Minutes of 1339th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 11.7.2025

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	
Professor Roger C.K. Chan	
Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho	
Mr Ben S.S. Lui	
Mr Timothy K.W. Ma	
Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui	
Dr C.M. Cheng	
Mr Daniel K.W. Chung	
Mr Simon Y.S. Wong	
Mr Derrick S.M. Yip	
Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories East) (a.m.) Transport Department Mr K.L. Wong	

Chief Traffic Engineer (Hong Kong) (p.m.)
Mr Horace W. Hong

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

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Gary C.W. Tam

Director of Lands
Mr Maurice K.W. Loo

Director of Planning
Mr C.K. Yip

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

Absent with Apologies

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

Professor B.S. Tang

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Isabel Y. Yiu (a.m.)
Ms Anny P.K. Tang (p.m.)

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Katherine H.Y. Wong (a.m.)
Mr Edward H.C. Leung (p.m.)

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1338th Meeting held on 27.6.2025

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The draft minutes of the 1338th meeting held on 27.6.2025 were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

(i) Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations on Draft Outline Zoning Plans

2. The Secretary reported that the item was to seek Members' agreement on the hearing arrangement for consideration of representations in respect of the draft Cheung Chau Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/I-CC/10 and the draft Tai Po OZP No. S/TP/31.

3. The Secretary briefly introduced that the draft Cheung Chau OZP and the draft Tai Po OZP were exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance on 21.3.2025 and 28.3.2025 respectively. During the 2-month exhibition period, one valid representation was received for the draft Cheung Chau OZP and 958 valid representations were received for the draft Tai Po OZP. The hearing of the representation for the draft Cheung Chau OZP was recommended to be considered by the full Town Planning Board (the full Board). In view of the similar nature of the representations of the draft Tai Po OZP, the hearing of the representations was recommended to be considered by 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 respective hearing session. Consideration of the representation(s) for each OZP by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for August 2025.

4. The Board agreed to the hearing arrangement in paragraph 3 above.

Sai Kung and Islands District

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations in respect of the Draft Tseung Kwan O Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TKO/31

(TPB Paper No. 11011)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

5. The Secretary reported that the amendments incorporated in the draft Tseung Kwan O (TKO) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TKO/31 (the draft OZP) were to take forward the recommendations of the Recommended Outline Development Plan (RODP) for the Development of TKO Area 137 (TKO 137) and the Associated Reclamation Sites – Investigation, Design and Construction (the Study), which was commissioned by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) with AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) as the consultant. Amendment Item A included, inter alia, (i) sites for proposed public housing developments to be developed by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) with the Housing Department as the executive arm; (ii) a site to be granted to the Urban Renewal Authority (URA); and (iii) development of a proposed MTR station by MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL). Two representations were submitted by the Conservancy Association (CA) (R1) and the Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design (HKIUD) (R12). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr C.K. Yip *(as Director of Planning)*	-	being a non-executive director of the URA Board and a member of its committee;
Mr Maurice K.W. Loo (*as Director of Lands*)	-	being a member of HKHA, and a non-executive director of the URA Board and a member of its committee;

Mr Bond C.P. Chow (*as Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department*)	-	being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and the Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA;
Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan	-	being a member of HKHA and its Strategic Planning Committee, the chairperson of its Audit Sub-committee and Tender Committee;
Mr Timothy K.W. Ma	-	being a member of the Land, Rehousing & Compensation Committee and Development Project Objection Consideration Committee of URA, and being a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund;
Professor B.S. Tang	-	being a former non-executive director of the URA Board;
Mr Ben S.S. Lui	-	being a former executive director of URA;
Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho	-	having current business dealings with URA and AECOM;
Mr Ryan M.K. Ip	-	having current business dealings with URA, and his spouse owning a car parking space in TKO;
Dr Tony C.M. Ip	-	having current business dealings with URA, AECOM and CA, and being a member of HKIUD;
Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong	-	being an independent non-executive director of MTRCL;
Mr Daniel K.W. Chung	-	being a former Director of CEDD; and

Dr C.M. Cheng - owning a flat in TKO.

6. Members noted that Messrs Bond C.P. Chow, Timothy K.W. Ma, Vincent K.Y. Ho and Ryan M.K. Ip, Professor B.S. Tang, Dr Tony C.M. Ip, Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan would not attend/had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the morning session of the meeting/the whole meeting. As the interests of Messrs C.K. Yip and Maurice K.W. Loo were considered direct, they were invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. As Mr Ben S.S. Lui had no involvement in the amendment items, Mr Daniel K.W. Chung had no involvement in the Study, and the property owned by Dr C.M. Cheng had no direct view of the sites under the amendment items, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

[Messrs C.K. Yip and Maurice K.W. Loo left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

7. The following government representatives (including the consultants) and the representers were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

Development Bureau (DEVB)

Miss Christine W.Y. Au - Principal Assistant Secretary (PAS)

Miss Rebecca H.Y. Chu - Assistant Secretary (AS)

Environment and Ecology Bureau (EEB)

Miss Ellen Y.T. Chow - PAS

Ms Chillie T.L. So - Senior Town Planner

Transport and Logistics Bureau (TLB)

Mr Kenny C.M. Or - AS

Planning Department (PlanD)

Mr Walter W.N. Kwong - District Planning Officer/Sai Kung and Islands (DPO/SKIs)

Mr Coway K.H. Chan	-	Senior Town Planner/Sai Kung and Islands (STP/SKIs)
Mr Adrian S.N. Chiu	-	Town Planner/Sai Kung and Islands
Mr Dicky Y.F. Chan	-	Assistant Town Planner/Sai Kung and Islands

CEDD

Mr Marco M.K. Lee	-	Chief Engineer (CE)
Mr Rick W.C. Ko	-	Senior Engineer

Environmental Protection Department (EPD)

Dr Keith C.K. Lai	-	Principal Environmental Protection Officer
Miss Christina H.K. Suen	-	Environmental Protection Officer

Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)

Dr C.M. So	-	Senior Marine Conservation Officer
Ms H.W. Mak	-	Nature Conservation Officer

AECOM

Mr Ivan Tsang	]	
Ms Loretta Au	]	
Ms Anna Chung	]	Consultants
Mr Clifford Chow	]	
Ms Elly Leung	]	

Representers

R2 – 西貢區議會議員張美雄

Mr Cheung Mei Hung	-	Representer

R3 – 西貢區議會議員陳繼偉

Mr Chiu Kam Shing - Representer's Representative

R4 – 維景灣畔業主委員會

Mr Chung Chi Kin, Leo] Representer's Representatives
Ms Wong Pui Yu]

R5 –香港海岸郊野公園服務團

Mr Yeung Cheung Fai, Richard - Representer's Representative

R6 –香港綠色郊野大聯盟

Mr Wai Chi Fai, William - Representer's Representative

R7 – 將軍澳屋苑大聯盟

Mr Yung Wai Hung, Daniel - Representer's Representative

R8 – Designing Hong Kong

Mr Wong Wan Kei, Samuel - Representer's Representative

R10 – Association for Geoconservation, Hong Kong

Ms Choi Mo Ching, Cindy - Representer's Representative

R11 – Peng Chau Reclamation Concern Group

Mr Fung Kam Lam - Representer's Representative

R12 – HKIUD

Mr Chan Chak Bun - Representer's Representative

R13 – Alexander Main Duggie

Mr Alexander Main Duggie - Representer

R14 – Kwong Tse Hin Glenn

Mr Kwong Tse Hin Glenn - Representer

R15 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer

8. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that the representatives from PlanD would be invited to brief Members on the representations. The representers and/or their 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/or their 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/or their representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives (including the consultants), the representers and/or their representatives. After the Q&A session, the government representatives (including the consultants), the representers and/or their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. The Town Planning Board (the Board/TPB) would then deliberate on the representations in closed meeting and would inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course.

9. The Chairperson then invited the representatives of PlanD to brief Members on the representations.

10. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Coway K.H. Chan, STP/SKIs, PlanD briefed Members on the representations, including the background of the amendments on the draft OZP, major grounds/views/proposals of the representers, government responses and PlanD's views on the representations as detailed in TPB Paper No. 11011 (the Paper). The amendment items on the OZP included:

(a) Item A – incorporation of the sea area to be reclaimed off Fat Tong O into the Planning Scheme Area (the Area), zoning the reclamation area as and rezoning the adjoining land from "Other Specified Uses" ("OU") annotated "Deep Waterfront Industry" ("OU(DWI)") and "OU" annotated "Desalination Plant" to "Residential (Group A) 9" ("R(A)9"), "R(A)10", "R(A)11", "R(A)12", "OU" annotated "Commercial/Residential Development with Public Transport Interchange (1)", "Government, Institution or Community (10)" ("G/IC(10)"), "OU" annotated "Effluent Polishing Plant", "OU" annotated "Green Fuel Station", "Open Space", "Green Belt" ("GB") and area shown as 'Road' for the proposed developments in TKO 137;

(b) Item B – rezoning of a site in Fat Tong Chau in Area 135 from "GB" and "OU(DWI)" to "G/IC(10)" for a fresh water service reservoir and a salt water service reservoir;

(c) Item C – incorporation of a site occupied by a pier near Tit Cham Chau into the Area, zoning the land as and rezoning the adjoining site from "OU(DWI)" to "OU" annotated "Pier";

(d) Item D – incorporation of the sea area to be reclaimed in Chiu Keng Wan in TKO Area 132B into the Area, zoning the reclamation area as and rezoning the adjoining land from "GB" to "OU" annotated "Electricity Facilities", "OU" annotated "Construction Waste Handling Facility and Public Fill Transfer Facility", "OU" annotated "Refuse Transfer Station", "OU" annotated "Concrete Batching Plant", "G/IC(10)", "G/IC" and area shown as 'Road';

(e) Item E – incorporation of four sites near Chiu Keng Wan into the Area and zoning the sites as "GB"; and

(f) Item F – excision of five sites within "OU(DWI)" zone from the Area.

11. There were also amendments to the Notes of the OZP consequential to the amendments to the Plan and to tally with the latest Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans.

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

R2 – 西貢區議會議員張美雄

13. Mr Cheung Mei Hung made the following main points:

(a) he was an incumbent District Councillor of the Sai Kung District Council (SKDC), serving the district council for almost 10 years. Throughout the years, he dedicated his service to the LOHAS Park community. Being a serving District Councillor, he had endeavoured to explain the enhanced land creation proposal for TKO to the local community. He maintained close dialogue with the local residents and would truly reflect their comments and views on the proposed developments at TKO Area 132 (TKO 132). He hoped that the proposal could be further adjusted and enhanced, with a view to achieving a balance between development and benefits of the residents;

(b) the proposed reclamation of TKO 132 under Item D was about 20 ha. Many residents considered that the proposed reclamation would affect the existing natural shoreline. They questioned the rectangular-shaped reclamation boundary and considered it lacking in detailed visual assessment. A 55m slope-cutting scheme, rather than the currently proposed 30m slope-cutting scheme, should be adopted to reduce the reclamation extent off TKO 132. Such proposal was technically feasible, as confirmed in previous discussions with relevant government departments. Although the 55m slope-cutting proposal would incur additional cost (i.e. a 20% increase in cost) and time (i.e. an extension of the construction period by 2 years), it was worthy of consideration as it could alleviate residents' dissatisfaction and bring about long-term environmental benefits. Besides, opportunity could be explored to shift the proposed reclamation for the public facilities at TKO 132 southward to increase the buffer distance from residents;

(c) the closest residential development was located just 1km away from the proposed obnoxious public facilities to be provided at TKO 132. Air, dust and

noise pollution from those facilities would have a significant impact on residents' health. Among the five public facilities, local residents expressed grave concerns regarding the proposed CBP. TKO residents believed that they had already borne their social responsibility for a long time by reluctantly tolerating the impacts brought by the existing temporary CBP and public fill. The proposed permanent CBP would result in adverse impacts on air quality, noise and traffic conditions in the area. Moreover, the proposed public facilities, together with the construction vehicles such as cement mixer tracks, would impose an additional traffic burden on the TKO-Lam Tin Tunnel (TKO-LTT). According to the Paper, the proposed CBP would produce and deliver freshly mixed concrete for construction sites in Kowloon East. Therefore, the CBP should be located closer to those construction sites, such as Yau Tong, where existing CBPs were already present, or in less densely populated areas, to reduce travelling time and transport cost. Furthermore, the proposed public facilities could be strategically planned and distributed across different areas;

(d) it was suggested that the construction and operation of various facilities in TKO 132 should be closely monitored to minimise potential environmental impacts. Proposed measures included (i) establishing performance indicators (for PM2.5 and noise level) for all works and facilities to enhance management and monitoring; and (ii) installing closed-circuit televisions (CCTV) cameras for real-time monitoring of vehicles and barge loading and unloading activities to enhance transparency;

(e) a community liaison group should be established, involving relevant stakeholders such as local residents from the TKO east coast and representatives from developments in the area, including Ocean Shores, CARPI, Alto Residences, Corinthia by the Sea, The Wings 3B, Ocean Wings, Monterey Place, THE PARKSIDE, SAVANNAH, Malibu, Marini, Sea to Sky, LOHAS Park Phase 13, etc. Regular meetings should be held to address and follow up on various issues related to the proposed developments; and

(f) the railway incident on 22.5.2025 revealed that the traffic infrastructure serving the area was operating at maximum capacity. To enhance connectivity in TKO,

various measures should be implemented, particularly the extension of the TKO Line Southern Extension (TKLSE) to Hong Kong Island East, and other possible connection to the Po Lam area.

