

**REVIEW OF APPLICATION NO. A/YL-HTF/1104**  
**UNDER SECTION 17 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE**

**Proposed Temporary Development and Learning Centre for  
Graphene with Ancillary Office for a Period of 3 Years  
in “Agriculture” and “Residential (Group D)” Zones,  
Lots 130, 131, 132 (Part), 260 (Part), 261, 262, 263, 264 and 268 in D.D.128 and adjoining  
Government Land, Lau Fau Shan, Yuen Long**

**1. Background**

- 1.1 On 25.2.2020, the applicant, Green Technology Consortium Limited represented by Mr. Wong Sun-wo William, sought planning permission for proposed temporary development and learning centre for graphene with ancillary office for a period of 3 years under s.16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) at the application site (the Site). The Site falls within an area zoned “Agriculture” (“AGR”) (about 86%) and “Residential (Group D)” (“R(D)”) (about 14%) on the Approved Ha Tsuen Fringe Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL-HTF/12 (**Plan R-1a**).
- 1.2 On 24.4.2020, the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (the RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board) decided to reject the application and the reasons were:
- (a) the proposed development was not in line with the planning intentions of the “AGR” and “R(D)” zones. The planning intention of the “AGR” zone was to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes, and also to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. 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. There was no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from such planning intentions, even on a temporary basis;
  - (b) the applicant failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not generate adverse environmental and traffic impacts on the surrounding areas; and
  - (c) approval of the application, even on a temporary basis, would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the “AGR” zone, the cumulative effect of which would result in a general degradation of the rural environment of the area.
- 1.3 The site area is about 12,563m<sup>2</sup> (including 376m<sup>2</sup> of Government Land (GL)). The Site is currently accessible via two local tracks, one from Deep Bay Road and one from Kai Pak Ling Road. The proposed ingress/egress is located at the south-western

boundary of the Site leading to Kai Pak Ling Road (**Drawing R-1 and Plan R-2**). As shown on the proposed layout plan at **Drawing R-1**, 9 temporary structures with a total floor area of about 1,820 m<sup>2</sup> and maximum building height of 5m are proposed including 5 learning centres, 1 ancillary office, 1 staff rest room and canteen, 1 guard room and 1 toilet. Northern portion of the Site is proposed for an exhibition area of the final products. The applicant indicates that 20 private car parking spaces and 2 loading/unloading spaces for medium goods vehicles not exceeding 24 tonnes will be provided on the Site.

1.4 The Site is subject to an enforcement action against unauthorised development (UD) involving storage and workshop use. Enforcement Notice (EN No. E/YL-HTF/910) was served on 25.10.2018 and expired on 25.11.2018. The notice recipients were convicted on 20.11.2019. Latest site inspection on 24.2.2020 revealed that UD was not discontinued and court hearing will be conducted on 25.11.2020 against the notice recipients.

1.5 For Members' reference, the following documents are attached:

- (a) RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-HTF/1104 (Annex A)
- (b) Extract of minutes of the RNTPC Meeting held on 24.4.2020 (Annex B)
- (c) Secretary of the Board's letter dated 15.5.2020 (Annex C)

## 2. Application for Review

On 31.5.2020, the applicant applied, under section 17(1) of the Ordinance, for a review of the RNTPC's decision to reject the application. In support of the review application, the applicant has submitted the following documents:

- (a) Email dated 31.5.2020 requesting for a review of the RNTPC's decision (Annex D)
- (b) Further Information (FI) dated 6.8.2020 responding to Transport Department's (TD) comment (Annex E)
- (c) FI dated 10.8.2020 responding to Lands Department's (LandsD) comment (Annex F)

## 3. Justifications from the Applicant

The grounds for review put forward by the applicant in support of the review application are detailed in the FI at **Annexes E and F**. They can be summarized as follows:

- (a) There are 20 private car parking spaces at the Site. Only 16 private car spaces will be occupied while 4 will be reserved for visitors' use.
- (b) There are 2 loading/unloading bay for medium goods vehicle at the Site. The proposed development will only use one loading/unloading bay. The other loading/unloading bay will be reserved for emergency use.
- (c) The proposed development is accessible through a local track leading to Kai Pak Ling Road from Fung Kong Tsuen Road or Kong Sham Western Highway. The proposed development will not cause adverse traffic impact to Kai Pak Ling Road.

