

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

**Minutes of 674th Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 25.6.2021**

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M. K. Chung

Chairman

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Vice-chairman

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Dr Roger C.K. Chan

Mr C.H. Tse

Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban),
Transport Department
Mr Patrick K.H. Ho

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department
Mr Gavin C.T. Tse

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment),
Environmental Protection Department
Dr Sunny C.W. Cheung

Assistant Director (Regional 1), Lands Department
Mr Albert K.L. Cheung

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Alvin C.H. Kan

Opening Remarks

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

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 673rd MPC Meeting held on 11.6.2021

[Open Meeting]

2. The draft minutes of the 673rd MPC meeting held on 11.6.2021 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matter Arising

[Open Meeting]

3. The Secretary reported that there were no matters arising.

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 3

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Y/TW/15 Application for Amendment to the Draft Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TW/34, To rezone the application site from “Green Belt” to “Government, Institution or Community (10)”, Lots 613 RP, 614 and 1229 in D.D. 453 and adjoining Government Land, Lo Wai, Tsuen Wan, New Territories
(MPC Paper No. Y/TW/15)

4. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Tsuen Wan. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Tsuen Wan; and

Professor John C.Y. Ng - his spouse owning a flat in Tsuen Wan.

5. The Committee noted that as the properties owned by the company of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi’s spouse and the property owned by Professor John C.Y. Ng’s spouse had no direct view of the Site, Professor Ng and Mr Choi could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

6. The following representatives from Planning Department (PlanD) and the applicant were invited to the meeting at this point:

PlanD

Mr Derek P.K. Tse - District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK)

Mr Ng Kar Shu - Senior Town Planner/ Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK)

Applicant's Representatives

Mr John H.Y. Yip]	
Mr L.K. Yeung]	Longest Profit (Hong Kong) Ltd
Ms T. Lin]	
Ms Tiffanie H.L. Tai]	
Mr Kim K.O. Chan]	Vision Planning Consultants Ltd.
Mr Chris S.M. Leung]	
Mr S.L. Ng	-	LLA Consultancy Ltd.

7. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the meeting. He then invited PlanD's representative to brief Members on the background of the application.

8. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ng Kar Shu, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed rezoning of the Site from "Green Belt" ("GB") to "Government, Institution or Community (10)" ("G/IC(10)");
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication periods, a total of 436 public comments were received. There were 412 supporting comments (of which 406 comments were submitted in 13 standard proformas) from a member of the Tsuen Wan East Area Committee, the Tsuen Wan Lo Wai Village Office and individuals, 13 objecting comments from Designing Hong Kong Limited, Alliance for the Concern over Columbarium Policy and

individuals including the residents of Lo Wai Village and existing developments along Lo Wai Road, and 11 comments providing views/expressing general concerns on the application from 三疊潭村居民關注組, Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation and individuals. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and

- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no in-principle objection to the application and recommended the Board to partially agree to the application by rezoning the Site to an appropriate zoning with 'Columbarium' as a Column 2 use under the Notes of the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. From land use point of view, columbarium use at the Site may not be incompatible with the surrounding religious institutions and temples/monasteries uses at the Fu Yung Shan foothill and was not within or directly adjacent to village cluster where the periphery of the existing "Village Type Development" ("V") zone of Lo Wai was over 200m from the Site. In terms of development intensity, the proposed columbarium was not incompatible with its surrounding developments. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) and the Commissioner of Police (C of P) had no in-principle objection to the application from traffic engineering and management perspectives, noting that the columbarium would be closed to visitors during the Ching Ming and Chung Yeung Festivals and their shadow periods and other traffic and crowd management measures were proposed. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. The applicant proposed to incorporate the management/operational measures for the columbarium in the Remarks under the Notes of the proposed "G/IC(10)" zone but those measures should be scrutinised and monitored through the established licensing mechanism by the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD)/Private Columbarium Licensing Board (PCLB). The applicant's proposal to stipulate 'Columbarium' as a Column 1 use deviated from the Master Schedule of Notes (MSN) for the "G/IC" zone. As such, it was considered prudent that 'Columbarium' use should be put under Column 2 such that the development details and other technical aspects

would be further considered by the Board in considering the future s.16 planning application. The Site was the subject of a previous s.12A application (No. Y/TW/9) submitted by the same applicant for rezoning the Site from “GB” to “G/IC(10)” for redeveloping the Site for columbarium use with 3,000 niches that was rejected by the Committee mainly on grounds of traffic impacts and undesirable precedent. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessment above were relevant.

[Messrs Stanley T.S. Choi and Franklin Yu joined the meeting during PlanD’s presentation.]

