

**TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

**Minutes of 737<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 1.3.2024**

**Present**

Director of Planning  
Mr Ivan M. K. Chung

Chairman

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Vice-chairman

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department  
Mr Chow Bing Kay

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department  
Mr Paul Y.K. Au

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory South),  
Environmental Protection Department  
Miss Queenie Y.C. Ng

Assistant Director/Regional 1,  
Lands Department  
Ms Trevina C.W. Kung

Deputy Director of Planning/District  
Mr C.K. Yip

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

**In Attendance**

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr Brian C.L. Chau

**Agenda Item 1**

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 736<sup>th</sup> MPC Meeting held on 16.2.2024

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 736<sup>th</sup> MPC meeting held on 16.2.2024 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

Matter Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

## **Deferral Cases**

### **Sections 12A and 16 Applications**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

#### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

3. The Secretary reported that there were four cases requesting the Town Planning Board to defer consideration of the applications. Details of those requests for deferral, Members' declaration of interests for individual cases and the Committee's views on the declared interests were in the **Annex**.

#### **Deliberation Session**

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

## **Hong Kong District**

### **Agenda Item 4**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/21  
(MPC Paper No. 3/24)

---

5. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments to the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) for the planning area of Pok Fu Lam involved rezoning of a site at Victoria Road to facilitate the development of the proposed Global Innovation Centre (Amendment Item A), and rezoning of strips of land along Victoria Road (Amendment Items B1 and B2) and in Wah Fu Estate (Amendment Item C) to reflect the as-built conditions. The University of Hong Kong (HKU) was the project proponent of the proposed Global Innovation Centre.

The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung<br>( <i>Vice-chairman</i> ) | - being the Chairman of the Accounting Advisory Board of School of Business, HKU;  |
| Ms Lilian S.K. Law                              | - being an Adjunct Associate Professor of the Department of Social Work and Social Administration, HKU;  |
| Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong                    | - having close relative living in Pok Fu Lam;  |
| Professor Roger C.K. Chan                       | - being an Honorary Associate Professor of the Department of Urban Planning and Design, HKU;   |
| Mr Ben S.S. Lui                                 | - co-owning with spouse a flat in Pok Fu Lam, his spouse owning a car parking space in Pok Fu Lam, and being a director of a company which owned flats and car parking spaces in Pok Fu Lam; and |
| Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui                  | - being an Adjunct Professor of the Department of Social Work and Social Administration, HKU”.   |

6. The Committee noted that Mr Ben S.S. Lui had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting, and according to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board, as the proposed amendments to the OZP in relation to the Global Innovation Centre (the proposed Centre) were proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the interests of Members having affiliations with HKU on the item only need to be recorded and they could stay in the meeting. The Committee agreed that as the residence of the close relative of Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong had no direct view of the amendment sites, he could stay in the meeting.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

7. The following representatives from the Innovation, Technology and Industry Bureau (ITIB), PlanD and HKU were invited to the meeting at this point:

**ITIB**

Miss Fung Long Yin, Betty - Assistant Secretary for Innovation, Technology and Industry (AS/IT&I)

**PlanD**

Ms Janet K.K. Cheung - District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK)

Ms Erica S.M. Wong - Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK)

Mr Ronald C.H. Chan - Town Planner/Hong Kong (TP/HK)

**HKU**

Professor Xiang Zhang ]

Professor Richard Y.C. Wong ] President's Office

Mr Syrus Tsui ]

Professor Vivian Yam ]

Professor Xiaobo Yin ] Professoriate Staff

Professor Anderson Shum ]

Mr Jeffrey Sy ]

Ms Bella Fan ]

Mr Joseph Kong ] Estates Office

Ms Deborah Chung ]

Dr Paul Hunt ]

Ms Michelle Lam - Communications and Public Affairs Office

**HKU's Consultants**

Mr Lim Wan Fung, Bernard Vincent ] Architecture Design and Research Group

Mr Chan Chun Yu, Ricco ] Limited

Mr Chan Kim On ] Vision Planning Consultants Limited

Mr Wong Sai Wai, Wilson ]

