

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

TPB Paper No. 10706
For Consideration by the
Town Planning Board on 15.1.2021

DRAFT STANLEY OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/H19/13

CONSIDERATION OF
REPRESENTATIONS NO. TPB/R/S/H19/13-1 TO 10
AND COMMENTS NO. TPB/R/S/H19/13-C1 TO C10

**DRAFT STANLEY OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/H19/13
 CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS NO. TPB/R/S/H19/13-1 TO 10
 AND COMMENTS NO. TPB/R/S/H19/13-C1 TO C10**

Subject of Representations (Amendment Items)	Representers (No. TPB/R/S/H19/13-)	Commenters (No. TPB/R/S/H19/13-)
<p><u>Item A</u> Rezoning of the Maryknoll House site from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Residential Development with Historic Building Preserved” (“OU(RDHBP)”) with stipulation of building height (BH) restriction.</p> <p><u>Item B1</u> Rezoning of a piece of land at north-eastern portion of Stanley Ma Hang Park from “G/IC” to “Open Space” (“O”).</p> <p><u>Item B2</u> Inclusion of the eastern portion of Blake Pier into the planning scheme area and zone it as “OU” annotated “Pier” (“OU(Pier)”).</p> <p><u>Item B3</u> Excision of a strip of sea to the west of Blake Pier zoned “OU(Pier)” from the OZP.</p>	<p>Total: 10</p> <p><u>Support Item A and Providing Views (9)</u> R1 to R8: Individuals</p> <p>R9: New Season Global Limited (owner of the Maryknoll House site)</p> <p><u>Oppose Item A and Support Items B1 to B3 (1)</u> R10: Individual</p>	<p>Total: 10</p> <p><u>Supporting R9 (8)</u> C1 to C8: Individuals (i.e. R1 to R8)</p> <p><u>Providing views (1)</u> C9: Individual</p> <p><u>Supporting R10 (1)</u> C10: Individual (i.e. R10)</p>

Note: The names of all representers and commenters are attached at **Annex IV**. Soft copy of their submissions is sent to the Town Planning Board Members via electronic means; and is also available for public inspection at the Town Planning Board’s website at https://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/whats_new/Website_S_H19_13.html and the Planning Enquiry Counters of the Planning Department (PlanD) in North Point and Sha Tin. A set of hard copy is deposited at the Town Planning Board Secretariat for Members’ inspection.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 On 5.6.2020, the draft Stanley Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H19/13 (**Annex I**) was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The Schedule of Amendments setting out the amendments incorporated in the OZP is at **Annex II** and the locations of the amendment items are shown on **Plan H-1**.
- 1.2 During the two-month exhibition period, a total of 10 valid representations were received. On 18.8.2020, the representations were published for public comments, and in the first three weeks of the publication period, a total of 10 valid comments were received.
- 1.3 On 30.10.2020, the Town Planning Board (the Board) agreed to consider all the representations and comments collectively in one group. This paper is to provide the Board with information for consideration of the representations and comments. The representers and commenters have been invited to attend the meeting in accordance with section 6B(3) of the Ordinance.

2. Background

Rezoning Application

- 2.1 The Maryknoll House site (the Site) falls within an area zoned “G/IC” on the then approved OZP No. S/H19/12 (**Plan H-1**). On 11.7.2018, a s.12A application (No. Y/H19/1) was submitted by the owner of the Site to rezone the Site from “G/IC” to “Residential (Group C)2” (“R(C)2”) or “OU(RDHBP)” for the proposed conservation-cum-development project. Under the “R(C)” option (**Annex VIa**), while ‘House’ and Flat’ uses were proposed to be Column 1 uses, the Site was divided into two sub-areas; namely sub-area A for the Maryknoll House building and the slope on the eastern side, and sub-area B for the remaining portion of the Site, subject to a maximum BH of 75mPD and 64 mPD respectively together with 3 storeys in addition to 1 storey of carport. Under the “OU(RDHBP)” option (**Annex VIb**), ‘House’ and Flat’ uses were proposed to be Column 2 uses which would require planning permission from the Board. In addition, Maryknoll House, which is a Grade 1 historic building, should be preserved in-situ and any addition, alteration and/or modification to the Maryknoll House building, except those minor modification works which are ancillary and directly related to the always permitted uses, would require planning permission from the Board. The applicant had also tabled a revised Notes of the proposed “OU(RDHBP)” zone at the meeting on 4.1.2019 (**Annex VIc**).
- 2.2 According to the conceptual development scheme submitted by the applicant (**Annex VII**), the proposed development comprises adaptive reuse of the Maryknoll House with a new 3-storey extension on the eastern side, a new basement carpark underneath the atrium garden and two new 3-storey houses over 1 storey of basement carpark at the southern platform. The proposed residential development will have a plot ratio (PR) of 0.75, BH of 3 domestic storeys in addition to 1 storey of carport and site coverage (SC) of 30%.