9. The Chairman then invited the applicant’s representatives to elaborate on the application. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Messrs Kim K.O. Chan and John H.Y. Yip, the applicant’s representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) the applicant had submitted six previous applications (four of which were withdrawn) since 2010. Due to the traffic constraint of the Site, the applicant had reduced the proposed number of niches from 12,000 niches in the earlier applications to 3,000 niches for the subject and other applications submitted since 2016. To support the current application, the applicant had submitted a management plan including a number of crowd control and operation arrangements which was considered acceptable by C for T and C of P. The management plan would be further submitted to the PCLB for consideration and approval at the licensing stage;
- (b) in the application, 3,000 niches were proposed, of which 103 niches were sold and with ashes interred, 181 niches were sold but ashes not yet interred, and 50 niches would be offered free of charge to the local villagers with financial difficulties. The remaining 2,666 niches would be sold in phases with a maximum of 500 niches to be sold each year (i.e. to be sold over a period of six years);
- (c) the applicant did not agree that ‘Columbarium’ should be a Column 2 use. The set of Notes for the proposed “G/IC(10)” zone was tailor-made for the Site. The key development parameters and management/operational

measures including the total gross floor area, maximum building height, maximum number of niches, minimum number of niches to be offered free of charge to the local villagers with financial difficulties, and maximum number of niches to be sold every year were proposed to be incorporated in the Remarks of the Notes of the proposed “G/IC(10)” zone. Given there was no outstanding requirement for technical assessments from the relevant government departments, a further s.16 planning application was considered unnecessary. Hence, it was appropriate to stipulate ‘Columbarium’ as Column 1 use under the proposed “G/IC(10)” zone. There were examples where the Notes of a zone would deviate from the MSN, such as ‘Public Vehicle Park’ as Column 1 use in some “Residential (Group A)” sub-zones. In addition, if Members considered that the management/operational measures should not be stipulated in the Remarks under the Notes of the new zoning, the applicant had no strong views in that regard. If there was no need for a s.16 planning application, the applicant could proceed to submit general building plans sooner and that would help expedite the redevelopment so that those who had bought the niches could have ashes interred at the earliest time possible;

- (d) after the licence application was rejected by PCLB, the applicant had contacted the concerned family members to remove their ancestors’ ashes temporarily. Most of them indicated that they would place their ancestors’ ashes back to the columbarium upon its redevelopment. Hence, the applicant wished to complete the redevelopment as soon as possible; and
- (e) in preparation for the application, the local villagers had been consulted. Noting the demand from the local villagers, the applicant would provide 50 niches free of charge to the local villagers with financial difficulties.

10. As the presentations of PlanD’s representative and the applicant’s representatives were completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

11. Some Members raised the following questions to PlanD’s representatives:

The Site and its surrounding area

- (a) distance from the closest residential uses and whether the residential care home for the elderly (RCHE) to the north of the Site currently provided residential accommodations;
- (b) whether the existing columbarium was an unauthorised development;
- (c) the year when the Site was zoned “GB” and when the structures on the Site were built;
- (d) the location of 三疊潭村 mentioned in a public comment submitted by 三疊潭村居民關注組;
- (e) whether the proposed development would have any adverse impact on the surrounding watercourses;
- (f) whether there were burial grounds for the nearby indigenous villagers living nearby, and if so, the reason why there was demand for niches from the local villagers;
- (g) whether the columbaria in the surrounding religious institutions and temples/monasteries such as Western Monastery (WM) and Yuen Yuen Institute (YYI) were operating on a commercial or non-profit making basis;
- (h) the programme for building the columbarium with 20,000 niches at YYI extension portion that was previously approved by the Board;

Traffic aspect

- (i) clarification on Transport Department (TD)’s comment regarding the traffic management measures implemented by the YYI and how the measures were related to the management plan for the subject columbarium;

Planning and lands control

- (j) rejection reasons of the previous s.12A rezoning application No. Y/TW/9;
- (k) whether ‘Columbarium’ was stipulated as a Column 1 use in other “G/IC”

zones on the OZP;

- (l) should the application be approved, whether there would be any further planning control under the Ordinance;
- (m) whether there would be any precedent effect of approving the application as the application seemed to be a case of ‘build first, apply later’;
- (n) whether there was any land administration concern for including the adjoining government land (about 30% of the site area) as part of the proposed development area;

Management plan and licensing control

- (o) rejection reasons of PCLB in respect of the applicant’s columbarium licence application; and
- (p) control and enforcement of columbarium operations under the licensing mechanism of the Private Columbaria Ordinance (PCO).

12. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, made the following main points:

The Site and its surrounding area

- (a) the Site was about 200m away from the periphery of Lo Wai Village. There was a RCHE in YYI to the north of the Site;
- (b) the columbarium was operating at the Site without planning permission;
- (c) the Site was first zoned “GB” in 1963. The aerial photos in 1964 showed that there were already building structures on the Site and appeared to be similar to the structures currently found on the Site;
- (d) Sam Dip Tam was a watercourse abutting the eastern boundary of the Site. Whilst there was no official record of 三疊潭村, the Tsuen Wan District Office advised that it might refer to the cluster of temporary structures to the southwest of the Site;

- (e) according to the submitted sewerage impact assessment, the columbarium would not have adverse impact on the water quality of the nearby water courses. The Environmental Protection Department and Drainage Services Department had no adverse comment on the application;
- (f) Lo Wai was a recognised village with burial grounds for indigenous villagers;
- (g) the columbaria at WM and YYI were private columbaria but there was no information at hand on whether they were operated on a commercial or non-profit making basis;
- (h) the general building plans for the 20,000 new niches at YYI extension portion were approved in 2013, and the land exchange application was being processed by the Lands Department (LandsD). YYI had not yet applied to PCLB for a licence for those niches;

Traffic aspect

- (i) YYI was located to the north of the Site at the end of Lo Wai Road. In addition to road closure by TD during the Ching Ming and Chung Yeung Festivals periods, special traffic management measures were also voluntarily implemented by YYI. TD considered that as there was no guarantee that YYI would continue to implement the voluntary measures, it was essential for any proposed columbarium development in the area, including the current application, to implement its own traffic management measures. Noting the applicant's traffic management plan, C for T and C of P had no adverse comment on the application;

Planning and lands control

- (j) the previous s.12A rezoning application No. Y/TW/9 was not agreed by the Committee on 17.2.2017 for the reasons that the applicant had failed to demonstrate that the proposed traffic management measures were practical, implementable and enforceable and approval of the application would set

an undesirable precedent leading to cumulative traffic impacts;

- (k) 'Columbarium' was stipulated as a Column 2 use in the MSN for "G/IC" zone for better planning control. For other "G/IC" sub-zones on the subject OZP, 'Columbarium', if any, was also a Column 2 use;
- (l) should the current s.12A application be agreed by the Committee, PlanD would proceed to the statutory plan making process under the Ordinance by incorporating the zoning amendment on the OZP when opportunity arose. After the OZP was amended with 'Columbarium' as a Column 2 use under the "G/IC(10)" zone, the applicant would need to submit a s.16 application for the proposed use. Appropriate approval conditions could then be imposed on the s.16 application by the Committee. If 'Columbarium' was stipulated as a Column 1 use (i.e. always permitted), the applicant could immediately proceed with other building and land procedures. Where a s.16 planning application was required, the statutory time limit for processing such application was two months;
- (m) after the PCO came into effect, operations of columbarium, which required a licence, had been put under its control and FEHD would monitor such operations and carry out enforcement action under PCO as necessary;
- (n) the area of government land within the Site was shown on Plan Z-2 of the Paper. The applicant would need to apply to LandsD for a land exchange which would be processed in accordance with the existing mechanisms;

Management plan and licensing control

- (o) the applicant's application for private columbarium licence was rejected by PCLB on 24.5.2021 mainly on grounds of non-compliance with lands, planning, buildings and fire safety requirements, and unauthorised building structures (UBW) on the Site; and
- (p) FEHD and PCLB would scrutinise and monitor the management/operational measures of a licensed private columbarium

through the management plan (including opening hours, traffic management plan etc.) submitted by the applicants. The Private Columbaria Enforcement Team of FEHD would conduct inspections of licensed private columbaria, especially during the periods of Ching Ming and Chung Yeung Festivals and their shadow periods. If any breach of licensing conditions was found, verbal warning, written warning and/or enforcement notice would be issued to the licensees for rectification.

13. In response to a Member's question, Mr Albert K.L. Cheung, Assistant Director (Regional 1), LandsD, supplemented that in processing land exchange application involving government land, the applicant would be required to surrender his own private lots within the proposed site in exchange for a new grant lot including the government land, which would be subject to a new set of terms and conditions. However, there was no guarantee that land exchange application involving adjoining government land would be approved.

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

- (a) background of the applicant;
- (b) the number of niches provided on the Site over the years, and whether there was any sale of unoccupied niches since 2010;
- (c) how the 50 niches to be offered free of charge would be allocated to the local villagers;
- (d) whether re-sale of niches amongst private parties was allowed;
- (e) arrangement for the niches that had been sold during the redevelopment;
- (f) expected selling price of niches;
- (g) any change in opening hours before and after the proposed redevelopment;
and
- (h) whether the UBW reported in 2016 had been demolished.

15. In response, Mr John H.Y. Yip, the applicant's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) the applicant was a private company and was not a religious organisation. The existing structure was originally an ancestral hall and was later bought by the applicant for conversion to columbarium use;
- (b) not a large number of niches were sold between 2010 and 2013. As of 2014, a total of 284 niches were sold. Since then, they had not sold any niches;
- (c) after consulting the local villagers, the applicant noted that there was local need for niches and 50 niches would be offered free of charge to the local villagers who had financial difficulties;
- (d) according to their sales agreement, the niches were not allowed to be sold amongst private parties, and niches which were no longer required had to be returned to the applicant for their further disposal;
- (e) for the 284 niches that had been sold, only 103 had ashes interred. After their licence application was rejected by PCLB, the applicant had requested the concerned family members to collect and remove the ashes temporarily. After the redevelopment, those niches could be re-interred in the new niches; and
- (f) according their record, niches were sold at a price ranging from a few thousand dollars to about \$20,000 in around 2010. The price to be charged for other niches after the redevelopment could not be determined at the current stage as it would depend on the land premium.