Mr Joseph C.C. Wong - Ho Wan SPB Limited

Mr Ko Yow

- Ko Landscape Architects Limited

8. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Erica S.M. Wong, STP/HK, PlanD, briefed Members on the background of the proposed amendments to the OZP, technical considerations, consultation conducted and departmental comments as details in the Paper. The proposed amendments were:

- (a) Amendment Item A - rezoning of a site between Pok Fu Lam Road and Victoria Road (Item A Site) from “Green Belt” (“GB”), “Residential (Group C)6” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “Other Specified Use” annotated “Global Innovation Centre” (“OU(Global Innovation Centre)”);
- (b) Amendment Item B1 - rezoning of strips of land along Victoria Road from area shown as ‘Road’ to “GB”;
- (c) Amendment Item B2 - rezoning of strips of land along Victoria Road from “GB” to area shown as ‘Road’; and
- (d) Amendment Item C - rezoning of a strip of land at Waterfall Bay Road from “Open Space” to “Residential (Group A)”.

[Mr Franklin Yu, Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu and Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui joined the meeting during PlanD’s presentation.]

9. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Professor Xiang Zhang, Professor Richard Y.C. Wong, Professor Vivian Yam, Professor Xiaobo Yin, Professor Anderson Shum and Mr Jeffrey Sy, HKU’s representatives, briefed Members on the following main points:

*Background*

- (a) as announced in the 2021 Policy Address, the Government agreed in principle to reserve a site at Pok Fu Lam for HKU to construct facilities for deep technology;
- (b) in the 2023-2024 Budget, the Government earmarked HK\$3 billion to

promote the development of facilities to enhance basic research in frontier technology, and such intention was re-emphasised in the recently announced 2024-2025 Budget;

- (c) deep technology was based on scientific discoveries of inventions and focused on production of knowledge with emphasis on interdisciplinary research and collaborations, aiming to addressing human grand challenges;
- (d) the proposed Centre would be an upstream deep technology research facility for Hong Kong's innovation and technology (I&T) ecosystem, acting as a hub for basic research and fountainhead for original discoveries, which aligned with the Government's policy intention in fostering further development in basic research;
- (e) the Central People's Government advocated that strengthening basic research was imperative for self-sufficiency in science and technology and the progress in basic research was the key to tackle technology bottleneck. In this regard, eight state-level laboratories were established in different Mainland cities;

#### *Importance of Upstream Deep Technology Research*

- (f) upstream deep technology research was transformative and the fountainhead for technology which could generate new industry sectors and inspire new area of study;
- (g) through interdisciplinary research and collaboration, upstream deep technology research would provide solutions to many global challenges, including cancer treatment, vaccine development, clean technology development as well as innovation for climate change;

#### *Strategic Importance of the Proposed Centre*

- (h) the proposed Centre would be a major driving force in developing Hong



Kong into an international I&T hub, and this was in line with the National 14<sup>th</sup> Five-Year Plan. It aligned with the Government's policy of attracting talents, as this facility would help nurture and host high calibre research talents, both locally and internationally, to station in Hong Kong. It would also enable research and innovation to work organically, creating a positive feedback loop where talents attracted talents;

- (i) Hong Kong had always been a successful cradle for world class scientists and the proposed Centre was essential to provide new infrastructure for research. With the most advanced facilities and laboratories, the proposed Centre would help diversify the type of research that Hong Kong could accommodate;
- (j) the proposed Centre would be the first ever deep technology research facility in Hong Kong. Unlike other I&T centres in Hong Kong, the proposed Centre would focus solely on upstream research which would generate innovative ideas, and would act as a bridge between upstream research and downstream applications in other I&T centres in Hong Kong, such as the Loop. The proposed Centre would also help connect Mainland Research & Development (R&D) institutes with the international counterparts;
- (k) on one hand, the proposed Centre would provide existing industries with more efficient and cost effective solutions, such as better manufacturing process and more advanced automation, and on the other hand, it would enable the development of new industry which in turn would create new job opportunities;
- (l) by developing a technological ecosystem that enabled start-ups to thrive, the proposed Centre would act as a springboard for local gross domestic product;
- (m) the proposed Centre would connect with the Medical Campus of HKU (HKUMed campus) and Queen Mary Hospital on one end and Cyberport on the other, creating an innovation corridor for deep technology which had the

potential to become the central innovation hub of Hong Kong. It would further uplift the economic and demographic landscapes of the Southern District as evidenced from the experience of similar developments in other countries, such as the Silicon Valley. Leveraging on the close proximity to the HKUMed campus and its expansion, the proposed Centre would also provide venue for comprehensive training and advanced research facilities for future healthcare professionals;

