

**Minutes of 858th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held at 9:00 a.m. on 12 May 2006**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands
(Planning & Lands)

Mrs. Rita Lau

Chairperson

Dr. Peter K.K. Wong

Vice-Chairman

Mr. Michael K.C. Lai

Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong

Mr. Erwin A. Hardy

Professor Nora F.Y. Tam

Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan

Mr. David W.M. Chan

Dr. Lily Chiang

Professor David Dudgeon

Mr. Edmund K.H. Leung

Professor N.K. Leung

Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim

Dr. C.N. Ng

Mr. Alfred Donald Yap

Ms. Sylvia S.F. Yau

Mr. B.W. Chan

Mr. Walter K.L. Chan

Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan

Mr. Y.K. Cheng

Mr. Felix W. Fong

Ms. Anna S.Y. Kwong

Professor Paul K.S. Lam

Ms. Starry W.K. Lee

Mr. K.Y. Leung

Director of Lands
Mr. Patrick L.C. Lau

Assistant Director (2), Home Affairs Department
Ms. Linda Law

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection(1),
Environmental Protection Department
Dr. Michael Chiu

Director of Planning
Mr. Bosco C.K. Fung

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Miss Ophelia Y.S. Wong

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Ms. Carmen K.M. Chan

Professor Leslie H.C. Chen

Professor Peter R. Hills

Mr. Tony C.N. Kan

Mr. Daniel B.M. To

Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong

Ms. Maggie M.K. Chan

Dr. James C.W. Lau

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport),
Environment, Transport and Works Bureau
Ms. Ava Chiu

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Mr. Lau Sing

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au (a.m.)
Mr. C.T. Ling (p.m.)

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr. Tom C.K. Yip (a.m.)
Ms. Teresa L.Y. Chu (p.m.)

1. The Chairperson extended a welcome to all Members.

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of Minutes of the 857th Meeting held on 21.4.2006

2. The minutes of the 857th meeting held on 21.4.2006 were confirmed subject to adding “The Board also agreed not to propose any amendment to the 25 draft OZPs to meet the remaining part of the objections for the reasons stated in paragraph 6.3 of the Paper.” at the end of paragraph 65.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

Approval and Reference of Outline Zoning Plans

3. The Secretary reported that on 9.5.2006, the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) approved the draft Mong Kok Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K3/23A (renumbered S/K3/24) and draft Chek Lap Kok OZP No. S/I-CLK/9A (renumbered S/I-CLK/10) under section 9(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The CE in C also referred the approved Yau Ma Tei OZP No. S/K2/17 to the Town Planning Board for amendment under section 12(1)(b)(ii) of the Ordinance. The approval and reference of these OZPs would be notified in the Gazette on 19.5.2006.

Agenda Item 4

(Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only))

Review of Application No. A/YL-TYST/305

Temporary Staff Canteen and Ancillary Storage of Dry Food and Drinks
for a Period of 3 Years in “Government, Institution or Community”
and “Residential (Group B)1” Zones

Lots No. 2520 RP (Part) and 2521 (Part) in D.D. 124

Hung Shun Road, Hung Shui Kiu, Yuen Long

(TPB Paper No. 7580)

[The hearing was conducted in Cantonese.]

Presentation and Question Session

23. Mr. Wilson So, the District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long (DPO/TMYL) of the Planning Department (PlanD), was invited to the meeting at this point.

24. The following applicant’s representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Ms. Betty Ho

Mr. Kwok Kim-leung

Miss Lam Hau-fa

25. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained briefly the procedures of the review hearing. The Chairperson then invited the DPO/TMYL to brief Members on the background to the application.