16. In response, Mr Kim K.O. Chan, the applicant's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) indigenous villagers also needed to pay for burial within the burial grounds, hence, there was still a demand for niches from the local villagers with financial difficulties;

- (b) at present, there was no restriction on opening hours. After the redevelopment, the proposed columbarium would be open from 9:00am to 5:30pm daily and visit would be by appointment. It would be closed on both Ching Ming and Chung Yeung Festival days and the two weekends before and after. Those proposed opening hours and visit by appointment proposal were stated in the management plan, which TD had no adverse comment on; and
- (c) the UBWs involving a retaining wall and a five-storey structure had been demolished. The remaining unauthorised structure was the existing structure with the niches and it could not be demolished until the interred ashes were collected by the concerned family members.

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung join the meeting during the question and answer session.]

17. As the applicant's representatives had no further points to raise and there were no further questions from Members, the Chairman informed the applicant's representatives that the hearing procedure for the application had been completed and the Committee would deliberate on the application in their absence and inform the applicant of the Committee's decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the representatives from PlanD and the applicant for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

18. Some Members did not support the application for the following reasons:
- (a) it was a case of 'build first, apply later' and involved unauthorised uses/structures under the planning, building and lands regimes. Approval of such case would set an undesirable precedent for similar columbarium developments implemented without complying with the relevant regulations or ordinances;
 - (b) the columbarium use might not be compatible with uses in the surroundings, including the RCHEs;

- (c) the applicant had not provided strong justifications for rezoning the Site from “GB” to “G/IC”; and
- (d) the 3,000 niches proposed would create substantial traffic impacts.

19. More Members had no in-principle objection to the application for the following reasons:

- (a) the application would help address the severe shortage of private columbaria in the territory;
- (b) the proposed columbarium was considered compatible with the surroundings with a number of columbaria and RCHEs;
- (c) the management plan submitted by the applicant was considered acceptable by C for T and C of P, which considered that the columbarium would not create adverse traffic impact on the surrounding area;
- (d) the Site, although zoned “GB”, was not a green site and had some building structures erected thereat since 1964 when it was zoned “GB”; and
- (e) ‘Columbarium’ use should be put under Column 2 of the proposed zoning such that the development details and other technical aspects of the proposed columbarium development, including traffic management plan, opening hours etc., would be further considered by the Board under a s.16 application.

20. A Member further expressed concern that the applicant’s procrastination of not dealing with the illegal building and land matters pertaining to the Site was not desirable and there was need for timely enforcement actions. In response, the Secretary said that government departments would undertake enforcement actions under their respective purviews according to the established mechanisms.

21. The Chairman summarised that more Members considered that the application could be partially agreed to and ‘Columbarium’ should be a Column 2 use under the new

zoning. The development details and other technical aspects of the proposed columbarium development would be subject to the scrutiny of the Committee in the s.16 planning application stage.

22. After deliberation, the Committee decided to partially agree to the application to rezone the Site to an appropriate zoning with ‘Columbarium’ as a Column 2 use. Amendments to the Tsuen Wan OZP, together with the revised Notes and Explanatory Statement, would be submitted to the Committee for consideration prior to gazetting under section 5 of the Ordinance.

[Mr Daniel K.S. Lau left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 4

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/TW/524 Renewal of Planning Approval for Temporary Shop and Services (Real Estate Agency) for a Period of 3 Years in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, Workshop No.52, G/F, Wing Fung Industrial Building, 40-50 Sha Tsui Road, Tsuen Wan, New Territories
(MPC Paper No. A/TW/524)

23. The Secretary reported that the application site was located in Tsuen Wan. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Tsuen Wan; and

Professor John C.Y. Ng - his spouse owning a flat in Tsuen Wan.

24. As the properties owned by the company of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi’s spouse and the property owned by Professor John C.Y. Ng’s spouse had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

25. The Committee noted that the application was for renewal of planning approval for temporary shop and services (real estate agency) for a period of three years. During the statutory publication period, two public comments including one supporting comment from a member of Tsuen Wan West Area Committee and one objecting comment from an individual were received.

26. The Committee noted that the Planning Department had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. The approval conditions under the previously approved application had been complied with. The application was generally in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 22D and 34C. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. To address the comments of the Director of Fire Services on fire safety, approval conditions and advisory clause on fire safety measures were recommended.

27. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application on a temporary basis for a period of three years and be renewed from 4.7.2021 to 3.7.2024 on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission was subject to the following conditions :

- “(a) the submission and implementation of the fire safety measures including provision of separate means of escape and fire service installations and equipment within 6 months from the date of commencement of the renewed planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board by 4.1.2022; and
- (b) if the above planning condition (a) was not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given should cease to have effect and should on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

28. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix V of the Paper.

