

**Minutes of 1180th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 27.7.2018**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-Chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr David Y.T. Lui

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 Stephen L.H. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr L.T. Kwok

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment),

Environmental Protection Department

Mr Tony W.H. Cheung

Assistant Director/Regional 3, Lands Department
Mr. Edwin W.K. Chan

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

Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon, Transport Department
Mr David C.V. Ngu

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms April K.Y. Kun

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Mr Stephen K.S. Lee

Agenda Item 1

[Open meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1178th Meeting held on 13.7.2018, the 1175th Meeting held on 7.6.2018 and the 1173rd Meeting held on 22.6.2018

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The Secretary reported that the draft minutes of the 1178th Meeting held on 13.7.2018, the 1175th Meeting held on 7.6.2018 and the 1173rd Meeting held on 22.6.2018 were sent to Members on 27.7.2018 and tabled at the meeting. Subject to no proposed amendments by Members on or before 30.7.2018, the minutes would be confirmed without amendments.

[Post-meeting Note: The minutes of 1178th and 1175th Meetings held on 13.7.2018 and 7.6.2018 respectively were confirmed on 30.7.2018 without amendments.

The minutes of 1173rd Meeting held on 22.6.2018 were confirmed on 30.7.2018 subject to the following amendments :

- (a) to revise paragraph 27(b)(i) to read “to request the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) to carry out a detailed study on the Hong Kong Slender Gecko including population genetics;” and
- (b) to revise paragraph 27(b)(iii) to read “to urge CEDD and HD to enhance the ecological compensation plan, especially compensation forest, by following the standards in the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance, and to consult the relevant professional bodies during the process;”.]

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

- (i) Letter from the Society for Community Organization
[Open Meeting] [The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

2. The Secretary reported that a letter from the Society for Community Organization (SOCO) was received by the Secretariat on 12.7.2018 and a copy of which was sent to Members on 20.7.2018 for information.

3. SOCO acknowledged the Town Planning Board (the Board)'s decision of retaining the "Residential (Group A) 6" zoning of a site in On Muk Street, Shek Mun for public housing development and requested the Board to give due consideration to the acute housing shortage in future land use planning. SOCO also requested meeting with the Board to discuss about the matter.

4. Members noted the views of SOCO and agreed to relay the request of SOCO to the Planning Department for follow-up action.

- (ii) The item was recorded under confidential cover.

[Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang and Miss Winnie W.M. Ng arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 3

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of Draft Kwun Tong South Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K14S/21

(TPB Paper No. 10447)

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

5. The Secretary reported that the amendment item on the draft Kwun Tong South Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K14S/21 (the Plan) was to facilitate a proposed public housing development by the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) (C1). Urbis Limited (Urbis), CYS Associates (Hong Kong) Limited (CYS), Meinhardt (C&S) Limited (Meinhardt), Ramboll Environ Hong Kong Ltd. (Environ), AIM Group Limited (AIM) and Rider Levett Bucknall Limited (RLB) were the consultants of the Planning Consultancy Services of HKHS. The following Members had declared interests on the item, for being associated/having business dealings with HKHS, Urbis, CYS, Meinhardt, Environ, AIM, RLB, Ms Mary Mulvihill (R51/C5) and the Mass Transit Railway Corporation Ltd. (MTRCL) (R82):

- | | | |
|---|-----|--|
| Mr Raymond K.W. Lee
<i>(as Director of Planning (D of Plan))</i> | - | being an ex-officio member of the Supervisory Board of HKHS (C1) |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - | having past business dealings with HKHS (C1) and current business dealings with MTRCL (R82) and Urbis |
| Dr Lawrence K.C. Li | - | being member of HKHS (C1) |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon | - | being ex-employee of HKHS (C1) |
| Mr Daniel K.S. Lau | - | being current employee and Director (Development & Marketing) of HKHS (C1) |
| Mr K.K. Cheung
Mr Alex T.H. Lai |]] | firm having current business dealings with HKHS (C1) and MTRCL (R82) and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill (R51/C5) on a contract basis from time to time |
| Mr Stephen L.H. Liu | - | having past business dealings with HKHS (C1), MTRCL (R82) and CYS and being |

consultant of RLB without remuneration

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| Mr Franklin Yu | - | having past business dealings with MTRCL (R82) and Urbis |
| Mr Ivan C.S. Fu | - | having current business dealings with MTRCL (R82), Urbis, Meinhardt and Environ |
| Professor S.C. Wong
(the Vice-Chairperson) | - | being a member of the Advisory Committee for Accredited Programme of MTR Academy |
| Mr Peter K.T. Yuen | - | being a Member of the Board of Governors of the Arts Centre, which had collaborated with the MTRCL on a number of arts projects before |
| Mr L.T. Kwok | - | being the Chief Executive of Christian Family Service Centre, the headquarters of which was located in Kwun Tong |

6. Members noted that Dr Lawrence K.C. Li and Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and Daniel K.S. Lau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Messrs L.T. Kwok, Franklin Yu and Ivan C.S. Fu had not yet arrived to join the meeting.

7. Since Messrs K.K. Cheung and Stephen L.H. Liu had no involvement in the proposed development scheme by HKHS and the interests of Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon, Professor S.C. Wong and Messrs Peter K.T. Yuen and Franklin Yu were indirect, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

8. As the interests of Messrs Raymond K.W. Lee and Thomas O.S. Ho were direct, Members agreed that they should leave the meeting for this item.

[Messrs Raymond K.W. Lee and David Y.T. Lui left the meeting temporarily, and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho left the meeting at this point.]

9. The Chairperson said that reasonable notice had been given to invite all representers and commenters to attend the hearing, but other than those who were present, the rest had either indicated not to attend or made no reply. As reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenters, the Town Planning Board (the Board) should proceed with the hearing of the representations in their absence.

