

就圖則作出申述
Representation Relating to Plan

參考編號
 Reference Number: 260826-182422-45837

Representation Number:
 TPB/R/S/H15/34-R1

提交限期
 Deadline for submission: 24/09/2026

Submission Number:
 TPB/R/S/H15/34-S1

提交日期及時間
 Date and time of submission: 26/08/2026 18:24:22

「申述人」全名
 Full Name of "Representer": 先生 Mr. Paulus Johannes Zimmerman

「獲授權代理人」全名
 Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與申述相關的圖則
 Plan to which the representation relates: S/H15/34

申述詳情
Details of the Representation:

有關事項 Subject Matters	你支持還是反對有關事項? Are you supporting or opposing the subject matter?	理由 Reason
S/H15/34	反對 Oppose	From the plan it is unclear how the future marina(s) development will have use of the seabed alongside the shore of the future development for lifting and launching of vessels subject repairs and maintenance. Shipyard activities are an important function of marinas. The boundaries of marinas require to include both land and seabed for quality operations. Moreover, it is unclear from the information provided what parts of the sea (typhoon shelter) are designated for moorings which will be under the control of the marina(s) and which parts will be under control of the marine department.

對圖則是否有任何擬議修訂? 如有的話, 請註明詳情。

Any proposed amendments to the plan? If yes, please specify the details.

The plan to include a section of the seabed in front of land designated for marinas, to support the mooring, lifting, and launching of vessels subject to maintenance and repairs.

Moreover, the plans must include clearly delineation of the areas of water designated for moorings vessels, and whether these moorings will be under the control of the future marina, and which waters will be let out via private moorings or other scheme under the control of the marine department.

就圖則作出申述**Representation Relating to Plan**

參考編號

Reference Number:

260918-152251-18837

提交限期

Deadline for submission:

24/09/2026

Submission Number:

TPB/R/S/H15/34-S2

提交日期及時間

Date and time of submission:

18/09/2026 15:22:51

「申述人」全名

Full Name of "Representer":

先生 Mr. Paulus Johannes Zimmerman

「獲授權代理人」全名

Full Name of "Authorized Agent":

與申述相關的圖則

Plan to which the representation relates: S/H15/34

申述詳情

Details of the Representation:

有關事項 Subject Matters	你支持還是反對有關事項? Are you supporting or opposing the subject matter?	理由 Reason
Amendment B	反對 Oppose	Object to loss of land set available for shipyards, specifically the loss of part of shipyard 29 Shum Wan Road. Hong Kong has embarked on aggressively growing the Yacht Economy and needs more, not less land for shipyards. Shipyard capacity in Hong Kong is severely constrained to small strips along Tam Kon Shan Road in Tsing Yi, along Ap Lei Chau Praya Road and Shum Wan Road at Aberdeen Harbour. Only one new small site is identified at Tung Chung New Town, and now made part of Skytopia led by the Hong Kong Airport.

對圖則是否有任何擬議修訂? 如有的話, 請註明詳情。

Any proposed amendments to the plan? If yes, please specify the details.

Do not reduce shipyard space.

☐Urgent ☐Return receipt ☐Expand Group ☐Restricted ☐Prevent Copy

Representation Number:

TPB/R/S/H15/34-R2

tpbpd/PLAND

寄件者:

寄件日期:

收件者:

主旨:

類別:

2026年09月24日星期四 1:27

tpbpd/PLAND

AMENDMENTS TO ABERDEEN & AP LEI CHAU OZP NO. S/H15/33

Internet Email

Submission Number:

TPB/R/S/H15/34-S3

AMENDMENTS TO ABERDEEN & AP LEI CHAU OZP NO. S/H15/33

Dear TPB Members,

Item A – about 1.6 ha. Rezoning of a site at Po Chong Wan from “G/IC” (69.9%), “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Ocean Park” (.05%), an area shown as ‘Typhoon Shelter’ (28%) and an area shown as ‘Road’ (1.7%) to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Marina cum Residential Development with Public Open Space” with stipulation of BHR

3 Towers – 252 Units / PR 8 / 130mPD / OS 705sq.m / 265 Vehicle Parking / 880sq.m POS / Marina Club House / Workshops / 231 Vehicle Parking

1987, the site was repurposed to reprovision marine engine workshops and marine associated trades displaced by the Ap Lei Chau North Reclamation project. Since then, it has been tendered and operated for this specific use under STTs.

