

**Minutes of 1139th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 21.4.2017**

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

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

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

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Professor T.S. Liu

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

Director of Lands

Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Deputy Director of Planning/District

Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr H.W. Cheung

Professor K.C. Chau

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Ms Christina M. Lee

Mr H.F. Leung

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport)
Transport and Housing Bureau
Mr. Andy S.H. Lam

In Attendance

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Sally S.Y. Fong

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

Agenda Item 1

[Open meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1138th Meeting held on 24.3.2017

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The minutes of the 1138th meeting held on 24.3.2017 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese]

- (i) [Confidential Item] [Closed Meeting]

2. This item was recorded under confidential cover.

- (ii) Town Planning Appeal Decision Received

Town Planning Appeal No. 1 of 2016

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) - Small House) in “Green Belt” zone, Government land (near Lot 393) in D.D. 28, Lung Mei Tsuen, Tai Po

(Application No. A/NE-TK/559)

[Open Meeting]

3. The Secretary reported that the subject appeal was against the decision of the Town Planning Board (the Board) to reject on review an application (No. A/NE-TK/559) for a proposed house (NTEH – Small House) at a site zoned “Green Belt” (“GB”) on the Ting Kok Outline Zoning Plan (the appeal site).

4. Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon declared an interest on the item as he owned a property in the Lung Mei Tsuen area. Noting that the item was to report on the receipt of a town planning appeal decision, the meeting agreed that Dr Poon could stay in the meeting.

5. The Secretary continued to say that the appeal was heard by the Town Planning Appeal Board (TPAB) on 23.11.2016 and that the TPAB dismissed the appeal on 22.3.2017. The main reasons for the decision were as follows:

- (a) the application was not in line with the planning intention of the “GB” zone. The appellant had failed to provide strong justifications for a departure of the planning intention;
- (b) the proposed development might cause adverse landscape and ecological impacts on the surroundings. Whilst the impacts might not be significant, the proposed Small House footprint covered the entire appeal site, and it would be impractical to implement any mitigation measure within the site to minimize the adverse landscape and ecological impacts;
- (c) the appellant had not provided strong evidence to establish that there was a shortage of land for Small House development within the “Village Type Development” zone of Lung Mei, Tai Mei Tuk and Wong Chuk Tsuen;
- (d) those similar approved applications quoted by the appellant were different from the subject application. Past approved cases were only one of the considerations of the Board. Each case should be considered on its individual merits; and
- (e) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications, thus affecting the integrity of the “GB” zone.

6. Members noted the decision of the TPAB on the application.

(iii) New Town Planning Appeal Received

Town Planning Appeal No. 1 of 2017

Proposed Comprehensive Development with Wetland Enhancement (including House, Flat, Wetland Enhancement Area, Nature Reserve, Visitors Centre, Social Welfare Facility, Shop and Services) as well as Filling of Land/Pond and Excavation of Land in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Comprehensive Development and Wetland Enhancement Area 1” and “Site of Special Scientific Interest (1)” Zones at Lots 1520 RP, 1534 and 1604 in D.D.123 and adjoining Government Land, Nam Sang Wai and Lut Chau, Yuen Long

(Application No. A/YL-NSW/242)

[Open Meeting]

7. The Secretary reported that a Notice of Appeal was received by the Appeal Board Panel (Town Planning) on 31.3.2017 against the decision of the Town Planning Board (the Board) to reject on review an application No. A/YL-NSW/242.

8. The application was for a proposed comprehensive development with wetland enhancement (including house, flat, wetland enhancement area, nature reserve, visitors centre, social welfare facility, shop and services) as well as filling of land/pond and excavation of land at Lots 1520 RP, 1534 and 1604 in D.D.123 and adjoining government land, Nam Sang Wai and Lut Chau, Yuen Long (the Site). The Site fell mainly within an area zoned “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Comprehensive Development and Wetland Enhancement Area 1” on the approved Nam Sang Wai Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) and partly zoned “Site of Special Scientific Interest (1)” on the approved Mai Po and Fairview Park OZP.

9. The application was rejected by the Board on 24.2.2017 for the following reasons:

- (i) the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Comprehensive Development and Wetland Enhancement Area” (“OU(CDWEA)”) zone which was

intended for conservation and enhancement of ecological value and functions of the existing fish ponds or wetland;

- (ii) the proposed development was not in line with Town Planning Board Guidelines for “Application for Developments within Deep Bay Area” (TPB PG-No. 12C). The “no-net-loss in wetland” principle had not been complied with. The Ecological Impact Assessment and the proposed mitigation measures were inadequate. The applicants had failed to demonstrate that the loss of ecological function could be adequately compensated by the proposed mitigation and habitat enhancement measures;
- (iii) the applicants had not prepared an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) report as required by the EIA Ordinance to address the ecological issues, and yet the submitted technical assessments had failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not generate adverse traffic, ecological and visual impacts on the surrounding areas;
- (iv) the proposed development did not conform to “Private-Public Partnership Approach” in that the proposed development was not limited to the ecologically less sensitive portion of the Site and the applicants had failed to demonstrate how the long-term conservation and management of the Wetland Enhancement Area for the Nam Sang Wai Site and the Lut Chau Nature Reserve could be satisfactorily achieved; and
- (v) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within “OU(CDWEA)” zone, and its cumulative effect might have the undesirable effect of leading to the general degradation of the environment of the area.

10. The hearing date of the appeal was yet to be fixed. The Secretary would act on behalf of the Board in dealing with the appeal in the usual manner.

(iv) Appeal Statistics
[Open Meeting]

11. The Secretary reported that as at 21.4.2016, the appeal statistics were as follows:

Allowed	:	35
Dismissed	:	148
Abandoned/Withdrawn/Invalid	:	197
Yet to be Heard	:	13
Decision Outstanding	:	1
<hr/>		
Total	:	394

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations in respect of Draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H3/30
(TPB Paper No. 10268)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

12. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests on the item for having affiliation/business dealings with Tung Wah Group of Hospitals (TWGHs) (R1) and its representative (i.e. Mr Yiu Tze Leung) and consultants (i.e. Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTAL) and CYS Associates Limited (CYS)); for having business dealings/being acquainted with representers (i.e. Ms Mary Mulvihill) (R4) and Designing Hong Kong Limited (R2)); and for owning a property in the Sheung Wan area:

- Ms Christina M. Lee - having current business dealings with TWGHs and being the Secretary-General of the Hong Kong Metropolitan Sports Events Association which had obtained sponsorship from TWGHs before

- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with TWGHs

- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with KTAL and past business dealings with CYS

- Mr K.K. Cheung] their company having business dealings with
Mr Alex T.H. Lai] TWGHs and hiring Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time

- Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong - having served as a Member at the Action Committee Against Narcotics of the Security Bureau in the past for which Mr Yiu Tze Leung was also a Member

- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having past business dealings with TWGHs and CYS; and his company owning an office unit in Unionway Commercial Centre, 283 Queen's Road Central

- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - personally knowing the co-founder and Chief Executive Officer of Designing Hong Kong Limited

13. Members noted that Ms Christina M. Lee and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. Members agreed that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Mr K.K. Cheung, Mr Alex T.H. Lai, Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu should be allowed to stay in the meeting as they had no direct involvement in the project, or discussion

with the representative of R1 or other representers, or the property did not have a direct view of the representation site. Members also agreed that the interest of Mr Franklin Yu was indirect and noted that Mr Yu had not yet arrived to join the meeting.

14. The Chairman said that reasonable notice had been given to the representers inviting them to attend the hearing, but other than those who were present or had indicated that they would attend the hearing, the rest had either indicated not to attend or made no reply. As reasonable notice had been given to the representers, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations in their absence.

