

**Minutes of 1049<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 10.1.2014**

**Present**

Permanent Secretary for Development  
(Planning and Lands)  
Mr Thomas Chow

Chairman

Mr Stanley Y.F. Wong

Vice-chairman

Professor S.C. Wong

Professor P.P. Ho

Professor Eddie C.M. Hui

Dr C.P. Lau

Ms Julia M.K. Lau

Mr Clarence W.C. Leung

Mr Laurence L.J. Li

Mr Roger K.H. Luk

Ms Anita W.T. Ma

Dr W.K. Yau

Professor K.C. Chau

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 Patrick H.T. Lau

Ms Christina M. Lee

Mr H.F. Leung

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Mr F.C. Chan

Deputy Director (1), Environmental Protection Department  
Mr C.W. Tse

Director of Lands  
Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Assistant Director (2), Home Affairs Department  
Mr Eric K.S. Hui

Director of Planning  
Mr K.K. Ling

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

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Professor Edwin H.W. Chan

Mr Rock C.N. Chen

Mr Maurice W.M. Lee

Ms Bonnie J.Y. Chan

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport)  
Transport and Housing Bureau  
Miss Winnie M.W. Wong

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board  
Ms Brenda K. Y. Au

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr Raymond H.F. Au

**Agenda Item 1**

[Open Meeting]

**Confirmation of Minutes of the 1048<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 20.12.2013**

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The minutes of the 1048<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 20.12.2013 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

[Open Meeting]

**Matters Arising**

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

- (i) Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H24/8
- 

2. The Secretary said that a compliant had been lodged with the Legislative Council (LegCo) in respect of the draft Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H24/8. Professor Edwin H.W. Chan had declared an interest in this matter as his relative had submitted a representation in respect of the draft OZP. Members noted that Professor Chan had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

3. The Secretary said that on 11.12.2013, the Clerk to LegCo wrote to the Secretary for Development (SDEV) enclosing the complaint regarding the zoning amendment to the OZP for the Central Military Dock and requesting relevant bureaux/departments to provide background information on the case and responses to the complaint. The letter was subsequently referred to the Secretariat of the Town Planning Board (the Board) for reply with respect to the planning procedure and the submission made by the complainants. A reply to LegCo providing the requested information was issued by the Secretariat of the Board on 23.12.2013.

4. The Secretary continued to say that some LegCo members met with the complainants on 3.1.2014 to hear their views. On 6.1.2014, the Clerk to LegCo sent two letters to SDEV requesting the relevant government bureaux/departments and the Secretariat of the Board to provide further responses, if any, and to attend a case conference to be held on 14.1.2014. The Clerk to LegCo later informed that the case conference was rescheduled to early February 2014 and the exact date had yet to be confirmed.

5. The Secretary said that since the consideration of the representations and comments in respect of the OZP was still on-going under the statutory process, it would be inappropriate, according to the legal advice, for the Board to attend the LegCo case conference to discuss the issues. She supplemented that representatives from relevant government bureaux/departments, including the Planning Department, would attend the LegCo case conference.

6. In response to a Member's question, the Chairman said that the complaint was lodged by the Central Harbourfront Concern Group and being processed by the Public Complaints Office of the LegCo Secretariat.

7. The Chairman said and Members noted that according to legal advice, it would not be appropriate for the Board to attend LegCo meetings related to the rezoning exercise when the hearing and deliberation had not been completed. The Secretariat of the Board would reply to the Clerk to LegCo to explain that. The relevant correspondence would be copied to Members for reference.

(ii) Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Sha Tau Kok Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-STK/1, Draft Lin Ma Hang Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-LMH/1, Draft Ta Kwu Ling North Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-TKLN/1, Draft Man Kam To Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-MKT/1 and Draft Ma Tso Lung & Hoo Hok Wai Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-MTL/1

---

8. The Secretary said that on 19.7.2013, the draft Sha Tau Kok Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/NE-STK/1, draft Lin Ma Hang OZP No. S/NE-LMH/1, draft Ta Kwu

Ling North OZP No. S/NE-TKLN/1, draft Man Kam To OZP No. S/NE-MKT/1 and draft Ma Tso Lung & Hoo Hok Wai OZP No. S/NE-MTL/1 were exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance. On 20.12.2013, the Town Planning Board (the Board) agreed that the representations and comments in respect of each of the five draft OZPs would be heard by the full Board collectively in one group.

