comments – the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape (CTP/UD&L) had reservation on the application from landscape planning point of view. The application site was set in an undeveloped field overgrown with natural vegetation creating a predominant rural and open landscape character with its prominent location adjacent to a major route and an existing village. The proposed 15m tall antenna post and single storey shelter would create an adverse landscape impact on the surrounding area. No space was available within the site for periphery planting to mitigate the impact;

- (d) three public comments were received during the statutory publication period raising objection for reasons of adverse health, pedestrian circulation and visual impacts. Two local objections from the Indigenous Inhabitant Representative and Resident Representative of Lo Tsz Tin were received by the District Officer; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone and there was no strong justification to depart from the planning intention. The proposed antenna pole was 15m tall with a single-storey shelter and located close to the visitor route of Ting Kok Road. There was insufficient information in the application to demonstrate that the application would not have adverse visual and landscape impacts on the surrounding areas.

30. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

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

- (a) the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” zone which was primarily to retain and safeguard agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes. There was no strong justification in the submission for a departure from such planning intention; and
- (b) there was insufficient information in the submission to demonstrate that the development would not have adverse visual and landscape impacts on the subject site and the surrounding areas.



application (No. A/NE-TK/242) which lay to the east of an existing wooded area. The sites were surrounded by the “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone and the nearby “Conservation Area” (“CA”) zone which were largely undisturbed and still predominately rural with woodland, low-lying plain, vegetated hillsides and ponds. Approval of Application No. A/NE-TK/242 previously had pushed the existing village boundary westward to the detriment of the nearby wooded land. Trees in the close proximity of the site were susceptible to tree felling activities arising from village expansion. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) considered the applications not in line with the planning intention of the “GB” zone which was close to the “CA” zone and there was a general presumption against development within the “GB” zone. Other Government departments consulted had no objection or no adverse comments on the application;

- (d) one public comment each was received during the statutory publication period for the two applications from WWF objecting on grounds of frustrating the planning intention of “GB” zone and the adverse traffic, environmental, landscape and visual impacts generated. Two local objections were received from the Indigenous Inhabitant Representative and Resident Representative of Wong Yue Tan by the District Officer for each of the application; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the applications based on the assessment in paragraph 12 of the Papers. The proposed Small Houses complied with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for New Territories Exempted House/Small House in New Territories (the Interim Criteria) in that the footprint of the proposed Small House fell entirely within the ‘village environs’ (‘VE’) and there was a shortage of land in meeting the forecast demand for Small House development. The proposed Small Houses were not incompatible with the surrounding rural environment and would not impose adverse impacts on the surrounding area nor overstrain the capacity of the existing or planned infrastructure. On the concern raised by DAFC, CTP/UD&L

and the public relating to the environmental, landscape and visual impacts, it should be noted that the sites were covered with grass and no tree would be affected. Should there be similar applications, each application would be considered on its own merits.

34. In response to a Member's question on whether the site was a wetland as illustrated in the public comment of WWF Hong Kong (WWF), Dr. Kenneth S.S. Tang clarified that the photo of WWF Hong Kong's submission was a wetland in the "CA" zone close to the application site. The application site fell within the "GB" zone which was further away from the "CA" zone.

#### Deliberation Session

35. A Member cited WWF's comments and green groups' concern on the adverse environmental impacts brought about by the Small Houses development in this area. This Member raised concern that the approval of a previous application (Application No. A/NE-TK/242) had already set an undesirable precedent for similar applications such as the two current applications. Approving these two Small Houses would bring further adverse landscape and environmental impacts on the surrounding area and might affect the "Conservation Area" nearby. He was concerned whether the large demand of 502 Small House sites could be met by sites within the 'VE'.

36. In response, Dr. Kenneth S.S. Tang advised that there was a serious shortfall of land in fully meeting the Small House demand of 502 sites in the "V" zone of the villages. However, the Board would still consider each application against the Interim Criteria. In this regard, he drew Members attention to Plan A-2 which indicated that all applications to the north which fell outside the 'VE' and near the "CA" zone were rejected by the Board.

37. The Chairperson remarked that there was a need to balance conservation and the need for village housing. Whilst noting that there was a large demand for Small House sites, the "V" zone had not been expanded. Each Small House application would still have to be justified on its own merits. It had been indicated clearly in the Interim Criteria that Small House applications falling outside 'VE' boundary would normally not be approved unless under exceptional circumstances.

38. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve applications No. A/NE-TK/246 and A/NE-TK/247 respectively, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). Each of the permission should be valid until 28.3.2012, and after the said date, each of the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the respective development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. Each of the permission was subject to the following conditions :

- (a) the submission and implementation of drainage proposals to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (b) the provision of fire fighting access, water supplies and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB.

39. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant :

- (a) water mains in the vicinity of the site could not provide the standard fire-fighting flow;
- (b) the applicant 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;
- (c) the applicant should consult Environmental Protection Department regarding the sewage treatment/disposal method for the proposed development; and
- (d) to note that permission was only given to the development under application. If provision of an access road was required for the proposed development, the applicant should ensure that such access road (including any necessary filling/excavation of land) complied with the provisions of





for conservation and greening. Three strong local objections from the Owners' Committees of nearby residential blocks were received by the District Officer/Tai Po; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessment in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The proposed development would intensify the development of the religious compound and was not in line with the planning intention of the “Green Belt” (“GB”) zoning for the area. There was a general presumption against development within this zone. The scale and bulk of the development was out of keeping with the landscape character of the surrounding hillslopes and the existing building structures of the religious institution adjacent to the site. Many trees had been cleared for the construction of the podium deck and hence the vegetation buffer between the adjacent residential development and the worship hall was inadequate. As such, the application did not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for “Application for Development within “GB” zone (TPB-PG No. 10) under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance” in that the scale, intensity and building height of the proposed development were considered not compatible with the surrounding areas. Insufficient information had been provided to demonstrate that there would be no adverse visual and landscape impacts.

41. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

42. A Member commented that since a superstructure had already been constructed on the application site, a worship hall might be allowed if the scale of the development was substantially reduced and the application was submitted by a genuine religious institution.

43. In response to the Chairperson's enquiries, Dr. Kenneth S.S. Tang advised that the applicant was a religious institution registered with the Home Affairs Bureau. The application site was cleared and a podium deck occupying most of the site was built.

According to Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West (CBS/NTW, BD), no building plan had been submitted for the building works and BD would take follow-up action.

44. A Member commented that BD should be asked to follow-up on the suspected unauthorised building works. The carrying out of building works without prior approval from BD was unacceptable especially on the safety aspect. Members agreed.

45. Members did not support the application. The Secretary added that the Secretariat would relay Members' request for follow-up action on the suspected unauthorised building works to BD and LandsD.

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

- (a) the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the "Green Belt" ("GB") zoning for the area which was to define the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There was a general presumption against development within this zone. There was insufficient information in the submission to justify a departure from this planning intention;
- (b) the application did not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for "Application for Development within "GB" zone (TPB-PG No. 10) under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance" in that the scale, intensity and building height of the proposed development were considered not compatible with the surrounding areas; and
- (c) there was insufficient information in the submission to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have any adverse visual and landscape impacts on the surrounding areas.

