

**Minutes of 1165th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 23.2.2018**

Present

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-Chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr H.W. Cheung

Professor K.C. Chau

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)

Mr Elvis W.K. Au

Deputy Director of Lands (General)

Mr Edwin W.K. Chan

Chief Traffic Engineer (Hong Kong), Transport Department

Mr Eddie C.K. Leung

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Director of Planning

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Deputy Director of Planning/District

Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Permanent Secretary for Development

(Planning and Lands)

Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Ms Christina M. Lee

Mr H.F. Leung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Jeff K.C. Ho

Agenda Item 1

[Open meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1155th meeting held on 19.1.2018

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The minutes of the 1155th Meeting held on 19.1.2018 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

[Open meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1163rd meeting held on 2.2.2018

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

2. The minutes of the 1163rd Meeting held on 2.2.2018 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 3

[Open meeting]

Matters Arising

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

(i) **Approval of Draft Outline Zoning Plan**

3. The Secretary reported that on 30.1.2018, the Chief Executive in Council approved the following draft Outline Zoning Plans (OZPs) under section 9(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance:

- (a) Kwu Tung South OZP (renumbered as S/NE-KTS/16); and

(b) Lok Ma Chau Loop OZP (renumbered as S/LMCL/2).

4. Members noted that the approval of the above OZPs was notified in the Gazette on 9.2.2018.

(ii) Reference Back of Approved Outline Zoning Plan

5. The Secretary reported that on 30.1.2018, the Chief Executive in Council referred the approved Fanling/Sheung Shui Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/FSS/22 to the Town Planning Board for amendment under section 12(1)(b)(ii) of the Town Planning Ordinance. Members noted that the reference back of the OZP was notified in the Gazette on 9.2.2018.

(iii) Consideration of Representations and Comments on the Draft Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K13/29 (Group 1)

6. The Secretary reported that the representation sites under Amendment Item A were related to a proposed public housing development to be undertaken by Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The following Members had declared interests on the item for having affiliations or business dealings with HKHA/HD or representer/commenter, Ms Mary Mulvihill (R10/C62), or the representative of Christian Action (R9), Masterplan Limited (Masterplan):

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee - being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee
(*as Director of Planning*) (SPC) and Building Committee of HKHA

Mr Edwin W.K. Chan - being an alternative member for the Director of
(*as Deputy Director of Lands (General)*) Lands who was a member of HKHA

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan - being a representative of the Director of Home
(*as Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department*) Affairs who was a member of the SPC and the Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA

- Mr H.F. Leung - being a member of the Tender Committee of HKHA
- Ms Janice W.M. Lai] having current business dealings with HKHA
Mr Patrick H.T. Lau]
Dr C.H. Hau]
Mr Thomas O.S. Ho]
- Mr K.K. Cheung] their firm having current business dealings with
Mr Alex T.H. Lai] HKHA and hiring Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis
from time to time
- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having past business dealings with HKHA and
current business dealings with Masterplan Limited
- Mr Franklin Yu] having past business dealings with HKHA
Mr Stephen L.H. Liu]
- Dr Lawrence W.C. - his spouse being an employee of HD but not involved
Poon in planning work

7. Members noted that Mr H.F. Leung, Ms Janice W.M. Lai and Mr Ivan C.S. Fu had tendered apologies for being not able to attend the meeting. Members agreed that as the item was to report the latest development regarding a representation site, the interest of the above Members who were present at the meeting was indirect and they were allowed to stay in the meeting.

8. The Secretary reported that on 2.1.2018, the Government issued a letter to Christian Action (CA), who was currently using the New Horizons Building (NHB) and a representer (R9) objecting to Amendment Items A and B of the draft Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K13/29. The letter set out the offer including allowing CA to use the premises at Choi Wan (II) Estate at nominal rent of \$1 per month throughout the 7-year Short Term Tenancy (STT). On 26.1.2018, the CA accepted the Government's offer of the STT for the relocation of CA to Choi Wan (II) Estate.

9. Members noted the latest development on the reprovisioning of CA's facilities.

(iv) Consideration of Representations and Comments on the Draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K22/5 (Group 2)

10. The Secretary reported that the representation site was related to a proposed campus development by the Vocational Training Council (VTC) and was currently partly occupied by a temporary training ground of Construction Industry Council (CIC) but the latter was not a subject of representations. The following Members had declared interests on the item for having affiliations or business dealings with VTC (also R1/C263) and its consultant, Ove Arup Partners HK Limited (Arup); or having affiliations or business dealings with CIC, Mr Paul Zimmerman of Designing Hong Kong Limited (C277) and Ms Mary Mulvihill (C433).

- | | |
|---|--|
| Mr Ivan C.S. Fu | - having current business dealings with the VTC and Arup, and being a council member of Construction Industry Council (CIC) |
| Mr Franklin Yu | - being the Director of a firm having current business dealings with VTC, a member of Construction Workers Registration Board (CWRB) of CIC, and having past business dealings with Arup |
| Ms Christina M. Lee | - being appointed as a member of the Student Development Discipline Advisory Board of VTC |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | - being an external examiner of the Technological and Higher Education Institute (THEi) which was a member institute of VTC, and having current business dealings with Arup |
| Professor S.C. Wong
(Vice-Chairperson) | - being an adjunct Professor of the THEi but the appointment was honorary and courtesy in nature, a |

council member of CIC and convenor of the Objections Board of CIC, and having current business dealings with Arup

- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having current business dealings with Arup and hiring Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time; having past teaching work in the member institute of VTC

- Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with Arup and hiring Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time

