

1. The meeting was resumed at 9:10 a.m. on 19.11.2013
2. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting:

Mr Thomas T.M. Chow

Chairman

Mr Stanley Y.F. Wong

Vice-Chairman

Professor S.C. Wong

Professor Eddie C.M. Hui

Dr C.P. Lau

Mr Clarence W.C. Leung

Mr Roger K.H. Luk

Ms Anita W.T. Ma

Dr W.K. Yau

Mr H.W. Cheung

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr H.F. Leung

Mr F.C. Chan

Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Presentation and Question Session

3. The following Government representatives were invited to the meeting:

- Miss Elsa H.K. Cheuk - Chief Town Planner/Special Duties (CTP/SD),
Planning Department (PlanD)
- Mr Timothy Y.M. Lui - Senior Town Planner/Special Duties (1), PlanD
- Mr C.T. Lam - Senior Engineer(2), Civil Engineering and
Development Department (CEDD)

4. The following representers and representer's representative were invited to the meeting:

R7032 – Sze Hiu Fai

Miss Sze Hiu Fai - Representer

R7082 – Lam Tsz Kwan

Mr Lam Man Ho - Representer's representative

R7524 – Chow Sin Ting

Ms Chow Sin Ting - Representer

R7580 – Li Kan Hung

Mr Li Kan Hung - Representer

R7764 – Pang Siu Fan Florence

Ms Pang Siu Fan - Representer

5. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the special arrangements for hearing the large number of representations and comments in respect of the OZP. Each representer/commenter was allocated a total of 10 minutes' speaking time. If an authorized representative was appointed by more than one representer/commenter of the same session to represent them, that authorized representative might use the cumulative time allotted to all the persons he represented to make his oral submission. Request for

further time for oral submission from a representer/commenter or his authorized representative would be considered by the Board. If his request was allowed by the Board, he would be either given further time in the same allotted session to make his submission (if time permitted), or notified of the date when he would be invited to return for such purpose.

6. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Miss Elsa Cheuk repeated the presentation that was made in the hearing session on 4.11.2013 as recorded in paragraph 21 of the minutes of 4.11.2013.

[Mr H.F. Leung, Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Professor S.C. Wong returned to join the meeting at this point.]

7. The Chairman then invited the representers and the representer's representative to elaborate on their representations. For the efficient conduct of the meeting, the Chairman asked the representers/representer's representative not to repeat unnecessarily long the same points that had already been presented by previous representers.

R7032 - Sze Hiu Fai

8. Ms Sze Hiu Fai made the following main points:

- (a) while the Government said that the zoning of the CMD site would not engage the Protection of Harbour Ordinance (PHO) as it did not give rise to any additional reclamation of the Harbour, CFA's interpretation of PHO required CE in C to consider whether there was an overriding public need and that a need should only be overriding if there was a compelling and pressing need. Whether there was an overriding need for CMD was not addressed;
- (b) as the rationale for the provision of a military dock at the site was never made known to the public, it was impossible to determine whether CMD should be supported. Given that the Board would need to consider the proposal, the rationale for developing a military dock at the subject site

should be provided to the Board for its consideration;

- (c) it was questionable whether conducting such a large scale public hearing that involved high administrative costs was worthwhile; and
- (d) it was not clear under what circumstances the Board would determine that the land use zone of CMD should be overturned or revised after hearing the views of the representers and commenters.

[Actual speaking time of R7032: 3 minutes]

R7524 - Chow Sin Ting

9. Ms Chow Sin Ting made the following main points:

- (a) the Defence Land Agreement (DLA) of 1994 only required the provision of a berth for military vessels at the waterfront and not a military site. There was also no requirement that the military berth be owned or managed by the Garrison;
- (b) according to Article 14 of the Basic Law, matters of defence should be the responsibility of the Central Government. It was not the responsibility of the HKSAR Government to pay for the construction of the military facility required. Now that CMD was built using Hong Kong's tax payers' money, the management of CMD should be retained by the HKSAR Government and, in determining the use of the site, priority should be accorded to meet the needs of the people of Hong Kong;
- (c) after years of public consultation, the Government sought LegCo's approval for funding for the implementation of Central Reclamation Phase III (CRIII) in 2002. The plans submitted in the document indicated that the waterfront was for public use without any site demarcated for military use. It was on that basis that the funding request

was approved. Even upon the announcement of the construction of the military berth in 2007, the public was not informed of the demarcation of a site for military use. It was only in April 2013 that the public was informed that the site adjoining the military berth would be granted to the Garrison;

