

**Minutes of 883<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 20.4.2007**

**Present**

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

Chairperson

Dr. Peter K.K. Wong

Vice-chairman

Mr. Michael K.C. Lai

Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong

Ms. Carmen K.M. Chan

Professor Nora F.Y. Tam

Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan

Mr. David W.M. Chan

Mr. Leslie H.C. Chen

Dr. Lily Chiang

Mr. Tony C.N. Kan

Mr. Edmund K.H. Leung

Professor N.K. Leung

Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim

Dr. C.N. Ng

Dr. Daniel B.M. To

Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong

Ms. Sylvia S.F. Yau

Mr. B.W. Chan

Mr. Walter K.L. Chan

Ms. Maggie M.K. Chan

Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan

Mr. Y.K. Cheng

Mr. Felix W. Fong

Ms. Anna S.Y. Kwong

Professor Paul K.S. Lam

Dr. James C.W. Lau

Ms. Starry W.K. Lee

Mr. K.Y. Leung

Director of Planning

Mrs. Ava S.Y. Ng

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection

Dr. Michael Chiu

Director of Lands

Mr. Herbert Leung

Assistant Director (2), Home Affairs Department

Ms. Margaret Hsia

Deputy Director of Planning/District

Miss Ophelia Y.S. Wong

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Professor David Dudgeon

Professor Peter R. Hills

Mr. Alfred Donald Yap

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. session)  
Mr. C.T. Ling (p.m. session)

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr. C.M. Li (a.m. session)  
Ms. Teresa L.Y. Chu (p.m. session)

1. The Chairperson extended a welcome to Members.

### **Agenda Item 1**

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

Confirmation of Minutes of the 881<sup>st</sup> and 882<sup>nd</sup> Meetings held on 30.3.2007 and 3.4.2007 respectively

2. The minutes of the 881<sup>st</sup> meeting held on 30.3.2007 were confirmed subject to an amendment to the attendance list that 'Mr. Daniel B.M. To' should read 'Dr. Daniel B.M. To'.
3. The minutes of the 882<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 3.4.2007 were confirmed without amendment.

[Dr. Daniel B.M. To arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 2**

#### **Matters Arising**

4. The first item of matters arising was recorded under confidential cover.

[Open Meeting]

- (ii) Town Planning Appeal Decision Received

Town Planning Appeal No. 18 of 2005

Proposed Comprehensive Residential/Commercial Development with

Government, Institution and Community and Open Space Uses in

“Comprehensive Development Area” Zone of

Land Development Corporation Lee Tung Street and McGregor Street

Development Scheme Plan Area, Wan Chai

(Application No. A/H5/349)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

5. The Secretary said that the subject appeal was against the decision of the Board on 22.7.2005 to reject on review an application submitted by a group of local residents and shop owners for a proposed comprehensive residential/commercial development with Government, institution and community and open space uses in the Lee Tung Street and McGregor Street Development Scheme Plan Area. The appeal was heard by the Town Planning Appeal Board (TPAB) in November and December 2006 and dismissed on 12.4.2007 on the following grounds:

- (a) the appellants provided no information as to what work could or should be done in respect of their proposal to preserve 30 odd old tenement buildings on Lee Tung Street, and how the preservation of these buildings could help to achieve the objective of improving the environment of the surrounding areas;
- (b) there was nothing particular about the design of the old buildings proposed to be preserved. Any historical value of them lied in the fact that Lee Tung Street was full of printing shops, which could be re-opened on Lee Tung Street or in its vicinity once the area was redeveloped;
- (c) mere preservation of the old buildings might prevent or hinder comprehensive renewal or redevelopment of the subject area to achieve environmental improvement;
- (d) the new buildings proposed by the appellants were tall and designed in a very odd shape, which could form a massive screen blocking the surrounding views and affecting the penetration of daylight and natural ventilation, and could not blend in with the old tenement buildings proposed to be preserved either architecturally or visually;
- (e) the appellants' proposal to treat the Lee Tung Street portion of the appeal site as a single Class C site did not comply with the Buildings Ordinance;
- (f) the appellants had not provided an environmental impact assessment report in respect of their development proposal and had not provided sufficient information to demonstrate that the proposed development would not generate adverse traffic impact on surrounding road network; and

- (g) the appellants had not shown that they had any future prospect of acquiring the properties in the site or that they would have the financial ability to carry out the proposed development by themselves or jointly with others.

6. The Secretary went on to say that the TPAB was impressed by the time and effort which the appellants and those assisting them had put in pursuing their proposal. The TPAB noted that the efforts of the appellants had received recognition by the Board, which had conveyed the appellants' concerns and the merits in their proposal to the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) for consideration and had revised the Planning Brief for the URA Lee Tung Street & McGregor Street Development Scheme to incorporate the good elements of the proposal. The appellants could further advance their views on the redevelopment of the appeal site in the stage of Master Layout Plan submission.

(iii) Appeal Statistics

7. The Secretary said that as at 20.4.2007, 23 cases were yet to be heard by the TPAB. Details of the appeal statistics were as follows:

|                             |   |          |
|-----------------------------|---|----------|
| Allowed                     | : | 17       |
| Dismissed                   | : | 96       |
| Abandoned/Withdrawn/Invalid | : | 121      |
| Yet to be Heard             | : | 23       |
| <u>Decision Outstanding</u> | : | <u>5</u> |
| Total                       |   | 262      |

[Messrs. B.W. Chan, K.Y. Leung, Raymond Y.M. Chan and Tony C.N. Kan and Ms. Sylvia S.F. Yau left the meeting temporarily and Dr. Lily Chiang arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 3**

[Open Meeting]

Briefing on Radiation Safety of Mobile Phone Base Station

(TPB Paper No. 7801)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

8. The Chairperson said that this item was arranged in response to Members' concerns on the installation of mobile phone base stations (base stations) in residential developments, in particular the impact of such installations on health, raised in the deliberation of a planning application in September 2006.

