

**Minutes of 1288th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 10.2.2023**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Ms Doris P.L. Ho

Chairperson

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Conrad T.C. Wong

Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Mr K.L. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon
Transport Department
Mr Gary C.H. Wong

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

Absent with Apologies

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairperson

Dr C.H. Hau

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr K.W. Leung

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

In Attendance

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

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

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms M.L. Leung (a.m.)
Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee (p.m.)

Opening Remarks

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1287th Meeting held on 20.1.2023

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The draft minutes of the 1287th meeting held on 20.1.2023 were sent to Members on 9.2.2023. Subject to any proposed amendments by Members on or before 13.2.2023, the minutes would be confirmed.

[Post-meeting Note: The minutes were confirmed on 16.2.2023, upon incorporation of a Member's proposed revision to paragraph 39(e).]

Agenda Item 2

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

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

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/20

(TPB Paper No. 10880)

[The item was conducted in English and Cantonese.]

3. The Secretary reported that the amendment items of the draft Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/20 (the OZP) were to take forward two agreed s.12A applications (No. Y/H10/13 and Y/H10/14) in Pok Fu Lam. The University of Hong Kong (HKU) was the applicant of application No. Y/H10/13 while C M Wong & Associates Limited (CMWA) was one of the consultants of the other application No. Y/H10/14. Representations/comments had been submitted by HKU, several departments/centres/schools under Faculty of Medicine, HKU (HKUMed) and other HKU-related organisations (including the HKU Medical Alumni Association, Medical Society of HKU and Safety Office of HKU) (**R1 to R26 and C1**), Gleneagles Hong Kong Hospital (**R28**) as well as Hong Kong Cyberport Management Company Limited (HKCMCL) (**R30**). The following Members had declared interests on the items:

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang - being a relative of R564;
(*Vice-Chairperson*)

Dr C.H. Hau - being a Principal Lecturer of HKU; and his spouse
being a Principal Lecturer of HKU;

Mr Franklin Yu - having current business dealings with CMWA;

Dr Conrad T.C. Wong - being an Adjunct Professor of HKU; and having
current business dealings with Gleneagles Hong
Kong Hospital;

- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung - being the Chairman of the Accounting Advisory Board of School of Business, HKU;
- Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui - being a Fellow of Department of Social Work and Social Administration and an ex-employee of HKU;
- Professor Roger C.K. Chan - being an Honorary Associate Professor of HKU;
- Professor John C.Y. Ng - being an Adjunct Professor of HKU;
- Ms Lilian S.K. Law - being an Adjunct Associate Professor of HKU;
- Dr Venus Y.H. Lun - being an external examiner of one of HKU's programmes;
- Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong - being a personal friend of the Chief Executive Officer of HKCMCL;
- Mr Ben S.S. Lui - being a director of a company owning flats and car parking spaces in Pok Fu Lam, co-owning with spouse a flat in Pok Fu Lam, and his spouse owning a car parking space in Pok Fu Lam;
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - co-owning with spouse two units in Pok Fu Lam; and
- Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong - having close relative living in Pok Fu Lam.

4. Members noted that Mr Lincoln L. H. Huang and Dr C.H. Hau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. Members agreed that as Dr Conrad T.C. Wong, Mr Franklin Yu and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong had no involvement in the amendment items of the OZP and/or submission of the relevant representations, they should be allowed to join

the meeting when they arrived later. Members also agreed that as the interests of Professor Roger C.K. Chan, Professor John C.Y. Ng, Dr Venus Y.H. Lun, Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung, Ms Lilian S.K. Law and Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui were indirect; and the concerned properties of Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong's relative and those of Mr Ben S.S. Lui, his spouse and the company of which he was a director had no direct view of the amendment sites, they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

5. 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.

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

Government Representatives

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

Health Bureau (HHB)

Ms Shirley Y.P. Kwan - Deputy Secretary for Health 3/HHB

Mr Chris P.C. Fung - Principal Assistant Secretary for Health 3/
HHB

Representers, Commenters and their Representatives

R24 – The University of Hong Kong Medical Alumni Association

Dr Tsui Sik Hon - Representer's Representative

R40 – Patients' Rights Association (香港病人權益協會)

Mr Pang Hung Cheong - Representer's Representative

R44 – 長期病患者關注醫療改革聯席

Mr Chan Wai Kit - Representer's Representative

R51 – Leong Che Hung

Dr Leong Che Hung - Representer

R133/C2 – Tang Hoi Yee Cindy

R636 – Chan Ying Shing

Professor Chan Ying Shing - Representer, Representer's and
Commenter's Representative

R352 – Wong Gordon Tin Chun

R381 – Tse Wai Choi Eric

R549/C6 – Kwok Yuk Yu

Dr Wong Gordon Tin Chun - Representer

Professor Tse Wai Choi Eric - Representer

Ms Kwok Yuk Yu - Representer and Commenter

R382/C5 – Ching Ho Yee

R493 – Yuen Kwok Yung

Professor Yuen Kwok Yung - Representer and Representer's and
Commenter's Representative

R396 – Leung Ka Kit GilbertoC4 – Chow On Yi Phoebe

Professor Leung Ka Kit Gilberto - Representer and Commenter's
Representative

R505 – Chan Wai Kee Vikkie

Ms Chan Wai Kee Vikkie - Representer

R525 – Luk Chi Sau JasonR540 – Lau Chak Sing WallaceC1 – The University of Hong Kong

Professor Lau Chak Sing - Representer and Commenter's
Wallace Representative

Mr Sy Wai Yin Jeffrey - Commenter's Representative

R746 – Wong Taam Chi Woon Vivian

Dr Wong Taam Chi Woon - Representer
Vivian

R761 – To MichaelR883/C7 – Ng Shuk Wai Sarah

Dr To Kai Tsun Michael - Representer

Ms Ng Shuk Wai Sarah - Representer and Commenter

Mr Li Wai Tak Victor - Representer's and Commenter's
Representative

R1352/C8 – Ho Sung Kwan

Mr Ho Sung Kwan - Representer and Commenter

Mr Au Hoi Kin - Representer's and Commenter's
Representative

R1496/C9 – Lo Tong Kit

- Mr Lo Tong Kit - Representer and Commenter
 Dr Paul Hunt - Representer's and Commenter's
 Representative