[Mr. Edmund K.H. Leung left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

- (viii)      A/TP/397                      Proposed Four Houses and Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction  
in “Village Type Development” zone,  
Lots 1217A2RP, 1217A3RP, 1217CRP, 1217C1(Part),  
1217C2, 1217DRP, 1217D1, 1217E, 1217F, 1217G,  
1217G1, 1217G2, 1217H, 1217IRP, 1217I1, 1217JRP,  
1217MRP, 1217M1(Part), 1217M2, 1217M3, 1217M6,  
1217O, 1217P, 1217Q, 1217R, 1217T, 1217W, 1217X  
and 1668 in DD 11 and Adjoining Government Land,  
Nam Hang, Tai Po  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TP/397)
- 

Presentation and Question Sessions

47.            The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 13.3.2008 for a deferment of the consideration of the application to allow time to preparation of further information to address comments from concerned Government departments on the submission made on 15.2.2008.

Deliberation Session

48.            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 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 one month was allowed for the preparation of the submission of further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

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



existing landscape quality and valuable landscape resources. The District Officer objected to the application as there were local objections;

- (d) four public comments were received during the statutory publication period from the Village Representative (VR) of Cheung Uk Tei, two green groups and a private individual objecting on grounds that the application was not in line with the planning intention of “GB” zone, leading to vegetation clearance and adverse landscape impact as well as fire safety problem, and that Small Houses should be confined within the “V” zone. Local objections were received by the District Officer from the VRs of Cheung Uk Tei for reasons of fire safety and for retaining the “GB” zone; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessment in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The application did not meet the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for New Territories Exempted House/Small House in New Territories (the Interim Criteria) as it was not in line with the planning intention of “GB” zone and would cause adverse landscape impact. The site was physically separated from the village proper of Cheung Uk Tei and fell entirely within the “GB” zone. There was a strong presumption against development within this zone. No strong justification was included in the submission to warrant a departure from the planning intention. DAFC and CTP/UD&L objected from nature conservation and landscape planning points of view. The application did comply with the TPB Guidelines for Application for Development within “GB” zone in that it would involve clearance of natural vegetation and affect the existing natural landscape of the surrounding environment. There was no proper access to the site and adverse impact on existing landscape resources was anticipated. The approval of this application would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications within the “GB” zone. The cumulative impact of approving such applications would result in a degradation of the existing landscape quality and valuable landscape resources. There were local objections to the application from nature conservation point of view.

50. In response to a Member's enquiry, Dr. Kenneth S.S. Tang advised that the subject application was different from the two approved applications (A/NE-TK/246 and A/NE-TK/247) for Small Houses development considered in the same meeting in terms of the landscape setting of the application site in particular. The current application site fell within an area surrounded by mature trees and heavy vegetation whereas the two previous cases were located in areas covered by grass and shrubs. The Chairperson added that the subject application site fell entirely on Government land.

### Deliberation Session

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

- (a) the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the "Green Belt" ("GB") zoning for the area which was to define the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There was a general presumption against development within this zone. There was insufficient information in the submission to justify a departure from this planning intention;
- (b) the application did not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for 'Application for Development within "GB" zone (TPB-PG No. 10) under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance' in that it would involve clearance of natural vegetation and affect the existing natural landscape of the surrounding environment. There was insufficient information in the submission to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have any adverse landscape impact on the surrounding areas; and
- (c) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the "GB" zone. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would result in a degradation of existing landscape quality and valuable landscape resources.

**Agenda Item 8**

Section 16A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/MOS/61-6           Comprehensive Residential Development with Commercial and Government, Institution or Community Facilities – Proposed Amendments to the Master Layout Plan under Application No. A/MOS/61 in “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” zone, Various Lots in DD 206 and Adjoining Government Land, Area near Lok Wo Sha, Ma On Shan  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/MOS/61-6)

---

52.           The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the subsidiaries of Henderson Land Development Co. Ltd. Mr. Alfred Donald Yap had declared an interest in this application as he had current business dealings with Henderson Land Development Co. Ltd.

[Mr. Alfred Donald Yap and Ms. Anna S.Y. Kwong left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

53.           Mr. W.K. Hui, DPO/STN, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the comprehensive residential development with commercial and Government, Institution or Community facilities – proposed amendments to the Master Layout Plan (MLP) under application No. A/MOS/61;
- (c) departmental comments – no objection or no adverse comment from concerned Government departments was received;

- (d) the District Officer/Shu Tin (DO/ST) advised that the Chairman of Owners' Committee of Monte Vista (the OC) was consulted about the proposal. According to the management company of the Monte Vista, the OC would like to express their comments on the proposal but he had not received any comment from them. The representatives of PlanD, DO/ST and the applicants met the OC on 19.3.2008 to discuss their concerns, which were related to pedestrian and cyclists safety, detailed use of public pedestrian walkway, environmental requirements, number of parking spaces and traffic impacts on this application. Their grounds of objection had been considered by the Board and the Committee previously; and
  
- (e) the PlanD's views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessment in paragraph 9 of the Paper. All the proposed amendments under application, including the change in disposition and forms of the buildings, the EVA alignment and clubhouse facilities, were mainly confined to the separate alienated site and were minor in nature. The changes were due to a change in the area and boundary of the separate alienated site at the land grant processing stage. There was no change in the overall gross floor area and height profile of the proposed development and the changes would not significantly affect the overall layout of the development. The development scheme with the incorporation of the minor amendments under application still met the requirements set out in the approved planning brief, including the requirement for view corridors. Concerned Government departments had no adverse comments on the changes. Some of their comments were technical in nature and would be dealt with through the imposition of relevant approval conditions on the submission and implementation of sewerage impact assessments, traffic impact assessments and a revised MLP showing the separate alienation of Government land in the north-eastern part of the site. Regarding the local concerns, Government departments had no adverse comments on the traffic safety, parking, traffic impact and environmental aspects. A segregated, direct and convenient public pedestrian walkway would be provided within the development as required in the approved planning brief and cycle track would be provided along the proposed new roads for access from Sai Sha



Road to the Whitehead headland.

54. In response to the Chairperson's request, Mr. W.K. Hui identified the location of Monte Vista on Plan AA-1 and advised Members that commercial and residential development had been proposed in the "Other Specified Uses (Railway Station and Public Transport Interchange with Commercial, Residential Development)" zone on top of the Wu Kai Sha railway station.

Deliberation Session

55. Members considered the proposed amendments to the approved scheme minor in nature and had no objection to the proposal.

56. 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 20.5.2009, 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 Master Layout Plan (MLP) taking into account conditions (b), (c), (d), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j) and (k) below to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission of a revised MLP showing separate alienation of Government land in the north-eastern part of the site to the satisfaction of the Director of Lands or of the TPB;
- (c) the submission and implementation of a revised landscape master plan, including tree felling and preservation proposals as well as a management plan for the woodland areas, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (d) the implementation of the noise mitigation measures identified in the revised noise impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of

Environmental Protection or of the TPB;

- (e) the submission of an Environmental Monitoring and Audit (EM&A) Manual and the implementation of the EM&A Programme identified therein, including but not limited to audit of the construction phase mitigation measures to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (f) the provision of vehicular access, pedestrian circulation system, parking spaces, entrance and exit points to car parks, loading/unloading and lay-by facilities to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (g) the submission of a revised traffic impact assessment and the implementation of the traffic improvement measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (h) the provision of footbridge connection and public pedestrian walkway(s) from the Ma On Shan Rail Wu Kai Sha Station to the Whitehead headland to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (i) the provision of emergency vehicular access, water supplies for firefighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB;
- (j) the provision of a kindergarten to the satisfaction of the Secretary for Education or of the TPB;
- (k) the implementation of the recommendations identified in the revised cultural heritage impact assessment (January 2007), including an archaeological survey and a historical survey to the satisfaction of the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services or of the TPB;

- (l) the submission of a revised drainage impact assessment and the implementation of the drainage facilities identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (m) the submission of a revised sewerage impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (n) the implementation of the sewerage facilities identified in the revised sewerage impact assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (o) the diversion of water mains to be affected by the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Water Supplies or of the TPB; and
- (p) the submission of a revised implementation programme, with phasing proposals to tie in with the completion of the major infrastructural facilities serving the proposed development and the proposed traffic improvement measures, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.

57. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that :

- (a) the approved MLP, together with a set of approval conditions, would be certified by the Chairman of the TPB and deposited in the Land Registry in accordance with section 4A(3) of the Town Planning Ordinance. Efforts should be made to incorporate the relevant approval conditions into the revised MLP for deposition in the Land Registry as soon as practicable;
- (b) the proposed new roads leading to the proposed development required under the Buildings Ordinance (BO) should be completed prior to application for occupation permit;
- (c) liaison should be made with CLP Power Hong Kong Ltd. to ensure that additional electricity demand for the proposed development could be supplied from the existing electricity network;

- (d) each phase of the proposed development should be self-sustainable in every aspect under the BO including plot ratio, site coverage, means of escape, means of access for firefighting and rescue, fire resisting construction, collection of refuse and segregation of vehicular and pedestrian traffic as well as provision of clubhouse facilities. Each phase of the development should have its self-contained clubhouse of which the Gross Floor Area (GFA) of such facilities would not exceed 5% of the total domestic GFA of the phase;
  
- (e) the Water Supplies Department (WSD) was planning to lay fresh water main and salt water main along the planned Road A and planned Road B. The main laying works would likely be carried out in conjunction with the developer's roadwork. The developer should take this into consideration in the planning and construction of the proposed roadworks and approach WSD during their detailed design stage to sort out the interfacing issue between the two projects. The cost of any necessary diversion of existing water mains affected by the development should be borne by the development project. Right of Way should also be provided to WSD for their staff and contractor to carry out inspection and maintenance of waterworks installations at the north-eastern corner of the development site; and
  
- (f) Observation of the Code of Practice for Means of Access for Firefighting and Rescue during General Building Plan submission stage.

[The Chairperson thanked Mr. W.K. Hui, DPO/STN, Ms. Stephaine P.H. Lai and Dr. Kenneth S.S. Tang, STPs/STN, for their attendance to answer Members' enquires. Mr. Hui, Ms. Lai and Dr. Tang left the meeting at this point.]

[Mr. Alfred Donald Yap returned to join the meeting whilst Dr. C.N. Ng left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

## **Tuen Mun and Yuen Long District**

[Mr. W.M. Lam, Mr. Anthony C.Y. Lee and Miss Paulina Y.L. Kwan, Senior Town Planners/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long (STPs/TMYL), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 9**

#### **Section 16 Applications**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

- (i)           A/TM/369                   Proposed Religious Institution (Church) and Residential Institution Development in “Government, Institution or Community” zone, Lots 491(Part), 492(Part), 500(Part), 501(Part) and 502RP(Part) in DD 374 and Adjoining Government Land, So Kwun Wat, Tuen Mun  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/TM/369)
- 

#### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

58.           The Committee noted that the applicant’s agent requested on 5.3.2008 for a deferment of the consideration of the application to allow time for the preparation of supplementary information to address departmental comments.

#### **Deliberation Session**

59.           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 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 the preparation of the submission of further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.



(Industrial Estate)” zone which was intended for industries meeting the criteria set by the Hong Kong Science and Technology Parks Corporation (HKSTPC). The proposed asphalt plant was not incompatible with other industrial uses within the YLIE. The maximum Gross Floor Area (GFA) restriction for the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Industrial Estate” (“OU(IE)”) (Area (a)) zone was not breached after including the additional GFA of the proposed asphalt plant. The proposed building height of the asphalt plant and the administrative buildings was within the maximum building height limit stipulated in the OZP. Concerned Government departments had no objection or adverse comments and DEP advised that the applicant had obtained a licence under the Air Pollution Control Ordinance. Although there were public and local objections on grounds of adverse environmental impacts, the traffic conditions and pedestrian safety of the area, there was no land use incompatibility problem and concerned departments had no adverse comments on the application. The applicant clarified that the asphalt plant met the admission criteria and was admitted to the YLIE.

61. In response to a Member’s enquiry, the Chairperson advised that the Yuen Long Industrial Estate, together with other two industrial estates in Tai Po and Tseung Kwan O, were under the management of the Hong Kong Science and Technology Parks Corporation.

62. A Member was concerned whether the discharge from the asphalt plant would pollute Shan Pui River adjoining the site since no drainage plan had been submitted in the application. In response, Mr. W.M. Lam advised that sewage from the asphalt plant would be discharged to the public sewerage system provided in the YLIE. The Chairperson added that the Drainage Services Department (DSD) had no objection to the application and an approval condition was suggested for the design, provision and maintenance of a drainage system for the proposed development to the satisfaction of DSD.

#### Deliberation Session

63. The Chairperson remarked that the eligibility of the asphalt plant for admission to the YLIE was a matter for the YLIE to consider.

64. 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 28.3.2012, 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 provision of fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB;
- (b) the design, provision and maintenance of a drainage system for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB; and
- (c) the submission and implementation of landscape proposals including a tree preservation scheme to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB.

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

- (a) the Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department (HyD)'s commented that if Transport Department agreed with the vehicular access proposal, a run-in should be constructed at the access point and in accordance with the latest version of HyD Standard Drawing Nos. H1113 and H1114 or H5115 and H5116 whichever set as appropriate to suit the type of pavement of adjacent footpath;
- (b) the Director of Fire Services (D of FS)'s comments that detailed fire safety requirements would be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans. Furthermore, the emergency vehicular access in the subject 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 Buildings (Planning) Regulation 41D. The applicant was advised to approach his Dangerous Goods Division for advice on licensing of the



premises for asphalt plant in which Dangerous Goods licences might be required for the storage of substances/material in excess of exempted quantity should it be classified as Dangerous Goods within the meaning of Cap. 295, Dangerous Goods Ordinance where necessary;

- (c) the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department's comments that detailed comments would be offered at building plan submission stage;
- (d) the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department's comments that in order to minimise adverse visual impact to the surroundings, the applicant should be advised to adopt subtle colour scheme for all the above-ground structures proposed in the application; and
- (e) the Head of the Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department's comments that because the site fell within Scheduled Area No. 2, the proponent should be aware that marble with cavities might be present underneath the site and extensive investigation involving experienced geotechnical engineers might be required for the design and construction of the development. Therefore, the "Scheduled Area Clause" should be incorporated in relevant land documents.

