

**Minutes of 1149<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 18.8.2017**

**Present**

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr H.W. Cheung

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

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 H.F. Leung

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

Mr Franklin Yu

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr. C.F. Wong

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport 3)  
Transport and Housing Bureau  
Mr Andy S.H. Lam

Assistant Director of Lands (Regional 1)  
Mr. Simon S.W. Wang

Chief Engineer (Works)  
Home Affairs Department  
Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Director of Planning  
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

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

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Permanent Secretary for Development  
(Planning and Lands)

Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Professor K.C. Chau

Ms Christina M. Lee

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Sally S.Y. Fong (a.m.)

Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen (p.m.)

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Karen F.Y. Wong (a.m.)

Mr T.C. Cheng (p.m.)

**Agenda Item 1**

[Open meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1147<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 1.8.2017

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The minutes of the 1147<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 1.8.2017 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

[Open meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1148<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 4.8.2017

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

2. The minutes of the 1148<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 4.8.2017 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 3**

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

Comments on Confirmed Minutes of the 1146<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 21.7.2017

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

3. The Secretary reported that as the item was related to the comments from Ms Mary Mulvihill, the following Members had declared interests on the item for having business dealings with Ms Mary Mulvihill :

Mr K.K. Cheung	]	their company hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract
Mr Alex T.H. Lai	]	basis from time to time

4. Members agreed that as Mr K.K. Cheung and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in their company's project in which Ms Mary Mulvihill was hired, they could stay in the meeting.

5. The Secretary reported that an email, which had been sent to Members before the meeting, was received on 8.8.2017 from Ms Mary Mulvihill who was the representer R5 and commenter C1 in respect of the draft Kowloon Tong Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K18/20. The email provided her views on paragraphs 51(a) and 60 of the confirmed minutes of the 1146<sup>th</sup> Town Planning Board (the Board) meeting.

6. Members noted that the minutes served to record the meeting proceedings of the Board including the gist of the presentation by the participants, discussion and deliberation of the Board. The minutes were not a verbatim record but to reflect the key messages put across by relevant parties. Besides, the audio record of the open part of the meeting was also available on the Board's website for at least 6 months. After deliberation, the meeting noted Ms Mary Mulvihill's views on the confirmed minutes of the 1146<sup>th</sup> meeting and agreed not to amend to the confirmed minutes.

[Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, Professor T.S. Liu, Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

#### **Agenda Item 4**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/NE-KLH/526

Proposed 6 Houses (New Territories Exempted Houses - Small Houses) in "Agriculture" Zone, Lots 853 S.E ss.1, 853 S.F, 853 S.G, 854 S.C ss.1, 854 S.C ss. 2, 854 S.C RP, 854 S.D, 854 S.G, 854 S.H, 854 S.I ss.1, 854 S.I ss.2, 854 S.I RP, 854 S.J, 855 S.B ss.1, 855 S.B RP, 855 S.D ss.1, 855 S.D RP, 855 S.E, 855 S.F, 855 S.G, 867 S.A, 867 S.B, 867 S.C and 867 RP in D.D. 9, Yuen Leng Village, Tai Po, New Territories

(TPB Paper No. 10311)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

7. The Vice-chairperson said that the applicant had indicated not attending the meeting.

8. The following representative from the Planning Department (PlanD) was invited to the meeting :

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

9. The Vice-chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the review hearing. He then invited DPO/STN to brief Members on the review application.

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng and Ms Janice W.M. Lai arrived to join the meeting during DPO/STN's presentation.]

10. 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. 10311 (the Paper).

11. As the presentation from DPO/STN had been completed, the Vice-chairperson invited questions from Members.

[Mr H.F. Leung arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

12. In response to a Member's enquiry, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, with reference to Plan R-4a of the Paper, indicated that part of the application site (the Site) was under cultivation.

13. As Members had no further question to raise, the Vice-chairperson said that the hearing procedure for the review application had been completed. The Board would further deliberate on the review application. The Vice-chairperson thanked DPO/STN for attending the meeting. Ms Jessica H.F. Chu left the meeting at this point.

#### Deliberation Session

14. A Member said that while there might be some agricultural activities on the Site, it was not a major consideration in deciding on the subject application. Members noted that there was no change in the planning circumstances since the rejection of the application which would warrant a departure from RNTPC's previous decision.

15. After deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application on review based on the following reasons :

- “ (a) the proposed developments do not comply with the Interim Criteria for consideration of application for New Territories Exempted House/Small House in New Territories in that the proposed Small Houses located within the water gathering ground cannot be able to be connected to the existing/planned sewerage system in the area as there is no fixed programme for implementation of such system at this juncture;
- (b) the applicants fail to demonstrate that the proposed developments located within the water gathering ground would not cause adverse impact on the water quality in the area; and
- (c) land is still available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Yuen Leng, Kau Lung Hang San Wai and Kau Lung Hang Lo Wai which is primarily intended for Small House development. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within the “V” zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructure and services. ”

**Tuen Mun & Yuen Long West District**

**Agenda Item 5**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/YL-HT/1064

Proposed Temporary Road Repair Workshop and Storage of Construction Materials with Ancillary Vehicle Repairing and Office for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 126 (Part), 127 and 128 in D.D. 128 and Adjoining Government Land, Deep Bay Road, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long, New Territories

(TPB Paper No. 10312)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

16. The Vice-chairperson said that the site was located in Ha Tsuen area and Ms Janice W.M. Lai had declared an interest on the item as her spouse was a shareholder of a company which owned two pieces of land in Ha Tsuen. Members agreed that as the concerned two pieces of land had no direct view of the application site, Ms Janice W.M. Lai could stay in the meeting.

17. The Secretary reported that the applicant had indicated not attending the meeting.

18. The following representative from the Planning Department (PlanD) was invited to the meeting :

Mr David C.M. Lam - District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun & Yuen Long West (DPO/TM&YLW), PlanD

19. The Vice-chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the review hearing. He then invited DPO/TM&YLW to brief Members on the review application.

20. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr David C.M. Lam, DPO/TM&YLW, 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. 10312 (the Paper).



21. As the presentation from DPO/TM&YLW had been completed, the Vice-chairperson invited questions from Members.

22. As Members had no question to raise, the Vice-chairperson said that the hearing procedure for the review application had been completed. The Board would further deliberate on the review application. The Vice-chairperson thanked DPO/TM&YLW for attending the meeting. Mr David C.M. Lam left the meeting at this point.

#### Deliberation Session

23. Members did not see any justifications which would warrant sympathetic consideration of the application, nor any change in the planning circumstances since the rejection of the application which would warrant a departure from RNTPC's previous decision.

24. After deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application on review based on 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. It is also intended to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. There is no strong planning justification to merit a departure from such planning intention, even on a temporary basis;
- (b) the development is not in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 13E) in that no previous approval has been granted for the site, there are adverse departmental comments on the agricultural, landscape and environmental aspects. The applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would not generate adverse landscape, traffic and environmental impacts; and
- (c) 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 will result in a general

degradation of the environment of the “AGR” zone. ”

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

### **Agenda Item 6**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/YL-PS/536

Temporary Minibus Seating Assembling Workshop, Open Storage of Minibus and Storage of Vehicle Seating and Parts with Ancillary Office for a period of 3 years in "Village Type Development" Zone, Lots 1804 (Part), 1805 (Part), 1808 RP, 1809 RP (Part) and 1817 (Part) in D.D. 124, San Lee Uk Tsuen, Yuen Long, New Territories

(TPB(Paper No. 10313))

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

25. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Ha Tsuen area and Ms Janice W.M. Lai had declared an interest on the item as her spouse was a shareholder of a company which owned two pieces of land in Ha Tsuen. Members agreed that as the concerned two pieces of land had no direct view of the application site, Ms Janice W.M. Lai could stay in the meeting.

26. The Vice-chairperson said that the applicant had indicated not attending the meeting.

27. The following representative from the Planning Department (PlanD) was invited to the meeting :

Mr David C.M. Lam - District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun & Yuen Long West (DPO/TM&YLW), PlanD

28. The Vice-chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the review hearing. He then invited DPO/TM&YLW to brief Members on the review application.

29. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr David C.M. Lam, DPO/TM&YLW, 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. 10313 (the Paper).

30. As the presentation from DPO/TM&YLW had been completed, the Vice-chairperson invited questions from Members.

31. As Members had no question to raise, the Vice-chairperson said that the hearing procedure for the review application had been completed. The Board would further deliberate on the review application. The Vice-chairperson thanked DPO/TM&YLW for attending the meeting. Mr David C.M. Lam left the meeting at this point.

#### Deliberation Session

32. Members noted that there was no change in the planning circumstances since the rejection of the application which would warrant a departure from the RNTPC's previous decision.

33. After deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application on review based on the following reasons :

- “ (a) the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone is to designate both existing recognised villages and areas of land considered suitable for village expansion. Land within this zone is primarily intended for development of Small Houses by indigenous villagers. The applied development is not in line with the planning intention of the “V” zone. No strong planning justification has been given in the submission for a departure from such planning intention, even on a temporary basis;
- (b) the applied development is not compatible with the surrounding land uses which are predominantly residential in nature intermixed with vehicle parks, cultivated agricultural land, orchard, vacant and unused land;
- (c) the applicant fails to demonstrate that the development would not generate adverse environmental impact on the surrounding areas;
- (d) the development does not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses under

Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 13E) in that the site falls within Category 4 areas and the applicant has not provided any strong planning justification to demonstrate that there is exceptional circumstance which warrants approval of the application; and

- (e) the approval of the application, even on a temporary basis, would set an undesirable precedent for similar uses. The cumulative impact of approving such applications would result in a general degradation of the environment of the area. ”

**Fanling, Sheung Shui & Yuen Long East District**

**Agenda Item 7**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/NE-KTS/448

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Agriculture” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lot 546 S.A in D.D. 100, Tsiu Keng Village, Sheung Shui, New Territories

(TPB Paper No. 10314)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

34. The following representative from the Planning Department (PlanD), applicant and applicant’s representatives were invited to the meeting :

Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin	-	District Planning Officer/Fanling, Sheung Shui & Yuen Long East (DPO/FS&YLE), PlanD
Mr Lok Chun Wah	-	Applicant
Mr Wong Chi Kwong	]	
<u>Good Luck Consultants &amp; Co.</u>	]	Applicant’s representatives
Mr Poon Hing Cheung	]	

35. The Vice-chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the review hearing. He then invited DPO/TM&YLE to brief Members on the review application.

36. A replacement page for Plan R-2a of TPB Paper No. 10314 (the Paper) was tabled at the meeting. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin, DPO/FS&YLE, 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 the Paper.

37. The Vice-chairperson then invited the applicant and his representatives to elaborate on the review application. With the aid of the visualizer, Mr Lok Chun Wan made the following main points:

- (a) he was an indigenous villager. Lot 546 was owned by his ancestor which was subdivided into different sections. It was not fair that the two applications (No. A/NE-KTS/292 and 349) for Small House development at Lot 546 S.C and S.D submitted by his cousin and uncle a few years ago were approved by the Board while his application at Lot 546 S.A (the Site) was rejected;
- (b) the Site with an area of only about 164 m<sup>2</sup> was too small for agricultural use. It was currently used as road access for the Small House development at Lot 546 S.C and S.D and could no longer be used for agricultural use. Although land was available in the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Tsiu Keng Village, he did not own any land within the “V” zone;
- (c) unlike in overseas where agricultural industry could be sustained due to economy of scale, large-scale agricultural use in the area was not feasible due to the shortage of irrigation water supply. The current supply of irrigation water was mainly through potable water along a pipeline running through the ancestral grave yard; and
- (d) while the proposed implementation of agricultural park (Agri-Park) in the area by the Government through land resumption was supported, the success of which would rely on the cooperation of local villagers, for example, to allow the continuous supply of irrigation water. Local villagers would support the

Agri-Park only if their right to build Small House as provided under the Basic Law was not affected.

[Mr Franklin Yu arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

38. With the aid of the visualizer, Mr Poon Hing Cheung made the following main points:

- (a) there were a number of Small House applications approved by the Board in the area to the south of Tsiu Keng Road between Tam Shui Hang and the existing village clusters of Tsiu Keng San Wai, Tsiu Keng Lo Wai and Tsiu Keng Pang Uk. There were some 13 sites near Tam Shui Hang and Tsiu Keng Road approved for Small House development which were neither within the “V” zone nor close to the existing villages. Those approved applications were far away (at least 80m) from the nearest house in Tsiu Keng Lo Wai while the Site was about 20m from the nearest house of Tsiu Keng San Wai; and
- (b) another application (No. A/NE-KTS/366) for a Small House development involving a large lot with its Small House footprint falling wholly outside the “V” zone was also approved. That site with an area of 3,000ft<sup>2</sup> would result in greater loss of agricultural land as compared with the Site of less than 2,000ft<sup>2</sup>. When comparing with the similar approved applications in the vicinity, the current application should be approved on the consideration that part of the Site fell within the “V” zone, it was located next to the existing village cluster and involved a smaller area of agricultural land.

39. As the presentation from DPO/FS&YLE, applicant and his representatives had been completed, the Vice-chairperson invited questions from Members.

#### *Approved Similar Applications*

40. Some Members raised questions about the difference in the planning considerations between the approved similar applications and the current application. In response, Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin, DPO/FS&YLE, made the following main points:

- (a) the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for New Territories Exempted House/Small House (the Interim Criteria) had been adopted in considering Small House applications, the main considerations included, amongst others, whether there was a general shortage of land within the “V” zone in meeting the Small House demand; whether the site was located close to the existing village cluster; whether the site had previous planning approval for Small House development, and the departmental comments. In the past, the Board/RNTPC might give sympathetic consideration to the application where there was a general shortage of land in the “V” zone in meeting the number of outstanding Small House Grant applications as well as the 10-year Small House demand forecast of the concerned village. In recent years, the Board/RNTPC in considering if there was a general shortage of land in meeting the Small House demand, more weighting had been put on the number of outstanding Small House Grant applications provided by the Lands Department (LandsD) in assessing the shortage of land in the “V” zone as the 10-year forecast could fluctuate; and
- (b) those similar applications mentioned by the applicant/his representative were approved either some years ago or mainly on the consideration that the sites were located close to the main road (Tsiu Keng Road) or had previous planning approvals. For the current application, the RNTPC had adopted the recent cautious approach and rejected it mainly on the ground that the land available in the “V” zone (i.e. 2.49 ha/99 Small Houses sites) could still meet the number of outstanding Small House Grant applications (i.e. 41) of the Tsiu Keng Village, and it was considered more appropriate to concentrate Small House development within the “V” zone for more orderly development. Besides, the Site with active agricultural activities in its vicinity had high potential for agricultural rehabilitation and there was no previous planning approval for Small House development at the Site.

41. Some Members raised the following further questions on the approved similar applications:

- (a) the planning considerations for the similar applications No. A/NE-KTS/292 and 349 approved in 2010 and 2013 respectively, No. A/NE-KTS/366

approved in 2014, as well as No. A/NE-KTS/420 and 422 approved recently in 2016; and

- (b) the land availability in the “V” zone and the Small House demand at the time when considering the similar applications No. A/NE-KTS/292 and 349, and the percentage of their Small House footprints within the “V” zone.

42. In response, Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin made the following main points:

- (a) for applications No. A/NE-KTS/292, 349 and 366, they were approved by the RNTPC between 2010 and 2014. At that time, the RNTPC had given sympathetic consideration to the applications as there was a general shortage of land taking into account the number of outstanding Small House Grant applications as well as the 10-year Small House demand forecast;
- (b) for application No. A/NE-KTS/420, the site was an in-fill site among the existing village houses or approved Small House development near Tsiu Keng Road. For application No. A/NE-KTS/422, the concerned site was already paved and also surrounded by existing village houses/approved Small House development near Tsiu Keng Road. The Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) had no objection to the application as the rehabilitation potential of the site was low; and
- (c) at the time when the Board considered applications No. A/NE-KTS/292 and 349 in 2010 and 2013 respectively, the land available in the “V” zone could not meet the 10-year Small House demand forecast as in the current application. The exact percentage of Small House footprints falling within the “V” zone for both applications was not in hand, but it was estimated from Plan R-2c of the Paper to be about 20%.

