

**Minutes of 1341st Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 8.8.2025**

Present

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

Chairperson

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Vice-chairperson

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

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

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Simon Y.S. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Chief Engineer (New Territories West)
Transport Department
Ms Vilian W.L. Sum

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

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

Deputy Director of Lands/General
Ms Jane K.C. Choi

Director of Planning
Mr C.K. Yip

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip

Professor B.S. Tang

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Katy C.W. Fung

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Karen F.Y. Lam

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1340th Meeting held on 25.7.2025

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The draft minutes of the 1340th meeting held on 25.7.2025 were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

(i) Reference Back of Approved Outline Zoning Plans

2. The Secretary reported that on 29.7.2025, the Secretary for Development referred the approved Kwun Tong South Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K14S/26 and the approved Nam Sang Wai OZP No. S/YL-NSW/10 to the Town Planning Board for amendment under section 12(1A)(a)(ii) of the Town Planning Ordinance. The reference back of the OZPs was notified in the Gazette on 8.8.2025.

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

Shau Kei Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP)

3. The Secretary reported that the item was to seek Members' agreement on the hearing arrangement for consideration of representations in respect of the draft Shau Kei Wan OZP No. S/H9/21. The Secretary briefly introduced that on 23.5.2025, the draft OZP was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). During the 2-month exhibition period, two valid

representations were received. In view of the similar nature of the representations, the hearing of the representations was recommended to be considered by the full Town Planning Board (the full Board) collectively in one group. To ensure efficiency of the hearing, a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time would be allotted to each representer in the hearing session. Consideration of the representations by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for September 2025.

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

Man Kam To OZP

5. The Secretary reported that the hearing arrangement for consideration of representation in respect of the draft Man Kam To OZP No. S/NE-MKT/6 was agreed by Members on 1.8.2025 by circulation. She briefly introduced that on 30.5.2025, the draft OZP was exhibited for public inspection under section 7 of the Ordinance. During the 2-month exhibition period, one valid representation was received. The hearing of the representation was recommended to be considered by the full Board. To ensure efficiency of the hearing, a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time would be allotted to the representer in the hearing session. Consideration of the representation by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for August 2025.

- (iii) Dismissal of Appeal (CACV 525/24) against the Court of First Instance's Judgment on Judicial Review (JR) Application (HCAL 2260/2023) in respect of the Town Planning Board's Decision on Section 12A Application No. Y/H5/7 by the Court of Appeal

6. The Secretary reported that the concerned site under the JR appeal (CACV 525/24) (the JR Appeal) was located at St. Francis Street and Sau Wa Fong in Wan Chai (the Site). Mr Simon Y.S. Wong had declared an interest on the item as he and his spouse owned properties in Wan Chai. As the item was only to report the dismissal of the JR Appeal, Mr Wong could stay in the meeting.

7. The Secretary reported that the appeal was lodged by Hostford Development Limited, Dialogue in the Dark (HK) Foundation Limited and Wong Wang Tai (the JR

Applicants) on 3.12.2024 against the Court of First Instance's judgment dismissing their JR Application in respect of the section 12A application No. Y/H5/7 (the s.12A application) for a proposed residential development made by Great Kinetic Limited, Full Glory Development Limited and Ever Genius Limited (the s.12A Applicants). Members were informed under Matters Arising at the Town Planning Board (the Board) meetings on 13.12.2024 and 21.3.2025 regarding updates of the JR Appeal. On 23.6.2025, the JR Applicants indicated their intention to withdraw the Appeal (CACV 525/24). Upon a joint application for dismissal of the JR Appeal by the concerned parties on 22.7.2025, a consent summons was filed to the Court of Appeal (CA), and the CA made an order dismissing the JR Appeal on 28.7.2025.

8. Members noted the dismissal of the JR Appeal and completion of the concerned legal proceedings.

Sai Kung and Islands District

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representation in respect of the Draft Cheung Chau Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-CC/10

(TPB Paper No. 11013)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

9. The Secretary reported that Mr Simon Y.S. Wong had declared an interest on the item for owning a property in Cheung Chau. As the property owned by Mr Wong had no direct view of the amendment item site, Members agreed that Mr Wong could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

Mr Walter W.N. Kwong	-	District Planning Officer/ Sai Kung and Islands (DPO/SKIs)
Mr Derek H.M. Tam	-	Town Planner/ Sai Kung and Islands (TP/SKIs)

Representer

R1 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill	-	Representer
-------------------	---	-------------

11. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that PlanD's representatives would be invited to brief Members on the representation. The representer would then be invited to make an oral submission. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, the representer would be allotted 10 minutes for making presentation. There was a timer device to alert the representer two minutes before the allotted time was to expire, and when the allotted time limit was up. A question and answer (Q&A) session would be held after the representer had completed her oral submission. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives and/or the representer. After the Q&A session, the government representatives and the representer would be invited to leave the meeting. The Town Planning Board (the Board/TPB) would then deliberate on the representation in closed meeting in their absence and would inform the representer of the Board's decision in due course.

12. The Chairperson then invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representation.

13. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Derek H.M. Tam, TP/SKIs, PlanD briefed Members on the representation, including the background of the amendments on the draft Cheung Chau Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/I-CC/10 (the draft OZP), major grounds/views of the representer, government responses and PlanD's views on the representation as detailed in TPB Paper No. 11013 (the Paper). The amendments mainly involved rezoning of a site at Fa Peng (the Site) from "Residential (Group C) 6" ("R(C)6") to "Residential (Group C) 9" ("R(C)9") subject to a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 1.58 and a maximum building height (BH) of 3 storeys (8.23m) to facilitate a residential development (Item A). Amendments had also been made to the Notes of the OZP, including, among others, (i) revision to the PR/gross floor area (GFA)/site coverage (SC) exemption clause to clarify the provision related to caretaker's quarters in the Remarks of the Notes for "Residential (Group A)" and "R(C)" zones; (ii) incorporation of 'Government Refuse Collection Point' and 'Public Convenience' under Column 1 of the Notes for "Village Type Development" ("V") zone, and corresponding deletion of 'Government Refuse Collection Point' and 'Public Convenience' under Column 2 of the Notes for "V" zone; (iii) incorporation of 'Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre' and 'Flat' under Column 2 of the Notes for "V" zone; and (iv) revision to the Planning Intention as well as the Remarks of the Notes for "Coastal Protection Area" ("CPA") zone on filling of land or excavation of land clause in accordance with the Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans (MSN).

[Professor Simon K.L. Wong and Ms Jane K.C. Choi joined the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

[Dr Venus Y.H. Lun joined the meeting at this point.]

14. The Chairperson then invited the representer to elaborate on her representation.

R1 – Mary Mulvihill

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

Item A

- (a) she strongly objected to Item A, which abused the New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) policy to justify an inappropriately dense development on the Site in the midst of the “Green Belt” (“GB”) zone and close to the “CPA” zone;
- (b) there were no recognised villages in Cheung Chau. The “V” zones in Cheung Chau covered areas with existing village houses concentrated in the central lowland of the island. Since the Site was not part of any existing villages, it should not be entitled to the development exemptions applicable to NTEHs. Moreover, as there was no indication that the proposed development was intended for the indigenous villagers of Cheung Chau, development of the Site should be restricted to its original planning intention and development restrictions to minimise impacts on the surrounding “GB” zone;
- (c) apart from two existing footpaths, there was no vehicular access to the Site. The proposed development would provide 18 flats, which could accommodate more than 50 residents. The original dwellings on the Site were intended for single families rather than a substantial community which would overstrain the existing access;
- (d) the Site was zoned for residential use solely due to the prior existence of residential dwellings. However, this zoning was not appropriate as the Site was surrounded by the “GB” zone which should be protected from any developments. Moreover, the proposed development would substantially increase the PR and SC for several times compared with the original zoning;
- (e) the use of six septic tanks to serve over 50 people on the Site with no vehicular access would very likely result in sewage leakage into the

surrounding “GB” zone in the long term, as it was difficult to ensure that the necessary servicing would be adequately maintained;

