

**Minutes of 884th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 4.5.2007**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands
(Planning and Lands)
Mrs. Rita Lau

Chairperson

Mr. Michael K.C. Lai

Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong

Ms. Carmen K.M. Chan

Professor Nora F.Y. Tam

Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan

Mr. David W.M. Chan

Mr. Leslie H.C. Chen

Dr. Lily Chiang

Professor Peter R. Hills

Mr. Tony C.N. Kan

Mr. Edmund K.H. Leung

Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim

Dr. C.N. Ng

Dr. Daniel B.M. To

Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong

Mr. Alfred Donald Yap

Ms. Sylvia S.F. Yau

Mr. B.W. Chan

Mr. Walter K.L. Chan

Ms. Maggie M.K. Chan

Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan

Mr. Y.K. Cheng

Ms. Anna S.Y. Kwong

Dr. James C.W. Lau

Ms. Starry W.K. Lee

Director of Planning

Mrs. Ava S.Y. Ng

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection

Dr. Michael Chiu

Director of Lands

Mr. Patrick L.C. Lau

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport),
Environment, Transport and Works Bureau

Ms. Ava Chiu

Assistant Director (2), Home Affairs Department

Ms. Margaret Hsia

Deputy Director of Planning/District

Miss Ophelia Y.S. Wong

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Dr. Peter K.K. Wong

Vice-chairman

Professor David Dudgeon

Professor N.K. Leung

Mr. Felix W. Fong

Professor Paul K.S. Lam

Mr. K.Y. Leung

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Mr. Lau Sing

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Mr. C.T. Ling (Item 4)

Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au (Items 1-3 and 5-15)

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Mr. Ivan Chung (Item 4)

Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Mr. Tony Wu (Items 1-3 and 5-15)

1. The Chairperson extended a welcome to Members.

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting. The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 883rd Meeting held on 20.4.2007

2. The minutes of the 883rd meeting held on 20.4.2007 were confirmed without amendment.

[Mr. Patrick L.C. Lau and Ms. Sylvia S.F. Yau arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting. The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

- (i) Town Planning Appeal Decision Received

Town Planning Appeal No. 13 of 2005

Temporary Open Storage of Construction Materials and Machinery

for a Period of 3 Years in “Comprehensive Development Area” Zone on the

Draft Ngau Tam Mei Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-NTM/9,

Lots 1711(Part), 1712(Part), 1716A(Part), 1717(Part), 1718, 1719(Part), 1720(Part),

1721(Part), 1722, 1723(Part), 1724(Part), 1725RP(Part), 1726(Part), 1728RP(Part),

1729(Part), 1731A(Part), 1732A(Part) in DD 104 and Adjoining Government Land,

Chuk Yau Road, Ngau Tam Mei, Yuen Long

(Application No. A/YL-NTM/174)

3. The Secretary said that the subject appeal was against the Board’s decision to reject on review an application for temporary open storage of construction materials and machinery for a

period of 3 years at a site zoned “Comprehensive Development Area”. The appeal was dismissed by the Town Planning Appeal Board (TPAB) on 23.4.2007 on the following grounds:

- (a) the Town Planning Board (TPB) Guidelines No. 13C for ‘Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’ clearly indicated that the TPB’s intention in relation to the Category 3 areas at which the appeal site was situated was to eliminate open storage and port pack-up uses, and to tolerate such uses where there were exceptional circumstances. There were no such exceptional circumstances in that the appeal site did not have any previous planning permissions which had been implemented in due compliance with planning conditions, and the appellant had not provided sufficient information to demonstrate that there would be no serious adverse environmental impacts and local/departmental concerns;
- (b) the TPAB did not agree that local objections had to come from residents in the immediate neighbourhood. Besides, Chuk Yau Road, which was not designed for heavy vehicle use and was already used up to its capacity, was used by a large number of land users in the appeal site’s neighbourhood. What the TPB considered was not just the traffic generated by the appeal site, but the cumulative impact of all those uses. There was no reason to disagree with the TPB on the question of adverse impact on the neighbourhood; and
- (c) most of the land in the appeal site’s immediate neighbourhood was put to unauthorized use for open storage and related purposes. Enforcement action had been taken in relation to quite a few of them and the appeal site itself. In such circumstances, the appeal could not be supported unless a strong case was made for exceptional favourable consideration under the TPB Guidelines No. 13C. However, the appellant had failed to do so.

(ii) New Town Planning Appeal Received

Town Planning Appeal No. 7 of 2007

Temporary Centre for Inspection of New Vehicles and Office

for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group D)” and “Recreation” zones on the Approved Ha Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL-HT/8,

Lots 4(Part), 5(Part), 6(Part) and 7(Part) in DD 124, Lots 1498BRP(Part),

1527RP, 1528RP and 1529RP in DD 125 and Adjoining Government Land,

Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long

(Application No. A/YL-HT/469)

4. The Secretary said that the subject appeal was received by the TPAB on 19.4.2007 against the Board’s decision on 16.3.2007 to reject on review an application for a temporary centre for inspection of new vehicles and office for a period of 3 years. The application was rejected on the grounds that the development was not in line with the planning intention of the “Residential (Group D)” zone and the TPB Guidelines No. 13D for Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses in that there were adverse departmental comments and there was insufficient information in the submission to demonstrate that the development would not have adverse environmental, traffic and drainage impacts on the surrounding area. The Secretariat would act on behalf of the TPB in dealing with the appeal in the usual manner.

(iii) Abandonment of Town Planning Appeal

Town Planning Appeal No. 14 of 2006

Proposed Houses in “Village Type Development” zone on the

Draft Yuen Long Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL/14,

Lots 1371C(Part), 1371RP and 1372D-1372H in DD 120,

Ma Tin Tsuen, Yuen Long

(Application No. A/YL/126)

5. The Secretary said that the subject appeal was received by the TPAB on 19.7.2006

against the Board's decision on 12.5.2006 to reject on review an application for proposed houses at a site zoned "Village Type Development". On 23.4.2007, the appeal was abandoned by the Appellant of his own accord. On 30.4.2007, the abandonment was confirmed by the TPAB in accordance with Regulation 7(1) of the Town Planning (Appeals) Regulations.

(iv) Appeal Statistics

6. The Secretary said that as at 4.5.2007, 23 cases were yet to be heard by the TPAB. Details of the appeal statistics were as follows:

Allowed	:	17
Dismissed	:	97
Abandoned/Withdrawn/Invalid	:	122
Yet to be Heard	:	23
<u>Decision Outstanding</u>	:	<u>6</u>
Total		265

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting]

Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront –
Stage 1 Public Engagement

(TPB Paper No. 7825)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

7. The Chairperson said that in response to the Board's request, the Planning Department (PlanD) had commissioned the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (the Study) for the refinement of the urban design framework for the Central Harbourfront and the preparation of planning/design briefs for key development sites in the area. The study outputs would guide the preparation of the Master Layout Plans (MLP) and future developments in the area.

[Mr. Leslie H.C. Chen and Mr. Y.K. Cheng arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

8. The following representatives from the PlanD and Study consultants were invited to the meeting at this point:

Ms. Phyllis Li	Chief Town Planner/Special Duties, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr. Kryan Sze) Aedas Limited
Ms. Irene Ip)
Professor Andrew Leung	CityU Professional Services Limited

Presentation and Question Session

9. The Chairperson extended a welcome and invited the representatives of the PlanD and the consultants to brief Members on the Study.

10. With the aid of Powerpoint slides, Ms. Phyllis Li made the following main points:

The Study

- (a) in considering several rezoning requests/application in relation to the Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) in 2005 and 2006, the Board had reaffirmed the land use zonings of the current plan and rejected the requests/application. After considering the concerned rezoning requests in August 2005, the Board requested the PlanD to refine the existing urban design framework and to prepare planning/design briefs to guide future development of the key sites in the Central Harbourfront;
- (b) the Study was commissioned by PlanD in late March 2007. Its main tasks were to examine the planning and design context, refine the urban design framework and prepare a landscape strategy plan, evaluate and refine the design concepts of key development sites, and prepare planning/design briefs or conceptual

landscape design guidelines, and identify design control mechanisms;

- (c) the Study outputs would guide the preparation of MLP and future developments in the Central Harbourfront. It would formulate a sustainable design assessment framework, undertake a sustainable assessment for the refined urban design framework, carry out air ventilation assessments to cover major development sites around the ferry piers, and examine the locations and design ideas for reconstructing the old Star Ferry Clock Tower (SFCT) and reassembling the Queen's Pier (QP);

Public Engagement

- (d) the public engagement programme comprised two stages:
 - i. the Stage 1 public engagement was launched on 3.5.2007 and would last for about 2 months. It aimed to solicit public views on the urban design objectives, urban design issues and sustainable design principles relating to the Central Harbourfront, and to explore with the community the possible locations and design ideas for reconstructing the old SFCT and reassembling the QP;
 - ii. planned public engagement activities in Stage 1 included a Focus Group Workshop mainly for the participation of professional and academic institutions on 5.5.2007; a Community Engagement Forum for the general public on 12.5.2007; engagement of the Harbourfront Enhancement Committee, relevant District Councils and relevant advisory bodies; and setting up of a web-page on the Study in PlanD's website to facilitate dissemination of information and to invite interested parties to offer their views through the web. A bilingual pamphlet for Stage 1 public engagement was at Attachment B of the Paper;

- iii. public comments received during Stage 1 would provide inputs to the subsequent phases of the Study; and
- iv. Stage 2 public engagement would focus on seeking public views on the refined overall urban design framework, design concepts and planning/design briefs for the key development sites, and on proposed locations and design ideas relating to the Clock Tower and QP.

[Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim, Dr. Lily Chiang and Ms. Anna S.Y. Kwong arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

11. With the aid of Powerpoint slides, Mr. Kryan Sze made the following main points on the Study:

Study Scope and Objectives

- (a) the new Central Harbourfront mainly comprised the already reclaimed land near the outlying ferry piers, Central Reclamation Phase III (CRIII) and a small part of the Wan Chai Development Phase II (WDII);
- (b) the eight key development sites were the “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) at Central Piers No. 4 to 6 (Site 1), the “Commercial” site adjacent to the International Finance Centre II (Site 2), the “CDA” with landscaped pedestrian deck and commercial complex (Site 3), three waterfront related commercial and leisure uses sites (Sites 4, 6 and 8), the “Government, Institution or Community (2)” site to the north of CITIC Tower (Site 5), and the promenade along waterfront of CRIII (Site 7);
- (c) the Study would take into account the urban design context including the statutory and administrative guidelines, the existing urban design framework, the illustrative concept of the new Central Harbourfront in 2006 and the design constraints;

- (d) the planning vision of the Study was to create a world-class waterfront which was vibrant, attractive, accessible and symbolic of Hong Kong;
- (e) the urban design objectives, urban design emphases, key urban design issues were stated in paragraph 5 of the Paper;
- (f) the sustainable design assessment framework was set out in the pamphlet at Attachment B of the Paper;

Proposals for Reconstructing Old SFCT and Reassembling QP

- (g) based on consideration of the spatial and historical context, identity, functionality, accessibility, visual prominence and flexibility for planning, four alternative concepts for reconstructing the old SFCT and reassembly of the QP were suggested to facilitate public discussion as set out in paragraph 6 and Attachment B of the Paper; and
- (h) the SFCT would be reconstructed as the focal point of the new Central Harbourfront and pedestrian corridor. The retained clock faces, chimes and mechanical parts would be reassembled in the reconstructed Clock Tower. A gallery might be built adjacent to the reconstructed Clock Tower to exhibit the salvaged items of the old Star Ferry Pier.

[Dr. James C.W. Lau arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

12. Professor Andrew Leung then made the following main points on public engagement:

- (a) the Stage 1 public engagement was mainly to find out the public aspiration of the harbourfront, i.e. what they would like, or would not like, to have on the future harbourfront;

- (b) public engagement activities in Stage 1 included a workshop, a public forum, exhibitions and consultation with various bodies. Opinion cards, telephone and web surveys, etc. would be used to collect public opinions; and
- (c) the public engagement process would be open, transparent and collaborative.

13. Ms. Phyllis Li went on to say that the Stage 1 public engagement was the starting point of the Study aiming at designing the new harbourfront with the public. The four alternative concepts for reconstructing the old SFCT and reassembly of the QP had been formulated to facilitate public discussion. Ms. Li stressed that the concepts were not exhaustive and the public were not asked to pick one from the four. Public views and suggestions on other concepts were welcomed. Some Board Members had agreed to lead the discussions in the workshop and forum to be conducted. On the basis of comments and suggestions received from Stage 1, a refined overall urban design framework and planning/design briefs for the key development sites would be formulated for public consultation at Stage 2.

14. Members supported the consultative approach of the Study and the engagement of the public in planning the harbourfront. Their comments and questions were summarized as follows:

Public Engagement

- (a) to facilitate public comments and suggestions, a roving exhibition should be staged;
- (b) the public should be encouraged to express their views and draw out their ideas and proposals. They should not be confined to any pre-defined design concepts;
- (c) how would public views and suggestions be consolidated, noting that some of which might be conflicting with one another;
- (d) as some of the jargons and the alternative concepts for the Clock Tower and QP

in the pamphlet were rather conceptual and abstract, members of the public might not be able to fully understand the meaning and implications behind. Also, there was no elaboration on the implications of the alternative concepts such as the length in delay of works and cost implications to CRIII. Hence, more illustrative materials and supplementary information on the 'Considerations' should be provided;

- (e) physical models to demonstrate the detailed design concepts and proposals should be used in the Stage 2 public engagement exercise;
- (f) more information on the development parameters of Site 3 (i.e. the 'groundscraper' site zoned "CDA") should be given as it would have significant impact on the harbourfront;

Study Approach and Scope

- (g) the Board's previous request for refining the urban design framework for the new harbourfront covered all the key development sites in the Study. Whilst the SFCT and QP had attracted much public and media attention, the Study should not lose sight of the overall picture and other harbourfront sites;
- (h) the Study should identify the elements that would contribute to the achievement of a world-class harbourfront and explore ways to turn such objective into reality. Apart from skyscrapers and cityscape that had made our harbourfront renowned worldwide, the water quality of Victoria Harbour and a clear sky were also major areas that needed to be improved;
- (i) whether there was any priority amongst the various urban design objectives, urban design issues and the key development sites;

Urban Design Issues

- (j) the urban design on two sides of the harbour should be considered as a whole and complementary to each other. The wide public views from Kowloon towards the Central Harbourfront should be preserved;
- (k) the Study should propose urban design solutions to link the Central Harbourfront to the east and west and to the hinterland to the south;
- (l) drawing reference to the Charles River in Boston, the design and development of the Central Harbourfront could adopt a maritime theme with provision of amphitheatre and outdoor venues for performance, in harmony with the Multi-media Lighting Spectacular event, therefore adding variety and vibrancy to the harbourfront;
- (m) the Study should take into consideration Hong Kong's hot and humid summer in designing the greenery and open space;
- (n) whether and how the Tamar site would be included in the refined urban design framework;
- (o) the Study should address the issues of bringing people to and from the harbourfront and facilitating the public to enjoy the harbour;

Clock Tower and QP

- (p) the various proposals to reassemble the QP should only be treated as some possible options. The future of QP was still under discussion by the general public and the Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB) would decide on the grading of QP at its next meeting on 9.5.2007. The Board's discussion should not be seen as pre-empting the deliberation of the AAB;

- (q) the architectural design of QP itself might not be outstanding. However, it was the clustering of City Hall, Edinburgh Place and QP that altogether had high cultural, historical and social significance;
- (r) whilst the design of a place should take due heed of its historical and cultural background holistically, the physical context of QP had changed over time. In considering the future of QP, a balance on the passion of history and development needs should be struck, thus achieving a sustainable development. For instance, the Sung Wong Toi Rock had also been relocated several times. The Board should look into the matter in a balanced and fair manner;
- (s) the Clock Tower could be integrated with the development in the 'groundscraper' site;
- (t) whether there was any proposal to reconstruct the Clock Tower in-situ;
- (u) whether the Edinburgh Place would be affected as a result of the proposed reconstruction of the Clock Tower and reassembly of the QP;

The 'Groundscraper' Site

- (v) whether there was any building height restriction for the 'groundscraper' site to avoid incompatible development; and

Military Berth

- (w) whether and to what extent the 150m military berth would affect the urban design of the area and impede the public enjoyment of the harbour, and whether the Government had made a firm decision on the use of this very important waterfront site.

15. The Chairperson said that the suggestion of setting up display boards and placing

opinion cards near the Star Ferry Pier should be pursued. The Study team should endeavour to work out an urban design framework that could help achieve the community's objective of having a world-class harbourfront, making the best use of our landmarks such as the Convention and Exhibition Centre, the skyline and the ridgeline. Members' views on the proposed reassembly of the QP would not pre-empt the public discussion and AAB's deliberation on the grading of the pier.