Presentation and Question Sessions

10. The following government representatives and representers, commenters or their representatives were invited to the meeting:

Government representatives

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

Ms Jessie K.P. Kwan - Senior Town Planner/Kowloon 5
(STP/K5), PlanD

Representers or their representatives

R4 - 李滿昌

Mr Lee Mum Cheong - Representer

R16 - 曾偉強

Mr Tsang Wai Keung - Representer

R48 - Joel Tang

Mr Joel Tang - Representer

R49 - 陳華裕區議員

Mr Chan Wah Yu Nelson - Representer

R51/C5 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer and Commenter

R53 – Wong Ka Chun

Ms Tai Wing Kwan - Representer's representative

C1- Hong Kong Housing Society

HKHS

Mr Yeung Ka Hong, Eric]

Mr Pang Chuck Hang] Commenter's representatives

Urbis Limited

Ms Winona Ip]

C3 - 循道衛理觀塘社會服務處

Mr Yu Yan Ming - Commenter's representative

11. The Chairperson briefly explained the arrangement and procedures of the hearing. She said that the government representative would brief Members on the background to the representations and comments. The representers, commenters or their representatives would then be invited to make oral submissions. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, each representer, commenter or his/her representative was allotted 10 minutes for making presentations. There was a timer device to alert the representers, commenters or their representatives two minutes before the allotted 10-minute time was to expire and when the allotted 10-minute time limit was up. Question and answer (Q&A) session would be held after the representers, commenters or their representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to government representatives, the representers, commenters or their representatives. After the Q&A session, government representatives, representers, commenters and their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting; and the Board would deliberate on the representations in their absence and inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

12. The Chairperson then invited Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, PlanD, to brief Members on the background to the representations and comments.

13. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, PlanD, briefed Members on the representations and comments, including background to prepare the Plan, public consultation, grounds and proposals of the representations and comments, planning assessment and responses to the representations and comments, as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10447 (the Paper). A replacement page for page 3 of the Paper had also been tabled for Members' information.

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

14. The Chairperson then invited the representers, commenters or their representatives to elaborate on the representations and comments.

R4 - 李滿昌

15. Mr Lee Mum Cheong made the following main points:

- (a) he was a tenant of Hay Cheuk Lau and supported the redevelopment scheme of Kwun Tong Garden Estate Phase II (KTGE II);
- (b) although passengers lifts had been provided in KTGE II in the last 10 years, the aged housing blocks, which were generally in dilapidated conditions, were still inconvenient to the tenants and in need of redevelopment. Although the use of an existing basketball court at Ting On Street (TOS) to facilitate redevelopment of KTGE II was supported, the affected tenants had not yet been informed if they could stay in the units of the new housing block in TOS or needed to return to KTGE II upon completion of the redevelopment; and
- (c) the traffic congestion problem in Ngau Tau Kok (NTK) Road was very serious, particularly during the afternoon peak, which was an issue that the

Government had to address in the redevelopment project.

R16 - 曾偉強

16. Mr Tsang Wai Keung made the following main points:

- (a) he was a tenant of Yin Chee Lau, KTGE II;
- (b) he supported the redevelopment of KTGE II as the estate was very old but requested assistance, removal allowance and adequate facilities to be made available to the tenants, particularly the elderly.

[Mr David Y.T. Lui returned to join the meeting at this point.]

R48 – Joel Tang

17. Mr Joel Tang made the following main points:

- (a) although the proposed redevelopment of KTGE II had been under discussion for over a year, little details were made available to the tenants;

Future rental and size of accommodation

- (b) the rent level and the future living environments were amongst the main concerns of the tenants, particularly the elderly. HKHS's broad-brush commitment of a minimum of 7m² of internal floor area per person and reasonable rental did not ease the worries of the tenants. They wanted a definite answer on whether they had to pay more when they were rehoused in the new housing block in TOS. He learned that HKHS was liaising with the Government about the premium of the subject site at TOS (TOS site) and very likely that the Government would grant the TOS site to HKHS at zero premium. If that was the case, there would be scope for HKHS to maintain the current rental level of KTGE II for new flats in the TOS site. When the tenants were at ease and did not have to worry about

the higher rental they needed to pay, it would facilitate the redevelopment process of KTGE II; and

Expediting the redevelopment process

- (c) to complete the redevelopment of KTGE II in 20 years, taking into account the nuisance caused in the demolition and construction process, was too long for the tenants. He learned that HKHS had been liaising with the Government to use a site in Kai Tak as a decanting site for redevelopment of KTGE II since 2012. The site in Kai Tak, as it turned out, was reserved for the redevelopment of Chun Seen Mei Chuen but not KTGE II. The Government should find out ways, e.g. by exploring the feasibility of offering tenants a rehousing choice in existing vacant public housing units of the Hong Kong Housing Authority or HKHS to expedite the redevelopment process of KTGE II.

R49 - 陳華裕區議員

18. Mr Chan Wah Yu Nelson, a member of Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC), made the following main points:

- (a) he did not support HKHS using the basketball court in TOS as a decanting site for redevelopment of KTGE II;
- (b) the TOS site was sandwiched between KTGE II to its north and a business zone to its south. The burgeoning of the property market had driven up property prices, resulting in building and rebuilding of office towers in the Kwun Tong Business Area (KTBA). Upon redevelopment, the number of units in KTGE II would be increased by about 3,000 flats from the current level of about 2,300 units to about 5,400 units. The probable redevelopment of private residential buildings in TOS would bring about some 2,000 to 3,000 additional units on top of the current number of 2,800 units. The proposed one and a half basketball courts in KTGE II would not be able to cater for the need of KTGE II, let alone the demand in TOS

and it was unreasonable to replace the existing basketball court in TOS with a half-sized one in view of an increasing population in the area. Residents had paid to live in the area with the hope to lead a better life but was disappointed to learn that their basketball court was going to be taken away;

- (c) Kwun Tong Road and NTK Road were two very busy roads. Traffic congestions were common in peak hours. Currently Ting Fu Street and TOS were serving a function of diverging traffic from the two busy roads. An increase in traffic in the area would bring no benefits to the residents;
- (d) the residents in TOS had paid tax and rate, and they were entitled to have a basketball court in the area. Even though there would be public lifts for a barrier-free pedestrian link from TOS to NTK Road and reprovisioning of refuse collection point (RCP) within the proposed development, it was not adequate to compensate for the loss of the existing basketball court highly utilized by students and residents in TOS; and
- (e) as a better arrangement, a more sustainable approach to redevelopment should have been considered. Instead of using the TOS basketball court as a decanting site for KTGE II redevelopment in a piecemeal manner, the basketball court together with its adjoining playground, public clinic and public toilet should be redeveloped in one go so that adequate space would be made available for reprovisioning of the affected facilities, including the basketball court.

R53 – Wong Ka Chun

19. Ms Tai Wing Kwan made the following main points:

- (a) she was a staff of a non-governmental organization (NGO) in the area;
- (b) according to the drawings and plans attached to the Paper, it appeared that a full-sized basketball court could be provided within the proposed public

housing development in TOS. The claim that space was only available for a half-sized basketball court was questionable; and

- (c) there was insufficient local consultation on the matter. Only two briefing sessions had been organized and only a few hundred out of some 2,000 households had taken part in the consultation activities. HKHS should conduct more consultation with the tenants of KTGE II to solicit views of the locals and identify the GIC facilities required, and consider more collaboration with the NGOs for community development planning.

