

**Minutes of 1269th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 13.5.2022**

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 C.H. Hau

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr. Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Dr Conrad T.C. Wong

Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Mr K.L. Wong

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport)
Transport and Housing Bureau
Miss Fiona W.S. Li

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

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department
Mr Paul Y.K. Au

Assistant Director(Regional 3),
Lands Department
Ms Jane Choi

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Mr C.K. Yip

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr L.T. Kwok

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Katherine 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 1267th and 1268th Meetings held on 25.4.2022 and 29.4.2022

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

2. The draft minutes of the 1267th and 1268th meetings held on 25.4.2022 and 29.4.2022 were sent to Members before the meeting. Subject to any proposed amendments by Members on or before 16.5.2022, the minutes would be confirmed.

[Post-meeting Note: The minutes were confirmed on 16.5.2022, subject to amendment to paragraph 35 of the 1267th meeting minutes.]

Agenda Item 2

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[This item was conducted in Cantonese.]

Reference Back of Approved Outline Zoning Plans

3. The Secretary reported that on 3.5.2022, the Chief Executive in Council referred the approved Yuen Long Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL/25, the approved Tai Tong OZP No. S/YL-TT/18, the approved Kam Tin North OZP No. S/YL-KTN/9, the approved Mong Kok OZP No. S/K3/34, and the approved Ma Tau Kok OZP No. S/K10/28 to the Town Planning Board for amendment under section 12(1)(b)(ii) of the Town Planning Ordinance. The reference back of the five OZPs was notified in the Gazette on 13.5.2022.

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Questions only)]

Consideration of Representation and Comment in respect of the Draft Shek Kip Mei Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K4/30
(TPB Paper No. 10826)

[The item was conducted in English and Cantonese.]

4. The Secretary reported that the amendment item on the draft Shek Kip Mei Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K4/30 involved two public housing developments in Shek Kip Mei to be developed by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) which was supported by an Engineering Feasibility Study (EFS) conducted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | |
|--|---|
| Mr Paul Y.K. Au
(as Chief Engineer (Works),
Home Affairs Department) | - being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA; |
| Dr C.H. Hau | - conducting contract research projects with CEDD; |
| Dr Conrad T.C. Wong | - having current business dealings with HKHA; being a director of a company which owned a property in Shek Kip Mei; |
| Mr Franklin Yu | - being a member of Building Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA; |
| Mr Daniel K.S. Lau | - being a member of Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) which had discussed with Housing |

Department (HD) (the executive arm of HKHA) on housing development issues;

- Ms Lilian S.K. Law - being a member of HKHS which had discussed with HD on housing development issues;
- Mr K.L. Wong - being a member and ex-employee of HKHS which had discussed with HD on housing development issues;
- Mr L. T. Kwok - his serving organisation operating a social service team which was supported by HKHA and openly bid funding from HKHA; and
- Miss Winnie W.M. Ng - owning properties in Shek Kip Mei.

5. Dr. C.H. Hau and Dr Conrad T.C. Wong had not yet joined the meeting. As the interests of Messrs Paul Y.K. Au, Franklin Yu and Dr. Conrad T.C. Wong were direct, they should be invited to leave temporarily or not to join the meeting for the item. As the interests of Mr L.T. Kwok were indirect, Dr C.H. Hau, Messrs Daniel K.S. Lau and K.L. Wong, and Ms Lilian S.K. Law had no involvement in the public housing developments, and the properties owned by Miss Winnie W.M. Ng had no direct view of the amendment site (the Site), they could stay in the meeting.

[Messrs Paul Y.K. Au and Franklin Yu left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

6. The Chairperson said that one representation and one comment were received on the draft OZP, which were submitted by the same person, Ms Mary Mulvihill (R1/C1), who would attend the meeting

7. The following government representatives and representer/commenter were invited to the meeting at this point:

Planning Department (PlanD)

- | | |
|--------------------|--|
| Mr Derek P.K. Tse | - District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK) |
| Ms Jessica Y.C. Ho | - Senior Town Planner/TWK (STP/TWK) |
| Mr C.K. Fung | - Town Planner/TWK (TP/TWK) |

CEDD

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| Mr F.S. Sit | - Chief Engineer/Housing Project (CE/HP) |
| Mr Bryan Ho | - Senior Engineer/Housing Project (SE/HP) |

Housing Department (HD)

- | | |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|
| Ms Belinda Lau | - Senior Planning Officer/5 (SPO/5) |
| Mr Jo Chau | - Architect/HD |
| Mr F. Chan | - Civil Engineer (CE/HD) |

Representer/Commenter

R1/C1

- | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Ms Mary Mulvihill | - Representer/Commenter |
|-------------------|-------------------------|

8. The Chairperson extended a welcome. She then briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that PlanD's representatives would be invited to brief Members on the representation and comment. The representer/commenter would then be invited to make oral submission. The representer/commenter was allotted 20 minutes for making presentation. There was a timer device to alert the representer/commenter two minutes before the allotted time was to expire, and when the allotted time limit was up. A question and answer (Q&A) session would be held after the representer/commenter had completed her oral submission. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives or the representer/commenter. After the Q&A session, the government representatives and the representers/commenter would be invited to leave the meeting. The Town Planning Board (the Board/TPB) would then deliberate on the representation/comment in the absence of the representer/commenter and inform her of the Board's decision in due course.

9. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representation and comment.

10. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr C.K. Fung, TP/TWK, briefed

Members on the representation and comment, including the background of the amendment item, the proposed housing developments, the grounds and views of the representer/commenter, and Government's responses to the representation and comment as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10826 (the Paper).

11. The Chairperson then invited the representer/commenter to elaborate on her representation/comment.

R1/C1 – Ms Mary Mulvihill

12. Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

- (a) the outcome of the OZP amendment was pre-determined and there was no public participation in the process;
- (b) application No. A/H7/181 on the submission of a layout plan for a proposed composite commercial development at Wong Nai Chung, which was approved by the Metro Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Board on 6.5.2022, was relevant to the current OZP amendment. According to the layout plan for application No. A/H7/181, the 6,000m² public open space (POS) was not provided in the manner as promised at the hearing stage, as it was no longer open to the public and 40% of the POS was covered and the public had been misled. The decision of the Committee had ignored the relevant guidelines on open space, that should be outdoor open-air for use of the general public;
- (c) the Site was not suitable for residential development. For example, there was a need to provide non-openable windows or windows with restricted opening for the government institution and community (GIC) uses and residential units in the proposed developments. Good air ventilation was needed to maintain a good quality of living, particularly, for the residential care home for the elderly (RCHE);
- (d) the Site was previously occupied by a textile dyeing factory which would

create potential site contamination issue, but the possible impacts to residents' health were ignored;

- (e) the Sham Shui Po (SSP) District Council members expressed concerns on the potential traffic and safety issues of reprovisioning the driving test centre (DTC) at the Site and the temporary DTC proposed at Pak Wan Street during the construction stage;
- (f) the social welfare facilities to be provided at the Site were insufficient. It was most regrettable that was no one with extensive local knowledge attended the hearing meeting to provide information on the local conditions, for example, whether there were odour concerns from the drainage facilities near the Site;
- (g) according to the preliminary Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), the proposed public housing developments with maximum building heights (BHs) of 199mPD would be taller than the surrounding developments and would inevitably result in a loss of visual openness. It was alarming to note that the overall resultant visual impact would range from negligible, moderately adverse to significantly adverse;
- (h) the Air Ventilation Assessment – Expert Evaluation (AVA) concluded that the proposed high-rise developments with minor encroachment on the existing non-building area (NBA) might affect the wind availability at the immediate downstream areas under the prevailing winds. The “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) sites, including part of the subject amendment site (the Site) originally zoned “G/IC” on the OZP, were not only planned for the provision of community services but should be also for enhancing air ventilation in the area;
- (i) a total of 99 trees were identified within the Site and the works area, and 80 trees would be felled;
- (j) the open space and ball court of the proposed developments should be

provided with an open-air design with sunlight penetration instead of under cover;

- (k) the Site was difficult to access;
- (l) the reprovisioned DTC at the Site would pose traffic, safety and pollution concerns; and
- (m) Chak On Road South (CORS), which took up 25% of the Site, should not be retained or should be partially covered to better integrate the proposed developments on the two portions of the Site. More recreational or sitting out areas might be provided atop the covered road section.

[Dr C.H. Hau joined the meeting during the presentation by R1/C1.]

13. As the presentations of PlanD's representative and the representer/commenter had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions to the representer/commenter and/or the government representatives. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendee to direct question to the Board or for cross-examination between parties.

14. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the two public housing developments (i.e. CORS Development and Pak Tin Extension Development) on the Site would be under the same or different management;

Site Suitability and Technical Considerations

- (b) the accessibility of the Site;
- (c) the cause of land contamination on the Site, and the mechanism to ascertain suitability of the Site for housing development;

- (d) the environmental concern of the Site raised by the representer/commenter;
- (e) noting the proposed developments with BH restriction of 200mPD amidst surrounding buildings of around 120-130mPD were visually prominent as shown in the photomontages at viewpoint (VP)1 and VP5 of the LVIA, the considerations for the proposed BH;

DTC

- (f) the capacity of the reprovisioned DTC, and whether DTC-related traffic generation had been taken into account in the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), and whether the driving test routes would pose any traffic impact to the roads in the vicinity;
- (g) how the safety issue had been taken into account in the reprovisioned DTC, such as whether there was re-routing of existing driving test routes and any safety improvement to the DTC after re-provisioning;
- (h) whether air pollution generated from the DTC was assessed;

Design Layout

- (i) the Site was relatively small and was divided by the public road, CORS. Whether consideration had been given to removing/relocating the public road so as to better utilize the Site and to avoid environmental pollution. Also, for emergency and maintenance access to the service reservoir and drainage facilities to the southwest and west of the Site respectively, whether it was necessary to maintain CORS as a public road;
- (j) the reasons for the proposed open carpark at the eastern corner of the Site in Pak Tin Extension Development, and whether HD had considered covering the car park and extending the podium to provide additional open space;

- (k) the target users of the proposed car parking spaces in the public housing developments and the supply of public car parks in the area;

Non-building Area (NBA)

- (l) how the proposal had affected the NBA originally designated on the OZP, and whether any AVA had been carried out;
- (m) whether the NBA on the OZP formed part of the Pak Tin Estate and had been included in the site area for gross floor area (GFA) calculation;

Proposed Open Space and GIC Facilities

- (n) as the Site was previously zoned “G/IC”, whether there were any planned GIC uses for the Site;
- (o) the layout of the 2,700m² open space to be provided within the public housing developments and whether the open space would adopt an open-air design;
- (p) whether there was any requirement for open space provision under “R(A)2” zone;
- (q) whether HD had information, such as age groups, of the potential residents of the proposed public housing developments at the Site; and
- (r) whether there was any deficit of GIC facilities in the district.

15. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Derek Tse, DPO/TWK, Ms Belinda Lau, SPO/5, Mr F. S. Sit, CE/HP3, and Mr Jo Chau, Architect/HD, made the following main points:

- (a) the future management of the two developments was yet to be confirmed;

Site Suitability and Technical Considerations

- (b) vehicular access to the proposed developments would be via CORS. The future residents could walk to the Shek Kip Mei MTR station via Nam Cheong Street (about 1km). Existing residents of the nearby Chak On Estate mainly travelled by public transport and the bus stops and public light bus stops in the vicinity of the Site were shown on Plan H-3 of the Paper. There were two at-grade crossings and a footbridge at the north of the Site linking to Chak On Estate. In addition, a new footbridge with lift tower connecting the Site with the Pak Tin Estate Redevelopment at the south, which would facilitate future residents of the proposed public housing developments to gain easy access to the retail facilities and public transport interchange at the Pak Tin Estate Redevelopment, was under study. The walking distance from the Site to Shek Kip Mei MTR station would also be shortened;
- (c) the Site was previously occupied by a textile dyeing factory and the EFS had preliminarily assessed and concluded that there was no insurmountable land contamination impact. More detailed land contamination assessment would be carried out in the implementation stage and remedial measures would be implemented as necessary to ensure no health and safety problems for future residents;
- (d) according to the preliminary Environmental Review of the EFS, no insurmountable environmental impact was anticipated with the implementation of mitigation measures such as fixed glazing for the domestic storeys and avoiding openable windows facing Lung Yuet Road and Nam Cheong Street for the GIC facilities. The proposed mitigation measures were acceptable to the Director of Environmental Protection;
- (e) the absolute BHs of the proposed public housing developments were similar to those in the Pak Tin Estate Redevelopment. As the Site was located at a higher site level, the BH in mPD was higher. The BH of some private residential developments in the north at higher site levels would reach 210mPD. The visual impact of the proposed developments from various

local public VPs was assessed in the VIA. In general, the impact as viewed from VPs at higher levels was more visible than those from lower levels. For example, from VP3 at Wan Chi Street Playground, the proposed residential developments on the Site were mostly blocked by the Pak Tin Estate Redevelopment, and the impact from VP7 at junction of Tai Po Road and Castle Peak Road was insignificant whereas the impact from VP8 along Lung Yuet Road was moderately to significantly adverse;

DTC

- (f) the existing DTC was located at the Site since 1995, and the reprovisioned DTC would be similar in size as the existing one. The reprovisioned DTC was taken into account in the TIA, and the result showed that traffic generation from the DTC was limited and the traffic impact would not be insurmountable;
- (g) the existing three driving test routes of the DTC had been used for many years and had operated smoothly. The driving test routes would remain the same after the reprovisioning of the DTC. The vehicular accesses of the housing developments were at CORS which were separated from the ingress/egress of the reprovisioned DTC at Nam Cheong Street. To address the road safety concern, traffic measures such as provision of adequate traffic signs and restricting driving tests to take place during non-peak hours, etc. would be proposed for the agreement of Transport Department (TD);
- (h) the reprovisioned DTC was taken into account in the environmental review and no exceedance of the concerned vehicular emission pollutants nor significant noise impact was anticipated;

Design Layout

- (i) CORS was required to be maintained as a 24-hour vehicular access to the Shek Kip Mei Fresh Water Service Reservoir and drainage facilities located at the western end of the road. The retained CORS would serve as the vehicular accesses of the proposed developments and as an air path. The windows of

the domestic units of the proposed public housing developments would face the road to fulfil the relevant building requirements, and according to HD's preliminary assessment, incorporation of the road into the site would not increase the flat supply;

- (j) car parking spaces were proposed at the street level of Pak Tin Extension Development. In order to accommodate the proposed footbridge connecting with Pak Tin Estate, a portion of the car parking spaces at the street level could not be covered due to construction considerations. The design would be further refined in the detailed design stage and Members' views on extending the podium thereat were noted;
- (k) the proposed carpark would provide about 100 private car parking spaces for the two developments and the car parking provision would be further fine-tuned in the detailed design stage in liaison with TD. The amount of parking spaces proposed was based on the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) for public housing development. There would be car parking facilities in the Pak Tin Estate Redevelopment serving the residents of the estate and the shopping facilities there;

Non-building Area (NBA)

- (l) a NBA of about 30m-wide was previously designated on the OZP covering a sloping area in Pak Tin Estate to serve as an air path in the area. A small strip of the NBA of about 7m-wide along the top of the slope was included in the Site and rezoned "R(A)2". The AVA concluded that the reduced NBA would still facilitate air ventilation by allowing prevailing winds to pass through;
- (m) the previous NBA that was rezoned "R(A)2" was currently within the Vesting Order (VO) of Pak Tin Estate and the VO boundary would be updated upon the completion of the public housing development accordingly. The NBA in Pak Tin Estate which was currently a slope without development was not included in the net site area for GFA calculation of Pak Tin Estate. Yet, strip of slope which was rezoned to "R(A)2" within the Site was included in the net

site area for GFA calculation of the proposed housing developments;