R1523 – Lim Wan Fung Bernard VincentC3 – Siu Hoi Ling Ada

- Mr Lim Wan Fung Bernard - Representer and Commenter's
 Vincent Representative

R1593/C10 – Leon Yuk Yu

- Ms Mary Ting Fung Hemrajani - Representer's and Commenter's
 Representative

R1755/C11 – Chau Ka Yu

- Ms Tsang Chi Pui April - Representer's and Commenter's
 Representative

R1771 – Xu ZhigangC13 – Incorporated Owners of Royalton

- Mr Xu Zhigang - Representer and Commenter's
 Representative

R1785/C12 – Incorporated Owners of Royalton IIR1919 – Leung Pik Chiu

- Ms Leung Pik Chiu - Representer, Representer's and
 Commenter's Representative

R1802 – Yvonne McMahonR1944/C19 – Paul Zimmerman

- Mr Paul Zimmerman - Representer, Commenter and
 Representer's Representative

R1925/C21 – The Ebenezer School and Home for the Visually Impaired LimitedC20 – Lin Ka WaiC22 – Wong Lik YiC23 – Leung Ka KiC24 – To Shuk Yi*Masterplan Limited*

Mr Ian Brownlee] Representer's and Commenters'

Ms Yuen Sik Kiu Heather] Representatives

Dr Yuk Tak Fun Alice - Representer/Commenter (R1925/C21)'s
Representative

Ms To Shuk Yi Shirley - Commenter

R1943/C18 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer and Commenter

7. 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, commenters and their representatives would then be invited to make oral submissions. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, each representer, commenter or his/her representative would be allotted 10 minutes for making presentation. There was a timer device to alert the representers, commenters or 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 and their representatives. After the Q&A session, the government representatives, the representers, commenters and their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. The Board 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.

8. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representations and comments.

9. 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 draft OZP, 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. 10880 (the Paper). The amendments were:

- (a) Item A - rezoning of a site to the east of 3 Sassoon Road from "Green Belt" ("GB") to "Government, Institution or Community (1)" ("G/IC(1)") subject to a maximum building height restriction (BHR) of 164mPD for proposed academic buildings as expansion of the nearby HKUMed's campus, which was to take forward the decision of the Metro Planning Committee of the Board (MPC) to agree to the s.12A application No. Y/H10/13 on 26.11.2021; and
- (b) Item B - rezoning of a site currently occupied by Ebenezer School and Home for the Visually Impaired (Ebenezer) at 131 Pok Fu Lam Road from "G/IC" to "Residential (Group C)7" ("R(C)7") for proposed residential development subject to a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 1.9, a maximum BHR of 151mPD and the requirement for submission of a layout plan together with technical assessments (i.e. air quality, traffic noise and sewerage impact as set out in the Notes) under s.16 planning application for the Board's approval, which was to take forward the MPC's decision to agree to the s.12A application No. Y/H10/14 on 6.5.2022.

[Dr Conrad T.C. Wong and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong joined the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

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

R51 – Leong Che Hung

11. Dr Leong Che Hung (a doctor, a HKUMed alumnus, former chairman of Hospital Authority (HA) and former chairman of HKU Council) made the following main points:

- (a) he supported Item A and urged for early completion of the proposed academic building;
- (b) there was an acute shortage of healthcare professionals in Hong Kong, and there was an urgent need to train more doctors, nurses and other healthcare professionals. Moreover, only under the auspices of research and scientific advances could the healthcare services progress. HKUMed had been a forerunner in health research and medical discoveries, and needed to enhance its teaching and research capabilities so as to stay at the forefront. To that end, HKUMed required more space to accommodate its expanding education and research needs; and
- (c) the Item A site was a logical choice for HKUMed expansion which could synergise with the existing HKUMed facilities at Sassoon Road and would facilitate students to undertake training in Queen Mary Hospital (QMH) which was only within a few minutes' walk.

R40 – Patients' Rights Association (香港病人權益協會)

12. Mr Pang Hung Cheong made the following main points:

- (a) he supported Item A;
- (b) the Society for Community Organisation (社區組織協會) (R45) and allied organisations including R40, 老人權益聯盟 (Elderly Rights League (Hong Kong) (R37) and 婦女健康關注組(Concern Group in Women's Health) (R42) had also submitted representations to support Item A;
- (c) Hong Kong had been facing a serious shortage of doctors, as reflected by its per capita doctor ratio. The ratio was about 1.8 doctors per 1,000 population in the past and had been slightly improved to the current 2 doctors per 1,000 population since 2009 when the number of medical students started to increase

from the then 250 per cohort to the recent 590 per cohort. Nonetheless, the ratio still lagged behind many other developed countries;

- (d) although the two 10-year hospital development plans would provide 15,000 beds in the next 10 to 20 years, it was unsure if the future supply of doctors could cope with the increasing supply of facilities and demand for medical services. The need to train more doctors was imminent;
- (e) on the above basis, the medical schools in Hong Kong needed to be expanded. For HKUMed, while the total number of medical students had surged from about 1,300 to over 3,500 in the past 20 years (i.e. increased by more than 1.5 times), the space for medical training had remained unchanged. The new academic buildings would provide better facilities and environment for the medical students;
- (f) QMH, the flagship training hospital of HKUMed, and the HKUMed campus should be agglomerated to facilitate close exchange amongst students and teaching staff on clinical practices. Hence, locating the proposed HKUMed's campus expansion at the Item A site was reasonable; and
- (g) the laboratory for the manufacturing of pharmaceutical products to be provided in the proposed development would be conducive to early diagnosis and treatment of serious illness.

[Mr Franklin Yu joined the meeting during R40's presentation.]

