Minutes of 1369th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 13.11.2026

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 Timothy K.W. Ma	
Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui	
Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan	
Dr C.M. Cheng	
Mr Rocky L.K. Poon	
Professor B.S. Tang	
Professor Simon K.L. Wong	
Mr Simon Y.S. Wong	
Mr Eric C.B. Chan	
Professor Janet K.Y. Chan	
Dr Chris K.T. Lam	
Dr Kelvin K.Y. Leung	

Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West
Transport Department
Ms Vilian W.L. Sum

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

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

Director of Lands
Mr Maurice K.W. Loo

Director of Planning
Mr C.K. Yip

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

Absent with Apologies

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung

Professor Herbert P.K. Chia

Mr Wilson H.K. Shum

Mr Gary X.Y. Zhang

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Katy C.W. Fung (a.m.)
Mr K.K. Lee (p.m.)

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Kenny C.H. Lau (a.m.)
Ms Tracy C.Y. Wong (p.m.)

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1368th Meeting

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The draft minutes of the 1368th meeting held on 30.10.2026 were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

2. The Secretary reported that there were no matters arising.

Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West District

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations in respect of the Draft Tuen Mun Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TM/42
(TPB Paper No. 11079)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

3. The Secretary reported that the amendments included, among others, revision to the building height restrictions (BHRs) of the Lingnan University (LU) (Item A1) and rezoning of sites in Tuen Mun Area 16 for a proposed sports ground with open space and public vehicle park (PVP) development (Items B1 and B2). LU and the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) were the project proponents of Item A1 and Items B1 and B2 respectively. P&T Architects and Engineers Limited (P&T) was one of the consultants of LU. Some of the consultants of ArchSD might be eligible voters/nominators of candidates in the Architectural, Surveying, Planning and Landscape Subsector of the 2026 Electoral Committee Subsector Ordinary Elections (the Election). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Professor Janet K.Y. Chan	-	being an external academic advisor of LU;
Dr Tony C.M. Ip	-	having current business dealings with ArchSD and P&T;
Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho	-	having current business dealings with ArchSD and having been nominated as a candidate in the Election; and
Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung	-	having been nominated as a candidate in the Election.

4. Members noted that Dr Tony C.M. Ip, Messrs Vincent K.Y. Ho and Vincent K.C. Cheung had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and Professor Janet

K.Y. Chan would join the meeting after this item.

Presentation and Question Sessions

5. The following government representatives (including the consultants) (hereinafter referred to as "government representatives"), representers and representer's representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

Mr Raymond H.F. Au	-	District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (DPO/TMYLW)
Mr Brian C.L. Chau	-	Senior Town Planner/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West (STP/TMYLW)
Mr Chris S.M. Leung	-	Town Planner/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West

Education Bureau (EDB)

Mr Pelon P.L. Cheng	-	Senior Executive Officer (Higher Education)

University Grants Committee (UGC) Secretariat

Mr Tommy H.Y. Tsang	-	Senior Project Officer (Capital)

ArchSD

Ms Sandy L.S. Wong	-	Project Manager

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Mr Samuel C.K. Ling	-	Assistant District Leisure Manager
Mr Benson S.L. Chan	-	Senior Executive Officer (Planning)

Consultants

URBIS Limited

Mr David Morkel

Ms Vinci T.C. Tam

Representers and Representers' Representatives

<u>R1 – Office of Campus Development and Management of Lingnan University</u>		
Mr Wong Chiu Lung Dennis	]	
Ms Kiang Ngai Sze Karen	]	
Mr Chan Hon Ching Hugo	]	
Ms Wong Pui Sai Kitty	]	Representer's Representatives
Mr Kan Chi Yau Otto	]	
Ms Man Yi Hang Cathy	]	
Ms Lin Shi Ying	]	
<u>R2 – Chan Chi Man Ernest</u>		
Mr Chan Chi Man Ernest	-	Representer
<u>R3 – Mary Mulvihill</u>		
Ms Mary Mulvihill	-	Representer

6. 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 2 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 representer's representatives. After the Q&A session, the government representatives, the representers and representer's representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. The Town Planning Board (the Board/TPB) would then deliberate on the representations in closed meeting and would inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course.

7. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representations. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Brian C.L. Chau, STP/TMYLW, PlanD briefed Members on the representations, including the background of

the amendment items on the draft Tuen Mun Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TM/42 (the draft OZP), the grounds and views of the representers, government responses and PlanD's views on the representations as detailed in TPB Paper No. 11079 (the Paper). The amendment items included:

(a) Item A1 – revision to the BHRs from 1/4/10 storey(s) to 120 metres above Principal Datum (mPD) for the "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") zones of two sites currently occupied by the Main Campus and Multi-Purpose Outdoor Sports Ground (i.e. the North Campus) of LU in Area 52;

(b) Item A2 – rezoning of a strip of land being part of the Main Campus of LU from "Residential (Group B) 16" ("R(B)16") to "G/IC" with corresponding adjustment in BHR to 120mPD;

(c) Item A3 – rezoning of a strip of land being part of a residential development to the north of the Main Campus of LU from "G/IC" to "R(B)16" with corresponding adjustment in BHR to 106mPD;

(d) Item A4 – rezoning of a strip of land to the northwest of the North Campus of LU from "Residential (Group C)" ("R(C)") to "G/IC" with corresponding adjustment in BHR to 120mPD;

(e) Item A5 – revision to the BHR from 1 storey to 2 storeys for a strip of land to the east of Lam Tei Raw Water Pumping Station Staff Quarters in the "G/IC" zone;

(f) Item A6 – revision to the BHR from 4 storeys to 10 storeys for a site currently occupied by a residential care home for the elderly to the north of Fu Tei Road in the "G/IC" zone;

(g) Item B1 – rezoning of a strip of land to the east of Tuen Mun River Channel in Area 16 from "Open Space" ("O") to "G/IC";

(h) Item B2 – deletion of the BHR for the southern portion of "G/IC" zone to the west of Hoi Wong Road in Area 16;

(i) Item C – rezoning of a strip of land to the east of Lam Tei Interchange from area shown as 'Road' to "Village Type Development" ("V");

(j) Item D1 – rezoning of a site in Area 55 from "Comprehensive Development Area" ("CDA") to "R(B)", subject to a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 1.3 and a maximum BH of 78mPD;

(k) Item D2 – rezoning of some strips of land in Area 55 from "CDA" to "R(B)" with stipulation of BHR of 10 storeys;

(l) Item D3 – rezoning of a site in Area 55 from "CDA" to "G/IC"; and

(m) Item D4 – rezoning of two strips of land currently occupied by Castle Peak Road – Tai Lam from "CDA" and "R(B)" to areas shown as 'Road'.

8. There were also amendments to the Notes of the OZP in relation to the above rezoning as well as other amendments, including revisions to the covering Notes and other technical amendments to align with the latest Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans and to keep pace with modern needs.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong joined the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

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

<u>R2 – Chan Chi Man Ernest</u>

10. Mr Chan Chi Man Ernest made the following main points:

(a) he was the Vice-President of LU and expressed support for Item A1 on behalf of LU to facilitate its campus expansion plan;

(b) in strategic alignment with the policy intention and vision of the National 15th Five-Year Plan and the First Five-Year Plan for Economic and Social Development of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) (2026-2030), LU was committed to promoting the "Study in Hong Kong" brand and establishing Hong Kong as an international talent hub. While upholding its heritage of excellence in the arts and humanities, LU had expanded into the fields of artificial intelligence (AI) including AI+ and big data, and interdisciplinary innovation. LU would sustain this growth trajectory as a leading research-oriented liberal arts university offering comprehensive education in the arts and sciences in the digital era; and

(c) LU had achieved local and international recognition in various fields, as evidenced by the growing appeal among students and the significant advancement in global rankings in the past few years. Nevertheless, the development of LU was constrained by the lack of adequate space and facilities. LU's proposal to optimise and expand its facilities within the existing campus area was considered a highly sustainable, land-efficient and cost-effective approach. In the long term, the campus expansion plan would generate substantial socio-economic vitality for Tuen Mun, Yuen Long and Tin Shui Wai. LU appreciated the support of the Tuen Mun District Council (TMDC), Tuen Mun Rural Committee and the stakeholders in the local community during the consultation and engagement process. LU had been established in Tuen Mun for 31 years. The proposed campus expansion would enable LU to create robust academic and technological synergy with the forthcoming Northern Metropolis University Town (NMUT), thereby reinforcing LU's role as a vital intellectual engine in the region.

R1 – Office of Campus Development and Management of Lingnan University

11. Mr Wong Chiu Lung Dennis made the following main points:

(a) he expressed support for Item A1 on behalf of the Office of Campus Development and Management of LU;

(b) in line with national policies and government initiatives to build Hong Kong into an international education hub, LU continued to expand its academic and research programmes. Beyond its strong foundation in the fields of arts and humanities, LU was actively developing programmes in data science, AI and interdisciplinary fields while supporting the "Study in Hong Kong" brand;

(c) LU had achieved excellent results in the latest global rankings, reflecting its sustained institutional progress. In the Times Higher Education Sustainability Impact Rankings 2026, LU entered the global top 100, ranking 63rd. It also climbed more than 120 places to 581st in the QS World University Rankings 2027;

(d) student enrolment had grown significantly in recent years. In the capacity as the Director of Campus Development and Management, it was anticipated that the existing campus space would no longer be sufficient to meet the increasing demand for floor space arising from the growth in student enrolment. To sustain this momentum and accommodate an increasing number of students, additional campus space and facilities were urgently needed;

(e) the number of students had increased from 3,600 in 2021 to around 8,000 in recent years at an average annual growth rate of 20%. LU had recently set up the School of Interdisciplinary Studies, the Institute of Data Science and the High-performance Computing Data Centre, and had also developed programmes in emerging fields, including data science, AI, biological science, carbon neutrality and sustainable development. These developments required additional space for academic, research, innovation activities, as well as supporting facilities. However, the remaining gross floor area (GFA) available for development in the Main Campus and the North Campus was only about 3,000m^2 and 1,000m^2 respectively;

(f) LU was located in close proximity to the MTR Siu Hong Station in Tuen Mun. With a BHR of 4/10 storeys for the Main Campus and 1 storey for the North Campus, the development intensity of LU's campus was relatively

low at a PR of 1, compared with those of other local universities. In view of the mature development of Tuen Mun with convenient accessibility by MTR nowadays, the campus expansion with a proposed BHR of 120mPD could achieve a PR of 4; and

(g) the proposed campus expansion was essential for alleviating the spatial constraints faced by LU and supporting its sustainable development. Existing teaching rooms, laboratories and study areas were running at full capacity. Additional floor space was urgently needed for academic and research activities. Developing within the current site boundary of LU without encroaching on any green belt area would optimise the land use in the existing campus. Bringing more students and researchers would enhance the vibrancy of Tuen Mun community and foster closer academic and educational synergies with NMUT.

