

**Minutes of 1354<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 30.1.2026**

**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 Stanley T.S. Choi

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 Timothy K.W. Ma

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Dr C.M. Cheng

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

Professor B.S. Tang

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Simon Y.S. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories East)  
Transport Department  
Mr K.L. Wong

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  
Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

**In Attendance**

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Anny P.K. Tang

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr Edward H.C. Leung

### **Agenda Item 1**

[Open Meeting]

#### Confirmation of Minutes of the 1353<sup>rd</sup> Meeting

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The draft minutes of the 1353<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on 16.1.2026 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 on the draft Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong, Lei Yue Mun Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K15/28 and the draft Ho Man Tin OZP No. S/K7/25.
3. The Secretary briefly introduced that the two draft OZPs were exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance on 31.10.2025 and 14.11.2025 respectively. During the 2-month exhibition period, three and 629 valid representations were received respectively. In view of the similar nature of the representations, the hearing of the representations for each OZP 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 respective hearing session. Consideration of the representations for the two OZPs by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for March 2026.

[Professor Simon K.L. Wong and Messrs Simon Y.S. Wong and Gary C.W. Tam joined the

meeting at this point.]

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

(ii) Dismissal of Appeal (CACV 44/25) against the Court of First Instance's Refusal to Grant Leave to the Judicial Review Application (HCAL 647/2024) against the Decision of the Town Planning Board on Section 16 Application No. A/HSK/474 by the Court of Appeal

5. The Secretary reported that a judgment was handed down by the Court of Appeal (CA) dismissing the appeal on the Court of First Instance (CFI)'s decision refusing to grant leave to the judicial review (JR) application lodged by Tang So Shan (the JR Applicant) against the decision of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board/TPB) on s.16 application No. A/HSK/474 (the s.16 application) for minor relaxation of the domestic plot ratio restriction on a site zoned "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Mixed Use" at Kiu Tau Wai, Yuen Long. The JR Applicant was a commenter of the s.16 application. Members were informed under Matters Arising at the Board's meeting on 7.3.2025 regarding the CFI's decision refusing to grant leave and the JR Applicant's appeal.

6. The Secretary reported that on 21.1.2026, the CA dismissed the appeal against CFI's decision and held that:

- (a) CA should not interfere the finding of facts made by the trial judge and the Court should not interfere the decisions of TPB unless the decision-making of TPB amounted to Wednesbury unreasonableness;
- (b) CFI was correct in applying the legal principle that the Court should accord TPB a wide margin of deference in its decisions given the expertise of TPB Members;
- (c) the JR Applicant had been afforded adequate opportunities to make representations before CFI;
- (d) other grounds were either insufficient to justify the intervention of TPB's

decision, unreasonable or unsubstantiated;

- (e) the JR Applicant should not have attempted to adduce new evidence by way of submissions; and
- (f) the JR Applicant had failed to identify any error of law and fact in CFI's judgment. As such, all 13 grounds of appeal (such as the Judge erred in ruling that TPB had processed the application and held the meeting in accordance with Town Planning Ordinance and planning guidelines) were rejected.

7. Members noted CA's judgment dismissing the appeal against CFI's refusal to grant leave to the JR application.

### **Deferral Cases**

#### Section 17 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

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

#### Deliberation Session

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

[Mr Stanley T.S. Choi joined the meeting at this point.]

**Sai Kung and Islands District**

**Agenda Item 3**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations in respect of the Draft Clear Water Bay Peninsula North Outline Zoning Plan No. S/SK-CWBN/7

(TPB Paper No. 11042)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

10. The Secretary reported that Amendment Item A (Item A) involved rezoning of a site at the junction of Clear Water Bay Road and Ngan Ying Road for campus extension of the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (HKUST). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |                      |   |   |
|----------------------|---|---|
| Dr Venus Y.H. Lun    | - | being a special project director of a research and development centre which was hosted by HKUST and two other universities; |
| Mr Stanley T.S. Choi | - | being a co-opted member of the Institutional Advancement and Outreach Committee and a past council member of HKUST; and     |
| Dr Tony C.M. Ip      | - | having past business dealings with HKUST.   |

11. Members noted that Dr Venus Y.H. Lun had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interests of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi and Dr Tony C.M. Ip were considered indirect, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

12. The Chairperson said that reasonable notice had been given to the representers inviting them to attend the hearing, but other than those who were present or had indicated that they would attend the hearing, the rest had either indicated not to attend or made no reply. As

reasonable notice had been given to the representers, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations in their absence.

13. The following representatives of the Planning Department (PlanD), representers and representer's representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

***PlanD***

|                      |   |   |
|----------------------|---|---|
| Mr Walter W.N. Kwong | - | District Planning Officer/Sai Kung and Islands (DPO/SKIs) |
| Ms Tammy S.N. Kong   | - | Senior Town Planner/Sai Kung and Islands (STP/SKIs)       |
| Ms Sylvia L.Y. Lam   |   | Town Planner/Sai Kung and Islands                         |

***Representers and Representer's Representatives***

R1 – Campus Development Office of the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology

|                       |   |                               |
|-----------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| Mr Leung Ying Kit     | ] |                               |
| Mr Lui Kwun Yuen, Joe | ] | Representer's Representatives |
| Mr Tsen Yiu Wan, Sam  | ] |                               |

R7 – Kwong Ka Sing, John (Vice-President for Development of the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology)

|                        |   |             |
|------------------------|---|-------------|
| Mr Kwong Ka Sing, John | - | Representer |
|------------------------|---|-------------|

R10 – Mary Mulvihill

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

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

[Mr Ryan M.K. Ip and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong joined the meeting at this point.]

15. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representations. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Tammy S.N. Kong, STP/SKIs, PlanD briefed Members on the representations, including the background of the amendment items on the draft Clear Water Bay Peninsula North Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/SK-CWBN/7 (the draft OZP), the grounds/views of the representers, government responses and PlanD's views on the representations as detailed in TPB Paper No. 11042 (the Paper). The amendment items on the OZP included:

- (a) Item A – rezoning of a site at the junction of Clear Water Bay Road and Ngan Ying Road (Item A Site) from “Green Belt” (“GB”) to “Government, Institution or Community (1)” (“G/IC(1)”) annotated Area (d) subject to a maximum building height (BH) of 8 storeys;
- (b) Item B1 – rezoning of a site to the east of Tai Po Tsai (Item B Site) from “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” (“CDA(1)”), “GB”, “Village Type Development” (“V”) and areas shown as ‘Road’ to “Residential (Group B)” (“R(B)”) subject to a maximum domestic and non-domestic gross floor area (GFA) of 98,200 square metres (m<sup>2</sup>) and 2,000m<sup>2</sup> respectively and a maximum BH of 24 metres (m) in Area (a) in the middle and 18m in Area (b) in the northern and western parts; and
- (c) Item B2 – rezoning of four strips of land to the east of Tai Po Tsai from



“CDA(1)” to “GB”, “V” and “Residential (Group C) 7” for rationalising the zoning boundaries.

16. There were also amendments to the Notes of the OZP in relation to the above rezoning as well as other amendments including those to align with the latest Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans (MSN).

17. The Chairperson then invited the representers and representer’s representatives to elaborate on their representations.

R1 – Campus Development Office of the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology

18. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Lui Kwun Yuen, Joe made the following main points:

- (a) the HKUST campus was in urgent need of expansion owing to the growing number of non-local students in recent years in response to the Policy Addresses, as well as the corresponding increase in professors and teaching staff. The campus extension would provide additional educational space and accommodate state-of-the-art technology infrastructure, with a view to promoting academic research and innovation;
- (b) HKUST all along adopted an open campus concept. The proposed extension would improve the campus environment, promote community integration of Tseung Kwan O and Sai Kung districts, and enhance regional competitiveness of HKUST, which in turn would attract more young people and high-quality professionals to reside in the area, thereby facilitating economic and cultural development;
- (c) Item A Site was located to the southwest of HKUST main campus adjacent to its south entrance, and was distant from existing residential areas (more than 100m away from Mount Pavilia and Tai Po Tsai Village). The site area was about 2.1 hectares (ha), comprising 1.2 ha of private land (accounting for more than 50% of the site) donated by The Shaw Foundation Hong Kong Limited to

HKUST, and 0.9 ha of government land (GL). The campus extension project served as a good example of fostering cooperation between the private sector and universities in taking forward the Government's education policies;

- (d) the proposed campus extension, with a GFA of about 45,300m<sup>2</sup>, would comprise four interconnected 6-storey towers atop a 2-storey podium for the provision of laboratories, teaching facilities, administrative offices, collaborative spaces, catering and other supporting facilities;
- (e) footbridge and access road connecting to the existing HKUST main campus were proposed. Building separations between towers with setback from Clear Water Bay Road were provided to enhance air ventilation. With a site formation level lower than Clear Water Bay Road, the 2-storey podium would be visually screened from the surroundings by the existing topography. The 6-storey towers atop the podium were considered compatible with the main campus from visual perspective. Most of the existing greening elements in the area would remain intact;
- (f) the proposed campus extension would make use of the existing road network of HKUST with vehicular access via the south gate. HKUST had also undertaken to design and construct an additional traffic lane along Clear Water Bay Road immediately adjacent to the site for southbound traffic. In view of the above, the proposed campus extension would not generate adverse traffic impact on Clear Water Bay Road;
- (g) The Shaw Foundation Hong Kong Limited and HKUST had signed a cooperation document for the donation of private land within Item A Site for the HKUST campus extension. HKUST was in the process of engaging consultants for the design of the project; and
- (h) HKUST would maintain close liaison and communication with relevant stakeholders and local residents throughout the development process. Upon completion of the rezoning process, it was anticipated that construction would commence in 2027 for completion in 2029 at the earliest in order to provide

more facilities for the students.

R7 – Kwong Ka Sing, John (Vice-President for Development of the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology)

19. Mr Kwong Ka Sing, John made the following main points:

- (a) he, being the Vice-President of HKUST, represented HKUST in expressing support for the OZP amendments to facilitate implementation of the HKUST campus extension project;
- (b) HKUST, as a leading international university, had always leveraged its strengths and actively aligned with the national policy of revitalising the country through science and education. HKUST had also actively responded to the Chief Executive's Policy Addresses in developing Hong Kong into an international education hub for post-secondary education;
- (c) the number of non-local students at HKUST had been gradually increasing. Together with the need to provide more scientific research facilities to meet the University's development requirements, there was an urgent need to implement the campus expansion plan to address the shortage of teaching and research space;
- (d) HKUST was established in Clear Water Bay in 1991, and this year marked its 35<sup>th</sup> anniversary. Over the past 35 years, HKUST had witnessed the development of Tseung Kwan O, Sai Kung and Clear Water Bay. The local communities had taken pride in the achievements of HKUST. The proposed campus extension plan had also received strong support from the communities;
- (e) he expressed gratitude to The Shaw Foundation Hong Kong Limited for the land donation, and to the Government for allocating the adjacent GL for comprehensive campus extension development. During the process, valuable opinions and support from government departments, the District Council and various stakeholders were received; and

- (f) it was hoped that the Board would agree to the OZP amendments so that HKUST could proceed with the campus extension plan as soon as possible.