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

- (iii) A/YL-PS/281 Temporary Recyclable Collection Centre  
for a Period of 3 Years  
in "Government, Institution or Community" and  
"Residential (Group B)1" zones,  
Lots 31RP(Part) and 33RP(Part) in DD 121 and Adjoining  
Government Land, Ping Shan, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-PS/281)
- 

Presentation and Question Sessions

- 66. Mr. W.M. Lam, STP/TMYL, presented the application and covered the following

aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the temporary recyclable collection centre for a period of 3 years;
- (c) departmental comments – the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) considered that the application should not be supported due to the environmental concerns arising from the breakage of computer parts, which was a kind of electronic waste on site that might cause soil and water pollution. DEP was enforcing the electronic waste (e-waste) handling on site and approval of the application would give a wrong impression that the handling of such e-waste could be legitimated. Sensitive receivers along Ping Kwai Road, which was an access to the site, were subject to noise nuisance caused by nearby vehicles. The Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department advised that the connection details and the information of the discharge point should be given in the drainage proposal, the details of boundary walls should be submitted to illustrate unobstructed flow of surface runoff from adjacent areas and the applicant should construct open channels of adequate sizes on both sides of the wall or construct adequate openings at the foot of the wall to allow the passage of rainwater from adjacent areas;
- (d) three public comments were received during the statutory publication period objecting on grounds of adverse traffic, noise and dust impacts, and nuisance to local residents; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessment in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The open storage use fell partly within “Government, Institution or Community” zone which was within Category 3 areas and partly “Residential (Group)B” zone which was within Category 4 areas under the Town Planning Board Guidelines for ‘Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses’ (TPB-PG No. 13D). The application did not meet the

TPB Guidelines 13D in that there were adverse comments from DEP and the Chief Engineer/Mainland North considered the submitted drainage proposal unsatisfactory. The previous approvals were for open storage of plastic materials only and not for the e-waste on site, the latter of which would lead to soil and water pollution. Access to the site was along Ping Kwai Road and the applicant confirmed that container vehicles would be involved for transporting the recycled materials. DEP objected strongly on such e-waste handling on site and the traffic noise impact on the sensitive receivers along the road.

[Ms. Anna S.Y. Kwong returned to join the meeting at this point.]

67. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

68. Members considered that the open storage use in Category 3 and 4 areas which involved storage of e-waste unacceptable.

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

- (a) there was insufficient information to demonstrate that the proposed development would not pose adverse environmental and drainage impacts on the surrounding areas; and
- (b) the approval of the application involving the storage of computer parts on open area would set an undesirable precedent for similar uses to proliferate in surrounding area.

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

- (iv)           A/YL-HT/516           Temporary Open Storage of Containers  
for a Period of 3 Years in “Recreation” zone,  
Lots 1489RP(Part), 1490RP(Part), 1492RP(Part),  
1503RP(Part), 1505A, 1505RP(Part), 1506(Part),  
1513(Part) and 1517(Part) in DD 125 and Adjoining  
Government Land, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-HT/516)
- 

Presentation and Question Sessions

70.           The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 13.3.2008 for a further deferment of the consideration of the application to allow time for preparation of the Traffic Impact Assessment which should be ready around late March 2008.

Deliberation Session

71.           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 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 the Committee had allowed a period of two months and a total period of four months for the preparation of the submission of further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

- (v)           A/YL-HT/517           Temporary Open Storage of Containers  
for a Period of 3 Years in “Recreation” zone,  
Lots 1506(Part), 1512(Part), 1513(Part), 1514, 1515, 1516,  
1517(Part), 1518, 1519(Part), 1520(Part), 1521(Part),  
1522(Part) and 1535(Part) in DD 125 and Adjoining  
Government Land, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-HT/517)
- 

Presentation and Question Sessions

72.           The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 13.3.2008 for a further deferment of the consideration of the application to allow time for preparation of the Traffic Impact Assessment which should be ready around late March 2008.

Deliberation Session

73.           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 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 the Committee had allowed a period of two months and a total period of four months for the preparation of the submission of further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

- (vi) A/YL-HT/518 Temporary Open Storage of Containers  
for a Period of 3 Years in “Recreation” zone,  
Lots 1488RP(Part), 1489RP(Part), 1490RP(Part),  
1491RP(Part), 1492RP(Part), 1503RP(Part), 1504(Part),  
1505RP(Part), 1506(Part), 1507(Part), 1510RP(Part) and  
1513(Part) in DD 125 and Adjoining Government Land,  
Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-HT/518)
- 

Presentation and Question Sessions

74. The Committee noted that the applicant requested on 13.3.2008 for a further deferment of the consideration of the application to allow time for preparation of the Traffic Impact Assessment which should be ready around late March 2008.

Deliberation Session

75. 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 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 the Committee had allowed a period of two months and a total period of four months for the preparation of the submission of further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

- (vii) A/YL-HT/536 Temporary Open Storage of Marble and Construction  
Materials for a Period of 3 Years  
in “Comprehensive Development Area” zone,  
Lot 766 in DD 125, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-HT/536)
-

Presentation and Question Sessions

76. 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 temporary open storage of marble and construction materials for a period of 3 years;
- (c) departmental comments – the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) did not support the application as there were sensitive uses in the vicinity of the site and the access road (Ping Ha Road), and environmental nuisance was expected. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L) had reservation from landscaping point of view. Moderate adverse landscape impact was observed as the vegetated slope along the southern perimeter of the site had been disturbed. Other Government departments consulted had no objection or no adverse comments on the applications;
- (d) no public comment was received during the statutory publication period and no local objection/view was received by the District Officer; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD considered that the application could be tolerated for a period of 3 years based on the assessment in paragraph 12. The application site fell within Category 1 areas under the Town Planning Board Guidelines for 'Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses' (TPB-PG No. 13D). The approval on a temporary basis would not frustrate the planning intention of the "CDA" zone since there was no known implementation programme for the comprehensive development. It was not incompatible with the open storage uses to its north and west. Planning approvals for similar uses had been granted in the surrounding areas. The applied use would unlikely

have significant adverse impacts on the surrounding areas. Concerned Government departments had no objection, except DEP and CTP/UD&L. DEP's and CTP/UD&L's concerns could be addressed through the inclusion of approval conditions on restriction on operation hours and types of activities on site; and landscaping and tree preservation requirements. Shorter compliance periods for approval conditions were recommended to monitor the situation of the site.

77. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

78. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 28.3.2011, 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 11:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. was allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no operation on Sundays and public holidays was allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no cutting, dismantling, cleansing, repairing and workshop activity was allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) the stacking height of the materials stored within 5 meters of the periphery of the site should not exceed the height of the boundary fence at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the submission of tree preservation proposal and landscape proposal for mitigating the adverse landscape impact within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 28.6.2008;



- (f) in relation to (e) above, the implementation of the tree preservation and landscape proposals within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 28.9.2008;
- (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 28.6.2008;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the provision of drainage facilities as proposed within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 28.9.2008;
- (i) the provision of fencing of the site within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 28.6.2008;
- (j) 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;
- (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 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.

