

**Minutes of 1233<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 30.10.2020**

**Present**

Permanent Secretary for Development  
(Planning and Lands)

Chairperson

Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairperson

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

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

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Dr Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr C.H. Tse

Dr Conrad T.C. Wong

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport) 3

Transport and Housing Bureau

Mr Andy S.H. Lam

Chief Engineer (Works)

Home Affairs Department

Mr Gavin C.T. Tse

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)

Environmental Protection Department

Mr Elvis W.K. Au

Director of Lands

Mr Andrew C.W. Lai

Director of Planning

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Deputy Director of Planning/District

Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Y.S. Wong

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Mr Eric C.Y. Chiu

## **Opening Remarks**

1. The Chairperson said that the meeting would be conducted with video conferencing arrangement.

## **Agenda Item 1**

[Open Meeting]

### Confirmation of Minutes of the 1232<sup>nd</sup> Meeting held on 16.10.2020

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

2. The draft minutes of the 1232<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 16.10.2020 were confirmed without amendments.

## **Agenda Item 2**

[Open Meeting]

### Matters Arising

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

### Emails from Mr Ting Lup Wong regarding the preparation of the draft Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H7/20

3. The Secretary reported that four emails from Mr Ting Lup Wong dated 8.5.2020, 26.5.2020, 1.9.2020 and 3.10.2020 were received and had been circulated to Members at the request of Mr Ting.

4. Mr Ting was a representer (R626) of the draft Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H7/20 (the draft OZP) but he clarified in his email on 26.5.2020 that his views provided on 8.5.2020, which raised concern on whether the Town Planning Board (the Board) had complied with the 'systematic preparation' requirement under section 3 of the Town Planning Ordinance in the preparation of the draft OZP, was not related to his representation in respect of

the draft OZP. On 1.9.2020, he wrote to the Board raising the same concern.

5. Subsequent to the Secretariat of the Board's reply to address Mr Ting's concern on 7.9.2020, he repeatedly raised the same concern regarding systematic preparation of statutory plan in his email of 3.10.2020 and doubted whether the Secretariat of the Board could represent Members of the Board to give him a reply.

6. Members noted the above and agreed that in line with the usual practice, the Secretariat would act on behalf of the Board to reply to Mr Ting.

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung , Dr Lawrence K.C. Li, Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng and Dr Conrad T.C. Wong joined the meeting at this point.]

### **Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West District**

#### **Agenda Item 3**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/YL-HTF/1104

Proposed Temporary Development and Learning Centre for Graphene with Ancillary Office for a Period of 3 Years in "Agriculture" and "Residential (Group D)" Zones, Lots 130, 131, 132 (Part), 260 (Part), 261, 262, 263, 264 and 268 in D.D.128 and Adjoining Government Land, Yuen Long (TPB Paper No. 10684)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

7. The Secretary reported that the applicant had indicated collaboration/potential collaboration with the Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU) and Hong Kong Productivity Council (HKPC) on graphene-related technology. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

- being the Deputy Chairman of the Council of PolyU;

Mr Stephen L. H. Liu - being a member of the Council of PolyU; and

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung - being a council member of the HKPC.

8. Members agreed that the interests of the above Members were remote and they could stay in the meeting.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

9. The representative of Planning Department (PlanD) and the applicant's representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen - District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (DPO/TMYLW), PlanD

Mr Andrew Yung ]

Mr Wong Sun Wo William ]

Dr Zerance Ng ]

Mr Lee Sai Hang ]

Ms Mandy Lui ]

Mr Lam Yiu Po ] Applicant's representatives

Mr Win Ho ]

Mr Wo Wai Kei ]

Mr Tang Lai Ming ]

Mr Tang Siu Kwong ]

Mr Jian Lai Jun ]

10. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the review hearing. She then invited PlanD's representative to brief Members on the review application.

11. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen, DPO/TMYLW, 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. 10684 (the Paper).