- (d) The applicant is willing to exclude the GL from the Site from the planning application should the planning application be approved.

#### 4. **The Section 16 Application**

##### The Site and Its Surrounding Areas

- 4.1 The situation of the Site and its surrounding areas at the time of the consideration of the s.16 application by the RNTPC was described in paragraphs 7.1 and 7.2 of **Annex A**. There has been no major change in the situation since then.
- 4.2 The Site is:
  - (a) currently being used as a plastic recycle workshop without valid planning permission (**Plans R-2, R-4a to R-4d**); and
  - (b) accessible via two local tracks from Deep Bay Road and Kai Pak Ling Road.
- 4.3 The surrounding areas have the following characteristics: (**Plans R-2, R-3, R-4a to R-4d**)
  - (a) to its north and northeast are suspected unauthorized development (UD) of open storage yards for construction materials and machinery, metal wares, recycling materials, workshop and parking of heavy vehicles;
  - (b) to its east are some graves, vacant land and warehouses which are suspected UD;
  - (c) to its south and southeast are warehouses and workshops which is a suspected UD, open storage yards for construction materials, machinery and vehicles which are suspected UD, and some residential structures (the closest one is about 43m away); and
  - (d) to its west is a warehouse which is a suspected UD. And to its northwest is an open storage of construction materials and workshop which is a use tolerated under the OZP. The residential cluster of Sha Kong Tsuen is located across Deep Bay Road to the northwest.

##### Planning Intentions

- 4.4 There has been no change in planning intentions of the concerned “AGR” and “R(D)” zones as mentioned in paragraph 8 of **Annex A**.
- 4.5 The planning intention of the “AGR” zone is primarily to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes. It is also intended to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes.
- 4.6 The planning intention of the “R(D)” zone is primarily for improvement and upgrading of existing temporary structures within the rural areas through redevelopment of

existing temporary structures into permanent buildings. It is also intended for low-rise, low-density residential developments subject to planning permission from the Board.

#### Previous Applications

- 4.7 The Site involves 8 previous applications (No. A/YL-HT/64, 77, 368, 391, 453, 744, A/YL-HTF/1093 and 1096) which were all rejected by the RNTPC or the Board on review between 1999 and 2019 for various open storage and workshop uses. Details of these previous applications are summarised at **Appendix II of Annex A** and their locations are shown on **Plan R-1b**.
- 4.8 Applications No. A/YL-HT/64 and 77 for temporary open storage of construction materials and construction machinery/water pipes for a period of 12 months were rejected by the RNTPC/the Board on review on 8.1.1999 and 9.7.1999 respectively. Applications No. A/YL-HT/368 and 391 for temporary workshop for recycling plastic waste and open storage of plastic raw materials for a period of 3 years were rejected by the RNTPC /the Board on review on 14.1.2005 and 16.9.2005 respectively. Application No. A/YL-HT/453 for temporary open storage of construction materials (steel and scrap metal) for a period of 3 years was rejected by the Board on review on 10.11.2006. Application No. A/YL-HT/744 for temporary open storage of used electronic appliances and parts for a period of 3 years was rejected by the RNTPC on 2.9.2011. Application No. A/YL-HTF/1093 for temporary plastic bottle recycling centre with workshop and ancillary office for a period of 3 years was rejected by the RNTPC on 1.2.2019.
- 4.9 The last application (A/YL-HTF/1096) for temporary plastic bottle recycling centre with workshop and ancillary office for a period of 3 years was rejected by the RNTPC on 20.9.2019.
- 4.10 The rejection reasons for these applications are similar including, amongst others, that the development was not in line with the planning intention of the “AGR” and/or “R(D)” zones; the development was not compatible with the rural neighborhood; the development was not in line with the then TPB PG-No.13C/13D/13E that there were adverse departmental comments and insufficient information to demonstrate no environmental, traffic, drainage and/or landscape impacts; and approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for applications for similar developments.

