

**Minutes of 1260th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 3.12.2021**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Dr Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr C.H. Tse

Mr Y.S. Wong

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Terence S.W. Tsang

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

Chief Traffic Engineer (Hong Kong), Transport Department
Mr Horace W. Hong

Director of Lands
Mr Andrew C.W. Lai (p.m.)

Assistant Director (Regional 1)
Lands Department
Mr Albert K.L. Cheung (a.m.)

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairperson

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Dr Conrad T.C. Wong

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo (a.m.)
Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng (p.m.)

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Katherine H.Y. Wong (a.m.)
Mr W.C. Lui (p.m.)

Opening Remarks

1. The Chairperson said that the meeting would be conducted with video conferencing arrangement.

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1259th Meeting held on 19.9.2021

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

2. The draft minutes of the 1259th meeting held on 19.11.2021 were sent to Members on 3.12.2021. Subject to any proposed amendments by Members on or before 6.12.2021, the minutes would be confirmed.

[Post-meeting Note: The minutes were confirmed on 6.12.2021 without amendments.]

Agenda Item 2

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[This item was conducted in Cantonese.]

(i) Approval of Draft Outline Zoning Plan

3. The Secretary reported that on 9.11.2021, the Chief Executive in Council approved the draft Wan Chai Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) (renumbered as No. S/H5/29) under section 9(2) of the Town Planning Ordinance. The approval of the draft plan was notified in the Gazette on 19.11.2021.

(ii) New Town Planning Appeal Received

Town Planning Appeal No. 9 of 2021

Proposed Temporary Shop and Services, and Place of Entertainment for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture”, “Government, Institution or Community”, “Open Space”, “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Sewage Pumping Station”, “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Amenity Area” Zones and area shown as ‘Road’ at Various Lots in D.D. 51 and Adjoining Government Land, Sheung Shui

Application No. A/FLN/22

4. The Secretary reported that a Notice of Appeal was received by the Appeal Board Panel (Town Planning) (TPAB) on 11.11.2021 against the decision of the Town Planning Board (the Board) on 3.9.2021 to reject on review an application No. A/FLN/22 for proposed temporary shop and services and place of entertainment for a period of 3 years at various lots in D.D. 51 and adjoining Government Land, Sheung Shui.

5. The review application was rejected by the Board for the following reasons:

- (a) the proposed retail and entertainment uses were excessive in scale considering the existing rural character of the application sites and their surrounding areas; and
- (b) the applicants failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not result in adverse traffic impacts on the surrounding areas.

6. Members noted that the hearing date of the appeal was yet to be fixed and agreed that the Secretary would act on behalf of the Board in dealing with the appeal in the usual manner.

(iii) Appeal Statistics

7. The Secretary reported that as at 29.11.2021, a total of 13 cases were yet to be heard by the TPAB and decisions of three appeals were outstanding. Details of the appeal statistics were as follows:

Allowed	:	37
Dismissed	:	167
Abandoned/Withdrawn/Invalid	:	210
Yet to be Heard	:	13
Decision Outstanding	:	3
<hr/>		
Total	:	430

(iv) Enhancement of Electronic Planning Application Submission System for Adoption of “iAM Smart”

8. The Secretary reported that Planning Department had enhanced the Board’s existing Electronic Planning Application Submission System (EPASS) to provide a new electronic submission platform. The enhanced EPASS would adopt “iAM Smart” and replace the current system using e-Cert for digital signing. With the enhancement, members of the public could conveniently make their submissions completely online. Unlike the existing EPASS, the enhanced EPASS would not have restrictions on total file size and number of pages for each submission.

9. Apart from the enhanced EPASS, the other two current submission channels, i.e. in hard copy together with soft copy, or in hard copy only, would remain in force. The application forms and the relevant Guidance Notes would be revised to reflect the new arrangement. The enhanced EPASS would be rolled out in end 2021/early 2022 and a press release (including links to the revised application forms and Guidance Notes) would be issued in advance for the public’s information.

10. Members noted the enhanced EPASS and the relevant arrangements.

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Kennedy Town & Mount Davis Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H1/21

(TPB Paper No. 10789)

[The item will be conducted in English and Cantonese.]

11. The Secretary reported that one of the amendment items to the draft Kennedy Town & Mount Davis Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H1/21 involved the University of Hong Kong (HKU) residences at Pokfield Road. HKU had submitted a representation and a comment (R2/C1) and Ms Mary Mulvihill had submitted a representation and a comment (R30/C104). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung | - being the Chairman of the Accounting Advisory Board of School of Business, HKU |
| Dr C.H. Hau | - being an Honorary Associate Professor and Principal Lecturer of HKU; and his spouse being a Principal Lecturer of HKU |
| Mr K.K. Cheung | - his firm having current business dealings with HKU; and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - his former firm having current business dealings with HKU; and hiring Ms Mary |

Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time

- Ms Lilian S.K. Law - being an Adjunct Associate Professor of HKU
- Prof John C.Y. Ng - being an Adjunct Professor of HKU
- Dr Conrad T.C. Wong - being an Adjunct Professor of HKU
- Dr Roger C.K. Chan - being an Honorary Associate Professor of HKU
- Dr Venus Y.H. Lun - being an external examiner of one of HKU's programmes
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - owning a property in Pok Fu Lam
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - being an advisor of a construction firm having business dealings with HKU
- Mr Ivan M.K. Chung - attended the same church with C130

12. Members noted that Dr C.H. Hau and Dr Conrad T.C. Wong had tendered apologies for not attending the meeting. As the property owned by Mr Stephen L.H. Liu had direct view of one of the amendment sites, and the interest of Mr Thomas O.S. Ho was considered direct, they should be invited to leave the meeting. As the interests of Messers Wilson Y.W. Fung and Ivan M.K. Chung, Ms Lilian S.K. Law, Prof John C.Y. Ng, Dr Roger C.K. Chan and Dr. Venus Y.H. Lun were considered indirect, and Messrs K.K. Cheung and Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the representations/comments, they could stay in the meeting.

[Messrs Stephen L.H. Liu and and Thomas O.S. Ho left the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

13. The Chairperson said that notification had been given to the representers and commenters inviting them to attend the hearing, but other than those who were present or had indicated that they would attend the hearing, the rest had either indicated not to attend or made no reply. As reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenters, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations and comments in their absence.

14. The following government representatives and representers/commenters or the representatives of the representers/commenters were invited to the meeting at this point:

Planning Department (PlanD)

Mr Mann M.H. Chow] District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK)
Ms Erica S.M. Wong] Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK)

Consultant

Dr Karl An] AECOM
------------	---------

Representers, Commenters and their Representatives

R2/C1 – HKU

Ms Fan Mei] Representer's & Commenter's
Mr Tam King Leung] Representatives
Mr Chan Cho Sing Joel]

R10/C5 Lam Wai Yin Michelle

<u>Ms Lam Wai Yin Michelle</u>] Representer & Commenter
--------------------------------	---------------------------

R17 – The Incorporated Owners of Nos. 6 & 10 Mount Davis Road

R18 – The Trustees of the Church of England in the Diocese of Victoria, Hong Kong

R19 – Michael Olesnicky

R21 – Comfort Art Ltd.

R23 – Thorsten Schroeder

R25 – Hodel, Rene Josef

R26 – Tan Nicholas Tsung Yuan

R27 – Alexander Schrantz

R28 – Jayne Kim Schrantz

Masterplan Ltd.] Representers' Representatives

Mr Ian Brownlee]

Ms Yuen Sik Kiu Heather]

R20 – Welgett Tree Ltd

Mr Ronald Duxbury Taylor] Representer's Representative

R30/C104 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill] Representer & Commenter

R32 – Ching Cheong Material Ltd.