- Miss Winnie W.M. Ng - an ex-Council member of VTC

- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu] having past teaching work in the member institute of
Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon] VTC
Mr Martin W.C. Kwan]

- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having past business dealings with VTC

- Mr Wilson Y. W. Fung - being a former member of the Accountancy Training Board of VTC

- Mr H.F. Leung - being a member of a committee of CIC and having past business dealings with the THEi

- Mr H.W. Cheung - being the past executive director of CIC and the Chairman of Zero Carbon Building of CIC

- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - being the Chairman of the Board of the Construction Innovation and Technology Application Centre of CIC, and personally knowing Mr Paul Zimmerman

- Ms Janice W.M. Lai - having current business dealings with Arup
- Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo - her spouse being a Group Director of the P&T Architects and Engineers Ltd., which was consultant of VTC, but not involved in project
(Secretary)

11. Members noted that Mr H.F. Leung, Ms Janice W.M. Lai, Ms Christina M. Lee, Miss Winnie W.M. Ng and Mr Ivan C.S. Fu had tendered apologies for being not able to attend the meeting. As the item was to report the information received from an enquiry, Members agreed that the rest of the Members who had declared interests in the item could stay in the meeting.

12. The Secretary reported that since the last hearing session of the representations and comments on the draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K22/5 (Group 2) on 11.1.2018, an email addressing to the Chairman and Members of the Town Planning Board (the Board) was received on 13.2.2018 lodging a complaint against the Planning Department and the Harbourfront Commission (HC) Secretariat in respect of Amendment Item W (i.e. item related to the proposed new VTC campus) of the draft Kai Tak OZP. The email was tabled at the meeting for Members' reference.

13. The enquirer raised concern on the letter issued by the HC Secretariat which claimed that the HC had found the revised scheme submitted by VTC acceptable. He said that the HC and its Task Force had in fact not formally arrived at a conclusion over the matter before the letter was issued. The letter was issued without proper authority and did not represent the views of the HC. He urged the Board not to give favour towards the Government, or any parties having commercial interest on the proposed VTC campus.

14. Members noted that the content of the email submitted by the enquirer was similar to the oral submission made by some representers/commenters and had already been recorded in the minutes of the hearing sessions. As the information was submitted after the hearing sessions, it was submitted out-of-time, and should be treated as not having been made under the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance).

15. Members agreed that the information provided by the enquirer was treated as not

having been made under the Ordinance, and the enquirer would be informed of the above in writing.

- (v) Proposed Eating Place, Shop and Services, Place of Entertainment, Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture in Salisbury Garden, the Avenue of Stars and Tsim Sha Tsui Promenade, Tsim Sha Tsui (Application No. A/K1/250)

16. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) and Sustainable Foundation Company Limited (SFCL), which was a subsidiary of the New World Development Co. Ltd. (NWD) with New World Project Management Limited (NWPM) and Mott MacDonald Hong Kong Limited (MMHK) as two of the consultants of the applicants. The following Members had declared interests on the item for having affiliations or business dealings with LCSD, SFCL, NWD, NWPM or MMHK:

- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with SFCL and a subsidiary of NWD
- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having past business dealings with NWD, NWPM and MMHK
- Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung - being the Chairman of the Chinese Traditional Performing Arts Panel of the LCSD
- Mr K.K. Cheung - having past business dealings with Automall Limited which was a subsidiary company of NWD
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung - being the Chairman of the Hong Kong Dance Company, which received donations from NWD before
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with MMHK

17. Members agreed that as the matter was not related to the substance of the planning application, the interests of the Members on the item only needed to be recorded and they could

be allowed to stay in the meeting.

18. The Secretary reported that a planning application No. A/K1/250 for proposed eating place, shop and services, place of entertainment, place of recreation, sports or culture in Salisbury Garden, the Avenue of Stars and Tsim Sha Tsui Promenade, Tsim Sha Tsui was approved with conditions by the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board) on 21.8.2015. On 19.2.2016, the MPC noted the decision of the applicants (i.e. LCSD and SFCL) not to proceed with the proposed works.

19. An enquirer had made a number of enquiries about the status of the above planning application and requested that the planning permission should be revoked by the Board. The request was reported to the MPC in September 2016 and November 2016. The MPC considered that there was insufficient planning ground to withdraw the planning permission.

20. On 16.12.2017, the same enquirer of the public wrote to the Secretariat in relation to the same planning application (No. A/K1/250) requesting to make a presentation to the Board with a group of 20 people on the proposals regarding the design ideas of the Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront. A reply was issued by the Secretariat on 15.1.2018, advising that there was no provision under the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) for such presentation. On 4.2.2018, the enquirer queried why they were not allowed to make a presentation to the Board on non-statutory planning items while other government departments could do.

21. Members noted that there was no provision under the Ordinance for a member of the general public to make presentation to the Board, except under the provision for attending the meeting of the Board and be heard as a representer/commenter/further representer in respect of a draft plan under section 6 or as an applicant under section 12A or section 17 of the Ordinance.

22. Members agreed that the request for making a presentation to the Board should not be acceded to, and the enquirer would be informed of the above in writing.

(vi) & (vii) [Confidential Item] [Closed Meeting]

23. The items were recorded under confidential cover.

Fanling, Sheung Shui & Yuen Long East District

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/NE-KTS/454

Proposed 2 Houses (New Territories Exempted Houses) in "Agriculture" Zone, Lots 493 S.A and 493 RP in D.D. 94, Hang Tau Tsuen, Kwu Tung South, Sheung Shui, New Territories (TPB Paper No. 10390)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

24. The following government representative, the applicant and her representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin - District Planning Officer/Fanling, Sheung Shui & Yuen Long East, Planning Department (DPO/FS&YLE, PlanD)

Ms Ip Jennifer Jiang Gee] The applicant and her representatives

Mr Ip Shang]

Ms Ip Wai Cheep]

25. The Vice-Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedure of the review hearing. He then invited DPO/FS&YLE, PlanD to brief Members on the review application.

26. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin, DPO/FS&YLE, PlanD, briefed Members on the background of the review application including the consideration of the application by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board), departmental and public comments, and planning

considerations and assessments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10390 (the Paper).

27. The Vice-Chairperson then invited the applicant to elaborate on the review application. Ms Ip Jennifer Jiang Gee made the following main points with the aid of the visualizer:

- (a) the lots surrounding the applications site (the Site) were mainly owned by two private companies. She suspected that they targeted to develop large-scale residential development. Moreover, the fruit trees at the Site were planted by a gardener employed by those two private companies; and
- (b) she noted that there was an approved planning application (No. A/NE-KTS/279) for Small House development at Lot 488 S.A, which fell within the Village 'Environs' ('VE') of Hang Tau Village. Given that one of the lots within the Site, i.e. Lot 493 S.A fell largely within the 'VE' of Hang Tau Village, she queried if an application for Small House development in Lot 493 S.A alone would be approved by the Board.

28. As the presentations of PlanD's representative and the applicant were completed, the Vice-Chairperson invited questions from Members.

29. Some Members had the following questions to the applicant:

- (a) whether the applicant was an indigenous villager, and how the applicant obtained the Site;
- (b) whether the applicant intended to develop the Site for New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) or Small House, or as part of a large-scale residential development; and
- (c) whether the applicant could apply for the land grant of house development (NTEH or Small House) at the Site.

30. In response, Ms Ip Jennifer Jiang Gee made the following main points with the aid

of the visualizer:

- (a) she was an indigenous villager, and the Site was passed down from her grandfather to her father and then to her;
- (b) she intended to develop a NTEH at the Site. However, since her lots were surrounded by the lots owned by two private companies, she might consider selling the Site to them for large-scale residential development if she could not develop the Site by herself; and
- (c) she would liaise with the relevant government departments to obtain approval for house development at the Site. She might also ask help from her father's nephew if the identity of an indigenous male villager was required for applying Small House grant.

31. The Vice-Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions:

The Site and its Surrounding

- (a) the difference between "Village Type Development" ("V") zone and 'VE';
- (b) whether one of the lots of the Site, i.e. Lot 493 S.A fell within the "V" zone and the 'VE' of Hang Tau Village; and
- (c) the characters of the Site and its surrounding areas including those temporary domestic structures on agricultural land.

32. In response, Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin, DPO/FSS&YLE made the following main points with the aid of the PowerPoint slides:

- (a) "V" zone on the approved Kwu Tung South Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) was designated for both existing recognized villages and areas of land considered suitable for village expansion based on the planning considerations including land use pattern, rural village and landscape setting, etc. in the area, while 'VE'

generally referred to a 300-foot radius from the edge of the last village house built before the introduction of the New Territories Small House Policy (the Small House Policy) in 1972. The Lands Department (LandsD) would generally consider and approve, as appropriate, Small House applications within 'VE' boundary. The boundaries of "V" zones on the statutory town plans might not necessarily coincide with those of 'VE';

- (b) the Site fell entirely within the area zoned "Agriculture" ("AGR") on the OZP and Lot 493 S.A. fell partly within the 'VE' of Hang Tau Village; and
- (c) the Site was partly fenced off and occupied by a plant nursery and a temporary single-storey structure. Its surrounding areas were predominantly rural in character with plant nurseries, fallow agriculture land and some scattered domestic structures. Regarding the 'On-farm Domestic Structure', it referred to the residential units on agricultural land for habitation of the genuine farmers who worked on the farm. The roofed-over area of those structures should not exceed 37.2m². 'On-Farm Domestic Structure' use was always permitted within the "AGR" zone on the OZP, but was subject to permission from concerned departments.

33. Ms Ip Jennifer Jiang Gee supplemented that social welfare facilities such as residential care home for the elderly (RCHE) were also allowed in a NTEH.

34. Some Members raised the following questions:

Similar Cases

- (a) the difference between the subject application and the 5 approved Small Houses cases mentioned by the applicant, i.e. those within Lots 385 S.A, 385 S.B, 385 S.C, 488 S.A and 496 S.G;
- (b) the difference between Small House and NTEH;

Planning Considerations

- (c) noting that in the same “AGR” zone in the vicinity of the Site, planning applications No. A/NE-KTS/236 and 237 for NTEH were rejected while application No. A/NE-KTS/255 for Small House development was approved, whether there were different considerations for application for Small House and NTEH developments. Whether PlanD would raise objection if Lot 493 S.A was applied for Small House development; and
- (d) whether the land available in the “V” zone could meet the Small House demand at Hang Tau Village;

35. In response, Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin, DPO/FSS&YLE made the following main points with the aid of the PowerPoint slides:

Similar Cases

- (a) the first three cases mentioned by the applicant at Lots 385 S.A, 385 S.B and 385 S.C respectively fell within the “V” zone where planning permission for Small House development was not required. The other two, i.e. Lots 488 S.A and 496 S.G involved two separate planning applications for Small House development, which were different from the subject application for NTEH. There were 2 relevant similar applications (No. A/NE-KTS/236 and 237) for NTEH in the same “AGR” zone in the vicinity of the Site which were rejected by RNTPC in 2006. The major rejection reasons were the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention for the area, there was no strong planning justification for a departure from the planning intention and the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the future;
- (b) Small House was for indigenous villager in the New Territories under the Small House Policy. Under the Policy, an indigenous male villager might apply to LandsD for permission to build for himself a Small House of a specified size. NTEH generally referred to those village houses situated in the New Territories which were exempted from certain provisions of the

