

**Minutes of 1200<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 10.5.2019**

**Present**

Permanent Secretary for Development  
(Planning and Lands)  
Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-Chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr Elvis W.K. Au

Assistant Director (Regional 1)  
Lands Department  
Mr Simon S.W. Wang

Chief Engineer (Works)  
Home Affairs Department  
Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Assistant Commissioner (Urban)  
Transport Department  
Mr Michael H.S. Law

Director of Planning  
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Deputy Director of Planning/District  
Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Professor John C.Y. Ng

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Christine C.M. Cheung

## **Agenda Item 1**

[Open Meeting]

### **Confirmation of Minutes of the 1199<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 26.4.2019**

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The minutes of the 1199<sup>th</sup> Meeting was confirmed without amendment.

## **Agenda Item 2**

### **Matters Arising**

- (i) Judgment Received on an Application for Leave to Appeal for a Civil Claim against the Town Planning Board in respect of the Tai Po Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TP/25

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

2. The Secretary reported that the civil claim was lodged by Mr Wong Yu Cho, the Plaintiff, against the Town Planning Board (the Board) arising from the rezoning of a site at 4770 Tai Po Road, Kon Hang, Tai Po (the Site) from “Green Belt” (“GB”) to “Residential (Group C) 8” (“R(C)8”) on the draft Tai Po Outline Zoning Plan (the OZP) No. S/TP/25. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr H.W. Cheung - owning a flat at Po Heung Street

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung - his company owning a flat at On Chee Road

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - owning a property at Ma Wo Road, Tai Po

3. Members noted that Mr H.W. Cheung had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung had not yet arrived to join the meeting. Members agreed that as the item was only to report the judgment on an application for leave to appeal, Mr Daniel K.S. Lau could be allowed to stay in the meeting.

4. The Secretary stated that as reported to Members on 14.12.2018, the District Court dismissed the subject civil claim on 19.11.2018 and the Plaintiff applied for leave to appeal on 30.11.2018. After considering the submissions from both sides in respect of the leave application, the District Court handed down judgment dismissing the application on 29.4.2019.

5. The Secretary said that the Court held the view that the Plaintiff had no legal right to instigate the subject civil claim which was an abuse of the legal proceedings and should have lodged a judicial review application at appropriate time instead. The Court concluded in the judgment that the appeal application had no reasonable prospect of success and there was no issue of justice that would require the Court of Appeal to consider. The Court also ordered the Plaintiff to pay the Town Planning Board for the legal costs of the appeal application.

(ii) [Confidential Item] [Closed Meeting]

6. The item was recorded under confidential cover.

(iii) Reference Back of Approved Outline Zoning Plan  
[Open Meeting] [The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

7. The Secretary reported that on 30.4.2019, the Chief Executive in Council referred the Central District Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H4/16 to the Town Planning Board for amendment under section 12(1)(b)(ii) of the Town Planning Ordinance. The reference back of the said OZP was notified in the Gazette on 10.5.2019.

**Hong Kong District**

**Agenda Item 3**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Proposed Amendment to the Approved Central District Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H4/16

(TPB Paper No. 10536)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

8. The following representatives from the Planning Department (PlanD) and the Commissioner for Heritage's Office, Development Bureau (CHO, DEVB) were invited to the meeting:

Mr Louis K.H. Kau - District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK),  
PlanD

Mr Jerry Austin - Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), PlanD

Mr José H.S. Yam - Commissioner for Heritage (C for H), DEVB

Ms Joey C.Y. Lee - Assistant Secretary (Heritage Conservation), DEVB

9. The Chairperson invited the representatives of PlanD to brief Members on the Paper.

10. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and a 3-D fly-through model, Mr Jerry Austin, STP/HK, PlanD briefed Members on the proposed amendments as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10536 (the Paper), including the background, the preservation-cum-development proposal of the Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui (HKSKH's proposal), the proposed rezoning of HKSKH Compound at 1 Lower Albert Road in Central (the Site) from "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") to "G/IC(1)", the

proposed building height restrictions (BHRs) and the assessment of the BHR options from visual, heritage conservation, traffic and air ventilation aspects, as well as from the angle of possible impact on HKSKH's proposal which was at an advanced stage of planning.

[Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong, Mr Alex T.H. Lai and Miss Winnie W.M. Ng arrived to join the meeting during the presentation of PlanD's representative.]

