

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 781<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 23.1.2026**

#### **Present**

Director of Planning Mr C.K. Yip	Chairperson
Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong	Vice-chairperson
Mr Stanley T.S. Choi	
Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu	
Professor Roger C.K. Chan	
Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui	
Dr Tony C.M. Ip	
Professor Simon K.L. Wong	
Mr Derrick S.M. Yip	
Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong, Transport Department Mr Horace W. Hong	
Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory South), Environmental Protection Department Ms Marlene Y.H. Ho	

Assistant Director/Regional 1,  
Lands Department  
Ms Catherine W.S. Pang

Deputy Director of Planning/District  
Ms Donna Y.P. Tam

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Chief Engineer (Works),  
Home Affairs Department  
Mr Bond C.P. Chow

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board  
Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Anny P.K. Tang

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Ophelia C.M. Wong

**Agenda Item 1**

**Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 780<sup>th</sup> MPC Meeting**

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 780<sup>th</sup> MPC meeting conducted by way of circulation of papers to all Members were confirmed without amendment.

**Agenda Item 2**

**Matters Arising**

[Open Meeting]

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

### **Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

[Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK), Mr Michael K.K. Cheung, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), Ms Jacqueline Y.H. Chan, Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (TP/TWK), and Mr Spencer K.T. Leung, Town Planning Graduate/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 3**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TW/39  
(MPC Paper No. 1/26)

---

3. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments to the Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) were to take forward two section 12A (s.12A) applications (No. Y/TW/19 and Y/TW/18) partially agreed by the Metro Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Town Planning Board (the Board). The application sites were located in Tsuen Wan. For application No. Y/TW/19 (Amendment Item A), Aurecon Hong Kong Limited was one of the consultants of the applicants. For application No. Y/TW/18 (Amendment Item B1), the application was submitted by Scarborough Development Limited, which was a subsidiary of Far East Consortium International Limited, with Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) and Singular Studio Limited as two of the consultants of the applicant. 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;
	- worked with a manager of Far East Consortium International Limited for serving a youth organisation;
Professor Simon K.L. Wong	- his company owning a property in Tsuen Wan;

Dr Tony C.M. Ip	- his firm having current business dealings with Aurecon Hong Kong Limited and past business dealings with Arup;
Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan	- worked with the founder and director of Singular Studio Limited in the Tender Committee of the Hong Kong Housing Authority; and
Mr Horace W. Hong	- owning a flat in Tsuen Wan.

4. The Committee noted that Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting and Professor Simon K.L. Wong had not yet joined the meeting. As the properties owned by the company of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi's spouse, the company of Professor Simon K.L. Wong and Mr Horace W. Hong had no direct view of the two amendment items, the other interest declared by Mr Stanley T.S. Choi was considered indirect, and Dr Tony C.M. Ip had no involvement in the amendment items, the Committee agreed that they could join/stay in the meeting.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

5. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Michael K.K. Cheung, STP/TWK, brief Members on the background of the proposed amendments to the OZP, the technical considerations and departmental comments as detailed in the Paper. The proposed amendments mainly included:

- (a) Amendment Item A – rezoning of a site from “Green Belt” (“GB”) and “Village Type Development” to “Residential (Group B) 9” (“R(B)9”) subject to a maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 34,722m<sup>2</sup>, of which not less than 5,400m<sup>2</sup> should be provided for government, institution and community (GIC) facilities, a maximum building height (BH) of 150mPD and the provision of a non-building area in the northwestern portion and a public vehicle park;
  
- (b) Amendment Item B1 – rezoning a site from “GB” and “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “R(B)10” (Item B1 Site) subject to a maximum GFA of 28,395m<sup>2</sup>, of which not less than 2,719m<sup>2</sup> should be

provided for GIC facilities, and a maximum BH of 180mPD; and

(c) Amendment Item B2 – rezoning of a site from “GB” to “G/IC” between the northern boundary of the Item B1 Site and the adjacent “G/IC” zone to rationalise the zoning boundaries.

6. There were also amendments to the Notes of the OZP in relation to the above rezoning and other specific zones, as well as amendments to the covering Notes.

[Professor Simon K.L. Wong, Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui joined the meeting during PlanD’s presentation.]

