

**Minutes of 1336th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 30.5.2025**

Present

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

Chairperson

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Vice-chairperson

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Dr C.M. Cheng

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Chief Traffic Engineer (Kowloon)
Transport Department
Mr Vico P. Cheung

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

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory North)
Environmental Protection Department
Ms Clara K.W. U

Director of Lands
Mr Maurice K.W. Loo

Director of Planning
Mr C.K. Yip

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Professor B.S. Tang

Mr Simon Y.S. Wong

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms Isabel Y. Yiu

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr K.K. Lee

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1335th Meeting held on 28.4.2025

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The draft minutes of the 1335th meeting were confirmed on 28.4.2025 by circulation without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

(i) Approval of Draft Urban Renewal Authority Development Scheme Plan

2. The Secretary reported that on 8.4.2025, the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) approved the draft Urban Renewal Authority Sai Yee Street/Flower Market Road Development Scheme Plan (DSP) (renumbered as S/K3/URA5/2) under section 9(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance. The approval of the DSP was notified in the Gazette on 17.4.2025.

(ii) Reference Back of Approved Outline Zoning Plans

3. The Secretary reported that on 16.4.2025, the Secretary for Development referred the approved Shau Kei Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H9/20, the approved Cheung Sha Wan OZP No. S/K5/39, the approved Hung Hom OZP No. S/K9/28, the approved Yuen Long OZP No. S/YL/27 and the approved Peng Chau OZP No. S/I-PC/12 to the Town Planning Board for amendment under section 12(1A)(a)(ii) of the Town Planning Ordinance. The reference back of the OZPs was notified in the Gazette on 25.4.2025.

(iii) Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations on Draft Outline Zoning Plan

4. The Secretary reported that the item was to seek Members' agreement on the hearing arrangement for consideration of representations in respect of the draft Tseung Kwan O OZP No. S/TKO/31. The Secretary briefly introduced that on 14.2.2025, the draft OZP was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Ordinance. During the 2-month exhibition period, 17 valid representations were received. In view of the similar nature of the representations, the hearing of the representations was recommended to be considered by the full Town Planning Board (the full Board) collectively in one group. To ensure efficiency of the hearing, a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time would be allotted to each representer in the hearing session. Consideration of the representations by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for July 2025.

5. The Board agreed to the hearing arrangement in paragraph 4 above.

[Mr Vico P. Cheung joined the meeting at this point.]

Deferral Cases

Section 17 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Presentation and Question Sessions

6. The Town Planning Board (the Board) noted that there were two cases requesting the Board to defer consideration of the review applications. Details of the requests for deferral were in **Annex 1**.

Deliberation Session

7. After deliberation, the Board decided to defer decisions on the review applications as requested by the applicants pending submission of further information, as recommended in the Papers.

[Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu joined the meeting at this point.]

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations in respect of the Draft Tsim Sha Tsui Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K1/29

(TPB Paper No. 11004)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

8. The Secretary reported that Amendment Item A of the draft Tsim Sha Tsui Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) (the draft OZP) involved relaxation of the building height (BH) restriction of the main campus of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU/the University) to facilitate its future development/redevelopment. Four representations were submitted by the Federation of PolyU Alumni Associations (R1), Student Affairs Office of PolyU (R2), Office of the Deputy President and Provost of PolyU (R3) and Campus Development Office of PolyU (R4) respectively. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Mr Simon Y.S. Wong | - being the former Vice President of PolyU; |
| Professor Roger C.K. Chan | - being the Professor and Divisional Head, College of Professional and Continuing Education, PolyU; |
| Professor B.S. Tang | - being the part-time Principal Research Fellow and Academic Advisor of College of Professional and Continuing Education, PolyU; |
| Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho | - being a member of the Federation of PolyU Alumni Associations, and was currently collaborating with The School of Professional Education and Executive |

Development of PolyU to run a short-term course which he was the lead instructor;

- | | |
|----------------------|---|
| Dr Venus Y.H. Lun | - being an advisor of a research centre of PolyU; |
| Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu | - being an advisor of a Faculty of PolyU; |
| Dr Tony C.M. Ip | - being a member of the Federation of PolyU Alumni Associations; and |
| Mr Stanley T.S. Choi | - his spouse being a director of a company which owned properties in Tsim Sha Tsui and his parent owning a property in Tsim Sha Tsui. |

9. Members noted that Mr Simon Y.S. Wong, Professor Roger C.K. Chan, Professor B.S. Tang, Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho, Dr Venus Y.H. Lun and Mr Stanley T.S. Choi would not attend/had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu and Dr Tony C.M. Ip had no involvement in the amendment item and representations, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

10. Mr Ryan M.K. Ip also declared an interest as he was a member of an advisory committee of a research institute of PolyU. Members agreed that since Mr Ip had no involvement in the amendment item and representations, he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

11. The Chairperson said that notification had been given to the representers inviting them to attend the hearing, but other than those who were present or had indicated that they would attend the hearing, the rest had either indicated not to attend or made no reply. As reasonable notice had been given to the representers, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations in their absence.