- (d) the use that was shown on the plan during the consultation process had always been a military berth along the harbour. There was no indication of any land area required to serve the military berth;
- (e) according to information that was available, the four buildings were for the provision of ancillary facilities including washroom, changing rooms, shower rooms, and supporting facilities for visitors. It was only in February 2013 that PlanD indicated that the ancillary facilities provided were mainly to serve the military berth;
- (f) as the site on which the four buildings were located was originally zoned “Open Space” on the OZP, planning permission should be obtained prior to the development of ancillary facilities for the military berth. By rezoning the site to “Other Specified Use” annotated “Military Use (1)” (“OU(MU)1”), the Government was trying to regularize an unauthorized development and the Board was forced to accept a *fait accompli*. As these actions were against procedural justice, the Board should not agree to the zoning amendment;
- (g) the Government only indicated that the Garrison had made a verbal promise that the CMD site would be open to the public when it was not in military use. However, there was no indication on the number of days that the site would be open to the public. Besides, as the site would be under the management of the Garrison, it could not be used as an open space. The rezoning of the site to “OU(MU)1” would empower the Garrison to close off the area from the public;

- (h) to balance the needs of the Garrison and the public, the Government should retain ownership of the site and, on a need basis, close the military dock and the surrounding area when the Garrison required it for military use. In fact, there was no need for the Garrison to be granted the site for use as a military berth. In the past, public piers such as Queen's Pier had served as places to receive Governors and royal visitors to the territory;
- (i) the current facilities being provided at the site proposed for military use mainly comprised duty rooms and pump rooms which did not serve any genuine military purposes. CMD would be used for berthing of vessels and, at times, for ceremonial functions. It would be a waste of precious land to zone the site for military use;
- (j) based on track records, military vessels of the Garrison would need to be berthed at the site only once every 3 to 4 years. Furthermore, as the dock would not serve as a military port, the military dock was of little significance to the Garrison. In this regard, the provision of a military berth along the waterfront would be more than adequate and there was no need for a site for military use. Indeed, a military dock for the Garrison had already been provided at Stonecutters Island;
- (k) the provision of a military site in Central would not serve any purpose from the defence point of view. If the military site was used for intelligence purposes, it could well become a military target in times of war and adversely affect Central as a financial centre; and
- (l) it was not necessary to proclaim Chinese sovereignty over the territory by locating a military berth in Central. The military dock at Stonecutters Island already served the purpose.

[Actual speaking time of R7524: 6 minutes]

10. Mr Lam Man Ho made the following main points:
- (a) objected to the rezoning of the CMD site. The root of the problem was that the Government had commenced construction of the military dock before obtaining any approval for the development of a military dock at the site;
 - (b) the Board should give a balanced consideration on whether there was a need for the provision of a military dock at the site and its impacts before making a decision on the rezoning of the CMD site for military use;
 - (c) the main justification provided by the Government for carrying out the Central and Wanchai Reclamation project was the provision of a major open space for the public. In this regard, the current proposal to rezone part of the site for the military dock was not justified;
 - (d) DLA only required leaving free 150m of the waterfront for the provision of a military dock. It did not specify the date when the military dock should be provided and there was no requirement that the site should be owned and managed by the Garrison;
 - (e) as sufficient land had already been provided to the Garrison for their use, including a military dock at Stonecutters Island which was of substantial size, it was not justified for the Garrison to require another military dock in Central. Besides, there was no justification to provide a site at such a central location for military use;
 - (f) the provision of the military site would adversely affect the open space along the waterfront as the public would not be able to enjoy that part of the waterfront promenade;
 - (g) the carrying out of military drills and parades at the military site would

adversely affect the general public;

- (h) the presence of a military site would affect people's lives in subtle ways. Taking the military barracks in Kowloon Tong as an example, the students in university hostels had to take a detour to the MTR station as the barracks stood in the middle of the direct route from student hostels to the MTR station;
- (i) the granting of the ownership and management of the site to the Garrison meant that Hong Kong would lose control over the site. Should any conflict or law enforcement issues arise, Hong Kong people would not be protected by the laws of Hong Kong as the site would be governed by the Garrison Law; and
- (j) although the land area of the site was only 0.3 ha, the implications arising from the use of the site for military purposes in conjunction with the Central Barracks nearby, such as military drills and parades, could affect a much larger area.