12. The Chairperson then invited the applicant's representatives to elaborate on the review application.

13. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Andrew Yung, Dr Zerance Ng and Mr Wong Sun Wo William, the applicant's representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) graphene was an advanced new material useful for various industrial applications. A team from PolyU Hong Kong Community College, which included Dr Zerance Ng, would collaborate with the applicant to promote development of graphene-related technology. Various products utilising graphene-related technology such as aluminium-air battery would be tested at the application site (the Site). The applicant would also test whether graphene could be used to improve the plastic recycling process;
- (b) the proposed development could provide a place for testing of graphene-related technology/products outside a laboratory setting and could help support the research and development (R&D) community in Hong Kong. Many R&D operations in Hong Kong were hindered by the lack of suitable testing facilities to validate research findings and test prototype products;
- (c) a small number of prototype units for testing purpose might be produced at the Site. The proposed development and learning centre was mainly set up for educational purpose, which was different in nature from the typical open storage or industrial uses. The Site could also be visited by primary and secondary school students for educational purposes while providing opportunity for practical work for tertiary students;
- (d) the Site could be accessed via Kai Pak Ling Road. Vehicles could enter Kai Pak Ling Road from the east via Fung Kong Tsuen or from the West near Hong Kong-Shenzhen Western Corridor. Drivers could take the less busy route to gain access to the Site;

- (e) the traffic impact generated by the proposed use would be minimal. Medium goods vehicles would transport raw materials to the Site on one to two days per week at non-peak hours. Notwithstanding that, the applicant was working on a proposal to address the concern on traffic aspect. If the application was approved, the Board could impose an approval condition to require the applicant to conduct a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) and propose mitigation measures to the satisfaction of the Transport Department; and
- (f) since the Site was occupied by a plastic recycling business and previously used for various types of open storage activities, the soil was contaminated. Without first carrying out costly decontamination works, the Site was not suitable for agricultural activities. It should also be noted that the current applicant was different from the applicants in the previously rejected applications.

14. As the presentations from PlanD's representative and the applicant's representatives had been completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

15. Two Members raised the following questions to PlanD's representative:

- (a) whether the applicant had provided technical assessment on traffic and environmental impacts in support of the review application; and
- (b) the subject matter of the environmental complaints and the reason of the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) for not supporting the application.

16. In response, Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen, DPO/TMYLW, made the following main points:

- (a) the applicant had not provided any technical assessment on traffic and environmental aspects to address the concerns of the RNTPC. The



applicant had only provided figures regarding vehicle parking and loading/unloading spaces in support of the review application; and

- (b) the environmental complaints related to the Site was mainly against the existing plastic recycling activities at the Site. DEP did not support the subject application as medium goods vehicles would be used, which might cause environmental nuisance to sensitive receivers along the access route.

17. Some Members raised the following questions to the applicant's representatives:

- (a) whether any industrial/production procedures would be carried out at the Site;
- (b) whether the proposed use would cause odour nuisance and if affirmative, what the proposed mitigation measures were;
- (c) the allocation of floor space for various uses in the proposed development and learning centre, and whether tests to be conducted at the Site were for mature prototypes that had already been tested at tertiary institutes;
- (d) whether the applicant had explored the feasibility to accommodate the proposed use at alternative locations such as the Hong Kong Science Park (HKSP) or the EcoPark;
- (e) what kind of investment was required from the applicant for development of the proposed use, and how long it would take before the centre could become operational should the application be approved;
- (f) whether the applicant had collaborated with or seek support from government department(s) regarding the development of graphene-related technology; and whether the applicant had plans to collaborate with other non-government organisations (NGOs);

- (g) noting that the Site was zoned “Agriculture” (“AGR”) and “Residential (Group D)” (“R(D)”) and the subject of the environmental complaints, whether there was scope to accommodate the proposed use within an industrial building;
- (h) whether the procedures involving extraction of graphene at the Site would result in health hazard to the workers at the Site, and whether there was plan to set up a laboratory at the Site;
- (i) the applicant’s plan if the application was not approved by the Board;
- (j) why the applicant had not prepared any technical submission to address the Transport Department’s concern on traffic; and
- (k) the number of members in the applicant’s organisation and the nature of business of the members.

