

**Minutes of 902nd Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held at 9.00 am on 21.12.2007**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning & Lands)
Mr. Raymond Young

Chairman

Dr. Peter K.K. Wong

Vice-chairman

Mr. Michael K.C. Lai

Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong

Professor Nora F.Y. Tam

Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan

Mr. David W.M. Chan

Mr. Tony C.N. Kan

Mr. Edmund K.H. Leung

Professor N.K. Leung

Dr. C.N. Ng

Dr. Daniel B.M. To

Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong

Mr. Alfred Donald Yap

Mr. B.W. Chan

Mr. Walter K.L. Chan

Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan

Mr. Y.K. Cheng

Ms. Anna S.Y. Kwong

Professor Paul K.S. Lam
Mr. K.Y. Leung

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport)
Transport and Housing Bureau
Ms. Ava Chiu

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection
Dr. Michael Chiu

Director of Lands
Miss Annie K.L. Tam

Director of Planning
Mrs. Ava Ng

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Mr. Lau Sing

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Ms. Carmen K.M. Chan

Mr. Leslie H.C. Chen

Dr. Lily Chiang

Professor David Dudgeon

Professor Peter R. Hills

Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim

Ms. Sylvia S.F. Yau

Ms. Maggie M.K. Chan

Mr. Felix W. Fong

Dr. James C.W. Lau

Ms. Starry W.K. Lee

Assistant Director (2), Home Affairs Department
Ms. Margaret Hsia

In Attendance

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr. C.T. Ling

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms. Teresa L.Y. Chu

Agenda Item 1

[Open meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 901st Meeting held on 7.12.2007

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The minutes of the 901st meeting held on 7.12.2007 were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

[Open meeting]

Matters Arising

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

Town Planning Appeals Received

- (i) Town Planning Appeal No. 10 of 2007
Proposed Hotel in “Residential” (Group A)” zone on the
Draft Sai Ying Pun and Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H3/21,
110, 112 and 114 Second Street, Sai Ying Pun
(Application No. A/H3/376)

2. The Secretary reported that an appeal against the decision of the Board to reject on review an application for a proposed hotel in the “Residential” (Group A)” zone on the draft Sai Ying Pun and Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H3/21 was received and acknowledged by the Town Planning Appeal Board on 30.10.2007 and 17.12.2007 respectively. The review application was rejected by the Board on 17.8.2007 for the reasons that the proposed hotel development was considered incompatible with the adjoining residential developments in terms of building bulk and development intensity, and approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar hotel developments within the residential neighbourhood. The hearing date of the appeal was yet to be fixed. The Secretariat would act on behalf of the Board in dealing with the appeal in the usual manner.
- (ii) Town Planning Appeal No. 11 of 2007 (11/07)
Proposed Temporary Concrete Batching Plant for a Period of 5 Years
in “Open Storage” Zone, Lot 167(Part)

in D.D. 83 and Adjoining Government Land, Kwan Tei North, Fanling
(Application No. A/NE-TKL/286)

3. The Secretary reported that an appeal against the decision of the Board to reject on review an application for a proposed temporary concrete batching plant in the “Open Storage” zone on the approved Ping Che and Ta Kwu Ling Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-TKL/12 was received and acknowledged by the Town Planning Appeal Board on 6.11.2007 and 17.12.2007 respectively. The application was rejected by the Board on 17.8.2007 for the reason that there was insufficient information in the submission to demonstrate that the use under application would not have adverse environmental impacts on the surrounding areas. The hearing date of the appeal was yet to be fixed. The Secretariat would act on behalf of the Board in dealing with the appeal in the usual manner.

(iii) Town Planning Appeal No. 12 of 2007 (12/07)
Proposed Hotel in “Residential (Group A)” zone,
380 Prince Edward Road West, Kowloon City
(Application No. A/K10/222)

4. The Secretary reported that an appeal against the decision of the Board to reject on review an application for proposed hotel development in the “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) on the approved Ma Tau Kok Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K10/18 was received was received and acknowledged by the Town Planning Appeal Board on 20.11.2007 and 17.12.2007 respectively. The application was rejected on review by the Board on 5.10.2007 on the grounds that the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of “R(A)” zone; it was premature to consider the application pending a land use review of the area; and the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar developments in the Kowloon City residential neighbourhood, the cumulative effect of which would adversely affect the traffic condition and general character of the area. The hearing date of the appeal was yet to be fixed. The Secretariat would act on behalf of the Board in dealing with the appeal in the usual manner.