- (n) the proposed Centre would become a hub for secondary school students to cultivate their interests in scientific research and provide a head start in local STEM education;

#### *The Proposal*

- (o) the proposed Centre with a site area of about 4.7ha was sandwiched between Pok Fu Lam Road and Victoria Road. A total maximum gross floor area (GFA) of about 222,000m<sup>2</sup>, including about 10,000m<sup>2</sup> domestic GFA for scholars' residence/staff quarters, and a maximum building height of 158mPD were proposed. Under the indicative scheme, a terraced building design with vertical greening and green roofs was proposed to enable the proposed Centre be better blending in with the surrounding areas. The proposed Centre would be developed in cluster form in order to optimise building gaps and hence, maximising air ventilation and visual permeability;
- (p) regarding vehicular access arrangement, with the site spanning over 450m in length, it was proposed to have one access at Pok Fu Lam Road and two accesses at Victoria Road. The fourth access was proposed to connect the proposed Centre with the adjoining HKUMed campus expansion and the existing Sassoon Road campus;
- (q) for pedestrian connectivity, a barrier free and traffic free pedestrian network with escalators and lifts connecting between Pok Fu Lam Road and Victoria Road, and with the adjoining HKUMed campus and the existing Sassoon Road campus was proposed;

- (r) on landscape design aspect, trees would be planted in clusters to create natural habitats and new trees of fruit bearing species would be selected to enhance biodiversity. Landscape courtyard would be incorporated along the main walkways for passive recreational activities. Communal open spaces would be provided within the proposed Centre for enjoyment of the students, staff and the general public. Taking into account the comments from the Southern District Council (SDC) during the consultation in January 2024, HKU would explore the possibility to incorporate pet-friendly facilities in the communal open spaces;
- (s) various technical assessments were conducted to ascertain the feasibility of the proposed Centre and it was concluded that with the implementation of appropriate enhancement measures and infrastructural works, the proposed Centre was technically feasible. HKU would continue to work with the relevant authorities to implement the measures/works;
- (t) although the proposed Centre might bring about inconvenience to the local community during the construction stage, modern construction methods would be adopted to minimise the potential impacts; and
- (u) in the long run, the proposed Centre would enhance the accessibility of the locality by providing barrier-free pedestrian connections and provide a wider range of public activity spaces to the local community.

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

10. The Chairman remarked that there were three proposed amendment items to the OZP. HKU's representatives had made a detailed presentation on Amendment Item A, whereas Amendment Items B and C were to reflect the existing conditions of the respective sites. Should the Committee agree to the proposed amendments, the draft OZP would be gazetted for public inspection. The representations on the OZP amendments received would be submitted to the Board for consideration. The Chairman then invited questions from Members.

*Strategic Positioning of the Proposed Centre and Site Selection*

11. A Member asked whether the proposed Centre was the only one of its kind and whether there were other similar innovation centres managed by other universities in Hong Kong. In response, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, DPO/HK, said that according to HKU's proposal, the proposed Centre was the first of its kind in Hong Kong.

12. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) how would the upstream research at the proposed Centre differ from other I&T developments in Hong Kong, including San Tin Technopole, Cyberport and Hong Kong Science and Technology Parks, and what would be the planning gain of having such innovation centre;
- (b) noting that healthcare was one of the research aspects at the proposed Centre in the future, whether the facility for such research aspect in the proposed Centre would be different from or related to those at the neighbouring HKUMed campus and its expansion;
- (c) the rationale for choosing Pok Fu Lam to locate the proposed Centre rather than other existing or planned I&T developments in Hong Kong; and
- (d) whether the current scale of the proposed Centre with an area of about 4.7ha was adequate for promoting upstream research and boosting I&T development of Hong Kong, and whether more similar facilities would be established, such as in the Northern Metropolis.

