

**Minutes of 908<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 11.4.2008**

**Present**

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

Chairman

Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan

Mr. David W.M. Chan

Professor David Dudgeon

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

Ms. Sylvia S.F. Yau

Mr. B.W. Chan

Mr. Walter K.L. Chan

Ms. Maggie M.K. Chan

Mr. Y.K. Cheng

Mr. Felix W. Fong

Ms. Anna S.Y. Kwong

Professor Paul K.S. Lam

Dr. James C.W. Lau

Mr. K.Y. Leung

Professor Edwin H.W. Chan

Mr. Rock C.N. Chen

Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee

Mr. Timothy K.W. Ma

Dr. Winnie S.M. Tang

Assistant Director (2), Home Affairs Department

Ms. Margaret Hsia

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection

Dr. Michael Chiu

Director of Lands

Miss Annie Tam

Director of Planning

Mrs. Ava Ng

Deputy Director of Planning/District

Miss Ophelia Y.S. Wong

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong

Vice-chairman

Mr. Leslie H.C. Chen

Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim

Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan

Ms. Starry W.K. Lee

Dr. Ellen Y.Y. Lau

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

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board  
Mr. S. Lau

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms. Christine K.C. Tse

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr. W.S. Lau

## **Agenda Item 1**

[Open Meeting]

### Opening

1. The Chairman welcomed the appointment of 6 new Members, namely, Dr. Winnie S.M. Tang, Mr. Rock C.N. Chen, Prof. Edwin H.W. Chan, Mr. Timothy K.W. Ma, Dr. Ellen Y.Y. Lau, and Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee. He also congratulated Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong being appointed as Vice-chairman of the Board, Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong as Vice-chairman of the Metro Planning Committee and Mr. Alfred Donald Yap as Vice-chairman of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee.

2. The Chairman also invited Members to attend the Opening Ceremony of the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront – Stage 2 Public Engagement – Public Exhibition at 3:00 pm at the Thematic Exhibition Gallery, Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre, Kowloon Park.

### Confirmation of Minutes of the 907<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 14.3.2008

3. The minutes of the 907<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 14.3.2008 were confirmed without amendment.

[Dr. James C.W. Lau, Miss Annie Tam 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 Decisions Received

Town Planning Appeal No. 19 of 2005

Temporary Container Vehicle and Lorry Park  
for a Period of 3 Years in “Undetermined” zone,  
Lots 120(Part), 121, 122, 246RP(Part), 247, 248A, 248B,  
248RP(Part), 249RP, 250RP and 254RP in DD 122, Ping Shan, Yuen Long  
(Application No. A/YL-PS/206)

---

Town Planning Appeal No. 20 of 2005  
Temporary Container Vehicle Park and Ancillary Repairing Activities  
for a Period of 3 Years in “Undetermined” zone  
Lots 105RP(Part), 106RP(Part), 107, 108(Part), 109, 110(Part),  
111(Part), 112-116, 118, 119(Part), 120(Part), 124(Part), 127, 128 and 158(Part)  
and Adjoining Government Land in DD 122, Ping Shan, Yuen Long  
(Application No. A/YL-PS/207)

---

Town Planning Appeal No. 2 of 2006  
Temporary Container Vehicle and Lorry Park and Ancillary Repairing Activities  
for a Period of 3 Year in “Undetermined” zone  
Lots 137(Part), 138-143, 145, 147(Part), 148, 149,151, 152(Part), 153(Part),  
155(Part), 159, 160, 164, 165,167-171, 172, 175, 176-179, 180RP,  
181RP, 182RP, 183RP(Part),236RP, 237RP, 238RP, 239R, 240RP, 241RP  
and 243RP and adjoining Government Land in D.D.122, Ping Shan, Yuen Long  
(Application No. A/YL-PS/228)

---

4. The Secretary reported that the three captioned appeals were against the Town Planning Board’s (TPB) decisions to reject on review three applications for temporary container vehicle and lorry park (No. A/YL-PS/206), temporary container vehicle park with ancillary repairing activities (No. A/YL-PS/207) and temporary container vehicle and lorry park with ancillary repairing activities (No. A/YL-PS/228), all for a period of 3 years at sites zoned “Undetermined” (“U”) on the Ping Shan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). The appeals were heard in a bundle by the Town Planning Appeal Board (TPAB) on 29 to 31.5.2007 & 23.6.2007 (for Appeal No. 19/05) and 28.6.2007, 9.7.2007 & 22.10.2007 (for Appeals No. 20/05 and 2/06). On 28.3.2008, the TPAB handed down the decisions on the three Appeals.

Appeals No. 19/05 (Site 1) and 20/05 (Site 2)

5. The TPAB allowed Appeal No. 19/05 for the parking of lorry and container vehicle and Appeal No. 20/05 for the parking of container vehicles, both for a period of 3 years with conditions, mainly based on the following considerations:

- it was unlikely that such application, when granted, would jeopardize the future planning of the land. There was no evidence in the case that once the site was allowed to be used for the applied use, the potential use of the site in the future would be affected irrevocably;
- even assuming that enforcement actions were promptly taken, the prospect of converting the site and the surrounding land into rural farm land was slim;
- the lorry and container vehicle park at the site would not have any real effect on the residents of Tin Tze Estate. Also, there would not have any serious risk of adverse effect on the drainage of Ha Mei San Tsuen or the surrounding areas at all if the drainage proposals of the Appellant were implemented;
- it was unlikely that the lorry and container vehicle park at the site would cause any parking problem to the villagers of Ha Mei San Tsuen. Nor would the applied use at the site cause any real traffic problem and nuisance to the Tin Shui Wai area;
- regarding Environmental Protection Department's concern on noise pollution, the noise generated from the activities on site could be satisfactorily contained if the measures recommended by the Appellant, particularly the erection of fence wall, were implemented;
- regarding the traffic noise impact, it was considered that the vehicles would not be travelling at great speed along the east-west stretch of Ha Mei San Tsuen Road and the vehicles parked in the appeal sites were expected to be mainly heavy and container lorries which would be leaving in the morning and returning in the evening. Hence, it was not anticipated that at any given point of time in the day

there would be really heavy traffic on both directions along this stretch of the road. Furthermore, it was also considered that the distance from the noise source along this stretch of the road to the nearest house of Ha Mei San Tsuen was sufficiently great;

- the departmental and local objections could reasonably be met by the implementation of the measures suggested by the Appellant. It was also observed that there was a shortage of supply of such parking spaces in the area and there was a reasonable demand for this kind of use in the location; and
- for Appeal No. 20/05, the application for ancillary repairing activities was not granted as the pollution caused by the car repairing activities might have some more permanent effect on the soil and the mitigation measures proposed by the Appellant might not be all that effective to prevent such pollution.