9. The following representatives from the Government were invited to the meeting at this point:

|                    |   |  |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Mr. Danny K.C. Lau | ) |  |
| Mr. Alex K.L. Tang | ) | Office of Tele-communications Authority (OFTA) |
| Dr. Henry C.C. Ng  | - | Department of Health (DoH)                     |

10. The Chairperson extended a welcome and invited the representatives to present the Paper.

11. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Mr. Alex K.L. Tang made the following points:

**Background**

- (a) in order to provide a good radio coverage, operators of mobile phone networks needed to install base stations at various locations on the territory. As at the end of 2006, there were about 19,300 base stations in Hong Kong. About 3,200 of them were newly installed in 2006;
- (b) the radiofrequency (RF) radiation emitted by base stations belonged to non-ionizing radiation, the energy of which was not strong enough to cause ionization;

### Health Effect from Exposure to RF Radiation

- (c) according to the Fact Sheet No. 304 “Electromagnetic fields and public health – base stations and wireless technologies” issued by the World Health Organization (WHO), the only health effect of exposing to RF radiation from base stations was an increase in body temperature of more than 1 °C from exposure at a very high field intensity, which was found only in certain industrial facilities, such as RF heaters. It was also highlighted in the Fact Sheet that the slight increase in body temperature did not affect human health; there were no studies establishing that the risk of cancer would increase from exposure to RF fields; there was no consistent evidence to show that sleep or cardiovascular function would be altered; and the symptoms collectively known as ‘Electromagnetic Hypersensitivity’ had not been shown to be caused by electromagnetic fields;

[Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan returned to the meeting at this point.]

### RF Radiation Safety Standard

- (d) to ensure RF radiation safety, OFTA, in consultation with DoH, had adopted the RF exposure limits set out in the “Guidelines for Limiting Exposure to Time-varying Electric, Magnetic and Electromagnetic Fields (up to 300 GHz)” published by the International Commission on Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (the ICNIRP Guidelines). The limits were specified in the “Code of Practice for the Protection of Workers and Members of Public against Non-ionizing Radiation Hazards from Radio Transmitting Equipment” (CoP) issued by OFTA for compliance by the mobile network operators;

### Approval of Base Stations and Assurance of RF Radiation Safety

- (e) approvals from various Government departments were required for installation of base stations. OFTA was the authority for compliance of RF radiation levels to ensure no radiation hazards to be caused to the public. In applying for OFTA’s approval, for both a new base station and alteration to an existing

station, an operator was required to provide technical details for assessment on RF radiation levels and submit a self-declaration statement undertaking to comply with the safety requirements under the CoP. OFTA would conduct measurements for compliance in case of doubts. Only stations with emission below the limits specified in the CoP would be approved;

- (f) the operator would also need to submit a measurement report within four weeks after commencement of operation of the new base station to ascertain compliance with the radiation levels. OFTA would assess the report and would carry out measurements when necessary;

[Mr. Tony C.N. Kan returned to the meeting at this point.]

- (g) to ensure compliance with the CoP, OFTA also conducted regular sample checks and measurements of RF radiation levels. The total number of on-site measurements undertaken in 2004, 2005 and 2006 was 199, 202 and 237 respectively. On average, four measurements had been undertaken per week; and

#### Public Education

- (h) OFTA had also undertaken actions to alleviate the public concern and to increase awareness on RF radiation safety, by publishing information leaflets, setting up hotlines for public enquiries, attending owners' committee meetings, publishing advertisements in newspapers and conducting measurements upon request by the public.

[Mr. K.Y. Leung and Ms. Sylvia S.F. Yau returned to the meeting at this point.]

12. Members had the following questions and suggestions:

- (a) whether the RF exposure limits set out in the ICNIRP Guidelines were applicable to Hong Kong, bearing in mind that Hong Kong might involve a much higher density of base stations than other countries;
- (b) taking into account the large number of base stations in Hong Kong, whether around 200 on-site measurements per year were sufficient and whether more measurements would be undertaken for areas with higher development density;
- (c) whether any cases of non-compliance with the specified exposure limits had been found during on-site measurements;
- (d) to relieve public concern on the health effect caused by radiation, consideration should be given by the Government to reducing the number of base stations by encouraging shared use of the facilities by several operators, confining the base stations to certain designated areas away from residential development, and requiring the operators to submit regular compliance reports in respect of their base stations;
- (e) whether there was any channel for the public to know how many base stations had been installed in the vicinity of their homes;
- (f) whether a base station installed on the roof of a building would affect the reception of television signal on the lower floors;
- (g) how was the radiation from a mobile phone base station compared with that from a microwave or radar station;
- (h) whether an application for installation of base station would be approved if there was objection from nearby residents and owners' corporation of the subject building or if the base station use was in breach of the lease;
- (i) whether the equipment installed by operators in shopping malls for improving the transmission of radiation would have adverse effect on health;

- (j) noting that warning signs about high level of radiation were not common, more measures should be undertaken to ensure that the public was well informed of the risk;

[Mr. Felix W. Fong left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

- (k) whether there was any limit on the duration of exposure to the radiation to ensure no adverse effect on health; and
- (l) in assessing a particular base station, whether the radiation from other base stations and other forms of radiation, such as microwave, in the nearby area would also be taken into account.

13. In response to Members' questions and suggestions, Mr. Danny K.C. Lau and Dr. Henry C.C. Ng made the following points:

- (a) the RF exposure limits set out in the ICNIRP Guidelines were the recommended limits of the accumulated RF radiation measured at a particular location due to the RF radiation from all the based stations. The limits set out had already taken into consideration the cumulative effects and were applicable to Hong Kong;
- (b) on-site measurements would be undertaken upon request by the public and for cases which OFTA had doubt on whether the specified exposure limits could be complied with. A frequency of four measurements per week was quite high and should be sufficient;
- (c) only a few cases of exceedance of the specified exposure limits had been found and the measurement were taken at locations very close to the base station itself and normally not accessible to the public, such as the top of a water tank. In these cases, the operators had been reminded to comply with the CoP issued by OFTA to put a warning sign and/or install fencing around the base stations to prevent the public from getting near;