12. The following government representatives, representers and representers' representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

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

Mr Kervis W.C. Chan - Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK)

Ms Niki Y.C. Wong - Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon

Representers and Representers' Representatives

R4 – Campus Development Office of PolyU

Mr Lau Man Piu Ben]
Ms Lam Po Yin] Representer's Representatives
Ms Ng Sze Nga Gladys]

R5 – Lam Yui Yim

Ms Lam Yui Yim - Representer
Ms Lam Po Yin] Representer's Representatives
Ms Ng Sze Nga Gladys]

R6 – Seto Pui Kwan

Ms Seto Pui Kwan - Representer

R7 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer

13. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that PlanD's representatives would be invited to brief Members on the

representations. The representers and representers' representatives would then be invited to make oral submissions. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, each representer would be allotted 10 minutes for making presentation. There was a timer device to alert the representers and the representers' representatives 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 representers and the representers' representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives, the representers and/or the representers' representatives. After the Q&A session, the government representatives, the representers and the representers' representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. The Town Planning Board (the Board) would then deliberate on the representations in closed meeting and inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course.

14. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representations. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Kervis W.C. Chan, STP/TWK, PlanD briefed Members on the representations, including the background of the amendments on the draft OZP, the grounds/views of the representers and PlanD's views on the representations as detailed in TPB Paper No. 11004 (the Paper). The amendment item on the OZP included:

Item A – revision to the BH restriction from 45mPD to 90mPD for the “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zone currently occupied by the main campus of PolyU.

15. There were also amendments to the Notes of the OZP based on the latest Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans, and amendments to the Schedule of Uses for the “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Ferry Terminal” (“OU(Ferry Terminal)”), “OU(Kowloon Point Piers)” and “OU(Pier)” zones to allow flexibility for provision of supporting/ancillary uses within the ferry terminal/piers.

16. The Chairperson then invited the representers and the representers' representatives to elaborate on their representations.

R4 – Campus Development Office of PolyU

17. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Lau Man Piu Ben made the following main points:

- (a) the main campus of PolyU of about 8.8 ha had been located at the current site for 53 years since 1972. Throughout the years, the University had undergone different stages of developments and redevelopments, nurtured numerous talents for Hong Kong, engaged in diverse research areas and supported the development of various sectors of the society;
- (b) PolyU had positioned itself as an innovative world-class university which ranked among the world's top 100 institutions. It would continue its pursuit of being widely recognised as a university with world-class excellence in engineering and technology disciplines as well as a world-leading university in a significant number of unique disciplines;
- (c) according to the assessment by the University Grants Committee (UGC), PolyU was facing a gross floor area (GFA) deficit of approximately 130,000m² to meet the needs of the existing students and staff. While PolyU's student numbers ranked among the top three of the eight UGC-funded universities, the site area of its main campus was the second smallest. The University had valued and made optimal use of every square metre of space within the campus by considering how to optimise and enhance the utilisation of various areas, including the green spaces, communal areas and floor spaces for education and research activities. As such, there was an urgent need for the re-planning and redevelopment of the floor spaces of the main campus;
- (d) the early buildings within the main campus were shorter in height and with relatively low headroom, which could not meet the operational needs of current research and development projects, particularly for accommodating large and specialised equipment. Sometimes, the slab between two floors had to be demolished to create higher headroom and larger interior spaces,

resulting in further reduction in GFA. It was anticipated that the redeveloped buildings could provide tailor-made floor spaces for specialised research areas, such as artificial intelligent robotics, hybrid immersive virtual environments, flight stimulators, monitoring systems for high-speed rail and those related to the national space missions;

- (e) PolyU had adopted various strategies to address its campus expansion needs, including seeking additional development sites near the main campus and carrying out development, redevelopment and alteration and addition works within the campus. Increasing the BH restriction for the main campus was essential to meet the development needs;
- (f) while pursuing additional floor space to meet the education and research demand, PolyU endeavoured to provide quality amenity and green spaces for its students and staff. Over the past ten years, various improvement works had been carried out to enhance the communal spaces. Each new development or redevelopment project was designed with green features and ample outdoor activity areas;
- (g) pedestrian and vehicular access routes within the main campus were grade-separated. The main podium level served as a major access ground to all buildings, which was free from vehicular traffic. Its ventilated design with green features provided plenty sheltered open-air areas for various activities and user enjoyment; and
- (h) with the relaxed BH restriction of 90mPD, three BH zones were proposed for the future development of the main campus, comprising a high zone of about 70mPD to 90mPD, a medium zone of about 45mPD to 70mPD and a low zone with BH below 45mPD. This stepped height concept could avoid uniform BH profile, allow flexibility in building design and create more breathing spaces. Priority would be given to redeveloping those older building blocks which needed high maintenance cost and could not meet the current spatial requirements. There was no plan to redevelop the recently built or expanded buildings.

[Mr Rocky L.K. Poon joined the meeting during R4's presentation.]

R5 – Lam Yui Yim

18. Ms Lam Yui Yim made the following main points:

- (a) she supported Item A;
- (b) she had been working at PolyU for nearly 20 years and witnessed its advancements in academic and research achievements. In her role overseeing the spatial development of PolyU, she fully understood the development needs and pressure faced by the University to cater for the increase in student and staff numbers, while aligning with the Government's policy to position Hong Kong as an international hub for post-secondary education;
- (c) the previous BH restriction of 45mPD posed constraints on PolyU's expansion. The requirement of planning application for minor relaxation of the BH restriction to facilitate recent development and redevelopment projects would bring about time and resource implications;
- (d) the submission of planning application for minor relaxation of BH restriction for individual project was less preferable as the focus would be on optimising the development potential of the available site rather than the overall planning and design of the entire campus; and
- (e) with the relaxation of the BH restriction from 45mPD to 90mPD, PolyU would have greater flexibility and efficiency in planning and designing for the future expansion of the main campus, as well as allowing room for the provision of more quality green communal spaces for its students and staff.

