

**Minutes of 1255th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 17.9.2021**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairperson

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Dr Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr C.H. Tse

Mr Y.S. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer (Kowloon),
Transport Department
Mr Gary C.H. Wong

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

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

Director of Lands
Mr Andrew C.W. Lai

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Dr Conrad T.C. Wong

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/New Territories
Mr Tom C.K. Yip

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Miss Annie H.Y. Wong

Opening Remarks

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

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1254th Meeting held on 3.9.2021

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

2. The draft minutes of the 1254th meeting held on 3.9.2021 were sent to Members on 17.9.2021. Subject to any proposed amendments by Members on or before 20.9.2021, the minutes would be confirmed.

[Post-meeting Note: The minutes were confirmed on 20.9.2021 without amendments.]

Agenda Item 2

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[This item was conducted in Cantonese.]

- (i) [Confidential Item] [Closed Meeting]

3. The item was recorded under confidential cover.

[Messrs K.K. Cheung, Y.S. Wong and L.T. Kwok, Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung and Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng joined and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon left the meeting, and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

- (ii) Court of First Instance's Judgment on a Judicial Review Application (HCAL

1549/2020) Lodged by Join Smart Limited in respect of a Section 12A Application
No. Y/TM-LTTY/8

[Open Meeting] [The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

4. The Secretary reported that the judicial review (JR) application was lodged by Join Smart Limited (the Applicant) against the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (the RNTPC)'s decision on a section 12A application No. Y/TM-LTTY/8 (the s.12A Application) for rezoning a site in Lam Tei, Tuen Mun (the Site). The Applicant was a subsidiary of Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (SHK). AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) and Ronald Lu & Partners Limited (RLP) were two of the consultants of the s.12A Application. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Miss Winnie W.M. Ng - being a director of Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited (KMB) and Long Win Bus Company Limited (Long Win) and SHK having shareholding interest in KMB and Long Win;
- Mr Franklin Yu - his spouse being an employee of SHK;
- Mr Peter K.T. Yuen - his relative being an independent non-executive director of SHK;
- Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with SHK, AECOM and RLP;
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm having current business dealings with SHK, AECOM and RLP;
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with SHK, AECOM and RLP;
- Dr Conrad T.C. Wong - having current business dealings with SHK;

- Dr Billy C.H. Hau - having past business dealings with AECOM;
- Ms Lilian S.K. Law - being an ex-Executive Director and committee member of The Boys' & Girls' Clubs Association of Hong Kong which received sponsorship from SHK; and
- Mr Gary C.H. Wong - owning a flat in Tuen Mun.
*(Chief Traffic Engineer
(Kowloon, Transport
Department)*

5. Members noted that Mr Thomas O.S. Ho and Dr Conrad T.C. Wong had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the item was to report the judgment on a Judicial Review (JR) application (the Judgment) and no discussion was required, Members agreed that the other Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting.

6. The Secretary reported that the Site was located at San Hing Road and Hong Po Road in Lam Tei, Tuen Mun. Part of the Site was the subject of a s.16 application (No. A/TM-LTY/273) approved by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) for proposed residential development in October 2014. The subsequent s.16A application for the extension of time for commencement of the approved development was allowed by the Appeal Board Panel (Town Planning) in March 2021. Another s.16 application (No. A/TM-LTY/381) was approved by RNTPC in May 2020. The two approved schemes were subject to a maximum domestic plot ratio (PR) of 1 and a maximum building height (BH) of four storeys over single-storey car park in the "Residential (Group E)" ("R(E)") zone on the then Lam Tei and Yick Yuen OZP No. S/TM-LTY/10. The same applicant submitted the subject s.12A Application for rezoning the Site to "R(A)" with a maximum domestic PR of 6 and a maximum BH of 120mPD.

7. The RNTRC decided not to agree to the s.12A Application for two reasons. Firstly, the long-term development of the general area covering the Site was being reviewed under an on-going feasibility study undertaken by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) for a proposed public housing development (the Study). The approval

of the rezoning application would adversely affect the comprehensive planning of the area and jeopardise the implementation of the proposed public housing development. Secondly, the applicant failed to demonstrate that the proposed rezoning would not generate adverse water supplies, archaeological and traffic impacts on the surrounding areas. The applicant then lodged the JR application against the RNTPC's decision.