- (f) the proposed buildings, leaving no space in between, would result in poor ventilation and limited penetration of natural light, particularly given that the floor-to-ceiling height was less than 3m. Instead of constructing six NTEHs, each requiring a staircase, consideration should be given to developing a low-rise residential building for more efficient use of floor space;
- (g) the approval of the “R(C)9” zone would encourage similar applications under the guise of the need to build NTEHs, which would affect the integrity of the “GB” zone;
- (h) the concerns of Islands District Council members regarding the environmental and traffic impacts of the proposed development and other nearby developments had not been adequately addressed. While PlanD only indicated that these concerns had been conveyed to the relevant government bureaux/departments for follow-up as appropriate, there was no information on the proposed solutions. It was particularly unacceptable that the access issue remained unresolved, as several walking trails popular with visitors could be adversely affected by the substantial increase in residents, impeding enjoyment of the lush environment. Besides, the proposed development would be visible from a distance amidst the surrounding greenery as it was situated on a sloping land. The “GB” should be protected from over development;
- (i) as indicated in the section 12A (s.12A) application No. Y/I-CC/7, the site formation plan for the proposed development was approved by the Building Authority (BA) in 1992 and the Certificate of Exemption (CoE) for building works for the six proposed NTEHs was issued by the Lands Department (LandsD) in 1993, before the Site was covered by the first Cheung Chau OZP in 2004. While

such approvals were granted over 30 years ago, there was no information indicating that they had been extended during the period. The applicant should apply to LandsD for extension of time for the building works of the NTEHs. Recently, a section 16 (s.16) application (No. A/NE-LYT/847) for a proposed Small House development was rejected by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) on 6.6.2025, under which the relevant building licence was issued by LandsD on 15.10.2001 but the development had not materialised, and the building licence was revoked on 9.3.2012. This demonstrated that the permit should have been revoked after a decade;

- (j) the response in the Paper that LandsD would generally make reference to the relevant lease conditions and requirements set out in the Buildings Ordinance (Application to the New Territories) Ordinance (Cap. 121) (BO(ATNT)O) to consider redevelopment of village houses was misleading, as there was no development right existed in the subject case;

Amendments to the Notes of OZP

- (k) she objected to amendment items (b), (c), (d) and (f) to the Notes of the OZP;
- (l) the revision to the PR/GFA/SC exemption clause to clarify the provision related to caretaker's quarters in "R(A)" and "R(C)" zones under amendment item (b) was questioned as there was no villa-style development in Cheung Chau;
- (m) the incorporation of 'Government Refuse Collection Point' and 'Public Convenience' under Column 1 of the Notes for "V" zone and corresponding deletion of the two uses under Column 2 in amendment item (c) was objected to. The two uses should remain in Column 2 to ensure public scrutiny;

- (n) the incorporation of 'Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre' under Column 2 of the Notes for "V" zone in amendment item (d) was objected to, as the planning intention of "V" zone was to provide family homes for indigenous villagers. This amendment would further encourage the abuse of the NTEH policy, where many newly built NTEHs had been sold to non-indigenous villagers; and
- (o) the revision to the Planning Intention and the Remarks of the Notes for "CPA" zone on filling of land or excavation of land clause in accordance with the MSN under amendment item (f) was strongly objected to, as this would give the Government unfettered and unaccountable power to act without adequate supervision, undermining the entire planning process and disregarding community interests.

16. Ms Mulvihill also expressed other views not related to the amendment items of the draft OZP. She said that she had sent emails to Members of RNTPC or the Board expressing concerns that the handling of cases selected for the streamlining arrangement had not adhered to the agreed criteria for streamlining the consideration of planning applications, and that those emails were handled by PlanD without informing the Board. She cited cases that were subject to adverse departmental and public comments, including objections from key stakeholders such as local villagers and Rural Committees. A large number of applications had been streamlined for consideration and Members had raised no questions on them.

[Post-meeting note: Regarding R1's allegation, Members were subsequently briefed on the matter at the same meeting. The Secretary referred to two emails received from R1 in June 2025 alleging that two s.16 applications with adverse departmental comments and public comments, including objections from local villagers, had been selected for streamlining arrangement, and that RNTPC Members had raised no comments. R1 considered this inconsistent with the agreed selection criteria for streamlining. The Secretary explained that according to the selection criteria, inter alia, if the adverse departmental comments or concerns could be addressed by imposing approval

conditions and/or advisory clauses, the case could be considered under the streamlining arrangement. A summary table of the streamlining cases together with the papers would be provided to Members before the meeting for their information and consideration, and Members could raise questions on the applications at the meeting and PlanD's representatives were available to answer questions from Members. The Secretary further said that as per established practice, the Secretariat would handle administrative matters on behalf of the Board, including answering public enquiries on statutory planning and procedural matters, in accordance with the Town Planning Ordinance and relevant guidelines, while matters requiring the Board's views and agreement would be brought to its attention. Replies to the two emails from R1 were issued in July 2025. Members noted and agreed to the above.]

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

Background of the Site

18. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the background of approving six NTEHs at the Site before the publication of the first Cheung Chau OZP;
- (b) a comparison of the development restrictions for the Site under the previous "R(C)6" zone and the current "R(C)9" zone;
- (c) noting that the land owner was not an indigenous villager of a recognised village but a CoE had been issued for building the six NTEHs, whether R1's assertion that the land owner of the Site had abused the NTEH policy could be substantiated or not, and whether the identity of the applicant being an indigenous villager and

compliance with the specific building dimensions of NTEH were prerequisites for permitting the building of a NTEH; and

- (d) whether the CoE for building works for the proposed NTEHs at the Site issued by LandsD in 1993 was subject to any validity period requiring renewal, noting that approvals under the planning and buildings regimes were generally granted with a time limit.

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

- (a) a set of site formation plans was approved by BA in 1992 and a CoE for building works for the six NTEHs was issued by the District Lands Officer (DLO) in 1993, prior to the gazettal of the first Cheung Chau OZP in 2004;
- (b) the development parameters for the six NTEHs at the Site corresponded to a PR of about 1.58 and a BH of 3 storeys (8.23m), which exceeded the development restrictions of a maximum PR of 0.2, a maximum SC of 20% and a maximum BH of 2 storeys (7.62m) under the previous “R(C)6” zone. The land owner therefore submitted the s.12A application, supported with relevant technical assessments, for rezoning the Site from “R(C)6” to “R(C)9” with higher development intensity to facilitate the development of the six NTEHs, which was agreed by RNTPC on 20.9.2024. The rezoning of the Site to “R(C)9” subject to a maximum PR of 1.58 and a maximum BH of 3 storeys (8.23m) was to take forward the agreed s.12A application;
- (c) a NTEH was not necessarily a Small House, as Small House was only a type of NTEH. The construction of NTEHs was governed by BO(ATNT)O, which restricted the roofed-over areas of each NTEH to not more than 65.03m² and the height to not more than 3 storeys (8.23m). NTEHs were exempted from submission of plans for

building works, site formation works and drainage works under the Buildings Ordinance (Cap. 123) provided that relevant CoE(s) were issued by LandsD under BO(ATNT)O if the exemption criteria (e.g. height of a NTEH and gradient of slopes) under relevant ordinance/guidelines were met. On the other hand, the building of a Small House up to the dimensions of a NTEH was a right exclusive to the male indigenous villagers of the New Territories. Since there were no recognised villages in Cheung Chau, the New Territories Small House Policy was not applicable to Cheung Chau or the Site. The six NTEHs on the Site were issued with a CoE for building works by DLO in 1993 under BO(ATNT)O; and

- (d) according to LandsD, the CoEs for building works and drainage works issued in 1993 and 2023 respectively for the Site remained valid.