- (d) operators agreeing to shared use of base stations would be unlikely due to keen competition for provision of coverage at various strategic locations. In some areas involving significant site constraints, different operators would usually install joint integrated base stations at the same location. This arrangement, however, was less preferable to having the base stations dispersed, in view of the cumulative level of RF radiation from the base stations;
- (e) to further address the public concern, OFTA would consider requesting the operators to undertake annual sample checking for randomly selected stations as suggested by a Member;
- (f) under the current arrangement, OFTA would disclose the locations of base stations to the public upon request. Subject to the outcome of the actual implementation of the new spectrum policy in future, consideration might be given to uploading the information on OFTA's website;
- (g) receipt of television signal would not be affected by a base station. Anyone having problem in receiving television signal could contact OFTA, which would undertake investigation and necessary rectification actions free of charge;
- (h) microwave link also emitted electromagnetic radiation, which would have thermal effect on human body. Since a clear path was required for its transmission, the transmitter of a microwave station would not be directed towards people. Approval from OFTA was required for the installation of microwave station and the operators were required to comply with the CoP issued by OFTA to ensure radiation safety;
- (i) emission from radar stations for navigation of aeroplanes was of a high energy level. These stations were confined to remote locations far from residential developments and would be fenced off. The installation and operation of these stations would also need to comply with the CoP issued by OFTA to ensure radiation safety;
- (j) an application for installation of base station would not be approved if there was

objection from the OC or the building management office of the subject building. No matter whether there was local objection or not, the operators would need to comply with specified radiation limits. Should there be complaints from nearby residents, OFTA would undertake on-site measurement to ensure that the radiation level did not exceed the limits;

- (k) the level of radiation from the equipment for improvement of transmission in shopping malls, which were mainly in form of microcells or picocells, was very low and would not have significant effect on health;
- (l) warning signs would only be put up at locations with level of radiation exceeding the INCIRP limits, which were very rare indeed. It was an on-going exercise of OFTA to inform the public on issues relating to radiation safety through various educational, publicity and consultation activities. Members could help relaying any specific public concern on this matter to OFTA for follow-up actions;
- (m) the factor on duration of exposure had already been taken into consideration in setting the safety limit of radiation level. If the exposure was within the safety limits, the risk of having adverse health effects was very low; and
- (n) in assessing the RF radiation from a newly installed base station, the cumulative level of radiation, including that from other base stations and other forms of RF radiation nearby, would be taken into account.

14. To conclude, the Chairperson said that the representatives of the Government had provided comprehensive information in respect of the control of radiation safety of base stations and actions to address public concern on the issue. The information would serve as useful background for Members in considering relevant planning applications in future.

15. The Chairperson thanked the representatives of the Government for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

16. The meeting adjourned for a break of 15 minutes and resumed at 11:15 a.m.

[Messrs. B.W. Chan and Felix W. Fong returned to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Items 4 and 5**

[Open Meeting]

Consideration of Draft Revised Wan Chai North Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H25/1C  
(TPB Paper No. 7802)

Proposed Amendments to Approved North Point Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H8/19  
(TPB Paper No. 7803)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

17. The Chairperson said that as the two items were related to the Planning and Engineering Review for Wan Chai Development Phase II (WDII Review), they could be considered together. Members agreed.

18. The Secretary said that Professor N.K. Leung had declared an interest for being the Chairman of the Council of the Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts. Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim had also declared an interest for being involved in the beautification works of the Golden Bauhinia Square and living in the Wan Chai North (WCN) area. Members considered that the interests of Professors Leung and Lim were indirect and agreed that both of them could stay at the meeting and participate in the discussion of the items.

19. The following representatives from the Government and study consultant were invited to the meeting at this point:

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| Ms. Phyllis Li | Chief Town Planner/Special Duties,<br>Planning Department (PlanD)             |
| Miss Katy Fung | Senior Town Planner/Special Duties, PlanD                                     |
| Mr. S.K. Lam   | Chief Engineer/Hong Kong (2),<br>Civil Engineering and Development Department |
| Mr. M.L. Wan   | Deputy Project Manager/Major Works (2),<br>Highways Department                |
| Mr. C.Y. Chan  | Senior Engineer/Housing and Planning,<br>Transport Department                 |
| Mr. Eric Ma    | Maunsell Consultants Asia Limited   |

#### Presentation and Question Session

#### ***Draft Revised Wan Chai North Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H25/1C***

20. The Chairperson extended a welcome and invited Ms. Phyllis Li to brief Members on the background to the draft revised WCN Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H25/1C (the WCN Plan).

21. With the aid of Powerpoint slides, Ms. Phyllis Li covered the following main aspects as detailed in the Paper:

#### Background

- (a) the planning history from the gazettal of the WCN OZP No. S/H25/1 on 19.4.2002, consideration of objections and further objections by the Board, judicial review of the Board's decisions in respect of the OZP and the ruling of the Court of Final Appeal, to the recently completed WDII Review, and the Board's endorsement of the RODP on 3.4.3007 to form the basis for amending the relevant OZPs as detailed in paragraph 2 of the Papers;

### Reclamation Extent

- (b) the reclamation extent was determined by the minimum extent of land required to accommodate the Trunk Road and its associated slip roads and structures, and to re-provision the affected waterfront facilities. The overriding and present need for building the Trunk Road and the proposed extent of reclamation had been justified and demonstrated in the 'Report on Cogent and Convincing Materials to Demonstrate Compliance with the Overriding Public Need Test Report' (CCM Report) submitted to the Board on 3.4.2007;
- (c) the permanent reclamation area amounted to 12.7 ha in the WDII including 5.7 ha in the WCN OZP area;

### Planning and Urban Design Framework

- (d) the planning and urban design framework was based on the the Vision and Goals for Victoria Harbour of the Board, the Harbour Planning Principles promulgated by the Harbourfront Enhancement Committee (HEC), and the Urban Design Guidelines as well as community aspirations. Four character precincts (i.e. Art and Culture Precinct, Water Park Precinct, Water Recreation Precinct and Heritage Precinct) were proposed;
- (e) a building height (BH) strategy adopting a stepped BH profile descending towards the waterfront, with heights ranging from 10mPD to 50mPD for all new developments, was adopted;
- (f) a waterfront promenade from Central to North Point and six new north-south links to the waterfront in the form of at-grade crossings, footbridges and landscaped decks were proposed. Longer term improvements to pedestrian links would be further considered;