#### *Site Condition*

43. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) why the Site was used as road access for the nearby two Small Houses under applications No. A/NE-KTS/292 and 349;



- (b) why there were bricks and construction debris on the Site in the applicant's photograph shown during the presentation; and
- (c) whether there was public road from Tsiu Keng Road to the Site and the two approved Small Houses under applications No. A/NE-KTS/292 and 349.

44. In response, Mr Lok Chun Wah, applicant, and Mr. Poon Hing Cheung, applicant's representative, made the following main points with the aid of the visualizer:

- (a) there was a fence wall around the nearby village houses to the west of the Site. The construction trucks would need to drive along the outer boundary of the fence wall via the Site to reach the construction sites for the two approved Small Houses. The vegetation on the Site had been removed and would no longer be suitable for agricultural use. Upon completion of the construction works, a footpath would be set aside between the fence wall and the proposed Small House at the Site for the access of the two new Small Houses; and
- (b) the bricks and debris on the Site were dumped by the contractors to form a temporary construction access for the two nearby Small House sites.

45. With reference to a Plan in the PowerPoint, Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin indicated that the Site and its vicinity could be accessed from Tsiu Keng Road via village tracks which were not public roads.

*Potential for Agricultural Use*

46. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there was any shortage of irrigation water in the area; and
- (b) whether the Agri-Park would encroach onto the land in the subject "V" zone.

47. In response, Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin, DPO/FS&YLE, made the following main points:

- (a) there were active agricultural activities in the Tsiu Keng area and AFCD advised that the Site had high potential for agricultural rehabilitation. Supply of irrigation water was not a problem in the area. For the Agri-Park, the Government had undertaken a consultancy study and confirmed that it was

technically feasibility to be developed in the area. Supporting infrastructure such as road network and water supply could be further enhanced, if required; and

- (b) the proposed Agri-Park would cover areas within the “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone, rather than the “V” zone.

*Others*

48. In response to a Member’s enquiry about the supply and demand of Small Houses in Tsiu Keng village, Mr Wong Chi Kwong, applicant’s representative, said that there were lots of land within village ‘environ’ (‘VE’) that could be developed for Small Houses. The Site, with part of it falling within the “V” zone, should be allowed for Small House development and the proposed Agri-Park should not affect the development of Small Houses in the area.

49. A Member asked whether it was possible to revoke the planning permissions of application Nos. A/NE-KTS/292 and 349 as RNTPC might not be aware that the construction of those Small Houses would affect the agricultural land in the vicinity of the sites. Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin said that the Small House Grant applications for the two sites had already been approved by LandsD.

50. In response to a Member’s enquiry on how the 10-year Small House demand forecast could be met, Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin said that while noting that the land available in the “V” zone might not be able to meet the 10-year forecast, the Board/RNTPC recently had adopted the cautious approach, and gave more weighting on the number of outstanding Small House Grant applications as well as the planning circumstances of the application site based on its individual merits.

51. As the applicant and the applicant’s representatives had no further comments to make and Members had no further questions to raise, the Vice-chairperson informed them 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 Vice-chairperson thanked DPO/STN, the applicant and the applicant’s representatives for attending the meeting. They all left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

52. The Vice-chairperson invited Members to consider the review application taking into account the written and oral submissions.

53. The Secretary informed Members that according to the relevant RNTPC papers, for application No. A/NE-KTS/292 approved in 2010, the land available in the “V” zone could accommodate 150 Small Houses, while the outstanding Small House Grant applications and the 10-year Small House demand forecast were 21 and 300 respectively, and about 23% of the Small House footprint fell within the “V” zone. For application No. A/NE-TKS/349 approved in 2013, the land available in the “V” zone could accommodate 126 Small Houses, while the number of outstanding Small House Grant applications and the 10-year Small House demand forecast were 47 and 400 respectively, and about 39% of the Small House footprint fell within the “V” zone.

54. Members in general had the following views:

- (a) the RNTPC had taken a more cautious approach in considering Small House application in the recent years to avoid significant sporadic development of Small Houses on land outside the “V” zone. In the past, in considering whether there was a general shortage of land to meet Small House demand, the RNTPC/Board would take into account the number of outstanding Small House Grant applications as well as the 10-year Small House demand forecast as provided by the indigenous inhabitant representatives of the concerned village. It was however noted that the figure of the 10-year forecast was not verified by LandsD and could fluctuate over a short period of time. In recent years, a cautious approach had been taken and more weighting had been put on the number of outstanding Small House Grant applications provided by LandsD;
- (b) despite the Site was close to the existing village clusters, the proposed Small House development was not in line with the planning intention of the “AGR” zone. The Tsiu Keng area had a vast area of quality active agricultural land, and the Site was close to active agricultural land. Noting the comments of AFCD, there was no convincing reason that the Site could not be rehabilitated for agricultural use;

- (c) land was still available within the “V” zone of the concerned village for Small House development. It was considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development in the “V” zone for more orderly development pattern; and
- (d) according to the Interim Criteria, Small House development with its footprint falling within ‘VE’ might only warrant sympathetic consideration by the Board/RNTPC in assessing the concerned application. It did not imply that the Board/RNTPC had to approve it. While the feeling of the applicant was fully understood, the Board should be consistent in exercising the cautious approach adopted in recent years. Approval of the current application might set an undesirable precedent in the area and result in proliferation of Small House development along the boundary of and outside the “V” zone. Such proliferation would also likely generate substantial construction of informal tracks across agricultural land leading to further degradation of the environment and the agricultural land.

55. A Member considered that the Site was along the “V” zone boundary with part of it falling within the zone and close to the existing village cluster similar to the applications approved in 2016, approval of it might not jeopardize the Board’s intention for a more orderly development pattern. Another Member also considered that based on the number of outstanding Small House Grant application and the land available within the “V” zone, it would appear that there was a genuine demand for Small House development in Tsiu Keng Village.

56. In response to an enquiry, Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, Director of Planning, said that with reference to Plans R-2c and R-3b of the Paper, existing and approved village houses and features like existing roads and trees/slopes were excluded in estimating the land availability in the two “V” zones for Small House development in Tsiu Keng Village, and the sites for outstanding Small House Grant applications were located both within or outside the “V” zones. The land available in the two “V” zones of Tsiu Keng Village could accommodate 99 Small Houses which was sufficient to meet the outstanding number of Small House Grant applications (i.e. 41 in total). While the presentation of the applicant and his representatives focused on the similar applications approved in the same ‘VE’, there were also quite a number of similar applications rejected by the Board/RNTPC in the past.

57. While a few Members were sympathetic to the application, a majority of Members were not in support of the applications.

58. After deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application on review based on the following reasons :

- “ (a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” zone in the Tsiu Keng area which is primarily to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes and to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention; and
- (b) land is still available within the “Village Type Development” zone of Tsiu Keng Village which is primarily intended for Small House development. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development close to the existing village cluster for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services. ”

### **Agenda Item 8**

[Open Meeting ]

Request for Deferment of Review of Application No. A/YL-NSW/250

Proposed Petrol Filling Station with Sales Office in “Undetermined” Zone and an area shown as 'Road', Lots 999 S.E (Part), 1001 S.A RP (Part), 1002 S.A RP (Part) and 1327 RP (Part) in D.D. 115 and Adjoining Government Land, Au Tau, Yuen Long, New Territories

(TPB(Paper No. 10315))

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

59. The Secretary said that on 17.7.2017, the applicant’s agent wrote to the Secretary of the Board and requested the Board to defer making a decision on the review application for two months to allow more time for the applicant to study and prepare further information to

address departmental comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the review hearing.

60. Members noted that the justifications for deferment met the criteria for deferment as set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Deferment of Decision on Representations, Comments, Further Representations and Applications made under the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No.33) in that the applicant needed more time to prepare further information which was essential for the consideration by the Board, the deferment period was not indefinite and the deferment would not affect the interests of other relevant parties.