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai left the meeting at this point.]

[Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District (STP/TWK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K5/830 Proposed Religious Institution (Church) in “Residential (Group A) 7”
Zone, G/F (Portion) and 1/F, 232 Fuk Wing Street, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/830B)

Presentation and Question Sessions

29. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed religious institution (church);
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, one public comment from an individual expressing concerns on the application was received. Major views were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. While the proposed use might not be entirely in line with the planning intention of the “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) zone, it was considered not incompatible with the existing kindergarten on G/F and the residential use above the podium of the building. The proposed use was also considered not incompatible with the surrounding developments and would unlikely cause adverse impacts on the surrounding areas. Concerned

government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. To address the comment of the Director of Fire Services, an approval condition on fire safety measures was recommended. Regarding the public comment received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

30. A Member asked whether the planning permission, if granted, would control the type of religious institution that could be operated in the premises. In response, Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK, said that the applicant was a Christian church seeking planning permission to operate a church use at the premises. Any planning permission granted would also allow other organisations to operate a church thereat.

31. The Chairman remarked that even if there were changes to the operator, as long as there was no material change to the use as a church, the planning permission if granted would remain valid.

Deliberation Session

32. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 25.6.2025, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for fire-fighting before operation of the proposed use to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB; and
- (b) if the above planning condition (a) was not complied with before operation of the proposed use, the approval hereby given should cease to have effect and should on the same date be revoked without further notice.”

33. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix IV of the Paper.

[The Chairman thanked Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho, STP/TWK, for her attendance to answer Members' enquiries. She left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K5/832 Proposed Industrial Use (Dangerous Goods Store) in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business (2)" Zone, Portion of Workshop A6, 1/F, Block A, Hong Kong Industrial Centre, 489-491 Castle Peak Road, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/832A)

34. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 10.6.2021 deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had not submitted further information as more time was required to prepare technical assessment to address departmental comments.

35. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information. Since it was the second deferment and a total of four months had been allowed for preparation of the submission of further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H3/442 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction for Permitted Office, Shop and Services and Eating Place Uses in “Commercial” Zone, 92-103A Connaught Road West and 91, 99 and 101 Des Voeux Road West, Sheung Wan, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H3/442A)

36. The Secretary reported that application site was located in Sheung Wan. Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP) and Ronald Lu & Partners (RLP) were two of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - | having current business dealings with ARUP and RLP; |
| Mr Franklin Yu | - | having current business dealings with ARUP; |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - | his former firm had business dealings with ARUP and RLP; and |
| Dr Roger C.K. Chan | - | his spouse owning a flat in Sheung Wan. |

37. The Committee noted that the applicant had requested deferment of consideration of the application and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting while Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As Mr Franklin Yu had no involvement in the application and the property owned by Dr Roger C.K. Chan’s spouse had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

38. The Committee noted that the applicant’s representative requested on 11.6.2021

deferment of consideration of the application for two months so as to allow more time to prepare further information to address departmental comments. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to respond to departmental comments.

39. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information. Since it was the second deferment and a total of four months had been allowed for preparation of the submission of further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 8

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/H5/413	Proposed Flat with Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction in “Residential (Group A)”, “Residential (Group C)” Zones and area shown as ‘Road’, 31 - 36 Sau Wa Fong, Wan Chai, Hong Kong
----------	---

40. The Secretary reported that consideration of the application had been re-scheduled.

[Mr Rico W.K. Tsang, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong District (STP/HK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 9

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/H15/285 Proposed School (Kindergarten and Nursery) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business (1)” Zone, 2/F of an Office Building at Aberdeen Inland Lot No. 360, Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H15/285A)

41. The Secretary reported that Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Limited (LD) and AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) were two of the consultants of the applicant. Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had declared an interest on the item for having current business dealings with AECOM and past business dealings with LD.

42. The Committee noted that Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

43. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Rico W.K. Tsang, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) proposed school (kindergarten and nursery);
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 8 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, a total of 21 public comments were received, including 18 supporting comments from individuals, and 3 objecting comments from a member of Southern District Council and individuals. Major views were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper; and
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)’s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper. The proposed school was acceptable from land use planning perspective,

and not incompatible with other floor uses within the same building and surrounding developments. A mandatory school bus policy, provision of exclusive lift and staggering school hours with specific traffic arrangement during the school bus arrival/dismissal periods would be adopted to minimise potential traffic impact on public roads and to enhance students' safety. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. To address the technical concerns/requirements of relevant government departments, an approval condition on the submission and implementation of a detailed traffic management plan with road safety measures was recommended. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

44. Some Members raised the following questions :

- (a) noting that students needed to walk through the dedicated pedestrian route at the car parking floor and cross over the run-in/run-out of the building to access the Premises, whether there was an alternative route that would better ensure students' safety;
- (b) noting that some public comments had raised concern that the application premises (the Premises) located in the industrial area was not suitable for the proposed school, whether there were similar applications for kindergarten use with similar site context;
- (c) the current distribution of kindergartens in the area and where future students were expected to reside;
- (d) clarifications on the mandatory school bus requirements; and
- (e) whether there would be sufficient activity space for students in the premises.