Proposed Open Space and GIC Facilities

- (n) the Site was currently occupied by the existing DTC, and vacant land previously used as site office/depot area and transit nursery. Redevelopment of the Site for public housing with the reprovisioned DTC was in accordance with 'single site multiple use' principle;
- (o) the open space provision was in accordance with the HKPSG. Given the estimated total population of the proposed developments was about 2,700, and having taken into account the requirement of 1m² open space per person, not less than 2,700m² would be provided. The preliminary design of the open space (all open-air) was shown on the conceptual landscape plan in Annex V of the Paper, and the open space design would be further studied;
- (p) there was no requirement of provision of open space under "R(A)2" zone but HD would provide local open space within the developments in accordance with HKPSG;
- (q) the earliest population intake of the proposed public housing developments would be 2030 or beyond, and HD had no projections on the profile of potential residents of the developments; and
- (r) there were deficits in the provision of child care centre (1,227 places), community care services facilities (868 places), RCHE (1,265 beds) and residential care services for persons with disabilities (335 spaces) in Sham Shui Po district. HD would take into account the requirements of the HKPSG and comments from relevant government departments such as Social Welfare Department (SWD) in providing suitable social welfare facilities to serve the district needs. An RCHE with 250 beds was included in the assumption of the EFS for assessment purpose. The actual provision would be subject to the site constraints, technical assessments and requirements from SWD. According to Government's policy, social welfare facilities equivalent to 5%

of domestic GFA would be provided with the developments.

16. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the Q&A session was completed. She thanked government representatives and the representer/commenter for attending the meeting. The Board would deliberate the representation/comment in closed meeting and would inform the representer/commenter of the Board's decision in due course. The government representatives and the representer/commenter left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

17. Members generally supported the OZP amendment and considered that the Site was suitable for public housing development, given its close proximity to Pak Tin Estate and Chak On Estate with various facilities and the convenient public transport serving the area.

18. A few Members opined that the CORS traversing the Site was a major development constraint, and considered that the road could be partly or fully decked for better integration of the two public housing developments with provision of more recreation/open space. Some Members also commented that the open-air carpark in Pak Tin Extension Development could be enclosed by extending the podium to provide more recreation space. A Member considered that the BH of the Site was excessive in local context. Another Member made a general comment that open space needed not be entirely open-air, as covered open space could allow the public to enjoy the space under hot or rainy weather conditions.

19. A Member said that information on planned GIC facilities in the concerned district should be provided to allow the Board to have a comprehensive picture of GIC provisions when considering future amendments to OZP. Some Members also suggested that enhancing pedestrian connectivity to surrounding areas, such as to Chak On Estate in the current case, was important.

20. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally agreed to the amendment to the draft Shek Kip Mei OZP for better utilization of land and to increase housing supply. The Board also considered that there was scope to enhance the design of the public housing developments and agreed that HD should be invited to take into account Members' views when

refining the layout of the Site. Specifically, there could be better integration between the two proposed housing developments, and the arrangement of CORS and the open-air carpark at the Pak Tin Extension development could be further considered for better utilization of the Site and maximizing recreation/open space for residents respectively. The pedestrian connectivity between the Site and the surrounding areas should also be enhanced as far as possible.

21. After deliberation, the Board decided not to uphold R1 and considered the draft Shek Kip Mei OZP should not be amended to meet the representation for the following reason:

it was considered suitable to zone the representation site as “Residential (Group A) 2” to facilitate the proposed public housing development as the site is located in the vicinity of public and private housing developments and government, institution and community facilities. It was well-served by public transport and pedestrian facilities. Relevant technical assessments conducted concluded that there was no insurmountable technical problem in developing the site for public housing development with supporting government, institution and community facilities.

22. The Board also agreed that the draft Shek Kip Mei OZP, together with its Notes and updated Explanatory Statement, was suitable for submission under section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

[Messrs Paul Y.K. Au and Franklin Yu rejoined and Dr Conrad T.C. Wong joined the meeting at this point.]

Sha Tin, Tai Po & North District

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/NE-TK/740

Proposed Temporary Private Vehicle Park (Private Cars and Light Goods Vehicles Only) for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 474 S.BB, 474 S.BI, 474 S.BK, 474 S.BR, 474 S.BT, 474 S.BV, 474 S.BX, 474 S.BY, 474 S.BZ, 474 S.CA, 474 S.CB, 475 S.B, 475 S.D, 475

S.G, 475 S.I, 475 S.L, 475 S.M, 475 S.N, 475 S.P, 475 S.Q, 475 S.R and 475 S.S in D.D. 23, Po Sam Pai, Ting Kok, Tai Po
(TPB Paper No. 10829)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- | | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Ms Margaret H.Y. Chan | - District Planning Officer/Shu Tin, Tai Po & North District (DPO/STN) |
| Mr Tony Y. C. Wu | - Senior Town Planner/Country Park Enclaves (STP/CPE) |

Applicant

Mr Chow Chiu Hang

Applicant's Representatives

Mr Kong Chi Ping Percy

Mr Pak Chung Man

Mr Boey Chak Ming David

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

25. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Margaret H.Y. Chan, DPO/STN, briefed Members on the background of the review application including the application site (the Site), the proposed uses, consideration of the application by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC/the Committee) of the Town Planning Board (TPB/the Board), departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10829 (the Paper). PlanD maintained its previous view of not supporting the application.