Mr Ng Kin Wai] Representer's Representative

R38 – Wong Chi On Andy

Mr Wong Chi On Andy] Representer

R57 – Tsoi Suen Tin

C106 – 翰林軒業主委員會

R136/C109 – Tam Kwong Shun

Tommy

Mr Tam Kwong Shun Tommy] Representer, Commenter &
Representer's & Commenter's
Representative

R58 – Yim Yui Kai

Mr Yim Yui Kai] Representer

R79 – Lee Shu Luen

R182 – Kuo Yan Ki

Mr Leung Man Kit Winston] Representers' Representative

R87 – Yeung Pui Man

Mr Kwan Kin Shing] Representers' Representative

R92 – Leung Lap Chi Michael

Mr Lui Lit Keung] Representers' Representative

R101 – Fung Foong

R137 – Pang Mei Po

Ms Pang Mei Po] Representers' & Representers'
Representative

R119 – Leung Siu Hang

Mr Lam Wing Hon Roy] Representers' Representative

R133 – Chiu Ying Wah

Ms Wan Sau Chun Karen] Representers' Representative

R139 – Cheung Yuk Yee

R196 – Wong, Leona

Mr Po Chun Wong] Representers' Representative

R140 – Tsoi Kam Bor

C120 – Yeung Hoi Wing

Mr Yeung Hoi Wing] Commenters' & Representers'
Representative

R142/C114 – Ma Lee

R144/C115 – Hung Chi Ho

R145/C116 – Hung Chi Kai

R143/C117 – Hung Chiu Yeung

Mr Hung Chiu Yeung] Representer, Commenter, Representers' &
Commenters' Representative

R153 – Meng Ye

Ms Meng Ye] Representer

R176 – Leung David

Mr David Leung] Representer

R177 – Fung Yee Ling

Ms Fung Yee Ling] Representer

R179 – Wang Fei

Ms Wang Fei] Representer

R194 – Lau Yuk Kam

Mr Lau Yuk Kam] Representer

R195 - Tu Choi Nai Charlies

Ms Tu Choi Nai Charlies] Representer

R208/C111 – Lai Pik Kwan

Ms Lai Pik Kwan] Representer & Commenter

C12 – Wan Wing Oi

Ms Wan Wing Oi] Commenter

C87 – Choy Pui Ying Trinni

Ms Choy Pui Ying Trinni] Commenter

C125 – Cheung Yuk Yee

Mr Hui Shun Ki Frankie] Commenter's Representative

C126 – Law Tat Keung

Mr Law Tat Keung] Commenter

C127 – Ng Wing Yee

Ms Ng Wing Yee] Commenter

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

16. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representative to brief Members on the representations and comments.

17. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Erica S.M. Wong, STP/HK, briefed Members on the representations and comments, including the background of the amendments, the grounds/views/proposals of the representers and commenters, planning assessments and PlanD's views on the representations and comments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10789 (the Paper).

[Messrs Franklin Yu, K.K. Cheung, Peter Yuen, Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Dr. Lawrence Li joined the meeting, and Mr Stephen Y.S. Wong left the meeting during the presentation by PlanD's representative.]

18. The Chairperson then invited the representers, commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their representations/comments.

R2/C1 – HKU

19. With aid of a Powerpoint presentation and video, Ms Fan Mei and Mr Chan Cho Sing Joel made the following main points:

- (a) they supported all amendments items as they allowed the development potential of all representation sites to be fully utilised while meeting the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG) requirements, and this would help improve the living environment of the area in the long term;
- (b) to cope with the rising demand from the increasing number of students and staff and to support HKU's plan to recruit more scholars and researchers from around the world, there was a need for HKU to optimise its land resources to provide more research, teaching, sports and accommodation facilities. The staff quarters currently available in HKU were insufficient and provision of more accommodation facilities was much needed to enhance the attractiveness and competitiveness of HKU for recruitment from outside Hong Kong;
- (c) the site of the Pokfield Campus, including Site under Item D, was considered suitable for provision of teaching, research and sports facilities as well as staff quarters, given its location being in proximity to the HKU Main Campus and the Centennial Campus, and was surrounded by residential developments;
- (d) the proposed Pokfield Campus Development had three phases including an academic complex of HKU Business School and a multi-purposed sports complex (phase 1), residences for staff and visiting scholars (phase 2, i.e. the

proposed staff quarters at Site D), and an academic complex and conference centre (phase 3). It was intended to construct a sustainable, green and smart campus;

- (e) HKU intended to promote community development through the proposed Pokfield Campus Development by improving pedestrian connections and creating more green and recreational spaces for enjoyment by the local residents. A footbridge was proposed to connect the Centennial Campus and the proposed Pokfield Campus and Pokfield Road. The recreational space at the southern entrance of the Pokfield Campus would be converted into a landscaped garden to provide an easier path from the new campus to Kennedy Town, and other pedestrian routes that could enhance the connectivity of the uphill and downhill areas would also be explored. Pick up/drop off points would be provided within the Pokfield Campus in order to minimise disturbance to the road traffic. The academic complex was designed in response to the visual context and the stepped building height (BH) profile would also facilitate air ventilation;
- (f) the original 7-storey staff quarters at Site D were built 60 years ago and the quarters were in poor conditions warranting redevelopment. It was estimated that the redeveloped staff quarters could provide around 350 to 370 residential units;
- (g) the design of the staff quarters sought to minimise the visual impact on the nearby buildings by providing setback from Pokfield Road, adjusting building orientation to minimise the direct views towards the residential units of University Heights, incorporating building gaps between building blocks, providing a higher headroom at the ground level to enhance air ventilation, and adopting green elements for the buildings. According to the latest proposal, the building blocks of the proposed staff quarters would be 7.8m to 10.5m away from the site boundary of University Heights, and 17.3m from the centre line of Pokfield Road;
- (h) modular integrated construction and non-percussive piling construction

methods would be adopted to reduce noise and air pollution caused by construction of the proposed staff quarters at Site D; and

- (i) meetings had been arranged with the Central and West District Council (C&WDC) and local residents to brief them on the HKU's development proposals and to seek their views. Local residents' major concerns on enhancing the connectivity in the area, improving the connection between the uphill areas and Kennedy Town via Pokfield Road and increasing the provision of lifts and elevators were noted.

[Dr Roger C.K. Chan and Ms Winnie Ng left the meeting during the presentation by HKU.]

R17 – The Incorporated Owners of Nos. 6 & 10 Mount Davis Road

R18 – The Trustees of the Church of England in the Diocese of Victoria, Hong Kong

R19 – Michael Olesnicky

R21 – Comfort Art Ltd.

R23 – Thorsten Schroeder

R25 – Hodel, Rene Josef

R26 – Tan Nicholas Tsung Yuan

R27 – Alexander Schrantz

R28 – Jayne Kim Schrantz

20. Mr Ian Brownlee made the following main points:

- (a) he represented nine owners of the developments at Nos. 6 & 10 Mount Davis Road who supported Item E for the reason that the two sites under Item E (Sites E) were downzoned by the Board in 2011 and the current OZP amendment restored the development rights and opportunities for these sites; and
- (b) the review on the OZP had also covered all the issues addressed in the judicial reviews (JR), and the amendments were also consistent with the planning of the area.

R20 – Welgett Tree Ltd

21. Mr Ronald Duxbury Taylor made the following main points:

- (a) being an owner of a property in one of the developments at the Sites E, he supported the amendments under Item E;
- (b) the zoning under Item E was considered appropriate, as it restored the original zoning for Sites E in 2011, given that the same zoning and development restrictions for their neighbouring site should also be applicable to Sites E for they warranted the same development context and planning considerations; and
- (c) he requested the Board to confirm the zoning amendment.

R32 – Ching Cheong Material Ltd.

22. Mr Ng Kin Wai made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of University Heights for over 20 years and was very familiar with the locality. Item D allowed the HKU staff quarters to be developed up to a BH of 150mPD at Site D which would seriously affect the building structure and structural safety of the adjacent University Heights. Reference could be made to the previous building collapse incident at Koon Lung Lau in the vicinity. He urged HKU to re-assess the loading of the buildings to be constructed at Site D and carried out a risk assessment;
- (b) the proposed staff quarters at Site D would create traffic burden to Pok Fu Lam Road, which was already very congested;
- (c) the Pok Fu Lam Moratorium (PFLM) applicable to Pok Fu Lam area was to control the amount of traffic generated within the area. According to the PFLM, the Government would defer sale of Government land and would not

process any lease modification application involving increase in development intensity. While the PFLM was not under the ambit of the Board, he commented that the PFLM had important implications to the rights of the local residents and invited the Board to take into account the PFLM in considering the amendments on the OZP;

- (d) the information provided on the plan of the proposed staff quarters by HKU was misleading in that the proposed 10m building separation between the staff quarters and University Heights had included the area of drainage pipes within the latter site; and
- (e) HKU had previously held a building design competition for the proposed staff quarters, but the winning design was currently not adopted and HKU had not informed the local residents of their latest proposal. He urged the Government and HKU to consider the view of the local residents.

