

**Minutes of 1217<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 3.3.2020**

**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 F.C. Chan

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr L.T. Kwok

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr Terence S.W. Tsang

Assistant Director (Regional 3)  
Lands Department  
Mr Alan K.L. Lo

Chief Engineer (Works)  
Home Affairs Department  
Mr Paul Y.K. Au

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

Director of Planning  
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Deputy Director of Planning/District  
Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Ms Lily Y.M Yam

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

### Matters Arising

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

- (i) Report on Rescheduling of Town Planning Board Meetings, Adjournment of Consideration of Review Applications and Confirmation of Minutes of the 1216<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 10.1.2020
- 

[Open Meeting]

1. The Secretary reported the followings:

- (a) in light of the novel coronavirus infection and the special work arrangement for government departments, the regular meetings originally scheduled for 31.1.2020, 14.2.2020 and 28.2.2020 had been rescheduled;
- (b) the consideration of representations and comments of the draft Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H7/20 originally scheduled for 3.2.2020 had been rescheduled. The respective representers and commenters had been informed and a meeting date would be fixed later;
- (c) Members agreed on 30.1.2020, 10.2.2020 and 24.2.2020 by circulation to adjourn the consideration of 11 review applications to another date under section 17(4A) of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). Those applications were A/YL-PN/58, A/YL-TT/480, A/YL-NTM/391, A/YL-TT/484, A/YL-ST/547, A/K1/259, A/I-MWF/31, A/NE-TK/674, A/NE-KLH/562, A/TP/662 and A/H19/79. The respective applicants/agents of the applicants had been informed of the decision of the Town Planning Board (the Board), and a meeting date would be fixed later to reconsider the applications; and
- (d) the draft minutes of the 1216<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 10.1.2020 was confirmed by circulation on 3.2.2020 without amendment.

(ii) [Confidential Item][Closed Meeting]

2. The item was recorded under confidential cover.

(iii) [Confidential Item][Closed Meeting]

3. The item was recorded under confidential cover.

(iv) Reference Back of Approved Outline Zoning Plans  
[Open Meeting]

4. The Secretary reported that on 7.1.2020, the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) referred the Approved Chai Wan OZP No. S/H20/23 to the Board for amendment under section 12(1)(b)(ii) of the Ordinance. The reference back of the said OZP was notified in the Gazette on 17.1.2020.

5. On 4.2.2020, the CE in C referred the Approved Stanley OZP No. S/H19/12 to the Board for amendment under section 12(1)(b)(ii) of the Ordinance. The reference back of the said OZP was notified in the Gazette on 14.2.2020.

(v) Approval of Draft Outline Zoning Plan  
[Open Meeting]

6. The Secretary reported that on 7.1.2020, the CE in C approved the draft Fanling/Sheung Shui OZP (renumbered as S/FSS/24) under section 9(1)(a) of the Ordinance. The approval of the draft plan was notified in the Gazette on 17.1.2020.

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

**Sai Kung & Islands District**

**Sha Tin, Tai Po & North District**

**Agenda Items 2 to 4**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Draft Pak Lap Outline Zoning Plan No. S/SK-PL/1 Incorporating Amendments Shown on Plan No. R/S/SK-PL/1-A2, the Draft So Lo Pun Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-SLP/1 Incorporating Amendments Shown on Plan No. R/S/NE-SLP/1-A2 and the Draft Hoi Ha Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-HH/1 Incorporating Amendments Shown on Plan No. R/S/NE-HH/1-A2  
(TPB Papers No. 10624, 10625 and 10626)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

7. Members noted that the three items were similar in nature and agreed that they could be considered together.
  
8. The following representatives of the Planning Department (PlanD) were invited to the meeting at this point:

Ms Donna Y.P. Tam - District Planning Officer/Sai King & Islands  
(DPO/SKIs)

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

Mr Tony Y.C. Wu - Senior Town Planner/Country Park Enclaves  
(STP/CPE)

Ms Katherine H.Y. Wong - Town Planner/Sai Kung

9. The Chairperson extended a welcome and invited DPO/SKIs and DPO/STN to brief Members on the items.

10. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs and Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, briefed Members on the background of the proposed amendments to the draft Outline Zoning Plans (OZPs) for Pak Lap, So Lo Pun and Hoi Ha areas, the judicial review (JR) application, the review of genuine need for Small House development, the review of 'maps issue' of Hoi Ha OZP and the recommendations as detailed in the TPB Papers No. 10624, 10625 and 10626 (the Papers).