#### Similar Application

- 4.11 There is no similar application within the same “AGR” or “R(D)” zone.

### **5. Comments from Relevant Government Departments**

- 5.1 For the review application, the following government department has been further consulted and his updated comments are summarised as follows:

#### **Traffic**

- 5.1.1 Comments of the Commissioner for Transport (C for T):

- (a) The traffic of the Site will be through Kai Pak Ling Road which is a single track road. On the basis of documents provided by the applicant, the proposed development would provide parking spaces for 20 private cars and loading / unloading bays for 2 medium goods vehicles.
- (b) The applicant is requested to conduct traffic analysis to justify that the nearby public road network has adequate capacity to accommodate the traffic induced by the proposed development. In particular, the traffic impact on Kai Pak Ling Road should be well assessed as a result of the proposed development, since it is highly likely that vehicles in opposite directions need to negotiate with each other where passing bay is not available.
- (c) On the basis of the supporting document submitted by the applicant on 6.8.2020 (**Annex E**), the applicant failed to provide traffic analysis with a view to demonstrating the proposed development would not pose adverse traffic impact to the local road network.

### **Environment**

#### 5.1.2 Comment of the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP):

- (a) DEP does not support the application as the application involves the use of medium goods vehicle and there are sensitive receivers of residential use in the vicinity (with the nearest one situated about 43 m to its south) (**Plan R-2**), thus environmental nuisance is expected.
- (b) There are a total of 24 complaints pertaining to the Site in the past three years, of which there are 15 substantiated air pollution complaints, 1 substantiated noise complaint, 1 substantiated water pollution complaint and 2 substantiated waste pollution complaints.
- (c) Should the planning application be approved, the applicant is advised to follow the relevant mitigation measures and requirements in the latest “Code of Practice (COP) on Handling the Environmental Aspects of Temporary Uses and Open Storage Sites”.

5.2 The following Government departments maintain their previous comments on the s.16 application in paragraph 9.1 of **Annex A**, which are recapitulated below:

### **Land Administration**

#### 5.2.1 Comments of the District Lands Officer/Yuen Long, Lands Department (DLO/YL, LandsD):

- (a) The Site comprises Old Schedule Agricultural Lots held under the Block Government Lease which contains the restriction that no structures are allowed to be erected without the prior approval of the Government.
- (b) There are three modifications of tenancy (MoTs) within the Site, MoT No. 10184 and 17090 for accommodation and porch in Lot 263 in D.D. 128 and MoT No. M18667 for residential and porch in Lot 132 in D.D. 128.

- (c) No permission is given for occupation of Government Land (GL) (about 376 m<sup>2</sup> subject to verification) included in the Site. The act of occupation of GL without Government's prior approval is not allowed.
- (d) Should planning approval be given to the planning application, the lot owner(s) of the lot(s) without Short Term Waiver (STW) will need to apply to his office for permitting the structures to be erected or regularize any irregularities on site, if any. The applicant has to either exclude the GL from the Site or apply for a formal approval prior to the actual occupation of the GL. Besides, given the proposed use is temporary in nature, only application for regularization or erection of temporary structure(s) will be considered. Application(s) for any of the above will be considered by LandsD acting in the capacity of the landlord or lessor at its sole discretion and there is no guarantee that such application(s) will be approved. If such application(s) is approved, it will be subject to such terms and conditions, including among others the payment of premium or fee, as may be imposed by LandsD.

### **Agriculture**

#### 5.2.2 Comments of the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC):

- (a) He does not support the application from agricultural point of view.
- (b) Although the Site is currently occupied by temporary structures, it has high potential for agricultural rehabilitation in terms of greenhouse cultivation and nursery.
- (c) It is noted that '*Taxus chinensis*' (紅豆杉樹) is proposed to be planted along the boundary of the Site. Since this species is an exotic species, it is preferable to plant native species instead, should the application be approved due to other consideration and landscape planning is considered necessary.