8. The Court of First Instance (CFI) handed down its decision on 15.9.2021 to dismiss the JR. The applicant took issues on nine grounds which could be summarised into five main areas: (i) the public housing development under study was not a relevant consideration for the s.12A Application; (ii) the Town Planning Board (the Board) was irrational not to make sufficient inquiries; (iii) PlanD failed to fairly and adequately present relevant materials to the Board for consideration; (iv) the rejection was *Wednesbury* unreasonable; and (v) the Board failed to properly consider the technical aspects of the application.

9. The CFI did not accept the applicant's submissions and made the following rulings:

- (a) the Board was entitled to regard the long-term development of the general area covering the Site under CEDD's study as a relevant consideration;
- (b) as a decision-maker, the Board had no general duty to make inquiries on matters which might be relevant to the decision to be made. When considering the s.12A Application, the Board had already been informed of the relevant information;
- (c) with the relevant information on the Study provided by PlanD, the Board did not proceed on any material mistake of fact in reaching the decision; and
- (d) there was no evidence showing that the Board failed to properly consider the technical aspects of the s.12A Application. Given the outstanding technical issues, the applicant had failed to demonstrate the feasibility in respect of the concerned technical matters.

10. In the Judgment, the CFI also endorsed most of the important legal principles put forth by the Board. The Board had two principal functions including the consideration of

s.12A applications which was a plan-making function and the consideration of applications for permission under s.16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). In the latter, the Board was confined to the provisions on the approved OZP as stated in *International Trader Ltd v Town Planning Appeal Board* [2009]. On the other hand, the considerations relevant to a s.12A application were broader than an application for permission under s.16. The Board was also entitled to regard to a matter concerning the ‘health, safety, convenience and general welfare of the community’, which was the statutory purpose of plan-making under the Ordinance, as a relevant consideration.

11. The deadline for lodging appeal by the parties of the JR was 13.10.2021. Should the applicant lodge an appeal against CFI’s order for the JR, the Secretary would report it to the Board.

12. The Chairperson remarked that the Judgment had made important observations on what could reasonably be regarded as relevant considerations in the examination of s.12A applications. It would have a bearing on the Board’s consideration of s.12A applications involving sites subject to on-going government studies for public housing developments and/or other developments.

13. Members noted the judgment on the JR application and agreed that the Secretary would represent the Board in all matters related to the JR and the subsequent appeal, if any, in the usual manner.

[Mr Andrew C.W. Lai, the Director of Lands, left the meeting at this point.]

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Proposed Amendments to the Draft Yau Ma Tei Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K2/22
(TPB Paper No. 10773)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

14. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests on the item for owning properties in the Yau Ma Tei (YMT) area; and/or having affiliation/business dealings with the Institute of Future Cities (IOFC) of the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK) which was the Planning Department (PlanD)'s consultant of the updated Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) in respect of the subject YMT Outline Zoning Plan (OZP):

Mr Andrew C.W. Lai - owning/co-owning with spouse properties in Yau
(*Director of Lands*) Tsim Mong District;

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

Dr Conrad T.C. Wong - being a director of a company which owned properties
in YMT; and

Professor John C.Y. Ng - being a fellow of IOFC, CUHK.

15. Members noted that Mr Stanley T.S. Choi and Dr Conrad T.C. Wong had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Andrew C.W. Lai, Director of Lands, had already left the meeting. As Professor John C.Y. Ng had no involvement in the amendment items, Members agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

16. The following representatives of PlanD were invited to the meeting at this point:

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

Mr Clement Miu - Senior Town Planner/Yau Tsim Mong

17. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the proposed amendments.

18. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, briefed Members on the proposed amendments, including the background, general implications of the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG) on building profile, building height (BH) concept on the current OZP, proposed BH restrictions (BHRs), review of air ventilation measures, visual and urban design considerations, previous representations submitted by the Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong (REDA) (R8) and the Methodist Church, Hong Kong (MCHK) (R9), MCHK's sites, and community needs, and proposed amendments to the OZP as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10773 (the Paper). The review of BHRs had been conducted for all "Commercial", "Residential (Group A)" ("R(A)", "R(A)1", "R(A)2", "Residential (Group B)", "Other Specified Uses" and "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") zones on the OZP.