[Dr C.P. Lau, Ms Anita W.T. Ma, Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn and Mr C.W. Tse arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

9. The Secretary continued to say that on 30.12.2013, two emails were received from Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation (KFBGC) requesting for the arrangement of separate hearing sessions for the environmental/non-governmental organisations and the villagers/landowners in order to ensure a better environment for expressing their views and to avoid a reoccurrence of the verbal conflict between the two groups during the hearing of the further representations on the proposed amendments to the draft Lin Ma Hang Development Permission Area (DPA) Plan on 11.11.2011. KFBGC also indicated that the same request had been made by other green/concern groups including World Wide Fund Hong Kong, Hong Kong Bird Watching Society, Green Power and Designing Hong Kong Limited. A hearing arrangement with separate hearing sessions for green/concern groups and local villagers had been adopted in the consideration of representations and comment in respect of the draft Yi O DPA Plan on 10.5.2013.

10. The Secretary informed Members that in view of the requests from the green/concern groups, the hearing arrangement for the five draft OZPs had been further reviewed. In respect of the Sha Tau Kok OZP, Lin Ma Hang OZP and Ma Tso Lung & Hoo Hok Wai OZP, there were two main groups amongst the representations and comments: (i) those relating to the general issues of conservation of the natural environment/habitats, and (ii) those relating to specific zonings on the OZPs. It was recommended that the representations and related comments for each of these three OZPs be heard by the full Board in two groups accordingly. As for the Ta Kwu Ling North OZP and Man Kam To OZP, no change to the hearing of the representations and comments by the full Board in one group was proposed since no representations and/or comments from the rural sector had been received.

11. The Chairman said that in the previous hearing for the draft Lin Ma Hang DPA Plan, some further representers had been disturbed by other further representers during their presentations. In view of the concern of the green/concern groups and that similar arrangement had been adopted in the Yi O case, the requests of green/concern groups could be acceded to. Details of the meeting and operational arrangements would be worked out by the Secretariat of the Board if the proposed arrangement was agreeable to Members.

12. After deliberation, the Board agreed to the proposed hearing arrangement for the consideration of representations and comments in respect of the five draft OZPs as set out in paragraph 10 above.

[Mr Clarence W.C. Leung arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Sha Tin, Tai Po and North District

**Agenda Item 3**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

Review of Application No. A/NE-PK/43

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) – Small House)

in “Recreation” zone, Lot 2337 RP in D.D. 91, Ping Kong, Sheung Shui, New Territories (TPB Paper No. 9508)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

Presentation and Question Session

13. The following representative of the Planning Department (PlanD), the applicant and her representative were invited to the meeting at this point:

Mr C.K. Soh - District Planning Officer/Shan Tin, Tai Po & North (DPO/STN), PlanD

- Ms Li Ying Ping - Applicant
- Mr K.K. Sit - Applicant's representative

14. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the review hearing. He then invited Mr C.K. Soh, DPO/STN, to brief Members on the review application.

15. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr C.K. Soh presented the review application and covered the following main points as detailed in the TPB Paper:

- (a) the applicant sought planning permission for the development of a proposed house (New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) - Small House) on the application site which fell within an area zoned "Recreation" ("REC") on the approved Ping Kong Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/NE-PK/11;
- (b) the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) rejected the application on 6.9.2013 for the following reasons:
  - (i) the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the "REC" zone in the Ping Kong area which was primarily for recreational developments for the use of the general public. It encouraged the development of active and/or passive recreation and tourism/eco-tourism. There was no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention;
  - (ii) the application did not comply with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in New Territories in that there was sufficient land within the "Village Type Development" ("V") zone of Ping Kong Village to meet the Small House demand. It was considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development close to the



existing village cluster for orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services; and

- (iii) approval of the application which did not comply with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in New Territories would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications in the “REC” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such similar applications would result in a general degradation of the environment of the area and adverse traffic impact;
- (c) the justifications put forth by the applicant in support of the review application were summarised in paragraph 3 of the TPB Paper and highlighted as follows:
- (i) the application site was located in the vicinity of existing domestic structures, houses and the sites of two Small House applications previously approved by Town Planning Board (the Board). The proposed development was therefore in line with the planning intention of the “REC” zone;
  - (ii) since vacant government land within “V” zone would not be released for NTEH/Small House development and landowners would reserve their land within “V” zone for their descendants for Small House development, it would have made the assessment in respect of ‘sufficient land in “V” zone for Small House development’ unreal. If land within “V” zone was available to the applicant, the proposed Small House development could proceed without going through the planning application process; and
  - (iii) there were two supporting and nine opposing local public comments on the application at the section 16 application stage. The local villagers objected to the application for the reason that ‘cross-village’ Small House applications should not be allowed in