- 2.3 On 4.1.2019, the Metro Planning Committee (the MPC) of the Board considered the rezoning application and decided to partially agree to rezone the Site to “OU(RDHBP)” for the proposed conservation-cum-development project. Besides, members’ views on various issues expressed during the meeting, including the public access arrangement, Remarks of the Notes and the uses to be incorporated under Column 1 and Column 2 of the “OU(RDHBP) zone would be taken into account by the Planning Department (PlanD) in preparing the proposed amendments to the OZP.
- 2.4 The relevant MPC Paper No. Y/H19/1 is available at the Board’s website at https://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/papers/MPC/HK/Y-H19-1/Y_H19_1_paper.pdf and the minutes of the said MPC meeting is at https://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/meetings/MPC/Minutes/m619mpc_e.pdf.

Proposed Amendments to the OZP

- 2.5 The proposed amendments to the OZP (**Annex II**) involving, among others, rezoning of the Site from “G/IC” to “OU(RDHBP)” to facilitate proposed preservation-cum-development project were submitted to the MPC for consideration on 15.5.2020. The proposed amendments to the OZP had taken into account the proposal in the s.12A application submitted by the applicant and Members’ views as mentioned in paragraphs 2.1 and 2.3 above respectively. For the proposed “OU(RDHBP)” zone of the Site, residential developments would require planning permission from the Board, while other Column 1 and Column 2 uses would generally follow the existing “G/IC” zone. It was proposed in the Remark (1) of the Notes for “OU(RDHBP)” that any new development, or demolition of, addition, alteration and/or modification to (except those minor alteration and/or modification works which are ancillary and directly related to the always permitted uses) or redevelopment of the Maryknoll House requires planning permission from the Board in order to provide adequate control over the in-situ preservation of the Maryknoll House. The Site was also proposed to be subject to a maximum PR of 0.75, SC of 30% and a stepped height control of 64mPD and 75mPD to preserve the public view of southern and western façades of the Maryknoll House. In addition, a standard minor relaxation clause in respect of the PR/SC/BH restrictions was proposed.
- 2.6 During the discussion, some Members considered that the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP should be suitably amended to reflect more clearly the Members’ previous views on the need to preserve public views of the façade of the Maryknoll House and the requirement for provision of public access to the Site for public appreciation. After taking into account all the relevant planning considerations, the MPC agreed that the proposed amendments were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance, and to adopt the revised ES subject to incorporation of the further revisions as agreed. Accordingly, the OZP renumbered to S/H19/13 was gazetted on 5.6.2020.
- 2.7 The relevant MPC Paper No. 1/20 is available at the Board’s website at https://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/papers/MPC/648-mpc_1-20.pdf and the minutes of the said MPC meeting is at https://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/meetings/MPC/Minutes/m648mpc_e.pdf.

3. Consultation with the Southern District Council (SDC)

On 21.5.2020, the Economy, Development and Planning Committee (EDPC) of SDC was consulted on the proposed amendments to the OZP. Members of EDPC expressed their concerns on whether the Maryknoll House would be developed into luxurious apartments and the historic significance of the building would be ruined. They also requested to open the historic building at the Site for public visit. PlanD's responses to the EDPC's concerns were recorded in the minutes of the EDPC meeting held on 21.5.2020. An extract of the relevant minutes is at **Annex III**.

4. The Representation Sites and their Surrounding Areas

4.1 The Representation Sites (Plan H-1) and their Surrounding Areas

Representation Site A (the Maryknoll House Site under "OU(RDHBP)" zone) (Plans H-2 and H-3)

4.1.1 The Representation Site A (about 7,718m²) is situated on a hilltop platform overlooking developments in the Stanley area and is surrounded mainly by a low-rise residential cluster under "R(C)" zone. The site is currently occupied by the Maryknoll House, which was built in 1935 and served as the headquarters of the Maryknoll Fathers and Brothers for their Chinese missionary work. The Maryknoll House is a Grade 1 historic building and currently vacant. The site is visible from public viewpoints such as Stanley Promenade, Blake Pier, Stanley Plaza, Stanley Ma Hang Park and Stanley Kwun Yam Temple. It is accessible from Stanley Village Road via an existing access road leading to the Stanley Knoll.