R38 – Wong Chi On Andy

23. Mr Wong Chi On Andy made the following main points:

- (a) whilst there was no dispute on HKU's need for new facilities including staff quarters, he doubted whether the staff quarters with a proposed BH of 150mPD should be constructed at Site D;
- (b) a minimum building separation of 15m was not provided between the proposed staff quarters and University Heights to allow air ventilation and hence, the staff quarters should not be allowed to be developed;
- (c) being a resident of University Heights, he experienced the noise and air pollution caused by demolition of the original staff quarters at Site D, and HKU had not undertaken any mitigation measures to alleviate the nuisance concerned;
- (d) the two trees located in between the proposed staff quarters and University

Heights within the quarters site were previously felled without reason;

- (e) it was doubtful whether the proposed staff quarters would bring positive impacts to the environment;
- (f) he urged HKU to consider swapping the proposed staff quarters with the landscape area so as to maintain a wider building separation from University Heights; and
- (g) the traffic congestion problem of Pokfield Road, the capacity of which was already saturated, was not addressed in HKU's latest proposal and the traffic impact brought by the proposed staff quarters was underestimated. Consideration could be given to providing loading and unloading bays, and minibus and bus stops on the Smithfield Road extension.

R57 – Tsoi Suen Tin

R58 – Yim Yui Kai

C106 – 翰林軒業主委員會

R136/C109 – Tam Kwong Shun Tommy

24. Mr Tam Kwong Shun Tommy made the following main points:

- (a) he was the Chairman of 翰林軒業主委員會 (the Estate Owners Committee of University Heights) and the convenor of HKU's Pokfield Campus Development Concern Group. The local residents had meetings with HKU in November 2020 and February 2021 regarding the design competition for the proposed Pokfield Campus Development, the progress of the proposed Pokfield Campus Development and the concerns on nuisance generated by the demolition of the original staff quarters at Site D. They only learnt about the increased in BH of HKU's staff quarters from 120mPD to 150mPD in the newspaper and they had not been informed of such a drastic change. Upon the local residents' request, a meeting was subsequently held with HKU. The residents considered that HKU had lost their integrity and

ignored the rights of the local residents;

- (b) there were several student hostels in the Pok Fu Lam Road/Pokfield Road area with a population of around 5,000, four colleges at Kennedy Town Lung Wah Street providing 1,800 accommodations for students, about 4,500 residents on Pokfield Road and at the Academic Terrace, and over 30,000 staff and students at HKU. The pedestrian traffic around the Mass Transit Railway (MTR) Kennedy Town Station and the road traffic along Pok Fu Lam Road near HKU campus were very congested during the morning peak hours. Besides, the pedestrian footpath at Pokfield Road was steep and narrow which was not suitable for the local residents, especially elderlies;
- (c) Pok Fu Lam Road was one of the main roads for travelling to and from the Southern District, and Pok Fu Lam Road and Pokfield Road were congested for most of the time. The Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) submitted by HKU adopting a large catchment area up to Wah Fu Estate for assessment on the overall traffic flow was misleading. According to that TIA, upon completion of the Pokfield Campus Development, the reserve capacity of the junction of Smithfield Road and Pokfield Road was only 8%, which was below the requirement of Transport Department (TD), reflecting that the captioned junction would be congested. Noise and air pollution in the area would also be worsened;
- (d) the pedestrian facilities proposed by HKU was a mismatch and could not facilitate pedestrian flow as the HKU campus was situated in uphill area along Pok Fu Lam Road and users could hardly walk from the MTR Kennedy Town Station to the campus. HKU should review the proposed pedestrian facilities to enable the users travelling between the MTR Kennedy Town Station and the uphill area around HKU campus;
- (e) the PFLM applicable to Pok Fu Lam area was to control the amount of traffic generated within the area. PlanD should not recommend approval of the Pokfield Campus Development to avoid aggravating the traffic congestion problem in the area; and

- (f) they opposed Item D to relax the building height restriction (BHR) from 120mPD to 150mPD. They also opposed another application by HKU involving an amendment to the BHR covering the Pokfield Campus, which consisted of buildings of 4 storeys to 18 storeys. They urged the Board to reject the application and requested HKU to improve the transport and community facilities in the area.

R58 – Yim Yui Kai

25. Mr Yim Yui Kai made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of University Heights;
- (b) the University Heights would be greatly affected by the proposed staff quarters at the Site D due to blockage of natural light and air ventilation, and noise pollution, resulting in detrimental effects on their physical and mental health; and
- (c) the proposed staff quarters at Pokfield Road was located closely to his flat and he hoped HKU would show sympathy to the locals and maintain a more comfortable living environment for the residents.

R79 – Lee Shu Luen

R182 – Kuo Yan Ki

26. Mr Leung Man Kit Winston made the following main points:

- (a) the estimated number of staff and students of the Pokfield Campus might be underestimated. In the TIA submitted by HKU, the number of staffs and students was about 38,000 in 2022. However, it would further increase to about 55,000 to 65,000 in ten years upon the completion of all the proposed developments of HKU along Pokfield Road and in the Centennial Campus;

- (b) the existing population along Pokfield Road, including the residential developments, the Belcher's, and other HKU's student hotels, was over 25,000. HKU had not duly considered the current poor traffic conditions along Pok Fu Lam Road, Pokfield Road and Smithfield Road. They also did not make good use of the MTR service, in particular the MTR Kennedy Town Station, to divert the pedestrian flow. Furthermore, they had not proposed any facilities for the disabled persons travelling between the campus and the MTR stations;
- (c) some photos were shown at the meeting illustrating the poor traffic condition in the areas along Pok Fu Lam Road heading to the MTR stations, which were congested with 700 to 1,000 people during the morning peak hours. He questioned how the traffic problem could be resolved; and
- (d) the proposed HKU Business School could be developed on another large site at 132 to 144 Pok Fu Lam Road, which was currently occupied by HKU's staff quarters. These quarters were either vacant or rented out to people who were neither HKU staff nor students. The Board should note that HKU had not fully utilised their land along Sassoon Road, and they should develop these sites rather than concentrating future developments on Pok Fu Lam Road.

27. The Chairman reminded the representers/commenters that their presentations should focus on the concerned OZP amendments (i.e. Item D) instead of other projects of HKU which would be examined in the context of other submissions to the Board.

R87 – Yeung Pui Man

28. Mr Kwan Kin Shing made the following main points:

- (a) the C&WDC had raised objection to Item D on the OZP. As an alumni of HKU, he was not in disagreement with the development of HKU, but would like to have a more comprehensive plan for campus development at Pokfield Road;

- (b) the BH of the proposed staff quarters was increased from 120mPD to 150mPD, which was about a 25% increase and resulting in a development of over 30 storeys, while the original staff quarters was only 7 storeys. He doubted whether HKU had considered the blockage of views from University Heights in formulating the development proposal. HKU could consider keeping the BH at 120mPD while increasing the building bulk in order to maintain the same floor area;
- (c) the building blocks of the existing campus were mostly about 11 or 12 storeys in height, and anti-reflective materials were used for construction. He questioned why the same treatments could not be applied for the design of the Pokfield Campus; and
- (d) the TIA submitted by HKU was misleading, in that the assessment was completed in July 2021 during the summer school recess and the university classes might also be conducted online at that time, and hence the results of the TIA might not be accurate. Secondly, the assumption that most of the trips generated from the Pokfield Campus would be trips on foot between the site and HKU Main Campus was wrong, but TD had accepted such assumptions. Thirdly, Belcher's Street and Pok Fu Lam Road were always congested, along with all the new developments in the area, the traffic condition of these two roads would be worsened in the future. Fourthly, the patronage of the MTR HKU Station was saturated and it was trusted that the additional population would further aggravate the congestion at the MTR Kennedy Town Station in the future. There was a need for government departments and MTR Corporation Limited to plan ahead for resolving these foreseeable traffic problems. Lastly, HKU should consider the provision of facilities for disabled persons travelling between HKU Campus and the MTR stations.