R6 – Seto Pui Kwan

19. Ms Seto Pui Kwan made the following main points:

- (a) she was a staff member of PolyU and was aware of the unique spatial requirements of different academic units through her daily interactions with various colleagues;
- (b) the ventilated podium level was an excellent design feature of the main campus, providing a comfortable and convenient environment for students and staff of PolyU, while allowing access to all building blocks within the campus;
- (c) in addition to the required GFA to support education and research activities, PolyU also needed various well-designed and spacious outdoor communal spaces for a positive campus life. The University Square completed last year had been well-utilised by students and staff; and
- (d) she supported Item A as the relaxation of the BH restriction to 90mPD would provide opportunities for PolyU to increase its GFA on one hand and create more quality outdoor communal spaces on the other.

R7 – Mary Mulvihill

20. With the aid of a visualiser, Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

Item A

- (a) she objected to Item A which had bypassed the s.12A application process and received no public support. All representatives from PolyU who supported Item A were staff members;
- (b) approval of Item A would effectively turn PolyU into “fortress university” characterised by restricted entrances and surrounded by a cluster of 90m high

walls. The objective appeared to be paving the way for a massive reconstruction of the southern part of the campus;

- (c) while the BH restrictions imposed on the Tsim Sha Tsui OZP in 2008 were intended to prevent excessively tall buildings, PolyU had since then sought three planning applications for minor relaxation of the BH restriction of 45mPD for permitted 'Educational Institution' use, including the development of the Jockey Club Innovation Tower (63.3mPD) and redevelopments of Blocks VA/VS (67.5mPD) and Blocks U and W (59.6mPD). It remained unclear if the current relaxation of the BH restriction to 90mPD would further increase the BHs of these buildings or allow the remaining buildings to reach a uniform BH of 90mPD, which would create a significant visual impact viewing from the railway station. There was no information regarding the imposition of any conditions in the OZP to achieve a stepped BH profile;
- (d) while PolyU considered that the BH restriction of 90mPD would provide greater design flexibility for implementation of green and sustainable building design with architectural design merits, higher air and visual permeability, and more greenery and open space, it should be noted that the open space within the campus would be eventually surrounded by high walls. The wall effect, together with the planned redevelopment of the MTR Hung Hom Station facilities, would block air ventilation from the southwest and east, potentially leading to significant adverse impact on air quality due to the accumulation of toxins from the cross-harbour tunnel entrance;
- (e) PolyU indicated that based on the assumption of a 10% increase, the total number of students and staff would reach 34,650 individuals by 2030. However, there was no information on the number of students and staff beyond 2030 or the eventual student intake target. According to PolyU, the space and accommodation demand for universities was assessed using the Room Use-based Approach adopted by UGC, under which a number of factors would be taken into account. However, there were no details on how the GFA requirements were calculated. The space demand appeared overly generous

when compared to the accommodation standard for school premises under the Education Regulations and the living space standard for public housing;

- (f) PolyU undertook to retain the distinctive red brick architectural style, but the new buildings on campus did not reflect such design. The restriction on public access to the campus limited people to enter and inspect recent developments, including the newly completed University Square;
- (g) the increase in student intake by PolyU would have impact on the provision of public services in the district as students would likely live close to the campus. This impact should be reflected in the table detailing the provision of major open space and GIC facilities in the district, as presented in the Paper for reference;
- (h) the strip of land abutting Chatham Road North and Chatham Road South along the western boundary of the campus, which PolyU claimed to have been designated as an amenity area for public enjoyment, was in fact a piece of government land included in the calculation of local open space provision for the district. However, the integrity of this open space had already been compromised by the planned ingress/egress for PolyU's development at Chatham Road South. Moreover, PolyU had surrounded this public open space with fencing and barriers, and with the entrance gates permanently closed. While there was a considerable amount of district open space in Tsim Sha Tsui, the community lacked adequate local recreational facilities;

Amendments to the Notes of the OZP

- (i) she objected to the amendments to the Notes of the OZP;
- (j) while 'Government Use' was moved from Column 2 to Column 1 of the Notes for the "OU(Ferry Terminal)" zone covering the Hong Kong China Ferry Terminal, the Paper did not provide any details on the specific types of government use being proposed within the ferry terminal, which was not suitable for most community facilities;

- (k) while development restrictions for the “OU(Kowloon Point Piers)” zone covering the Star Ferry Pier were deleted and ‘Shop and Services’ and ‘Eating Place’ uses were moved from Column 2 to Column 1 of the Notes, the Paper did not provide any information on the envisaged changes to the Star Ferry Pier. The Star Ferry Pier should be graded and guaranteed full protection of its unique structure and appearance;
- (l) the amendment of the Notes for the “OU(Pier)” zone covering the Kowloon Permanent Pier No. 7 was intended to facilitate potential redevelopment from a temporary public vehicle park to pier use. There were, however, no details on the development plan. Redeveloping the pier to accommodate cruise liners would involve filling in part of the harbour and would breach the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance. As the current pier was narrow, it would not be able to support any large commercial facilities; and

Others

- (m) there had been no amendments to the Tsim Sha Tsui OZP for over a decade. It was evident that demand for commercial floor space in Tsim Sha Tsui had declined significantly in recent years as commercial activities had shifted to West Kowloon and areas near the Express Rail Link. The vacancy rates of commercial premises in Tsim Sha Tsui Central and Tsim Sha Tsui East were high. The Government should adequately address the current land use issues in the district by designating more sites for residential use.