19. The Chairperson said that follow-up actions had been taken to give effect to the order of the Court subsequent to the judicial reviews (JRs) in respect of the OZPs including the Causeway Bay, Wan Chai and Mong Kok OZPs. Correspondingly, PlanD reviewed the BHRs and air ventilation measures (i.e. non-building area (NBA) and setback (SB)) for the YMT area taking the updated AVA findings into account in response to the general implications of the SBDG on the development intensity of the sites under amendments. As mentioned in PlanD's presentation, the BHRs in various zones were proposed to be relaxed for the incorporation of SBDG requirements, which would not impose adverse visual and air ventilation impacts on the YMT area as ascertained by the relevant technical assessments. Subject to the agreement of the Town Planning Board (the Board), the amended OZP incorporating the proposed amendments would be published for public inspection for inviting representations and comments on the representations in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). Regarding the community needs and the "G/IC" sites owned by MCHK, in the absence of concrete redevelopment proposals, it was difficult to predetermine any appropriate BHR for the sites. If MCHK and owners of other "G/IC" sites in the district had any concrete redevelopment proposal for their sites in future with policy support from the relevant bureaux and could demonstrate no significant adverse impact, PlanD would, with the benefit of the redevelopment proposal(s) so put forward, review the BHRs of those sites and make suitable amendments to the OZP. Similar approach had been adopted

for a “G/IC” site owned by MCHK. The Chairperson then invited questions and comments from Members.

Provision for the “G/IC” Zone on the OZP

20. The Vice-chairperson and some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) regarding the approach of reviewing and amending BHRs for redevelopment proposals of “G/IC” sites, whether minor relaxation of BHRs through s.16 applications would be allowed under the OZP and whether it was a new provision under the proposed amendments to the OZP;
- (b) for the “G/IC” sites owned by MCHK, the considerations of a redevelopment proposal involving uses other than community, institution and community (GIC) facilities, such as office; and
- (c) the circumstances requiring the owners of “G/IC” sites including MCHK to submit s.16 planning applications.

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

- (a) there were provisions for minor relaxation of BHRs in the Notes for the “G/IC” zone on the OZP currently in force and such provisions would remain unchanged. Subject to the development parameters of the redevelopment proposal, the project proponent could submit a s.16 planning application for minor relaxation of the BHR to facilitate the proposed redevelopment;
- (b) each application would be considered on its individual merits. If the uses involved in the redevelopment proposal were Column 1 uses which were always permitted, the matter to be dealt with under the s.16 application would be the BH of the proposed development, should it exceed the BHR under the OZP. If the redevelopment proposal involved Column 2 uses,

the assessments and considerations of the proposed scheme would be different; and

- (c) taking the site currently occupied by the Methodist College as an example, it was subject to a BHR of eight storeys. If the redevelopment proposal involved a school with a BH not exceeding eight storeys, planning permission would not be required as the proposed use was a Column 1 use and the BH conformed to the restriction of the OZP. If the redevelopment proposal involved Column 2 uses with a BH exceeding eight storeys, planning permission for both the proposed uses and minor relaxation of the BHR would be required.

22. In response to a Member's further enquiry on the circumstances requiring planning permissions for the redevelopment of "G/IC" sites and any flexibility to facilitate the redevelopment of those sites, the Chairperson supplemented that if any land owner, including MCHK, intended to redevelop a site for Column 1 uses, no planning permission was required. However, if the redevelopment proposal involved Column 2 uses, such as office (not ancillary to a permitted use) and hotel, planning permission from the Board was required. Apart from the land use, if the proposed BH of the redevelopment slightly exceeded the BHR, say by one or two storeys, a s.16 planning application for minor relaxation of the BHR was also required. On the other hand, if the proposed BH was substantially higher than the permissible one, amendment to OZP would be required. If MCHK in future came up with a batch of redevelopment proposals for its remaining "G/IC" sites requiring relaxation of the BHRs, subject to the acceptability of the proposals from the planning and technical aspects, it would be possible to make amendments to the OZP in one go so that planning permissions for redevelopment of conforming GIC uses on individual sites would not be required.