R3 – Mary Mulvihill

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

Item A1

(a) she strongly objected to Items A1;

(b) higher education was shifting towards a hybrid model in which physical attendance was optional. While it was desirable for students to live or congregate on campus, this might not be compatible with a technology-driven society. The proposed layout was essentially a repetition of the conventional combination of classrooms, recreational facilities and dormitories, which might no longer be popular in the coming years;

(c) the Government was adopting the model of large-scale development projects in Chinese Mainland without sufficient regard to local circumstances, which could result in over-expansion as was the case with residential developments there. Most university campuses were anticipated to remain construction sites for many years, and the facilities available for students would be limited;

(d) while there was a significant increase in the number of students, the provision of sports facilities and open space would be reduced. The Main Campus would effectively lose all its sports facilities and around 50% of its open space. The open space near the Main Building in the Main Campus would be surrounded by buildings, resulting in a wall effect, while the proposed sports ground in the North Campus would also have a similar problem. There was no comparison between the existing and proposed open space provision, and there was no requirement on the provision of recreational facilities in post-secondary education institution under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. This was contrary to the pledges to expand sports and other facilities to promote student wellness and sports excellence;

(e) the visual impact of the proposed development was extensive, and the existing views of the ridgeline would be affected. There was concern that planning application to further relax the BHR would be submitted at a later stage. There should be regulations to protect the ridgelines in the New Territories;

Items B1 and B2

(f) she strongly objected to Items B1 and B2;

(g) removing the BHR would allow for multi-storey development. It was anticipated that the site might be developed into a high-rise residential development with sports facilities provided on a podium. Nevertheless, sports facilities should be designed as low-rise structures to maximise natural light;

(h) redevelopment of the tennis court at Victoria Park would result in further tree felling and deprive the community of facilities for many years. The Government had limited resources which should be spent prudently and focused on making the Northern Metropolis (NM) a liveable community with facilities comparable to those in the urban area. New sports facilities should be constructed in the New Territories where there was a dearth of facilities of international standard. The subject "G/IC" zone,

which was intended for sports ground use, would be an appropriate and convenient location for the much-needed facilities;

Item C

(i) she strongly objected to Item C, which would result in the expansion of the "V" zone. House developments should not have been approved on the site as the indigenous villagers had been abusing their right to build Small Houses. The site should be rezoned to "O" or "G/IC" to provide community facilities for residents. While there was no current plan to provide community facilities, every village would have to be upgraded sooner or later to ensure that residents there enjoyed the same services as those in the "Residential" zones;

Amendments to the Notes (a) and (c)

(j) she strongly objected to the amendment to the Notes (a) as the use of drones should be limited to rescue operations or delivery of medicines. Allowing the low-altitude operation of drones freely in common areas would disturb public areas like parks and schools, generate noise pollution, and create hazards. The recent event involving a paraglider injuring three hikers was an example of the potential risk. Drone operations might also infringe upon people's privacy, affect their enjoyment of their homes, and cause public security issues. Rushing to accommodate the latest fad without due diligence and consultation would end in disaster. Tighter controls adopted in Chinese Mainland should be followed;

(k) she strongly objected to the amendment to the Notes (c), as it might allow the Government to introduce facilities or operations within a development without adequate public scrutiny or consideration of the views of the occupants and the local community. A recent example cited was the installation of a lighting system at the Peak by the Hong Kong Tourism Board, which had attracted public concern regarding its impact on trees, vegetation and the surrounding environment, without submission of the proposal to TPB;

Items A2 to A6 and D1 to D3

(l) Items A2 to A6 and D1 to D3 were housekeeping matters; and

Others

(m) the presentation of the data should be simplified as representers had to go through many pages of the Paper to identify the key information. The streamlining process reduced the role of the community while ignoring the need to refine and clarify the presentation of materials.

13. As the presentations of PlanD's representative, the representers and representer's representative 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 the government representatives to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board or for cross-examination between parties. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

Item A1

Campus Expansion Plan

14. Noting the anticipated increase in student enrolment, some Members raised the following questions:

(a) whether there was any concern about the sources of students, and what the proportion of local students and non-local students would be;

(b) whether student quarters/hostels would be built within the campus or acquired in the private housing market outside the campus;

(c) whether the ratio of open space and sports facilities serving the students would decrease;

(d) whether the campus expansion plan was funded by the existing reserves of LU or other financial resources;

(e) while TMDC supported the campus expansion, whether LU would allow the public to access and use its enhanced facilities; and

(f) whether the proposed campus expansion would bring any external benefits to the community, such as the provision of local employment.

15. In response, Mr Chan Chi Man Ernest, R1, and Mr Wong Chiu Lung Dennis, R2's representative, made the following points:

(a) LU had been a small-scale liberal arts university. With changes in technology and the implementation of streamlining policies, there was room for expansion to enroll more students. The anticipated increase in student numbers under the campus expansion plan was based on a conservative estimate with reference to the actual data. A university operating on a comprehensive scale needed to be supported by economies of scale in teaching, research and industry. While students from Chinese Mainland were a significant source, LU targeted at recruiting more students from the countries along the Belt and Road initiatives, with a view to realising the vision of developing Hong Kong into an international education hub. The enrolment ceiling for self-financing non-local students in taught programmes at UGC-funded universities had been raised to 50% of local student places and there was no limit on the number of post-graduate research students. These measures constituted the growth engine of student enrolment at LU;

(b) four student residence buildings, providing about 4,000 bed spaces, would be built in phases in the North Campus to enable each student to have the opportunity to reside on campus for 1 year during the 4-year study period. The timing of the construction of these residences would depend on LU's expansion programme, the actual demand and the availability of funding. Since LU was located close to a residential neighbourhood in Tuen Mun, it was, in fact, relatively easy for students, whether local or non-local, to find convenient and affordable housing outside the campus;

(c) although some recreational facilities would be turned into academic buildings in the Main Campus, substantial space was reserved for open space and sports facilities in the North Campus, including those to be relocated from the Main Campus. The ratio of these facilities to students would increase. The enhancement of recreational facilities would match the increase in number of students;

(d) LU's campus expansion was a long-term development plan to be implemented progressively. In the process, a variety of financial resources could be deployed, including LU's current reserves, social capital and financial support available under relevant government policies for specific areas;

(e) LU had all along been adopting an open campus policy to strike a balance between security and openness. After 2023, LU was the first university to remove the entrance gates. There was no restriction on public access to all the common areas such as Wing On Plaza and Contemporary Garden in the Main Campus. Residents nearby, visitors and hikers could enter the campus and use the water fountain during the daytime. There would not be any change in this regard upon the expansion of the campus. LU had maintained close liaison with TMDC and had invited its members to visit LU's campus. Ongoing communication with relevant stakeholders would be maintained throughout the implementation of the proposed campus expansion to strengthen the connection between LU and the community; and

(f) among the faculty and staff of LU, many were local residents living in the vicinity who worked as clerical staff, frontline workers and contracted service providers. The proposed campus expansion would require more manpower during both the construction and operation stages, thereby creating job opportunities for local residents. As a partner of the local economy, LU welcomed the employment of local residents. This would allow staff to live and work in the neighbourhood, resulting in lower staff turnover.

16. A Member enquired about the extent to which the Board should participate in scrutinising the indicative campus master plan submitted by LU and whether amendments to the BHR should be reviewed on individual basis or as a whole on the OZP. In response, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, PlanD said that the campus master plan was indicative in nature and might be subject to change during the site investigation and detailed design stages. The relaxation of BHR to 120mPD would provide LU with greater flexibility in its campus design. Development of the site would also be governed by the land lease, including requirements for tree preservation and the submission of relevant technical assessments, as appropriate. In seeking public funding for campus expansion, LU would be required to obtain policy support from EDB and submit a proposal to UGC to ensure that the expansion proposal was in line with LU's roles, missions and future development plan. The feasibility, design, cost, implementation and other relevant aspects of the proposal would be subject to scrutiny by relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds). A comprehensive review of the BHRs on the OZP had been undertaken in 2009, taking into account urban design and air ventilation considerations. Subsequently, an updated Air Ventilation Assessment had been conducted in 2014 during a land use review exercise for the area. Adjustments to the BHRs stipulated on the OZP were necessary from time to time to respond to changing circumstances and the needs of individual projects.

NMUT

17. Some Members raised the following questions:

(a) how the future expansion of LU would create synergy with NMUT;

(b) whether, in addition to the proposed campus expansion, LU would be interested in applying for setting up a campus in NMUT; and

(c) whether LU would relocate some of its students to the new campus and reduce the development intensity of the existing campus if its application for sites in NMUT was successful and, if not, whether LU would further develop the existing campus.

18. In response, Mr Chan Chi Man Ernest, R1, and Mr Wong Chiu Lung Dennis, R2's representative made the following points:

(a) as a mature university area closest to NM, LU could assume a pioneering role in contributing to the development of NMUT. It was willing to provide any assistance to institutes setting up a foothold in NMUT. As NMUT gradually developed, it was a common vision for the local universities to seize the opportunities for cooperation in academic research, knowledge transfer and innovation industry;

(b) with a view to participating in the development of NMUT, LU was preparing to submit a proposal to apply for sites in the Hung Shui Kiu (HSK) University Town; and

(c) HSK University Town was to be developed as a centre for applied post-secondary education in smart and advanced manufacturing industry and for global talent cultivation. Unlike LU in Tuen Mun, the positioning and functions of the HSK University Town campus would focus on the integrated development of academia, research and industry by attracting top research institutes and industry leaders to support industry development in NM. As it was expected that a range of laboratories, innovation and technology bases, accelerators and incubators would be established in HSK University Town, more postgraduate courses of LU might be provided there, while its postgraduate students, particularly its researchers, might have more opportunities for development. With the expansion plan of LU in Tuen Mun, the core disciplines at LU in Tuen Mun would be further developed.

Environmental Impact

19. A Member enquired whether the impact on the natural environment and the green belt in the surrounding areas such as the bird roosting area and flight paths had been considered in amending the BHR of the subject sites to 120mPD. In response, Mr Wong Chiu Lung Dennis, R2's representative said that the BHR of 120mPD was set to blend in with the surroundings, taking into account the BHs of the developments nearby. While LU was not situated along the birds' flight path, the building design would adopt a stepped height profile and buildings of varying heights would not create wall effect that would obstruct any bird flight. It was considered that the prospective development would not generate any adverse impact on

the surrounding environment. Moreover, LU had devoted resources to enhancing the environment such as establishing a butterfly garden in the campus for biodiversity and education purposes. With the aid of a PowerPoint slide, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, PlanD supplemented that the Main Campus site, which was zoned "G/IC", had already been developed and was not of particular ecological interest, notwithstanding its proximity to a "GB" zone. In that regard, relevant assessments had been conducted and the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department had no adverse comment on LU's proposal.

20. Noting the scale of the proposed campus expansion and the new facilities to be constructed, two Members enquired whether a central energy plant or a district cooling system would be considered to reduce energy consumption and whether LU would adopt the international standards of building technology in relation to environmental friendliness, energy efficiency, carbon neutrality and innovation and technology. In response, Mr Wong Chiu Lung Dennis, R2's representative, said that LU was in full support of green and energy-efficient facilities in the proposed development. In the past, LU had installed over 210 solar panels on the campus and upgraded the chiller plant system with AI functions for energy saving. In pursuit of sustainable development, LU would consider the installation of energy-saving utilities at the detailed design stage. To meet the international green building standards, LU had joined the BEAM Plus scheme with the aim of attaining the Platinum rating for the planned Science Building currently under construction. A range of green and environmentally friendly measures, including vertical solar panels, air-conditioning systems and a rainwater harvesting system, had been incorporated into the building design. LU would adopt a similar approach in the proposed campus expansion.