61. After deliberation, the Board agreed to defer a decision on the review application, and that the review application would be submitted to the Board for consideration within three months upon receipt of the further submission from the applicant. The Board also agreed that if the written submission of the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Board's consideration. The Board agreed to advise the applicant that the Board had allowed two months for the preparation and submission of further information and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

[The meeting was adjourned for a 5-minute break.]

[Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon left the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 9**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Further Representations on Proposed Amendment to the Draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H3/30 Arising from the Consideration of Representations on the Draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H3/30 (TPB Paper No. 10316)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

62. 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), Mr Yiu Tze Leung (representative of R1 and F30), Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTAL) (R1's consultants), CYS Associates (Hong Kong) Limited (CYS) (R1's consultant), Ms Mary

Mulvihill (R4/representative of F34) 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 Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with KTAL and past business dealings with CYS
  
- Mr K.K. Cheung ] their company having current business dealings  
Mr Alex T.H. Lai ] with TWGHs and hiring Ms 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 Queen's Road Central
  
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with TWGHs and personally knowing some further representers/representers attending the hearing
  
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - personally knowing the co-founder and Chief Executive Officer of Designing Hong Kong Limited
  
- Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung - personally knowing some further representers/representers attending the hearing

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having past business dealings with TWGHs

Professor T.S. Liu - being a member of Chinese Temple Committee which might have relation with the Man Mo Temple Complex (MMTC)

63. Members noted that Ms Christina M. Lee and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong 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, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, Mr Franklin Yu, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho and Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung could stay in the meeting as they had no direct involvement in the project, nor discussion with the respective representer/further representer or their representatives, nor having property with a direct view of the representation site. Members also agreed that the interests of Mr Ivan C.S. Fu and Professor T.S. Liu were indirect, and they could stay in the meeting.

64. The Vice-chairperson said that reasonable notice had been given to the further representers and 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 further representers and representers, the Town Planning Board (the Board) should proceed with the hearing of the further representations in their absence.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

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

##### *PlanD's representatives*

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

Mr Jerry J. Austin - Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong 4 (STP/HK4), PlanD



*Further representers, representers and their representatives*

F1- Timothy Ng Man Wai

Mr Timothy Ng Man Wai - Further representer

F2 – Margaret Wong

Ms Margaret Wong - Further representer

F3 - Yeung King Lun

Mr Yeung King Lun - Further representer

F4 - Sham Ching Yin Letty

Ms Sham Ching Yin Letty - Further representer

F5 - Wan Yu

Ms Tsang Suk Yi Shirley ] Further representer's representatives

Ms Chan Chui Yi Carrin ]

F9 - Clement Lau

Mr Clement Lau - Further representer

F12 - Au Yeung Ka Chun

Mr Au Yeung Ka Chun - Further representer

F13 - Chan Lin Kit

Mr Chan Lin Kit - Further representer

F15 - Lee Chi Yan

Mr Lee Chi Yan - Further representer

F16 - Fung Po Yue Kitty

Mr Cheung Chit Leung - Further representer's representative

F26 - Ho Wing Yan

Mr Cheung Wai Sun, Rex - Further representer's representative

F29 - Wu Sze Man

Ms Wu Sze Man - Further representer

F30 - Ho Kwan Wing

Mr Ivan Yiu ]

Ms Monika Lau ] Further representer's representatives

Mr Henry Chan ]

F34 - Tsim Sha Tsui Residents Concern Group

R4 -Ms Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer and further representer's representative

F40 - Martin Merz

R3- Mr John Batten

Mr John Batten

Representor and further representor's representative

R438 - Kiyoko Taneyama

R380 - Katty Law

Ms Katty Law

- Representor and representor's representative

R526 - Charlton Cheung

Mr Charlton Cheung

- Representor

66. The Vice-chairperson extended a welcome. He went on to say that PlanD's representatives would brief Members on the background to the further representations. He would then invite the further representors or their representatives to make oral submission, followed by the oral submissions of the representors or their representatives. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, each further representor, representor or their representative would be allotted 10 minutes for oral submission. There was a timer device to alert the further representors, representors or their representatives two minutes before the allotted 10-minute time was to expire and when the allotted 10-minute time limit was up. A Question and Answer (Q&A) session would be held after all attending further representor, representors or their representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to government representatives, further representor, representors or their representatives. After the Q&A session, government representatives, further representor, representors or their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting, and the Board would deliberate on the further representations in their absence and inform the further representors and representors of the Board's decision in due course.

67. The Vice-chairperson then invited DPO/HK to brief Members on the background to the further representations.

68. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Jerry J. Austin, STP/HK4, briefed Members on the further representations, including the background of the proposed amendments to the draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H3/30 (the draft OZP), the views and proposals of the further representations, the planning assessments and PlanD's views on the further representations, as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10316.

69. The Vice-chairperson then invited the further representors, representors and their representatives to elaborate views on the further representations.

[Mr David Y.T. Lui left the meeting at this point.]

F1- Timothy Ng Man Wai

70. Mr Timothy Ng Man Wai made the following main points:

- (a) he supported the proposed youth hostel development at the site under Amendment Item A (the Site) as he witnessed the benefits brought about by a similar redevelopment project in Taiwan. In that project, a charity organization redeveloped a large piece of land previously used as nursery, church and youth hostel for other Government, institution or community (GIC) uses which included social welfare and educational facilities as well as residential units so as to meet the long-term need of the community in the area. That project was similar to the current case in which TWGHs would redevelop the ex-school building into a youth hostel to cater for the accommodation need of the youth which was especially important for those underprivileged or those from problem families or Small Group Home (兒童之家);
- (b) he doubted whether those representers who suggested to convert the ex-school building into other GIC facilities e.g. library had conducted an assessment on such provision in the area. There were abundant open space and recreational/cultural/social welfare facilities in the area and such GIC provision at the Site was not required; and
- (c) the close proximity of the Site to MMTC could provide an opportunity for nurturing the interest of young people in cultural heritage.

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

F2 – Margaret Wong

71. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Margaret Wong made the following main points:

- (a) she supported the proposed youth hostel at the Site;
- (b) the Policy Address in 2011-2012 indicated that the Government would actively support non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to build hostels for single

youths. Youth hostel could provide an option for the working youth to have their own living space to pursue their dreams while saving money for their future plan, and could also release the development potential of the under-utilized land granted to NGOs;

- (c) based on legal advice, the redevelopment of the ex-school building at the Site was allowed under the Man Mo Temple Ordinance. Various technical assessments on traffic, environmental, air ventilation, landscape and visual impacts in relation to the proposed youth hostel at the Site had been submitted for the consideration of various government departments and advisory bodies including the Central and Western District Council, Antiquities and Monuments Office and Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB). Taking into account the comments received, the project was refined and approved by the Development Bureau in October 2014;
- (d) the youth hostel could help young people who currently encountered various problems due to reduction in salary despite a higher education level attained. The scheme could provide the youth with their own living space;
- (e) a questionnaire survey conducted by the Hong Kong Baptist University revealed that the majority of the interviewees supported the proposed youth hostel at the Site with the reasons that it could enhance the knowledge of the young people on the local history and culture amongst others. The Site was the only proposed youth hostel site located in the central business district in Hong Kong Island, and those interviewees living in the New Territories in particular indicated greater interest in living at the Site; and
- (f) conservation of cultural heritage and urban development could co-exist. In response to the community's views, TWGHs had already enhanced the design of the proposed youth hostel to commensurate with that of the adjacent MMTC. The future tenants in the youth hostel would also be invited to participate in the cultural heritage activities of MMTC.

F3 - Yeung King Lun

72. Mr Yeung King Lun made the following main points:

- (a) he considered that the high property rent in Hong Kong had deterred the youth from pursuing their dreams;
- (b) he was a YouTuber. As he had a day-time job, he only filmed at night. He lived in a very cramped flat with his family. He felt distressed as he always disrupted the sleep of his mother and brother when he got home after filming at night, but he could not afford to rent a flat for himself. He and his friends set up a studio some years ago but had to give up as his friends needed to pay the rent and support the living of their families although they were still interested in filming industry;
- (c) there was a misunderstanding that young people were not interested in cultural heritage. His volunteer experience in organizing the activities for Blue House in Wan Chai revealed that young people were interested in the project and willing to share the responsibility for conserving/promoting the cultural heritage; and
- (d) though he would not be eligible for the youth hostel by the time the development was completed, he still supported it as he understood the hardship the youth was facing and the proposed youth hostel could benefit the future young generation.