16. In response to Members' comments and questions, Ms. Phyllis Li, Mr. Kryan Sze and Ms. Irene Ip made the following main points:

Public Engagement

- (a) the public would be engaged in various ways throughout the Study process. For example, in the forthcoming Focus Group Workshop and Public Engagement Forum, group discussions led by facilitators would be held and participants could put forward their ideas and suggestions verbally and in drawings. They would not be confined to commenting on the four alternative concepts for reconstructing the SFCT and reassembling the QP;
- (b) the sustainable design principles to be agreed at the Stage 1 public engagement would be used to guide the process of building community consensus on the refinement of the urban design framework, evaluate various proposals and suggestions put forward by the public, and prepare planning/design briefs for the key development sites;
- (c) the bilingual pamphlet had incorporated some 3-dimensional perspectives of the new harbourfront. Additional illustrative materials and supplementary information on the design concepts and proposals would be provided to the public;

Study Approach and Scope

- (d) the launch of the Stage 1 public engagement was only the starting point of the Study. The issues for public consultation at this stage were largely conceptual, relating to the principles to be adopted in the formulation of urban design framework and planning/design briefs for the key development sites. The public would be further consulted on the detailed proposals and design framework in the Stage 2 public engagement;
- (e) the Study would adopt an integrated and comprehensive approach to explore and refine the urban design framework for the Central Harbourfront. It would look into the urban design objectives and urban design issues before formulating detailed planning/design briefs of the eight key development sites and exploring design solutions for the Clock Tower and QP;
- (f) Victoria Harbour, the ridgelines and the city skyline were indeed the major assets of our harbourfront and would be given due recognition in the effort to turn the area into a world-class harbourfront. The Study would prepare detailed planning/design briefs with key development parameters including building height restrictions. The Study outputs would guide the preparation of MLP and future developments on this important part of Hong Kong;
- (g) the consultants had carried out researches on what made harbourfront developments successful. In designing the Central Waterfront, both overseas experience and local views on ways to enhance the harbourfront would be duly considered;
- (h) the Board's 'Vision and Goals for Victoria Harbour' promulgated since 1999 would be adopted to guide the Study with a view to turning the Study area into a vibrant, accessible, and world-class harbourfront;
- (i) the Government had a comprehensive policy on sewage treatment and

improving the water quality of the harbour. The Study would adopt sustainable urban design principles to improve urban climate such as provision of breezeways, air ventilation corridors, high quality public space and pedestrian environment, and enhancement of openness and greenery;

- (j) the Study covered the entire harbourfront and emphasized on achievement of an integrated urban design framework. The Clock Tower and QP were part and parcel of the waterfront;

Urban Design Issues

- (k) urban design framework and landscape strategy plan would be prepared to maximize views from various vantage points through the Central Harbourfront;
- (l) the Study team had commenced work on preparing planning/design briefs for the eight key development sites to ensure the future developments would be functional, of high quality, diversified with unity, vibrant and highly accessible;
- (m) the Study would look into ways to enhance the urban design connections between the Central Harbourfront and the adjacent areas. In the east, Site 6 which straddled the CRIII and WDII would provide an essential link between the harbourfront in Central and Wanchai. In preparing the design briefs for the site, special effort would be made to the urban design and pedestrian connections along the harbourfront. The Study would also explore ways to integrate the design of the harbourfront with the hinterland. There would be an integrated pedestrian connection system to maximize accessibility to and from the harbour and along the waterfront;
- (n) as an extension to the proposed expansion of the Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts, Site 6 would also have a high potential for development into a harbourfront arts and cultural precinct with outdoor venues;

- (o) the proposed maritime or an appropriate theme for the harbourfront with a variety of open space and outdoor performance venues would be explored as part of the Study with a view to creating ‘anchoring space’ for people to congregate and enjoy various activities;
- (p) as the Tamar site was at the tendering stage, it was not included as one of the eight key development sites of the Study. However, the selected scheme for Tamar development would be integrated in the design of the new harbourfront under the Study;

Clock Tower and QP

- (q) the alternative proposals put forward by the consultants were based on the design objective to group the City Hall, Edinburgh Place and the Clock Tower sufficiently close together and form an axial relationship amongst them. The Study team would adopt an open attitude and look into the in-situ reconstruction option in the course of the Study;
- (r) the value of QP as manifested in its co-existence with the adjacent City Hall and Edinburgh Place was recognized in the Concept A Series (‘QP with City Hall’). On the other hand, the Concept B Series (‘QP by the Harbour’) could better reflect of the history that QP was always located on the harbourfront;
- (s) the Edinburgh Place would not be affected by the proposed reconstruction of the Clock Tower and reassembly of the QP. Instead, the place would be improved by expanding the open area for public use;

The ‘Groundscraper’ Site

- (t) the preliminary design concept for the ‘groundscraper’ site had been incorporated in the pamphlet. Although the design solution was yet to be

worked out, the public concern on the bulk of future development was fully recognized. Building height control was one of the most important issues to be addressed in the urban design briefs for the site;

- (u) through the planning permission system, the Board could exercise proper control on the future form and bulk of the development via the scrutiny of the submission of MLP at the s.16 application stage; and

Military Berth

- (v) the location of the military berth in Central had been determined for a long time. Allowance had been made to the design of the berth such that it could be open to the public when the berth was not in use by the navy.

17. The Chairperson said that Members' valuable comments and suggestions should be carefully considered by the Study team. The Study aimed at refining the urban design framework for the entire waterfront and formulating detailed planning/design briefs to guide the preparation of MLP and future developments of the eight key development sites. The Study Team should clarify that the Study would not solely focus on the reconstruction of the SFCT and reassembly of the QP.

18. The Chairperson went on to say that it was important to plan with the community. Every effort should be made to conduct the public engagement exercise properly and facilitate the public to provide their comments. Whilst the public consultation period should not be unduly prolonged, flexibility should be allowed to extend the period if necessary. Given the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance, the Central Harbourfront would be the last reclaimed site in the Central Business District. It was thus essential to ensure the delivery of a high quality design taking into account the public views as far as practicable.

19. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson thanked the representatives of the PlanD and the consultants for attending the meeting. They all left the meeting at this point.

20. The meeting adjourned for a break of 5 minutes and resumed at 10:45 a.m.

[Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan and Dr. Daniel B.M. To returned to the meeting, while Professor Nora F.Y. Tam and Mr. Patrick L.C. Lau left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the
Draft Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K9/19

(TPB Papers No. 7818 and 7819)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

156. The Secretary reported that Messrs. Alfred Donald Yap and Raymond Y.M. Chan had declared interests on this item for having current business dealings with Henderson Land Development Company Limited, which was the parent company of the Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited, Representer No. 1. Members noted that Messrs. Yap and Chan had not yet arrived.

Group 1 – Representation No.1

Presentation and Question Session

157. The Secretary said that the representer had indicated that it would not attend or be represented at the hearing. As sufficient notice had been given to the representer, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing in the absence of the representer.

158. Mr. Eric Yue, District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K), Planning Department (PlanD), and Mr. C.C. Lau, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), PlanD, were invited to the meeting at this point.

159. The Chairperson extended a welcome and invited Mr. Eric Yue to brief Members on the background to the representation.

160. Mr. Eric Yue said that a letter dated 3.5.2007 from the representer confirming that it would not attend the hearing and providing further information in support of the representation was tabled at the meeting. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. Yue presented the case and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) the background as set out in paragraph 1 of the Paper;
- (b) subject of representation – the representer supported the “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zoning of the representation sites and proposed to include a gas pigging station (GPS) in one of the sites;
- (c) the grounds of representation – to cope with the development of cruise terminal and Central Kowloon Route, the existing strategic submarine pipelines from Ma Tak Kok to North Point needed to be re-diverted. To facilitate the re-diversion, a site for a GPS was necessary;
- (d) responses of relevant Government departments to the representation as detailed in paragraphs 4.6 to 4.10 of the Paper; and
- (e) PlanD’s views – PlanD noted the representer’s support for the “G/IC” zoning of the representation sites but did not support its proposal to include a GPS in any of the two sites for reasons as detailed in paragraph 6.2 of the Paper in that the proposed GPS was not compatible with the proposed school use on the sites; neither of the two sites was large enough to accommodate a secondary school and a GPS; the safety and noise impacts of the proposed GPS on the surrounding developments were yet to be assessed; the alignment for the re-diversion of the pipelines and siting of the GPS were still being considered by relevant Government departments; and there was no information to demonstrate that there was no alternative site for the proposed GPS.

[Mr. Tony C.N. Kan left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

161. A Member raised a concern on the safety aspect if the proposed GPS was located next to a school. Mr. Eric Yue responded that the Secretary for Education and Manpower had also pointed out that siting the proposed GPS next to a school was not desirable, and the Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services had advised that the representer should undertake a quantitative risk assessment on the proposed GPS to confirm whether the risk level would be acceptable. Since no information was available on the safety aspect, PlanD did not support the representer's proposal of siting the GPS in either of the two representation sites. Concerned Government departments were identifying a suitable site for the GPS.

[Messrs. Tony C.N. Kan and Y.K. Cheng returned to the meeting at this point.]