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

- (a) obtain prior planning permission before commencing the development on site;

- (b) note that shorter compliance periods were imposed in order to monitor the situation of the site and its surroundings, and the fulfillment of approval conditions;
- (c) resolve any land issues relating to the development with the concerned owner(s) of the application site;
- (d) note the comments of the District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department (DLO/YL) that the lots under application were Old Schedule Agricultural Lots granted under the Block Government Lease upon which no structure was allowed to be erected without prior approval from his Office, to clarify the discrepancy between the existing occupation area with that under application, and to apply for Short Term Tenancy to regularize the unauthorized occupation of Government land;
- (e) follow the latest “Code of Practice on Handling Environmental Aspects of Temporary Uses and Open Storage Sites” issued by the Director of Environmental Protection;
- (f) note the Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department’s comments on the drainage proposal in the application :
  - (i) the connection details and the information of the discharge point should be given in the drainage proposal;
  - (ii) the details of boundary walls should be submitted to illustrate unobstructed flow of surface runoff from adjacent areas. The applicant should construct open channels of adequate sizes on both sides of the wall or construct adequate openings at the foot of the wall to allow passage of rainwater from adjacent areas;
  - (iii) the applicant was required to ensure that the drain which the runoff collected by the site would be discharged was adequate to discharge additional flow from the site. DLO/YL should be consulted and

relevant lot owners' consent should be obtained as regards all proposed drainage works outside the subject lots; and

- (iv) the size, gradient and flow direction of the proposed/existing channels in the site should be shown in the drainage proposal.
  
- (g) note the comments of the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/New Territories, Transport Department that the land status of the track leading to the site from Ping Ha Road should be checked with the lands authority and that the management and maintenance responsibilities of this access road should be clarified, and the relevant lands and maintenance authorities should be consulted accordingly; and
  
- (h) note the Chief Engineer/Land Works, Civil Engineering and Development Department's comments that the ingress/egress via Ping Ha Road to/from the site might be affected during the construction period for the widening of Ping Ha Road under Contract No. CV/2006/01 "Ping Ha Road Improvement Works (Ha Tsuen Section)" commenced in December 2007. The applicant should not be entitled for any compensation thereof.

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

- (viii) A/YL-NTM/223 Proposed Comprehensive Low Density Residential Development in "Comprehensive Development Area" zone, Lots 700, 701, 702A, 702B, 718(Part), 719(Part), 720(Part), 721A, 721B, 721C, 721RP, 722A, 722B, 722C, 722RP, 723A, 723B, 723RP, 724A, 724RP, 725, 726, 727, 728, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739RP(Part), 740(Part), 741(Part), 842RP, 845RP, 853RP, 854, 855, 952RP, 954, 956, 960RP, 961, 962, 963, 966, 967, 968RP, 972RP, 973RP, 975, 976, 977, 1019, 1020, 1021, 1022, 1023, 1024 and 4469RP in DD 104, and Adjoining Government Land, Ngau Tam Mei, Yuen Long (RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-NTM/223)
-

Presentation and Question Sessions

80. The Committee noted that the applicant's agent requested on 11.3.2008 for a deferment of the consideration of the application to allow time to prepare supplementary information to address the departmental comments.

Deliberation Session

81. 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 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 the preparation of the submission of further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[Mr. B.W. Chan and Dr. James C.W. Lau left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

- (ix) A/YL-ST/349 Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicle) for a Period of 3 Years in "Village Type Development" zone, Lot 674RP(Part) in DD 99 and Lots 3064, 3065, 3066, 3069, 3070 and 3079 in DD 102 and Adjoining Government Land, San Tin, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-ST/349)
- 

Presentation and Question Sessions

82. 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 temporary public vehicle park (excluding container vehicle) for a period

of 3 years;

- (c) departmental comments – no objection or no adverse comment from concerned Government departments was received;
- (d) one public comment from an adjacent lot owner was received during the statutory publication period objecting on ground that her lot had been illegally occupied without her consent, and access to her lot was blocked by the current application. One objection from the same owner was received by the District Officer/Yuen Long objecting on grounds which were same as those in the public comment; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD considered that the application could be tolerated for a period of 3 years based on the assessment in paragraph 12. According to the Town Planning Board Guidelines for 'Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses' (TPB-PG No. 13D), applications for cross-boundary parking facilities at suitable sites in San Tin area, particularly near the existing cross-boundary link in Lok Ma Chau might be considered based on individual merits. Although the applied temporary use for vehicle park was not entirely in line with the planning intention of the "Village Type Development" ("V") zone, it could satisfy some of the local parking demand arising from the local villagers and cross-boundary travellers in San Tin Area, particularly near Lok Ma Chau Control Point. Given its temporary nature and that there was no Small House application received in the application site, the proposed development would not frustrate the long term planning intention of the subject "V" zone. The proposed development was not incompatible with the surrounding land uses which comprised mainly vehicle parks, vehicle repair workshops and open storage yards. Previous planning approvals for similar uses on the site had been granted. All the approval conditions of the previous planning approval had been complied with. Other similar applications in the locality within the same "V" zone were approved. The applied use would unlikely have significant adverse impacts on the surrounding areas. To address potential environmental

concerns, approval conditions restricting the types of vehicles and activities on site were recommended. The applicant was also advised to follow the “Code of Practice on Handling Environmental Aspects of Temporary Uses and Open Storage Sites” to minimise any potential environmental impacts. The public commenter’s objection on trespassing of private land was a land management issue which should be sorted out by the applicant with the concerned lot owner.

[[The Vice-Chairman left the meeting temporarily at this point whilst Mr. B.W. Chan and Dr. James C.W. Lau returned to join the meeting at this point.]

83. Mr. Anthony Lee further advised that the public commenter submitted a letter, which was tabled at the meeting, in response to the applicant’s letter dated 6.3.2008 regarding the issue on access. The public commenter provided background to her comments, reiterating the illegal use of her lot for public vehicle park use and the obstruction of access to her lot. She requested an access be provided to her lot or the application be rejected. In view of the public comment, approval condition (a) had been included to exclude Lot 3063 in DD 102 from the application site and advisory clause (c) advising the applicant to liaise with the owner of Lot 3063 on the access arrangement to the said lot was recommended.

84. In response to a Member’s enquiry, Mr. Anthony C.Y. Lee clarified that Lot 3063 was the fenced off area identified in photo 3 in Plan A-4a. The Chairperson noted that the application site, as illustrated in Plan A-2, had not included Lot 3063 although it was noted from the site photos that structures were found extending into this lot. The Secretary referred Members to the letter from the applicant (Appendix Ib of the Paper) which clarified that the application site had excluded Lot 3063.

#### Deliberation Session

85. Members had the following comments and observations :

- (a) Plan A1-b indicated that Lot 3063 was included in previous applications but excluded in the current application;

- (b) since Lot 3063 was not included in the application site, approval condition (a) requiring exclusion of Lot 3063 in DD 102 from the application site should be deleted. The applicant should be advised to liaise with the concerned lot owner to resolve the land issues; and
- (c) whether planning enforcement action should be taken for Lot 3063 noting that there was structures on the site.

86. In response, the Chairperson advised that planning enforcement action would be taken if Lot 3063 was used for public vehicle park as no planning approval was obtained. Members agreed that the approval condition (a) should be deleted. Instead, an advisory clause should be added reminding the Applicant that approval had not been given to Lot 3063 which had not been included in the application.

87. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 28.3.2011, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the following conditions :

- (a) no vehicles without valid licences issued under the Road Traffic Ordinance were allowed to be parked/stored on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (b) no vehicles exceeding 5.5 tonnes including medium and heavy goods vehicles and container vehicles were allowed to be parked/stored on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) no car washing, vehicle repair workshop and canteen were allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) the drainage facilities on the site should be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;

- (e) the submission of a condition record of the existing drainage facilities approved under Application No. A/YL-ST/276 within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 28.9.2008;
- (f) the submission of a landscape and tree preservation proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 28.9.2008;
- (g) in relation to (f) above, the implementation of landscape and tree preservation proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 28.12.2008;
- (h) the provision of a proper run-in within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB by 28.12.2008;
- (i) the provision of a 9-litre water type/3 kg dry powder fire extinguisher in each of the container-converted site offices within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 28.9.2008;
- (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.