F4 - Sham Ching Yin Letty

73. Ms Sham Ching Yin made the following main points:

- (a) she supported the proposed youth hostel development at the Site. The Central and Western District was a place rich in western and eastern cultures. It had various cultural heritages, art clubs and a variety of small shops;
- (b) she had no relationship problem with her family, but she still would like to live independently in searching for her own identity and development. When looking for a flat six years ago, she found that the Central and Western District

was an interesting place to live in but eventually had to give up as she could not afford the high rent even for a very small flat; and

- (c) the proposed youth hostel at the Site could provide a safe private space for its tenants as well as common space for the youth to share their experience. It could also allow the youth to explore their potentials as well as to save money for the future. The interest and linkage of young people to MMTC could only be nurtured if they were living close to it.

[Ms Janice W.M. Lai left the meeting at this point.]

#### F12 - Au Yeung Ka Chun

74. Mr Au Yeung Ka Chun made the following main points:

- (a) he supported the proposed youth hostel development at the Site;
- (b) he had grown up and lived in the Central and Western District, and witnessed the changes in the area. The ex-school building had been left vacant for more than 10 years. Its redevelopment into a youth hostel could fully utilize the valuable land resource and bring in more young people to add vibrancy into the area. Living next to MMTC was also an effective way to encourage young people to learn and appreciate the traditional Chinese history and culture; and
- (c) he understood the hardship young people was facing arising from the high property rent. His friends had to live in subdivided flats as they could not afford otherwise. The recent fire accident in an industrial building revealed the difficulties encountered by the youth in having their own space in pursuing their dreams.

#### F15 - Lee Chi Yan

75. Mr Lee Chi Yan made the following main points:

- (a) as his brother's family including his wife and a new born child could not afford the high rental of a flat, they had to live together with his parents, his younger sister and himself in a small flat. While he understood the difficulties his

brother encountered, a lot of inconveniences caused when the living space was so cramped;

- (b) when the Government announced the policy on supporting youth hostel development in 2011, he had a hope that he could reside in the youth hostel and have his own living space. As years lapsed, he and his brother were no longer eligible to apply for the youth hostel due to their ages or marital status. He still hoped that his younger sister could reside in the youth hostel so as to ameliorate his family's living condition; and
- (c) a youth hostel, therefore, could not only benefit the youth but also their families by improving their cramped living condition.

F16 - Fung Po Yue Kitty

76. Mr Cheung Chit Leung made the following main points:

- (a) he was a student and supported the proposed youth hostel at the Site. Due to his family background, he had lived in different youth hostels after leaving the Small Group Home when he reached the age of 18. He not only needed to pay the high rents for those hostels, but also had to move from time to time as they had a very short term tenancy periods (about 6 months) which was very disturbing to his study. He also faced with great pressure as he needed to attend school and at the same time worked as a private tutor to pay the rent and other living expense; and
- (b) he once lived in a youth hostel where a room was shared by 3 to 4 persons which had affected his study especially during the examination periods. The proposed youth hostel would, however, offer a longer tenancy period and individual rooms. The Central and Western District was also a convenient location which would save his travelling time.

[Mr Raymond K.W. Lee left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

F26 - Ho Wing Yan

77. Mr Cheung Wai Sun, Rex made the following main points:

- (a) he supported the proposed youth hostel at the Site. The proposed youth hostel could not only benefit the young people, but also the community in the Central and Western District;
- (b) according to the survey conducted by the Commission on Youth, only 17% of the youth aged 19 to 24 surveyed would participate in recreational or community activities. That age group of young people was busy either in study or for career development. Youth hostel would offer the opportunity for the young people to serve the community where they lived. Youth hostel development and conservation of cultural heritage could co-exist. The development of cultural heritage had to involve the young generation such that it could sustain;
- (c) a survey conducted in 2012 revealed that 58.8% young people gave up purchasing a property as they could not afford it. The current situation should be worse than in 2012. While young people might give up purchasing their own flats, they still would like to pursue their dreams. Youth hostel offered young people an affordable individual space for home-office use and supporting social and cultural network; and
- (d) the proposed youth hostel offered a tenancy of 5 years for the young people to pursue their dreams. A generation of tenants could also pass on their knowledge of cultural heritage to the next generation of tenants which was a win-win situation to both the youth and the community.

[Professor T.S. Liu left the meeting at this point.]

F29 – Wu Sze Man

78. Ms Wu Sze Man made the following main points :

- (a) she was the only child in the family and her parents were very concerned about her well-being, unknowingly giving her pressure. She would like to have a



private space and enjoy some time for being alone. Her friend was in a similar but worse situation and could not cope with living with her family;

- (b) the proposed youth hostel would provide opportunities for the youth to live away from their families at an affordable rent level. As the youth hostel would be managed by TWGHs, parents could rest assured that the accommodation would be reasonably well managed;
- (c) while the elderly could have their choice to live away from their families in homes for the elderly, there were few youth hostels in the territory and the youth had no such choice; and
- (d) she hoped that by sharing her own experience, Members could understand that the youth should be allowed to have their own place and support the proposed youth hostel development.

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

#### F30 – Ho Kwan Wing

79. Mr Ivan Yiu played a short video to illustrate the vision of the youth hostel and made the following main points :

- (a) the proposed youth hostel with 300 places was cost effective in providing private space for the youth at an affordable level. It would enhance connection amongst the youth, foster harmony in the community and promote an integrated society;
- (b) the proposed youth hostel would provide viewing platforms on the lower floors for the public to appreciate MMTC from a different angle and a cultural square for holding events for MMTC. The youth would be given chance to be in close contact with and learn more about MMTC. The history and culture of MMTC would sustain through the development of youth hostel;
- (c) there were tall buildings in the vicinity of MMTC including Centrestage, Tung Shing Terrace and Grandview Garden. MMTC would not be dwarfed by the

proposed youth hostel. Some further representers' criticism on the building height of the proposed youth hostel was not based on objective facts;

- (d) the proposed youth hostel would adopt a design to be commensurated with MMTC and would not cause any damage to MMTC. The AAB had examined the design of the proposed youth hostel and considered that there would not be any adverse impact on MMTC in terms of heritage conservation and visual aspects. The design of the youth hostel could be fine-tuned for better integration with MMTC, if necessary;
- (e) retaining the vacant school building could not serve the purpose of respecting the heritage setting of MMTC. TWGHs had been responsible for the maintenance of MMTC for over a century and had spent over \$10 million on maintenance of MMTC in the past decade. TWGHs also held different cultural events and prepared publications to promote the public's understanding of the history of MMTC; and
- (f) the proposed youth hostel had balanced the overall benefit of the society and the housing need of the youth.

F34/R4 – Mary Mulvihill

80. Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points :

- (a) the aspiration of the youth for having their own living space and the provision of youth hostel were supported. However, the youth hostel should not be developed next to MMTC. The policy for providing youth hostel was being exploited by TWGHs as an excuse to develop the proposed youth hostel for their own benefit without caring about the potential damage to the structure and integrity of MMTC;
- (b) TWGHs owned a number of other properties in the territory. Nothing had been done to convert those properties for youth hostel use nor to support the latest policy of providing subdivided flats and/or shelter for single mothers at low rent on a non-profit making basis to help the people in-need in the society. Even worse, some NGOs were driven out of TWGHs' properties in order that those properties could be put to more profitable uses;

- (c) while the questionnaire survey carried out by the Hong Kong Baptist University indicated that the proposed youth hostel was generally supported by young people, the way how the questionnaires was set out was unknown. The supporters might not be told about the potential damage that could be done to MMTC;
- (d) the Government had not done anything to provide youth hostels in the past such as by taking back those “Government, Institution or Community (“G/IC”) sites intended for hostel development but were converted to and operated as hotels. Instead, the Government colluded with TWGHs on the development of youth hostel at the further representation site and the Board was also responsible since it approved the rezoning in the planning process;
- (e) there was a lack of facilities in Central and Western District for caring of the elderly or related supporting services. The ex-school building at the Site could be converted to such use; and
- (f) in making a decision on the OZP, Members should take into consideration that some further representers were actually against the subject youth hostel development but had not indicated whether they supported or opposed Amendment Item A to include such use in Column 2 under the “G/IC” zone.

