

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 761st Meeting of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee held at 2:30 p.m. on 14.3.2025

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Chairperson

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Vice- chairperson

Mr K.W. Leung

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Dr C.M. Cheng

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

Professor B.S. Tang

Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories East,
Transport Department
Mr K.L. Wong

Chief Engineer (Works),
Home Affairs Department
Mr Bond C.P. Chow

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory North),
Environmental Protection Department
Ms Clara K.W. U

Assistant Director/Regional 3,
Lands Department
Mr Lawrance S.C. Chan

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Ms Donna Y.P. Tam

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Simon Y.S. Wong

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Katy C.W. Fung

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Sandy S.Y. Yik

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 760th RNTPC Meeting held on 28.2.2025

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 760th RNTPC meeting held on 28.2.2025 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Deferral Cases

Sections 12A and 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Presentation and Question Sessions

3. The Committee noted that there were 22 cases requesting the Town Planning Board to defer consideration of the applications. Details of the requests for deferral, Members' declaration of interests for individual cases and the Committee's views on the declared interests were in **Annex 1**.

Deliberation Session

4. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer decisions on the applications as requested by the applicants pending submission of further information, as recommended in the Papers.

Renewal Cases

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Presentation and Question Sessions

5. The Committee noted that there were three cases for renewal of temporary planning approval and the Planning Department had no objection to the applications. Details of the planning applications were in **Annex 2**.

Deliberation Session

6. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the applications on a temporary basis for the applied renewal periods on the terms of the applications as submitted to the Town Planning Board subject to the approval conditions, if any, stated in the Papers. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicants to note the advisory clauses, if any, as set out in the appendix of the Papers.

Cases for Streamlining Arrangement

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Presentation and Question Sessions

7. The Committee noted that there were 22 cases selected for streamlining arrangement and the Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the applications for temporary uses for the applied/recommended periods. Details of the planning applications were in **Annex 3**.

Deliberation Session

8. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the applications on a temporary basis for the applied periods or the periods as recommended by PlanD on the terms of the applications as submitted to the Town Planning Board subject to the approval conditions, if any, stated in the Papers. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicants to note the advisory clauses, if any, as set out in the appendix of the Papers.

[Messrs K.W. Leung, Ryan M.K. Ip, Rocky L.K. Poon and Bond C.P. Chow joined the meeting at this point.]

Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East District

Agenda Item 4

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Y/YL-SK/1 Application for Amendment to the Approved Shek Kong Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-SK/9, To rezone the application site from “Residential (Group D)” to “Residential (Group C)” and amend the Notes of the zone applicable to the site, Lots 246, 247 (Part), 251 (Part), 253 (Part), 254, 255 (Part), 256, 257, 258 (Part), 260, 263 S.A, 263 RP, 273 RP, 274, 275, 277, 278 S.B, 279, 280, 284, 294 RP, 295, 849, 850, 851 (Part), 853, 856 (Part), 859 (Part), 861 (Part) and 862 in D.D. 112 and Adjoining Government Land, Kam Sheung Road, Shek Kong, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. Y/YL-SK/1A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

9. The following representatives from the Planning Department (PlanD) and the applicant’s representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

PlanD

- | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|
| Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo | - | District Planning Officer/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (DPO/FSYLE) |
| Mr Kimson P.H. Chiu | - | Senior Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (STP/FSYLE) |
| Mr Louis H.W. Cheung | - | Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East |

Applicant's Representatives

KTA Planning Limited

Ms Pauline Lam

Ms Camille Lam

Mr Elden Chan

Mott Macdonald Hong Kong Limited

Ms May Tse

Ms Edith Chow

Westwood Hong & Associates Limited

Ms Kit Wong

China Hong Kong Ecology Consultants Limited

Dr Mark Shea

CTA Consultants Limited

Mr Kelvin Leung

10. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the meeting. He then invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the background of the application.

11. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Kimson P.H. Chiu, STP/FSYLE, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed rezoning of the application site (the Site) from "Residential (Group D)" ("R(D)") to "Residential (Group C)" ("R(C)") to facilitate a proposed low-density private residential development, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. PlanD had no in-principle objection to the application.

12. The Chairperson then invited the applicant's representatives to elaborate on the application. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Pauline Lam, the applicant's representative, made the following main points:

Site History and Background

- (a) the Site was zoned “R(D)” on the Shek Kong Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) gazetted in 1994 with the planning intention primarily for improving and upgrading of existing temporary structures within the rural areas through redevelopment of existing structures into permanent buildings. The “R(D)” zone had remained unchanged since then. The designation of the “R(D)” zone was to echo with the Government’s policy in 1980s for designating rural upgrading areas to tackle the problem of high concentration of temporary structures scattered in rural areas. A small portion in the northern part of the Site was occupied by open storage use and about 80% of the southern part of the Site was vacant and overgrown with vegetation;

Suitability for Rezoning

- (b) according to their analysis conducted on “R(D)” zones in the New Territories, as of March 2025, about 432 hectares (ha) of land in the “R(D)” zones remained unchanged in terms of site conditions. Among 1,430 planning applications involving “R(D)” zone since January 2007, only a small proportion (i.e. 4.7%) pertained to small-scale residential developments such as New Territories Exempted House, ‘Flat’ or ‘House’ uses, while the majority of planning applications (i.e. about 95.3%) were for open storage use, which was not in line with the planning intention of the “R(D)” zone. In that regard, the planning intention of the “R(D)” for residential development had not been materialised;
- (c) the “R(D)” zones in rural areas were mainly designated due to various development constraints, including fragmented ownership, limited infrastructural capacity and site constraints. Individual lot owners would develop their land parcels for residential use with a relatively low plot ratio (PR). Nevertheless, the Site was not subject to the abovementioned constraints, as land ownership had been consolidated with a sizable area

and high accessibility, which was favourable for residential development with a higher development intensity;

- (d) at the territorial level, the Site, situated in the southwestern portion of the Northern Metropolis, served as a new engine for future development of Hong Kong and was one of the main sources of housing land supply in the next 20 years. The proposed development would contribute to the short-to-medium term housing supply. The proposed development was also in line with the recommendations of 'Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030' published in 2021 as Kam Tin South and Pak Heung area was identified as the major committed land supply for housing development, and the Land Use Review of Kam Tin South and Pat Heung (KTS/PH Land Use Review) was conducted in 2014 with the findings indicating that the area was suitable for development into a suburban township. The proposed development, located about 700m away from the eastern periphery of Kam Tin South and Pat Heung development, could contribute to the suburban township;
- (e) in the local context, the Site was situated in an area predominated by low-density residential developments (Wah Yuen and village clusters of Lai Uk Tsuen and Lin Fa Tei) intermixed with open storage use, fallow agricultural land and abandoned land. The proposed development was considered compatible with the existing low-density developments in the surrounding areas;
- (f) based on the current planning circumstances and land uses at the Site, retaining the Site as "R(D)" zone was considered inappropriate. The current development restrictions on the "R(D)" zone would undermine the development potential of the Site, resulting in underutilisation of land resources. With reference to other "R(C)" zones with similar development parameters as the current rezoning application, it was considered that the proposed development parameters with a maximum PR of 0.8 and a maximum building height (BH) of 6 storeys for the Site were appropriate;