13. In response, Professor Xiang Zhang and Professor Richard Y.C. Wong, HKU's representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) the current and committed I&T initiatives in Hong Kong, including those at the Loop and San Tin areas, were mainly related to downstream applications. In order to enhance the I&T ecosystem of Hong Kong,

infrastructure and talents for both upstream research and downstream applications would be required. As evidenced from the experience in the Mainland and other countries, such as Israel and India, it was considered crucial to plan ahead for upstream research to facilitate the development of I&T industry and avoid bottleneck in the innovation process. The proposed Centre would be a facility for upstream research while those in the San Tin Technopole, for example, may focus more on transforming ideas to valuable products. These research facilities would complement each other and form a comprehensive I&T ecosystem;

- (b) the HKUMed campus expansion was developed in response to Government's policy of enhancing the training for more medical staff where there would be all sorts of teaching, training and researches on medical and healthcare conducted by the Faculty of Medicine of HKU. Yet, it could create synergy effect with the proposed Centre, which focused more on basic research with researchers from not only HKU but also other institutions in Hong Kong and from overseas;
- (c) as the proposed Centre would be managed by HKU, it would be beneficial in management and operation terms to locate the proposed Centre close to other HKU premises and the Main Campus of HKU. Also, as the proposed Centre was for basic research, being in proximity to downstream applications was not necessary as the two processes involved different parties; and
- (d) development of basic research was still in a very initial stage in Hong Kong and it might take decades for the establishment to mature. The scale of the proposed Centre was comparable to most of the state-level laboratories in the Mainland and was considered optimum at this stage. Hence, having another facility of similar nature in another location in Hong Kong was not conceivable in the foreseeable future.

*Zoning and Land Use*

14. A few Members raised the following questions:
- (a) the rationale for adopting the zoning of “OU(Global Innovation Centre)”, instead of “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”), which was consistent with the zoning for universities campuses, noting that most of the permitted uses under Column 1 of the “OU(Global Innovation Centre)” zone resembled those commonly found in a university;
  - (b) whether the concept of “deep technology” and “basic research” would be featured in the statutory planning documents to highlight the uniqueness of the proposed Centre;
  - (c) whether there was any restriction on the total GFA dedicated for supporting facilities, such as ‘Shop and Services’, for the “OU(Global Innovation Centre)” zone;
  - (d) in addition to building height control, whether other design-related restrictions, such as those under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines, would be incorporated for the “OU(Global Innovation Centre)” zone; and
  - (e) whether there was any assessment on the loss of “GB” zone due to the proposed Centre and whether there would be other planned development at “GB” zones in the area.
15. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, DPO/HK, PlanD, made the following main points:
- (a) as stated clearly in the Notes of the “OU(Global Innovation Centre)” zone, the planning intention was specifically tailored for the provision of land for development of a Global Innovation Centre by HKU for deep technology research rather than other uses covered by “G/IC” zones. In

deriving the schedule of uses for this specific zoning, reference had been made to the technical assessments conducted for the proposed Centre which confirmed the feasibility of the land use mix, and the schedules of uses of I&T related zonings on other OZPs, such as those for the Hong Kong Science and Technology Parks, Cyberport, etc. Some of the uses might not be permitted under a “G/IC” zoning;

- (b) the concepts of deep technology and basic research of the proposed Centre were specified in paragraph 7.8.6 of the draft Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP;
- (c) to provide suitable flexibility at detailed design stage, supporting facilities such as ‘Eating Place’ and ‘Shop and Services’ for the proposed Centre were incorporated under Column 1 of the “OU(Global Innovation Centre)” zone and there would be no statutory planning control on the maximum GFA for such supporting facilities;
- (d) since various technical assessments had already been conducted and confirmed the technical feasibility of the proposed Centre, no further technical assessments were required to support the rezoning proposal at this stage. Specific building design concepts, such as terraced design, were incorporated in the draft ES of the OZP to guide the future development. Relevant government departments would closely monitor the implementation of the proposed Centre through various mechanisms, such as vetting of general building plan submission and imposition of relevant land lease conditions; and
- (e) the Item A Site occupied about 3% of the total area of “GB” zone on the OZP and there was currently no plan to further develop any “GB” site in the area. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD, considered that the proposed Centre was not incompatible with the surrounding environment.