Items B1 and B2

21. Two Members raised the following questions:

(a) whether the greenery coverage would be enhanced upon completion of the project; and

(b) noting the adoption of the principle of 'Single Site, Multiple Use' in the development of a sports ground and open space with PVP at the subject site, whether there were similar government, institution and community

(GIC) projects without BHR and whether it would be preferable to impose BHR for public information.

22. In response, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following points:

(a) currently, the site was mainly occupied by four temporary uses under short term tenancies, including a PVP and bus depots with limited vegetation cover. According to the tree survey, a total of 140 trees were recorded, most of which were invasive or undesirable species. While 43 trees would be felled, compensatory planting would be provided at a ratio of 1:1. Upon completion of the project, an area of about 5,620m^2 along Hoi Wong Road would be provided as open space, comprising landscape areas with sitting-out facilities for public enjoyment; and

(b) there were similar GIC projects with no BHR, such as Tin Tsui Wai Sports Ground, Tsing Yi Sports Ground, North District Sports Ground, Hammer Hill Road Sports Ground and Wan Chai Sports Ground. In accordance with the established practice, flexibility would generally be provided for GIC projects involving low-rise buildings through the removal or non-imposition of BHR of the "G/IC" zone. While this project had progressed to the stage of seeking funding approval from the Legislative Council (LegCo), there remained scope for refinements at the detailed design stage to enhance the overall scheme. The GIC project at the subject site was first put forward in 2008 and was subsequently included in the Government's Five-year Plan for Sports and Recreation Facilities in 2017. The design of the project had been made known to the public, and TMDC had been consulted on the project on several occasions, with the latest design submitted to TMDC for consultation in 2026.

23. Another Member followed up and enquired whether more GIC facilities such as a community centre would be proposed at the subject site as there was no BHR. In response, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, DPO/TMYLW, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that the site had been fully utilised for sports and recreational facilities despite its large area of nearly 6 hectares (ha). The proposed sports ground at 1/F would consist of two sports pitches,

incorporating an 11-a-side football pitch, an eight-lane 400m synthetic athletics track, high-jump runways, secondary pitches and other ancillary facilities. Although a single-level PVP was incorporated at G/F, there was no plan to incorporate additional GIC facilities at the site.

24. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the Q&A session was completed. The Board would further deliberate on the representations in closed meeting and inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representers, representer's representatives and the government representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

25. The Chairperson invited views from Members. Members generally considered that the amendment items could be supported and expressed the following views/observations:

Item A1

(a) there was a general shortage of space for the development of local universities. To strengthen LU's global competitiveness through the provision of more advanced teaching and research facilities, the proposed campus expansion should be supported. Should public funding be required for the project, its use might warrant further public discussion in future;

(b) among the local universities, LU was geographically closest to Chinese Mainland. On account of its proximity and relatively lower fees, LU was a preferred choice among students from Chinese Mainland wishing to pursue master's degree programmes, which were conducive to increasing their earning potential and enhancing their prospects of applying for civil service posts in Chinese Mainland. Such demand necessitated the proposed campus expansion of LU;

(c) there would be keen competition for sites at NMUT. The rapid expansion of universities' capacities at the existing campuses and/or in

NMUT should take into account resource allocation priorities as well as market supply and demand. While NMUT emphasised innovation and technology development, which might not be LU's strength, LU, as a university of applied science providing various digital science and AI courses, might leverage its development in gerontechnology, such as the LU Jockey Club Gerontech-X Lab, to conduct relevant studies to meet the needs of an ageing society;

(d) with the policy support of EDB, the proposed campus expansion of LU was in line with the government policy and the First Five-Year Plan for Economic and Social Development of HKSAR. There was no reason to object to the proposed campus expansion. The grounds/views of R3 were considered to be based on an amateur assessment of the impacts on local residents. Taking into consideration the surrounding development, the relaxation of the BHR to 120mPD was reasonable. Further minor relaxation of the BHR might also be considered;

(e) the low-rise architecture of the existing campus with its distinctive rooftop features was unique. This character might be preserved through the submission of a master layout plan (MLP) for the scrutiny of the Board. As LU diversified its academic focus from liberal arts to various emerging fields, the revamp of the campus design should convey a new image of a multi-faceted university;

(f) the proposed four student hostel buildings in the North Campus might not be able to accommodate about 4,000 bed spaces as proposed. To create a special character, diverse facilities and elements could be incorporated into the North Campus, which was currently occupied by the multi-purpose outdoor sports ground;

(g) the incorporation of green building standards and the achievement of carbon neutrality should be ascertained during the implementation stage. In addition to maintaining an open campus, the connection with the community should be enhanced. The positive external effects of the proposed campus expansion on the community and the grassroots should

be assessed so that useful experience could be gained for future projects;

(h) instead of proposing BHR relaxation on a case-by-case basis, a holistic review of the BHRs for all "G/IC" zones on the OZP might be considered to streamline the administrative works and expedite the transformation needed in the district; and

Items B1 and B2

(i) noting that there were similar examples of low-rise GIC projects with no BHR, consideration might be given to whether the BHR should be deleted or replaced with a higher but reasonable height restriction for future projects to avoid giving rise to negative public perception.

26. In response to Members' views/observations above, the Chairperson recapitulated her experience in seeking LegCo funding for GIC projects. LegCo Members had in the past queried whether it would be unduly restrictive to impose BHRs on GIC projects as any minor changes in BH would require separate planning application requiring approval from the Board. There were pros and cons to reviewing the BHRs of the "G/IC" zones on the OZP as a whole and to considering relaxation of the BHR at individual sites on a case-by-case basis. The adoption of either approach would need to be carefully assessed having regard to the background and local context of the area concerned. As regards MLP submission, in general, an MLP was required for "CDA" zone. For developments in other zonings, rather than university development, the Board might require the submission of MLP mostly for private commercial development to ensure the development was taken forward with planning gains as planned, and the MLP requirement was rarely made for university development. In any event, the views and observations expressed by Members at the meeting would be recorded in the minutes and conveyed to LU, EDB and UGC for reference in the implementation of the proposed campus expansion. Apart from LU, the Board also agreed to relax the BHR for the campus of the Polytechnic University in late 2024. As for the proposed NMUT development to be implemented in phases, three campus sites with a total area of around 26 ha in the HSK University Town were currently rolled out for application. All the local universities were invited to apply for the sites in the HSK University Town, and keen competition was expected among universities. EDB would have to consider which of the proposals received would best meet the objectives and long-term development of the HSK University Town/NMUT.

Depending on factors such as their financial positions and the targets/objectives set by the Government, universities had to consider whether to expand their existing campuses or develop new campuses in the HSK University Town, taking into account their own development needs and strategic objectives. In terms of resource allocation, the Government had earmarked a $10 billion loan scheme to support the participating institutions in constructing new campuses at NMUT. In addition to the government subsidy, the participating institution might consider deploying its own reserves and collaborating with outside corporations.

27. Upon the invitation of the Chairperson, Mr C.K. Yip, Director of Planning, supplemented on several issues raised by Members and made the following main points:

(a) on the BHRs for "G/IC" sites, BHRs were imposed on OZPs in the past mainly to reflect the existing BH or based on known GIC proposals. For instance, to reflect the as-built developments in the existing campus of LU, the BHRs of 1/4/10 storeys were imposed on the OZP. Low-rise buildings including community centres, libraries and schools were usually 8 storeys or lower and would not have significant visual impact. With the BHR imposed, subsequent changes such as redevelopment involving BHs exceeding the stipulated limits to meet changing societal needs would require planning application or amendment to the OZP, even where the increase in BH was minor and the associated impacts were insignificant. Taking the sports ground under Items B1 and B2 as an example, if the original BHR of 3 storeys was maintained, the addition of 1 storey for the stand or PVP would require planning application. This involved considerable social resources and time. The deletion of the BHRs for Items B1 and B2 allowed flexibility at the detailed design stage. In formulating OZPs for the new development areas (NDAs), BHR was no longer stipulated for low-rise GIC developments to allow flexibility in meeting changing community needs. Residential or commercial developments with a higher BH and greater visual impact required the imposition of BHR. Likewise, BHRs would be imposed on taller government office buildings, e.g. the planned government complexes in Kowloon City and Kwu Tung North and the redeveloped GIC building in Cheung Sha Wan. Any changes in the design of a government project would have to go through the relevant procedures under the established

mechanism, thereby ensuring public accountability;

(b) in respect of the need of comprehensive BHR review, based on the urban design concept and air ventilation assessment, a holistic evaluation of the BHR on various OZPs was carried out between 2008 and 2013. A comprehensive review was considered not necessary unless there was a significant change in planning circumstances. As established practice, an overall assessment on the BHRs for developments in the NDAs had been conducted when formulating the respective OZPs. The enhanced facilitation measures for buildings adopting modular integrated construction needed not trigger relaxation of the BHRs across the entire OZP. When considering applications for BHR relaxation on a case-by-case basis, the Board would examine whether the proposed BHR relaxation was reasonable, the proposed BH was compatible with the surroundings and the potential impacts of the proposed development would be acceptable; and

(c) regarding MLP control, an MLP via a planning application was required for development in the "CDA" zone. This might be due to concerns relating to infrastructure, visual and landscape, air ventilation, preservation of historic buildings and environmental issues such as industrial/residential interface. The detailed use, layout and design of the development would have to be vetted to ensure that the above-mentioned concerns could be addressed. The proposed campus expansion of LU was not expected to generate any adverse impact that required submission of MLP for approval. By the same token, with the BHR and non-building area imposed on the OZPs, MLP was not required for NMUT despite the substantial scale of development. When considering the proposed amendments to the subject OZP, the Rural and New Town Planning Committee of the Board decided at its meeting on 26.6.2026 to specify in the Explanatory Statement of the OZP the urban design principles and considerations to be adopted for the proposed campus expansion of LU, such as stepped BH profiles, maintaining the low-rise urban fabric of the campus central core (i.e. Wing On Plaza and the nearby LU Main Building which were of historical significance, reflecting Lingnan architectural style), careful building orientation, and provision of open space and building setbacks. When seeking LegCo funding for the

proposed expansion, EDB and relevant government departments would provide comments on the proposed design from their respective purviews.

28. In response to a Member's enquiry, the Chairperson said that submission of MLP was not required for the original "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Global Innovation Centre" zone for the proposed centre of The University of Hong Kong.