Planning Gains

- (g) the proposed development would not cause adverse impacts based on the submitted technical assessments and there were no objection/adverse comments from concerned government departments. According to the submission, drainage and traffic improvement measures were proposed;
- (h) in view of the existing blockage of a section of the northern engineering channel currently located at the Site and in its vicinity, a new drainage system was proposed to reconnect the upstream and downstream of the existing channel currently running through the Site. A total of five sets of new channels and associated pipes were proposed to collect surface runoff from the surrounding areas and direct it to the public channel to the north; and
- (i) various traffic improvement works were proposed, including widening the existing footpath and pedestrian crossing at the section of Kam Sheung Road outside the Site, and improvement works at the junction of Kam Sheung Road and Kam Tin Road.

13. As the presentations of PlanD's representative and the applicant's representative had been completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

Site Configuration and Interface with Private Land outside the Site

14. The Vice-chairperson and a Member raised the following questions:

- (a) given the irregular configuration of the Site, whether there were any constraints on the development potential of the residual areas surrounding the Site, should the rezoning application be agreed; and
- (b) noting that the Site had not included four private lots located in the southern part of the Site, what planning procedures would be required if the four private lots were eventually included in the proposed scheme.

15. In response, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) should the rezoning application be agreed, PlanD would either propose a more rationalised boundary for the “R(C)” zone, taking into account the residual land around the Site, or review whether the entire “R(D)” zone could be rezoned to “R(C)”, subject to consultation with relevant government departments. Proposed amendments to the OZP, taking into account the current rezoning application and the review results, would be submitted to the Committee for consideration at a later stage; and
- (b) PlanD’s review would cover the residual land around the Site currently zoned “R(D)” including the four private lots encircled by the Site.

16. In response to two Members’ enquiries regarding any update on the acquisition of the remaining private lots outside the Site within the “R(D)” zone for incorporation into the proposed development and how a comprehensive development could be achieved given that private land was encircled or enclosed by the proposed development, Ms Pauline Lam, the applicant’s representative, said that the Site comprised 99% private land and only 1% government land. The applicant would continue to explore ways to assemble other surrounding private lots within the “R(D)” zone and there was no update at the current stage. The master layout plan under the indicative scheme had given due regard to addressing the interface between the Site and un-acquired private land near the Site by providing car parking spaces with landscaping areas at the peripheries of the Site as buffer and possible future connections to the un-acquired private land.

17. In response to the Chairperson’s enquiry on whether access would be provided to the four private lots encircled by the Site, Ms Pauline Lam, the applicant’s representative, said that footpaths were proposed within the Site to allow free access to those private lots to and from the existing local tracks in the surrounding areas, and vehicular access for emergency vehicles through the proposed development would also be allowed in case of emergency.

Sewerage Impacts

18. The Vice-chairperson and some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) detailed arrangements for the proposed drainage improvement works to be implemented by the applicant at the Site, and whether the design of open channel with water bodies would be considered;
 - (b) noting that the southern engineering channel was wider than the northern engineering channel as shown in Drawing Z-6 of the Paper, which might have a larger carrying capacity, whether the proposed drainage system could be connected to the southern engineering channel instead of the northern one as proposed;
 - (c) the reason(s) for proposing a box culvert in curved alignment, and whether there would be any drainage impact on the surrounding areas;
 - (d) the flood protection standard adopted for the design and planning of the proposed drainage improvement works;
 - (e) given the large number of objecting public comments on the rezoning application from Yuen Long District Council members, Pat Heung Rural Committee members and local villagers due to sewerage/drainage concerns, whether the applicant had endeavored to liaise with the Pat Heung Rural Committee and the locals to address their concerns; and
 - (f) the responsibilities for the maintenance and management (M&M) of the proposed drainage improvement works within and outside the Site.
19. In response, Ms Pauline Lam and Ms May Tse, the applicant's representatives, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:
- (a) an existing watercourse near Wah Yuen and the northern engineering channel were found running through the Site. Due to the observed

blockage in the northern engineering channel, a new drainage system was proposed, including an underground box culvert (3m (W) X 2.5m (H)) to reconnect the upstream and downstream of the existing channel, and five sets of new channels with associated pipes near Wah Yuen to intercept flow to the proposed box culvert would be provided within the Site. Besides, a new concrete channel with floodwalls and box culverts was proposed outside the Site to its southwest at Lin Fa Tei to reconnect the upstream and downstream of the existing northern engineering channel (Drawing Z-6 of the Paper). Other options suggested by the Committee would be conveyed to the applicant for consideration at the detailed design stage;

- (b) although the width of the northern and southern engineering channels varied, both had similar carrying capacities in terms of flood prevention. The southern engineering channel was at a level higher than the Site and the surrounding areas, and more engineering works would be required to overcome the level difference and technical issues if the proposed drainage system had to be connected to the southern engineering channel;
- (c) the alignment of the proposed box culverts had taken into account land ownership, site configuration, site conditions and surrounding drainage systems when devising the proposed drainage improvement works. Five sets of new channels were proposed to collect surface runoff generated from the surrounding areas (i.e. Wah Yuen) to the downstream of the northern engineering channel. The size of box culvert had been examined and found to be sufficient to accommodate the additional surface runoff generated from the surrounding catchment areas;
- (d) the proposed drainage improvement works could cater for extreme weather conditions according to the submitted Drainage Impact Assessment, which could attain flood protection standards of 1 in 10 years, 1 in 50 years and 1 in 200 years;
- (e) the proposed drainage improvement works were capable of handling the surface runoff collected from the surrounding areas, e.g. Wah Yuen. The

current rezoning application, including the proposed drainage improvement works, was circulated to the Home Affairs Department by PlanD for seeking comments from the relevant District Council and Rural Committee; and

- (f) the applicant would design and build the proposed drainage improvement works, including the section running through the Site and another section outside the Site from the southwestern end of the Site to Lin Fa Tei. The M&M responsibilities of the section within the Site would be taken up by the future property owners while the section outside the Site would be borne by the applicant.