6. Sites 1 and 2 were allowed by the TPAB with majority of 4 to 1. As such, the TPAB could not reach a unanimous view on whether the two Appeals should be allowed. The minority considered that (a) one should further consider the general Government policy of confining open storage and port back-up uses and not to give any new permission for open storage and port back-up uses in areas outside Category 1 areas; and (b) the grant of planning permission, albeit for only a temporary period of 3 years, would set an undesirable precedent for similar application in the area.

#### Appeals No. 2/06

7. The Appeal No. 2/06 was dismissed by the TPAB based on the following considerations:

- even with the mitigation measures suggested by the Appellant, TPAB were not satisfied that the development would not cause any unreasonable adverse effect on the residents nearby;
- there were quite a number of residential structures immediately to the north-west, north-east and south-east of the site; and

- with particular reference to the car repairing activities, the Appellant had not suggested any measure or effective measure to avoid or mitigate any harmful effect of the pollution so caused.

8. The Secretary supplemented that a copy of the Summary of the three Appeals and the TPAB's decisions were despatched to Members for reference on 9.4.2008.

(ii) Town Planning Appeal Received

Town Planning Appeal No. 1 of 2008

Proposed Rebuilding of a 2-Storey House

in "Green Belt" and "Residential (Group C)1" zones,

1 Fung Sau Road,

Lot 246 and Extension in DD 252,

Tso Wo Hang, Sai Kung

(Application No. A/SK-TMT/8)

---

9. The Secretary reported that an appeal against the decision of the TPB to reject on review an application for rebuilding of a 2-storey house in "Green Belt" and "Residential (Group C)1" zones on the approved Tai Mong Tsai and Tsam Chuk Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/SK-TMT/2 was received by the TPAB on 20.3.2008. The application was rejected by the TPB on 11.1.2008 on the following grounds:

- (a) there was insufficient information in the submission to demonstrate that the existing house, with the claimed gross floor area of about 405m<sup>2</sup>, was an 'existing building' as defined in the covering Notes of the draft Tai Mong Tsai and Tsam Chuk Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/SK-TMT/3;
- (b) the proposed relaxation in development intensity was not minor. There was no justification to merit an increase in development intensity and to depart from the planning intention of the "Residential (Group C)" ("R(C)") zone which was for low-rise and low-density residential development; and

- (c) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications for substantial increase in development intensity within the “R(C)” zone in the area.

10. The hearing date of the appeal was yet to be fixed. The Secretary would represent the Board on all matters relating to the proceedings of the TPAB in the usual manner.

(iii) Appeals Statistics

11. The Secretary reported that as at 11.4.2008, 12 cases were yet to be heard by the TPAB. Details of the appeal statistics were as follows:

Allowed	:	23
Dismissed	:	107
Abandoned/Withdrawn/Invalid	:	128
Yet to be Heard	:	12
Decision Outstanding	:	1
<hr/> Total	:	271

(iv) Reference of Outline Zoning Plans (OZPs)

12. The Secretary reported that on 8.4.2008, the Chief Executive in Council referred the approved Tsim Sha Tsui OZP No. S/K1/22 and Tsz Wan Shan, Diamond Hill and San Po Kong OZP No. S/K11/22 back to the Board for amendment under s.12(1)(b)(ii) of the Ordinance. The reference back of the approved OZPs for amendment would be notified in the Gazette on 18.4.2008.

**Agenda Item 3**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront – Stage 2 Public Engagement

(Open Meeting)

(TPB Paper No. 8058)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

Declaration of Interest

13. Professor Edwin H.W. Chan declared interest on the item as he was part of the consultant team of the Study and left the meeting temporarily at this point. Professor Paul K.S. Lam, Ms. Maggie M.K. Chan and Mr. Rock C.N. Chen also declared interest for being members of academic staff, the Council and the Board of Management respectively of the City University (CityU). The CityU Professional Services Ltd., a member of the consultant team, was a company of the University. As this was a briefing session, Members agreed that their interests were indirect and they could stay in the meeting and joined the discussion.

14. The following Government representatives and the consultants were invited to the meeting to brief Members:

Ms. Phyllis Li	-	Chief Town Planner, Planning Department
Mr. Eric Fung	-	Chief Engineer, Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr. H.L. Cheng	-	Chief Traffic Engineer, Transport Department
Mr. Kyran Sze	)	Aedas Ltd.
Ms. Irene Ip	)	
Mr. Tony Yeung	)	
Miss Aaurafe Poon	)	
Professor Andrew Leung	]	CityU Professional Services Ltd.
	]	
Mr. C.M. Tam	]	
Professor Lee Ngok	)	Public Policy Research Institute, HKPolyU
	)	
	)	
Professor Edwin Chan	)	
	)	
Dr. Hanqin Zhang	)	
	)	

Dr. K.K. Yuen )

15. The Chairman extended a welcome and invited Ms. Phyllis Li to brief Members on the Paper.

#### Presentation Session

16. Ms. Phyllis Li briefly introduced the background of the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (the Study) which commenced in March 2007. The Board was briefed in May 2007 when the Stage 1 Public Engagement was launched. The Study Team would brief Members on the Stage 2 Public Engagement of the Study in this meeting. She showed a video on the proposals for the new Central Waterfront.

17. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. Kyran Sze made the following main points:

#### Focus of Engagement

- (a) the focus of the Stage 2 Public Engagement was on the refined urban design framework for the new Central Harbourfront, alternative design concepts for the key sites and re-assembly of Queen's Pier (QP) and reconstruction of the old Star Ferry (SF) Clock Tower;

#### Refined Urban Design Framework

- (b) the overall urban design vision was to create a vibrant, green and accessible new Central harbourfront;
- (c) the refined urban design framework provided a coherent and legible structure of uses, building forms, open space and connectivity. It was built upon a waterfront promenade and four principal design corridors (i.e. Statue Square Corridor, Civic Corridor, Pierside Corridor, and Arts and Cultural Precinct), each of which with its own character;

#### Urban Design Emphases

- (d) the six urban design emphases were:
- (1) diversity and vibrancy – design corridors, precincts, nodal attractions, anchoring spaces and a mix of commercial, retail, recreational, arts, cultural and tourism uses at different locations were proposed;
  - (2) development intensity in harmony with the harbourfront – a controlled massing approach was adopted and the development intensities of five key sites were reduced by a total GFA of 61,460m<sup>2</sup> or 86,235m<sup>2</sup> as compared to the permissible level under the OZPs;
  - (3) respecting natural context and existing urban fabric – six key view corridors were defined to enhance visual connectivity to the new harbourfront. Varying building height descending towards the harbour with emphasis on low and medium rise buildings would complement the existing skyline;
  - (4) ease of access and pedestrian connectivity – the new harbourfront was easily accessible by a multi-modal transport system and a comprehensive multi-level pedestrian network. A reserve for an environmental friendly transport system was proposed;
  - (5) respecting cultural heritage – the historical context and setting for the heritage assets were maintained. QP would be re-assembled and the old SF Clock Tower would be reconstructed; and
  - (6) promoting environmentally friendly design and greening – environmentally friendly design features and a comprehensive greening network were proposed to enhance air ventilation, microclimate and energy conservation;

Design Concepts for Key Sites

- (e) alternative design concepts as detailed in paragraph 5 of the Paper and the Consultation Digest had been developed for the key sites. The design concepts were not exhaustive and other ideas from the public were welcome;
- (f) ‘mix and match’ of the different design concepts was possible. Two illustrative Master Layout Plans were prepared to show how various design concepts for the key sites could be put together. The combinations were not exhaustive;

#### Pierside Corridor (Sites 1 and 2)

- (g) there would be a facelift for Central Piers No. 4 to 6 by adding an additional floor for retail, dining and other waterfront-related facilities as well as a Pier Walk along the waterfront;
- (h) to the north of International Finance Centre II, two alternative concepts for office/hotel development were proposed:
  - Concept A (‘Hotel and Office’): a 18-storey hotel and a 30-storey office tower above a bus terminus to add vibrancy with variety of uses;
  - Concept B (‘Office and Office’): two office buildings of 16 and 30 storeys (including a bus terminus) to meet existing demand of Grade A office in Central;

#### Statue Square Corridor (Site 3)

- (i) the key design features included reduced development intensity and smaller building mass with interconnected smaller blocks. 4 to 6 office/retail blocks of 8 to 10 storeys with cascading design, setbacks, roof gardens, etc. were proposed in the west;
- (j) in the east, a low-rise landscape deck and at-grade landscape pedestrian areas with two alternative concepts were proposed. Concept A involved a reduced

landscape deck with a series of public open space at ground level while Concept B involved a larger landscape deck with public open space primarily on deck level providing unimpeded pedestrian movement to the waterfront;

#### Site North of City Hall (Site 4)

- (k) the key design features included 1 to 3 storeys waterfront-related commercial and leisure development named “Harbour Place” for al fresco dining, café and other leisure and tourism uses. Two alternative design concepts were proposed. Concept A included the old SF Clock Tower together with a Clock Tower Gallery in the site and smaller and more separated blocks. Concept B did not include the old SF Clock Tower and there would be fewer and larger blocks on a smaller site area;

#### Arts and Cultural Precinct (Sites 5 and 6)

- (l) in the site north of CITIC Tower (Site 5), 3 separate blocks of 13 to 17 storeys primarily for arts and cultural facilities were proposed;
- (m) in the site near Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (Site 6), there would be a Bayside Walk along the harbourfront and small-scale commercial and leisure uses in a cluster of 1 to 3-storey blocks named “Marine Place” for alfresco dining and outdoor performance;

#### The Waterfront Promenade (Site 7)

- (n) there were 3 walking zones with different characters. The People’s Liberation Army berth would be part of the promenade and open for public access when it was not in military use. A reserve had been provided for environmentally friendly transport system;
- (o) there would be luxuriant landscape setting with two alternative concepts: Urban Park and Urban Green. The former was a park setting with a great variety of nodal attractions and more activity space while the latter would emphasize a

more natural form of landscaping to provide a green icon at the waterfront;

Site Near Central Piers No. 9 and 10 (Site 8)

- (p) two alternative concepts were explored. For Concept A, the site would be the landscape forecourt for the re-assembled QP at the waterfront with the pier function of QP revived. For Concept B, the site would be developed with a small structure of 1 to 2 storeys as an entrance and viewing deck for Central Piers No. 9 and 10;

Re-assembling QP and Reconstructing Old SF Clock Tower

*OP by the Harbour*

- (q) two concepts were proposed for re-assembling QP. Concept A was to re-assemble QP at the harbourfront between Central Piers No. 9 and 10, revive the pier function and maintain an axial relationship among City Hall, the old SF Clock Tower and the re-assembled QP. The design of Central Piers No. 9 and 10 would be integrated with that of the re-assembled QP. The old SF Clock Tower would be reconstructed on the western portion of Site 4 with a Clock Tower Gallery;
- (r) this concept would require reconstruction of seawall caissons, ground stabilization works and refurbishment of Central Piers No. 9 and 10. The estimated re-assembly and associated cost was about HK\$220 million. The re-assembled QP would be completed in late 2012 while Road P2 would be completed in late 2009;

QP at the Original Location

- (s) Concept B was to re-assemble QP at its original location, reconstruct the old SF Clock Tower close to its original location, and maintain its relationship with City Hall and Edinburgh Place. QP would be re-assembled as a sitting-out area with a proposed water feature around. The old SF Clock Tower would be

re-constructed close to its original location at Site 3 together with a Clock Tower Gallery;

- (t) in Concept B, the QP would maintain its relationship with City Hall and Edinburgh Place but would lose the harbour setting and pier function. The proposal required the re-alignment of Road P2 northwards. The estimated re-assembly and associated cost was about HK\$200 million. The re-assembled QP would be completed in late 2013 and there would be delay in the completion of Road P2; and

#### Sustainability Assessment

- (u) preliminary sustainability assessment indicated that the refined urban design framework would bring a range of benefits particularly on economic, social and mobility aspects. Further sustainability assessment would be conducted in drawing up the recommendations after the Stage 2 Public Engagement.

18. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Professor Andrew Leung made the following main points:

- (a) the Stage 2 public engagement would last for 3 months from 11 April to 10 July 2008;
- (b) the engagement activities would include public exhibition at Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre and Queensway Government Offices supplemented by roving exhibitions in different parts of Hong Kong; briefings to relevant statutory and advisory bodies, LegCo Panel, the 18 District Councils, professional institutes; focus group workshops and community engagement forum; and
- (c) public views would be collected through different channels including comment cards, interview questionnaires and telephone interviews. A concluding forum was planned towards the end of the public engagement exercise with a view to consolidating ideas and facilitating consensus building before finalizing the

study proposals and recommendations.

19. Members then spent some time examining the models displayed in the meeting.

### Discussion Session

20. The comments/questions raised by Members were summarized below:

#### Design Concepts

- (a) Members generally welcomed the design concepts for the new harbourfront. A Member indicated that the reduction in development intensities and massing of key sites, in particular Site 3 would help minimise the wall effect and improve air ventilation at the waterfront;
- (b) the planning concepts were good but they needed to be accompanied by good architectural design which could portrait the image of Hong Kong as a world city;
- (c) whether the alternative design concepts of key sites could be mixed and matched. The inter-relationship of certain design concepts which might restrict their 'mix and match' should be spelt out in the public consultation exercise;
- (d) whether accessibility to the waterfront could be further enhanced. A Member asked if it would be possible to provide pedestrian access to the new waterfront at an interval of about 100m;
- (e) the design of the new waterfront should include facilities such as shading and seating to encourage people to stay;
- (f) in planning for the waterfront, a sustainable approach balancing heritage conservation, economic needs and other public aspirations should be adopted;

### QP and old SF Clock Tower

- (g) whether the re-assembling of QP between Piers No. 9 and 10 would affect the current operation of the two piers;
- (h) the design of the new waterfront should integrate the old SF Clock Tower with the surrounding area;
- (i) the old SF Clock Tower should be revitalized and keep its original function of clock tolling for the public;
- (j) noting that a water feature was proposed around the re-assembled QP at the original location under Concept B, a Member asked about the size and depth of the water feature and the function it carried;

### Environmentally Friendly Transport

- (k) what sort of environmental friendly transport mode was contemplated for the waterfront promenade. How the conflict between pedestrians and vehicles would be resolved with the introduction of a transport system in the new waterfront;
- (l) a travelator system was suggested to enhance accessibility to and within the waterfront;
- (m) whether cycling could be promoted as a mode of transport in the new harbourfront;

### Open Space/Landscape

- (n) the proposed large-scale greening in the new waterfront was supported. Greening should more preferably be provided at-grade than on podium deck;
- (o) the design should include different thematic elements for different age groups;

- (p) consideration should be given to provide tree groups in the form of woodland rather than just lines of trees;
- (q) the use of green earth bunds should be considered to replace conventional noise barrier should it be required for Road P2;
- (r) Bauhinia, Hong Kong's emblematic tree, should be included as a theme in the landscape design;

#### Public Engagement

- (s) the public engagement exercise should involve the elderly. Relevant social service organizations should be approached to collect comments from the elderly;
- (t) apart from the two Master Layout Plans, consideration should be given to put forward more combinations of the different design concepts for public consultation;
- (u) given the variety of urban design concepts for key sites and the complexity of the combinations involved, how public comments would be collected and whether QP and the old SF Clock Tower were the main focus in seeking public comments;
- (v) apart from video, models and Powerpoint presentation, consideration should be given to employ more illustrative tools like photomontage and other techniques to illustrate the various concepts to the public in the consultation exercise;
- (w) whether the public consultation materials would be uploaded to Planning Department (PlanD)'s web site and whether it was technically feasible to access the virtual 3-D model displayed in the public exhibition on the internet;

#### Study Timetable

- (x) the completion time of the Study; and

#### Others

- (y) there was concern on the management of the new waterfront including control on eating and drinking activities to keep the area neat and tidy. The management mode of the new harbourfront should be considered.

21. In response to Members' comments/questions, Ms. Phyllis Li, Mr. Kyran Sze, Ms. Irene Ip, Professors Andrew Leung and Lee Ngok, and Mr. Eric Fung made the following main points :

#### Design Concepts

- (a) efforts had been made to reduce the development intensities and the overall building mass at the new harbourfront. The total GFA of Site 3 was reduced from 190,000m<sup>2</sup> to 157,400m<sup>2</sup>. At the same time, the public car park and public transport interchange to be provided within the site would be accountable for GFA calculation and there would not be any GFA "bonus" claim for public passage. The resultant mass of the development at Site 3 would be significantly reduced as compared to the previous proposal;
- (b) the Study focused on the urban design perspective. The architectural design of individual buildings could be considered in future;
- (c) the alternative design concepts for the key sites could be mixed and matched flexibly. The two Master Layout Plans were just illustrative schemes for the public's reference;
- (d) there would be a number of new underground connections, at-grade crossings, elevated walkways and podium decks enhancing pedestrian access to the waterfront. The suggestion of pedestrian access network to the waterfront at

an interval of 100m could be explored;

- (e) in the new waterfront, there would be a wide variety of anchoring spaces and nodal attractions that would attract people to stay. Resting places would also be provided at suitable locations along the waterfront;
- (f) the new waterfront provided a good opportunity for sustainable development in Central. The proposed uses along the new waterfront had balanced the demand for office use in the Central Business District, the public demand for public open space and the introduction of waterfront-related commercial uses and cultural facilities to add vibrancy to the waterfront promenade;