Conclusion

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

30. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) noted the supportive views of **R1 and R2** on Item A1 and the views provided by **R3 (part)**, and decided not to uphold **the remaining part of R3** and agreed that the draft Tuen Mun Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) should not be amended to meet the representation for the following reasons:

"Item A1

(a) the current building height restriction (BHR) of 120 metres above Principal Datum (mPD) provides design flexibility to facilitate the future expansion of the Lingnan University (LU)'s campuses in Tuen Mun. The proposed campus expansion responds to the Government's policy initiatives to develop Hong Kong as an international hub for post-secondary education and promote the 'Study in Hong Kong' brand. It will also enable LU to strengthen its capacity in interdisciplinary teaching and research and to expand its programme offerings to emerging fields in the digital era. The proposed campus expansion is supported by the Technical Feasibility Study (TFS) conducted by LU. The Secretary for Education has given policy support to the proposed campus expansion from higher education perspective;

(b) relevant technical assessments, including visual impact assessment (VIA), have been conducted under the TFS by LU to demonstrate that the proposed campus expansion would not bring about insurmountable adverse impacts on the surrounding areas. According to the VIA, with the incorporation of relevant design measures, the relaxation of BHR would not result in insurmountable visual impact from all identified public viewing points. The proposed campus expansion is also considered not incompatible with the existing high-rise residential developments in the vicinity with BHRs ranging from 85mPD to 120mPD and will blend in well with the overall townscape of Tuen Mun New Town;

(c) should any further relaxation of the BHR be required, the project proponent will have to submit a section 16 planning application to the Board for consideration;

Items B1 and B2

(d) the site is planned for a proposed sports ground and open space with public vehicle parks in Tuen Mun Area 16. In view of the low-rise nature of the proposed facilities and with a view to allowing more flexibility in developing the proposed development at the detailed design stage, it is considered appropriate for not imposing BHR in the subject "Government, Institution or Community" zone;

Item C

(e) Item C is to take forward the Rural and New Town Planning Committee's recommendation to review the zoning boundaries near Lam Tei Interchange. It is considered appropriate to rezone the site to "Village Type Development" to reflect the as-built condition of the completed road works and the area intended for village type development;

(f) the existing and planned provision of government, institution and community (GIC) facilities in Tuen Mun District is generally adequate to meet the overall population in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines and concerned government bureaux/departments (B/Ds)' assessments. The provision and implementation of GIC facilities

will continue to be reviewed by relevant B/Ds. The Planning Department will continue to liaise with relevant B/Ds to facilitate the provision of GIC facilities in future development/redevelopment when opportunities arise;

Amendment to the Notes (a)

(g) allowing provision, maintenance or repair of small unmanned aircraft take-off and landing facilities under the covering Notes of the OZP is to facilitate the low-altitude economy development. Any proposals for the aforesaid uses will be governed by other legislations in Hong Kong, and follow the relevant requirements and guidelines set out by relevant government B/Ds and regulatory authorities; and

Amendment to the Notes (c)

(h) the amendment is to align the control of 'Government Use (not elsewhere specified)' across the two schedules in the Notes for the "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" zone of the OZP and accords with the streamlined approach. The provision of government facilities will follow the established government procedures."

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

[The meeting was adjourned for a 5-minute break.]

[Dr Chris K.T. Lam left the meeting and Professor Janet K.Y. Chan joined the meeting during the break.]

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations in respect of the Draft Aberdeen and Ap Lei Chau Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H15/34
(TPB Paper No. 11080)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

32. The Secretary reported that the amendments were to take forward the recommendations of a feasibility study for a proposed marina-cum-residential development at the Aberdeen Typhoon Shelter (ATS) expansion area (the Study) commissioned by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD), with Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) as one of the consultants of the Study. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung	-	being a former Director of CEDD;
Dr Tony C.M. Ip	-	having current business dealings with CEDD and past business dealings with Arup;
Mr Simon Y.S. Wong	-	co-owning with spouse properties in Aberdeen and Ap Lei Chau; and
Ms Vilian W.L. Sum	-	her spouse being an employee of CEDD.

33. Members noted that Dr Tony C.M. Ip and Mr Daniel K.W. Chung had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interest of Ms Vilian W.L. Sum was considered indirect, and the properties of Mr Simon Y.S. Wong had no direct view of the amendment item sites, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

34. Professor Simon K.L. Wong said that he was a member of the Aberdeen Boat Club. As the interest of Professor Simon K.L. Wong was considered indirect, Members agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

35. The following government representatives (including the consultants) (hereinafter referred to as "government representatives") and representers were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

Development Bureau (DEVB)

Ms Alice L.F. Yeung	-	Head of Invigorating Island South Office (H(IISO))
Mr William W.T. Wong	-	Senior Town Planner (Invigorating Island South) (STP(IIS))
Mr Benny J.C. Han	-	Senior Engineer (Invigorating Island South)
Mr Jonathan L.H. Chow	-	Town Planner (Invigorating Island South)

Planning Department (PlanD)

Ms Janet K.K. Cheung	-	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK)
Ms Maggie H.K. Wu	-	Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK)

CEDD

Mr Samuel C.W. Yau	-	Senior Engineer/3, Special Duties (Works) Division

Consultants

Arup

Mr Barry C.S. Wong

Mr Franki C.K. Chiu

Mr Ivan T.L. Wan

Mr Davis K.H. Li

Mr S.K. Tai
Ms Joyce Y.J. Chan

Representers

R1 – Paulus Johannes Zimmerman

Mr Paulus Johannes Zimmerman - Representer

R2 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer

36. 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 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 2 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 had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives and the representers. After the Q&A session, the government representatives and the representers would be invited to leave the meeting. The Town Planning Board (the Board/TPB) would then deliberate on the representations in closed meeting and would inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course.

37. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representations. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Maggie H.K. Wu, STP/HK, PlanD briefed Members on the representations, including the background of the amendment items on the draft Aberdeen and Ap Lei Chau Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H15/34 (the draft OZP), the grounds and views of the representers, government responses and PlanD's views on the representations as detailed in TPB Paper No. 11080 (the Paper). The amendment items included:

(a) Item A – rezoning of a site at Po Chong Wan (Item A Site) from "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC"), "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Ocean Park" ("OU(Ocean Park)"), an area shown as

'Typhoon Shelter' and an area shown as 'Road' to "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Marina cum Residential Development with Public Open Space" ("OU(Marina cum Residential Development with Public Open Space)") subject to a maximum total gross floor area (GFA) of 46,900m^2 (including a minimum GFA of 8,900m^2 for non-domestic use), and a building height (BH) restriction of 130 metres above Principal Datum (mPD) for the proposed marina-cum-residential development, and the requirement for provision of a public open space (POS) at the Po Chong Wan breakwater;

(b) Item B – rezoning of a strip of land to the south of the "Industrial" ("I") zone at Po Chong Wan from "G/IC" to "I" subject to a BH restriction of 2 storeys; and

(c) Item C – rezoning of two pieces of land at Shum Wan Road from "OU(Ocean Park)" to areas shown as 'Road'.

38. There were also amendments to the Notes of the OZP in relation to the above rezoning, amendments to the covering Notes as well as other amendments to the Notes including those to align with the latest Master Schedule of Notes (MSN) to Statutory Plans and to keep pace with modern needs.

39. The Chairperson then invited the representers to elaborate on their representations.

R1 – Paulus Johannes Zimmerman

40. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Paulus Johannes Zimmerman made the following main points:

(a) Hong Kong had adopted the policy to develop the yacht economy, which would facilitate yacht travel within the Greater Bay Area archipelago, including northbound and southbound voyages between Hong Kong, Macau, and Chinese Mainland. The Greater Bay Archipelago comprised about a thousand islands and a long coastline, including destinations such as Guishan Island, Wailingding Island and Dong'ao Island in Zhuhai, as well as locations in Jiangmen, Shenzhen, Huizhou (Daya Bay) and

Guangzhou. Shipyards, moorings and supporting marine facilities were needed to support the growth of the yacht economy;

(b) the professional shipyards for larger vessels at Hing Wa Street West, Stonecutters Island were governed by a special purpose lease of 50 years, including the seabed. The shipyards comprising dilapidated sheds at Tam Kon Shan Road at Tsing Yi were governed by a combination of 15-year tenancies and various short term tenancies (STTs). The ship building and ship repairing yards, which comprised dilapidated buildings, at Ap Lei Chau Praya Road, Ap Lei Chau and Shum Wan Road, Aberdeen were also governed by short term leases. Long term land leases were needed to facilitate the upgrading of the shipyards;

(c) he had campaigned for an increase in the number of berthing spaces including the expansion of ATS since 2013. The Southern District Council (SDC) passed a motion in 2014 requesting the Government to conduct a feasibility study to ascertain the costs and benefits of expanding ATS. A total of 474 vessels were lost during Typhoon Mangkhut in 2018. In 2025, IISO briefed SDC on the plan to expand ATS. Currently, only 3,000 out of 12,000 vessels had access to safe moorings in the territory. Many vessels were exposed to extreme weather conditions and were therefore at risk of damage;

(d) 1,200 new moorings were planned at four different locations. No typhoon shelter was proposed in the ex-Lamma Quarry Area, where 150 to 200 moorings were planned, leaving the vessels exposed to wind conditions. Although 200 moorings were planned at the Hung Hom Station Waterfront Development, the tunnel underneath would hinder access by large vessels. Despite the aircraft noise, the provision of copious shipyards at the Airport Bay Marina, which would provide 600 moorings, would be highly desirable. Besides, Designing Hong Kong had put forth a proposal for a local marina in Tung Chung New Town Extension in 2014. While the ATS expansion, covering an area of 24 hectares (ha), would provide 200 moorings, some existing moorings and workshops would be lost as a result;

(e) more berthing spaces could be explored at other locations in Hong Kong such as Tai Tam Bay, ex-Shek O Quarry and Yau Tong Bay. For Sai Kung Town and Pak Sha Wan, Sai Kung, breakwaters could be added to provide shelter for the safe mooring of vessels. A small extension to the pier at the former cargo working area at Wan Chai could provide sheltered waters for boats. At the Kai Tak Water Sports, Events and Yacht Bays, the planned bridge could be relocated away from the mooring area. The opportunity to make use of an existing boat shelter in Junk Bay had been lost because of reclamation. It took a long time to provide new safe berthing spaces;

(f) under the proposal of Item A, an area of 8,150m^2 would be provided for clubhouse, shower and changing facilities and an area of 750m^2 for dry berth, boat repair and maintenance workshop. In terms of supporting marine facilities, such a tiny space could only accommodate five speed boats for storage and one small boat for maintenance. With limited marine activities at the proposed marina, essential facilities for trash disposal, black water disposal, fresh water supply, fuel supply, electricity supply and boat ramp were missing; and

(g) he objected to the loss of land set available for shipyards. Long term land leases were needed for the remaining shipyards. More locations were also needed to provide additional safe berthing spaces. It was unclear how the proposed marina at Item A would make use of the seabed alongside the shore of the future development for the lifting and launching of vessels, as well as repair and maintenance works. Extensive marine supporting facilities were required, starting with the expansion of ATS.