Presentation and Question Sessions

15. The following government representatives, representers and their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

Mr Louis K.H. Kau - District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK)

Mr J.J. Austin - Senior Town Planner/HK(4)

Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) of the Leisure & Cultural Services Department (LCSD)

Mr K.T. Chau - Senior Architect (Antiquities & Monuments)1
(SA(A&M)1)

Ms Janny W.Y. Lui - Maintenance Surveyor (A&M) (MS(A&M))

Representers and their Representatives

R1 - TWGHs

TWGHs:]	
Mr Yiu Tze Leung]	
Mr Lau Chee Kin Clement]	
Dr Margaret Wong]	
Mr Chan Tak Szy Edwin]	
Mr Chan Hoi Henry]	Representer/ Representer's Representatives
]	
KTAL:]	
Mr Kenneth L.K. To]	
Ms Kitty P.S. Wong]	
]	
CYS:]	
Mr Daniel H.Y. Ho]	

R3 - Central & Western Concern Group

R455 - Ben Mok

Mr John Batten - Representers' Representative

R4 - Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer

R359 - David Fu

R526 - Charlton Cheung

Mr Charlton Cheung - Representer and Representer's Representative

R380 - Katty Law

R560 - Sing Chan

R438 - Kiyoko Taneyama

Ms Katty Law - Representer and Representers' Representative

R382 – Hui Kin Kwun

Mr Hui Kin Kwun - Representer

R486 - Hung Ching Wei Harry

Mr Hung Ching Wei Harry - Representer

R607 – Melanie Moore

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer's Representative

16. The Chairman extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. He said that PlanD's representative would be invited to brief Members on the representations. The representers or their representatives would then be invited to make oral submissions in turn according to their representation number. To ensure the efficient operation of the meeting, each representer or his representative would be allotted 10 minutes for making oral submission. There was a timer device to alert the representers or their representatives two minutes before the allotted time was to expire and when the allotted time limit was up. A question and answer (Q&A) session would be held after all attending representers or their representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to government representatives, representers or their representatives. After the Q&A session, the Town Planning Board (the Board) would deliberate on the representations in the absence of the representers, their representatives and the government representatives, and would inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course.

17. The Chairman then invited PlanD's representative to brief Members on the representations.

18. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, briefed Members on the representations, including the background of the amendments of the draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H3/30 (the draft OZP) to facilitate the development of a youth hostel at the ex-school site by TWGHs under Amendment Item A, the grounds and proposals of the representers, planning assessments and PlanD's views on the representations, as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10268 (the Paper).

[Mr Franklin Yu arrived to join the meeting during the presentation of DPO/HK.]

19. The Chairman then invited the representers and/or their representatives to elaborate on their representations.

R1 - TWGHs

20. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Yiu Tze Leung made the following main points:

- (a) the concerns of the community on the youth hostel proposal in terms of heritage conservation and technical aspects had been fully addressed;

Heritage Conservation

- (b) to minimize any potential adverse impact on the Man Mo Temple Compound (MMTC), various heritage charters/principles including Burra Charter and China Principles had been taken into account in the formulation of the conservation plan for the subject development (e.g. provision of a heritage bazaar, careful selection of building materials and special façade design) to enhance compatibility with MMTC and the surrounding environment;
- (c) a number of mitigation measures would be adopted during the demolition and construction stages, for instance, provision of buffer zone, the use of prefabricated building parts and double-deck catch platforms as well as non-percussive piling methods, so as to minimize any physical impact on MMTC;
- (d) the G/F portion of the youth hostel building would be set back from Hollywood Road by 5.8m and would have a headroom of 11m, thus enhancing better vista to MMTC at pedestrian level;

- (e) the relevant heritage impact assessment (HIA) and the design of the youth hostel had been accepted by AMO and supported by the Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB). The HIA had strictly followed the guidelines set out in the Technical Circular (Works) No. 6/2009 of the Development Bureau (DEVB);

Technical Aspect

- (f) the technical feasibility of the proposal had been demonstrated by various studies and assessments covering traffic, visual, environmental and air ventilation aspects. The concerned departments and statutory bodies had no adverse comments on those amendments;
- (g) the Technical Feasibility Statement (TFS) of the proposal had been approved including the Geotechnical Assessment Report in accordance with the relevant Financial Circular;
- (h) prior to commencement of any construction works, monitoring check points would be installed in agreement with AMO. Various devices would be used to monitor the site conditions including settlement, tilting and vibration during construction works. All construction works would be ceased at once if there was any sign of excessive movement or undue settlement;

Local Consultation

- (i) the local stakeholders including the Central and Western District Council (C&WDC) and local residents had been consulted on the proposal. Supportive views or no adverse views had been received;

Proven Experiences

- (j) TWGHs had been in Hong Kong for 147 years. It had vast and proven experiences in handling construction projects next to monuments/graded

historic buildings, including Tung Shing Terrace (1993) behind MMTC, Tower 125 (1996) next to Kwong Fook Tsz, and Tung Wah College (2003) on both sides of Shui Yuet Kung;

- (k) Tung Shing Terrace was only half a metre behind MMTC, while Kwong Fook Tsz, a Grade II historic building, was about 600m away from the residential development (Tower 125). Shui Yuet Temple, a Grade III historic building, had been seamlessly integrated with the two towers of Tung Wah College. All three monuments/historic buildings including MMTC remained intact and were being managed by TWGHs. The redevelopment of Kwong Wah Hospital next to a monument was an on-going project also being managed by TWGHs;

Youth Hostel Scheme

- (l) the Youth Hostel Scheme (YHS) was a major proposal in the 2011-2012 Policy Address. It aimed to provide personal living space for the working youths on low incomes who were aged 18 to 30 and give them an opportunity to accumulate savings to meet their aspirations. As at September 2015, about 74,600 applicants on the waiting list for public housing were single youths (aged 18-29), an increase of 156% compared to the corresponding figure in 2011. The subject youth hostel was the only YHS project on Hong Kong Island; and
- (m) the youths consulted welcomed the proposal and urged for its early completion. The proposal would meet the needs of the youths and respect the heritage value of MMTC, while making full use of the valuable land resources.

R3 - Central & Western Concern Group

R455 - Ben Mok

- 21. With the aid of the visualizer, Mr John Batten made the following main points:

- (a) he had been living in Po Hing Fong for 25 years. When the section 12A application relating to the subject youth hostel development was submitted to the Board for consideration, he wrote an article in Ming Pao Weekly which by and large summarised the feelings of most people on the matter. C&WDC (R635) had strongly objected to the proposal but their views had not been reflected fully;
- (b) Man Mo Temple was one of Hong Kong's most important heritage buildings. The site was granted by the colonial government in the early days, functioning as a city hall in a temple setting. Today it remained a vibrant and functioning temple with lots of visitors every day. It was a site of cultural and heritage significance and MMTC was not a suitable site for youth hostel development;
- (c) the Government should take the opportunity to honour Man Mo Temple by either retaining the school building for community use or developing the ex-school site into a one-storey building to mirror the built form of the temple;
- (d) the area was amongst one of the most expensive places on Hong Kong Island. Given that the rental level of the youth hostel would be set at a maximum 60% of the market rental level, the proposed youth hostel would become a potential area for the high-income youths rather than those in need;
- (e) whilst not objecting to the development of youth hostel, there should be other more suitable sites elsewhere;
- (f) although the proposed youth hostel had appeared to meet the requirements of all concerned government bureaux/departments, the proposed 21-storey building would overwhelm MMTC with its bulk and compromise the integrity of the temple;

- (g) the HIA should have been conducted by an independent assessor rather than the consultant of TWGHs;
- (h) the construction of the proposed youth hostel might cause damages to Man Mo Temple and put it at risk of collapsing. The collapse of a building within the former Central Police Station Compound (CPSC) showed that heritage buildings were delicate. Allowing any proposed new development near MMTC was poor planning and it should not be permitted;
- (i) Ping On Lane, including the granite doorframe and the ladder street, was an integral part of MMTC and the ex-school sites. It should be preserved and graded by AAB;
- (j) with reference to paragraph 6.3.15 of the Paper, while the Government responded that TWGHs were required to repay the Government the capital subvention for the construction of the youth hostel should the youth hostel cease to operate, he doubted how effective the subsequent control would be after the hostel had been built. Moreover, it was odd that the construction cost related to the proposed youth hostel development was to be funded from the public purse;
- (k) it was ironic that he once proposed to provide a youth hostel at the former Hollywood Road Police Married Quarters site in 2006/2007 but that proposal was not accepted by the Board; and
- (l) C&WDC's representation (R635) had raised basically the same grounds of objection as R3 which should be taken seriously by the Board.