4.1.2 The Representation Site A is governed by the Conditions of Sale No. 3114 for RBL 333, in which there are no restriction on user, GFA, SC nor BH. In 1974, the Maryknoll Fathers and Brothers sold part of RBL 333 for private residential development which is subsequently registered as RBL 333 s.A. Both parties entered an assignment that RBL 333 RP would not erect more than 3 houses and RBL 333 s.A could erect the remaining 7 houses. It was also agreed that a right-of-way to be reserved for the user of RBL 333 RP leading from the main road crossing RBL 333 s.A. Subsequently, the owner of Lot RBL 333 s.A applied for lease modification and removed the house number restriction under the original lease, which is now known as the Stanley Knoll.

Representation Site B1 (North-eastern Portion of Stanley Ma Hang Park zoned "O") (Plans H-8 and H-9)

4.1.3 The Representation Site B1 (about 2,419m²) is a piece of undesignated "G/IC" land to the northwest of Murray House which has already been developed as part of the Stanley Ma Hang Park. The site is currently under the management of the Housing Authority.

***Representation Site B2 (Eastern Portion of Blake Pier zoned “OU(Pier)”
(Plans H-8 and H-9)***

4.1.4 The Representation Site B2 (about 171m²) is a piece of Government land occupied by the Blake Pier. The site is currently under the management of the Transport Department.

***Representation Site B3 (a Strip of Sea to the West of Blake Pier)
(Plans H-8 and H-9)***

4.1.5 The Representation Site B3 (about 490m²) is a strip of sea which is excised from the OZP.

4.2 Planning Intention

4.2.1 The planning intention of the zones in relation to the above representation sites are as follows:

- (a) The “OU(RDHBP)” zone is intended primarily to preserve the historic building of the Maryknoll House in-situ through the preservation-cum-development project.
- (b) The “O” zone is intended primarily for the provision of outdoor open-air space for active and/or passive recreational uses serving the needs of the local residents as well as the general public.
- (c) The “OU(Pier)” zone is intended to designate land for a new pier for tourist and pleasure vessels to enhance the tourism potential of Stanley.

5. The Representations and Comments on Representations

5.1 Subject of Representations

5.1.1 There are a total of 10 valid representations. **R1** to **R9** are supportive representations and **R10** is adverse representation. **R1** to **R8** are submitted by individuals while **R9** is submitted by the owner of the Representation Site A (i.e. the applicant of s.12A application No. Y/H19/1). They are all supportive to Item A, but **R9** also proposes some amendments to the Plan, Notes and ES of the OZP. **R10** submitted by an individual objects to Item A, but supports Items B1 to B3.

5.1.2 The major grounds of representations, their proposals and PlanD’s responses, in consultation with the relevant government bureaux/departments, are at **Annex V** and summarised in the paragraphs 5.2 to 5.4 below.

5.2 Major Grounds/Proposals of and Responses to Supportive Representations

5.2.1 **Rezoning of the Maryknoll House Site (Item A)**

Statutory Requirement of Planning Permission

Major Grounds/Proposals	Representations
<p>(1) Support the rezoning of the Maryknoll House to retain the character of the Stanley or to preserve the historic building.</p> <p>(2) Support in principle the rezoning.</p> <p>(3) The statutory requirement of planning permission from the Board for any new development at the Representation Site A, or demolition of, addition, alteration and/or modification to or redevelopment of the Maryknoll House as stipulated in the Remark (1) of the Notes and the corresponding wording in the ES of the OZP should be removed on the grounds that the requirement impacts the property rights of the owner. The owner should retain the right to modify or demolish the building unless they are duly compensated for the loss of this property right.</p>	<p>R1 to R8</p> <p>R9</p> <p>R9</p>
Responses	
<p>(a) In response to (1) and (2) above, the supportive views are noted.</p>	
<p>(b) In response to (3) above, the designation of the “OU(RDHBP)” zone in the OZP is to take forward the decision of the MPC on the s.12A application No. Y/H19/1 on 4.1.2019. The statutory requirement stipulated in the Remark (1) of the Notes and corresponding wording of the ES of the OZP are to provide adequate planning control over the in-situ preservation of the Maryknoll House, which is generally in line with the proposed Remarks under the s.12A application submitted by the owner of the Representation Site A (i.e. R9) (Annex VIc). Indeed, for any new development, demolition and/or modification proposal for the historic building, the requirement for s.16 application is not uncommon under other “OU” zonings related to the preservation of the historic building on the OZPs. The s.16 requirement would enable the Board to scrutinise the development scheme so that relevant planning concerns including in-situ preservation of the historic building could be addressed.</p>	
<p>(c) Deletion of the relevant provision in the Remark (1) would inevitably lead to a lack of effective mechanism to enforce the in-situ preservation of the Maryknoll House and to monitor the implementation of the proposed preservation-cum-development project. In this regard, the Commissioner for Heritage (CHO) and Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) do not support the R9's proposal from the heritage conservation policy perspective and advises that the Remarks and the</p>	