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

- (a) obtain prior planning permission before continuing the applied use at the application site;
- (b) resolve any land issues relating to the development with the concerned owner(s) of the application site;
- (c) note that planning approval had not been given to Lot 3063 in D.D. 102 for public vehicle park which had not been included in the application;
- (d) liaise with the owner of Lot 3063 in D.D. 102 on the access arrangement to Lot 3063 through Lot 673 in D.D. 99 and Lot 3064 in D.D. 102;
- (e) note the District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department (DLO/YL)'s comments that the lots under application were Old Schedule Agricultural Lots held under the Block Government Lease under which no structures were allowed to be erected without prior approval from his Office. The applicant should apply to DLO/YL for Short Term Waiver (STW) and Short Term Tenancy (STT) to regularize the unauthorized structures on site and illegal occupation of Government land. Should no STW/STT application be received/approved, his Office on review of the situation would resume or take new action as appropriate according to the established district lease enforcement/control programme. Government was not obliged to provide an access to the Lot 3063 in D.D. 102 under lease, the lot owner should make his own arrangements with the land owners concerned. It was their policy that they would not guarantee any right-of-way for any STT/STW to be regularized;
- (f) note the Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department's comments that no public sewerage maintained by his Office was currently available for connection. The applicant should review his drainage

proposal/works as well as the site boundary in order not to cause encroachment upon areas outside his jurisdiction. The applicant should not disturb all existing drains and streams in its vicinity and all existing flow paths should be properly intercepted and maintained without increasing the flooding risk of the adjacent areas;

- (g) follow the latest “Code of Practice on Handling Environmental Aspects of Temporary Uses and Open Storage Sites” issued by the Environmental Protection Department to minimize potential environmental impacts on the surrounding areas;
- (h) note the Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department’s comments that a run-in should be constructed at the access point at Tung Wing On Road in accordance with Highway Standard Drawings No. H1113B and H1114A; and
- (i) note the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department’s comments that the granting of planning approval should not be construed as condoning to any unauthorized structures existing on the site under the Buildings Ordinance (BO) and the allied regulations. Actions appropriate under the BO 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. If the site did not abut on a street having a width of not less than 4.5m, the development intensity should be determined under Building (Planning) Regulation 19(3) at the building plan submission stage.

[Ms. Carmen K.M. Chan left the meeting temporarily whilst the Vice-Chairman returned to join the meeting at this point.]

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

- (x)           A/YL-KTN/291       Temporary Private Car Park for a Period of 3 Years  
in “Comprehensive Development Area” zone,  
Lots 3316RP(Part), 3331RP(Part), 3337RP, 3338RP(Part),  
3339, 3340 RP(Part), 3341RP(Part), 3342(Part), 3343 to  
3346, 3347(Part), 3348(Part), 3349RP(Part), 3350,  
3351(Part), 3359RP and 3360RP in DD 104 and Adjoining  
Government Land, Kam Tin North, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTN/291)
- 

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

- (xi)          A/YL-KTN/292       Proposed Temporary Private Car Park  
for a Period of 3 Years  
in “Comprehensive Development Area” zone,  
Lots 3307RP(Part), 3308RP(Part), 3312RP(Part) and  
3313RP(Part) in DD 104, Kam Tin North, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTN/292)
- 

89.           Noting that the two applications were submitted by the same applicant, they were similar in nature and the application sites were adjoining to each other, Members agreed to consider the two applications together.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

90.           Mr. Edmund K.H. Leung declared an interest in these two applications as he had business dealings with the applicant’s subsidiary company.

[Mr. Edmund K.H. Leung left the meeting temporarily whilst Ms. Carmen K.M. Chan returned to join the meeting at this point.]

91.           Miss Paulina Y.L. Kwan, STP/TMYL, presented the applications and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Papers :

- (a)   background to the applications;
- (b)   the temporary private car park for a period of 3 years for both applications

No. A/YL-KTN/291 and A/YL-KTN/292;

- (c) departmental comments – the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) did not support the applications as there were residential dwellings located to the immediate north, east and south of the application sites and environmental nuisance was expected. Other Government departments consulted had no objection or no adverse comments on the applications;
- (d) one public comment was received during the statutory publication period on each of the applications, both from the same person for the same reasons that the proposed use would lead to adverse environmental and traffic impacts, noise nuisance and safety problem; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD considered that the applications could be tolerated for a period of 3 years based on the assessments made in paragraph 11 of the respective Paper. The proposed private car parks were similar to a park and ride facility to serve members of a Shenzhen golf club. They were not incompatible with the surrounding land uses which were mainly mixed uses with storage or open storage yards, parking lot, cultivated land, sites for gardening and residential structures. The approval of the application on a temporary basis would not frustrate the planning intention of the “CDA” zone which had no known implementation programme for comprehensive development. Previous planning approvals for similar uses had been granted at the site. The applied uses would unlikely have significant adverse impacts on the surrounding areas. Although there was a public objection for each of the application on environmental and traffic grounds, concerned Government departments had no objection, except DEP. The environmental concern could be addressed through the inclusion of approval conditions prohibiting the use of medium or heavy goods vehicles, restricting the types of activities, and the provision of mitigation measures.

92. Members had no question on the applications.

Deliberation Session

93. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve Applications No. A/YL-KTN/291 and No. A/YL-KTN/292 respectively on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 28.3.2011, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and subject to the conditions as set out below.

94. Application No. A/YL-KTN/291 was subject to the following conditions :

- (a) no vehicles without valid licences issued under the Traffic Regulations were allowed to be parked on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (b) no medium and heavy goods vehicles (i.e. exceeding 5.5 tonnes) as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance and container trailers/tractors were allowed to be parked/stored on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no car washing and vehicle repair workshop were allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) all existing landscape planting should be maintained at all times during planning approval period;
- (e) the drainage facilities implemented on the application site (under application No. A/YL-KTN/249) should be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) the provision of mitigation measures to minimize any possible nuisance of noise and artificial lighting on site to the residents nearby within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 28.9.2008;
- (g) the provision of a 9-litre water type/3kg dry powder fire extinguisher within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of

the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 28.9.2008;

- (h) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d) or (e) 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;
- (i) if any of the above planning conditions (f) or (g) 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
- (j) 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.

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

- (a) obtain prior planning permission before commencing the applied use at the application site;
- (b) resolve any land issues relating to the development with the concerned owner(s) of the application site;
- (c) note the District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department's comments that his office reserved the right to take lease enforcement action against the unauthorized structures and the applicant should apply for the issue of Short Term Waiver or Short Term Tenancy to regularize the unauthorized structures on site;
- (d) follow the latest "Code of Practice on Handling Environmental Aspects of Temporary Uses and Open Storage Sites" issued by the Director of Environmental Protection to minimise any potential environmental nuisances;

- (e) note the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department's comments that 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. Authorized Person must be appointed to coordinate all building works;
- (f) note the Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department's comments that his office was not/should not be responsible for the maintenance of any existing vehicular access connecting the application site and San Tam Road;
- (g) liaise with CLP Power Hong Kong Limited to obtain safety advice and ascertain that adequate safety clearance from the 11KV and LV overhead lines were maintained from the vicinity of the development prior to establishing any structure within the site; and
- (h) note the Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services's comments that the overhead line poles within the site should be guarded against the possibility of being knocked down by the vehicles and a safety clearance for vehicles parked under the 11KV and LV overhead lines and a 24-hour unrestricted access for emergency operation/maintenance works of CLP Power Hong Kong Limited beneath the 11KV and LV lines were required. Besides, double-deck/multi-deck mechanical driven parking facilities should not be installed beneath the overhead lines. A rigid cross bar acting as a height limiter installed at the entrance would be a simple and effective means to restrict the height of the vehicles. In addition, the 'Code of Practice on Working near Electricity Supply Lines' established under the Electricity Supply Lines (Protection) Regulation should be observed by the applicant and his contractors when carrying out works in the vicinity of electricity supply lines.