[Dr Lawrence K.C. Li and Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

R4 - Mary Mulvhill

22. Ms Mary Mulvhill made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed youth hostel development contravened section 3 of the Man Mo Temple Ordinance (Cap 154) (MMTO) and could be subject to legal challenge;
- (b) the ex-school site should be regarded as an intrinsic part of MMTC given that the plot ratio (PR) of the latter had been transferred to the ex-school site;
- (c) the proposed youth hostel was in breach of the guidelines for conservation of heritage buildings as set out in paragraph 4.6 of Chapter 10 of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). Some of the relevant considerations were as follows:
 - (i) adjoining uses should be controlled to minimise adverse impacts on conservation zones and optimise their conservation value;
 - (ii) efforts should be made to protect and preserve buildings of historical or architectural merits either in their own right or as an integral part of a group or series of buildings;
 - (iii) the value of archaeological heritage as a cultural resource should be recognised in the planning process. Efforts should be made to avoid encroachment of development onto sites of archaeological interest;
 - (iv) efforts should be made to ensure that the setting of the heritage sites could be preserved with consideration of the visual impact, alteration of the landscape and physical intrusion or overshadowing of high buildings in adjacent developments, compatibility between uses, air flow, buffer zones;

- (v) expert advice should be sought on whether the new design could effectively blend in with the old harmoniously in terms of character, scale and visual impact;
- (vi) care should be taken to ensure that declared monuments, historic buildings, sites of archaeological interest and recorded heritage items did not suffer damage as a side effect of development; and
- (vii) the intention to conserve should be the main consideration. Where the original use of the building is no longer continued, adaptive re-use of the building should be conscientiously considered. New use should aim to conserve the heritage values and significance of the historic building to ensure authenticity and integrity of the cultural heritage;

[Mr Stephen L.H. Liu left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

- (d) the collapse of a building within the former CPSC showed that despite the effort to conduct impact assessments and implement mitigation measures, and the pledge by the Hong Kong Jockey Club to carry out the works in a safe and prudent manner, heritage buildings were fragile and prone to damages. AMO and AAB should have revisited their position on the youth hostel project in view of that incident;
- (e) it was apparent that TWGHs' heritage consultant was not qualified for conducting a HIA for Man Mo Temple which was one of the most important heritage sites in Hong Kong. The HIA should have been carried out by independent overseas experts in a proper manner;
- (f) as the costs for the proposed youth hostel development were to be paid by the Government, the people of Hong Kong should be the decision makers. Charitable organisations should not be allowed to spend public funds in projects which were against the aspiration of the community;

- (g) the ex-school site was an inappropriate location for the development of youth hostel as there were bars and drunken people in the locality which would have bad influence on the youths;
- (h) if the Board supported the OZP amendment, it should bear the responsibility in case of damages to Man Mo Temple occurred in the future; and
- (i) Man Mo Temple was unique. Its stability and longevity were much more important than the provision of a youth hostel which could be constructed anywhere in Hong Kong.

R359 - David Fu

R526 - Charlton Cheung

23. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Charlton Cheung made the following main points:

School Use

- (a) the land covering MMTC including the ex-school building was intended for school use under the original land grant, as reflected in the historic records/correspondence dated back to 1848;
- (b) the ex-school site had in fact been used for school purposes for over a hundred years, originating as a private school known as “Cheung Wa Su Un School” (中華書院) from 1847 to 1880, which later became the first free/public school (run by the Chinese) in Hong Kong. School use continued during the Imperial Japanese occupation of Hong Kong during 1940s;
- (c) TWGHs’ proposal to demolish the current school building to make way for a youth hostel was therefore against the original intention for the land, its

historical background and violated the 1908 MMTO, which had stipulated the use of Man Mo Temple Fund (the Fund) for maintaining free schools in Hong Kong for children of Chinese race;

Air Quality

- (d) the environmental acceptability of the proposed hostel had not been properly demonstrated. According to the HIA, air quality nuisance from MMTC was expected due to joss burning. Although TWGHs claimed that the air filtration system would achieve 80% odour and particulate removal efficiency, without knowing the actual figure of the predicted level of exceedance, such assessment offered no real meaning;
- (e) the use of air filtration system would not be an effective means to mitigate the problem as there might be mechanical and power failures in the maintenance of the filtration system;

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

Alternative Uses

- (f) subject to compliance with the relevant air quality standards after mitigation, the ex-school building could be converted to accommodate a community library. Such use would be fully in line with the historical background and long-standing tradition of the ex-school site;
- (g) if there would still be non-compliance with air quality standards after mitigation, alternative uses involving short-term stay only such as tourism centre, community hall or night-time training centre at the ex-school building could be considered;

Disrespectful & Safety Risks to MMTC

- (h) MMTC and the ex-school site were formerly under two inland lots (i.e. IL 338 and IL 338A respectively) in 1850. Man Mo Temple and Lit Shing Kung fell within IL 338 whereas the ex-school site fell within IL 338A. The two inland lots were merged to form one lot (i.e. IL 338) subsequently;
- (i) Man Mo Temple was the main and highest temple building within MMTC. The proposed youth hostel, with its future occupants living at a higher level than the god residing at the main temple building, would be unacceptable as that was disrespectful to the god; and
- (j) being only 14 inches in thickness, the boundary wall of the Man Mo Temple facing the ex-school site was the thinnest amongst those of the existing buildings of MMTC and the construction of the proposed youth hostel would pose undue safety risks to the structure.

R380 - Katty Law

R560 - Sing Chan

R438 - Kiyoko Taneyama

24. With the aid of the visualizer, Ms Katty Law made the following main points:

- (a) she was a member of the Central & Western Concern Group (the Group). The Group had all along been active in seeking the preservation of monuments/historic buildings since 2005. Its continuous efforts had led to the preservation of several important heritage sites, e.g. the former Police Married Quarters (PMQ) on Hollywood Road, and the West Wing of the former Central Government Office (CGO). The government's plan to relocate a freshwater pumping station at Harcourt Road to Hong Kong Park, which would affect an old stone wall of heritage value, had also been shelved due to the Group's efforts;

“Point-Line-Plane” Approach

- (b) preservation of monuments/historic buildings should not only focus on the structure itself, the surrounding areas including their settings and landscapes should also be conserved. The “point-line-plane” (i.e. 點、線、面) approach in conservation sought to extend the scope of conservation beyond an individual building (“point”) to a “line” (such as a particular street) and even the whole “plane” (such as a particular area). AMO and AAB should embed such approach in the overall policy of heritage conservation. Allowing the erection of a high-rise building so close to MMTC would violate all the heritage charters/principles (e.g. Burra Charter and China Principles). The Government had previously been criticized for abusing Burra Charter when considering the development of the West Wing of the former CGO;
- (c) to be in line with the “Conserving Central” and “Old Town Central” initiatives put forth by the DEVB and Hong Kong Tourism Board respectively, the concerned government departments should act diligently to promote better heritage conservation. The Board, being an independent body, should safeguard the welfare of the community and not be a rubber stamp;

Adverse Visual Impact

- (d) the TWGHs’ treatment to Shui Yuet Temple, which was sandwiched between the two towers of Tung Wah College, was a bad example of heritage conservation. A high-rise building should not be considered as visually compatible with the low-rise buildings at MMTC and the proposal should be rejected based on common sense alone;
- (e) the current 8-storey ex-school building had provided some visual relief/buffer zone for MMTC in the urbanised area. The adverse visual impact on MMTC that would be generated by the proposed high-rise youth

hostel would be irreversible;

Inappropriate Location

- (f) the Group was not against the YHS but considered the subject ex-school site, being located inches away from MMTC, not suitable for the proposed youth hostel;
- (g) the ex-school site was within the Mid-levels Scheduled Area, which was prone to landslip. The construction of the proposed youth hostel would give rise to adverse structural and geotechnical impacts on MMTC and its surrounding areas. The collapse of a heritage building at the former CPSC demonstrated that heritage buildings were fragile and no matter how extensive impact assessments were carried out, the structural impact on them was often unpredictable. Subjecting MMTC to the potential risks of structural damage or collapse was unjustifiable. Other alternative sites for the proposed youth hostel should be considered instead; and
- (h) the existing ex-school building was in good condition and could be easily refurbished for alternative uses (e.g. heritage educational centre on G/F and library/community hall/family services on the upper levels). A good example was the former school premises at 99 Caine Road which had been successfully converted into a community centre by a non-government organisation (NGO).