C1 – Hong Kong Housing Society

20. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Yeung Ka Hong, Eric made the following main points:

- (a) KTGE II with about 2,300 units was built in the 1960s and was already over 50 years old. Although HKHS had maintenance plans to upgrade the services to the estate, such as installing passenger lifts to enhance accessibility to units on upper floors, redevelopment of KTGE II was an indispensable part of the estate improvement strategy in view of the aging housing blocks;
- (b) commencing from 2017, HKHS had started consulting KTDC and the locals on the redevelopment arrangements. It was noted that the tenants in general supported the redevelopment plan and requested rehousing in the same district;
- (c) to kick-start the redevelopment of KTGE II, the basketball court in TOS (Amendment Item A on the Plan) was the only suitable decanting site identified in the area. It was anticipated that about 400 units could be provided to rehouse the tenants affected by the first phase of the redevelopment. The technical assessments concluded that the proposed public housing development would not have significant adverse impacts on the surrounding areas. Besides, the proposal would not only facilitate

redevelopment of KTGE II to improve the living environment of the tenants in three phases, but also optimize the development potential of KTGE II to produce more highly demanded public housing units;

- (d) to compensate for the loss of the basketball court, as a temporary measure, one and a half basketball courts together with Tai Chi courts and seating area would be provided in KTGE II for public use. A half-sized basketball court would be reprovisioned permanently within the proposed development in TOS. Activities and landscaped areas would also be provided for public enjoyment. The provision was an improvement to the current situation where the greenery space was on slope at the TOS site, which was inaccessible to the public. The proposed development would improve pedestrian connectivity by provision of a barrier-free pedestrian link and help ameliorate the traffic conditions. The current substandard RCP of about 76m² in size in TOS would be replaced by an indoor-operated and up to standard RCP of 308m² within the proposed development at the TOS site. The Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) had been consulted on the proposal and it considered the reprovisioning feasible. Supporting facilities including a neighbourhood elderly centre (NEC) and retail facilities would also be provided. All those facilities were planning gains to improve the living conditions of the residents; and
- (e) should Amendment Item A be agreed by the Board, HKHS would follow up with the relevant departments to proceed with the proposed public housing development in TOS for commencement of works in early 2019 and completion in 2023.

C3 - 循道衛理觀塘社會服務處

21. Mr Yu Yan Ming made the following main points:

- (a) he was the pastor and social welfare services officer of a church cum social services centre in KTGE II. His church set up the social services centre

in the estate in 1966 and had over the years provided essential supporting assistance and services, including a kindergarten, to the residents. The social services centre had on occasions collaborated with HKHS to provide services and spiritual caring support to those in need in KTGE II;

- (b) HKHS was requested to respect the agreement made with his centre and ensure sufficient social services would continue to be provided throughout the redevelopment process; and
- (c) his centre could continue to be a middle man between the residents and HKHS to enhance communication in the redevelopment process.

R51/C5 - Mary Mulvihill

22. Ms Mary Mulvihill, with the aid of the visualizer, made the following main points:

- (a) the sandwich class, who did not live in public rental housing estates nor big private residential developments but paid for their own accommodation, were constantly being deprived in that open space and other facilities provided on the basis of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) were removed to make way for other purposes. They were not adequately represented. In the current case, a full-sized basketball court was being reduced to a half-sized court for a public housing development. People using certain facilities currently should be able to continue using them. The right of access to facilities by people living in the area should be respected;
- (b) according to the information she got, there were only 23 basketball courts in Kwun Tong. The information of the planned provision of some 80 basketballs courts provided by DPO/K, PlanD was not available to the public;
- (c) as regards the subject TOS site, it was an 'island' site in a highly built-up

neighbourhood with few places for people to hang around. The basketball court was the only active recreational facility in the area. Although it was said that there were some 80 basketball courts that people could use, the TOS site being surrounded by busy roads with limited crossings would be very difficult for people, particularly those with young children, to go elsewhere for such facilities. People in the area were entitled to have a full-sized basketball court, or even additional facilities. To the south of the site were workshops. The working population also needed a basketball court for recreation during the breaks. The park and the basketball court in the area were very popular facilities;

- (d) reprovisioning of a half-sized basketball court at the TOS site would give rise to concern on freedom of use of the court. She anticipated that the basketball court would not be open for use after 11:00 p.m. It would not be available to the night owls and people who worked shifts. The basketball court would likely be managed by people in uniform restricting the types of activities allowed. The green hillslope on the TOS site was also going to be taken away. There would be fewer trees, which would affect adversely the air quality. The ordinary people who paid rent and income tax got nothing back in return;
- (e) regarding the decanting arrangement, there was no need to go as far as Kai Tak for a decanting site. There was a big site currently used by the Christian Action near Kai Yip Estate for proposed housing development. Arrangement could be made to lease one of the housing blocks to HKHS for 10, 15 or 20 years to decant the tenants in KTGE II. When the redevelopment of KTGE II was completed, the tenants should be given a choice of either staying in the decanting site or returning to the KTGE site; and
- (f) the taking away of land from the community for commercial and private residential developments for rich people had to be stopped and Members of the Board had to stand up to protect the rights of the ordinary people.

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

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

Reprovisioning of the basketball court

24. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions in relation to the reprovisioning of the basketball court in TOS:

- (a) how the original full-sized basketball court in KTGE II would be turned into one and a half basketball courts and whether the construction of the basketball courts would be completed before closing of the existing basketball court at the TOS site;
- (b) whether the basketball court in KTGE II was currently open to the public;
- (c) whether HKHS could compensate for the loss in basketball court provision with more population in the area upon completion of the proposed public housing development in TOS;
- (d) the utilization rate of the existing basketball court in TOS and the feasibility of reprovisioning a full-sized basketball court in the public housing development at the TOS site; and
- (e) whether it was feasible to reprovision the basketball court at the adjoining NTK Road Children's Playground.

25. In response to Members questions on the basketball court in KTGE II, Mr Yeung

Ka Hong, Eric, HKHS (C1), with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that the existing basketball court in KTGE II would be re-orientated, and there would be sufficient space to house one and a half basketball courts in KTGE II. Other than the basketball courts, a Tai Chi court and seating area would also be provided. While the current basketball court in KTGE II was restricted for use by the tenants, the future one and a half basketball courts, Tai Chi court and the seating areas would be open for public use. The alteration works of the basketball courts in KTGE II would be completed before closing the existing one in the TOS site so that the use of basketball court by the public would not be affected. The opening hours of the basketball courts would not be shorter than the existing one at TOS, i.e. from 6:30 a.m. to 11:00 p.m..