Amendments to the WCN OZP

- (g) Amendment Item A – revision of the Planning Scheme boundary (reduced from 76.54 ha to 55.31 ha in area) as a result of a significant reduction of the proposed reclamation area;
- (h) Amendment Item B – revision of land use zonings and layout on the basis of the RODP as follows:
  - i. the WCN Plan included 3.2 ha of “Commercial” (“C”) zone, 8.9 ha of “Open Space” (“O”) zone, 10.9 ha of “Government/Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zone, 15.5 ha of “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) zones for “Public Waterfront Promenade and Water Recreation Related Uses”, “Waterfront Related Commercial and Leisure Uses”, “Helipad”, “Pier”, “Railway Ventilation Building” and “Railway Station Facilities”, “Central-Wanchai Bypass (CWB) Exhaust Vent”, “Amenity Area”, “Landscaped Elevated Walkway”, and existing developments at the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (HKCEC), Royal Hong Kong Yacht Club (RHKYC), Police Officers’ Club (POC), Cross Harbour Tunnel (CHT) vent shaft, and petrol filling station;
  - ii. compared to the draft WCN OZP No. S/H25/1, there was a reduction of area zoned “C”, “O” and ‘Road’ and an increase in area zoned “G/IC” and “OU” in the WCN Plan. The previous “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) zone was deleted from the WCN Plan;
- (i) the Notes had been updated to reflect the WCN Plan and incorporate the revised Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans (MSN) endorsed by the Board. The Explanatory Statement (ES) had also been updated to reflect the overall concept, urban design and landscape framework and planning intention of the land use zonings;

- (j) major changes to the draft WCN OZP No. S/H25/1 were detailed in paragraph 9 of the Paper;

Previous Objections

- (k) most of the objectors' concerns on the draft WCN OZP No. S/H25/1 had been addressed as follows:
- i. extensive reclamation – by substantial reduction of reclamation from 26.4 ha to 5.7 ha;
  - ii. elevated Island Eastern Corridor Link (IECL) – by constructing the CWB in tunnel form within the Planning Scheme area;
  - iii. visual and traffic impacts of the “CDA” site – by deleting the “CDA” zoning and designating the site for GIC, railway facilities, amenity, landscaped elevated walkway and road uses;
  - iv. uses at the ex-public cargo working area site – by designating the site for public waterfront promenade and water recreation related uses including a harbour education centre and a water sports centre;
  - v. floating Tin Hau Temple – by identifying the A-King Shipyard site as the possible re-provisioning site for the temple;
  - vi. the RHKYC, breakwaters of the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter (CBTS), Noonday Gun, and pumphouse site at ML 710 RP together with its marine access right would not be affected;
  - vii. inadequate height control – by imposing BH restrictions on all new developments on the waterfront;
  - viii. design of pedestrian linkages – by proposing new pedestrian linkages including at-grade crossings, landscaped decks and footbridges;

[Mr. Edmund K.H. Leung left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

- (1) those objectors' concerns on the draft WCN OZP No. S/H25/1 that could not be addressed were as follows:
  - i. CWB and Road P2 – their need and scale had been established in the WDII Review;
  - ii. North Island Line (NIL) and Shatin-Central Link (SCL) – their alignments on the WCN Plan were indicative. The proposed railway station facilities and ventilation building were subject to a maximum BH of 25mPD;
  - iii. helipad and pier – their locations remained unchanged due to physical and technical constraints;
  - iv. exhibition use at the previous “CDA” site – the site was now zoned “G/IC(1)” with “Exhibition or Convention Hall’ use requiring planning permission;
  - v. existing electric substation (ESS) and sewage screening plant – both were retained on the WCN Plan as as it was difficult to identify suitable alternative sites in the congested WCN area. Relocation of these facilities would involve re-laying of a large amount of cable mains and sewers, and re-provisioning would cause disruption to the provision of services and to the Wan Chai area;
  - vi. BHs of the “OU (Waterfront Related Commercial and Leisure Uses)” and “OU (Pier)” zones – the proposed BHs would promote architectural variety and visual interest and allow feature roof on the pier; and

Consultation

- (m) subject to the Board's agreement, the four District Councils (DCs) of Hong Kong Island and the HEC Sub-committee on WDII Review would be consulted on the WCN Plan. Comments received from the public would be submitted to the Board for consideration prior to finalizing the proposed amendments to the draft OZP No. S/H25/1 for gazetting under section 6(7) of the pre-amended Town Planning Ordinance.

22. The Chairperson said that Members had been briefed on the findings of the WDII Review and the public views gathered from the public engagement exercise under the HEC Sub-committee on WDII Review in a public engagement exercise titled 'Harbourfront Enhancement Review – Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas' (HER). The recommendations of the Expert Panel on Sustainable Transport Planning and CWB under the Sub-Committee of WDII Review and the conclusions of the CCM Report had provided a concrete basis for consideration of the WCN Plan. At the meeting of 3.4.2007, the Board endorsed the RODP prepared under the WDII as the basis for amending the OZP. She added that the WCN Plan would form the basis for reconsideration of the previous objections to the WCN OZP No. S/H25/1.

23. A Member expressed appreciation of the contribution of concerned Government departments and participation of the public in the formulation of the WCN Plan. Whilst in full support of the proposals indicated on the WCN Plan, this Member asked whether any urban design briefs would be prepared for the visually sensitive sites on the waterfront, similar to those being done for the new waterfront in Central. The "OU" sites designated for such uses as the helipad, pier, railway ventilation building and CWB exhaust vent were of particular concerns as they could be developed up to a maximum height of 20mPD to 25 mPD. In view of their prominent locations, proper design control should be put in place. To ensure compatibility with the waterfront setting, the Board should be involved in vetting the design of these structures at a later stage.

24. Sharing this Member's view, the Chairperson said that the waterfront was the asset of the community and it was the duty of the Board to exercise proper control on the design of the developments within the "OU" sites on the waterfront.

25. Members generally welcomed and supported the WCN Plan and raised the following main points and questions:

- (a) whether the Government had any measures to resolve the water pollution problem in the CBTS given that the typhoon shelter would not be reclaimed under the WCN Plan;
- (b) the water quality of the 'Water Recreation Precinct' should be addressed in the on-going environmental impact assessment (EIA) exercise and monitored continuously;
- (c) whether it was feasible to widen the promenade in the vicinity of the Noonday Gun;
- (d) the proposal for a continuous waterfront promenade from Central to North Point was supported; and
- (e) what was the nature of the proposed museum at the new breakwater.