11. The Chairperson said that, as mentioned in paragraph 4.20 of the Paper, when formulating Option 1 and Option 2, there was a strong case for setting a BHR of 80mPD for the southern portion in order to minimise the visual impact on the Hong Kong Zoological and Botanical Gardens across the road. Regarding the BHR for the northern portion, two options (i.e. the high end of 135mPD under Option 1 and the low end of 120mPD under Option 2) were devised for consideration by the Board. Noting the impact under the two options, the Board might also consider a variation of BHR between 120mPD and 135mPD for the northern portion.

#### *Formulation of the BHR Options*

12. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the difference between the two BHR options for the northern portion of the Site, noting that both options had taken into account the existing height profile of the Site, the surrounding site context and the BHRs that were currently in effect in the surrounding areas;
- (b) the reasons for adopting a lower BHR of 80mPD in the southern portion of the Site, which featured a stepped height profile in reverse direction with BHR descending towards Upper Albert Road; and
- (c) whether there was any sensitivity test for different BHR options for assessing the impact on the operation of the proposed hospital by HKSKH.

13. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, PlanD made the following points:
- (a) the proposed BHR of 135mPD for the northern portion of the Site for the proposed hospital development was comparable with the BHRs of the surrounding areas ranging from 120mPD to 150mPD stipulated on the draft Sai Ying Pun and Sheung Wan OZP No. S/H3/32. On the other hand, the proposed BHR of 120mPD was an extension of the existing BHR covering the area along Wyndham Street to the west of Glenealy on the said OZP;
  - (b) setting a BHR of 80mPD for the southern portion was to maintain a buffer and minimise the visual impact on the Hong Kong Zoological and Botanical Gardens across Upper Albert Road; and
  - (c) the assessments of the BHR options were mainly from the visual, heritage conservation and air ventilation aspects. No sensitivity test for different BHR options had been conducted for assessing the impact arising from the proposal on the operation of the proposed hospital. Subject to the Board's decision on the appropriate BHR, the project proponent could review the impact on the operation of the proposed hospital, and revise the building design, as appropriate.

*Minimum Requirement of Hospital Beds*

14. A Member enquired about the minimum requirement of hospital beds set out by the Food and Health Bureau (FHB) and whether the BHR of 135mPD for the northern portion of the Site was necessary for meeting such requirement. In response, Mr José H.S. Yam, C for H, said that the minimum requirement of hospital beds set out by FHB was 274. According to HKSKH's proposal, the proposed hospital with a BH of about 134.8mPD could provide 293 beds. Given the typical floor-to-floor height of a hospital was about 4.5m, if the BHR of 120mPD was adopted, the proposed hospital would be reduced by 4 storeys and the corresponding loss of gross floor area was about 5,600m<sup>2</sup>, which was equivalent to the loss of 114 beds (about 40% of the proposed number of beds). He also indicated, using a location plan, that the footprint at the Site that could be used for hospital development was limited as a result of the need to preserve the four historic

buildings and their ambience.

*HKSKH's Proposal*

15. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions on the details of HKSKH's proposal:

- (a) whether there would be any setback of the proposed hospital development from Lower Albert Road, and whether the open space provided within the Site would be open to the public;
- (b) the grading of the historic buildings in the Site and how their ambience could be preserved, and whether the impact on the Government House had been taken into account;
- (c) whether there was any redevelopment proposal for the Alford House and Ridley House in the Site, which had been vacant for years;
- (d) the proposed use of the area currently occupied by the HKSKH Welfare Council and whether the area could be used for car park;
- (e) whether there would be any underground car park in the proposed development, and the possibility of relocating some hospital facilities to the underground levels and the graded buildings;
- (f) whether the Old Sheng Kung Hui Kei Yan Primary School (Kei Yan PS) would form part of the proposed hospital development, and whether decking over part of the Kei Yan PS would have any impact on the overall BH of the proposed hospital development; and
- (g) the services to be provided in the proposed hospital, and whether the proposed hospital development involved any government funding.

