

**Minutes of 1294th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 1.6.2023**

Present

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang Vice-chairperson

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Dr C.H. Hau

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Conrad T.C. Wong

Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories West)
Transport Department
Ms Carrie K.Y. Leung

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

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

Director of Lands (Acting)
Ms Sophia C.W. Chiang

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Ms Doris P.L. Ho

Chairperson

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Mr K.L. Wong

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee

1. The Vice-chairperson said that the Chairperson had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting, and he would take the chair of the meeting.

Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/YL-LFS/447

Proposed Filling of Pond for Permitted Agricultural Use in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 1169 in D.D.129, Mong Tseng Wai, Lau Fau Shan, Yuen Long
(TPB Paper No. 10900)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

PlanD

- | | |
|--------------------|---|
| Mr Raymond H.F. Au | - District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (DPO/TMYLW) |
| Mr Eric C.Y. Chiu | - Senior Town Planner/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (STP/TMYLW) |
| Mr Keith P.S. Wong | - Town Planner/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West |

Applicant’s Representatives

- Mr Tang Nam Shing (鄧南盛)
- Mr Tang Wing Keung (鄧永強)
- Mr Tang Chuen Lam (鄧椿林)
- Mr Tang Tim Fuk (鄧添福)
- Mr Tang Chun Lam (鄧振林)

Mr Tang Shui Hing (鄧水慶)

Mr Chan Yu Him (陳宇謙)

Mr Tang Hok Yau Eric (鄧學優)

FiBi International Project Consultancy Co. Ltd.

Mr Man Kai Chung (文啟聰) - the Consultant

3. The Vice-chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the review hearing. He then invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the review application.

4. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Eric C.Y. Chiu, STP/TMYLW, briefed Members on the background of the review application including the application site (the Site) and the surrounding areas, the applicant's proposal and justifications, the consideration of the application by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board), departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10900 (the Paper). PlanD maintained its previous view of not supporting the application.

[Professor John C.Y. Ng and Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui joined the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

5. The Vice-chairperson then invited the applicant's representatives to elaborate on the review application.

6. Messrs Tang Nam Shing (the village representative of Mong Tseng Wai), Tang Tim Fok and Tang Shui Hing, the applicant's representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) the Site was a pond which had been in existence for about 70 years. The Site was originally a piece of agricultural land which was dredged to create a retention pond by the villagers for the purposes of fire-fighting, irrigation and daily use as there was no water supply in the village at that time;
- (b) water supply infrastructure for the village was provided by the Water Supplies

Department in 1983, and the pond had been abandoned since then;

- (c) in 1992, the Works Section of the Home Affairs Department (HAD) constructed two village drains which were connected to the pond. Rainwater and debris collected by the two village drains were discharged to the pond, causing silting of the pond and hence, poor hygienic condition with odour problem and mosquito/rodent infestation over the years;
- (d) to solve the silting problem of the pond, the villagers had requested the Drainage Services Department (DSD) and the Works Section of HAD to improve the drainage system in the village, yet nothing had been done. They had only been asked for signing consent letters to allow the Government to construct drains on those private lots along Deep Bay Road, but so far no proper drains/drainage system were provided by the Government in the village. Besides, there was no sandpit in the village to perform the intercepting function, and hence rainwater together with debris and wastes were all discharged to and accumulated in the pond;
- (e) as mosquito infestation was very serious in the area, they had liaised with district councillors, HAD and the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) to tackle the problem, but no action had been taken by the Government;
- (f) the quality of the pond water was very poor and hence, not suitable for fish culture purpose. It was doubtful why the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) considered the pond having potential for fish culture. A bottle of pond water was displayed at the meeting and it was suggested that government officials such as AFCD should send the bottle of pond water for a laboratory test to ascertain whether the water quality was suitable for fish culture. Government officials should visit the Site to experience the terrible condition of the pond;
- (g) the pond was not a piece of wetland. It was located in the middle of the village and surrounded by village houses. It was doubtful how the Site could

act as a wetland buffer area and why the pond could possess ecological value;
and

- (h) the pond was located within a private lot owned by the villagers, and the villagers should have the right to use the pond. The proposed pond filling was to improve the hygiene condition and the living environment for the sake of villagers' health.

[Dr Conrad T.C. Wong and Mr Franklin Yu joined the meeting during the presentation of the applicant's representatives.]