R3 – 西貢區議會議員陳繼偉

14. Mr Chiu Kam Shing made the following main points:

(a) he was a resident of Ocean Shores, a community that had long suffered from noise and air pollution caused by adjacent connecting roads. The proposed development at TKO 132 was expected to exacerbate these issues significantly, due to the anticipated increase in heavy vehicles on these roads and increased barging operations. Despite persistent concerns voiced by residents, no mitigation measures, such as the installation of noise barriers, had been implemented to address the ongoing noise pollution affecting Ocean Shores;

(b) the cumulative impact of the proposed public facilities at TKO 132 under Item D, particularly the construction waste handling facility, public fill transfer facility and the CBP, was a major concern. Given that the nearest residential development was located just 1km away, the anticipated air and noise pollution would adversely affect residents' health. Furthermore, the presence of a mountain to the west of TKO 132 obstructed wind flow, preventing the dispersion of dust generated by the proposed public facilities and causing it to accumulate in the area, thereby exacerbating environmental and health concerns;

(c) the construction and operation of the public facilities in TKO 132 should be closely monitored to minimise potential environmental impacts. Despite repeated recommendations at the SKDC meetings and consultation sessions, the Government had shown reluctance to commit to installing CCTV cameras and implementing an environmental monitoring system, such as measures to track PM2.5 level and noise pollution, to effectively oversee the situation;

(d) the proposed CBP, construction waste handling facility and public fill transfer facility, should be planned at a more suitable site. Consideration could be

given to situating them in a designated corner at TKO 137, with a buffer between these public facilities and nearby residential developments to be provided. More compatible land uses such as data centres and commercial operations (e.g. warehouse storage) could be planned in the surrounding areas. For residential developments to be provided in this new development area, the Government could mandate the incorporation of a centralised air purification system into the design of new buildings; and

(e) the transport infrastructure in TKO 137 was already operating at full capacity. The population growth resulting from the proposed developments under Item A would impose a substantial traffic burden on the area. The existing transport systems, particularly the MTR, would not be able to accommodate the additional population.

R4 – 維景灣畔業主委員會

15. Mr Chung Chi Kin, Leo made the following main points:

(a) paragragh 4.1.8 of the Paper stated that the zero-carbon energy support would be sourced from the Mainland. Consequentially, the proposed electricity facilities at TKO 132 under Item D should ideally be situated in the Northern Metropolis (NM). Similarly, the proposed CBP, which would produce and deliver freshly mixed concrete for construction sites in the New Territories (NT) East and Kowloon East, should be strategically located in proximity to these sites. While the concrete might also support future development in TKO, the CBP did not necessarily need to be located at TKO 132, given that the concrete did not set within a short timeframe;

(b) the proposed reclamation area of 20 ha, which was equivalent to the size of 30 football pitches or Victoria Park, in TKO 132 under Item D was extensive. The proposed public facilities at TKO 132 was in close proximity to residential developments, with Ocean Shores situated approximately 1km away. While the methodology for determining this 1km buffer distance was not specified, the project proponent should ensure no reclamation works would be conducted

within the buffer area with Ocean Shores. Residents of Ocean Shores currently enjoyed vast sea views, but the majority of which would be obstructed by the proposed developments at TKO 132;

(c) the revised reclamation boundary of TKO 132 under Item D was considered less favourable than the previous proposal. To mitigate visual impacts on Ocean Shores and reduce air pollution for local residents, the proposed public facilities should be moved southward towards Lei Yue Mun. Besides, heavy vehicles entering or exiting the proposed public facilities should be equipped with covers to prevent dust dispersion;

(d) owing to its geographical location, TKO was subject to humidity and poor ventilation. As a result, dust generated by the proposed public facilities and heavy vehicles was unable to disperse effectively. The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) had failed to adequately address the air quality impact;

(e) the stepped building height (BH) profile should be maintained in the proposed developments at TKO 137 under Item A, with BHs descending progressively from hillside towards the sea; and

(f) given the current downturn in the housing market and the proposed development of obnoxious public facilities, the developments at TKO 132 and TKO 137 would likely exacerbate downward pressure on flat prices in the area. The resulting financial burden would ultimately fall on local residents.

R5 – 香港海岸郊野公園服務團

16. Mr Yeung Cheung Fai, Richard made the following main points:

(a) as a resident of TKO for over a decade, he observed the transformation of TKO South, including the construction of Cross Bay Link and the promenade. While the Government actively promoted tourism across all districts, the existing tourist attractions at TKO were currently facing adverse impacts due to the proposed developments at TKO 132 under Item D;

(b) the relocation of the existing temporary CBP at TKO 137 to TKO 132 was primarily to facilitate housing developments at the site. However, the five proposed public facilities at TKO 132 were anticipated to have adverse impacts on local residents. Specifically, the CBP should not be situated within an established residential area. The proposed CBP should be located at alternative suitable sites, such as Kwun Tong, Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay;

(c) the future design of the proposed public facilities at TKO 132 was questionable. Controlling the actual operation and users of those facilities, particularly the proposed CBP, was challenging and difficult to enforce. Furthermore, there was a lack of government enforcement. The proposed public facilities should be closely and effectively monitored to minimise potential environmental impacts; and

(d) given its geographical location, TKO was prone to high humidity and poor ventilation. As a result, dust generated by the proposed public facilities would likely be trapped in the area, making it difficult to disperse effectively.

R6 – 香港綠色郊野大聯盟

17. Mr Wai Chi Fai, William made the following main points:

(a) he was a resident of Ocean Shores in TKO. He queried the rationale for permanently locating the CBP at TKO 132, as the heavy vehicles generated by its future operations would likely cause significant damage to the existing roads;

(b) TKO was situated in a valley with prevailing winds from the southeast. As a result, dust and pollutants tended to accumulate and were unable to dissipate adequately. He had long been affected by air pollution generated by the Cross Bay Link;

(c) the cumulative adverse impacts of air and noise pollution arising from the proposed public facilities, such as barges, were a major concern for the residents

in TKO. Those impacts would adversely affect residents' physical and mental well-being, potentially leading to increased medical costs. The proposed planning for TKO appeared short-sighted, and the Government seemed to disregard the comments from residents; and

(d) the transport infrastructure in TKO was already operating at full capacity, making it challenging to support further population growth in the area. The influx of over 100,000 new residents in TKO 137 would impose significant strain on the MTR system, especially during peak hours. It seemed that the Government had failed to adequately consider the concerns and needs of the current TKO residents.

R7 – 將軍澳屋苑大聯盟

18. Mr Yung Wai Hung, Daniel made the following main points:

(a) he had lived in TKO for over 30 years, including 8 years in TKO South, and had been affected by poor air quality, particularly due to dust pollution;

(b) residents expressed grave concerns about the potential pollution that could be generated by the proposed CBP. While the EPD stated during the SKDC meeting that the proposed CBP would incorporate a modern and enhanced design similar to the one currently operating in Tai Po, the environmental conditions at the Tai Po site remained unsatisfactory. During a recent visit, he observed that the roads were still dirty and the overall conditions were poor;

(c) the TKO-LTT, particularly the lane heading towards Hong Kong Island, experienced significant congestion during peak hours. The heavy vehicles frequently using the TKO-LTT had caused hygiene issues inside the tunnel, with no assigned party responsible for its upkeep. Those conditions were expected to deteriorate further upon the completion of future developments in TKO 132, as the increased use of construction vehicles such as cement mixing trucks would impose additional traffic loads on the tunnel. This would likely lead to further environmental and hygiene problems, which the Government might find

challenging to regulate and enforce effectively;

(d) the necessity of the proposed reclamation was questionable. According to the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance, reclamation should only be pursued if the need was compelling and overriding. Given the current surplus in flat supply across Hong Kong, the rationale for constructing the proposed CBP was uncertain. Based on his understanding, the concrete used for LOHAS Park was sourced from the CBP in the NT, rather than from the one in Yau Tong. The justification for locating the proposed CBP at TKO 132 remained unclear. It was worth noting that TKO residents did not object to all proposed public facilities at TKO 132 under Item D. For example, the proposed electricity facility was deemed essential to support the planned developments; and

(e) given the Government's recent fiscal situation, reducing the number of public facilities to be constructed at TKO 132 would help save costs.

R8 – Designing Hong Kong

19. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Wong Wan Kei, Samuel made the following main points:

(a) TKO 137 was located near Victoria Harbour. The existing barging basin was readily available for mooring, addressing the territory's current shortage of safe mooring spaces and facilitating various marine activities. It should be re-designed as a public marina, complemented by a breakwater, to serve visiting yachts, TKO residents, and the wider marine community in Hong Kong. He made the following comments and clarifications in response to PlanD's points outlined in paragraph 5.3.2.1 of the Paper:

(i) it was considered that the layout for TKO 137 could be slightly adjusted to accommodate the planned TKLSE tunnel while retaining adequate space for a marina;

(ii) while the expansion of the Aberdeen Typhoon Shelter, the Ex-Lamma

Quarry, the waters near Hung Hom, and the Airport Bay Marina could collectively address about 10% of the shortfall in moorings, they would not fully meet the demand for mooring facilities. Moreover, those moorings were located at a considerable distance from TKO 137. Mooring facilities should ideally be situated closer to waterfront areas and nearer to future residents; and

(iii) their proposal was not merely to provide another water sports centre akin to those operated by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD), which primarily focused on teaching boating skills rather than providing space for individuals to own or store boards. Instead, the proposal aimed to retain sheltered waters where residents could safely store their own boards;

(b) the marine economy, encompassing sectors such as yachting and water sports, had support from both national and local polices. At the national level, President Xi Jinping had emphasised the importance of promoting high-quality development of the marine economy, reinforcing the principle that 'lucid waters and lush mountains are invaluable assets'. At the local level, the Chief Executive in the 2024 Policy Address outlined a strategic focus on developing innovative tourism products. Yacht tourism was specially highlighted as a key opportunity to bolster Hong Kong's economy;

(c) during the discussion of the draft Pak Shek Kok (East) OZP No. S/PSK/10 on 12.7.2013, the Chairperson of the Board highlighted the importance of reviewing the provision of marine and water sports facilities, particularly the establishment of a public marina. It was recommended that a comprehensive territorial study be conducted to identify a suitable site for the development of a public marine centre;

(d) the number of pleasure vessels had continued to grow significantly, i.e. more than doubling from 2002 to 2023. However, the supply of mooring facilities had remained similar over the same period. The imbalance of demand and supply had resulted in an estimated shortfall of 10,000 public moorings in

Hong Kong;

(e) sheltered moorings were essential as many vessels were currently moored in open water and exposed to the risks posed by adverse weather conditions. The extent of damage caused by typhoon could be seen from a report published by the Marine Department following Typhoon Mangkhut;

(f) regarding the reclamation at TKO 132, it was proposed that the natural shoreline should be preserved to the greatest extent possible. The location of the reclamation was highly visible to residents of TKO, including those in LOHAS Park and future residents of TKO 137, as well as to residents of Heng Fa Chuen on Hong Kong Island. To better integrate with the surrounding natural environment, consideration should be given to reducing the extent of the reclamation and adjusting the shape of the future shoreline. The rectangular outline of the reclamation should be revised or redesigned to incorporate a more natural, greener shoreline. This approach would not only soften the boundary of reclamation but also enhance compatibility with the existing natural shoreline; and

(g) while it was appreciated that the Government was exploring the feasibility to enhancing the hiking trails between TKO 132 and Lei Yue Mun to improve connectivity, there remained a notable absence of pedestrian connectivity between Butterfly Beach in Tuen Mun and LOHAS Park.

R10 – Association for Geoconservation, Hong Kong

20. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Choi Mo Ching, Cindy made the following main points:

(a) the natural shoreline along TKO 132 comprised a rich coastal landscape, including beaches, sea cliffs, capes, sea caves, wave-cut platforms and sheeting joints. These features held significant geodiversity value, showcasing the transition from volcanic formation in Sai Kung to granitic intrusions in the urban area. The shoreline not only featured both rock formations but also

included granite that had been metamorphosed into "Greisen" and other mineralised structures;

(b) the coastal landscape had been shaped over thousands of years, representing a precious natural asset for TKO and Hong Kong. The proposed reclamation would irreversibly destroy this invaluable heritage and natural resource, resulting in its permanent loss;

(c) the natural shoreline was prominently visible when entering Victoria Harbour and was highly valued by both the public and tourists. The trail from Lei Yue Mun to TKO was particularly renowned as a popular scenic walk;

(d) they were not intended to oppose development but rather to preserve natural resources. Hong Kong had numerous examples of successful preservation of natural shorelines alongside development projects. For example, the site for the incinerator at Shek Kwu Chau, and Hong Kong Disneyland where the entire 2km natural shoreline was preserved; and

(e) the affected shoreline should be preserved and rezoned as a "Coastal Protection Area" ("CPA"). For the proposed reclamation in TKO 132 under Item D, consideration could be given to creating an offshore artificial island. The western coastline of this artificial island could be developed into a regional geopark and recreation amenities.

R11 – Peng Chau Reclamation Concern Group

21. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Fung Kam Lam made the following main points:

(a) the EIA Report for the Development of TKO 137 and Associated Reclamation Site (the EIA Report) was approved with conditions by the Director of Environment (DEP) on 30.4.2025, and the application for the Environmental Permit was submitted on 26.6.2025. Given that the hearing of representations of the draft OZP was conducted after the EIA approval, he queried whether

there was a binding effect in approving the draft OZP;

(b) the proposed developments at TKO 132 and TKO 137 were based on the assumption that large-scale land reclamation projects in Hong Kong would be implemented progressively. However, the Administration did not provide projections or estimates on the amount of landfill generated at the local level or the anticipated consumption of landfill in the coming years;

(c) the project boundary outlined in the EIA Report differed from the affected foreshore and seabed under the Foreshore and Sea-bed (Reclamations) Ordinance. He consulted relevant government departments and raised concerns about whether all potential environmental impacts had been fully assessed in the EIA;

(d) the public comments and submissions on the EIA Report were not published for public inspection, nor were members of the public invited to present their views to the Advisory Council on the Environment (ACE);

(e) the coral survey conducted was not comprehensive, and the EIA Report failed to evaluate the effectiveness of coral translocation as a recommended mitigation measure. According to the minutes of the ACE meeting dated 17.3.2025, it was confirmed that no rare coral species were found in the project areas. The corals identified were primarily common species, with coverage rates of less than 10% in TKO 132 and 5% in TKO 137. Notably, a condition was imposed requiring the project proponent, in consultation with the AFCD, to submit a Coral Translocation and Enhancement Plan (CTEP) to DEP for approval;

(f) a letter was submitted by the Peng Chau Reclamation Concern Group to the Board on 16.1.2025, expressing their concerns on the visual impact of the amendments of the OZP. They questioned the omission of one of the most striking visual impact photomontages (i.e. Figure 11.4.11 of the EIA Report) in the drawings of TPB Paper No. 10992, which outlined the amendments to the approved TKO OZP No. S/TKO/30; and

(g) a site within TKO 137 was designated to be granted to URA. However, the Paper did not provide information on how the land use budget, i.e. the areas allocated for public housing (25.9%) and private housing (26%) would be affected.