R92 – Leung Lap Chi Michael

29. Mr Lui Lit Keung made the following main points:

- (a) he had been living in University Heights for over 20 years. HKU should take into account the views of the local residents and he questioned whether there was a genuine need for the proposed staff quarters with a BH of 150mPD;
- (b) Pokfield Road, Smithfield Road and Pok Fu Lam Road were very congested in the morning peak hours everyday. With the additional 5,000 population upon completion of the Pokfield Campus Development, the traffic condition of the area would become unbearable; and
- (c) the residents had no objection to the previous staff quarters proposal with a BH of 120mPD. The current proposal (with a BH of 150mPD) would obstruct the views from University Heights and he urged HKU to revise their proposal by maintaining the BH at 120mPD or below.

R101 – Fung Foong

R137 – Pang Mei Po

30. Ms Pang Mei Po made the following main points:

- (a) HKU had not informed the local residents of the revised proposal for the staff quarters in order to prevent the residents from making comments to the Board or relevant government department. She hoped that HKU would inform the residents of any amendments to the proposal in the future;
- (b) while the development of HKU's Business School was supported, she requested HKU to take into consideration the traffic condition in the area where the road capacity was saturated;

- (c) HKU had not fully utilised the land they owned and some of their residences were left vacant. They doubted if HKU had exaggerated the need for the staff quarters; and
- (d) she experienced the nuisance caused by the demolition of the original staff quarters at Site D and could feel the shaking of the building she resided at University Heights . She urged that structural safety should be taken into consideration during construction of the proposed staff quarters.

R119 – Leung Siu Hang

31. Mr Lam Wing Hon Roy made the following main points:

- (a) he strongly objected to the BH of 150mPD for the proposed staff quarters and the proposed Pokfield Campus Development which would destroy the greenery of the area. He noted that two trees were felled together with the demolition of the original staff quarters at Site D;
- (b) pedestrian safety in the area was a concern which should be brought to the attention of relevant parties. He asked for improvement in the provision of pedestrian facilities, in particular, the provision of lift connecting MTR Kennedy Town Station to uphill areas;
- (c) the TIA submitted by HKU wrongly assumed that most of the trips generated from Site D would be on foot. In fact, there were many people queuing up at MTR Kennedy Town Station for taxis going to uphill areas. TD and HKU should identify ways to resolve the congestion problem, such as provision of minibus to divert the pedestrian flow; and
- (d) HKU should reconsider if it was appropriate to develop the large-scale staff quarters at Site D given the steep topography of the area including Pokfield Road. The BH of the proposed staff quarters should be lowered to 120mPD. Geotechnical concerns of the site and its vicinity should also be addressed.

R133 – Chiu Ying Wah

32. Ms Wan Sau Chun Karen made the following main points

- (a) HKU had not informed the local residents of the revised proposal for the Pokfield Campus Development. She objected to the proposed staff quarters with a BH of 150mPD as it was located too close to University Heights. The view from and natural light penetration to her flat at University Heights would be entirely blocked by the proposed staff quarters;
- (b) the Board should consider the comprehensive planning of the area as a whole instead of focusing solely on Site D. She invited Members to carry out a site visit to University Heights when considering whether the BH and building separation proposed by HKU were appropriate;
- (c) the pavement along Pokfield Road was very narrow and allowed only one pedestrian to pass through. Given the steep slope and the narrow pavement, there were not many people walking uphill by foot;
- (d) the traffic in the area was already congested and the proposed developments by HKU would worsen the traffic condition; and
- (e) the potential landslide issue on the slope adjacent to Site D should be carefully assessed.

[Mr C.H. Tse temporarily left the meeting at this point.]

R139 – Cheung Yuk Yee

R196 – Wong Leona

33. Mr Po Chun Wong made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of University Heights and the Secretary of the Estate Owners Committee of University Heights;

- (b) he opined that HKU should provide facilities to serve the local residents. He also wished that HKU's university status could be further enhanced through its redevelopment plan;
- (c) the proposed staff quarters at Site D would create a wall-effect, causing air and noise pollution and blockage of light penetration to the area;
- (d) he doubted the effectiveness of proposed escalator linking up uphill area and MTR Kennedy Town Station to benefit the pedestrian flow;
- (e) according to the latest proposal for the Pokfield Campus Development, the proposed increase number of parking spaces was in conflict with the intention of encouraging the use of public transport. Staff and students of HKU and the local residents should be encouraged to use public transport, so as to lessen the burden on the local traffic. The provision of pedestrian connection from HKU to the MTR stations was a good initiative, however, consideration should be given to connecting to the MTR Kennedy Town Station instead of the HKU Station. The relaxation of BHR for various sites in the area would generate traffic pressure on Pokfield Road and Pok Fu Lam Road, and increase pedestrian traffic flow in the area; and
- (f) HKU should re-consider the staff quarters proposal given its potential impacts on the locality.

R140 – Tsoi Kam Bor

C120 – Yeung Hoi Wing

34. With aid of the visualizer, Mr Yeung Hoi Wing made the following main points:

- (a) the local residents, including the residents of Academic Terrace and University Heights, had set up the HKU's Pokfield Campus Development Concern Group as the proposed development was large in scale and would cause huge impacts on them;

- (b) the pedestrian flow to be brought by the developments of HKU was seriously underestimated. The MTR HKU Station was congested every day during the peak hours, and the proposed Pokfield Campus development would worsen the situation in future. It was noted that TD had not carried out any TIA to confirm that the proposed staff quarters at Site D would not bring about significant traffic impact to the area;
- (c) according to the TIA submitted by HKU, upon completion of the Pokfield Campus Development, the reserve capacity of the junction of Smithfield Road and Pokfield Road was only 8%, which was below the requirement of TD, reflecting that the road capacity in the area was saturated, in particular, for Pok Fu Lam Road which was the main road for travelling to and from the Southern District;
- (d) whilst HKU's design concept was to encourage people to walk instead of taking vehicular transport, the pedestrian facilities proposed by HKU, for example a proposed escalator from Kennedy Town to Pokfield Campus, was considered a mismatch and could not facilitate pedestrian flow along the steep Pokfield Road;
- (e) the PFLM was applicable to developments in the Pok Fu Lam area to control the amount of traffic generated within the area. According to the PFLM, the Government would defer sale of Government land and would not process any lease modification applications involving increase in development intensity. He questioned why PlanD could initiate amendments that would result in increase in development intensity of various sites in the area;
- (f) he opposed the relaxation of BHR for Site D, as it would result in additional population and generate traffic impact on the existing transport network in the area. He reiterated that the local residents had not opposed the continuous development of HKU but suggested that HKU should consider planning their campus development in the New Territories/Northern Metropolis;

- (g) HKU previously held a design competition on Pokfield Campus and according to the winning design, the BH of future development at Site D was 120mPD. Both HKU and the local residents were content with the winning design as it would improve the environment of the area. It was not necessary for HKU to maximise the development potential of the site;
- (h) he did not understand why the Government had initiated to relax the BHR of Site D while HKU was required to submit a rezoning application (i.e. application No. Y/H1/2) for their proposed Business School;
- (i) HKU mentioned in their presentation earlier that they had consulted the C&WDC and local residents on the proposed Pokfield Campus Development, but they did not mention that most of the people consulted objected to the proposal; and
- (j) he hoped the Board would listen to the comments of the local residents and consider the planning of the area in a comprehensive manner and not to uphold Item D.