11. As the presentation from DPO/SKIs and DPO/STN had been completed, the Chairperson invited questions and views from Members.

*Genuine Need for Small House Development*

12. Noting that the 10-year forecast of Small House demand, the number of outstanding Small House applications and the actual number of Small House applications received/ approved/ rejected by the Lands Department (LandsD) had been provided to facilitate the review on the genuine need of Small House demand, some Members had the following questions:

- (a) whether the Small House demand forecast provided by the Indigenous Inhabitant Representatives (IIRs) would be verified;
- (b) whether the IIRs would provide the 10-year forecast of Small House demand annually so the up-to-date forecast could be compared with the actual number of Small House applications; and
- (c) the definition of an indigenous villager and whether indigenous villagers living overseas were eligible for applying Small House.

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

- (a) as advised by LandsD, the Small House demand forecast was provided by the IIRs and could not be easily verified based on the information currently available. While the IIRs should be able to provide a list of names of indigenous villagers, LandsD would only verify the status of an applicant for Small House development at the stage of Small House grant application; and
- (b) the 10-year Small House demand forecast was subject to change over time. Although LandsD would normally ask the IIRs for updated figures on an annual basis, some IIRs might not submit the required form/figures every year. Also, there was often discrepancy between the figures provided by the IIRs and the actual number of Small House applications. Hence, the 10-year Small House demand forecast was only one of the references to evaluate the Small House demand.

14. In response to a Member's enquiry on the definition of an indigenous villager, Mr Alan K.L. Lo, Assistant Director (Regional 3), LandsD pointed out that under the Small House Policy, in general, an indigenous villager was a male person of at least 18 years old who was descended through the male line from a resident in 1898 of a recognised village. In processing Small House application on private land, the District Lands Officer (DLO) would consider applications from villagers residing overseas. However, application for Small House grants on government land from villagers living overseas would be refused unless the DLO was satisfied that the applicant intended to return and reside in his village.

*Designation of "Village Type Development" ("V") Zone*

15. Noting the principles for designating the "V" zone as set out in the Papers, some Members had the following questions:

- (a) whether there were any villagers living in the existing village settlement in So Lo Pun and whether the dilapidated village houses would be preserved;
- (b) whether the land area of existing dilapidated village houses was counted as land available for Small House developments in So Lo Pun; and



- (c) whether the historical background of the village settlement would be taken into account in drawing up “V” zones.

16. For the “V” zone in So Lo Pun, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, responded that although the villagers were not living in the existing village settlement in So Lo Pun, there were signs that some of them would return to the village to hold ritual/festive events and to undertake repairing works. There was no information from the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) that any village houses were of heritage importance. Consistent with the methodology generally adopted in estimating the area of land available for Small House development in rural OZPs, the land of existing dilapidated village houses/ruins in So Lo Pun had been counted. Notwithstanding that, as advised by LandsD, there was currently no application for redevelopment of New Territories Exempted Houses (NTEHs) on those areas.

17. Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, indicated that researches had been conducted for better understanding on the planning areas including the historical background of the existing villages and economic activities in the areas when preparing the OZPs.

#### *Designation of “Agriculture” (“AGR”) Zone*

18. Some Members raised questions on the rationale of designating “AGR” zones and how to ensure that the land zoned “AGR” would be used and not be abandoned.

19. For Pak Lap OZP, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, pointed out that the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) was of the view that the fallow arable land to the east of the village cluster possessed good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes and was worthy of preservation from agricultural point of view, and hence the land was zoned “AGR”. The land was not covered by any trees and was not identified as ecologically important areas.