R10 – Ms Mary Mulvihill

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

*Positioning and Site Selection of the Campus Extension*

- (a) the proposed campus extension proposal in metro area should be rejected as it was contrary to the Northern Metropolis (NM) Development Strategy and the urgent need to provide a more balanced distribution of services and job opportunities across the territory. The selection of Item A Site was not in line with the policy objective of integration into the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area. Resources and capital that should be invested in NM were being diverted to other locations that were not in need of stimulus;

*Proposed Medical School of HKUST*

- (b) the new medical school of HKUST was promoted as a key component of the NM development and should be located at Ngau Tam Mei. However, there were already indications that the new medical school would be established in the Clear Water Bay area. The proposed increase of 2,000 Mainland students would inevitably include several hundred medical students who should be based at the NM University Town. By relocating the medical school to Ngau Tam Mei, space would be freed up within HKUST main campus for the campus extension. This would also deprive the New Territories of much-needed services and job opportunities for the population to be relocated there. As job and recreational opportunities were concentrated in the metro areas, the lack of such provision in the New Territories would continue to pose a problem for society;

*Planning Intention*

- (c) the rezoning of Item A Site would eliminate the “GB” zone along the adjoining Clear Water Bay Road. There was no policy support for the rezoning of vegetated, non-deserted or non-formed “GB” sites for uses other than residential use. Plant nurseries on part of the Item A Site, while not ideal, had been tolerated under this zoning as they were generally compatible with the planning intention. There was an active ecosystem at the site as revealed from the presence of a number of trees there;
- (d) the rezoning proposal was contrary to the 2023 Policy Address which stated that the Government would not use “GB” areas for large-scale development as sufficient land for housing and other needs had been identified. The “GB” zone should be retained for recreational and tourism purposes. The response in the Paper that there were other “GB” areas in the district was not a valid justification;

#### *Tree Compensation*

- (e) part of Item A Site was the subject of a section 12A (s.12A) planning application (No. Y/SK-CWBN/10) for rezoning from “GB” to “G/IC(7)” to facilitate a proposed secondary school development. Under the said s.12A planning application, out of 618 trees on site, 389 trees were proposed to be felled, with 105 new trees and 284 tree whips proposed for compensatory planting. The additional area currently incorporated into Item A Site comprised GL which was heavily wooded. According to the HKUST campus extension proposal, 45% of the site was GL, compared with one-third under the approved scheme of the aforesaid s.12A application;
- (f) Item A Site was heavily vegetated. Among 755 trees on the site, only 80 trees along the northern site boundary would be preserved while the remaining 675 trees would be felled. According to the indicative Landscape Master Plan (LMP) of the proposed campus extension, HKUST proposed to plant a total of 446 new trees, comprising a mix of high-quality broadleaf, native and ornamental trees, whips and plant species, resulting in a tree compensation ratio of 1:0.66 and a net loss of about 230 trees. The plantation of 90 palms could

not be regarded as trees and would bring no ecological benefits;

- (g) the number of additional trees to be felled to accommodate the proposed footbridge and access road connecting to the main campus had not been mentioned, and the associated impacts should be addressed;
- (h) the proposed additional facilities at Item A Site could be accommodated within the main campus. HKUST would effectively be expanded through the use of this “GB” site, which involved a significant amount of GL provided at no cost;

*Traffic, Drainage and Visual Aspects*

- (i) there was no railway connection to HKUST and the bus service was not reliable. According to the original school development proposal under the aforesaid s.12A planning application, various traffic improvement measures were proposed, indicating inherent limitations in road capacity. The proposed campus extension would significantly increase the number of commuters. Besides, the new development at the Ex-Shaw Brothers’ Studio would also generate additional traffic;
- (j) Item A Site was located at a relatively low level and would be vulnerable to flooding, potentially causing drainage impact on the surrounding area. The proposed development should be provided with its own drainage system. There was also no mention of the installation of a water harvesting system to provide water for irrigation and other campus uses;
- (k) the proposed development would generate adverse visual impact, which had not been addressed;

*Provision of Open Space*

- (l) no open space was provided for the 380 non-faculty staff within the proposed campus extension, which would set an undesirable precedent whereby non-faculty staff could be excluded from the calculation of open space provision;

*Public Support for the Campus Extension Proposal*

- (m) public support for the campus extension proposal was questionable as all the supporting individuals/parties in respect of Item A were all related to HKUST;

*Item B1*

- (n) mitigation measures to address the adverse visual impact of the existing retail block in Mount Pavilia had not been implemented. Members were urged to raise questions in that regard;

*Amendments to the Notes of the OZP*

- (o) the incorporation of ‘Government Refuse Collection Point’ and ‘Public Convenience’ uses under Column 1 for the “V” zone and the corresponding deletion of these uses from Column 2 would affect public scrutiny of the location and design of such facilities;
- (p) the planning intention of the “V” zone was to provide housing for indigenous villagers. The incorporation of ‘Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre’ and ‘Flat’ uses under Column 2 for the “V” zone would encourage abuse of the Small House policy and could result in developments being sold to non-indigenous villagers; and
- (q) the revision to the Remarks of the Notes for “Conservation Area” (“CA”) and “Coastal Protection Area” (“CPA”) zones to exempt filling of land/pond or excavation of land pertaining to public works coordinated or implemented by the Government would give the Government unfettered and unaccountable power to act without adequate supervision, which would undermine the planning process, disregard community interests and allow the relevant works to be subject to minimal supervision, thereby adversely affecting community interests. The intention of such amendments had also not been clearly explained. The only exemptions allowed should be those relating to maintenance and repair of existing structures. Recent incidents involving

damage to sensitive conservation areas caused by the influx of tourists were cited as examples arising from the Government's "tourism everywhere" strategy. The Government should impose limits on the number of tourists to such conservation areas. Members were urged to acknowledge their responsibility on the impropriety in the decision-making process since they had supported similar amendments in other OZPs.

21. Ms Mary Mulvihill, R10, also expressed other views not related to the amendments to the OZP. She said that the Paper and relevant documents consisted of over a thousand pages that could not be downloaded using a basic domestic laptop computer. Printing and searching by page number were also not feasible. While it was advised that the issue was related to the relocation of the online government files, this did not justify the failure to provide reasonable access to the Paper and relevant information by the public. The Town Planning Ordinance (Cap. 131) stipulated that "the Board must also publish, during such period, the inspection information on the Board's website". Public information should be reasonably accessible to facilitate the submission of representations. Poor access to public information would undermine the public consultation process and render the consultation meaningless.