26. In response, Mr. S.K. Lam and Ms. Phyllis Li made the following main points:

- (a) that part of the promenade near the Noonday Gun could not be widened further without reclaiming land from the Harbour, and such additional reclamation might be in contravention of the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO). Should there be community consensus for reclamation for harbourfront enhancement in future, further works could be carried out to widen the promenade;
- (b) the water quality of the CBTS would be addressed in the EIA being conducted for the WDII and CWB proposals to comply with the EIA Ordinance. It was the Government's intention to tackle the water pollution problem at source by dredging the contaminated mud in the typhoon shelter, stopping expedient connections, and strengthening management of the water body with a view to reducing rubbish dumping and pollution; and

- (c) one of the objectors to the draft WCN OZP No. S/H25/1 had suggested to build a harbour museum in the previously proposed new breakwater at the CBTS. Under the WCN Plan, however, the proposed breakwater had been deleted and no museum was proposed.

27. While acknowledging that part of the promenade near the Noonday Gun was very narrow, the Chairperson cautioned the need to fully justify reclamation at the harbour and noted that the provision of open space might not meet the overriding public need test. She however urged concerned departments to adopt innovative design to address the issue to the extent possible in future.

28. A Member said that in the documents for the forthcoming consultation with the DCs, it would be advisable to point out that the new open space to be provided at the waterfront would improve the provision of the same in Wan Chai. Moreover, apart from consulting the four DCs on Hong Kong Island, the consultation documents could also be circulated to the other DCs given the wide public interest in harbour planning. In response, the Chairperson said that the HEC Sub-committee on WDII Review had carried out extensive public engagement under HER and the relevant materials had been posted on its web-site. Nevertheless, the PlanD could pass the relevant documents to the Home Affairs Department (HAD) to arrange distribution to other DCs as HAD considered appropriate. As the HEC would undertake further public consultation on the RODP, the Chairperson asked the Government representatives to relay the Board's request for the HEC to consider distributing the consultation materials as widely as possible.

29. As Members had no further question on the WCN Plan, the Chairperson invited Ms. Phyllis Li to brief Members on the proposed amendments to the approved North Point OZP.

***Proposed Amendments to the Approved North Point OZP No. S/H8/19***

30. With the aid of Powerpoint slides, Ms. Phyllis Li covered the following main aspects as detailed in the Paper:

**Background**

- (a) the background to the proposed amendments to the North Point (NP) OZP as

set out in paragraph 3 of the Paper;

- (b) on 13.4.2007, the Secretary of Housing, Planning and Lands, under the delegated authority of the Chief Executive, gave directive to extend the Planning Scheme boundary of the NP OZP to include a reclamation area for accommodating the CWB and IECL and related facilities proposed under the WDII Review;

#### Reclamation Extent

- (c) the proposed reclamation in the NP OZP area comprised 3.3 ha, and a short section of flyover structures over water to link the CWB with the existing IEC to the east which would affect a water area of about 0.4 ha;

#### Amendments to the NP OZP

- (d) the proposed Amendment Items A to L as described in paragraph 6, and the proposed amendments to the Notes of the OZP as set out in paragraph 7 and Annex II of the Paper; and

[Mr. Leslie H.C. Chen left the meeting at this point.]

#### Consultation

- (e) subject to the Board's agreement, the four DCs of Hong Kong Island and the HEC Sub-committee on WDII Review would be consulted on the proposed amendments. Comments received from the public would be submitted to the Board for consideration prior to gazetting under the Town Planning Ordinance.

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

31. Members then had a discussion on the proposed amendments to the NP OZP and raised the following main points:

- (a) the proposed amendments should be able to meet the needs of the community. The intention to provide a promenade from Central to NP and the imposition of BH restrictions on the administration building and ventilation building of the CWB were supported;

[Professor Paul K.S. Lam left the meeting at this point.]

- (b) particular attention should be paid to the interface area of the WCN OZP and NP OZP to ensure sufficient pedestrian connections. The proposed promenade in the vicinity of A-King Shipyard was quite narrow, whilst further north near the ESS, the promenade could not continue along the waterfront, thus impeding pedestrian accessibility and public enjoyment of the harbour thereat;
- (c) given the increasing public concern of the visual impact of highway infrastructures, whether urban design briefs would be prepared to guide the detailed design of the CWB ventilation building, realigned IEC and road connections near the tunnel portal;
- (d) there were concerns on the need and alignment of Slip Road 8 and its impacts on Tsing Fung Street and Hing Fat Street, and whether the relevant DCs had made any comments on the road realignment proposal; and
- (e) to reduce the encroachment of Slip Road 8 on the Victoria Park and the resultant adverse visual impact, one possible alternative might be to 'swap' the horizontal alignments of the NIL and the slip road such that the latter would be located further away from the park.

32. In response, Ms. Phyllis Li, Mr. S.K. Lam, Mr. M.L. Wan and Mr. Eric Ma made the following main points:

- (a) given that the ESS site at the south-eastern end of the CBTS was under private ownership and reclamation solely for the provision of promenade would contravene the PHO, the footpath in the vicinity would have to run along the landward side of the ESS site. Nevertheless, the promenade from

CBTS could still be connected to that in NP via this footpath. This was a practical approach in the interim, but the Government would explore whether there was any opportunity to improve the situation in the longer term;

[Mr. Tony C.N. Kan returned to join the meeting at this point.]

- (b) the design of highway infrastructures would follow the EIA Ordinance requirements which would include the assessment of visual impacts. The Government would make the best effort to ensure that the design of the elevated roads and the administration and ventilation buildings of the CWB would blend in with the surrounding environment;
- (c) under the WDII Review, Slip Road 8 was essential in helping relieve traffic from the overloaded Connaught Road Central – Harcourt Road – Gloucester Road corridor. Except for the current proposed alignment, all other alignment options examined would require additional harbour reclamation. The Consultants of the WDII review were now carrying out detailed investigation with a view to optimising the road alignment, minimizing encroachment on the Victoria Park and retaining more trees. The ongoing EIA would also address and minimize the visual impacts of Slip Road 8 and other proposed roads; and
- (d) the Consultants would further investigate the interface between the horizontal alignments of the NIL and Slip Road 8.

33. The Chairperson stated that there was a need for preparation of an urban design framework for the new harbourfront in WCN and NP to achieve a high quality design. Ms. Phyllis Li said that for the “OU” sites associated with the infrastructural projects, they would be subject to the ongoing EIA, under which the visual impacts of these developments would be scrutinized. The Board would be further consulted on the detailed design in future.

34. The Chairperson said that in view of the importance of the waterfront and the public aspiration for better urban design, the design of the “OU” sites should be subject to the Board’s approval to ensure that they would be compatible with the surrounding developments. Mere consultation with the Board would not be sufficient. A Member fully supported the

Chairperson's view and said that urban design matter was within the ambit of the Board.

35. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson thanked the representatives of the Government and consultant for attending the meeting. She asked the Government representatives to follow up on Members' suggestions in further revising the WCN OZP and NP OZP. They all left the meeting at this point.

#### Deliberation Session

36. The Chairperson said that in discharging the responsibility to prepare statutory plans, the Board would have to strike a balance amongst various considerations. No reclamation should be carried out without first establishing the overriding public need. In planning for the WCN and NP areas, it was also necessary to maintain flexibility and introduce improvement measures in an incremental manner.

37. In response to the Chairperson's question, Mrs. Ava S.Y. Ng said that various railway and highway related structures would be subject to detailed design. Further urban and landscape design study could be carried out, if necessary, to ensure that the future developments would meet the various standards and commensurate with the waterfront setting and the surrounding developments. The Chairperson said that in carrying out detailed design, 'vertical greening' should be explored as a means to reduce the visual impact of buildings/structures with a view to enhancing the cityscape.

#### ***Draft Revised Wan Chai North Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H25/1C***

38. After deliberation, the Board agreed that that the draft revised WCN OZP No. S/H25/1C, its Notes and ES should be adopted as the basis for the preliminary consideration of the previous objections to the draft WCN OZP No. S/H25/1. The Board also agreed that the draft revised WCN OZP, its Notes and the ES were suitable for consultation with the Sub-committee on WDII Review of the HEC and the relevant District Councils.

#### ***Proposed Amendments to the Approved North Point OZP No. S/H8/19***

39. After deliberation, the Board agreed that the draft NP OZP No. S/H8/19D, its Notes and the ES were suitable for consultation with Sub-committee on WDII Review of the HEC

and the relevant District Councils.

40. The Board also agreed that the Planning Department should work out the appropriate planning control on the future design of the relevant “OU” sites for incorporation into the WCN OZP and NP OZP.

[Mr. B.W. Chan, Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong, and Ms. Carmen K.M. Chan left the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 7**

[Open meeting (Presentation and Question Session Only)]

Submission of the Draft Urban Renewal Authority Hai Tan Street/  
Kweilin Street/Pei Ho Street Development Scheme Plan No. S/K5/URA2/A  
Prepared under Section 25 of Urban Renewal Authority Ordinance  
(TPB Paper No. 7806)

---

64. The minutes of this item were recorded under separate confidential cover temporarily.

[Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong, Mrs. Ava Ng, Ms. Margaret Hsia and Mr. Herbert Leung arrived to join the meeting at this point. Mr. K.Y. Leung and Dr. James C.W. Lau left the meeting at this point. Dr. Michael Chiu left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

**Agenda Item 8**

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

Review of Application No. A/NE-TKL/290

Temporary Storage of Containers, Iron Materials and Machine Accessories  
for a Period of 3 Years in “Industrial (Group D)” and “Green Belt” zones,  
Government Land, in DD 77, Ping Che  
(TPB Paper No. 7804)

---

[The hearing was conducted in Cantonese.]

**Presentation and Question Session**

65. Mr. W.K. Hui, District Planning Officer/Shatin, Tai Po and North District (DPO/STN) of Planning Department (PlanD), and the applicant’s representative, Mr. Yip Mou-cheong were invited to the meeting at this point.

[Dr. Michael Chiu returned to join the meeting at this point.]

66. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained briefly the procedures of the review hearing. The Chairperson then invited Mr. W.K. Hui to brief Members on the background to the application. With the aid of some plans, Mr. Hui did so as detailed in the Paper and made the following main points:

- (a) the reasons of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) to reject the planning permission for temporary storage of containers, iron materials and machine accessories for a period of 3 years on a site zoned “Green Belt” (“GB”) (70% of site area) and “Industrial (Group D)” (“I(D)”) on 17.11.2006;
- (b) the justifications put forth by the applicant in support of the review application as set out in paragraph 3 of the Paper;
- (c) departmental comments – Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) did not support the application due to presence of sensitive uses nearby and

environmental nuisance was expected. Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD raised objection as the natural vegetated slope with mature trees in the southern part of the application site had been cleared, which exposed the bare surface to erosion and caused significant disturbance to the landscape character. There would likely be further deterioration of the “GB” zone if the application was permitted. District Lands Officer/North, Lands Department expressed reservation due to use of government land and local objections;

- (d) 1 public comment was received during public inspection period and 2 more were received during the publication of further information. The Ta Kwu Ling Rural Committee (RC) and Indigenous Inhabitant Representative (IIR) of Ta Kwu Ling raised strong objections due to hillside excavation affecting the ‘fung-shui’ of burial ground, damage to natural environment, impact on landscape, slope stability and landform causing flooding and blockage during rainy seasons. The District Officer (North) advised that the IIR and the Residents’ Representative (RR) of Ping Che maintained their previous objections; and
- (e) PlanD’s view – not supporting the application as the application site was mainly within Category 4 area under the TPB Guidelines No. 13D for ‘Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses’ where permission was only allowed under exceptional circumstances which was not evident for this case. In addition to environmental concerns on nearby residential uses, the proposed development encroached onto a burial ground causing disturbance to the vegetated slopes and affecting the landscape character. There was no previous or similar approval in the vicinity.

67. The Chairperson then invited the applicant’s representative to elaborate on the application. With the aid of some plans, Mr. Yip Mou-cheong made the following main points:

- (a) the application was just for a small scale storage yard on Government land with limited operating hours. There would only be a few containers for iron materials and machine accessories, but not for storage of a large number of containers serving port back-up uses;

- (b) if approved, the applicant would not occupy the open areas on the slope and the burial ground; and
- (c) the surface of the slope was paved with cement so as to avoid underground water flowing down from the hill. The trees were planted by the applicant but destroyed by the natural runoff discharged from the hill.

68. In response to a query from a Member, Mr. Yip Mou-cheong confirmed he was willing to excise the burial ground from the boundary of the application site. He explained that the slope surface was overlaid with cement to stop the seepage of underground water. Mr. W.K. Hui remarked that even if the slope of the burial ground was to be excluded, the proposed use was still on Government land with majority of the area falling within the “GB” zone, which was not compatible with the planning intention and the surrounding natural setting.