R382 – Hui Kin Kwun

25. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Hui Kin Kwun made the following main points:

- (a) with reference to some historic photos and drawings in the 19th century, the original Man Mo Temple consisted of two symmetrical ‘wings’ on either side of the main temple structure, with the west wing being the existing Lit

Shing Kung and the east wing at the ex-school site being a study hall. The current declared monument of MMTC missing the east wing was no longer balanced in built form;

- (b) the proposed high-rise youth hostel would create adverse visual impact and further undermine the integrity of MMTC. Opportunity should be taken to conducting a conservation study for MMTC and restoring the original symmetrical outlook of the temple by building a new single-storey structure with pitched roof at the ex-school site to echo with the west wing of the temple. The conservation of Tap Seac Square in Macau where the building bulk, height and architectural style of the new buildings were in conformity with those of the historic buildings could be taken as a reference;
- (c) opportunity could also be taken to demolishing the fence wall in front of the existing MMTC and relocating the joss paper furnace at the forecourt of the temple to the ex-school site when it was redeveloped to reveal the front elevation of the temple for public appreciation; and
- (d) while a single-storey structure was proposed to be built at the ex-school site, a basement could be constructed to optimise utilisation of the site. Public uses, such as multi-purpose hall, lecture hall, library, resource centre and exhibition centre, could be considered at the basement.

R486 - Hung Ching Wei Harry

26. Mr Hung Ching Wei Harry made the following main points:

- (a) it was strange to note from paragraph 6.3.10 of the Paper that the visual impact of the proposed youth hostel was assessed based on its compatibility with the nearby high-rise residential developments but not MMTC, which should be the focus. The proposed youth hostel was visually incompatible with MMTC in terms of style, design, colour and building materials used. The visual contrast was significant;

- (b) while the development of Tung Wah College on the two sides of Shui Yuet Temple was quoted by TWGHs as one of their successful examples in integrating new developments with historic buildings, he did not consider that such modern high-rise towers of Tung Wah College were visually compatible with the old temple sandwiched in between;
- (c) TWGHs, being the owner of many historic buildings, should put better effort to conserve their historic buildings and enhance the heritage significance with due respect to the original building design; and
- (d) other sites in Hong Kong could be used for the development of the proposed youth hostel. There was no strong justification for the proposed youth hostel building at the ex-school site which was visually incompatible with the historic temple.

R607 – Melanie Moore

27. Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

- (a) in view of the collapse incident at the former CPSC, the proposed youth hostel should have been shelved and AMO/AAB should have reviewed their decision on the proposal;
- (b) while the Government was promoting cultural/heritage tourism, development proposals that would undermine the heritage integrity of historic buildings/monuments including MMTC were being formulated. There should be a consistent policy across the various bureaux/departments of the Government;
- (c) it was speculated that the reason for TWGHs not to appoint renowned heritage consultants for the youth hostel project was in fear that dealing with the heritage issues seriously could affect the viability of the project itself;

- (d) under the current proposed arrangement with the Government, TWGHs could reimburse the Government the construction cost for the hostel and take control of the new building. That could allow TWGHs the opportunity in turning the social project into a commercial one, either through building conversion or redevelopment;
- (e) TWGHs had previously attempted to commercialise Government, Institution and Community (GIC) facilities, as shown by its previous planning application to convert a commercial building in Sai Wan, which was occupied by many NGOs, into a hotel, which was rightly rejected by the Board;
- (f) given the high property price in the subject area, setting the future rental of the proposed youth hostel units at 60% of the market level would imply that the targeted youths on a low income (e.g. monthly salaries at around HK\$10,000 or HK\$12,000) could not afford those units;
- (g) the PR of MMTC should not be transferred to the ex-school site;
- (h) the proposed 3m-wide buffer between the youth hostel building and MMTC was highly insufficient. It had already been demonstrated in the case of Shui Yuet Temple that the heritage integrity of a historic building would be undermined if it was sandwiched between high-rise towers;
- (i) ceasing construction works when there was any sign of excessive movement or undue settlement would be unacceptable since damage to MMTC would have been done; and
- (j) the former Western Police Married Quarters, which had been vacant for about 20 years, should be considered for the proposed youth hostel development.

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

28. As the presentation from government representative, and the representers/their representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairman explained that Members would raise questions and the Chairman would invite the representers/their representatives and/or the government representatives to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board, or for cross-examination between parties. The Chairman then invited questions from Members.

YHS

29. Some Members raised the following questions regarding YHS:

- (a) the number of youth hostels built since the announcement of YHS in the 2011-2012 Policy Address;
- (b) whether alternative sites suggested by the representers could be considered under YHS;
- (c) noting that the proposed youth hostel was located in an area of relatively high property values and surging rents, whether setting the future rental at 60% of the market level would render the hostel units unaffordable to the working youths; and
- (d) the targeted working youths for the subject proposed youth hostel and the related selection criteria.

30. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, made the following main points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) there were currently six YHS sites at various stages of development, including the subject ex-school site. Construction works had commenced on two sites, located in Tai Po and Yuen Long respectively, which had

obtained funding approvals from the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council. Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups and Po Leung Kuk were the respective NGOs for the two sites. Technical feasibility studies were being carried out for the remaining three sites, one of which involved an approved section 16 planning application; and

- (b) under the policy on YHS, NGOs would be fully funded by the Government to build youth hostels on the land that were previously granted to NGOs by the Government. The new youth hostels would be operated on a self-financing basis. Using other sites not yet granted to NGOs, i.e. those alternative sites suggested by the representers, would fall outside the scope of YHS.

31. Mr Yiu Tze Leung (Representative of R1) also made the following main points:

- (a) under YHS, the maximum income limit for youth hostel tenants would be the 75th percentile of the monthly employment earnings of employed youths, averaging about HK\$20,000. The 60% market level was the maximum rental limit under YHS. With the objective of meeting the housing needs of the low-income working youths, TWGHs would consider lowering the rental to 50% of the market level or even lower, subject to reviews; and
- (b) the targeted working youths included single persons, married couples and siblings sharing the youth hostel units. All eligible applicants would be fairly considered.

Heritage/ Cultural Aspect

32. Some Members raised the following questions on the heritage/cultural aspect:

- (a) whether using the ex-school site for the proposed youth hostel was within the scope of the MMTO;

- (b) whether there was any restriction in the MMTO or other legislation in Hong Kong governing developments in areas in close proximity to a monument/historic building;
- (c) further information on the applicability of Burra Charter for the youth hostel proposal and the way it had been taken into account in the proposed development;
- (d) whether the qualifications of TWGHs' heritage consultants had been assessed in considering the HIA submission;
- (e) if the existing fence wall of MMTC fronting Hollywood Road was of heritage value and whether it could be removed to allow for an open courtyard;
- (f) whether TWGHs considered MMTC as an important monument with strong historical ties with TWGHs; and
- (g) what types of festivals/activities would be celebrated/carried out at MMTC.

33. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, and Mr K.T. Chau, SA(A&M)1 of AMO, made the following main points with the aid of the visualizer:

- (a) according to the advice from the Home Affairs Bureau, developing a youth hostel at the ex-school site was in compliance with MMTO. Under MMTO (Cap. 154), TWGHs, as the manager of the Fund, had the right to rebuild any of the buildings belonging to the Fund (which included the subject ex-school building). MMTO did not specify the types of uses for the buildings. While the lease for the subject lot covering MMTC and the ex-school site was virtually unrestricted except that "Virtue Court" of MMTC was restricted for use as an non-profit-making ancestral tablets hall;

- (b) all declared monuments were protected under the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance (Cap. 53). No person could carry out any building works or other works in a monument except in accordance with a permit granted by the Antiquities Authority (i.e. Secretary of Development). There was no restriction under MMTO or other legislation governing development in the surrounding areas of a monument in Hong Kong in general. For Capital Works projects, the project proponent would need to submit to AMO a checklist in accordance with the technical circular, setting out the details of any heritage site within 50 metres of the project site boundary. AMO would advise whether a HIA would be required;
- (c) Burra Charter contained general conservation principles that should be adopted in the preparation of HIA. Conservation approach should not merely confine to strict preservation of a monument/historic building. Rather, how changes could be managed from the conservation perspective should be considered;
- (d) while currently there were no ordinances/regulations governing the qualifications of heritage consultants for submission of HIA, most of the heritage consultants by and large held membership of the Hong Kong Institute of Architectural Conservationists; and
- (e) the fence wall of MMTC fronting Hollywood Road did not form part of the monument. If the project proponent proposed to demolish the fence wall, AMO would review the proposal accordingly.