7. As the presentation of Planning Department (PlanD)’s representative had been completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

*Amendment Item A*

8. Noting that according to the notional scheme under the partially agreed s.12A application, there was an underground on-site sewage treatment plant (STP) at the basement of the residential care home for the elderly (RCHE) block, a Member enquired about the management and maintenance (M&M) arrangement for the STP as the RCHE and the residential towers might be under different ownership. In response, Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, DPO/TWK, said that according to the information from the applicant, the location of the proposed STP would be subject to detailed design. That said, there would be separate accesses for the RCHE and STP. The M&M arrangement for the STP would be considered in the preparation of the Deed of Mutual Covenant at the implementation stage and the cost could be apportioned proportionally between the RCHE and residential portions.

*Amendment Item B1*

9. In response to a Member’s enquiry on the partially agreed s.12A application in relation to Amendment Item B1, Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, DPO/TWK, explained that both s.12A applications under Amendment Items A and B1 were partially agreed by the Committee and appropriate revisions to the applicants’ proposed Notes and Explanatory Statement of the OZP

were made. For Amendment Item B1, as mentioned in paragraph 4.9 of the Paper, the following restrictions were stipulated in the Notes of the OZP, which were in line with the prevailing practice: (i) a total GFA restriction instead of a domestic GFA restriction as proposed by the applicant; (ii) a minimum GFA requirement for the provision of GIC facilities; and (iii) GIC facilities as Government Accommodation might be disregarded from GFA calculation while those which were privately-operated would be GFA accountable.

10. A Member raised the following questions on the Item B1 Site:

- (a) given the elongated configuration of the site, whether there would be any outdoor recreation area for the enjoyment of RCHE users;
- (b) details of the compensatory tree planting; and
- (c) noting that the site was located next to Yau Kom Tau Fresh Water Service Reservoir, whether there were any plans to revitalise the rooftop for public use and whether any access would be required via the site.

11. In response, Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, DPO/TWK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the indicative scheme proposed by the applicant, the garden on 1/F of the proposed development would be opened for the enjoyment of RCHE users;
- (b) most of the trees within the Item B1 Site would be removed and compensatory trees and shrubs would be planted mainly along the proposed access road leading to the site with the remaining trees planted at multi-levels of the site; and
- (c) access to Yau Kom Tau Fresh Water Service Reservoir was via Yau Kom Tau Water Treatment Works. Public uses atop the service reservoir would be subject to the arrangements of relevant government departments and it might be possible to provide access to the service reservoir via the proposed

access road outside the Item B1 site.

*“G/IC(9)” Zone*

12. In response to a Member’s enquiry regarding the justifications for incorporating ‘Driving School’, ‘Place of Entertainment’ and ‘Private Club’ as Column 2 uses under Schedule III of the “G/IC” zone (i.e. for the “G/IC(9)” zone), Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, DPO/TWK, said that the Board had, during the hearing for representations for a site near one of the “G/IC(9)” zones, suggested PlanD to explore the possibility of allowing longer-term uses to take place in the “G/IC(9)” zone. To this end, the aforesaid three uses had taken reference from the MSN for the “G/IC” zone and were proposed to be included as Column 2 uses for the “G/IC(9)” zone, as appropriate. Relevant government departments were consulted and considered that no insurmountable adverse impacts were anticipated and possible interface issues could be addressed through planning application under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance.

*Covering Notes Related to Small Unmanned Aircraft (SUA) Take-off and Landing Facilities*

13. Noting that Tsuen Wan was predominantly a residential area, a Member enquired about the potential impacts of the proposed SUA take-off and landing facilities on the surrounding area, Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, DPO/TWK, with the aid a PowerPoint slide, said that the covering Notes of the OZP, *inter alia*, stipulated uses/developments that were always permitted within the boundaries of the OZP, and the current amendment to the covering Notes of the OZP would allow provision, maintenance or repair of SUA take-off and landing facilities to be always permitted within the boundaries of the OZP unless so specified in Column 2 of the Notes of individual zones, so as to facilitate provision of such facilities and related activities and to keep abreast of recent development trends. The same amendment had also been incorporated in the covering Notes of the Ngau Tam Mei OZP considered by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee of the Board in 2025.