Group 2 – Representation No. 2 and Comments No. 1 to 7

162. As Members had no further question to raise on Representation No. 1, the Chairperson invited the following representatives of Representation No.2 to the meeting at this point:

Mr. Kim Chan

Miss Kerry Lee

Mr. Allen Yu

Mr. Larry Lau

163. The Secretary said that sufficient notice had been given to the commenters, but they either indicated not to attend or made no reply. Members agreed to proceed with the hearing in the absence of the commenters.

164. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained briefly the procedures of the hearing. She then invited Mr. Eric Yue to brief Members on the background to the representation and comments.

165. Mr. Eric Yue said that a replacement page of Annex Va of the Paper incorporating an amendment to the PlanD's proposal to partially meet the representation was tabled at the meeting. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. Yue presented the case and covered the following

aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) the background as set out in paragraph 1 of the Paper;
- (b) subject of representation – the representer, DHL Express (Hong Kong) Limited, opposed to the Notes of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Pier” (“OU(Pier)”) and “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) zones, and proposed to include ‘Freight Forwarding Services Centre’ (FSSC) use in Column 2 and Column 1 of the Notes of the “OU(Pier)” and “OU(B)” zones respectively and to delete ‘Cargo Handling and Forwarding Facilities’ (‘CHFF’) from Column 2 of the Notes of the “OU(B)” zone;
- (c) the grounds of representations and the representer’s proposals as detailed in paragraphs 2.4 and 2.5 of the Paper;
- (d) the seven comments received in respect of the representation, which were all in support of the representer’s proposal to incorporate ‘FFSC’ use in Column 2 of the Notes of the “OU(Pier)”, for reasons as detailed in paragraph 2.4(c) of the Paper;
- (e) responses of relevant Government departments to the representation and comments as detailed in paragraphs 4.7 and 4.8 of the Paper; and
- (f) PlanD’s views – PlanD proposed to amend the Plan to partially meet the representation by rezoning the subject site to “OU(Pier)1” with ‘CHFF’ as a Column 2 use for reasons as detailed in paragraph 6.1 of the Paper. The proposed amendment to the Plan and the Notes of the “OU(Pier)” zone was shown in Annex V of the Paper and the replacement page of Annex Va tabled at the meeting respectively. PlanD also proposed not to amend the Plan to meet the remaining part of the representation for reason that ‘CHFF’ use should be retained in Column 2 of the Notes of the “OU(B)” zone so as to maintain planning control on traffic ground.

166. The Chairperson then invited the representer's representatives to elaborate on the representation.

167. Mr. Kim Chan said that in view of the planning approval granted by the Board on 23.3.2007 for the proposed cargo handling and forwarding facility (distribution centre) at Workshop No. 1 on the ground floor of Harbour Centre Tower 2 (Application No. A/K9/216), the representer decided to withdraw the part of its representation relating to the "OU(B)" zone.

168. Regarding the part of the representation relating to the "OU(Pier)" zone, Mr. Kim Chan said that the representer accepted the amendments proposed by PlanD to the Plan and the Notes of the "OU(Pier)" zone. If the Board agreed to the proposed amendments, the representer would withdraw that part of its representation as well.

169. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. Kim Chan went on to make the following points in respect of the part of representation relating to the "OU(Pier)" zone:

- (a) the subject pier was accessible only via Workshop No.1 on the ground floor of Harbour Tower 2. It was highly isolated and could not be used by the public. The existing Column 2 uses in the Notes of the "OU(Pier)" zone, which might be viable in a public pier, would not be viable in the subject pier;
- (b) including 'CHFF' use in Column 2 of the Notes of the "OU(Pier)" would facilitate the representer's plan to establish a local distribution centre in the Harbour Tower No. 2. This would enhance the economic development of Hong Kong; and
- (c) the representer's proposal would put the pier into proper use and maintenance. It was generally compatible with the planning intention of the "OU(Pier)" zone and would not have adverse impact on the environment.

170. Members had no questions on the representation.

171. As the representer's representatives had finished their presentation and Members had no question to raise, the Chairperson informed them that the hearing procedures for the representation and comments had been completed, and the Board would deliberate on the representation and comments in their absence and inform the representer and commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representatives of PlanD and the representer for attending the meeting. They all left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

Representation No. 1

172. Members considered that the representer had not provided sufficient information to address the safety and environmental concerns on siting the proposed GPS next to school use. It was also noted that the location of the proposed GPS was still under study, and would be followed up by relevant Government departments.

173. After deliberation, the Board decided not to propose any amendment to the Plan to meet the representation.

Representation No. 2

174. The Chairperson remarked that the representer had indicated acceptance of the amendments proposed by PlanD to partially meet its representation, and had withdrawn the part of its representation relating to the "OU(B)" zone.

175. After deliberation, the Board decided to propose amendments to the Plan to partially meet the representation by rezoning the subject site from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Pier" ("OU(Pier)") to "OU(Pier)1" with 'Cargo Handling and Forwarding Facilities' ('CHFF') as a Column 2 use, as shown at Annex V of the Paper and the replacement page of Annex Va tabled at the meeting. The Board also agreed to the proposed revisions to the Explanatory Statement of the Plan as shown at Annex VI of the Paper.

176. Since the representer had withdrawn the part of its representation regarding the “OU(B)” zone, Members agreed that no amendment to the Plan to meet that part of the representation was necessary.

[Mr. Edmund K.H. Leung left the meeting while Messrs. Alfred Donald Yap and Raymond Y.M. Chan arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

Section 16 Application No. A/H3/375

Proposed Comprehensive Residential and Commercial Development with Government, Institution and Community Facilities and Public Open Space, Three Sites of Urban Renewal Authority Development Scheme at Peel Street/Graham Street, Sheung Wan, Hong Kong
(TPB Paper No. 7784)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

177. The Secretary said that as the application was submitted by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA), the following Members had declared interests on this item:

Mrs. Ava S.Y. Ng as the Director of Planning)	
Mr. Patrick L.C. Lau as the Director of Lands)	being non-executive directors of the URA
Mr. Walter K.L.Chan)	
Ms. Margaret Hsia as the Assistant Director (2) of Home Affairs Department	-	being a co-opt member of the Planning, Development and Conservation Committee of URA

Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim)

Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong) having current business dealings with URA

178. Members noted that Mr. Walter K.L. Chan, Mr. Patrick L.C. Lau and Ms. Margaret Hsia had already left the meeting.

[Mrs. Ava S.Y. Ng, Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim and Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Session

179. Ms. Christine Tse, District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK), Planning Department (PlanD), and Ms. Lily Yam, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), PlanD, were invited to the meeting at this point.

180. The Chairperson extended a welcome and invited Ms. Christine Tse to brief Members on the background to the application.

181. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Ms. Christine Tse presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) planning history of the application site and the approved Peel Street/Graham Street Development Scheme Plan (DSP) No. S/H3/LDC4/2 as set out in paragraph 3 of the Paper;
- (b) details of the proposed development as set out in paragraph 1 and the Drawings attached to the Paper. A model of the proposed development was submitted by the applicant and displayed at the meeting;
- (c) departmental comments – there was no objection from relevant Government departments on the application. In respect of the comment on air quality impact under paragraph 9.1.15(b) of the Paper, the Director of Environmental

Protection (DEP) confirmed on 3.5.2007 that his concern had been addressed by the further submission from the applicant;

- (d) 182 public comments were received during the statutory public period, with 75 in support of, 97 objecting to and 10 providing comments and suggestions on the proposed development. The comments were summarized in paragraph 10.4 of the Paper. The concerns raised by the objectors were related mainly to the adequacy of public consultation on the application and possible adverse impacts on the historical, traditional and local character, the existing business in the area, and the environmental, traffic and visual aspects. The major supporting views were that the proposed development would improve the environment, pedestrian circulation and provision of community facilities in the area and the impact on the existing business would only be minimal. Some commenters had suggested to incorporate additional areas into the scheme;

- (e) PlanD's views – PlanD had no objection to the application for reasons as detailed in paragraph 11.1 of the Paper in that the proposed development was in line with the planning intention of the subject “Comprehensive Development Area” zone to achieve environmental improvement through comprehensive redevelopment and provision of public open space and was generally in compliance with the requirements set out in the endorsed Planning Brief. In response to the public concerns on the inadequacy of consultation on the application, it should be noted that the public had been consulted in accordance with the statutory procedures and the URA had also carried out a series of consultation activities. Regarding the concerns on possible adverse impacts of the proposed development, the applicant had proposed measures to preserve the historical, traditional and local character of the area, and relevant Government departments had no adverse comments on the application. The concern on adverse impact on existing businesses should be addressed by URA under its current policy and established procedures. The proposal to expand the scheme area was not supported since the DSP boundary had been thoroughly considered by the Board and was approved by the Chief Executive in Council in 1999. The remaining concerns were mainly

implementation issues, or technical matters which could be addressed by imposing the approval conditions as recommended in paragraph 11.3 of the Paper. Since the concern of DEP on air quality impact had been addressed, the proposed condition on the submission of a revised air quality impact assessment at paragraph 11.3(i) of the Paper could be deleted.