7. As the presentations of PlanD's representative and the applicant's representatives had been completed, the Vice-chairperson invited questions from Members.

The Site

8. Two Members raised the following questions to PlanD's representatives and the applicant's representatives:

- (a) whether the pond was currently in poor condition with odour problem and was a breeding place for mosquitos as claimed by the applicant's representatives; and
- (b) land status of the pond (i.e. the Site).

9. In response, with the aid of some site photos on PowerPoint slides, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, said that the Site was currently a pond overgrown with vegetation on wet soil where pond water could not be obviously observed. According to paragraph 10.1.6 of the RNTPC paper (Annex A of the Paper), FEHD conducted two site visits in November 2022. It was observed during the site visits that the Site was a pond with dense vegetation where no obvious mosquito infestation was noted. In the past five years, there were six complaint cases regarding mosquito infestation in the vicinity of Mong Tseng Wai, but all were not related to the Site. FEHD also indicated that cultivated land with dense vegetation might also provide favourable resting places for mosquitos. Rather, regular mosquito control measures, such as

applying larvicide and regular vegetation trimming, could help prevent mosquito breeding on the pond, and there was no need for filling the pond.

10. As regards the land status of the pond, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, said that the pond was located within a private lot. Mr Tang Nam Sang, the applicant's representative, confirmed that the pond was located within a private lot owned by the villagers.

Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 12C for 'Application for Developments within Deep Bay Area under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance' (TPB PG-No. 12C)

11. Two Members raised the following questions to PlanD's representatives and the applicant's representatives:

- (a) the definition of "wetland";
- (b) the interpretation of the "no-net-loss in wetland" principle in the TPB PG-No. 12C, and whether such principle would be considered in terms of "area" and /or "function";
- (c) noting that one of the rejection reasons in the s.16 application was that the proposed pond filling was not in line with the TPB PG-No. 12C in that the "no-net-loss in wetland" principle was not complied with, whether the rejection reason was specifically applicable to the Site;
- (d) noting that the pond was located in a wetland area but the pond had been abandoned/degraded, whether the Government had any measures to restore the pond in order to achieve the objective of conserving the ecological value of the wetland area;
- (e) details of the similar approved applications, and whether the "no-net-loss in wetland" principle had been considered for those similar approved applications; and
- (f) whether the applicant had submitted any technical assessment or relevant

information such as an Ecological Impact Assessment (EcoIA) to demonstrate that the proposed pond filling would not have negative impact on the ecological value of the wetland area.

12. With the aid of a visualizer and some PowerPoint slides, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, made the following main points:

- (a) in general, wetlands referred to areas where the water met the land and where the water was the primary factor controlling the ecosystem. Wetlands generally covered a wide variety of natural habitat types, such as rivers and streams, freshwater or brackish marshes, intertidal areas at estuaries and mangroves. There were also human-made wetlands such as fish and shrimp ponds, irrigated agricultural land, farm ponds, reservoirs and drainage canals;
- (b) according to TPB PG-No. 12C, the Site fell within the Wetland Buffer Area (WBA) in the Deep Bay Area. In considering development proposals in the Deep Bay Area, the Board adopted the principle of “no-net-loss in wetland” which provided for the conservation of continuous and adjoining fishponds. The “no-net-loss in wetland” principle could refer to both loss in “area” and “function”, and no decline in wetland or ecological functions served by the existing fish ponds should occur. Within WBA, for most development or redevelopment which required planning permission from the Board, an EcoIA would generally need to be submitted to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have negative impact on the ecological value of the wetland area;
- (c) as shown on the plan indicating the boundaries of the Wetland Conservation Area (WCA) and WBA in the Deep Bay Area attached to TPB PG-No. 12C, the light blue line and the dark blue line indicated the boundaries of WCA and WBA respectively. WCA comprised mainly the existing and contiguous, active or abandoned fish ponds in the Deep Bay Area while WBA was a buffer area of about 500m along the landward boundary of WCA intended for protecting the ecological integrity of the fish ponds and wetland within WCA. The Site fell within WBA, and the WCA boundary was about

200m to its south. For any applications for developments within the Deep Bay Area, the planning considerations stipulated in TPB PG-No. 12C were applicable;