26. Mr. Wilson So did so as detailed in the Paper and made the following main points:

- (a) the review application was for deleting approval conditions (a) and (b) of the planning approval for a temporary staff canteen and ancillary storage of dry food and drinks granted by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) on 3.2.2006. Approval condition (a) stipulated that no operation between 9p.m. and 7a.m. should be carried out at the site. Approval

condition (b) stipulated that no operation was allowed on any Sundays and public holidays. The applicant considered that it was difficult to comply with these two conditions due to operational reasons;

- (b) departmental comments - the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) had no objection to the review application if the proposed canteen was for exclusive use of the persons employed in the working place but requested the operator to properly manage the canteen. The Environmental Protection Department (EPD) had received a complaint against the site and advised that the applicant should minimize oily fume and cooking odour emissions to the sensitive receivers in the vicinity of the site;
- (c) public comments – two public comments from a villager and the Owners' Corporation of Symphony Garden were received. The former had no comment on the application, while the latter maintained its objection to the application on the grounds of the nature and long operation hours of the canteen as well as possible noise, hygiene and sewage nuisances; and
- (d) PlanD's view – the deletion of the two approval conditions was not supported. Noting the local concerns, the RNTPC considered that restrictions should be imposed on the days and hours of operation of the canteen. A proper balance had to be struck between the operation needs of the canteen and the environmental quality in the area.

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

28. With the aid of some documents tabled at the meeting, Ms. Betty Ho and Mr. Kwok Kim-leung made the following main points:

- (a) the canteen would serve some 80 staff who managed the applicant's public vehicle parks in the area. The staff were working on three shifts so as to maintain 24-hour operation for the vehicle parks throughout the year. To provide dinners for the staff in the last shift, the canteen had to operate until late hours;

- (b) there was no restriction on the days and hours of operation of the canteen in the two previous planning permissions in respect of the site. The applicant was willing to comply with other approval conditions imposed by the RNTPC. The canteen was in fact a welfare facility for the staff. It would be very inconvenient to the staff if the time of its operation was restricted. It was hoped that the Board could allow operation on Sundays and public holidays and extend the permitted operation hours at least up to 10p.m. on weekdays; and

[Mr. Erwin A. Hardy, Mr. Felix W. Fong and Ms. Anna S.Y. Kwong returned to join the meeting at this point.]

- (c) in view the concerns of local residents, the applicant had adopted measures to minimize the nuisances to the sensitive receivers in the vicinity of the site, including proper installation of gas supply facilities, regular cleansing of the premises, stringent insect control and treatment of wastewater through grease trap. The previous complaint against the canteen was related to the noise generated by the radio of a staff, which had been addressed. The complaint was subsequently withdrawn, and the noise level of the canteen was acceptable to the EPD. Other concerned Government departments had no objection to the review application.

29. In response to Members' questions, Ms. Betty Ho, Mr. Kwok Kim-leung and Miss Lam Hau-fa made the following main points:

- (a) the canteen was restricted to staff and their families only. A sign to prohibit use by other people was posted at the entrance of the canteen. Before taking up the canteen, the operator had run business in the Hung Shui Kiu area for more than 10 years. The canteen had used the name of the operator, i.e. the New Treasure Court Restaurant, which was well known to the locals. Cash payments were accepted for food and drinks. Coupons were not used because it would incur additional administrative cost;

- (b) the application was in fact for a renewal of two previous permissions. Although the planning permission for the subject application was granted in February 2006, the applicant had in fact implemented various measures to minimize the nuisances to the surrounding areas between late 2005 and early 2006;
- (c) the canteen had a canteen licence and the applicant was the representative of the licence holder. Since the canteen was not open to the public, a food licence from the FEHD was not required; and
- (d) the canteen served about 80 staff, who worked in three shifts. Two meals were served for about 30 staff in each shift. The dining time for the last shift was 9p.m.

30. In response to Members' questions, Mr. Wilson So made the following main points:

- (a) apart from the complaint received by the EPD, the Owners' Corporation of Symphony Garden had raised objection to the application during the publication periods at both the section 16 and section 17 stages on the grounds of long operation hours of the canteen and the possible nuisances; and
- (b) the applicant site was the subject of two previous applications. Application No. A/YL-TYST/120 for temporary refreshment kiosk was approved for a period of 2 years in 2000. There was no objection to the application from the nearby residents and Government departments at that time, except that the principal of a nearby school had expressed concern on the impact of oily fume emission on the health of students. The second application, i.e. A/YL-TYST/190, was for the same use as the current application and was approved in 2003 for a period of 3 years. There was no restriction on the time of operation of the canteen in both permissions. For the subject application, the PlanD recommended imposing approval conditions to prohibit operation between 11p.m. and 7a.m. and on Sundays and public holidays at the section 16 stage. In view of the concerns of the nearby

residents, the RNTPC considered that a more stringent restriction should be imposed to prohibit operation between 9p.m. and 7a.m.