corresponding wording in the ES of the OZP should be retained to ensure in-situ preservation of the Maryknoll House.

(d) In view of the above, it is considered that a balance has been struck between the property right of the owner in the redevelopment of the Representation Site A and the need for preserving the Maryknoll House. Hence, **R9**'s proposal of removing the statutory requirement of planning permission from the Board for new development, or demolition of, addition, alteration and/or modification to or redevelopment of the Maryknoll House is not supported.

BH Restriction

Major Grounds/Proposals	Representation
<p>(4) It is proposed to relax the BH restriction of the area to the west of Maryknoll House from 64mPD to 75mPD (Drawing H-1a) on the following grounds:</p> <p>(i) The extent of the 64mPD BH restriction would impose the unnecessary restriction to implement adaptive reuse of Maryknoll House. Design flexibility should be allowed for new development to enable optimal preservation of the Maryknoll House. There may be possibility that the proposed gross floor area may not be realized under the current BH restriction due to the potential site constraints; and</p> <p>(ii) Development to the west of the Maryknoll House may not necessarily obscure the public views of the western façade of the Maryknoll House as demonstrated by the Indicative Layout Plans and photomontages submitted by R9 (Drawings H-1b to H-1e). The intention to not significantly obscure the public views of the western façade of the Maryknoll House can be stipulated in the ES of the OZP. The Board can ensure this intention be met at the s.16 stage, and hence the BH restriction of 64mPD is considered excessive and unnecessary.</p>	<p>R9</p>
Responses	
<p>(e) The delineation of the sub-areas of the Representation Site A has made reference to the submission made by the owner of the Representation Site A in the s.12A application No. Y/H19/1 as mentioned in paragraph 2.1 above (Annex VIa). The imposition of a stepped height control of 64mPD and 75mPD is to preserve the public views of southern and</p>	

<p>southwestern façades of the Maryknoll House.</p> <p>(f) The Indicative Layout Plans and photomontages (Drawings H-1b to H-1e) submitted by R9 have shown that there would be a 2-storey extension at the west of the Maryknoll House with a BH of 71.4mPD, which is different from the conceptual development scheme submitted under the s.12A application (Annex VII and Plan H-4). Contrary to the R9's claim that not to significantly obscure the public views of the western façade of the Maryknoll House, the visual impact of the proposed relaxation of BH restriction from 64mPD to 75mPD has been assessed by PlanD from three local public view points at the southwest of the Maryknoll House site (i.e. Stanley Ma Hang Park, Kwun Yum Temple and the planned open space at Chung Hom Kok Road). Based on the PlanD's photomontages (Plans H-5 to H-7), any new development with a BH of 75mPD at the west of the Maryknoll House would largely obstruct the public views of the western façade of the Maryknoll House.</p> <p>(g) For the possible site constraints or innovative design for heritage conservation as claimed by R9, there is already provision for minor relaxation of the BH restriction on the OZP to cater for the design flexibility. Besides, there is no sufficient information in R9's submission to demonstrate the actual site constraints and innovative design to justify the proposed relaxation of BH restriction for the area to the west of Maryknoll House. Under the current BH restrictions on the OZP, the Indicative Layout Plans proposed by R9 can be submitted for the Board's consideration through s.16 application.</p> <p>(h) In view of the above, R9's proposal of relaxing the BH restriction of the area to the west of the Maryknoll House from 64mPD to 75mPD <u>is considered not justified</u>.</p>

The Provision of Public Access

Major Grounds/Proposals	Representation
<p>(6) The requirement for provision of reasonable public access to the Maryknoll House for public appreciation as stipulated in the ES of the OZP (i.e. para. 7.6.5) should be removed on the grounds that the access road requires passing through the neighbouring property and involves in the right of way issue, which cannot be controlled solely the owner of Representation Site A. The Maryknoll House has never been accessible to the public. It is legally impossible to guarantee the provision of public access to the Maryknoll House.</p>	<p>R9</p>
Responses	
<p>(i) The "OU(RDHBP)" zone is intended primarily to preserve the historic building of the Maryknoll House in-situ through the preservation-cum-development project. The ES, which does not</p>	