[Professor Roger C.K. Chan left the meeting at this point.]

[The meeting adjourned for a 10-minute break.]

R12 – HKIUD

22. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Chan Chak Bun made the following main points:

(a) he was the president of HKIUD. The HKIUD objected to the amendments to the OZP related to developments in TKO 132 and TKO 137. Their major concerns included the disruption to the natural shoreline, as well as the visual and environmental impacts caused by the proposed developments at TKO 132 under Item D;

(b) there was no urgent need for the proposed reclamation at TKO 132. The proposed developments at TKO 132 involved large scale reclamation situated at the eastern entrance of Victoria Harbour, which would create a significant visual eyesore. It would result in adverse visual impacts for all cruise ships arriving in Hong Kong. Even a single small utility building could create serious adverse impacts, as evidenced by the existing sewage treatment plant on Lamma Island;

(c) the HKIUD suggested relocating the proposed public facilities to less sensitive sites or within a cavern featuring marine frontage in the form of a pier. By housing unsightly utilities inside the cavern, visual impacts could be minimised, the natural shoreline preserved, and noise and air pollution from the utilities better controlled; and

(d) with reference to the Cavern Master Plan published by CEDD, power stations and public utilities were identified as land uses with potential for development within caverns. According to DEVB Technical Circular (Works) No. 2/2024, there was already a strategic cavern area near TKO 132. Relocating the proposed public facilities into a cavern offered long-term benefits that outweighed the associated costs.

R13 – Alexander Main Duggie

23. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Alexander Main Duggie made the following main points:

(a) he was a Landscape Architect and the managing director of Urbis Limited. The representation was made in his personal capacity;

(b) the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) failed to identify several adverse landscape impacts of substantial significance. In accordance with the five criteria outlined in the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO) Technical Memorandum (TM) Annex 10, the LVIA should have concluded that the landscape impact was unacceptable;

(c) the permanent and irreversible loss of the beautiful coastline along TKO 132, as well as the enduring presence of extensive reclamation, were not recognised as sources of landscape impact during the operation phase. The proposed developments at TKO 132 would cause substantial, permanent and irreversible adverse landscape impacts, affecting both the natural coastline (including rocky and sandy shores) along the western edge of Junk Bay and the overall landscape character of Junk Bay;

(d) the LVIA failed to incorporate fundamental engineering design measures to mitigate the landscape impact of the project, such as establishing an open channel between the coast and the reclamation area. Notably, Hong Kong had precedents where coastlines had been successfully preserved alongside reclamation projects. For instance, the 4.5km Tung Chung natural coastline

was preserved under the airport development, and the 2km Penny's Bay natural coastline was maintained under the Hong Kong Disneyland project;

(e) the statement in the EIA Executive Summary claiming that "the land to be created of TKO 132 is at a relatively obscure area" was inaccurate and misguided. The location of TKO 132 under Item D was not obscure, and it was highly visible from Siu Sai Wan, Chai Wan, LOHAS Park and eastern TKO. The proposed developments at TKO 132 would pose substantial adverse visual impacts, particularly to cruise ships arriving from the eastern side of Victoria Harbour;

(f) there was a significant failure in the EIA public consultation process. CEDD and EPD disregarded the objections he raised in February 2024 and failed to present or discuss those objections with ACE. Furthermore, there were no registered landscape architects in the ACE, meaning no one was qualified to critically and professionally analysing the details of the LVIA. As a result, the fundamental flaws in the LVIAs were overlooked, and this had been a recurring issue in all EIAs;

(g) PlanD, as the gatekeeper responsible for safeguarding Hong Kong's landscape, failed to identify the fundamental flaws in the EIA. A similar issue was observed in the EIA Report for the Fanling Golf Course development, for which he prepared a comprehensive list of fundamental faults that EPD and PlanD neglected to address. The judgment of the relevant judicial review fully supported all his principal technical criticisms of the LVIA;

(h) town planning in Hong Kong was afflicted by 'shifting baseline syndrome', characterised by ongoing environmental degradation at local, regional and global scales. As a result, public thresholds for acceptable environmental conditions were continually being lowered. The natural landscape was persistently disrupted, and the net cumulative effect of the disruption was consistently underestimated; and

(i) to conclude, the current proposals on the OZP should be rejected due to the

permanent and irreversible damage they would inflict on the beautiful and geodiverse natural coastline along the west coast of TKO. Instead, the coastline should be rezoned to "CPA", and the reclamation at TKO 132 should be reconfigured to avoid impacting the "CPA" zone. This could be achieved by creating an open water channel between the coastline and the reclamation area.

R14 – Kwong Tse Hin, Glenn

24. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Kwong Tse Hin, Glenn made the following main points:

(a) he was a civil engineer specialising in construction and road traffic engineering, and he was also a Fellow of the Institution of Civil Engineers (ICE);

(b) while civil engineering had played a pivotal role in urban development, and engineers took pride in creating land through reclamation over the decades to improve citizens' lives, the standards of engineering design should now be elevated to incorporate nature-based solutions, as advocated by the ICE. The integration of engineering design with nature conservation was crucial, particularly as the proposed reclamation in TKO 132 threatened the region's unique natural coastline and geological diversity;

(c) the natural coastline of TKO 132 was exceptional, representing one of the few remaining natural coastlines with significant scenic value and geological diversity. This area featured an alternating composition of volcanic and granite rocks, shaped by years of erosion from prevailing southeasterly winds, which had resulted in the creation of unique and distinctive landscapes;

(d) he cited a previous example concerning the routing of the TKO-LTT project, where public feedback was incorporated, leading to a more environmentally friendly design that avoided additional reclamation. In contrast, the currently proposed reclamation did not align with that approach and would cause

significant and irreversible damage to the coastline;

(e) the exclusive industrial land use in TKO 132 would deter public visitation. Instead, the development of mixed-use facilities should be encouraged, integrating industrial spaces with parks, walking paths and cycling routes;

(f) the EIA Report and subsequent approval processes deliberately excluded discussions on the natural coastline, rendering the assessment's acceptance unconvincing;

(g) he strongly urged the Board to reject the reclamation proposal at TKO 132 and to explore alternatives, such as reducing its scale or relocating it to a more suitable area. Offshore reclamation should be pursued to preserve the natural coastline. Furthermore, the establishment of a natural park should be considered to integrate walking and cycling paths connecting Lei Yue Mun and Yau Tong. CEDD's claims regarding the infeasibility of offshore reclamation due to cable connection to the power facilities were questionable, particularly given the successful implementation of a similar approach during the development of the Hong Kong Disneyland, which protected the coastline along the South Lantau Country Park. Several technically feasible alternatives for power cable connections were available, such as the installation of power lines on bridge structures or the implementation of underground cable tunnels; and

(h) failure to preserve the natural coastline would result in a loss of public interest and connection to nature, ultimately diminishing the quality of life in Hong Kong. Therefore, a shift towards nature-based solutions should be advocated to safeguard Hong Kong's natural beauty for future generations.

[Mr Derrick S.M. Yip left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

R15 – Mary Mulvihill

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

Item A

(a) she raised strong objection to Item A on the grounds that the high-density development proposed for TKO 137 was unsuitable due to inadequate transport infrastructure and potential ecological and visual impacts. Climate change considerations were notably absent from the proposed reclamation plan, which featured a long, straight, manmade coastline that increased the risks of erosion and flooding. A stepped BH profile and naturally curved coastline should be adopted to enhance visual quality, particularly for cruise ships entering the harbour;

(b) the proposed waterfront area should be designed to be vibrant and dynamic, incorporating catering and entertainment facilities. The proposed roads should be constructed underground to maximise aboveground space for alternative uses;

(c) in terms of land use, the public market and the health centre within the proposed joint-user government complex were incompatible. Planned schools should not be situated between high-density residential towers. There was also a notable absence of commercial facilities in the area to provide local employment opportunities;

Item B

(d) as about 1,250 trees would need to be felled at the site, the natural panorama of the area would be irreversibly compromised. No photomontage was provided to illustrate the visual impact of the proposed service reservoirs;

Item C

(e) it was unreasonable to locate a recreational and tourism pier adjacent to the landfill. The pier should be situated in a waterfront area integrated with public ferry services, similar to those in Discovery Bay and Ma Wan. She supported the recommendations of Designing Hong Kong (R8) to retain and

transform the existing marina into a marine centre equipped with public ferry services, which would enhance community engagement and create employment opportunities. The provision of public ferry services would also alleviate pressure on the road networks;

Item D

(f) she agreed with the recommendations of Designing Hong Kong (R8) that the current reclamation outline appeared unnatural and should be softened to better harmonise with the existing natural shoreline. A buffer zone should be established along the shoreline to mitigate the impacts of extreme weather conditions caused by the climate change. Moreover, a designated mooring area should be incorporated;

Item F

(g) no information was provided regarding whether the five sites excised from the planning scheme area would be appropriately restored for incorporation into the country park;

Others

(h) the provision of government, institution and community facilities, including social welfare, healthcare, recreational facilities and open spaces were inadequate to meet the needs of a growing population;

(i) she objected to the incorporation of 'Government Refuse Collection Point' and 'Public Convenience' to Column 1 of the Notes for "Village Type Development" zone, as it deprived the community of the opportunity to comment on the location and design of these facilities; and

(j) future planning should prioritise sustainability and community needs over immediate costs. Given the possible risks of disregarding climate change and the necessity for responsible planning in harmony with nature, she urged

Members to reconsider the development proposals.

26. As the presentations of the representers and/or their representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions and the Chairperson would invite the representers, their representatives and/or the government representatives (including the consultants) to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board or for cross-examination between parties. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

[Mr Daniel K.S. Lau left the meeting at this point.]

Traffic and Transport Infrastructure

27. Noting that a major concern among local residents was the traffic impact of the proposed developments, two Members raised the following questions:

(a) the transport infrastructure/arrangements in TKO to accommodate the additional population; and

(b) given that Wan Po Road served as the major access route to TKO 137, whether there would be any alternative routes to divert the traffic if Wan Po Road was blocked.

28. In response, Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, DPO/SKIs, PlanD made the following main points:

(a) TKO 137 was planned to accommodate approximately 50,000 residential units for a new population of about 135,000. The transport demand arising from the proposed developments in TKO 137 would be supported by the existing road infrastructure, complemented by the newly proposed TKO – Yau Tong Tunnel (TKO-YTT) and TKLSE, as outlined in the Hong Kong Major Transport Infrastructure Development Blueprint (the Blueprint) promulgated in 2023. The proposed TKLSE, which included a planned MTR station at TKO 137, was

expected to further improve connectivity. To bolster transport capacity, the MTR TKO Line signaling system would be upgraded, and the train frequency and maximum carrying capacity of the TKO Line could be increased. Those enhancements were expected to adequately meet the transport demands arising from the long-term developments of TKO. The Transport Department would continue to closely monitor the passenger demand and the level of public transport services in TKO to ensure efficient and sustainable transport solutions for the growing population; and

(b) Wan Po Road was a dual two-lane carriageway. In the event of an accident affecting one lane, the other lane would remain operational for uninterrupted access. If both lanes of Wan Po Road were blocked, traffic could be rerouted through the internal roads within the TKO InnoPark. Furthermore, the area would be served by the TKLSE, which included a planned station at TKO 137. The detailed road network for TKO 137 and associated railway infrastructure would be further refined and finalised during the detailed design stage.

29. A Member enquired whether any quantitative information was available regarding the future traffic situation in the area. In response, Mr Kenny C.M. Or, AS, TLB, made the following main points:

(a) the Blueprint formulated a planning framework for the city's future transport infrastructure development, and outlined the strategic railway and major road networks which could meet the transport and logistics demand up to 2046 and beyond. Taking into account the available planning data on land development, the Blueprint had duly considered the transport and logistics demand brought about by population growth, employment and economic activities, including those in TKO 137 and other areas in TKO. The Government had proposed utilising the existing MTR TKO Line as a basis, with the TKLSE envisioned to extend southward from the LOHAS Park Station to the planned station at TKO 137. Besides, the signalling system of the MTR TKO Line was undergoing a comprehensive upgrade, with completion anticipated by 2029. This enhancement could improve the TKO Line's carrying capacity. The assessment concluded that, through upgrading the signalling system and

increasing the number of trains, the carrying capacity of TKO Line would be sufficient to meet both the existing and future transport demand arising from the long-term developments in TKO;

(b) following the railway incident on 22.5.2025, the Government had instructed MTRCL to strengthen the maintenance of its railway system and incident handling capacity to enhance the overall resilience of the railway network. At the Government's request, the MTRCL had formulated an action plan on incident prevention and handling. The plan covered a one-off special inspection of targeted critical assets and a series of mid- to long-term measures. They included strengthening the monitoring and risk management of railway assets to enhance the overall resilience of the railway network; formulating plans for extreme scenarios, reinforcing drills and training under different scenarios, strengthening the decision-making and execution capacities of MTR staff during incidents; and enhancing free shuttle bus arrangements and strengthening information dissemination such as updates on repair work progress, suggestions on alternative routes to facilitate the public in planning their journey according to the latest situation, and rallying community support to assist affected passengers. The Government would closely monitor the MTRCL in implementing the improvement measures to ensure that the MTR would continue to provide safe and reliable services to the public; and

(c) regarding road infrastructure, the future TKO-YTT was anticipated to share over 30% of overall external traffic volume of TKO during peak hours. Additionally, with the completion of Route 6 next year, the journey time between TKO town centre and the Yau Ma Tei Interchange during peak hours was anticipated to reduce significantly from 65 minutes to approximately 12 minutes, increasing commuting options, thereby improving connectivity and alleviating traffic congestion.