16. A Member considered that the zoning of “OU(Global Innovation Centre)” might

be too specific as the uses in the proposed Centre would be similar to those in a standard university and further asked that if there was another innovation centre proposed by a different university in the future, whether such facility would be zoned as “OU(Global Innovation Centre)”. In response, the Chairman stated that universities which usually came with a large campus would generally be zoned as “G/IC” to allow flexibility for different kinds of related uses. For the proposed Centre, a specific land use zoning was considered appropriate to reflect the unique purpose of this particular site as set out in the Policy Address. Besides, the project proponent had undertaken relevant technical assessments to substantiate the feasibility of this specific land use at this particular site. If there were similar facilities to be proposed by other universities in the future, each case would be considered on its own merit.

*Ecological, Landscape and Visual Impacts*

17. A Member enquired on the nature of the five affected watercourses within Item A Site and if there were any measures proposed to protect them. In response, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, DPO/HK, said that according to the Ecological Impact Assessment submitted by HKU, the five watercourses found on site were channelised at different levels with low to moderate ecological value. Nonetheless, the watercourses would be preserved and 5m preservation zones offset from them had been proposed to serve as local habitats for existing flora and fauna. Building voids and skylights would be adopted in the design of the proposed Centre to allow sunlight penetrating to the preserved watercourses and nearby vegetation.

18. Noting that some 2,000 trees within Item A Site would be affected and the proposed compensation ratio was less than 1:0.5, a Member asked if the tree compensation ratio could be further increased. In response, Mr Jeffrey Sy, HKU’s representative, stated that the tree compensation ratio was derived after taking into account various factors, such as the footprint of the facilities to be accommodated within the site as well as the vehicular and pedestrian network arrangement. In addition to tree planting, various forms of landscaping such as vertical greening and green roof were proposed. HKU would endeavour to maximise the greening provision as far as practicable.

19. A Member noted that the residential block of the proposed Centre would be close



to Baguio Villa, an existing residential development to the immediate south of Item A Site, and asked whether there would be design/mitigation measures to minimise the possible overlooking effect. In response, Mr Jeffrey Sy, HKU's representative, said that the orientation of the proposed scholars' residence block was designed with a view to minimising the possible overlooking effect on the neighbouring residential developments. HKU would continue to have close dialogues with the local residents during the implementation stage and would further refine the layout design if necessary.

*Communal Open Space and Pedestrian Connectivity*

20. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) whether the café, shops and restaurants and communal open space as proposed in the indicative scheme would be opened to public at all hours;
  - (b) measures undertaken to create a weather proof internal connection to facilitate movement of people and goods; and
  - (c) whether footbridge would be provided to connect the proposed Centre and the communal open space with the other side of Pok Fu Lam Road to enhance the accessibility.
21. In response, Professor Xiang Zhang and Mr Jeffrey Sy, HKU's representatives, made the following main points:
- (a) as the project was still at an initial stage, the specific management and operation details such as the opening hours and access arrangement of the facilities and open space, were yet to be determined. HKU would determine such management and operation details as the project proceeded and after consulting the relevant stakeholders including the local community; and
  - (b) with reference to the design of the HKU Main Campus, it was planned to create a traffic-free and barrier-free pedestrian network throughout

the proposed Centre with connections to the adjoining existing and planned HKU premises and campus with a view to achieving a safe pedestrian environment for the future users as well as the visiting general public.

22. Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, DPO/HK, supplemented that the proposed Centre would be connected with the neighbouring HKUMed campus expansion, which could lead to an existing footbridge across Pok Fu Lam Road and Queen Mary Hospital, as well as other existing HKU premises along Sassoon Road.