Buildings Ordinance (BO), including submission of general building plan (GBP) to the Buildings Department (BD) for approval. There were restrictions on dimensions of NTEH, such as building height and roofed-over area;

Planning Considerations

- (c) in processing the applications of NTEH and Small House, PlanD would assess the applications case by case based on the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in the New Territories (the Interim Criteria). The assessment criteria included whether more than 50% of the proposed NTEH/Small House footprint fell within “V” zone and ‘VE’, whether there was a general shortage of land in meeting the demand for Small House development in the “V” zone, outstanding Small House application, any previous planning permission and whether the proposed development would be compatible with the surrounding area, etc. For the subject application, the Site fell within the “AGR” zone and was currently used as plant nurseries. Since the surrounding areas of the Site were predominantly rural in character with fallow agricultural land, the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) had advised that the Site should be retained for agricultural use. There was no strong planning justification for a departure from the planning intention. If part of the Site, i.e. Lot 493 S.A was applied for Small House as suggested by the applicant, it would be considered on its individual merit. It should be noted that the RNTPC had rejected two recent applications for Small House development in the same “AGR” zone, which fell within the ‘VE’ of Hang Tau Village; and
- (d) according to District Lands Officer/North (DLO/N), the number of outstanding Small House applications was 60, while the 10-year Small House demand forecast for Hang Tau Village was 200. According to the latest estimate by PlanD, a total of about 3.77ha of land, which was equivalent to 150 Small House sites, was available within the “V” zone. Land available within the “V” zone was sufficient to cater for the outstanding Small House application though it could not fully meet the 10-year forecast demand. It should be

noted that the Board had adopted a more cautious approach in recent years and more weight had been put on the number of outstanding Small House applications rather than the 10-year forecast demand.

36. Mr Edwin W.K. Chan, Deputy Director of Lands (General) (DD(G), LandsD) supplemented the following main points:

- (a) NTEH referred to those village houses situated in the New Territories which were exempted from certain provisions of the BO, including the requirement of GBP submission to BD prior to commencement of works. NTEH included Small House under the Small House Policy. When LandsD approved a Small House grant, the applicant would be allowed to building NTEH and no GBP approval was required; and
- (b) since the Site was not to be developed for a Small House under the Small House Policy and that the existing lease of the lot was not covered by building licence, DLO/N therefore considered the proposed NTEH on the Site was not acceptable from both lease and land administration points of view. If the planning application was approved by the Board, the applicant would need to apply for further approval (i.e. lease modification) from LandsD. Even if approval to build a house on the Site was subsequently given by LandsD, no NTEH would be allowed under the lease and that GBP submission to BD would still be required.

37. A Member asked whether there were separate application forms for Small House and NTEH development. In response, the Secretary said that the application form (No. S16-2) was applicable for application for Small House or NTEH development. If the applicant was applying for Small House, the box requiring name of indigenous villager would be filled. Such information would be relevant to LandsD for consideration of the planning application in respect of the Small House Policy. The land administrative process adopted by LandsD for Small House development would be different from that for NTEH development.

38. As Members had no further question, the Vice-Chairperson informed the applicant and her representatives that the hearing procedure for the review application had been

completed. The Board would further deliberate on the review application in their absence and inform her of the Board's decision in due course. The Vice-Chairperson thanked the representative of PlanD, the applicant and her representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

39. In response to the Vice-Chairman's query, the Secretary said that the Interim Criteria was applicable to both Small House and NTEH applications. If Small House development was applied for, the applicant should provide information on his indigenous villager status and the name of the recognized village to which he belonged on the application form. That information would facilitate LandsD in considering the planning application under the Small House Policy, i.e. whether the site fell within 'VE'.

40. Mr Edwin W.K. Chan, DD(G), LandsD supplemented that LandsD generally would allow NTEH development for (a) rebuilding of house lot, with no restriction for building a NTEH under the existing lease condition or (b) land grant under the Small House Policy.

41. A Member opined that land matter was not the major concern of the subject planning application and land administration matter could be resolved after the planning stage. Although LandsD had advised that the proposed NTEH development was not acceptable from lease and land administration points of view, the Board could approve the application and leave the land administration procedure to be sorted out afterward. Moreover, noting that the Interim Criteria was applicable to both Small House and NTEH applications, planning considerations for NTEH and Small House developments should be the same. Given that there were approved planning applications for Small House development in the vicinity, approval of the subject application for NTEH development should be considered.

42. Members noted that apart from departmental comments, other considerations as stated in the Interim Criteria, including site context and planning intention, etc. would be taken into account when assessing NTEH or Small House application. For Small House application, the Board would also take into account the Small House demand in the recognized village and see whether sympathetic consideration might be given, while for NTEH development, the Board would consider whether there was strong planning justification for a departure from the

planning intention.

43. For the subject application, Members generally considered that the Site was located in an area predominantly rural in character and some fruit trees were growing at the Site. Relevant departments had raised concerns/objections to the application. There was no similar approved application for NTEH in the vicinity of the Site and two similar applications (No. A/NE-KTS/236 and 237) for NTEH were rejected by the RNTPC. There was no strong planning justification in the current application for a departure from the planning intention. For Small House application, the Board had adopted a more cautious approach in recent years and more weight had been put on the number of outstanding Small House applications rather than the 10-year forecast demand. Noting that two previous applications for Small House development in the vicinity were rejected by RNTPC last year, even the subject of the application was changed to Small House development, Members considered that sympathetic consideration might not be given.

