

**Minutes of 1132nd Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 20.1.2017**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Mr Michael W.L. Wong

Chairman

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-Chairman

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Professor K.C. Chau

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Ms Christina M. Lee

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)

Mr C.W. Tse

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport)³

Transport and Housing Bureau

Mr Andy S.H. Lam

Deputy Director of Lands/General
Ms Karen P. Y. Chan

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr H.W. Cheung

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr H.F. Leung

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Wendy W.L. Li

Agenda Item 1

[Open meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1131st meeting held on 6.1.2017

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The minutes of the 1131st meeting held on 6.1.2017 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

[Open meeting]

Matters Arising

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

(i) Approval of Draft Outline Zoning Plans

2. The Secretary reported that on 3.1.2017, the Chief Executive in Council approved the following draft Outline Zoning Plans (OZPs) under section 9(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance:

- (a) draft Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau OZP (renumbered as S/H15/31);
- (b) draft Fanling/Sheung Sheung OZP (renumbered as S/FSS/22); and
- (c) draft Kuk Po, Fung Hang & Yung Shue Au OZP (renumbered as S/NE-KP/2).

3. Members noted that the approvals of the OZPs were notified in the Gazette on 13.1.2017.

(ii) Reference Back of Approved Outline Zoning Plan

4. The Secretary reported that on 3.1.2017, the Chief Executive in Council referred the approved Tuen Mun Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TM/33 to the Town Planning Board for amendment under section 12(1)(b)(ii) of the Town Planning Ordinance. The reference back of the OZP was notified in the Gazette on 13.1.2017.

Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West District

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/YL-HT/1040

Proposed Temporary Training Centre (Construction Lifting Crane) with Ancillary Office and Machinery Repair Workshop for a Period of 3 years in “Agriculture” zone, Lot No. 298RP (Part) in D.D. 128, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long, New Territories
(TPB Paper No. 10235)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

5. The Secretary reported the application site (the Site) was located in Ha Tsuen and Ms Janice W.M. Lai had declared interest in the item as her spouse was a shareholder of a company which owned two pieces of land in Ha Tsuen. The meeting noted that Ms Lai had tendered apologies for not being able to attend the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

6. The following representative from the Planning Department (PlanD) was invited to the meeting at this point:

Mr David C.M. Lam

- District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (DPO/TM&YLW), PlanD

7. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the review hearing. He said that the applicant had indicated not to attend the review hearing and then invited Mr David C.M. Lam, DPO/TM&YLW, to brief Members on the review application.

8. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr David C.M. Lam briefed Members on the background of the review, including the consideration of the application by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board), justifications provided by the applicant, and planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper.

9. As the presentation of PlanD's representative had been completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

10. The Chairman and a Member raised the following questions:

- (a) the zoning and current situation in respect of the residential dwelling located to the northwest of the Site; and
- (b) the current progress concerning enforcement actions against the unauthorized developments (UDs) found on the Site.

11. In response, Mr David C.M. Lam made the following main points:

- (a) the subject residential dwelling fell within the "Agriculture" ("AGR") zone and according to recent site inspections, it was occupied for residential use; and
- (b) Enforcement Notices (ENs) requiring the discontinuation of the UD were issued in May and June 2016. Since the UD had not been discontinued upon expiry of the ENs, further enforcement/prosecution actions would be taken following the established practice.

12. As Members had no further questions, the Chairman said that the hearing procedures for the review application were completed. The Board would further deliberate on the review application in the absence of the government representative and would inform the applicant of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairman thanked DPO/TM&YLV for attending the meeting. He left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation

13. Some Members made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the "AGR" zone;
- (b) no strong justifications had been provided by the applicant on review for the Board to depart from the RNTPC's decision of rejecting the application;
- (c) while the applicant had claimed that he had obtained approval from the Labour Department for running the training courses at the Site, it would be up to the Board to decide whether the use of the Site for training purposes was suitable;
- (d) as the current application was a "Destroy First, Build Later" case, it should not be approved as it would set an undesirable precedent; and
- (e) since a Tin Hau Temple of religious importance was located in the vicinity of the Site, the rural environment should be maintained and the proposed development was not supported.

14. After deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application on review for the following reasons:

- “ (a) the development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone which is intended primarily to retain

and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes. There is no strong planning justification to merit a departure from such planning intention, even on a temporary basis;

- (b) the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would not generate adverse ecological, landscape, drainage and environmental impacts; and
- (c) the approval of the application, even on a temporary basis, would set an undesirable precedent for applications for other developments within the “AGR” zone, the cumulative effect of which would result in a general degradation of the environment. ”

[Mr Philip S.L. Kan and Mr Alex T.H. Lai arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting]

Further Consideration of Review Study of Kai Tak Development and Proposed Amendments to the Approved Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K22/4
(TPB Paper No. 10236)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

15. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments to the approved Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K22/4 involved four residential sites that were reserved for public housing developments by the Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The consultants of the Review Study of Kai Tak Development (the Review) included AECOM Asia Co. Limited (AECOM) and Urbis Limited

(Urbis) and Leigh & Orange Limited (L&O), and the Harbourfront Commission (HC) was consulted on the proposals of the Review. The following Members had declared interests in the item for having affiliations/business dealings with HKHA, HC or business dealings with the consultants:

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| Mr Michael W.L. Wong
<i>(as Permanent Secretary for
Development (Planning and
Lands)</i>
<i>(The Chairman)</i> | - | being an official member of HC |
| Mr Raymond K.W. Lee
<i>(as Director of Planning)</i> | - | being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and Building Committee of HKHA; and an official member of HC |
| Ms Karen P.Y. Chan
<i>(as Deputy Director of
Lands/General)</i> | - | being an alternate member for the Director of Lands who was a member of HKHA |
| Mr Martin W.C. Kwan
<i>(as Chief Engineer (Works), Home
Affairs Department)</i> | - | being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of SPC and the Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA |
| Mr H.F. Leung | - | being a member of the Tender Committee of HKHA |
| Mr Stephen L.H. Liu | - | having current business dealings with HKHA |
| Dr C.H. Hau |] | having current business dealings with HKHA |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau |] | and AECOM |
| Mr Ivan C.S. Fu |] | having current business dealings with HKHA, |
| Ms Janice W.M. Lai |] | AECOM and Urbis |

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| Mr K.K. Cheung
Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - | their company having current business dealings with Urbis |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - | having current business dealings with HKHA and past business dealings with AECOM; and his company having current business dealings with Urbis |
| Professor S.C. Wong
(<i>The Vice-chairman</i>) | - | being the Chair Professor and Head of Department of Civil Engineering of the University of Hong Kong where AECOM had business dealings with some colleagues and had sponsored some activities of the Department before |
| Mr Franklin Yu | - | having past business dealings with HKHA, AECOM and Urbis |
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam | - | having past business dealings with HKHA, AECOM and current business dealings with L&O |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon | - | his spouse being an employee of HD but not involved in planning work |

16. Members noted that Ms Janice W.M. Lai and Mr H.F. Leung had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting while Mr Franklin Yu had not yet arrived to join the meeting. According to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board (the Board), as the public housing development sites were the subject of amendments to the OZP proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the interests of those Members with affiliations/business dealings with HKHA only needed to be recorded and they should be allowed to stay in the meeting. As for those Members who had declared interests for having affiliations with HC or current/past business dealings with the consultants, the meeting

considered those interests remote/indirect and agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

17. The following government representatives and consultants were invited to the meeting at this point:

PlanD

Mr Tom C.K. Yip - District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K)

Mr Stephen C.Y. Chan Senior Town Planner/Kowloon 3

Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)

Mr Peter S.K. Chui - Chief Engineer/Kowloon (1) (CE/K(1))

Mr Edmund P. W. Chan Senior Engineer/Kowloon (6) (SE/K(6))

AECOM

Mr Vincent H.S. Au Yeung - Technical Director

Mr Steven C.W. Wong - Associate

Mr Simon T.K. Lee - Senior Engineer

Urbis

Mr Alan Macdonald - Director

L&O

Mr David N. Standford - Principal Director

Ms Jennifer T.T. Chik - Senior Architect

18. The Chairman invited the representatives of PlanD to brief Members on the Paper.

19. Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, drew Members' attention to the letter dated 19 January 2017 submitted by HC, which was tabled at the meeting. The letter summed up HC's views on the three refined schemes for the development proposals at the former runway (Area 4) arising from the presentation made by PlanD and CEDD to HC on 13.12.2016. In gist, HC considered that given the prime location of the Kai Tak Development (KTD), the development proposals should demonstrate innovative urban design elements and diversity, while complying with the established Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines (HPPG), and that the refined schemes represented improvements in urban design and more areas in KTD should be set aside for subsidized housing. Mr Yip also tabled Figures 1 to 5 at the meeting, which were the updated attachments to the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/4A (Attachment III of Paper No.10236) (the Paper). He added that two petition letters were received shortly before the meeting from a Legislative Council Member Hon. Jeremy M.H. Tam and a Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC) Member Mr W.C. Tang respectively, objecting to the proposed amendment to the approved Kai Tak OZP involving the development of a new campus building for the Vocational Training Council (VTC) at a Cha Kwo Ling waterfront site. The latter also enclosed opposing views and comments from the residents of Laguna City.

20. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, briefed Members on the further consideration of the Review, including its background, the views collected from the consulted bodies on the proposals of the Review as well as the three refined schemes for Area 4, the formulation of the final refined scheme and the overall proposed amendments to the approved OZP including the proposed VTC Campus as detailed in the Paper. Members noted that a physical model of KTD was displayed at the meeting for Members' reference.

[Mr Franklin Yu, Mr C.W. Tse, Miss Winnie W.M. Ng and Ms Christina M. Lee arrived to join the meeting during DPO/K's presentation.]

21. As the presentation of PlanD's representative was completed, the Chairman then invited questions and comments from Members.

22. The Chairman remarked that since the briefing to the Board on the proposals of the Review by PlanD and CEDD in October 2016, some of the original proposals had been enhanced taking into account the Board's views. The relevant DCs, HC and its Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (Task Force) had subsequently been consulted on the proposals. The current meeting was to consider if the proposed amendments to the approved Kai Tak OZP and its Notes and ES were suitable for exhibition for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance).

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

23. The Vice-chairman and some Members raised the following questions and views:

Area 4

Former Airport Runway

- (a) referring to the former airport runway as shown in Plan 15b of the Paper, what the basis was for maintaining the linear shape of the runway in the design and layout of the future developments, which appeared to be lacking in aesthetic appeal;
- (b) whether the various development sites in Area 4 could have variations in size or be merged to form a large site to facilitate more interesting or innovative urban design;

Building Heights

- (c) the basis for the building heights (BHs) formulated under the final refined scheme, as compared to those of other refined schemes;
- (d) with reference to the photomontage in slide No. 20 showing the public vantage point of Quarry Bay Park towards KTD, the tallest buildings under the final refined scheme had not yet breached the 20% building free zone (BFZ) under the ridgelines of Lion Rock. Whether there was scope to increase the proposed BHs of those buildings so as to maximize development opportunities while preserving the 20% BFZ;