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

Deliberation Session

32. A Member doubted if the canteen was genuinely restricted to staff use and said that the RNTPC's approval was already lenient. There was no strong ground to delete the approval conditions to restrict the days and hours of operation of the canteen. Some other Members shared the view. However, a Member considered that a slight extension of the permitted operation hours of the canteen by one hour to 10p.m. on weekdays could help meet the needs of the workers in the last shift and should not make a great difference in terms of the impacts on the surrounding areas. Other Members concurred.

33. In response to a Member's query on whether there were enough patrons to support the operation of the staff canteen, the Chairperson said that the financial viability of the canteen was not a material planning consideration of the Board.

34. After deliberation, the Board decided to amend the approval condition (a) to "No operation between 10p.m. and 7a.m. should be carried out at the application site during the planning approval period."

[Dr. C.N. Ng and Mr. Felix W. Fong left the meeting at this point.]

[The meeting was adjourned for a break of 5 minutes.]

Agenda Item 5

(Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only))

Review of Application No. A/NE-TKL/278

Temporary Open Storage of Containers for the Purposes
as Office and Store-room for a Period of 3 Years
in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 752RP(Part) in DD 77,
Ping Che Road, Ta Kwu Ling

(TPB Paper No. 7577)

Agenda Item 6

(Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only))

Review of Application No. A/NE-TKL/279

Temporary Open Storage of Waste Paper and Metal
for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone,
Lot 761RP(Part) in DD 77, Ping Che Road, Ta Kwu Ling

(TPB Paper No. 7578)

[The hearings were conducted in Cantonese.]

35. The Chairperson said that reasonable notices had been given to the applicants of the two applications but they informed the Secretariat that they would not attend or be represented at the review hearings. Members agreed to proceed with the hearings in their absence.

36. Noting that the two applications were similar in nature and the sites were adjacent to one another within the same “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone, Members agreed that the applications could be considered together.

Presentation and Question Session

37. Mr. W.K. Hui, the District Planning Officer/Sha Tin, Tai Po and North (DPO/STN) of the Planning Department (PlanD), was invited to the meeting at this point.

38. The Chairperson extended a welcome and invited the DPO/STN to brief Members on the background to the applications.

39. Mr. W.K. Hui did so as detailed in the Papers and made the following main points:

- (a) the two applications were rejected by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee on 13.1.2006 on grounds of no strong justification for a departure from the planning intention of the “AGR” zone and being not in compliance with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for ‘Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses’;
- (b) the applicants had not submitted any further representation to support the review applications. The relevant Government departments maintained their previous views on the applications;
- (c) public comments – four comments each on the two applications were received from the locals. All of them objected to the applications on traffic, drainage, safety and environmental grounds. In addition, the District Officer/North relayed a local objection to Application No. A/NE-TKL/279 based on similar grounds; and
- (d) PlanD’s view – maintained the previous views of not supporting the applications as both applications did not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for ‘Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses’ and the applicants had not submitted information to demonstrate that the proposed developments would not generate adverse traffic and environmental impacts on the surrounding areas. For Application No. A/NE-TKL/278, the Transport Department (TD) had reservation on the application as there was no proper vehicular access to the site from Ping Che Road. As regards Application No. A/NE-TKL/279, the use under application was not compatible with the adjacent residential structures. The TD also had reservation on the application as the village track leading to the site was sub-standard.

40. As Members had no question to raise, the Chairperson thanked the DPO/STN for attending the meeting. He left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

41. The Chairperson said that the applicants had not provided sufficient justifications for a departure from the planning intention of the “AGR” zone and the relevant Town Planning Board Guidelines. Members concurred.