18. In response, Mr Andrew Yung, Dr Zerance Ng and Mr Wong Sun Wo William, the applicant’s representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) various types of processes utilising graphene would be carried out at the Site, including adding graphene to plastic recycling products and testing of aluminium–air battery;
- (b) ion technology could be adopted at the Site to mitigate potential odour nuisance associated with melting of plastic for recycling. So far, the ion technology had been proved quite effective in that respect. The operations at the Site would unlikely cause adverse environmental impact on the surrounding areas;
- (c) small-scale production would be carried out at the Site mainly to produce prototype units to showcase graphene-related technology. The detailed allocation of floor space for educational and production uses had yet to be determined at the current stage. It was hoped that a complete testing and

production chain could be provided at the Site. The applicant would implement the project in stages depending on the market situation;

- (d) the rent at HKSP was not cheap and it was mainly to provide space for high-technology enterprises therefore not suitable for material recycling operations, while the EcoPark was mainly to cater for large-scale recycling operations requiring substantial amount of capital investment which was unaffordable by the applicant;
- (e) other than carrying out site formation works, the applicant would also need to provide suitable fire service installations and noise insulation in order to meet relevant government requirements and regulations. The general layout of the proposed development and learning centre at the Site would largely follow that of the existing structures. Details would be formulated at the building plan submission stage in accordance with the requirements under the Buildings Ordinance. The applicant had completed substantial part of the preparatory work and if planning permission was granted by the Board, the centre could be set up within three months. Detailed development programme could be provided to the Board in writing if required. However, it was later acknowledged that application to the Lands Department for a short term waiver might take at least nine months;
- (f) the applicant was not collaborating with any government departments or NGOs at the moment. However, upon successful testing of the prototypes, collaboration with other parties such as HKPC could be explored. A period of three years should be sufficient for testing of the prototypes. The applicant hoped that the proposed development could be relocated to the Lok Ma Chau Loop after a few years if its operation was successful;
- (g) besides cost consideration, due to the large size of the machineries to be used in the recycling process, it was more suitable for them to be operated in an open area than within an industrial building. The environmental complaints were mainly against the current plastic recycling operations at the Site, rather than the proposed use. The applicant was confident that

the odour issue associated with melting of plastic could be satisfactorily resolved with the use of suitable technology. For example, the plasma technology currently available to remove volatile organic compounds in emission was quite effective;

- (h) procedures to extract graphene would be carried out at the Site. Based on the method that the applicant planned to use, it would not involve aerosol processing of graphene and hence would unlikely create any health hazard. At this juncture there was no plan to set up a laboratory at the Site as many of the testing procedures would first be conducted in the facilities of PolyU. If a laboratory was required to be set up at the Site in the future, it would be set up in compliance with the prevailing government requirements and regulations;
- (i) if the application was not approved, the development and testing operations might need to be conducted in Mainland China instead. It would represent a missed opportunity to support technology development in Hong Kong;
- (j) the applicant had not conducted any technical assessment on traffic mainly due to cost consideration; and
- (k) the applicant, Green Technology Consortium Limited, was a charitable organisation which had a few tens of members coming from various fields of green technology. Members of the consortium had involved in projects on electric buses, recycling of kitchen waste and aquaponics.

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

### Deliberation Session

20. Two Members said that the applicant had not properly addressed the RNTPC's reasons to reject the application at the s.16 application stage. In particular, the applicant had not really dealt with the concerns of relevant departments on traffic and environmental aspects. Furthermore, no convincing information was provided by the applicant on why alternative locations had not been explored for the proposed use. Two other Members considered that the applicant's submission lacked solid proposal for implementation of the proposed use. It was also disappointing that the applicant had not provided any information regarding effluent discharge and emission, nor proposed suitable measures to mitigate potential impacts associated with the various recycling processes that might be carried out at the Site.

21. Members in general considered that whilst the Board was supportive to technology development and R&D activities in Hong Kong, it was the applicant's responsibility to identify a suitable location for a particular use and demonstrate that the use would not cause significant adverse impact on the surrounding environment or nuisance to nearby residents. The Chairperson remarked that there was very limited information from the applicant regarding the operation of the proposed development and learning centre for graphene at the Site. Specifically, the applicant had not given a clear account of the nature of activities to be conducted at the Site, without which it would be very difficult for relevant government departments and the Board to form a view on compatibility with land uses in the vicinity, potential impacts and the associated mitigation measures. It appeared that the applicant's main reason to use the Site, which was mostly zoned "AGR", for the proposed use was its lower cost compared to alternative locations such as the EcoPark or industrial buildings. Members in general doubted whether the applicant had any concrete implementation programme as apparently there was contradiction in the answers given by the applicant's representatives on the time required to carry out the preparatory work before the proposed use could commence to operate. Given that much of the important information regarding the proposed development was not available, Members generally considered that there was no strong justification for the Board to approve the application and it might set an undesirable precedent for similar applications.