- (e) referring to the same photomontage, whether those buildings in Kowloon Bay that had breached the mountain ridgelines were existing buildings;
- (f) whether the proposed BH of the hotel site (i.e. Site 4C5) was the same as that of the neighbouring residential site. Taking into account the proposed increase in BHs for those residential sites located in the core area, whether the proposed BHs for the two hotel sites (i.e. Sites 4B5 and 4C5), which were located at the southern edge of Area 4, could be reduced to achieve a better BH profile on the former runway as a whole;

Plot Ratios

- (g) further clarification on the plot ratios (PRs) adopted in the final refined scheme;
- (h) whether there was scope to further increase the PRs;

Landmarks to Promote Tourism

- (i) whether the KTD contained any proposals for developing a landmark to promote Hong Kong's tourism, with reference to the Gardens By the Bay in Singapore as an example. Uniqueness should be a key feature of any landmark;
- (j) to commemorate the history of the former airport, a museum could be considered to showcase the rich history of the former airport or an old aircraft could be placed at the take-off location of the former runway;

Walkability and Accessibility/Connectivity

- (k) whether more information could be provided as to the walkability of the waterfront promenade, pedestrian networks and activity nodes (e.g. linkage between residential developments and the 'tourism node') in the waterfront of the former runway, and whether people from all walks of life with different spending power had been catered for in Area 4;
- (l) the proposed widths of those pedestrian precincts/streets surrounding the development sites in Area 4;

- (m) the linear shape of the former runway would involve long walking distances between various activity nodes located in the former runway and the rest of the KTD. Careful consideration should be given to enhancing walkability between those activity nodes and cycling might be a good option for reaching activity nodes. Whether cycling had been considered in the planning and design of the pedestrian connections and open spaces of the KTD;

Heritage Trails

- (n) whether more information could be provided regarding the two proposed heritage trails along the former runway;

Transport and Traffic

- (o) whether the final public transport mode for the Environmentally Friendly Linkage System (EFLS) had been confirmed;
- (p) any further details on the development programme for the EFLS and other major transport networks (e.g. road construction);
- (q) whether there would be any changes in terms of traffic impact during the peak hours arising from the proposed revisions as compared with that of the original proposals under the Review;

Kai Tak Sports Park

- (r) whether special arrangements would be made for dispersing the crowd from the sports stadium at Kai Tak Sports Park (KTSP), where major events would be held;
- (s) whether activities in the sports stadium would give rise to noise impact on the surrounding residential developments; and

Water Quality of Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter and Kai Tak Approach Channel

- (t) the progress of works for improving the water quality of Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter (KTTS) and Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC) and whether there was any target for water quality to facilitate sports and recreational activities.

24. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip of PlanD and Mr Peter S.K. Chui of CEDD made the following main points:

Area 4

Former Airport Runway

- (a) the former airport runway itself was a feature of historical interest. Under the approved Kai Tak OZP, the design and layout of the future development followed the elongated shape of the former runway with the intention of respecting and showcasing the runway's history. The centre of the runway would be the Central Boulevard where a landscaped deck would be provided serving as an open space as well as a pedestrian walkway, and from the tip of the runway the public could enjoy the vista to Lei Yue Mun, so as to recap the flight take-off memory;
- (b) under the approved Kai Tak OZP, the development sites along the runway had been delineated to facilitate development of an appropriate scale on each individual site. To address the concerns on the linear layout, more variations in BH profile would be introduced by proposing low blocks of six to eight storeys in each residential site. A 15m wide non-building area (NBA) had also been incorporated into Sites 4A1 and 4A2, which were the most elongated sites in Area 4, so as to improve visual permeability and air ventilation;

Building Heights

- (c) a range of factors had been considered in formulating the BHs for the various development sites, including balancing the design principles of the Urban Design Guidelines in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), HPPG and the original design concepts for the former runway. Referring to a plan showing the photomontage of the built forms of the three refined schemes with the aid of a Visualiser, it could be illustrated that some hotel sites under Refined Scheme No. 3 with BH up to 170mPD would breach the mountain ridgelines, and the scheme was thus considered not desirable. As for Refined Schemes No. 1 and 2, most of the proposed buildings were generally of lower BHs with a larger site coverage, and therefore were considered less preferable. The final refined scheme, which was developed based on Refined Scheme No. 1, was selected to address the Board's concerns on wall effects and the need to improve visual permeability;
- (d) compliance with the 20% BFZ under the ridgelines was only one of the factors in determining the BH restrictions. Original urban design concepts for the KTD under the approved OZP including an undulating BH profile were also the key consideration. The current proposed BHs should also be compatible with those buildings in the inland areas. The BHs of those buildings in the waterfront areas of Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay were around 100 to 120mPD;
- (e) those buildings that had breached the mountain ridgelines and its 20% BFZ were existing buildings (e.g. MegaBox) in Kowloon Bay that were built at an earlier time, with BHs in the range of about 160 to 170mPD. There was no BH restriction on the concerned OZP at that time;
- (f) the proposed BH of Sites 4C3, 4C4 and 4C5 was 95mPD, all facing Victoria Harbour. A maximum BH of 108mPD was proposed for Site 4B5, facing KTAC. Other than the ridgeline consideration, the proposed BHs for Sites 4B5 and 4C5 had reflected the design objectives of achieving greater variations in BH profile and compatibility with adjoining developments. It

was the general intention to have the higher buildings with BH up to 120mPD in the core area, and gradually descending on both sides towards 95mPD. Referring to slide No. 7 of the PowerPoint presentation, it could be seen that next to Sites 4B5 and 4C5 was the proposed 'tourism node' at the tip of the former runway, with a maximum BH of 100mPD under the approved Kai Tak OZP. To allow for design flexibility, relaxation of the BH restriction might be considered by the Board upon application under s. 16 of the Ordinance. The proposed BHs of Sites 4B5 and 4C5 had taken on board Members' previous views on the original proposal under the Review, in that the building mass/site coverage of the proposed hotel sites had been reduced under the final refined scheme, so as to improve visual permeability, avoid wall effect and achieve a greater separation of buildings, etc.;