R44 – 長期病患者關注醫療改革聯席

13. Mr Chan Wai Kit made the following main points:

- (a) he supported Item A;
- (b) Hong Kong did not have CAR-T therapy and he knew a blood cancer patient who had to undertake such therapy in the Mainland, which caused much

inconvenience to the patient and his carers. It would be better if such advanced therapy could be introduced into Hong Kong in the near future;

- (c) there was current deficiency in medical teaching facilities in HKUMed. The new HKUMed campus would provide advanced facilities, including the first stem cell laboratory in Hong Kong. Those new facilities could help promote medical advances and benefit the patients in Hong Kong; and
- (d) HKUMed would comply with the international safety standards and there should not be any risk concerns.

R24 – The University of Hong Kong Medical Alumni Association

14. Dr Tsui Sik Hon (the President of HKU Medical Alumni Association and deputy hospital chief executive of QMH) made the following main points:

- (a) he supported Item A;
- (b) there was a significant reduction of medical professionals in the public sector in recent years, with some switched to the private sector and some left Hong Kong;
- (c) in anticipation of the doubling of population aged over 65 in the next 20 years, the shortage of medical doctors in Hong Kong would worsen. To address the issue, the intake for each of the two medical schools in Hong Kong had increased to 295 in 2022/23, and the total number of medical students had increased from 1,300 to 3,500 in the past 20 years. The new HKUMed campus in the Item A site, including the clinic skills laboratory, would provide an ideal environment for teaching and learning; and
- (d) QMH, the flagship training hospital of HKUMed, was a facility of over 80 years and there was a lack of space to host more clinical teaching sessions. The proposed new HKUMed campus in the Item A site being close to QMH and other teaching venues along Sassoon Road could facilitate students' frequent

travel to the hospital to attend clinical teaching sessions and provide space for experience sharing after the sessions.

R746 – Wong Taam Chi Woon Vivian

15. Dr Wong Taam Chi Woon Vivian was a HKUMed alumna, an ex-teaching staff member of HKU, former chief executive of QMH, former chief executive of HA and former Chairman of Friends of the Earth (HK) Limited (FoE).

16. She said that in order to combat climate change, achieving a net-zero carbon built environment should be the best way forward. Apart from pursuing green buildings, planting more trees through collaboration with different sectors of the society would help maintain a strong global carbon sink. The Plantation Enrichment Programme organised by the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) aimed at enhancing the sustainability of the plantations, and FoE had been helping to promote AFCD's programme through its Tree Planting Challenge. The HKUMed and some alumni associations had rendered support to the Tree Planting Challenge by planting more trees than those felled for compensation in their development projects.

R1352/C8 – Ho Sung Kwan

17. Mr Au Hoi Kin, the principal of Caritas Wu Cheng-Chung Secondary School, made the following main points:

- (a) he supported Item A;
- (b) although the school was located very close to the Item A site and would be most affected by the proposed expansion project, HKU had maintained good communication with the school;
- (c) currently, many of their students and teachers walked down from the steep Sassoon Road near QMH on Pok Fu Lam Road to their school on Northcote Close. In future, they could benefit from the proposed pedestrian connections

between Pok Fu Lam Road and Northcote Close via the HKUMed's proposed development; and

- (d) on the concern on gas leakage from HKUMed facilities, it was trusted that HKUMed would be very responsible and their facilities would comply with high safety standards. Also, no record of such leakage had been reported in the past.

R1593/C10 – Leon Yuk Yu

18. Ms Mary Ting Fung Hemrajani, the Chairman of Global Chinese Breast Cancer Organisations Alliance (全球華人乳癌組織聯盟大會), made the following main points:

- (a) she supported Item A; and
- (b) the number of cancer patients had increased three-folds over the past 30 years and cancer patients were increasing in the younger age groups (e.g. the forties). Scientific research was needed to develop more effective preventive measures and treatment for patients based on evidence and experimental findings. Medical research laboratories should be located close to hospitals where patients of various illness would be readily available for clinical trials.

R1771 – Xu Zhigang

C13 – Incorporated Owners of Royalton

19. Mr Xu Zhigang, the Chairman of the Incorporated Owners of Royalton, made the following main points:

- (a) whilst supporting medical development in Hong Kong, he objected to Item A;
- (b) the supporting representations were submitted by parties related to HKUMed, that constituted conflict of interest, and the large number of supporting comments was meaningless. At the s.12A stage, some 900 objecting comments mainly from Pok Fu Lam residents were received;

- (c) since the HKUMed expansion plan at the Item A site was made public in 2021 (about two years ago), HKUMed had only consulted the local residents twice and the consultation sessions were so short that there was not enough time for questions and answers. Despite their repeated requests, HKUMed failed to arrange more meetings to better understand local residents' concerns;
- (d) Item A involved rezoning a site from "GB" to "G/IC(1)" and Item B from "G/IC" to "R(C)7". From a layman's point of view, such rezoning proposals were not logical as Government could acquire the Item B site (originally zoned "G/IC") for the HKUMed expansion and relocate Ebenezer elsewhere;
- (e) for the Item B site, a BHR of 151mPD comparable to that of the existing school buildings on-site was stipulated under the OZP. The Item A site should similarly be restricted to the same BHR of 151mPD, instead of 164mPD as currently stipulated. According to the HKUMed's proposal, building blocks at the Item A site would be built on stilted structures above the slope in order to preserve as many trees thereon as possible. However, the proposed development of up to 164mPD would create adverse visual impact on the local residents along Pok Fu Lam Road. To reduce such impact, Mr Paul Zimmerman (R1944/C19) had suggested lowering the entire podium and the building blocks while maintaining the same development scale. Requests for meeting with HKUMed to discuss the above proposal were made but HKUMed had not responded;
- (f) HKUMed should provide information about enrolment target and fallback option in case of failure to meet the target. HKUMed might not be able to achieve the enrolment target, considering the abundant supply of medical schools in Guangdong Province, the recent surge in emigration from Hong Kong and the Government's recent policy of allowing non-locally trained doctors to work in Hong Kong. Since the proposed HKUMed's expansion was Government-funded, HKUMed should be accountable to the taxpayers;
- (g) the local residents had previously identified seven alternative sites for HKUMed's consideration, including Alberose, redevelopment of HKUMed's

existing obsolete and under-utilised facilities along Sassoon Road, land adjacent to the Chinese Christian Cemetery, government land zoned “GB” below Victoria Road, etc. All those alternatives were within a 15-minute walk of QMH. Despite that a larger “GB” site had been reserved for HKU expansion as mentioned in the 2021 Policy Address, the HKUMed still chose to expand its facilities in the smaller Item A site, without a convincing explanation. Moreover, development on the steep slope in the Item A site was difficult and costly;