182. The Secretary informed Members that a petition was staged by the Concern Group of the Residents Affected by Redevelopment Projects in the Central and Western District and two Central and Western District Councillors in the afternoon urging for early implementation of the development scheme. The petition letter was tabled at the meeting for Members' reference.

183. Members had the following questions:

- (a) whether the scheme could provide an opportunity to enhance the pedestrian accessibility to Pak Tsz Lane behind the buildings at 34 and 36 Gage Street, which was a place of historical importance relating to Dr. Sun Yat-sen; and
- (b) what measures the applicant would undertake to ensure that the existing hawker stalls in the area could continue their business such that the local character of the area could be retained.

184. In response to Members' questions, Ms. Christine Tse made the following points:

- (a) the proposed multi-purpose activities hall at Site A of the scheme and the at-grade public open space would serve as a public focal point and a north-south passageway between Staveley Street and Gage Street respectively, which would help enhance the pedestrian accessibility to that part of Gage Street near Pak Tsz Lane. The URA could take on board the Member's suggestion at the implementation stage; and
- (b) as regards the existing hawker stalls, the applicant had been working closely with the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department, in consultation with the

Central and Western District Council, on possible ways to assist the affected hawkers. Consideration would be given to allowing the hawkers to return after completion of the project.

185. The Chairperson said that relevant Government departments should allow flexibility to ensure that due assistance was given to the affected hawkers such that the local character of the area could be preserved.

186. As Members had no further questions, the Chairperson thanked Ms. Christine Tse and Ms. Lily Yam for attending the meeting. Ms. Tse and Ms. Yam left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

187. The Chairperson said that for improvement of the environment, there was a need for early implementation of comprehensive redevelopment of the site. She said that the proposed scheme had undergone adequate public consultation and addressed all major concerns raised by the Government departments and the public. The outstanding concerns were mainly technical issues which could be addressed by imposing appropriate planning conditions, or implementation issues which should be resolved by the applicant in conjunction with relevant Government departments.

188. A Member was concerned about possible canyon effect at the proposed public open spaces which would be surrounded by high-rise buildings. This Member said that the applicant should put more efforts to enhance the air ventilation so that the air quality in the area would not be adversely affected. The Chairperson said that these concerns should be addressed in the revised air ventilation assessment and design of public open space to be submitted under approval conditions. Another Member said that the applicant should also be reminded to ensure that there would be good air ventilation at the proposed car park and loading/unloading area in basements.

189. After deliberation, the Board decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Board. The permission should be valid until 4.5.2011, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development

permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- (a) the submission and implementation of a revised Master Layout Plan to incorporate, where appropriate, the approval conditions as stipulated in items (b) to (h) below to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board;
- (b) the design and provision of car parking facilities, loading/unloading bays, vehicular access and pedestrian footbridge/footbridge connection for the proposed development to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board;
- (c) the provision of footpaths with a minimum width of 2.75m, where practicable, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board;
- (d) the implementation of the junction improvement measures, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board;
- (e) the submission of a revised air ventilation assessment and the implementation of mitigation measures identified therein, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board;
- (f) the provision of a multi-purpose activities hall, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Director of Home Affairs or of the Town Planning Board;
- (g) the design and provision of public open space to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board;
- (h) the submission and implementation of a landscape master plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board;

- (i) the submission of drainage and sewerage impact assessments and the implementation of drainage improvement works identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (j) the provision of water supply for fire fighting and fire service installations to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board.

190. The Board also agreed to advise the applicant:

- (a) that the approved Master Layout Plan, together with the set of approval conditions, would be certified by the Chairman of the Town Planning Board and deposited in the Land Registry in accordance with section 4A(3) of the Town Planning Ordinance. Efforts should be made to incorporate the relevant approval conditions into a revised Master Layout Plan for deposition in the Land Registry as soon as practicable;
- (b) to note the comments of the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West & South (DLO/HK&W) on the related land and road closure issues;
- (c) to note the comments of the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/Urban, Transport Department on the need to submit details of traffic management measures/proposals along Wellington Street in connection with the proposed vehicular run-in/run-out at Wellington Street at the building plan submission stage, and that the implementation of the proposed junction improvement measures should be at the applicant's own cost;
- (d) to note the comments of the Chief Engineer/Development(2), Water Supplies Department on the requirements for provision of waterworks reserve and diversion works required for the proposed development;

- (e) to note the comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design & Landscape on the public open space, planting at ground level, sky gardens and roof areas and the implementation arrangement for the revitalisation works in Peel Street, Graham Street and Gutzlaff Street;
- (f) to note the comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong West, Buildings Department on the building aspect of the development;
- (g) to note the comments of DLO/HKW&S, Director of Home Affairs and District Office (Central & Western) on the funding, management and maintenance responsibility of the multi-purpose activities hall and to expedite liaison with the concerned Government departments including the DLO/HKW&S and Home Affairs Department; and
- (h) to ensure that there would be good air ventilation at the proposed car park and loading/unloading areas in basements.

[Mr. B.W. Chan left the meeting while Mrs. Ava S.Y. Ng, Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim and Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong returned to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 7

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

Review of Application No. A/K14/521

Proposed 'Shop and Services' Use in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" Zone,

Portion of Workshop Units No. 1 and 2, G/F, 11-13 Shing Yip Street, Kwun Tong

(TPB Paper No. 7820)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

Presentation and Question Session

191. The following representatives of Government departments and the applicant were invited to the meeting at this point:

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| Mr. Eric Yue | - District Planning Officer/Kowloon, Planning Department (DPO/K, PlanD) |
| Mr. Yeung Chung-hau | - Senior Divisional Officer (New Projects), Fire Services Department (FSD) |
| Mr. Lok Kin-chong | - Senior Station Officer (New Projects), FSD |
| Mr. Lam Kin-ning |) |
| Ms. Angie Lam |) |
| Mr. Li Fu-chuen |) Applicant's representatives |
| Mr. Kelvin Lee |) |

192. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained briefly the procedures of the review hearing. The Chairperson then invited Mr. Eric Yue to brief Members on the background to the application.

193. Mr. Eric Yue presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) rejected the application on 5.1.2007 for the reason that the application was not supported from fire safety point of view;
- (b) the further written representation submitted by the applicant in support of the review application as summarized in paragraph 3 of the Paper;
- (c) departmental comments – FSD did not support the application on the ground that the total area of the application premises which amounted to 1,256m² had exceeded the commercial floor area limit of 460m² as stipulated in the Town Planning Board (TPB) Guidelines No. 22C for Development within “Other Specified Uses”

annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) Zone, and there was no independent means of escape for the proposed non-industrial portion of the building; and

- (d) PlanD’s view – PlanD did not support the application for reasons as detailed in paragraph 7.1 of the Paper in that the proposed use was not acceptable from fire safety point of view.

194. The Chairperson then invited the applicant’s representatives to elaborate on the application.

195. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. Lam Kin-ning made the following points:

- (a) the application premises was located in the Kwun Tong Industrial Area where many industrial units had been changed to commercial uses;
- (b) according to the applicant’s proposal, the application premises would be sub-divided for various uses, including 416m² of shop and services use, 173m² of bank/fast food counter/local provisions store/electrical shop, to which the limit of commercial floor area under TPB Guidelines No. 22C did not apply, 566m² of access/circulation area and 101m² of toilet;
- (c) the applicant had previously submitted an application for shop and services use at the application premises (Application No. A/K14/513), which was rejected by the MPC on 20.10.2006. In that application, FSD had raised an objection on the ground that the proposed use would exceed the commercial floor area limit of 460m². However, it did not mention that the access/circulation area should also be counted in the calculation of commercial floor area and that the proposed means of escape was not acceptable. FSD’s grounds for objection to the current review application seemed to be arbitrary and inconsistent with its previous comments;
- (d) in a similar application in respect of a premises on the ground floor of Everest

Industrial Centre at 396 Kwun Tong Road (Application No. A/K14/479) which was approved by the Board on 28.10.2005, the commercial floor limit of 460m² had also been exceeded and the access/circulation area was excluded in the calculation of commercial floor area. Compared with that application, the proposal under the subject review had several advantages from fire safety point of view, namely, single ownership of the application premises rendering more effective control and management on the use, availability of separate fire escape route for the shop and services use and the remaining workshops in the building, and a separation between the access/circulation area and the loading/unloading area for industrial goods. Therefore, the subject review application should be given more favourable consideration;

- (e) to ensure that no unauthorized uses would be allowed in the application premises, the applicant was prepared to lodge an undertaking to be registered at the Lands Registry to that effect. The Board might also impose a planning condition requiring the applicant to commence the proposed use within one or two years to ensure that the premises would be used genuinely as approved; and
- (f) for the above reasons, the applicant considered that the application was in compliance with the TPB Guidelines No. 22C and should be approved.