R142/C114 – Ma Lee

R144/C115 – Hung Chi Ho

R145/C116 – Hung Chi Kai

R143/C117 – Hung Chiu Yeung

35. Mr Hung Chiu Yeung made the following main points:

- (a) he was the Vice-chairman of the Estate Owners Committee of University Heights and living in University Heights for over 10 years;
- (b) the proposed staff quarters should adopt the winning design of the Pokfield Campus design competition which, with proposed BH of 120mPD, was considered better in terms of design concept and air ventilation;

- (c) the original staff quarters at Site D was not in such a poor condition as described by HKU in their presentation earlier. The staff quarters was refurbished three to four years ago and well equipped with proper facilities. HKU had spent a large sum of money to refurbish the original staff quarters, which had now been demolished, and this constituted a wastage of public resources;
- (d) as some HKU's residences at Sassoon Road were either vacant or rented out to people who were neither HKU staff nor students. He envisaged that HKU would rent out the proposed staff quarters at Pokfield Campus in future and asked if it was possible to urge HKU to undertake in writing that the proposed staff quarters would not be rented out to people who were neither HKU staff nor students in future;
- (e) the proposed staff quarters of roughly the height of 38/F of University Heights would create blockage effect on University Heights. He suggested HKU to revise the development proposal of the proposed staff quarters by reducing the BH in order to reduce blockage of University Heights. It was not necessary for HKU to maximise the development potential of Site D;
- (f) while it was a general approach for a TIA to assess the traffic flow within 1km buffer from the development site, HKU had adopted a larger assessment area which covered Wah Fu Estate area in the TIA submitted for the proposed Pokfield Campus Development;
- (g) Pokfield Road and Pok Fu Lam Road were always very congested and he questioned how the traffic congestion problem during peak hours could be resolved. Better transport facilities were needed to alleviate the poor traffic condition in the area;
- (h) the footbridge adjacent to the residential development, The Belcher's, which linked HKU main campus and the MTR HKU Station was insufficient to cope with the demand. The proposed escalator linking the Pokfield Campus with MTR Kennedy Town Station was considered not realistic;

- (i) the demolition of the original staff quarters caused vibration to University Heights, and he could hardly believe that the construction of the Pokfield Campus would not cause adverse impact to them; and
- (j) he invited the Board to carry out site visit to the area and hoped the Board would listen to the views of the local residents and not to uphold Item D. He also urged that the Board to consider other planning applications made by HKU carefully.

[Mr K.K. Cheung temporarily left the meeting during the presentation by Mr Hung Chiu Yeung.]

[The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 12:45p.m.]

[Messrs Wilson Y.W. Fung, Philip S.L. Kan, Franklin Yu and Dr. Lawrence W.C. Li left the meeting at this point.]

[The meeting was resumed at 2:00 p.m.]

36. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting:

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Mr K.K. Cheung

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr C.H. Tse

Mr Y.S. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer (Hong Kong)
Transport Department
Mr Horace W. Hong

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

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Terence S.W. Tsang

Director of Lands
Mr Andrew C.W. Lai

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

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

Secretary

37. The following government representatives, representers, commenters and their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

PlanD

Mr Mann M.H. Chow] DPO/HK
Ms Erica S.M. Wong] STP/HK

Consultant

Dr Karl An] AECOM

Representers, Commenters and their Representatives

R2/C1 – HKU

Ms Fan Mei] Representer's & Commenter's
Mr Tam King Leung] Representatives
Mr Chan Cho Sing Joel]

R30/C104 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill] Representer & Commenter

R32 – Ching Cheong Material Ltd.

Mr Ng Kin Wai] Representer's Representative

R57 – Tsoi Suen Tin

C106 – 翰林軒業主委員會

R136/C109 – Tam Kwong Shun

Tommy

Mr Tam Kwong Shun Tommy] Representer, Commenter,
Representer's & Commenter's
Representative

R58 – Yim Yui Kai

Mr Yim Yui Kai] Representer

R79 – Lee Shu Luen

R182 – Kuo Yan Ki

Mr Leung Man Kit Winston] Representers' Representative

R87 – Yeung Pui Man

Mr Kwan Kin Shing] Representer's Representative

R92 – Leung Lap Chi Michael

Mr Lui Lit Keung] Representer's Representative

R101 – Fung Yoong

R137 – Pang Mei Po

Ms Pang Mei Po] Representer & Representer's
Representative

R139 – Cheung Yuk Yee

R196 – Wong Leona

Mr Po Chun Wong] Representers' Representative

R140 – Tsoi Kam Bor

C120 – Yeung Hoi Wing

Mr Yeung Hoi Wing] Commenter & Representer's
Representative

R142/C114 – Ma Lee

R144/C115 – Hung Chi Ho

R145/C116 – Hung Chi Kai

R143/C117 – Hung Chiu Yeung

Mr Hung Chiu Yeung] Representer, Commenter &
Representers' & Commenter's
Representative

R176 – Leung David

Mr David Leung] Representer

R177 – Fung Yee Ling

Ms Fung Yee Ling] Representer

R194 – Lau Yuk Kam

Mr Lau Yuk Kam] Representer

R195 – Tu Choi Nai Charlies

Ms Tu Choi Nai Charlies] Representer

R208/C111 – Lai Pik Kwan

Ms Lai Pik Kwan] Representer & Commenter

C12 – Wan Wing Oi

Ms Wan Wing Oi] Commenter

C87 – Choy Pui Ying Trinni

Ms Choy Pui Ying Trinni] Commenter

C125 – Cheung Yuk Yee

Mr Hui Shun Ki Frankie] Commenter's Representative

C126 – Law Tat Keung

Mr Law Tat Keung] Commenter

C127 – Ng Wing Yee

Ms Ng Wing Yee] Commenter

38. The Chairperson extended a welcome to the government representatives and the consultant, representers, commenters and their representatives. She then invited the representers, commenters and their representatives to continue with their oral submissions.

R176 – Leung David

39. With the aid of site photos, Mr David Leung made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of University Heights. The increase in BH from 120mPD to 150mPD was significant. The current site level of Site D was about 68mPD. The actual BH of the proposed staff quarters would be increased from about 52m to 82m, which was an about 60% increase, and not 25% as mentioned by other representers;
- (b) the proposed staff quarters was very close to University Heights. Sunlight penetration and air ventilation would be affected, and these were critical concerns especially under the pandemic situation;
- (c) the increase in BH would allow the proposed staff quarters to accommodate more students/staffs. As a result, the existing road and pedestrian traffic conditions in the area, in particular along Pokfield Road, would be adversely affected, as it was unlikely that residents in the staff quarters would walk up the narrow and steep staircase connecting Pokfield Road; and
- (d) the university staff might not choose to stay in the staff quarters as it was built too close to University Heights.

R177 – Fung Yee Ling

40. Ms Fung Yee Ling made the following main points:

- (a) there were lots of new developments in the Western District in recent years, and Sai Wan Estate would be redeveloped in future. These developments had attracted and would attract more road traffic including delivery vehicles for daily necessities, which could not be mitigated by any extension of railway services to the area;
- (b) the increase in BH for the proposed staff quarters would further induce traffic congestion in the Western District. HKU should have social responsibility and should not intensify the proposed staff quarters development and maximise the development's gross floor area (GFA) like developers, which would further aggravate local traffic in the area. The views of local residents should be considered; and
- (c) there was no adequate traffic capacity to accommodate the future road and pedestrian traffic in the area. The existing road traffic conditions on Smithfield Road and Pokfield Road had already affected access of emergency vehicles to Queen Mary Hospital. A more detailed traffic assessment on road traffic and pedestrian flow was needed for the Western District.

R194 – Lau Yuk Kam

41. Mr Lau Yuk Kam made the following main points:

- (a) Site D was rezoned to “Residential (Group B)” (“R(B)”) in 2011 with BHR of 120mPD. Based on that BHR, HKU had presented a design scheme at 120mPD during their consultation with the locals who had no objection to the proposal. HKU had not indicated that the BH of the proposed staff quarters would be increased during the consultation;

- (b) there was no evidence to justify that the increase in BH of the proposed staff quarters at 150mPD would enhance the competitiveness and ranking of HKU as stated in the supportive representations and comments;
- (c) the increase in BH was not requested by HKU but initiated by PlanD. Such an increase was not necessary and Item D should be reverted to 120mPD by the Board. If so, HKU would construct the proposed staff quarters based on the winning design scheme at 120mPD, that was acceptable to the local residents; and
- (d) the proposed staff quarters at 150mPD was not sustainable in terms of infrastructure capacity.

R195 – Tu Choi Nai Charlies

42. Ms Tu Choi Nai Charlies made the following main points:

- (a) she objected to Item D. There was no justification for relaxation of the BHR for Site D. HKU did not apply for a relaxation of the BHR but the Board suddenly amended the BHR. There was no sufficient information and data provided by HKU on the demand for staff quarters to justify a scheme with BH at 150mPD. She queried the number of existing and new staff quarters in HKU; the actual demand and waiting time for staff quarters; and the number of visiting professors and their duration of stay at HKU. The increase in BH would not significantly benefit HKU's competitiveness but would severely affect the living quality of residents in the surrounding areas;
- (b) the traffic impact on the local district induced by Item D should be assessed in a holistic manner. Emergency vehicles including ambulances, police cars, fire engines etc., were already affected by traffic congestion on Smithfield Road, Pokfield Road and Pok Fu Lam Road causing delays in emergency services; and

- (c) there was a lack of community services to cater for further intensification of development and population in the district. As University Heights and the proposed staff quarters were located very close to each other, there would be canyon effect causing accelerated gust, especially during typhoons that would cause damage to the glass curtain walls of University Heights.

