

**Minutes of 1195th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 15.2.2019**

Present

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

Chairperson

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-Chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Wong

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

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

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)

Environmental Protection Department

Mr Elvis W.K. Au

Assistant Director (Regional 1)

Lands Department

Mr Simon S.W. Wang

Chief Engineer (Works)

Home Affairs Department

Mr Paul Y.K. Au

Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong

Transport Department

Mr Eddie S.K. Leung

Director of Planning

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Deputy Director of Planning/District

Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Mr K.W. Leung

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

Ms Christine C.M. Cheung

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1194th Meeting held on 25.1.2019

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The draft minutes of the 1194th Meeting were set to Members on 14.2.2019 and tabled at the meeting. Subject to no proposed amendment by Members on or before 18.2.2019, the minutes would be confirmed without amendment.

[Post-meeting Note : The minutes were confirmed on 18.2.2019 without amendments.]

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

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

2. The item was recorded under confidential cover.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Miss Winnie W.M. Ng arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (ii) Disposal of Judicial Review lodged by the Trustees of the Church of Christ in China, Wanchai Church against the Town Planning Board in respect of the Wan Chai Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H5/26

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

3. The Secretary reported that the judicial review (JR) was lodged by the Trustees of the Church of Christ in China, Wanchai Church (Wanchai Church) against the Town Planning Board's (the Board) decision on Wanchai Church's representation in respect of the Wan Chai Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H5/26. PlanArch Consultants Limited was Wanchai Church's representative for submitting the concerned representation on the OZP No. S/H5/26. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr David Y.T. Lui - co-owning with spouse a flat at Star Street
- Miss Winnie W.M. Ng - her company owning an office at 28 Queen's Road East
- Mr Stephen H.B. Yau - his office being located at Southorn Centre

4. Members agreed that the item was only to report the disposal of a JR, all the above Members could be allowed to stay in the meeting.

5. The Secretary reported that the Court granted a consent order on 1.2.2019 as follows:

- (a) the JR proceeding be wholly discontinued;
- (b) the order of interim stay of submission of the OZP to the Chief Executive in Council be discharged;
- (c) leave be granted to the Board to withdraw the strike-out application; and
- (d) there be no order as to costs.

6. The Secretary said that, with the court order, the JR had been wholly disposed of.

7. In response to a Member's enquiry, the Secretary clarified that while the draft Wan Chai OZP No. S/H5/28 was currently in force, the amendments incorporated in the OZP No. S/H5/26 and OZP No. S/H5/27 had been carried to the OZP No. S/H5/28.

8. Members noted the disposal of the JR.

(iii) Court's Refusal to Grant Leave for Judicial Review Application (HCAL 158/2019) against the Town Planning Board and Development Bureau in respect of the Draft Hung Shui Kiu and Ha Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan No. S/HSK/1
[Open Meeting] [The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

9. The Secretary reported that the draft Hung Shui Kiu and Ha Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan (HSK OZP) No. S/HSK/1 approved by the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) on

16.10.2018 involved zoning of sites for proposed public housing developments by the Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA), and rehousing development by the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS). AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) was the consultant of the HSK New Development Area Study. The following Members had declared interests on the item, for being associated/having business dealings with HD/HKHA, HKHS, AECOM, Masterplan Limited (Masterplan) (R1), Mass Transit Railway Corporation Ltd. (MTRCL) (R14), or affiliated with the World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong (WWF-HK) (R8), the Conservancy Association (CA) (R117), and the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society (HKBWS) (C11):

- Mr Raymond K.W. Lee (as Director of Planning) - being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and Building Committee of HKHA, and an ex-officio member of the Supervisory Board of the HKHS

- Mr Paul Y.K. Au (as Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department) - being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and the Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA

- Professor S.C. Wong (Vice-chairperson) - being a member of the Advisory Committee for Accredited Programme of MTR Academy and the consultant of AECOM

- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having current business dealings with AECOM, MTRCL and Masterplan, and past business dealings with HKHA

- Dr C.H. Hau - his institute having current business dealings with HKHA and AECOM; being a member of HKBWS; a life member of CA; and a past member of the Conservation Advisory Committee of WWF-HK; spouse being the Honorary