### *Traffic Impacts*

23. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether Victoria Road could accommodate the anticipated traffic flow of the proposed Centre, especially during peak hours;
- (b) the rationale for adopting a design year of 2032 in the preliminary Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA); and
- (c) whether a district-wide comprehensive review on the medium/long term cumulative traffic impact of the proposed Centre had been undertaken in view that there were various other upcoming development initiatives, such as the Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment, proposed in the Pok Fu Lam area.

24. In response, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, DPO/HK made the following main points:

- (a) a preliminary TIA had been conducted for the proposed Centre to ascertain the technical feasibility of the development from traffic engineering perspective, taking into account the planned and committed traffic improvement schemes in the vicinity. It was concluded that major road links and junctions (except few junctions) would operate satisfactorily within their capacities. Road works/traffic improvement measures were

proposed under the TIA, and the project proponent was required to submit an updated TIA upon confirmation of the design parameters at the detailed design stage and assess the construction traffic impact. Also, in view that the development programme of the project would span across a long timeframe, the project proponent would also be required to submit a traffic review before the commissioning of the proposed Centre;

- (b) under the general practice, the design year adopted in a TIA for assessing the performance of major road links and junctions was usually set at three years after project completion. In this case, given that phase 1 of the proposed Centre would be completed in 2029, hence a design year of 2032 was adopted; and
- (c) the TIA conducted for the proposed Centre had already taken into account the planned and committed developments in the Pok Fu Lam area and it was anticipated that even without taking into account the proposed MTR South Island Line (West) (SIL(W)), the proposed Centre would not cause significant traffic impact onto the local road network.

25. A Member further enquired should the subsequent traffic review revealed that the roads and junctions had exceeded their capacities, and improvement measures were warranted, which party would be responsible for the implementation as well as works expenses. In response, Mr Chow Bing Kay, AC/Urban, Transport Department said that the project proponent would need to implement the traffic improvement measures as identified in the submitted TIA. If additional traffic improvement measures were required in the traffic review before the commissioning of the development, the project proponent should implement the relevant traffic improvement measures for mitigating the associated traffic impact induced from the proposed development at their own cost.

#### *Risk Management*

26. A Member enquired whether there was any risk management plan, in particular environmental and chemical aspect, to ensure safety given there would be laboratories in the proposed Centre. In response, Professor Richard Y.C. Wong, HKU's representative, said

that the proposed Centre would be managed by HKU and made available to local and international researchers engaged in upstream research. In this regard, international environmental and safety standards would be strictly adhered to. Also, majority of the proposed facility would be dry laboratories.

#### *Local Consultation*

27. A few Members enquired on the consultation with the local community and the neighbouring users, including Ebenezer School, undertaken by HKU and how HKU would continue to maintain communication with them. In response, Mr Jeffrey Sy, HKU's representative, stated that due regards had been paid to the surrounding developments in formulating the development intensity and design of the proposed Centre, such as that the proposed building height of 158mPD was only about 20m above Pok Fu Lam Road and was considered compatible with the surrounding developments. HKU had been in close liaison with SDC to solicit their support and views, and would continue to work with them throughout the implementation of the project. Consultation meetings and regular meetups with the local residents would be conducted. For Ebenezer School to its immediate north, HKU had maintained a close dialogue with them continually.

28. A Member further appealed to HKU that they should not limit their consultation to DC members but should expand further to strenuously engage the general local community. In response, Mr Jeffrey Sy, HKU's representative, assured that HKU would maintain close and regular liaison with the local community and neighbouring users.

#### *Funding and Implementation Arrangement*

29. Some Members enquired on the funding arrangement of the proposed Centre, in particular whether the Government would provide any funding to support the development. In response, Professor Xiang Zhang, HKU's representative, stated that funding would be raised from both private and public sectors, locally and from overseas. It would also be funded via the research grants brought along by the future users of the proposed Centre. HKU had recently secured HK\$200 million from a single donor and would continue to seek various funding sources.