<u>R2 – Mary Mulvihill</u>

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

Item A

(a) there were 91 STTs for marine engine workshops and marine-related trades that would be displaced by the proposed development. According to the Lands Department, only 25% to 35% of the tenants remained in operation. There was no information on whether the Tin Wan Praya Road site could accommodate all the existing marine engine workshop operators at the Item A site who wished to continue operating. As highlighted by R1, there was concern about the significant reduction in space for marine workshops and the insufficient space to cope with the proposed number of vessels;

(b) the extent of the Aberdeen Channel that would effectively be reclaimed was significant. She objected to Item A on the grounds that it would have a negative impact on the views of the natural and undeveloped coastline enjoyed from Ocean Park and the view of Mount Johnston Lighthouse as seen by residents and visitors travelling along the coastal trail from Ap Lei Chau to Ap Lei Pai. The community had no say in the development of the waterbody;

(c) the three proposed residential towers would have a significant adverse impact on the unobstructed views of the verdant hillsides. The height of any development at this location should be capped to preserve the ridgeline. The same BH restriction as that for the Fullerton Hotel should be applied to ensure that any new development would not overwhelm the natural coastline or act as a wall against the hills. The existence of the Larvotto on the other side of Aberdeen Channel was no excuse for repeating the same degradation of the panorama;

(d) the proposed POS of 880m^2 appeared to be nothing more than an extended footbridge. It was only 6m wide and could not accommodate a bicycle lane. It was merely a form of compensation for rezoning the "G/IC" site through the inclusion of a small public facility. The sunset view from the POS would be obscured by the masts and sails of the yachts. Public access was not convenient as it was not clear how close the POS was to the access road. Pollution generated by heavy traffic and diesel vessels

was also a concern;

(e) there was no clear account of the supposed benefits arising from the increased number of visitors, and there was no mention of the additional expenditure required for maintenance, manpower and other resources. The local population's enjoyment of the local areas and attractions would likely be adversely affected. Ordinary people who could not afford a yacht or private club membership would derive little benefit from the project;

Items B and C

(f) Items B and C were housekeeping matters;

Amendments to the Notes (b), (c) and (g)

(g) she strongly objected to the amendment to the Notes (b) as the use of drones should be limited to rescue operations or delivery of medicines. Allowing the low-altitude operation of drones freely in common areas would disturb public areas like parks and schools, generate noise pollution, and create hazards. The recent event involving a paraglider injuring three hikers was an example of the potential risk. Drone operations might also infringe upon people's privacy, affect their enjoyment of their homes, and cause public security issues. Rushing to accommodate the latest fad without due diligence and consultation would end in disaster. Tighter controls adopted in Chinese Mainland should be followed;

(h) she strongly objected to the amendment to the Notes (c), as it might allow the Government to introduce facilities or operations within a development without adequate public scrutiny or consideration of the views of the occupants and the local community. A recent example cited was the installation of a lighting system at the Peak by the Hong Kong Tourism Board, which had attracted public concern regarding its impact on trees, vegetation and the surrounding environment, without submission of the proposal to TPB; and

(i) she strongly objected to the amendment to the Notes (g), as it might facilitate the Government's construction of viewing platforms and other amenities that attracted visitors who did not respect regulations or nature. Many members of the community objected to such works. TPB Members should preserve the right of the community and concerned groups to scrutinise these 'public works' as they were often intrusive and caused damage to vulnerable locations.

[Mr Simon Y.S. Wong left the meeting during R2's presentation.]

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

Item A

Proposed Development

43. Noting R1's representation on the analysis of the territorial shoreline and alternative locations for berthing areas, having regard to the Government's initiative of 'Tourism is Everywhere', a Member enquired about the relevance of Ap Lei Chau to the overall situation in Hong Kong regarding the supply of vessel berthing spaces and provision of supporting services. In response, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, DPO/HK, PlanD said that the concept of yacht tourism was announced in the 2024 Policy Address (PA), followed by the promotion of the yacht economy in the 2025 PA and 2026 PA. The Government sought to capitalise on the opportunity presented by the expansion of ATS to increase the number of berthing spaces for vessels. As mentioned by R1, the number of pleasure boats had been increasing over the years, creating a strong demand for berthing spaces. Apart from providing a new public mooring area to increase the number of berthing spaces in the ATS expansion area, the marina development was also proposed to complement with the Government's policy of promoting the yacht economy.

44. The Vice-chairperson enquired whether the four lots located to the north of Item A Site would be included in the proposed development as the existing shipyards on the four lots might cause nuisance to the residents and users of the proposed development. In response, the Chairperson said that the four elongated lots were occupied by shipyards providing ship repair and maintenance services, and the Transport and Logistics Bureau (TLB) advised that these shipyards should be retained for their continued operation and provision of services. As such, the four lots were not included in the proposed development. Whether there would be opportunity to review the land use of the four lots would be subject to future demand for ship repair and maintenance services. Item A Site was mainly occupied by marine engine workshops providing small scale maintenance services on spare parts of vessels. During the site visits conducted by IISO in February 2026, it was observed that the overall operations in the area were inactive, with many workshops having ceased operation. As such, there was an opportunity to review the land use of Item A Site for the proposed marina-cum-residential development.

Berthing Spaces and Maintenance and Supporting Facilities

45. Noting R1's concerns about insufficient area for yacht repair and maintenance under Item A, a Member enquired whether there would be any change in the proportion between the number of berthing spaces and the area for vessel maintenance services in the area before and after the implementation of the proposed marina under Item A.

46. In response, Ms Alice L.F. Yeung, H(IISO), DEVB, with the aid of PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

(a) the expansion of ATS involved a Designated Berthing Area for marina yachts in the east and a Public Mooring Area for local vessels in the west. The ATS expansion would result in an increase in the number of berthing spaces compared with the existing provision;

(b) the Marine Department (MD) planned to conduct public consultation in the first half of 2027 to gather views from existing stakeholders in ATS on the actual demand on berthing spaces for local vessels, including the types and sizes of vessels in order to formulate the design for an orderly arrangement of moorings in the Public Mooring Area. The review aimed to alleviate the

demand for berthing space in ATS. Through the ATS expansion project, MD also aimed to rationalise the berthing zones for various types of vessels in ATS; and

(c) there was no information at hand on the proportion of berthing spaces and the area for vessel maintenance services under the current situation and with the implementation of the proposed marina.

47. With regard to the issues of berthing spaces and area for vessel maintenance services in the area, the Chairperson made the following main points:

(a) in the existing ATS area, pleasure boats were berthed in the eastern part, while fishing boats were berthed in the western part. Taking advantage of the ATS expansion project, which involved the provision of two new breakwaters in the south, a total sheltered water area of 24 ha could be used for the provision of berthing spaces for the proposed marina and the Public Mooring Area, thereby providing more berthing spaces for vessels;

(b) the Po Chong Wan Temporary Industrial Area was currently mainly occupied by marine engine workshops covered by STTs providing small scale maintenance services on spare parts of vessels, while R1's request for more shipyards concerned those providing large scale repair and maintenance services, which might require supporting structures such as slipways for hauling vessels onto shipyards;

(c) during the consultation with stakeholders, the industry advised that large scale maintenance could be undertaken at shipyards in Ap Lei Chau, Tsing Yi or Stonecutters Island to meet the current demand for vessel maintenance; and

(d) with the launch of "Entry and Exit of Hong Kong Yachts into Guangdong", the industry practitioners observed that many vessel maintenance activities had shifted to Chinese Mainland due to the wide range of services available at lower costs. This would alleviate the demand and land requirement for vessel maintenance in Hong Kong.

48. Noting that R1's presentation provided an overview of the yacht economy, a Member invited R1 to elaborate on the specific issues in relation to Item A for the Board to consider the representation. In response, Mr Paulus Johannes Zimmerman, R1, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

(a) while appreciating the provision of new breakwaters and additional safe berthing spaces under Item A, he considered that to promote the yacht economy in Hong Kong, the Government should make greater efforts to provide long term leases instead of STTs for the remaining shipyards in Ap Lei Chau, Aberdeen and the north of Tsing Yi. Besides, more locations for safe mooring were needed as Hong Kong was short of mooring spaces;

(b) regarding the specific comments in relation to the proposed marina development under Item A, more marina supporting facilities should be provided at Item A Site. The dry berth and boat repair and maintenance workshops within the proposed marina would occupy a GFA of only about 750m^2. The remaining non-domestic GFA would be mainly allocated to a large clubhouse with eating/retail facilities. There was very little space for boat repair, which could only accommodate five speedboats and one small boat. Despite the low income generated by vessel repair and maintenance, such activities were an important function in supporting the marina;

(c) other specific issues included the provision of electricity, fuel and fresh water supplies, as well as black water and trash disposal. Regarding fuel supply, boats currently had to obtain fuel from a barge in open waters. There was no large scale fuel supply facility in Aberdeen. It was important to provide a fuel supply point for vessels; and

(d) the parking spaces provided at Item A Site should not only serve visitors to the marina and the clubhouse, but also other people including those whose vessels were moored at the Public Mooring Area. Apart from

visitor parking spaces, parking spaces for the general public were necessary.

49. Mr William W.T. Wong, STP/IISO, DEVB, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that based on the indicative scheme, the marina clubhouse would accommodate restaurants and retail facilities as well as some workshop areas for carrying out urgent maintenance works on small boats, which was common in similar marina developments. During the consultation with stakeholders, some interested parties suggested that the area for restaurants could be reduced. As the proposed scheme was indicative, the future developer could adjust the distribution and mix of the non-domestic GFA according to market needs.

50. The Chairperson remarked that R1's comments, including the land use distribution and provision of fueling and trash disposal facilities in the proposed marina, could be addressed at the detailed design stage. On car parking, the Government had conducted research which showed that a large number of car parking spaces were available in the area for public use.

Land Use Mix

51. Noting that the marina clubhouse would comprise 4 storeys with only a limited area allocated to dry berth and electrical and mechanical (E&M) facilities, a Member enquired about the types of uses and facilities to be provided in the clubhouse. In response, Mr Barry C.S. Wong, the Consultant, said that reference had been made to other existing marina facilities in Hong Kong, where a variety of facilities could be provided in the clubhouse. In the indicative scheme, dry berth and maintenance workshops would be available for minor repairs. E&M facilities, loading/unloading bays, food and beverages area, fitness area, meeting rooms and multi-function rooms were provided. Swimming pool and sitting-out area would be provided on the rooftop of the clubhouse.

52. The Vice-chairperson and a Member raised the following questions:

(a) the considerations for the proportion of GFAs allocated to the residential development and the marina clubhouse; and

(b) any views on R1's suggestion to increase the area allocated to vessel maintenance.

53. In response, Mr William W.T. Wong, STP/IISO, DEVB, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, made the following main points:

(a) the non-domestic GFA of the marina clubhouse was about 8,900m^2 and the domestic GFA of the residential development was about 38,000m^2. The non-domestic GFA of 8,900m^2 would accommodate various uses as mentioned in paragraph 20 above. The non-domestic GFA of the proposed marina clubhouse was determined with reference to the views collected from the industry and stakeholders on the scale required to support its viability during the Expression of Interest exercise. As for the domestic portion, the domestic GFA was equivalent to plot ratio (PR) of about 3.24, which was compatible with the surrounding residential developments with domestic PRs ranging from 5 to 10. The development parameters were proposed, taking into account the site's waterfront location, land use compatibility with the surrounding developments and traffic and infrastructure constraints; and

(b) the proposed marina clubhouse included a small scale workshop area for boat maintenance, with reference to the views of stakeholders that small scale workshops were usually provided in a marina for urgent repairs to parts of vessels.

54. R1 commented that the non-domestic GFA of 8,900m^2 included a large proportion allocated to food and beverages uses in the marina clubhouse, but only a small area allocated to vessel maintenance.