45. In response, Mr Rico W.K. Tsang, STP/HK, made the following main points:

- (a) the applicant proposed a dedicated pedestrian route and an exclusive lift for students to commute between the school bus drop-off area on G/F and the Premises on 2/F as shown in Drawing A-3 of the Paper. There appeared to be no direct access from the school bus drop-off area to the lobby/escalators of the office building. The applicant advised that the pedestrian route proposed and the use of the exclusive lift for access to the Premises was the most feasible route and they would arrange staffs to guide and assist the students. If the exclusive lift was not in operation, students could access the Premises by the fireman's lift, stairs or via the main entrance of the building;
- (b) there was no similar application for kindergarten use within "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" zone;
- (c) there were 21 existing kindergartens in the planning area which were mainly located in Aberdeen and Ap Lei Chau, and there were only two international kindergartens in Wong Chuk Hang. The residential development under construction in phases near the Wong Chuk Hang MTR Station would have some 10,000 population with a total of 5,200 flats (of which about 2,000 flats would be completed by 2024), and there would likely be local demand for kindergartens arising from the new population;
- (d) all students, except those living within walking distance or opted to take public transport, were required to take school bus to/from the proposed kindergarten; and
- (e) the Premises had a total floor area of about 790m² and would accommodate a maximum of 112 students each at the morning and afternoon sessions. The relevant requirement of Education Bureau to allow a minimum floor area of 1.8m² per student would be met. There would be four classrooms and a play area of some 300m². The Secretary for Education had no adverse view on the provision of kindergarten at the Premises.

Deliberation Session

46. A Member considered that it was not suitable to provide a kindergarten within an industrial area, while other Members generally considered that the proposed kindergarten in the subject office building was acceptable from land use compatibility perspective. Another Member further remarked that kindergarten uses within business/industrial areas might be convenient for working parents.

47. Some Members expressed concerns that the dedicated pedestrian route might not be desirable for students' safety and needed to be further considered. In that regard, Members noted that an approval condition on submission and implementation of a detailed traffic management plan with road safety measures to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) and Commissioner of Police was recommended in the Paper. Mr Patrick K.H. Ho, Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban), Transport Department said that the safety of students was of utmost concern. Whilst it appeared that an alternative pedestrian route might not be easy to be identified, management measures including deployment of school staff could be explored by the applicant when submitting the detailed traffic management plan with road safety measures under the approval condition.

48. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 25.6.2025, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following condition:

“the submission and implementation of a detailed traffic management plan with road safety measures to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport and Commissioner of Police, or of the TPB.”

49. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix III of the Paper.

Agenda Item 10

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/H18/86 Proposed Utility Installation for Private Project (Utility Pipelines) in
 “Green Belt” Zone and area shown as ‘Road’, 9 Big Wave Bay Road,
 Shek O, Hong Kong
 (MPC Paper No. A/H18/86)

50. The Secretary reported that KTA Planning Limited (KTA), LWK & Partners (HK) Limited (LWK) and Gammon Engineering Construction Company Limited (which was a subsidiary of Gammon Construction Limited (Gammon)) were three of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - | being the Chief Executive of Gammon; |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - | his former firm had business dealings with LWK and Gammon; and |
| Mr Daniel K.S. Lau | - | being a member and an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society which had business dealings with KTA. |

51. The Committee noted that Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting and Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and Daniel K.S. Lau had already left the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

52. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Rico W.K. Tsang, STP/HK, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed utility installation for private project (utility pipelines);

- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication period, one objecting comment from an individual was received. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper;
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper. Given that the proposal was small in scale, mainly falling within a paved driveway and was to serve the adjoining residential development, the proposed utility installation was not envisaged to have significant geotechnical, environmental, visual and landscape impacts. Except for the meter cabinet, the proposed utility pipelines would be laid underground, which was considered not incompatible with the surrounding environment. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. The application complied with the relevant assessment criteria laid down in the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 10. Regarding the public comment received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

53. In response to a Member's question, Mr Rico W.K. Tsang, STP/HK, said that the laying of utility pipelines for private project within "Green Belt" zone required planning permission from the Board. In the subject application, all proposed utility pipelines, except the meter cabinet, would be laid underground.

Deliberation Session

54. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board. The permission should be valid until 25.6.2025, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed.

55. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix IV of the Paper.

[The Chairman thanked Mr Rico W.K. Tsang, STP/HK, for his attendance to answer Members' enquiries. He left the meeting at this point.]