44. After deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application on review for the following reasons:

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone which is primarily 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. There is no strong planning justification in the current submission for a departure from the planning intention; and
- (b) approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the “AGR” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would lead to further extension of village development beyond the existing “Village Type Development” zone boundary resulting in irreversibly further reduction of farmland and degradation of the agricultural environment of the “AGR” zone.”

Housing and Office Land Supply Section

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Planning and Design Study on the Redevelopment of Government Sites at Sai Yee Street and Mong Kok East Station – Feasibility Study Recommended Development Scheme
(TPB Paper No. 10394)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

45. The Secretary reported that as Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup), BMT Asia Pacific Ltd (BMT) and AGC Design (AGC) were the consultants of the Planning and Design Study on the Redevelopment of Government Sites at Sai Yee Street and Mong Kok East Station (the Study), the following Members had declared interests on the item for owning properties in the area, and/or having affiliation with the above consultants:

- | | | |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Ms Janice W.M. Lai |] | having current business dealings with Arup and AGC |
| Mr Ivan C.S. Fu |] | |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | - | having current business dealings with Arup and AGC and had past business dealings with BMT |
| Mr K.K. Cheung |] | their firms having current business dealings with Arup |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai |] | |
| Professor S.C. Wong | - | having current business dealings with Arup
(Vice-chairperson) |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - | having past business dealings with BMT |
| Mr Franklin Yu | - | having past business dealings with Arup |

Ms Christina M. Lee - being director of a company which own properties at Nathan Road

46. Members noted that Mr H.F. Leung, Ms Janice W.M. Lai, Mr Ivan C.S. Fu and Ms Christina M. Lee had tendered apologies for not being able to attend the meeting. Since the item was only a briefing to Members on the key recommendations of the Study, Members agreed that the rest of the Members above who had declared interests could stay in the meeting and participate in the discussion.

47. The following government representatives and consultants of the Study (the Consultant) were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

- | | | |
|------------------------|---|--|
| Ms Phoebe Y.M. Chan | - | Chief Town Planner/Special Duties 2 (CTP/SD2) |
| Ms Yvonne Y.T. Leong | - | Senior Town Planner/Housing & Office Land Supply 1 (STP/HOLS1) |
| Mr Vincent C.L. Cheung | - | Town Planner (TP)/HOLS1 |

Transport Department (TD)

- | | | |
|--------------------|---|---|
| Mr Mario C.S. Choy | - | Chief Transport Officer/Kowloon (CTO/K) |
| Mr W.H. Leung | - | Chief Transport Officer/Boundary (CTO/B) |
| Mr L.M. Wong | - | Senior Engineer/Kowloon District West (SE/KW) |

Consultant Representatives

Arup

Ms Theresa Yeung	-	Director/Study Manager
Ms Carmen Chu	-	Director/Deputy Study Manager
Mr Chris Romanos	-	Associate/Team Leader of Planning & Design Team
Mr Matthew Fung	-	Town Planner/Study Coordinator

48. The Vice-Chairperson extended a welcome and invited the representatives of the Government and the Consultant to brief Members of the Study. Members noted that two replacement pages regarding the public consultation and building height in paragraphs 5 and 7 of the Paper (pages 2 and 4) respectively were tabled at the meeting.

49. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Phoebe Y.M. Chan, CTP/SD2, and Ms Carmen Chu and Mr Chris Romanos of Arup briefed Members on the Study including the background of the Study, the site characteristics, the major views and comments received during the public consultation exercise conducted during March to June 2016, the Recommended Development Scheme (RDS) and the comments of the Yau Tsim Mong District Council (YTM DC) on further consultations of the RDS held on 30 November 2017, the planning and design brief (PDB), with the urban design, traffic and transport aspects as well as the way forward as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10394 (the Paper).

50. As the presentation of the representatives of the Government and the Consultant was completed, the Vice-Chairperson invited comments and questions from Members.

51. Some Members had the following comments and questions:

Land Use, Development Intensity and Building Height (BH)

- (a) since it would be difficult to identify other available land in the area and the Site was a piece of government land, the general public would have high expectation on the proposed development. It might be more appropriate to develop the Site into a public transport interchange (PTI) with government, institution or community (GIC) facilities and public open space (POS) to help alleviate the existing traffic congestion problems and provide more GIC facilities and POS in the area instead of mainly for commercial developments which would generate additional traffic to the area;
- (b) due to the proposed commercial use, the Site would be an attraction point for visitors. Whether it was appropriate to limit the gross floor area (GFA) for eating places and retail use but allow more office spaces, which would generate lesser pedestrian flow;
- (c) whether more at-grade retail shops along Luen Wan Street had been explored;
- (d) what the plot ratios (PRs) of the developments were in the surrounding areas; and
- (e) given a high-rise landmark commercial tower with a large area of POS was proposed within the Site, the development bulk and BH of the proposed development under the RDS were considered appropriate.