20. Ms Jane K.C. Choi, Deputy Director of Lands/General (DD/G), LandsD confirmed that the issued CoEs were not subject to any time limits and remained valid.

Planning of the Area

21. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the planning history of the area, particularly why individual “R(C)” sites were designated amidst a large “GB” zone, and whether there was an intention to confine the extent and development scale of those “R(C)” sites; and
- (b) whether there were any hiking trails near or within the Site that might be affected by the proposed development.

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

- (a) scattered residential dwellings existed in the upland area of Fa Peng long before the publication of the first Cheung Chau OZP in 2004, including the two abandoned ruined houses erected on the Site. When the Cheung Chau OZP was prepared, the intention was to maintain the existing rural character and greenery of Fa Peng while allowing existing scattered low-rise residential developments. The development restrictions for the “R(C)” zone were mainly to reflect the existing developments at that time. Individual “R(C)” sites in the area could be redeveloped in accordance with the development restrictions of the OZP; and
- (b) Fa Peng was not a popular hiking destination, as most visitors tended to visit the central lowlands of Cheung Chau near the pier and the Sai Wan area in the southwestern part of the island where Cheung Po Tsai Cave was located. The walking trails in the vicinity mainly served as access to scattered developments, such as the campsites of The Salvation Army Bradbury Camp and Caritas Jockey Club Ming Fai Camp in the “Recreation” zone, and the residential developments. The Site was all along zoned “R(C)” and the rezoning was mainly to facilitate a residential development with higher PR and BH restrictions, without affecting the surrounding woodland in the “GB” zone, walking trails or the nearby campsites.

Sewerage Concerns

23. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there were any public sewers in the vicinity of the Site, and how sewage from the adjacent residential development of Fa Peng Knoll was treated; and
- (b) whether the proximity of the Site to the “GB” and “CPA” zones was a relevant consideration for permitting the use of septic tanks.

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

- (a) as Fa Peng was not served by public sewers, the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) allowed alternative means of sewage treatment, such as the use of septic tanks. EPD had reviewed the design and location of the proposed septic tanks for the proposed NTEHs during the s.12A application stage and raised no adverse comment on the application and the current OZP amendments; and
- (b) except for strict control on the use of septic tanks in developments located within water gathering grounds, the use of septic tanks in other areas was acceptable, provided that the design, construction, operation and maintenance of the septic tanks complied with the relevant guidelines published by EPD to ensure regular desludging and no sewage leakage during sludge disposal.

25. Mr Gary C.W. Tam, Assistance Director (Environmental Assessment), EPD supplemented that the use of septic tank was an acceptable measure for sewage treatment in areas not served by public sewers. A septic tank should be designed with the capacity to treat all sewage generated from a development independently so that the adjacent water bodies or land would not be affected. The provision and operation of septic tank should comply with the relevant guidelines issued by EPD.

26. 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 representer and the government representatives for attending the meeting. The Board would deliberate on the representation in closed meeting and would inform the representer of the Board's decision in due course. The representer and the government representatives left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

27. The Chairperson invited views from Members.

28. Members generally expressed support for Item A and had the following views:

- (a) for the subject case, the land owner had the right to develop the Site which was a building lot, regardless of whether the land owner was an indigenous villager as the proposal did not involve building Small Houses. The development restrictions imposed on the “R(C)9” zone were to reflect the development parameters of the proposed development with CoE for building works issued. The amendment under Item A should be allowed;
- (b) some opposing views presented by R1 were not crucial and were unjustifiable. For instance, the alleged adverse impact on the existing footpaths due to a slight population increase from the proposed development was considered negligible. On the other hand, the amendment under Item A was well justified as CoE had been issued for building six NTEHs at the Site prior to the publication of the first OZP; and
- (c) while many of R1’s arguments were repetitive and unsubstantiated, the Government still had a duty to respond to all the grounds raised in order to clarify factual information and convey accurate messages to the public.

29. Noting that Item A was to reflect an agreed s.12A application mainly for increasing the development intensity of the “R(C)” site, a Member was concerned whether this would set a precedent for nearby “R(C)” sites to increase their development intensities, and enquired about the reason that the development parameters of the permitted NTEHs at the Site were not reflected in the first OZP and why the development proposal had not been implemented for a long time since the approval in 1992/93. Another Member enquired about the reason for the issue of CoE for the six NTEHs without planning permission.

30. In response, Mr C.K. Yip, Director of Planning (D of Plan), made the following points:

- (a) when the CoE was issued in 1993, there was no statutory plan covering the Site and hence no planning application was required;
- (b) when the Cheung Chau OZP was prepared, a number of individual “R(C)” zones were designated in the upland areas in the southern part of the island mainly to reflect the existing residential sites with building rights, including some vacant sites or sites with abandoned houses that were zoned “R(C)6” subject to a maximum PR of 0.2. The Site had a unique background as a set of site formation plans was approved in 1992 and CoE for building works for six NTEHs was issued in 1993, which were both still valid. The land owner sought to increase the development intensity of the Site through the s.12A application in order to proceed with the six NTEHs with CoE for building works approved in 1992/93. As such, the rezoning of the Site from “R(C)6” to “R(C)9” with higher PR and BH would not set a precedent for all “R(C)” zones in the vicinity. Each rezoning application would be considered on its own merits, taking into account relevant planning and technical considerations;
- (c) although the Site had obtained CoE for building works for six NTEHs back in 1993, CoE for drainage works had not yet been obtained at that time. Moreover, the building works had not commenced by the time the OZP was prepared in 2004, and the development restrictions imposed on the “R(C)” zones were mainly to reflect the development parameters of the existing buildings on the Site at that time. Therefore, the Site was zoned “R(C)6” with a maximum PR of 0.2 and a maximum BH of 2 storeys (7.62m). Nevertheless, in 2023, the land owner expressed the intention to pursue the permitted NTEH development by applying for a CoE for drainage works, and followed by a s.12A application for rezoning the Site from “R(C)6” to “R(C)9” in 2024; and

- (d) preparation of a statutory plan would take into account all relevant considerations at the prevailing time. As reflected in the then “R(C)6” zoning, plan-making some 20 years ago had put more weight on containing the existing development scale in the vegetated upland in Fa Peng by imposing the development parameters of the existing buildings on the OZP.

31. Ms Jane K.C. Choi, DD/G, LandsD supplemented that the issued CoEs for the Site were still valid. They were not subject to expiry dates, revocation provision (unless with lease breaches), or any requirements on commencement date of works. Mr C.K. Yip, D of Plan, remarked that the concepts of time for commencement of a permitted development under planning permission and the validity of the CoEs issued by LandsD, which were two separate regimes of development control, should not be mixed up. The Secretary supplemented that the rejection of the s.16 application for Small House development mentioned by R1 was related to the cancellation of the granted building licence by LandsD, which was not the same as the CoEs issued for NTEH development in this case.

32. A Member enquired whether it was possible to allow the development of the proposed NTEHs permitted in 1992/1993 at the Site without amendments to the OZP, for the sake of streamlining the development procedures. In response, Mr C.K. Yip, D of Plan, said that the proposed development had to comply with all development control requirements under the planning, buildings and lands regimes. With the new set of development restrictions of a maximum PR of 1.58 and a maximum BH of 3 storeys (8.23m) imposed under the “R(C)9” zoning for the Site, the land owner would have greater flexibility in pursuing the proposed development, such as not building the permitted NTEHs but opting for another type of residential development through submission of general building plans to BA provided that the development parameters complied with the development restrictions of the “R(C)9” zone on the OZP.