14. In response to the Chairperson’s enquiry on the regulation of SUA operations, Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, DPO/TWK, said that there were relevant regulatory orders to regulate SUA operations in Hong Kong. The Chairperson supplemented that issues such as potential noise nuisance, privacy and flight safety would be governed by other relevant regulatory authorities. The provision for SUA take-off and landing facilities on the OZP was to facilitate the emerging

low-altitude economy in the long term.

15. In response to a Member's enquiry about whether there were any site selection criteria for SUA related facilities, Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, DPO/TWK, said that uses incorporated in the covering Notes of the OZP were permitted within the boundaries of the OZP unless so specified in Column 2 of the Notes of individual zones. The site selection criteria would be governed by relevant regulations. The proposed amendment to the covering Notes was to maximise flexibility in planning terms to facilitate the low-altitude economy. The Chairperson added that locations such as building rooftops or open area such as parks might be considered for these facilities. The proposed amendment was to provide planning flexibility for SUA operations, with their implementation to be regulated under the Government's comprehensive mechanism.

16. Members generally supported the proposed amendments to the OZP. The Chairperson remarked that should the Committee agree with the proposed amendments, the draft OZP would be gazetted for public inspection for 2 months and the representation received, if any, would be submitted to the Board for consideration.

17. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TW/39 and that the draft Tsuen Wan OZP No. S/TW/39A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/TW/40 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of the Paper are suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance); and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Attachment IV of the Paper for the draft Tsuen Wan OZP No. S/TW/39A (to be renumbered to S/TW/40 upon exhibition) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Town Planning Board (the Board) for various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES will be published together with the OZP.”

18. Members noted that as a general practice, the Secretariat of the Board would undertake detailed checking and refinement of the draft OZP including the Notes and ES, if

appropriate, before their publication under the Ordinance. Any major revisions would be submitted for the Board's consideration.

[The Chairperson thanked PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting. Messrs Steven Y.H. Siu and Frankie H.C. Tsang left the meeting at this point.]

#### **Agenda Item 4**

##### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/TWW/134              Proposed House Development at Plot Ratio of 0.75 in "Residential (Group C)" Zone, Lot 405 in D.D. 399, Castle Peak Road – Ting Kau, Ting Kau, New Territories  
(MPC Paper No. A/TWW/134B)

---

##### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

19.              With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jacqueline Y.H. Chan, TP/TWK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed development, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

20.              Noting that there were retaining wall/man-made slopes between the application site (the Site) and Castle Peak Road to the north, a Member asked the following questions:

- (a) whether the slopes were maintained by the Government or by the private owner;
- (b) given the close proximity of the proposed development to the slopes (approximately 1.8m), whether the stability of the slopes and the proposed bridge access had been confirmed and whether there was sufficient space for future inspection and maintenance; and
- (c) whether it would be permissible for the ownership of the proposed 2-storey

house to be stratified in future, resulting in separate access arrangements, i.e. residents on 1/F being able to access the building via the bridge and residents on G/F via the main access.

21. In response, Mr Michael K.K. Cheung, STP/TWK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the slopes/retaining features abutting the Site were situated on government land and held under Short Term Tenancy (STT), with the applicant as one of the tenants. The slopes/retaining features were mainly maintained by the applicant;
- (b) regarding slope stability, the applicant had submitted a Geotechnical Planning Review Report and the Geotechnical Engineering Office of the Civil Engineering and Development Department and Slope Maintenance Section of the Lands Department had no adverse comment on the application from geotechnical perspective. The applicant was required to submit a geotechnical assessment at the general building plan (GBP) submission stage to ensure slope safety; and
- (c) according to the applicant, the current proposal was for a 2-storey house for one family. Should the ownership of the 2-storey house be stratified in the future, the access arrangement would be formulated by the landowner in consultation with concerned government departments. Apart from the bridge access connecting to 1/F of the proposed house, there were two public footpaths/staircases at the eastern and western sides outside the Site providing access to the proposed development.