(v) Town Planning Appeal Statistics

5. The Secretary reported that as at 21.12.2007, 15 cases were yet to be heard by the Town Planning Appeal Board. Details of the appeal statistics were as follows :

Allowed	:	20
Dismissed	:	106
Abandoned/Withdrawn/Invalid	:	126
Yet to be Heard	:	15
Decision Outstanding	:	3
Total		270

[Mr. Y.K. Cheng arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 3

[Open meeting (Presentation and Question Session Only).]

Review of Application No A/YL-TT/210

Temporary Open Storage of Detergent for a Period of 3 Years in
“Agriculture” and “Open Storage” zones, Lot 1506(Part) in DD 117
and Adjoining Government Land, Tai Tong, Yuen Long

(TPB Paper No. 7981)

Agenda Item 4

Review of Application No. A/YL-TT/211

Temporary Open Storage of Advertising Materials for a Period of 3 Years
in “Agriculture” and “Open Storage” zones, Lot 1506(Part) in DD 117,
Tai Tong, Yuen Long

(TPB Paper No. 7982)

Agenda Item 5

Review of Application No. A/YL-TT/212

Temporary Open Storage of Household Products for a Period of 3 Years
in “Agriculture” and “Open Storage” zones, Lot 1506(Part) in DD 117,
Tai Tong, Yuen Long

(TPB Paper No. 7983)

[The hearing was conducted in Cantonese.]

6. The Secretary said that Dr. James C.W. Lau had declared an interest in these items as he had business dealings with Top Bright Consultants Ltd., the consultant of the applicant. Dr. Lau had tendered apology for being unable to attend the meeting

7. The Chairman said that the three applications submitted by the same applicant were of similar nature within the same zones and in vicinity of each other. The three applications were considered together by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) on 24.8.2007. The applicant had agreed to combined hearing of the three review applications. Members also agreed to consider these three cases together.

[Dr. K.K. Wong, Prof. Nora F.Y. Tam and Mr. Tony C.N. Kan arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Session

8. [Mr. Wilson So](#), District Planning Officer/[Tuen Mun and Yuen Long](#) of the Planning Department (PlanD) and the following [applicant's representatives](#) were invited to the meeting at this point:

Mr. Raymond Leung]	
Mr. Lam Tim-kit]	Applicant's Representatives
Mr. Leung Ming-kin]	

[Dr. B.M. To and Mr. David W.M. Chan arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

9. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained briefly the procedures of the review hearing. The Chairman then invited [Mr. Wilson So](#) to brief Members on the background to the application. With the aid of some plans, [Mr. So](#) did so as detailed in the Paper and made the following main points:

- (a) the reasons of the RNTPC to reject the applications for temporary open storages of detergent, advertising materials and household products for 3 years at the three application sites respectively on [24.8.2007](#);
- (b) the justifications put forth by the applicant in support of the review of the three applications;
- (c) departmental comments – District Lands Officer/[Yuen Long](#) advised that

the unauthorized structures found in all three sites would need to be regularized if the applications were approved and CLP Power HK Limited (CLPP) should be consulted on safety issue due to proximity to the high voltage cable. Assistant Commissioner for Transport/NT, Transport Department (AC for T/NT, TD) commented that the precedent effect should be considered and approval might induce cumulative adverse traffic impact on the nearby road network. The three applications were not supported by Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) as there were sensitive receivers including residential dwellings in the vicinity of the site and environmental nuisance was expected. Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services (DEMS) advised that CLPP expressed concern on the electrical clearance as the 400kV cable overhead line was directly above the sites and opposed to the applications. If approved, approval conditions on safety aspects should be imposed and CLPP should be consulted;

