

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)1320/04-05
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/PLW/1

Panel on Planning, Lands and Works

Minutes of meeting
held on Tuesday, 22 March 2005, at 2:30 pm
in Conference Room A of the Legislative Council Building

- Members present** : Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBS, JP (Chairman)
Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon WONG Yung-kan, JP
Hon CHOY So-yuk
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon LEE Wing-tat
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, SBS, JP
- Members attending** : Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah, SC
- Members absent** : Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, S.B.St.J., JP
Hon LI Kwok-ying, MH
Hon Daniel LAM Wai-keung, BBS, JP
- Public officers attending** : **Agenda item IV**
Mr SUEN Ming-yeung, Michael
Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands

Mrs LAU NG Wai-lan, Rita
Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands
(Planning and Lands)

Mr TSO Man-tai, Thomas
Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands
(Planning and Lands) 1

Mr FUNG Chee-keung, Bosco
Director of Planning

Miss WONG Yuen-sheung, Ophelia
Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Ms WOO Kit-ching, Jacinta
Senior Town Planner/Ordinance Review (1)
Planning Department

Mr LAU Lai-chiu, Patrick
Director of Lands

Mr Christopher Seabrook MILLS
Assistant Director (Headquarters)
Lands Departments

Agenda item V

Mrs LAU NG Wai-lan, Rita
Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands
(Planning and Lands)

Mr TSO Man-tai, Thomas
Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands
(Planning and Lands) 1

Mr FUNG Chee-keung, Bosco
Director of Planning

Miss WONG Yuen-sheung, Ophelia
Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Ms WOO Kit-ching, Jacinta
Senior Town Planner/Ordinance Review (1)
Planning Department

Clerk in attendance : Miss Odelia LEUNG
Chief Council Secretary (1)4

Staff in attendance : Ms Sarah YUEN
Senior Council Secretary (1)6

Ms Christina SHIU
Legislative Assistant

Action

I Confirmation of minutes

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1117/04-05 -- Minutes of meeting on
22 February 2005)

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 February 2005 were confirmed.

II Information papers issued since last meeting

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1040/04-05(01) -- Submission from Mr Ruy
BARRETTO S.C. on Concept
Plan for Lantau Consultation
Digest

LC Paper No. RP03/04-05 -- Research Report on Public
Private Partnerships

LC Paper No. CB(1)1131/04-05(01) -- Memorandum dated 16 March
2005 referring to the Panel the
views expressed by Kowloon
City District Council members
at the meeting with Legislative
Council Members on
3 February 2005 on major
development projects under
the South East Kowloon
Development and the
provision of the waterfront
promenade in South East
Kowloon)

2. Members noted the above information papers issued since the last
monthly regular meeting of the Panel on 22 February 2005.

III Items for discussion at the next meeting

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1116/04-05(01) -- List of outstanding items for discussion

LC Paper No. CB(1)1116/04-05(02) -- List of follow-up actions)

3. Members agreed to discuss the following items at the next meeting scheduled for 26 April 2005:

(a) Sha Tin New Town, remaining engineering works (7177CL);

(b) Northern access to Area 86, Tseung Kwan O (7741TH); and

(c) Application List System for land sale.

IV Comprehensive review of planning and land policy and mechanism of Town Planning Board

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1116/04-05(03) -- Hon LEE Wing-tat's letter requesting discussion of the item

LC Paper No. CB(1)1116/04-05(04) -- Information paper provided by the Administration

LC Paper No. CB(1)1116/04-05(05) -- Background brief on "Town Planning (Amendment) Ordinance 2004" prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat)

4. Mr Patrick LAU Sau-shing declared interests as Vice-chairman of the Town Planning Board (TPB).

5. The Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (SHPL) briefed members on the existing planning and land policy as outlined in the Administration's paper.

The planning and land policy

6. The Chairman highlighted Heung Yee Kuk's concern about the lack of compensation for diminution of development rights due to planning actions, and asked whether the concern could be addressed in the next rounds of review of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPO) (Cap. 131). In response, SHPL advised that the standing policy of not taking into account the hope value of land when working out the compensation for land resumption had survived legal challenges and hence would remain unchanged. There were already ex-gratia payment arrangements for land resumed in the New Territories (NT). If the land owners concerned accepted the arrangements, the resumption process could be expedited.

7. Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming considered it unfair that in the late eighties and early nineties, the Administration zoned many plots of land in NT as conservation areas without first consulting the owners concerned, who were thus deprived of the right to apply for change of use of their land to enhance its value. In response, SHPL explained that where farmland was concerned, zoning as conservation area only meant that the land concerned could not be used for purposes other than as farmland. Zoning had not adversely affected the land's original value. Even when land originally zoned for housing development was subsequently rezoned as conservation area, the land owner could still apply to redevelop houses on it provided the restrictions imposed on conservation areas were observed.

8. Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming was unassured. He was concerned about the criteria adopted for approving land use in conservation-related zoning areas, which according to him were more stringent than those applicable to pure farmland. In response, SHPL confirmed that in considering applications for planning approval also requiring lease modifications, TPB would have regard to Government policies in relation to the land concerned.

Mechanism for changing land use zoning

9. Mr Albert CHAN Wai-yip highlighted the need to enhance the transparency of the mechanism for changing land use zoning, so that the Administration could not collude with developers to transfer benefits to them as in the case of the development in the buffer zone of Terminal No. 9, where service apartments were sold as residential units. He also highlighted the use of bus depot sites for property development by the Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Ltd. (KMB), and called for tighter control over the change of use of land granted by way of private treaty.

10. In response, SHPL pointed out that major planning reviews were conducted from time to time to cope with changing circumstances and the public's aspirations for the development of different regions or areas. As such, with the expansion of the urban area, land zoned for other uses might need to be rezoned for residential development. He also clarified that KMB's bus depot sites subsequently used for property development were acquired by KMB through land auction. Some of these sites were also subject to no development restrictions under lease. He added that with years of operation, the mechanism for changing land use zoning had improved a lot. For lots previously acquired by owners concerned in the open market, application for modification of the lease conditions would be considered by the Lands Department (Lands D), which would also decide on the appropriate premium payable to reflect the enhancement in value of the lot, if any. If a lot was granted by private treaty by the Chief Executive in Council (ExCo), to modify the lease conditions to a use for which no delegated authority from ExCo to make the grant existed, ExCo's approval was necessary. In this regard, SHPL also took the opportunity to report that the Administration was examining concerns about the enforcement of the cessation of user clause in the lease conditions of the private treaty grants, and would report to the Panel on

Admin the proposed measures for improvement in due course.

11. Mr Albert CHAN expressed concern that over half of the land used for private housing development was made available through land exchange and change of land use but the procedures concerned were not transparent and sufficiently monitored. In particular, the Legislative Council (LegCo) and other relevant statutory bodies had no power to monitor the relevant premium determination process. The additional premium payable for the change of land use was always under-estimated at the expense of the public coffers, giving rise to unfairness and grievances of developers who paid high prices for land acquired through open bidding. He therefore called upon the Administration to review and improve the premium determination mechanism, and proposed that public consultation be conducted on the amount of additional premium under negotiation, or that an independent committee be established for determining the premium.

12. In response, SHPL opined that it might be too simplistic to assume that all developers made profits, or that they stood to benefit whenever additional premium payable for change of land use was determined. He stressed that Lands D officers were professionals who acted according to professional ethics. Isolated incidents should not be blown out of proportion. Professionals should be trusted to perform their duties. Whether the amount of additional premium was fairly determined should be judged in perspective and not with hindsight. He did not consider it appropriate to involve the general public in the process bearing in mind the large number of applications for lease modifications handled by Lands D annually, otherwise the smooth running of development activities in Hong Kong would be adversely affected. He pointed out that when determining the premium, Lands D would make reference to open market information. It would also disclose the premium so determined to ensure transparency. The existing premium determination mechanism worked well.

13. Mr Albert CHAN was unassured. He reiterated the need to enhance the transparency of the mechanism for changing land use zoning. He further pointed out that, as he understood, many former Lands D officers had become developers' staff after retirement. In his view, the lack of transparency in the mechanism had rendered it vulnerable to manipulation by Lands D officers so that they could deliberately transfer benefits to developers to pave way for employment after retirement. In response, SHPL said that the recently proposed changes to the guidelines governing the post-retirement employment of senior civil servants, in particular those related to the length of the sanitization period, were one of the best ways to address the member's concern.