Ping Kong. The applicant for the Small House application and his ancestors had been living in harmony with their villager neighbours for more than ten decades and would never object the lawful development rights of other villagers for Small House development. The Board should act impartially and approve the application so as to reduce similar unfounded objections in future;

- (d) the application site, with an area of about 269m<sup>2</sup>, was located within the village 'environs' ('VE') of Ping Kong Village. It was partly deposited with construction materials, partly covered with wild grasses and surrounded by vacant land, agricultural land intermixed with domestic structures. The "V" zone of Ping Kong Village was located to the north-east of the application site;
- (e) there was no previous planning application for NTEH/Small House development on the application site. Moreover, there were two similar applications for Small House development within the same "REC" zone in the Ping Kong area since the first promulgation of the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House development in New Territories (the Interim Criteria) on 24.11.2000. These two applications were approved with conditions by the RNTPC on 28.6.2002 and 2.9.2011 respectively on grounds that the applications complied with the Interim Criteria as the footprint of the proposed Small Houses fell entirely within the 'VE' of Ping Kong Village and there was a general shortage of land in meeting the demand for Small House development in the "V" zone of the same village; the proposed developments were not incompatible with the surrounding rural and village environment; the proposed developments would unlikely have significant adverse environmental and traffic impacts on the surrounding areas; and relevant Government departments had no adverse comments on or no objection to the applications;
- (f) departmental comments – the departmental comments were summarised in paragraph 5 of the TPB Paper. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries

and Conservation maintained his view of not supporting the application from the perspective of agricultural development as the application site had high potential for agricultural rehabilitation. Although the applicant had indicated that the proposed development would not cause damage to the branches and roots of trees, some trees adjacent to the application site might be affected. The Commissioner for Transport had reservation on the application as Small House development should be confined within the “V” zone as far as possible. Although additional traffic generated by the proposed development was not expected to be significant, such type of development outside the “V” zone, if permitted, would set an undesirable precedent case for similar applications in the future and the resulting cumulative adverse traffic impact could be substantial. Other Government departments consulted generally had no adverse comment on or no objection to the review application. The District Lands Officer/North, Lands Department (DLO/N, LandsD) advised that any application for Small House grant, including private treaty grant on Government land, should be submitted by a native indigenous villager and the Government land under application should be located inside the ‘VE’. If the applicant was not an indigenous villager eligible for Small House grant, the Small House application would not be considered by his office. The latest figures of outstanding Small House applications and forecast of Small House demand for 10-year period (2013 to 2023) for Ping Kong were 23 and 35 respectively, with the latter provided by the relevant Indigenous Inhabitants Representative without any supporting evidence and was not verified;

- (g) public comments – six public comments were received from a North District Council (NDC) member, Designing Hong Kong Limited (DHKL) and local villagers during the statutory publication period of the review application. The NDC member supported the application as it could facilitate villagers to build Small House. DHKL objected to the application mainly on the grounds that the proposed development was incompatible with the “REC” zone; there was a lack of plan for a sustainable village layout to ensure the health and well-being of the

current and future residents; and most villagers build Small Houses for financial gain and not for domestic purpose. The remaining four public comments from local villagers objected to the application on the grounds that village land should be reserved for indigenous villagers of their own clan and the proposed development would affect the drainage improvement project in the vicinity;

- (h) PlanD's views – PlanD did not support the review application based on the planning considerations and assessments as set out in paragraph 7 of the TPB Paper, which were summarised below:
  - (i) the application site fell entirely within the “REC” zone which was primarily for recreational developments for the use of the general public and encouraged the development of active and/or passive recreation and tourism/eco-tourism. The applicant had not given strong planning justifications in the review application, except that the Small House application was compatible with the surrounding land uses, to demonstrate that the proposed Small House development was in line with the planning intention of the “REC” zone or warranted a departure from this planning intention;
  - (ii) the application did not comply with the Interim Criteria as there was sufficient land (about 3.17 ha for 126 Small House sites) within the “V” zone of Ping Kong Village to meet the outstanding and 10-year Small House forecast demand of 23 and 35 respectively (equivalent to a land requirement of 1.45 ha);
  - (iii) the two similar applications for Small House developments (No. A/NE-PK/22 and 28) within the same “REC” zone in the vicinity of the application site were approved by the RNTPC in 2002 and 2011 respectively and at that point of time, there was a general shortage of land in meeting the demand for Small House developments in Ping Kong Village, thus sympathetic consideration was given to these applications. The subject

application did not warrant the same consideration as there was no general shortage of land within the “V” zone. Approval of the subject application which was not in compliance with the Interim Criteria would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications in the “REC” zone;

- (iv) DLO/N, LandsD advised that an application for Small House grant could be submitted by a native indigenous villager and each case would be processed in accordance with the Small House Policy. So far, no Small House application for the subject site had been received by DLO/N. In respect of private land within the “V” zone, whether the landowners would sell their land to buyers for Small House development was a market decision which was outside the purview of the Board;
- (v) regarding the public comments from local villagers, it should be noted that the Board would consider and decide on each application based on individual merits, taking into account the departmental comments as well as the public comments received/local views relayed by the respective District Officer; and
- (vi) there had been no material change in planning circumstances for the application site and its surrounding areas since the rejection of the application by the RNTPC.