16. In response, Mr José H.S. Yam, C for H, made the following points:

- (a) there would be no setback of the proposed development from Lower Albert Road, where the ingress and egress for the vehicular traffic of the proposed hospital would be located. The open space provided within the Site could be freely accessible by the public according to HKSKH's proposal;
- (b) among the 11 existing buildings in the Site, there were four graded buildings. Bishop's House, St. Paul's Church and Church Guest House were Grade 1 historic buildings, while Kei Yan PS was a Grade 2 historic building. According to the proposal, HKSKH would preserve and revitalise all four graded historic buildings within the Site, which would provide the needed space for HKSKH's religious and community services. To preserve the ambience of the historic buildings, the footprint of the proposed hospital would be constrained with a view to keeping a distance from the historic buildings. HKSKH had been advised to take into account the impact of the proposed hospital on the surrounding developments, including the Government House, which was at a distance away from the proposed hospital;
- (c) Alford House and Ridley House would be renovated and reserved for use by the staff of the proposed hospital and other religious services provided by HKSKH;
- (d) given the small site area, the area currently occupied by the HKSKH Welfare Council would be used for greening after redevelopment with a view to maintaining the ambience of Bishop's House and St. Paul's Church. Also, in view of the traffic along Glenealy, the ingress and egress for the vehicular traffic of the proposed hospital would be at Lower Albert Road which was not close to the area of the HKSKH Welfare Council;
- (e) there would be three levels of underground car park providing about 90 car parking spaces. HKSKH had not mentioned whether it was possible to relocate some hospital facilities to the underground levels. However, the structural stability of the four graded historic buildings should be taken into

account when considering any further underground development. Also, the graded buildings within the Site were currently being actively used and it would be more preferable to accommodate all hospital facilities within the new building;

- (f) the proposed hospital would deck over part of the Kei Yan PS, but the latter would not be used for hospital purpose. The part of the proposed hospital decking over the school would not be up to 135mPD and would have no impact on the overall BH of the hospital; and
- (g) the proposed hospital would provide 12 operation theatres to cater for the need of hospital facilities for patients and medical practitioners in Central and the nearby areas. There would be no Accident and Emergency (A&E) service, hence less traffic arising from emergency vehicles. HKSKH would fund the full cost of the proposed hospital development.

17. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, explained that the Government House was not identified as a public viewing point as it would not be open to the public for most of the time. As such, there was no photomontage showing the view from the Government House.

18. In response to a Member's enquiry on whether there would be any other development restrictions on controlling the bulk of the proposed development, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that the footprint for the proposed hospital development would be constrained by the need for preserving the four historic buildings. Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, Director of Planning (DoP), supplemented that the development bulk of the proposed hospital would be subject to the control under the Buildings Ordinance.

19. Some Members questioned about the need for a new hospital in the district and whether the Government had any territorial plan for hospital development. Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, responded that there was a shortfall of 847 hospital beds in the Central & Western District in the long term according to the requirements of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). Besides, FHB had given its policy support for the proposed hospital.

20. The Chairperson said that HKSKH had initiated the proposal of developing a non-profit-making private hospital in the Site since 2013. Throughout the years, the project proponent had been consulting the Central & Western District Council and various government departments in resolving the technical concerns. The project proponent also consulted the Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB) in June 2018. However, when considering a s.12A application under the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) as detailed in the Paper, the Board considered that it was necessary to impose suitable development restrictions on the OZP to ensure that the urban design aspect of any redevelopment proposal on the Site would be given due consideration under the planning regime. As such, the focus of the discussion on the proposed amendment to the OZP should be on whether the BHRs imposed were suitable, rather than whether there should be a new hospital which would in any case be permissible on the Site falling on a “G/IC” zone.

21. The Chairperson noted that HKSKH’s proposal was already at a very advanced stage of planning, and invited C for H to advise the remaining procedures HKSKH needed to go through had there been no BHR imposed on the Site through the proposed OZP amendments. The Chairperson added that it was nonetheless proper for the Board to consider the proposed amendments notwithstanding the history of the HKSKH’s proposal.

22. Mr José H.S. Yam, C for H, explained that if there was no BHR, the Lands Department would have proceeded to conclude its consideration of the lease modification submitted by HKSKH and the approval from the Chief Executive in Council would be sought for the proposed hospital development.

#### *Traffic Impact*

23. A Member raised a question on how the local concern on traffic impact could be addressed, noting that no traffic impact assessment (TIA) had been conducted for the proposed BHRs for the Site on OZP. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that no TIA had been conducted as there was no change in the land use zoning of the Site. Both hospital and religious institution uses were currently always permitted under the “G/IC” zone. In any case, the project proponent was required to submit various technical

assessments, including a TIA with necessary mitigation measures, if any, to the satisfaction of the Transport Department (TD) before it could proceed with lease modification and take forward its preservation-cum-development proposal at the Site. There would be adequate safeguards to ensure that the proposed development would not cause adverse traffic impact on its surroundings.