Plot Ratios

- (g) in preparing the final refined scheme, public views, the design principles of the Urban Design Guidelines in the HKPSG, HPPG and the original design concepts for the former runway had been thoroughly considered. With a view to maximizing the usage of valuable land resources without compromising the aforesaid, the PRs of the fourteen development sites had been adjusted in correspondence with the BHs proposed. Compared to the original proposal, one more additional residential site had been added, resulting in eleven residential sites in Area 4 while the number of hotel sites were reduced from four to three. The PRs of the residential sites had been changed from 6.5/6.55 to 5.5, 6.1 and 7, with a PR of 6 on average and were in line with the HPPG that the development density of the waterfront sites should be lower than those in the inland areas under the Review, the domestic PR of which was 6.5. For the three hotel sites, their PRs had been increased from 4, 5 and 6.3 to 6, 6.5 to 7.5 respectively;
- (h) the current proposed PRs for Area 4 had taken into account the infrastructural capacities, and further increase in development intensity might give rise to adverse traffic and environmental impacts on the

surrounding areas, which was not desirable;

Landmarks to Promote Tourism

- (i) several landmark developments had been proposed in the KTD. An area at the runway tip was designated for the development of a tourism and leisure hub, which was zoned “Other Specified Use” (“OU”) annotated “Tourism Related Uses to Include Commercial, Hotel and Entertainment” under the approved Kai Tak OZP. The planning intention for the site was primarily for the provision of tourism-related use with commercial, hotel and entertainment facilities as well as a public observation gallery (POG), which would allow the general public to view that part of the Victoria Harbour as well as the KTD and the surrounding areas. As stipulated under the Notes and ES of the approved OZP, a building or structure incorporating the POG with design merits could be submitted to the Board for consideration of relaxation of the BH restriction. Subject to the overall design merits, such a building/structure would have the potential to reach some 200mPD. It would echo with another landmark building, planned at the Kai Tak City Centre in Area 1 for commercial use and was subject to a maximum BH of 200mPD. KTSP was another important landmark, the detailed design of which was being worked out by the relevant Bureaux;
- (j) Phase 1 of the Runway Park at the former runway tip had been completed, which showcased some of the history of the former airport, including aviation-related features showing the landing/takeoff location;

Walkability and Accessibility/Connectivity

- (k) measures to enhance walkability at the waterfront of the former runway had been thoroughly considered and included in the current proposals. Aside from walkability, the waterfront would also cater for a variety of activities. The former runway would have a waterfront promenade on both sides and pedestrian precincts/streets of 10 to 20m wide would run alongside the individual development sites in the east and west directions for enhancing connectivity between the sites and the waterfront. The Central Boulevard

in the middle of the runway would have a landscaped deck above the road, serving as an open space as well as a walkway. The landscaped deck would also link up with a network of footbridges and staircases/lifts for connecting with the various developments and the ground level. Hence, the public could make use of those pedestrian networks to access various parts of the waterfront. All of the precincts/walkways, promenade, landscaped deck and pedestrian network systems would provide direct access to the 'tourism node' at the tip of the former runway, which would be served by the station of the proposed EFLS;

- (l) the Government would conduct a further review on the overall design of the former runway and waterfront promenade and that more detailed urban design guidelines would be devised for the concerned development sites for incorporation into the land sale conditions;
- (m) it was envisaged that the waterfront would have a number of low blocks with retail shops and eating places on lower floors. The products to be sold and the pricing would be determined by the future operators;
- (n) cycling had been incorporated into the urban design framework of the KTD. To further strengthen the cycle track network and to better cater for the various needs of the users (e.g. connecting routes between activity nodes), CEDD was conducting a feasibility study concerning cycle track network and public consultation would commence shortly;

Heritage Trails

- (o) the two proposed heritage trails along the runway would link up with those areas outside the runway area, including Hoi Sham Park in To Kwa Wan and those near Kowloon City, including Sung Wong Toi Park and Lung Tsun Stone Bridge and the preservation corridor;

Transport and Traffic

- (p) a feasibility study for the EFLS for Kowloon East was being carried out by CEDD, which would provide an in-depth evaluation on the most suitable

green public transport mode(s) for the proposed EFLS and formulate an integrated multi-modal linkage system to enhance the connectivity of Kowloon East. The Study would examine a range of issues including financial viability, environmental acceptability and technical feasibility of the EFLS. The Study was scheduled for completion by the end of 2017. The CEDD would conduct timely consultation to solicit views from different stakeholders during the course of the Study;

- (q) a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) had been conducted for the development proposals, which had demonstrated that the proposals would have no significant impact on the capacity of the transport infrastructure. The TIA had been further updated to take into account the changes under the final refined scheme, and no adverse traffic impact on the local roads would be anticipated. According to the updated TIA, during the morning peak hours, the passenger car unit per hour (pcu/hour) at Shing Cheong Road would increase from about 2,500 to 3,200, due to the final refined scheme in Area 4. Nonetheless, widening works at Shing Cheong Road from single two-lane to dual two-lane had commenced to cater for more traffic in the future. As for the afternoon peak hours, there was not much difference between the original proposal and the final refined scheme;
- (r) the provision of various transport infrastructure or facilities would tie in with the development programme of the various projects throughout KTD. The two stations of the Shatin to Central Link (SCL) i.e. To Kwa Wan and Kai Tak Stations were tentatively scheduled for completion in 2019. Tseung Kwan O (TKO) – Lam Tin Tunnel, a dual two-lane highway, together with the proposed Trunk Road T2 and Central Kowloon Route (CKR), would form Route 6 and provide an east-west express link between West Kowloon and TKO. The construction of the said tunnel would commence soon while funding would be sought for the construction of Trunk Road T2 and CKR. A number of road improvement schemes in KTD would also be completed in the next few years. In fact, about 50% of the local roads in the KTD had been completed or near completion and more road works would be carried out in the upcoming years to tie in with the development

pace of KTD;