21. As the presentations of PlanD’s representative, the representers and the representers’ representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions to the representers, the representers’ representatives and/or the government representatives. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board nor for cross-examination between parties. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

GFA Requirement in the Main Campus

22. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) any information on the campus space utilisation of PolyU and other institutions;
- (b) how the current GFA deficit of PolyU of approximately 130,000m² was assessed;
- (c) how teaching and research activities were affected by the severe GFA deficit; and
- (d) what measures would be taken to address the further GFA deficit during the interim period when the existing buildings on the campus were demolished for redevelopment.

23. In response, with the aid of the visualiser, Mr Lau Man Piu Ben, R4's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) a comparative analysis revealed that PolyU had a campus site area of 10.2 ha, which was the second smallest campus among the six UGC-funded universities covered in the analysis;
- (b) PolyU's current GFA deficit of approximately 130,000m² was not assessed by the University itself but UGC. Every year, UGC evaluated space and accommodation entitlements for PolyU based on the number of students enrolled in each programme and the research funding allocated using a specific formula;
- (c) the students in PolyU, including research students, were facing a long-standing issue of being confined to very congested spaces for their studies and research. Despite these constraints, students had adapted with great perseverance. Laboratories were also shared by students from different disciplines at various occasions. While faculties received funding to carry out their research, both

students and staff might encounter a lack of adequate accommodation space. Relaxing BH restriction to allow redevelopment with more GFA within the main campus was a viable solution to resolve PolyU's current congestion problem; and

- (d) the existing congested conditions of the main campus had posed severe constraint for each redevelopment project. The redevelopment projects should proceed progressively, starting from the redevelopment of a small site into a larger building with more GFA. The new GFA would serve as decanting space for accommodating occupants of the next building to be redeveloped, and so on. The entire redevelopment process would span over a considerable timeframe. It was anticipated that the proposed additional GFA of 150,000m² on the main campus would be realised by phases in 10 to 20 years.

24. In response to two Members' follow-up questions, with the aid of the visualiser, Mr Lau Man Piu Ben, R4's representative, provided the following information:

- (a) PolyU had the highest accommodation density among the six UGC-funded universities previously mentioned, at 3.13m² per person; and
- (b) the campus site area of 10.2 ha of PolyU in the analysis previously mentioned comprised the main campus site (about 8.8 ha) and the site of Block Z to the north.

25. A Member asked whether the need for more GFA on the main campus was due to increased student intake, or to accommodate future enrolment growth. In response, Mr Lau Man Piu Ben, R4's representative, explained that PolyU's GFA entitlement and the current GFA deficit were assessed by UGC not only based on the student numbers but also the research component, which was related to the allocated funding and the space required for conducting research.

26. In response to a Member's enquiry about the detailed methodology adopted by UGC to assess PolyU's GFA entitlement, Ms Seto Pui Kwan, R6, explained that UGC had adopted the

Room Use-based Approach to calculate the space and accommodation demand for universities based on various parameters. Under the approach, the space demand was categorised into different categories, including classroom, study space, teaching laboratory, open laboratory, research laboratory, office, library, indoor sports area, amenity area, supporting area, etc. Different parameters, such as student numbers and their enrolled programmes, would be applied to each category of space demand. For instance, the space demand of research laboratory was related to the approved research funding, the office space was determined by the types of staff members, the library space was based on book stock and student and staff numbers, and indoor sports and amenity areas were related to student and staff numbers. Different space factors would be applied to calculate the space demand based on some specific formulae.

27. A Member's raised the following questions:

- (a) the discrepancies in student and staff numbers as presented in different documents, e.g. those in the District Council paper and the Paper; and
- (b) whether PolyU's student hostels were sufficient to meet the needs of its students, particularly with a forecasted 10% increase in student numbers by 2030.

28. In response, Mr Lau Man Piu Ben, R4's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) the number of enrolled students changed over time, and PolyU had all along aimed to present the most updated information in each document. The University was transparent about its student numbers which could be viewed on its website. The reported number of about 31,500 students and staff on the main campus in the Paper was accurate and updated; and
- (b) PolyU currently had over 4,000 hostel bed spaces for its students. It aimed at providing each full-time student the opportunity to reside in a hostel for at least one year during his/her four years of study. Two student hostel projects at Ho Man Tin and a site near the City University of Hong Kong were being developed to provide about 3,000 additional hostel beds by 2028/29.

Development Intensity and Technical Concerns

29. In view of the proposed increase in additional GFA of 150,000m² on the main campus, the Vice-chairperson enquired whether there were any traffic improvement measures recommended in the traffic impact assessment to address the possible increase in traffic flows, and whether the green deck above the cross harbour tunnel toll plaza previously proposed by PolyU would benefit the main campus development. In response, Mr Lau Man Piu Ben, R4's representative, said that as most students would travel to and from the campus by public transport including MTR and buses, the increase in vehicular traffic flows due to the additional GFA was not expected to be significant. Nevertheless, PolyU anticipated improvement works would be carried out by the Government on the existing footbridge connecting MTR Hung Hom Station and the main campus which served as the major pedestrian access route for students. PolyU had already submitted the green deck proposal to the Government and would provide comments related to the accessibility of the campus in the forthcoming stakeholder consultation of the on-going study on the development proposals around Hung Hom Station.

30. Noting the concerns raised by R7 regarding wall effect, air quality impact and non-achievement of the proposed stepped BH profile due to the blanket relaxation of the BH restriction to 90mPD for the entire main campus site, a Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there would be any monitoring measures and further technical assessments to confirm the technical feasibility if the future additional GFA within the main campus exceeded 150,000m² as currently proposed; and
- (b) what considerations would UGC take into account when vetting proposals for building developments of universities, and whether it would review the proposals from a town planning perspective.