Application No. A/NE-TKL/278

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

- (a) the application site fell within an area zoned “Agriculture” (“AGR”). The planning intention of the “AGR” zone was to retain and safeguard agricultural land for agricultural purposes and to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation. No strong justification had been provided for a departure from the planning intention; and
- (b) the development did not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for ‘Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses’ in that the use was not compatible with the adjacent domestic structures, there was no previous planning approval granted to the application site and no information had been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed development would not generate adverse traffic and environmental impacts on the surrounding areas.

Application No. A/NE-TKL/279

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

- (a) the application site fell within an area zoned “Agriculture” (“AGR”). The planning intention of the “AGR” zone was to retain and safeguard agricultural land for agricultural purposes and to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation. No strong justification had been provided for a departure from the planning intention; and
- (b) the development did not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for ‘Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses’ in that the use was not compatible with the adjacent residential structures and no technical assessments/proposals had been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed development would not generate adverse traffic and environmental impacts on the surrounding areas and sensitive receivers.

Agenda Item 7

(Open Meeting)

Consultation with District Councils on Planning Briefs

(TPB Paper No. 7590)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

44. The Secretary reported that as the Paper covered the procedures for preparation of planning briefs (PBs) by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA), the following Members had declared interests on this item:

Mr. Bosco C.K. Fung - being a non-executive director of the
as the Director of Planning URA

Mr. Patrick L.C. Lau - ditto
as the Director of Lands

Ms. Linda Law - being a co-opt member of the Planning,
as the Assistant Director (2) of the Development and Conservation
Home Affairs Department Committee of the URA

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

Mr. Michael K.C. Lai - being an ex-member of the URA

45. Members noted that Mr. Michael K.C. Lai had tendered his apologies for being unable to attend the a.m. session of the meeting and Mr. Patrick L.C. Lau had left the meeting temporarily. The Secretary said that as the Paper was on general procedures relating to consultation on PBs, the other concerned Members could be allowed to stay in the meeting and participate in the discussion on the item. Members agreed.

Presentation Session

46. The following representatives from the Planning Department (PlanD) and the URA were invited to the meeting at this point:

Mr. C.T. Ling - Chief Town Planner/Town Planner Board, PlanD

Miss Fiona Lung - Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board, PlanD

Mr. Hiroshi Ikegaya - General Manager/Planning and Development, URA

Ms. Y.Y Pong - General Manager/Community Development, URA

47. The Chairperson extended a welcome and invited PlanD's representatives to introduce the Paper. Mr. C.T. Ling said that during the consideration of the amendments to the endorsed PB for the Lee Tung Street/McGregor Street Development Scheme on 21.10.2005, the Board agreed that consultation with the relevant District Council (DC) should be adopted as a standard practice in the preparation of PBs for major development projects. The purpose of the Paper was to seek Members' agreement to the draft Town Planning Board Guidelines on the revised procedures.

48. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Miss Fiona Lung covered the following major aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) the general contents of PBs, the types of projects requiring preparation of PBs and the bodies responsible for preparing PBs;
- (b) the existing administrative procedures for the preparation of PBs; and
- (c) the revised administrative procedures for consultation with DCs on PBs.

49. As Members had no question to raise, the Chairperson thanked the representatives from the PlanD and URA for attending the meeting. They all left the meeting at this point.

Discussion Session

50. Welcoming the revised administrative arrangement for consultation with DCs on PBs, a Member suggested that PBs should be supplemented by models where appropriate to facilitate easy understanding by the local residents during consultation. As such, the Remark in Appendix I to Annex I of the Paper was suggested to be amended to include the word 'models'. The amendment was supported by Members.

51. After deliberation, Member agreed to the revised arrangement for consultation with DCs on PBs, and that the draft Town Planning Board Guidelines on consultation with DCs on PBs, subject to the incorporation of the amendment referred to in paragraph 50, was suitable for promulgation.