26. With respect to other questions concerning the reprovisioning of the affected basketball court, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, PlanD said that while only a half-sized basketball court would be provided in the proposed public housing development at the TOS site, about 1,090m² of activities/landscaped area would also be provided and open for public enjoyment. Currently, apart from the basketball court, the rest of the site was slope without seating or recreational areas. The one and a half basketball courts to be provided in KTGE II, which was about 250m away, would also be open for public use in the interim. Mr Yip, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that apart from the 23 open-air basketball courts in the district under the management of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD), there were another 53 basketball courts provided within public housing estates. The total provision of 76 basketball courts in Kwun Tong was more than the number required under HKPSG. According to the information provided by LCSD, the utilization rate of the basketball court in TOS in 2015 was about 81.5%.

27. On the feasibility of reprovisioning a full-sized basketball court in the proposed public housing development in the TOS site, Mr Yeung Ka Hong, Eric, HKHS (C1), with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that the option had been explored but owing to the small size of the site, requirements on or restrictions imposed by building setback, provision of lift hall and emergency vehicular access (EVA), and building lines, the space available was only enough for a half-sized basketball court. In response to whether there was conflict of shared use between EVA and basketball court, Mr Yeung said that the basketball court could not be provided on EVA. Nevertheless, efforts had been made to make good use of the covered area to provide landscaped and activities areas for use by the public.

28. In response to the questions on the feasibility of reprovisioning the basketball court in NTK Road Children's Playground, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that about one third of the area of the playground concerned was on slope. There was not enough level ground for a full-sized basketball court without interfering the existing leisure and recreational facilities. As regards the feasibility of using the southern part of the playground along TOS for a full-sized basketball court, it could be subject to further study.

Alternative sites for KTGE II redevelopment

29. In response to Members' questions on whether there were alternatives for KTGE II's decanting site and whether the sites adjoining the basketball court in TOS could be included for comprehensive redevelopment, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, PlanD said that it was the aspiration of the existing tenants of KTGE II to be rehoused in the same district. Although a site in Kai Tak was mentioned by a representer, it was not in the Kwun Tong District. As regards the feasibility of amalgamating the adjoining GIC sites for comprehensive redevelopment, Mr Yip, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that the NTK Jockey Club Clinic, NTK Public Toilet cum Bathhouse and NTK Road Children's Playground were currently highly utilized and providing various services to the community. The Department of Health, FEHD and LCSO had no redevelopment plan for those facilities and requested seamless reprovisioning should those sites be taken up for other uses. To consolidate a large area for decanting the tenants affected by KTGE II redevelopment in one go might take a long time while making use of the basketball court in TOS would quickly kick-start the redevelopment by phases to meet the imminent redevelopment need of KTGE II.

30. In relation to the redevelopment programme of KTGE II, Mr Yeung Ka Hong, Eric, HKHS (C1) said that the redevelopment would be implemented in three phases. The 378 units to be provided in the TOS site would be for decanting the tenants mainly affected by the first phase of KTGE II redevelopment. The vacated sites in KTGE II would then be used to facilitate subsequent redevelopment phases in turn. Upon completion of the whole redevelopment, the number of units in KTGE II would be increased from the current some 2,300 units to some 5,400 units.

Building design and development intensity

31. In relation to building design, some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) how the air ventilation and traffic concerns of the proposed public housing development in TOS would be addressed, taking into account that the summer prevailing wind was from the east and southwest;
 - (b) whether it was feasible to house some of the facilities of the proposed public housing development underground to release more space for facilities or uses that required to be provided above ground; and
 - (c) whether there were plot ratio (PR) and building height (BH) restrictions and whether the maximum PR and BH had been used up in the proposed public housing scheme in the TOS site.

32. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that the terrace and reduced podium design with maximum provision of landscape areas of the proposed development had minimized the blockage effect along NTK Road and facilitated effective air ventilation. Building setbacks along TOS and NTK Road coupled with the minimized building bulk would also help mitigate the impact. The air ventilation assessment (AVA) conducted by HKHS indicated that air penetration on the western side of the proposed development would be slightly affected, the proposed development would also induce downwash wind that would be beneficial to areas located to its eastern side. Further quantitative AVA would be carried out by HKHS at detailed design stage to explore opportunities for further improvement. In relation to the traffic concerns, as the proposed development was for public housing, the parking space requirements were relatively low. According to the traffic impact assessment (TIA) conducted by HKHS, the number of two-way passenger car unit (pcu) generated by the proposed development with about 378 public housing units were only 34 and 27 in the morning and afternoon peaks respectively. The traffic conditions of the major junctions nearby were acceptable and the additional traffic generated by the proposed development would not overload the junctions. With regard to the impacts of KTGE II redevelopment, the detailed design scheme had yet to be formulated,

and relevant technical assessments, including TIA, AVA and visual impact assessment, would be conducted by HKHS and the recommended mitigation measures would be implemented to minimise such impacts.

33. Mr Yeung Ka Hong, Eric, HKHS (C1) added that the void on 2/F had been raised 5.2m above ground at NTK Road level to increase permeability for effective wind penetration. Regarding the use of underground space, Mr Yeung said that nearly half of the site at TOS was slope requiring construction of retaining structures for the proposed development. There was also a requirement to retain the existing RCP until the indoor RCP was in place. In view of the site constraints and technical difficulties, the time and construction cost involved in building a basement would greatly reduce the feasibility of the project. However, the use of underground space would be studied in redeveloping KTGE II. As the KTGE II site was on slopes, options of maximizing the use of the space provided by the slopes would also be explored.

34. In respect of the development intensity, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, Plan D said that the maximum total (domestic) PR and BH for the TOS site were 9 (7.5) and 110mPD respectively and Mr Yeung Ka Hong, Eric, HKHS (C1) said that the PR and BH of the proposed public housing development under the current scheme were 8.1 and 107mPD respectively.

GIC facilities and assistance to the tenants

35. In response to Members' questions on whether there would be provision of sufficient GIC facilities, seamless reprovisioning of existing GIC facilities, and assistance and allowance to the affected tenants, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that to ensure continued refuse collection service, the existing RCP would only be demolished upon completion of the indoor RCP within the proposed development.