[The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 12:45 p.m.]

81. The meeting was resumed at 2:10 p.m. on 18.8.2017.

82. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting :

Professor S.C. Wong Vice-chairperson

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr H.F. Leung

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

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

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)

Environmental Protection Department

Mr C.F. Wong

Assistant Director (Regional 1)

Lands Department

Mr Simon S.W. Wang

Chief Engineer (Works)

Home Affairs Department

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Director of Planning

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

[Dr C.H. Hau arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

[Open Meeting]

83. The following government representatives, further representers/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), PlanD |
| Mr J.J. Austin    | - | Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong(4) (STP/HK4), PlanD    |

**Further Representers, Representers and their representatives**

F1 – Timothy Ng Man Wai

- |                       |   |                     |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------|
| Mr Timothy Ng Man Wai | - | Further representer |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------|

F2 – Margaret Wong

- |                  |   |                     |
|------------------|---|---------------------|
| Ms Margaret Wong | - | Further representer |
|------------------|---|---------------------|

F5 – Wan Yu

- |                          |   |                                      |
|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| Ms Tsang Suk Yi, Shirley | - | Further representer's representative |
|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|

F9 – Clement Lau

- |                |   |                     |
|----------------|---|---------------------|
| Mr Clement Lau | - | Further representer |
|----------------|---|---------------------|

F30 – Ho Kwan Wing

Mr Ivan Yiu - Further representer's representatives  
Ms Monika Lau  
Mr Henry Chan

F34 – Tsim Sha Tsui Residents Concern Group

R4 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer and further representer's representative

F40 – Martin Merz

R3 – John Batten

Mr John Batten - Representer and further representer's representative

R438 – Kiyoko Taneyama

R380 – Katty Law

Ms Katty Law - Representer and representer's representative

R526 – Charlton Cheung

Mr Charlton Cheung - Representer

F40 – Martin Merz

R3 – John Batten

84. Mr John Batten made the following main points :

- (a) since the site for the proposed youth hostel was small, the youth hostel would be in the form of a tall building. It fell within a heritage site of

the Man Mo Temple Complex (MMTC) and the youth hostel development would overwhelm the Man Mo Temple (MMT);

- (b) the Board's concerns were about the building height/compatibility of the proposed youth hostel with MMT and how the design of the proposed development could be scrutinized. However, the proposed amendments to the draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan (the OZP) by including 'Residential Institution' in Column 2 of the "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") zone would not address the Board's concerns;
- (c) there would be a possibility that the 97mPD building height restriction (BHR) would be relaxed in considering the future s.16 application;

[Mr H.W. Cheung and Dr Lawrence K.C. Li arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (d) the 8-storey building height of the existing school should be retained as the BHR for the future development at the site or the BHR should be in-keeping with that of MMTC;
- (e) PlanD had only focussed on building a youth hostel at the site but not on the preservation of the heritage value of MMTC. The need for a youth hostel was actually a housing problem which should be solved by a fundamental change in the housing and land policy in Hong Kong;
- (f) the heritage conservation of MMTC, not the developments in its surrounding area, was the relevant consideration in assessing the proposed youth hostel development;
- (g) the legal opinion given by the Department of Justice and the lawyer of Tung Wah Group of Hospitals (TWGHs) as stated in paragraph 3.5.3

of the TPB Paper No. 10316, if correct, would allow TWGHs to redevelop the entire MMTC site, including MMT, in future;

- (h) there were over 200 vacant school buildings in the territory which could be used for youth hostel development. TWGHs' intention for the youth hostel proposal was questionable as the site was left vacant for over 10 years; and
- (i) the collapsing of part of the Central Police Station Complex illustrated that situations could go wrong during construction. The requirement of a heritage impact assessment and an environmental impact assessment in the Explanatory Statement of the OZP could not serve the purpose of preserving MMTC.

R438 – Kiyoko Taneyama

R380 – Katty Law

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

- (a) the Central and Western Concern Group (CWCG) had a long track record in fighting for the conservation of heritage buildings in the Central and Western District. CWCG considered that the OZP should not be amended to permit youth hostel development at the heritage site of MMTC;
- (b) CWCG supported the preservation of heritage buildings and considered that the focus of the matter should be preserving MMTC instead of building a youth hostel. The proposed youth hostel at the site had ignored the heritage value of MMTC;
- (c) the photo shown on the visualizer demonstrated the incompatibility of TWGHs' tall buildings next to a temple (a Kwun Yam Temple, namely



Shui Yuet Palace) in Mongkok. The future youth hostel of more than 20 storeys in height next to MMT would be bulky and would overwhelm MMTC;

- (d) TWGHs owned a number of properties in the Central and Western District and they could be converted to youth hostel use. Youth hostel could also be provided in other “G/IC” sites or those sites currently used by non-government organisations (NGOs) as hotels;
- (e) Article 2 of Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites in China stated that a buffer zone around the heritage site boundary should be established to preserve the natural and cultural setting. The Burra Charter also stated that developments surrounding the heritage site should be controlled for heritage conservation, or to recover the setting of the heritage site. As such, the Government should exercise its power to control the scale of development at the site adjoining MMT. The proposed youth hostel development next to MMT had ignored the principle of providing a buffer zone around the heritage site, and was contrary to the Government’s promulgation of heritage tourism in an ‘Old Town Central’;

[Mr Raymond K.W. Lee returned to join the meeting at this point.]

- (f) despite technical assessments had been carried out for the Central Police Station Complex, part of the complex had collapsed due to construction works at or near the site. The proposed youth hostel development should be considered carefully as it would adversely affect the fragile MMT, which was also built in 1840s and might not be able to survive the vibration caused by construction works at the adjoining site. Once the youth hostel was built, the damage to MMT would be irreversible;

- (g) TWGHs should be requested to retain and convert the ex-school building to community use such as day care centre for the elderly or heritage related education centre; and
- (h) Mr Xi Jinping, the President of the People's Republic of China, had directed government officials that heritage conservation should be promoted.

R526 – Charlton Cheung

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

- (a) the site of MMTC was originally granted for school development. The site area of MMTC was included in the plot ratio calculation of the proposed youth hostel. The history and tradition of MMTC should be respected;
- (b) the site should be used for the provision of other community uses, e.g. a public library, taking into consideration the original school use of the site and the demand for library service in Sheung Wan. It was inconvenient for residents in Sheung Wan to rely on the limited service of a mobile library or to travel to Central/Shek Tong Tsui for library service;

[Mr Philip S.L. Kan arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (c) it was not appropriate to build a youth hostel at the site as there would be air quality problem caused by burning incense from MMT. The future youth hostel would depend on mechanical air ventilation and filter to address the air quality problem. Retaining the school building for a tourist centre or community hall would be a better alternative; and

- (d) the Police Quarters at the Western Police Station site, which had been left vacant since 2006, could be readily converted to youth hostel use. Government resources should be utilised flexibly to meet the demand for youth hostel.

87. As the presentation from the government's representatives, and the further representers/representers or their representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the question and answer (Q&A) session.

88. In response to questions from the Vice-chairperson, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK said that MMTC was a declared monument zoned "G/IC" on the draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan OZP. Under the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance (Cap. 53), any works in a declared monument without a permit issued by the Antiquities Authority were prohibited. Under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO), an environmental permit was also required for the redevelopment of MMTC. Also, the future redevelopment of MMT would need to conform to the OZP. For the proposed youth hostel, planning permission from the Board would be required after the proposed amendment to put 'Residential Institution' under Column 2 of the "G/IC" zone. According to the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance), all planning applications would be made available for public inspection and the public could make comments on the planning applications to the Board in writing within the first 3-week of the public inspection period.