Secretary of the Board of Directors of CA

- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with HKHA, MTRCL and AECOM and past business dealings with HKHS

- Mr K.K. Cheung] their firm having current business dealings with
Mr Alex T.H. Lai] HKHA, HKHS, AECOM and MTRCL

- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his spouse being an employee of the HD but not involved in planning work; being previous employee of HKHS

- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having past business dealings with HKHA, HKHS and MTRCL

- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with HKHA, AECOM and MTRCL

- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being ex-Director (Development and Marketing) of Hong Kong Housing Society which was currently in discussion with HD on housing development issues

- 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 before

- Dr Lawrence K.C. Li - being a member of HKHS

- Mr K.W. Leung - being vice-chairman of Crested Bulbul Club Committee of the HKBWS

10. Members noted that Mr Thomas O.S. Ho, Mr K.W. Leung and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and agreed that as the item was to report the Court's decision, the above Members could be allowed to stay in the meeting.

11. The Secretary reported that on 17.1.2019, Mr 黃港威 lodged an application for leave for judicial review (JR) application (HCAL 158/2019) against the Town Planning Board and Development Bureau in respect of the approval of the draft HSK OZP No. S/HSK/1. Given that the applicant failed to clearly identify any grounds for the JR, the Court refused to grant leave and handed down the decision on 25.1.2019.

(iv) Approval of Draft Outline Zoning Plan

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

12. The Secretary reported that further to Ms Ho Loy's application on 14.12.2018 for leave to appeal on the Court of First Instance's decision on her application for being an applicant of the judicial review (JR) in respect of the Central Military Dock, Ms Ho sought from the Court a fresh interim stay of the submission of the draft Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) on 19.12.2018. The Court refused the stay application on 8.1.2019 and directed that Ms Ho's leave application should be dealt with on paper with submissions from both parties by 1.3.2019. On 22.1.2019, the Chief Executive in Council approved the draft OZP (renumbered as No. S/H24/9) under section 9(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance. The approval of the draft plan was notified in the Gazette on 1.2.2019. On 8.2.2019, Ms Ho's legal representative submitted to the Court proposing to withdraw her leave application for the appeal. On 12.2.2019, the Court granted leave to Ms Ho to withdraw the appeal with costs ordered to the Town Planning Board. Ms. Ho Loy would have 14 days to respond in respect of the costs order.

Fanling, Sheung Shui & Yuen Long East District

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/YL-KTN/624

Proposed Temporary Shop and Services (Plant Showroom) for a Period of 3 Years in
“Agriculture” Zone, Lots 1204 and 1208 in D.D. 107, Kam Tin, Yuen Long
(TPB Paper No. 10516)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

13. Members noted that the applicant had indicated that he would not attend the meeting.

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

Mr Tom C.K. Yip - District Planning Officer/ Fanling, Sheung Shui &
Yuen Long East (DPO/FS&YLE), PlanD

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

16. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, 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 TPB Paper No. 10516 (the Paper).

17. As the presentation from DPO/FS&YLE had been completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

18. A Member enquired about the location of the subject application and the six similar approved applications within the same “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone. Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/FS&YLE, responded that the application site of the subject application was located in the northern part of the “AGR” zone while the six similar applications were in the southern part. In the vicinity and in particular to the south of the subject application site, there were fallow agricultural land and some active agricultural uses. As agricultural activities in this area were active and agricultural infrastructures were available, the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) considered that the application site possessed potential for agricultural rehabilitation. On the contrary, the sites of the six similar approved applications located in the southern part of the “AGR” zone were paved area with temporary structures and were in close proximity to some residential developments and open storage uses. DAFC considered that the potential of those sites for agricultural rehabilitation was low and therefore had no objection to these applications.

19. As Members had no further question, the Chairperson informed that the hearing procedure for the review application had been completed. The Board would further deliberate on the review application. The Chairperson thanked DPO/FS&YLE, PlanD for attending the meeting and he left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

20. Members noted that the applicant had not submitted any written representation in support of the review application and had not attended the meeting, and considered that there was no major change in the planning circumstances since the rejection of the application by RNTPC.

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

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” zone which is 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 justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis; and

- (b) the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed development will not generate environmental nuisance on the surrounding areas.”