14. Mr James TO Kun-sun referred to the procedure for approving modification of lease conditions of a lot granted by private treaty as described in paragraph 10 above, and expressed concern about its arbitrariness and lack of transparency and public participation. In his view, the involvement of the ExCo in the process would not help because the influence of the business sector on ExCo was significant. Highlighting the magnitude of the interests involved in land use

zoning, he opined that there should be guidelines on how applications for lease modification should be handled. He further opined that the Administration should provide in table form details on lease modifications approved as well as estimates of future applications, so that members and the public could examine relevant proposals for improvement in perspective. He also saw a need to conduct public consultation on the proposals.

15. In response, SHPL reiterated that the Administration had already undertaken to publish information on lease modifications approved as proposed by Mr James TO above. He pointed out that plots of land granted by way of private treaty were few and their uses were limited to meeting specific policy objectives. The arrangement of direct land grant to service providers for specified purposes was necessary because, as in the case of buildings for telephone exchanges, they had to be situated in specific locations in order to be functional.

16. Ms Emily LAU Wai-hing was glad to note the Administration's readiness to provide information about lease modification. She urged the Administration to provide the information as soon as practicable to address public concern about benefit transfers, and opined that a special Panel meeting should be called to discuss the paper when the information was available.

17. Mr James TO enquired about the timetable for the above-mentioned review exercise, and whether applications for lease modification would be handled in the meantime. In reply, SHPL assured members that the exercise would be completed as soon as practicable. Pending a decision on the future policy directions, applications for lease modification of private treaty grants would not be considered unless under exceptionally urgent circumstances.

Mechanism of Town Planning Board

General comments

18. Mr Albert CHAN considered TPB's operation problematic, and cast doubt on why the development of Cheung Kong Centre was approved by TPB while the proposed Mega Tower, which in his opinion would implicate on its surroundings in a lesser degree, was not given the go-ahead. Mr Alan LEONG Kah-kit also pointed out that the introduction of reforms to TPB was important to ensure public participation and hence sustainable development. The Administration noted their views and concerns.

19. Mr LEE Wing-tat emphasized that to ensure fairness, applicants for change of land use should not be allowed to lobby individual TPB members although the members were required to declare interests in this regard. Applicants should present their cases at TPB meetings. In response, the Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) (PSPL) clarified that there were clear guidelines restricting TPB members from direct contact with applicants whose projects had been included in the agenda of any TPB meeting. TPB

members were also fully aware of the need to perform their roles impartially and professionally. She considered that it would be difficult to restrict TPB members from contacting project applicants throughout the project period because projects normally spanned over many years.

20. Mr Alan LEONG opined that TPB should establish its own secretariat to enhance its independence. Ms Emily LAU shared his view, and said that the additional resources so incurred were worthwhile as proven by the performance of the LegCo secretariat, which in her view had been able to provide better service to LegCo Members since its independence. She also believed that the Administration should have no difficulty in securing the required funding from LegCo's Finance Committee. In response, SHPL said that resource implications were a major consideration because an independent secretariat would duplicate the professional/technical support and resources currently provided by Plan D. He assured members that Plan D officers had all along been providing impartial services to TPB and there had not been any role conflicts.

Composition of the Town Planning Board

21. Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming stressed the importance of ensuring the transparency, impartiality, integrity and credibility of TPB because of its possession of significant statutory powers and the far-reaching implications of its decisions on the development and well-being of Hong Kong. In reply to him on the distribution of professional representation on TPB, PSPL agreed to provide the information in writing.

Admin

22. Ms Emily LAU highlighted the need for the chairman of TPB to be a non-government official to enhance openness and objectiveness of the planning system. In response, SHPL pointed out that there was practical difficulty in identifying a suitable person for the post because he/she had to possess the necessary expertise as well as command a high degree of respect in the field but at the same time without any connection with developers. Having considered the relevant factors, the Administration remained of the view that a Government official was a better candidate for the post. Ms LAU was however unconvinced.