33. Members generally supported Item A and had no objection to other amendments to the Notes of the OZP, including amendment items (b), (c), (d) and (f) to the Notes which were mainly technical amendments in accordance with the latest MSN.

34. 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 representation. All grounds of the representation had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in the Paper as well as the presentation and responses made by the government representatives at the meeting.

35. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) noted the view of **R1(part)** on amendment to the Notes (b) and decided not to uphold the remaining part of R1, and considered that the draft Cheung Chau Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) should not be amended to meet the representation for the following reasons:

- “(a) Item A is to take forward the decision of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee on an agreed section 12A application for proposed residential development with increased plot ratio and building height. The proposed development is considered not incompatible with the surrounding environment and landscape character and will not cause significant adverse impacts on the surroundings, while concerned government bureaux/departments has no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed development at the site. The zoning and relevant development restrictions for this item on the Notes of the Outline Zoning Plan are considered appropriate;
- (b) the incorporation of ‘Government Refuse Collection Point’ and ‘Public Convenience’ under Column 1, as well as ‘Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre’ and ‘Flat’ under Column 2 of the Notes for “Village Type Development” zone is in line with the latest Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans (MSN) promulgated by the Board. The provision of these facilities will follow the relevant established government procedures and/or require planning permission from the Board; and

- (c) the incorporation of the exemption clause that filling of land or excavation of land related to public works co-ordinated or implemented by the Government is exempted from the requirement for planning application in the “Coastal Protection Area” (“CPA”) zone is in line with the latest MSN promulgated by the Board and will streamline the planning application process. The exemption clause is only applicable to public works and minor works in which no major adverse impacts are anticipated. Statutory control over the developments in the “CPA” zone would not be undermined.”

36. 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 adjourned for a 15-minute break.]

General

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting]

Development Proposal for Lung Kwu Tan Reclamation and the Re-planning of Tuen Mun West Area

(TPB Paper No. 11014)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

37. The Secretary reported that the “Planning and Engineering Study for Lung Kwu Tan Reclamation and the Re-planning of Tuen Mun West Area – Investigation” (the Study) was jointly commissioned by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) and the Planning Department (PlanD), with Arup-AtkinsRéalisis Joint Venture (AAJV) as the consultant. As Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited

(ARUP) had participated in the AAJV, the following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | |
|----------------------|---|
| Dr Tony C.M. Ip | - having past business dealings with ARUP;
and |
| Mr Daniel K.W. Chung | - being a former Director of CEDD. |

38. As the item was a briefing to Members on the development proposal for Lung Kwu Tan (LKT) Reclamation and the Re-planning of Tuen Mun West (TMW) Area, the interests of the above Members only needed to be recorded, and they could stay in the meeting and participate in the discussion.

39. The following government representatives and the consultants (the study team) were invited to the meeting:

PlanD

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| Ms Elsa H.K. Cheuk | - Assistant Director of
Planning/Territorial (AD/T) |
| Ms Doris S.Y. Ting | - Chief Town Planner (CTP) |
| Ms Paulina L.S. Pun | - Senior Town Planner |

CEDD

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| Mr Louie C.T. Lau | - Deputy Head of Civil Engineering
Office (Port & Land) (DH of CEO
(PL)) |
| Ms Esther C.W. Yung | - Chief Engineer |
| Mr Eric Y.M. Cheng | - Senior Engineer |
| Ms Zoe S.Y. Lo | - Senior Engineer |

AAJV

- | | |
|----------------|---|
| Mr Jack Yiu |] |
| Mr Franki Chiu |] |

Dr K.S. Leung]	Consultants
Ms Wingki Kwok]	
Mr Marcus Yen]	

40. The Chairperson extended a welcome and invited the study team to brief Members on TPB Paper No. 11014 (the Paper).

41. Ms Elsa H.K. Cheuk, AD/T, PlanD said that the preliminary development proposal of LKT reclamation and re-planning of TMW area would provide a total development area of about 301 ha, comprising near-shore reclaimed land and re-planning of existing land at LKT and TMW areas. The proposal adopted an ‘industry-led’ planning approach, positioning the LKT and TMW areas as “Smart and Green Industrial Port” (SGIP) for developing four core industries with growth potential. The study team would like to seek the views of the Board on the proposal. Following the 2-month public engagement, which had commenced on 1.8.2025 and would gather comments from the public and stakeholders, the development proposal would be refined and detailed engineering design and technical assessments would be conducted for the preparation of the Recommended Outline Development Plan.

42. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and a video, Ms Doris S.Y. Ting, CTP, PlanD briefed Members on the planning vision and positioning, preliminary development proposal, broad land use proposals, project highlights including the development of four core industries with growth potential, improvement of transport connectivity, creating a new generation industry park as well as re-planning for maximising planning gains, and the way forward and preliminary implementation programme of the Study as detailed in the Paper.

43. After the presentation of PlanD’s representatives, the Chairperson invited questions and comments from Members.

Four Core Industries with Growth Potential

44. Members generally expressed support for and welcomed the development positioning of the LKT and TMW areas as SGIP through the industry-led planning approach, recognising the region's distinct locational advantages with well-connected strategic transportation network and the existing compatible industries in the area. Some Members emphasised the urgent need for Hong Kong to develop new industries with strong growth potential. They remarked that this demand arose not only from stakeholders of the concerned industries but also aligned with Hong Kong's future aspirations to evolve into an innovation and technology driven city.

45. Some Members had the following questions/comments:

- (a) for the circular economy industry, whether there would be any collaboration with the existing recycling operations and other establishments in the vicinity (e.g. EcoPark, public fill bank, sawmill, etc.);
- (b) the proposed location for the circular economy industry near the Tuen Mun – Chek Lap Kok Link (TM-CLKL) might give the tourists a negative impression upon their arrival from the airport if there was haphazard scatter of recycling materials in the TMW area. Consideration might be given to relocating the circular economy industry closer to the green/new energy industry in the LKT area;
- (c) in the context of the modern logistics industry/River Trade Terminal (RTT), RTT was originally designed to support river trade business, serving the Greater Bay Area (GBA) and complementing the Kwai Tsing Container Terminals (KTCT). A comprehensive review of the development, operational chain and territory-wide transportation infrastructure supporting modern logistics in Hong Kong was essential to strengthen its position as a key logistics hub. Moreover, the future development of the industry towards further enhancement of inter-modal logistics development comprising sea and air transport as well as the functions and roles of KTCT and RTT in advancing the

industry should also be reviewed, particularly given that the utilisation rate of the RTT had been declining in the recent years;

- (d) whether the sea frontage at the proposed modern logistics site would be adequate to accommodate the relocation of the Tuen Mun Public Cargo Working Area (TMPCWA);
- (e) whether the advanced construction industry site would be for production/storage or product testing;
- (f) stakeholders in the construction industry had long urged the establishment of a permanent concrete batching plant in the LKT and TMW areas. This location was considered ideal due to its marine access, distance from residential areas and its potential to support the development of the Northern Metropolis (NM);
- (g) regarding the green/new energy industry, there was strong market demand for the use and supply of green/new energy in sea and air transport, such as green methanol and liquefied natural gas, as Hong Kong aimed to be developed into a green port. Trade stakeholders would likely co-ordinate among themselves regarding the storage and production of green energy in different locations, such as Tsing Yi, taking into account various considerations. The circular economy and green/new energy industries could be planned across districts. A clear roadmap and well-defined plans for developing green energy were essential. The proposed land allocation for the green energy industry was insufficient to cater for the diverse types of new/green fuels. Hence, it would be preferable to establish a clear target for developing specific types of new/green fuel in the LKT area;
- (h) for the green/new energy industry, whether there would be co-operation with the existing operators in the surrounding area (e.g. T·Park, power stations, etc.), whether the study team had discussed with the operators of the power plants on their future plan for

developing green fuels and their intention to collaborate with the existing operators; and

- (i) noting that sites would be reserved for multi-storey buildings (MSBs) for the relocation of existing brownfield operations, the difficulties, feasibility and time required for relocating the operations to MSBs as raised by the industry's stakeholders, whether the reserved land area for MSBs would be sufficient and their relocation would affect the implementation programme, and whether the MSBs would be for existing brownfield operations in the LKT and TMW areas as well as others affected by the implementation of New Development Areas.