34. Mr Yiu Tze Leung (Representative of R1) also made the following main responses;

- (a) TWGHs would review the feasibility of removing the concerned fence wall of MMTC to allow a better integration of the heritage bazaar with the courtyard of MMTC to enhance visual permeability and public

access/enjoyment;

- (b) MMTC was in existence when TWGHs were first established. MMTC had been very important to TWGHs. TWGHs had more than one hundred years of experience in managing MMTC;
- (c) the youth hostel proposal was the result of a well-thought-out plan, involving the carrying out of various assessments including examining the potential risks to MMTC. The past contributions of MMTC to the community would be showcased in the heritage bazaar, which would help promote the history and culture of MMTC and Hong Kong; and
- (d) yearly and longstanding signature/regular events such as Qiu ji Dian li (秋祭典禮) and birthdays of Wu Di and Wen Di (文帝及武帝誕) were organised by TWGHs and held at MMTC, which were attended by the local stakeholders, religious bodies and members of the public. The heritage bazaar in the proposed youth hostel development could help provide back-up space for those events.

35. Mr John Batten (representative of R3 and R455) also responded that the crux of the issue was about the appropriateness of construction of a 21-storey high-rise building next to MMTC which would have adverse impact on the heritage value of the monument and violate the conservation principles.

Visual Aspect

36. Some Members raised the following questions on the visual aspect:

- (a) whether photomontages/illustrations could be provided to illustrate the interface between the proposed youth hostel building and the neighbouring MMTC at pedestrian level;

- (b) whether the assessment on visual impact of the proposed development should have made reference to MMTC, instead of the high-rise buildings in the neighbourhood; and
- (c) noting that the ex-school site was mainly surrounded by high-rise buildings, whether other design options seeking to alleviate visual impact on MMTC (e.g. maximising the G/F headroom, locating a skygarden on lower floors, further building setback from Hollywood Road and adopting terraced built form with lower buildings fronting MMTC) had been considered.

37. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, made the following main points with the aid of some PowerPoint Slides:

- (a) a visual impact assessment (VIA) had been conducted in support of the application for the proposed youth hostel development under section 12A of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). In accordance with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 41 on submission on VIA, the potential visual impact of the proposed hostel on the surrounding areas had been assessed from key public viewing points (including those nearby locations at Hollywood Road and Caine Road). It was concluded that the resultant visual impact was minimal; and
- (b) HIA conducted had examined the interface between the proposed youth hostel and MMTC, including the visual impact of the proposed hostel on MMTC. With the incorporation of various design measures such as building setback from Hollywood Road to address the current visual blockage to MMTC by the existing school building, HIA considered the visual impact on MMTC acceptable.

38. Mr Yiu Tze Leung (Representative of R1) also made the following responses with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) the interface between the proposed youth hostel building and MMTC was illustrated with reference to the photomontages showing the street frontage of the hostel building and MMTC;
- (b) TWGHs had been reminded by AAB that artifacts should not be made/used to form an extension/new wing of MMTC. It would continue to take into consideration the views from the public and stakeholders in the community to enhance design harmonisation between the heritage bazaar and MMTC for better visual effect or compatibility; and
- (c) the current design elements of the proposed hostel, including the introduction of high headroom, setback from Hollywood Road and the number of hostel bed spaces to be provided, had taken into account the views of various stakeholders and government departments. The current proposal of 302 hostel bed spaces would help maximise the use of the valuable land resources at such location. The suggested alternative design options might require further relaxation of the building height (BH) restriction.

Design Aspect

39. Some Members raised the following questions on the design aspect:

- (a) whether the buffer distance between the youth hostel building and MMTC and the building setback from Hollywood Road would be less than 3m and 5.8m at upper storeys respectively; and
- (b) whether sufficient maneuvering space would be allowed for vehicles using the two car parking spaces and one loading/unloading (L/U) bay proposed at the heritage bazaar and the related interface between vehicular and pedestrian traffic including visitors to MMTC.

40. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK made the following main points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) the G/F buffer distance between the proposed youth hostel building and MMTC would be 3.1m while the upper storeys of the hostel building would maintain a setback distance of 2.9m from MMTC. The G/F setback distance from Hollywood Road would be 5.8m and from 11m above-ground onwards, the setback distance would be about 3m; and
- (b) the two car parking spaces and one L/U bay proposed at the heritage bazaar as shown on plan would only be used to facilitate the future occupants during moving in/out from the hostel. L/U activities would not be permitted when exhibitions or activities were being held at the heritage bazaar. Prior arrangements with the management office for use of the parking spaces and L/U were required to ensure no safety issues concerning vehicular and pedestrian movements.

41. Mr Yiu Tze Leung (Representative of R1) supplemented the following main points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) the ground-level setback of 5.8m from Hollywood Road would allow aligning the building with the courtyard of MMTC; and
- (b) the proposed car parking spaces were provided in compliance with the requirements of the concerned departments and they were anticipated to be of infrequent use. The occupants would be prohibited from using the parking spaces and L/U bay when the heritage bazaar was in use.

Others

42. Some Members raised the following questions:

Structural Impact

- (a) whether further measures would be adopted to safeguard the structural safety of the buildings at MMTC;

Air Quality

- (b) the proposed hostel would be equipped with an air filtration system capable of achieving 80% odour and particulate removal efficiency. Whether there was any information on the measures to mitigate the residual impact;

PR

- (c) whether MMTC and the ex-school site were one lot and whether there was any transfer of PR from MMTC to the proposed youth hostel building;

GIC Provision

- (d) provision of library, community hall and education/family centre in the local area;

Rights of TWGHs

- (e) whether TWGHs had the right to demolish the youth hostel, if built, for other commercial building, upon reimbursing the construction cost to the Government;

Alternative Proposal

- (f) if the youth hostel proposal could not be proceeded with, whether there was any alternative proposal for the ex-school building that would be pursued by TWGHs;

- (g) whether the existing school building on site could be refurbished to accommodate the youth hostel; and

Future Management

- (h) any information on the future management of the proposed youth hostel and whether management fee would be borne by the future tenants.

43. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, and Mr K.T. Chau, SA(A&M)1 of AMO made the following main points with the aid of the visualizer/ PowerPoint slides:

Structural Impact

- (a) the detailed mitigation measures for checking/monitoring the stability of the buildings at MMTC as recommended in HIA would be further discussed between TWGH's heritage consultants and the structural engineers of AMO. The project team of the project proponent would closely monitor the carrying out of works to ensure no risks to MMTC. Apart from AMO, concerned departments including the Buildings Department would also be involved for approving the related works and there were close liaison among departments ensuring full protection of the monument;

PR

- (b) the Lands Department (LandsD) advised that the ex-school site and MMTC were under one lot i.e. IL 338. Based on the whole site, the PR of the proposed hostel building was 4.7. If based on the site area of the ex-school site only, the PR of the proposed hostel building amounted to about 16. There was no transfer of PR from MMTC to the proposed youth hostel building as they were on the same lot;

GIC Provision

- (c) for the Central & Western (C&W) district, there was a surplus of one library in accordance with HKPSG's requirement. There were also four community halls, though there was no specific standard under the HKPSG. There was, however, a shortfall of Integrated Children and Youth Services Centre in the district; and

Rights of TWGHs

- (d) TWGHs would need to seek the Board's permission for a commercial development at the ex-school site under the "Government, Institution or Community (2)" ("G/IC(2)") zone. If the commercial component exceed 50% of the total gross floor area of the GIC facility, rezoning of the site to an appropriate zone might be required.

44. In response, Mr Yiu Tze Leung (Representative of R1) made the following points:

Structural Impact

- (a) MMTC was at the heart of TWGHs and it would not subject MMTC to adverse safety risks. Apart from TWGHs which would closely monitor the structural safety of the buildings at MMTC before and during construction, government departments including AMO would also closely monitor the situation;

Air Quality

- (b) the internal air quality of the proposed youth hostel would be in compliance with the statutory standards. The air filtration system could in fact achieve about 90% odour and particulate removal efficiency in respect of the detailed design scheme. Worshippers visiting MMTC would be encouraged to use substitutes instead of burning joss papers so as

to reduce smoke emission;

Alternative Proposal

- (c) the existing school building had been left vacant since 2005 and in a poor state. It would not be able to comply with the current standards for school premises e.g. lack of universal access;
- (d) youth hostels were urgently needed in Hong Kong. The subject proposal represented the most feasible option for the ex-school site and would maximise the use of valuable land resources. Currently, no other alternative proposal for the site was being considered; and

Future Management

- (e) TWGHs would be responsible for managing the hostel and the rents to be charged for the youth hostel units would be inclusive of the management fees.