20. For So Lo Pun OZP, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, said that the fallow agricultural land adjoining the existing village settlement at “V” zone was paddy fields many years ago. Those land could be distinguished from other fallow agricultural land to the south, which was zoned “Conservation Area” (“CA”). The “CA” zone was

intended to preserve the wetland system in So Lo Pun including the intertidal habitats with mangrove and seagrass bed, reed bed, a natural stream identified as Ecologically Important Stream and the freshwater marsh of ecological importance. The “CA” zone was designated since the So Lo Pun area was first covered by OZP in 2013 reflecting the conservation value of the area. The current proposal was to rezone the land adjoining the existing village settlement from “V” to “AGR” was based on AFCD’s advice that the land had good potential for rehabilitation for agricultural purposes and could be preserved from agricultural point of view. Furthermore, upon rezoning, the land would merge with the existing “AGR” zone to the northeast to form a continuous agricultural belt, which would further encourage agricultural rehabilitation and also serve as a buffer between the “V” zone to the north and the “CA” zone to the south.

21. The Chairperson supplemented that, with the support of the Food and Health Bureau and the Development Bureau, AFCD had commissioned a consultancy study to identify suitable quality agricultural land for possible designation of agricultural priority areas, with a view to contributing to the modernisation and sustainable development of local agriculture. It was expected that the study would take some time for completion.

22. In response to a Member’s enquiry, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, confirmed that agricultural activities could be carried out in “CA” zones. However, permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board) was required for agricultural use involving diversion of streams, filling of land/pond or excavation of land.

*“Government, Institution or Community (1)” (“G/IC(1)”) Zone of Pak Lap OZP*

23. The Chairperson and some Members had the following comments and questions:

- (a) the location of the “G/IC(1)” zone for the new RCP and a public convenience could be a concern of villagers;
- (b) whether there were any existing government refuse collection point (RCP) and public convenience in the area;
- (c) whether the RCP and a public convenience at the “G/IC(1)” site would

obstruct the access of the nearby village houses; and

- (d) the possibility of relocating the “G/IC(1)” site to the north of the village.

24. In response, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, made the following points:

- (a) the future RCP would collect the household refuse of the existing village settlement and the new public convenience would serve visitors in the area and would adopt an environmentally friendly design;
- (b) there was no existing RCP and public convenience in the area;
- (c) the original “G/IC” site reserved for the future RCP and public convenience was located to the south of the village office. As that site was currently partly covered by trees, it was therefore proposed to make use of the vacant and cleared government land to the west of the village office to accommodate the two facilities;
- (d) sufficient buffer between the new facilities and village houses would be maintained and the new facilities would not obstruct the access of the nearby village houses; and
- (e) the piece of land to the north of the village was private land and a Small House had been approved in the area. That location was considered not acceptable by concerned departments for siting the RCP and public convenience as it was close to a natural stream. The “G/IC(1)” site to the south of the village was closer to the seafront which would facilitate water transport of refuse. There was an existing track leading from the site to the seafront.

25. In response to a Member’s enquiry, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, indicated that the “G/IC” zone in the southern part of the area was currently occupied by an existing temple.

### *Supporting Facilities*

26. Noting that there was an increasing number of visitors to Pak Lap and Hoi Ha areas for leisure purpose, a Member asked whether there were any supporting facilities for recreational use in the areas.

27. Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, indicated that the Pak Lap area was encircled by the Sai Kung East Country Park (SKECP) which was a famous scenic spot and a popular tourist and hiking attraction in the territory. Recreational facilities such as camp sites had been provided within SKECP. Nevertheless, the area covered by the OZP was country park enclave with the general planning intention to avoid undesirable disturbances to the natural environment. Given the limited infrastructure in the area, large scale recreational activities were not recommended, while supporting facilities such as public convenience and signage would be provided in the area to serve the visitors.

28. Regarding Hoi Ha area, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, responded that Hoi Ha Wan, with its scenic sea bay and sandy beach, was a popular local tourism destination. A number of recreation facilities were found in the area, including a water sports recreation centre, which was currently zoned “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Water Sports Recreation Centre” on the Hoi Ha OZP. There was also a visitor centre for the Hoi Ha Wan Marine Park under construction by AFCD on Hoi Ha Road near the village. Supporting facilities such as public convenience and RCP were also provided in the area.

29. In response to the Chairperson’s question on whether commercial facilities could be provided in “V” zone, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, pointed out that the planning intention of the “V” zone was to designate both existing recognised villages and areas of land considered suitable for the provision of village expansion. While ‘Shop and Services’ and ‘Eating Place’ uses were always permitted on the ground floor of an NTEH, other commercial or recreational uses such as holiday houses might be permitted on application to the Board.