Reclamation at TKO 132 (Item D)

30. Some Members raised the following questions:

(a) the site selection criteria and scale of reclamation;

(b) the possibility of shifting the proposed reclamation southward or relocating the proposed public facilities to the ex-Lei Yue Mun Quarry site;

(c) to mitigate the cumulative impacts of the proposed public facilities, whether these facilities could be situated in separate locations; and

(d) whether it would be beneficial to locate the proposed construction waste handling facility, public fill transfer facility and refuse transfer station (RTS) near the existing public fill area at TKO 137.

31. In response, Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, DPO/SKIs, PlanD, with aid of some PowperPoint slides, made the following main points:

(a) the location and scale of the proposed reclamation had taken into account all relevant factors, including water current, marine and land-based traffic, ecological considerations, cultural heritage, operational requirements of the proposed public facilities, construction costs and project timelines. Situated along the marine frontage, the proposed facilities in TKO 132 would leverage marine transportation to support their operations. Additionally, the proximity of the TKO 132 portal to the TKO-LTT ensured that vehicular traffic generated by these facilities could directly access the TKO-LTT to Kowloon, bypassing the existing road network in the TKO town centre. This approach minimised potential disruptions to the local residents in TKO. In formulating the RODP, public comments on the layouts and configurations of TKO 132 received in Preliminary Outline Development Plan (PODP) stage had been thoroughly reviewed and taken into account in formulating the current proposal, where appropriate. Compared to the reclamation outlined in the PODP, the total reclamation area had been reduced from 25 ha to about 20 ha, and the length of natural shoreline affected had been reduced from 790m to around 500m;

(b) shifting the proposed reclamation southward was not desirable as it would reduce the buffer distance towards Hong Kong Island. As the proposed public

facilities required a substantial area of land and sea frontage to support their operations, the ex-Lei Yue Mun Quarry, located close to Devil's Peak with hilly terrain and built heritages, lacked sufficient space for these facilities. Besides, the ex-Lei Yue Mun Quarry was situated at Lei Yue Mun Point, directly facing the major waterway between Victoria Harbour and Tathong Channel. Locating public facilities requiring marine access in this area could potentially disrupt the heavy marine traffic and affect navigation safety;

(c) locating the five public facilities in a single location would optimise land resource utilisation by allowing for shared utilities and infrastructure, such as parking and berthing facilities. If these facilities were distributed separately, it would not be possible to allow shared use of these common utilities; and

(d) the proposed construction waste handling facility, public fill transfer facility, and RTS were designed to manage and transfer construction waste, public fill, and municipal solid waste generated in the eastern part of Hong Kong, including TKO, to downstream facilities in Hong Kong via marine transport. The RTS would play a critical role in compacting and containerising municipal solid waste for efficient transfer to waste management facilities, including the I-Park at Shek Ku Chau under construction by marine transport. At present, the lack of an RTS in TKO required waste generated in the area to be transported to waste management facilities in other areas via road networks. By establishing the RTS at TKO 132 and utilising marine transport, potential nuisances to TKO residents could be minimised.

32. Regarding the proposal to shift the proposed reclamation southward, Mr Marco M.K. Lee, CE, CEDD highlighted that this option was considered undesirable as it would adversely affect the translocated coral and marine habits of an existing coral recipient site at the southwestern coast of the Junk Bay.

33. Some Members raised the following questions:

(a) whether there was any proposal to enhance or restore the marine habitat after

the reclamation;

(b) whether there were any limitations or challenges associated with shifting the proposed reclamation inward through additional slope cutting, and what the associated construction costs would be; and

(c) whether the feasibility of relocating the proposed public facilities into cavern had been examined.

34. In response, Mr Marco M.K. Lee, CE, CEDD made the following main points:

(a) CEDD would explore the feasibility of implementing eco-shoreline or ecologically enhanced seawall designs to foster diverse habitats for marine organisms. Approximately 2.6 km of eco-shoreline or ecologically enhanced seawall would be developed at TKO 132 and TKO 137, as compared with the affected 500m natural shoreline. This initiative aimed to enhance marine biodiversity and emulate natural shoreline habitats by integrating aesthetically textured and patterned designs;

(b) the current 30m slope-cutting scheme at Chiu Keng Wan Shan represented an optimised design that balanced the need for land to accommodate essential public facilities with financial and time implications of construction. Adopting the proposed 55m slope-cutting scheme would increase construction costs by approximately 20%. Other than the additional costs incurred, the overall construction period for the 55m slope-cutting scheme would be extended by about 2 years; and

(c) a comprehensive feasibility review had been conducted to assess the potential of accommodating public facilities into a cavern near TKO 132. This review took into account design and construction risks, operational requirements, land requirements (including berthing areas and open-air operation space), as well as cost and time implications. In general, caverns, not being flat land, posed numerous technical constraints for development. They were unsuitable for large-scale facilities that could not be segregated, such as the proposed

electricity facilities, which required a space of at least 80m in diameter. The remaining four proposed public facilities required marine frontage for the normal operation, making it essential for them to be situated near the seafront. The additional construction cost of relocating each of the four public facilities into cavern was estimated to range from HK$1.1 billion to HK$5 billion, depending on their respective sizes. Furthermore, owing to the need for additional ventilation and associated electrical and mechanical facilities, the cavern development option would likely incur higher initial and operating costs compared to the reclamation option. In terms of the implementation timeline, the cavern option would require a longer construction period, making it impossible to meet the required commissioning dates for these public facilities. After considering the overall costs and benefits, the cavern option was not considered feasible for TKO 132 at this stage.

35. A Member enquired whether the representers (i.e. R10, R12 and R13) had previously raised their concerns and suggestions regarding the proposed reclamation at TKO 132 with the relevant government bureaux/departments during the earlier stage of the project, and sought those representers' views on the responses from government representatives. The responses of the concerned representers and their representatives were:

(a) Ms Choi Mo Ching, Cindy (R10) emphasised that many representers recognised the importance of preserving the natural shoreline at TKO 132, which held significant geodiversity value in Hong Kong due to its volcanic and granite rock formations. The proposed reclamation project would cause irreversible damage to these natural assets. They strongly advocated offshore reclamation and the relocation of the proposed public facilities into cavern as an alternative;

(b) Mr Chan Chak Bun (R12) said that relocating the proposed developments into a cavern at TKO 132 was not technically infeasible, citing global and local precedents, such as the Sha Tin Sewage Treatment Works. While the Government's responses highlighted that relocating the proposed public facilities into cavern would entail higher costs and a longer implementation period, he believed that these additional expenses and time investments were justified in exchange for a significantly improved living environment; and

(c) Mr Alexander Main Duggie (R13) emphasised that disrupting the natural shoreline and its unique geological features would result in irreversible damage. He highlighted that the eco-shoreline proposal neglected the significant loss of valuable geological formations along the shoreline. He criticised the LVIA for failing to assess the permanent loss of the natural shoreline and its long-term consequences and impact, advocating offshore reclamation and an open sea channel as technically feasible, given that Hong Kong had several successful examples of similar projects in the past.

The Proposed CBP

36. In response to the representers' enquiries on the need for a CBP at TKO 132, Miss Christine W.Y. Au, PAS, DEVB explained that concrete was extensively used in construction projects across Hong Kong. Maintaining a reliable and stable concrete supply was therefore crucial. In this relation, CEDD had conducted a study on concrete supply in the territory in 2022. The findings of the study indicated that in order to cope with the developments at East Kowloon and NT East, there was a need to identify an appropriate site within the region to set up a CBP. In response to a Member's question on the possibility of locating the CBP elsewhere instead of TKO 132, Miss Au said that as freshly mixed concrete would harden shortly, it had to be delivered timely to construction sites across various regions. Prolonged travelling time might affect the quality of the concrete. Therefore, the locations of CBPs entailed a geographical consideration. That was also why a number of CBPs had been set up in various regions to supply concrete for the construction projects in nearby areas.

37. In response to representers' concerns over the potential environmental impact caused by the future operation of the CBP, Miss Christine W.Y. Au, PAS, DEVB said that there were currently more than 20 CBPs in Hong Kong, some of which were located in close proximity to residential developments. As shown by the existing operation of the CBP in Tai Po, although it was only 50m away from the nearest residential development, Beverly Hills, the relevant environmental mitigation measures currently put in place by the operator were proved to be effective in reducing the impact on the nearby communities. Operators of CBPs had to comply with all the relevant legislation in Hong Kong, and the terms of the operating licence issued by EPD. Besides, since the proposed CBP at TKO 132 would be located on government land, the Government, as the party inviting bids from the market, could set tender conditions to debar

CBP operators who failed to get their operating licences renewed with EPD from taking part in the tender exercise, thus eliminating operators with poor track records from the outset. Additional requirements relating to the design and daily operations of the proposed CBP could also be laid down in the land lease. In addition, the Air Pollution Control Ordinance was amended in April 2025 to tighten the control over unlicensed specified process (SP) operations. The said amended ordinance empowered DEP to issue a closure notice to the operator of a premises if he believed that an SP was being carried out without a valid SP licence. The relevant government departments would continue to closely monitor the operation of the CBPs in Hong Kong, and take stringent enforcement action against any acts violating the laws. Mr Marco M.K. Lee, CE, CEDD supplemented that the proposed CBP would be required to adopt a modernised design aimed at minimising nuisances to nearby residents.

The Proposed Electricity Facilities

38. Noting from the Paper that the proposed electricity facilities were intended to receive zero-carbon energy from the Mainland, some Members raised the following questions:

(a) whether the proposed electricity facilities could be located at NM;

(b) given the example of Lamma Island, the reasons why the proposed electricity facilities could not be located offshore; and

(c) where in the Mainland the electricity would be sourced from and why the electricity needed to be transferred via submarine cables.

39. In response, Miss Ellen Y.T. Chow, PAS, EEB made the following points:

(a) the proposed electricity facilities, which included power receiving and converter infrastructure, were designed to import zero-carbon energy from the Mainland. To facilitate this, it was necessary for the facilities to be situated along the seafront. Given the limited availability of land, identifying another suitable coastal site in the region for constructing such facilities was highly unlikely. In addition to the seafront location, the proposed electricity facilities at TKO 132 were strategically positioned in an area that allowed for

connections with both the transmission networks of the Hongkong Electric Company Limited and CLP Power Hong Kong Limited. This dual-network connectivity would not only enhance the interconnection but also contribute to a more stable and reliable electricity supply;

(b) the existing electricity facilities at Lamma Island were situated on a large piece of land and were equipped with ancillary fire safety and maintenance facilities. In contrast, ancillary facilities for the electricity facilities at TKO 132 were not required in the proposal to reduce the scale of reclamation. If the electricity facilities were to be constructed on an offshore artificial island, it would not only increase maintenance and operational costs but also expose the facilities to risks posed by extreme weather conditions. To ensure reliable electricity supply, it was imperative that the proposed electricity facilities be accessible by both land and marine transport, so that maintenance staff could reach the site promptly and the necessary materials and components could be delivered swiftly for inspection and urgent repairs. Locating the proposed electricity facilities within a cavern was infeasible as it required a space of at least 80m in diameter; and

(c) to tackle climate change and align with the national policy, the Hong Kong's Climate Action Plan 2050 published in 2021 had set "net-zero electricity generation" as one of the major decarbonisation strategies with the goal of achieving carbon neutrality before 2050. To this end, it was essential to increase the supply of zero-carbon energy. The proposed electricity facilities at the seafront were necessary to receive zero-carbon energy imported from the Mainland, likely sourced from the coastal areas of Guangdong Province, via submarine cables. It was estimated that around 10 years would be required to plan, construct and complete the new cross-boundary electricity transmission and receiving facilities to align with the target set under the Hong Kong's Climate Action Plan 2050 of increasing the share of zero-carbon energy in the fuel mix for electricity generation to about 60% to 70% before 2035.

40. The Chairperson supplemented that taking into account the operational needs of the public facilities at TKO 132, the potential environmental, cost and timeline impacts of

alternative options, as well as the public comments gathered during the PODP stage, the current reclamation location and layout of TKO 132 were considered optimal. Compared with the reclamation proposed in the PODP, the total reclamation area had been reduced from 25 ha to about 20 ha (a reduction of 5 ha or 20%). Additionally, the length of natural shoreline affected had been reduced from 790m to around 500m (a reduction of 290m or 37% out of a total of 1,600m from Lei Yue Mun Point to Tiu Keng Leng).

Offshore Reclamation

41. Noting that the visual impact of the proposed reclamation might not be fully mitigated through the adoption of an offshore artificial island design for TKO 132, a Member invited Mr Kwong Tse Hin, Glenn (R14) to elaborate on the benefits of the offshore design. In response, Mr Kwong Tse Hin, Glenn (R14) explained that the offshore design could preserve the natural shoreline along TKO 132, which possessed significant geodiversity value for the enjoyment of future generations. He suggested that the artificial island could be multi-purpose, incorporating various land uses such as industrial, recreational and open spaces. To enhance the design, an open channel of about 20m could be constructed between the natural shoreline and the artificial island, and a belt-shaped garden developed along the periphery of the island opposite the natural shoreline. The artificial island could be connected to the inland via a bridge, and a walking trail could be established along the shoreline, linking to the pedestrian corridor leading towards the Yau Tong area. Suitable mitigation measures, such as landscape treatments, could also be provided to minimise the visual impact of the proposed developments.