24. Another Member asked whether there was any figure showing the traffic flow to be generated. Mr José H.S. Yam, C for H, advised that as there would be no A&E service, a substantial increase in the traffic flow was not anticipated. Having said that, the project proponent had been liaising with TD in complying with relevant requirements, including car parking provision, which would be provided in line with HKPSG.

25. Noting that there would be about 90 car parking spaces to be provided within the Site, a Member enquired whether the car parking provision was a requirement that HKSKH had to comply with. Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that HKPSG was to provide guidance on the car parking requirement, which was not mandatory, and the provision of car parking facilities should be subject to the satisfaction of TD.

[Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang, Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung and Mr Franklin Yu arrived to join the meeting during the question and answer session.]

### Deliberation

26. A majority of Members (15 Members speaking) supported Option 1 (i.e. 135mPD for the northern portion and 80mPD for the southern portion). They considered that the proposed BHR of 135mPD in the northern portion of the Site was not incompatible with the surrounding BH profile and the visual impact was not significantly different from the alternative BHR of 120mPD. Allowing a higher BHR would help maximize the development potential and land utilisation. As the proposed hospital development was in a very advanced stage, HKSKH might need to revisit the design if a more stringent BHR was imposed, which would further delay the implementation of the proposed development. The more stringent BHR would also lead to the reduction in the number of hospital beds to be provided, not to mention the possibility of HKSKH not being able to meet FHB's minimum requirement. The Site itself was a good location for a hospital,

which was convenient to patients and medical practitioners in Central and could meet the deficit of hospital beds in the district. In terms of heritage conservation, HKSKH had also made efforts in preserving all four graded historic buildings in the Site. A Member considered that HKSKH might need to submit further details for the proposed hospital development during the statutory public inspection period. Another Member opined that the open space provided within the Site should be accessible to the public and better pedestrian connectivity should be planned.

27. Some Members (seven Members speaking) preferred Option 2 (i.e. 120mPD for the northern portion and 80mPD for the southern portion). They considered that a lower BHR should be adopted and HKSKH could submit further information during the statutory public inspection period for the Board's consideration to justify why a relaxed BHR should be allowed. They doubted whether the imminent need for a new private hospital in the area would justify a more lenient BHR.

28. Two Members did not support either Option 1 or 2. They considered that the need to have a new private hospital on the Site and the maturity of HKSKH's proposal could not in themselves justify what they would regard as an overly lenient approach. The proposed development would severely affect the historic ambience of the Site and its surrounding. The Board should critically review an appropriate BHR and even consider other control parameters for the Site, instead of imposing a BHR based on the HKSKH's proposal, adding that the current heritage conservation approach was too fragmented and should be considered in a wider context. A Member specifically doubted why the visual impact on and the possible adverse effect on the ambience of the Government House were not taken into consideration.

29. Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, DoP, said that when considering the s.12A application for rezoning the Site, Members considered that the existing control mechanism through CHO, Antiquities and Monuments Office and AAB adequate in terms of heritage conservation and it might not be necessary for the Board's scrutiny on the heritage conservation aspect. The Board however considered that the proposal might have implication from the urban design perspective. As such, the Board requested PlanD to consider suitable amendment to the OZP to ensure that the urban design aspect of any redevelopment proposal on the Site would be given due consideration. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr Lee said

that if no BHR was to be imposed on the OZP, the BH of the future redevelopment on the Site might exceed the currently proposed 135mPD for the proposed hospital.

30. The Chairperson summed up the discussion and said that a majority of Members considered that Option 1 should be adopted as the basis for amending the Central District OZP. The stakeholders could submit representations during the statutory public inspection period. Any representation received would be considered according to the provision of the Ordinance.

31. After deliberation, the Board:

- (a) decided that Option 1 should be adopted as the basis for amending the Central District OZP;
- (b) agreed that the proposed amendments to the approved Central District OZP No. S/H4/16 and that the draft Central District OZP No. S/H4/16A at Attachment IIa of the Paper (Option 1) (to be renumbered to S/H4/17 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of the Paper were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance; and
- (c) adopted the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft Central District OZP No. S/H4/16A at Attachment IV of the Paper as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land use zonings of the OZP and agreed that the revised ES was suitable for publication together with the OZP.

32. Members noted that, as a general practice, the Secretariat of the Board would undertake detailed checking and refinement of the draft OZP including the Notes and ES, if appropriate, before their publication under the Ordinance. Any major revision would be submitted for the Board's consideration.