[Actual speaking time of R7082: 10 minutes]

R7580 - Li Kan Hung

11. Mr Li Kan Hung made the following main points:

- (a) contrary to the Government's claim that the proposal had undergone wide public consultation, the public were not aware of the proposed CMD at the site until early 2013, as reflected by the nearly 20,000 objections received by the Board;
- (b) the public was only consulted on CMD at this stage. It was not genuine public consultation as construction works at the site were nearing completion. The public consultation exercise served no purpose;

- (c) the only justification provided by the Government for the construction of CMD was DLA. The Government should explore whether amendments could be made to DLA to take account of changes in the circumstances including the public aspiration for a change. Taking the example of the treaties that led to the cessation of Hong Kong Island to the British Government in 1841 and of Kowloon Peninsula in 1860, these agreements had been changed in view of the changed circumstances resulting Hong Kong Island and Kowloon Peninsula being handed back to the People's Republic of China in 1997. Given the public sentiment against CMD, DLA should be amended in the same manner;
- (d) DLA did not state that a military dock needed to be built;
- (e) the presence of the Garrison in Central District in such a high profile would only remind the people of Hong Kong of the June 4 Incident;
- (f) although the current proposal was only for the use of 0.3 ha of land along the waterfront, the Board should give due consideration that the case would be a precedent for further land requirements from the Garrison in future; and
- (g) there was no need for the Garrison to own and manage the site. Should there be a need for the berthing of military vessels in Central, the Garrison could always request for permission for the vessels to be berthed at a public pier. In this regard, there was no need for the construction of CMD.

[Actual speaking time of R7580: 6 minutes]

R7764 – Pang Siu Fan Florence

12. Ms Pang Siu Fan made the following main points:

- (a) Central District was already congested with very little space available for office workers to rest or take a break during lunch time. It was also filled with domestic workers during weekends. In this regard, even though the amount of land proposed for military use was only about 0.3 ha, the site would be able to serve a much larger population if it was retained for open space use;
- (b) as the Board was charged to promote the health, safety, convenience and general welfare of the community, the Board was obliged to take these aspects into consideration when planning the use of a site and whether the proposed use was efficient use of land. In terms of promoting the health of the public, the proposed extension of CMD from a military berth of 150m in length to a 0.3 ha site for military use would fail to promote the physical and psychological health of the public. The proposed military site did not serve any practical purpose for the people of Hong Kong;
- (c) the proposed development of a military dock of 0.3 ha in Central would not only deprive Hong Kong people of precious open space but also adversely affect Hong Kong people's sense of security and jeopardise the safety of Hong Kong people;
- (d) even though public consultation for CMD was conducted, the situation had changed as the proposed CMD at the time of consultation only involved a military berth that was 150m in length along the waterfront while the current proposal was for a military dock that was 0.3 ha in area. The 150m long military berth would already serve the purpose of demonstrating the Central Government's sovereignty over Hong Kong;
- (e) given the political atmosphere of Hong Kong in recent years, the proposed development of a military dock of this scale in Central at this point in time would cause anxiety to the people of Hong Kong, reminding them of the June 4 Incident;

- (f) although the site would be open to the public when not in military use, Hong Kong people would lose control over the site as it would be up to the discretion of the Garrison to open up the site to the public. It was also uncertain whether the ancillary facilities that were provided in support of CMD would also be open to the public when not in military use; and
- (g) Hong Kong people currently had a good impression of the Garrison as it had been operating in a low profile. However, this public image of the Garrison would be adversely affected if they were granted the CMD site.

[Actual speaking time of R7764: 6 minutes]

13. As the representers had completed their presentations, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

[Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn returned to join the meeting at this point.]

14. In response to a Member's question on the process in dealing with the large number of representations and comments received by the Board, Miss Elsa Cheuk said that over 19,000 representations and comments were received respectively during the 2-month public exhibition of the OZP and in the first three weeks of the publication of the representations. The representations and comments were subsequently circulated to the relevant Government departments and bureaux for their comments and responses. A TPB Paper which summarized the representations and comments, consolidated responses from Government departments and bureaux on these representations and comments and provided an assessment of the case was then prepared for the consideration of the Board. All the points raised by the representers and commenters and the responses of the relevant Government departments were set out in Appendix II of the Paper. The purpose of the TPB Paper was to facilitate the Board to give consideration to the representations and comments, taking into account the views of the relevant Government departments.