R208/C111 – Lai Pik Kwan

43. With the aid of visualiser, Ms Lai Pik Kwan made the following main points:

- (a) according to SBDG issued by the Buildings Department (BD), a ventilation corridor with minimum section of 15m x 15m should be maintained. However, the proposed staff quarters would only be about 10.5m away from University Heights. As there was no control on plot ratio (PR) for Site D, HKU would maximise the BH to 150mPD and needed not to comply with SBDG, resulting in a development which would be very bulky and adversely affect air ventilation to the surrounding areas;
- (b) higher BH was allowed for sites with building setback as the building footprint would be reduced. However, the so-called building setback proposed by HKU at Site D was only provided by swapping the internal access from the East to the West side of the proposed development. There was reduction in the building footprint while the BH was still allowed to be increased;
- (c) in 2011, the BH for Site D was increased from 84mPD to 120mPD. The increase in BH to 150mPD (roughly the height of 38/F of University Heights), would be more than 80% compared to the previous BH of 84mPD. A BHR of 120mPD would be adequate for Site D and SBDG was not a mandatory factor to be considered in the BH review. Thus, there was no justification for further increase of BH for Site D, and insufficient justification was provided by HKU for intensification of the proposed staff quarters. A high-rise development at Site D would have

adverse visual, air ventilation, natural light and traffic impacts. The nearby proposed Pokfield Campus Development would further worsen these impacts on University Heights;

- (d) she agreed with R30/C104 that the South-eastern/Eastern winds approaching University Heights would be potentially blocked by Site D with increased BH of 150mPD. The submissions made by the staff of HKU also acknowledged that the staff quarters development would have some adverse impacts on the neighbouring developments;
- (e) the proposed parking spaces, including public parking spaces, in the proposed staff quarters would induce a lot of traffic to the area. Besides, the proposed lift connecting to the MTR Kennedy Town Station would attract huge pedestrian flow along Pokfield Road. There would be significant cumulative traffic impacts generated by the proposed development at Site D, the HKU expansion project at Sassoon Road and redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate. The emergency vehicles, particularly ambulance services to Queen Mary Hospital, would inevitably be affected; and
- (f) there was no adequate consultation regarding the increase in BH for Site D or revision of the proposed staff quarters scheme to 150mPD which was bulky and would affect University Heights. On the contrary, the HKU development near 3 Sassoon Road was designed in the form of low-rise blocks to minimize impacts on the neighbours.

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung joined and Mr K.K. Cheung rejoined the meeting at this point.]

C125 – Cheung Yuk Yee

44. With the aid of some site photos, Mr Hui Shun Ki Frankie made the following main points:

- (a) he was the chairperson of the owners' committee of Block 1 of Academic

Terrace and convenor of the HKU's Pokfield Campus Development Concern Group;

- (b) while proposed development of the Pokfield Campus was supported, it would induce significant impacts on the surrounding areas in terms of pedestrian and road traffic that was not addressed by HKU. He did not agree with the assessment that there would not be significant traffic impact from the staff quarters at Site D and the claim that staff would walk to the main campus. The high-rise staff quarters would attract more staff and the resulting traffic impact, especially during peak hours, on the local areas would be anticipated;
- (c) the capacity of pedestrian walkway and road crossing facilities along Smithfield Road and Pok Fu Lam Road were not able to cater for the increase in the pedestrian flow even with road improvement works, such as adjusting the traffic light signal. There was no overall plan or supporting facilities for the pedestrian network as suggested by HKU to address the high pedestrian flow to/from HKU campuses. An all-weather pedestrian walkway with escalator connecting Pokfield Campus and MTR Kennedy Town Station should be provided to alleviate congestion at the MTR HKU Station. The narrow pavement along Pok Fu Lam Road should be widened and the duration of the green light for pedestrian crossing should be lengthened; and
- (d) other than the proposed Pokfield Campus Development, there would be a potential high-rise redevelopment at Nos. 10-16 Pokfield Road which might further increase the traffic flow in the area.

C127 – Ng Wing Yee

45. With the aid of some site photos, Ms Ng Wing Yee made the following main points:

- (a) she was a resident of University Heights;

- (b) according to the press release of HKU, the proposed staff quarters at Site D was originally only about 10 to 12 storeys. However, HKU had now indicated they would revise the scheme to maximise the BH to 150mPD. She did not agree with HKU's justifications to revise the scheme particularly when demolition of the existing building was completed and construction of the new development had commenced. She requested the Board not to amend the BHR to 150mPD and should not allow the staff quarters to be built up to the maximum BH as currently stipulated on the OZP; and
- (c) the BH of the revised scheme of the proposed staff quarters would be roughly the height of 38/F of University Heights. Serious nuisances in terms of lighting, noise and privacy would be caused to residents of University Heights due to its close distance (about 7.5m) from the proposed staff quarters. Only limited set back of Tower 2 was provided in the revised scheme of the proposed staff quarters. There was doubt on whether the future staff would wish to live in such a development.

R30/C104 – Mary Mulvihill

46. Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

- (a) reviewing the BHRs in view of the Court's ruling did not necessitate amending the BHRs for the sites in Kennedy Town. The circumstances had changed and with the pandemic situation, ventilation and panoramic views of the landscape etc. had become more important concerns. The amendments originally for two small sites subject to the Court's ruling had led to massive changes to the entire OZP that would impact the character of Kennedy Town and would transform it into a densely built area like Mong Kok. While justification was given that the increase in BH was essential to comply with SBDG requirements, it was believed that SBDG could be achieved under the previous BHR and permissible development intensity needed not be fully guaranteed;

- (b) HKU would maximise the development potential and the proposed staff quarters at Site D would create an extensive wall effect amidst schools and community facilities. The role of GIC sites should also be for providing visual relief and breathing space;
- (c) the cumulative impacts to be generated by the proposed Pokfield Campus Development should be considered together. There was plenty of land available in the New Territories/Northern Metropolis that provided alternative solution spaces for the expansion of HKU. HKU was intensifying its developments in the existing area without sufficient justifications;
- (d) the findings of TIA were queried as it was conducted during the pandemic period and the real traffic condition was not reflected in the assessment. It also had not taken into account the cumulative traffic impacts from the proposed Pokfield Campus Development;
- (e) the ridgeline was breached at more than one point. The panoramic view from the upper portion of Pok Fu Lam Road, that was an important public view, could not be preserved. For Item E, the uniform height would create wall effect with no visual relief. The development at Site E should be harmonious with the cemetery;
- (f) improvement to air ventilation, even at localised level, was essential for better urban climate. She objected to the deletion of two building gaps previously imposed on the western boundaries of Smithfield Terrace and the southwestern corner of Smithfield Garden under Items F1 and F2;
- (g) there was no community gain from the HKU campus developments. Currently, the public was not allowed to enter the campus to enjoy the open spaces. Besides, as people preferred to walk at-grade, the proposed footbridges/elevated walkway would not benefit the community, and it would also involve the removal of trees; and

- (h) overseas teaching staff would not be attracted to HKU solely due to the availability of staff quarters. No data was submitted by HKU to justify the staff quarters development. In fact, HKU had previously rented out their quarters to members of the public.

[Mr Y.S. Wong left and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong temporarily left the meeting at this point.]

47. As the presentations of government representatives, the representers, commenters and their representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions and the Chairperson would invite the representers, commenters, their representatives and/or 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.