- (h) regarding the proposed public open space on building podia, it was very unlikely that the local residents would go there due to the presence of Physical Containment Level 3 (‘PC3’) laboratory thereunder;
- (i) although the development scale of the Item B site was far smaller than that of the Item A site, the development in the Item B site was required to submit a layout plan with impact assessments on air quality, traffic noise and sewerage by way of a planning application for the Board’s consideration. In view that adverse impacts (e.g. stinky exhaust emissions such as that from the existing HKUMed facilities along Sassoon Road, treatment of laboratory wastes, traffic congestion on nearby road network, etc.) would also be caused by the proposed HKUMed’s expansion in the Item A site, the same requirement for layout plan submission supported by various impact assessments should also be applicable to Item A and be subject to the satisfaction of relevant government departments and approval of the Board before proceeding to development;
- (j) there was current traffic congestion on Pok Fu Lam Road near the junction with QMH and the construction traffic impact was not properly assessed. HKUMed should submit relevant technical assessment in that regard;
- (k) there were gas installations on the rooftop of Block B under HKUMed’s proposal. Since Royalton was located on the downwind side of Block B under the summer southwesterlies, the wind from the seaward side would carry the gas emissions from Block B to the residential developments nearby. The said

gas installations should be orientated towards Victoria Road and Sassoon Road at the farthest location from developments on Pok Fu Lam Road;

- (l) in response to the concerns on possible leakage from the research laboratories, the HKUMed indicated that there had been no major incidents in the research laboratories in HKU; however, he found information about gas leakage incidents in 2014, 2020 and 2022 from HKU from the internet;
- (m) the PC3 laboratory in the proposed development would be lit up round the clock and would create light pollution to nearby residents. HKUMed's proposed mitigation as set out in paragraph 5.3.1(m) of the Paper was too flimsy; and
- (n) since the local residents' concerns had not been addressed, they would like to request:
 - (i) the Board to consider the proposed development at the Item A site afresh and require HKUMed to submit various technical assessments to justify their proposal; and
 - (ii) HKUMed to closely liaise with the local residents and seek their support on the proposed development before commencing construction.

R1785/C12 – Incorporated Owners of Royalton II

R1919 – Leung Pik Chiu

20. Ms Leung Pik Chiu, representative of the Incorporated Owners of Royalton II, made the following main points:

- (a) she supported HKUMed to develop new facilities but expressed concerns on the proposed development in the Item A site;
- (b) the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP stipulated that the BH would descend from 164mPD in the north-western portion to 123mPD in the south-eastern portion. However, it had not specified the extent of the 164mPD portion and whether the roof-top structures (some 4 to 5m tall) were accountable

for BH calculation. There were also concerns that the BH would be increased at the general building plan submission stage;

- (c) currently, there were often white smoke emissions from existing HKUMed facilities along Sassoon Road. Since Royalton II was located on the downwind side of the wind from the sea and was close to the Item A site (only about 29m away), any emissions (e.g. odour, radiation, etc.) from the proposed development would be carried by wind towards Royalton II. To avoid such impacts, the ES should be amended to limit development in the Item A site to a maximum building height (BH) of 148mPD with an exception of 164mPD for the north-western portion, and relaxation of BH should not be permitted in future;
- (d) the minutes of the 684th MPC meeting held on 26.11.2021 (for consideration of the relevant s.12A application) recorded that rounds of consultation had been held since early 2020. However, the local residents were only shown the HKUMed's scheme on 3.6.2021 when the two parties first met and the local residents were not able to relay their comments to HKUMed earlier. At the second meeting with HKUMed, the development plans shown to the local residents also lacked details;
- (e) the building façade of the proposed development facing the nearby residential properties should be provided with maximum greening so as to enhance visual interest and minimise glare effect and light pollution;
- (f) as explained by the Chairman of Incorporated Owners of Royalton (R1771), the entire podium and building blocks of the proposed development should be sunken further to reduce visual impact on the local residents along Pok Fu Lam Road; and
- (g) the Board was invited to continue to monitor the project to ensure that the development scheme previously submitted to the Board would be implemented at subsequent stages and that more meetings would be held by HKUMed to keep local residents informed of the project progress.

R1802 – Yvonne McMahon

R1944/C19 – Paul Zimmerman

21. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Paul Zimmerman made the following main points:

- (a) since the feasibility of the HKUMed’s proposal for Item A site had not been ascertained in the following aspects, the Board was asked to maintain its control by requiring the submission of a master layout plan (MLP) under Item A:
 - (i) in the 694th MPC meeting held on 6.5.2022 when the s.12A application (No. Y/H10/14) of the Item B site was considered, Members opined that the MPC should be apprised of any planned developments in the vicinity when considering future applications or OZP amendments. In that regard, the Board should note that there were intense developments in the area in the pipeline, including:
 - redevelopment of QMH,
 - HKUMed expansion in the Item A site,
 - HKU Deep Technology Research Centre in a larger “GB” site (4 ha) between the Item A site and Baguio Villa,
 - MTR South Island Line (West) (SIL(W)) QMH Station,
 - potential development in Kong Sin Wan Valley, and
 - redevelopment projects by HKUMed along Sassoon Road, etc;
 - (ii) it was not comprehensible why the requirement for the submission of a MLP was not imposed on a larger scale development (i.e. Item A) but on a smaller one (i.e. Item B) when the two were adjacent to each other;
 - (iii) the Item A site would be subject to the following extreme geotechnical limitations as revealed in the Geotechnical Planning Review Report (attached to MPC Paper No. Y/H10/13A for consideration by MPC on 26.11.2021). However, no further studies had been conducted to address the following issues:

- consequence-to-life category might be changed due to the proposed development,
 - the proposed development was encircled by nearby building structures,
 - the site was within drainage reserve zone,
 - two natural open channels were within the site,
 - SIL(W) possibly running across the site,
 - excavation and lateral support system were required for construction of foundation and basement structures,
 - rockhead only a few meters below surface ground (suggesting that both the top soil and the vegetation thereon could be easily washed away), and
- (iv) the trees on the slope under the building block would not survive as envisaged in the HKUMed's proposal. There were many examples in Hong Kong demonstrating that the vegetation/trees underneath stilt structures could not survive. As such, the podium and building blocks should be sunken to eliminate dead space underneath and to lower the overall BH; and
- (b) since the requirement for submission of a MLP was imposed on the Item B site and the Cyberport Expansion, the same should also be imposed on the HKUMed's proposed development in the Item A site.

R1925/C21 – The Ebenezer School and Home for the Visually Impaired Limited

C20 – Lin Ka Wai

C22 – Wong Lik Yi

C23 – Leung Ka Ki

C24 – To Shuk Yi

22. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ian Brownlee, the representative of Ebenezer, made the following main points:

- (a) the Ebenezer relocation had taken a long time. The first rezoning proposal of the Item B site was considered in 2009 and it took 13 years for the rezoning to be agreed in 2022;

To Stipulate under the OZP the Requirement for Submission of MLP under Item A

- (b) for the Item A site, it was proposed to impose a requirement for submission of a MLP through s.16 planning application in the Notes of the “G/IC(1)” zone. This could allow the Board to retain control on the implementation of the HKUMed’s proposed development, ensure compliance with the requirements set out in the ES and that concerns and suggestions raised by MPC members were incorporated where appropriate. Members’ suggestions raised in the 684th MPC Meeting held on 26.11.2021 were:

- (i) concern on whether the indicative scheme would be built as planned;
- (ii) suggestions to enhance the quality and quantity of the proposed landscaping to better integrate with the existing vegetation preserved in the secondary forest and to better maintain the “GB” character of the area; and
- (iii) suggestions to review the proposed development intensity, to reconsider the necessity of the proposed emergency vehicular access (EVA) and to enhance pedestrian connections and road crossings.

The controls subsequently stipulated under the “G/IC(1)” zone could not effectively address the above Members’ concerns;

- (c) in the Paper (paragraph 6.3.1), there were comments from HKUMed that:
- (i) the proposed HKUMed’s expansion in the Item A site was fully funded by the Government with full support from the HHB and Education Bureau. The proposal was submitted to the Panel on Health Services and Panel on Education in May 2021, and would be submitted to the Legislative Council (LegCo) for funding approval. There was a well-established mechanism to ensure that the project would be viable, economical and in compliance with all relevant requirements; and
 - (ii) relevant restrictions had been incorporated in the ES, e.g. the provision of communal open space, stepped BH concept, etc.

- (d) in response to the above points made by HKUMed, the Board should note that:
 - (i) none of the above authorities would ensure that the proposed development would not create nuisance to the neighbourhood. The Board was the only authority that could impose statutory provision to control those nuisances; and
 - (ii) the ES was not a statutory control and HKUMed could disregard it;

To Stipulate under the OZP a 32m-wide Non-Building Area Restriction under Item A

- (e) in HKUMed's scheme for the Item A site, there was a 32m-wide non-building area (NBA) from Ebenezer's site boundary. However, the NBA was not stipulated on the OZP and there was no mechanism to ensure that the 32m-wide NBA would eventually be provided. The Board should stipulate a minimum 32m-wide NBA from the Ebenezer's site boundary on the OZP;
- (f) the said 32m-wide NBA would provide a healthy, comfortable living and learning environment for the existing visually impaired students and future residents in the Item B site by providing a buffer from the HKUMed's proposed campus. The NBA could also help preserve public views from Pok Fu Lam Road;
- (g) regarding the development timeline for the Item B site, it was targeted at Q1-Q3/2023 to finalise land grant of the Tung Chung (TC) relocation site, year 2027 for completion of new premises at the TC site and year 2028 for completion of relocation with occupation permit and relevant licenses issued for the TC site. Regarding the development timeline for the Item A site, construction was expected to commence in end-2023 for completion in 2027. Hence, the visually impaired students in Ebenezer would be impacted by construction works in the Item A site in the next few years before the relocation to the TC site. The provision of the 32m-wide NBA was essential to serve as a buffer to reduce the negative impacts;

Building Height Restriction

- (h) the ES (paragraph 5.2) of the OZP stated that “on the seaward side along the section of Pok Fu Lam Road to the north of its junction with Chi Fu Road, it is intended to keep developments below the level of Pok Fu Lam Road as far as possible in order to preserve public view and amenity and also the general character of the area”. The Item B site was therefore restricted to a BHR of 151mPD, that was the BH of the existing buildings on-site, but the BHR of the Item A site was 164mPD which was not in line with the ES requirement;

To Remove from the OZP the Requirement for Layout Plan Submission for Item B Site