20. Noting that the proposed drainage system, which would also serve the public, were located within the Site, a Member enquired whether there would be any implication on the drainage services in the surrounding areas. In response, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, said that the proposed drainage system, which would be connected to the public channel, would be administered at the general building plans submission stage and would be maintained by the future property owners/applicant as proposed by the applicant (as stated in paragraph 19(f) above).

Traffic Improvements

21. Noting that the proposed junction improvement works at Kam Sheung Road and Kam Tin Road fell outside the Site, the Chairperson and a Member asked how the above junction improvement works could be implemented timely to tie in with the population intake of the proposed development. In response, Ms Pauline Lam and Mr Kelvin Leung, the applicant's representatives, said that the proposed traffic improvement works, including widening the existing footpath from 1m to 2m wide, providing a pedestrian crossing at the section of Kam Sheung Road outside the Site, and the improvement works at the junction of Kam Sheung Road and Kam Tin Road, largely fell within government land. The above works to be implemented by the applicant would be a further improvement to the proposed improvement works to be undertaken by the Highways Department (HyD). If the proposed works to be carried out by the Government were not implemented in time before the population intake of the proposed development, the applicant was committed to carrying out

the improvement works proposed by the applicant, at its own cost, in advance.

22. In response to a Member's follow-up enquiries on the required procedures to implement the proposed junction improvement works if they were undertaken by the applicant and the potential impact on the proposed development should objections arise during the gazettal process under the relevant ordinance, Ms Pauline Lam and Mr Kelvin Leung, the applicant's representatives, said that junction improvement works under private development project would be processed according to the established procedures under the lands administration regime. If the proposed junction improvement works deemed to be major works and required gazettal under relevant ordinance, the process would take about 9 to 15 months. No gazettal would be required if the proposed junction improvement works were classified as minor works. Relevant government departments including the Transport Department (TD) and HyD were consulted and had no adverse comment on the submitted Traffic Impact Assessment. Relevant clauses could be incorporated in the land lease to require the implementation of the proposed junction improvement works prior to the population intake of the proposed development.

23. In response to a Member's enquiry regarding the interpretation of level-of-service (LOS) A attained for the proposed widened footpath at Kam Sheung Road to the north of the Site, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, said that according to the Transport Planning and Design Manual published by TD, 'LOS' ranging from A to F would indicate the satisfactory level of pedestrian flow. 'LOS A' implied that pedestrians basically moved in desired paths without altering their movements in response to other pedestrians, walking speeds were freely selected and conflicts between pedestrians were unlikely.

24. Noting that the implementation of all 14 potential development sites identified in the KTS/PH Land Use Review was subject to the constraint of transport infrastructural capacity, a Member asked whether the planned transport capacity could cater for the proposed development. In response, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that among the 14 potential development sites, three were for public housing developments with site formation works in progress, and there was no implementation programme for other sites for planned public/private developments at the current juncture. Given the proximity to MTR Kam Sheung Road Station, the development sites identified under the KTS/PH Land Use Review had higher development intensities in

order to optimise land resources, which resulted in higher requirements for infrastructural capacity accordingly. On the contrary, for the current rezoning application, the proposed PR was 0.8 providing about 850 flats, which was much lower than that of the development sites of the KTS/PH Land Use Review, and hence the requirements for supporting infrastructures were relatively lower. The technical assessments had demonstrated that no adverse impacts were anticipated from the proposed development with the proposed mitigation measures.

BH

25. Noting that the Site fell within an area affected by the Shek Kong Airfield Height Restriction (SKAHR), the Chairperson enquired about the SKAHR and its implication on the proposed development. In response, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that the BH of proposed development would not exceed the height limit of 69 metres above the Hong Kong Principal Datum as stipulated under the SKAHR for the area covering the Site.

Government, Institution and Community (GIC) Provision

26. In response to the Vice-chairperson's enquiry on whether any assessment on provision of GIC facilities on a district basis was conducted and whether there was GIC facility provided in the proposed development to address the potential shortfall, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, said that while the Site was located in Yuen Long district, the existing and planned GIC facilities serving the locality were largely concentrated in areas near MTR Kam Sheung Road Station. Given the rural character and location of the Site which was not in close proximity to the transport node such as MTR Kam Sheung Road Station, there was no provision of large-scale GIC facility in the locality and the applicant did not propose any GIC facility in the development at the Site.

27. As the applicant's representatives had no further points to raise and there were no further questions from Members, the Chairperson informed the applicant's representatives that the hearing procedure of the application had been completed and the Committee would deliberate on the application in their absence and inform the applicant of the Committee's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked PlanD's representatives and the applicant's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

28. The Chairman remarked that the planning intention of the “R(D)” zone was primarily for improvement and upgrading of existing temporary structures within the rural areas through redevelopment of existing temporary structures into permanent buildings. The developments under the “R(D)” zone were predominantly individual house developments. The current application sought to rezone the Site to “R(C)” with higher PR and BH compared to those permitted under the “R(D)” zone, which should be assessed based on relevant planning considerations including land use compatibility and technical feasibility. The applicant submitted the current application with supporting technical assessments in 2022 and relevant government departments consulted had no objection to or adverse comment on the submitted technical assessments and the application. The applicant would provide footpaths to the four private lots encircled by the Site, and would allow vehicular access for emergency vehicles to those lots via the proposed development. PlanD, in consultation with relevant government departments, would conduct a review of the remaining areas outside the Site within the “R(D)” zone, and the proposed amendments taking into account the review results would be submitted to the Committee for consideration in one go, should the rezoning application be agreed.

29. Members had no in-principle objection to the rezoning application and acknowledged that the applicant had endeavoured to address various technical issues arising from the proposed development with mitigation measures. A Member opined that the commitments undertaken by the applicant to carry out traffic and drainage improvement works were appreciated. The strategic location of the Site, falling within the Northern Metropolis, was considered suitable for the proposed development to meet the housing demand. Approval of the rezoning application might incentivise the applicant to explore ways to assemble adjacent private lots for a more comprehensive development.

30. The Vice-chairperson and two Members had the following observations:

- (a) detailed implementation programme and procedures of the proposed road improvement works were not ascertained at the current juncture, which might have implication on the implementation of the proposed development.