[Ms Katy C.M. Fung, District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K) and Ms Helen H.Y. Chan, Senior Town Planner/ Kowloon District (STP/K), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 11

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K22/30 Proposed Comprehensive Development including Flat (Subsidised Sale Flats), Shop and Services and Eating Place in "Comprehensive Development Area (5)" Zone, Kai Tak Area 2B Site 1, Kowloon (MPC Paper No. A/K22/30A)

56. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Kai Tak. The application was submitted by the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) and Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA) (renamed to KTA Planning Limited) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|--------------------|---|---|
| Mr Ivan M.K. Chung | - | being an ex-officio member of the Supervisory Board of HKHS; |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - | his former firm had business dealings with HKHS; |
| Mr Daniel K.S. Lau | - | being a member and an ex-employee of the HKHS, and HKHS had business dealings with KTA; and |

Dr Sunny C.W. Cheung - owning a flat in Kai Tak.

57. The Committee noted that Messrs Daniel K.S. Lau and Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As the interest of Mr Ivan M.K. Chung (the Chairman) was direct and the property owned by Dr Sunny C.W. Cheung had direct view of the Site, they were invited to leave the meeting temporarily for this item.

[Mr Ivan M.K. Chung and Dr Sunny C.W. Cheung left the meeting at this point.]

58. Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung, the Vice-chairman, took over the chairmanship at this point.

Presentation and Question Sessions

59. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Helen H.Y. Chan, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed comprehensive development including flat (subsidised sale flats), shop and services and eating place;
- (c) departmental comments were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper;
- (d) during the statutory publication periods, five public comments including three objecting comments from the Owners Committee of One Kai Tak (II) and individuals, and two comments providing views on the application from Kowloon City Redevelopment Concern Group and an individual were received. Major views were set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper;
- (e) the Planning Department (PlanD)'s views – PlanD had no objection to the application based on the assessments set out in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The proposal was generally in line with the planning intention of the

“Comprehensive Development Area (5)” zone and complied with the development restrictions under the Notes of the zone. The proposed development had adopted various responsive urban design measures meeting the requirements set out in the Planning Brief (PB) for a compatible and congruous development with the surrounding settings, including the Lung Tsun Stone Bridge Preservation Corridor (LTSBPC) and Station Square. The retail belt with cantilever and colonnade design generally followed the design requirements set out in the PB. A permeable and welcoming entrance space was proposed on G/F for an attractive interface between the Site and LTSBPC. The size of colonnade column above Shatin-Central Link Tunnel, retail frontage length abutting the Station Square and the location of loading/unloading (L/UL) bays were three design variations from the PB requirements. As regards the interface of the proposed development with LTSBPC and the Station Square, the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) and Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) had no adverse comments. The Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) had no objection to the application after reviewing the impact assessment on cultural heritage and the mitigation measures proposed. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape (CTP/UD&L), PlanD considered that the proposed development with mitigation measures incorporated would not generate significant adverse air ventilation impact on the overall pedestrian wind environment. Other concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. To address the technical concerns/requirements of relevant government departments, appropriate approval conditions were recommended. Regarding the public comments received, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

[Mr Stanley T.S. Choi left the meeting at this point.]

60. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) why the design of the retail belt was rather monotonous, and whether there were any visual and physical connections between the Site and the

LTSBPC and Station Square;

- (b) how the development could complement the heritage ambience of the LTSBPC;
- (c) whether there were any proposed measures to protect the cultural heritage of LTSBPC during the construction and operation stages;
- (d) whether the landscape area within the Site was for private or public use;
- (e) what the roof top structures were on the residential towers shown on Plan A-7 of the Paper;
- (f) pedestrian connections with adjacent sites and the MTR stations;
- (g) whether the number of parking spaces and L/UL bays proposed was appropriate given the proximity of the Site to the MTR station, as raised in a public comment; and
- (h) why some transport facilities were located on the ground floor rather than in the basement.

61. In response, Ms Katy C.M. Fung, DPO/K, made the following main points:

- (a) as required by the PB, the retail belt would adopt responsive building design features, cantilever with more open and permeable design would be adopted at the façade fronting LTSBPC, while colonnade design would be adopted at the façade fronting the Station Square. A 3m-wide covered and unobstructed pedestrian passageway, with timber paving, would be provided along the boundaries abutting LTSBPC and Station Square. An entrance space of 9m-wide would be provided on G/F of the retail belt at the side facing LTSBPC. Another pedestrian connection point would also be provided to connect the lower ground floor of the LTSBPC and the underground shopping street. The applicant had not provided detailed information but the residential portion and retail belt would appear to be largely segregated by a wall;