36. Mr Yeung Ka Hong, Eric, HKHS (C1) said that the provision of GIC facilities in KTGE II would be considered once the availability of the decanting site was confirmed. A planning brief would be prepared to guide the KTGE II redevelopment and adequate provision of GIC facilities and open space would be specified to meet the requirements under

HKPSG and that from the relevant departments. HKHS would undertake technical assessments in relation to visual, air ventilation, pedestrian connectivity, GIC and commercial provisions and traffic and parking facilities, in planning the KTGE II redevelopment. HKHS would continue to liaise with NGOs and the tenants to work out the services and facilities to be provided in the KTGE II redevelopment and to avoid disruption of the existing facilities and services. HKHS had all along been in close contact and would keep close liaison with KTDC, the DC members concerned and mutual aid committees to collect local views. As for the TOS site, an NEC, as requested by the Social Welfare Department, would be provided to meet the local demand. Removal allowance would also be provided to the affected tenants. HKHS would brief tenants about the decanting arrangements two years before removal when details were available. Besides, a team of social workers would also be set up to provide the necessary assistance and services to the tenants. Mr Yeung said that the new rental would be based on the operation cost and would probably be above the current level. However, HKHS had a rent assistance scheme to help those tenants with financial difficulties.

37. In response to Members' questions in relation to the estimated population in TOS and the redevelopment projects in the KTBA and the TOS area, Mr Chan Wah Yu, Nelson (R49), KTDC member, said that the current population in TOS was about 10,000. As subdivision of flats was noted in the area, the population might have been doubled. TOS and KTBA were developed in the 1960s and 1970s and were mainly occupied by medium-rise tenement housing and industrial buildings respectively. With the soaring of property price, he expected that those industrial and tenement buildings would gradually be redeveloped into high-rise business and residential buildings resulting in more congested environment and additional population.

38. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedures had been completed. The Chairperson thanked the government representatives and the representers, commenters and their representatives for attending the meeting and said that the Board would deliberate on the representations in their absence and would inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The government representatives, the representers, commenters and their representatives left the meeting at this point.

[Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung left the meeting during the Q&A Session.]

[Mr Philip S.L. Kan left the meeting temporarily and Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung left the meeting at this point.]

[The meeting was adjourned for a short break of 10 minutes at this point.]

Deliberation

39. The Chairperson said that the concerns of the representations and comments were mainly about the reprovisioning of the affected basketball court, better design of the proposed public housing development, provision of adequate supporting facilities and services and arrangement of the KTGE II redevelopment.

40. Members in general supported the proposed public housing development, and agreed that the TOS site, although small in area, provided a great opportunity to kick-start the redevelopment of KTGE II. The benefits, particularly the number of additional housing units to be provided and the opportunity to improve the living environment of the tenants in KTGE II, were well recognised. Nevertheless, Members considered that there were still rooms to further improve the scheme to minimise its impact on the surrounding areas. In the course of discussion, Members made the following views/suggestions:

Building design

- (a) as the maximum PR and BH had not been exhausted, further improvement to air ventilation of the proposed public housing development might be possible by increasing the height of the void fronting NTK Road and relocating the retail uses to the lower floor to make room for the provision of public open space near the building core on 2/F to allow better air flow. Further opportunities should also be taken to provide more greenery and open space within the development;

Connectivity and provision of supporting facilities and services

- (b) since the site was segregated from the adjoining areas by roads forming an 'island-like' piece of land, HKHS should explore how to enhance connectivity of the site with the surrounding areas, in particular to the waterfront, and HKHS should also consider to provide a wider range of supporting GIC facilities at the detailed design stage;

Reprovisioning of basketball court

- (c) while it was appreciated that LCSD might have its own plan and consideration with respect to whether the existing facilities in the NTK Road Children's playground had to be retained, the Government might in the long term further explore the feasibility of incorporating a full-sized basketball court within the playground. Other options, such as the provision of basketball courts on roof-tops of GIC facilities in TOS might also be explored; and

Site selection

- (d) taking 20 years to redevelop KTGE II was considered too long. While recognizing that it was the tenants' aspiration to be rehoused in the same area, HKHS might further liaise with the tenants to investigate if they would accept rehousing in other districts, and keep in view the possibility of using the playgrounds and other GIC sites in the area as pump-priming sites with a view to shortening the redevelopment programme of KTGE II.

41. Members agreed that their suggestions (a), (b) and (d) above should be relayed to HKHS and suggestion (c) to LCSD for consideration.

42. After discussion, Members were in support of the rezoning of the TOS site from "Government, Institution or Community" to "Residential (Group A) 3" to facilitate the proposed public housing development. Members agreed that there was no justification to amend the draft OZP to meet the adverse representations, and the major points of the representations and comments had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10477 and the presentations and responses made by government

representative in the meeting.

43. After deliberation, the Board noted the supportive views of R1 to R36 and R38 to R40 and decided not to uphold R37 and R41 to R103. The Board also agreed that no amendment should be made to the Plan to meet the representations for the following reasons:

- “(a) land suitable for housing development in Hong Kong is scarce and there is a genuine need for optimizing the use of land available to meet the pressing demand for public housing. The proposed development at the representation site would facilitate the Kwun Tong Garden Estate Phase II (KTGE II) redevelopment. It is compatible with the surrounding environment, and sustainable from traffic, environment, air ventilation, visual, hygiene and law and order perspectives (R37, R41, R43 to R61, R63 to R71, R74 to R103);
- (b) taking into account the additional population from the proposed development and KTGE II redevelopment, the provision of open space and major Government, institution or community (GIC) facilities in the area is generally sufficient. A neighbourhood elderly centre, a half-sized basketball court, covered activities/landscaped areas and a barrier-free pedestrian passageway will be provided in the proposed development to serve the local community (R49, R51 to R53, R59, R62, R72 to R73 and R81);
- (c) since the adjacent residential developments are under private ownership and there is no redevelopment programme for adjacent GIC/open space facilities, it is considered inappropriate to include these sites for comprehensive development with the representation site, which will require a longer time for implementation and may not meet the aspirations for early redevelopment of the KTGE II (R42 only); and
- (d) the statutory and administrative procedures in consulting the public on the OZP amendments have been duly followed. The views received were duly considered and responded to by the departments concerned in

the process. The exhibition of the OZP for public inspection and the provisions for submission of representations and comments form part of the statutory consultation process under the Town Planning Ordinance (R48, R50, R51, R72 and R81).”