#### QP and SF Clock Tower

- (g) if QP was re-assembled between Central Piers No. 9 and 10, the pier function could be revived;
- (h) the design of the old SF Clock Tower was not done in isolation. In Concept A, the Clock Tower and the Clock Tower Gallery would be a focal point with a linear axial relationship with City Hall and the re-assembled QP. In Concept B, the Clock Tower was reconstructed close to its original location and would maintain its relationship with City Hall and Edinburgh Place. The design of the landscaped deck would highlight the location of the Clock Tower;
- (i) the function of the re-constructed old SF Clock Tower for clock toll could be revived;
- (j) the water feature around the re-assembled QP in Concept A was intended to re-create a waterfront setting for the pier. The water feature proposed in the design concept was about 120m in length and 1m in depth. The depth was constrained by the extension of MTR over-run tunnel and infrastructural facilities underneath;

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

#### Environmental Friendly Transport

- (k) whilst the specific type of environmental friendly transport system had not been determined, sufficient space had been reserved at the waterfront promenade. The transport system would not be one of those used currently on the existing road network because of potential conflicts with pedestrians and safety concerns. The suitability of similar types of transport system used in Darling Harbour and Kobe had to be further explored. The proposal of a travelator system might be possible in the “Comprehensive Development Area” sites but it would be subject to greater constraints along the waterfront promenade where many other facilities were located;

#### Open Space/Landscape

- (l) the design of thematic spaces for different age groups could be incorporated in the future design brief;
- (m) according to the environmental impact assessment, no noise barrier was required for Road P2;
- (n) there was a landscape strategy for the new waterfront. A Bauhinia Walk had been proposed near the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre;

#### Public Engagement

- (o) the views of the elderly would be sought as proposed;
- (p) in addition to the two Master Layout Plans, 1:750 models showing 4 different possible combinations involving Site 3, 4, 8 and QP were also prepared for the public exhibitions;
- (q) in view of the complexity of the issues involved, the Consultant team would

conduct both quantitative and qualitative analysis on the public comments received. The comments obtained from different channels like comment cards, telephone survey, interviews and workshop would be counter-checked against each other. The professional analysis on the public comments collected would be highly reliable. The reassembly of QP and the old SF Clock Tower were key issues in the public consultation exercise;

- (r) in the public exhibitions, a variety of illustrative tools would be employed to illustrate the proposals to members of the public. It included display panels, photomontages, two 1:1500 models and eight 1:750 models, virtual interactive 3-D model, video, etc.;
- (s) the public consultation materials had been uploaded to PlanD's web site for public viewing. The virtual interactive 3-D model could not be accessed via the internet. Interested parties were invited to visit the public exhibition venue to try out the model; and

#### Study Time-table

- (t) the Study would be completed by the end of 2008.

22. On promotion of cycling in the waterfront, Mr. H.L. Cheng said that it would be difficult to allow cycling along the entire waterfront for safety reasons as the promenade was designed primarily for pedestrians. It would also be impractical to promote cycling as a transport mode in the new harbourfront, as its connection with the adjoining area was constrained by the absence of a cycle track network along the northern part of Hong Kong Island.

23. In response to the concern on the management of the new harbourfront, the Chairman said that the Task Group on Management Model for Harbour-front under the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee was exploring the framework for the sustainable management of the new harbourfront, including public-private partnership.

24. As Members had no further questions, the Chairman asked the consultants to

take into account the views expressed by Members in drawing up the recommendations of the Study.

25. The Chairman thanked the Government representatives and the study consultants for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[Miss Annie Tam left temporarily while Ms. Maggie M.K. Chan, Professor Paul K.S. Lam, Mr. Felix W. Fong, Ms. Margaret Hsia, and Mr. David W.M.Chan left the meeting at this point. Professor Edwin H.W. Chan returned to join the meeting at this point.]

#### **Agenda Item 4**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

Review of Application No. A/YL-KTN/281

Temporary Open Storage of Scrap Metal for a Period of 3 Years in “Undetermined” zone, Lots 1558(Part), 1560(Part) and 1562CFRP(Part) in DD 107, Cheung Chun San Tsuen, Kam Tin, Yuen Long

(TPB Paper No. 8066)

---

[The hearing was conducted in Cantonese.]

26. Dr. James C.W. Lau declared an interest on this item as he had business dealings with the consultant of the application.

[Dr. James C.W. Lau left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

#### **Presentation and Question Session**

27. Mr. Wilson So, District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long of the Planning Department (PlanD) and the following applicant and his representative were invited to the meeting at this point:

Mr. Tang Ying-fat - Applicant

Mr. Tang Chun-wah - Applicant's Representative

28. 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.

29. With the aid of some plans, Mr. Wilson So did so as detailed in the Paper and made the following main points:

- (a) the applicant sought planning permission for temporary open storage of scrap metal for a period of 3 years in an area zoned "Undetermined" ("U");
- (b) the reasons for the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) to reject the application on 4.1.2008 were set out in paragraph 1.2 of the Paper;
- (c) no written representation in support of the review application was submitted by the applicant;
- (d) departmental comments – the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation had reservation on the application as the proposed open storage use deviated from the original intended purpose of pond filling for plant nursery previously approved in 1999. The Director of Environmental Protection did not support the application because of environmental concern. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape of PlanD objected on the grounds of setting an undesirable precedent and hence adversely affecting the rural landscape character. Drainage Services Department raised concern as no technical proposal on drainage was submitted;
- (e) public comments – a public comment objecting to the review application on environmental and health grounds was received; and

- (f) PlanD's view – PlanD did not support the application for the reasons stated in paragraph 7.1 of the Paper. The application did not comply with TPB Guidelines No. 13D in that it was incompatible with the rural land uses in the vicinity and there were adverse departmental comments and local objection. There was insufficient information in the submission to demonstrate that the development would not generate adverse impacts to the area.