It was likely that the proposed junction improvement works required gazettal under the relevant ordinance and time would be required to resolve the objections received. This might delay the implementation of the proposed improvement works, and consequently, either the implementation of the proposed development would be deferred or traffic congestion issues might arise if the development proceeded before the improvement works were completed;

- (b) there should be a mechanism to ensure that the proposed traffic and drainage improvement works would be implemented by the applicant; and
- (c) the irregular configuration of the Site constrained its development as well as that of the surrounding land, and posed interface issues with adjacent private lots not included in the Site.

31. The Chairperson said that PlanD in consultation with relevant government departments would conduct a review of the “R(D)” zone to explore the feasibility of rezoning the entire “R(D)” zone to “R(C)” or rationalising the boundary of the proposed “R(C)” zone. The proposed amendments to the OZP taking into account the review results would be submitted to the Committee for consideration should the rezoning application be agreed. The implementation of the proposed traffic and drainage improvement works could be included in the land lease. Regarding a Member’s concern about the possible lag time between the implementation of the proposed junction improvement works and the population intake, Mr K.L. Wong, Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories East, said that apart from the land lease, TD could raise objection to the issuance of occupation permit if the proposed traffic improvement works had not yet been implemented.

32. After deliberation, the Committee decided to agree to the application. The relevant proposed amendments to the Shek Kong Outline Zoning Plan, together with the revised Notes and Explanatory Statement, would be submitted to the Committee for consideration prior to gazetting under the Town Planning Ordinance.

[The meeting was adjourned for a 5-minute break.]

Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West District

Agenda Item 5

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Y/YL/21 Application for Amendment to the Approved Yuen Long Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL/27, To rezone the application site from “Residential (Group A)” to “Residential (Group A) 9” and to amend the Notes of the zone applicable to the site, Lot 3678 in D.D. 120, Yuen Long

(RNTPC Paper No. Y/YL/21)

Presentation and Question Sessions

33. The following representatives from the Planning Department (PlanD) and the applicant’s representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

PlanD

Mr Raymond H.F. Au	-	District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (DPO/TMYLW)
Ms Carol K.L. Kan	-	Senior Town Planner/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (STP/TMYLW)
Ms Carmen K.K. Cheung	-	Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East

Applicant and his Representatives

Full Year Limited - Applicant

Mr Kwok Sum Wong

Ms Karrie Cheuk Yiu Wong

DeSPACE (International) Limited

Mr Greg Kwok Chun Lam

Mr Endy Shing Tai Cheng

Ms Samantha Yui Ning Ng

I Consultants & Contracting Company Limited

Mr Calvin Ka Hing Fung

Ms Amy Sik Hie Wong

Ms Emily Wan Kiu Tsang

Ms Jody Cho Ying Wan

DF Consultancy Co. Limited

Mr Ding Fung Lam

S. T. Wong & Partners Limited

Mr Shing Tsang Wong

Mr James Kwun Yip Lo

CTA Consultants Limited

Mr Kelvin Chi Wai Leung

34. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the meeting. He then invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the background of the application.

35. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Carol K.L. Kan, STP/TMYLW, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed rezoning of the Site from "Residential (Group A)" ("R(A)") to "Residential (Group A) 9" ("R(A)9") to facilitate a proposed private residential development with social welfare facility (i.e. residential care home for the elderly (RCHE)), departmental comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. PlanD had no in-principle objection to the application.

36. The Chairperson then invited the applicant's representatives to elaborate on the

application. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Messrs Greg Kwok Chun Lam and Ding Fung Lam, the applicant's representatives, made the following main points:

Proposed Development Parameters

- (a) the rezoning application was made mainly to facilitate the development of an RCHE. A new set of Notes for the "R(A)9" zone was proposed, with the same Column 1 uses as "R(A)" zone. The Site fell entirely within the private lot owned by the applicant. The boundary for the proposed "R(A)9" zone was in line with the lot boundary;
- (b) the Site was involved in a previous section 16 planning application (s.16 application) for minor relaxation of plot ratio (PR) restriction for permitted flat, social welfare facility and shop and services. As relevant government departments had no objection to the technical assessments to support the previous s.16 application, the development parameters with a domestic PR of 3.96 and a non-domestic PR of 8.01 (equivalent to maximum non-domestic gross floor area (GFA) of 1,522m² (PR 1.95) for shop and services and 4,723m² (PR 6.06) for RCHE) under the proposed development of the rezoning application remained identical as those in the previous s.16 application, which was rejected mainly on the ground that the proposed relaxation of non-domestic PR from 1.98 to 8.01 (i.e. +305%), resulting in an increase in total PR from 5.94 to 11.97 (i.e. +101%), was considered excessive and could not be regarded as minor. The building height (BH) under the proposed "R(A)9" zone would remain unchanged as the current "R(A)" zone subject to a maximum of 30 storeys, which was considered sufficient to accommodate both the proposed domestic and non-domestic uses;

In line with Policy Direction

- (c) the Site was originally pursued for residential cum commercial development prior to the promulgation of "Incentive Scheme to Encourage Provision of RCHE Premises in New Private Developments – Time-limited

Enhancements” (the Incentive Scheme) on 20.6.2023. According to the Incentive Scheme, GFA concession for RCHE subject to a cap of no more than 12,000m² in total might be granted subject to compliance with the Town Planning Ordinance. If the proposed RCHE was not permitted or would result in development parameters in exceedance of the restrictions stipulated under the statutory plan, planning application was required. Relevant issue was discussed by the Legislative Council Panel on Welfare Services at its meeting on 12.6.2023, which also stated that the total GFA of the eligible RCHE would be exempted and would not be counted in the original total permissible GFA of the entire project under the lease, allowing the developers to use the original permissible GFA for other purposes. In that regard, more incentive was provided to the developers due to greater flexibility given to the development projects. Relevant authorities would consider giving policy support based on the merits of each development scheme. For the subject case, the Social Welfare Department (SWD) had rendered in-principle support to the proposed development;

Provision of Quality Service

- (d) the demand for subsidised residential care services for elderly (RCSE) was pressing. There were about 17,000 applicants in the waitlist for various types of subsidised RCSE as at 31.1.2025, and the average waiting time was about 19 months for subvented homes and contract homes, and 5 months for private homes participating in the Enhanced Bought Place Scheme, based on the information as at 31.1.2025. There was no private RCHE in the densely populated Tin Shui Wai area, and the elderly persons were required to apply cross-district RCHE in Tuen Mun or Yuen Long district. The proposed RCHE could not only meet the acute community demand for subsidised RCSE, but also provide quality service. The applicant had endeavored to study the operation, demand and supply of RCHE, including on-site inspection, in particular, in Yuen Long area, for three to four months. The proposed RCHE was also devised in consultation with experienced practitioners in the field in order to provide

quality and genuine RCSE;

- (e) after the Residential Care Homes Legislation (Miscellaneous Amendments) Ordinance came into effect on 16.6.2023, a number of RCHEs in Yuen Long district which failed to meet the minimum area of floor space of 9.5m² per resident were anticipated to cease operation. The area of floor space for each resident of the proposed RCHE under the current rezoning application was about 22.2m², which was two times higher than the required standard. Besides, the Site situated at the centre of Yuen Long town was easily accessible, which would encourage family members to make more frequent visits and promote the concept of living in the community; and
- (f) piling works at the Site commenced in 2022 for pursuing residential cum commercial development. In view of the acute demand for RCHE, the applicant had ceased construction and prepared for a new layout and planning application for about one and a half years, despite additional piling works would be required to cater for additional RCHE facility (i.e. from 3/F to 9/F in the indicative scheme).