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

- (a) as PolyU was a UGC-funded university, all capital works proposals for university development should be submitted to UGC for vetting. UGC would evaluate the proposals from an educational policy perspective, while the

Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) would act as technical adviser providing comments on the feasibility, design, scope, cost, implementation and other relevant aspects. Relevant government departments, including PlanD, would be consulted on the technical feasibility of the development proposal as necessary;

- (b) during the consideration of the concerned OZP amendment proposals back in December 2024, the Metro Planning Committee noted the need to clarify that the BH restriction of 90mPD was to allow an additional GFA of 150,000m² to cater for PolyU's campus expansion. A relevant paragraph had been added to the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP to reflect this information and was showed on the visualiser for Members' reference. Should future development proposals exceed the proposed additional GFA of 150,000m², PlanD and other relevant Government departments would request PolyU to review the suitability and demonstrate the technical feasibility of the proposals through the UGC's funding procedures;
- (c) the air ventilation assessment (AVA) (expert evaluation (EE)) conducted by PolyU to support the OZP amendments indicated that Cheong Wan Road, Chatham Road South and Gascoigne Road surrounding the PolyU main campus were the major air paths in the area. By maintaining these air paths, the surrounding pedestrian wind environment would not be adversely affected. The permeable design of the campus podium level, which PolyU proposed to maintain, would also ensure a well-ventilated pedestrian environment for the campus and surrounding streets; and
- (d) for the development of an additional GFA of 150,000m², there was no need to raise the height of all buildings within the main campus to 90mPD as permitted under the OZP. PolyU was committed to adopting an urban design concept characterised by a stepped BH profile with low, medium and high BH zones. As such, future buildings within the campus would not be of a uniform BH.

32. In response to the same Member's question on whether the cap on additional GFA within the main campus would remain at 150,000m² as detailed in the Paper, Mr Lau Man Piu

Ben, R4's representative, reiterated that the proposed redevelopment aimed at providing a decent campus environment for its students and staff. PolyU had no plan at present to pursue any additional GFA beyond the proposed 150,000m² within the main campus. For the University's long-term expansion, PolyU would seek new sizeable sites in the Northern Metropolis (NM) from the Government.

33. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD said that the current plot ratio (PR) of the PolyU main campus was estimated to be almost 4 based on the available information, and PolyU's proposed additional GFA of 150,000m² amounted to a PR of about 1.7.

34. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the stepped BH profile proposed to be adopted by PolyU in the main campus would be reflected on the Plan or the Notes of the OZP;
- (b) whether the AVA was conducted based on the adoption of a stepped BH profile and whether it was conducted only by means of qualitative assessment rather than quantitative; and
- (c) the impact of the current relaxation of BH restriction on the wind environment of Tsim Sha Tsui district and the surrounding areas as the relaxation might induce urban heat island effect.

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

- (a) the BH of the PolyU main campus site was controlled by a single BH restriction of 90mPD as stipulated on the Plan of the OZP. The adoption of the stepped BH profile was not stated in the Notes or ES of the OZP as the BH restriction had already balanced the land utilization, design flexibility for campus expansion and visual compatibility with the surroundings. The BH restriction of 90mPD for the main campus site formed part of the overall stepped BH profile of the Tsim Sha Tsui East area and was comparable to the adjacent

development sites in Tsim Sha Tsui and Hung Hom. Detailed design comments on individual development proposal would be provided by ArchSD and relevant government departments when the respective funding applications were submitted to UGC; and

- (b) the AVA was conducted by PolyU by way of EE on the basis of a single BH of the main campus site at 90mPD. It concluded that by maintaining the existing major air paths of Cheong Wan Road, Chatham Road South and Gascoigne Road and with the adoption of permeable design of PolyU's podium level, there would not be any significant adverse air ventilation impact on the surrounding pedestrian wind environment.

36. In response to a Member's enquiry on how the BHs of the three BH zones (i.e. the low, medium and high zones) within the main campus as proposed by PolyU could be enforced, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD said that the current BH control was a single BH restriction of 90mPD for the whole main campus site, which was to allow design flexibility for future development/redevelopment. The stepped BH profile proposed by PolyU had in fact followed the lower BH of those buildings already redevelopment/expanded, i.e. the low and medium zones, and allowed higher BH for the areas with potential for redevelopment of some older buildings, i.e. the high zone. As such, it was unlikely to redevelop the relatively new buildings in the low and medium zones into higher rise building as future building proposals would be vetted by UGC/ArchSD at the detailed design stage. In view of the above, the three delineated BH zones were not incorporated into the OZP for development control purposes.

37. Noting that the AVA and visual impact assessment (VIA) conducted by PolyU were not based on a detailed layout of the future building dispositions within the main campus site but rather on the assumption that all redeveloped buildings would follow current footprints, a Member questioned the validity of the AVA. In response, Mr Lau Man Piu Ben, R4's representative, said that the AVA for the current OZP amendment was based on a worst-case scenario assuming all existing buildings would reach the maximum permitted BH of 90mPD. However, this would not be the case in reality. The air ventilation impact from the future redevelopment projects should be less significant as their building footprints would be much smaller compared to those assumed in the worst-case scenario. Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD also said that according to the established procedures, ArchSD serving as UGC's

technical adviser would provide comments on the feasibility and design of individual funding application for PolyU's development proposal. ArchSD would require necessary technical assessments to demonstrate the feasibility of proposal.