#### Deliberation Session

22. The Chairperson remarked that according to the Notes of the Outline Zoning Plan for the subject “Residential (Group C)” zone, an increase in maximum plot ratio might be permitted upon application provided that the noise impact from Castle Peak Road on the proposed development would be mitigated. As this issue had been addressed by the applicant,

relevant government departments had no in-principle objection to the application.

23. A Member shared a past experience regarding the development of a 2-storey building with stratified ownership, where the building configuration was similar to that of the current application. There was dispute over the management and maintenance responsibilities for a slope located on adjacent government land. The Committee noted that whether the applicant would stratify the ownership of the building in the future or not should not be a material planning consideration for the application.

24. The Chairperson said that the proposed bridge access might also be provided for slope maintenance. Noting that there was no provision for slope maintenance in the land lease of the Site and the maintenance responsibility for the slopes/retaining structures under the STT rested with the tenant, the Chairperson said that the future slope maintenance issues could be addressed through the land administration mechanism.

25. 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 23.1.2030, 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 Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

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

## **Hong Kong District**

[Ms Erica S.M. Wong, Ms Maggie H.K. Wu and Mr Elton H.T. Chung, Senior Town Planners/Hong Kong (STPs/HK), Ms Natalie S.M. Yim, Ms Gloria Y.L. Sze and Mr Jacky C.L. Lee, Town Planners/Hong Kong (TPs/HK), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

## **Agenda Item 5**

## Section 16 Application

## [Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H1/105 Proposed Religious Institution (Church) with Permitted Shop and Services in “Residential (Group A)” Zone, Shops 2 and 3 on G/F, 1/F and 2/F (Portion), Dragonfair Garden, 455-485 Queen’s Road West, Hong Kong

(MPC Paper No. A/H1/105)

## Presentation and Question Sessions

26. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Natalie S.M. Yim, TP/HK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed use, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

27. Members had no question on the application.

## Deliberation Session

28. The Chairperson remarked that the Committee had considered a number of applications for religious institution use located on the non-domestic podium of composite commercial/residential buildings. The key planning considerations for such applications included the provision of separate access to avoid disturbance to residents and any significant traffic impact. As those concerns had been addressed by the applicant, the proposal was considered generally acceptable by relevant government departments.

29. In response to a Member's enquiry regarding the comments of the Secretary for Home and Youth Affairs (SHYA) that the applicant was a "bona fide religious organisation", the Committee noted that SHYA was responsible for liaising with religious groups and played a coordinating role in local religious affairs. While adhering to the principle of non-intervention in the freedom of religion, SHYA verified the status of the religious group under the current application based on information available on the religion, branches, activities and services involved, etc.

30. Noting from the floor plan (Drawing A-3 of the Paper) that the applicant proposed a basketball/pickleball/badminton court (the ball court) at the flat roof on 1/F, a Member indicated no objection to the application but expressed concerns about the potential nuisances such as noise and light impacts on neighbouring residents. To prevent balls from dropping off the building, a fence of a certain height would be required, which might create adverse visual impact. The Member was concerned about the appropriateness of including the ball court at the flat roof. The Committee noted that the application premises (the Premises) were currently occupied by a school, whose students had previously carried out ball activities on the flat roof and had received complaints about balls falling from the building, and therefore ceased such activities. The applicant was aware of this issue and had indicated that measures would be taken to prevent similar incidents in the future.

31. Another Member enquired whether, as a general practice, ball games or similar activities at the flat roof were permitted as of right, or were subject to any government regulations. In response, the Chairperson said that such activities were primarily governed by the Deed of Mutual Covenant. From planning perspective, an assessment of the application should focus on whether the applied use (e.g. 'School' or 'Religious Institution') complied with the statutory plan. The planning approval would regulate the main use, rather than details of the related ancillary activities. It would be impractical to control every detailed ancillary activity carried out within the Premises.

32. While not objecting to the application, some Members expressed concerns regarding the proposed ball court and had the following views/suggestions:

- (a) for basketball courts located on the rooftop of a school building, standard safety measures such as a parapet wall and metal fence of a specified height

(i.e. a minimum of 6m) would be required. However, it might create adverse visual impacts for surrounding residents;

- (b) there was no compelling justifications for conducting ball activities in the church in this application. The applicant should critically review the proposal and consider removing the ball court and making good use of the flat roof within the Premises for other church related activities;
- (c) although the Town Planning Board (the Board) was not responsible for regulating specific activities carried out at the Premises, the Board's concerns on the ball activities on the flat roof should be clearly recorded in the minutes and relayed to the applicant for appropriate follow-up action (i.e. proper management of facilities and activities); and
- (d) there was adequate legal framework to address potential nuisances and the Board should not overly involve in regulating specific activities conducted within a permitted development.