### **Landscape**

#### 5.2.3 Comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD):

- (a) He has reservation on the application from the landscape planning perspective.
- (b) The Site is located to the east of Deep Bay Road and lies mainly in the area of "AGR" zone and partly in "R(D)" zone. The Site is subject to 8 previous rejected planning applications (No. A/YL-HT/64, 77, 368, 391, 453, 744, A/YL-HTF/1093 and 1096) for various temporary open storage and recycling workshop uses. The last application No. A/YL-HTF/1096 for temporary plastic bottle recycling centre with workshop use to which he had reservation from landscape planning perspective. The current application seeks planning approval for temporary development and learning centre for graphene with ancillary office for a period of 3 years.

- (c) With reference to the aerial photo taken in 2018, most of the site area is hard paved and used as open storage of construction machinery with some large temporary structures. Existing trees are generally along the boundary outside the Site. Some existing trees are located at the eastern and south-eastern end of the Site. The Site is situated in an area of rural landscape character disturbed by open storage yards and temporary structures. The proposed use is not entirely compatible with the surrounding landscape character.
- (d) Since the planning intention of the “AGR” zone is primarily to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes, approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent to encourage other similar applications to modify the site prior to obtaining planning permission. The cumulative impact of which would result in a general degradation of the surrounding rural environment.
- (e) In view that the Site is not facing any prominent public frontage and there are existing trees along the site boundary, it is considered that the approval condition to maintain all existing vegetation within the Site in good condition for the duration of the approval period is adequate should the application be approved by the Board.

5.3 The following government departments maintain their previous views on the s.16 application as stated in paragraph 9.1 of **Annex A**:

- (a) Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department (CHE/NTW, HyD);
- (b) Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department (CE/MN, DSD);
- (c) Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department (CBS/NTW, BD);
- (d) Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene (DFEH);
- (e) Director of Fire Services (D of FS); and
- (f) District Officer (Yuen Long), Home Affairs Department (DO(YL), HAD).

5.4 The following government bureau and departments maintain their previous views of having no comment on the review application:

- (a) Antiquities and Monuments Office, Development Bureau (AMO, DEVB);
- (b) Project Manager/New Territories West, Civil Engineering and Development Department (PM/NTW, CEDD);
- (c) Chief Engineer/Sewerage Projects, DSD (CE/SP, DSD);
- (d) Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services (DEMS);
- (e) Director of Leisure, Cultural and Services (DLCS);
- (f) Commissioner of Police (C of P); and
- (g) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department (CE/C, WSD).

## **6. Public Comments on the Review Application Received During Statutory Publication Periods**

- 6.1 On 12.6.2020, the review application was published for public inspection. During the statutory public inspection period, seven public comments were received from the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society (HKBWS), Kadoorie Farm & Botanic Garden Corporation (KFBG), World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong (WWF) and four individuals objecting to the review application (**Annex G**). The main objecting reasons are summarized below:
- (a) The proposed use is not in line with the planning intention of the “AGR” zone.
  - (b) No previous approval has been granted for the Site.
  - (c) The proposed use is incompatible with rural neighborhood and associated with unauthorized development. The Board should not encourage “develop first, apply later”.
  - (d) There were numerous complaints from the residents of nearby Sha Kong Tsuen on the air pollution from the Site.
  - (e) There is insufficient information in the submission to demonstrate that the proposed use will not have significant impacts on the environment, ecology, sewerage and traffic in the area.
  - (f) Approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications and cumulative effect of which would result in general degradation of the environment of the area.
- 6.2 Six public comments, all objecting to the application, were received at the s.16 application stage and are set out in paragraph 10 of **Annex A**.