[Messrs Raymond K.W. Lee and Philip S.L. Kan returned and Mr Ivan C.S. Fu arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Tuen Mun & Yuen Long West District

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/YL-TYST/858

Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Hobby Farm), Picnic Area, Barbecue Spot and Tent Camping Ground for a Period of 3 Years in “Green Belt” Zone, Lots 40, 130, 502 (Part), 503, 504, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 512, 516, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 544 and 2154 in D.D. 119 and Adjoining Government Land, Lam Tai West Road, Yuen Long (TPB Paper No. 10448)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

44. The Secretary reported that the application had been withdrawn by the applicant before the meeting.

[Mr L.T. Kwok arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Fanling, Sheung Shui & Yuen Long East District

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/KTN/40

Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Vehicle Repair Workshop (including Container Vehicle Repair Yard) for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group A) 1”, “Residential (Group A) 3” and “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business and Technology Park” Zones and an area shown as ‘Road’, Lots 759 S.A, 759 RP (Part), 761 S.A, 761 S.C (Part), 762 S.A and 762 S.C (Part) in D.D. 95 and Adjoining Government Land, Ho Sheung Heung Road, Kwu Tung, Sheung Shui
(TPB Paper No. 10451)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

45. The following Member had declared interest on this item:

Dr C.H. Hau - owning a property in Ho Sheung Heung, Kwu Tung North

46. As the property of Dr C.H. Hau did not have a direct view of the application site, Members agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

47. The following representative of Planning Department (PlanD) and the applicant’s representative were invited to the meeting at this point.

Government Representative

Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin - District Planning Officer/Fanling,
Sheung Shui & Yuen Long East,
(DPO/FS&YLE, PlanD)

Applicant’s Representative

Mr Wong Kwok Fai Eddie - The applicant's representative

48. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedure of the review hearing. She then invited DPO/FS&YLE, PlanD to brief Members on the review application.

49. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin, DPO/FS&YLE, PlanD, 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. 10451 (the Paper).

50. The Chairperson then invited the applicant's representative to elaborate on the review application. Mr Wong Kwok Fai Eddie made the following main points:

- (a) his company had submitted seven to eight planning applications for the same use at the subject site since 2002. All of them were approved and all the approval conditions were complied with. RNTPC rejected the current application on the ground that no traffic impact assessment (TIA) had been submitted; and
- (b) according to his company's record for the past 10 years, vehicles going to the site had dropped about 40 to 50%. The use at the site would not have significant traffic impact on the surrounding areas.

51. As the presentations of PlanD's and the applicant's representatives were completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

52. In response to a Member's question on why the subject renewal application was rejected by RNTPC, Mr Wong Kwok Fai Eddie said that his company had submitted a few renewal applications in the past and all of them were approved. Despite the use at the site remained unchanged, the application was rejected because no TIA had been submitted. As

such, the applicant had prepared a TIA, which costed over \$100,000, and submitted it together with the subject review application for Members' consideration.

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

Deliberation Session

54. Two Members considered that for some straight forward applications or renewal applications, TIA might not be necessary. In response to Members' comments, Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, Director of Planning said that as recorded in RNTPC minutes of meeting held on 26.1.2018, which was attached as Annex B to the Paper, the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) did not support the application from traffic management viewpoint. C for T considered that the recent traffic condition on roads in the North District had deteriorated. As the applicant did not provide a TIA, it was not possible for C for T to advise whether the applicant's proposed mitigation measures were feasible. Mr David C.V. Ngu, Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon, Transport Department (TD) confirmed that those were TD's views on the section 16 application. The Chairperson supplemented that the applicant was only required to provide sufficient information rather than a comprehensive TIA to address TD's concerns.

55. After deliberation, the Board decided to approve the application on review on a temporary basis for a period of 3 years until 27.7.2021 with the following conditions:

- “(a) no operation between 8:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m., as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the Site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no operation on Sundays and statutory holidays, as proposed by the applicant, is allowed on the Site during the planning approval period;

- (c) the existing peripheral fencing on the Site should be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (d) no parking and reverse movement of vehicles should be allowed on public road outside the Site at all times during the planning approval period;
- (e) the existing trees on the Site shall be maintained in good condition at all times during the planning approval period;
- (f) the existing drainage facilities on the Site should be properly maintained at all time and rectified if found inadequate/ineffective during the planning approval period;
- (g) the replacement of the dead tree on the Site within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board by 27.10.2018;
- (h) the submission of a condition record of the existing drainage facilities on site within 3 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board by 27.10.2018;
- (i) the submission of fire service installations and water supplies for fire fighting proposals within 6 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board by 27.1.2019;
- (j) in relation to (i) above, the implementation of fire service installations and water supplies for fire fighting proposals within 9 months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board by 27.4.2019;
- (k) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) or (f) is not complied with during the approval period, the approval hereby given shall

cease to have effect and shall be revoked immediately without further notice; and

- (l) if any of the above planning conditions (g), (h), (i) or (j) is not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given shall cease to have effect and shall on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

56. The Board also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Annex F of the Paper.

Agenda Item 6

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/YL-PH/774

Proposed Temporary Open Storage of Construction Machinery and Equipment with Ancillary Office and Staff Rest Room for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 357 in D.D. 110, Tsat Sing Kong, Pat Heung, Yuen Long
(TPB Paper No. 10453)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

57. Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin, District Planning Officer/Fanling, Sheung Shui & Yuen Long East, (DPO/FS&YLE, PlanD) was invited to the meeting at this point.

58. The Chairperson extended a welcome and informed the meeting that the applicant had decided not to attend the hearing. She then invited DPO/FS&YLE, PlanD to brief Members on the review application.

59. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin, DPO/FS&YLE, PlanD, 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. 10453 (the Paper). An additional page 59 of Annex B of the Paper had also been tabled for

Members' information.

60. As the presentation of PlanD's representative was completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members. As Members had no question, the Chairperson thanked Ms Chin for attending the meeting. Ms Chin left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

61. 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 to retain and safeguard good agricultural land for agricultural purposes. This zone is also intended to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation. No strong planning justification has been given in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis;
- (b) the application does not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13E in that there is no previous approval granted at the Site and there are adverse departmental comments and public objection against the application;
- (c) the applicant fails to demonstrate that the development would not generate adverse environmental and landscape impacts on the surrounding areas; and
- (d) the approval of the application, even on a temporary basis, would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications to proliferate into this part of the “AGR” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such application would result in a general degradation of the rural environment of the area.”

[Dr C.H. Hau left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 7

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/YL-MP/268

Proposed Temporary Open Storage of Construction Machinery and Equipment with Ancillary Converted Container Office and Staff Common Room for a Period of 3 Years in “Open Space” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lots 22, 23, 24, 25, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34 and 38 in D.D. 101 and Adjoining Government Land, San Tin, Yuen Long
(TPB Paper No. 10454)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

62. The following Members had declared interest on this item:

Mr Leung Ka Wing - owning a house in Fairview Park

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong - owning a house in Fairview Park

63. Members noted that Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong had tendered apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As the property of Mr Leung Ka Wing did not have a direct view of the application site, Members agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

64. Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin, District Planning Officer/Fanling, Sheung Shui & Yuen Long East, Planning Department (DPO/FS&YLE, PlanD) was invited to the meeting at this point.