16. The Chairman then invited the applicant and her representative to elaborate on the review application. Ms Li Ying Ping, the applicant, made the following main points:

- (i) she was the owner of the application site;
- (ii) the application site was purchased in the hope that the application for NTEH/Small House would be approved by the Board for her retirement life;

- (iii) there were similar planning applications approved by the Board in the vicinity of the application site;
- (iv) the reduction in the Small House demand within the “V” zone of Ping Kong Village should not be a ground for rejecting the application; and
- (v) it was hoped that sympathetic consideration would be given to the application.

17. Mr K.K. Sit, the applicant’s representative, made the following main points:

- (i) in order to reduce unnecessary disputes between different clans, ‘cross-village’ Small House applications were generally acceptable in Sheung Shui Heung under the consensus of local villagers and such good practice should be respected;
- (ii) according to the comments relayed by the District Officer (North), Home Affairs Department (DO(N), HAD) at the section 16 application stage, the Vice-chairman of NDC and the Chairman of Sheung Shui District Rural Committee (SSDRC) had no comment on the application;

[Mr Ivan C.S. Fu arrived to join and Ms Julia M.K. Lau left the meeting at this point.]

- (iii) the Drainage Services Department had no in-principle objection to the application from drainage viewpoint. The application site did not fall within the drainage improvement project area for Ping Kong. Public sewerage works would be provided in Ping Kong and completed in 2015, before the completion of the proposed NTEH/Small House development;
- (iv) the grounds of objection provided in the public comments were unfounded and unreasonable. The Board should act impartially

and approve the current application; and

- (v) rejecting the current application would set an undesirable precedent and might intensify the dispute between different clans regarding the issue of 'cross-village' Small House applications.

18. As the presentations from the representative of PlanD, the applicant and her representative had been completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

19. Noting that the Chairman of SSDRC had submitted a public comment objecting to the application at the section 16 application stage, the Chairman asked the applicant's representative to point out the relevant part of the TPB Paper which recorded that the Chairman of SSDRC had no comment on the application. With the aid of the visualiser, Mr K.K. Sit said that according to the comments relayed by DO(N), HAD in paragraph 10 of Appendix IV of the RNTPC Paper (i.e. Annex A of the TPB Paper), the Chairman of SSDRC had no comment on the application. Mr Sit said that although the Chairman of SSDRC had also submitted a public comment objecting to the application, this objection was raised by the local villagers and the Chairman of SSDRC was forced by them to sign on it. 'Cross-village' Small House applications were accepted in Sheung Shui Heung under the consensus of various clans in order to minimise dispute, and both DO(N), HAD and DLO/N, LandsD were aware of such practice. Upon further enquiry by the Chairman, Mr Sit said that it was only his guess that the Chairman of SSDRC was forced by the villagers to sign the objection. He would withdraw that statement.

20. In response to the question of a Member, Ms Li Ying Ping said that she bought the application site in 2012.

21. The Chairman asked the applicant how the proposed NTEH/Small House development would be implemented as only male indigenous villagers were eligible for Small House development under the Small House Policy. Ms Li Ying Ping said that a male relative of her, who was an indigenous villager of Sheung Shui Heung, would apply for a Small House grant on her land and they would co-use the Small House in future. Mr K.K. Sit supplemented that the name of the indigenous villager had been provided in the planning application.

22. As the applicant and her representative had no further comment to make and Members had no further questions, the Chairman informed the applicant and her representative that the hearing procedure for the review application had been completed. The Board would inform the applicant of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the applicant, her representative and the representative of PlanD for attending the meeting. They all left the meeting at this point.

#### Deliberation Session

23. Members noted that the issue of 'cross-village' Small House applications as submitted by the applicant's representative was not a relevant planning consideration. They also noted that the applicant was not eligible for Small House grant.

24. A Member said that no new or strong planning justifications had been put forward by the applicant to support the review application. This Member did not support the application.