<p>constitute a part of the OZP, provides elaboration on the planning intention and objectives of the Board for the various land use zones of the OZP.</p> <p>(j) As mentioned in paragraphs 2.3 and 2.6 above, when considering the s.12A application No. Y/H19/1 on 4.1.2019 and the proposed amendments to the OZP on 15.5.2020, the MPC deliberated, among others, that it would be important to have the public access to the Representation Site A to facilitate public appreciation of the historic building (i.e. the Maryknoll House), and such requirement should be clearly reflected in the ES of the OZP. CHO considers the ES requiring the applicant to allow reasonable public access to the historic building matches with the applicant’s original intention in the approved s.12A application and hence should not be removed. Should there be any problems in providing the public access or other feasible alternatives, it can be submitted as part of the development scheme for the Board’s consideration at the s.16 planning application stage.</p> <p>(k) In view of the above, R9’s proposal to remove the requirement for provision of reasonable public access to the Maryknoll House for public appreciation as stipulated in the ES of the OZP <u>is considered not necessary</u>.</p>

5.2.2 Technical Amendments to the OZP to Reflect the As-built Conditions of the Stanley Area (Items B1 to B3)

Major Grounds	Representation
(7) Supports Amendment Items B1 to B3.	R10
Response	
(1) The supportive view is noted.	

5.3 Major Grounds/Proposals of and Responses to Adverse Representation

5.3.1 Rezoning of the Maryknoll House Site (Item A)

Major Grounds / Proposals	Representation
(1) There is a shortfall of Community Care Services (CCS) facilities, Residential Care Homes for the Elderly (RCHE) and Child Care Center (CCC) in the Stanley area. Given that essential community needs are not being met, the proposed rezoning of a “G/IC” site in a residential area is not supported.	R10
Responses	
(a) Under the “OU(RDHBP)” zone, ‘Social Welfare Facility’ use such as CCS facilities, RCHE and CCC is always permitted. However, as the Representation Site A is privately owned, it is subject to the owner’s	

<p>decision to pursue any government, institution and community (GIC) facilities within the site.</p> <p>(b) Based on the existing and planned provision of major GIC facilities in the Stanley area (Annex VIII), there are shortfall in the provision of CCS facilities (62 places), RCHE (100 places) and CCC (64 places) as compared with the requirement of the HKPSG. The Social Welfare Department has adopted a multi-pronged approach to identify suitable premises for social welfare facilities including CCC and elderly facilities.</p>

5.4 Comments on Representations

There are 10 valid comments on representations submitted by individuals. **C1 to C8** support **R9** without giving any grounds while **C9** supports **R1 to R9**. **C10** recapitulates the concerns about the provision of community care facilities in the Stanley area. It is noted that **C1 to C8** and **C10** are also representers themselves (i.e. **R1 to R8** and **R10** respectively). The major grounds of comments and PlanD’s responses, in consultation with the relevant government bureaux/departments, are at **Annex V**.

Major grounds of comments	Comments
(1) Support R9 and its proposal.	C1 – C8
(2) There is not enough private housing land. The Government should relax the PR restriction to address the shortage.	C9
(3) The concerns on the shortfall of CCS in the Stanley area are recapitulated.	C10
Responses	
<p>(a) C1 to C8’s supportive views are noted.</p> <p>(b) In response to (2), the PR restriction of the Representation Site A is considered appropriate as it is generally in line with that of the surrounding “R(C)” zone on the OZP and the proposal submitted by the owner of the Representation Site A in the s.12A application No. Y/H19/1 which was agreed by the MPC on 4.1.2019.</p> <p>(c) The ground of C10’s comment is largely similar to those raised in the adverse representation R10 and the responses to the adverse representation in paragraph 5.3.1 above are relevant.</p>	

6. Departmental Consultation

6.1 The following government bureaux/departments have been consulted and their comments have been incorporated in the above paragraphs and **Annex V**, where appropriate:

- (a) CHO and AMO;
- (b) Director of Housing;
- (c) Commissioner for Transport;
- (d) Chief Highway Engineer/Hong Kong, Highways Department;
- (e) Director of Environmental Protection;
- (f) Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene;
- (g) Director of Social Welfare;
- (h) Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation;
- (i) Director of Leisure and Cultural Services;
- (j) Commissioner of Police;
- (k) Chief Building Surveyor/HKW, Buildings Department;
- (l) District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West & South, Lands Department;
- (m) Project Manager (HKI&I), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD);
- (n) Chief Engineer/Special Duties (Works), CEDD;
- (o) Chief Engineer/Hong Kong & Islands, Drainage Services Department;
- (p) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department;
- (q) District Officer (Southern), Home Affairs Department; and
- (r) Chief Town Planner/Urban Design & Landscape, PlanD.