26. The Chairman then invited the applicant to elaborate on the review application.

27. Mr Chow Chiu Hang, the applicant, made the following main points:

- (a) he represented the owners of the lots on the Site (the owners) to submit the planning application. The owners understood the rejection reasons given by the Committee but they hoped that the Board would give sympathetic consideration to the application;
- (b) at the same RNTPC, another application (No. A/NE-TK/739) for temporary private vehicle park was also considered by the Committee. That case had misled Members of RNTPC, which was unfair to the applicant of the subject application, as the two cases were different in nature;
- (c) the Site had been divided into various parcels and sold to 19 owners, and the owners had no intention for agricultural rehabilitation on the Site;
- (d) the developer of their residential developments close by had bundled the sale of the individual parcels on the Site to the sale of their residential units. Since their purchase of the Site in 2018, they had not undertaken any vegetation clearance nor site formation to alter the landscape character of the Site. They had no information on the condition of the Site prior to 2018 as mentioned in the presentation of PlanD;
- (e) they heard that the Site was once fenced off and reinstated with grass cover by the developer. The owners were not informed by the developer of the actions taken and the reasons behind. The owners were no longer using the Site for car parking since enforcement action had been taken by the Planning Authority;
- (f) there was a shortage of car parking spaces in the Ting Kok area. Given the remoteness of the area, it was impossible for the residents to use public transportation for commuting;
- (g) the proposed carpark was accessed via a private road; and

- (h) the proposed carpark would only be used by the owners for parking purpose and the Board was urged to approve the review application and allow them to park their cars on the Site on a temporary basis for three years.

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

29. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions to the applicant:

- (a) the land status of the road providing access to the proposed carpark;
- (b) the reasons for applying for temporary car park use and whether they would consider using the Site for carpark in the long term;
- (c) the number of owners involved in the Site; and
- (d) the nature of properties bought by the owners together with the individual lots on the Site.

30. In response, the applicant and his representatives made the following points:

- (a) the access road to the Site (shown in dotted line on Plan R-2 of the Paper) was a private road, which the owners had access rights. The relevant village representative was responsible for maintenance of that access road with a fee paid by the owners;
- (b) they made the application on a temporary basis for three years as there had been applications for temporary carparks in the vicinity of the Site. They wished to obtain a temporary approval first and seek to renew the approval upon its expiry. They would prove to the Board that they were well disciplined and would comply with the requirements of government departments. They would be willing to park their vehicles in public

carpark nearby if it was available;

- (c) there were 19 owners owning 17 individual lots. Some of the owners knew while others were not aware that the lots were for agricultural purpose as the individual lots looked like car parking spaces when they bought them; and
- (d) the properties the owners bought together with the individual lots were village houses, and the whole development consisted of 17 village houses, which were constructed by the same developer. The owners would only use the Site for car parking and would not cause damage to the green areas.

31. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions to the PlanD's representatives:

- (a) how the Site could be accessed;
- (b) whether there were other car parks near the Site and the land status of the area within the boundary of enforcement case No. E/NE-TK/149 as shown on Plan R-2 of the Paper;
- (c) whether the Board had approved permanent car park in the subject "Agriculture" ("AGR") zone; and
- (d) the locations of the owners' properties.

32. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Ms Margaret H.Y. Chan, DPO/STN, made the following points:

- (a) the Site was accessible from the south via a local track connecting to Tung Tsz Road and Ting Kok Road, and the local track comprised mainly private land;
- (b) land within the boundary of the enforcement case No. E/NE-TK/149 was

mostly private land. Within the enforcement area, private cars were found parking nearby the Site during a recent site visit. Car parking was also observed beside some village houses in the nearby “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone;

- (c) there were two similar applications for temporary carpark in the same “AGR” zone and both of them were rejected by the RNTPC. The Board/Committee had not approved permanent car parking use in the subject “AGR” zone; and
- (d) the applicant had not provided information on the locations of the owners’ houses. Village houses in the area were located mainly in the “V” zone to the south of the Site.

33. In response to a Member’s question, Ms Margaret H.Y. Chan, DPO/STN, said that she had no information on whether there was any restriction in the purchase agreements between the owners and the developer against the sales of the lots on the Site. According to the applicant, the lots were purchased in bundle with the corresponding residential properties. The Chairperson said that the Lands Department (LandsD) would not be involved in the sale and purchase of land among private parties.

34. A Member enquired whether the applicant could submit a rezoning application under s.12A of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) for the car park use, and the relevant considerations to be taken into account. In response, Ms Margret H.Y. Chan, DPO/STN, said that while there was provision for such s.12A application, similar considerations for assessing the s.16 planning application might also be involved, in particular the potential for agricultural rehabilitation and landscape value of the Site. Relevant departments, including the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC), would be consulted on the rezoning application if received, and their comments together with all relevant planning factors would be taken into consideration. The Chairperson supplemented that an applicant who wished to pursue a rezoning via s.12A application should provide strong justifications to support changing the current planning intention of the application site.

35. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson thanked PlanD’s

representatives, the applicant and his representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[Mr. Stephen Liu left the meeting during the question session.]

Deliberation Session

36. The Chairperson remarked that the applicant and the owners should be aware that the Site was for agricultural purpose when they purchased the land, or at least purchasers had the responsibility to ascertain the land status and relevant conditions. Given the circumstances of the case, Member should be mindful that the application, if approved, could possibly set a precedent for similar applications. Parking of vehicles at the Site was an unauthorized development subject to enforcement (enforcement case No. E/NE-TK/149).

37. A Member showed sympathy to the applicant and the owners, and commented that the lack of car parking spaces in the area was a concern, and relevant government departments should help educate the general public on the risks involved in buying agricultural land for unauthorized uses and preventing them from being misled by developers/estate agents. Another Member said that the owners should have sought legal advice on the land transaction and no sympathetic consideration should be given.