38. Mr C.K. Yip, Director of Planning, supplemented that according to the AVA(EЕ) conducted by PolyU, specific measures would be implemented to improve the surrounding pedestrian wind environment, including building setbacks of 5m to 17m from Chatham Road South and the maintenance of a permeable podium level with a 4m headroom. With these measures, there would not be significant adverse air ventilation impact even if all existing buildings were raised to a BH of 90mPD. The AVA(EЕ) also did not recommend the need for conducting a further quantitative AVA for future redevelopment projects. As mentioned by DPO/TWK, PlanD, established procedures were in place for ArchSD to vet future projects. The project proponent should also observe the prevailing Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG) as far as practicable, which entailed building separation and building setback requirements for enhancing air ventilation. Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD added that the building setback area of the main campus abutting Chatham Road South was zoned "Open Space".

39. In response to the Member's follow-up question on why a detailed layout of the future building dispositions could not be revealed, Mr Lau Man Piu Ben, R4's representative, explained that since every development or redevelopment project of PolyU was subject to UGC's funding approval, it would be premature to present the envisaged development proposals before they had been endorsed by UGC. Members could rest assured that PolyU was committed to providing quality spaces within its main campus for the enjoyment of its students and staff. For example, in the recent redevelopment project of Blocks VA/VS at the former swimming pool site, a large building void was designed to serve as a ventilation corridor. The current relaxation of BH restriction allowed PolyU greater flexibility to adopt improved building design in future projects and to create more quality open spaces.

40. A Member enquired if consideration had been given to imposing PR or GFA restriction on PolyU's main campus site in addition to the current BH restriction to avoid excessive building bulk. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD said that in general, imposing PR or GFA restriction on "G/IC" zone was not preferable as the GIC developments within the zone were beneficial to the public and would cover different types of GIC uses. For the subject site which

was relatively large, the imposition of a BH restriction was considered necessary to contain the development scale while allowing for design flexibility for the university development. For some small “G/IC” zones, imposing BH restriction would be avoided so as to optimise the utilisation of the sites for GIC uses.

Expansion Plan outside the Main Campus

41. A Member enquired whether PolyU had explored the feasibility of purchasing or renting commercial floor space in the adjacent Tsim Sha Tsui East area for campus use, as this might be more cost-effective and time-efficient than redeveloping buildings on the main campus. In response, Mr Lau Man Piu Ben, R4’s representative, said that PolyU had considered various options for expansion. Although Tsim Sha Tsui East had a good supply of commercial floor space, acquiring an entire building for university use was challenging. PolyU did not intend to occupy only a few floors in a building as this arrangement would not provide a conducive learning environment for students. Moreover, the floor space in conventional office buildings might not be able to meet the University’s unique operational requirements.

42. Noting the limited development space available within PolyU’s main campus at Tsim Sha Tsui and sites were reserved by the Government for development of University Town and Technopole in the NM, a Member enquired about the plan of PolyU on utilising the sites in NM for its future expansion and details of the space requirements. In response, Mr Lau Man Piu Ben, R4’s representative, said that at the invitation of the Government, PolyU had submitted two expression of interest proposals regarding the University’s development plan in the NM with a view to acquiring sizeable sites for new campus development. One plan involved establishing Hong Kong’s third medical school together with a teaching hospital at Ngau Tam Mei. This new faculty of medicine was intended to be an independent development and would not address the current GFA shortfall at PolyU’s main campus. Another proposal sought to acquire about 10 ha of land at the future University Town for accommodating some programmes in hotel and hospitality, as well as extensive research labs related to advanced railway technology. However, as the NM development was a long-term project of the Government which would take considerable time to materialise, PolyU still had an urgent need to optimise its floor space on the main campus to address the current space shortfall.

43. A Member enquired whether the development of a new campus in the NM was a more viable solution for the current GFA deficit than pursuing partial redevelopment of the existing main campus. In response, Mr Lau Man Piu Ben, R4's representative, said that in parallel with the progressive in-situ redevelopment of the main campus, PolyU was also pursuing the development of a new campus in the NM. The NM option was regarded as a long-term solution as it involved a lengthy development programme, including the time required for funding approval for public works. At this stage, it was uncertain how the reserved land for education in the NM would be allocated to each institute that had expressed interest in locating there. PolyU hoped that land in the NM could be allocated to the University by 2034 for its new campus development.

44. In response to a Member's enquiry on whether PolyU would relocate its current health-related programmes from the main campus to the future NM campus for decentralisation purpose if land was allocated to PolyU to develop the third medical school in the NM, Mr Lau Man Piu Ben, R4's representative, said that if the land allocated to PolyU in the NM was sufficient to accommodate a whole faculty, PolyU would likely arrange different departments of the same faculty in the same location for efficient use of floor space and operations. Ultimately, it would depend on the size of the land allocated.

45. The Chairperson supplemented that the Development Bureau had reserved some 90 ha of land in three locations in the NM, namely Hung Shui Kiu/Ha Tsuen, Ngau Tam Mei and the New Territories North New Town, for the development of the NM University Town. The development programme of the Ngau Tam Mei University Town would proceed faster, as the Government planned to start the statutory plan-making procedures in Q4 2025 for site formation works to commence in 2026/27 afterwards. The formed land was targeted to be handed over to the selected institutions for development of the University Town and the third medical school by 2029 or earlier. The actual use and positioning of the University Town were subject to review by the Education Bureau (EDB). Options under consideration included using the land to address the current GFA shortage of existing tertiary institutions, inviting renowned institutions from the Mainland and overseas to establish branches in Hong Kong, or fostering collaborations between local universities and these institutions to run new teaching programmes that aligned with Hong Kong's future development. EDB would announce the development conceptual framework and strategies for the NM University Town next year. In this context, as it was not known at this stage whether and if yes how much land proposed for the NM

University Town would be made available for local universities including PolyU and that PolyU would want to retain its centrally located main campus in Hung Hom, its initiative to optimise the development intensity of its main campus by relaxing the BH restriction was understandable.