Currently, the PCWTIA is occupied by 91 STTs. LandsD claims to have recently conducted five site inspections, in which it was observed that only about 25% to 35% tenants remained in operation. Some will be relocated to Tin Wan Praya Road.

No information provided as to whether the Tin Wan Praya facility can accommodate all the operators who wish to continue in business?

What is striking about the OZP is not what is included, but what is left out:

*“The ATS will be expanded southward by **about 24 ha** (including navigation channels) with the construction of two new breakwaters and a floating breakwater. It is intended to allocate the western part of the expansion area for public mooring, and the eastern part adjacent to Tai Shue Wan for marina development. In addition, the project will incorporate public open spaces atop both the*

☐Urgent ☐Return receipt ☐Expand Group ☐Restricted ☐Prevent Copy

existing and proposed eastern breakwaters for public enjoyment. A public landing facility will be provided on the proposed eastern breakwater, which will be connected via a 240m-long pedestrian walkway to the promenade along Ocean Drive."

Does this not require approval of TPB? The extent of the Aberdeen Channel to be effectively filled in is significant and given the opportunity I would object to this on the grounds that it will have a negative impact on the public domain, including the views of the natural and undeveloped coastline enjoyed from Ocean Park and those of residents and visitors taking the Ap Lei Chau to Ap Lei Pai coastal trail that takes one out to Mount Johnston Lighthouse.

Will there be an opportunity to voice out that the proposed moorings be confined to the mainland coast line?

The proposed marina development at ATS expansion has also been identified as a key measure to promote island tourism. So its all about tourism with a complete disregard for the local population and the loss of an extensive green panorama.

Unfortunately, there is no accountability with regard to the supposed benefits of ever- increasing number of visitors. No mention of how much additional expenditure on maintenance, manpower, etc. At the same time local people have to avoid certain areas and attractions because of over crowding and restrictions are being imposed on visiting sensitive ecological sites.

There is also no mention of the impact on services generated by the Golden Weeks. Additional resource and manpower have to be employed to cope. Many businesses find coping with a very uneven influx of visitors to be unsustainable. A large restaurant near my home that catered to the low-cost tour groups recently shut down because there was little business between the Golden Weeks. Local residents are delighted of course because we no longer have to tolerate idling tour buses parked under our windows.

Re the development, like those of the URA it has nothing to do with appropriate location, it is all about financing.

The three towers will have a significant negative impact on the unobstructed verdant views of the hillsides: The height of any development at this location should be capped to preserve the ridgeline.

☐Urgent ☐Return receipt ☐Expand Group ☐Restricted ☐Prevent Copy

The POS 880sq.m appears to be nothing more than an extended footbridge. It is only 6mt wide so cannot accommodate a bicycle lane. Unless one is walking to the Marina there would be little point in using it. The intention is clearly to include a small public facility in order to mitigate the rezoning of a significant "GIC".

It is not clear how close it is to the road that will have heavy and frequent traffic re the almost 500 parking spaces plus additional drops offs from coaches and taxis. Members should question this point as the heavy traffic will generate both noise and air pollution.

Once again, the interests and preferences of the community are being sacrificed to fund a project that will serve the wealthy with little benefit for ordinary folk who cannot afford a yacht and private club membership.

Item B – about 373m2. Rezoning of a strip of land to the south of the "Industrial" zone at Po Chong Wan from "G/IC" to "I" with stipulation of 2-storey BHR.

Part of shipyard operation.

Item C –about 49m2. Rezoning of two pieces of land at Shum Wan Road from "OU(Ocean Park)" to areas shown as 'Road'.

Part of the existing Shum Wan Road.