Background of BHR Review

48. The Chairperson and some Members would like DPO/HK to recapitulate and clarify the background of the BHR review for the OZP as well as details and assumptions adopted in the review process. In response, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, with the aid of Powerpoint slides and visualiser, made the following main points:

- (a) the subject review of BHRs for the OZP was conducted in view of the Court's ruling on two JRs in relation to the OZP for sites under Item E. The BHRs and building gap requirements for other relevant zones were reviewed taken into account the permissible development intensity and implications of the SBDG;
- (b) making reference to Attachment E1a of TPB Paper No. 10720, there were three key building design elements in SBDG: building setback, building separation and site coverage of greenery. In general, building setback required that building fronting a street less than 15m wide to be set back so that no part of the building up to a level of 15m above the street was within 7.5m from the street centreline to enhance the pedestrian

environment. Building separation required that continuous projected façade length to be not more than 60m to enhance building permeability. Site coverage on greenery required a minimum greenery area to improve the environmental quality of the urban space. Taking into account the setback and building separation requirements, basic BH profiles for various permissible GFA were drawn up. If the existing BHR was inadequate to meet SBDG requirements and accommodate the permissible GFA at the same time, the BHR would be revised upwards unless there were other overriding considerations. After review, the permissible GFA could not be accommodated under the previous BHRs for sites under Items A, B, C and D and amendments were therefore made to the respective BHRs;

- (c) in reviewing the BHR, underground car park was assumed as in BHR reviews for other OZPs;
- (d) all amendments including relaxation of the BHRs and the revisions of building gap requirements had taken into account all relevant planning considerations (such as the existing BH profile, potential redevelopment, topography, site formation level, local characteristics, compatibility with the surroundings, visual impact and air ventilation), SBDG requirements (such as building separation, building setback and site coverage of greenery) and urban design guidelines. The same approach had been adopted for review of all other OZPs (including Causeway Bay, Wan Chai and Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay OZPs); and
- (e) on 5.3.2021 and 9.4.2021, the proposed amendments to the OZP were considered and agreed by the Board, and were gazetted on 30.4.2021 for public inspection under s.7 of the Town Planning Ordinance.

Planning History and BHR of Site D

49. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the planning history of Site D and University Heights in relation to the imposition of BHRs;
- (b) how the BHR of 150mPD was determined and whether there was no PR restriction for Site D;
- (c) elaboration on traffic impact induced by the increase in BH for Site D;
- (d) whether there would be control on the development in Site D to address the structural safety, parking facilities and related traffic concerns etc. raised by the representers/commenters if the BHR of 150mPD was maintained; and
- (e) the factors to be considered by the Board if the Board was to impose a different BHR for Site D that might not accommodate the permissible GFA after taking into account the SBDG requirements.

50. In response, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, with the aid of Powerpoint slides and visualiser, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the draft Kennedy Town and Mount Davis OZP No. S/H1/1 gazetted in 1986, Site D (then occupied staff quarters) and the adjoining area (where University Heights was currently located) was zoned “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) without BHR. University Heights was subsequently developed with population intake in 1996. In 2011, the said area was rezoned to “R(B)” and BHRs of 120mPD and 170mPD were stipulated for Site D and the University Heights site (to reflect its existing BH) respectively;
- (b) the BHR of 150mPD for Site D was determined with reference to the BH profile of 90m (based on assumptions adopted in the BHR review) for the site and adding the existing site level of about 59mPD. There was no PR restriction for Site D under the OZP, and according to the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R), the maximum PR for Site D was 8;

- (c) the increase of 30m in BH would not significantly increase the traffic impact of the development at Site D. TD considered that as Site D would be for staff quarters of HKU, most of the commuter trips in peak hours would be on foot between Site D and the HKU main campus;
- (d) HKU would still need to submit general building plans to the Building Authority. Relevant departments would be consulted at that time to ensure that the development scheme would adequately meet the requirements on structural safety, parking facilities and related traffic issues etc.; and
- (e) the Board could consider the appropriate BHR for Site D based on planning considerations. Nevertheless, the rationale to deviate from the adopted approach for imposing BHR for other sites within the same OZP and other OZPs had to be clearly explained. If the BHR for Site D was proposed to be amended, the proposed amendment to the OZP would be gazetted for public inspection for further representation.

Scheme of the Proposed Staff Quarters

51. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions to HKU:

- (a) elaboration on the proposed staff quarters and the targeted scholars, and the potential traffic impact of the scheme;
- (b) what the implication would be if the BHR was reverted back to 120mPD;
- (c) clarification on the setback between the proposed staff quarters and University Heights under the 120mPD and 150mPD schemes, and clarification on whether the schemes met the building setback requirement under SBDG;
- (d) comparison of the design of 120mPD and 150mPD schemes in respect of

their impacts on the surrounding developments; and

- (e) elaboration on how the design of the 150mPD scheme could address natural lighting, privacy and visual concerns.

52. In response, Ms Fan Mei and Mr Chan Cho Sing Joel, representatives of R2/C1, with the aid of Powerpoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed staff quarters was targeted for young scholars in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) field. Hence, more than 80% (or around 300 units) of the staff quarters would be one-bedroom unit or studio. Only about 10 to 20 odd units would be 3-bedroom or larger units. The trip generation from family members residing in the proposed staff quarters and the resultant traffic impact as raised by some representers was not an issue of concern. Without suitable staff quarters provision, it would be difficult to attract young scholars who might not be able to afford the high rental in the market;
- (b) if the BHR was reverted back to 120mPD, the direct impact would be a reduction of about 100 units. HKU would need to ask the government for other staff quarters site or might need to rent accommodations on the market, and both involved additional public resources;
- (c) the 150mPD scheme proposed a setback arranging from 7.8m to 10.5m from the site boundary facing University Heights, and the separation between the staff quarters blocks and buildings at University Heights was 10m to 17m. The setback was more than 17m from the centreline of Pokfield Road which complied with the SBDG requirements. For the 120mPD scheme, only a minimum setback of 7.5m from the site boundary facing University Heights could be provided and less GFA could be accommodated;
- (d) for the 120mPD scheme, the proposed staff quarters would have a continuous building façade of 90m in length. For the 150mPD scheme, the GFA would be higher but the building would be slimmer with continuous

building façade not more than 80m, with wider building gaps and wider building setback from Pokfield Road. The impacts on the lower floors and the eastern block of University Heights would be less in terms of air ventilation, visual and natural lighting aspects; and

- (e) under the BHR of 150mPD, there would be more design flexibility in the disposition and orientation of the towers/units to allow more natural lighting to the units and avoid direct views to University Heights. Also, no glass curtain wall would be used in the proposed staff quarters. Vertical greening would be provided to minimize the visual impact of the development on the surroundings.

53. In response to a Member's enquiry, the representers/commenters at the meeting who were residents of University Heights confirmed that they would prefer a BHR of 120mPD for Site D.

54. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) PlanD's response to the representers'/commenters' concerns on the adverse impact on natural lighting caused by the proposed development at Site D; and
- (b) the implications if HKU decided not to build up to the BHR.

55. In response, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, made the following main points:

- (a) the design of any windows of a new development should meet the requirements on natural lighting and ventilation aspects under the building regime; and
- (b) under the BHR of 150mPD, the land owner could decide whether to build up to the maximum BH. However, a building with lower BH would be more bulky and might have more impact on the lower levels of University Heights.

HKU Campus Development

56. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions to HKU:

- (a) whether the staff quarters in HKU were rented to the public, and the current occupancy rate of HKU's staff quarters;
- (b) whether there were plans to improve pedestrian and traffic flow for the HKU campuses;
- (c) whether HKU campuses would be opened to the public; and
- (d) whether the staff quarters could be relocated to other campus areas, say within the adjacent "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") zone.

57. In response, Ms Fan Mei and Mr Tam King Leung, representatives of R2/C1, with the aid of Powerpoint slides, made the following responses:

- (a) in the past, there was an initiative proposed by the Government to rent out some of the HKU staff quarters units to the public but such initiative had already been suspended. Currently, the occupancy rate of HKU staff quarters was more than 80% which was considered a high rate taking into account the possible vacancy during refurbishment periods between occupancies;
- (b) it was the intention of HKU to provide pedestrian connection facilities for the proposed Pokfield Campus Development, including an elevated walkway across Pok Fu Lam Road connecting to the Centennial Campus, and a proposed escalator to connect to Smithfield Road (the latter would need to route through a piece of government land and was subject to study). The elevated walkway could provide separation of pedestrian and road traffic that would improve local traffic flow and pedestrian safety. HKU would continue to liaise with TD and the public for possible measures to

further improve the local traffic condition (e.g. road junction improvement). It was also the HKU's intention that the campuses could connect to MTR Kennedy Town Station, HKU Station and Sai Ying Pun Station so as to spread out the pedestrian flow and relieve congestion at the MTR HKU Station;

- (c) the HKU campuses would be opened to public except under special circumstances including the recent pandemic situation; and
- (d) after the development of Centennial Campus, there was a lack of available land in the surrounding areas of HKU campuses for further development, thus, they needed to utilize the land within their campuses for academic related facilities. For staff quarters development, there were restrictions under the "G/IC" zone on statutory plan and in the lease and it would take a very long time to assess, justify and process such proposal that might involve further planning applications and lease modification procedures. The staff quarters redevelopment at Site D would address their needs in a timely manner. There was currently no plan to develop staff quarters in the Pokfield Campus within the adjacent "G/IC" zone.