30. A Member asked about the anticipated split of future users between HKU and other universities in Hong Kong and also between local and overseas researchers. In response, Professor Xiang Zhang and Professor Richard Y.C. Wong, HKU's representatives, stated that as the project was still at the very initial stage, it was difficult to anticipate the actual split. Given the size and scale of the proposed Centre and drawing experience from other similar facilities overseas, such as the Argonne National Laboratory in Chicago, it was anticipated that the vast majority of the facility would be used by HKU and international researchers. Hong Kong had the unique position to act as an international centre linking the research centres in the Mainland and those overseas. Besides, while not being the main development objective of the proposed Centre, activities like weekend seminars for the local community or the general public could be held for public outreach.

31. A Member further enquired about the Government's role in taking forward the implementation of the proposed Centre. Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, DPO/HK, explained that government bureaux/departments would continue to take part in the implementation of the project and offer professional advice under the existing mechanisms. For example, the relevant departments would review the general building plans submitted by the project proponent and ensure that the committed building design concepts and enhancement/mitigation measures were duly reflected in the development scheme and implemented as proposed.

32. In response to a Member's question about the roadmap for development of basic research in Hong Kong, Miss Fung Long Yin, Betty, AS/IT&I, ITIB, stated that the Government promulgated the Hong Kong Innovation and Technology Development Blueprint in 2022 which emphasised the importance of having upstream, midstream and downstream sectors to enhance the I&T ecosystem and promote interactive development. While the San Tin Technopole, the InnoPark and the Hong Kong Science and Technology Parks covered different sectors in the I&T ecosystem, the proposed Centre focused on the upstream basic research. To facilitate the development of such research facility in Hong Kong, the Government would continue to render support to the project proponent on planning and land administration aspects.

33. Members had no question on Amendment Items B and C and generally considered that all the proposed amendments to the OZP were acceptable.

34. The Chairman remarked that Members had expressed different views and suggestions on the proposed Centre and consultations with the local community, and HKU was invited to take them into account in refining the development proposal of the proposed Centre, as appropriate, in order to maximise its public benefit.

35. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) and that the draft Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/21A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/H10/22 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III are suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/21A at Attachment IV of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/H10/22 upon exhibition) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for the various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES will be published together with the OZP.”

36. Members noted that, as a general practice, the Secretariat of the Board would undertake detailed checking and refinement of the draft OZP including the Notes and ES, if appropriate, before their publication under the Ordinance. Any major revision would be submitted for the Board’s consideration.

[The Chairman thanked the representatives from ITIB, PlanD and HKU for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.]

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

**Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

[Mr Derek Tse, District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK), and Mr Clement Miu, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

[Ms Lilian S.K. Law left the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 6**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Mong Kok Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K3/36  
(MPC Paper No. 2/24)

---

37. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments to the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) for the planning area of Mong Kok involved rezoning of a site at Fuk Tsun Street to allow land use and design flexibility for future development (Amendment Item A), and rezoning of the site of Mong Kok Road Playground and a strip of land to its north to rationalise the zoning boundary (Amendment Item B1 to Amendment Item B3). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Ms Lilian S.K. Law - having close relative owning a property in Mong Kok; and

Mr Ben S.S. Lui - his former employer conducted a study related to urban renewal in Mong Kok.

38. The Committee noted that Mr Ben S.S. Lui had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting, and Ms Lilian S.K. Law had already left the meeting.

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

39. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Clement Miu, STP/TWK, briefed Members on the background of the proposed amendments to the OZP and the Notes of the OZP, technical considerations, provision of government, institution and community facilities

and open space in the area, consultation conducted and departmental comments as detailed in the Paper. The proposed amendments were:

- (a) Amendment Item A (Item A) - rezoning of a site at Fuk Tsun Street from “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” (“CDA(1)”) to “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) and relaxation of the building height restriction (BHR) from 80mPD to 115mPD;
- (b) Amendment Item B1 (Item B1) - rezoning of a portion of the site of Mong Kok Road Playground from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “Open Space”;
- (c) Amendment Item B2 (Item B2) - rezoning a strip of land to the immediate north of Mong Kok Road Playground from “G/IC” to “R(A)”; and
- (d) Amendment Item B3 (Item B3) - deletion of the BHRs of the “G/IC” sites currently occupied by the refuse collection point cum public toilet fronting Mong Kok Road and the electricity sub-station fronting Canton Road.