### *Maps Issue of Hoi Ha OZP*

30. A Member asked the details of the Court’s judgment on the ‘maps issue’. Ms

Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, said that it was the Court's view that the Board had not properly inquired into the questions raised in the representations regarding the accuracy of the map base for the OZP. As such, in response to the Court's judgement, PlanD set out the contentions in details in paragraph 5 of TPB Paper No. 10626 for the Board's consideration and making inquiries as necessary. Ms Chu further said that the map base adopted for preparing the Hoi Ha OZP was extracted from the survey maps prepared by the Survey and Mapping Office (SMO) of LandsD, which was the latest version available from SMO at the time when the OZP was prepared. The survey maps might not fully reflect the prevailing situation due to on-going changes in topographic features over time and the selection and generalisation of features in making maps to address cartographic limitations. However, planning control under OZP was not affected because planning control was exercised based on the physical features/activities on the ground instead of the map base which was only a locational reference. She also explained that the northern boundary of the OZP coincided with the Hoi Ha Wan Marine Park (HHWMP) instead of the High Water Mark (HWM) and the rationale was to provide certainty and avoid duplication of controlling authorities. As for the protection of Hoi Ha Wan from effluent pollution, there was an established mechanism to ensure that septic tank and soakaway systems (STS) to be installed for Small House developments were environmentally acceptable. An applicant was required to comply with the provisions in the Practice Note for Professional Person on "Drainage Plans Subject to Comments by the Environmental Protection Department" (ProPECC PN 5/93), which set out various requirements including the minimum clearance requirement between the STS and the HWM and the nearest watercourses.

31. To sum up, the Chairperson said that PlanD had presented the findings and recommendations of the review of genuine need for Small House development and 'maps issue' in relevant Papers, elaborated in their presentations, and responded to Members' inquiries on a number of issues. Whilst Members had observed that the basis for evaluating the genuine need for Small House development for the purpose of the three OZPs and the proposed location of the future RCP and public convenience in Pak Lap would probably attract some public concerns, the meeting in general agreed that the proposed amendments to the draft OZPs were based on explicable considerations and could be exhibited for public inspection. The Board would further consider the proposed amendments to the draft OZPs upon receiving the representations and comments.

32. After deliberation, the Board:

- (a) noted the findings and recommendations of the review as detailed in TPB Papers No. 10624, 10625 and 10626;
- (b) agreed to the proposed amendments to the draft Pak Lap Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) and that the draft Pak Lap OZP No. S/ SK-PL/2A at Annex B1 of TPB Paper No. 10624 (to be renumbered as S/SK-PL/3 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Annex B2 of the Paper were suitable for exhibition under section 7 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance);
- (c) agreed to the proposed amendments to the draft So Lo Pun OZP and that the draft So Lo Pun OZP No. S/NE-SLP/2A at Annex B1 of TPB Paper No. 10625 (to be renumbered as S/NE-SLP/3 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Annex B2 of the Paper were suitable for exhibition under section 7 of the Ordinance;
- (d) agreed to the proposed amendments to the draft Hoi Ha OZP and that the draft Hoi Ha OZP No. S/NE-HH/2A at Annex B1 of TPB Paper No. 10626 (to be renumbered as S/NE-HH/3 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Annex B2 of the Paper were suitable for exhibition under section 7 of the Ordinance;
- (e) agreed to adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Annex B3 of TPB Paper No. 10624 for the draft Pak Lap OZP No. S/SK-PL/2A, Annex B3 of TPB Paper No. 10625 for the draft So Lo Pun OZP No. S/NE-SLP/2A and Annex B3 of TPB Paper No. 10626 for the draft Hoi Ha OZP No. S/NE-HH/2A as expressions of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for the various land use zonings of the OZPs and agreed that the revised ES should be published together with the draft OZPs; and
- (f) agreed to inform all the representers, commenters and further representers in respect of the draft Pak Lap OZP No. S/SK-PL/1, draft So Lo Pun OZP No.