KTSP

- (s) a consultancy study for the detailed design of KTSP was being carried out under the directive of the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB). The main stadium to be provided in the sports park had a seating capacity of around 50,000, and arrangements for the crowd dispersal had already been proposed under the study and were considered feasible. As KTSP was located in proximity to the future MTR stations, crowds would be dispersed generally in two directions, one to the To Kwa Wan Station via Sung Wong Toi Park (SWTP) to its west and another to Kai Tak Station via an open space to its northeast;
- (t) the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report of the KTSP was approved by the Director of Environmental Protection with conditions under the EIA Ordinance on 6.1.2017. To minimise noise impact to the surrounding area, the main stadium where international sports events and entertainment/community events would be held would be designed with a retractable roof, which would be closed when needed; and

Water Quality of Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter and Kai Tak Approach Channel

- (u) the CEDD had been actively monitoring the water quality of KTTS and KTAC and according to the results gathered, the water quality of KTTS could generally be regarded as meeting the standard of secondary contact for water sports activities, e.g. suitable for rowing and dragon boat racing, while that of KTAC was not yet suitable for water sports. An Interception Pumping (IP) Scheme, which would involve intercepting and pumping stormwater from the upstream of KTAC to the Victoria Harbour to improve the water quality of KTAC, was currently at the detailed design stage.

25. Some Members raised the following questions and views:

Proposed Amendments to the Approved OZP

Public Housing Sites – Item D2

- (a) the increase in the provision of public housing under the proposed amendments was welcome, but whether public rental housing or subsidized housing at affordable prices would be provided to meet the public needs;

Retail Belt - Provision of 'Shop and Services' and 'Eating Place' Uses

- (b) the introduction of 'Shop and Services' and 'Eating Place' uses along the street frontages at various areas in the KTD was welcome since it would enhance vibrancy in those areas including the waterfront. Whether some of those areas would be allocated for use by social enterprises (SEs), non-governmental organisations (NGOs), art galleries and cultural bodies as they could unlikely afford the high rents of commercial/shop premises;

VTC Campus – Item W

- (c) whether consideration could be given to allowing a greater separation distance between Laguna City and the VTC Site, e.g. reserving green/open space between the two, in order to avoid creating a congested environment;
- (d) whether some of the facilities such as classrooms and library of the future VTC Campus could be open for use by the local residents, promoting social integration and harmony;
- (e) whether conceptual design plans showing the future VTC Campus were available;
- (f) the connection between the waterfront promenade of Cha Kwo Ling (fronting VTC Site) and Kwun Tong, and if the VTC Campus would have activities that would help encourage usage of the promenade at night-time to sustain vibrancy;

Kai Tak Acute Hospital, Hong Kong Children's Hospital and Residential Development - Items M & N

- (g) taking into account the location of the Hong Kong Children's Hospital in the vicinity, whether the expansion of the proposed Kai Tak Acute Hospital would give rise to interface issues between the users of the hospital and

other road users, and if the resultant traffic impact on the capacity of the Eastern Harbour Crossing (EHC) had been assessed;

- (h) whether the Kai Tak Acute Hospital would also be a general hospital catering for both emergency and other hospital services in the future;

Other Issues

- (i) the amount of open space proposed for the population in the KTD;
- (j) whether tendering of development sites under the Review had begun since the last briefing to the Board;
- (k) the planning history of the sites in Area 3 that were proposed to be rezoned from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to commercial uses;
- (l) whether overseas experiences such as those in Germany and Holland in terms of usage of basements and centralized refuse collection had been adopted in the KTD; and
- (m) noting that the Task Force was consulted regarding the Review on 18.11.2016, whether a similar opportunity in the form of an urban design workshop could be conducted for Members.

26. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip of PlanD and Mr Peter S.K. Chui of CEDD made the following main points:

Proposed Amendments to the Approved OZP

Public Housing Sites – Item D2

- (a) the four residential sites reserved for public housing in Area 2 i.e. Sites 2B3 to 2B6 were of sufficient size and close to SCL To Kwa Wan Station, and were considered suitable for public housing development. Those sites had the potential to provide about 6,000 public housing units. Nonetheless, the types of public rental/subsidized housing to be provided at those sites would

be determined by HD at a later stage;

Retail Belt – Provision of ‘Shop and Services’ and ‘Eating Place’ Uses

- (b) the ‘Retail Belt’ concept was to add vibrancy at the waterfront promenade and adjoining open spaces by requiring the provision of ‘Shop and Services’ and ‘Eating Place’ uses on the lowest two floors of the buildings along the waterfront promenade. The concept had taken into consideration the comments of HC and the Task Force. Whether some of those waterfront premises should be allocated for use by SEs and NGOs, etc. would need to be further considered, given many development sites in KTD had already been planned for social welfare and community uses, including those “G/IC” sites in the Kai Tak City Centre (Area 1) and the lower floors of public housing developments;

VTC Campus – Item W

- (c) while the distance between the VTC Site and Laguna City, being separated by a road, was some 30m, designation of the roadside area within the VTC Site as open space or setting back of the VTC Campus from the road might be an option to enhance separation between the two developments. Under the conceptual design, the VTC Campus would have three buildings, all of which would be set back by at least 10m from the adjoining road, and public passages were proposed on the ground floor of the buildings to allow access to the waterfront. The nearest campus building would be more than 40m from the residential building of Laguna City;
- (d) VTC campuses were of open designs, similar to those of the major universities in Hong Kong, an example of which was the VTC campus building in Tseung Kwan O. VTC had expressed their commitments to adopting the similar design approach and allowing reasonable public access. As such, the public would have free access via the VTC Campus to the waterfront. A footbridge would also be built by VTC for connecting the VTC Campus with the area to the north for better connectivity;