38. Two Members raised a general concern on the need for car parking spaces within villages in the New Territories, and said that provision for car parking spaces and community facilities within “V” zones might be considered in future.

39. A Member disagreed with one of the justifications raised by the applicant that consideration of the subject application together with another similar application at the RNTPC meeting was misleading and unfair to the applicant.

40. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally agreed with the decision of the RNTPC and that the review application should be rejected. The Board also agreed that LandsD and PlanD might consider issuing letters to the relevant bodies e.g. Hong Kong Real Estate Agencies General Association, regarding the subject case and request them to remind estate agents on exercising due diligence in providing their services. Members' views on the

provision of community facilities and carpark for villages in the New Territories involved policy issue that needed to be separately dealt with.

41. After deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application on review for the following reasons:

- “(a) the proposed use is not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone which is primarily to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes. It is also intended to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. There is no strong planning justification in the current submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis; and
- (b) the applicant fails to demonstrate in the submission that the proposed use would not result in adverse landscape impacts on the area.”

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/NE-KLH/602

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 1065 S.A in D.D. 7 and Adjoining Government Land, Wai Tau, Tai Po, New Territories
(TPB Paper No. 10835)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

Ms Margaret H.Y. Chan - District Planning Officer/Shu Tin, Tai Po
& North District (DPO/STN)

Mr Tony Y. C. Wu

- Senior Town Planner/Country Park
Enclaves (STP/CPE)

43. The Chairperson informed Members that the applicant had indicated not to attend the meeting. She then invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the review application.

44. Ms Margaret H.Y. Chan, DPO/STN, briefed Members on the background of the review application including the application site (the Site), the proposed development, the consideration of the application by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (the Committee/RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board/TPB) as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10835 (the Paper). As the applicant had not submitted any written representation in support of the review application, and there had been no major change in planning circumstances since the consideration of the s.16 application, PlanD maintained its previous view of not supporting the application.

45. As the presentation of PlanD's representative had been completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

46. Members had no question to raise. The Chairperson thanked PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

47. The Chairperson remarked that the applicant had not submitted any written representation in support of the review application and did not attend review meeting. Given that there had been no major change in planning circumstances since the consideration of the application by the RNTPC, Members agreed with the decision of the RNTPC, and that the review application should be rejected.

48. After deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application on review for the following reasons:

“(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the

“Agriculture” (“AGR”) zone which is primarily to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes. It is also intended to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention;

- (b) the proposed development does not comply with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for New Territories Exempted House/Small House in New Territories in that the proposed development would cause adverse landscape impact on the surrounding area; and
- (c) land is still available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Wai Tau Tsuen which is primarily intended for Small House development. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within the “V” zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructure and services.”

Fanling, Sheung Shui & Yuen Long East District

Agenda Item 6

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/YL-SK/322

Proposed Temporary Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Hobby Farm) in “Agriculture” Zone for a Period of 3 Years, Lot 361 S.B RP (Part) in D.D. 112, Shek Kong, Yuen Long, New Territories

(TPB Paper No. 10830)

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- Mr Anthony K.O. Luk - District Planning Officer/Fanling, Sheung Shui & Yuen Long East (DPO/FS&YLE)
- Mr Patrick M.Y. Fung - Senior Town Planner/Fanling Sheung Shui (STP/FS)

Applicant

Ms Wong Yin Mia

Applicant's Representatives

Ms Chong Shan Shan Hermose

Mr Chapman Chan

Mr Jacky Wong

Mr Henry Wong

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

51. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Patrick M.Y. Fung, STP/FS, briefed Members on the background of the review application including the application site (the Site), proposed use, consideration of the application by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC/the Committee) of the Town Planning Board (TPB/the Board), departmental and public comments, and planning considerations and assessments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10830 (the Paper). PlanD maintained its view of not supporting the application.

52. The Chairman then invited the applicant to elaborate on the review application.

53. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Wong Yin Mia, the applicant, and Messrs Jacky Wong and Henry Tong, the applicant's representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) the applicant sought planning permission to use the Site for proposed hobby farm for a period of three years. The Site would largely be used for farmland with some circulation area. There would be two 2-storey structures with building height not more than 6m for site office, reception and agriculture education room, etc;

- (b) the Site was the subject of a previously approved application No. A/YL-SK/241 for the same use with the same layout in 2018. The application was revoked in 2021. One of the reasons for the revocation was that the waiver was not issued in time and thus the implementation aspect of the approval conditions could not be complied with before the deadline;
- (c) the Site was about 17m from the Shek Kong Barracks and was buffered from it by road and a forested area. The RNTPC had approved many applications for temporary uses in the areas surrounding the Shek Kong Barracks with some located even closer than the Site and some even involved storage of dangerous goods. Some of the sites with planning permissions were also accessed via Shek Kong Airfield Road, which was the same vehicular access as the Site;
- (d) the applicant introduced her personal background and her vision to build a facility that would provide knowledge and resources to nurture the younger generation and raise awareness of eco-friendly living concepts and sustainability, which would benefit the society of Hong Kong;
- (e) the proposed hobby farm was supported by Mr Wong Louis Kar Chit, OBE J.P, and Mr. Wong had known the applicant for many years and agreed to be her character reference;
- (f) the proposed hobby farm would teach the younger generation hydroponics and traditional farming. Building structures were needed for the hydroponics lab, education room and storage for farming tools;
- (g) the target visitors of the proposed hobby farm would be children, parents and students. They had approached some schools which expressed initial interest in visiting the proposed hobby farm; and
- (h) to address the security concern of the Security Bureau (SB), the number of visitors of the proposed hobby farm would be limited to a maximum of 10

persons at one time and registration and record of names would be required for all visitors to the farm.