15. The Chairman supplemented that the Board would consider all the representations and comments received (including the oral submissions made by the representers/commenters at the meeting), the views of the relevant Government bureaux/departments and all relevant planning considerations before making a decision on whether an amendment should be proposed to the OZP to meet the representations. If an amendment was proposed to the OZP, the proposed amendment would be published for further representations, followed by a hearing of the further representations, together with the original representers and commenters, by the Board. As a final step, the draft OZP together with all the representations, comments and further representations, if any, and the Board's decision would be submitted to CE in C for approval. The decision of CE in C would be final. The Chairman continued to say that the representation hearing procedure served a useful purpose as the background to the zoning amendment, the diverse public views received and the responses of the relevant Government departments would be made known to the representers/commenters.

16. In view of the concerns raised by some representers, the Vice-Chairman requested the representatives of PlanD to explain the necessity for the provision of a military dock in Central. In response, Miss Elsa Cheuk said that before the handover in 1997, the headquarters of the British Garrison at Tamar Basin used to have a naval basin and dock facilities which were affected by the Central Reclamation project commenced before 1997. When DLA was signed in 1994, it was stipulated in Annex III of the agreement that besides the re-provision of the existing military base at Stonecutters Island, 150m of the eventual permanent waterfront of the future Central and Wanchai Reclamation should be left free for the construction of a military dock after 1997 at a place close to the Prince of Wales Barracks (i.e. Central Barracks). In this regard, the military dock was one of the military facilities that had to be re-provisioned for defence purposes. In 2000, when the draft Central District (Extension) OZP No. S/H24/2 was first approved by CE in C, a military berth of 150m along the waterfront was designated on the OZP to reflect the proposed re-provision of the military dock as required by DLA.

17. The Vice-Chairman further requested the representatives of PlanD to explain the relationship between the military dock and reclamation works as well as whether there had been a change in the design of the military dock from the originally proposed 'military

berth' to the current proposal of a site designated for military use. In response, Miss Elsa Cheuk said that in the document submitted to LegCo's Public Works Subcommittee (PWSC) of Finance Committee in 2002 for funding approval for the proposed CRIII works, the overriding public need for the reclamation works was set out and the 'construction of a berth of about 150 m and associated facilities for use by the Chinese People's Liberation Army Forces Hong Kong' was included as part of the reclamation works. From the reclamation point of view, as CRIII had already adopted a minimum reclamation option that had satisfied the overriding public need test and the waterfront promenade and the CMD were only developed on land formed for the Central-Wanchai Bypass (CWB) and the re-provisioned facilities, the CMD proposal would not engage PHO as additional reclamation did not arise. Miss Cheuk continued to say that the PWSC Paper had also stated specifically the intention to open the military dock to the public as part of the future waterfront promenade when it was not in military use. This was agreed by the Garrison. In the public engagement exercise for the UDS, the public had been requested specifically to give their views on the location and design concept of the proposed military dock. In the Final Report of the UDS, there was a section specifically discussing the CMD as an issue raised by the public and the Government's response. The public had also been consulted on the proposed folding gates that would be used to close off the site when it was in military use and, when the site was not in military use, the area that would be made accessible by the public. The Central and Western District Council and the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island (HKTF) of the Harbourfront Commission were briefed on the architectural design of the military dock as part of the advance works of the promenade of the new Central harbourfront in 2010. In particular, perspectives of the military dock design with ancillary facilities were shown in the consultation documents.

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

18. In response to the Vice-Chairman's further enquiry on the size of the site proposed for CMD, Miss Elsa Cheuk said that while the total site area for CMD was 0.3 ha, the four ancillary structures within the site took up 220m² only. Most of the site would be open to the public when it was not in military use.

19. In response to the Chairman's question on the building height of the ancillary

facilities of CMD, Miss Elsa Cheuk made reference to a cross-section of the building accommodating the ancillary facilities and said that as the existing ground level of the waterfront promenade was at 4.2 mPD, the current building height restriction of 10mPD at the CMD site meant that any building to be erected on the site could not exceed 5.8 metres in height. In fact, the existing buildings on the site had a maximum building height of only 4.5 metres.