25. Members generally agreed that the proposed Small House was not in line with the planning intention of the "REC" zone and land was still available within the "V" zone of Ping Kong Village for Small House development. There was no change in planning circumstances after rejection of the section 16 planning application, and the applicant had not put forward any further valid grounds to support a departure from the previous decision of the RNTPC.

26. After deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application on review. Members then went through the reasons for rejection as stated in paragraph 8.1 of the Paper and considered that they were appropriate. The reasons were:

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Recreation” (“REC”) zone in the Ping Kong area which is primarily for recreational developments for the use of the general public. The “REC” zone is to encourage the development of active and/or passive recreation



and tourism/eco-tourism. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention;

- (b) the application does not comply with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for New Territories Exempted House (NTEH)/Small House in New Territories in that there is sufficient land within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Ping Kong Village to meet the Small House demand. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development close to the existing village cluster for orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services; and
- (c) approval of the application which does not comply with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in New Territories would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications in the “REC” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such similar applications would result in a general degradation of the environment of the area and adverse traffic impact.”

#### **Agenda Item 4**

[Open Meeting]

Request for Deferment of Review of Application No. A/K9/250

Proposed Hotel in “Residential (Group A)” zone, 54–56 Ma Tau Wai Road, Hung Hom (TPB Paper No. 9507)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

27. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests in this item:

Professor Edwin H.W. Chan	-	living in a quarters in Hung Hom provided and owned by the Polytechnic University
---------------------------	---	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- Mr Maurice W.M. Lee - owning two shops at Bulkeley Street and Ma Tau Wai Road
- Mr F.C. Chan - owning a flat in Laguna Verde
- Ms Christina M Lee - owning a flat with her spouse at Oi King Street
- Professor P.P. Ho - having business dealing with CKM Asia Ltd. which was a consultant of the applicant, and his spouse owned a flat in Harbour Place
- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having business dealing with Lanbase Surveyors Ltd. which was a consultant of the applicant
- Professor S.C. Wong - being the Director of the Institute of Transport Studies of the University of Hong Kong and CKM Asia Ltd. had sponsored some of its activities

28. Members noted that the applicant had requested for deferment and agreed that the above Members could stay in the meeting but should be refrained from involving in the discussion. Members also noted that Mr Lee and Professor Chan had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

29. The Secretary reported that on 24.12.2013, the applicant requested the Town Planning Board (the Board) to defer making a decision on the review application for two months to allow more time for the applicant to prepare supplementary information in support of the application. This was the first request from the applicant for deferment of the review hearing.

30. Members noted that the justification met the criteria for deferment as set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Deferment of Decision on Representations, Comments, Further Representations and Applications made Under the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 33) in that more time was required by the applicant to prepare

supplementary information, the deferment period was not indefinite and the deferment would not affect the right or interests of other parties.

31. After deliberation, the Board agreed to defer a decision on the review application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information by the applicant. The Board also agreed that the review application should be submitted to the Board for consideration within three months upon receipt of further submission from the applicant. The applicant should be advised that the Board had allowed a maximum period of two months for preparation of submission of further information and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

#### Procedural Matter

#### **Agenda Item 5**

[Open Meeting]

Submission of the Draft Kuk Po, Fung Hang and Yung Shue Au Development Permission Area Plan No. DPA/NE-KP/1A to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval under Section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance

(TPB Paper No. 9556)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

32. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. On 8.3.2013, the draft Kuk Po, Fung Hang and Yung Shue Au Development Permission Area (DPA) Plan No. DPA/NE-KP/1 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). During the 2-month exhibition period, 12 representations were received. On 24.5.2013, the representations were published for public comments for three weeks and no comment was received. On 6.12.2013, after giving consideration to the representations, the Town Planning Board (the Board) noted the supportive views of R6(part) to R12(part), and decided not to uphold R1 to R5 and R6(part) to R12(part) and not to amend the draft DPA Plan to meet the representations.

33. As the representation consideration process had been completed, the draft DPA Plan was ready for submission to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval.

34. After deliberation, the Board:

- (a) agreed that the draft Kuk Po, Fung Hang and Yung Shue Au DPA Plan No. DPA/NE-KP/1A and its Notes were suitable for submission under section 8 of the Ordinance to the CE in C for approval;
- (b) endorsed the updated Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft Kuk Po, Fung Hang and Yung Shue Au DPA Plan No. DPA/NE-KP/1A as an expression of the planning intention and objectives of the Board for the draft Kuk Po, Fung Hang and Yung Shue Au DPA Plan and issued under the name of the Board; and
- (c) agreed that the updated ES was suitable for submission to the CE in C together with the draft DPA Plan.

**Agenda Item 6**

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

35. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 9:35 a.m.