58. In response to the Chairperson's and some Members' enquiry on the cumulative traffic impact of HKU's planned expansion of campuses in the area, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, supplemented that a s.12A Application (No. Y/H1/2) was submitted by HKU in August 2021 regarding the proposed Pokfield Campus Development. The technical assessments in support of that application should include assessment on the cumulative impacts in a holistic manner on various aspects (e.g. air ventilation, visual, traffic etc.) of the campus developments. That proposal also had to take into account all preceding amendments to the OZP, including the current round of amendments covering Site D. That s.12A application was tentatively scheduled for consideration by the Board in January 2022.

Other Issues

59. In response to a Member's enquiry on the PFLM, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, said that PFLM was an administrative measure for restricting new developments in Pok Fu Lam

to control the amount of traffic generated within the area. Under the PFLM, the Government would defer sale of government land and would not process lease modification applications which would result in greater development intensity. However, Site D and the Pokfield Campus did not fall within the area covered by PFLM.

60. In response to a Member's enquiry on removal of trees at Site D by HKU as pointed out by some of the representers, Ms Fan Mei, representative of R2/C1, said that two large trees were damaged during a previous typhoon despite the pre-cautionary measures taken by them, and had to be subsequently removed due to safety concern.

[Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong left and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong rejoined the meeting during the Q&A session.]

61. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedures for the presentation and Q&A sessions had been completed. The Board would further deliberate on the representations and comments in closed meeting and inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representers and commenters and their representatives and PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[The meeting was adjourned for a short break of 5 minutes.]

Deliberation Session

62. The Chairperson recapitulated the main points and made the following remarks:

- (a) except Item D, there was no controversial issue on other amendment items raised by the representers and commenters attending the meeting. The responses to the grounds and proposals of all representers/commenters relating to the other Items were detailed in the Paper and noted by Members;
- (b) while noting the remarks made by some representers/commenters that the owners and residents of University Heights had never been made aware of the possibility of a high-rise development at Site D, the fact was that both

Site D and the site on which University Heights was now situated were put under “R(A)” zoning and not subject to any BHR when University Heights was developed and occupied, until the current “R(B)” zoning with BHRs were stipulated in 2011. Had HKU proceeded with redevelopment of Site D earlier, BHR would not have been applicable to the site. With this zoning history, one could not reasonably claim that a high-rise residential development had never been intended for Site D;

- (c) the amendment of the BHR to 150mPD was based on the BHR Review that adopted the same assumptions and approach applied in similar BHR reviews for other OZPs. The amendment to the BHR at Site D was not made to cater to HKU’s development proposal;
- (d) the representers/commenters considered that there would be adverse impacts in terms of visual, air ventilation and traffic by amending the BHR of Site D to 150mPD. Members might wish to consider whether those concerns should override the adjustment of BHR normally recommended by the Board after BHR reviews prompted by SBDG considerations; and
- (e) while noting that some representers/commenters had expectations on the corporate social responsibility of HKU as an academic institution, the mere fact that HKU was the owner of the site could not be a reasonable justification for lowering the BHR of Site D. The Board had to be impartial towards all land owners. That said, whether HKU decided to build up to the BHR was a matter of their choice.

Amendment Item D

63. All Members considered that relaxation of the BHR for Site D was generally acceptable and agreed that in view of the Court’s ruling on the JRs, it was necessary to take into account the permissible development intensity and implications of SBDG in reviewing the BHR for the site. Noting that the approach and assumptions adopted in the review of BHRs had been applied on the same basis by the Board on other OZPs, the Board needed to maintain consistency in the imposition of BHRs on the OZP. There were also merits to increase the

BH to 150mPD which allowed taller but slimmer buildings with more building gap in between and it would also allow more design flexibility.

64. Some Members said that it was the choice of HKU to decide whether a lower BH would be adopted to meet the design requirements and their needs for staff quarters. Noting the community's concerns, some Members considered that HKU should enhance their engagement and communication with the public/community on their development projects.

65. Some Members also considered that road and pedestrian traffic congestion in the area should be addressed by HKU in their proposed Pokfield Campus Development. A Member agreed with HKU's proposal to separate the pedestrian and vehicles flow by introducing an elevated walkway leading to the Centennial Campus but considered that enhanced connection to the neighbouring MTR stations should also be planned.

66. In response to a Member's enquiry, the Secretary said that the s.12A Application No. Y/H1/2 submitted by HKU involved an amendment to the BHR covering the Pokfield Campus, which was currently zoned "G/IC" and subject to a BHR of 4 storeys. Noting that the s.12A application would be considered by the Board tentatively in January 2022, Members considered that the forthcoming meeting would be a more appropriate venue for HKU to demonstrate the overall impacts induced by the HKU projects in the Pok Fu Lam area in a holistic manner, taking into account also the approved BHR for Site D and HKU's proposal for the site.

67. In response to the enquiries from the Chairperson and a Member on whether the Explanatory Statement (ES) should be amended to highlight the need for HKU to address the cumulative impact of their developments, Mr Ivan M.K. Chung, the Director of Planning, said that Item D was an amendment in relation to the Court's ruling of JRs to take into account SBDG requirements in reviewing BHRs. Site D had all along been a development zone, and there appeared to be no exceptional circumstances to deviate from the consistent approach adopted for other OZPs in reviewing the BHRs to further amend the BHR which was considered appropriate for the site. Any amendment to the ES arising from the current hearing should be related to Site D. As for the concerns on the cumulative traffic conditions raised by Members and the representers/commenters, they would be recorded in the minutes. If the said s.12A application for Pokfield Campus by HKU was approved by the Board in future, amendment to

the OZP would be required and that would be an opportunity to update the ES to reflect the latest planning intention and requirements as appropriate. The Chairperson supplemented that PlanD could convey to HKU the concerns raised by the Members regarding cumulative impacts of Pokfield Campus and urged them to fully address those concerns in the s.12A application.

Other Amendment Items

68. Members generally agreed with PlanD's responses to Items A to C, E, F1 and F2, and no further amendments to the OZP and its Notes were required.

69. After deliberation, the Board noted the supportive views of R1 to R28. The Board decided not to uphold R29 to R212 and considered that the draft Kennedy Town and Mount Davis Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

“Revision of Building Height Restriction (BHR) and Building Gap (BG) requirements (Amendment Items A, B, C, D, F1 and F2)

- (a) the current BHRs and BG requirements are considered appropriate as they have taken into account all relevant planning considerations (such as the existing building height (BH) profile, stepped BH profile, potential redevelopment, topography, site formation level, local characteristics, compatibility with the surroundings, visual impact, air ventilation), Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG) requirements, urban design guidelines and a proper balance between public interest and private development right. No adverse air ventilation, visual and landscape impacts would be induced to the surrounding; **(R29 to R212)**
- (b) the relaxation of BHR for Amendment Item D would not cause significant traffic impact on the vicinity as most of the trips generated from and attracted to the site in peak hours would still be trips on foot between the representation site and the HKU Main Campus along Pok Fu Lam Road; **(R31 to R35, R38, R41 to R208, R211, and R212)**

- (c) the revision of BHRs is mainly for accommodating the permissible plot ratio (PR) under the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R) and to meet the SBDG requirements. There is no planning justification for lowering the BHR of Amendment Item D to 90mPD or lower; **(R40, R211 and R212)** and

Rezoning two Sites at Mount Davis Road (Amendment Item E)

- (d) the “Residential (Group B)1” (“R(B)1”) zone for Amendment Item E with imposition of maximum PR of 3 and BH of 160mPD is considered appropriate, as it is not incompatible with the stepped BH profile and characteristics of the surrounding neighbourhood including the adjacent “R(B)1” zone. **(R30)**

70. The Board also agreed that the draft Kennedy Town and Mount Davis OZP, together with its respective Notes and updated Explanatory Statement, was suitable for submission under section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

Any Other Business

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

71. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 5:45 pm.