Sha Tin, Tai Po & North District

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/NE-LK/114

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Agriculture” Zone,
Lot 1356 S.B in D.D. 39, Ma Tseuk Leng San Uk Ha, Sha Tau Kok
(TPB Paper No. 10517)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

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

Mr S.F. Yeung - Applicant’s representative

23. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the review hearing. She then invited DPO/STN to brief Members on the review application.

24. 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 the TPB Paper No. 10517 (the Paper).

25. The Chairperson then invited the applicant's representative to elaborate on the review application. Mr S.F. Yeung made the following main points:

- (a) the application site was 100% falling within the village 'environ' ('VE') of Ma Tseuk Leng, Ma Tseuk Leng San Uk Ha and Wo Tong Kong, rather than "more than 50% of the footprint of the proposed Small House falls within the 'VE' of Ma Tseuk Leng, Ma Tseuk Leng San Uk Ha and Wo Tong Kong" as stated in paragraph 7.5 of the Paper. As compared with the Small House development to the south of the application site, which was approved on 19.7.2013, the application site was even closer to the existing village cluster in the north;
- (b) the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) had no strong view against the application from agricultural point of view. Though the application site fell within an area zoned "Agriculture" ("AGR"), it was in fact a small pocket of land between two Small Houses immediately to the south and the village cluster to the north. Also, there was no cultivated and fallow arable land near the application site;
- (c) PlanD's view that land was still available within the "Village Type Development" ("V") zone of Ma Tseuk Leng, Ma Tseuk Leng San Uk Ha and Wo Tong Kong was arguable. It was stated in the Paper that land available within the "V" zone was insufficient to fully meet the total Small House demand (about 14ha of land or equivalent to about 559 Small House sites); and
- (d) it was difficult to acquire private land in the "V" zone of Ma Tseuk Leng, Ma Tseuk Leng San Uk Ha and Wo Tong Kong. The application site was held by the applicant's grandfather. If the application was approved, the applicant could live close to his senior relatives and take care of them.

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung, Mr Franklin Yu and Ms Lilian S.K. Law arrived to join the meeting during the presentation of the applicant's representative.]

26. As the presentation from DPO/STN and the applicant had been completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

27. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions to DPO/STN:

- (a) whether the application site was 100% within the 'VE' of Ma Tseuk Leng, Ma Tseuk Leng San Uk Ha and Wo Tong Kong;
- (b) the views of DAFC regarding the potential of the site for agricultural rehabilitation;
- (c) the reasons for approving those similar applications;
- (d) whether the cautious approach had been consistently adopted in assessing all Small House applications since 2015;
- (e) whether there was any approved application for Small House development after the adoption of the cautious approach since 2015; and
- (f) the existing condition of the site and the site history.

28. Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, made the following responses:

- (a) the application site was 100% within the 'VE' of Ma Tseuk Leng, Ma Tseuk Leng San Uk Ha and Wo Tong Kong, but it was wholly outside the "V" zone. The statement of "more than 50% of the footprint of the proposed Small House falls within the 'VE' of Ma Tseuk Leng, Ma Tseuk Leng San Uk Ha and Wo Tong Kong" in paragraph 7.5 of the Paper was referring to the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/Small House in New Territories (IC). According to the IC, sympathetic consideration might be given if not less than 50% of the proposed NTEH/Small House footprint fell within the 'VE' of a

recognised village, subject to the compliance with other relevant criteria and the latest planning circumstances. The percentage of the footprint was only one of the criteria for assessing Small House applications;

- (b) DAFC had no strong view against the application from agricultural point of view. However, it was considered that the application was not in line with the planning intention of “AGR” zone and the application site could be used not only for cultivation, but also for other agricultural activities such as plant nursery;
- (c) most of the similar applications previously approved were considered before the adoption of cautious approach by the Board in 2015;
- (d) the cautious approach had been consistently adopted in all Small House applications since 2015. One of the justifications put forward by the applicant was that the application was close to the Small Houses of his senior relatives. During the consideration of the applications No. A/NE-LT/626 and 637 on review for proposed Small House developments in Chuen Shui Tseng Village on 9.11.2018 and 23.11.2018 respectively, the respective applicants had raised similar justification that the proposed Small House developments were in close proximity to that of their family members. This notwithstanding, noting that land was still available in the concerned “V” zone, the Board decided to reject the applications;
- (e) for those applications in the vicinity of the Site as shown on Plan R-2, only application No. A/NE-LK/109 was approved by the RNTPC in November 2017 mainly taking into consideration that the application site was the subject of previously approved application (No. A/NE-LK/30); and
- (f) there were some fruit trees on the site, but recently it was noted that they had been removed after the Typhoon Mangkhut in September 2018.