42. In response to Members' enquiries on other possible implications of adopting an offshore artificial island design for the proposed reclamation, Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, DPO/SKIs, PlanD, with aid of a PowerPoint slide, added that a hillside in front of Ocean Shores currently obscured the view of the proposed developments at TKO 132 from the lower floors of the buildings. Nevertheless, if the reclamation boundary was extended further into the sea, the proposed public facilities at TKO 132 would become more visible from Ocean Shores. Besides, the proposed reclamation was situated in a relatively shallow sea area. Extending the reclamation boundary into deeper waters would incur additional costs and time, making the offshore artificial island design less desirable from both financial and implementation programme perspectives.

43. The Chairperson remarked that the importance of the natural shoreline along TKO 132 was acknowledged, and the Government had made every effort to minimise its impact while balancing development needs. Various alternative development options had been carefully considered, and the proposed reclamation extent and configuration of TKO 132 had been revised to reduce impacts on the natural coastline. Given that the proposed public facilities at TKO 132 required marine transport support, the current proposal balanced the intention of minimising impacts on the natural shoreline while addressing the anticipated visual impacts of the developments and keeping the construction cost and duration within a reasonable range. Compared to the original proposal under the PODP, the length of affected natural shoreline had been substantially reduced from 790m to around 500m. Additionally, an approximately 2.6 km long eco-shoreline/ecological-enhanced seawall would be created at TKO 132 and TKO 137. This initiative would enhance marine biodiversity and emulate natural shoreline habitats by incorporating aesthetic textures and patterns. Regarding the suggestion to adopt an offshore artificial island design for the TKO 132 reclamation, the Chairperson explained that such a design would extend the reclaimed land further into the sea. On one hand, this would make the proposed public facilities more visible from nearby TKO residential developments and cruises entering the Victoria Harbour from the east. On the other hand, maintaining an open channel between the inland and the artificial island that was too narrow would cause water stagnation and adversely affect water quality and marine habitats.

Climate Change and Extreme Weather

44. In response to a Member's enquiry on whether the design of the proposed developments at TKO 132 and TKO 137 had taken into consideration the potential effects of climate change and extreme weather, Mr Marco M.K. Lee, CE, CEDD made the following main points:

(a) the design of the proposed developments at TKO 132 and TKO 137 had incorporated considerations for the potential effects of climate change and extreme weather, in consultation with the Hong Kong Observatory, in assessing various scenarios outlined in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)'s 6th Assessment Report (AR6);

(b) scenario testing had been conducted to evaluate various greenhouse effect

discharge scenarios by the end of this century. This ensured that the developments were resilience and designed with adequate capacities to cope with diverse climate situations. Sensitivity test was also performed to evaluate potential risk associated with climate change extending beyond this century up to the year 2150; and

(c) resilient measures had been integrated into the design, including the adoption of an appropriate site formation level (approximate 6.75mPD) for the sites, and ensuring sufficient buffer zones along the seashore and between nearshore buildings to mitigate impact of storm surges. The design also incorporated the construction of water barriers and allowed for adjustments in the barrier height to accommodate future flood risks at the proposed developments in TKO 137 and TKO 132.

Urban Design of TKO 137

45. In response to a Member's question regarding the urban design elements of TKO 137, Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, DPO/SKIs, PlanD explained that the urban design framework for TKO 137 had been incorporated in the Explanatory Statement of the OZP. In particular, the stepping-down BH profile had been translated into specific BH restrictions on the OZP for individual sites. Furthermore, variations in BHs within development sites were encouraged to create a dynamic and visually appealing skyline. Detailed urban design requirements would be further studied and specified in the Outline Development Plans (ODPs) to be prepared, which would be subsequently stipulated in land leases as appropriate. Nonetheless, the developments would also adhere to the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines to ensure that adequate building gaps were provided, promoting sustainability and enhancing the overall urban environment.

46. 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. She thanked the representers, their representatives and the government representatives (including the consultants) for attending the meeting. The Board would deliberate on the representations in closed meeting and would inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course. The representers, their representatives and the government representatives (including the

consultants) left the meeting at this point.

[Mr Derrick S.M. Yip rejoined the meeting at this point.]

Deliberation Session

47. The Chairperson invited views from Members.

48. Members generally supported the amendments on the draft OZP. While appreciating the views expressed by some representers regarding the preservation of the natural shoreline and geoconservation, Members acknowledged the technical constraints associated with alternative proposals for the proposed reclamation of TKO 132. Those alternatives included offshore reclamation, shifting the reclamation southward, the 55m slope-cutting scheme, and relocating the proposed public facilities into cavern or to other sites. It was generally agreed that offshore reclamation could not mitigate the visual impacts of the proposed TKO 132 developments. On the contrary, it could potentially exacerbate visual disturbances for residents of Ocean Shores. The proposal to relocate the public facilities into cavern was considered infeasible due to technical and cost-related constraints. After balancing all relevant factors, Members generally agreed that the current proposed location for TKO 132 was an optimal option. Members also made the following comments and suggestions:

TKO 132

(a) with reference to overseas experiences, it was recommended that the proposed public facilities should incorporate better architectural design and façade treatments to minimise their visual impacts. To ensure consistency and quality, relevant design guidelines should be formulated to guide the future design;

(b) responding to residents' concerns regarding air and noise pollution generated by the proposed CBP, additional requirements should be imposed to govern its design and daily operations. These measures should be suitably reflected in the tender documents and land lease to ensure compliance and accountability;

(c) enforcement mechanisms should be strengthened to address the off-site

environmental and hygiene impacts caused by heavy vehicles associated with the proposed public facilities. This would help minimise disruptions and maintain the quality of the surrounding environment;

(d) the potential for promoting marine economy within the area should be explored;

(e) compensation measures for the natural shoreline, such as the design of eco-shorelines, should be studied in greater details. These measures aimed to enhance marine biodiversity and emulate natural shoreline habitats, contributing to the ecological balance and sustainability of the area;

TKO 137

(f) an urban design framework featuring a stepped BH profile should be adopted in TKO 137 to guide future developments and foster community harmony. This framework should be supported by enhanced pedestrian connections to improve accessibility and walkability within the area, ensuring a cohesive and user-friendly urban environment;

(g) emergency exit(s) should be planned to ensure contingency measures in the event that major trunks serving TKO 137 became blocked. The possibility of upgrading the existing roads at TKO InnoPark should be explored to enhance connectivity and resilience within the area;

(h) given Tai Miu Wan had historically been affected by typhoons and the proposed pier at the southern tip of TKO 137 (Item C) was situated in close proximity, relevant government departments should conduct further studies to assess the suitability of the pier for providing ferry services; and

(i) the possibility of introducing ferry services connecting TKO to Hong Kong Island, such as those from Lei King Wan, could be explored.

49. Mr Gary C.W. Tam, Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment) (AD(EA)), EPD provided clarifications on the representations related to the EIA as follows:

(a) an Environmental Monitoring and Audit (EM&A) programme had been established to monitor the project and mitigate any adverse environmental impacts;

(b) the requirement to submit CTEP to DEP for approval before the commencement of marine work was due to the expectation that the conditions of coral colonies directly impacted by the project (e.g., number, size, health, suitability for translocation, etc.) would undergo minor changes over time. Imposing this requirement was not related to the comprehensiveness or any inadequacy of the survey previously conducted for the EIA Report;

(c) EPD had strictly adhered to the provisions of the EIAO in processing the EIA for the proposals for TKO 132 and TKO 137. The public inspection of the EIA Report was conducted in compliance with the EIAO's statutory procedures for consulting both the public and ACE. Public comments received during the public inspection period were duly considered by ACE;

(d) under an approval condition of the EIA Report, CEDD would set up community liaison group(s) comprising representatives from concerned and affected parties to enhance communication and effectively address enquiries on all environmental issues associated with the project; and

(e) the Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) evaluated the nose impacts generated by all relevant roads, including those from upslope, and provided clear indications of the predicted noise levels at the representative noise sensitive receivers arising from the Project Roads and Other Roads (existing roads within the assessment area).

50. The Chairperson concluded that Members supported the amendments on the draft OZP, and agreed that the draft OZP should not be amended to meet the representations. All grounds of the representations had been addressed through the departmental responses as detailed in the Paper, as well as the presentations and responses made by the government representatives at the meeting. Relevant government departments should follow up on

Members' comments and suggestions as detailed in paragraph 48 above, including the provision of emergency exit(s) for TKO 137, and the operational and regulatory aspects of the proposed public facilities. After the draft OZP was approved, PlanD would proceed with the formulation of ODPs. The design requirements for the proposed public facilities at TKO 132 and the urban design framework guiding the developments of TKO 137 would be elaborated in the ODPs. These details would be suitably reflected in the tender documents or land lease for prospective developers and relevant government departments to implement.

[Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui left the meeting during deliberation.]

51. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) noted the supportive views of **R1(part)** and the views of **R17**, and decided not to uphold **R1(part) and R2 to R16**, and agreed that the draft Tseung Kwan O (TKO) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) (the draft OZP) should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

"Developments in TKO Area 137 (TKO 137) and TKO Area 132 (TKO 132) (Items A to F)

(a) the Government has been adopting a multi-pronged approach to provide much-needed land for housing supply and economic development in the short-to-long term, and remains determined to sustain efforts in land production and take forward various projects in a steady and paced manner. TKO 137 will be developed into a new waterfront community primarily for residential purpose. At the same time, a piece of land to be reclaimed off TKO 132 in Chiu Keng Wan is identified for accommodating five public facilities serving the territory east area including TKO. Items A to F are to take forward this initiative **(R3 to R7, R11 and R15)**;

(b) various technical assessments, including Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), have been conducted to demonstrate that the proposed developments in TKO 137 and TKO 132 would not impose significant impacts to the local neighbourhoods and surrounding areas, and are technically feasible without any insurmountable problem from traffic, drainage, sewerage, environment, ecological, visual and air ventilation perspectives with implementation of mitigation measures **(R1 and R2**

to R16);

(c) according to the Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment conducted, with the implementation of the necessary road improvement works and recommended public transport provision in place, the proposed developments in TKO 137 and TKO 132 are acceptable in overall traffic term **(R2, R8, R10 and R14 to R16)**;

(d) the EIA, including the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, has been conducted in compliance with the established standards and requirements of the EIA Study Brief and Technical Memorandum to evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed developments at TKO 137 and TKO 132. The EIA Report was approved with conditions by the Director of Environmental Protection. With the implementation of all recommended mitigation measures, the proposed developments would be environmentally acceptable. An Environmental Monitoring and Audit Programme is also recommended to ensure proper execution of the proposed mitigation measures **(R1, R10, R12, R13 and R15)**;

Items A to C related to TKO 137 Only

(e) the current reclamation extent and layout of TKO 137 are considered optimised. Any reduction in developable land will reduce flat production and limit flexibility in the overall layout design. The proposed developments at TKO 137 are also considered not incompatible with the surrounding developments. The zonings and relevant development restrictions under the Notes of the OZP for the sites under Items A to C are considered appropriate **(R8, R9 and R15)**;

(f) based on the urban design framework for TKO 137, a stepping-down building height (BH) profile has been translated into the BH restrictions on the OZP for individual sites. Besides, a network of linked open spaces connecting the blue-green natural resources will be provided to allow close interaction of the developments with the natural environment **(R15)**;

(g) the proposed pier at the site under Item C is desirable and cost effective to utilise the existing pier facility for provision of a public pier **(R8, R9 and R15)**;

Items D and E related to TKO 132 Only

(h) located away from the population centre of TKO New Town, TKO 132 is considered a suitable location to house the five region-specific public facilities that require marine frontages for operation, serving the territory east area including TKO. Considering the operational requirements of the public facilities and relevant technical considerations, including water current, marine and land based traffic, ecology, cultural heritage, construction cost and programme implications of the project, the current extent, location and reclamation layout of TKO 132 have been optimised. Various technical assessments have also demonstrated that the proposal would be environmentally acceptable and technically feasible. The zonings and relevant development restrictions under the Notes of the OZP for the sites under Items D and E are considered appropriate **(R1, R2 to R8 and R10 to R16)**;

Item F

(i) major part of the sites under Item F excised from the OZP falls within Clear Water Bay Country Park. All uses and developments within the Country Park are subject to the control of the Country and Marine Parks Authority under the Country Parks Ordinance (Cap. 208) **(R15)**; and

Amendments to the Notes for "Village Type Development" ("V") Zone

(j) the incorporation of 'Government Refuse Collection Point' and 'Public Convenience' under Column 1 and 'Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre' under Column 2 of the Notes for "V" zone is in line with the latest Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans promulgated by the Board. The provision of these facilities will follow the relevant established government procedures and/or require planning permission from the Board **(R15)**."

52. 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.

[The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 2:20 p.m.]