## **7. Planning Considerations and Assessments**

- 7.1 The application is for a review of the RNTPC’s decision on 24.4.2020 to reject the subject application for proposed temporary development and learning centre for graphene with ancillary office for a period of 3 years at the Site zoned “AGR” and “R(D)” on the OZP (**Plan R-1a**). The application was rejected for the reasons that the proposed development was not in line with the planning intentions of the “AGR” and “R(D)” zones, the applicant failed to demonstrate the proposed development would not generate adverse environmental and traffic impacts on the surrounding areas and approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the “AGR” zone.
- 7.2 The applicant submitted justifications in support of the review application mainly on grounds that the traffic concerns of TD have been responded to and illegal occupation of GL at the Site will be rectified to address LandsD’s concern. Since the consideration of the subject application by the RNTPC on 24.4.2020, there has been no change in planning circumstances. Planning considerations and assessments on the review application are appended below.

### **Planning Intentions of “AGR” and “R(D)” Zones**

- 7.3 The application is for proposed temporary development and learning centre for



graphene with ancillary office for a period of 3 years at the Site mainly zoned “AGR” (about 86%) with a portion straddling the adjacent “R(D)” zone (about 14%) on the OZP. The planning intention of the “AGR” zone is primarily to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes. The planning intention of “R(D)” zone is intended primarily for improvement and upgrading of existing temporary structures within the rural areas through redevelopment of existing temporary structures into permanent buildings. It is also intended for low-rise, low-density residential developments subject to planning permission from the Board. The proposed temporary development and learning centre for graphene with ancillary office use is not in line with the planning intentions of the “AGR” and “R(D)” zones. In this regard, DAFC maintains his view of not supporting the application from agricultural point of view as the Site possesses high potential for agricultural rehabilitation. There is no strong planning justification for a departure from such planning intentions, even on a temporary basis.

#### Land Use Compatibility

- 7.4 The Site is situated in an area of rural landscape character disturbed by open storage yards and temporary structures (**Plan R-3**). Besides, village cluster of Sha Kong Tsuen is located to its further north and northwest. The proposed use is not entirely compatible with the surrounding landscape character. The approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent to encourage other similar applications with site modification prior to planning permission is obtained. The cumulative impact of which would result in a general degradation of the surrounding rural environment. In this regard, CTP/UD&L, PlanD maintains his previous view of having reservation on the application from the landscape planning perspective.

#### Adverse Environmental and Traffic Impacts on the Surrounding Areas

- 7.5 DEP maintains his view of not supporting the application as it involves the use of medium goods vehicles and there are sensitive receivers of residential use in the vicinity of the Site, with the nearest one located about 43m to its south (**Plan R-2**), and environmental nuisance is expected. After consideration of the justifications in support of the review application submitted by the applicant, C for T maintains his view of having concerns over the traffic impact of the proposed development with 20 private car parking spaces and 2 loading / unloading bays for medium goods vehicles on Kai Ping Ling Road (a single track road) and the nearby public road network. Although the applicant asserts that the proposed development would not cause adverse traffic impact on Kai Pak Ling Road (**Annex E**), C for T considered that the applicant still failed to provide traffic analysis to support his assertion. In this regard, the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed use would not have adverse environmental and traffic impacts on the surrounding areas.

#### No Previous Planning Approval

- 7.6 The Site is the subject of 8 previous applications (No. A/YL-HT/64, 77, 368, 391, 453 744, A/YL-HTF/1093 and 1096) for various open storage and workshop uses which were rejected by the RNTPC/the Board on review from 1999 to 2019 mainly on the grounds, inter alia, that the development was not in line with the planning intentions of the “AGR” and “R(D)” zones; the development was not compatible with the rural neighborhood; there were adverse departmental comments and insufficient information to demonstrate no environmental, traffic, drainage and/or landscape

impacts. Rejecting the current application is in line with the RNTPC/the Board's previous decisions.

### Public Comments

7.7 There are 7 public comments objecting to the review application mainly on grounds stated in paragraph 6 above. The planning considerations and assessments in paragraphs 7.1 to 7.6 above are relevant.