96. Application No. A/YL-KTN/292 was subject to the following conditions :

- (a) no vehicles without valid licences issued under the Traffic Regulations were allowed to be parked on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (b) no medium and heavy goods vehicles (i.e. exceeding 5.5 tonnes) as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance and container trailers/tractors were allowed to be parked/stored on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no car washing and vehicle repair workshop were allowed on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) the provision of mitigation measures to minimize any possible nuisance of noise and artificial lighting on site to the residents nearby within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 28.9.2008.
- (e) the submission of landscape proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 28.9.2008;
- (f) in relation to (e) above, the implementation of landscape proposal within 9 months from the date of the planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB by 28.12.2008;
- (g) the submission of drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 28.9.2008;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implementation of drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 28.12.2008;
- (i) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b) or (c) 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;

- (j) if any of the above planning conditions (d), (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.

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

- (a) obtain prior planning permission before commencing the applied use at the application site;
- (b) resolve any land issues relating to the development with the concerned owner(s) of the application site;
- (c) note the District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department's comments that his office reserved the right to take lease enforcement action against the unauthorized structures and the applicant should apply for the issue of Short Term Waiver or Short Term Tenancy to regularize the unauthorized structures on site;
- (d) follow the latest "Code of Practice on Handling Environmental Aspects of Temporary Uses and Open Storage Sites" issued by the Director of Environmental Protection to minimise any potential environmental nuisances;
- (e) note the Chief Engineer/Mainland North and the Chief Engineer/Drainage Projects, Drainage Services Department's comments on the drainage proposal;

- (f) note the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department's comments that 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. Authorized Person had to be appointed to coordinate all building works;
- (g) note the Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department's comments that his office was not/should not be responsible for the maintenance of any existing vehicular access connecting the application site and San Tam Road;
- (h) liaise with CLP Power Hong Kong Limited to obtain safety advice and ascertain that adequate safety clearance from the 400KV overhead lines were maintained from the vicinity of the development prior to establishing any structure within the site; and
- (i) note the Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services's comments that a safety clearance for vehicles parked under the 400KV overhead lines and a 24-hour unrestricted access for emergency operation/maintenance works of CLP Power Hong Kong Limited beneath the 400KV lines were required. Besides, double-deck/multi-deck mechanical driven parking facilities should not be installed beneath the overhead lines. A rigid cross bar acting as a height limiter installed at the entrance would be a simple and effective means to restrict the height of the vehicles. In addition, the 'Code of Practice on Working near Electricity Supply Lines' established under the Electricity Supply Lines (Protection) Regulation should be observed by the applicant and his contractors when carrying out works in the vicinity of electricity supply lines.

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

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

- (xii) A/YL-KTS/417 Temporary Open Storage of Vehicles and Modification Workshop for Vans and Lorries for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group D)” zone, Lots 1319(Part) and 1336A(Part) in DD 106, Kong Ha Wai, Kam Sheung Road, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-KTS/417)
- 

Presentation and Question Sessions

98. Miss Paulina Y.L. Kwan, STP/TMYL, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the temporary open storage of vehicles and modification workshop for vans and lorries for a period of 3 years;
- (c) departmental comments – the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) did not support the application as there were sensitive receivers i.e. residential structures located in the vicinity of the application site and environmental nuisance was expected. Other Government departments consulted had no objection or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) no public comment was received during the statutory publication period and no local objection/view was received by the District Officer; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD considered the application could be tolerated for a period of 3 years based on the assessments made in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The application site fell within Category 3 areas under the TPB-PG No. 13D. The application was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for ‘Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses’ (TPB-PG No. 13D) in that previous approvals had been granted on the site for similar use. Under the pervious planning approval (Application No. A/YL-KTN/335), all the

approval conditions had been complied with. As the applicant had demonstrated effort in complying with the approval condition and concerned departments except EPD had no adverse comment, sympathetic consideration should be given. The development was located in a mixed use area with fallow and cultivated agricultural land, open storage yards, workshops, warehouses and residential structures. There was no environmental complaint received by DEP in the past 3 years and no objection had been received during the statutory publication period. The environmental concern expressed by EPD could be addressed through the imposition of approval conditions restricting the operation hours and the types of activities on site.

99. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

100. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 28.3.2011, 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 6:30 p.m. and 8:30 a.m. on Mondays to Saturdays, as proposed by the applicant, was allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no operation on Sundays and public holidays was allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no paint-spraying activities should be carried out at the open area of the application site;
- (d) all landscape plantings within the site should be maintained (including replacement of any dead or missing trees) at all time during the planning approval period to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Board;

- (e) the submission of drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 28.9.2008;
- (f) in relation to (e) above, the implementation of drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 28.12.2008;
- (g) the provision of fire service installations within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 28.9.2008;
- (h) 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;
- (i) if any of the above planning conditions (e), (f) or (g) 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
- (j) 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.

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

- (a) obtain prior planning permission before commencing the applied use at the application site;
- (b) resolve any land issues relating to the development with the concerned owners of the application site;

- (c) note the District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department's comments that his office reserved the right to take lease enforcement action against unauthorized structures on site and the applicant should apply for issue of Short Term Waiver to regularize the unauthorized structures on site;
- (d) adopt environmental mitigation measures as set out in the "Code of Practice on Handling Environmental Aspects of Temporary Uses and Open Storage Sites" issued by the Director of Environmental Protection to minimise any potential environmental nuisances;
- (e) note the Director of Fire Services' comment that detailed fire safety requirements would be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans and the applicant/operator of the site should approach the Dangerous Goods Division for advice on licensing of the premises for the applied use where necessary;
- (f) note the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department's comments that 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. Authorized Person must be appointed to coordinate all building works; and
- (g) note the Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services' comments that the 'Code of Practice on Working near Electricity Supply Lines' established under the Electricity Supply Lines (Protection) Regulation should be observed by the applicant and his contractors when carrying out works in the vicinity of electricity supply lines. Prior to establishing any structure in the vicinity of the electricity supply lines, the applicant and/or his contractors should consult CLP Power Hong Kong Limited (CLPP) and, if necessary, ask CLPP to divert the supply lines away from the vicinity of the proposed structure.