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

55. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions to the applicant:

- (a) to address the security concern of SB, whether the applicant would consider implementing alleviation measures such as erecting fence wall and forbidding the use of unmanned aerial vehicles, etc.;
- (b) whether the previous planning applications No. YL-SK/215, 241 and 314 at the Site were submitted by the same applicant; and
- (c) the reasons for not complying with the approval conditions under application No. YL-SK/241, and whether the applicant would be able to comply with the approval conditions if the current application was approved by the Board.

56. In response, Ms Wong Yin Mia, the applicant, and Ms Chong Shan Shan Hermose, the applicant's representative made the following main points:

- (a) operation of unmanned aerial vehicle was not allowed at the Site. Photo-taking would be restricted just for school activity purpose and the photos should only be kept by the school. The applicant was willing to undertake other measures considered necessary, such as erection of fence wall etc. to alleviate any security concern;
- (b) the previous planning applications No. YL-SK/215 (rejected) and 241 (approved) were not submitted by the applicant. Application No. YL-SK/314 (rejected) was submitted by the applicant; and
- (c) the approval conditions in relation to the implementation of landscape and

drainage proposals under application No. YL-SK/241 could not be complied with before the deadline in March 2021 as the previous applicant could not obtain waiver for construction of building structures at the Site in time. The waiver was only obtained from Lands Department in April 2021. If planning permission for the subject application was granted to the applicant, she would definitively comply with the relevant approval conditions.

57. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions to PlanD's representatives:

- (a) the differences between the previous application No. A/YL-SK/314 and the current application, and whether the applicant had submitted a s.17 application for a review of the RNTPC's decision to reject application No. A/YL-SK/314;
- (b) whether SB had raised any comment on application No. A/YL-SK/241, which was approved in 2018, and whether the proposed hobby farm applied under application No. A/YL-SK/241 had so far been operated;
- (c) whether there was any further elaboration on the security concerns;
- (d) the relative locations of the Shek Kong Barracks, Shek Kong Airfield Road and the Site, and whether Shek Kong Airfield Road could be accessed by the public;
- (e) whether there were similar applications in the vicinity of the Site, along Kam Tin River and the southern boundary of the Shek Kong Barracks approved by the Committee or the Board. If so, what locations of those approved applications were and their approximate distance from the Shek Kong Barracks; and
- (f) the building height of structures in the surrounding area of the Site.

58. In response, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FS&YLE, made the following points:

- (a) the proposed use, proposed layout and rejection reason of the previous application No. A/YL-SK/314 were the same as those of the current application. The applicant of the previous application No. YL-SK/314, which was also the applicant of the subject application, had not submitted a s.17 application for a review of RNTPC's decision on that application;
- (b) according to record, the SB had not been consulted on application No. A/YL-SK/241. The proposed hobby farm approved under application No. A/YL-SK/241 had not been operated;
- (c) the comment of SB stated in the Paper was that the Site was in close proximity to the Shek Kong Barracks and the application was not supported due to security concerns. There was no further supplement in addition to the above;
- (d) the Shek Kong Barracks and Shek Kong Airfield Road were located to the north of the Site separated by the Kam Tin River. The Site was at the northern fringe of the "Agriculture" ("AGR") zone, which was closest to the boundary of the Barracks in the eastern end. The Shek Kong Airfield Road could be accessed by the public;
- (e) there were approved applications for temporary uses along Kam Tin River and the southern boundary of the Shek Kong Barracks, involving various uses such as temporary shop and services, hobby farm and open air camping site, etc. The approved similar applications were located nearer the western end of the Shek Kong Barracks; and
- (f) the building structures surrounding the Site were about two to three storeys in height.

59. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson thanked PlanD's representatives, the applicant and his representatives for attending the meeting. They left the

meeting at this point.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong left the meeting at this point.]

Deliberation Session

60. Two Members indicated appreciation to the applicant's vision and passion to promote sustainability and eco-friendly living through the proposed use. However, Members generally considered that there was insufficient information about the security concerns of SB to decide on the case and considered it prudent to defer a decision on the application so that PlanD could ensure that SB was well informed about the nature of the application as elaborated by the applicant and could seek elaboration from SB on their specific security concerns and whether there were ways to alleviate such concerns.

61. For instance, clarification could be sought on whether the security concerns were related to the proposed use and its operation, or the proposed structures, or the distance of the Site from the Shek Kong Barracks, or whether there were concerns on the aggregate number of approvals for such temporary uses within a particular area from the Barracks. It would also be useful if the applicant could be advised of any refinement to the proposal and/or measures that could be made or undertaken to alleviate the security concerns.

62. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally agreed that the application should be deferred to allow time to seek clarifications on the comments of SB. PlanD was requested to convey Members' views to SB and to apprise them of the particulars of the current application, together with relevant information such as the grant of planning permission for the same use on the Site under a previous application and the planning permissions given for other sites in the vicinity.

63. After deliberation, the Board decided to defer a decision on the review application pending PlanD's clarification with SB on the above stated matters.