Public Access to the Main Campus

46. The Vice-chairperson enquired whether PolyU had any plan to open part of its open spaces on the main campus for public access free of charge, allowing the public to become better acquainted with the University. In response, Mr Lau Man Piu Ben, R4's representative, said PolyU had already opened all its open spaces on the main campus to the public by registration. Regular guided tours were also arranged to showcase the campus environment to the public. Moreover, the auditorium was open to the public for seminars and events.

47. In response to a Member's enquiry about the current use of the strip of land at Chatham Road South along the northern and western boundaries of the main campus, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD said that the strip of land was zoned "Open Space" on the OZP and was designated as an open space/amenity area for public enjoyment under PolyU's lease. Currently, it served as a jogging track accessible to the public and its accessibility would be enhanced upon completion of the redevelopment project for Blocks VA/VS.

Kowloon Permanent Pier No. 7

48. A Member enquired about the ownership of Kowloon Permanent Pier No. 7 and whether there was any proposed use for the pier apart from its current use as a temporary public vehicle park. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD said that Kowloon Permanent Pier No. 7 was government land. It had ceased its pier function since 1986 and was currently used as a temporary public vehicle park under short-term tenancy. There was no other planned use for the pier at the moment.

[The meeting was adjourned for a 15-minute break during the Q&A session.]

49. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedures for the presentation and Q&A sessions had been completed. The Board would further deliberate on the representations in closed meeting and inform the representers of the

Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representers, the representers' representatives and the government representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

50. The Chairperson invited views from Members.

51. A Member opined that the current relaxation of BH restriction for the main campus of PolyU, which was located amidst a crowded urban environment, could induce urban heat island effect. The increase in temperature in Hong Kong was primarily due to climate change and urban heat island effect. It was apparent that the wind speed in Tsim Sha Tsui area had weakened significantly due to general increase in BHs in Kowloon since the relocation of the airport. While the air ventilation impact caused by increase in BH of a single building might not be significant, the cumulative impact arising from increasing of BH for a large number of buildings could be immense. The s.16 application mechanism for minor relaxation of BH restriction for individual development project was more preferable than the current relaxation of BH restriction from 45mPD to 90mPD for the entire main campus. In this regard, the Member did not support Item A.

52. A Member had reservation on Item A as PolyU's representative could not clearly explain the urgent need for expansion of the existing main campus.

53. The Vice-chairperson and some Members expressed support to Item A and had the following views:

- (a) the relaxation of BH restriction would facilitate development of the much needed educational facilities within PolyU's main campus to support Hong Kong's future post-secondary education;
- (b) PolyU had a genuine need to increase the development scale of its main campus to meet its educational and research demand as the possibility of using the reserved educational land in the NM for campus development was still uncertain;

- (c) the relaxed BH restriction of 90mPD was compatible with the BH restrictions of the surrounding development sites in Tsim Sha Tsui;
- (d) PolyU was committed to adopting a stepped BH profile with three BH zones in its main campus to create an undulating and more interesting built environment, as well as avoid adverse visual and air ventilation impacts;
- (e) the feasibility of the BH relaxation to allow an additional GFA of about 150,000m² was supported by relevant technical assessments;
- (f) the proposed development intensity of the main campus site, accommodating the additional GFA of about 150,000m², remained acceptable in the context of the main urban area;
- (g) the statement in the ES of the OZP indicated that the BH restriction of 90mPD for the main campus site was intended to allow for an additional GFA of about 150,000m² for campus expansion, which had obtained policy support and had been demonstrated to be feasible by relevant technical assessments. This would effectively confine the building bulk and ensure that the main campus would not become excessive in scale in the future;
- (h) the design flexibility allowed by the relaxation of BH restriction for the future development projects would enable the projects to proceed more efficiently; and
- (i) for more informed consideration, PolyU should present a detailed layout of the future building dispositions and schematic design of the proposed development projects to support the BH relaxation.

54. A Member said that PolyU should be more innovative and exploring other opportunities in planning for its future expansion. Consideration could be given to decentralising some of its current teaching programmes outside the main campus. For instance, it might collaborate with airline companies to utilise the airport space for flight

simulation training for its students, or partner with the People's Liberation Army to use the adjacent Gun Club Hill Barracks to organise new military training programmes.

55. A Member suggested that for ease of reference, the gazetted Notes and ES of the draft OZP, which were currently not attached to the TPB Paper, should be incorporated into the future papers for consideration of the Board as part of the submission, instead of searching online.