- (e) furthermore, VTC had also intended to allocate some of the school facilities for shared use by the local residents, with a view to fostering a win-win situation and social harmony;
- (f) the promenade at Cha Kwo Ling waterfront would connect with the Kwun Tong waterfront promenade via a proposed elevated walkway underneath Kwun Tong Bypass. There were also other proposed connections to link up the promenade at Cha Kwo Ling with the inland area, all of which would be subject to detailed design. Views on enhancing night-time vibrancy of the waterfront promenade as well as pedestrian connectivity would be conveyed to VTC for their consideration in the detailed design of the campus development;

Kai Tak Acute Hospital, Hong Kong Children's Hospital and Residential Development - Items M & N

- (g) the TIA conducted for the development proposals under the Review had been updated to take into account the proposed rezoning, which demonstrated that there would be no adverse traffic impact on the local roads. The Hong Kong Children's Hospital was currently under construction. Shing Cheong Road, which would serve Hong Kong Children's Hospital as well as the Kai Tak Acute Hospital and its extension, was being widened from single two-lane to dual two-lane;
- (h) the overall traffic conditions had been comprehensively assessed in the TIA, taking into account the traffic conditions of major roads including Kwun Tong Bypass and Prince Edward Road East. Upon completion of the SCL and commencement of the CKR, there would be further improvement in the connection between East Kowloon and West Kowloon;
- (i) the local residents of Kwun Tong, Wong Tai Sin and Kowloon City had all along called for more accident and emergency (A&E) services in the district. The residents of Wong Tai Sin, in particular, considered that while there were two hospitals offering such services i.e. United Christian Hospital and Queen Elizabeth Hospital serving East and West Kowloon, the central area

of Kowloon was lacking such facility. The Food and Health Bureau (FHB) and Hospital Authority (HA) considered that providing an acute hospital in KTD would serve the whole East Kowloon area. The Kai Tak Acute Hospital would provide 2,400 beds with inpatient and ambulatory services of major specialties and would also house an A&E department and an oncology centre. The district councils of Kwun Tong, Wong Tai Sin and Kowloon City had rendered support to the hospital proposal and urged for its early implementation;

Other Issues

- (j) KTD would provide a total of about 100ha of open space, far exceeding the required provision of about 27 ha for the planned population of 134,000 for Kai Tak in accordance with the HKPSG (based on the requirement of 1m² of district open space and 1m² of local open space per person). The total open space included the Metro Park of about 20ha, a size similar to that of Victoria Park, which would form a regional open space for the East Kowloon area. The existing open space on the rooftop of Kai Tak Cruise Terminal was not included in the open space calculation;
- (k) some of the development sites in Area 1 had been tendered and Area 1 was not subject to the current proposed amendments to the approved Kai Tak OZP;
- (l) five “G/IC” sites at the South Apron (Area 3) of the former airport were previously reserved for a school and other possible GIC uses and were proposed to be rezoned to “Commercial(1)” (“C(1)”) and “C(8)” for commercial developments. Taking into account the sufficient supply of sites for schools and other GIC facilities in the district and that Trunk Road T2 would traverse Area 3, the sites were considered suitable for commercial use;
- (m) KTD had proposed using underground spaces more effectively including provision of car parks in basement levels and underground shopping streets. As regards the suggestion on centralized refuse collection, since nearly half

of the major roads in KTD had been built, whether such system would be feasible at KTD would need to be further examined. It might be more practicable for the future developers to devise the appropriate refuse collection means. Notwithstanding that, KTD had taken on board the greening initiatives, including the implementation of a District Cooling System (DCS), which supplied chilled water to buildings through underground water-pipe network for cooling purposes; and

- (n) on 18.1.2017, a workshop was conducted to solicit the views of the Task Force on the final refined scheme in Area 4. All the views collected including the views of the Board would be taken into account in the formulation of the detailed urban design guidelines for Area 4.

27. Upon a Member's enquiry on whether the configuration of the former runway could be modified by further reclamation, the Chairman noted that the "overriding public need test" would need to be satisfied under the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance if reclamation in the Victoria Harbour was to be conducted. Regarding a Member's suggestion on centralized refuse collection, the Chairman supplemented that at a recent study tour of the Board, it had been observed that the centralized refuse collection system for residential buildings in some German cities was implemented through the use of shared underground space, where refuse was collected centrally. Apart from infrastructural support, it seemed that the implementation of such system was the result of government policy and local consensus. However, there was currently no such government policy in Hong Kong. Members' views might be conveyed to the relevant Bureau for consideration, as appropriate.

28. The Vice-chairman and some Members raised the following questions and views:

- (a) the final refined scheme in Area 4 was considered an improvement, taking into account the more interesting BH profile and better visual permeability;
- (b) the proposed increase in PRs and BHs in the final refined scheme was supported, but whether the original layout for Area 4 under the approved Kai Tak OZP could be retained;

- (c) more innovative design should be injected into the proposals for the former runway as far as possible to reflect its prominent location and history;
- (d) noting that innovative ideas might be hindered by the constraints set by the development sites, it was important to achieve design harmony for all those development sites at the former runway;
- (e) whether the concept of 'urban forestry' as called for in the Policy Address 2017 would be adopted in the KTD;
- (f) integration of people from different classes or social backgrounds of the society, rather than segregation, should be enhanced;
- (g) to better cater for people from all walks of life with different spending power, the Government might need to devise appropriate measures to ensure that the future retail and eating places would offer a wide range of products at different price range;
- (h) noting that the feasibility study on cycle track network was being carried out by CEDD, there should be scope to examine the public bicycle system for shared use of bicycles, which would alleviate the need for providing a large cycle parking area; and
- (i) an earlier dialogue with the MTR Corporation would facilitate smooth dispersal of crowds from the KTSP to the stations of the SCL.

29. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip of PlanD made the following main points:

- (a) detailed urban design guidelines would be devised for the concerned development sites to ensure design harmony upon further review on the overall design of the former runway and waterfront promenade;

- (b) Members' views including the need to inject more innovative ideas for the former runway would be duly explored and considered; and
- (c) the concept of 'urban forestry' would be examined in the urban design/landscape planning of KTD, particularly the large open spaces such as the Metro Park.

30. Miss Winnie W.M. Ng declared an interest in the item as she was a council member of VTC. According to the procedure and practice adopted by the Board, as the proposed VTC Campus was the subject of amendments to the OZP proposed by PlanD, the interest of Miss Ng would only need to be recorded and she could stay in the meeting.

31. Mr Raymond Lee, Director of Planning, said that the planning for Kai Tak had gone through many rounds of public engagements over the years. Appropriate changes had been made to cater for the prevailing needs of the society. The current meeting was to consider whether the proposed amendments to the OZP, including the increase in the development intensity for KTD, were appropriate. Members' views were largely on the detailed design of the proposals, which would be subject to the urban design guidelines to be formulated.

32. The Vice-chairman considered that the opinions expressed by some Members were mainly on the detailed design and agreed that it would be appropriate to gazette the proposed amendments to the OZP so that public comments on the OZP could be sought. The view was generally shared by other Members.

33. A Member asked whether the ES could be updated to reflect the design requirement in respect of the proposed VTC Campus development as discussed at the meeting. Mr Tom Yip, DPO/K, said that the ES would be refined to take into account the views of Members.

34. After deliberation, the Board agreed:

- (a) to the proposed amendments to the approved Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/4 and that the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/4A (to be renumbered as S/K22/5 upon exhibition) and its Notes (Attachments I and II of the Paper) were suitable for public exhibition under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance);
- (b) to adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) (Attachment III of the Paper), subject to refinement on the design requirement for the VTC Campus, as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land use zonings of the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/4A; and
- (c) that the revised ES was suitable for publication together with the draft OZP.

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

36. The Chairman thanked the government representatives and the consultants for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

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

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai, Dr. Frankie W.C. Yeung, Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon, Ms Christina M. Lee, Mr K.K. Cheung and Mr Stephen L.H. Liu left the meeting at this point.]

Sha Tin, Tai Po and North District

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting]

Draft Tai Po Kau Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-TPK/B – Further Consideration of a New Plan
(TPB Paper No. 10237)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

37. The following government representatives were invited to the meeting:

Ms Jessica H.F. Chu - District Planning Officer/Shan Tin, Tai Po and North, Planning Department (DPO/STN, PlanD)

Ms Channy C. Yang - Senior Town Planner/Country Park Enclaves (STP/CPE), PlanD

38. The Chairman extended a welcome and invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the Paper.

39. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, PlanD, briefed Members on the background for the draft Tai Po Kau Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/NE-TPK/B, results of the local consultation on the draft OZP and PlanD's responses as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10237 (the Paper).

40. After DPO/STN's presentation, the Chairman invited questions and comments from Members.

41. A Member asked whether grave sweeping activities would be restricted under the "Conservation Area" ("CA") zoning, which was a concern raised by local villagers. In response, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu said that maintenance or repair of graves was always permitted in areas zoned "CA" on the draft OZP, and hence, the draft OZP would pose no restriction to any grave sweeping activities.

42. After deliberation, Members noted the comments from and responses to the Shatin District Council, Tai Po District Council, Tai Po Rural Committee and the green/concern groups and individuals on the draft OZP as detailed in Parts 3 and 4 of the Paper.

43. Members also agreed:

- (a) that the draft Tai Po Kau OZP No. S/NE-TPK/B (to be renumbered as S/NE-TPK/1 upon gazetting) and its Notes (Annexes I and II of the Paper) were suitable for exhibition for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance);
- (b) to adopt the Explanatory Statement (ES) (Annex III of the Paper) as an expression of the planning intention and objectives of the Town Planning Board (the Board) for the land use zoning of the draft Tai Po Kau OZP No. S/NE-TPK/B; and
- (c) that the ES was suitable for exhibition for public inspection together with the draft OZP and issued under the name of the Board.

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

[Professor K.C. Chau and Mr Stephen H.B. Yau left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

[Open Meeting]

Draft Cheung Sheung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-CS/B –

Further Consideration of a New Plan

(TPB Paper No. 10238)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

45. The following government representatives were invited to the meeting:

- Ms Jessica H.F. Chu - District Planning Officer/Shu Tin, Tai Po and North, Planning Department (DPO/STN, PlanD)
- Ms Channy C. Yang - Senior Town Planner/Country Park Enclaves (STP/CPE), PlanD

46. The Chairman extended a welcome and invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the Paper.

47. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, PlanD, briefed Members on the background for the draft Cheung Sheung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/NE-CS/B, results of the local consultation on the draft OZP and PlanD's responses as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10238 (the Paper).