22. A Member noted that many of the existing open storage uses near the Site were suspected unauthorised developments subject to planning enforcement action. Another

Member opined that while that might be the case, there was an actual demand for land for recycling operations in Hong Kong. Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, the Director of Planning, pointed out that the Site was involved in an unauthorised development that was convicted in 2019. Another round of planning enforcement action at the Site was being undertaken by the Planning Authority. To make the most effective use of limited resources, priority would be given to take enforcement action against unauthorised developments in environmentally sensitive areas. For unauthorised developments located in less environmentally sensitive areas where ‘existing uses’ of similar nature had been proliferated, the strategy was primarily to contain the situation while channelising such operations to other more suitable areas. In that regard, the Chairperson said that the updated Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 13F had been promulgated in 2020 to better channel brownfield operations to suitable locations planned for such use in the New Territories.

23. A Member said that many start-up and R&D companies in Hong Kong faced tremendous difficulties in finding suitable yet affordable space to accommodate their office and operations. In that regard, additional support from the Government would be helpful.

24. The Chairperson summarised that while the Board supported R&D of green technology in Hong Kong, it was crucial that sufficient information should be provided by the applicant in support of the planning application so that the Board could consider the case in an informed manner. In this regard, the applicant had failed to provide essential information, including a clear account of the proposed operation, to enable the Board to better understand what exactly would take place at the Site and in turn consider the potential impact of the proposed development. Members unanimously agreed that the review application should not be supported and the applicant’s failure to provide sufficient information should be added as an additional rejection reason.

25. 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 intentions of the “Agriculture” (“AGR”) and “Residential (Group D)” (“R(D)”) zones. The planning intention of the “AGR” zone is to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes, and also to retain

fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. The planning intention of the “R(D)” zone is primarily for improvement and upgrading of existing temporary structures within the rural areas through redevelopment of existing temporary structures into permanent buildings. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from such planning intentions, even on a temporary basis;

- (b) the applicant fails to give a clear account of the nature of activities to be conducted at the Site, without which it would be very difficult for relevant government departments and the Board to form a view on compatibility with land uses in the vicinity, potential impacts and the associated mitigation measures;
- (c) the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would not generate adverse environmental and traffic impacts on the surrounding areas; and
- (d) approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the “AGR” zone, the cumulative effect of which will result in a general degradation of the rural environment.”

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai and Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu left the meeting during the deliberation session.]

## **Procedural Matters**

### **Agenda Item 4**

[Open Meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comments on the Draft Stanley Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H19/13  
(TPB Paper No. 10685)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

26. The Secretary reported that a representation had been submitted by Ms Mary Mulvihill and the following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |                  |   |   |
|------------------|---|---|
| Mr K.K. Cheung   | - | his firm hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time; and    |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - | his former firm hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time. |

27. Members noted that Mr K.K. Cheung had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting.

28. The Secretary briefly introduced the TPB Paper No. 10685 (the Paper). On 5.6.2020, the draft Stanley Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H19/13 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). A total of 10 representations were received. On 18.8.2020, the representations were published for public comment and 10 comments were received.

29. Since the representations/comments were of similar nature, it was suggested that the hearing would be considered by the full Board collectively in one group in the regular meeting. To ensure efficiency of the hearing, it was recommended to allot a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time to each representer and commenter in the hearing session. Consideration of



the representations and comments by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for December 2020/January 2021.

30. After deliberation, the Board agreed that:
- (a) the valid representations and comments should be considered collectively in one group by the Board; and
  - (b) a 10-minute presentation time would be allotted to each presenter and commenter.

### **Agenda Item 5**

[Open Meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comments on the Draft Tung Chung Town Centre Area Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-TCTC/23 (TPB Paper No. 10686)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

31. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments were to allow a proposed residential development on a MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) site, and a representation had been submitted by Ms Mary Mulvihill and a comment had been submitted by MTRCL. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |                  |   |   |
|------------------|---|---|
| Mr K.K. Cheung   | - | his firm having current business dealings with MTRCL, and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time; |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - | his former firm having current business dealings with MTRCL, and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from        |

time to time;

- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having past business dealings with MTRCL;
- Mr Peter K.T. Yuen - being a member of the Board of Governors of the Hong Kong Arts Centre which had collaborated with MTRCL on a number of arts projects; and
- Professor T.S. Liu - his close relative co-owning a property in Tung Chung.