- (b) the design for the Site to complement the LTSBPC, which was being implemented by ArchSD, generally complied with the requirements set out in the PB. The residential towers were setback from the LTSBPC by 15m to 60m and would be less imposing on the heritage corridor. The detailed design could be further refined through the applicant's submission to comply with the approval conditions regarding the submission of Landscape Master Plan (LMP) and design and implementation of the retail belt to the satisfaction of relevant government departments, including CTP/UD&L, PlanD and ArchSD, should the application be approved;
- (c) AMO had no objection to the application after reviewing the impact assessment on cultural heritage. During the operation stage, the design requirements to complement the heritage ambience of the LTSBPC would follow those under the PB. During the construction stage, the impact of excavation and foundation works had been assessed and protection measures were proposed to protect the bridge remnants. An approval condition on implementation of mitigation measures to protect the cultural heritage to the satisfaction of AMO was suggested. According to CEDD's investigation conducted in 2008/2009, no other remnants of LTSBPC were identified. If any remnants were found during the construction stage, they would be dealt with following AMO's established practice;
- (d) the landscape area within the Site would be a private open space for residents of the proposed housing development and would not be open for public use;
- (e) the roof top structures shown on Plan A-7 of the Paper were mainly for E&M facilities as well as lift-hood structures;
- (f) the Site was connected to both the Kai Tak and Sung Wong Toi MTR Stations by the planned open spaces at Station Square and Sung Wong Toi Park respectively. In the Site as well as in the adjacent sites for public housing, there would be a retail belt with colonnade design along Station Square that would provide weather protection for pedestrians;

- (g) the provision of parking spaces and L/UL bays was in line with the requirement of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines and TD had no comment in that regard; and
- (h) all of the parking spaces for private cars and goods vehicles would be provided at the basement level. As the extent of excavation and size of the basement was restricted due to the need to avoid encroachment of the Shatin-Central Link tunnel at the southern portion of the Site, there was insufficient space in the basement and the L/UL bays had to be provided above ground at the southern portion of the Site.

Deliberation Session

62. Members had no objection to the application as the proposed scheme generally complied with the planning and design requirements stipulated under the PB. However, some Members raised concerns on the monotonous design with a long strip of retail belt abutting the LTSBPC and Station Square. There were also insufficient visual and physical connections between LTSBPC and the Site especially the at-grade landscape area within the proposed development. In response, the Secretary said that Members' concern on the need to enhance the visual and physical connection between the Site, particularly the proposed landscaped area for the residents within the housing development, and the LTSBPC could be addressed when considering the submission of LMP in compliance with the relevant approval condition. As suggested by some Members, an advisory clause might also be added requesting the applicant to refine the design of the retail belt to better harmonise with the LTSBPC and enhance the visual and physical connections between the Site, particularly the landscaped area for the residents, and the LTSBPC.

63. A Member said that as the Site was directly abutting the LTSBPC, AMO should be more involved to ensure a harmonious design that was compatible with the heritage ambience. Members noted that ArchSD had made available to the public design drawings of the LTSBPC and an approval condition on the implementation of the mitigation measures to protect the cultural heritage identified in the Environmental Assessment to the satisfaction of AMO was recommended. The Secretary supplemented that AMO's advice on protection and enhancement of the heritage of LTSBPC had been sought and incorporated into the PB to guide the design of future developments abutting the LRSBPC. The design interface of the

proposed development with the LTSBPC could be further fine tuned by the applicant through submissions for compliance with relevant approval conditions.

64. A Member suggested that consideration should be given to providing more weather protected pedestrian passageways connecting different sites, including the subject Site, other sites in Kai Tak and the MTR stations. Members noted that the Station Square and the adjacent public open space would be subject to detailed design to be undertaken by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD), and PlanD could convey Members' comments to LCSD accordingly.

65. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application and the Master Layout Plan under sections 4A and 16 of the Ordinance, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The permission should be valid until 25.6.2025, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the following conditions:

- “(a) the submission and implementation of a revised Master Layout Plan, taking into account the approval conditions (b) to (l) below to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (b) the submission and implementation of a revised Landscape Master Plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the TPB;
- (c) the implementation of the mitigation measures to protect the cultural heritage as identified in the Environmental Assessment to the satisfaction of Antiquities and Monuments Office or of the TPB;
- (d) the design and implementation of retail belt to the satisfaction of the Director of Architectural Services or of the TPB;
- (e) the provision of fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the TPB;

- (f) the submission of a revised Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (g) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/sewerage connection works as identified in the revised Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the TPB;
- (h) the submission of a revised Noise Impact Assessment and the implementation of the noise mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection or of the TPB;
- (i) the submission of a revised Traffic Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (j) the design and provision of vehicular access, parking spaces, loading/unloading facilities to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB;
- (k) the design and implementation of the junction improvement works, as proposed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the TPB; and
- (l) the submission of implementation programme indicating the timing and phasing of the proposed development to the satisfaction of Director of Planning or to the TPB.”

66. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out at Appendix V of the Paper with the following additional advisory clause:

“the applicant is encouraged to refine the design of the retail belt to better harmonise with the Lung Tsun Stone Bridge Preservation Corridor (LTSBPC) and enhance the visual and physical connections between the site, particularly the landscape area for the residents, and the LTSBPC.”

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung left the meeting during the deliberation session.]

[The Vice-chairman thanked Ms Katy C.M. Fung and Ms Helen H.Y. Chan, STP/K, for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 12

Any Other Business

67. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 1:00 p.m.