52. In response, Ms Phoebe Y.M. Chan, CTP/SD2, and Ms Carmen Chu and Mr Chris Romanos of Arup, with the aid of PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

Land Use, Development Intensity and BH

- (a) the proposed development would provide an ample amount of POS and various GIC facilities which were most needed in the Mong Kok area as well as various public transport facilities to address the traffic problems in the area;
- (b) the PDB would be prepared to guide the development, but not specifying the

mix of commercial GFA. That would ensure that the salient planning and design issues would be addressed in the proposed development yet allowing flexibility to cater for the future market need;

- (c) the existing ramp at Luen Wan Street leading to the existing PTI outside the Mong Kok East Station on KCRC deck would occupy 1/2 to 2/3 of the street frontage along Luen Wan Street, the suggested at-grade retail shops would not be accessible from the street; and
- (d) the commercial developments in the surrounding areas, which were zoned “Commercial” on the OZP, were subject to a maximum PR of 12, while the residential developments, which were zoned “Residential (Group A)” on the OZP, were subject to a maximum PR of 7.5 for a domestic building or a maximum PR of 9 for a building that was partly domestic and partly non-domestic. The proposed PR of 12 at the Site was technically feasible and comparable to other commercial developments in Kowloon.

53. Some Members had the following comments and questions:

Traffic and Transport

- (a) the accommodation of public light bus (PLB) in PTI and loading/unloading (L/UL) facilities for cross-boundary (X-B) coaches within the Site for relocating certain existing on-street PLB stands and some X-B coach stopping points in the Mong Kok area was highly appreciated;
- (b) given that X-B coaches required large turning radius and their L/UL activities took relatively long time, and there would be a lot of PLBs in PTI, whether there was sufficient space within the Site for manoeuvring of X-B coaches and queueing of PLBs to avoid causing congestion at the ingress/egress points;
- (c) noting that the proposal would accommodate new commercial use, transport and GIC facilities, whether the existing traffic congestion problem in the area would be aggravated;

- (d) whether it would be possible to locate the PTI and L/UL facilities for X-B coaches all at basement level for better use of the at-grade space;
- (e) noting that Argyle Street was very busy and congested, whether the possibility of providing vehicular underpass exist from basement of the Site to street level at a location away from the congested area, as well as providing underground pedestrian connections had been explored;

Pedestrian Connectivity

- (f) together with large pedestrian flows generated by the three MTR Stations, i.e. Mong Kok Station, Prince Edward Station and the Mong Kok East Station, the proposed commercial development might attract a lot of pedestrians, which might create some bottlenecks at the pedestrian network, particularly at some vertical connection points;
- (g) whether the pedestrian passageways to be provided would be barrier-free to cater for those physically disabled and open 24-hour a day for public use; and
- (h) the level of the proposed podium and elevated footbridges should be reviewed in order to minimize the use of staircases, escalators and lifts. The elevated landscaped walkways linking the Mong Kok Government Offices (MKGO) and the Site could have access to the existing elevated footbridge system at Sai Yee Street/Mong Kok Road.

54. In response, Ms Phoebe Y.M. Chan, CTP/SD2, and Ms Carmen Chu and Mr Chris Romanos of Arup, with the aid of PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

Traffic and Transport

- (a) There would be sufficient space for circulation and manoeuvring of X-B coaches and queueing of PLBs within the Site to avoid queueing back to the public road. The PTI for PLBs at ground floor and L/UL facilities for X-B

coaches at basement level would have separate ingress/egress points to avoid causing congestion in the area. Other ancillary facilities for X-B coaches including ticket office, public toilet and waiting area would also be provided. The views of the current X-B coaches and PLBs operators had been sought on the design of the concerned facilities. The relocation of PLB and X-B coach stands to the Site would also help to address the traffic congestion problem in the area;

- (b) sufficient space would need to be provided to ensure the efficient operation of the PLB PTI without causing congestion at the ingress/egress of the PTI. The proposed ground floor layout could accommodate all the existing PLB stands at sections of Tung Choi Street, Fa Yuen Street between Mong Kok Road and Argyle Street and Fife Street between Fa Yuen Street and Sai Yee Street. If the PLB PTI was located at basement, some spaces would be taken up for internal ramp system reducing the available area for PLBs, which might affect the flexibility/efficiency of the PLB operation;
- (c) the possibility of providing vehicular underpass or pedestrian tunnel in the area had been explored. However, in the congested developed urban area, there were utilities facilities underneath the streets/roads. The provision of vehicular underpass or pedestrian tunnel would involve complicated technical issues. Given Mong Kok was already well developed with its existing and planned pedestrian footbridge connections, it would be better to capitalise on the existing and planned systems to avoid large level changes for pedestrian circulation;

Pedestrian Connectivity

- (d) the bottleneck of the existing pedestrian network in the area was at the existing narrow footbridge across Argyle Street to Yim Po Fong Street. The proposed development would provide additional direct, unobstructed and convenient linkages for the pedestrians. Multi-levels pedestrian network connecting the PLB PTI, L/UL facilities for X-B coaches, GIC facilities, POS as well as the existing and planned footbridge systems at Sai Yee Street/Mong Kok Road

and Argyle Street would be provided for efficient, comfortable and barrier-free connection. Moreover, two elevated landscaped walkways connecting the Site and the Mong Kong East Station and MKGO would be provided. The pedestrian network would form a grid system diverting the pedestrian flow. Different levels would also be connected vertically with staircases, escalators and/or lifts; and

- (e) to ensure the provision of convenient and pedestrian friendly passageways, the proposed pedestrian connections would be barrier-free with weather protection and open 24-hour a day for public use. The design of the multi-level pedestrian network would comply with the Buildings Ordinance and relevant requirements for barrier free access promulgated by the Buildings Department.