[Mr. Y.K. Cheng left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

30. The Chairman then invited the applicant's representative to elaborate on the application.

31. Mr. Tang Chun-wah made the following main points:

- (a) the site was small in area (about 2,600m<sup>2</sup>). It was used for open storage and did not generate nuisances to the adjoining area. Sympathetic consideration should be given to the application;
- (b) nearly all Government departments consulted had no objection to the application. On the concern of possible impact on Greater Painted-snipe in the area, the number of birds was not affected according to Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department;
- (c) greening and drainage work would be provided to mitigate against any adverse impacts; and
- (d) the objection raised by a resident and a previous District Councillor was not justified.

32. A Member asked whether the structures in Plan R-3 fell within the application site. Mr. Wilson So said that the structures were within the application site.

33. As the applicant and his representative 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 application in their absence and inform the applicant of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the applicant and his representative and also PlanD's representative for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

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

### Deliberation Session

34. A Member said that there were no strong grounds to support the application as it did not comply with the TPB Guidelines No. 13D and there was insufficient information to demonstrate that the development would not cause adverse impacts to the area. Other Members shared the view.

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

- (a) 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 the development was considered incompatible with rural land uses in the vicinity which were mainly ponds and fallow agriculture land and there were adverse departmental comments and local objection; and
- (b) there was insufficient information/technical assessment in the submission to demonstrate that the development would not generate adverse environmental, drainage and landscape impacts on the surrounding areas.

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

### **Agenda Item 5**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

Review of Application No. A/YL-HT/487

Temporary Open Storage of Containers for a Period of 3 Years in “Recreation” and “Open Storage” zones, Lots 383(Part), 386(Part), 387(Part), 388(Part), 389, 390, 391, 392(Part), 393, 394(Part), 395(Part), 396(Part), 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413(Part), 416(Part), 424(Part), 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443A, 443B, 445, 446, 447, 448, 450, 451(Part), 452(Part), 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458A(Part), 458B(Part), 458C(Part), 459A, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465(Part), 466, 467(Part), 547(Part), 548 (Part), 549, 550(Part), 551(Part), 552(Part), 559(Part), 560(Part), 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574(Part), 575(Part) , 576(Part) , 577(Part) , 578(Part) and 579(Part) in DD 125 and Adjoining Government Land, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long  
(TPB Paper No. 8065)

---

[The hearing was conducted in Cantonese.]

#### Presentation and Question Session

36. 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. Kenneth To	)	Applicant’s Representatives
Ms. Kitty Wong	)	
Mr. Tang Chok-lam	)	
Mr. Kwok Chi-man	)	
Mr. David Yeung	)	
Mr. S.L. Ng	)	

37. 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.

38. With the aid of some plans, Mr. Wilson So did so as detailed in the Paper and made the following main points:

- (a) the applicant sought planning permission for temporary open storage of containers for a period of 3 years in an area zoned “Recreation” (“REC”). 98% of the site was zoned “REC” and 2% was zoned “Open Storage” on the current draft Ha Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-HT/9 gazetted on 25.1.2008;
- (b) the reasons for the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) to reject the application on 30.11.2007 were set out in paragraph 1.2 of the Paper;
- (c) written representation was submitted by the applicant and the major justifications were summarised in paragraph 3 of the Paper;
- (d) departmental comments – the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/New Territories considered that approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent which might induce cumulative adverse traffic impact on the nearby road network. The Director of Environmental Protection did not support the application because of environmental nuisance. The Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department raised technical concerns and required the submission of a revised Drainage Impact Assessment;
- (e) public comments – no public comment was received during the public inspection period of the review application. There was 1 public comment objecting to the application received from a District Councillor at the s.16 application stage; and
- (f) PlanD’s view – PlanD did not support the application for reasons stated in paragraph 8.1 of the Paper. The development was not in line with the planning intention of the “REC” zone. It was not in line with the TPB Guidelines No. 13D in that there were adverse departmental comments and there was insufficient information to demonstrate that the development would not generate adverse impacts on the surrounding area. Approval of the application would result in degradation of the

natural environment. The site was the subject of 11 previous applications for various temporary open storage uses which were all rejected by RNTPC or TPB. Compared with the last rejected application (No. A/YL-HT/408), the current application involved a site area larger than the last one by about 1 ha.

39. The Chairman then invited the applicant's representatives to elaborate on the application.

40. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. Kenneth To made the following main points:

- (a) the site was formed in 1996 and had been intermittently used for open storage of containers since 2001;
- (b) the site was accessible by a well-paved access road with proper landscape planting and drainage channel along the periphery;
- (c) although the subject site was within a Category 2 area under TPB Guideline No. 13D, it was located close to the open storage uses along both sides of San Wai Road which were now zoned as "Open Storage";
- (d) the application was in line with TPB Guidelines No. 13D in that it was in close proximity to the existing and proposed cross boundary links in the North West New Territories and the concerns of Government departments could be addressed through the implementation of approval conditions;
- (e) on Environmental Protection Department's concern as stated in paragraph 5.2.3(b) of the Paper, the residential dwelling 24m away from the site was vacant and not used for domestic purpose. The Applicant would implement sufficient mitigation measures along the site boundary to reduce impact on the existing sensitive uses;

- (f) regarding the concern on traffic noise nuisance caused by the development as stated in paragraph 5.2.3(c) of the Paper, their traffic noise assessment results indicated that the off-site traffic noise due to the development would not have unacceptable impact on the sensitive receivers within 300m from the subject site. In addition, there were neither pollution complaint against the site between 2005 and 2007 nor local objection to the review application;
- (g) on the concern of management and maintenance responsibility of the access road as raised by Transport Department in paragraph 5.2.4(a) of the Paper, the operator of the existing open storage use had agreed to take up the responsibility to manage and maintain the improved access road;
- (h) for the cumulative adverse traffic impact raised in paragraph 5.2.4(b) of the Paper, their Traffic Impact Assessment had suitably and adequately considered the traffic impact of the site and other sites used for open storage of containers in the surrounding area. Approval of the application would not set an undesirable precedent for similar applications in the area;
- (i) a total of 922 trees (including 389 existing ones) was proposed as screen planting along the periphery and in the middle of the site. A detailed tree preservation and landscape proposal would be submitted upon approval of the application;
- (j) given the strategic location of Ha Tsuen for cross-boundary logistic function, the site was suitable for open storage use;
- (k) the development was compatible with adjacent land uses which were mainly open storage and container storage yards;
- (l) approval of the application would alleviate the shortage of land for port back-up facilities; and

- (m) the container storage yards created employment especially for residents in Tin Shui Wai.