- (d) [no public comment was received during the public inspection period.](#) District Officer (Yuen Long) (DO(YL)) advised that objection was received from the village representative of Wong Nai Tun Tsuen on all applications due to impact on nearby residents, environmental hygiene and ecology of the area, while the road facilities could not support the large number of transportation vehicles accessing the site. During the s.16 stage, a local objection from a Yuen Long District Council member was received on A/YL-YY/210 objecting on grounds of proximity to residential dwellings, noise and dust from movement of heavy vehicles, and nuisances to residents due to handling of goods; and
- (e) PlanD's view – not supporting the cases as the three sites were located next to an existing river channel, and the majority area was in the “AGR” zone (59%, 63% and 72% for A/YL-TT/210, 211 and 212 respectively) and within Category 3 areas under the TPB PG No. 13D. There was no previous planning approval and the sites were subject to enforcement actions for suspected unauthorized development. Insufficient assessments were submitted to demonstrate the technical acceptability of the proposed open storage uses. Given the close juxtaposition of the “OS” zone with the stream course and residential dwellings further west, the boundary of the

“AGR” zone was intended to reflect the rural character and provide a buffer from undesirable impacts of nearby open storage activities. The development was not compatible with the surrounding land uses and the predominantly rural setting further west. Apart from EPD’s environmental concern to nearby residential dwellings, there was concern on potential spillage of detergent to the adjacent river for A/YL-TT/210 but no information on prevention measures was submitted. There was insufficient information to demonstrate that the development would not have adverse traffic and environmental impacts on the surrounding areas. Given the availability of land in the “OS” zone to the east, there was no strong justification for proliferation of storage uses in the “AGR” zone. Approval of these cases would set an undesirable precedent for similar uses with proliferation into the “AGR” zone and cumulative effect resulting in degradation of the local environment.

10. The Chairman then invited the applicant’s representatives to elaborate on the application. With the aid of some plans and photos, Mr. Raymond Leung made the following main points:

- (a) it was necessary to consider landuse compatibility from another perspective including land ownership and zoning boundaries. The extent of the “AGR” and “OS” zones left much to be desired as it had not taken into account the land status. It was not sure whether the boundaries were drawn up with due regard given to the topography, river, road, fencing and current conditions. Despite DPO’s comment, the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (AFCD) had not raised concern regarding proximity to the adjacent river;
- (b) whilst the TPB PG No. 13D were guidelines promulgated after the sites had been zoned “AGR” and “OS” on the Tai Tong Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) to address the general issue of open storage in a broader context rather than to cater for site-specific issues, the subject applications should be considered on individual basis, with regard to land ownership and prevalent planning circumstances. At the time when the sites were designated “AGR” and “OS” on the OZP, the locals realized that temporary open storage on the “AGR” zone could be considered through the planning permission mechanism and

detailed boundary could be adjusted accordingly, but were generally not aware of the restrictions imposed in the subsequent 13D;

- (c) the OZP had provision for application for temporary uses and each case should be considered on individual merits. Although the majority of the sites were in the “AGR” zone, it would be prudent to consider the application sites as a whole taking into account land status and existing conditions. Part of the sites were zoned “OS” and it would be difficult to bring the “AGR” portion back to cultivation. Allowing only the “OS” section to operate might give rise to difficulties in enforcement issue. Approval of the cases would bring about planning gain as the applicant would implement landscaping proposal and improve the drains. Compassionate consideration should be given;
- (d) regarding departmental views on traffic and environmental aspects, the access to the application sites would be via the frontage falling within the “OS” zone to the east rather than the “AGR” and river to the west, while the nearby sensitive receivers were mostly farm structures. A letter was received from the neighbouring farmers and the village representative stating that they would not be affected by environmental impacts. Sensitive receivers were also found within the “OS” zone and there was no conflict arising from such co-existence. AFCD had no adverse comments while the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD noted that the eastern portion was on higher ground and raised no objection from the landscape perspective. The detergent stored in one of the sites could be removed; and
- (e) given permission for similar uses was granted for applications No. A/YL-TYST/34 and 35 within the same “OS” zone, approval for the subject cases would not set an undesirable precedent. As the land status and topography were not given full consideration in the boundary delineation, it would be unfair if open storage could be carried out on part of the site while the remaining portion could not be put to beneficial use.

11. In response to the query from a Member regarding the planning history and the Chairman’s question on similar approvals, Mr. Wilson So explained that part of the area was

already zoned “OS” and “AGR” in the first version of OZP gazetted in 1994. The then “OS” zone was of a smaller size, while the western edge of the zone boundary and area fronting the river, now occupied by the application sites, comprised a pond. Given the presence of the pond, the river and the rural setting, the in-between area to the west was zoned “AGR”. The “OS” zone was subsequently expanded eastwards, northwards and southwards since late 1990’s to suit changing planning circumstances but the western boundary remained unchanged. Planning applications No. A/YL-TYST/34 and 35 were approved on 5.6.1998 with the understanding that the “OS” zone would be extended southwards to cover the application sites. The pond was gradually filled up and taken up by open storage uses. As seen from the air photos in the papers, the western part of the “OS” was still predominantly rural in nature and the “AGR” zone still served to reflect the rural setting and provided a buffer along the river to address the interface issues arising from the “OS” zone.