46. In response, Ms Elsa H.K. Cheuk, AD/T, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) consultations were conducted with some stakeholders of the existing industrial operations in the LKT and TMW areas and there were currently no plans for changes in their future development. Besides, careful consideration was given to promoting collaboration among industries. For example, there could be collaboration between the future operators in the circular economy and EcoPark to drive technological advancements through research and development (R&D) for production of high-value products such as core materials for electricity-free cooling products. The circular economy industry would foster new growth areas with potential, creating a complete chain of high-value production from recycled materials to finished products;
- (b) modern and orderly park-type development was proposed for the four core industries to promote innovation and new technology and would be provided with supporting facilities and a high-quality environment, thereby creating a development landscape and ambience distinct from that of a traditional industrial area. A green corridor would be developed at the eastern side of the TMW area designated for the circular economy near TM-CLKL. The corridor would incorporate

pedestrian and cycling paths while integrating blue and green resources to create a green and high-quality environment;

- (c) RTT, located in close proximity to the Pearl River Delta (PRD) and Hong Kong International Airport (HKIA), had been providing transshipment services for small river vessels, while KTCT primarily served ocean-going vessels. Considering that the utilisation rate of RTT berths (occupying 65 ha) had remained on the low side in recent years (about one-fifth of the overall capacity), it was proposed, after consultation with the Transport and Logistics Bureau (TLB), to retain part of the RTT (about 35 ha) for continual river trade while providing planning flexibility to accommodate other modern logistics uses in response to future demand. Consultations with relevant stakeholders and government bureaux/departments (B/Ds) would be continued so as to further refine the land use proposal with a view to consolidating Hong Kong's position as an international maritime centre and international logistics hub;
- (d) among the land reserved for modern logistics industry with sea frontage, an area of about 4 ha with a berth length of about 700m was proposed to accommodate the relocation of the existing TMPCWA on a like-for-like basis. Relevant B/Ds had confirmed the need for relocation of TMPCWA and agreed on the proposed location. It was anticipated that such relocation might create synergy with the surrounding logistics industries, fostering high value-added logistics operations. Ongoing dialogues with relevant stakeholders and B/Ds would be essential to ensure smooth co-ordination and alignment with the future development of modern logistics industry;
- (e) the land reserved for advanced construction industry would foster the development primarily for R&D, testing, certification and storage, such as related facilities for local processing of Modular Integrated

Construction (MiC) and Integrated Mechanical, Electrical and Plumbing (MiMEP);

- (f) in developing the advanced construction industry at the LKT area, it was proposed to prioritise R&D and production of green construction materials such as prefabricated rebar and sustainable concrete, with a view to promoting the adoption of advanced and sustainable construction practices;
- (g) TLB promulgated the ‘Action Plan on Green Maritime Fuel Bunkering’ to promote the development of Hong Kong into a high-quality green maritime fuel bunkering centre. Similarly, there was government policy direction and increasing market trend to promote the use of sustainable new energy such as green energy by sea and aviation fuel in the aviation industry. In view of the above, the land reserved for green/new energy industry should not be limited to green fuel storage but might also reserve capacity to support the local production of green fuel to cater for the future technological development of the industry. Communication with TLB and relevant industry stakeholders would continue to spearhead the green transformation of the industry;
- (h) the study team had previously liaised with relevant stakeholders and acknowledged their future development plan to increase the production of clean new energy. With the operations in the green/new energy industry coming into place, there would be synergy between the existing and new operations; and
- (i) currently, there were brownfield operations such as open storage, port-related logistics, recycling uses scattered in LKT accounting for more than 10 ha of land. It was proposed to reserve sufficient land (including open-air sites or sites for developing MSBs) for relocating and consolidating the existing brownfield operations, thereby facilitating their upgrading and transformation along with the development of the core industries of advanced construction, circular economy and modern

logistics in the area. Subject to the comments received during public engagement, flexibility would be allowed for the proposed land reservation to accommodate the brownfield operations in the LKT area as well as those in other areas. The study team would communicate with the concerned stakeholders to better understand their needs.

47. On whether the production of MiC components would take place in the advanced construction industry area, a Member remarked that the production would be undertaken in the Mainland for cost-effectiveness in terms of raw materials and manpower costs when compared with Hong Kong. The Development Bureau (DEVB) had permitted the direct procurement of such services from the Mainland to help lower the costs of the construction industry. Besides, land had been reserved in NM for R&D and testing of the MiC products.

Land Areas for Four Industries

48. Two Members expressed concerns about the insufficient land allocated for these core industries involving large-scale operations or storage, pointing out that it would be unrealistic to meet the land requirements for accommodating all four core industries such as the advanced construction industry, given that the production and storage of MiC components required a substantial land area. A Member enquired whether there was any market research, information or data on the proposed core industries and their operations to support the proposed land areas designated for each industry. In response, Ms Elsa H.K. Cheuk, AD/T, PlanD said that in determining the locational distribution of the core industries, a wide range of factors, including geographical advantages, locational requirements of industries, opportunities for collaboration with GBA and existing industries, views of stakeholders from different industries, impacts of reclamation on the villages and the Fairway, etc., had been taken into account. Regarding the proposed area for the four industries, desktop research on overseas industrial parks, development trends of concerned industries and government policies had been conducted. Relevant B/Ds had also been consulted on the land area required for the four industries, including provision for strategic reserve. The preliminary development proposal would be subject to refinement after receiving comments from the relevant stakeholders during the public engagement. Due

consideration would be given to allow flexibility for the land areas allocated for the core industries at the detailed planning stage. Dr K.S. Leung, the consultant, supplemented that the proposed land allocation for the core industries was systematically estimated based on desktop research covering regional and local development trends, operational requirements, long-term investment prospects and market demand, together with consultations with stakeholders from the four core industries. A Member expressed appreciation for the prudent analysis supported by desktop research and market data on the proposed land allocation for the four core industries.

49. A Member emphasised the need for adequate land allocation to address the territory-wide challenges faced by the recycling industry. Among the proposed core industries, the circular economy industry was particularly critical as it directly related to the livelihood of the general public and urgent action was required. The reservation of only 32 ha of land for circular economy industry was considered insufficient to tackle the territory-wide waste disposal problem, and the proposal only made reference to yard waste treatment due to the potential relocation of Y·Park. The Member cited an example that more than 10 ha of land were required to treat just 100 tonnes of plastic waste. Given that Hong Kong generated approximately 2,000 tonnes of plastic waste per day, it would be impossible to rely solely on the planned site at the TMW area to provide adequate waste treatment capacity. The Member stressed that the Government, including DEVB and the Environment and Ecology Bureau (EEB), should work together to adopt a long-term vision for comprehensive planning over the next 10 to 50 years to address the waste management issue effectively. This would necessitate identifying sufficient and suitable sites, such as the area near the West New Territories Landfill in Tsang Tsui (north of LKT) for low-end processing while reserving the TMW area for high-end operations. In addition, the Member highlighted the importance of regional collaboration, particularly with GBA, to address the waste problem. Hong Kong could partner with cities in GBA to establish a complete industrial chain for waste processing. Another Member suggested that DEVB could consult EEB regarding the potential function of the West New Territories Landfill in Tsang Tsui, and whether it could incorporate the circular economy industry. In response, Ms Elsa H.K. Cheuk, AD/T, PlanD said that having consulted relevant B/Ds and stakeholders, the land reserved for the circular economy was for the development of green industry to support local green technology industries such as upcycling local waste materials into high-value products

like cooling and acoustic metamaterials. With extensive sea frontage and marine transport at the LKT and TMW areas, there was potential for the transshipment of recycled materials to and from PRD for high value-added processing, such as the repurposing of car batteries, at the circular economy in the TMW area.