[Ms. Anna S.Y. Kwong left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

41. The questions raised by Members were summarised as follows :

- (a) the storage capacity of containers at the site;
- (b) what would be the use of the site if the application was not approved;
- (c) given the site was surrounded by open storage uses, whether the rural landscape in the area could be maintained;
- (d) the location of the 389 existing trees in the site as the trees could not be identified in Plans R-3 and R-4;
- (e) referring to Plan R-2, whether part of the application site would be required for public sewage project; and
- (f) the number of employment provided and the number of staff living in Tin Shui Wai.

42. In response, Mr. Wilson So made the following main points :

- (a) the site was zoned "REC" which was intended for recreational developments for the use of the general public. Uses such as holiday camp was considered suitable;
- (b) as pointed out in paragraph 7.1 of the Paper, the site fell within Category 2 areas under the TPB Guidelines No. 13D where permission could be granted on a temporary basis subject to no adverse comments or the concerns could be mitigated. In the present case, the container storage

use would generate adverse impacts on the surrounding areas;

- (c) as shown in an aerial photograph taken in 2001, some green landscape features could still be found in the inner part of the “REC” zone but were subsequently eroded by open storage uses. The areas on both sides of San Wai Road had been rezoned to “Open Storage” use in January 2008. The unauthorised open storage uses in the “REC” zone would be subject to planning enforcement action. Given the height of the containers stacked up on the site, Members might wish to consider if the proposed tree planting at the periphery of the application site would be able to mitigate the landscape impact of the proposed use;
- (d) according to site inspection, there were not many trees planted at the periphery of the site; and
- (e) the eastern portion of the site partly fell within the project limit of Yuen Long and Kam Tin Sewerage and Sewage Disposal Stage II. The project would commence in June 2009.

43. Mr. Kenneth To then made the following main points :

- (a) the maximum storage capacity of the site was about 10,000 container boxes. As the operation was rather dynamic with container boxes coming in and going out frequently, there would be less than 10,000 boxes at any one time;
- (b) according to their survey on site, there were indeed over 300 trees planted along the periphery of the site; and
- (c) the container storage yard had employed over 100 people, including drivers, office workers and site staff and a number of the employees lived in Tin Shui Wai.

44. A Member asked whether Environmental Protection Department would

maintain its previous view noting that the nearest residential dwelling 24m away from the site was no longer used for residential purpose. Dr. Michael Chiu replied that their comments were still valid as there were also other sensitive uses in the vicinity of the site.

45. 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 application 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 left the meeting at this point.

[Ms. Anna S.Y. Kwong and Miss Annie Tam returned to join the meeting at this point.]

#### Deliberation Session

46. A Member said that there had been a proliferation of open storage uses in the area and that had spoilt the rural landscape setting of the area. Whilst open storage uses were permitted on both sides of San Wai Road, proliferation of open storage uses into the "REC" zone should be prohibited to avoid further deterioration of the area. Approval of the current application would set an undesirable precedent. A few Members shared the views.

47. Another Member said that the traffic noise nuisances caused by the proposed use would adversely affect the residents living in the area. This Member considered that the approval of the current application would send a wrong message that the unauthorised use could be allowed through planning application..

48. A Member said that while he supported the need of the logistics industry, the application should not be supported in view of its adverse impacts on the surrounding area.

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

- (a) the development was not in line with the planning intention of the “Recreation” zone, which was intended primarily for recreational developments for the use of the general public. No strong justification had been given in the submission for a departure from such planning intention, even on a temporary basis;
- (b) the development was not in line with the Town Planning Board 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, drainage and landscape impacts on the surrounding areas; and
- (c) approval of the application would result in degradation of the natural environment.

[Dr. Michael Chiu and Mr. Walter K. L. Chan left the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 6**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

Section 16A Application No. A/H15/202-1

Application for Extension of Time for Commencement of Development – Proposed Hotel Development in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business(1)” zone, 41 Heung Yip Road, Aberdeen Inland Lot 354

(TPB Paper No. 8073)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

50. The Secretary reported that Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong and Mr. Felix W. Fong had declared interests on this item as the applicant was a subsidiary of Cheung Kong (Holdings) Ltd. with which they had current business dealings. Members noted that Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong had sent his apology for not attending the meeting and Mr. Felix W. Fong had already left the meeting.

51. The Chairman said that the s.16A application could not be processed by the Director of Planning under delegated authority because there were adverse departmental comments. The application should be considered by Metro Planning Committee but it was submitted to the Board for consideration at this meeting because there would be no Metro Planning Committee meeting before the expiry of the planning permission on 16.4.2008.

#### Presentation and Question Session

52. Ms. Brenda Au, District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK) of Planning Department (PlanD) was invited to the meeting to brief Members on the Paper.

53. Ms. Brenda Au tabled a replacement page for p.4 of the Paper. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Ms. Au briefed Members on the background to the application as detailed in the Paper and made the following main points :

- (a) the applicant sought planning permission for extension of time (EOT) for commencement of the approved hotel development for a period of 4 years until 16.4.2012 in a site zoned “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business (1)”;
- (b) the justifications put forward by the applicant to support the EOT application were detailed in paragraph 2 of the Paper;
- (c) the relevant assessment criteria in the TPB Guidelines on Extension of Time for Commencement of Development (TPB PG No. 35A) and the TPB Guidelines for Class A and Class B Amendments to Approved Development Proposals (TPB PG-No. 36) were highlighted in paragraph 3 of the Paper;
- (d) local objection – a Southern District Councillor objected to the EOT on the ground that the developer had no intention to implement the hotel project and approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent; and

- (e) PlanD's view – PlanD did not support the application for reasons stated in paragraph 9.1 of the Paper. There had been a change in planning circumstances in that a building height restriction of 120mPD was imposed on the application site after the original planning permission for hotel use was granted. The approved hotel development with a building height of 135mPD would exceed the newly imposed building height restriction on OZP. The approval of the EOT application to allow a hotel with a non-conforming building height would have adverse planning implications on the townscape of the area. Furthermore, the applicant had not demonstrated that reasonable actions had been taken to implement the approved hotel development. There had not been any building plan submission for the approved hotel development so far. The lease modification for the application site pursued by the applicant also did not include hotel use.