37. As the presentations of PlanD's representative and the applicant's representatives had been completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

Operation and Manpower of Proposed RCHE

38. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) noting that Residential Care Services Scheme in Guangdong was launched, how the occupancy rate could be guaranteed for the proposed RCHE;
- (b) recruitment of sufficient and qualified care workers to support operation of the proposed RCHE;
- (c) whether the proposed RCHE would be operated by the applicant or

contracted out to an RCHE operator; and

- (d) whether the fee would be affordable by the general public.

39. In response, Messrs Greg Kwok Chun Lam and Ding Fung Lam, the applicant's representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) the Site was at a convenient location and the proposed average floor area per resident would comply with the latest requirements and design standards. Several potential service operators, whose RCHEs could not meet the latest requirements, had expressed interest in operating the proposed RCHE. The occupancy rate of the proposed RCHE, which would provide about 170 bedspaces, was anticipated to be high;
- (b) with the launch of the Special Scheme to Import Care Workers for Residential Care Homes and the concerted efforts of practitioners in the sector, manpower shortage affecting the service quality of RCHEs was not anticipated;
- (c) the applicant was committed to providing a quality RCHE. A service quality enhancement vetting committee would be established, comprising experienced practitioners in RCHE licensing and social work sectors, and non-government organisation(s). The quality of the RCHE would be assured, regardless of whether it was operated by the applicant or outsourced to an operator; and
- (d) unlike high-end private elderly residences such as Ventria Residence in Happy Valley or the RCHE in Yoho Mall, the business model for the proposed RCHE was different and targeted for the general public. The lower floors would provide affordable accommodation for the general public, while the upper floors would offer higher quality services. Besides, as the number of residential care service vouchers (valued at about \$16,000) had increased by 1,000, which would be widely used, this could help the proposed RCHE achieve financial sustainability.

Implementation

40. The Chairperson and a Member raised the following questions:

- (a) the implementation of various design measures which were proposed outside the Site; and
- (b) the overall implementation programme of the proposed RCHE.

41. In response, Mr Greg Kwok Chun Lam, the applicant's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed design measures (i.e. streetscape improvement) could be incorporated in the land lease, similar to the case of the youth hostel in Yuen Long. Relevant government departments including the Lands Department and the Highways Department were consulted. The applicant would implement the proposed design measures while the future maintenance could be taken up by the Government or the applicant. The detailed arrangements could be dealt with during the land administration stage; and
- (b) the applicant had explored different measures to expedite the development process, including the adoption of Modular Integrated Construction. The proposed RCHE was scheduled for completion within 3 to 4 years, including the processing of the lease modification.

Development Control on Number of Bedspaces

42. Referring to the GFA restriction stipulated in the proposed Notes of the Outline Zoning Plan, a Member enquired whether the proposed number of bedspaces under the indicative scheme would also be stipulated in the Notes. Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, said that the proposed number of bedspaces (i.e. 170) in the development scheme was indicative only. The applicant had also indicated in the submission that the

proposed number of bedspaces would be in a range of 160 to 220 subject to detailed design. In other words, the number of bedspaces would be determined at the later detailed design stage subject to future market demand and the operation mode. Specifying only the GFA restriction for the RCHE in the Notes could allow greater flexibility in the proposed development. Mr Greg Kwok Chun Lam, the applicant's representative, supplemented that other mechanisms were in place to control and scrutinise the number of bedspaces, including stipulation in the land lease during the lease modification process and specification in the licensing plan, which would be reviewed by SWD before the submission of general building plans.

43. As the applicant's representatives had no further points to raise and there were no further questions from Members, the Chairperson informed the applicant's representatives that the hearing procedure of the application had been completed and the Committee would deliberate on the application in their absence and inform the applicant of the Committee's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked PlanD's representatives and the applicant's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

44. The Chairperson remarked that the development parameters of the current rezoning application were the same as those in the previous s.16 application for minor relaxation of PR restriction, which was rejected as the relaxation of PR sought was considered excessive and could not be regarded as minor. The current rezoning application was submitted mainly to accommodate the permitted social welfare facility with non-domestic GFA of 4,723m² at the Site while the BH restriction of 30 storeys for the "R(A)" zone would remain unchanged. The Site was located in the Yuen Long town centre with convenient accessibility and the surrounding land uses were mainly residential buildings with commercial use and RCHEs. SWD rendered support to the current application. Members were invited to express views on the application.

45. Members generally had no in-principle objection to the proposed development. A Member, while appreciating the provision of RCHE at the convenient location in Yuen Long district, expressed concern on the potential interface issue between the residential portion and the RCHE within the same building if separation access was not provided. The

proposed RCHE might also face keen competition as some RCHEs were currently under application for operation in Yuen Long district in the near future. Another Member referred to a previously approved planning application for minor relaxation of BH restriction for permitted RCHE and house development with conservation proposal for a Grade 3 historic building, namely 'Siu Lo' (筱廬), and concurred with the applicant that the proposed development would facilitate the provision of quality RCHE to replace those with poor conditions.

46. After deliberation, the Committee decided to agree to the application. The relevant proposed amendments to the Yuen Long Outline Zoning Plan, together with the revised Notes and Explanatory Statement, would be submitted to the Committee for consideration prior to gazetting under the Town Planning Ordinance.

Sai Kung and Islands District

[Ms Tammy S.N. Kong, Senior Town Planner/Sai Kung and Islands (STP/SKIs), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/SK-PK/304 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in
 "Recreation" Zone, Lots 293 S.B ss.2 and 293 S.B RP in D.D. 221, Sha
 Kok Mei, Sai Kung
 (RNTPC Paper No. A/SK-PK/304)

Presentation and Question Sessions

47. With the aid of some plans, Ms Tammy S.N. Kong, STP/SKIs, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed development, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The

Planning Department (PlanD) did not support the application.

48. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

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

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Recreation” zone which is primarily for recreational developments for the use of the general public. There is no strong justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention; and
- (b) land is still available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Sha Kok Mei for Small House development. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within the “V” zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services.”

[The Chairperson thanked PlanD’s representative for attending the meeting. She left the meeting at this point.]

Sha Tin, Tai Po and North District

[Mr Ryan C.K. Ho and Ms Ivy C.W. Wong, Senior Town Planners/Shan Tin, Tai Po and North (STPs/STN), and Mr Timothy W.P. Wu, Assistant Town Planner/Shan Tin, Tai Po and North (ATP/STN), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 11

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-HT/23 Proposed Temporary Public Utility Installation (Solar Photovoltaic System) for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Various Lots in D.D. 76, San Uk Tsai, Fanling
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-HT/23)

Presentation and Question Sessions

50. With the aid of some plans, Mr Ryan C.K. Ho, STP/STN, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed installation, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

51. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

52. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 14.3.2028, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board and subject to the approval conditions stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

Agenda Item 12

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-LYT/844 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Agriculture” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lot 639 S.C in D.D. 83, Kwan Tei Village, Fanling
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-LYT/844)

Presentation and Question Sessions

53. With the aid of some plans, Mr Ryan C.K. Ho, STP/STN, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed development, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

54. Noting that land available in the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Kwan Tei was sufficient to accommodate the outstanding Small House (SH) applications, a Member asked what sympathetic considerations were given for approving the previous and current applications. With the aid of some plans, Mr Ryan C.K. Ho, STP/STN, said that the application site (the Site) was the subject of a previous application (No. A/NE-LYT/603) submitted by the same applicant of the current application. The previous application was approved in 2017 mainly on the favourable considerations that the Site largely fell within the “V” zone, the proposed SH was in close proximity to the existing village proper and there were approved SHs applications nearby. The Site was sandwiched by three approved applications for SH developments (No. A/NE-LYT/527, 587 and 588) and an outstanding SH application being processed by the Lands Department to the immediate north and south respectively (Plan A-2a of the Paper). For the outstanding SH in the south, planning permission was not required as the proposed SH footprint fell entirely within the “V” zone. The current application was assessed based on the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for New Territories Exempted House (NTEH)/SH in New Territories in that application for SH with previous planning permission lapsed would be considered on its own merits and sympathetic consideration might be given if there are specific circumstances to justify the case, such as the site was an infill site among existing NTEH/SHs, the processing of the SH grant was at an advance stage. For the current application, the Lands Department advised that the SH grant application was still being processed and the proposed SH was in proximity to the village cluster, which warranted sympathetic considerations.

55. The Site straddled largely “V” zone (i.e. about 80%) with a small portion in the “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone. A Member enquired on whether the area within the “V” zone would be sufficient to accommodate the proposed SH without encroachment onto the “AGR” zone, and any justifications provided by the applicant to support the application. Mr Ryan

C.K. Ho, STP/STN, said that the footprint of proposed SH largely fell within “V” zone (i.e. 86%) with the remaining portion within the “AGR” zone (i.e. 14%). If the entire proposed footprint fell within the “V” zone, planning permission for SH was not required. Having said that, according to the applicant’s submission, the septic tank was proposed in the western portion of the Site and a buffer from the existing houses to the west in the vicinity would be maintained. As a result, the footprint of the proposed SH would encroach upon the “AGR” zone. In view of the site circumstances, the applicant had made efforts to confine the proposed SH footprint within the “V” zone as much as practicable.

Deliberation Session

56. The Chairperson remarked that while there might be room to review the location of the SH to avoid encroachment on the “AGR” zone, the proposed SH under the current application was generally similar to the previously approved one in that the proposed SH footprint under the current application largely aligned with the “V” zone.

57. A Member considered that the proposed footprint, though straddling the “AGR” zone, could achieve better utilisation of land resources on his own private lot. Another Member, whilst raising no objection to the application given the site background, expressed that more justifications should be given with regard to the encroachment onto the “AGR” zone for future similar cases as the planning intention of “AGR” zone was not for SH development. The Secretary said that the applicant should note that planning application was not required if the entire footprint of SH fell within the “V” zone. It was the applicant’s decision to design the footprint of the proposed SH and whether to not to submit the application.

58. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board. The permission should be valid until 14.3.2029, 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 Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

Agenda Items 17 to 20

Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-TKL/787 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 546 S.C ss. 1 in D.D. 77, Ping Che, Ta Kwu Ling

A/NE-TKL/788 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 546 S.A ss. 1 in D.D. 77, Ping Che, Ta Kwu Ling

A/NE-TKL/789 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 546 S.D ss. 1 in D.D. 77, Ping Che, Ta Kwu Ling

A/NE-TKL/792 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 546 S.I ss. 1 in D.D. 77, Ping Che, Ta Kwu Ling

(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TKL/787, 788, 789 and 792)

Presentation and Question Sessions

59. The Committee agreed that as the four applications for proposed house (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) were similar in nature and the application sites (the Sites) were located in close proximity to one another within the same “Agriculture” zone, they could be considered together.

60. With the aid of some plans, Ms Ivy C.W. Wong, STP/STN, briefed Members on the background of the applications, the proposed developments, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the applications.

61. Members had no question on the applications.

Deliberation Session

62. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the applications, on the terms of the applications as submitted to the Town Planning Board. Each of the permission should be valid until 14.3.2029, 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 Committee also agreed to advise the applicants to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Papers.

Agenda Item 21

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/NE-TKLN/94 Temporary Filling of Land for Vehicular Access for Permitted Agricultural Use for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 1650 (Part) and 1657 (Part) in D.D. 78, Ta Kwu Ling North
(RNTPC Paper No. A/NE-TKLN/94)

Presentation and Question Sessions

63. With the aid of some plans, Mr Timothy W.P. Wu, ATP/STN, briefed Members on the background of the application, the applied works, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department (PlanD) did not support the application.

64. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

65. Members generally agreed with PlanD’s recommendation to reject the application. A Member expressed that there was no detailed information on the operation of the proposed farm to support the application as mentioned in paragraph 11.1 of the Paper. In that regard, the Member opined that this consideration should be reflected in the rejection reason. The Chairperson suggested and the Committee agreed to incorporate the Member’s suggestion

with regard to the rejection reason.