29. Some Members raised the following questions to the applicant’s representative:

- (a) the progress of those Small House developments which were approved under application No. A/NE-LK/79 in 2013; and
- (b) the reasons for proposing to plant 3 nos. of bauhinia blakeana under the revised landscape proposal.

30. Mr S.F. Yeung, the applicant's representative, made the following responses:

- (a) after application No. A/NE-LK/79 was approved in 2013, the building license was issued in 2018 and the respective applicant was applying to the Lands Department for the Certificates of Exemption prior the commencement of the building works. In order to be more cost-effective, the construction of those Small Houses would be commenced in one go when all Certificates of Exemption had been obtained; and
- (b) noting that bauhinia blakeana was proposed for the Small House development on the adjacent lot, the applicant proposed to plant 3 nos. of bauhinia blakeana in the application site.

31. 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.

[Mr David Y.T. Lui left the meeting during the question session.]

Deliberation Session

32. The Chairperson said that one of the reasons of RNTPC to reject the application was that the proposed development would involve vegetation clearance and hence affect the natural landscape. However, the group of existing fruit trees had somehow been removed and the applicant had provided a revised landscape proposal at the review stage,

and the concerned department no longer raised objection to the application from landscape planning perspective. As such, Members could focus on the remaining two rejection reasons, which were the proposed development being not in line with the planning intention of the “AGR” zone and land being still available within the respective “V” zone. A Member said that the applicant had put forward the justifications that there were eight similar cases nearby and the application site was wholly within the ‘VE’, which should also be covered in the deliberation.

33. The Chairperson said that although sympathetic consideration might be given if more than 50% of the proposed NTEH/Small House footprint fell within the ‘VE’ of a recognised village according to the IC, there were many precedent cases that the applications would be rejected if they failed to comply with other requirements even though they were 100% within the ‘VE’.

34. Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, the Director of Planning, pointed out that as shown on Plan R-2a of the Paper, similar planning applications for Small House developments which were outside the “V” zone but wholly within the ‘VE’ in the area were rejected by the RNTPC. As regards the similar applications quoted by the applicant, Mr Lee said that application No. A/NE-LK/109 was approved after the adoption of cautious approach mainly taking into consideration that the application site was the subject of a previously approved application. The similar planning applications to the northwest were approved before the adoption of cautious approach. On the contrary, to the southeast of the application sites, there was a number of similar planning applications which were rejected recently in 2018 for the reasons of being not in line with the planning intention of the “AGR” zone and land being available within the “V” zone.

35. A Member indicated that, in the past, in considering whether there was a general shortage of land to meet the Small House demand, the Board had taken into account the 10-year Small House demand forecast as provided by the indigenous inhabitant representatives of the concerned village. Since 2015, the Board had adopted a more cautious approach for considering planning applications and would not solely rely on the 10-year Small House demand forecast which could be difficult to verify. Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, the Director of Planning, clarified that no change was made to the IC per se in 2015. The cautious approach mainly referred to the manner in which the Board would

consider whether there was a general shortage of land in meeting the demand for Small House development in the “V” zone. Under the cautious approach, the Board would consider all relevant factors including 10-year Small House demand forecast, while more weight would be put on the number of outstanding Small House applications as advised by the Lands Department.

36. Members in general agreed that the cautious approach adopted in 2015 for considering the applications for Small Houses development should be followed. The approval of the subject application would set an undesirable precedent and it would have a significant read-across implication to all similar cases. The justifications put forth by the applicant including the proximity to his family and the difficulty in acquiring private land in the “V” zones were not strong justifications for the application.