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

### Item A Site

#### *Tree Compensation*

23. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) the types of trees/vegetation at the site; and
- (b) the reasons for not achieving the tree compensation ratio of 1:1 or above for the



campus extension project.

24. In response, Mr Lui Kwun Yuen, Joe, R1's representative, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the tree survey conducted by HKUST, there were 755 existing trees on site, most of which were common species and no Registered Old and Valuable Trees had been identified; and
- (b) HKUST proposed to plant a total of 446 new trees, taking into account the need to provide sufficient space for teaching and learning as well as the provision of access road. More greening would be provided on the podium and rooftops of the buildings, with an overall greenery coverage of not less than 20%. Apart from quantity, the quality of greening was considered equally important in creating a high-standard greening environment for users' enjoyment. HKUST would further explore various means to maximise greening opportunities and minimise landscape impacts at the detailed design stage.

25. With the aid of a visualiser, Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, DPO/SKIs, PlanD supplemented that according to the internal guidelines, government projects should achieve a tree compensation ratio of 1:1 as far as practicable. Whether such a ratio was achievable would depend on the site conditions and design of the proposed development. For example, on a relatively small site, planting trees at a density sufficient to achieve a tree compensation ratio of 1:1 might adversely affect their healthy growth. A greening ratio of not less than 20% should be provided to comply with the relevant standards and guidelines for the proposed campus extension. For the HKUST campus as a whole, there was an extensive number of trees in the sloping areas. The trees on the peripheral slopes of Item A site would be preserved. There was also a substantial area of woodland zoned "GB" in the vicinity of HKUST. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD considered that the proposed development was not incompatible with the surrounding environment.

26. In response to the enquiry raised by Mr C.K. Yip, Director of Planning (D of Plan), on the feasibility of off-site compensatory planting within HKUST main campus to achieve a tree compensation ratio of 1:1, Mr Lui Kwun Yuen, Joe, R1's representative, said that HKUST's

consultant had considered the suggestion and advised that the tree planting opportunities within the main campus had generally been maximised, further increasing the tree density would lead to overcrowding. HKUST had to strike a balance between tree planting and provision of adequate space for teaching, learning and student facilities. Relevant government departments had no objection to the greening proposal. In that connection, a Member expressed that HKUST should compensate for the felled trees to achieve a ratio of 1:1; otherwise, HKUST should demonstrate that the compensation and landscaping were of good quality.

27. A Member concurred that if on-site compensation was not feasible, trees could be replanted elsewhere within the university campus or even on nearby government slopes designated for reforestation. As a university funded by the Government and responsible for educating the next generation, HKUST should set a higher standard and demonstrate better performance in tree compensation than that required of government projects. In response to the Member's question on whether there were private development projects previously submitted to the Board that had achieved a tree compensation ratio of 1:1 or above, Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, DPO/SKIs, PlanD, with the aid of a visualiser, said that there were projects in the Sai Kung and Islands districts that had achieved a tree compensation ratio of 1:1 or above. He emphasised that the site conditions and development layout would be among the considerations in determining the optimal tree compensation ratio. Each project should be assessed on individual basis.

28. Another Member was concerned that based on the current proposal, there would be a net loss of trees, notwithstanding that the surrounding areas of HKUST were woodland and greenery in nature. HKUST should compensate for the loss of trees and proactively maximise tree planting opportunities across the campus. For instance, trees could be planted in the area surrounding the Shaw Auditorium. The design of the four building towers did not reflect HKUST's leading academic status. As an internationally renowned research institution, the buildings appeared relatively conventional in design. While some roof greening was proposed, the rooftops would seldom be used during summer due to hot weather. HKUST should make reference to more innovative design adopted overseas, such as planting trees within buildings or on rooftops, as part of the tree compensation strategy. In response, Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, DPO/SKIs, PlanD said that compensatory trees were usually planted at ground level, while roof and vertical greening could also be counted towards the total greenery provision. Mr Kwong Ka Sing, John, R7, supplemented that the Master Layout Plan (MLP) was indicative in nature,

and the final building design would be more innovative, reflecting HKUST's standing while remaining cost-effective. HKUST would continue to explore various means to enhance tree compensation opportunities.

29. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) noting the allegation made by Ms Mary Mulvihill, R10, that the planting of palms could not be regarded as trees, whether there were any specifications in the relevant guidelines regarding the types of trees acceptable for compensating felled trees; and
- (b) whether it was common practice to stipulate a tree preservation clause together with a landscaping clause in the lease conditions, as suggested by the District Lands Office/Sai Kung, Lands Department (LandsD).

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

- (a) tree compensation and greening was considered in the context of the overall landscape design, rather than being limited to the planting of specific tree species; and
- (b) as Item A Site comprised GL, a land exchange application to LandsD was required. Relevant lease conditions on the submission and implementation of a landscape proposal could be imposed as appropriate. LandsD and/or other relevant government departments would act as gatekeepers in assessing the proposal.

31. Mr Maurice K.W. Woo, Director of Lands, supplemented that if an applicant or land owner was required to submit and implement a landscape proposal with regard to the subject lot, such requirement could be incorporated into the land lease in the form of a landscape clause. However, if the applicant or land owner was required to implement a tree compensation plan on other sites, such requirement could not be imposed under the lease and would need to be handled separately outside the land administration regime, since lease conditions applied to the

designated land/lot only.