196. Mr. Li Fu-chuen, a representative of the applicant, went on to say that the application premises had been vacant for a long time because the applicant did not want to commence a use without obtaining necessary approvals from Government departments. Three planning applications had been made by the applicant since 2006 which were all rejected due to FSD's objection, but FSD's grounds of objection were different in each application. He wished that FSD could fully explain the fire safety requirements in respect of the proposed use.

197. Members had the following questions:

- (a) whether the access/circulation area should be counted in the calculation of aggregate commercial floor area under the TPB Guidelines No. 22C;

- (b) what the commercial floor area would be if the proposed access/circulation area was excluded;
- (c) whether the proposed access/circulation area was communal area under a Deed of Mutual Covenant; and
- (d) whether it was possible to impose an approval condition forbidding the change of the proposed access/circulation area to other uses.

198. In response to Members' questions, Mr. Eric Yue made the following points:

- (a) according to a footnote under paragraph 4.6 of the TPB Guidelines No. 22C, common circulation areas might be excluded in calculating the commercial floor area. However, since the Occupation Permit for the application premises indicated that the proposed access/circulation area was for workshop use, FSD advised that the area could not be excluded;
- (b) the area of the proposed shop and services use would be 416m² after deducting the access/circulation area; and
- (c) any planning approval was given on the terms of the application as submitted and the proposed access/circulation area should be kept to the same use. However, there would be difficulty in enforcement.

199. Mr. Yeung Chung-hau supplemented that if the proposed access/circulation area was excluded from part of the shop and services use, there would be no guarantee that independent means of escape would be provided, and it was unacceptable from fire safety point of view. Since the problem of having no independent fire escape route did not exist in the previous applications, the requirement of including the circulation area in the calculation of commercial floor area was not included in FSD's advice previously conveyed to the applicant.

200. In response to Members' questions and the answers of Messrs. Eric Yue and Yeung Chung-hau, Mr. Lam Kin-ning made the following points:

- (a) although the proposed access/circulation area was for workshop use under the Occupation Permit, it would be converted to a corridor under the applicant's proposal. Upon approval by the Board, the applicant would apply to the Building Authority (BA) for partitioning the application premises and creating the corridor. Given the differences between the structural requirements in respect of a workshop and shop and services use, it would be more cost effective for the applicant to obtain planning approval for the shop and services use before proceeding to applying to BA for the building works;
- (b) alternatively, the applicant might have to obtain BA's approval for partitioning the premises for some Column 1 uses, such as 'Office' and 'Showroom' in order to fulfil FSD's requirement before applying for planning approval. However, this was unreasonable since the applicant would need to apply to the BA again to effect a shop and services use after obtaining the planning approval;
- (c) the applicant's commitment to lodge an undertaking to the Lands Registry and acceptance of appropriate planning conditions to be imposed by the Board should be sufficient to address the concern on possible conversion of the proposed access/corridor area to other uses; and
- (d) it was unfair to the applicant as the advice from FSD on the fire safety requirements was not clear. The repeated rejection of the applicant's applications had caused much hardship to the applicant.

201. The Chairperson said that while the Board had the responsibility to consider the review application, the onus was on the applicant to address the concerns of relevant Government departments.

202. As the applicant's representatives had no further comment to make and Members had

no further question, the Chairperson informed them that the hearing procedures for the review had been completed and the Board would further deliberate on the application in their absence and inform the applicant of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representatives of the applicant and Government departments for attending the meeting. They all left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

203. A Member said that the proposed access/circulation area in the application should not be excluded from the calculation of commercial floor area because it was not a 'common' circulation area as required under the TPB Guidelines No. 22C, bearing in mind that the area was for workshop use under the Occupation Permit and was under the sole ownership of the applicant. Furthermore, for an area to be accepted as a common circulation area, there should be adequate fire separation between the area and individual units. Such requirement was not satisfied in the applicant's proposal. Another Member said that the proposed access/circulation area would become a genuine common circulation area only if the area was so designated on the building plans and there was a Deed of Mutual Covenant covering that part of the premises.

204. After deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application on review for the reasons that the application was not supported from fire safety point of view.

[Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong and Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 8

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

Review of Application No. A/YL-KTN/262

Temporary Container Vehicle Park and Open Storage of Vehicle Parts with

Ancillary Warehouse for a Period of Three Years in

"Other Specified Uses" annotated "Railway Reserve" Zone,

Lots 433C, 1736C and 1738 in DD107, Yuen Long

(TPB Paper No. 7823)

[The meeting were conducted in Cantonese.]

205. The Secretary reported that Dr. James C.W. Lau had declared an interest on this item for having current business dealings with the applicant's agent, Top Bright Consultants Ltd. Dr. Lau had already left the meeting.

Presentation and Question Session

206. Mr. Wilson So, District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun & Yuen Long, Planning Department (DPO/TMYL, PlanD) and the following representatives of the applicant were invited to the meeting at this point:

Mr. Raymond Leung

Mr. Paul Zhao-bang Leung

Miss Cannis Lee

Mr. Fung Shek-wa

Mr. Cheng Yuen

Mr. Cheng Wai-kwong

207. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained briefly the procedures of the review hearing. She then invited Mr. Wilson So to brief Members on the background to the application.

208. Mr. Wilson So presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) the reasons for the Rural and New Town Planning Committee to reject the application on 17.11.2006 as set out in paragraph 1.2 of the Paper;
- (b) the further written representation submitted by the applicant in support of the review application which was summarized in paragraph 3 of the Paper;

- (c) departmental comments – the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) maintained his objection to the application on the grounds that there were sensitive uses including residential dwellings in the vicinity of the site and the applicant’s further written representation failed to demonstrate that the ‘Code of Practice on Handling Environmental Aspects of Temporary Uses and Open Storage Sites’ (CoP) had been complied with. The Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department considered that the applicant’s drainage proposal was still not satisfactory. However, he had no in-principle objection to the application provided that an approval condition of the submission and implementation of proper drainage facilities was imposed. The Assistant Commissioner for Transport/New Territories, Transport Department had no further objection to the application, having regard to the revised layout plan submitted by the applicant showing that sufficient manoeuvring space for container vehicles would be provided within the site. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape had no in-principle objection to the application. However, the overlapping of the proposed vehicle parking spaces and tree-planting zone was undesirable for successful planting;
- (d) one public comment was received from the Village Representative (VR) of Fung Kut Heung maintaining his previous objection to the application on the grounds that the proposed use would affect the living environment of the village and create serious damage to the rural environment; and
- (e) PlanD’s view – PlanD did not support the application for reasons as detailed in paragraph 6.2 of the Paper. The proposed use did not comply with the Town Planning Board (TPB) Guidelines No. 13D for Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses in that there were adverse departmental comments on the application on environmental and drainage grounds and there was local objection. The subject application did not warrant the same consideration as a previous application for open storage of construction materials (Application No. A/YL-KTN/258) approved by the Board on review on 2.3.2007 in that the nature of the proposed uses under the two applications was different and there was no

objection from relevant Government departments on the previous application. The subject application was more akin to a similar application for temporary logistic use and ancillary container vehicle park (Application No. A/YL-KTN/261) on an adjoining site to the south, to which there were objections from the DEP and AC for T/NT and local objections, and the previous application was rejected by the Board on review on 2.3.2007.

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

210. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. Raymond Leung made the following points:

- (a) due to the limited size, the site could only accommodate seven parking spaces for container tractors/trailors. Furthermore, the site would be used solely by the applicant and would not be open to other operators. Compared with the open storage use approved under Application No. A/YT-KTN/258 which involved a much bigger site, storage of bulky materials and more frequent traffic of heavy vehicles, the proposal under the subject review would have less impact on the area;
- (b) the existing residential dwellings to the south of the site were squatter structures and were mainly within the "Industrial (Group D)" ("I(D)") zone which was intended for industrial uses that could not be accommodated in conventional flatted factories. They were screened from the application site by the containers in an existing open storage yard and a vacant two-storey house, and were adjacent to an existing food factory, some open storages yards and car parks. The proposed use under application would not cause significant nuisances to these dwellings and in fact, no objection to the application had been raised by the concerned residents;
- (c) the AC for T/NT had no further objection to the application. The concern of the CTP/UD&L, PlanD could be easily addressed by revising the landscape proposal. The comments of CE/MN, DSD on the drainage proposal were only technical

advice instead of adverse comments on the application;

- (d) the objection of the DEP was largely based on paragraph 1.2 of the CoP which mainly reflected the comment of the Ombudsman that 'the public interest in securing a reasonably clean, pleasant and comfortable living environment was so important that it ought not be compromised or overridden lightly by economic concerns'. While the comment of the Ombudsman was respected, the Board's decision on a planning application should be made on the basis of planning considerations;
- (e) regarding the objection raised by the VR of Fung Kut Heung, it should be noted that Fung Kat Heung would not be affected by the proposed use since the village was far away from the application site and was served by a different access road;
- (f) with the departmental concerns and local objections resolved as explained above, there was no ground for the PlanD to hold a view that the proposed use did not comply with the TPB Guidelines No. 13D; and
- (g) as the construction of the Northern Link/Express Rail Link would commence in 2009 at the earliest, the applicant would accept PlanD's recommendation in paragraph 6.5 of the Paper that a shorter approval period up to 31.12.2008, instead of three years as applied, should be granted.