32. Members noted that Mr K.K. Cheung had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting, and agreed that as the item was procedural in nature, all other Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting.

33. The Secretary briefly introduced TPB Paper No. 10686 (the Paper). On 19.6.2020, the draft Tung Chung Town Centre Area Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-TCTC/23 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The amendment items were mainly to facilitate residential development at a site currently occupied by the MTR Tung Chung Traction substation. After discounting five duplicated submissions, a total of 72 representations were received, of which, two had their identity information missing or incomplete and should be considered as invalid pursuant to sections 6(2)(b) and 6(3)(b) of the Ordinance. On 4.9.2020, the 70 valid representations were published for public comment and nine comments were received.

34. Since the representations/comments were of similar nature, it was suggested that the hearing would be considered by the full Board collectively in one group in the regular meeting. To ensure efficiency of the hearing, it was recommended to allot a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time to each representer and commenter in the hearing session. Consideration of the representations and comments by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for

January/February 2021.

35. After deliberation, the Board noted that the representations made with the required identity information missing as mentioned in paragraph 1.2 of the Paper should be considered as invalid pursuant to sections 6(2)(b) and 6(3)(b) of the Ordinance, and agreed that:

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

### **Agenda Item 6**

[Open Meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comments on the Draft Tseung Kwan O Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TKO/27  
(TPB Paper No. 10687)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

36. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments were to allow a proposed residential development on a MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) site and representations had been submitted by Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited (HKCG), a subsidiary of Henderson Land Development Co. Limited (HLD), and Ms Mary Mulvihill, and a comment had been submitted by MTRCL. The following Members have declared interests on the item:

- Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with MTRCL, HLD and HKCG, and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time;

- Mr Alex T.H. Lai

  - his former firm having current business dealings with MTRCL, HLD and HKCG, and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time;
  
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

  - having past business dealings with MTRCL;
  
- Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

  - being a member of the Board of Governors of the Hong Kong Arts Centre which had collaborated with MTRCL on a number of arts projects and received a donation from an Executive Director of HLD before;
  
- Dr C.H Hau

  - being an employee of HKU which had received a donation from a family member of the Chairman of HLD before;
  
- Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

  - being the deputy chairman of the Council of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU) which had obtained sponsorship from HLD before;
  
- Mr Stephen L. H. Liu

  - being a member of the Council of PolyU which had obtained sponsorship from HLD before;
  
- Professor T.S. Liu

  - owning and co-owning properties with his spouse and his spouse owning properties in Tseung Kwan O; and

Mr L.T. Kwok - his employing organisation having social service units located in Tseung Kwan O.

37. Members noted that Mr K.K. Cheung had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting, and agreed that as the item was procedural in nature, all other Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting.

38. The Secretary briefly introduced TPB Paper No. 10687 (the Paper). On 19.6.2020, the draft Tseung Kwan O Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TKO/27 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The amendment items were mainly to facilitate residential development at a site currently occupied by the MTR Pak Shing Kok Ventilation Building. After discounting five duplicated submissions, a total of 130 representations were received. On 4.9.2020, the 130 representations were published for public comment and seven comments were received, of which, one had its identity information missing and should be considered as invalid pursuant to sections 6A(2) and 6A(3)(b) of the Ordinance.

39. One out-of-time comment was submitted by an individual after the expiration of the 3-week public inspection period. Pursuant to section 6A(3)(a) of the Ordinance, it should be treated as not having been made.

40. Since the representations/comments were of similar nature, it was suggested that the hearing would be considered by the full Board collectively in one group in the regular meeting. To ensure efficiency of the hearing, it was recommended to allot a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time to each representer and commenter in the hearing session. Consideration of the representations and comments by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for January/February 2021.

41. After deliberation, the Board noted that the comment made with the required identity information missing as mentioned in paragraph 1.3 of the Paper should be considered as invalid pursuant to sections 6A(2) and 6A(3)(b) of the Ordinance, and the comment submitted after the expiration of the 3-week public inspection period as mentioned in

paragraph 1.4 of the Paper should be treated as not having been made under section 6A(3)(a) of the Ordinance. The Board also agreed that:

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

**Agenda Item 7**

[Open Meeting]

**Any Other Business**

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

42. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 11:25 a.m.