SBDG Requirements

23. With the incorporation of amended BHRs in association with SBDG requirements in the OZP, a Member enquired whether the private lot owners would be required to incorporate those requirements in their redevelopment schemes. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, said that the proposed relaxation of BHRs on the OZP had taken into consideration the implication of SBDG requirements in accordance with the Court's ruling. Since SBDG

was under the building regime, the specific and relevant building design requirements could be determined at the general building plan submissions. The Chairperson supplemented that if a redevelopment involved lease modification, the project proponent would be required to incorporate SBDG requirements in the scheme, but for a site subject to an unrestricted lease, the incorporation of SBDG requirements in the scheme was not mandatory. Having said that, as revealed in the statistics of PlanD's previous reviews, it was not uncommon for project proponents to incorporate SBDG requirements in their redevelopments.

Review of Air Ventilation Measures

24. In response to a Member's question on the proposed deletion of a 3m setback (SB) at the Ward Church site, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that the requirement of the provision of a minimum SB of 3m at the site was incorporated in the OZP in 2014 based on the scheme proposed by MCHK to allow for streetscape improvement and amenity planting purpose. According to the updated AVA conducted in 2018, Waterloo Road with a width of about 30m was identified as an air path. The Ward Church site in the "G/IC(2)" zone abutting Waterloo Road would not affect the air path, and the 3m SB was hence recommended to be deleted to allow design flexibility for the future redevelopment of community facilities at the site. The treatment would be similar to other "G/IC" sites not falling within air paths on the OZP.

Planning at the District Level

25. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) noting that the YMT area was a dense urban area, the incentives for private lot owners to improve the streetscape through urban design;
- (b) how the historical and cultural characteristics including the traditional businesses along Shanghai Street and Reclamation Street, the YMT Jade Hawker Bazaar and the YMT Fruit Market would be preserved; and
- (c) given that YMT was the centre of Kowloon and the bottleneck of the traffic between East Kowloon and West Kowloon, whether there was any measure

to improve the traffic condition in the YMT area.

26. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, made the following main points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) the proposed relaxation of BHRs in some land use zonings under the amendment items was to facilitate the incorporation of SBDG requirements such as SB and greenery provision with a view to achieving good urban form. Taking the “R(A)” zone as an example, it was found that a BH in the range of about 78m to 93m, subject to the site conditions, would be required to incorporate the SBDG requirements in accordance with the review of BHRs. The proposed relaxation of BHR in the “R(A)” zone to 100mPD would allow design flexibility for the developer to further improve streetscape through better architectural design. If a development required a BH exceeding the BHR for special design features, a s.16 planning application for minor relaxation of the BHR could be submitted;
- (b) the YMT Jade Hawker Bazaar had temporarily been relocated to a site near the junction of Shanghai Street and Market Street. It was observed that some street shops for jade business were also agglomerated in the section of Canton Road near Jordan Road. The area along Shanghai Street and Reclamation Street was mainly zoned “R(A)”, in which ‘Shop and Services’ use was always permitted on the lowest three floors of a building, and would not be affected by the current proposed OZP amendments in relation to BHRs. With regard to the YMT Fruit Market, it was located in an area zoned “G/IC” at the junction of Waterloo Street and Ferry Street subject to a BHR of three storeys to reflect the existing condition. No amendment item was proposed in relation to the YMT Fruit Market; and
- (c) the Central Kowloon Route connecting East and West Kowloon, which was anticipated to be in operation in 2025, would alleviate the traffic congestion of the existing major east-west transport corridor in central Kowloon, including the YMT area.

27. Regarding the incentives for improving the streetscape in a densely built and populated district, the Chairperson supplemented that the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) was conducting a study, namely the Yau Mong District Study, to formulate measures with a view to encouraging urban renewal in the district to improve the living conditions of the community and to address the urban decay issues.