[Ms. Anna S.Y. Kwong left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

- (xiii) A/YL-PH/558 Temporary Container Trailer/Tractor Park  
for a Period of 3 Years in “Open Storage” zone,  
Lots 854(Part) and 856(Part) in DD 111 and Adjoining  
Government Land, Chung Yan Pei, Pat Heung, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-PH/558)
- 

Presentation and Question Sessions

102. Miss Paulina Y.L. Kwan, STP/TMYL, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the temporary container trailer/tractor park for a period of 3 years;
- (c) departmental comments – the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/New Territories, Transport Department (AC for T/NT, TD) did not support the application as the existing access road of minimum width of 4.5m was not sufficient for two-way traffic of container trailer/tractor. Reversing vehicles of container trailer/tractor might be required in the access road and might cause dangers to other road users. Other Government departments consulted had no objection or no adverse comments on the application;
- (d) no public comment was received during the statutory publication period and no local objection/view was received by the District Officer; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments made in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The application for temporary container trailer/tractor park was in line with the planning intention of the “Open Storage” zone which was to cater for the continuing demand for open storage and to regularize the already haphazard proliferation of open storage uses within the zone. The proposed use was not incompatible with the surrounding open storage yards

and workshop uses. There was no sensitive receiver in the immediate vicinity of the site and along the access road leading from Fan Kam Road. The parking of container trailers/tractors could not be accommodated in conventional car-park building. The site fell within Category 1 area and the development was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for 'Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses' (TPB-PG No. 13D) in that concerned Government departments had no objection and no local objection had been received. In addition, no environmental complaint had been received by DEP in the past 3 years. Besides, approval conditions restricting the operation hours and types of activities and vehicles on site were recommended. Regarding AC for T/NT's concern on insufficient width of access road, an approval condition restricting all reversing manoeuvring of vehicles to be carried out inside the site was recommended.

103. Members had no question on the application.

#### Deliberation Session

104. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 28.3.2011, 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 8:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, was allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no vehicle dismantling, maintenance, repairing, cleansing, paint spraying and other workshop activities should be carried out at the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) no vehicle without valid licences issued under the Traffic Regulations was allowed to be parked/stored at the site at any time during the planning approval period;



- (d) all reversing manoeuvring of vehicles for operations should be carried out inside the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) all existing landscape plantings on the site should be maintained at all time during the planning approval period;
- (f) the submission of drainage proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 28.9.2008;
- (g) in relation to (f) above, the implementation of drainage proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB by 28.12.2008;
- (h) the submission of fire service installations proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 28.9.2008;
- (i) in relation to (h) above, the provision of fire service installations proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB by 28.12.2008;
- (j) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d) or (e) 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; and
- (k) if any of the above planning conditions (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.

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

- (a) resolve any land issues relating to the development with concerned owners

of the site;

- (b) renew planning permission before continuing the applied use at the application site;
- (c) note the District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department's comments that the lots were Old Schedule Agricultural Lots held under Block Government Lease under which no structures were allowed to be erected without prior approval from his office;
- (d) note the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/New Territories, Transport Department's comments that the land status of the proposed access between the site and Fan Kam Road should be checked;
- (e) note the Director of Environmental Protection's comments that the applicant should follow the latest "Code of Practice on Handling Environment Aspects of Temporary Uses and Open Storage Sites" issued by Environmental Protection Department;
- (f) note the Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department's comments that the existing drainage facilities should be reviewed if it was necessary to modify the existing drainage facilities on site to suit the latest extent of the site;
- (g) note the Director of Fire Services's comments that detailed fire safety requirements would be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans. In consideration of the design/nature of the proposed structures, fire service installations (FSIs) were anticipated to be required. Therefore, the applicant was advised to submit relevant building plans incorporated with the proposed FSIs to his department for approval even though the submission of general building plans was not required under the Buildings Ordinance;

- (h) 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 suitable 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
  
- (i) note the Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services's comments that the "Code of Practice on Working near Electricity Supply Lines" established under the Electricity Lines (Protection) Regulation should be observed by the applicant and his contractors when carrying out works in the vicinity of the electricity supply lines. Prior to establishing any structure in the vicinity of the low voltage overhead lines, the applicant and his contractors should liaise with CLP Power Hong Kong Limited to divert the existing low voltage overhead lines away from the vicinity of the proposed development.

[Ms. Anna S.Y. Kwong returned to join the meeting at this point.]

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

- (xiv) A/YL-TYST/384 Temporary Vehicle Repair Workshop with Ancillary Office and Store Rooms for a Period of 3 Years in "Undetermined" zone, Lots 1876RP(Part), 1882(Part) and 1889(Part) in DD 117 and Adjoining Government Land, Kung Um Road, Yuen Long  
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TYST/384)
- 

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

106. Miss Paulina Y.L. Kwan, STP/TMYL, informed Members that letters from the applicant dated 25.3.2008 and 26.3.2008 each including a letter from locals clarifying the application details in response to public comments received had been tabled for Members reference. She went on to present the application and covered the following aspects as

detailed in the Paper :

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the temporary vehicle repair workshop with ancillary office and store rooms for a period of 3 years;
- (c) departmental comments – the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) did not support the application as there were sensitive receivers located to the immediate west and south-west and in the vicinity of the application site, and environmental nuisance was expected;
- (d) two public comments were received during the statutory publication period objecting on grounds of adverse environmental and traffic impacts and nuisance to local residents; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The development for vehicle repair workshop was not compatible with the surrounding land uses with cultivated/fallow agricultural land, gardening sites and scattered residential structures. The open storage yards, workshops and warehouses in the vicinity were suspected unauthorized developments subject to enforcement action taken by the Planning Authority. There were two residential structures to the immediate west and south-west of the site and DEP did not support the application on environmental protection ground. There was insufficient information in the submission to address the potential environmental nuisance and to demonstrate there would be no adverse impacts on drainage and landscaping of the site and the area. There were local objections against the application for environmental pollution, traffic and safety reasons.

107. Members had no question on the application.

## Deliberation Session

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

- (a) the development was considered not compatible with the residential structures located to the immediate west and southwest and in the vicinity; and
- (b) there was insufficient information in the submission to demonstrate that the proposed development would not generate adverse environmental and drainage impacts on the surrounding areas.

[The Chairperson thanked Mr. W.M. Lam, Mr. Anthony C.Y. Lee and Miss Paulina Y.L. Kwan, STPs/TMYL, for their attendance to answer Members' enquires. Messrs. Lam, Lee and Miss Kwan left the meeting at this point.]

## **Agenda Item 10**

### Any Other Business

109. The Chairperson said that the Chief Executive had appointed 6 officials and 31 non-officials to the Town Planning Board (the Board) for a two-year term from 1.4.2008 and the Board's new membership was gazetted today. Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong had been appointed as the Vice-chairman of the Board. Mr. Alfred Donald Yap and Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong were appointed as the Vice-chairman of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) and the Metro Planning Committee respectively. Of the 31 non-official members, six were newly appointed, including Professor Edwin H.W. Chan, Mr. Rock C.N. Chen, Dr. Ellen Y.Y. Lau, Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee, Mr. Timothy K.W. Ma and Dr. Winnie S.M. Tang. Five members of the RNTPC, the Vice-Chairman Mr. K.K. Wong, Dr. Lily Chiang, Professor Peter R. Hills, Ms. Carmen K.M. Kan, Professor Nora F.Y. Tam were retiring from the TPB. Two members from the MPC, Ms. Maggie M.K. Chan and Professor Paul K.S. Lam, will join the RNTPC.

110. As this was the last MPC meeting of the current term, the Chairperson took the opportunity to thank Members for their dedication and support to the work for the Board over the past two years.

111. The Vice-Chairman also gave a vote of thanks to Members for their support in his term at the RNTPC.

112. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 5:00 p.m..