50. With reference to Enclosure 1 of the Paper, a Member enquired about the rationale for not including the existing operations in TMW (i.e. the power station, steel mill and EcoPark) in the development proposal. In response, Ms Elsa H.K. Cheuk, AD/T, PlanD said that the study team had communicated with the operators of the existing establishments and they indicated their preference to maintain their operations while welcoming the development proposal for the area, as there could be opportunities for collaboration and the creation of synergies with the new core industries to maximise growth potential. Regular reviews of planning requirements would be necessary to ensure effective implementation and to foster synergies

51. The Chairperson noted that as highlighted by the study team, various factors had been taken into consideration in determining the extent of reclamation and allocation of land areas for the four core industries. The reclamation area had been reduced from the originally proposed 220 ha to 145 ha, representing a one-third reduction. This adjustment was mainly to address the grave concerns of LKT villagers regarding the originally proposed extensive reclamation extent including reclaiming the entire beach in front of their village. Besides, the proposed reclamation should avoid conflict with the busy marine traffic of the Fairway and the cost of reclamation would escalate if reclamation went beyond the near-shore areas when the water depths would increase substantially. DEVB welcomed advice from relevant policy bureaux on the need for land areas to support the emerging industries and had been proactively working with them in formulating the land use plan. For instance, regarding the advanced construction industry, the Works Branch of DEVB (WB/DEVB) had regularly reviewed the land requirements to meet the industry's need and development. Based on the information from WB/DEVB, an area of 47 ha of land at the LKT area with water marine access was reserved for the advanced construction industry, primarily for R&D, testing, certification and of MiC and MiMEP. An additional 20 to 30 ha of land had also been allocated in the New Territories North New Town in NM for advanced construction. For the circular economy industry, DEVB welcomed the initiative of EEB requesting land reservation in the TMW area to address

waste treatment issues. The circular economy would not only accommodate yard waste treatment but also support the upgrading of the recycling industry through upcycling and green technology development. For example, a technology company at the Tseung Kwan O InnoPark had conducted research in using recycled plastic pellets to produce noise-absorbing metamaterials, thereby addressing the plastic waste problem in Hong Kong and creating value from recycled materials at the same time. EEB noted that the operations at EcoPark had been relatively low-end and targeted to develop high technology industry, promoting the transformation of the recycling industry towards high value-added production in the TMW area. In terms of the modern logistics industry, RTT occupied 65 ha with only one-fifth of its planned capacity space currently in use. With the successful development of port facilities in the Mainland, there had been changes in river trade businesses at RTT as the need for transshipment had been reduced. To optimise land use, flexibility had been allowed, pending further consultation with TLB on whether to maintain RTT's original functions or upgrade its operation. The current proposal could align with modern logistics trends, particularly e-logistics (e-commerce), where high value-added goods or small parcels were shipped from the Mainland to Hong Kong for efficient and reliable delivery through HKIA to other destinations, leveraging RTT's proximity to HKIA. As for new energy, green energy such as biodiesel and green methanol was expected to be used in air, sea and land transport in future. The green/new energy facilities in the LKT area would not only provide storage but also support green energy production to facilitate development in future.

52. To supplement, Ms. Elsa H.K. Cheuk, AD/T, PlanD said that the "industry-led" planning for the development of the four core industries in the form of a park was formulated, taking into account relevant government policies, industry requirements and future needs. The Government had been formulating initiatives to promote and develop these industries with growth potential, i.e. advanced construction, new energy, recycling and modern logistics. The proposed SGIP development at the LKT and TMW areas would also generate synergies with other existing operations in the area, helping Hong Kong move towards carbon neutrality.

Implementation and Mode of Operation

53. A Member enquired about the implementation timeline for the proposed developments. Ms Elsa H.K. Cheuk, AD/T, PlanD said that subject to funding availability, it was targeted to commence the reclamation works in the LKT area in early 2028 while those in the TMW area would be considered in due course at the next stage of the Study.

54. A Member asked about the mode of operation of the industrial park. The Member said that an integrated approach to managing the industrial park would foster a more flexible and cohesive environment, enhancing its potential to attract investment and enterprises. The Chairperson said that the Government had been considering the establishment of an industrial park by granting the land designated for the planned industry to one company. This company, in accordance with the Government's policy, would be responsible for overseeing the operation, management and development of the park, including formulation of strategies to attract and invite suitable enterprises to set up businesses in the park. This approach was being examined for some logistics sites in the Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area.

Transport and Other Infrastructures

55. Some Members expressed concerns about the current traffic congestion in the Tuen Mun area and the future traffic conditions with the proposed developments, as well as the proposed traffic improvement measures, and had the following questions and comments:

- (a) the considerations for constructing a new sea-crossing bridge in LKT, given that the travel distance was comparable to a land-based route, yet the potential impacts on the marine ecosystem and the construction cost would be significantly higher;
- (b) whether the capacity of the new sea-crossing bridge would be sufficient to accommodate the increased traffic generated by the core industries, particularly in light of the already congested conditions near TM-CLKL;

- (c) regarding the proposed traffic arrangement connecting the LKT and TMW areas via Lung Mun Road and Lung Fu Road to Tuen Mun Town Centre where traffic was already congested or saturated, whether an alternative arrangement of bypassing Tuen Mun Town Centre through transport links to the northwest of the LKT and TMW areas could be considered, and how the LKT and TMW areas were connected to TM-CLKL;
- (d) the roundabout near TM-CLKL was congested, a situation exacerbated by the imposition of a speed limit of 50km/hour, causing traffic to back up to Tuen Mun Town Centre and even Lam Tei. Traffic conditions in the Tuen Mun Town Centre were already highly congested. During peak hours, buses were permitted by the Transport Department (TD) to bypass certain stops and detour, while illegal vehicle parking remained a major issue. Special attention should be given to evaluating the traffic conditions with the proposed developments to ensure that the current situation would not be further exacerbated. Consideration should be given to the traffic arrangements of the LKT and TMW areas, noting the significant volume of traffic during peak hours that would be generated as the LKT and TMW areas would serve as a key transportation hub for movement of goods in addition to employment traffic. Besides, the Lau Fau Shan area also suffered from serious congestion, particularly with the large influx of people leaving Ha Pak Nai after sunset. A comprehensive review of traffic arrangements in the Tuen Mun area was required; and
- (e) whether the feasibility of extending the proposed bridge eastward, say connecting with the planned Route 11, had been considered.