33. The Chairperson thanked the government representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng, Mr Sunny L.K. Ho and Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng left the meeting at this point.]

### **Procedural Matters**

#### **Agenda Item 4**

[Open Meeting]

Submission of the Draft Urban Renewal Authority Queen's Road West/In Ku Lane Development Scheme Plan No. S/H3/URA3/1A to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval under Section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance  
(TPB Paper No. 10538)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

34. The Secretary reported that the draft Development Scheme Plan (DSP) was located in Sai Ying Pun and Sheung Wan area (H3) and submitted by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA). The following Members had declared interests on the item for owning properties in Sai Ying Pun and Sheung Wan area; and/or having affiliation/business dealings with URA, Christian Family Service Centre (CFSC) which had been commissioned by the Urban Renewal Fund to act as the Social Service Team to provide assistance and advice to residents and operators affected by the Scheme, and/or Ms Mary Mulvihill (R13/C3):

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| Mr Raymond K.W. Lee<br>(as Director of Planning) | - being a non-executive director of the URA Board and a member of the Planning, Development and Conservation Committee (PDCC) of URA |
| Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang                            | - being the Deputy Chairman of Appeal Board Panel of URA   |
| Mr H.W. Cheung                                   | - being a former co-opt member of PDCC of URA and his spouse owning a flat at Queen's Road West                                      |

- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - being a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA and having current business dealings with Cheung Kong Holdings Limited for the URA Peel Street / Graham Street project
- Mr Stephen H.B. Yau - being a past member of the Wan Chai District Advisory Committee of URA
- Mr Philip S.L. Kan - formerly being a non-executive director of the URA Board and a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - being a non-executive director of the URA Board, a member of the Lands, Rehousing and Compensation Committee and PDCC, and a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA
- Mr K.K. Cheung ] their firm having current business dealings with  
Mr Alex T.H. Lai ] URA, CFSC and Ms Mary Mulvihill (R13/C3) on a contract basis from time to time
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung - being a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with URA
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - being a past member of the Wan Chai District Advisory Committee of URA, his former company having current business dealings with URA and his company owning an office unit at Queen's Road Central
- Mr L.T. Kwok - being the Chief Executive of the CFSC

- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being a former Director (Development & Marketing) of Hong Kong Housing Society which was currently in discussion with URA on housing development issues
- Ms Lilian S.K. Law - being a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA
- Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu - being a director of the Board of Urban Renewal Fund of URA and Director and CEO of Light Be (Social Realty) Co. Ltd. which was a licensed user of a few URA's residential units in Sheung Wan

35. Members noted that Mr H.W. Cheung, Mr Ivan C.S. Fu and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for not being able to attend the meeting. As the items were procedural in nature, Members agreed that the above Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting.

36. The Secretary briefly introduced the TPB Paper No. 10538 (the Paper). On 21.9.2018, draft URA Queen's Road West/In Ku Lane DSP No. S/H3/URA3/1 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). A total of 13 representations and 3 comments were received. After giving consideration to the representations and comments under section 6B(1) of the Ordinance on 29.3.2019, the Town Planning Board (the Board) decided not to propose any amendment to the draft DSP to meet the representations under section 6B(8) of the Ordinance. As the representation consideration process had been completed, the draft DSP was ready for submission to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval.

37. After deliberation, the Board:

- (a) agreed that the draft URA Queen's Road West/In Ku Lane DSP No. S/H3/URA3/1A and its Notes at Annexes I and II of the Paper respectively were suitable for submission under section 8 of the Ordinance to the CE in C

for approval;

- (b) endorsed the updated Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft URA Queen's Road West/In Ku Lane DSP No. S/H3/URA3/1A at Annex III of the Paper as an expression of the planning intention and objectives of the Board for the various land use zonings on the draft OZP and to be issued under the name of the Board; and
- (c) agreed that the updated ES was suitable for submission to the CE in C together with the draft DSP.

**Agenda Item 5**

[Closed Meeting]

- 38. The item was recorded under confidential cover.

**Agenda Item 6**

[Closed Meeting]

- 39. The item was recorded under confidential cover.

**Agenda Item 7**

[Closed Meeting]

- 40. The item was recorded under confidential cover.

**Agenda Item 8**

Any Other Business

[The item was conducted in Cantonese]

- 41. As this was the last meeting attended by the Secretary, Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo, Members passed a vote of thanks for her dedicated service as the Secretary of the Town Planning Board in the past years.

42. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:05 p.m.