[Professor S.C. Wong left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

20. A Member enquired about the public engagement exercise, including the number of persons that participated in the exercise and the number of views received. In response, Miss Elsa Cheuk said that a 2-stage public engagement exercise was carried out under the UDS which commenced in March 2007. The Stage 1 Public Engagement Exercise was conducted in 2007 with the aim of setting the design objectives for the study. The Stage 2 Public Engagement Exercise was carried out in 2008 with the aim of focusing on the refined urban design framework and alternative design concepts for the key sites. In gist, the two large scale public exhibitions attracted 13,700 visitors while the seven roving exhibitions attracted 11,340 visitors. Focus group workshops were conducted and briefing sessions were held with the 18 District Councils, the Town Planning Board, the then Harbourfront Enhancement Committee, the Development Panel and the Home Affairs Panel of the Legislative Council, the Land and Building Advisory Committee and the Antiquities Advisory Board, as well as various professional institutes and organizations. Besides, 9 guided tours were conducted. Moreover, a consultancy firm had been engaged to help collect public opinions and the activities that were conducted included the dissemination and collection of comment cards during the roving exhibitions, focus group workshops and public forums; two rounds of questionnaire surveys; and telephone polls. A full day consolidation forum was also held in 2009 to discuss in detail the critical issues of the Study.

[Mr Clarence W.C. Leung left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

21. Noting that the zoning amendment for CMD was still at the representation hearing procedure, a Member enquired the reason why the ancillary facilities for CMD had

already been under construction and the current state of construction works. In response, Miss Elsa Cheuk said that as the military berth was shown on the OZP when it was first approved in 2000, it was a permitted use. The 4 ancillary structures directly related to a permitted use were always permitted and no separate planning permission from the Board would be required. The ancillary structures were currently nearing completion.

22. In response to the same Member's further enquiry, Miss Cheuk said that before the Central District (Extension) OZP No. S/H24/2 was approved by CE in C in 2000, the OZP had gone through a similar objection hearing procedure whereby the draft OZP was published for public comments, objections were heard by the Board, the draft OZP together with all the objections not withdrawn and the Board's decisions were submitted to CE in C for consideration and approval. On the OZP approved by CE in C in 2000, a straight line annotated '150m Military Berth (subject to detailed design)' was shown at the subject location. In this regard, the planned use of the site as a military berth had been clearly indicated on the OZP since 2000.

23. A Member enquired whether there was a difference in the terms used in DLA and on the OZP. In response, Miss Cheuk said that according to DLA, the Government was required to leave free 150 m of the eventual permanent waterfront for the construction of a military dock after 1997. When the draft OZP was first approved in 2000, as the design of the dock and the area it would occupy were not decided, the use was represented by a straight line annotated as '150m Military Berth (subject to detailed design)' on the OZP. Upon confirmation of the detailed design and delineation of the CMD, the term 'dock' was used to tally with the term used in DLA. In general, their primary functions were the same, i.e. berthing of military vessels.

24. In response to the same Member's further enquiry, Miss Cheuk said that the extent of reclamation for CRIII was determined on the basis of the overriding public need for the strategic infrastructure to be provided by CRIII. The location and design of the military dock was only determined after the extent of the reclamation had been finalized. In this regard, the existing waterfront would remain the same no matter whether CMD was provided or not. There was no additional reclamation required for CMD.

25. A Member raised a follow-up question on the difference between the terms “military berth” and “military dock”. In response, Miss Elsa Cheuk said that no matter which term was used, the requirement was the provision of a facility 150m in length on the waterfront for the berthing of military vessels together with the necessary ancillary facilities. In this regard, the terms “military berth” and “military dock” were similar.

26. A Member requested Miss Elsa Cheuk to further clarify the point raised by one representer regarding whether planning permission was required for the development of buildings ancillary to the military dock along the waterfront promenade. In response, Miss Elsa Cheuk said that the military berth was shown on the OZP when it was first approved in 2000. Hence, it was a permitted use. The four ancillary structures were facilities directly related to a permitted use, which were always permitted and no separate permission was required.