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

- “(a) the filling of land is not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” zone which is primarily to retain and safeguard good quality agriculture land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes and to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis; and
- (b) the applicant fails to justify the need for filling of land to provide vehicular access to support the operation of a proposed farm.”

[The Chairperson thanked PlanD’s representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.]

Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East District

[Mr Kimson P.H. Chiu, Senior Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (STP/FSYLE), and Ms Jane C.K. Lau, Assistant Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (ATP/FSYLE), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 38

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-SK/376 Proposed Filling and Excavation of Land for Permitted House (New Territories Exempted House) in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 143 S.B RP in D.D. 112, Shek Kong, Yuen Long
(RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-SK/376B)

Presentation and Question Sessions

67. With the aid of some plans, Ms Jane C.K. Lau, ATP/FSYLE, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed works, departmental comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

68. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

69. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board. The permission should be valid until 14.3.2029, 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 approval conditions stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

[The Chairperson thanked PlanD’s representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.]

Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West District

[Ms Carol K.L. Kan, Senior Town Planner/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (STP/TMYLW), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 59

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL-TT/698 Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in
 “Agriculture” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lot 168 S.A in
 D.D. 118, Tai Tong, Yuen Long
 (RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-TT/698)

Presentation and Question Sessions

70. With the aid of some plans, Ms Carol K.L. Kan, STP/TMYLW, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed development, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

71. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

72. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board. The permission should be valid until 14.3.2029, 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 Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

Agenda Item 61

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/YL/321 Proposed Social Welfare Facility (Excluding those involving Residential Care) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, 3/F and 7/F, Tower 1, One North, 8 Hong Yip Street, Yuen Long (RNTPC Paper No. A/YL/321A)

Presentation and Question Sessions

73. With the aid of some plans, Ms Carol K.L. Kan, STP/TMYLW, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed use, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

74. Noting that a wide variety of social welfare facilities was proposed under the current application, a Member enquired on the operation mode and whether the applicant had relevant experiences in operating the proposed social welfare facilities. In response, Ms Carol K.L. Kan, STP/TMYLW, said that the subject office building was under the ownership of the applicant. According to the applicant, several non-government organisations, including Heep Hong Society, St James’ Settlement and Yang Memorial Methodist Social Service, had initially expressed interest in renting the application premises (the Premises) for operating the proposed social welfare facilities. The details of the arrangement, including the tenancy agreement, would be determined upon obtaining planning permission.

75. The same Member expressed concerns regarding the lack of detailed information on the operation and the overall layout of the proposed social welfare facilities as there might be interface and stereotyping issues as the public and the service users would share the same ancillary facilities in the building. It was not desirable to provide social welfare facilities at upper floors due to less convenient in terms of accessibility for service users. The applicant could apply for the sale of the premises in the subject building for provision of welfare facilities under the Labour and Welfare Bureau (LWB)/the Social Welfare Department (SWD)’s ‘Purchase of Premises for the Provision of Welfare Premises’ scheme.

76. Ms Carol K.L. Kan, STP/TMYLW, said that according to the applicant, some premises on 5/F of Tower 1 were leased out while the Premises (i.e. 3/F and 7/F of Tower 1) were largely vacant. The premises in Tower 1 (the subject building) in general were vacant and yet to be leased out with potential tenants while Tower 2 located to the west of Tower 1 was largely leased out for office uses.

Deliberation Session

77. The Chairperson remarked that the Premises fell within the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) zone and the application could provide flexibility for the applicant to consider the types of uses to be provided within the building, as the Premises could be allocated for office use, which was always permitted under the “OU(B)” zone.

78. A Member, whilst indicating no in-principle objection to the application and appreciating the provision of the proposed use in the subject Premises, said that the applicant might consider liaising with LWB/SWD for the purchase of the premises of the building for the provision of social welfare facilities. Another Member observed that as advised by SWD, the proposed social welfare facilities under the application were not standard services under SWD’s subvention scheme. The Chairperson said that it was subject to the applicant’s decision whether or not to implement the proposal, should the application be approved by the Committee.

79. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board. The permission should be valid until 14.3.2029, 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 Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

[The Chairperson thanked PlanD’s representative for attending the meeting. She left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 62

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

80. This was the last Rural and New Town Planning Committee meeting chaired by Mr Ivan M.K. Chung, Director of Planning, before his retirement. On behalf of all Members, the Vice-chairperson extended a vote of thanks to Mr Chung for his contributions to the Committee over the years and wished him a happy and healthy retirement. Mr Chung thanked Members for their support and dedication to the Committee's work.

81. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 5:20 p.m.

**Minutes of 761st Rural and New Town Planning Committee
(held on 14.3.2025)**

Deferral Cases

Requests for Deferment by Applicant for 2 Months

Item No.	Application No.*	Times of Deferment
3	Y/I-TCV/1	1 st
9	A/NE-FTA/259	1 st
14	A/NE-TK/822	2 nd [^]
15	A/NE-MUP/213	1 st
22	A/NE-TKLN/95	1 st
23	A/YL-KTN/1058	2 nd [^]
25	A/YL-KTN/1088	1 st
27	A/YL-KTN/1092	1 st
29	A/YL-KTS/1056	1 st
30	A/YL-KTS/1057	1 st
31	A/YL-KTS/1058	1 st
32	A/YL-KTS/1059	1 st
33	A/YL-KTS/1060	1 st
36	A/YL-PH/1048	1 st
39	A/YL-SK/408	1 st
42	A/HSK/546	1 st
43	A/HSK/547	1 st
47	A/YL-HTF/1185	1 st
48	A/YL-LFS/546	1 st
53	A/YL-TYST/1305	1 st
57	A/YL-TT/695	1 st
58	A/YL-TT/697	1 st

Note:

[^] *The 2nd Deferment was the last deferment and no further deferment would be granted unless under special circumstances and supported with strong justifications.*

Declaration of Interests

The Committee noted the following declaration of interests:

Item No.	Members' Declared Interests
3	The application was submitted by - Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho for his firm having

	Coral Ching Limited, which was in affiliation with Sun Hung Kai Real Estate Agency Limited and AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) was one of the consultants of the applicant.	current business dealings with Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited and AECOM
30	The application was submitted by CLP Power Hong Kong Limited (CLP).	- Mr Ryan M.K. Ip for being the vice-president and executive director of Public Policy Institute of Our Hong Kong Foundation which had received donations from CLP

The Committee noted that Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Ryan M.K. Ip had not joined the meeting yet.

* Refer to the agenda at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/RNTPC/Agenda/761_rnt_agenda.html for details of the planning applications.