- (i) the requirement to submit a layout plan for the Item B site should be deleted. That requirement was imposed to address the concern of the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) who considered that there was a lack of mechanism to ensure implementation of suitable mitigation measures in terms of air quality, traffic noise and sewerage impact in the future residential development;
- (j) at the s.12A stage, all the submitted technical assessments had demonstrated no adverse impacts from the proposed development. Mitigation measures had been proposed to comply with relevant environmental requirements relating to air quality and traffic noise. The submitted sewerage impact assessment (SIA) also indicated no adverse sewerage impact, and DEP and the Drainage Services Department (DSD) had no adverse comment on the application and the SIA;
- (k) while both HKUMed and Ebenezer expressed commitment to providing mitigation measures to comply with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), the requirement for layout plan submission by way of s.16 planning application was only imposed on the Item B site;
- (l) while the SIAs submitted by both HKUMed and Ebenezer had demonstrated no adverse impact arising from their respective developments, DEP was concerned about the lack of control mechanism for the Item B site only. Since the Item B

site was a small, elongated and constrained site with sufficient control under the OZP (i.e. maximum plot ratio (PR) of 1.9 and maximum BHR of 151mPD), there would be limited scope to depart from the approved s.12A scheme and the proposed mitigation measures (including setback from Pok Fu Lam Road);

(m) in view of the above, the following amendments were proposed:

Item A

- (i) to impose in the Notes the requirement for a MLP submission through s.16 planning application; or
- (ii) to impose in the OZP a minimum 32m-wide NBA from the Item B site boundary; and

Item B

- (i) to remove the layout plan submission requirement for the “R(C)7” zone; or
- (ii) to remove the layout plan submission requirement from the Notes of the “R(C)7” zone and amend the ES for the “R(C)7” zone such that the layout plan submission was only required to be submitted to the DEP for approval.

23. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Dr Yuk Tak Fun Alice, the Chief Executive Officer of Ebenezer, made the following main points:

- (a) she supported Item B;
- (b) the existing Ebenezer school buildings were built over 60 years ago to suit the needs of the occupants back then. Nowadays, about 70% of the visually impaired students had moderate to severe intellectual disability and/or were physically handicapped and wheelchair-bounded. The existing premises could not cater for the needs of the occupants with such multiple disabilities. With the changing profile of the visually impaired persons and more diversified assistance to be offered, the existing facilities and services of Ebenezer were in urgent need of upgrade and expansion. However, due to the constraints of the

existing site, the much-needed improvements were only achievable in a larger development; and

- (c) the new premises at the TC site would provide facilities and services to users in various age groups (including infants, juveniles and elderly) with varying degree of impairment. The successful relocation of the school hinged on the approval of the Item B amendment. The future redevelopment and its associated impacts in the Item B site had already been properly addressed at the s.12A stage; hence, the subsequent approval process for the redevelopment should be expedited.

24. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms To Shuk Yi Shirley made the following main points:

- (a) construction activities would cause changes to the pedestrian environment, e.g. temporary diversions of pedestrian walkways, use of traffic control devices without sound alerts, increase in heavy vehicular traffic, uneven pavement surface, etc. The school staff and visually impaired students would find those sudden changes difficult to cope with. To safeguard their safety, Ebenezer should be informed of any such changes in advance such that the school could make appropriate arrangement and provide guidance to their students and staff; and
- (b) the visually impaired persons in Ebenezer were from different age groups (including infants and elderly), some with multiple impairments or in weak health conditions, and most of them resided in the Item B site. They were very sensitive to noise nuisance and vulnerable to air pollutants. It was imperative that noise reduction measures be installed to minimise noise level and air pollutants.

[Professor Roger C.K. Chan left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

[The meeting was adjourned for a 15-minute break.]

R1943/C18 – Mary Mulvihill

25. Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

- (a) she objected to Item A;
- (b) the Government had rezoned substantial number of “GB” sites across the Territory. To strike a balance, the Government should retain the relatively small Item A site as “GB” and the Item B site as “G/IC”;
- (c) the Government should have stepped in and assisted Ebenezer in identifying a new site for reprovisioning of the services to the visually impaired and disabled. Then, Item B site could be used for other Government, institution and community (GIC) uses;
- (d) in considering the earlier s.12A application (No. Y/H10/5) for the Ebenezer redevelopment in Item B site on 19.6.2009, MPC Members generally had no objection as there was then no shortage of “G/IC” land in the Southern District. However, HKUMed now expressed that there was not enough “G/IC” land to accommodate their campus expansion. The Board should re-consider whether there was sufficient “G/IC” land and whether the Item B site should be rezoned for residential use. The HKUMed’s campus expansion could instead be developed on the Item B site together with some adjoining “GB” areas, hence preserving the natural environment of the Item A site (i.e. the existing some 800 trees, water courses, mature eco-system, etc.). The Item B site shared similar strategic location as the Item A site, that would be able to create synergy with QMH and HKUMed’s existing campus;
- (e) since research laboratories involving the use of small animals for testing were noxious facilities and the related issues of biohazards had not been addressed, they should not be located close to residential areas. Instead, HKUMed should develop any new research and educational facilities close to the border in order to facilitate better integration of Hong Kong with the Greater Bay Area;

- (f) the proposed public open space in the Item A site could not benefit the neighbourhood as it was not conveniently located, facing the heavily trafficked Pok Fu Lam Road and close to the future laboratory facilities;
- (g) as HKUMed had not presented any detailed building design, she supported the requirement for MLP submission under Item A;
- (h) the mere increase of about 150 healthcare students (only 60 doctors and the rest being nurses and dentists) could be easily accommodated in the existing under-utilised premises of HKUMed. Besides, the spaces for nurse and dentist students could be accommodated within their respective faculties;
- (i) extensive redevelopment of QMH and other projects planned in the area would create wall effect along Pok Fu Lam Road. The Item A site was the only relief and buffer that should remain undeveloped;
- (j) the felling of numerous trees without compensation at the Item A site was unacceptable and against carbon reduction policy; and
- (k) if the Item B site was to be redeveloped for residential purpose, then the Item A site should be retained for its existing green belt function.