Agenda Item 8

(Open Meeting)

Briefing Note on the Urban Renewal Authority

(TPB Paper No. 7581)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

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

- Mr. Bosco C.K. Fung
as the Director of Planning
- Mr. Patrick L.C. Lau
as the Director of Lands
- Ms. Linda Law
as the Assistant Director (2) of the
Home Affairs Department
- Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong
- Mr. Michael K.C. Lai
- being a non-executive director of the URA
 - ditto
 - being a co-opt member of the Planning, Development and Conservation Committee of the URA
 - having current business dealings with the URA
 - being an ex-member of the URA

53. Members noted that Mr. Michael K.C. Lai had tendered his apologies for being unable to attend the a.m. session of the meeting and Mr. Patrick L.C. Lau had left the meeting temporarily. The Chairperson said that as the Paper was related to a general briefing on the work of the URA, the other concerned Members could be allowed to stay in the meeting and participate in the discussion on the item. Members agreed.

Presentation Session

54. The following representatives from the Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau (HPLB) and the URA were invited to the meeting at this point:

- Ms. Ivy Law
- Mr. Billy Lam
- Mr. Stephan Lam
- Principal Assistant Secretary (Planning and Lands), HPLB
 - Managing Director, URA
 - District Development Director, URA

Mr. Hiroshi Ikegaya - General Manager/Planning and Development, URA

Ms. Y.Y Pong - General Manager/Community Development, URA

55. The Chairperson extended a welcome and invited Mr. Billy Lam to introduce the Paper. With the aid of a video and PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Billy Lam covered the following major aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) the physical conditions of buildings in the old urban areas and the need for urban renewal;
- (b) the objectives of the URA and its mandate under the URA Ordinance (URAO) and the Urban Renewal Strategy (URS);
- (c) the holistic 4Rs Strategy (Redevelopment, Rehabilitation, pReservation and Revitalization) and the people-oriented approach adopted by the URA;

[Professor Bernard V.W.F Lim left the meeting at this point.]

- (d) the benefits of URA's activities; and
- (e) the interface between the URAO and the Town Planning Board, particularly in relation to projects implemented by way of development schemes.

[Mr. Patrick L.C. Lau returned to join the meeting at this point.]

Discussion Session

56. Members raised the following questions and comments:

- (a) for rehabilitation schemes, since colour scheme was a vital design element, it might not be appropriate to rely entirely on the views of residents in determining the colour scheme;

- (b) the number of buildings and residents affected by the 200 projects identified by the URA;
- (c) whether there was any timeframe for completion of the 25 ex-Land Development Corporation (LDC) projects;
- (d) there was a need for a flexible and continuous strategy to deal with old buildings, the physical conditions of which would deteriorate over time;
- (e) the criteria for determining preservation of a building; and
- (f) whether the URA would assist the owners and residents to form an Owners' Corporation (OC) or a Mutual Aid Committee (MAC).

57. Messrs. Billy Lam and Stephan Lam made the following points:

- (a) the URA would encourage and assist residents of buildings with OCs to implement rehabilitation schemes with a view to improving their living environment through various means, such as landscaping on the roofs and refurbishment of lobbies;
- (b) the URA recognized that the colour schemes of various rehabilitation projects could impact on the amenity of the surrounding areas but considered that the views of the residents of the concerned buildings had to be respected. Apart from financial subsidy amounting to one tenth of the cost of a rehabilitation project, the URA would provide professional advice and offer options for consideration by the residents, and would help them resolve conflicts and achieve consensus. However, the ultimate decision on the colour scheme rested with the residents as they owned the buildings;
- (c) as stated in paragraph 6 of the URS, the identified URA projects would involve redevelopment of some 2,000 ageing or dilapidated buildings, improvement of the environmental quality of 67 hectares of old and run-down urban areas, rehousing of some 27,000 tenant households, provision of around 60,000m² of open space, and provision of about

90,000m² of floor space for community/welfare facilities;