23. Referring to a developer's recent complaint about unfair treatment by TPB, Mr LEE Wing-tat saw a need to ensure that TPB would fairly perform its role, and expressed concern that a TPB member was employed as a senior staff member of a property development company after his appointment to TPB. SHPL responded that it would be difficult to find potential TPB members who had absolutely no connection with developers because of Hong Kong's small size and the close relationships among practitioners in the construction industry. Nevertheless, TPB's elaborate system of declaration of interests should be able to address concerns about conflicts of interests because, under the system, TPB members were required to give details of their involvement in the projects under consideration and, if they were involved in the projects, they would not be

provided with the relevant papers and/or could not attend at the relevant meeting as appropriate.

24. Mr LEE Wing-tat was unassured, and maintained that TPB should be seen to be acting fairly, and as such should avoid having members directly connected with developers because its members had access to more information than others on planning actions and could affect decisions in this regard. Mr Ronny TONG Ka-wah was likewise unassured, and opined that the appointment criteria of TPB members should be reviewed to enhance TPB's impartiality and acceptability. He also did not agree that the requirement to declare interests could address the concern about conflicts of interests arising from the appointment of a TPB member closely related to a developer. This was because firstly, developers in general had an interest in all developments in Hong Kong and it was impracticable for the member concerned to declare interests in every project considered by TPB. Secondly, the development of one site might affect the values of other sites in its vicinity and hence the market strategy of the developer(s) affected. Thirdly, the property market in Hong Kong was small and the number of stakeholders few. Any decision made by TPB might affect to a certain extent some of the stakeholders.

25. In reply, SHPL clarified that the TPB member in question was recruited by a developer only after his appointment. He further emphasized that the criteria for the appointment of TPB members had been actively reviewed before, but the difficulty in ascertaining whether a prospective TPB member was connected to a developer in any way remained to be overcome. In response to Mr Ronny TONG's call for bolder reforms in this regard, SHPL reported that the Town Planning Bill introduced in 2000 (the 2000 Bill) did make such an attempt. However, mainly because of time constraints and difficulties in achieving a consensus on certain more innovative proposals, the Bill was lapsed after expiry of the relevant legislative term. The Administration had therefore decided to adopt a phased approach in introducing amendments to TPO, starting with the Town Planning (Amendment) Ordinance 2004 (the Amendment Ordinance) to deal with the less controversial issues. He believed that with joint efforts by members, the other phases of reforms could be launched within this legislative term.

Meeting arrangements

26. Mr LEE Wing-tat found it undesirable that not all meetings of TPB would be opened up. Mr Alan LEONG also enquired whether meetings and papers of TPB would be further made open in the next round of amendments to TPO.

27. In response, PSPL explained that the decision to open up all meetings of TPB to the public, except for the deliberation part in relation to consideration of representations/comments and planning applications and under certain specified circumstances in respect of other meetings, had been made after thorough debate by the Bills Committee on the Amendment Ordinance, given TPB members' grave concern that conducting deliberations in public might inhibit them from

expressing views freely. Moreover, there were justifications for not opening up TPB meetings under the specified circumstances which included, among others, where TPB considered it not in the public interest to conduct open meetings and where sensitive or legal/professional privileged information would be disclosed at the meetings. For example, if TPB discussed in public plans to impose planning restrictions on certain areas, people might set up the prohibited developments before restrictions were imposed. She further stressed that a major step had already been made in enhancing TPB's transparency because, upon commencement of the Amendment Ordinance, most papers submitted to TPB would be made available for public inspection before its meetings. The minutes of the meetings (including the deliberation parts) would also be uploaded onto TPB's website to keep the public informed of its deliberations and decisions.

28. Ms Emily LAU however maintained that there was a great need for TPB meetings to be further opened up because a staff member of a developer was presently sitting on TPB. Moreover, issues considered by TPB involved public resources. She did not agree that the above concern of TPB members should be accepted as an excuse for not opening up the deliberation parts of TPB meetings. In her view, as in the case of LegCo, all meetings of TPB should be opened up except only where sensitive or legal/professional privileged information would be disclosed at the meetings.