45. Noting that the major views of C&WDC (R635) including the minutes of the relevant C&WDC meeting had been incorporated/attached to the Paper, a Member asked whether Mr John Batten (Representative of R3 and R455) could clarify his view that the comments of the C&WDC (R635) had not been reflected fully in the Paper. In response, Mr Batten said that various concerns of the C&WDC relating to BH and air quality of the proposed youth hostel, structural safety for the buildings at MMTC and that the need to conduct a geotechnical assessment and building setback from Hollywood Road etc., as provided in Annex IV of the Paper, had not been addressed. The high BH and limited building setback of the upper floors of the youth hostel building were highly unsatisfactory. More importantly, the C&WDC considered the proposed hostel building visually incompatible with MMTC.

46. The same Member asked if Mr Yiu Tze Leung (Representative of R1) could clarify as to why the ex-school site was selected amongst those sites belonging to TWGHs. In response, Mr Leung said that besides the subject ex-school building, there were no other

available sites being held by TWGHs at the current time.

47. Ms Katty Law (R380 and R438/560's Representative) indicated that Members should be mindful of the need for the project proponent to conduct an environmental impact assessment (EIA) for the youth hostel proposal given that the ex-school site and MMTC were regarded as one site.

[Mr Stephen L.H. Liu returned to join the meeting and Mr K.K. Cheung left the meeting during the Q&A Session.]

48. As Members did not have any further questions, the Chairman said that the Q&A session was completed. He thanked the government representatives as well as the representers and their representatives for attending the meeting. The Board would deliberate the representations in closed meeting and would inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course. The government representatives as well as the representers and their representatives left the meeting at this point.

49. As the attendees of Agenda Item 4 and Agenda Item 5 had been waiting for some time, the meeting decided to defer the deliberation of this item until a later stage.

Sai Kung & Islands District

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/I-TCTC/55

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in "Green Belt" and "Village Type Development" zones, Government Land in D.D. 3 TC, Sheung Ling Pei Village, Tung Chung, Lantau Island, New Territories
(TPB Paper No. 10269)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

50. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Professor T.S. Liu | - | close relative co-owning with a friend a property in Tung Chung |
| Mr Martin W.C. Kwan | - | close relative owning properties in Tung Chung New Town |

51. As the properties of Professor T.S. Liu and Mr Martin W.C. Kwan's close relatives had no direct view of the application Site (the Site), Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

52. The following representative from the Planning Department (PlanD) and the applicant were invited to the meeting at this point:

- | | | |
|-------------------|---|--|
| Ms Donna Y.P. Tam | - | District Planning Officer/Sai Kung & Islands (DPO/SKIs), PlanD |
| Mr Cheng Wai Kin | - | Applicant |

53. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the review hearing. He then invited DPO/SKIs to brief Members on the review application.

54. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, briefed Members on the background of the review application including the consideration of the application by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board), departmental and public comments, and planning considerations and assessments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10269 (the Paper).

55. The Chairman then invited the applicant to elaborate on the review application. With the aid of the visualiser, Mr Cheng Wai Kin made the following main points:

- (a) the application was in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 (TPB PG-No. 10) in that the Site was in close proximity to the existing village, the proposed development was in keeping with the surrounding uses and to meet the demand from indigenous villagers, and there were satisfactory sewage disposal facilities and access arrangements;
- (b) PlanD's view that each application should be considered based on its individual merits and that approval of the subject application would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications was self-contradictory. If each application was to be considered based on its individual merits, approval of the subject application should not have any precedent effect on other applications. Besides, the judgement on precedent effect without any consideration on whether the subject application and other subsequent applications were subject to similar circumstances was unfound and unfair, and was not in line with TPB PG-No. 10 that each application should be considered based on its individual merits;
- (c) the argument regarding cumulative impact was hypothetical. As noted from the comments of Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape (CTP/UD&L), the landscape impact of the proposed Small House development was not significant;
- (d) the subject application was unique in that the Small House application was submitted to the Lands Department (LandsD) in 2010 well before the Site was included in the subject outline zoning plan (OZP) and PlanD raised no objection to the Small House grant application in 2012 and 2014. The Site would have been zoned "Village Type Development" ("V") on the OZP if the subject Small House grant application was approved by LandsD before 2016. In end 2015, he was informed by LandsD that his Small House grant application was nearly completed. However, PlanD had overlooked that

fact and designated the Site as “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone. The subject application was different from those other applications which were submitted after the sites were zoned “GB” and should not be considered as a precedent case;

- (e) there were existing Small Houses located at similar level of the Site. Since the “GB” areas to the south of the Site were natural slopes, Small House development would unlikely be approved due to safety concerns. Hence, PlanD’s assessment that the cumulative effect of approving the subject application would result in degradation of the landscape character of the “GB” zone was unjustified;
- (f) it was misleading to say that the applicant could apply for Small House development within the common “V” zone covering the four villages. As informed by LandsD, under the Small House Policy, application for Small House grant on government land could only be made in the applicant’s own village. It would not be reasonable to argue that the applicant could purchase private land in other villages for Small House development as that would deprive the rights of the indigenous villagers for Small House development under the Basic Law;
- (g) in assessing the land available for Small House development within the four villages, PlanD had inappropriately included into calculation a number of areas such as an area comprising a retaining wall managed by the Water Supplies Department to the east of the Site, surveyed squatters, fung shui areas and private land. It was noted that a plan showing the land available for Small House development presented at the section 16 stage (Plan A-2b) had been amended by excluding the said retaining wall and vehicular access without any explanation and renumbered to Plan R-2b appended to the Paper at the section 17 stage. As PlanD’s assessment on land availability for Small House development was based on such unreliable information, the Board was urged not to accept the assessment that land was still available within the “V” zone for Small House development;

- (h) it was revealed in the site photos that the land available for Small House development as identified by PlanD was currently occupied by different uses such as car parking area and most land was under private ownership. It was very difficult to acquire those land for Small House development. The indigenous villagers' right to apply for Small House development on government land should be respected;
- (i) the planning intention of the "GB" zone was primarily for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas rather than for conservation purpose. It should be noted that the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation and the Director of Environmental Protection had no objection to the application; and
- (j) given the history and uniqueness of the application, the Board was urged to give sympathetic consideration to the subject application.

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

57. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether PlanD was aware that the subject Small House grant application was nearly completed, as claimed by the applicant, when preparing the OZP amendments;
- (b) how many Small House grant applications were being processed by LandsD and how the applications outside "V" zone but within village environ ("VE") would be handled;
- (c) whether PlanD's assessment on land available within the "V" zone for Small House development at the section 17 stage (i.e. Plan R-2b) was different from that at the section 16 stage (i.e. Plan A-2b);

- (d) whether traffic impact assessment (TIA) and tree survey had been conducted for the Site, and whether emergency vehicular access (EVA) serving the Site was required; and
- (e) any information on the two Small Houses near Ha Ling Pei outside the “V” zone.

58. Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs made the following responses:

- (a) when the Tung Chung Town Centre OZP was amended in January 2016, the boundary of the OZP was extended to cover four villages, namely, Sheung Ling Pei, Ha Ling Pei, Wong Ka Wai and Lung Tseng Tau. In drawing up the boundary of the “V” zone for the four villages, LandsD had been consulted on the status of Small House grant applications in the area. Private lots with building entitlement and sites with approved Small House grant applications and Small Houses under construction would be included in the “V” zone, whereas sites with Small House applications under processing would not be included. According to the information provided by LandsD, there was no differentiation on whether a Small House grant application was nearly completed, or still under processing. As the subject Small House grant application was still under processing at that time, the Site had not been included in the “V” zone;
- (b) as per the latest information, there were 122 outstanding Small House grant applications for the four villages being processed by LandsD. For Small House grant applications within ‘VE’, LandsD would seek comments from relevant government departments including PlanD on the suitability of the sites for Small House development. For those applications outside “V” zone, planning permission from the Board would be required and each application would be considered based on its individual merits;

- (c) PlanD would from time to time review the land available within the “V” zone for Small House development. Some adjustments had been made with reference to the latest available information and Plan R-2b of the Paper was updated accordingly. Both government and private land would be considered as available land for Small House development. Based on the latest assessment, the land available within the “V” zone for Small House development was sufficient to meet the outstanding Small House demand;
- (d) TIA was generally not required for Small House development. The Fire Services Department had been consulted on the application and no requirement of EVA for the Site had been raised. No tree survey had been conducted at the Site. CTP/UD&L of PlanD advised that there were three small trees of common woodland species within the Site. As the Site was situated on a slope covered with vegetation and trees, the proposed development might involve extensive site formation works and construction of a retaining wall and require vegetation clearance outside the Site, thus adversely affecting the overall landscape resource in the “GB” zone; and
- (e) there was currently no information at hand regarding the two Small Houses near Ha Ling Pei outside the “V” zone as shown on Plan R-2b.

59. As Members had no further question, the Chairman informed the applicant that the hearing procedure for the review application had been completed. The Board would further deliberate on the review application in their absence and inform the applicant of the Board’s decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the applicant and PlanD’s representative for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

60. As the attendees of Agenda Item 5 had been waiting for some time, the meeting decided to defer the deliberation of this item until a later stage.

Sha Tin, Tai Po and North District

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/NE-TK/598

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in "Green Belt" zone,
Government land in D.D. 28, Tai Mei Tuk Village, Tai Po, New Territories
(TPB Paper No. 10270)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

61. The following representative from the Planning Department (PlanD), the applicant and the applicant's representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Ms Jessica H.F. Chu	-	District Planning Officer/Shan Tin, Tai Po and North (DPO/STN), PlanD
Applicant	-	Mr Wong Tin Yiu
Applicant's Representatives]	Wong Pik Hon, Alan
]	Wong Yuk Ying, Delanda

62. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the review hearing. He then invited DPO/STN to brief Members on the review application.

63. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, briefed Members on the background of the review application including the consideration of the application by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board), departmental and public comments, and planning considerations and assessments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10270.

64. The Chairman then invited the applicant's representative to elaborate on the review application. Mr Wong Pik Hon, Alan, with the aid of the visualiser, made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed development would not have adverse impacts on the surrounding environment as the adjacent areas had been developed, the stream to the west of the application site (the Site) had been filled, the Site was paved and there was an access road connecting to the Site;
- (b) PlanD's estimates on land available within the "Village Type Development" ("V") zone for Small House development was incorrect as some areas currently occupied by graves and building structures had been included in the estimates; and
- (c) the proposed development would not have adverse landscape impact as only some bamboo within and near the Site would be cleared.

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

66. In response to a Member's enquiry on PlanD's estimates on land available within the "V" zone for Small House development, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, said that PlanD would conduct site visits and review the estimates regularly. Land occupied by graves, access road, tree clusters, etc. would be discounted from the land available for Small House development. In assessing the land available for Small House development, a conservative approach had been adopted with the assumption of a rate of 40 houses per hectare which would allow the provision of space for access road, circulation space and other necessary supporting facilities. According to the latest estimation, about 3.12 ha (or equivalent to about 124 Small House sites) of land were available within the "V" zone, which was nearly twice the outstanding Small House applications of 63.

67. As Members had no further question, the Chairman informed the applicant and his representatives that the hearing procedure for the review application had been completed. The

Board would further deliberate on the review application in their absence and inform the applicant of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the applicant and his representatives and PlanD's representative for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

68. A Member supported the decision of the RNTPC to reject the application as land was still available within the "V" zone to meet the outstanding Small House applications. Other Members generally concurred with the views of the RNTPC.

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

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Green Belt” zoning for the area which is primarily for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There is a general presumption against development within this zone;
- (b) the proposed development does not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10 for ‘Application for Development within “Green Belt” zone under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’ in that the proposed development would involve clearance of vegetation affecting the existing natural landscape in the area;
- (c) the proposed development does not comply with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for New Territories Exempted House/ Small House in New Territories in that the proposed development would cause adverse landscape impacts on the surrounding areas; and
- (d) land is still available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Lung Mei, Tai Mei Tuk and Wong Chuk Tsuen which is primarily

intended for Small House development. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within “V” zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructure and services.”

Agenda Item 4 (Continued)

[Closed Meeting (Deliberation)]

Review of Application No. A/I-TCTC/55

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in "Green Belt" and "Village Type Development" zones, Government Land in D.D. 3 TC, Sheung Ling Pei Village, Tung Chung, Lantau Island, New Territories
(TPB Paper No. 10269)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

Deliberation Session

70. A Member was of the view that the Site, locating on a slope, was not suitable for Small House development which would require extensive site formation, construction of retaining wall and massive vegetation clearance, thus adversely affecting the landscape character of the area. Whilst no information was available on the two Small Houses outside the “V” zone near Ha Ling Pei, they were located far away from the Site and might not be relevant for the consideration of the subject application. The concern on adverse landscape impact was shared by another Member.

71. A Member wondered whether the processing of a Small House grant application was at an advanced stage at the time of OZP gazettal should be a relevant factor. Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn, Director of Lands, said that in drawing the boundary of the “V” zone, PlanD’s established practice was to include those Small House applications already approved by LandsD. It would be difficult and arbitrary to say an application had a good chance or low chance of being approved. An application that had not been completed should simply be regarded as such.

72. In response to a Member's question, the Secretary said that under the planning application system, the applicant could submit a new application or lodge an appeal against the decision of the Board under section 17B of the Town Planning Ordinance.

73. A Member said that although the land available within the "V" zone for Small House development as estimated by PlanD was slightly less than that at the section 16 stage, land was still available within the "V" zone to meet the outstanding Small House demand. As such, there was no strong justification to depart from the RNTPC's decision.

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

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone which is primarily for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to preserve the existing topography and natural vegetation at the fringe of the new town as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There is a general presumption against development within this zone. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention;
- (b) land is still available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Sheung Ling Pei, Ha Ling Pei, Wong Ka Wai and Lung Tseng Tau for Small House development. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House within the “V” zone for orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services; and
- (c) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the “GB” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such similar applications would result in the encroachment on the “GB” zone and a general degradation of the landscape character of the area.”

[Mr Stephen L.H. Liu left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 3 (Continued)

[Closed Meeting (Deliberation)]

Consideration of Representations in respect of Draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H3/30
(TPB Paper No. 10268)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

Deliberation Session

75. The Chairman recapitulated the main concerns of the representers and he invited Members to express their views.

Air Quality and EIA

76. A Member considered that the concerns on adverse air quality from MMTC as claimed by some representers might have been overstated and that there were already many residential developments surrounding the ex-school site. Two other Members shared the view and considered that air quality might not be a significant concern.

77. Mr C.W. Tse, Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1), Environmental Protection Department (EPD), said that joss/incense burning was not a major source of air pollution and its effects on air quality would be too small to be reflected in air quality monitoring data. The most common complaints were against nuisances to adjacent residents caused by the smell and ash emissions. Temples could install suitable equipment or make other arrangements to control the emission of smell and ash which had generally been quite effective in mitigating the nuisances. For the proposed youth hostel, an air filtration system that could achieve 80% odour and particulate efficiency would be able to substantially mitigate the nuisance effects, if any, from MMTC.

78. Mr. Tse also clarified that since the proposed youth hostel would not encroach upon a declared monument (i.e. MMTC), the proposal was not a Designated Project under the EIA Ordinance and hence no EIA was required.

Transfer of PR

79. On the concern of the representers that there might be a transfer of PR from MMTC to the ex-school site as the two were on separate lots, Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn said that the two aforesaid sites were under one lot as explained by DPO/HK, and that the lot was under a virtually unrestricted lease with a non-offensive trade clause. As such, the meeting noted that the issue of transfer of PR did not arise.

Heritage/Visual/ Design Aspect

80. A Member considered that the heritage value of MMTC was significant and MMTC should not be adversely affected by the proposed youth hostel development. Another Member considered that higher BH might be tolerable as long as the building mass of the lower part of the youth hostel building could be reduced so as to minimise visual impact on MMTC.