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

#### Deliberation Session

70. The Chairperson noted that in addition to departmental concerns on land administration, environmental and landscape aspects, there were strong local objections. Members generally agreed as there were insufficient information to demonstrate the technical acceptability and to address the technical concerns, the subject application could not be approved.

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

- (a) the application did not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for ‘Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses’ in that there was no

exceptional circumstances to justify approval to the uses under application, no information had been submitted to demonstrate that the uses under application would not generate adverse environmental and landscape impacts on the surrounding areas;

- (b) the application site on Government land encroached upon a burial ground on a natural slope with mature trees and the uses under application were considered not compatible with the surrounding natural environment. There was no information in the submission to demonstrate that the uses under application would not adversely affect slope stability and landscape character; and
- (c) there was no information in the submission to demonstrate that the uses under application would not have adverse environmental impacts on the surrounding sensitive receivers.

### **Agenda Item 9**

[Open meeting (Presentation and Question Session Only)]

Review of Application No. A/NE-KTS/244

Proposed Religious Institution (Buddhism Study Center) in “Agriculture” zone,

Lots 413 to 415, 417, 418 and 420 to 423 in DD 94, Kwu Tung South, Sheung Shui

(TPB Paper No. 7808)

---

[The hearing was conducted in Cantonese]

### **Presentation and Question Session**

72. Mr. W.K. Hui, District Planning Officer/Shatin, Tai Po and North District (DPO/STN) of Planning Department (PlanD), the applicant and his representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Mr. So Tung Lam

Applicant

Mr. Sit Kwok-keung

]

Miss Li Fong-fong ] Applicant's Representatives  
Mr. Wong Choi-hing ]

73. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained briefly the procedures of the review hearing. The Chairperson then invited Mr. W.K. Hui to brief Members on the background to the application. With the aid of some plans, Mr. Hui did so as detailed in the Paper and made the following main points:

- (a) the reasons of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) to reject the application for proposed religious institution (Buddhism study center) on a site zoned "Agriculture" on 11.17.2006;
- (b) the justifications put forth by the applicant in support of the review application as set out in paragraph 3 of the Paper;
- (c) departmental comments – Assistant Commissioner for Transport/NT, Transport Department (AC for T/NT, TD) advised that as the proposal would attract a large number of users (600 as indicated by the applicant), a planned vehicular access with information on transport arrangement for major events was required. The proposed provision of car parking spaces was considered not acceptable. The car parking provision and the adequacy of the proposed access should be addressed by a traffic impact assessment. Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) expressed reservation as the proposed development was considered massive and incompatible with the surrounding environment. There would be significant disturbances to the landscape character as existing mature trees along river slope of Sheung Yue River and the perimeter of the application site would likely be affected;
- (d) there were 4 public comments received during public inspection and 3 comments during the publication of further information, including a member of North District Council (NDC) and local residents, due to incompatibility with the rural setting and damage to the tranquillity of Hang Tau Village and its 'fung shui'. The proposal would bring adverse impacts in terms of traffic, infrastructural, psychological, safety, hygiene and visual aspects, as well as

environmental impacts including noise, air and water pollution, adverse ecological impact to the rural environment and the slopes/river banks. It would be used for burial grounds, columbarium, crematorium and funeral facility. There was no clarification on the actual operation as to whether Buddhist cuisine catering, ritual and funeral services would be involved. In response to the public comments, DEP advised that the indoor activities would unlikely cause excessive nuisance to nearby village houses while the two parking spaces would unlikely generate large traffic nuisance. TD considered the two disabled parking spaces unacceptable and planned access with detailed transport arrangement was required;

- (e) District Officer (North) advised that there were objections from a NDC Member, Sheung Shui District Rural Committee, local organization and residents of Hang Tau Village mainly reiterating the similar grounds expressed in the public comments.
- (f) PlanD's view – not supporting the application as the proposal was considered out of scale and incompatible with the surrounding rural setting. There was insufficient information to address the technical concerns, notably the traffic and parking provision. According to the Notes of the “AGR” zone, the use of ‘Burial Ground’ required planning permission and there was no provision for ‘Columbarium’ or ‘Crematorium’ or ‘Funeral Facility’. The applicant did not apply for such uses.

74. The Chairperson then invited the applicant's representatives to elaborate on the application. Mr. Sit Kwok-keung tabled some additional information and a publication celebrating the 30 Years Anniversary of Chuk Lam Ming Tong for Members' reference. Mr. Sit made the following main points:

- (a) the applicant was the Chairman of Chuk Lam Ming Tong, a charity agency with a large number of members which had been set up for 30 years. The project would be funded personally by the applicant for donation/transfer to the agency after completion. The proposed use was intended to be a venue resembling a school for study of Buddhism/Taoism philosophy instead of religious worship. Such facility was considered necessary for major

seminars which would otherwise be held in other rental venues thus causing inconvenience to their operation. The centre would include social/community facility and open space to benefit the local villagers. Its rejection was due to failure to recognize its genuine purpose as a cultural facility operated by a charity agency;

- (b) the proposal was a small-scale development comprising a low-rise, 2-storey single building at a plot ratio (PR) of 0.23, site coverage (SC) of 16.31% and building height of 8.2m, with open space and 2 disabled car parks. The layout had been revised to present a more symmetric built-form with no increase in building bulk, and details on landscape, drainage and sewage proposals had been submitted;
- (c) although major seminars held twice a year would attract an attendance of 600 persons, the proposed centre would unlikely create heavy vehicular traffic. The attendants would resort to public transport, i.e. Green Mini Bus (GMB) Route No. 50K, available at Hang Tau Road within a walking distance of 10 minutes from the centre. Hence only 2 disabled car parks are reserved to reduce impact on the road;
- (d) TD's comments on traffic impact and parking provision were unreasonable as there was no need for vehicular access in view of the availability of public transport. As visitors would be travelling in an opposite direction to the main flow of local passengers; it would optimize the usage of the GMB route without overstraining the capacity and affecting the schedule of the service. 2 disabled parking spaces were provided in accordance with the standard for special school under the HKPSG. Apart from the use of GMB service, 7-8 coaches would be required for delivering some 300-400 attendants to Hang Tau Road within a short walk to the centre, thus minimizing the impact on surrounding road network. It would be unnecessary to over-estimate the additional traffic requirements and consequential impacts on road system. As the event attendance would be lower than the patronage generated by a normal school picnic, it would be unfair to require the applicant to conduct a traffic impact assessment and provide direct vehicular access;