28. Noting that some Members were concerned about the redevelopment and revitalisation of the YMT area, at the invitation of the Chairperson, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, said that while the findings and recommendations of the Yau Mong District Study were not yet available, preservation of the historical and cultural sites in the district was included in the study scope. There were also completed developments and projects in the area which involved development cum preservation of historical buildings, such as the development of '8 Waterloo', which was a residential development with in-situ preservation of the graded former pumping station of the Water Supplies Department.

29. The Chairperson concluded that the amendments to the OZP were proposed pursuant to the Court's order to review the BHRs. The redevelopment and revitalisation of the whole district would be subject to the comprehensive review and recommendations of the Yau Mong District Study which would be a blueprint with strategies and initiatives for the long-term planning of the YMT and Mong Kok areas. Members would be briefed on the study outcomes in due course.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong rejoined the meeting during the question and answer session.]

30. After deliberation, the Board:

- (a) agreed to the proposed amendments to the draft YMT OZP No. S/K2/22 and that the draft YMT OZP No. S/K2/22A at Annex A1 of the Paper (to be renumbered as S/K2/23 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Annex A2 of the Paper were suitable for exhibition under section 7 of the Ordinance;
- (b) agreed to adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Annex A3 of the Paper for the draft YMT OZP No. S/K2/22A (to be renumbered as S/K2/23) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for

the various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES would be published together with the draft OZP; and

- (c) noted the updated planning circumstances of MCHK's sites and the review of community needs in the YMT area, and agreed that there should be no amendment to the YMT OZP No. S/K2/22 to meet MCHK's representation insofar as MCHK's sites were concerned.

31. In view of the Board's decisions (a) and (b) above, Representer R8 and Commenter C1, who opposed R8, would be informed accordingly and would be invited to submit representation on the draft YMT OZP No. S/K2/23 for the Board's consideration under section 6 of the Ordinance if they so wished.

32. 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.

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

Procedural Matters

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comments on the Draft Kennedy Town & Mount Davis Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H1/21
(TPB Paper No. 10774)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

33. The Secretary reported that the amendments to the draft Kennedy Town & Mount Davis Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H1/20 involved the University of Hong Kong (HKU)

Residences at Pokfield Road. Representations/comments had been submitted by HKU (R2/C1) and Mary Mulvihill (R30/C104). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung | - being the Chairman of the Accounting Advisory Board of School of Business, HKU; |
| Dr C.H. Hau | - being an Honorary Associate Professor and Principal Lecturer of HKU, and his spouse being a Principal Lecturer of HKU; |
| Mr K.K. Cheung | - his firm having current business dealings with HKU and hiring Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time; |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - his former firm having current business dealings with HKU and hiring Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time; |
| Ms Lillian S.K. Law | - being an Adjunct Associate Professor of HKU; |
| Professor John C.Y. Ng |] being Adjunct Professors of HKU; |
| Dr Conrad T.C. Wong |] |
| Dr Roger C.K. Chan | - being an Honorary Associate Professor of HKU; and |
| Dr. Venus Y.H. Lun | - being an external examiner of HKU. |

34. Members noted that Dr Conrad T.C. Wong had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As the item was procedural in nature, Members agreed that the other Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting.

35. The Secretary briefly introduced TPB Paper No. 10774. On 30.4.2021, the draft Kennedy Town & Mount Davis OZP was exhibited for public inspection under s.7 of the Town Planning Ordinance. During the two-month exhibition period, 212 valid representations were received. The valid representations were subsequently published for three weeks and 131 valid comments were received.

36. In view of the similar nature of the representations and comments, the hearing of all representations and comments was recommended to be considered by the full Town Planning Board (the Board) collectively in one group. To ensure efficiency of the hearing, a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time would be allotted to each representer/commenter in the hearing session. Consideration of the representations and comments by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for November/December 2021.

37. After deliberation, the Board noted the representations and comment with the required identity information missing and agreed that:

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

Agenda Item 5

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting] [The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

38. The Board noted that Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung, the Secretary, was attending the meeting of the Town Planning Board for the last time before her retirement. On behalf of all Members,

the Chairperson extended a vote of thanks for Miss Lung's valuable contributions to the operation of the Board and the town planning regime over the years.

39. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 10:55 a.m.