12. Members sought clarification from Mr. [Wilson So](#) on the following:

- (a) the latest site conditions for the three cases;
- (b) any departmental guidelines regarding storage of detergent. How would the situation be monitored if the applications were approved,
- (c) the zoning background of the boundary adjustment of the “OS” zone.

13. [Mr. Wilson So](#) replied with the following main points:

- (a) based on the latest site visit and site photos in the papers, application site No. A/YL-TT/211 was currently vacant with some structures. There were storage of household products on application site No. A/YL-TT/212. Application site No. A/YL-TT/210 was occupied by storage of detergent and some lorries with detergent containers, although this might not reflect the latest situation;
- (b) if approved, approval conditions would be imposed to safeguard pollution and spillage of detergent to the nearby streamcourse at all times and to require submission and implementation of drainage proposals within a prescribed period. The compliance of approval conditions would be monitored by PlanD. In case of non-compliance, the approval could be

revoked; and

- (c) the “OS” zone had been further extended to the north and south since 1998 to reflect the evolving planning process in keeping abreast with the changing circumstances. But the western limit had been kept intact to give due respect to the streamcourse, the remaining pond and rural setting to the west.

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

14. Members sought clarification from the applicant’s [representatives](#) on the following:

- (a) as land status and lot boundaries would change over time; it might not be appropriate to take it as a prime consideration in drawing up the zoning boundaries;
- (b) any mitigation measures regarding storage of detergent;
- (c) how long had the current owner possessed the land and whether he was aware of the pond filling; and
- (d) the option of storing detergent and household products in proper warehouses in industrial buildings rather than in “OS” zone.

[Ms. Anna S.Y. Kwong arrived to join the meeting at this point. Mr. Tony C.N. Kan returned to join the meeting at this point.]

15. Mr. Raymond Leung replied as follows:

- (a) the total area of the three application site was only 1800m². It might not be appropriate to presume that the land status and lot boundaries could be easily adjusted to tie in with the zoning boundaries. Given the application sites straddled two land use zones, the landowner only intended to make a living out of his present landholdings for open storage uses and, at the same time, extending to the “AGR” zone with improvement to the general environment by providing greenery, boundary fence along the river and drainage works;
- (b) DEP had no objection to storage of detergent and the issue could be

monitored during operation. The site photos in the paper only presented a snap shot of the site conditions which might change in future. The applicant would comply with approval conditions regarding prevention of detergent spillage and implementation of drainage and landscape proposals. The applicant would be required to adhere to such conditions and the approval would be revoked for non-compliance;

- (c) whilst storage of detergent and household products could be technically carried out in proper warehouses, there were other aspects to be considered especially when the small firms could hardly afford the high rental cost. There were limited “Industrial (D)” zones. As it was the government’s intention to encourage local economy in rural areas, opportunity should be given to help these small operations to make a living and provide jobs for the local community; and
- (d) the current owner acquired the land not long ago and was not aware of the pond filling. AFCD had not raised adverse comments on the pond filling aspects.

16. Mr. Raymond Leung supplemented that as the zoning boundary had not taken into full account individual landholdings and the OZP had provision for planning application, approving the applications would in effect result in adjusting the boundaries based on individual merits.

17. Dr. Michael Chiu said that as shown in the site photos, R-4 and R-5 in the paper, separation and transfer of detergent from the truck to smaller containers were undertaken on site. He commented that there should be zero discharge if the site was purely for storage of detergent. However, no drainage assessment had been submitted in support application No. A/YL-TT/210.

18. Mr. Raymond Leung replied that, given there was no objection from DEP from the pollution point of view on the storage of detergent, he had not provided further assessments in this regard. He noted that a drainage proposal would need to be submitted if the applications were approved. Nevertheless, attempt was made to address the noise concern due to the presence of sensitive receivers. The on-site handling of detergent would depend on the actual mode of operation and it would not be possible to rule out the separation and transfer process at this stage. However, the Board could impose conditions to prevent

spillage and ensure implementation of drainage measures.