27. Noting that the Government was only required to construct a military dock on the waterfront and that one of the military facilities provided by the Government at Chek Lap Kok Airport was not zoned for military use, the same Member enquired whether it was necessary for the military dock to be zoned as “OU(MU)1” on the OZP. The Member noted that a passageway which was provided for use by the Garrison was also not zoned for military use. The Member referred to the view of a representer that the rezoning of the site for military use might affect the low-profile image of the Garrison. In response, Miss Elsa Cheuk said that the military facility at Chek Lap Kok Airport was zoned “OU(Airport Service Area)” on the Chek Lap Kok OZP. It was located within the closed area of the airport and was not accessible by the general public. In this regard, the zoning adopted for the military facility at Chek Lap Kok would not be appropriate for CMD. Given that the Garrison had already agreed to open up the area of the military dock for public use as part of the future waterfront promenade when it was not in military use, there should not be undesirable implication on the public image of the Garrison. The HKSAR Government would liaise with the Garrison on the detailed arrangements on the opening up of CMD when not in military use. The arrangements would be made known to the public in due course.

28. Noting the concern on law enforcement within the CMD site raised by the

representers at this and previous sessions of the meeting, the Chairman requested Miss Elsa Cheuk to explain the arrangement on this aspect. In response, Miss Elsa Cheuk said that according to the Garrison Law, controlling military facilities was one of the defence functions and responsibilities of the Hong Kong Garrison. Similar to other military facilities, CMD would be under the management and use by the Hong Kong Garrison. When CMD was not in military use, it would be open to the public as part of the waterfront promenade. Irrespective of whether the land was a private place or a public place, the police could carry out enforcement duties under the Hong Kong laws against social stability or other criminal acts.

29. In response to the Chairman's request to explain the land lease arrangement for CMD, Miss Elsa Cheuk said that under Article 7 of the Basic Law, all land within the territory of Hong Kong was state property. The HKSAR Government should be responsible for its management, use and development and for its lease or grant to individuals, legal persons or organizations for use or development. In accordance with the Garrison Law, controlling military facilities was one of the defence functions and responsibilities of the Hong Kong Garrison and CMD would be under the management and use by the Hong Kong Garrison. Pending the completion of all works and all the legal procedures, the military dock would be handed over to the Hong Kong Garrison for management and a land lease document would not be required.

30. In response to a Member's enquiry, Miss Elsa Cheuk said that CMD would be under the management and use by the Hong Kong Garrison. No requirements on the operational aspects or management of the site were specified in the Notes or the Explanatory Statement of the OZP.

31. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairman thanked the Government representatives, representers and representer's representative for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[The meeting took a break of 5 minutes.]

[Closed Meeting]

32. The Secretary reported that 2 letters dated 18.11.2013 received from the Central Harbourfront Concern Group and the Central and Western Concern Group respectively, bearing the same contents and issued by the same person (Ms Katty Law), were tabled at the meeting. The main concern raised was on the restrictions set out in the 'Guidance Notes on Attending the Meeting for Consideration of the Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H24/8'. Ms Law reiterated the complaint that the Permanent Secretary for Planning and Lands (PSPL) had a clear role conflict in chairing the meeting as the Development Bureau was the lead proponent for the current rezoning exercise. Ms Law demanded that the 10-minute restriction and other prohibitive measures should be lifted, the Board should resume its normal hearing procedures and the meeting should not be chaired by PSPL.

33. The Chairman said that the points raised in the two letters were not new and had been deliberated by the Board before. He suggested that the Secretariat reply to the two letters along the lines discussed previously. Members agreed.

34. Regarding the Board's invitation for representers who had requested for an extension of time to indicate the amount of time they needed, the Chairman said that only the Society for Protection of Harbour (SPH) and Designing Hong Kong Limited (DHK) had responded. The Secretary supplemented that while SPH said they would need 1 hour for their presentation, DHK said they needed 48 minutes. In this regard, it might not be necessary to hold an additional session for the hearing of representations and comments on 21.11.2013.

35. In response to a Member's suggestion to prepare a summary table on the public consultation exercise that had been conducted for CMD for easy reference by Members, the Secretary said and Members noted that the information had already been provided in the TPB Paper and had been further elaborated in the PowerPoint presentation given by PlanD.

36. As no more representer or their representatives arrived to attend the session of the meeting, the Chairman said that the meeting was adjourned at 11:20 a.m. and would be resumed at 9:00 a.m. on 20.11.2013.