55. Some Members had the following comments and questions:

Open Space Provision, Landscape and Tree Preservation

- (a) the provision of a large amount of POS for public enjoyment within the Site was appreciated;
- (b) POS to be managed and maintained by the future developer was supported. However, taking into account experiences gained in similar cases, more attention should be paid to details of the management plan of the POS and relevant requirements should be specified in the PDB;
- (c) to avoid bisecting the at-grade POS at the south of the Site by the proposed footbridge connecting Tower 3 and Hak Po Street, whether it was possible to move Tower 3 and the proposed footbridge westwards;
- (d) visual and physical linkages between different levels should be enhanced;
- (e) whether the Old and Valuable Trees (OVTs) could be properly preserved given there would be basement underneath;

- (f) whether the POS on the KCRC deck would be managed by the future developer and whether it would also be accountable for meeting the 20% site greening coverage requirement, as well as whether temporary commercial activities would be accountable for the 10% allowable area for commercial activities in the POS in accordance with the relevant government guideline;
- (g) urban forestry strategy for the proposed development should be studied and incorporated into the PDB;

GIC Facilities

- (h) whether there was deficit in GIC facilities and open space in the area;
- (i) whether it was possible to provide some GIC facilities at the upper levels of the tower building for public enjoyment;

Others

- (j) whether there was possibility to redevelop the site as joint development with the redevelopment of MKGO and Mong Kong East Station;
- (k) as a government project, whether there would be any environmental initiatives in this project, e.g. waste management and disposal; and
- (l) whether the PDB would incorporate requirements for those architectural features or scale of retail shops as shown in the schematic drawings. The PDB as well as the land sale conditions should be drafted carefully to ensure that the future developer would meet the proposed requirements.

56. In response, Ms Phoebe Y.M. Chan, CTP/SD2, and Ms Theresa Yeung, Ms Carmen Chu and Mr Chris Romanos of Arup, with the aid of PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

Open Space Provision, Landscape and Tree Preservation

- (a) a minimum of 6,550m² of POS would be provided within the Site and an addition of 3,200m² of POS would be provided at the KCRC deck which would be connected by elevated landscaped walkways to the Site;
- (b) the future developer would be required under lease to submit a Master Layout Plan and Landscape Master Plan to illustrate the design scheme and management of the POS with reference to the requirements under the PDB prior to implementation;
- (c) the proposed footbridge to Hak Po Street would be about 6 to 7m above ground, which would not bisect the at-grade POS to the south of the Site. The visual permeability at pedestrian level would be acceptable. The spaces at different levels would be visually connected. Moreover, the at-grade POS would also allow activities, such as Sunday markets and events, rather than just a pedestrian circulation area;
- (d) the existing OVT and two trees bearing OVT characters within the Site would be preserved and integrated into the design of the at-grade POS. The design of the basement level would allow sufficient depth of soil for the growth of the trees and comply with requirements of relevant Bureaux/Departments;

GIC Facilities

- (e) in the Mong Kok Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), there were shortfall of one primary school (34 classrooms), one divisional police station, 752 hospital beds, a sports ground complex, 7.93ha of local open space and 8.87ha of district open space while in the Yau Tsim Mong district, there were shortfall of a sports ground complex and 0.86ha of local open space but 14.58ha surplus of district open space;
- (f) four GIC facilities (i.e. a day care centre for the elderly, a neighbourhood elderly centre, an integrated children and youth services centre, and an integrated community centre for the mental wellness) as required by the Social

Welfare Department (SWD) would be accommodated in the Site. A standard community hall was proposed in response to the public comments. About 14% of the total GFA of the proposed development was designated for GIC and public facilities. Some requests for GIC facilities, e.g. library and swimming pool, etc. were received from previous public consultations but were considered not necessary or feasible to be provided at the Site given the current provisions of such facilities were in accordance with HKPSG requirements. The Site with an area of only 1.18ha could not accommodate a proper sports ground complex, which required an area of 3ha. The proposed development would also provide a total of 9,750m² local open space to address the shortfall in open space provision in the area;

- (g) provision of some GIC facilities at high levels might not be feasible as there were statutory requirements to designate many GIC facilities at low levels. However, a public viewing deck would be provided on the top floor of the tower building for public enjoyment;

[Professor K.C. Chau and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong left the meeting at this point.]

Others

- (h) the possibility of incorporating the Mong Kong East Station and MKGO for comprehensive redevelopment had been examined. As the area was vested in KCRC and the redevelopment of the railway station and MKGO would affect the live operation of the East Rail as well as involve issues relating to the structural and loading capacity of the platform area, the Study had focused on the redevelopment of the Site. PlanD would brief/consult the Board and public for any redevelopment proposal of the Mong Kong East Station and MKGO in the future if any;
- (i) environmentally friendly measures such as wastes recycling and sorting facilities could be provided within the proposed development. However, district-wide central waste disposal would involve technical considerations in an old district like Mong Kok; and

- (j) detailed requirements on architectural design features would not be incorporated into the PDB. However, some urban design considerations as well as open space provision, landscape and tree preservation requirements would be incorporated into the PDB to ensure the Site would be developed as required. Requirements specified in the PDB would be incorporated into the land lease as appropriate.

[Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon, Mr K.K. Cheung, Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung, Mr Stephen H.B. Yau, Mr Alex T.H. Lai, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho, Dr Wilton W.T. Fok, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung and Mr Sunny L.K. Ho left the meeting at this point.]

57. Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, Director of Planning thanked Members for their comments on the Study, and said that the main objective of the Study was to seize the opportunity of redevelopment of the Site to provide improvement to the area. In order to explore whether the design concepts and improvement measures could be incorporated into the proposed development, conceptual design scheme was formulated. Improvement measures proposed included provision of PLB PTI and X-B coach L/UL facilities to alleviate the local traffic congestion problem, a comprehensive pedestrian network to enhance connectivity to major public transport facilities, road/footpath widening to improve local traffic conditions, provision of about 5,000m² of various GIC facilities and more than 9,700m² of POS spaces to address community needs and shortfall in open space in the area. PlanD would take account of Members' comments and further liaise with the Environmental Protection Department on the requirement of environmentally friendly waste disposal facilities, and further assess the management plan of the POS to be undertaken by the future developer and the possibility of incorporating urban forestry strategy into the future Landscape Master Plan. Meanwhile, amendment to the land use zonings would be required to facilitate implementation of the redevelopment proposal. Taking on board the findings and recommendations of the Study as well as Member's comments, PlanD would submit proposed amendments to the OZP specifying major development parameters for the Site to the Board for consideration in due course.