56. In response, Mr Louie C.T. Lau, DH of CEO (PL), CEDD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) in order to support the proposed developments and having taken into account the new traffic demand, it was proposed to improve the local road transport system by constructing a new sea-crossing bridge to link the LKT reclamation area to Lung Mun Road. Lung Mun Road, which was approximately 6.5 km in length connecting the LKT and TMW areas to Tuen Mun Town Centre, would be widened for a section of about 1.5 km in length from a single-2 to a dual 2-carriageway. During consultations with the village representatives and some villagers of LKT Village on the first day of the public engagement on 1.8.2025, the proposal to construct a new sea-crossing bridge and to widen Lung Mun Road was supported by the villagers. The bridge would provide a more direct route for heavy vehicles, effectively diverting traffic away from the section of LKT Road near LKT Village, thereby significantly reducing noise and air pollution to LKT Village;
- (b) the new sea-crossing bridge would have four lanes, with two lanes northbound and two lanes southbound, and there should be sufficient capacity to meet the traffic demand;
- (c) in addition to the proposed new sea-crossing bridge and the widening of Lung Mun Road to accommodate increased traffic flow, junction improvement works were planned along Lung Mun Road. An elevated new road was proposed to bypass the Lung Fu Road roundabout. The Highways Department (HyD) was implementing the Tuen Mun Bypass project and its western end would be near TM-CLKL. CEDD would continue to work closely with HyD in designing the road network for better integration of the two projects to meet traffic demand. According to the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) of the Study, traffic from the LKT and TMW areas would be routed through Lung Mun Road and Lung Fu Road to Tuen Mun Town Centre, and through TM-CLKL to Tung Chung;
- (d) the TIA was underway to evaluate the potential effects of the proposed developments on the surrounding road network. CEDD would

continue to closely co-ordinate with TD and HyD to identify appropriate improvement measures to address the traffic issues arising from the proposed developments; and

- (e) the Study area was in close proximity to the heavily trafficked Urmston Road Fairway, which was located approximately 700m from the LKT reclamation area and 400m from the TMW reclamation area. The Fairway was busy with around 500 vessels travelling daily. Extending the sea-crossing bridge eastward bypassing TM-CLKL would be significantly constrained by the Fairway.

57. With regard to the road speed limit near the roundabout at TM-CLKL and the traffic conditions in Tuen Mun, Ms Vilian W.L. Sum, Chief Engineer (New Territories West), TD said that the Lung Fu Road roundabout was converted from a T-junction, necessitating a reduction in road speed when entering the roundabout for road safety purpose. TD had been conducting a review of the speed limit along Lung Mun Road, and any recommendations would need to take into the consideration road geometry and safety. The review could also study the signage for road speed limit to enhance drivers' awareness as suggested by a Member. Ms Sum further said that the TIA for the Study was still ongoing, which would cover the split of road-based traffic to support the core industries in the LKT and TMW areas. The traffic impact generated from the proposed developments would be carefully assessed with road improvement measures recommended which would be implemented in tandem with the development of the core industries. TD would maintain close communication with the study team on the traffic arrangements. Besides, it was well understood that traffic congestion remained a major concern for residents in Tuen Mun. TD had been working with HyD to explore measures to relieve traffic congestion in Tuen Mun, and these measures would be implemented in phases according to available resources.

58. A Member enquired about the connectivity between the LKT and TMW areas and the Lau Fau Shan/Nim Wan North/Ha Pak Nai areas, taking into account the potential for synergistic effects particularly in relation to the presence of T·Park and the proposed developments for Lau Fau Shan under the NM initiative. A Member further enquired about the timeline for opening up a section of Nim Wan Road to connect the Lau

Fau Shan and Tuen Mun areas, noting that the concerned section of Nim Wan Road was currently closed due to the operation of the West New Territories Landfill. In response, Mr Louie C.T. Lau, DH of CEO (PL), CEDD said that Lau Fau Shan was located to the northeast of the LKT and TMW areas. The Environmental Protection Department and HyD had been conducting a review on improving the connectivity between Lau Fau Shan and the LKT and TMW areas by upgrading Deep Bay Road, Nim Wan Road north and Nim Wan Road south as well as considering the possible opening-up of the closed section of Nim Wan Road within West New Territories Landfill. Upon completion of the said review, improved connectivity was expected. Another Member said that with the opening of Nim Wan Road, the direct and fast route from Shenzhen Bay Bridge to TM-CLKL might lead to a significant increase in traffic along the route. Special attention should be given to assessing this impact in the review.

59. The Chairperson acknowledged Members' concerns about traffic issues in the area. With the unique geographical and locational advantages of the LKT and TMW areas, including the extensive sea frontage for marine access, proximity to HKIA and connectivity to major road infrastructure such as TM-CLKL to Tung Chung and the metro areas and the future opening of Nim Wan Road and hence its connection with Deep Bay Road to Lau Fau Shan, the LKT and TMW areas were well-positioned to support the development of emerging industries with high growth potential as proposed, in particular e-commerce which required convenient transportation to HKIA. The traffic arrangements would be examined in detail in the next stage of the Study.

60. A Member asked how would the vast amount of sewage effluent generated by the proposed core industries would be managed, whether the sewage effluent would be treated at the Pillar Point Sewage Treatment Works (STW), and whether any improvement works would be required. In response, Mr Louie C.T. Lau, DH of CEO (PL), CEDD said that the sewage effluent generated by the proposed core industries in the TMW area would be treated at the Pillar Point STW, and improvement works might be required to increase its capacity. Sewage effluent generated by the proposed core industries in the LKT area would necessitate the construction of a new sewage treatment facility.

Climate Change and Green and Smart Infrastructure

61. Some Members had the following questions/comments:

- (a) the land formation level of the reclaimed land, and whether the design would allow flexibility to meet the standards set out in the 7th Assessment Report (AR7) of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, which might be released in around 2029 (the anticipated time for the first batch of land availability), that might recommend new standards;
- (b) the concept of integrating green and smart initiatives and promoting a water-friendly environment was appreciated, in particular the proposed green channels in the LKT area for preserving the natural coastlines and creating a green landscape and communal space for the community. On the other hand, there were concerns about the water quality of the two proposed green channels, which appeared to have a one-way water flow and relatively narrow width, and the potential impact on the aquatic environment therein;
- (c) whether any district cooling system (DCS) was planned as a green initiative in the two areas to take advantage of their close proximity to the sea; and
- (d) whether the proposed green infrastructure such as green channels and eco-shorelines would be constructed alongside other infrastructure before the implementation of the core industries.

62. In response, Mr Louie C.T. Lau, DH of CEO (PL), CEDD made the following main points:

- (a) the preliminary proposed reclamation land formation level would be about 7mPD, compared to the existing levels of 4 to 5mPD in the vicinity of Victoria Harbour. The proposed level was designed according to the Port Works Design Manual, which had been updated to take into account the recommendations on climate change effects as

outlined in the AR6 and extreme weather conditions such as storm surges during Super Typhoons Mangkhut and Hato. To address the challenges of climate change impacts including sea level rise, a progressive adaptive approach would be adopted such that flexibility would be allowed to increase the height of the wave wall along the shoreline with a sufficient foundation to cater for actual needs. Besides, the design of marine structures would be based on the intermediate greenhouse gas emission scenario as the base scenario, while the scenario of very high greenhouse gas emission would also be covered by adopting design allowance to address the anticipated sea level rise and storm surge increase due to climate change;

- (b) the two green channels, designed to preserve the natural shorelines, would have a width of 50m each and lengths of about 900m and 1,100m in the north and east of the LKT reclamation area, respectively. There was an existing stream connecting to each of the channels. Taking into account factors such as water currents and tidal waves, the water quality of the green channels had been preliminarily assessed to comply with the relevant standards;
- (c) the adoption of DCS could be considered at the next stage as the Study focused on the broad land use proposals. In addition to the green corridors and green channels mentioned earlier, green initiatives such as an integrated blue-green drainage system, porous pavements, green roofs and rainwater harvesting systems would be proposed. Smart construction techniques would also be explored, such as the use of high-strength S690 to S960 steel and ultra-high performance concrete for the new sea-crossing bridge construction; and
- (d) it was aimed to start reclamation works in the LKT area first. During the reclamation process, seawalls and eco-shorelines would be constructed simultaneously along the northern and eastern coastal areas where the two proposed green channels were located. The environmental protection/mitigation measures recommended in the

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), as well as in the conditions and requirements specified in the Environmental Permit obtained for the proposed reclamation at LKT would be strictly followed.