40. The Chairman remarked that Item A was to take forward the decision of the Committee on 5.5.2023 in respect of the review of “CDA” sites in the Metro Area, and Items B1 to B3 were to reflect the as-built conditions of the sites. He then invited questions from Members.

41. A Member enquired whether the entire site of Item A, including the existing open area at the site, was adopted to determine the plot ratio (PR) restriction. In response, Mr Derek Tse, DPO/TWK, confirmed that the entire site was used to determine the PR and clarified that the existing open-air forecourt of the temple were and would continue to be opened to public. The Chairman added that the entire site was owned by the Government.

42. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Mong Kok Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K3/36 and that the draft Mong Kok OZP No. S/K3/36A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered as S/K3/37 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of the Paper were suitable for



exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance; and

- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft Mong Kok OZP No. S/K3/36A at Attachment IV of the Paper (to be renumbered as S/K3/37 upon exhibition) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for the various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES will be published together with the draft OZP.”

43. Members noted that, as a general practice, the Secretariat of the Board would undertake detailed checking and refinement of the draft OZP including the Notes and ES, if appropriate, before their publication under the Ordinance. Any major revision would be submitted for the Board’s consideration.

[The Chairman thanked PlanD’s representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.]

[Ms Lilian S.K. Law rejoined the meeting at this point.]

### **Kowloon District**

[Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon, and Mr Kenneth P.C. Wong, Town Planner/Kowloon (TP/K), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 9**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K15/131                      Proposed Eating Place and Shop and Services in “Open Space” Zone,  
Shops A to D, Sam Ka Tsuen Ferry Pier, Shung Shun Street, Yau  
Tong, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K15/131)

---

### Presentation and Question Sessions

44. With the aid of some plans and visualiser, Mr Kenneth P.C. Wong, TP/K, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed use, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

45. Members had no question on the application.

### Deliberation Session

46. A Member appealed that more flexibility on provision of retail or eating place uses at ferry piers should be allowed as far as possible with a view to subsidising the operation of ferry services.

47. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board. The permission should be valid until 1.3.2028, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the approval condition stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

[The Chairman thanked PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 10**

#### Any Other Business

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

**Minutes of 737<sup>th</sup> Metro Planning Committee  
(held on 1.3.2024)**

**Deferral Cases**

(a) Request for Deferment by Applicant for Two Months

Item No.	Application No.	Times of Deferment
3	Y/K9/24	2 <sup>nd</sup> <sup>^</sup>
5	A/H11/107	1 <sup>st</sup>
7	A/K1/270	1 <sup>st</sup>
8	A/K10/271	1 <sup>st</sup>
<p><u>Note:</u>  <sup>^</sup>The 2<sup>nd</sup> Deferment is the last deferment and no further deferment will be granted unless under special circumstances and supported with strong justifications.</p>		

**Declaration of Interests**

The Secretary reported the following declaration of interests:

Item No.	Members' Declared Interests	
3	The application site was located in Hung Hom.	- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi for owning a flat in Hung Hom.
5	The application site was located in Mid-Levels West, and C M Wong & Associates Ltd. (CMWA) was one of the consultants of the applicant.	- Mr Franklin Yu for having current business dealings with CMWA.  - Mr Ben S.S. Lui for being a director of a company which owns a flat in Mid-Levels West.  - Mr Paul Y.K. Au for owning a flat in Mid-Levels West.
7	The application site was located in Tsim Sha Tsui.	- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi for his spouse's company owning properties in Tsim Sha Tsui.

The Committee noted that Mr Stanley T.S. Choi and Mr Ben S.S. Lui had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As Mr Franklin Yu had no involvement in the application, and the property owned by Mr Paul Y.K. Au had no direct view of the application site, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

\*Refer to the agenda at [https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Agenda/737\\_mpc\\_agenda.html](https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Agenda/737_mpc_agenda.html) for details of the planning applications.