53. The meeting was resumed at 3:00 p.m.

54. The following Members and the Secretary were present in the afternoon session:

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 K.W. Leung	
Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong	
Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu	
Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho	
Mr Ben S.S. Lui	
Mr Timothy K.W. Ma	
Dr C.M. Cheng	
Mr Daniel K.W. Chung	
Mr Simon Y.S. Wong	
Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong Transport Department Mr Horace W. Hong	
Chief Engineer (Works) Home Affairs Department Mr Bond C.P. Chow	
Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment) Environmental Protection Department Mr Gary C.W. Tam	
Director of Lands Mr Maurice K.W. Loo	
Director of Planning Mr C.K. Yip	

General

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting]

Progress of the Global Innovation Centre Proposed by the University of Hong Kong

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

55. The Secretary reported that the item was related to the development of Global Innovation Centre (the Centre) proposed by the University of Hong Kong (HKU) at a site in Pok Fu Lam, and Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) was the consultant of HKU. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu *(Vice-chairperson)*	-	co-owning with spouse properties in Pok Fu Lam;
Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong	-	having close relative living in Pok Fu Lam;
Professor Roger C.K. Chan	-	being an Honorary Associate Professor of Department of Urban Planning and Design of HKU;
Dr Venus Y.H. Lun	-	being a special project director of a research and development centre which was hosted by HKU and two other universities, and an external examiner of one of HKU's programmes;
Mr Ben S.S. Lui	-	co-owning with spouse a property in Pok Fu Lam, his spouse owning a car parking space in Pok Fu Lam, and he and his spouse being directors of a company owning properties and car parking spaces in Pok Fu Lam;

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui	-	being an Adjunct Professor of Department of Social Work and Social Administration of HKU, and having close relative living in Pok Fu Lam;
Dr Tony C.M. Ip	-	being an Adjunct Associate Professor of School of Biological Sciences of HKU, and having past business dealings with Arup;
Professor B.S. Tang	-	being an Honorary Professor of Department of Urban Planning and Design and Department of Real Estate and Construction of HKU;
Professor Simon K.L. Wong	-	his spouse being a programme director of Master in Statistics of HKU; and
Mr Derrick S.M. Yip	-	having current business dealings with HKU, being a member of the Advisory Board of the Gleneagles Hospital which was partnering with HKU to provide medical services, and participating in voluntary work for HKU.

56. Members noted that Dr Venus Y.H. Lun, Dr Tony C.M. Ip, Professor Roger C.K. Chan, Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui, Professor B.S. Tang, Professor Simon K.L. Wong and Mr Derrick S.M. Yip would not attend/had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the afternoon session of the meeting. Members agreed that as the residence of Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong's relative, and the concerned properties owned/co-owned by Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, and Mr Ben S.S. Lui, his spouse and his company had no direct view of the concerned site, they could stay in the meeting.

57. The following representatives from HKU and its consultant were invited to the meeting:

HKU

Professor Richard Wong	-	Acting President and Vice-Chancellor
Professor Vivian Yam	-	Vice-President and Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Global Innovation Centre)
Mr Sunny Yeung	-	Director of Estates
Mr Syrus Tsui	-	Director of Strategic Planning Unit
Ms Bella Fan	-	Assistant Director of Estates
Mr Joseph Kong	-	Assistant Director of Estates
Professor Sam Chan	-	Senior Advisor to Executive Vice President
Ms Michelle Lam		Senior Manager (Public Affairs and Engagement)

Arup

Ms Josephine Wong	-	HKU's Consultant

58. The Chairperson extended a welcome and said that when considering the further representations in respect of the Centre in Pok Fu Lam in March 2025, Members requested that HKU be invited to report to the Town Planning Board (the Board) on the latest development of the project within 3 months, which should include its decision on site selection with detailed justifications, a development timeline for the project and an update on engagement with stakeholders. Accordingly, HKU attended the meeting to report the progress of the Centre project and present the latest proposal.

59. The Secretary informed Members that the Planning Department (PlanD) and the Secretariat of the Board received over 60 letters and emails related to the Centre project before the meeting. A few of them were sent to PlanD, while the majority were submitted to the Secretariat of the Board, expressing their views and comments on the Centre project. Those letters and emails were primarily submitted by the HKU GlC Public Representation Group (the GIC PRG), Pokfulam Incorporated Owners Forum, the Ebenezer School and Home for the Visually Impaired (Ebenezer School), the Chairman of Baguio Villa Incorporated Owners, local residents and individuals, raising objection/concerns regarding HKU's latest proposal, the proposed facilities therein and associated environmental and traffic impacts, HKU's site selection, public consultation process, etc. In addition, some also suggested alternative sites for the Centre, such as a "Green Belt" ("GB") site in Mount Davis (the Mount Davis site). All

public comments/views received had been/would be conveyed to HKU for consideration and follow-up in refining their proposal.

60. The Chairperson then invited representatives from HKU to brief Members on the latest development of the Centre project.

61. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Professor Richard Wong, Professor Vivian Yam, Mr Sunny Yeung and Ms Josephine Wong of HKU, briefed Members on the progress and the latest proposal of the Centre and made the following main points:

Vision

(a) the Centre was envisioned as an interdisciplinary research centre with upstream deep technology research as the cornerstone, aiming to find innovative solutions to global challenges and create knowledge for the benefit of humanity. As the Central Government and the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administration Region were actively promoting basic research and 'new quality productive forces' (新質生產力), the Centre would serve as a key driver of this initiative, enabling Hong Kong to better support the nation's goal of becoming a global leader in innovation and technology;

(b) the research would focus on climate change, where innovative research was crucial, and on infectious diseases, which posed a significant threat not only to Hong Kong but also to the world. In terms of new opportunities, rapid technological advancements enabled the discovery of new materials that could address previously unresolved issues in medical devices and manufacturing, leading to innovative biomedical solutions. These advancements required new materials and therapies. While many diseases remained incurable, research in life sciences and molecular sciences offered pathways to develop new therapies;

Initial Strategic Research Areas

(c) the Centre would engage in six initial strategic research areas, including quantum sciences, molecular sciences, life sciences, energy technology,

artificial intelligence (AI) and financial technology;

(d) quantum sciences were one of the focus areas and a highly significant research field. Research in quantum sciences included quantum computing, which would significantly enhance computers' processing power, thereby accelerating research productivity and the development of new drugs and advanced AI models. Quantum optics was another research area. Breakthroughs in this area might advance quantum sensors to improve the resolution and sensitivity of medical imaging, or might drive innovations in secure data transfer, as well as the development of quantum computers and Global Positioning System technology. Major science and technology infrastructure (such as the national laboratory near Hefei University of Technology which specialised in quantum information research) was considered a powerful tool for achieving breakthroughs at scientific frontiers, and having high-quality research facilities was crucial for achieving new quality productivity;

(e) molecular sciences served as the foundational research that enabled breakthroughs in new materials and pharmaceutical advancements, such as the OLED screens for mobile devices and new drugs;

(f) the remaining four key research priorities included (i) life sciences, leveraging Hong Kong's established strengths in medical research; (ii) energy technology with emphasis on sustainable development and clean energy, including solar cells and battery research; (iii) AI, developing computer systems that could reason, learn and act in ways which required the intelligence level of a human or beyond; and (iv) financial technology, integrating digital technology with financial services to innovate and enhance performance;

Success Factors

(g) HKU had commissioned a consultant (Arup) to conduct an independent study on the users, need, and operational and spatial requirements of the Centre;

(h) research groups, visiting scholars, international researchers, other relevant

faculty members, and administrative, management, technical and support teams were identified as the primary users of the Centre, whereas industry partners and start-ups, visitors and students, and community and public stakeholders would be the secondary users. The design as well as research and development (R&D) infrastructures of the Centre should cater for different users of the research ecosystem to facilitate research collaboration in the future;

(i) in the independent study, interviews were conducted with researchers and professors to understand the essential components and unique characteristics of a successful Centre from their respective fields of expertise. During the interviews, three major themes were identified, i.e. people, space and operation. It was revealed that the right people, a supportive culture and strong administrative staff should be in place to form the basis for a successful Centre. The Centre should not only provide space for research but also be embedded in the city with close liaison with relevant organisations. It should also be policy-oriented and interactive with different disciplines across knowledge, medical, financial, economic and community networks. On the operational front, high international standards and partnerships with industries were essential to drive its operational impact and foster an international innovative hub where academic knowledge could solve more problems for humanity;

(j) a successful deep technology research centre should be located in proximity to the university with established research culture as well as adequate customised space to enhance synergy so as to foster innovation, generate impact and maximise its potential;

(k) HKU had been prominently featured in recent reports for its excellence in research and teaching, as well as its strong academic reputation. The ability to attract global talents and foster a vibrant academic community was a key success factor for the Centre. HKU had also established strong partnerships with the Government and academic institutions, providing valuable resources, professional knowledge, and opportunities for joint innovative research projects;

Site Selection

(l) the independent study identified that proximity to HKU, established research culture and community, appeal to global talents and site readiness were all important considerations for site selection, and were crucial to the long-term success of the Centre. The study also confirmed that a site in Pok Fu Lam was appropriate and necessary;

(m) other than Pok Fu Lam, alternative locations such as Mount Davis and the Northern Metropolis (NM) were suggested by the public for the Centre. Among these, Pok Fu Lam was considered the most suitable and viable option for the Centre, given its proximity to HKU's Main Campus and Medical School along Sassoon Road, which was crucial for fostering synergy and attracting scholars to the Centre. If the Centre project proceeded smoothly at the Pok Fu Lam site, the Centre could commence operation by 2032. Although NM had been designated as Hong Kong's future innovation and technology hub, much of its infrastructure remained under development, with anticipated major population intake by 2034, and there were still uncertainties on the timing of availability of a critical mass of research infrastructure and talents. All these posed risks to the feasibility of the Centre to commence operation promptly if it was located in NM;

(n) the Centre would focus on academia-driven upstream research, with the goal of broadening the theoretical foundations across various disciplines and scientific fields. In the long run, such research could lead to profound and transformative breakthroughs, ultimately advancing knowledge and development. This direction was distinguished from NM which would focus on downstream industrial research, targeting market-specific or sector-driven challenges;

(o) the alternative site at Mount Davis, as suggested by some parties, was mainly zoned "GB" on the relevant Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). It would be a significant challenge to develop a "GB" site for the Centre, which was not just a local issue for the Pok Fu Lam area but a concern for all in Hong Kong;

Overseas Examples

(p) the independent study also benchmarked successful research centres around the world (in Singapore, the Mainland and the United States) against the Centre, analysing key parameters such as floor space, research areas, availability of short-term accommodation and conference facilities, and proximity to universities;

(q) one example was the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory (the Laboratory) near the University of California, which was a national facility that accommodated five national user facilities and had nurtured 14 scientists who had been awarded Nobel Prizes. The Laboratory adopted a modular design to accommodate the ever-evolving nature of technological development. It included lecture halls and meeting rooms, where researchers could engage in discussions, brainstorming sessions, and presentations to foster new ideas and breakthroughs. A core operational feature of the Laboratory was the immediate translation of new concepts into laboratory verifications;

(r) another relevant example was One-North in Singapore, which was a high technology R&D cluster with eight precincts located in close proximity to the National University of Singapore (NUS) and Singapore Polytechnic. The two key precincts, including Biopolis and Fusionopolis, had formed a comprehensive innovation ecosystem. The development of Biopolis began in 2004 and was divided into six phases, with a gross floor area (GFA) of 190,000m^2 in the first phase, which was comparable to that of the Centre. Fusionopolis started development in 2008. In Biopolis and Fusionopolis, besides laboratories and dining facilities, spaces for break-out sessions and brainstorming, which were crucial for fostering interactions among researchers, were also included. Hong Kong had fallen significantly behind Singapore in developing innovation and research centres, with its competitive edge continuing to narrow. As the proposed site for the Centre in Pok Fu Lam was in close proximity to HKU and its Medical Campus, Cyberport and Queen Mary Hospital, it presented an already-established ecosystem combining academic, research and industry, to nurture a synergy comparable to One-North in

Singapore. HKU was ready to collaborate with leading technology companies, such as BYD Company Limited and Huawei Technologies Company Limited, to establish joint laboratories for deep technology research in the Centre;

(s) furthermore, the SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory was located adjacent to Stanford University (1.6 km away or a 6-minute drive) and was close to Silicon Valley. Leading tech giants, namely Google Inc. were situated approximately 9 km away, accessible within a 15-minute drive, while Apple Inc. was located about 19 km away, reachable by car in about 20 minutes. The proposed site for the Centre in Pok Fu Lam was about a 5 to 7-minute drive (about 2.8 km away) from the HKU Main Campus, creating immediate synergy and cultivating an optimal environment for scientific, innovation and technology research, while optimising the use of facilities and equipment;

Essential Facilities to Advanced Research

(t) regarding the provision of essential facilities, approximately two decades ago, Oxford University proposed that students should avoid sitting in laboratories for doing analytical and clerical tasks. They introduced glass partitions so that students could conduct analyses while observing the ongoing processes within the laboratory. Laboratories at Nanyang Technological University and NUS were already equipped with such modern facilities. Hong Kong was also keen on adopting this approach, but there was currently a lack of a suitable site for implementation. In addition to the above, lecture and conference rooms should be provided as the incubation hubs for the best minds to gather, share research outcomes, break through bottlenecks and celebrate discoveries;

(u) experiments were typically conducted round-the-clock. The availability of quality short-term accommodation was crucial for attracting top-tier talents, visiting students and postdoctoral researchers as it would enable the researchers and scientists to stay close to laboratories. This maximised their time efficiency for monitoring research during irregular hours, administering periodic interventions and checking, optimised the utilisation of equipment and ensured smooth operation, thereby increasing productivity;

Proposed Revision to the Development Plan

Site boundary

(v) noting the strong opposition to the use of the "GB" zone from local residents, a comprehensive review of the indicative scheme for the Centre had been conducted by HKU in the past few months. A preliminary conceptual layout illustrating the revisions to the proposal for the Centre was now presented. The site boundary was suggested to be adjusted by utilising an undeveloped site adjacent to the "Undetermined" ("U") zone, which was zoned "Residential (Group C) 6" ("R(C)6") (the "R(C)6" site) on the Pok Fu Lam OZP for the development of the Centre, thus allowing more than 75% (about 3.2 ha) of the former "GB" area to be retained. The remaining portion of the former "GB" area would be mainly for enhanced connectivity. Additional measures would also be explored to retain as many trees as possible and increase green coverage on-site through innovative design. With further refinements to the preliminary development plan, it was anticipated that an even larger portion of the former "GB" zone could be preserved;

Development intensity and uses

(w) the proposed site area would be reduced from 4.72 ha to 4 ha, representing a reduction of 0.7 ha, equivalent to approximately 16 to 17 standard basketball courts. The total GFA for the Centre would be reduced from 222,720m² to 190,000m², i.e. a reduction of approximately 15%. The overall plot ratio would be about 4.75;