*Green Buffer Area, Vertical Greening and Building Setback*

32. Two Members considered that further building setback should be provided to create additional planting space and form a green buffer area/landscape planting strip along Clear Water Bay Road, and the implementation of vertical greening on building façades to mitigate visual intrusion should be explored. In response, Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, DPO/SKIs, PlanD, with the aid of a visualiser, said that while there were currently a number of trees along the section of Clear Water Bay Road abutting Mount Pavilia and Tai Po Tsai Village, part of the roadside area had been reserved for future road widening works. In view of the proposed campus extension project, HKUST had undertaken to construct an additional traffic lane along Clear Water Bay Road immediately adjacent to the site for southbound traffic. According to the Visual Impact Assessment conducted by HKUST, the provision of building setback could screen the visual bulk of the proposed towers, thereby preventing pedestrians on Clear Water Bay Road from having direct views of the two proposed towers at the southern part of the site. Mr Lui Kwun Yuen, Joe, R1's representative, supplemented that HKUST would further examine the greening measures with its consultants. As Item A Site was situated at a level lower than Clear Water Bay Road, there would be opportunities to plant taller trees even with limited building setback. Vertical greening and provision of planters would also be incorporated. Other mitigation measures, including further setback, provision of terraces and other greening and tree planting measures, would be further explored at the detailed design stage to minimise visual impact and wall effect of the proposed towers.

*Traffic Aspect*

33. In response to a Member's enquiry on the arrangements to relieve potential traffic pressure arising from the increase in student and staff population upon completion of the campus extension, Mr Kwong Ka Sing John, R7, said that the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) conducted by HKUST's consultant had taken such increase into account and concluded that there would have no adverse traffic impact on the surrounding road network.

34. A Member raised concerns about the capacity of the existing road network to cope with the cumulative traffic impact arising from the HKUST campus extension and the

redevelopment of the Ex-Shaw Brothers' Studio. The Member enquired whether any road improvement works were proposed to alleviate potential traffic impacts, noting that Clear Water Bay Road was the only major access route serving the area. In response, Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, DPO/SKIs, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, made the following main points:

- (a) the TIA conducted by HKUST had taken into account the additional traffic generated from the redevelopment of the Ex-Shaw Brothers' Studio for proposed residential and commercial development. An approval condition requiring the implementation of improvement works at the junction of Clear Water Bay Road and Ngan Ying Road was imposed when the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Board approved the section 16 application for the above redevelopment project; and
- (b) HKUST had undertaken to construct an additional southbound traffic lane along Clear Water Bay Road immediately adjacent to the site. In addition, the Government was implementing improvement works at the Clear Water Bay Road/Hang Hau Road/Silverstrand Beach Road roundabout. According to the TIA conducted by HKUST, the proposed campus extension would not cause adverse traffic impact on the surrounding road network.

35. Noting that both the Sai Kung District Council (SKDC) and the Hang Hau Rural Committee (HHRC) supported the proposed HKUST campus extension but had expressed concerns on potential traffic impacts on Clear Water Bay Road, a Member enquired about the details of redevelopment project of the Ex-Shaw Brothers' Studio. In response, Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, DPO/SKIs, PlanD said that the site concerned was currently zoned "CDA" on the OZP. According to the approved scheme, the site would be developed mainly for residential use with retail/commercial facilities and a kindergarten. Portions of the existing buildings with heritage value would be preserved. The proposed redevelopment would be governed by land lease and submission of building plans.

36. Noting that some members of SKDC and HHRC had suggested enhancing HKUST's student/staff shuttle bus services to alleviate the demand on public transport services in the area, a Member raised the following questions:

- (a) the proportions of students and staff using public transport services and shuttle buses; and
- (b) the number of complaints received regarding insufficient provision of public transport services.

37. In response, Mr Kwong Ka Sing, John, R7, made the following major points:

- (a) shuttle bus services could be enhanced for students and staff as necessary. HKUST was the only university in Hong Kong not directly served by rail transport and the University was pursuing enhanced transport connections and actively exploring other means, which would benefit students, staff and local residents; and
- (b) no complaints regarding insufficient public transport provision were received.

38. Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, DPO/SKIs, PlanD supplemented that when new developments were near completion, the Transport Department (TD) would review the public transport situation and consider adding new bus and minibus routes if necessary. HKUST was not far from MTR Hang Hau, Tseung Kwan O and Choi Hung Stations by road-based public transport. The local road network still had spare capacity to accommodate enhanced public transport services.

39. In response to the same Member's enquiry on the remaining capacity and improvement plan for the local road network, Mr K.L. Wong, Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories East), TD said that traffic congestion arose primarily at road junctions rather than along the road itself. About two years ago, TD initiated a junction improvement scheme at the Clear Water Bay Road/Ying Yip Road roundabout, taking into account the planned developments in the area concerned. The prevailing design flow to capacity ratio during the morning peak was around 0.8. It was projected to lower to about 0.6 upon completion of the junction improvement scheme which was under implementation.

*Drainage*

40. Noting that Item A Site was situated in a low-lying area and a new drainage system would be installed for the project, a Member enquired whether rainwater would be collected and reused as recommended by Ms Mary Mulvihill, R10, and whether the “sponge city” concept would be adopted in view of the climate change and the increasing frequency of torrential rainfall. In response, Mr Lui Kwun Yuen, Joe, R1’s representative, said that various drainage and sustainable design options had been explored by HKUST, and the consultants would take the suggestions into account at the detailed design stage with a view to formulating a final proposal incorporating an effective implementation strategy.

### *Construction Impacts*

41. In response to a Member’s enquiry on liaison with Clearwater Bay School (CBS) in the vicinity of Item A Site in relation to HKUST’s proposed campus extension and the measures to mitigate potential construction impacts (such as noise arising from dredging and other site works) on CBS, Mr Kwong Ka Sing, John, R7, and Mr Lui Kwun Yuen, Joe, R1’s representative, made the following main points:

- (a) HKUST maintained a good relationship with CBS. For example, parents were allowed to park their vehicles at the public transport interchange area at the University south entrance under the management of HKUST for picking up their children after school, thereby helping to alleviate traffic congestion in the area. The construction of an additional traffic lane along Clearwater Bay Road by HKUST would also facilitate commuting for local residents; and
- (b) HKUST would continue to maintain close liaison with CBS throughout the construction period. On-site construction works would be scheduled to avoid school operation hours, examination periods and major school events in order to minimise noise impact and air pollution. Mitigation measures such as off-site fabrication or preparatory works and the erection of noise barriers would also be implemented where practicable.