19. As the [applicant's representatives](#) had no further comment to make and Members had no further question to raise, the Chairman informed them that the hearing procedures for the review had been completed and the Board would further deliberate on the applications in their absence and inform the applicant of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the [applicant's representatives](#) and PlanD's representative for attending the meeting. They all left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

20. Dr. Michael Chiu clarified that as detergent was not considered as a chemical product and could only be controlled by the Water Pollution Control Ordinance, it did not constitute a concern on environmental grounds except when spillage occurred. Nevertheless, the requirement for zero effluent emission would still be relevant in consideration of the application.

21. Members were generally not in support of the three review applications and expressed the following views:

- (a) it was clear from DPO's explanation that the zoning boundaries were drawn up on justifiable grounds, taking into account the relevant planning considerations when the OZP was first drawn up. The "OS" zone was later extended northwards and southwards to keep abreast of changing circumstances while the western boundary was kept to retain the rural setting. Notwithstanding, instead of going through the planning history, it would be essential to focus on the TPB PG No. 13D which provided the guidelines for assessing the cases. The individual merits should be based on the criteria of the guidelines and departmental views, including noise concerns to sensitive receivers;
- (b) TPB PG No. 13D should be adopted as the reference in determining the subject applications and other similar cases in future;
- (c) regarding livelihood, the operators were still entitled to run their business in the "OS" portion of the sites;

- (d) it would not be advisable to encourage proliferation of open storage onto the “AGR” zone;
- (e) for application No. A/YL-TT/210, the actual operation seemed to involve an industrial process of transferring the detergent from trucks to smaller containers which was likely to cause soil contamination and eventual river pollution, hence not supported;
- (f) the applications did not demonstrate sufficient planning gains to justify sympathetic consideration; and
- (g) the absence of environmental complaint did not necessarily suggest that the situation would be acceptable and there was still the possibility of environmental nuisances and impacts on other sensitive receivers. It would be more proactive to avoid future nuisances and likely complaints rather than to consider mitigation measures.

22. The Chairman shared the views above and concluded that the cases should be assessed on the basis of TPB PG No. 13D. Members agreed that there was no ground to support the three applications.

Application No. A/YL-TT/210

23. After further deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application on review and the reasons were:

- (a) the development was not compatible with the surrounding land uses in particular the stream course and the predominantly rural setting to the west of the site;
- (b) the development did not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13D for ‘Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses’ in that there was no previous planning approval granted on site and there were local objections and adverse departmental comments on traffic and environmental aspects;
- (c) there was insufficient information in the submission to demonstrate that the development would not have adverse traffic and environmental impacts on

the surrounding areas; and

- (d) approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for other similar uses to proliferate further into the “AGR” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such similar applications would result in a general degradation of the environment of the area.

Application No. A/YL-TT/211

24. After further deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application on review and the reasons were:

- (a) the development was not compatible with the surrounding land uses in particular the stream course and the predominantly rural setting to the west of the site;
- (b) the development did not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13D for ‘Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses’ in that there was no previous planning approval granted on site and there were local objection and adverse departmental comments on traffic and environmental aspects;
- (c) there was insufficient information in the submission to demonstrate that the development would not have adverse traffic and environmental impacts on the surrounding areas; and
- (d) approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for other similar uses to proliferate further into the “AGR” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such similar applications would result in a general degradation of the environment of the area.

Application No. A/YL-TT/212

25. After further deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application on review and the reasons were:

- (a) the development was not compatible with the surrounding land uses in particular the stream course and the predominantly rural setting to the west

of the site;

- (b) the development did not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13D for ‘Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses’ in that there was no previous planning approval granted on site and there were local objection and adverse departmental comments on traffic and environmental aspects;
- (c) there was insufficient information in the submission to demonstrate that the development would not have adverse traffic and environmental impacts on the surrounding areas; and
- (d) approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for other similar uses to proliferate further into the “AGR” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such similar applications would result in a general degradation of the environment of the area.