S/NE-SLP/1 and draft Hoi Ha OZP No. S/NE-HH/1 on the amendments to the draft OZPs, and that they might submit representations on the amendments to the OZPs or comments on the representations for the Board's consideration under sections 6 and 6A of the Ordinance respectively.

33. The Chairperson thanked PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[The meeting adjourned for a short break of 10 minutes.]

### **Agenda Item 5**

[Open Meeting]

Study on Existing Profile and Operations of Brownfield Sites in the New Territories  
(TPB Paper No. 10638)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

34. The following representatives of the Planning Department (PlanD) were invited to the meeting at this point:

Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau - Chief Town Planner/Studies & Research (CTP/SR)

Mr Otto Chan - Senior Town Planner/Studies & Research (STP/SR)

35. The Chairperson extended a welcome and invited CTP/SR to give a presentation to Members on the Study on Existing Profile and Operations of Brownfield Sites in the New Territories (the Study).

36. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau, CTP/SR, briefed Members on the background and the findings of the Study as well as the follow-up actions by the Government as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10638 (the Paper).

37. The Chairperson remarked that out of the total 1,579 ha of brownfield land, 803 ha

(about 51%) were already covered by New Development Areas/Potential Development Areas (NDAs/PDAs) projects, government projects or development projects initiated by the private sector, which underlined the long-held position that development involving brownfield sites had been an important component of Government's multi-pronged land supply strategy. Another 5% of the brownfield sites were within the conservation-related zones. Among these sites, some involved "existing uses" tolerated under the Town Planning Ordinance, while the rest were subject to ongoing enforcement action or investigation. For the remaining 700 ha (about 44%), as announced in the 2019 Policy Address, PlanD would review by phases the 450 ha classified by the consultant as having relatively higher possible potential for development with a view to identify sites suitable for public housing. PlanD had substantially completed the assessment of the 160 ha of brownfield sites that were closer to existing infrastructures and identified suitable clusters for public housing development. The Civil Engineering and Development Department ("CEDD") would undertake technical studies on the shortlisted brownfield clusters to ascertain their feasibility for public housing development and the required improvement to the necessary infrastructure facilities to support the public housing development. Upon completion of the technical studies, PlanD would submit rezoning proposals for consideration by the Town Planning Board (the Board). The remaining 290 ha of brownfield sites would be covered in PlanD's next stage of review which was targeted for completion within 2020.

38. The Chairperson also pointed out that there was a need to provide land or space to accommodate the displaced brownfield operations affected by the NDAs/PDAs development and which were still needed by the economy. The Government would identify large land parcels with good accessibility and infrastructure in major development projects including the Lam Tei Quarry and near-shore reclamation at Lung Kwu Tan for consolidation of brownfield operations. PlanD was also reviewing the Town Planning Board Guidelines for Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses (TPB PG-No. 13E) with regard to the latest planning circumstances to facilitate consolidation of such uses at appropriate locations on a temporary basis and as an interim measure for locating displaced brownfield operations.

39. The Chairperson then invited questions and comments from Members.



*Support for Brownfield Operations*

40. A Member asked about the feasibility of accommodating the logistics industry in multi-storey buildings (“MSBs”) and whether sites were reserved for logistics, port back-up, storage and workshop uses in the NDAs. Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau, CTP/SR, responded that some logistics operators indicated in the study interviews that it was feasible to accommodate logistic operations into MSBs, but they had concerns on rental affordability. About 72 ha of land had been reserved for logistics, port back-up, storage and workshop uses in both MSB and open-air setting in the Hung Shui Kiu (HSK)/Ha Tsuen (HT) and Yuen Long South (YLS) NDAs.

41. The Chairperson supplemented that while the technical feasibility to accommodate brownfield operations in purpose-built industry-specific MSBs could be ascertained, there was a need to identify a sustainable operation mode of MSBs. As such, there would be a market sounding exercise to ascertain the market interest towards developing and operating MSBs for key brownfield businesses.

42. The Vice-chairperson was of the view that, in addition to land use planning, the Government should consider providing technological support to enhance the efficiency of brownfield operations and to optimise the use of land resource.