54. As Members had no questions to raise, the Chairman thanked Ms. Brenda Au for attending the meeting. Ms. Au left the meeting at this point.

#### Deliberation Session

55. The Chairman said that there had been a change in planning circumstances since the granting of the planning permission in 2004 and no reasonable actions had been taken by the applicant to implement the hotel development.

56. Members considered that there were no strong grounds to support the EOT application.

57. After further deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application and the reasons were :

- (a) a building height restriction of 120mPD had been imposed on the application site after the original planning permission was granted. The originally approved scheme with a building height of 135mPD would exceed the newly imposed building height restriction stipulated on the

Outline Zoning Plan. Approval of the application for extension of the time for commencement of development would have adverse planning implications; and

- (b) the applicant had not demonstrated that reasonable actions had been taken to implement the approved hotel development.

[Mr. Y.K.Cheng left temporarily while Messrs. Tony C.N. Kan and Alfred Donald Yap left the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 7**

[Open Meeting]

Request for Deferral of Review of Section 16A Application No. A/H15/214-3  
Application for Amendment to Permission - Amendments to the Approved Residential Development in "Residential (Group E)1" zone, Ap Lei Chau Inland Lot 129, Ap Lei Chau Praya Road  
(TPB Paper No. 8064)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

58. The Secretary reported that Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong, Messrs. Raymond Y.M. Chan, Alfred Donald Yap, Y.K. Cheng and Felix W. Fong had declared interests on the item as the applicant was a subsidiary of Sun Hung Kai Properties Ltd. with which they had current business dealings. Mr. Rock C.N. Chan also declared an interest as he was a good friend of one of the applicant's consultants. Members noted that Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong had sent his apology for not attending the meeting while Mr. Y.K. Cheng had temporarily left and Messrs. Raymond Y.M. Chan, Alfred Donald Yap and Felix W. Fong had already left the meeting. As this application was for deferral and no deliberation was required, Members agreed that Mr. Rock C.N. Chan could stay in the meeting.

59. The Secretary said that the request for deferment of the review application was to allow sufficient time for departmental circulation of supplementary submission made by the applicant on 29.2.2008 and for Planning Department to process the application. The applicant's representative further sent in a letter on 10.4.2008 (copy tabled for Members'

reference) requesting the consideration of the application be deferred to 16.5.2008. The request 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 (TPB PG-No. 33).

60. After deliberation, the Board agreed to the request for deferment and that the application would be submitted to the Board for consideration on 16.5.2008 as requested by the applicant.

### **Agenda Item 8**

[Open Meeting]

Request for Deferral of Review of Application No. A/TY/101

Concrete Batching Plant in “Industrial” zone, Tsing Yi Town Lot 108RP(Part), Tsing Yi  
(TPB Paper No. 8067)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

61. The Secretary reported that Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong, Messrs. Raymond Y.M. Chan and Felix W. Fong had declared interests on the item as the applicant was a joint venture of Hutchison & Swire Joint Venture with which they had current business dealings. Members noted that Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong had sent his apology for not attending the meeting while Messrs. Raymond Y.M. Chan and Felix W. Fong had already left the meeting.

62. The Secretary said that the request for deferment of the review application for two months was to allow sufficient time to address the comments raised by relevant departments. The request 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 (TPB PG-No. 33).

63. After deliberation, the Board agreed to the request for deferment and that the application should be submitted to the Board for consideration within 3 months upon receipt of further submission from the applicant. The Board also agreed to advise the applicant that the Board had allowed 2 months for the preparation of submission of further

information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

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

**Agenda Item 10**

[Open Meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations to Draft Kennedy Town and Mount Davis Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H1/15  
(TPB Paper No. 8071)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

70. The Secretary reported that Professor David Dudgeon had declared interest on the item as he owned a property at Mount Davis Road. As the item was procedural in nature, Members agreed that Professor Dudgeon could stay in the meeting.

71. The Secretary reported that on 9 November 2007, the draft Kennedy Town and Mount Davis Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H1/15 (the Plan) was exhibited for public inspection under section 7 of the Town Planning Ordinance. A total of 2 representations and 9 public comments were received. Of the 2 representations, Representation No. 1 was considered valid while Representation No. 2 was considered partially invalid as one of its items of representation objected to the proposed alignment of Route 7, which was not related to any amendments shown on the Plan or incorporated in its Notes. Out of the 9 public comments, 4 (No. C1 to C4) were related to Route 7 and other items of the representations while the remaining 5 (No. C5 to C9) were exclusively related to Route 7. Those parts of Representation No. 2 and Comments No. C1 to C4 concerning Route 7 and the other 5 Comments No. C5 to C9 relating exclusively to Route 7, which were not related to any of the amendments, were considered invalid and should be treated as not having been made.

72. As there were only 2 representations and 4 public comments, it was more efficient for the full Board to hear the representations and comments itself. The hearing

could be accommodated in the Board's regular meeting. As the representations were of similar nature mainly concerning amendments in respect of the public cargo working area and the adjoining area, they would be considered collectively at the same hearing. Consideration of the representations and comments by the full Board was scheduled for 16 May 2008.

73. After deliberation, the Board agreed that:

- (a) those parts of Representation No. 2 and Comments No. C1 to C4 relating to Route 7 as well as Comments No. C5 to C9 relating exclusively to Route 7 were considered invalid under sections 6(3)(b) and 12(3)(b)(i) of the Ordinance; and
- (b) the representations and comments should be considered in the Board's regular meeting as proposed in paragraph 2 of the Paper.

#### **Agenda Item 14**

#### Any Other Business

77. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 1:05 p.m.

CHAIRMAN  
TOWN PLANNING BOARD