37. Regarding the planning intention of the “AGR” zone, a Member was of the view that the application site was in fact no longer suitable for cultivation and therefore doubted whether the application site should be zoned “AGR”. Another Member noted that the “AGR” zone would permit not only cultivation but also agricultural activities other than cultivation. A Member said that the site might probably be abandoned under the “AGR” zone given the low incentive for farming nowadays. The Chairperson said that PlanD might review the land use of the area when there was a change in planning circumstances in future.

38. The Chairperson summed up the discussion and concluded that the rejection reasons of being not in line with the planning intention of the “AGR” zone and land being available to meet the Small House demand were still applicable to the application. Also, in deciding whether there was sufficient land within the “V” to meet the Small House demand, the Board had adopted a more cautious approach since 2015 by putting more weight on the outstanding Small House application and such approach had been consistently applied in other similar cases.

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

“(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the

“Agriculture” zone in the Luk Keng and Wo Hang 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 Ma Tseuk Leng, Ma Tseuk Leng San Uk Ha and Shek Kiu Tau village cluster where land 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 orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services.”

Procedural Matters

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comment on the Draft Urban Renewal Authority Queen’s Road West / In Ku Lane Development Scheme Plan No. S/H3/URA3/1

(TPB Paper No. 10519)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

Agenda Item 6

[Open Meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comment on the Draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H3/32

(TPB Paper No. 10520)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

40. Members noted that the two procedural items were related to the draft Urban Renewal Authority (URA) Development Scheme Plan (DSP) located within the Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan planning scheme area and agreed that they could be considered together.

41. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests on the items for owning properties in Sai Ying Pun and Sheung Wan area; and/or having affiliation/business dealings with URA and Christian Family Service Centre (CFSC) which had been commissioned by the URA Fund to act as the Social Service Team to provide assistance and advice to residents and operators affected by the Scheme:

- | | |
|---|---|
| Mr Raymond K.W. Lee
<i>(as Director of Planning)</i> | - being a non-executive director of the URA Board and a member of the Planning, Development and Conservation Committee (PDCC) of URA |
| Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang | - being the Deputy Chairman of Appeal Board Panel of URA |
| Mr H.W. Cheung | - his spouse owning a flat at Queen's Road West |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon | - being a non-executive director of the URA Board, a member of the Lands, Rehousing and Compensation Committee and PDCC, and a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA |
| Mr Philip S.L. Kan | - being an ex-non-executive director of the URA Board and ex-director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA |
| Mr Stephen H.B. Yau | - being a past member of the Wan Chai District Advisory Committee of URA |

- Mr K.K. Cheung] their firm having current business dealings with URA
Mr Alex T.H. Lai] and CFSC
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - being a past member of the Wan Chai District Advisory Committee of URA, his former company having current business dealings with URA and his company owning an office unit at Queen's Road Central
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with URA
- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - being a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA and having current business dealings with Cheung Kong Holdings Limited for the URA Peel Street / Graham Street project
- Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu - being a director of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA and Director and CEO of Light Be (Social Realty) Co. Ltd. which was a licensed user of a few URA's residential units in Sheung Wan
- Mr L.T. Kwok - being the Chief Executive of the CFSC
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung] being a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal
Ms Lilian S.K. Law] Fund of URA
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being ex-Director (Development & Marketing) of Hong Kong Housing Society which was currently in discussion with URA on housing development issues

42. As the items were procedural in nature, Members agreed that the above Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting. Members noted that Mr H.W. Cheung, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had tendered apologies for not being able to attend the meeting.

43. The Secretary briefly introduced the Papers. On 21.9.2018, draft URA Queen's Road West/In Ku Lane DSP No. S/H3/URA3/1 and the draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H3/32 were exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance. A total of 13 representations and 3 comments were received on the DSP, and 2 representations and 7 comments were received on the OZP.

44. Since the representations and comments received on the DSP and the OZP were of similar nature, the hearing of representations and comments was suggested to be considered in one group collectively by the Town Planning Board (the Board).

45. To ensure efficiency of the hearing, a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time would be allotted to each representer/commenter in the hearing session. Consideration of the representations and comments by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for March 2019.

46. After deliberation, the Board agreed that :

(a) the representations/comments on the DSP and the OZP 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 7

Any Other Business

[The item was conducted in Cantonese]

47. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 10:35 a.m.