43. A Member raised concerns that some smaller-scale operations which were an important part of the production chain of an industry might be phased out in the process of transforming the brownfield sites for other uses. It was necessary for the Government to provide some sort of subsidy or assistance for their survival. Another Member suggested that the Government might consider how to facilitate the emerging businesses which would benefit the economy as a whole. The Chairperson supplemented that those issues could be taken into consideration in the market sounding exercise in the next stage of the MSBs study.

*Possible Development Potential of the Brownfield Sites outside NDAs/PDAs and Other Known Development Projects and Consolidation of Brownfield Operations*

44. A Member opined that provision of more infrastructure facilities was required in

order to unleash the potential of using brownfield sites for housing developments. Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau, CTP/SR, responded that consultant had broadly classified the brownfield sites close to existing new towns and infrastructures to have higher possible potential for housing development in short-to-medium term. For brownfield sites which were currently away from existing new towns and infrastructures, they would have lower possible development potential as major upgrading of infrastructure facilities would be required.

45. A Member considered that public housing and MSBs could be developed at brownfield sites located close to existing developments and infrastructures so as to optimise the existing resources for early developments. The Member also indicated that brownfield operations involving storage of large-scale construction machineries and pre-fabricated structures could be accommodated in more remote location. Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau supplemented that the proposed near-shore reclamation at Lung Kwu Tan provided opportunities to accommodate such brownfield operations in addition to the land reserved in the HSK/HT and YLS NDAs. In response to another Member's enquiry, Mr Chau said that relevant government departments would also review how the displaced vehicle parking industry in brownfield sites could be accommodated. Another Member opined that the Government should examine those inactive brownfield sites and explore how the sites could be better planned for alternative uses.

46. In response to a Member's comment that public housing developments in the brownfield sites should be planned in an integrated manner, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau said that, in reviewing the brownfield sites with higher possible development potential, PlanD had taken into account planning strategy, land use compatibility, availability of infrastructures and community facilities, amongst others. Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, the Director of Planning (DoP), supplemented that PlanD had reviewed the 160 ha of brownfield sites that were closer to existing infrastructures and identified brownfield clusters with potential for public housing development. CEDD would conduct detailed technical studies on these brownfield clusters to ascertain the scope for public housing development and the extent of infrastructure works required. Subject to confirmation that the proposed public housing developments were technically feasible and environmentally acceptable, PlanD would submit rezoning proposals for consideration by the Board. The required community and supporting facilities for the proposed public

housing development would be duly addressed in the rezoning process.

*Interim Measures for Accommodating Displaced Brownfield Operations*

47. A Member enquired whether there would be any interim measures for accommodating the displaced brownfield operations. In response, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau, CTP/SR, said that PlanD was reviewing the TPB PG-No. 13E with regard to the latest planning circumstances which could facilitate consolidation of such uses at the more appropriate locations.

48. Mr Raymond KW Lee, DoP, explained that the findings of the Study had provided an overview on the profile of brownfield operations, including their spatial distribution and nature of operation. As revealed in the Study's findings, brownfield operations were performing a vital economic function in providing affordable accommodation to local industries and employment opportunities of about 52,000 jobs. Some industries also had genuine operational need rendering them not suitable for accommodating in MSBs, e.g. those involving storage large-scale construction machineries and pre-fabricated structures. Nevertheless, there was scope to rationalize the brownfield operations and optimize the use of our scarce land resources. With this in mind, a few follow-up actions were being undertaken:

- (a) sites were reserved in NDAs for purpose-built MSBs to accommodate brownfield operations. A market sounding out exercise would be undertaken to ascertain the market's interests in developing and operating the MSBs;
- (b) for brownfield sites located outside NDAs and committed development projects, PlanD would review those that were closer to existing infrastructure with a view to identifying brownfield clusters with potential for public housing development for further technical studies to ascertain their feasibility;
- (c) further studies would be undertaken to examine potential for provision of sites for brownfield operations not suitable for accommodating in MSBs, e.g.

the proposed Lung Kwu Tan reclamation and the after-use of Lam Tei Quarry; and

- (d) the updating of TPB Guidelines 13E taking into account the latest planning circumstances with a view to facilitate consolidation of brownfield operations to more appropriate locations.