### *Student Accommodation*

42. In response to a Member’s enquiry on the arrangements for student hostels in view

of the anticipated increase in student population arising from the campus extension and the establishment of the new medical school, Mr Kwong Ka Sing, John, R7, made the following main points:

- (a) under the proposed campus extension, more scientific research facilities and teaching and learning space would be provided. As for the new medical school, it was anticipated that enrolment would commence in 2028 with an initial intake of about 50 local students, expanding to about 100 to 150 places in the subsequent 1 to 2 years; and
- (b) a new hostel named “1551” had recently been completed, providing 1,551 student accommodation places. Together with the existing hostel capacity, HKUST currently provided a total of about 6,000 on-campus accommodation places, which would enable the University to maintain its commitment to offering “one dormitory stay for four years” to eligible students.

### *Planning Gains*

43. In response to a Member’s enquiry on the greenery provision and other planning gains of the proposed campus extension to enhance the community’s sense of pride in HKUST, Mr Kwong Ka Sing, John, R7, and Mr Lui Kwun Yuen, Joe, R1’s representative, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the latest world university rankings, HKUST was ranked second in Hong Kong and sixth in Asia. HKUST was distinguished by its excellent research achievements, including the establishment of its own Artificial Intelligence centre, which contributed to its reputation and community recognition; and
- (b) Item A Site was currently situated below the level of Clear Water Bay Road and was not readily accessible to the public due to topographical constraints. With the implementation of the proposed campus extension, members of the public would be able to access the podium of the future campus directly to experience the University environment. The project would also provide an overall



greenery coverage of not less than 20%.

*Promotion of Life-Long Learning and Science and Technology*

44. In response to a Member's question on HKUST's efforts in promoting life-long learning as well as science and technology with the wider community, Mr Kwong Ka Sing, John, R7, made the following main points:

- (a) local residents generally supported the development of HKUST and expressed pride in the achievements of the University;
- (b) HKUST organised regular activities and leisure courses (such as Putonghua courses) for local residents. Being an open campus, HKUST welcomed interaction and exchange with the community;
- (c) a number of students and staff resided in Tseung Kwan O New Town. HKUST had witnessed the development of Tseung Kwan O New Town and had been part of the community over the past 35 years; and
- (d) SKDC and HHRC had been consulted and generally supported HKUST's campus extension proposal. It was hoped that HKUST could garner broader local support through continuous communication and engagement.

Item B

*Greening Measures*

45. A Member enquired whether there had been prior approval by TPB for the landscaping/greening measures for Mount Pavilia and whether the measures were implemented in accordance with the approved scheme, as it was criticised by Ms Mary Mulvihill, R10, for the visual impact of its retail block. In response, Mr Walter W.N. Kwong, DPO/SKIs, PlanD, with the aid of a visualiser, said that Item B Site had been rezoned from "CDA(1), "GB" and "V" and areas shown as 'Road' to "R(B)" to reflect the residential development, Mount Pavilia, which was completed in 2016. The retail block was 4 storeys high, with supermarket and

catering facilities mainly supporting the residential development. It was located at the vehicular entrance of Mount Pavilia abutting Clear Water Bay Road. Mount Pavilia was a medium-density residential development covering an area of about 6.68 ha. Overall, landscaping with greenery had been provided within the development. RNTPC approved the MLP for the site in 2004, subject to the approval condition, among others, on the submission and implementation of a LMP. The LMP had been scrutinised and approved by PlanD. The developer took forward the development in accordance with the approved MLP and LMP.

#### Access to Meeting Documents on the Board's Website

46. In response to the criticism made by Ms Mary Mulvihill, R10, regarding the difficulties in accessing meeting documents on the Board's website, a Member said that all the relevant documents, including the main papers, appendices and plans of each meeting of the Board, Metro Planning Committee and RNTPC, could be easily downloaded and printed with a standard computer and printer, and expressed appreciation for the efforts made by PlanD in that regard. Regarding the specific concern that previous information in the RNTPC paper was not fully incorporated in the Paper, Mr C.K. Yip, D of Plan, said that the RNTPC paper related to this agenda item was not attached to the Paper. Instead, a hyperlink had been provided on page 4 of the Paper to allow direct access to the document. The Chairperson said that the Board fully recognised the importance of ensuring public access to meeting documents. While the current practice was considered acceptable, it was acknowledged that some members of the public might encounter difficulties due to unstable wireless connections. In view of the above, the Secretariat was taking action to divide large document files into smaller ones before being uploaded to the Board's website. Testing of this new practice would be conducted in mid-February, with full implementation targeted by the end of the same month.

47. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedures for the presentation and Q&A sessions had been completed. The Chairperson thanked the representers, representer's representatives and PlanD's representatives 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, representer's representatives and PlanD's representatives left the meeting at this point.

[Mr Simon Y.S. Wong left the meeting during the Q&A session.]

### Deliberation Session

48. The Chairperson invited views from Members.

49. Members generally supported Item A, which was in line with the Government's policy objective of developing Hong Kong into an international education hub for post-secondary education. The campus extension project was regarded as a good example of encouraging cooperation between the private sector and universities in taking forward this objective. Some Members considered that the NM University Town might not have sufficient space for accommodating all educational institutions. Item A, being located in close proximity to HKUST, was considered a suitable site for campus extension. Members also had no objection to other amendments to the OZP.