POS

55. While appreciating the proposal to transform the existing eastern breakwater near Shum Wan Road into POS with a pedestrian connection from the proposed marina, a Member enquired whether a pedestrian connection from another road (i.e. Ocean Drive) could be provided without the need for the public to pass through the marina. In response, Mr William W.T. Wong, STP/IISO, DEVB said that the idea of providing the proposed POS on top of the existing Po Chong Wan breakwater stemmed from local aspirations in view of the marina development. With the new breakwaters in the eastern and western parts of the expanded

ATS, the protective function of the existing Po Chong Wan breakwater would no longer be required. Instead of demolishing the breakwater, which would generate construction waste, a more sustainable and desirable option was to open up the top of the breakwater as POS for public enjoyment within reasonable opening hours. As the top level of the breakwater was higher than the level of Shum Wan Road, CEDD would address the level difference under the ATS expansion project, facilitating direct public access from Shum Wan Road to the POS on the breakwater.

Parking Facilities

56. Two Members enquired whether visitor parking spaces would be provided for the proposed marina and whether there would be electric vehicle (EV) charging facilities. In response, Mr Barry C.S. Wong, the Consultant, said that about 230 parking spaces were proposed for the marina including 30 spaces allocated to marina visitors. In addition, motorcycle parking spaces and a loading/unloading bay were proposed. It was common for developers to provide EV charging facilities in carparks. The future development would also reserve space for EV charging facilities with onshore power supply for the landside development and the Designated Berthing Area.

Flooding

57. Noting that the proposed development would be located along the coastline and two new breakwaters would be built at the southern part of the waterbody while the existing breakwater to the west of ATS would be shortened, a Member raised the following questions:

(a) whether the construction and modification of the breakwaters would be completed before or after the development of the proposed marina-cum-residential development; and

(b) considering that the coastal area was severely affected by flooding during Super Typhoon Ragasa in 2025 and that the maximum water level in the Victoria Harbour during a historical storm in 1874 was about 4.7mPD to 4.8mPD, while the site formation level was about 5.1mPD, representing a difference of only about 0.4m from the historic maximum water level, whether there were any estimates on the high wave crest and the

assessment on the impact of overtopping wave and any preventive or mitigation measures had been proposed to address the flooding risks.

58. In response, Mr Barry C.S. Wong, the Consultant, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, made the following main points:

(a) the proposed marina was estimated to commence operation in 2032, which would be after the completion of the two new breakwaters; and

(b) the Fullerton Hotel located to the south of Item A Site was situated at a site level of 7mPD, and had experienced flooding during Super Typhoon Ragasa with wave height of about 2m. The site formation level of the proposed marina-cum-residential development was proposed to be between 5.2mPD and 5.5mPD. Upon completion of the new breakwaters under the ATS expansion project, the wave height in the inner waters of the expanded ATS would be reduced to between 0.6m and 0.9m, resulting in a lower flooding risk in the area.

Environmental Impacts

59. Noting that there would be about 200 berthing spaces and about 500 parking spaces for private cars and motorcycles for the proposed marina and residential development, a Member asked about the environmental impacts of the proposal on the surroundings, including air quality, noise, glare and waste, and whether any environmental mitigation measures were proposed. In response, Mr Franki C.K. Chiu, the Consultant, said that environmental assessment covering air quality, noise, etc. were conducted. Mitigation measures, e.g. the use of acoustic windows, were proposed. On air quality, with the background air quality taken into account the small amount of vessel movements generated by the proposal, the assessment indicated that the air sensitive receivers would be in full compliance with the Air Quality Objectives (AQO). For example, the nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) level was estimated to be only 62% of the AQO.

Fire Safety

60. Noting R1's concerns about the lack of supporting facilities for vessels, despite the proposed marina being the third marina in the area, a Member raised the following questions:

(a) whether there would be any fire safety measures under the ATS expansion project as there had been fire incidents in the typhoon shelters; and

(b) whether there were any Fire Services Department (FSD) fireboats stationed at the Marine Police Aberdeen Base located near Item A Site that could be deployed in the event of a fire.

61. In response, Mr Barry C.S. Wong, the Consultant, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, made the following main points:

(a) close liaison with FSD was maintained during the formulation of the marina proposal, and sufficient width of the passage area within the ATS expanded area had been reserved for fireboats to navigate and carry out rescue and fire-fighting operations; and

(b) a fireboat was stationed at the Aberdeen Fireboat Station in ATS instead of at the Marine Police Aberdeen Base.

62. The Chairperson also remarked that MD would take the opportunity of ATS expansion to rationalise the berthing arrangement of vessels. The vessels could be berthed with wider separation to each other, and sufficient space would be reserved as passage area for fireboats.

Cultural Heritage

63. Noting that there was an existing location for the storage of dragon boats in ATS and recognising the aspirations of local fishermen to preserve the tradition of dragon boat racing during the Tuen Ng Festival in ATS, a Member enquired whether an area would be reserved for storing dragon boats if the existing storage location was affected by the proposal. In response, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, DPO/HK, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said

that a shrine was located near the Po Chong Wan breakwater with storage of dragon boats, while the shrine was not covered by any STT or licence. According to a recent discussion in the SDC, MD would explore a suitable location for the storage of dragon boats in the ATS expansion area.

Operation Mode

64. The Vice-chairperson and two Members raised the following questions:

(a) whether the design and works of the proposed marina including the Designated Berthing Area would be carried out by CEDD and the future developer would be responsible for its operation and management, or vice versa; and

(b) whether the marina and the residential development would be bundled for tender, and if both uses were covered by a single lease, what arrangements would be made for the operation and management of the public facilities.

65. In response, the Chairperson made the following main points:

(a) while the public works would be carried out by the Government, the future developer would be responsible for the design, implementation, operation and management of the proposed marina-cum-residential development and the Designated Berthing Area; and

(b) the proposed marina-cum-residential development and the Designated Berthing Area would be covered by a single tender, and the maintenance of the public facilities, e.g. the POS on top of the breakwater, would be bundled with the commercial portion of the proposed development through the lease conditions so that the maintenance cost would be borne by the developer, rather than by individual flat owners.

Consultation

66. A Member enquired whether the Ocean Park and nearby schools had been consulted on the proposal. In response, Mr William W.T. Wong, STP/IISO, DEVB said that IISO had briefed SDC on the proposal and consulted SDC members at different meetings. SDC supported the proposal as it would be conducive to the yacht economy and bring vibrancy to the area. Besides, IISO had maintained close liaison with the Ocean Park, which had welcomed the proposal.

Amendment Item (g) to the Notes of "Site of Special Scientific Interest" ("SSSI") Zone

67. In response to a Member's enquiry on the revision to the Remarks of the Notes for the "SSSI" zone, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, DPO/HK, PlanD said that public works co-ordinated or implemented by Government e.g. geotechnical works, local public works, road works, etc. in the "SSSI" zone were permitted under the covering Notes of the draft OZP. The amendment was to incorporate an exemption clause for filling or excavation of land in association with public works co-ordinated or implemented by the Government. The amendment was in line with the latest MSN agreed by the Board in 2021 to streamline the planning application process for minor government works with no major adverse impact.

68. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the Q&A session was completed. The Board would further deliberate on the representations in closed meeting and inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representers and the government representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

69. The Chairperson invited views from Members.

70. A Member enquired how the wastewater and waste would be disposed of from the marina and the control of anti-fouling paint in Hong Kong. She also enquired whether air pollutants generated by diesel-powered vessels, including nitrogen oxides (NOx), sulphur oxides (SOx) and PM2.5, had been assessed. In response, Mr Gary C.W. Tam, Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment), Environmental Protection Department

(EPD) said that the marina operator would be responsible for managing the disposal of waste and wastewater. A pump-out system would be installed at the marina to collect the vessels' sewage and discharge to public sewerage system. The application of TBT-based paints had been banned in Hong Kong and vessels maintenance were to be conducted at the vessel repair workshop and the waste barnacles/oyster shells scraped off would also be properly disposed of at the waste disposal facility. EPD conducted regular water quality and sediment monitoring across Hong Kong's typhoon shelters and sheltered anchorages. A comprehensive environmental assessment covering air, noise and water pollution had been conducted for the proposed marina-cum-residential development. The Chairperson supplemented that the marina including the Designated Berthing Area, the Designated Water Space and the marina facilities in the landside development portion constituted a designated project under the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Ordinance. Appropriate mitigation measures during both the construction and operation phases would be implemented to ensure all the environmental impacts would be acceptable. The EIA report including the management and operational plan for the marina would be subject to scrutiny by EPD.

71. The Vice-chairperson and Members generally considered that the amendment items could be supported and expressed the following views/observations:

(a) while supporting Item A for the development of the yacht economy, the management problems associated with the proposed marina that had been raised should be resolved. Regarding the area reserved for marina supporting facilities within the proposed marina-cum-residential development, it was understood that the design of such facilities remained uncertain at the tender stage as the future developer would not yet be known. Sufficient boat maintenance facilities should be provided in the marina clubhouse at a later stage. The marina operator ought to assume its social responsibility by providing facilities for public use such as the POS on the Po Chong Wan breakwater;

(b) the TLB's advice that the industrial area to the north of Item A Site remained necessary to provide ship repairing services in the area had addressed R1's concern. The proposed increase in berthing spaces would inevitably increase the overall demand for vessel repairing services.

In comparison with vehicles, it was less likely for pleasure boats to be sent to Chinese Mainland for maintenance because of the higher costs of fuel and captains. The Government should consider providing the necessary maintenance and repair services in the territory;

(c) with reference to the Aberdeen Marina Club managed by the Kerry Group, most club members mainly used the dining and sports facilities in the clubhouse, while relatively fewer members used the berthing facilities. Dry berths were provided for small boats mainly for basic and minor repairing works such as hull cleaning. Fuel, water and electricity were supplied at the wet berths. The marina operator, which usually managed the clubhouse and berthing facilities separately, would not have much incentive to provide facilities for major maintenance and repair works;

(d) given its proximity to the Fullerton Hotel and the Ocean Park, Item A Site was a suitable location for the proposed marina-cum-residential development in terms of land use. A pedestrian walkway would connect the POS on the breakwater to the promenade adjoining the Water World Ocean Park. Reference could be made to the Hong Kong Gold Coast in Tuen Mun where residential buildings, a resort hotel, a shopping mall, a yacht and country club, a marina and a beach were established. Additional functions for meetings, incentives, conferencing and exhibitions, and ancillary coach parking facilities could be considered in the proposed development;

(e) although the proposed breakwaters would reduce the wave height within the expanded portion of ATS, there was still concern on the potential threats posed by storms to the coastal facilities. As the seawater level continued to rise over the past century, the potential serious impact of historic storm surges, such as that associated with the typhoon in 1874, should be taken into account. Flooding risks should be minimised under extreme weather conditions; and

(f) there was concern about traffic congestion on Shum Wan Road during holiday peak periods. The marina operator might consider incorporating

a dragon boat hall in the marina clubhouse to enhance the local character, which would be conducive to attracting visitors and recruiting members. The integrated development under the "large-scale land disposal" approach was supported as it would provide berthing spaces for yachts and supporting landside facilities with topside residential development, thereby leveraging market forces to promote yacht tourism.