## **8. Planning Department's Views**

8.1 Based on the assessments made in paragraph 6, having taken into account the public comments mentioned in paragraph 5 and given that there has been no change in the planning circumstances since the consideration of the subject application by the RNTPC on 24.4.2020, the Planning Department maintains its previous view of not supporting the review application for the following reasons:

- (a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intentions of the "AGR" and "R(D)" zones. The planning intention of the "AGR" zone is to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes, and also to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. The planning intention of the "R(D)" zone is primarily for improvement and upgrading of existing temporary structures within the rural areas through redevelopment of existing temporary structures into permanent buildings. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from such planning intentions, even on a temporary basis;
- (b) the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would not generate adverse environmental and traffic impacts on the surrounding areas; and
- (c) approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the "AGR" zone, the cumulative effect of which will result in a general degradation of the rural environment.

8.2 Alternatively, should the Board decide to approve the application on review, it is suggested that the permission shall be valid on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until **30.10.2023**. The following conditions of approval and advisory clauses are also suggested for Members' reference:

### Approval conditions

- (a) no operation from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the Site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no vehicle exceeding 24 tonnes, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed to enter/exit or to be parked/stored on the Site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (c) the submission of the revised drainage proposal within **6 months** from the date

of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board by **30.4.2021**;

- (d) in relation to (c) above, the implementation of the revised drainage proposal within **9 months** from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board by **30.7.2021**;
- (e) in relation to (d) above, the implemented drainage facilities shall be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) the existing trees within the Site shall be maintained in good condition at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) the submission of a fire service installations proposal within **6 months** from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board by **30.4.2021**;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implementation of the fire service installations proposal within **9 months** from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board by **30.7.2021**;
- (i) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (e) or (f) is not complied with during the approval period, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice;
- (j) if any of the above planning conditions (c), (d), (g) or (h) is not complied with by the above specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice; and
- (k) upon expiry of the planning permission, the reinstatement of the Site to an amenity area to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board.

Advisory clauses

The recommended advisory clauses are attached at **Annex H**.

**9. Decision Sought**

- 9.1 The Board is invited to consider the application for a review of RNTPC's decision and decide whether to accede to the application.
- 9.2 Should the Board decide to reject the review application, Members are invited to advise what reason(s) for rejection should be given to the applicant.
- 9.3 Alternatively, should the Board decide to approve the review application, Members are invited to consider the approval condition(s) and advisory clause(s), if any, to be attached to the permission, and the period of which the permission should expire be valid on a temporary basis.

**10. Attachments**

|                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| <b>Drawing R-1</b>      | Proposed Layout Plan  |
| <b>Plan R-1a</b>        | Location Plan   |
| <b>Plan R-1b</b>        | Previous Applications Plan  |
| <b>Plan R-2</b>         | Site Plan   |
| <b>Plan R-3</b>         | Aerial Photo  |
| <b>Plans R-4a to 4d</b> | Site Photos   |
| <br>                    |   |
| <b>Annex A</b>          | RNTPC Paper No. A/YL-HTF/1104   |
| <b>Annex B</b>          | Extract of minutes of the RNTPC Meeting held on 24.4.2020                               |
| <b>Annex C</b>          | Secretary of the Board's letter dated 15.5.2020   |
| <b>Annex D</b>          | Email of 31.5.2019 from the applicant applying for review                               |
| <b>Annex E</b>          | FI dated 6.8.2020 responding to TD's comment  |
| <b>Annex F</b>          | FI dated 10.8.2020 responding to LandsD's comment                                       |
| <b>Annex G</b>          | Public comments received during statutory publication periods of the review application |
| <br>                    |   |
| <b>Annex H</b>          | Recommended advisory clauses  |

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
OCTOBER 2020**

**TPB Paper No. 10684**

**For Consideration by  
the Town Planning Board on 30.10.2020**

**REVIEW OF APPLICATION NO. A/YL-HTF/1104  
UNDER SECTION 17 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE**

**Proposed Temporary Development and Learning Centre for  
Graphene with Ancillary Office for a Period of 3 Years  
in “Agriculture” and “Residential (Group D)” Zones,  
Lots 130, 131, 132 (Part), 260 (Part), 261, 262, 263, 264 and 268 in D.D.128 and  
adjoining Government Land, Lau Fau Shan, Yuen Long**