58. As Members had no further question, the Vice-Chairperson thanked the representatives of the Government and the Consultant for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang left the meeting at this point.]

Procedural Matters

Agenda Item 6

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comments on the Draft Tseung Kwan O Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TKO/25
(TPB Paper No. 10395)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

59. The Secretary reported that the amendment items on the draft Tsueng Kwan O Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TKO/25 (the draft OZP) involved rezoning of sites for public housing development by the Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) was the consultant for the Preliminary Feasibility Study (FS) and technical assessments to support the proposed public housing developments conducted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD). The Secretary reported that the following Members have declared interest on the item for owning properties in the Tseung Kwan O area and/or having affiliation with HKHA, CEDD, Arup, the Conservancy Association (CA) (R62), Mary Mulvihill (R686), World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong (WWF-HK)(R755), Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden (KFBG) (R756), Mass Transit Railway Corporation Ltd. (MTRCL)(R999), the Hong Kong and China Gas Co Ltd (Towngas) (R1000) and/or the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society (HKBWS) (C2):

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee - being a member of the Strategic Planning
(*as Director of Planning*) Committee (SPC) and Building Committee of the
Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA)

Mr Edwin W.K. Chan - being an alternative member for the Director of
(*as Deputy Director of Lands (General)*) Lands who was a member of HKHA

- Mr Martin W.C. Kwan - being a representative of the Director of Home
(as Chief Engineer Affairs who was a member of the SPC and the
(Works) Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA
- Mr H.F. Leung - being a member of the Tender Committee of
HKHA and a convenor of the Railway Objections
Hearing Panel
- Ms Janice W.M. Lai - having current business dealings with HKHA,
CEDD, Arup and MTRCL
- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with HKHA,
Arup and MTRCL
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai] their firms having current business dealings with
Mr K.K. Cheung] HKHA, Arup, KFBG, MTRCL and Towngas; and
hiring Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from
time to time
- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having current business dealings with Arup and
MTRCL and past business dealings with HKHA
- Dr C.H. Hau - having current business dealings with HKHA and
CEDD; being a member of HKBWS; a life
member of CA and his wife was the Honorary
Secretary of the Board of Directors of CA; and a
past member of the Conservation Advisory
Committee of WWF-HK
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with HKHA and
MTRCL
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having past business dealings with HKHA and

MTRCL

- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with HKHA, Arup and MTRCL
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his spouse being an employee of the HD but not involved in planning work
- Professor S.C. WONG - being an engineering consultant of and having current business dealings with Arup and being a member of the Advisory Committee for Accredited Programme of MTR Academy
- Vice-chairperson
- Mr Peter K.T. Yuen - being a member of the Board of Governors of the Hong Kong Arts Centre, which had collaborated with the MTRCL on a number of arts projects
- Professor T.S. Liu - Owning and co-owning properties and his spouse owning properties at Tsueng Kwan O

60. Members noted that Mr H.F. Leung, Ms Janice W.M. Lai, Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, and Mr Peter K.T. Yuen had tendered apologies for being not able to attend the meeting and Mr K.K. Cheung, Mr Alex T.H. Lai, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon had already left the meeting. As the item was procedural in nature, Members agreed that the rest of the Members who had declared interests in the item could stay in the meeting.

61. The Secretary briefly introduced the TPB Paper No. 10395. On 11.8.2017, the draft OZP was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). During the public inspection period, the Secretariat of the Town Planning Board (the Board) received confirmation from a member of the public that he had not submitted any representation to the Board. The concerned representation, i.e. R303, would be disregarded. The content of R1022 to R1036 had not been made in such manner as required under section 6(2) of the Ordinance, where a representation should indicate the particular matter in any of the amendments to which the representation related. As such, R1022 to R1036 were

considered invalid and should be treated as not having been made in accordance with section 6(3)(b) of the Ordinance. There was an out-of-time representation submitted by the Sai Kung Rural Committee after the plan exhibition period. In accordance with section 6(3)(a) of the Ordinance, where a representation was made to the Board after the expiration of the 2-month plan exhibition period, it should be treated as not having been made. As such, the submission was disregarded.

62. Taking the above into account, there was a total of 1,020 valid representations and 9 comments on representations (comments). As the representations were interrelated and related to the proposed public housing developments, the hearing of the representations could be considered collectively in one group. Since the draft OZP had attracted much public interest, it was recommended that the representations and comments should be considered by the full Board. A separate hearing session might be arranged, if necessary.

63. To ensure efficiency of the hearing, it was recommended to allot a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time to each representer/commenter in the hearing session. Consideration of the representations by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for April/May 2018.

64. After deliberation, the Board agreed that:

- (a) the R303 could be disregarded and the 15 representations (R1022 to R1036) were considered as invalid and should be treated as not having been made for reasons in paragraph 61 above;
- (b) the representations should be considered collectively in one group by the Board itself; and
- (c) a 10-minute presentation time would be allotted to each representer/commenter.

Agenda Item 7

[Confidential Item] [Closed Meeting]

65. The item was recorded under confidential cover.

Agenda Item 8

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

66. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:45 p.m.