Ecological Impacts

63. Some Members had the following questions/comments:

- (a) noting the presence of various butterfly species in the area, whether any measures would be adopted to conserve them; and
- (b) whether any compensation and/or protective measures would be implemented to safeguard and minimise the impacts of reclamation on the habitat of the Chinese White Dolphin (中華白海豚) in the area.

64. In response, Mr Louie C.T. Lau, DH of CEO (PL), CEDD made the following main points:

- (a) the strategy of environmental/ecological protection adhered to the principles of avoiding, minimising and compensating for identified ecological impacts. The proposed developments had been carefully planned to avoid the two identified butterfly habitat areas, maintaining a sufficient buffer distance to protect these habitats. In addition, tree species conducive to butterfly roosting and foraging would be planted, further supporting the preservation of their natural habitat in the area; and
- (b) the impact on the Chinese White Dolphin was thoroughly assessed in the ongoing EIA. According to the ecological survey, no Chinese White Dolphins were observed within the LKT and TMW reclamation areas. A total of approximately 10 Chinese White Dolphins was observed in area near Lung Kwu Chau which was more than 2 km away from the LKT and TMW reclamation areas. The assessment

also employed passive acoustic monitoring to detect underwater sound and identify dolphin activity in the LKT and TMW reclamation areas. The findings revealed very low activity frequency sound in the vicinity, in contrast to the high activity frequency sound recorded in areas north and southwest of Lantau Island, where the dolphins were more frequently observed. Following the completion of the EIA, its findings and recommendations regarding the Chinese White Dolphins would be carefully implemented to minimise any ecological impact.

65. A Member asked whether the views of Chinese White Dolphin Lookout would be obstructed by the planned advanced construction industry, and whether any building height restriction (BHR) would be imposed to preserve the existing view corridor. In response, Ms Elsa H.K. Cheuk, AD/T, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that low-rise buildings were planned for the core industries in the LKT reclamation area to ensure that the visual openness from the Chinese White Dolphin Lookout, which was situated at a higher level, towards the scenic views in the southwestern direction would be preserved.

Supporting Facilities

66. A Member appreciated that the home-job balance had been taken into consideration. Noting that about 35,000 job opportunities would be created, two Members expressed concern about the provision of supporting facilities for talents/experts and workers in the area. A Member noted that the supporting facilities were currently concentrated at the peripheral of the two areas and considered that more thoughtful arrangements should be explored at the detailed planning stage to provide greater convenience for workers. In response, Ms Elsa H.K. Cheuk, AD/T, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that supporting facilities such as food and beverage facilities, community facilities, open space, cycle tracks and footpaths and transport facilities would be planned and provided to support workers in the two areas.

LKT Villagers and Local Cultural Preservation

67. Some Members stressed the importance of addressing and respecting the concerns of LKT villagers, who had long expressed concerns about the placement of territory-wide obnoxious facilities in Tuen Mun West. A Member emphasised that planning should go beyond merely minimising the impact on villagers but should aim to enhance their living and quality of life, e.g. by improving the condition of the LKT Beach and exploring tourism opportunities. The villagers should be engaged in the planning process and opportunities should be created for their participation in the industries so that a good narrative with the adoption of a people-oriented approach could be presented. A Member highlighted the importance of promoting urban-rural integration with the LKT Village in the development process, with the village culture being preserved.

68. In response, Ms Elsa H.K. Cheuk, AD/T, PlanD and Mr Louie C.T. Lau, DH of CEO (PL), CEDD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that the planning concept of the SGIP differed from traditional industrial developments, focusing on a modern park-style design that emphasised a high-quality environment and the integration of the industrial park with the surrounding rural setting. Blue and green features as well as the existing historic and cultural resources in the LKT area, such as the renowned LKT Beach for sunset viewing, the Tin Hau Temple, the Chinese White Dolphin Lookout and the Cenotaph, would be preserved. Open space of approximately 12 ha had been planned, in addition to the green corridors, to create a high-quality environment for the industrial park and for the enjoyment of workers and villagers. Besides, the proposed developments would provide a wide range of public facilities, including pedestrian paths and cycling tracks. Since the 2-month public engagement commenced on 1.8.2025, the study team met with the village representatives and some villagers of LKT Village (with a population of more than 2,000 residents) to present and explain the latest development proposals. Notably, the village representatives expressed their support for the significant reduction of reclaimed land and the construction of the sea-crossing bridge, which would divert heavy vehicles away from LKT Village, providing direct access to the LKT reclamation area. The study team would continue to engage the villagers in the planning process and carefully reviewed their comments for refinement of the development proposals.

Potential for Tourism

69. Two Members asked whether the potential for tourism had been considered in the planning of the two areas, and considered that tourism showcasing advanced industries with the planned amenity facilities and local cultural elements could attract visitors and enhance the utilisation of supporting facilities not only for local workers but also for tourists during leisure times, making the area enjoyable by the public round-the-clock. In response, Ms Elsa H.K. Cheuk, AD/T, PlanD said that as mentioned earlier, a broad range of uses was planned to support the core industries and serve the needs of workers in both the LKT and TMW areas as well as visitors. These included food and beverage outlets, open spaces and community facilities, integrated with well-planned pedestrian and cycling networks to enhance accessibility. With the application of smart initiatives in emerging industries, workers might adopt flexible working hours, requiring the design of community facilities to meet their needs. Drawing on experiences from overseas and the Mainland, such as Singapore and Shanghai, the provision of supporting facilities (including retail, catering and residential accommodation for workers) could significantly enhance the industrial park's appeal. After the public engagement, the potential for tourism would be examined in refining the development proposals in the next stage of detailed planning.

Other Issues

70. Some Members generally considered that residential development was not suitable in the TMW area, given its long-standing industrial uses. TMW would also provide an opportunity to relocate the public cargo working area currently operating in Tuen Mun Area 16 into modern logistics/RTT in TMW. A Member asked about any assessment regarding housing supply in Tuen Mun in view of the changes in planning of the TMW area which had previously been proposed for residential development. In response, Ms Elsa H.K. Cheuk, AD/T, PlanD said that the Government had previously put forward the proposal of a residential development-oriented planning for the TMW area. Upon review, it was considered that residential development might not be compatible with the existing industrial operations, the flat production would also be limited by the Airport Height Restrictions (AHR) and land had already been identified to meet medium to long-term housing demand. Taking into account its geographical advantage and having considered the views of the stakeholders and the trades, it was

considered more appropriate to pursue industry-oriented development and provide more land for the development of different industries in the TMW area. The after-use of the land currently occupied by TMPCWA would be studied, taking account of relevant planning and technical considerations including land use compatibility.

71. A Member said that the Terminal Doppler Weather Radar (TDWR) of the Hong Kong Observatory purposely built in Tuen Mun played a critical role in detecting weather conditions for HKIA. The Member enquired about the BHR for the TMW area, as the BHR might potentially impact the performance and effectiveness of the TDWR. In response, Ms Elsa H.K. Cheuk, AD/T, PlanD said that the area would also be subject to AHR ranging from 53mPD (seaside) to 120mPD (inland), and the proposed developments in the TMW area would generally adopt a low-rise building cluster design.

72. The Board noted the development proposal for the LKT reclamation and the re-planning of TMW. The Chairperson also invited the study team to take into account Members' comments and suggestions in taking forward the Study as appropriate.

[Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui, Dr Venus Y.H. Lun, Messrs Simon K.L. Wong, Bond C.P. Chow and Ricky W.Y. Yu left the meeting during the discussion.]

73. The Chairperson thanked the government representatives and the consultants for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Agenda Item 5

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

Any Other Business

74. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 1:15 p.m.