**Minutes of 761st Rural and New Town Planning Committee
(held on 14.3.2025)**

Renewal Cases

Applications for renewal of temporary approval for 3 years

Item No.	Application No.	Renewal Application	Renewal Period
8	A/NE-YTT/3	Temporary Eating Place (Outside Seating Accommodation of a Restaurant) and Ancillary Vehicle Park in “Residential (Group D)” and “Government, Institution or Community” Zones, Lot 70 (Part) in D.D. 27 and Adjoining Government Land, Yim Tin Tsai, Tai Po	19.3.2025 to 18.3.2028
37	A/YL-NTM/480	Temporary Private Swimming Pool in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 2158 RP in D.D. 104, Sheung Chuk Yuen, Ngau Tam Mei, Yuen Long	22.4.2025 to 21.4.2028
52	A/YL-TYST/1304	Temporary Warehouse and Open Storage of Exhibition Materials and Construction Materials with Ancillary Office in “Undetermined” Zone, Lot 1876 RP (Part) in D.D. 117 and Adjoining Government Land, Kung Um Road, Yuen Long	23.3.2025 to 22.3.2028

**Minutes of 761st Rural and New Town Planning Committee
(held on 14.3.2025)**

Cases for Streamlining Arrangement

(a) Applications approved on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 14.3.2028

Item No.	Application No.	Planning Application
10	A/NE-HLH/79	Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Office Stationery and Equipment Supplies and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 397 in D.D. 87, Hung Lung Hang
14A	A/NE-MUP/210	Proposed Temporary Private Car Park (Private Car Only) in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 57 (Part) in D.D. 46, Tai Tong Wu, Sha Tau Kok
16	A/NE-TKL/784	Proposed Temporary Warehouse and Open Storage of Construction Materials and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 128 S.A and 128 S.B RP in D.D. 84, Ping Che
26	A/YL-KTN/1089	Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Excluding Container Vehicle) and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 936 RP (Part) in D.D. 109, Lots 34 (Part) and 750 S.B RP (Part) in D.D. 110, Yuen Long
28	A/YL-KTS/1045	Proposed Temporary Warehouse (Excluding Dangerous Goods Godown) with Ancillary Facilities and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 154 RP (Part) in D.D. 106 and Adjoining Government Land, Kam Tin, Yuen Long
34	A/YL-NSW/339	Proposed Temporary Eating Place and Shop and Services (Sales of Private Cars) in “Undetermined” Zone, Lots 725 (Part), 726 (Part), 727 RP (Part), 729, 730, 731 (Part), 758 (Part), 759 (Part), 760 (Part), 774 S.A (Part), 774 S.B and 775 (Part) in D.D. 115, Castle Peak Road-Yuen Long Section, Yuen Long
35	A/YL-PH/1047	Proposed Temporary Shop and Services and Associated Filling of Land in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 213 (Part) in D.D. 111, Pat Heung, Yuen Long
40	A/HSK/541	Temporary Storage of Construction Materials and Containers, Logistics Centre and Ancillary Workshop in “Government, Institution or Community”, “Open Space”, “Residential (Group A) 4” and “Residential (Group A) 3” Zones and area shown as ‘Road’, Various Lots in D.D. 125, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long
41	A/HSK/545	Temporary Open Storage of Construction Machinery and Materials, Scrap Metal and Used Electrical/ Electronic Appliances and Parts with Ancillary Packaging Activities in “Residential (Group A) 3”, “Government, Institution or Community”, “Residential (Group A) 4” and “Open Space” Zones and area shown as ‘Road’, Various Lots in D.D. 125 and Adjoining Government Land, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long
44	A/HSK/548	Proposed Temporary Shop and Services (Convenient Store and Real Estate Agency) in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 1046 RP (Part) in D.D. 125 and Adjoining Government Land,

		Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long
45	A/HSK/549	Proposed Temporary Shop and Services (Real Estate Agency and Interior Design Company) in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 1046 RP (Part) in D.D. 125, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long
46	A/HSK/550	Temporary Shop and Services (Real Estate Agency) in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 650 RP (Part) in D.D. 125 and Adjoining Government Land, Sik Kong Tsuen, Yuen Long
49	A/YL-LFS/548	Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Private Cars) and Associated Filling of Land in “Village Type Development” Zone, Various Lots in D.D. 129 and Adjoining Government Land, Lau Fau Shan, Yuen Long
50	A/YL-TYST/1302	Proposed Temporary Shop and Services in “Residential (Group C)” Zone, Lots 1285 (Part) and 1287 (Part) in D.D. 119, Pak Sha Tsuen, Yuen Long
51	A/YL-TYST/1303	Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Construction Materials in “Undetermined” Zone, Lots 990 (Part), 991 (Part), 994 (Part), 1024 (Part), 1025 and 1026 (Part) in D.D. 119 and Adjoining Government Land, Pak Sha Tsuen, Yuen Long
54	A/YL-TT/657	Temporary Shop and Services and Public Vehicle Park in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lots 4891 RP (Part), 4892 RP (Part), 4893 (Part) and 4894 (Part) in D.D. 116 and Adjoining Government Land, Tai Tong Road, Yuen Long
55	A/YL-TT/664	Proposed Temporary Logistics Centre and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 489 RP (Part) in D.D. 117, Tai Tong, Yuen Long, New Territories
56	A/YL-TT/694	Temporary Public Vehicle Park (Private Cars) in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lots 2040 and 2054 (Part) in D.D. 119, Muk Kiu Tau Tsuen, Yuen Long
60	A/YL-TT/699	Proposed Temporary Animal Boarding Establishment (Cattery) and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 1938 RP (Part) in D.D. 119, Yuen Long

(b) Applications approved on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years until 14.3.2030

Item No.	Application No.	Planning Application
7	A/ST/1037*	Shop and Services (Fast Food Shop) in “Industrial” Zone, Unit B5, G/F, Block 1, Kin Ho Industrial Building, No. 14-24 Au Pui Wan Street, Fo Tan, Sha Tin
13	A/NE-KLH/649	Proposed Temporary Public Vehicle Park (excluding Container Vehicles) with Ancillary Electric Vehicle Charging Facilities and Utility Installation for Private Project (Solar Photovoltaic System) in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 37 RP (Part) in D.D 7, Kau Lung Hang, Tai Po
24	A/YL-KTN/1080	Proposed Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Hobby Farm) with Ancillary Facilities and Associated Filling of Land in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 9 (Part) and 10 (Part) in D.D. 109, Kam Tin, Yuen Long
* The application was for the applied use on a permanent basis, but approved by the Committee on a temporary basis for 5 years, as recommended in the Paper.		