211. Mr. Fung Shek-wa, a representative of the applicant, made the following points:

- (a) vehicular access to the application site was via San Tam Road which was separated from the access road to Fung Kut Heung. The objection of the VR of Fung Kut Heung on environmental grounds was unreasonable; and
- (b) the daily traffic to be generated from the proposed use was very low and there would be no activities during the night-time. The site was far away from residential dwellings and was surrounded by industrial and open storage uses. The

impact on the area was minimal.

212. A Member asked about the background and current situation of the “I(D)” zone covering the area where the residential dwellings were located. With the aid of some plans, Mr. Wilson So said that the “I(D)” zone was first designated on the Kam Tin OZP in 1994. Previously, the concerned area was partly under “Open Storage” zoning and partly shown as “Unspecified” on the Kam Tin North Development Permission Area Plan. In 1999, part of the “I(D)” zone was rezoned to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Railway Reserve” to reserve land for the then proposed West Rail (Phase II) alignment. However, that part of the remaining “I(D)” zone near to the application site was still largely occupied by residential uses.

213. As the applicant’s representatives had no further comment to make and Members had no further question, the Chairperson informed them that the hearing procedures for the review had been completed and the Board would further deliberate on the application in their absence and inform the applicant of the Board’s decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked Mr. Wilson So and the representatives of the applicant for attending the meeting. They all left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

214. In response to the Chairperson’s enquiry, the Secretary said that Application No. A/YL-KTN/258 was approved by the Board on the considerations that the applicant had undertaken to carry out various environmental mitigation measures, including restriction of operation hours, abandonment of industrial activities and excluding the use of heavy vehicles on site, and the relevant Government departments and the villagers had withdrawn their objection to the application.

215. Members noted that the applicant had clarified that the site would be used for the parking of the applicant’s own container tractors/trailers only and would not be open to other operators. Moreover, the application site was served by a different access road from the one to Fung Kut Heung. In these circumstances, the impacts of the proposed use in the area would unlikely be significant. The other concerns of Government departments could be addressed by

imposing appropriate approval conditions.

216. After deliberation, the Board decided to approve the application on review on a temporary basis for a period until 31.12.2008, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board and subject to the following conditions:

- (a) the site should be used only for the parking of container tractors/trailers by the applicant and should not be open to other operators during the planning approval period;
- (b) no operation between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. was allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no operation on Sundays and public holidays was allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (d) no cleansing, dismantling, industrial and workshop activities should be carried out on site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the Kowloon Canton Railway Corporation should have the right to access the site to carry out ground investigation works at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) the submission of drainage proposals 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 4.11.2007;
- (g) in relation to (f) above, the implementation of the drainage proposals 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 4.2.2008;
- (h) the submission of landscape proposal within 6 months from the date of

planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board by 4.11.2007;

- (i) in relation to (h) above, the implementation of landscape proposal within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board by 4.2.2008;
- (j) the provision of a 9-litre water type/3kg dry powder fire extinguisher in each of the site office within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board by 4.11.2007;
- (k) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d) or (e) was not complied with during planning approval, the approval hereby given should cease to have effect and should be revoked immediately without further notice;
- (l) if any of the above planning conditions (f), (g), (h), (i) or (j) was not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given should cease to have effect and should on the same date be revoked without further notice; and
- (m) upon expiry of the planning permission, the reinstatement of the application site to an amenity area to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board.

217. The Board agreed to remind the applicant that the permission was only given to the use/development as approved. It did not condone any other use/development existing on the site that was not covered by the permission. The applicant should take immediate action to discontinue such use/development not covered by the permission.

218. The Board also agreed to advise the applicant :

- (a) that a shorter approval period up to 31.12.2008 was imposed in order not to

jeopardise the construction programme of the proposed Northern Link and Express Rail Line;

- (b) to resolve any land issues relating to the development with the concerned owner(s) of the application site;
- (c) to note the District Lands Officer/Yuen Long's comments in paragraph 10.1.1 of Annex A of the Paper that the applicant should be reminded specifically to apply for a Short Term Waiver (STW) and Short Term Tenancy (STT) to regularise the irregularities on site. Should no STW/STT application be received/approved and the irregularities persist on site, his office would consider taking appropriate lease enforcement/land control action against the registered owner/occupier accordingly;
- (d) to note the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/New Territories, Transport Department's comments in paragraph 4.1.1 of the Paper that the right of way to the site from San Tam Road might not be guaranteed;
- (e) to note the Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department's comments in paragraph 4.1.2 of the Paper that Highways Department was not responsible for the maintenance of any existing vehicular access connecting the site and San Tam Road;
- (f) to adopt the environmental mitigation measures as set out in the "Code of Practice on Handling Environmental Aspects of Temporary Uses and Open Storage Sites" issued by the Environmental Protection Department to minimize any possible environmental nuisances;
- (g) to note the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design & Landscape, Planning Department's comments in paragraph 4.1.5(b) of the Paper that the proposed vehicle parking spaces were overlapping with the proposed tree-planting zone. This was considered undesirable for successful planting and the establishment

of the trees. Statements on the protective measures for the newly planted trees should be provided to safeguard the trees from the daily operation of the site. Species such as *Bambusa toldoides* Munro with at least two shoots and a minimum height of 2.75m and maximum spacing of 500mm was suggested for peripheral planting where space was tight (e.g. the eastern boundary and the part of the northern boundary adjacent to the proposed vehicle parking space);

- (h) to note the Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department's comments in paragraph 4.1.6(a) of the Paper that the invert level at the downstream end of the proposed 450mm drainage pipe should be indicated. Details of all proposed works at the site boundary, including the peripheral fence wall, should be included for indication of unobstructed flow of surface runoff from the adjacent areas. The District Lands Officer/Yuen Long or relevant lot owners should be consulted regarding any proposed drainage works outside the lot boundary or the applicant's jurisdiction;
- (i) to note the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department's comment in paragraph 10.1.10 of Annex A of the Paper that the granting of this planning approval should not be construed as condoning any structures existing on the site under the Buildings Ordinance and the allied regulations. Actions appropriate under the said Ordinance or other enactment might be taken if contravention was found. Use of container as offices and stores were considered as temporary buildings and were subject to control under Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R) Part VII. Formal submission of any proposed new works, including any temporary structure for approval under the Buildings Ordinance is required. If the site was not abutting on a street having a width of not less than 4.5m, the development intensity should be determined under Building (Planning) Regulation 19(3) at the building plan submission stage; and
- (j) to note the Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services's comments in

paragraph 10.1.12 of Annex A of the Paper that the ‘Code of Practice on Working near Electricity Supply Lines’ established under the Electricity Supply Lines (Protection) Regulation should be observed by the applicant and his contractors when carrying out works in the vicinity of electricity supply lines. Prior to establishing any structure within the site, the applicant and his contractors should liaise with CLPP to divert the existing low voltage overhead lines away from the vicinity of the proposed development.

Agenda Item 9

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

Review of Application No. A/YL-TYST/332

Proposed Temporary Warehouse for Storage of Tiles and

Advertising Board for a Period of Five Years in “Undetermined” Zone,

Lots 670(part), 768 (Part), 769 (Part) and 785 (Part) in DD119 and Adjoining Government Land,

Tong Yan San Tsuen, Yuen Long

(TPB Paper No. 7826)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

219. The Secretary reported that Dr. James C.W. Lau had declared an interest on this item for having current business dealings with the applicant’s agent, Top Bright Consultants Ltd. Dr. Lau had already left the meeting.

220. Members noted that the application was rejected by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) on 3.11.2006 for the reason that there was insufficient information in the submission to demonstrate that the proposed development would not generate adverse landscape, drainage and fire safety impacts on the surrounding area. In response to the rejection reason, the applicant had submitted landscape and drainage proposals and made a commitment to meet the requirements set out by the Fire Services Department. Having considered the applicant’s submissions, concerned Government departments had no objection to the review application

221. As the reasons for rejection by the RNTPC had been resolved, Members generally agreed that the proposed development could be tolerated for a temporary period of 3 years subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 6.4 of the Paper.