(x) based on the preliminary findings of the ongoing independent study conducted by the Consultant, 66% of the total GFA was proposed for laboratories and research facilities, 9% for research offices (including administration offices and facilities), 18% for lecture and conference facilities (representing a significant downward adjustment in response to Members' previous comments), 2% for amenities and supporting facilities (e.g. canteen, coffee shop and lounge), and 5% for a short-term hostel accommodating about 50 to 60 units;

Building height (BH) and visual corridors

(y) taking into account the BH of nearby developments, including Woodbury Court (about 217mPD) with its swimming pool located on the podium level (about 154mPD), and Ebenezer school (about 151mPD, or 3 to 4 storeys above Pok Fu Lam Road (PFLR)), the BH of the preliminary scheme of the Centre would range from 150mPD (adjacent to Ebenezer School), 154mPD (adjacent to Woodbury Court) and 158mPD (in the central part of the site to optimise land use), so as to harmonise with existing mature trees along PFLR and the surrounding environment. The proposed BH would not obstruct the existing seaward views of Ebenezer School as well as the views of its future redevelopment. The existing visual corridors along PFLR, including that of PFLR 138 and Woodbury Court would also be preserved, which were well above the requirements stipulated in the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines. Noting that the Ebenezer New Hope School would remain in operation after redevelopment of the Ebenezer School site for residential use, an east-west direction visual corridor was proposed;

Building setback above PFLR, greening and façade treatment

(z) a building setback of approximately 30m from Ebenezer School was proposed. The Centre would also maintain a border-to-border separation distance of more than 100m from Upper Baguio Villa. These separations might be increased, subject to the detailed design of the Centre;

(aa) the proposed BH of the Centre was similar to the height of the existing tree canopies along PFLR. Façade treatment and vertical greening would be adopted to minimise the wall effect of the Centre. The proposed buildings would be set back from PFLR, with additional tree planting to form a botanical boulevard for the enjoyment of pedestrians;

Through-site-link and access points

(bb) part of the former "GB" zone near the Medical Campus of HKU (HKUMed

Campus) would be retained for constructing a through-site-link connecting PFLR with Victoria Road to enhance connectivity, facilitating logistics for HKU and the construction of the Centre, and alleviating traffic congestion in the area, especially during emergencies. Currently, the internal road of the HKU Main Campus linking Bonham Road with PFLR was open to the public. Similarly, the proposed through-site-link would provide public access for both vehicular and pedestrian traffic. It would also connect with the future extension of HKUMed Campus and might enhance the connectivity of the currently refined site with the future South Island Line (West);

Preliminary conceptual layout

(cc) the proposed buildings would be concentrated along the "Innovation Serpentine", with the through-site-link underneath. Conference and related facilities would be provided in the southwestern portion of the site, which could be made available for community use (e.g. for Owners' Committee meetings or community activities). Short-term hostels for researchers, resembling university dormitories, would be provided within the part of the Centre near Ebenezer School;

Roadmap

(dd) following the Board's consideration of the representations in respect of the amendments to the Pok Fu Lam OZP in November 2024 and further representations in March 2025, HKU had liaised with relevant government departments and stakeholders to explore refinements to the development plan. In January 2025, HKU met with the GIC PRG and Ebenezer School to listen to their views and comments. Having considered their views as well as broader community feedback, a preliminary plan was formulated and a new round of public consultation was conducted recently with stakeholders, including Legislative Council (LegCo) Members, Southern District Council Members, community leaders and representatives of nearby developments. The parties consulted were generally supportive for using the "R(C)6" site for the development of the Centre. HKU undertook to continue dialogue and

engagements to address the concerns of stakeholders, including owners' incorporations, resident groups and environmental groups on issues such as BH, development density, non-research facilities in the Centre, potential construction nuisance, ecological impact and alternative site proposals in order to refine the development plan and advance the project through constructive discussions;

(ee) noting the public concerns, the target work programme involved conducting another round of technical feasibility studies in the third and fourth quarters of 2025 with a view to proactively seeking innovative solutions and refining the preliminary plan. Subject to the acceptance of the technical assessments and refined development proposal by relevant government bureaux/departments, another round of public consultation would be conducted in the first quarter of 2026. Upon consolidation, the refined development plan together with the corresponding proposed amendments to the Pok Fu Lam OZP would be submitted to the Board for consideration in March 2026 tentatively; and

(ff) according to the latest development programme, upon approval of the OZP amendments by the Chief Executive in Council, an architectural consultant would be engaged for the detailed design of the Centre in 2027, followed by land allocation through a private treaty grant and site formation to be commenced by the end of 2028. It was anticipated that the first building of the Centre would be in operation by 2032, with continuous planning and development for subsequent phases from 2033 onwards.

62. After the presentation of the HKU's project team, the Chairperson invited questions and comments from Members.

63. Members in general expressed strong support for the establishment of the Centre, recognising its critical role in advancing Hong Kong as a hub for university education and international scientific research. They highlighted the necessity of attracting top talents and distinguished professors by providing sufficient space for their research. They also acknowledged the urgency of developing the Centre and the synergy created by establishing it in close proximity to HKU, and highly commended the project team for their dedicated efforts in formulating the current scheme and engaging with the community. The people-centric

approach adopted in refining the scheme represented a substantial improvement over the previous indicative scheme, particularly in retaining the major part of the former "GB" zone, minimising tree felling, preserving existing visual corridors and utilising the "R(C)6" site in response to Members' previous comments and public feedback. The project team was encouraged to further refine the scheme, review the facilities to be provided holistically and highlight the planning gains/benefits it would offer to the community.

Public Comments on the Current Scheme

64. A Member enquired whether the GIC PRG and Ebenezer School had been consulted on the current scheme, and if so, their views and comments. In response, Mr Sunny Yeung, Director of Estates of HKU, made the following main points:

(a) since he took up the position as Director of Estates at HKU in February 2025, he had presented the relevant information to the two parties and duly consulted them;

(b) Ebenezer School was currently in discussion with a developer regarding the redevelopment of the Ebenezer School site for private residential development upon its relocation to Tung Chung, and had submitted a s.16 planning application to the Board which involved minor relaxation of the BH restriction (BHR) under the OZP to facilitate the future residential development. However, the developer opposed HKU's request for relaxing the BHR for the Centre, which was difficult to comprehend. He met with Dr Yuk Tak Fun, the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of Ebenezer School, who expressed that HKU should refrain from any construction in the vicinity of Ebenezer School, including the proposed through-site-link. While he assured that HKU would endeavour to minimise the use of the former "GB" zone for the Centre, HKU could not commit to fully accommodating their requests due to design constraints;

(c) the consultations with the GIC PRG, led by Mr Gregory DE 'EB, were challenging. The GIC PRG expressed that the Centre should be located away from Woodbury Court. To address their concerns, the project team

revised the previous development plan by reducing the height of the proposed building closest to Woodbury Court from 158mPD to 154mPD, i.e. to the same level as the existing swimming pool on the podium level of Woodbury Court in order not to overlook the swimmers;

(d) at the representation hearing held in late 2024, the GIC PRG had suggested HKU to develop the Centre at the "R(C)6" site. However, their position was subsequently changed, and they requested that the Centre be located at an alternative site zoned "GB" at Mount Davis. While the current proposal would minimise the impact on the former "GB" zone (currently "U" zone) in Pok Fu Lam, developing the Mount Davis site would significantly affect another "GB" zone. He explained to the GIC PRG that HKU would adopt a compensatory tree planting ratio of 1:1 for the Pok Fu Lam site as far as possible and would liaise with the environmental groups in that respect. Nonetheless, the GIC PRG insisted that not a single tree at the Pok Fu Lam site should be removed;

(e) although the above consultations had not yielded substantial alignment with the concerned parties, HKU maintained amicable relations with them and sincerely hoped that through continued dialogue and further refinements to the Centre's development plan, a mutually acceptable plan for the Centre could be agreed; and

(f) HKU had also consulted other relevant stakeholders, who mainly expressed concerns about site selection and suggested that alternative sites such as NM, San Tin Technopole, Pak Tam Chung and other areas should be explored for the Centre. While HKU was keen to develop the Centre in Pok Fu Lam, it acknowledged and respected those suggestions. HKU, after reviewing the need for and locational requirements of the Centre, maintained the view that the Pok Fu Lam site remained the preferred location due to its proximity to HKU's Main Campus. Moreover, the construction cost might not be excessively high as the ground investigations for the proposed site at the "U" zone revealed that the bedrock depth was shallow, and the currently refined site was anticipated to share similar geological characteristics.

65. In response to another Member's question on the preference of the public between the previous indicative scheme and the currently refined scheme as revealed during the recent consultation process, Mr Sunny Yeung, Director of Estates of HKU, made the following main points:

(a) many consultees considered that their previous comments had been taken into account by HKU in formulating the currently refined scheme, particularly the use of the "R(C)6" site for the Centre, which was recognised as an improvement by LegCo Members, Southern District Council Members and the owners of PFLR 138; and

(b) on the other hand, some consultees requested HKU to consider locating the Centre at the Mount Davis site or other alternative sites, without much discussion on the merits of the currently refined site in Pok Fu Lam. Nevertheless, it stood to reason that any site demonstrating the merits outweighing the demerits, and located in close proximity to HKU, should naturally be deemed the preferable option for the Centre.

Site Selection

66. At the invitation of the Chairperson, Ms Bella Fan, Assistant Director of Estates of HKU, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points regarding the Mount Davis site:

(a) the majority (over 90%) of the Mount Davis site was zoned "GB" on the Kennedy Town and Mount Davis OZP. Small portions of the site were zoned "Other Specified Uses" ("OU") annotated "Public Mortuary" ("OU(Public Mortuary)") and "Green Belt (2)" ("GB(2)"), which were intended for the reprovisioning of the Victoria Public Mortuary;

(b) the Mount Davis site had a site area over 4 ha, which implied that at least 4 ha of "GB" area would be affected. As for the currently refined site in Pok Fu Lam, only about 1 ha of the original "GB" area would be affected and more than 75% (i.e. 3.2 ha) of former "GB" area would be retained;

(c) there were no declared monuments or graded historic buildings in the currently refined site in Pok Fu Lam. In contrast, the Mount Davis site straddled part of the Mount Davis Historic Walk of the future "Round-the-Island Trail" (活力環島長廊), and was in close proximity to the Mount Davis Battery (a Grade 2 historic building) and the Hong Kong Jockey Club University of Chicago Academic Complex (formerly the Victoria Road Detention Centre, a Grade 3 historic building) and the Jubilee Battery. An assessment on the preservation of these historic buildings would be required;

(d) the Pok Fu Lam site abutted PFLR (two lanes in each direction) and would connect to both Victoria Road (a two-lane single carriageway) and Sassoon Road (a two-lane single carriageway) via the proposed through-site-link and the HKUMed Campus. The proposed through-site-link could serve as a traffic relief route in case of emergencies. On the contrary, the Mount Davis site was currently accessible by Victoria Road only, and was susceptible to isolating Lower Baguio Villa and other residential developments along Victoria Road from Kennedy Town in case of road blockage. As such, the currently refined site in Pok Fu Lam was clearly preferable to the Mount Davis site in terms of accessibility;

(e) the "R(C)6" site in Pok Fu Lam had relatively gentle topography compared with the Mount Davis site, with roughly a 10-degree difference in gradient. While no ground investigation had been undertaken for either site at the current stage, available data suggested that there might be potential for strategic cavern development beneath the Mount Davis site. Given that the surrounding areas of the Pok Fu Lam site were already built-up, the "R(C)6" was considered technically feasible for the Centre in terms of constructability; and

(f) no tree survey had been conducted for either site. That said, referring to aerial photos, the Mount Davis site appeared to have denser tree coverage compared to the currently refined site in Pok Fu Lam, which was predominantly zoned "R(C)6" with a small portion within the former "GB" zone.

67. With the aid of a visualiser, the Chairperson supplemented the following main points:

(a) while the GIC PRG had originally proposed using the "R(C)6" site for the Centre during the representation hearing process in November 2024, its latest proposal was for HKU to locate the Centre at the Mount Davis site instead;

(b) although the Mount Davis site covered an area of about 8.6 ha, not all of it was usable for development. The area close to the coastline, which was zoned "GB" on the Kennedy Town and Mount Davis OZP, might not be suitable for development due to its proximity to the seashore. The central portion of the site, which was zoned "OU(Public Mortuary)" and "GB(2)", had been earmarked for the reprovisioning of the Victoria Public Mortuary and related operation, and funding approval for the construction works from LegCo was obtained recently. The northern part of the site, which was zoned "GB(1)" on the aforementioned OZP, was an existing cavern currently used as the Island West Refuse Transfer Station. These existing and committed developments had significantly reduced the actual developable area within the site; and

(c) in response to public feedback, HKU had endeavoured to minimise the use of the former "GB" zone in Pok Fu Lam for the Centre. Nevertheless, the Mount Davis site, which was largely made up of "GB" land, contradicted the above principle and undermined the logic of considering Mount Davis as an alternative.

68. The Vice-chairperson and other Members generally considered the Mount Davis site as unsuitable for the Centre in view of its steep terrain and other site constraints, with technical challenges that needed to be overcome for development at the site.

69. A Member enquired about the possibility of redeveloping the HKU Stanley Ho Sports Centre at Sandy Bay, which occupied an area equivalent to four standard football fields, as part of the Centre so as to reduce the building mass at the currently refined site. Opportunities to provide sports facilities on the rooftops of the buildings and office space could be explored. Another Member concurred and said that the Stanley Ho Sports Centre was currently underutilised due to its relatively remote location. This would not only save substantial construction costs associated with site formation and related slope works at the

currently refined site but also create synergy with the nearby Cyberport. New sports facilities could be provided at the currently refined site, thereby enhancing their accessibility and usability for students. The alternative site at Sandy Bay would effectively eliminate the potential environmental, ecological and visual impacts associated with the currently refined scheme in Pok Fu Lam.