33. The Chairperson said that all uses and developments should conform to any other relevant legislation and were subject to control by the respective authorities. For instance, noise impact would be monitored by the Environmental Protection Department under the relevant environmental legislation. The Chairperson said that Members might consider: (i) approving the application and including an advisory clause to remind the applicant of Members' concerns or reflecting the same in the minutes; (ii) approving the application and imposing an approval condition to restrict ball activities if there were strong planning justifications; or (iii) deferring a decision on the application to allow time for the applicant to revise the plan or submit further justifications for the ball court, along with details of proposed mitigation measures (including operational hours). Nevertheless, it might be practically difficult to monitor and enforce an approval condition relating to ball activities. After some discussion, Members generally considered that the application could be approved while the applicant should take note of Members' concerns regarding the carrying out of ball activities on the flat roof within the Premises as expressed in paragraph 32 above.

34. The Chairperson concluded that Members were generally in support of the

application and indicated that Members' grave concerns on conducting ball activities at the Premises would be recorded in the minutes, which would be conveyed to the applicant. The applicant should duly note these concerns and implement appropriate mitigation measures to minimise any potential impacts on the surrounding area.

35. 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 23.1.2030, 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 an approval condition stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

[The Chairperson thanked PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting. Ms Erica S.M. Wong and Ms Natalie S.M. Yim left the meeting at this point.]

## **Agenda Item 6**

## Section 16 Application

## [Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H17/144      Proposed Minor Relaxation of Site Coverage Restriction for Permitted  
‘House’ Use in “Residential (Group C3)” Zone, 66 Deep Water Bay  
Road, Shouson Hill, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H17/144)

36. The Secretary reported that Aurecon Hong Kong Limited was one of the consultants of the applicant. Dr Tony C.M. Ip had declared an interest on the item for his firm having current business dealings with Aurecon Hong Kong Limited. As Dr Tony C.M. Ip had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

## Presentation and Question Sessions

37. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Maggie H.K. Wu, STP/HK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed development, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

38. Members had no question on the application.

## Deliberation Session

39. 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 23.1.2030, 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 an approval condition stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

## **Agenda Item 7**

### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H20/202      Proposed Hotel with Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction in  
“Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, Chai Wan Inland  
Lots 12 and 43, 14-16 Lee Chung Street, Chai Wan, Hong Kong  
(MPC Paper No. A/H20/202)

---

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

40.      With the aid of a PowerPoint Presentation, Mr Elton H.T. Chung, STP/HK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed development, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

41.      Members had no question on the application.

### **Deliberation Session**

42.      Noting that one of the grounds of the adverse public comments was that a similar application for hotel use was rejected, a Member opined that the area where the Site was situated had undergone transformation, making the current proposal compatible with the surrounding land uses. The Chairperson concurred and said that when considering the previously rejected similar application, transformation had not yet taken place in the area and the specific policies to support industrial revitalisation or tourism development were not yet in place at that time. Having regard to the changing planning circumstances, favourable consideration could be given to the current application.

43.      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 23.1.2030, 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 approval conditions stated in the Paper. The Committee

also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

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

### **Agenda Item 8**

#### **Any Other Business**

[Open Meeting]

#### **Revised Paper Format for Renewal Applications**

44. The Secretary reported that to facilitate Members' consideration of renewal applications, a simplified paper in tabulated form, covering the relevant key information including planning information, compliance with relevant Town Planning Board Guidelines, departmental and public comments, planning considerations and assessments for ease of reference, had been adopted by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee since January 2026. Subject to Members' agreement, the revised paper format would also be adopted by this Committee starting from next meeting, i.e. 6.2.2026.

45. The Committee agreed to the proposed paper format for renewal applications, which would take effect from the next meeting.

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