R525 – Luk Chi Sau Jason

R540 – Lau Chak Sing Wallace

C1 – The University of Hong Kong

26. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Professor Lau Chak Sing Wallace, Dean of HKUMed, made the following main points:

- (a) he supported Item A;
- (b) over the past 20 years (2002/03-2021/22), the total number of staff and students of HKUMed had increased from around 3,000 to 8,600 (more than double), with the undergraduates increased from 273 students enrolled under four

programmes to 633 students enrolled under seven programmes. However, HKUMed's floorspace had only expanded by 55% (from 43,700m² to 66,500m²) and therefore was in dire need to develop additional floorspace to enhance its teaching and research facilities;

- (c) as promised in the 684th MPC Meeting in 2021 and again in the current TPB meeting, the good design features of the approved s.12A scheme would be implemented, including the stepped BH and the 32m-wide NBA from the Item B site boundary;
- (d) HKUMed would continue to liaise with the local residents and address their concerns as appropriate;
- (e) some commented that there would not be any academic buildings in HKUMed's proposed campus at Item A site but only research laboratories. In that regard, it should be noted that medical research was not only important to find cures to save lives but also served as catalyst for medical advancement that would benefit the whole society. As evident in overseas experience, medical breakthroughs usually stemmed from university laboratories; and
- (f) in recent years, HA had been suffering from a severe drain of medical practitioners, with 8% loss of doctors and 10% loss of paramedical staff per year. Since it took time to address the shortfall, the HKUMed expansion in the Item A site should be expedited.

[Mr Timothy K.W. Ma left the meeting temporarily during R540's presentation.]

R133/C2 – Tang Hoi Yee Cindy

R636 – Chan Ying Shing

27. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Professor Chan Ying Shing, Director (Development and Infrastructure) of HKUMed, made the following main points:

- (a) he supported Item A;

Local Consultation

- (b) HKUMed had held two consultation meetings with local residents in mid-2021 and end-2022, each lasting for about 2 to 3 hours, and had also consulted Southern District Council (SDC), the respective SDC Member and a LegCo Member on several occasions. HKUMed would continue to liaise with the local residents and various stakeholders;

The Latest Scheme

- (c) HKUMed was committed to providing the 32m-wide NBA from the Item B site under the s.12A scheme to minimise impact on Ebenezer;
- (d) to minimise the visual impact, the BH of Block B (+148mPD) would be lower than the level of the first residential floor of Royalton and Royalton II (+153mPD), and the BH of Block A would be reduced from 164mPD in the s.12A scheme to 161mPD in the latest scheme with staggered, landscaped terraces receding away from Royalton and Royalton II;
- (e) there were two natural watercourses traversing the Item A site. To minimise the ecological impact, the one near the Item B site falling within the 32m-wide NBA would remain intact, and there would be minimum disturbance to the one under the building block ('the latter watercourse'). Within the building gap between Block A and Block B was an open-air courtyard which would allow retention of both the latter watercourse and the vegetated slope underneath. Also, in the latest scheme, the footprint of the car ramp structure leading from Northcote Close (+93mPD) had been reduced and set further back from the latter watercourse to minimise impact. Since the slope was facing west, the vegetation thereon (including those under the podium) could have access to afternoon sunlight;

- (f) for compensatory planting, 1.13 trees would be planted for every tree felled;
- (g) the proposal of further sinking the podium and building blocks to reduce the visual intrusiveness at the Pok Fu Lam Road level would further compress the void underneath and have more impact on the trees; and
- (h) HKUMed was committed to implementation of the good design features, including descending BH profile, sensible architectural design, the 32m-wide NBA, etc. in the latest scheme presented at the meeting. Government departments would continue to vet and monitor the implementation of the scheme.

R1523 – Lim Wan Fung Bernard Vincent

C3 – Siu Hoi Ling Ada

28. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Lim Wan Fung Bernard Vincent, the authorised architect of the HKUMed's proposed development, made the following main points:

- (a) he supported Item A;
- (b) the HKUMed's proposed development was scheduled for operation in March 2028. The new facilities would become an integral part of HKUMed, providing teaching, learning, laboratories, research facilities, lecture theatres (all amounting to about 74% of the total floorspace), offices and ancillary facilities. The development parameters under the approved s.12A scheme would be carried through and enhanced during the development process, taking into account comments from the local residents and the Board. The comments so far received from the local residents and the MPC were:
 - (i) 684th MPC Meeting held on 26.11.2021:
 - to explain to the public and stakeholders,
 - to provide better connection with QMH,
 - to build the s.12A scheme as planned,

- to re-consider the need for the proposed EVA connecting Blocks A and B,
 - to provide more design flexibility while striking a balance with other considerations,
 - to enhance the greening,
- (ii) Consultation Meeting on 16.12.2022 and Other Meetings:
- to provide more stepped greenery,
 - to preserve the nature,
 - to be compatible with the surroundings,
 - to minimise the visual impact,
 - to reduce the BH,
 - to avoid day glare/night light,
 - to improve pedestrian traffic,
 - to take into account vehicular traffic, and
 - to take into account health, safety and possible exhaust;

The Latest Scheme

- (c) taking into account the above comments, the s.12A scheme had been enhanced and the latest scheme included the following aspects:
- (i) building façade facing Royalton and Royalton II would be provided with more staggering landscaped terraces and rooftop greenery,
 - (ii) the BH of Block A would be lowered from 164mPD to 161mPD. The BH of Block B would be maintained at 148mPD, that was lower than the first residential floor of Royalton,
 - (iii) the rooftop structures were only stairhoods,
 - (iv) podium decks for pedestrian access were available on the Pok Fu Lam Road level (+138mPD) and the Sassoon Road level (+123mPD),
 - (v) people gaining access from Victoria Road (+70mPD) could go up to the podium on the Pok Fu Lam Road level (+138mPD) via a direct lift, obviating the need for changing lifts as in the s.12A scheme,
 - (vi) pedestrian connection between QMH and the Item A site would be provided via the HKUMed development at 3 Sassoon Road,