65. The Chairperson extended a welcome and informed the meeting that the applicant had decided not to attend the hearing. She then invited DPO/FS&YLE, PlanD to brief Members on the review application.

66. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin, DPO/FS&YLE, PlanD, 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. 10454 (the Paper).

67. As the presentation of PlanD's representative was completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

68. In response to a question by the Chairperson, Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin, DPO/FS&YLE, PlanD said that the need for relocation of the applicant's open storage use from a brownfield site to the subject site was not considered a strong justification for the application. The applicant should identify a site which was suitable for the applied use.

69. As Members had no further question, the Chairperson thanked Ms Chin for attending the meeting. Ms Chin left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

70. 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 “Open Space” (“O”) and “Village Type Development” (“V”) zones. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from such planning intention, even on a temporary basis;
- (b) the proposed development is not in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for Application for Temporary Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses (TPB PG-No. 13E) in that no previous approval has been granted for the site, there are adverse department comments on environmental and landscape aspects and local objection; and
- (c) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the “O” and “V” zones. The cumulative effect

of approving such application would result in general degradation of the environment of the area.”

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 (TPB Paper No. 10421)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

71. The Secretary said that on 21.6.2018, the applicant’s representative wrote to the Secretary of the Town Planning Board (the Board) requesting a further deferment of hearing of the review application for one month to allow time for the applicant to address further comments received from the Transport Department (TD) and Environmental Protection Department (EPD). Although the applicant had submitted further information with a revised traffic impact assessment and responses to address departmental comments since the last deferment on 5.1.2018, the applicant needed more time to prepare further information to address further comments received from TD and EPD.

72. Members noted that the justification 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 in response to departmental comments, the deferment period was not indefinite, and that the deferment would not affect the interests of other parties.

73. After deliberation, the Board agreed to defer a decision on the review application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information by the applicant. The Board also agreed that the review application should be submitted for its consideration within three months upon receipt of the further submission from the

applicant. If the submission by 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 also agreed to advise the applicant that the Board had allowed a period of 1 month for preparation of further information and since this was already the third deferment, the Board had allowed a total of 4 months for the preparation of further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Procedural Matters

Agenda Item 9

[Open Meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comments on the Draft Causeway Bay Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H6/16

(TPB Paper No. 10457)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese]

74. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments were formulated upon review of the draft Causeway Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H6/15 in order to give effect to the Court's orders in respect of two judicial reviews (JRs) lodged by Hysan Development Co. Ltd. (Hysan) and its subsidiaries (together, Hysan Group Companies) and by Excelsior Hotel (BVI) Limited (Excelsior) respectively. The following Members had declared interests on the item for owning properties in the Causeway Bay area; and/or having affiliation/business dealings with Hysan (R102), the mother company of Barrorgate Limited (R103), the affiliated companies of Excelsior (C1), including the Jardines Group Companies (Jardines), Hongkong Land Ltd. (HKL) and Mandarin Oriental, Owners' Committee of Illumination Terrace (R245) and/or Ms Mary Mulvihill (R110/C5):

Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn (Chairperson)	-	co-owning with spouse a self-occupying flat and a carparking space at Broadwood Road, Happy Valley
--	---	--

- Mr Martin W.C. Kwan - close relative owning a flat and a carparking space
(Chief Engineer (Works), in The Beverly Hill
Home Affairs
Department)
- Mr Edwin W.K. Chan - close relative owning a flat in Causeway Bay
(AD (R3), LandsD)
- Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo - self-occupying a flat at Tai Hang Road
(Secretary)
- Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong - being an ex-employee of Maxim's Group
Companies, an associate company of Jardines,
and self-occupying a flat at Illumination Terrace,
Tai Hang
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung - being an ex-employee of Jardines
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with Hysan and
HKL
- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having current business dealings with HKL
- Mr K.K. Cheung - co-owning with spouse a flat at The Leighton
Hill, Happy Valley and firm having current
business dealings with Jardines, HKL and
Mandarin Oriental and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill
on a contract basis from time to time
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai father and mother co-owning a flat at The
Leighton Hill, Causeway Bay and firm having
current business dealings with Jardines, HKL and

Mandarin Oriental and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time

- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having past business dealings with Hysan and HKL
- Dr Lawrence K.C. Li - co-owning with spouse a flat at Tai Hang Road
- Mr Franklin Yu - owning a unit at Stubbs Road, Wan Chai
- Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong - having Lee Hysan Foundation sponsored some of his projects before
- Ms Lilian S.K. Law - co-owning with spouse a flat at Ventris Road, Happy Valley and having Lee Hysan Foundation sponsored some of the activities of the Boys' and Girls' Clubs Association of Hong Kong, in which she was an ex-Executive Director and committee member, before
- Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu - having Lee Hysan Foundation sponsored some of his projects before and being the Director of Light Be which had received donation from Lee Hysan Foundation
- Mr L.T. Kwok - having Lee Hysan Foundation sponsored some of his projects before

75. Members noted that Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong, Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and Ricky W.Y. Yu and Dr Lawrence K.C. Li had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Wilson Y.W. Fung had left the meeting. As the item was procedural in nature, Members agreed that the other Members who had declared interests on the item could stay in the meeting.

76. The Secretary briefly introduced the TPB Paper No. 10457. On 26.1.2018, the draft Causeway Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H6/16 (the Plan) was exhibited for public inspection under section 7 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The amendments to the OZP mainly involved the revision of building height restrictions for various development zones, and revision of non-building area, building gap and setback requirements taking into account the Courts' rulings on the judicial reviews and related appeals related to the OZP. A total of 247 representations and 7 comments were received. Of the 247 representations, 104 are supporting, 141 opposing and 2 providing comments.

77. Since all representations and comments were of similar nature, it was recommended that the representations and comments should be considered by the full Board in one group.

78. In view of the number of representations and comments received and to ensure efficiency of the hearing, it is recommended to allot a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time to each representer/commenter in the hearing session. Consideration of the representation by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for September 2018.

79. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board agreed that:

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

Agenda Item 10

[Open Meeting]

Submission of Draft Tong Yan San Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-TYST/11A under Section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval (TPB Paper No. 10452)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

80. The Secretary reported that the amendment items on the draft Tong Yan San Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL-TYST/11 included rezoning of two sites for a public housing development (to be undertaken by the Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) and rezoning of another two sites to take forward two approved s.12A applications agreed by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board) on 17.4.2015 and 8.1.2016 respectively. The following Members had declared interests on the item for being associated/having business dealings with HKHA, and the consultants for the proposed public housing development including Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (Arup) and Black & Veatch Hong Kong Ltd. (B&V), the MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) (R5), Ms Mary Mulvihill (R127/C254), the Conservancy Association (CA) (R128/C255), the Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited (HKCG) (R203) (a subsidiary of Henderson Land Development Co. Ltd. (HLD) as well as New World Development Co. Ltd. (NWD) (the applicant of s.12A application No. Y/YL-TYST/6 was its subsidiary):

- | | |
|--|---|
| Mr Raymond K.W. Lee
<i>(as Director of Planning)</i> | - being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and Building Committee of HKHA |
| Mr Martin W.C. Kwan
<i>(as Chief Engineer (Works),
Home Affairs Department)</i> | - being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the SPC and the Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - having current business dealings with HKHA and MTRCL, and his firm having past business dealings with B&V |
| Mr Ivan C.S. Fu | - having past business dealings with HKHA and current business dealings with Arup, MTRCL, HLD and NWD |
| Dr C.H. Hau | - the institute he serves having current business |

dealings with HKHA; being a life member of the CA and his spouse being the Honorary Secretary of the Board of Director of the CA; having K11 Concept Limited of NWD sponsored his student learning projects in Hong Kong University (HKU) since 2009, and being employee of HKU which had received a donation from a family member of the Chairman of HLD

- | | |
|---|--|
| Mr K.K. Cheung |] firm having current business dealings with |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai |] HKHA, Arup, B&V, HKGC and MTRCL and having past business dealings with a subsidiary of NWD and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time |
| Mr Franklin Yu | having past business dealings with HKHA, Arup, HLD and MTRCL |
| Mr Stephen L.H. Liu | - having past business dealings with HKHA, MTRCL, HLD and NWD |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon | - spouse being an employee of HD but not involved in planning work |
| Professor S.C. Wong
(Vice-chairperson) | - being a member of the Advisory Committee for Accredited Programme of MTR Academy and having current business dealings with Arup, and being employee of HKU which had received a donation from a family member of the Chairman of HLD |

- Mr Peter K.T. Yuen - being a Member of the Board of Governors of the Arts Centre, which had collaborated with the MTRCL on a number of arts projects, and had received a donation from an Executive Director of HLD
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung - being the Chairman of the Hong Kong Dance Company and a Director of the Hong Kong Business Accountants Association (HKBAA). Both entities had received sponsorship from NWD before and HKBAA had obtained sponsorship from HLD
- Dr Lawrence K.C. Li - being the Treasurer of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University which had obtained sponsorship from HLD
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being an employee and the Director (Development & Marketing) of Hong Kong Housing Society, which was currently in discussion with HD on various housing development issues
- Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu - firm having received donation from Chow Tai Fook Charity Foundation, which was related to NWD

81. Members noted that Messrs Alex T.H. Lai, Daniel K.S. Lau, Ricky W.Y. Yu and Dr Lawrence K.C. Li had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Wilson Y.W. Fung, and Dr C.H. Hau had left the meeting. As the item was procedural in nature and no discussion was required, Members agreed that the other Members who had declared interests on the item could stay in the meeting.

82. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. On 29.9.2017, the draft Tong

Yan San Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL-TYST/11 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). During the two-month exhibition period, a total of 203 representations were received. On 12.1.2018, the representations were published for public comment. During the first three weeks of the publication period, 292 comments were received.

83. After giving consideration to the representations and comment on 7.6.2018, the Board decided not to propose any amendment to the draft OZP to meet the representations.

84. Since 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.

85. After deliberation, the Board agreed:

- (a) that the draft Tong Yan San Tsuen OZP No. S/YL-TYST/11A and its Notes were suitable for submission under section 8 of the Ordinance to the CE in C for approval;
- (b) to endorse the updated Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft Tong Yan San Tsuen OZP No. S/YL-TYST/11A 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) that the updated ES was suitable for submission to the CE in C together with the draft OZP.

Agenda Item 11

[Open Meeting]

Submission of Draft Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/16A under Section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval
(TPB Paper No. 10456)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

86. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests on the item for owning properties in the area, being associated / having business dealings with the Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA), Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) (the consultants of the Preliminary Feasibility Study (FS) and technical assessments supporting the proposed public housing developments conducted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)), World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong (WWF-HK) (R4332), the Ebenezer School and Home for the Visually Impaired (Ebenezer School) (R4336) and Ms Mary Mulvihill (R1787/C129) :

- | | | |
|--|-----|---|
| Mr Raymond K.W. Lee
(as Director of Planning) | - | being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and Building Committee of HKHA |
| Mr Martin W.C. Kwan
(as Chief Engineer (Works),
Home Affairs Department) | - | being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of SPC and Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA |
| Professor S.C. Wong
(Vice-chairperson) | - | having current business dealings with Arup and being a traffic consultant of Arup |
| Dr C.H. Hau | - | the institute he served having current business dealings with HKHA and being a former member of the Conservation Advisory Committee of WWF-HK |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - | having current business dealings with HKHA |
| Mr K.K. Cheung
Mr Alex T.H. Lai |]] | firm having current business dealings with HKHA, Arup and Ebenezer School, and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time |

- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - spouse being an employee of HD but not involved in planning work
- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having current business dealings with Arup and past business dealings with HKHA and owning a flat at Bel-Air
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having past business dealings with HKHA, co-owning with spouse flats at Fulham Garden and Chi Fu Fa Yuen
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with HKHA and Arup
- Professor T.S. Liu - having current education programme with the Caritas Pokfulam Community Development Project Centre at Pok Fu Lam Village
- Professor Johathan W.C. Wong - close relative living in Wah Fu Estate

87. Members noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai and Professor T.S. Liu had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Dr C.H. Hau and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had left the meeting. As the item was procedural in nature and no discussion was required, Members agreed that the other Members who had declared interests on the item could stay in the meeting.

88. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. On 15.9.2017, the draft Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H10/16A was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). During the two-month exhibition period, a total of 4,335 representations were received. On 5.1.2018, the representations were published for public comment. During the first three weeks of the publication period, 146 comments were received.

89. After giving consideration to the representations and comment on 17.5.2018, 21.5.2018, 25.5.2018 and 22.6.2018, the Town Planning Board (the Board) decided not to propose any amendment to the draft OZP to meet the representations.

90. Since 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.

91. After deliberation, the Board agreed:

- (a) that the draft Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/16A and its Notes were suitable for submission under section 8 of the Ordinance to the CE in C for approval;
- (b) to endorse the updated Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/16A 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) that the updated ES was suitable for submission to the CE in C together with the draft OZP.

Agenda Item 12

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting][The item was conducted in Cantonese]

92. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:20 p.m.