- (d) since 2001, the URA had inherited 10 on-going projects from the LDC and commenced 30 new projects, including 21 of the 25 ex-LDC projects identified for priority treatment. Four projects had been completed and two were under sales. The remaining projects were at different stages of planning and development. There were only a few projects for which the resumption procedures had not yet commenced, including the projects at Staunton Street/Wing Lee Street, Peel Street/Graham Street, Sai Yee Street, Nga Tsin Wai Village and Kwun Tong Town Centre. Local consultation for some of these projects was underway through a bottom-up approach, e.g. participatory workshops and forums. For the Kwun Tong Town Centre project, the URA would strive to secure acceptability of the compensation package by the owners, minimize the disturbance to the residents, maintain the economic vibrancy of the town centre, improve the environmental quality of the area while giving due regard to the financial viability of the project;
- (e) urban renewal was a continuous process as the conditions of buildings would deteriorate over time. In this regard, the 4Rs strategy adopted by the URA could cater for buildings of different ages and conditions. For old and dilapidated buildings, redevelopment would be a more effective means to address the problem. However, for those in good condition, rehabilitation would be more desirable as it would induce less disturbance to the residents. The URA would adopt a holistic approach in urban renewal through the 4Rs strategy, and would review the strategy adopted for different areas from time to time;
- (f) preservation of old buildings within a development site was costly in that it would incur significant maintenance costs and reduce the redevelopment potential of the site. In determining whether a building should be preserved, the URA would take advice from the Antiquities and Monuments Office. In general, monuments and graded buildings would be preserved so long as they were structurally safe. For other historical buildings, preservation would also be considered if requested by the Board and the public, e.g. Woo

Cheong Pawn Shop in the Johnston Road project, some historical structures in Nga Tsin Wai Village. While the general public might support the preservation of old buildings, the residents in the concerned buildings might prefer redevelopment with compensation and rehousing. The URA therefore had to balance the needs of different sectors of the community. Preserved buildings would also be revitalized through adaptive economic reuse, e.g. Western Market and ex-Stanley Police Station; and

- (g) in the absence of an OC, it was difficult for the URA to mobilize the residents to rehabilitate their buildings. In this regard, the Home Affairs Department and the Hong Kong Housing Society were taking the lead in assisting the residents in various buildings to form OCs. With the formation of OC, the URA would offer the necessary assistance to the residents in rehabilitating their buildings within URA's project area.

[Dr. Lily Chiang and Mr. David W.M. Chan left the meeting during the discussion session.]

58. The Chairperson thanked Mr. Billy Lam and his team for the briefing. The presentation and discussion had provided Members with a better understanding of the work of the URA. Such understanding would facilitate Members in considering submissions from the URA in future.

59. The meeting was adjourned for lunch at 12:50 p.m.

60. The meeting was resumed at 2:15 p.m.

61. The following Members and the Secretary were present in the afternoon session:

Mrs. Rita Lau

Dr. Peter K.K. Wong

Mr. Michael K.C. Lai

Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong

Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan

Mr. Edmund K.H. Leung

Mr. Alfred Donald Yap

Ms. Sylvia S.F. Yau

Mr. B.W. Chan

Mr. Walter K.L. Chan

Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan

Mr. Y.K. Cheng

Professor Paul K.S. Lam

Ms. Starry W.K. Lee

Mr. K.Y. Leung

Mr. Patrick L.C. Lau

Dr. Michael Chiu

Mr. Bosco C.K. Fung

Agenda Item 12

Submission of Draft Urban Renewal Authority Lai Chi Kok Road/Kweilin Street
and Yee Kuk Street Development Scheme Plan No. S/K5/URA1/1A
to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval
(TPB Paper No. 7586)

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

97. The following Members had declared interests in this item:

Mr. Bosco C.K. Fung - being a non-executive director of the URA
as the Director of Planning

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| Ms. Linda Law
as the Assistant Director (2) of
the Home Affairs Department | - | being a co-opt member of the Planning,
Development and Conservation Committee
of the URA |
| Mr. Patrick L.C. Lau
as the Director of Lands | - | Being a non-executive director of the URA |
| Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong | - | having current business dealings with the
URA |
| Mr. Michael K.C. Lai | - | Being an ex-member of the URA |

98. It was noted that Ms. Linda Law had tendered apology for being unable to attend the afternoon session of the meeting and Mr. Patrick L.C. Lau had already left the meeting.