Conclusion

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

73. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) noted the views provided by **R2 (part)**, decided not to uphold **R1 and the remaining part of R2** and agreed that the draft Aberdeen and Ap Lei Chau Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

"Item A

(a) the Item A is to take forward the proposed development at the Landside Portion of the marina development at the expansion area of Aberdeen Typhoon Shelter, which is in line with the initiative of promoting yacht tourism and the yacht economy announced in the Policy Addresses and the Development Blueprint for Hong Kong's Tourism Industry 2.0. The proposed marina will inject vitality into the Southern District, improve the environment, and stimulate the local economy, as well as drive the growth of related industries. It will also create other benefits, including the provision of additional housing flats and public open space (**R2**);

(b) the Item A site is situated in an area with medium-rise government, institution and community and tourist facilities, as well as high-rise residential developments in the vicinity. The proposed development, with a maximum building height of 130mPD, is considered not incompatible with

the surrounding area, with the implementation of design measures as stated in the Explanatory Statement to provide guidance for the future developer. Technical assessments covering various aspects, including traffic and transport, marine traffic, environmental, visual, landscape, air ventilation and infrastructure, also confirmed that there would be no insurmountable technical problems in developing the Item A Site for the marina-cum-residential development (**R2**);

(c) the "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Marina cum Residential Development with Public Open Space" zone will allow 'Marina' use including such ancillary facilities as small-scale workshops for boat repair, while the uses within the Waterbody Portion will be regulated and administered under other relevant ordinances, regulations and administrative mechanisms. The rezoning of Item A and the relevant development control are considered appropriate (**R1 and R2**);

Item B

(d) Item B reflects the existing use of the site for shipyard purposes. The supply of land for shipyard use will not be affected. The rezoning of Item B is considered appropriate (**R1**);

Amendments to the Notes (b)

(e) allowing provision, maintenance or repair of small unmanned aircraft take-off and landing facilities under the covering Notes of the OZP is to facilitate the low-altitude economy development. Any proposals for the aforesaid uses will be governed by other legislations in Hong Kong, and follow the relevant requirements and guidelines set out by relevant government bureau/departments and regulatory authorities (**R2**);

Amendments to the Notes (c)

(f) the amendment is to align the control of 'Government Use (not elsewhere specified)' across the two schedules in the Notes of the "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" zone of the OZP and accords with the streamlined approach. The provision of government facilities will follow the established government procedures (**R2**); and

Amendments to the Notes (g)

(g) the incorporation of an exemption clause to exempt filling of land or excavation of land pertaining to public works coordinated or implemented by the Government from the requirement for planning application is in line with the latest Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans promulgated by the Board and facilitates streamlining of 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 "Site of Special Scientific Interest" zone would not be undermined (**R2**)."

74. 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 Chief Executive in Council for approval.

[Mr Eric C.B. Chan left the meeting during deliberation.]

[The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 1:55 p.m.]

[Mr Daniel K.S. Lau, Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan and Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui left the meeting during the lunch break.]

75. The meeting was resumed at 2:30 p.m.

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

Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) Ms Doris P.L. Ho	Chairperson
Mr Stephen L.H. Liu	Vice-chairperson
Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong	
Mr Timothy K.W. Ma	
Dr C.M. Cheng	
Mr Rocky L.K. Poon	
Professor B.S. Tang	
Professor Simon K.L. Wong	
Professor Janet K.Y. Chan	
Dr Kelvin K.Y. Leung	
Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West Transport Department Ms Vilian W.L. Sum	
Chief Engineer (Works) Home Affairs Department Mr Bond C.P. Chow	
Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment) Environmental Protection Department Mr Gary C.W. Tam	
Director of Lands Mr Maurice K.W. Loo	
Director of Planning Mr C.K. Yip	

General

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans, Definitions of Terms Used in Statutory Plans and Broad Use Terms
(TPB Paper No. 11081)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

77. The following representatives from the Planning Department (PlanD) were invited to the meeting at this point:

Mr K.K. Lee	-	Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board (CTP/TPB)
Ms Karen F.Y. Lam	-	Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board (STP/TPB)
Mr Tommy T.W. Wong	-	Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Norris P.W. Chung	-	Town Planning Graduate/Town Planning Board

78. The Chairperson extended a welcome and invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on TPB Paper No. 11081 (the Paper). With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Karen F.Y. Lam, STP/TPB, briefed Members on the background and the proposed amendments to the Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans (MSN), Definitions of Terms Used in Statutory Plans (DoT) and Broad Use Terms (BUT) as detailed in the Paper.

79. As the presentation of PlanD's representative had been completed, the Chairperson invited questions and comments from Members.

Proposed Amendments to MSN

'Smart and Green Mass Transit System (SGMTS) Stop and Lay-by' and 'Small Unmanned Aircraft (SUA) Take-off and Landing Facilities' under Covering Notes

80. A Member raised the following questions:

(a) details on the nature of the mass transit system (e.g. landborne, waterborne or airborne modes of transport) and the types of green fuel that would be used in SGMTS; and

(b) whether the SUA take-off and landing facilities would be allowed in conservation-related zones.

81. In response, Mr K.K. Lee, CTP/TPB, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

(a) SGMTS was first announced in the 2023 Policy Address. The Hong Kong Major Transport Infrastructure Development Blueprint also recommended that this system be adopted as a light and green feeder service to nearby railways and major public transport interchanges in areas with limited space or lower transport demand. Three SGMTS proposals in Kai Tak, East Kowloon and Hung Shui Kiu/Ha Tsuen, which were all land-based, were gazetted under the Railways Ordinance (Cap. 519) and the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (Cap. 370) respectively and were being taken forward. Subject to the proposals of relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds), other types of non-land-based SGMTS, such as cable cars, might be examined in suitable locations in Hong Kong in the future; and

(b) according to the amended covering Notes in the MSN, provision, maintenance and repair of SUA take-off and landing facilities would be permitted in all areas within the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), except in specific conservation-related zones, such as "Conservation Area", "Coastal Protection Area", "Site of Special

Scientific Interest" and some "Other Specified Uses" ("OU") zones designated for conservation purposes.

Provision for Cross-district Transfer of Plot Ratio (PR) under Covering Notes

82. With regard to the newly-added paragraph (16)(b)(ii) in the amended covering Notes (for areas previously covered by Development Permission Area plans), a Member enquired whether the wording 'other statutory plan(s)' in that paragraph referred to the Development Scheme Plans (DSPs) of the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) or other types of statutory plans.

83. In response, Mr K.K. Lee, CTP/TPB, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that the covering Notes in the MSN had been amended to facilitate the implementation of the cross-district transfer of PR scheme introduced under the 2025 Policy Address. As set out in the Schedule to the Land (Compulsory Sale for Redevelopment) (Specification of Lower Percentage) Notice (Cap. 545A), there were currently seven OZPs that were designated areas within which a 'sending site' for PR or gross floor area (GFA) transfer could be located. Under the current mechanism, cross-district transfer of PR or GFA from one or more 'sending site(s)' in the seven OZPs to one or more 'receiving site(s)' in any OZPs was allowed. There were two versions of paragraph (16) provided in the amended covering Notes in the MSN, with the first version catering for the seven OZPs under Cap. 545A which could have 'sending site(s)' and/or 'receiving site(s)', and the second version for all other OZPs which could have 'receiving site(s)' only. The wording 'other statutory plan(s)' in paragraph (16)(b)(ii) could generally refer to OZPs as well as other statutory plans including URA DSPs.

Logistics-related Uses

84. With regard to the positioning of Hong Kong's development in eight key areas, three of which were relevant to the logistics industry, a Member raised the following questions:

(a) given the stringent requirements for and difficulties in obtaining planning permission, whether freight handling and warehousing uses could be considered as Column 1 rather than Column 2 uses in the "Commercial" ("C") and "OU" annotated "Business" ("OU(B)") zones to streamline planning procedures and facilitate the development of the logistics sector;

(b) whether warehouse storage could be permitted as 'Cargo Handling and Forwarding Facility' use under Column 1 of the "OU(B)" zone, and whether freight handling and warehousing would remain to be Column 2 uses if an existing industrial building (IB) was converted into a logistics centre; and

(c) whether the "OU" annotated "Pier" ("OU(Pier)") zone covered piers for cargo vessels and barges, noting that the provisions in the Notes appeared not to align with Hong Kong's positioning to facilitate the development of the logistics sector.

85. In response, Mr K.K. Lee, CTP/TPB, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides and the visualiser, made the following main points:

(a) the MSN was a reference document used in preparing statutory plans, notably OZPs. It set out for each land use zone the uses that were always permitted (Column 1) and those that required planning permission (Column 2). The "C" zone was intended primarily for commercial activities, including office developments, and Schedule I (for open-air development or for building other than industrial or industrial-office building) of the "OU(B)" zone was to cater for developments generally of a more commercial nature. From land use compatibility perspective, freight handling and related logistics uses were considered not suitable for inclusion as Column 1 uses in the "C" zone and Schedule I of the "OU(B)" zone. On the other hand, logistics-related uses, including 'Cargo Handling and Forwarding Facility' and 'Warehouse' were Column 1 uses in zones specifically designated for logistics-related industries, such as "OU" annotated "Container Related Uses" ("OU(Container Related Uses)"), "OU" annotated "Container Terminal" ("OU(Container Terminal)") and "Open Storage" zones. However, such uses might not be suitable for incorporation as Column 1 uses in the "C" zone and Schedule I of the "OU(B)" zone;

(b) according to the MSN for the "OU(B)" zone, 'Warehouse (excluding Dangerous Goods Godown)' was a Column 1 use under Schedule II (for

industrial or industrial-office building). 'Cargo Handling and Forwarding Facility (not elsewhere specified)' might also be included as a Column 1 use under Schedule II where infrastructure and traffic capacity permitted, whereas 'Cargo Handling and Forwarding Facility (Container Freight Station, free-standing purpose-designed Logistics Centre only)' was a Column 2 use as it would involve more significant traffic impact. While general freight handling and logistics activities to be carried out within an IBs were always permitted under "I" and Schedule II of "OU(B)" zone, container freight station or a free-standing purpose-designed logistics centre might only be permitted subject to planning permission in the "I" and Schedule II of the "OU(B)" zones. Under Schedule I of the "OU(B)" zone, which was mainly for non-IBs, both 'Cargo Handling and Forwarding Facility' and 'Warehouse (excluding Dangerous Goods Godown)' were Column 2 uses; and

(c) the "OU(Pier)" zone was primarily designated for passenger piers, whereas piers for cargo vessels would be designated with specific zonings, such as "OU" annotated "Cargo Handling Area" or "OU(Container Terminal)". The proposed amendments in relation to the "OU(Pier)" zone did not apply to cargo piers.

86. The Secretary remarked that the MSN set out schedules of uses tailored to each zone and the "OU(B)" zone was not intended to cater for all types of development. The "OU(B)" zone was intended for areas undergoing a transition from industrial to business use. To facilitate the transition, Schedule I applied to non-IBs, while Schedule II applied to IBs. Larger-scale logistics centres and container freight stations were unlikely be located in the "OU(B)" zone, and such facilities were generally found near ports or container terminals where the sites were zoned "OU(Container Terminal)" or other specific "OU" zones to cater for such uses. While logistics and freight activities were not prohibited within areas zoned "OU(B)", they were regulated as the areas were not expected to accommodate large-scale freight forwarding facilities.