7. Planning Department's Views

- 7.1 The supportive views of **R1 to R8, R9 (part)** and **R10 (part)** are noted.
- 7.2 Based on the assessments in paragraphs 4 and 5 above, and for the following reasons, PlanD does not support the remaining part of representation **R9** and **R10** in respect of the Representative Site A and considers that the OZP should not be amended to meet the representations:
- (a) The Notes of the “OU(RDHBP)” is considered appropriate to ensure proper planning controls for the in-situ preservation of the Maryknoll House. It has struck a balance between the property right of the owner in the redevelopment and the need for preserving the Maryknoll House. The removal of the Remark (1) of the Notes to require planning permission from the Board for new development, or demolition of, addition, alteration and/or modification to or redevelopment of the Maryknoll House, is not justified (**R9**).
 - (b) The BH restriction of the “OU(RDHBP)” zone is considered appropriate to ensure the preservation of public views of southern and southwestern façades of the Maryknoll House. There is also provision in the OZP for minor relaxation of the BH restriction to allow for design flexibility due to possible site constraints and innovative design. The proposal for relaxing the BH restriction is considered not justified (**R9**).
 - (c) The planning intention of “OU(RDHBP)” zone is primarily to preserve the historic building of the Maryknoll House in-situ through the preservation-cum-development project. The ES of the OZP, which does not form part of the OZP, is intended to reflect the planning intention and the objectives of the Board for the zone. Should there be any problems in

providing the public access, it can be dealt with at the s.16 planning application stage. The proposal for revising the ES is considered not necessary (**R9**).

- (d) The ‘Social Welfare Facility’ use is always permitted under the “OU(RDHBP)” zone. As the site is privately owned, its use for any social welfare facilities is subject to the owner’s decision (**R10**).

8. Decision Sought

- 8.1 The Board is invited to give consideration to the representations and comments taking into consideration the points raised in the hearing session, and decide whether to propose/not to propose any amendments to the draft Stanley OZP to meet/partially meet the representations.
- 8.2 Should the Board decide that no amendment should be made to the draft Stanley OZP to meet the representations, Members are also invited to agree that the OZP, together with their respective Notes and updated ES, are suitable for submission under section 8 of the Ordinance to the CE in C for approval.

9. Attachments

Annex I	Draft Stanley OZP No. S/H19/13 (Reduced Size)
Annex II	Schedule of Amendments to the Approved Stanley OZP No. S/H19/12
Annex III	Minutes of EDPC of SDC Meeting on 21.5.2020 (Extracted)
Annex IV	List of Representers (R1 to R10) and Commenters (C1 to C10) in respect of the draft Stanley OZP No. S/H19/13
Annex V	Summary of Representations and Comments and Responses
Annex VIa	“R(C)” Option Proposed by the Applicant of s.12A application No. Y/H19/1
Annex VIb	“OU(RDHBP)” Option Proposed by the Applicant of s.12A Application No. Y/H19/1
Annex VIc	Revised Notes of the “OU(RDHBP)” Option Submitted by the Applicant of s.12A application No. Y/H19/1 at the Meeting on 4.1.2019
Annex VII	Conceptual Development Scheme and Photomontages Submitted by the Applicant of s.12A Application No. Y/H19/1
Annex VIII	Provision of Open Space and Major Community Facilities in Stanley Area
Drawing H-1a	Proposed Relaxation of the BH Restriction submitted by R9
Drawings H-1b to H-1e	Proposed Indicative Layout Plans and Photomontages submitted by R9
Plan H-1	Location Plan of Representations and Comments
Plans H-2 and H-3	Site Plan and Aerial Photo for Amendment Item A

- Plan H-4** Comparison of the Conceptual Development Scheme under s.12A Application No. Y/H19/1 and Indicative Layout Plans Submitted by **R9**
- Plans H-5 to H-7** Photomontages Based on the Proposed Relaxation of BH Restriction by **R9**
- Plans H-8 and H-9** Site Plan and Aerial Photo for Amendment Items B1 to B3

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT
JANUARY 2021**