- (d) the Site was a private lot falling within an area zoned “Village Type Development” (“V”) on the Lau Fau Shan and Tsim Bei Tsui Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), and any use or development of the pond proposed by the private land owner(s) had to conform to the OZP restrictions and any other relevant government legislations and regulations; and
- (e) there were three similar approved applications for proposed pond filling for permitted New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) development (No. A/YL-LFS/58, 72 and 216) in the vicinity. Applications No. A/YL-LFS/58 and 72 were approved by RNTPC in 2000 and 2001 respectively mainly on the considerations that DSD and the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) had no objection to the applications or their technical concerns could be addressed by approval conditions. Application No. A/YL-LFS/216 was approved by the Board on review in 2013 mainly on the considerations that the proposed development was of small scale covering an area of about 132m², and an ecological appraisal had been submitted to demonstrate that no significant ecological impact on the WCA was anticipated, to which AFCD had no adverse comment from nature conservation perspective.

13. In respect of the submission of technical assessment, Mr Chan Yu Him, the applicant’s representative, said that they had not submitted an EcoIA in support of the application and queried whether an EcoIA was really required since the pond was in a poor condition without any ecological value. However, the applicant was willing to submit an EcoIA which could be incorporated as an approval condition if the application was approved.

Drainage Aspect and Silting Problem of the Pond

14. Some Members raised the following questions to PlanD’s representatives and the applicant’s representatives:

- (a) why drainage problems had to be addressed for carrying out pond filling at the Site;
- (b) noting that the applicant had submitted a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) to support the application while DSD considered the submitted DIA not acceptable, what the applicant's drainage proposals were and what DSD's comments were;
- (c) noting the applicant's representatives' allegation that the existing village drains were not properly managed and maintained by the Government that caused silting problem of the pond, which department(s) was/were the responsible agent(s) for the construction, management and maintenance of the mentioned village drains;
- (d) whether carrying out desilting works in the pond required planning permission from the Board; and
- (e) whether the drainage problem or even the silting problem at the Site could be solved by the applicant's representatives themselves.

15. With regard to the rationale of addressing drainage problems for carrying out pond filling at the Site, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, said that as filling of pond might cause adverse drainage impacts on the adjacent areas and adverse impacts on the environment, planning permission from the Board was required for such activity. Hence, it was important to ensure that the proposed filling of pond was considered acceptable by relevant departments including DSD, AFCD and EPD from the drainage, ecological and environmental aspects.

16. As regards the applicant's drainage proposals and DSD's comments on the submitted DIA, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, said that according to the submitted DIA, the applicant proposed to install surface U-channels along the peripheries of the Site upon pond filling to intercept the surface runoff passing through the Site. However, DSD considered the submitted DIA not acceptable as there was insufficient information in the DIA to demonstrate that the proposed drainage facilities on-site, i.e. the surface U-channels, would be adequate to cater for the upstream overland flow. Besides, without the provision of hydraulic calculation

of the capacity of the existing downstream drainage system in the DIA, the applicant could not demonstrate that the capacity of the existing downstream drainage system could cater for the additional flow from the Site as well as the conveyed surface runoff from existing village drainage system if the pond was filled as proposed.

17. Mr Man Kai Chung, the applicant's representative (the consultant), said that since the pond was located at an undulating level which was generally lower than that of the adjoining land where the existing discharge points were located, rainwater together with debris collected by the village drains were easily discharged to and accumulated in the pond. In the submitted DIA, the applicant suggested that pond filling was required to raise the level of the Site to align with the adjoining land and proposed drainage facilities could then be laid on/underneath the proposed filled-up area to discharge the rainwater flow. As regards DSD's comments on calculation of the capacity of the upstream and downstream drainage systems, the applicant was willing to liaise with DSD to rectify/provide the hydraulic calculation. However, without pond filling, the pond could not perform the function of discharging rainwater flow.

18. Regarding the responsible agent(s) for the construction, management and maintenance of the village drains, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, said that according to DSD's advice, the existing village drains were not constructed and maintained by DSD. Messrs Tang Nam Shing and Tang Tim Fuk, the applicant's representatives, said that the existing village drains were constructed by the Works Section of HAD long time ago. The village drains were not properly designed and constructed as they were connected to the pond. Villagers in the area had been requesting the Works Section of HAD/DSD to improve the existing drainage system in the village. Mr Paul Y.K. Au, Chief Engineer (Works) (CE(W)), HAD, said that the Rural Public Works Programme under HAD served to carry out local improvement works to enhance the living environment of villages. If the village drains were constructed by HAD, HAD would be responsible for relevant management and maintenance works.