Presentation and Question Session

222. Mr. Wilson So, District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun & Yuen Long, Planning Department (DPO/TMYL, PlanD) and the following representatives of the applicant were invited to the meeting at this point:

Mr. Raymond Leung

Mr. Paul Zhao-bang Leung

Miss Cannis Lee

223. The Chairperson extended a welcome and informed the applicant's representatives that having considered the applicant's further written representation and the comments of relevant Government departments, the Board agreed to grant planning permission to the application for a temporary period of 3 years, instead of 5 years as applied, subject to the conditions proposed in paragraph 6.4 of the Paper. She asked if the applicant's representatives had any comments to make. The applicant's representatives confirmed that they agreed to the proposed approval period and approval conditions.

224. As the applicant's representatives had no comment to make and Members had no question, the Chairperson informed them that the hearing procedures for the review had been completed. She thanked Mr. Wilson So and the representatives of the applicant for attending the meeting. They all left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

225. After deliberation, the Board decided to approve the application on review on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 4.5.2010, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board and subject to the following conditions.

- (a) no night-time operation between 7 p.m and 7 a.m. was allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no operation on Sundays and public holidays was allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no open storage, repairing, dismantling and workshop activities should be carried out on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no heavy vehicles, i.e. over 24 tonnes, were allowed for the operation of the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) the submission of landscape proposal within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board by 4.8.2007;
- (f) in relation to (e) above, the implementation of landscape proposal within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board by 4.11.2007;
- (g) the submission of drainage proposal within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board by 4.8.2007;
- (h) in relation to (g) above, the implementation of 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 4.11.2007;
- (i) the submission of the emergency vehicle access (EVA), water supplies for fire fighting and fire service installations within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the

Town Planning Board by 4.8.2007;

- (j) in relation to (i) above, the implementation of the EVA, water supplies for fire fighting and fire service installations proposals and provision of a fire hydrant within 500m from the application site 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 4.11.2007;
- (k) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c) or (d) was not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given should cease to have effect and should be revoked immediately without further notice; and
- (l) if any of the above planning conditions (e), (f), (g), (h), (i) or (j) was not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given should cease to have effect and should on the same date be revoked without further notice.

226. The Board agreed to remind the applicant that the permission was only given to the use/development under application. It did not condone any other use/development existing on the site that was not covered by the application. The applicant should take immediate action to discontinue such use/development not covered by the permission.

227. The Board also agreed to advise the applicant :

- (a) that a shorter approval period of 3 years and shorter compliance periods were granted so as to monitor the situation of the site and fulfillment of planning conditions;
- (b) to resolve any land issues relating to the development with the concerned owner(s) of the site;
- (c) to note the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/New Territories, Transport

Department's comments in paragraph 4.1.1 of the Paper that the land status of the road/path/track leading to the site should be checked with the lands authority. The management and maintenance responsibilities of the same road/path/track should be clarified and the relevant lands and maintenance authorities should be consulted accordingly;

- (d) to note the Director of Fire Services's comments in paragraph 4.1.3 of the Paper that detailed fire safety requirements would be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans;
- (e) to note the Chief Highway Engineer/New Territories West, Highways Department's comments in paragraph 9.1.3 of Annex A of the Paper that his office did not maintain the access track between the site and Kung Um Road;
- (f) to note the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Buildings Department's comments in paragraph 9.1.6 of Annex A of the Paper that all building works were subject to compliance with the Buildings Ordinance. Authorised Person had to be appointed to coordinate all building works. The granting of planning approval should not be construed as an acceptance of the unauthorised structures on site under the Buildings Ordinance. Enforcement action might be taken to effect the removal of all unauthorised works in the future; and
- (g) to follow the latest 'Code of Practice on Handling the Environmental Aspects of Temporary Uses and Open Storage Sites' issued by the Director of Environmental Protection.

Agenda Item 10

[Open Meeting]

Request for Deferral of Review of Application No. A/YL-TYST/310

Proposed Flats and Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction in “Residential (Group B)1” zone,
Lot 2131 in DD121, Tong Yan San Tsuen, Yuen Long
(TPB Paper No. 7827)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

228. The Secretary said that a replacement page 3 incorporating amendment to a typographic error in paragraph 2.2 of the Paper was tabled. She said that the request was for further deferment of consideration of the review application for three months in order to allow time for preparation of further information taking into account the outcome of another application in respect of the site (Application No. A/YL-TYST/343). The request for deferment met the criteria set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 33 in that the applicant needed more time to resolve major technical issues with relevant Government department, the deferment period was not indefinite, and the deferment would unlikely affect the interest of other relevant parties.

229. After deliberation, the Board decided to agree to the request for further deferment and that the application should be submitted to the Board for consideration within three months upon receipt of further submission from the applicant. The Board also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation and submission of further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 11

[Open Meeting]

Draft Yuen Long Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL/16

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comment
(TPB Paper 7828)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

230. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. The draft Yuen Long Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL/16 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) on 5.1.2007. During the two-month exhibition period, a total of eight representations

were received. On 20.3.2007, the representations were published for three weeks for public comments and one comment relating to Representation No. 7 was received.

231. The Secretary went on to say that Representations No. 7 and 8 were not related to any amendments shown on the Plan or incorporated in the Notes. Upon the Secretariat's request for clarification, Representer No. 7 made no response and Representer No. 8 still failed to indicate which amendment her representation was related to. Pursuant to sections 6(3)(b) and 12(3)(b)(i) of the Ordinance, these two representations together with the public comment relating to Representation No. 7 should be considered as invalid and be treated as not having been made.

232. As there were only six valid representations and they were of similar nature concerning mainly development restrictions for individual zones, the Secretary said it would be more efficient for the Board to hear the representations collectively at the same meeting without resorting to the appointment of a Representation Hearing Committee. The hearing could be accommodated in the Board's regular meeting scheduled for 1.6.2007.

233. After deliberation, the Board agreed that:

- (a) Representations No. 7 and 8 and the comment relating to Representation No. 7 should be considered as invalid under sections 6(3)(b) and 12(3)(b)(i) of the Ordinance; and
- (b) Representations No. 1 to 6 should be considered in the manner as set out in paragraph 2.2 of the Paper.

Agenda Item 12

[Open Meeting]

Submission of the Draft Kam Tin South Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-KTS/10A
under Section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval
(TPB Paper 7824)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

234. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper.

235. After deliberation, the Board agreed that:

- (a) the draft Kam Tin South Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL-KTS/10A and its Notes at Annexes A and B of the Paper respectively were suitable for submission under section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval;
- (b) the updated Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft Kam Tin South OZP No. S/YL-KTS/10A at Annex C of the Paper should be endorsed as an expression of the planning intention and objectives of the Board for various land-use zones on the draft OZP and issued under the name of the Board; and
- (c) the updated ES for the draft Kam Tin South OZP No. S/YL-KTS/10A was suitable for submission to the CE in C with the draft OZP

Agenda Item 13

[Open Meeting]

Submission of the Draft Jardine's Lookout & Wong Nai Chung Gap

Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H13/11A under Section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval

(TPB Paper 7822)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

236. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper.

237. After deliberation, the Board agreed that:

- (a) the draft Jardine's Lookout & Wong Nai Chung Gap Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H13/11A and its Notes at Annexes I and II of the Paper respectively were suitable for submission under section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval;
- (b) the updated Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft Jardine's Lookout & Wong Nai Chung Gap OZP No. S/H13/11A at Annex III of the Paper should be endorsed as an expression of the planning intention and objectives of the Board for various land-use zones on the draft OZP and issued under the name of the Board; and
- (c) the updated ES for the draft Jardine's Lookout & Wong Nai Chung Gap OZP No. S/H13/11A was suitable for submission to the CE in C with the draft OZP.

Agenda Item 14

[Open Meeting]

Submission of the Draft Urban Renewal Authority

Stone Nullah Lane/Hing Wan Street/King Sing Street

Development Scheme Plan No. S/H5/URA2/1A under Section 8 of the

Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval

(TPB Paper 7821)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

238. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper.

239. After deliberation, the Board agreed that:

- (a) the draft Urban Renewal Authority (URA) Stone Nullah Lane/Hing Wan Street/King Sing Street Development Scheme Plan (DSP) No. S/H5/URA2/1A and its Notes at Annexes I and II of the Paper respectively were suitable for

submission under section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval;

- (b) the updated Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft URA Stone Nullah Lane/Hing Wan Street/King Sing Street DSP No. S/H5/URA2/1A at Annex III of the Paper should be endorsed as an expression of the planning intention and objectives of the Board for various land-use zones on the draft DSP and issued under the name of the Board; and
- (c) the updated ES for the draft URA Stone Nullah Lane/Hing Wan Street/King Sing Street DSP No. S/H5/URA2/1A was suitable for submission to the CE in C with the draft DSP

Agenda Item 15

[Open Meeting]

Another Other Business

240. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 7:50 p.m.