[Messrs. Bosco Fung and Michael K.C. Lai and Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong left the meeting at this point.]

99. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper.

100. After deliberation, the Board:

- (a) agreed that the draft Urban Renewal Authority (URA) Lai Chi Kok Road/Kweilin Street and Yee Kuk Street Development Scheme Plan (DSP) No. S/K5/URA1/1A and its Notes respectively were suitable for submission under section 8 of the Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval;
- (b) endorsed the updated Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft URA Lai Chi Kok Road/Kweilin Street and Yee Kuk Street DSP No. S/K5/URA1/1A as an expression of the planning intention and objectives of the Board for the various land-use zonings on the draft DSP and 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.

[Messrs. Bosco Fung and Michael K.C. Lai returned to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 13

Submission of the Draft Ngau Tau Kok & Kowloon Bay Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K13/24A to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval under section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB Paper No. 7579)

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

- 101. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper.
- 102. After deliberation, the Board:
 - (a) agreed that the draft Ngau Tau Kok & Kowloon Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K13/24A together with its Notes were suitable for submission under section 8 of the Ordinance to Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval;
 - (b) endorsed the updated Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft Ngau Tau Kok & Kowloon Bay OZP No. S/K13/24A as an expression of the planning intention and objectives of the Board for various land use zonings of the OZP and issued under the name of the Board; and
 - (c) agreed that the updated ES was suitable for submission to CE in C together with the draft OZP.

Agenda Item 14

Submission of the Draft Tsing Yi Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TY/21A
to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval
under Section 8 of the Pre-amended Town Planning Ordinance
(TPB Paper No. 7587)

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

103. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper.

104. After deliberation, the Board:

- (a) agreed that the draft Tsing Yi Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TY/21A and its Notes were suitable for submission under section 8 of the Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval;
- (b) endorsed the updated Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/21A as an expression of the planning intention and objectives of the Board for various land use zonings on the draft OZP advertised 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 OZP.

Agenda Item 15

Draft Sham Chung Development Permission Area Plan No. DPA/NE-SC/1
Information Note and Hearing Arrangement
for Consideration of Representations and Comments
(TPB Paper No. 7588)

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

105. Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong and Mr. Alfred Donald Yap had declared interests in this item as they had current business dealings with the Sun Hung Kai Properties Ltd., the parent company of Sun Hung Kai Real Estate Agency Ltd., which submitted a conceptual development proposal for Sham Chung to the Chief Executive's Office in 2003. Dr. C.N. Ng should declare an interest on the item as he was a director of the Conservancy Association (CA) and the preparation of a new Development Permission Area (DPA) Plan for Sham Chung was in response to a request submitted by CA. It was noted that Dr. C.N. Ng had tendered apology for being unable to attend the afternoon session of the meeting and Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong had already left the meeting.

[Mr. Alfred Donald Yap left the meeting at this point.]

106. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. On 3.2.2006, the draft Sham Chung Development Permission Area (DPA) Plan No. DPA/NE-SC/1 was exhibited for public inspection under s.5 of the Town Planning Ordinance. During the two-month exhibition period, 37 valid representations were received. One additional representation received after expiry period should be treated as not having been made. On 11.4.2006, the representations were published for 3 weeks for public comments and 4 valid comments were received. The representations/comments were submitted by three major groups, i.e. villagers, developers and green groups, all of which raised objections to various land use zones of the DPA.

107. Due to the significant conservation interests of Sham Chung, it was considered more appropriate for the full Board to hear the representations and comments. The hearing could be accommodated in the Board's regular meeting. As the subject of representations and comments were considered closely inter-related, it was suggested to consider the representations and the related comments collectively.

108. After deliberation, the Board agreed that as the subject of representations and comments to the draft Sham Chung Development Permission Area (DPA) Plan No. DPA/NE-SC/1 were considered closely inter-related, the representations and the related comments should be considered collectively in the Board's regular meeting. Consideration of the representations and comments by the full Board was scheduled on 14.7.2006.

Agenda Item 16

Any Other Business

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

109. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 3.40 p.m.