Agenda Item 6

[Open meeting]

Request for Deferral of Review of Application No. A/K20/99

Proposed Hotel (Amendments to an Approved Scheme) in

“Residential (Group A)1” zone, G/F (Part) and UG/F (Part),

Kowloon Inland Lot 11158, Hoi Fai Road, West Kowloon Reclamation

(TPB Paper No. 7978)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese]

26. The Secretary said that Dr. Greg Wong had declared an interest in this item as the application was submitted by Active Success Development Ltd. which was a subsidiary company of Sino Land Ltd. where he had business dealings with. As the application was for deferral of consideration of the application, Members considered Dr. Wong could remain in the meeting.

27. The Chairman said that the applicant had requested the Board to defer consideration of the review application in order to allow time for the applicant to discuss with

the concerned Government departments with a view to addressing some outstanding issues and to reschedule the hearing of review application to the Board meeting on 11.1.2008. The justification for deferment met the criteria for deferment as set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Deferment of Decision on Representations, Comments, Further Representations and Applications made under the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 33).

28. After deliberation, the Board agreed to the request for deferment and that the application would be submitted to the Board for consideration on 11.1.2008.

Agenda Item 7

[Open meeting]

Request for Deferral of Review of Application No. A/H8/384

Proposed Hotel in “Residential (Group A)” zone,

11-15 Lin Fa Kung Street East, Causeway Bay

(TPB Paper No. 7979)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese]

29. The Chairman said that the applicant had requested the Board to defer consideration of the review application in order to allow time for the applicant to discuss with the concerned Government departments with a view to addressing some outstanding issues. The justification for deferment met the criteria for deferment as set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Deferment of Decision on Representations, Comments, Further Representations and Applications made under the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 33).

30. After deliberation, the Board agreed to the request for deferment and that the application would be submitted to the Board for consideration within three months upon receipt of further submission from the applicant. Two months were given for the applicant to submit the further information. The Board also agreed to advise the applicant that no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 8

[Open meeting]

Request for Deferral of Review of Application No. A/H17/119

Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for an Additional Level
for Residents' Lifts and Lift Lobbies use in "Residential (Group C)3" zone,
37 Island Road, Deep Water Bay
(TPB Paper No. 7980)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese]

31. The Chairman said that the applicant had requested the Board to defer consideration of the review application in order to allow time for the applicant to discuss with the concerned Government departments with a view to clarifying some technical issues. The justification for deferment met the criteria for deferment as set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Deferment of Decision on Representations, Comments, Further Representations and Applications made under the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 33).

32. After deliberation, the Board agreed to the request for deferment and that the application would be submitted to the Board for consideration within three months upon receipt of further submission from the applicant. Two months were given for the applicant to submit the further information. The Board also agreed to advise the applicant that no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 9

[Open meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement
for Consideration of Representations and Comments
to the Draft Yau Ma Tei Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K2/19
(TPB Paper No. 7984)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese]

33. The Secretary introduced the Paper and said that the draft Yau Ma Tei Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K2/19 was exhibited for public inspection under section 7 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) on 31.8.2007. During the two-month exhibition period,

9 valid representations were received. On 9.11.2007, the representations were published for 3 weeks for public comments and no comment was received.

34. The Secretary went on to say that as all the representations were related to the zoning of the same site under Amendment Item A, it was considered more efficient for the full Board to hear the representations in a collective hearing without resorting to the appointment of a Representation Hearing Committee.

35. Members agreed to accommodate the collective hearing in the Board's regular meeting without resorting to a separate session. The hearing under section 6B of the Ordinance was tentatively scheduled for 25.1.2008.

Agenda Item 10

[Open meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement
for Consideration of Representations to the
Draft Tai Tam and Shek O Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H18/9
(TPB Paper No. 7985)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese]

36. The Secretary reported that the draft Tai Tam and Shek O Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H18/9 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) on 31.8.2007. During the two-month exhibition period, 2 valid representations were received. On 9.11.2007, the representations were published for 3 weeks for public comments and no comment was received.

37. The Secretary went on to say that as there were only 2 representations, it was considered more efficient for the full Board to hear the representations without resorting to the appointment of a Representation Hearing Committee. Consideration of the representations under section 6B was tentatively scheduled for 25.1.2008.

38. Members agreed to accommodate the hearing in the Board's regular meeting without resorting to a separate session. The hearing under section s6B of the Ordinance was tentatively scheduled for 25.1.2008.

Agenda Item 11

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

39. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at [10.15 a.m.](#)

CHAIRMAN
TOWN PLANNING BOARD