56. Mr C.K. Yip, Director of Planning, supplemented the following points:

- (a) it was the Government's policy to promote integrated development of education, technology and talent to bring together top talents. The relaxation of the BH restriction to accommodate more GFA within the PolyU main campus was supported by EDB, which would assess whether the GFA of the future development projects proposed by PolyU was reasonable in scale and for educational purposes;
- (b) as PolyU's development projects were funded by UGC, the Government and the Legislative Council would carefully scrutinise the cost-effectiveness of each project. Relevant government departments, including PlanD, would review the projects to ascertain their technical feasibility as necessary;
- (c) from a macro perspective, the BH restriction of 90mPD at the main campus was not excessively high and considered compatible with the BH profile of the wider area, which had BH restrictions ranging from 90mPD to 110mPD in the Tsim Sha Tsui commercial areas, 80mPD to 95mPD in the Tsim Sha Tsui East commercial areas, and over 100mPD in Hung Hom;
- (d) it was unlikely that all buildings within the main campus would reach the maximum BH of 90mPD upon redevelopment as the development proposals would be vetted by UGC and relevant departments to ensure a conducive campus environment. The imposition of different BH zones for the site would affect design flexibility; and

- (e) for air ventilation, the major roads and open spaces served as the key air paths in the area. The existing air paths at Gascoigne Road, Chatham Road South and Cheong Wan Road would be maintained. Maintaining the existing building setbacks from Chatham Road South, open spaces within the campus and its permeable podium design feature, together with compliance with SBDG on building separation, building setback and greenery coverage for future redevelopments would ensure that the surrounding pedestrian wind environment would not be significantly affected. As such, the AVA report made no requirement for further AVAs for individual development projects in the future.

57. The Chairperson remarked that despite the imposition of a single BH restriction for the main campus on the OZP, there were established procedures in place for relevant government departments to review future development proposals of PolyU to ensure their technical feasibility. The “G/IC” zones covering other universities in the urban areas including the Hong Kong Baptist University and the City University of Hong Kong were also subject to a single BH restriction covering the whole or major portion of the university campuses.

58. The Chairperson concluded that majority of the Members supported or had no objection to the OZP amendments, and agreed that the OZP should not be amended to meet the adverse representation. All grounds of the representations had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in the Paper as well as the presentation and responses made by the government representatives at the meeting.

59. After deliberation, the Board noted the supportive views of **R1 to R6** on Item A, and decided not to uphold R7 and agreed that the draft Tsim Sha Tsui Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) should not be amended to meet the representation for the following reasons:

- “(a) the current building height (BH) restriction of 90mPD under Item A has provided design flexibility to facilitate the future expansion of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU)’s main campus which is supported by relevant technical assessments conducted by PolyU. It would also generally

maintain the overall BH profile stepping down towards the harbour in the area;
and

- (b) the amendments to the Notes for “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Ferry Terminal” (“OU(Ferry Terminal)”), “OU(Kowloon Point Piers)” and “OU(Pier)” zones are intended to allow flexibility for provision of supporting/ancillary uses within the ferry terminal/piers. The concerned sites are Government land. Any proposed development is subject to approval from relevant Government bureaux/departments and compliance with relevant legislation and other Government requirements.”

60. The Board also agreed that the draft OZP, together with its Notes and updated Explanatory Statement, was suitable for submission under section 8(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

[Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong, Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui, Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan, Messrs Daniel K.S. Lau, Ricky W.Y. Yu and Daniel K.W. Chung left the meeting during deliberation.]

Agenda Item 6

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

62. The Secretary reported that from time to time, the applicants and their consultants of section 12A (s.12A) and section 17 (s.17) applications made lengthy presentations even more than an hour for a case at the Planning Committee (PC)/Town Planning Board (the Board/TPB) meetings, which would inevitably affect the smooth conduct and efficient operation of the meetings.

63. The Secretariat had conducted some research to review the presentation times of the s.12A and s.17 applications, and noted that the average presentation times of the applicants were about 14 minutes and 8 minutes for s.12A and s.17 applications respectively. Although

lengthy presentations were relatively uncommon, they could have a notable impact on meeting efficiency when they occurred.

64. Section 2C(3) of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPO) empowered the Board or its Committees to “determine the practice and procedure at its meeting”. According to the Board’s Guidance Notes (GN) on “Application for Amendment of Plan under Section 12A of the TPO” and GN on “Application for Permission under Section 16 of the TPO”, there were existing provisions stating that “a time limit might be imposed on oral submission of the applicant” taking into account all relevant circumstances, including the meeting agenda, the nature and complexity of the applications, and the need to allocate adequate time for both the question and answer session and deliberation session.

65. To ensure smooth and efficient conduct of meetings, it was proposed to set a maximum presentation time of 15 minutes for applicants of s.12A and s.17 applications, which was considered adequate to accommodate most presentations and would provide sufficient time for the applicants to cover key points without encouraging unnecessary prolongation. The proposed 15-minute presentation time had made reference to the maximum presentation time of 10 minutes allotted to each representer in the hearing session and considered the need to allow a longer time for the presentations of the s.12A and s.17 applicants as their cases usually involved technical assessments. To cater for special circumstances, flexibility to grant additional time might be allowed subject to the Chairperson’s discretion.

66. After discussion, the Board agreed with the proposed imposition of a time limit of 15 minutes for the presentations of the applicants in s.12A and s.17 applications. The Secretariat would update the relevant GNs, and the applicants of s.12A and s.17 applications would be informed of the 15-minute presentation time limit through the invitation letters for attending the meetings starting from the next PC/TPB meetings.

67. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:40 p.m.

**Minutes of 1336th Town Planning Board
(held on 30.5.2025)**

Deferral Cases

Requests for Deferment of Review Application by Applicant for 2 Months

Item No.	Application No.*	Times of Deferment
4	A/SK-HC/354	1 st
5	A/YL-PN/83	1 st

* Refer to the agenda at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/TPB/Agenda/1336_tpb_agenda.html for details of the planning applications.