- (e) it was noted that EPD had no objection on sewerage aspect, having studied the further information on soakaway pit;
- (f) the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) considered the agricultural life in the vicinity inactive and the potential for agricultural rehabilitation low. Hence CTP/UD&L's concern regarding disturbances to the landscape character was not well justified;
- (g) despite PlanD's comments on massive development and incompatibility with the surrounding environment, the proposed centre with a PR of 0.23 was considered low as compared with other developments. It was unreasonable to require a new development to be compatible with the surrounding temporary structures and open storage uses;
- (h) as the applicant had made it clear that the proposed use would be a study centre but not a place of worship, the villagers' worries, including air and noise pollution, as well other use such as columbarium, crematorium and funeral facility, were unfounded;
- (i) based on the above explanation, the proposed approval conditions in Paragraph 6.3 of the paper should be deleted. Condition (b) on design and provision of vehicular access, parking and loading/unloading was unnecessary while condition (c) on restriction on crematorium or columbarium was irrelevant since these uses were not under application; and
- (j) the departmental comments had not given due regard to the further information on traffic and land use aspects provided by the applicant, nor did they understand the genuine nature of the proposed use as an academic institute with planning gain to the community.

[Professor Nora F.Y. Tam left the meeting at this point.]

75. Members sought clarification from the applicant and his [representatives](#) on the following:

- (a) the specific use of areas next to the toilets on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor plan (Drawing R-3);
- (b) whether there would be inhabitants on site and the number of inhabitants to be accommodated, as a large dormitory was indicated on the Drawing;
- (c) whether cooking facilities would be provided; and
- (d) whether emergency facilities had been planned in the premises.

76. Mr. [Sit Kwok-keung](#) replied as follows:

- (a) the area next to the toilets on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor plan was for changing rooms;
- (b) the dormitory would accommodate about 100 persons, 50 in each of the dormitories on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor plan, as over-night accommodation for special functions ;
- (c) no cooking facilities would be provided and visitors were expected to dine outside; and
- (d) no first aid or emergency facilities had been planned on the premises as large scale functions would only be held twice a year. Visitors could easily take taxi services to such facilities in the nearby new town in case of emergency.

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

#### Deliberation Session

78. The Chairperson noted that despite the proposed use was not a large scale

development, there were insufficient assessment to substantiate the acceptability of the proposal from various technical aspects while strong local objections had been received.

79. Members were generally not in support of the application and expressed the following views:

- (a) the concern due to traffic impact was clearly stated by TD in the Paper and considered to be a genuine traffic issue;
- (b) there was insufficient information to demonstrate the acceptability of the proposal;
- (c) there were doubts on the applicant's request to delete the suggested approval condition (c) on restriction of crematorium or columbarium, even though he claimed that such uses were not applied for;
- (d) notwithstanding the benefits the applicant claimed to bring to the community, there were strong local objections to the proposal; and
- (e) there was concern on the future operation and management of the proposed dormitory.

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

- (a) the proposed religious institution was considered out of scale with the local context and was not compatible with the surrounding areas which were rural in character, taking into account of the existing land uses;
- (b) the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the "Agriculture" ("AGR") zone which is to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes. The "AGR" zone was also intended to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. No strong justification had been provided in the submission for a departure from the

planning intention;

- (c) there was not sufficient information submitted to demonstrate that the proposed religious institution would not have adverse traffic and landscape impacts to the surrounding areas; and
- (d) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications. The cumulative impacts of approving such similar applications would result in a general degradation to the environment of the area.

### **Agenda Item 10**

[Open Meeting]

Draft Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H7/12  
Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representation  
(TPB Paper No. 7810)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

81. The Secretary said Mr. Michael K.C. Lai had declared an interest in this item as he owned a flat within the area covered by the OZP. However, as the subject matter was procedural in nature Mr. Lai could be allowed to stay at the meeting. It was noted that Mr. Lai had tendered apology for being unable to attend the afternoon session of the meeting.

82. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. The draft Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H7/12 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) on 8.12.2006. During the two-month exhibition period, a total of 31 valid representations were received. On 16.2.2007, the representations were published for 3 weeks for public comments and nine valid comments were received.

83. In view of the similar nature of the representations and the interests of the general public in the plot ratio and building height restrictions for the Wong Nai Chung area, it is recommended that the representations and comments should be considered by the full Board.

The hearing could be accommodated in the Board's regular meeting and a separate hearing session would not be necessary. Consideration of the representations and comments by the full Board under section 6B is scheduled for 18 May 2007.

84. After deliberation, as all of the representations and comments were related to the same issues, the Board agreed to have a collective hearing for all the representations and the related comments.

### **Agenda Item 11**

[Open Meeting]

Submission of the Draft Wan Chai Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H5/24A  
under section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance  
to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval  
(TPB Paper No. 7811 )

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

85. The Secretary said Mr. Michael K.C. Lai had declared an interest in this item as he owned a flat within the area covered by the subject OZP and had relationship the St. James' Settlement which was involved in a rezoning proposal covered by the OZP. However, as the subject matter was procedural in nature Mr. Lai could be allowed to stay at the meeting. It was noted that Mr. Lai had tendered apology for being unable to attend the afternoon session of the meeting.

86. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper.

87. After deliberation, the Board :

- (a) agreed that the draft Wan Chai Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H5/24A together with 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 Wan Chai

OZP No. S/H5/24A as an expression of the planning intention and objectives of the Board for the various land-use zonings on the draft OZP and issued under the name of the Board; and

- (c) agreed that the updated ES for the draft Wan Chai OZP No. S/H5/24A was suitable for submission to the CE in C together with the draft OZP.

### **Agenda Item 12**

[Open Meeting]

Submission of the Draft Lamma Island Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-LI/8A under section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval  
(TPB Paper No. 7812)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

- 88. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper.
- 89. After deliberation, the Board:
  - (a) agreed that the draft Lamma Island Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/I-LI/8A together with its Notes are 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 Lamma Island OZP No. S/I-LI/8A 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 for the draft Lamma Island OZP No. S/I-LI/8A is suitable for submission to the CE in C together with the draft OZP.

**Agenda Item 15**

[Open Meeting]

**Any Other Business**

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

92. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 4:30 [p.m.](#)