B and C HOUSEKEEPING

Amendments to the Notes of the Plan

(b) Revision to paragraph (7)(a) of the covering Notes to allow provision, maintenance or repair of small unmanned aircraft take-off and landing facilities on land falling within the boundaries of the Plan except (a) where the uses or developments are specified in Col 2 of the Notes of individual zones or (b) as provided in paragraph (8) of the covering Notes in relation to areas zoned "Coastal Protection Area" or "Site of Special Scientific Interest" ("SSSI").

☐Urgent ☐Return receipt ☐Expand Group ☐Restricted ☐Prevent Copy

STRONG OBJECTIONS. USE OF DRONES SHOULD BE STRICTLY CONTAINED. ALLOWING PEOPLE WHO ARE TOO LAZY TO WALK TO THE NEAREST OUTLET TO HAVE ITEMS DELIVERED BY DRONE WOULD EFFECTIVELY ALLOW COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES TO TAKE OVER OUR PARKS, ETC. HAVING LOW RISE DRONES ETC OPERATE FREELY ON COMMON AREAS WOULD GENERATE NOISE POLLUTION AND CREATE HAZARDS.

SCHOOLS ARE ANOTHER AREA OF CONCERN. HAVING DRONES HOVERING WITHIN RANGE OF HOMES STRIPS CITIZENS OF THEIR RIGHT TO PRIVACY AND THE ENJOYMENT OF THEIR OWN HOME.

MORE STARTLING IS THAT IN A JURISDICTION OBSESSED WITH NS THAT THE MANY WAYS IN WHICH DRONES COULD BE USED AND ABUSED ARE COMPLETELY IGNORED.

Re drones, HK is completely out of line with the mainland where issues including NS have become a concern.

<https://www.scmp.com/news/china/politics/article/3363535/china-halts-drone-shows-across-country-airspace-controls-tighten>

<https://www.thestandard.com.hk/china/article/329687/Mainland-drone-market-cools-as-drone-regulations-to-be-tightened-more-than-ever>

Because business operators and legislators are pushing the low altitude economy the government here is ignoring all the potential issues, including public security.

Members have a duty to raise issues that are being overlooked by govt depts.

Rushing to accommodate the latest fad without due diligence and consultation always ends in disaster as has been the case over the years.

(c) Incorporation of 'Government Use (not elsewhere specified)' under Col 1 of Schedule I of the Notes for "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" zone; and corresponding deletions of 'Government Use (Police Reporting Centre, Post Office only)' from Col 1 and 'Government Use (not elsewhere specified)' from Col 2 of Schedule I of the Notes for "OU(Business)" zone.

☐Urgent ☐Return receipt ☐Expand Group ☐Restricted ☐Prevent Copy

STRONG OBJECTIONS AS THIS ALLOWS THE ADMINISTRATION TO INSTALL ANY OPERATION OF ITS CHOICE INTO A DEVELOPMENT WITHOUT ANY OVERSIGHT AS TO WHETHER THE OCCUPANTS AND THE COMMUNITY APPROVE.

(g) Revision to the Remarks of the Notes for "SSSI" zone in accordance with the MSN

Amendments are made to the Remarks of the Notes for "SSSI" zone to exempt public works co-ordinated or implemented by Government, maintenance or repair works from planning permission requirement, based on the updated MSN.

STRONGEST OBJECTIONS. WE ARE SEEING AN INVASION OF SENSITIVE SITES BY VISITORS WHO SHOW NO RESPECT FOR REGULATIONS OR FOR NATURE. IN ORDER TO ACCOMMODATE THEM THE GOVERNMENT PLANS VIEWING PLATFORMS AND OTHER AMENITIES THAT MANY IN THE COMMUNITY OBJECT TO.

MEMBERS SHOULD RETAIN THE CURRENT RIGHT OF THE COMMUNITY AND CONCERN GROUPS TO SCRUTINIZE THESE SO CALLED 'PUBLIC WORKS' AS THEY ARE OFTEN INTRUSIVE AND GENERATE DAMAGE TO VULNERABLE LOCATIONS.

Mary Mulvihill