29. In response, SHPL reiterated his clarification to Mr Ronny TONG in paragraph 25 above. He also stressed that TPB members' concern about opening up all parts of meetings was valid and warranted due consideration. He stressed the need to strike a proper balance to safeguard the public interest for a more transparent planning system while maintaining the smooth operation of the planning and development system in Hong Kong. In his view, the meeting arrangements to be effected by the Amendment Ordinance should suffice to strike the right balance.

30. In reply to Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, the Assistant Director of Planning/Board (AD of Plan/B) advised that the quorum required for holding TPB meetings was five members. In addition, in forming a quorum for the planning committee meeting, three out of the five members should be non-official members. Having regard to the fact that issues considered by TPB had wide implications, Mr CHEUNG was gravely concerned that the required quorum was too small to enable meaningful deliberation. In response, SHPL agreed that the matter warranted review. He and the Director of Planning (D of Plan) however clarified that the attendance rate at TPB meetings was high and the decisions of TPB were not made by five members only even though this was the minimum quorum set out in the existing Ordinance. D of Plan further explained that the quorum was set in 1939 when TPB's membership was small. As the size of TPB grew, the Administration also saw a need to increase the quorum and had in fact proposed to do so in the 2000 Bill. He assured members that proposals to increase the quorum would be introduced in the context of stage two amendments to TPO.

31. Mr James TO Kun-sun elaborated that he was chairman of the bills committee on the 2000 Bill and that on the Amendment Ordinance, and that all issues highlighted at this meeting had been thoroughly debated by the two bills committees. The public had also been thoroughly consulted on some of them. He urged the Administration to really make an effort to address these issues properly in the next rounds of review of the TPO. Ms Emily LAU shared his views, and enquired about the timetable for introducing the other amendment bill. In response, SHPL said that it would depend on the progress of the relevant preparatory work and whether a consensus could be achieved on the issues concerned. In this regard, PSPL added that whether further reforms to TPB should be introduced might need to be considered in the light of experience gained from implementation of the Amendment Ordinance. This was because the TPB would have to cope with many changes as a result of the Amendment Ordinance, and it might not be desirable to introduce too many changes within a short time.

V Implementation of the Town Planning (Amendment) Ordinance 2004

- (LC Paper No. CB(1)1116/04-05(06) -- Information paper provided by the Administration
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1116/04-05(05) -- Background brief on “Town Planning (Amendment) Ordinance 2004” prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat
- LC Paper No. CB(1)2279/03-04(01) -- Memorandum dated 28 June 2004 from Complaints Division referring to the Panel the comments raised at a meeting of Legislative Council Members with representatives from the Coalition of Open Storage Operators in the North West of the New Territories on 9 June 2004 on the Town Planning Ordinance (Cap. 131) and other planning policies
- LC Paper No. CB(1)557/04-05(01) -- Submission from The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong on the Town Planning (Amendment) Ordinance)

32. PSPL briefed members on the result of the public consultations conducted by Plan D on the implementation of the Amendment Ordinance. Members noted that in view of the controversy over the fee proposals and in order not to delay the implementation of the Amendment Ordinance, the Administration’s

recommendation was to proceed with the Amendment Ordinance leaving the Town Planning (Fees) Regulation to be commenced at a later date. AD of Plan/B clarified that the number of Chinese newspapers in which a notice of application should be published should be two instead of one as stated in paragraph 12(b) of the Administration's paper.

33. Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming welcomed the above recommendation, and pointed out that the fee increase arising from the Amendment Ordinance was too significant to be acceptable. Ms Emily LAU, on the other hand, was concerned about the delay in commencing the Town Planning (Fees) Regulation. In response, PSPL explained that the issues relating to the fee proposals had policy implications which needed to be further considered. The Administration would seek to commence the Regulation once such issues were resolved.

Applications for planning permission and amendment of plans

34. Mr LEE Wing-tat enquired about the criteria and procedures for determining whether an application for amendment of plan involved a "material change" in the nature of an application and hence should be published for three weeks for public comments. In his view, the "10% threshold" was just a quantitative criterion, and qualitative criteria were necessary because the change might relate to the land use. He opined that the criteria and procedures should be both clear and transparent to prevent abuse to circumvent more stringent controls and public consultation, and to avoid corruption opportunities.