Sai Kung & Islands District

Agenda Item 7

[Open Meeting]

Request for Deferment of Review of Application No. A/SK-CWBN/63

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Green Belt” Zone, Lot 158 S.C RP in D.D. 238, Pan Long Wan, Clear Water Bay, Sai Kung, New Territories
(TPB Paper No. 10832)

64. The Secretary reported that on 19.4.2022, the applicant requested deferment of consideration of the review application for two months to allow more time to liaise with relevant government departments due to the epidemic situation. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of consideration of the review application.

65. Members noted that the justifications for deferment met the criteria set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Deferment of Decision on Representations, Comments, Further Representations and Applications made under the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 33A) in that more time was required by the applicant to liaise with relevant government departments, the deferment period was not indefinite and the deferment would not affect the interests of other relevant parties.

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

Procedural Matters

Agenda Item 8

[Open Meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K22/7
(TPB Paper No. 10831)

67. The Secretary reported that the amendments involved rezoning proposals in Kai Tak that were supported by the Study on Further Review of Land Use in Kai Tak Development (the Review Study), which was commissioned by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) with AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) as one of the consultants. The proposed amendments for development of a proposed Dedicated Rehousing Estate (DRE) by the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) were supported by a feasibility study with AECOM as one of the consultants. Amendment Item I was to take forward the decision on an approved section 12A application (No. Y/K22/3), with Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) being one of the consultants of the applicant. Representations/comments had been submitted by HKHS (R1/C1) and the Hong Kong and China Gas Co. Ltd. (Towngas) (R51) (a subsidiary of Henderson Land Development Co. Limited (HLD)).

68. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| Mr Ivan M.K. Chung
<i>(as Director of Planning)</i> | - | being an ex-officio member of the Supervisory Board of HKHS; |
| Dr C.H. Hau | - | conducting contract research project with CEDD, having past business dealings with AECOM and HLD, and being an employee of the University of Hong Kong which had received a donation from a family member of the Chairman of HLD; |

- Dr Conrad T.C. Wong - having current business dealings with HKHS;
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being a member of HKHS;
- Ms Lilian S.K. Law - being a member of HKHS;
- Mr Timothy K.W. Ma - being a member of the Supervisory Board of HKHS;
- Mr K.L. Wong - being a member and ex-employee of HKHS;
- Mr Franklin Yu - having current business dealings with ARUP; and
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - being a member of the Council of Hong Kong Polytechnic University which had obtained sponsorship from HLD before.

69. Members noted that as the item was procedural in nature, all Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting.

70. The Secretary briefly introduced the TPB Paper No. 10831 (the Paper). On 10.12.2021, the draft Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). During the two-month exhibition period, a total of 123 representations were received and 8 were made with identity information missing and should be treated as not having been made pursuant to sections 6(2)(b) and 6(3)(b) of the Ordinance. The 115 valid representations were subsequently published for three weeks and a total of 54 valid comments were received.

71. 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 June 2021.

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

- (a) the 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 9

[Open Meeting]

Application to the Chief Executive under Section 8(2) of the Town Planning Ordinance for Extension of Time Limit for Submission of the Draft Lam Tei and Yick Yuen Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TM-LTTY/11 to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval
(TPB Paper No. 10836)

73. The Secretary reported that the amendments mainly involved two sites for a public housing development and supporting infrastructural facilities by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) and the Housing Department (HD) was the executive arm of HKHA. The Engineering Feasibility Study (EFS) for the aforesaid amendment items was conducted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD). Representations had been submitted by the Conservancy Association (CA) (R3) and MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) (R420).

74. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr Paul Y.K. Au
*(as Chief Engineer (Works),
Home Affairs Department)*
- being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA;
- Dr C.H. Hau
- conducting contract research projects with CEDD, and a life member of CA and his spouse being the Vice Chairman of the Board of Directors of CA;
- Dr Conrad T.C. Wong
- having current business dealings with HKHA and MTRCL;
- Mr Franklin Yu
- being a member of the Building Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA;
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau
- being a member of Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) which had discussed with HD on housing development issues;
- Ms Lilian S.K. Law
- being a member of HKHS which had discussed with HD on housing development issues;
- Mr K.L. Wong
- being a member and ex-employee of HKHS which had discussed with HD on housing development issues;
- Mr Timothy K.W. Ma
- being a member of the Supervisory Board of HKHS which had discussed with HD on housing development issues; and

Mr L.T. Kwok - his serving organisation operating a social service team which was supported by HKHA and had openly bid funding from HKHA.

75. Members noted that as the item was procedural in nature, these Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting.

76. The Secretary briefly introduced the TPB Paper No. 10836. On 20.8.2021, the draft Lam Tei and Yick Yuen Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TM-LTYYY/11 (the draft OZP) was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). During the two-month exhibition period, a total of 421 valid representations were received. Upon publication of the representations, 11 valid comments on the representations were received. According to the statutory time limit, the draft OZP should be submitted to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval on or before 20.7.2022. Consideration of the representations and comments by the full Board under section 6B of the Ordinance was originally scheduled for April 2022. Due to the epidemic situation, the hearing of the representations and comments had to be rescheduled, and could now only be scheduled for May/June the earliest. There was a need to seek CE's agreement for an extension of the statutory time limit for six months to allow sufficient time to complete the plan-making process.

77. After deliberation, the Board agreed that the CE's agreement should be sought under section 8(2) of the Ordinance to extend the time limit for submission of the draft OZP to the CE in C for a period of six months from 20.7.2022 to 20.1.2023.

Agenda Item 10

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

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