89. A Member asked and Mr Louis K.H. Kau confirmed that under the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance, declared monuments were protected and it was unlikely that MMT would be demolished for redevelopment.

90. In response to another Member's question on how to ensure that MMT would not be affected by the construction works of the proposed youth hostel, Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that the developer would be required to submit building plans to the Building Authority to prove that the construction works would not have any adverse safety impact on the surrounding developments. The amendments to the OZP were to take forward the decision

of the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Board to approve an application under section 12A of the Ordinance to amend the zoning of the site to facilitate youth hostel development. In considering that application, the applicant had submitted technical assessments to demonstrate that there would not be any insurmountable adverse impact on the surrounding area.

91. As Members had no further question, the Vice-chairperson said that the hearing procedures had been completed. He thanked the government representatives and the further representers/representers and their representatives for attending the meeting and said that the Board would deliberate on the further representations in their absence and would inform the further representers and representers of the Board's decision in due course. The government representatives, the further representers/representers and their representatives left the meeting at this point.

#### Deliberation Session

92. Noting that Mr H.W. Cheung, Mr Philip S.L. Kan, Dr Lawrence K.C. Li and Dr C.H. Hau had not attended the major part of the presentation session of the further representers/representers or their representatives, the meeting agreed that the above Members could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion and deliberation.

93. The Vice-chairperson invited Members to express their views on the further representations, particularly on whether the proposed amendments to include 'Residential Institution' in Column 2 under the "G/IC" zone of the OZP were appropriate.

94. Two Members considered that as MMTC was a declared monument, the residents and concern groups' concerns on heritage conservation, design of the proposed youth hostel, and visual and safety impacts were relevant. The proposed amendments to the OZP by including 'Residential Institution' in Column 2 under the "G/IC" zone would require planning permission from the Board, thus enabling MPC to scrutinize the future youth hostel

development when considering the planning application. Members generally supported the proposed amendments.

95. Regarding the objecting views raised by F34 (part), F35 to F41 on the suitability of youth hostel development at the site, the Vice-chairperson said that there was a long discussion on that issue in the previous representation hearing and the Board had agreed that 'Residential Institution' should be included in Column 2 under the "G/IC" zone of the OZP for better control of the future youth hostel development. Members generally had no further views and agreed that the responses as outlined in the TPB Paper No. 10316 were appropriate.

96. The Vice-chairperson said that some further representers had also commented on the BHR for the proposed youth hostel. Members noted that the building height issue had been thoroughly discussed and a vote was taken to retain the BHR at 97mPD on the OZP in the previous representation hearing, and it was not an amendment item in the proposed amendments to the OZP. Members considered that the responses on the BHR issue as outlined in the TPB paper No. 10316 were appropriate.

97. After deliberation, the Board noted the views of all supportive further representations (F1 to F33 and F34 (part)). The Board also decided not to uphold F34 (part) and F35 to F41 and considered that the draft OZP should be amended by the proposed amendments for the following reasons :

- “(a) the proposed amendments to the “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zone under Amendment Item A and the requirement to obtain planning permission for the proposed youth hostel development from the Town Planning Board (the Board) would ensure that the design of the proposed development and any impacts generated would be scrutinized before development could proceed;
- (b) as the further 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 Man Mo Temple Complex during construction would be addressed through the building plan processing system; and

- (c) the building height of the proposed youth hostel is not the subject of the proposed amendments.”

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai left the meeting at this point.]

### **Procedural Matters**

#### **Agenda Item 10**

[Open Meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comment on the Draft Kwu Tung South Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-KTS/15 (TPB Paper No. 10317)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

98. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests on the item for being members of Hong Kong Golf Club (Golf Club) and/or Hong Kong Jockey Club (HKJC) or their projects were supported / funded by HKJC. The club facilities were in the vicinity of the representation site :

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li                    -    being a member of the Golf Club and  
HKJC

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu                        ]

Ms Christina M. Lee                 ]

Mr H.F. Leung	]	
Mr David Y.T. Lui	]	
Mr Peter K.T. Yuen	]	being a member of HKJC
Mr Philip S.L. Kan	]	
Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung	]	
Mr Alex T.H. Lai	]	
Mr Stephen L.K. Liu	]	
Miss Winnie W.M. Ng	]	
Mr Stephen H.B. Yau	-	some projects of his organisation were supported by HKJC
Professor T.S. Liu	-	being the Principal Investigator of a community project funded by HKJC Charities Trust

99. Dr C.H. Hau also declared that he was applying for funding from HKJC Charities Trust for his project. Mr K.K. Cheung and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam declared that they were members of HKJC and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho declared that he was a member of both the Golf Club and HKJC. Members noted that Ms Christina M. Lee had tendered apologies for being not able to attend the meeting and Mr David Y.T. Lui, Mr Peter K.T. Yuen, Mr Alex T.H. Lai, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, Miss Winnie W.M. Ng, Mr Stephen H.B. Yau and Professor T.S. Liu had already left the meeting. As the item was procedural in nature, Members agreed that the other Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting.

100. The Secretary briefly introduced the TPB Paper No. 10317. On 24.3.2017, the draft Kwu Tung South OZP No. S/NE-KTS/15 (the draft OZP) was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). A total of four representations and one comment were received. As the representations and comment were of similar nature, they could be considered collectively in one group by the full Board. The hearing could be accommodated in the Board's regular meeting and a separate hearing session would not be necessary.

101. To ensure efficiency of the hearing, it was recommended that each representer/commenter be allotted a maximum 10 minutes for presentation in the hearing session. Consideration of the representations by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for October 2017.

102. After deliberation, the Board agreed that :

- (a) the representations and comment should be considered collectively in one group by the Board itself; and
- (b) a 10-minute presentation time would be allotted to each representer/commenter.

### **Agenda Item 11**

[Open Meeting]

Submission of the Draft Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K9/25A under Section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval  
(TPB Paper No. 10318)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

103. The Secretary reported that amendments to the Draft Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K9/25A involved an elderly housing project of the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS). The following Members had declared interests on the item for having affiliation/business dealings with HKHS or its representative, Urbis Limited (Urbis) and its consultant, CYS Associate (HK) Limited (CYS) or owning properties in Hung Hom :

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee            -    being ex-officio member of the Supervisory  
(*as Director of Planning*)            Board of HKHS



- Ms Janice W.M. Lai - having current business dealings with HKHS and Urbis
- Mr K.K. Cheung ] their firm having current business dealings
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai ] with HKHS
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having past business dealings with HKHS and CYS
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with Urbis and past business dealings with HKHS
- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having current business dealings with Urbis
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with Urbis
- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having past business dealings with CYS
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - being an ex-employee of HKHS
- Ms Christina M. Lee - co-owning a flat with spouse in Hung Hom
- Dr F.C. Chan - owning a flat in Hung Hom

104. Dr Lawrence K.C. Li also declared that he was a member of HKHS. Members noted that Ms Christina M. Lee had tendered apologies for being not able to attend the meeting and Ms Janice W.M. Lai, Mr Alex T.H. Lai, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon and Mr Franklin Yu had already left the meeting. As the item was procedural in nature, Members agreed that the other Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting.

105. The Secretary briefly introduced the TPB Paper No. 10318 (the Paper). After giving consideration to the representations and comments on 19.5.2017, the Town Planning Board (the Board) decided not to uphold the representations and that no amendment should be made to the draft Hung Hom OZP No. S/K9/25 to meet the representations. 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.