19. In response to a Member's enquiry about the need for planning permission for desilting works, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, said that planning permission was not required for desilting works in ponds. In that regard, the Secretary supplemented that according to the Notes of the OZP for the concerned "V" zone, filling of land/pond or excavation of land required planning permission from the Board. Whether planning

permission was required for land excavation depended on the nature and scale of the proposed excavation works. In general, regular and minor excavation directly related to agricultural activities, such as desilting works in ponds and ploughing on agricultural land, did not require planning permission. Besides, excavation works that were public works co-ordinated or implemented by Government were also exempted from the requirement of planning permission.

20. Messrs Tang Nam Sang and Tang Shui Hing, the applicant's representatives, said that they could carry out desilting works in the pond if needed. However, if the village drains nearby were not improved by the Government, the silting problem in the pond would occur again later. The silting problem and associated mosquito infestation and hygiene problems could not be solved. Mr Tang Nam Sang, the applicant's representative, also raised concern that planning permission might be required for the desilting works. The Vice-chairperson remarked that if the applicant's representative(s) was/were not certain about whether carrying out desilting works or other works at the Site required planning permission, he/they could seek advice from PlanD.

Applicant's Justifications for Proposed Pond Filling for Permitted Agricultural Use

21. Two Members raised the following questions to the applicant's representatives:

- (a) the justifications for proposed pond filling, and whether the main purpose of the proposed pond filling was to address the problem of mosquito infestation; and
- (b) noting the applicant's proposal of partitioning the agricultural area into 21 mini-farmlands upon pond filling, what the operation details of the mini-farmlands were, and whether such farmlands would be operated as commercial farms for outsiders or subsistence/leisure farms for the villagers.

22. In response, Mr Tang Nam Sang, the applicant's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed pond filling was not for profit-making nor building houses. The main purpose of the proposed pond filling was to address the hygiene

problem which was caused by mosquito infestation and odour of the pond. The proposed pond filling could also create a better living environment for the villagers; and

- (b) the farmlands would be used by the villagers for subsistence/leisure farming, and some open spaces/resting places could also be provided thereat for villagers.

Others

23. A Member noted that the similar approved applications were for NTEH/ Small House (SH) development and asked the details of the demand and land available for SH development in the concerned villages. In response, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, said that the subject application was for proposed pond filling for permitted agricultural use, not for proposed SH development. For Members' reference, as of 2023, the total number of outstanding SH applications for Mong Tseng Tsuen and Mong Tseng Wai which shared the same "V" zone was about 200 while the 10-year SH demand forecast was around 430. It was estimated that about 10.6 ha of land (equivalent to about 420 SH sites) was available within the "V" zone of the concerned villages for SH development as of 2021.

24. As Members had no further question to raise, the Vice-chairperson said that the hearing procedures for the review application had been completed. The Board would further deliberate on the review application in the absence of the applicant's representatives, and inform the applicant of the Board's decision in due course. The Vice-chairperson thanked PlanD's representatives and the applicant's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

25. The Vice-chairperson invited views from Members. Members generally agreed with the decision of RNTPC, and that the review application should be rejected. Some members had the following views and suggestions:

Applicant's Justifications for the Proposed Pond Filling

- (a) no strong justifications nor technical assessments such as EcoIA were provided by the applicant to support the review application;
- (b) pond filling was not a solution to address the applicant's special hardship/concerns on mosquito infestation as well as silting and odour problems of the pond;
- (c) the pond was located within a private lot owned by the villagers. Private land owners should have the responsibility to solve the silting problem/mosquito infestation on their own lot. Such responsibility of private land management should not be transferred to the Government;

Ecological Aspect

- (d) with reference to some online photos, the Site was considered as a wetland since some wetland vegetation such as taro and ginger lily could be observed in the pond;
- (e) the "no-net-loss in wetland" principle stipulated in TPB PG-No. 12C should be adhered to. Although some similar applications for pond filling were approved, they were of small scale and/or technical assessments were submitted to demonstrate no significant ecological impact on the wetland area. For the current application, sympathetic consideration could not be given as the applicant failed to demonstrate that the proposed pond filling would not have negative impacts on the ecological value of the wetland area;

Drainage Aspect

- (f) it was suggested that the applicant should liaise with HAD/DSD to improve the existing drainage system in the village. For example, consideration could be given to extending the two existing village drains southwards to the

downstream area so as to minimise the discharge to the pond and hence, alleviate the silting problem; and

Others

- (g) two Members showed sympathy to the villagers as they had been perplexed by mosquito infestation and odour problems for many years. It was suggested that government departments, such as HAD, should provide more assistance to the villagers in solving the problems.