*Brownfield Operations within Conservation-related Zonings*

49. A Member opined that opportunity should be taken to review the existing brownfield sites in conservation related zones. The Government could provide incentives for relocation of those which were allowed as “existing uses” on the relevant OZPs to more suitable locations.

*Others*

50. A Member asked whether the Greater Bay Area development initiatives had been taken into consideration in the Study. In response, the Chairperson said that the Study mainly focused on the profile of the brownfield operations and necessary follow-up actions to be taken within the territory. The tapping of economic opportunities in the Greater Bay Area would continue to be explored by the Government through other established forums.

51. The Chairperson concluded the Board noted the finding of the Study and the follow-up actions being undertaken. She thanked PlanD’s representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong, Dr Lawrence K.C. Li, Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong, and Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho, Terence S.W. Tsang, Ricky W.Y. Yu and Wilson Y.W. Fung left the meeting at this point.]

**Procedural Matters**

**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/H3/33 (TPB Paper No. 10622)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

52. The Secretary reported that the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) Staunton Street/Wing Lee Street Development Scheme Plan (DSP) area was one of the subject sites of the proposed amendments to the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). The following Members had declared interests on the item for having affiliation/business dealings with URA or Ms Mary Mulvihill (R8 and C3), or owning properties, or providing services in the district :

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| Mr Raymond K.W. Lee<br>(as Director of Planning) | - being a non-executive director of the URA Board and a member of its Committee  |
| Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang                            | - being the Deputy Chairman of Appeal Board Panel of URA   |
| Mr H.W. Cheung                                   | - being a former co-opt member of a Committee of URA and his spouse owning a flat at Queen's Road West   |
| 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 Ltd. for the URA Peel Street/Graham Street project |
| Mr Philip S.L. Kan                               | - being a former non-executive director of the URA   |

Board

- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - being a non-executive director of the URA Board, a member of its Committees, and a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA
- Mr K.K. Cheung ] their firm having current business dealings with  
Mr Alex T.H. Lai ] URA; and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung - being a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with URA
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - his former company having past business dealings with URA; and his company owning an office unit at Queen's Road, Central
- Mr L.T. Kwok - his institution had received sponsorship from URA and provided Service Team services to URA in the district
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being a former Director of Hong Kong Housing Society which was currently in discussion with URA on housing development issues
- Ms Lilian S.K. Law - being a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA
- Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu - being a director of the Board of Urban Renewal Fund of URA, and Director and Chief Executive Officer of Light Be (Social Realty) Co. Ltd. which was a licensed user of a few URA's residential

units in Sheung Wan

53. Members noted that Messrs Alex T.H. Lai, K.K. Cheung, Stephen L.H. Liu and Daniel K.S. Lau had tendered apologies for not being able to attend the meeting. Members also noted that Messrs Wilson Y.W. Fung, Ricky W.Y. Yu and Thomas O.S. Ho had left the meeting. As the item was procedural in nature, Members agreed that the above Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting.

54. The Secretary briefly introduced the TPB Paper No. 10622 (the Paper). On 9.8.2019, the draft OZP was exhibited for public inspection under section 7 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The amendments mainly involved the incorporation of the area covered by the approved URA Staunton Street/Wing Lee Street DSP No. S/H3/URA1/4 into the OZP (Item A1); zoning of the DSP area mainly as “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Cultural, Community, Commercial and Open Space Uses” (Item A2), “OU” annotated “Residential, Institutional and Commercial Uses” (Item A3) and “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”) (Item A5); rezoning of the Wing Lee Street area from “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) to “OU” annotated “Residential, Institutional and Commercial Uses” (Item A4); rezoning of a site at 72 Staunton Street from “R(C)” and “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) to “R(A)25” (Item B); rezoning of sites at Tak Sing Lane from “O”, “R(A)8” and an area shown as ‘Pedestrian Precinct/Street’ (‘PPS’) to “R(A)24” and an area shown as ‘PPS’ (Items C1 to C4); and stipulation of building height (BH) restrictions for various land use zones. A total of 57 valid representations and 25 comments were received.

55. As the representations and comments were related to two different areas, it was proposed to consider the representations and comments in two groups by the full Board. Group 1 would consider representations R1 to R12 and comments C1 to C5 in relation to Items A1 to A7 (URA Staunton Street/Wing Lee Street DSP Site) and Item B (72 Staunton Street Site). Group 2 would consider representations R8, R13 to R57 and comments C3, C6 to C25 in relation to Items C1 to C4 (Tak Sing Lane Site).