106. After deliberation, the Board :

- (a) agreed that the draft Hung Hom OZP No. S/K9/25A and its Notes at Annexes I and II of the Paper respectively were suitable for submission under section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the CE in C for approval;
- (b) endorsed the updated Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft Hung Hom OZP No. S/K9/25A 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 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 12**

[Open Meeting]

Submission of the Draft Urban Renewal Authority Hung Fook Street/Ngan Hon Street Development Scheme Plan No. S/K9/URA2/1A under Section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval  
(TPB Paper No. 10319)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

107. The Secretary reported that the draft Urban Renewal Authority (URA) Hung Fook Street/Ngan Hon Street Development Scheme Plan (DSP) No. S/K9/URA2/1A was related to an URA development scheme. The following Members had declared interests on the item for having affiliation/business dealings with the URA or its consultants, MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA) and Ramboll Environ Hong Kong Limited (Environ) or owning properties in Hung Hom :

- |   |     |   |
|---|-----|---|
| Mr Raymond K.W. Lee<br><i>(as Director of Planning)</i> | -   | being a non-executive director of URA, and a member of the Planning, Development and Conservation Committee of URA  |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon                                   | -   | being a non-executive director of URA, a member of the Lands, Rehousing & Compensation Committee and the Planning, Development and Conservation Committee, and a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA |
| Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang                                   | -   | being the Deputy Chairman of Appeal Board Panel of URA  |
| Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung                                     | -   | being a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA  |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau<br>Mr Thomas O.S. Ho                | ] ] | having current business dealings with URA and MVA   |
| Mr Ivan C.S. Fu   | -   | having current business dealings with MVA and Environ   |

- Ms Janice W.M. Lai - having current business dealings with Environ
- Mr K.K. Cheung ] their firm having current business dealings
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai ] with URA
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having past business dealings with URA
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with MVA
- Dr F.C. Chan - owning a flat at Laguna Verde, Hung Hom
- Ms Christina M. Lee - co-owning a flat with spouse at Oi King Street, Hung Hom
- Professor S.C. Wong - being the Chair Professor of University of Hong Kong (HKU) and a group of HKU students had submitted a representation (R111) but he had no involvement in the representation

108. Members noted that Ms Christina M. Lee had tendered apologies for being not able to attend the meeting. Members also noted that Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon, Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Ms Janice W.M. Lai, Mr Alex T.H. Lai, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu and Mr Franklin Yu had already left the meeting. As the item was procedural in nature, Members agreed that the other Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting.

109. The Secretary briefly introduced the TPB Paper No. 10319 (the Paper). After giving consideration to the representations and comments on 2.6.2017, the Town Planning Board (the Board) decided not to uphold the representations and that no amendment should

be made to the draft URA Hung Fook Street/Ngan Hon Street DSP No. S/K9/URA2/1A to meet the representations. As the representation consideration process had been completed, the draft DSP was ready for submission to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval.

110. After deliberation, the Board :

- (a) agreed that the draft URA Hung Fook Street/Ngan Hon Street DSP No. S/K9/URA2/1A and its Notes at Annexes I and II of the Paper respectively were suitable for submission under section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the CE in C for approval;
- (b) endorsed the updated Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft URA Hung Fook Street/Ngan Hon Street DSP No. S/K9/URA2/1A 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 DSP 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 DSP.

### **Agenda Item 13**

[Open Meeting]

Submission of the Draft Chuen Lung & Ha Fa Shan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TW-CLHFS/1A under Section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval  
(TPB Paper No. 10321)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

111. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests on the item for having affiliation/business dealings with the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society (HKBWS) (R247), World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong (WWF-HK) (R249), Ramboll Environ Hong Kong Limited (Environ) and AIM Group (Hong Kong) Limited (AIM Group) (consultants of R253) and Ms Mary Mulvihill (C5) :

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| Dr C.H. Hau                               | - | being a member of HKBWS and a past member of the Conservation Advisory Committee of WWF-HK  |
| Mr K.K. Cheung                            | ] | their firm having current business dealings with AIM Group and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time   |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai                          | ] |   |
| Mr Ivan C.S. Fu                           | ] | having current business dealings with Environ   |
| Ms Janice W.M. Lai                        | ] |   |
| Mr David Y.T. Lui                         | - | having affiliations with the Hong Kong Buddhist Association and the Hong Kong Taoist Association, being an advisor for Po Lin Zen Monastery and Western Monastery                         |
| Professor S.C. Wong<br>(Vice-chairperson) | - | being the Chair Professor and Head of Department of Civil Engineering of the University of Hong Kong (HKU) and one of the the representers was the Centre of Buddhist Studies of HKU (R5) |

112. Members noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai, Ms Janice W.M. Lai and Mr David Y.T. Lui had already left the meeting. As the item was procedural in nature, Members agreed that the other Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting.

113. The Secretary briefly introduced the TPB Paper No. 10321 (the Paper). After giving consideration to the representations and comments on 7.7.2017, the Town Planning Board (the Board) decided not to uphold the representations and that no amendment should be made to the draft Chuen Lung & Ha Fa Shan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TW-CLHFS/1 to meet the representations. 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.

114. After deliberation, the Board :

- (a) agreed that the draft Chuen Lung & Ha Fa Shan OZP No. S/TW-CLHFS/1A and its Notes at Annexes I and II of the Paper respectively were suitable for submission under section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the CE in C for approval;
- (b) endorsed the updated Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft Chuen Lung & Ha Fa Shan OZP No. S/TW-CLHFS/1A 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 14**

[Open Meeting]

Submission of the Draft Cheung Sheung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-CS/1A under Section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval (TPB Paper No. 10322)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

115. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests on the item for having affiliation with the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society (HKBWS) (R1), World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong (WWF-HK) (R2), Designing Hong Kong Limited (DHKL) (R3) and Ms Mary Mulvihill (R5) :

- |                   |   |  |
|-------------------|---|--|
| Dr C.H. Hau       | - | being a member of HKBWS and a past member of the Conservation Advisory Committee of WWF-HK |
| Mr K.K. Cheung    | ] | their firm hiring Ms 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 DHKL                      |

116. Members noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As the item was procedural in nature, Members agreed that the other Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting

117. The Secretary briefly introduced the TPB Paper No. 10322 (the Paper). After giving consideration to the representations and comments on 21.7.2017, the Town Planning Board (the Board) decided not to uphold the representations and that no amendment should be made to the draft Cheung Sheung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/NE-CS/1 to meet the representations. 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.

118. After deliberation, the Board :

- (a) agreed that the draft Cheung Sheung OZP No. S/NE-CS/1A and its Notes at Annexes I and II of the Paper respectively were suitable for



submission under section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the CE in C for approval;

- (b) endorsed the updated Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft Cheung Sheung OZP No. S/NE-CS/1A 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 15**

[Open Meeting]

Submission of the Draft Kowloon Tong Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K18/20A under Section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval (TPB Paper No. 10324)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

119. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests on the item for living or owning properties in Kowloon Tong, or having affiliation with Ms Mary Mulvihill (R5/C1) :

- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - living in the City University of Hong Kong's quarters in Kowloon Tong
- Ms Christina M. Lee - being a director of a company owning two blocks and six carparking spaces and her close relative owning a property leased to a kindergarten in Kowloon Tong, and her

		close relative owning a flat at Beacon Hill
Mr David Y.T. Lui	]	
Mr Peter K.T. Yuen	]	owning properties in Kowloon Tong
Mr H.W. Cheung	]	
Miss Winnie W.M. Ng	]	
Ms Janice W.M. Lai	-	her spouse owning properties in Kowloon Tong
Mr K.K. Cheung	]	their firm hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a
Mr Alex T.H. Lai	]	contract basis from time to time

120. Members noted that Ms Christina M. Lee had tendered apologies for being not able to attend the meeting. Members also noted that Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon, Mr David Y.T. Lui, Mr Peter K.T. Yuen, Miss Winnie W.M. Ng, Ms Janice W.M. Lai and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As the item was procedural in nature, Members agreed that the other Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting.

121. The Secretary briefly introduced the TPB Paper No. 10324 (the Paper). After giving consideration to the representations and comments on 21.7.2017, the Town Planning Board (the Board) decided not to uphold the representations and that no amendment should be made to the draft Kowloon Tong Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K18/20 to meet the representations. 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.

122. After deliberation, the Board :

- (a) agreed that the draft Kowloon Tong OZP No. S/K18/20A and its Notes at Annexes I and II of the Paper respectively were suitable for submission under section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the CE in C for approval;

- (b) endorsed the updated Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft Kowloon Tong OZP No. S/K18/20A 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 Items 16 to 17**

[Confidential Item] [Closed Meeting]

123. The items were recorded under confidential cover.

**Agenda Item 18**

[Open Meeting]

**Any Other Business**

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

124. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 3:25 p.m.