26. Mr Paul Y.K. Au, CE/W, HAD, said that the Rural Public Works Programme under HAD served to implement local drainage improvement works to village drains in the villages and carrying out necessary maintenance and repair works to those drains completed by HAD. While he had no information in hand on whether the mentioned village drains were constructed by HAD, he would follow up after the meeting. He supplemented that HAD often encountered difficulties in constructing village drains on private lots as owners' consent had to be obtained for such construction works, but some of the private lot owners could not be contacted or had deceased/migrated. Having said that, with concerted efforts by HAD, DSD and other relevant departments in past years, a number of drainage improvement works had been carried out in different villages by which many flooding blackspots had been eliminated. HAD would continue the efforts in implementing local drainage improvement works in villages.

27. The Vice-chairperson concurred with Members' views that pond filling was not a solution to solve mosquito infestation and odour problems, and private land owners should have the responsibility to tackle the silting problem in their own lot. He remarked that HAD had committed to check whether the concerned village drains were under the jurisdiction of HAD and to take appropriate action as necessary. The applicant and his representatives should liaise with concerned departments such as PlanD, DSD and HAD if they had any enquiries about planning/drainage issues.

28. After deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application for the following reasons:

- “(a) the proposed pond filling, which falls within the Wetland Buffer Area, is not

in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for ‘Application for Developments within Deep Bay Area under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’ (TPB PG-No. 12C) in that the “no-net-loss in wetland” principles are not complied with, and the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed pond filling would not have negative off-site disturbance impact on the ecological value of the fish ponds and wetland within the Wetland Conservation Area; and

- (b) the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed pond filling would not have adverse drainage and landscape impacts on the surrounding areas.”

[The meeting was adjourned for a 5-minute break.]

Agenda Item 2

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/YL-LFS/450

Proposed Holiday Camp in “Coastal Protection Area” Zone, Lot 256 RP in D.D. 129, Tsim Bei Tsui, Yuen Long

(TPB Paper No. 10901)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

PlanD

- Mr Raymond H.F. Au - District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (DPO/TMYLW)
- Mr Eric C.Y. Chiu - Senior Town Planner/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (STP/TMYLW)

Mr Keith P.S. Wong

- Town Planner/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West

30. The Vice-chairperson extended a welcome and informed Members that the applicant had indicated not to attend the meeting. He then invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the review application.

31. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Eric C.Y. Chiu, STP/TMYLW, briefed Members on the background of the review application including the application site (the Site) and the surrounding areas, the applicant's proposal and justifications, the consideration of the application by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board), departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10901 (the Paper). PlanD maintained its previous view of not supporting the application.

32. As the presentation of PlanD's representative had been completed, the Vice-chairperson invited questions from Members.

33. Members had no question to raise. The Vice-chairperson said that the hearing procedures for the review application had been completed. The Board would further deliberate on the review application. The Vice-chairperson thanked PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

34. A Member said that the applicant had not provided any strong justifications to support the review application. The Vice-chairperson concluded that Members generally agreed with the decision of RNTPC to reject the application.

35. After deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application for the following reasons:

- “(a) the proposed use is not in line with the planning intention of the “Coastal Protection Area” zone, which is intended to conserve, protect and retain the natural coastlines and the sensitive coastal natural environment, including

attractive geological features, physical landform or area of high landscape, scenic or ecological value, with a minimum of built development. There is a general presumption against development in this zone. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from such planning intention;

- (b) the proposed use, which falls within the Wetland Buffer Area, is not in line with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for ‘Application for Developments within Deep Bay Area under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’ (TPB PG-No. 12C) in that no ecological impact assessment is submitted to demonstrate the ecological impact of the proposed development and propose any mitigation measures; and
- (c) the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would not be susceptible to adverse environmental impact and would not have adverse landscape impacts on the surrounding areas.”

Agenda Item 3

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

Any Other Business

36. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 11:05 a.m.