87. Mr C.K. Yip, Director of Planning, explained that the large-scale logistics facilities typically required supporting infrastructure for freight transshipment and suitable locations, such as sites with marine access. Such operations could not generally be accommodated in conventional IBs. These requirements were taken into account during the planning process, and

suitable sites were reserved accordingly. For example, sites in Kwai Chung and Tsing Yi, covering a total area of hundreds of hectares, had been designated as "OU(Container Related Uses)", "OU(Container Terminal)" or related zones.

88. Ms Vilian W.L. Sum, Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West, Transport Department (TD) supplemented that site-based logistics centres could generate significant traffic impacts. It was therefore necessary to assess the volume of traffic generated, and how the site layout and vehicular ingress/egress arrangements would affect the surrounding areas. This was particularly important in the "OU(B)" zone, where developments were generally more compact than those on sites specifically zoned for logistics facilities. Putting logistics centres as a Column 2 use in the "OU(B)" zone would allow TD to assess those impacts in detail when a planning application was submitted.

Government Use

89. A Member asked whether 'Government Use (not elsewhere specified)' was always a Column 1 use in all land use zones such that it did not require planning permission. The Member observed that putting 'Public Clinic' as a separate use in Column 1 alongside 'Government Use (not elsewhere specified)' might not be necessary, as the latter should already cover public clinics.

90. In response, Mr K.K. Lee, CTP/TPB, with the aid of the visualiser, said that 'Government Use (not elsewhere specified)' covered a broad range of government services and administrative functions. Under the extant Notes for Schedule I of the "OU(B)" zone of the MSN, specific government uses including 'Police Reporting Centre' and 'Post Office' were expressly listed in Column 1, while other unspecified government uses were regarded as 'Government Use (not elsewhere specified)' under Column 2. The proposed amendment to Schedule I of the "OU(B)" zone by moving 'Government Use (not elsewhere specified)' from Column 2 to Column 1 was to align the land use control across Schedule I and Schedule II. 'Government Use (not elsewhere specified)' was placed under Column 1 in most land use zones for high-density developments as it was considered a compatible use in those circumstances. However, in specific land use zones, such as "OU" annotated "Funeral Parlour", and other non-development zones, such as "Green Belt" and "Conservation Area", 'Government Use (not elsewhere specified)' was generally placed under Column 2.

Hotel

91. Noting from paragraph 3.9 of the Paper that 'Hotel' was proposed to be moved from Column 2 to Column 1 in Schedule I of the "OU(B)" zone, and when considering hotel applications, including recent cases involving the conversion of commercial buildings into hotels (student hostels), in the "OU(B)" zone, the Town Planning Board (the Board/TPB) had to assess the land use compatibility and traffic impact of the proposals as well as the demand and supply of hotel rooms in the district, a Member asked how those concerns would be addressed and how the impacts of individual hotel proposals would be assessed if 'Hotel' became an always permitted use in the "OU(B)" zone.

92. In response, Mr K.K. Lee, CTP/TPB, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that 'Hotel' use was considered compatible with the surrounding land uses commonly found in the "OU(B)" zone. While incorporating 'Hotel' as a Column 1 use in Schedule I of the "OU(B)" zone could enhance land use flexibility, it would be subject to review in consultation with relevant B/Ds when proposing amendments to the respective OZPs. If there were concerns about infrastructure and traffic capacity or local context considerations, 'Hotel' use would be incorporated as a Column 2 use which would require planning permission from the Board. For instance, PlanD had recently considered moving 'Hotel' from Column 2 to Column 1 in Schedule I of the "OU(B)" zone when proposing amendments to the Kwun Tong (South) OZP. However, as the Drainage Services Department had expressed concerns about the sewerage capacity constraints in the area, 'Hotel' remained as a Column 2 use in Schedule I of the "OU(B)" zone. Relevant B/Ds would assess the potential impacts of the OZP amendments on a case-by-case basis.

Pier

93. Noting that low patronage and poor accessibility to ferry piers had led to the closure of some ferry routes, some Members welcomed the proposed inclusion of 'Shop and Services' and 'Eating Place' as Column 1 uses for major piers, such as North Point Ferry Pier, under the "OU(Pier)" zoning and suggested that a wider range of uses could be considered for better utilisation of the existing pier space. They had the following comments/questions:

(a) whether uses, such as Chinese restaurants, other eateries, and facilities to support the development of the Meetings, Incentives, Conventions and Exhibitions (MICE) industry could be added to Column 2 of the "OU(Pier)" zone; and

(b) whether the vacant spaces in ferry piers could be used by service organisations, such as domestic helper associations, to provide gathering spaces for domestic helpers on weekends, so that they did not need to make makeshift arrangements in public areas. Previously, the Home Affairs Department (HAD) had arranged similar indoor facilities but they were not used by domestic helpers due to stringent restrictions.

94. In response, Mr K.K. Lee, CTP/TPB, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides and the visualiser, made the following main points:

(a) a new schedule of uses was included in the MSN for the "OU(Pier)" zone. Most government ferry piers were managed by TD for use by licensed/franchised ferry operators which were responsible for daily operation of the piers. To better utilise the vacant floor space in piers and capitalise on the locational advantage of piers in built-up areas, a wider range of uses could be added as Column 1 or Column 2 uses under the "OU(Pier)" zone, including 'Shop and Services', 'Eating Place' and 'Exhibition or Convention Hall', to enhance vibrancy and land use flexibility, as and when necessary. As part of the ongoing review of the MSN, further uses might be considered for incorporation if there was a need to reflect changing public aspirations and societal needs in the future; and

(b) 'Government Use' was proposed under Column 1 of the "OU(Pier)" zone. If the proposed facilities for domestic helpers were to be operated by HAD, the Social Welfare Department or other organisations with the support of the Government, the use might be considered as 'Government Use'.

95. Mr C.K. Yip, Director of Planning, supplemented that the MSN for the "OU(Pier)" zone was a general reference and the uses suitable for accommodation in piers would depend

on the location and size of the facilities. For example, given its location and scale, Cheung Chau Ferry Pier would not be able to accommodate a wide range of Column 1 uses. As the primary function of ferry piers was to facilitate the boarding and alighting of passengers, a large number of visitors passing through the piers might disturb normal ferry operations. That said, food kiosks and small retail stores selling food and drinks for consumption by ferry passengers were directly related to the pier use. On the other hand, the use of space for domestic helpers to gather might have implications for ferry operations and would require a careful balance between such use and the smooth operation of ferry services. Another example was Kwun Tong Passenger Ferry Pier, where 'Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture' and 'Institutional Use' were included under Column 1 of the "OU(Pier)(1)" zone on the Kai Tak OZP, taking into account the large floor space available. Although it would be difficult to apply the same relaxation of uses generally across all piers, uses related to food and beverages and retail shops in ferry piers were considered to be directly and reasonably related to serving ferry passengers and would not affect ferry operations. The provision of certain types of Column 1 uses could be determined having regard to the individual circumstances of each OZP.

Proposed Amendments to DoT

Shop and Services

96. A Member noted that tutorial schools and interest classes were not regarded as formal schools, and previous planning applications for such uses in shopping malls had been assessed against the planning intention of the relevant zone. For example, applications relating to the commercial portion of Kai Tak Sports Park had been assessed against the planning intention of providing for sports-related commercial uses. The Member asked how, under the proposed amendments to include tutorial schools and interest classes under 'Shop and Services', such uses would be kept in proportion to other commercial uses and remain consistent with the planning intention of the relevant zone, for example, in the proposed commercial portion of a development within the "Residential (Group B)" zone. The Member also asked whether the Board should intervene if these educational uses became disproportionate to the intended commercial uses or were no longer in line with the planning intention.

97. In response, Mr K.K. Lee, CTP/TPB, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, explained that the proposed revision to the definition of 'Shop and Services' use was to include

tutorial schools and learning centres offering interest classes in shopping malls or street shops within non-IBs. In the past two years, several planning applications for 'School' use involving tutorial schools or learning centres in the shopping mall portion of Kai Tak Sports Park had been approved, as there were no significant concerns about land use compatibility or other technical issues. The proposed revision was intended to provide a more flexible and market-responsive planning framework that allowed a wide range of learning services while avoiding unnecessary planning applications. Meanwhile, the actual use of individual retail premises would depend largely on market demand. For example, in some less popular retail locations, it was not uncommon for retail premises to be let to businesses attracting fewer customers, such as tutorial schools, beauty parlours and real estate agencies. In that connection, the revised definition of 'Shop and Services' use would allow greater land use flexibility to accommodate different uses.

98. Noting that tutorial schools operating in IBs had aroused public concerns about land use compatibility and fire safety, a Member enquired whether the proposed amendments could set out criteria for assessing planning applications for tutorial schools in different types of buildings, and whether enforcement action would be taken against unauthorised uses, noting that other non-industrial uses, such as restaurants, massage parlours or religious institutions, were also found in IBs.

99. In response, Mr K.K. Lee, CTP/TPB, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that while some tutorial schools or learning centres were operating in IBs, they were likely to constitute unauthorised uses. Under the current planning control regime, there was no provision to allow 'School' use in the "I" zone or IBs. For the "OU(B)" zone, 'School (excluding free-standing purpose-designed building and kindergarten)' was a Column 1 use under Schedule I for non-IBs, while there was no provision for 'School' use in existing IBs under Schedule II of the "OU(B)" zone, except in the purpose-designed non-industrial portion on the lower floors of an existing building where 'School (excluding kindergarten)' was always permitted. The expanded definition of 'Shop and Services' referred to the permitted 'School' use in shop premises, but did not include such use in IBs due to fire safety concerns.

100. Mr Maurice K.W. Loo, Director of Lands, supplemented that unauthorised uses in IBs, such as the operation of tutorial schools in IBs, would generally be followed up by the Lands Department (LandsD) and/or the Buildings Department under the respective regimes.

With regard to lease breaches involving the change of uses in IBs, LandsD had been adopting a risk-based approach when following up on complaints. In particular, priority would be accorded to cases in which members of the public were attracted by the uses in breach of the lease to a unit in the IBs to use its facilities or services, while other premises in the same IB had been issued with Licences for Manufacture and/or Storage of Dangerous Goods by the Fire Services Department. In such cases, LandsD would take lease enforcement action in respect of the breach including but not limited to exercising the Government's right of re-entry. With regard to a lease breach in IBs with lower priority, LandsD would continue with the current arrangement of issuing a warning letter to the owners requiring them to rectify the breach of uses and register the warning letter at the Land Registry if the breach was not rectified. LandsD would also share information on cases with other relevant government departments, such as the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department in relation to food premises in IBs, as appropriate.

[Mr Bond C.P. Chow rejoined the meeting, and Dr Kelvin K.Y. Leung, Professor Simon K.L. Wong, Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Mr Gary C.W. Tam left the meeting during the question and answer session.]

101. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally agreed with the proposed amendments to the MSN, DoT and BUT as detailed in the Paper. The Secretariat would follow up on the administrative arrangements as appropriate.

102. After deliberation, the Board agreed that the proposed amendments to the MSN, DoT and BUT at Annexes A to D of the Paper, subject to detailed checking, should take effect upon promulgation and uploading to the TPB's website (i.e. upon confirmation of the minutes of the subject meeting).

103. The Chairperson thanked PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Agenda Item 6

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

104. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 3:30 p.m.