50. Majority of Members expressed grave concern over the proposed tree compensation ratio of 1:0.66 for the campus extension at Item A Site, which fell below the common referenced standard of 1:1. This might give rise to a negative public impression of HKUST. Noting that a tree compensation ratio of 1:1 had been achieved in many private development projects previously considered by the Board, HKUST was urged to examine the issue with a view to achieving the compensation target, either by reviewing the landscape and tree compensation proposal for Item A Site or by adopting off-site compensatory planting. Members generally considered that space should be available within the existing main campus for compensatory planting. A Member said that consideration could be given to compensatory planting on suitable slopes elsewhere. Another Member considered that even if trees could not be replanted at the original location, compensation elsewhere in Hong Kong would still constitute a meaningful ecological offset for the city as a whole, and that a tree compensation ratio of 1:1 or higher should be pursued. Other than the above, a Member expressed that HKUST should also consider the quality of landscaping, while recognising that cost effectiveness was a relevant consideration. Members requested that specific requirements be incorporated into the Explanatory Statement (ES) to reinforce and ensure the delivery of tree compensation measures. Given that the conditions of the future land lease would only apply to Item A Site, there might be concerns about the mechanism for monitoring off-site compensatory planting undertaken by HKUST under its landscape proposal. Regarding off-site compensatory planting, Mr C.K. Yip, D of Plan, made the following main points:

- (a) off-site compensatory planting was not uncommon in government projects. HKUST main campus might be considered for additional tree planting under the campus extension project;
- (b) as requirements for off-site compensatory planting could not be stipulated or enforced under the land lease for Item A Site, PlanD would closely liaise and follow up with HKUST on this matter. As a leading university in Hong Kong with its esteemed status, it was expected that HKUST would strive to pursue excellence in the design of the campus extension; and
- (c) if the tree compensation issue was not adequately addressed by HKUST, PlanD would raise such concern when considering the landscape proposal to be submitted by HKUST under the land lease. HKUST should therefore enhance the landscape and tree compensation proposal prior to the completion of the campus extension proposal.

51. A Member said that the ecological value of Item A Site was low and the proposed campus extension was considered compatible with the surrounding land uses. The technical issues relating to the proposal had been addressed, and the development scale and parameters were considered reasonable. Nevertheless, there was still room for enhancing tree planting and compensation measures.

52. Some Members also made the following comments and suggestions on the campus extension proposal of HKUST at Item A Site:

*Expectation for HKUST*

- (a) as a university substantially funded by the Government and entrusted with nurturing future generations, HKUST was expected to demonstrate foresight, foster innovation and achieve a higher standard of excellence;

*Reuse of Rainwater and Drainage Aspect*

- (b) the suggestion on the reuse of rainwater made by Ms Mary Mulvihill, R10,

would help reduce the demand for potable water, contribute to more efficient utilisation of water resources and eliminate the need for rainwater discharge. The above, together with the application of “sponge city” concept by designing the site to allow natural infiltration of rainwater, would reduce runoff and ease the burden on the public drainage system, thereby conserving resources that would otherwise be required for system upgrade. That said, attention should also be paid to the associated costs, noting that construction costs in Hong Kong ranked first in Asia and fifth worldwide;

*Greening, Landscaping, Building Setback and Design*

- (c) despite the considerable greenery areas already present in the surroundings of Item A Site, additional greening efforts would further enhance the city’s environment, contribute to carbon-neutrality goals, and help make Hong Kong a more attractive place to attract and retain students;
- (d) trees were considered to serve dual functions, i.e. ecological and environmental on one hand, and social and recreational on the other, by providing spaces for the community to enjoy. While Item A Site was originally zoned “GB” on the OZP and was not easily accessible to the public, the conversion of the “GB” site for the proposed campus extension with integrated greening and enhanced public access that would transform the site into an accessible space for public enjoyment was supported from a people-centred perspective;
- (e) further setback of the two proposed building towers at the southern part of Item A Site from the site boundary and Clear Water Bay Road should be considered to preserve existing trees and provide more space for a continuous landscape planting strip/green buffer area to alleviate the visual impact and wall effect of the towers. The LMP to be submitted by HKUST should include a proper landscape planting strip along Clear Water Bay Road with adequate building setback. Tree planting along the peripheries of the developments within the campus was also encouraged to provide shade and improve the microclimate for teaching staff and students;

- (f) for the proposed 2-storey podium below the level of Clear Water Bay Road, an open cut or semi-cut-and-cover design was recommended to facilitate vegetation growth, improve natural drainage and enhance ventilation;
- (g) the proposed internal roads within Item A Site should be landscaped with trees to alleviate visual impacts;
- (h) vertical and roof greening should be duly considered, thereby encouraging the project proponent to deliver high-quality and more innovative landscape design;
- (i) the design of the proposed buildings appeared conventional. It was recommended that an ecosystem concept be applied to better integrate buildings with the landscape, thereby facilitating more greening and tree planting opportunities;

#### *Ecological Impact*

- (j) according to the Ecological Impact Assessment (EcoIA) conducted by HKUST, the woodland along Clear Water Bay Road was considered a continuous tree habitat. A total of seven *Aquilaria sinensis* (土沉香) were identified in the tree survey, of which four were proposed to be felled due to potential conflict with the proposed development and the inferior quality of the trees rendering them unsuitable for transplanting, while the remaining three would be retained. While the ecological value of Item A Site was assessed as low to moderate, it appeared that the findings of EcoIA had not been fully taken into account in the formulation of the indicative MLP at the initial planning stage;

#### *Public Participation and Promotion of Life-long Learning*

- (k) it was doubtful whether the general public and local communities were fully aware of the campus extension project and had been adequately engaged in the consultation process;

- (l) HKUST should play a more proactive role and devote greater effort to promoting life-long learning for the community;

*Construction Impacts*

- (m) as CBS was located in close proximity to the site, HKUST should closely liaise with the CBS and take suitable measures to minimise impacts (including air and noise impacts) on CBS during the construction stage; and

*Planning Gains*

- (n) compared with recent expansion projects of other universities in Hong Kong, HKUST's current campus extension proposal might only bring limited concrete planning gains to the community. HKUST was encouraged to identify and incorporate more substantive community benefits into the scheme.

53. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally supported or had no objection to the OZP amendments, and agreed that the draft OZP should not be amended to meet the adverse representation. 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 PlanD's representatives at the meeting. The Chairperson remarked that Members' views/suggestions on tree compensation within Item A Site as well as off-site compensatory planting to achieve the tree compensation ratio of 1:1, the LMP submission, and the provision of building setback along Clear Water Bay Road to accommodate a landscape planting strip/green buffer area would be incorporated in the ES of the OZP to ensure that HKUST would duly consider such requirements at the detailed design stage. Other suggestions raised by Members in respect of the reuse of rainwater, application of "sponge city" concept, and maintaining close liaison with CBS to minimise the construction impacts would be recorded in the meeting minutes.

54. Regarding the allegation made by Ms Mary Mulvihill, R10, in her oral submission on impropriety in the Board's decision-making process in relation to some amendments to the Notes of the OZPs, Mr C.K. Yip, D of Plan, emphasised that each case had undergone careful

and comprehensive review with independent thought, judgement and analysis before any decision was made by the Board, and therefore her allegation was unfounded. Another Member concurred and remarked that while she was entitled to express her opinion, this did not equate to acceptance of her allegation.

[Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan, Professor Simon K.L. Wong, and Messrs Daniel K.S. Lau, Ryan M.K. Ip, Derrick S.M. Yip, Timothy K.W. Ma, Stanley T.S. Choi and Rocky L.K. Poon left the meeting during deliberation.]

55. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) noted the supportive views of **R1 to R9** on Item A, and decided not to uphold R10 and agreed that the draft Clear Water Bay Peninsula North Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/SK-CWBN/7 should not be amended to meet the representation for the following reasons:

“Item A

- (a) the proposed campus extension of the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (HKUST) at the site under Item A will provide additional educational space, research and ancillary facilities near its existing main campus which is in response to Government’s policy initiatives of post-secondary education. The Secretary for Education supports the proposal from higher education development perspective;
- (b) the proposed campus extension is considered compatible with the surrounding land uses comprising existing and planned government, institution and community facilities, residential developments and open space, which will become an extension of the existing education institution cluster in Clear Water Bay Peninsula North. The zoning and relevant development restrictions of the OZP are considered appropriate;
- (c) the technical assessments conducted by HKUST have demonstrated that the proposed campus extension is technically feasible. With mitigation measures in place, the proposed development will not cause significant adverse traffic, drainage, visual and landscape impacts on the surroundings.



Concerned government bureau/departments have no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposal;

Amendments to the Notes of the OZP

- (d) 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 “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 government procedures and/or require planning permission from the Board; and
- (e) the incorporation of the exemption clause that filling of land/pond or excavation of land related to public works coordinated or implemented by the Government are exempted from the requirement for planning application in the “Conservation Area” (“CA”) and “Coastal Protection Area” (“CPA”) zones 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 developments in the “CA” and “CPA” zones would not be undermined.”

56. 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.

[Post-meeting note: Paragraph 9.6.3 of the ES of the OZP was amended to address Members’ concerns/suggestions regarding tree compensation within Item A Site and in other off-site locations, the provision of building setback and buffer planting along Clear Water Bay Road, and the requirement of LMP submission at the detailed design stage. The paragraph was amended to read as:

“9.6.3 The largest existing GIC use in the Area is the HKUST which together with the associated staff quarters are within the “G/IC(1)” sub-area. The northern core of the existing main campus in Area (a) is subject to a maximum building height of 14 storeys. The remaining part of the main campus in Area (b) is subject to a maximum building height of 8 storeys. These building height restrictions generally reflect the existing heights of the main campus. The main campus covers an extensive hilly area overlooking Port Shelter. Lower heights should therefore be adopted for the visually prominent platforms and the coastal areas to create a stepped building height profile. The existing staff quarters near the junction of Clear Water Bay Road and University Road in Area (c) are subject to a maximum building height of 6 storeys. A site at the junction of Clear Water Bay Road and Ngan Ying Road falling within Area (d) is for HKUST campus extension with a maximum building height of 8 storeys and GFA of about 45,300m<sup>2</sup>. As part of the campus extension project, the section of Clear Water Bay Road abutting this site will be widened. *Building setback of at least 5m from widened Clear Water Bay Road should be provided in the campus extension development. To maintain and enhance the landscape quality of the HKUST campus extension and overall amenity of HKUST, a Landscape Master Plan (LMP) is required for Area (d) through administrative means subject to agreement with relevant Government departments as appropriate. HKUST should endeavor to enhance tree compensation arrangement/ratio in Area (d), as far as practicable, for any tree felling due to the campus extension project. Compensation of some affected trees in other locations such as HKUST main campus (Areas (a) and (b)) may also be explored in the LMP. To reduce possible visual impact at the Clear Water Bay Road side, tree planting in reasonable scale should be provided in the building setback area which should be reflected in the LMP.*”]

#### Agenda Item 6

[Open Meeting]

#### Any Other Business

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

57. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 11:55 a.m.

**Minutes of 1354<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Town Planning Board  
(held on 30.1.2026)**

**Deferral Cases**

Requests for Deferment of Review Applications by Applicants for 2 Months

| <b>Item No.</b> | <b>Application No.*</b> | <b>Times of Deferment</b> |
|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 4               | A/SK-PK/306             | 1 <sup>st</sup>           |
| 5               | A/SK-PK/307             | 1 <sup>st</sup>           |

*\* Refer to the agenda at [https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/TPB/Agenda/1354\\_tpb\\_agenda.html](https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/TPB/Agenda/1354_tpb_agenda.html)  
for details of the planning applications*