

## Planning Applications

Process		Some Problems		Possible Recommendations
<b>1. Obtain owners' consent/notify owners</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Send a request for consent/notice OR</li> <li>Publish notice on newspaper <u>and</u> post a notice on site <u>or</u> send a notice to OC, MAC, etc</li> </ul>			
<b>2. Submit application</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Processing time 2 months</li> </ul>			
<b>3. Invite public comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TPB issue notice on application</li> <li>Public comments within 3 weeks</li> <li>Public comments for public inspection</li> </ul>			
<b>4. Submit further information</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 1 week before TPB meeting</li> <li>Secretary of TPB to decide               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ to accept/not (material/not)</li> <li>❖ to exempt from public inspection/not</li> <li>❖ to recount statutory time/not</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>(a) Incline to decide to go for public inspection and recount 2 months (which may be very critical for a development)</p> <p>(b) Each department looks at application with a microscope. Planning stage may not have that much details and there should be a more global view.</p>	<p>(c) Detailed information at planning stage may necessitate frequent amendment applications in future.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reasonable and due process is enough</li> <li>Stay on broad principles</li> <li>Design freedom should be allowed</li> </ul>
<b>5. Seek deferment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With good reasons</li> <li>Normally 2 months to prepare further submission</li> <li>2 months to process</li> <li>No further deferment will be granted</li> </ul>			
<b>6. Discharge planning conditions after planning approval</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discharge planning conditions before building plans approval</li> </ul>	<p>(a) Contradictory requirements among departments prolonging discharge of planning conditions and delaying building plan approval</p>	<p>(b) Controlling too much details and too subjective at times</p> <p>(c) Inconsistent interpretation on when to discharge conditions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mechanism needed to resolve departmental conflicts</li> <li>Objective views required</li> <li>Clearer guidelines for both officials and the public</li> </ul>
<b>7. Minor Amendments to approved scheme</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Class A: no need to seek approval</li> <li>Class B: Director of Planning to approve</li> <li>No publication requirement</li> <li>If adverse comments from one government department, the case will be submitted to TPB</li> </ul>	<p>(a) Class B amendments referring to the earliest approval, ignoring subsequent TPB approvals – unreasonable</p> <p>(b) Circulate to District Office who may gather public views again →delay the process</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review definition of reference approval</li> <li>Not to consult public again</li> </ul>
<b>8. Planning review</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review hearings within 3 months</li> </ul>	<p>(a) Professional departments change their original recommendations to tally with TPB's first decision</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Professional departments should give independent advices to TPB</li> </ul>