35. In reply, PSPL and D of Plan pointed out that there were clear guidelines on what constituted a "material change" and Plan D staff would adhere to these guidelines in making decisions. In fact, comparing to the current system where the District Planning Officer or the D of Plan may approve minor amendments to an approved development proposal under the delegated authority of the TPB, the discretion to be exercised by the Plan D staff would be tightened up and a proper check and balance mechanism would be in place. Besides, the list of Class A and Class B amendments would be published in the Gazette and included in the relevant TPB Guidelines for reference by the public. PSPL further explained that the proposed new scope of Class A and B amendments broadly followed the list of minor amendments currently processed by the District Planning Officer or D of Plan under delegated authority of TPB as set out in the existing TPB Guidelines. Class A amendments to planning permission were minor in nature and would not be substantially different from the application for which planning permission had been given. They were therefore deemed to be permitted without the need to submit an application to TPB. However, a new requirement had been added to the effect that Class A and Class B amendments would not be applicable if such change was restricted by an approval condition imposed by the TPB on the original planning permission. As for Class B amendments, although TPB might also delegate its authority to the D of Plan to consider the application, if any relevant Government department did not agree with the amendments, the application would need to be submitted to TPB for a decision.

36. Mr James TO noted that if an application involved only change of use of premises within existing buildings, or temporary uses involving an application site area of less than one hectare, the requirement for newspaper notice would be exempted. He was concerned about the exemption because the above uses could be offensive. Addressing his concern, AD of Plan/B explained that the exemption only applied to the applicant in satisfying the 'reasonable steps' requirement for obtaining owner's consent or giving notification to the owner. The TPB would publish all planning applications in newspapers as required under the Amendment Ordinance as well as post notices on site so far as local circumstances permitted. In addition, as an administrative measure to further enhance the effectiveness of publication, the TPB would also upload a notice together with a gist of the relevant application to TPB's website and post a notice at the TPB Secretariat, the relevant District Planning Office, District Office and Rural Committee (where appropriate). A notice would also be sent to the Owners' Corporation(s) or other management committee(s) of buildings within 100 feet (around 30 metres) from the boundary of the application site. For cases of territorial or major local significance, a notice would also be mounted to a roadside railing in a prominent location in the area.

Other views and comments

37. Mr James TO asked when an applicant should decide whether his application should be further processed with or without the submitted further information should the Secretary of TPB decide that such further information should be published for public comment and the statutory time limit should be recounted. He also sought to ascertain whether the applicant could revert his decision and if so, the implications. In reply, AD of Plan/B confirmed that the applicant would be required to indicate his intention when the further information was submitted and in case that the applicant changed his mind and subsequently decided that he did not wish to include the further information as part of the application, the original application (i.e., without the further information) would continue to be processed by the TPB and the statutory time limit would not be recounted.

38. In response to Ms Emily LAU on the opening of TPB meetings, PSPL confirmed that they would be opened up as soon as the Amendment Ordinance took effect. The meetings would be held in the conference room of the North Point Government Offices where facilities for public viewing were available.

39. Ms Emily LAU expressed concern about the availability of exceptions to the requirement to post a site notice. To address her concern, AD of Plan/B emphasized that a site notice would in principle be posted for all planning applications that had to be published for public comments. Exceptions to this were made only when the application site involved a large area or many buildings; or was remote and inaccessible by the public; or the application was not site-specific (e.g. application for amending the notes of a zoning plan).

40. Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming considered it undesirable that the period for posting notices of planning applications involving small plots of land should be extended from two to four weeks. In his view, the extension was unfair to applicants of small house developments because their small house applications already took a very long time to process. The Administration noted his views.

41. Mr Albert CHAN opined that since he still had queries about the implementation details of the Amendment Ordinance, he suggested that the Panel set up a subcommittee to further examine the subject.

(Post-meeting note: A special meeting was held on 1 April 2005 to further discuss issues relating to the implementation of the Amendment Ordinance.)

VI Any other business

42. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 4:35 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
25 April 2005