81. A Member observed that the function of MMTC was different from other temples in Hong Kong. It was a popular tourist spot. The introduction of a heritage bazaar to educate the public including tourists about the history of MMTC was thus welcome. He opined that the assessment on the visual impact of the proposed youth hostel building should focus more on the impact on MMTC. Another Member observed that the proposed youth hostel building with building setback at G/F represented an improvement to the current situation as the views to MMTC at pedestrian level were obstructed by the existing school building.

82. Members in general considered the proposed high-rise building immediately adjoining MMTC, a declared monument, might not be the ideal option as that would have adverse visual impact on MMTC. At the same time, Members were generally supportive of using the site to meet the need for youth hostel development. Some Members considered that there was scope to improve the design of the proposed youth hostel development, whilst other Members took the view that aesthetics were to some extent subjective and that the scope for

improvement could be limited.

Planning Permission

83. To facilitate better planning control, some Members suggested that the future youth hostel development should be subject to planning permission from the Board to ensure that the building design would be scrutinized by the Board so as to minimise any adverse visual impact it might have on MMTC. Some Members doubted whether it was necessary as the scope for the design to be further improved could be limited.

[Mr Stephen H.B. Yau left the meeting at this point.]

84. Given the divergent views of Members, the meeting took a vote on whether to delete the “Residential Institution (Hostel only)(on land designated “G/IC(2)” only) from Column 1 use under the “G/IC” zone and to correspondingly replace “Residential Institution (not elsewhere specified)” under Column 2 by “Residential Institution”. A majority of the Members were in support of the above amendments to the Notes of the “G/IC” zone.

Building Height

85. Some Members considered that the BH of 97mPD was appropriate as it would allow design flexibility. Whilst the BH restriction only set out the maximum, the Board was not bound to accept the maximum BH in considering the planning application submitted at the section 16 stage. Some Members, however, considered the original BH of 8-storey should be kept, so that the building bulk of the future development would be the same as that of the current ex-school building, and that the feasibility of adoptive reuse of the existing school building for youth hostel use could also be further explored. A Member opined that simply converting the existing ex-school building would imply limited floor area for the future youth hostel and might not be a feasible option.

86. Given the divergent views of Members, the meeting took a vote on whether 97mPD or 8 storeys should be adopted as BH restriction, and a majority of Members were in support of adopting 97mPD, which meant that no amendment to the BH restriction for the ex-school site (i.e. Amendment Item A) as shown on the draft OZP was required.

87. In conclusion, the Board decided to note the supportive view of Representation R1, and to partially uphold Representations R2 to R635. The Board considered that the Plan should be amended to partially meet the representations by deleting the “Residential Institution (Hostel only)(on land designated “Government, Institution or Community (2)” (“G/IC(2)”) only) from Column 1 use under the “G/IC” zone as well as replacing “Residential Institution (not elsewhere specified)” under Column 2 by “Residential Institution”. To correspond with such amendments, the representation site would be rezoned from “G/IC(2)” back to the original zoning of “G/IC”.

88. The Board also decided not to uphold the remaining part of Representations R2 to R635 for the following reasons:

- “(a) as the representation site is within the Mid-levels Scheduled Area, any works would be subject to stringent geotechnical controls under the Buildings Ordinance and should follow the relevant Practice Note (APP-30) to safeguard public safety and ground stability. The issue of the youth hostel causing structural damage to the Man Mo Temple Compound during construction would be addressed through the building plan processing system;
- (b) the statutory and administrative procedures in consulting the public on the proposed zoning amendment have been duly followed. The exhibition of the Outline Zoning Plan for public inspection and the provision for submission of representations/comments form part of the statutory consultation process under the Town Planning Ordinance; and
- (c) as the policy intention of the Youth Hostel Scheme (YHS) is to unleash the potential of under-utilised site held by non-government organisations, the alternative proposals would fall outside the scope of the YHS policy.”

Procedural Matters

Agenda Item 6

[Open Meeting]

Submission of the Draft The Peak Area Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H14/12A under Section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval
(TPB Paper No. 10271)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

89. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interest on the item for having affiliations/being acquainted with the representers/commenters or their representatives including Cheung Kong Hutchison Holdings Limited (CKHH), being the mother company of Juli May Limited (R1/C1), LWK & Partners (HK) Limited (LWK) (R1/C1's representative), World Wide Fund for Nature of Hong Kong (WWF) (R5/C32), Hong Kong Bird Watching Society (HKBWS) (R6), Designing Hong Kong Limited (R8) and Mary Mulvihill (R12/C40):

- | | | |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Mr Ivan C.S. Fu | - | having current business dealings with CKHH and being a Director and shareholder of LWK; |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | - | having current business dealings with CKHH; |
| Dr C.H. Hau | - | being a member of the HKBWS and a past member of the Conservation Advisory Committee of WWF; |
| Mr K.K. Cheung |] | their company hiring Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time; |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai |] | |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - | personally knowing the co-founder and Chief Executive Officer of Designing Hong Kong |

Limited;

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam]	personally knowing some representers/
Dr Lawrence K.C. Li]	commenters; and
Professor T.S. Liu]	
Mr Stephen L.H. Liu	-	having past business dealings with CKHH and LWK.

90. Members noted that Dr C.H. Hau and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr K.K. Cheung and Mr Stephen L.H. Liu had left the meeting. As the item was procedural in nature, Members agreed that the above Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting.

91. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. On 29.4.2016, the draft The Peak Area Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H14/12 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (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.

92. After deliberation, the Board:

- (a) agreed that the draft The Peak Area OZP No. S/H14/12A 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 The Peak Area OZP No. S/H14/12A 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 to be 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 7

[Open Meeting]

Submission of the Draft North Point Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H8/25A under Section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval
(TPB Paper No. 10272)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

93. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests on the item for having affiliations with the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) relating to a proposed public housing development (Amendment Item A) on the draft North Point Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) to be undertaken by the Housing Department (HD), the executive arm of HKHA, and for having business dealings with the consultants of HD (i.e. Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) and MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA)) and a representer/commenter (Ms Mary Mulvihill) (R406/C3):

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| Mr Raymond K.W. Lee
<i>(as Director of Planning)</i> | - | being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and the Building Committee of HKHA; |
| Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn
<i>(as Director of Lands)</i> | - | being a member of HKHA; |
| Mr Martin W.C. Kwan
<i>(as Chief Engineer (Works), HAD)</i> | - | being the representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the SPC and the Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA; |
| Mr H.F. Leung | - | being a member of the Tender Committee of HKHA; |
| Dr C.H. Hau | - | having current business dealings with HKHA; |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | - | having current business dealings with HKHA, Arup and MVA; |

- Ms Janice W.M. Lai - having current business dealings with HKHA and Arup;
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with HKHA and MVA and owning a flat at Braemar Hill Mansion, North Point;
- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having current business dealings with Arup and MVA and past business dealings with HKHA;
- Mr K.K. Cheung] their firm having current business dealings with
Mr Alex T.H. Lai] HKHA and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract
] basis from time to time;
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having past business dealings with HKHA;
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with HKHA, Arup and MVA;
- Professor S.C. Wong - being an engineering consultant of Arup and the Chair Professor and Head of Department of Civil Engineering of University of Hong Kong where Arup had sponsored some activities of the Department before;
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his spouse being an employee of HD but not involved in planning work;
- Dr Wilton W.T. Fok - co-owning with spouse a flat at Cloud View Road, North Point; and
- Mr Stephen H.B. Yau - owning a flat in North Point.

94. Members noted that Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, Mr H.F. Leung, Dr C.H. Hau, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho and Dr Wilton W.T. Fok had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr K.K. Cheung, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu and Mr Stephen H.B. Yau had left the meeting. As the item was procedural in nature, Members agreed that the above Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting.

95. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. On 5.8.2016, the draft North Point Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H8/25 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (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.

96. After deliberation, the Board:

- (d) agreed that the draft North Point OZP No. S/H8/25A 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;
- (e) endorsed the updated Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft North Point OZP No. S/H8/25A 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 to be issued under the name of the Board; and
- (f) agreed that the updated ES was suitable for submission to the CE in C together with the draft OZP.

Agenda Item 8

[Confidential Item] [Closed Meeting]

97. The item was recorded under confidential cover.

Agenda Item 9
[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

98. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 4:45 p.m.