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

April/May 2020.

57. After deliberation, the Board agreed that the representations and comments should be considered in the manner as proposed in paragraphs 3.1 to 3.3 of the Paper.

**Agenda Item 7**

[Open Meeting]

Application to the Chief Executive under Section 8(2) of the Town Planning Ordinance for Extension of Time Limit for Submission of the Draft Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H7/20 to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval  
(TPB Paper No. 10635)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

58. The Secretary reported that the draft Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) involved a proposed District Court and a commercial development at the Carolina Hill Road (CHR) site in Wong Nai Chung (H7). AECOM Asia Company Ltd. (AECOM) was one of the consultants for the proposed development. The following Members had declared interests on the item for owning properties in Wong Nai Chung area; and/or having affiliation/business dealings with AECOM, Hysan Development Company Limited (Hysan) which had submitted representation (R6), Ronald Lu & Partners (Ronald Lu) and Masterplan Limited (Masterplan) (representatives of R6), Townland Consultants Ltd (representative of R33) and/or Ms Mary Mulvihill who had submitted representation and comment (R34/C105):

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Ms Bernadette Linn<br>(Chairperson)       | - co-owning with spouse a flat and car parking space at Broadwood Road in Happy Valley |
| Professor S.C. Wong<br>(Vice-chairperson) | - having current business dealings with AECOM  |
| Mr Ivan C.S. Fu                           | - having current business dealings with AECOM and Masterplan                           |



- Dr C.H. Hau - having current business dealings with AECOM
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with AECOM, Ronald Lu and Hysan, and having past business dealings with Townland
- Mr. K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with Ronald Lu; having past business dealings with AECOM and Townland; hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time; and co-owning with spouse a flat at The Leighton Hill in Causeway Bay
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having current business dealings with Ronald Lu; having past business dealings with AECOM and Townland; hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time; and his family members owing a flat at The Leighton Hill in Causeway Bay
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with AECOM
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having past business dealings with Hysan and Ronald Lu
- Ms Lilian S.K. Law - co-owning with spouse a flat on Ventris Road in Happy Valley and being an ex-Executive Director and committee member of The Boys' & Girls' Clubs Association of Hong Kong and Lee Hysan Foundation had sponsored some of the activities of the association before
- Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu - having Lee Hysan Foundation sponsored some

of his projects and being the Director and Chief Executive Officer of Light Be (Social Realty) Company Limited which had received donation from the Foundation before

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong ] Lee Hysan Foundation had sponsored some of  
Mr L.T. Kwok ] their projects before

59. Members noted that Messrs Stephen L.H. Liu, Alex T.H. Lai and K.K. Cheung had tendered apologies for not being able to attend the meeting. Members also noted that Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong, and Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Ricky W.Y. Yu had left the meeting. As the item was procedural in nature and no discussion was required, Members agreed that the above Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting.

60. The Secretary briefly introduced the TPB Paper No. 10635 (the Paper). On 24.5.2019, the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/20 (the draft OZP) was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). During the exhibition period, a total of 629 valid representations and 105 valid comments on representations were received. According to the statutory time limit, the draft OZP should be submitted to the Chief Executive in Council (the CE in C) for approval on or before 24.4.2020. Consideration of the representations and comments by the full Board under section 6B of the Ordinance was originally scheduled for 3.2.2020. Due to the latest position related to the novel coronavirus infection, the hearing of the representations and comments had been rescheduled until further notice. It was anticipated that there would be insufficient time for the whole plan-making process including submission of the draft OZP to the CE in C for approval to be completed within the 9-month statutory time limit (i.e. on or before 24.4.2020). There was a need to apply to the Chief Executive (CE) for an extension of the statutory time limit for six months to allow sufficient time to complete the plan-making process.

61. After deliberation, the Board agreed that the CE's agreement should be sought under section 8(2) of the Ordinance to extend the time limit for submission of the draft OZP to the CE in C for a period of six months from 24.4.2020 to 24.10.2020.

**Agenda Item 8**

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

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