70. A Member said that the currently refined site in Pok Fu Lam was preferred to the Mount Davis site due to its proximity to Cyberport, which would create synergy effect and boost utilisation of existing facilities (e.g. conference facilities and industry, academia and research resources), where the Government had invested resources in its expansion. Cyberport was also within walking distance of the currently refined site, and a footbridge linkage might be constructed. Besides, HKU should consider utilising High West's various accommodation units as short-term residences for researchers and providing a subway/footbridge across PFLR to unlock more space for deep technology research purposes. In addition, the currently refined site was considered more suitable for the Centre as it was easily accessible to HKU's existing facilities and accommodation, as well as the HKUMed Campus. If the site was inadequate for future expansion needs, the Stanley Ho Sports Centre site could be considered as a Phase 2 development location.

71. In response, Mr Sunny Yeung, Director of Estates of HKU, made the following main points:

(a) a recent study conducted by HKU revealed that as a world-class university, there was a significant shortfall in the provision of sports facilities at HKU. Owing to this substantial deficiency, HKU had resorted to borrowing the sports facilities from the nearby Kennedy School at Sha Wan Drive; and

(b) given that there was a proposal of further development of the Stanley Ho Sports Centre, the feasibility of utilising the site was quite slim at the moment. The possibility of establishing a new research and education tower at the Stanley Ho Sports Centre site as an extension of the Centre could be considered in the longer run. That said, HKU would explore synergies with Cyberport and utilise NM if feasible. HKU would also explore overflow possibilities at High West development, say, setting aside 5% of hostel space there for research purposes

if practicable.

Facilities to be Provided in the Centre

72. In response to the questions raised by a Member regarding the facilities to be provided when the first building of the Centre would be in operation in 2032, and the extent to which the Centre's functions could be achieved at the initial operation stage, Professor Vivian Yam, Vice-President and Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Global Innovation Centre) of HKU, said that the Centre was established on the principle of fostering interdisciplinary and cross-sector collaboration, with its six initial strategic research areas designed to be interconnected and mutually reinforcing. During the launch phase, the Centre would provide facilities for all these six research areas, albeit on a modest scale, together with essential supporting amenities such as dining facilities.

73. Another Member remarked that conference facilities and short-term hostels would be more suitably located within the Centre, considering their modest scale and the convenience for users. Mr Sunny Yeung, Director of Estates of HKU, concurred and said that it was necessary to provide some conference facilities such as mini-theatres for visiting scholars to present their research findings before departing, and such spaces were critical for academic exchange.

74. The same Member was of the view that higher quality hostels should be provided to align with HKU's prestigious reputation and Hong Kong's vision to become an international educational hub, and urged stronger government support for this project. In response, the Chairperson said that the Development Bureau (DEVB) was positive about releasing the "R(C)6" site to HKU for the development of the Centre, given its strategic location in Pok Fu Lam for the research community. DEVB would continue providing the necessary support to HKU for the project from the land perspective.

Building Height and Design

75. The Vice-chairperson and some Members raised the following questions/suggestions:

(a) noting that the existing BH of Ebenezer School was only 151mPD, whether the BH of the Centre could be further reduced to alleviate the sense of oppression for those travelling along PFLR;

(b) whether HKU could carry out deeper excavation such that the proposed BH could be reduced to 150mPD or 151mPD while maintaining the required GFA;

(c) whether HKU would consider increasing the site coverage and critically review the need for such a large amount of office space for the research teams, with a view to lowering the height of building structures and minimising the visual impact of the proposed buildings; and

(d) whether the frontage of the development on PFLR could be reduced.

76. In response, Mr Sunny Yeung, Director of Estates of HKU, made the following main points:

(a) not all the buildings in the Centre would reach 158mPD. The BH was determined having considered the reduction in site area and the space demand. That said, the subject issue would be further reviewed and the Consultant would assess whether the GFA of 190,000m^2 was required for the Centre;

(b) further extensive excavation would necessitate the construction of basement levels and retaining walls, which was less desirable than the previously proposed terraced-platform building design. In any case, such proposal could be considered at the detailed design stage, taking into account the bedrock levels and conditions of decomposed granite;

(c) the currently refined scheme was preliminary and subject to further refinement. Assuming the site coverage increased from approximately 30% under the currently refined scheme to 50% - 60% through expanded podium areas below PFLR level and adjusted tower configurations above, and with the incorporation of building setback, terraced design and balconies, the BH could be reduced by half to one storey and the building bulk could be minimised. The project team

would strive to reduce the BH where feasible; and

(d) the suggestion on reducing the development frontage on PFLR would be considered in the further development of the proposal.

Traffic Impact and Provision of Vehicular and Pedestrian Connections

77. A Member recalled the lengthy discussion during representation hearing in November 2024 and raised concerns on the traffic issue. While HKU had previously informed the Board that the staff, researchers, professors and students would be expected to commute mainly during off-peak hours, the potential traffic impact had not been addressed in the current presentation. In response, Mr Sunny Yeung, Director of Estates of HKU, said that HKU would commission a traffic consultant to conduct a traffic impact study. The study would examine the vehicular and pedestrian traffic impacts through on-site surveys at different times of the day and the estimation of trip generation. The study findings would be included in the submission of the revised proposal for the Board's consideration.

78. Some Members raised the following questions:

(a) whether construction traffic impact would be assessed in the forthcoming traffic impact study, given the extensive excavation on the sloping site required to remove the rocks and vegetation, and the potential disturbance to the local community;

(b) the location of main access, noting the concerns raised by local residents regarding the potential traffic impact generated by the Centre on Victoria Road; and

(c) the Transport Department (TD)'s views on the proposed traffic measures for the Centre from transport planning perspective, and the feasibility of providing a pedestrian link across PFLR.

79. In response, Mr Sunny Yeung, Director of Estates of HKU, made the following main points:

(a) the construction traffic impact arising from the Centre would be assessed. It was anticipated that the proposed through-site-link, a dual carriageway allowing access via PFLR and Victoria Road, would help alleviate the traffic impact during the construction period;

(b) PFLR would be the main access to the Centre for vehicles, pedestrians and logistics transport, given that PFLR was a road with four lanes compared to Victoria Road which was just a two-lane single carriageway. The proposed access at Victoria Road would serve as additional access to the Centre. HKU would explore with Ebenezer School that the proposed access at Victoria Road and the planned pedestrian and escalator system within the Centre could be shared with Ebenezer School or the future residents upon its redevelopment if needed. The vehicular access arrangement and management control measures would be considered in the traffic impact study; and

(c) TD had not been consulted on the currently refined scheme and the proposed traffic measures yet, as they were still under refinement. Footbridges across PFLR to connect to HKU's buildings and High West development and across Victoria Road would be further explored. It was also noted that the existing in-lane bus stop at Ebenezer School would need to be relocated and replaced with a bus lay-by upon redevelopment of the school site. Whilst HKU had offered to provide the required bus lay-by at the currently refined site, TD did not agree with the proposal as it contravened relevant guidelines relating to the distance between bus lay-bys/stops. HKU could further discuss the subject matter with the developer of Ebenezer School.

80. The Vice-chairperson highlighted that it was important to provide a bus lay-by to avoid the blockage of traffic lanes during bus pick-up and drop-off. It was also necessary to provide vehicular access on Victoria Road and Sassoon Road via HKU Medical Campus to divert the traffic flow and alleviate congestion on PFLR in light of the introduction of working and residential population at the Centre, High West development and the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate. The potential traffic obstruction at PFLR caused by unloading activities of Modular Integrated Construction structures associated with building construction should be duly considered. In response, Mr Sunny Yeung, Director of Estates of HKU, said that the above

comments would be duly taken into account in the further refinement of the proposal. To mitigate the environmental impacts during the construction period, measures including the use of water cannons for dust suppression and chemical/hydraulic rock blasting techniques would be implemented. The proposed through-site-link would enable efficient transportation of excavated materials, thereby minimising on-site storage needs.

Environmental and Ecology Impacts and Carbon Neutrality

81. A Member reminded HKU to address the questions previously raised by Members, including that on the potential impact of the Centre on yellow-crested cockatoos (*Cacatua sulphrea*) (小葵花鳳頭鸚鵡), during the representation hearing process. Mr Sunny Yeung, Director of Estates of HKU, said that an environmental consultant would be engaged to conduct an environmental impact study to assess the impacts on both flora and fauna. The area that would not be developed would be dedicated to green spaces, and greening measures such as green roof would be adopted. HKU would collaborate with ecological experts, including Kadoorie Farm and Botanical Garden Corporation, to ensure biodiversity protection and implement compensatory planting where necessary.

82. In response to a Member's suggestion regarding the adoption of a carbon-neutral design for the Centre, Mr Sunny Yeung, Director of Estates of HKU, said that all new buildings at HKU had achieved the BEAM Plus Platinum standard, reflecting HKU's commitment to sustainable development. Carbon neutrality was an imperative obligation and the suggestion would be duly considered in the design of the Centre.

Planning Gains

83. In response to a Member's question on the planning gains to the community/merits of utilising the currently refined site in Pok Fu Lam for the Centre, Professor Vivian Yam, Mr Sunny Yeung and Ms Bella Fan of HKU, with the aid of two video clips, made the following major points:

(a) the Centre had incorporated various planning gains/design merits, including (i) provision of vehicular drop-off point at Victoria Road with pedestrian link for shared use by Ebenezer School or its future redevelopment; (ii) planting of an

additional row of trees along PFLR to form a landscaped boulevard for pedestrians and local residents; (iii) provision of building setback along PFLR to maintain streetscape harmony; (iv) preservation of existing view corridors along PFLR, including the sightlines for the residents of PFLR 138; (v) incorporation of building façade treatment, tree planting as well as high-quality landscape and environmental design to reduce the visual and environmental impacts; (vi) provision of conference and related facilities for public use when not in use by HKU; (vii) utilisation of conference and related facilities for outreach talks for students and residents in the neighbourhood, and designation of an exhibition corner for technological developments if possible; (viii) provision of open areas within the Centre for community use; (ix) implementation of compensatory planting for geotechnical works to ensure slope stability; and (x) the Centre, which would replace the originally planned residential development in the "R(C)6" zone, would not compete commercially with nearby private residential developments; and

(b) the developer of PFLR 138 was aware that there was no legal easement of views under the laws of Hong Kong. That said, to address the residents' concerns, mitigation measures and better design strategies would be implemented to minimise the visual impacts of the Centre.

84. The Vice-chairperson and another Member said that HKU should explore and elaborate more on the planning gains brought by the Centre to the community in the further study and emphasise the planning gains to garner community support in the next round of public consultation, particularly from those who had raised objection to the Centre proposal in Pok Fu Lam before. In response, Mr Sunny Yeung, Director of Estates of HKU, said that all the above suggestions would be duly considered by the project team.

Development Programme

85. In response to a Member's question regarding the potential nuisance to visually impaired students of Ebenezer School due to construction activities, Mr Sunny Yeung, Director of Estates of HKU, said that he had assured Dr Yuk Tak Fun, CEO of Ebenezer School, that construction activities near Ebenezer School would be carried out in the last phase of

construction if Ebenezer School was still in operation at that time, and that the construction timeline of the Centre would be aligned with the redevelopment of Ebenezer School site.

86. A Member said that HKU should critically review whether the currently proposed 4-year construction timeline was realistic, given the public's apprehension about potential prolonged nuisance. In response, Mr Sunny Yeung, Director of Estates of HKU, said that the previously suggested 3-year construction period was too optimistic. The revised 4-year construction period was considered achievable. A detailed development programme, including building plan submission and approval, site formation and excavation, and construction of superstructures, would be formulated for the Board's consideration. Subject to detailed design, the first building or a cluster of buildings was expected to be in operation by 2032.

[Messrs Simon Y.S. Wong and Ricky W.Y. Yu left the meeting during the question and answer session.]

87. As Members had no further questions and comments to raise, the Chairperson thanked the project team for briefing Members on the latest development of the Centre. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally supported HKU's refined scheme in Pok Fu Lam and agreed that HKU should continue to take forward its project based on the refined scheme. HKU's presentation was comprehensive, enabling Members to better understand the rationale for locating the Centre in Pok Fu Lam. While preserving the objective of promoting cross-disciplinary research efforts between HKU and other Mainland and overseas research institutions, the proposed refined location would keep the majority of the "GB" zone intact and minimise the ecological and visual impact of the development on the surrounding environment. According to HKU's development programme, technical studies would be conducted in the third and fourth quarters of 2025. Based on Members' comments/suggestions at the meeting, the project team was advised of the following:

(a) to further explore means of reducing the impact of the Centre on nearby residents and the local community, including considering ways to further reduce the BH by increasing the site coverage of the currently refined site;

(b) to address the traffic concerns, including the anticipated increase in vehicular

and pedestrian flow both during construction and operation phases, and to consider phased development to mitigate potential disruptions to Ebenezer School;

(c) to identify further planning gains/benefits that the proposed development could bring to the local community, including but not limited to, providing connectivity between PFLR and Victoria Road, and the provision of new pedestrian linkages, particularly at PFLR; and

(d) to maintain proactive communication with residents and the local community particularly Ebenezer, and to further engage and explain to the public upon completion of the technical studies and prior to submitting the refined proposal with confirmed key development parameters to the Government.

88. Professor Richard Wong, Acting President and Vice-Chancellor of HKU, thanked Members for their invaluable time and constructive feedback. He acknowledged the challenges ahead in reconciling diverse perspectives. The encouragement from Members would undoubtedly serve as a powerful motivation for the project team to dedicate their utmost efforts to the initiative. It was anticipated that HKU would be able to present a comprehensive and detailed report on the project to Members in 2026.

89. The Chairperson thanked the project team for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

90. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 5:35 p.m.