48. After DPO/STN's presentation, the Chairman invited questions and comments from Members.

49. Noting that there were two country park enclaves (i.e. Wong Chuk Long and Tai Hum) located to the northeast of the draft OZP, a Member asked if any updated information could be provided on the latest thinking of the Government. In response, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu said that out of the 54 country park enclaves mentioned in the 2010-11 Policy Address, PlanD had completed preparation of statutory plans for 30 enclaves and for the remaining 24 enclaves, the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department had incorporated six of them into country parks while the rest of the 18 enclaves (including Wong Chuk Long and Tai Hum) were being examined to determine if they would be suitable for incorporation into country parks.

50. After deliberation, Members noted the comments from and responses to the Tai Po District Council, Sai Kung North Rural Committee, concerned Indigenous Inhabitant Representative and Kadoorie Farm & Botanic Garden Corporation on the draft OZP as detailed in Parts 3 and 4 of the Paper.

51. Members also agreed:

- (a) that the draft Cheung Sheung OZP No. S/NE-CS/B (to be renumbered as S/NE-CS/1 upon gazetting) and its Notes (Annexes I and II of the Paper) were suitable for exhibition for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance);
- (b) to adopt the Explanatory Statement (ES) (Annex III of the Paper) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Town Planning Board (the Board) for the various land use zonings of the draft Cheung Sheung OZP No. S/NE-CS/B; and
- (c) that the ES was suitable for exhibition for public inspection together with the draft OZP and issued under the name of the Board.

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

53. The Chairman thanked PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting and they left the meeting at this point.

Procedural Matters

Agenda Item 7

[Open Meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comments on the Draft North Point Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H8/25
(TPB Paper No. 10239)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

54. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests in the item for having properties in the North Point area:

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok - co-owning with his spouse a flat at Cloud View Road, North Point

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau - owning a flat in North Point

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - owning a flat at Braemar Hill Mansion, North Point

55. Members noted that Dr Wilton W.T. Fok had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Stephen H.B. Yau had already left the meeting. As the item was procedural in nature and no discussion was required, the meeting agreed that Mr Thomas O.S. Ho could stay in the meeting.

56. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. On 5.8.2016, the draft North Point Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). A total of 442 representations and four comments were received.

57. It was recommended that the representations and comments should be considered collectively in one group by the full Town Planning Board (the Board) as they were of similar nature. The hearing could be accommodated in the Board's regular meeting and a separate hearing session would not be necessary.

58. Owing to the large number of representations/comments received and to ensure efficiency of the hearing, it was also recommended that each representer/commenter be allotted a maximum of 10 minutes for presentation in the hearing session. Consideration of the representations and comments by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for March 2017.

59. After deliberation, the Board agreed that:

- (a) the representations and comments should be considered collectively in one group by the Board itself; and
- (b) a 10-minute presentation time would be allotted to each presenter and commenter, subject to confirmation of the number of presenters and commenters attending the hearing and the aggregate presentation time required.

Agenda Item 8

[Open Meeting]

Submission of the Draft Tseung Kwan O Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TKO/23A under Section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval (TPB Paper No. 10240)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

60. The Secretary reported that Professor T.S. Liu had declared interest in the item for self-owning a flat, co-owning a flat and a parking space with his spouse, and his spouse owning two parking spaces at Ocean Shores, Tseung Kwan O (TKO).

61. As the item was procedural in nature and no discussion was required, the meeting agreed that Professor Liu could stay in the meeting.

62. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. On 24.6.2016, the draft TKO Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TKO/23 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). A total of one representation and one comment were received. On 16.12.2016, after giving consideration to the representation and comment, the Town Planning Board (the Board) decided not to propose any amendment to the draft OZP to meet the representation under section 6B(8) of the Ordinance. As the representation consideration process had been completed, the draft OZP was ready for submission to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval.

63. After deliberation, the Board:

- (a) agreed that the draft TKO OZP No. S/TKO/23A and its Notes at Annexes I and II of the Paper respectively were suitable for submission under section 8 of the Ordinance to the CE in C for approval;
- (b) endorsed the updated Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft TKO OZP No. S/TKO/23A at Annex III of the Paper as an expression of the planning intention and objectives of the Board for the various land-use zonings on the draft OZP and 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 OZP.

Agenda Item 9

[Open Meeting]

Submission of the Draft Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TW/32A under Section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval
(TPB Paper No. 10241)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

64. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests in the item for owning properties in the Tsuen Wan area:

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| Ms Christina M. Lee | - being a director of a company which owned some properties and car parking spaces at Texaco Road, Tsuen Wan |
| Dr C.H. Hau | - co-owning a property in Belvedere Garden, Castle Peak Road, Tsuen Wan |

65. Members noted that Ms Christina M. Lee had already left the meeting. As the item was procedural in nature and no discussion was required, Members agreed that Dr C.H. Hau could stay in the meeting.

66. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. On 13.5.2016, the draft Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TW/32 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). A total of 17 representations and one comment were received. On 16.12.2016, after giving consideration to the representations and comment under section 6B(1) of the Ordinance, the Town Planning Board (the Board) decided not to propose any amendment to the draft OZP to meet the representations under section 6B(8) of the Ordinance. As the representation consideration process had been completed, the draft OZP was ready for submission to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval.

67. After deliberation, the Board:

- (a) agreed that the draft Tsuen Wan OZP No. S/TW/32A and its Notes at Annexes I and II of the Paper respectively were suitable for submission under section 8 of the Ordinance to the CE in C for approval;
- (b) endorsed the updated Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft Tsuen Wan OZP No. S/TW/32A at Annex III of the Paper as an expression of the planning intention and objectives of the Board for the various land-use zonings on the draft OZP and 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 OZP.

Agenda Item 10

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

68. The Chairman said and the meeting noted that Mr T.Y. Ip had tendered his resignation from the Town Planning Board (TPB) with effect from 1.11.2016. The notification of the cessation of Mr Ip as a TPB and its Metro Planning Committee member was gazetted on 13.1.2017.

69. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:40 p.m..