- (vii) maintenance vehicles would no longer access via Northcote Close (+93mPD) as in the s.12A scheme but via Sassoon Road (+123mPD). This could help avoid nuisances to residents along Northcote Close, reduce the bulk of the car ramp structure leading from Northcote Close and minimise disturbance to the vegetated slope and natural watercourse,
 - (viii) to avoid day glare and reduce light pollution, window openings had been reduced and the internal lighting of laboratories would not be on 24 hours a day,
 - (ix) the 32m-wide NBA from the Item B site boundary would be retained; and
 - (x) excavation would not be lower than the bedrock in order to reduce construction cost and construction noise nuisance;
- (d) the representers' suggestion of further sinking the podium and building blocks was not desirable as that would involve excavation into the bedrock which would be more costly and aggravate the construction noise nuisance; and
- (e) the s.12A scheme was a well-thought-out scheme with details equivalent to a MLP, and so was the latest scheme presented at the meeting. The HKUMed's proposed development was a public works project and subject to vetting by various Government departments in the downstream. In January 2023, enquiry submission of general building plan was made to the Building Authority. In end-2023, the project would be submitted to LegCo for funding approval, whereby both the LegCo and the public could scrutinise the project, and then followed by a very tight development programme with works commencement in 2024 for completion in 2028. In view of the above timeframe, the scheme could not accommodate substantial changes at the current stage but could be further enhanced to incorporate public comments where appropriate.

R396 – Leung Ka Kit Gilberto

C4 – Chow On Yi Phoebe

29. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Professor Leung Ka Kit Gilberto, Associate Dean (Teaching and Learning) of HKUMed, made the following main points:

- (a) he supported Item A;
- (b) very often, the teaching staff of HKUMed needed to carry out clinical practice in QMH and the HA doctors of QMH would go to HKUMed to deliver lectures. Locating the HKUMed campus close to the QMH could facilitate close contact among HKUMed teaching staff, HA doctors, students and patients and would reduce impact on doctors' work at the hospital; and
- (c) the manpower gap of doctor was projected to widen from some hundreds in 2022 to about 1,000 in 2030. Although the intake of medical students had increased in recent years, the corresponding expansion of HKUMed campus to enhance the teaching capacity had not yet been finalised as of today. Further delay in the campus expansion programme would exacerbate the bridging of the manpower gap.

R382/C5 – Ching Ho Yee

R493 – Yuen Kwok Yung

30. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Professor Yuen Kwok Yung, Professor of HKUMed, made the following main points:

- (a) he supported Item A;
- (b) the long-standing shortage of healthcare professionals and hospital space had been evident in the fight against the COVID-19 pandemic in the past three years. To retain local talents and attract overseas specialists, more training, research and supporting facilities should be provided to the healthcare professionals and medical research sector;
- (c) pandemics could occur anytime and anywhere in the world. Hong Kong should get prepared all the time for the next pandemic by grasping information about new diseases. Scientific research findings could alert the world about any emerging infectious disease and the need to stand guard against any related

potential threat in a timely manner. Adequate research facilities of international standards would be required to achieve the above target;

- (d) to effectively deal with new diseases, Hong Kong should be geared up well ahead of any widespread of infection. HKUMed had made a lot of contributions to the early discovery of new infectious diseases, development of vaccines and giving expert advice on various anti-pandemic measures to the Government. All these could not have been accomplished without the laboratory facilities, in particular the PC3 laboratory in HKUMed which was the only one of its kind in Hong Kong. However, HKUMed had been facing an acute shortage of research facilities and found it difficult to retain local talents, not to mention attracting overseas high-end talents; and
- (e) in face of the longer life expectancy of Hong Kong population and before the next pandemic, HKUMed should be expeditiously equipped with adequate teaching and learning facilities for medical education and more research laboratories of international standards to build up a more solid research foundation.

R352 – Wong Gordon Tin Chun

R381 – Tse Wai Choi Eric

R549/C6 – Kwok Yuk Yu

31. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Dr Wong Tin Chun Gordon, Assistant Dean (Professional Development) of HKUMed, made the following main points:

- (a) he supported Item A; and
- (b) to face with the healthcare challenges of the present day, doctors had to equip themselves with a different range of skill set and with the help of new technology, e.g. clinical simulation laboratory, augmented reality/virtual reality teaching facilities, etc. However, the existing HKUMed facilities were already over-utilised. For instance, one teaching venue could be required for multiple teaching sessions in one single day, which usually involved the setting-up and

removal of heavy equipment between sessions. That had rendered the inefficient and ineffective use of space and offered little space for students to undertake self-practices.

32. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Professor Tse Wai Choi Eric, Associate Dean (Enabling Platforms) of HKUMed, made the following main points:

- (a) he supported Item A;
- (b) CAR-T therapy, a cell-based therapy, could help blood cancer patients but it was very expensive and required weeks to develop the treatment from cell tissues, especially if prepared overseas. Such therapy necessitated a Good Manufacturing Practices (GMP) laboratory and required transportation of cell tissues between the hospital and the GMP laboratory. Currently, there was a GMP laboratory in HKUMed which had limited capacity due to its small size. Hence, the one planned in the HKUMed's proposed campus would be larger and, with its close proximity to QMH, could facilitate faster and less costly operation of the therapy to help more patients; and
- (c) the proposed GMP laboratory could also provide a venue for training medical professionals.

R761 – To Kai Tsun Michael

R883/C7 – Ng Shuk Wai Sarah

33. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Dr To Kai Tsun Michael, Clinical Associate Professor of HKUMed, made the following main points:

- (a) he supported Item A;
- (b) training new doctors involved a considerable amount of capital, manpower and land resources. Over the years, while the number of medical students in HKUMed had increased, there was no corresponding increase in the space in the QMH and HKUMed for teaching and research purposes;

- (c) one of the important elements in training new doctors had always been the close interaction between teachers and students. Due to lack of space, after clinical training sessions in QMH, the post-clinical discussions could only take place outside the hospital, such as currently in the nearby HKUMed's facility along Sassoon Road; and
- (d) research was inseparable from medical treatment. As an example, they had previously sourced funding for 3D printing technology of bones about seven years ago. Due to lack of space in HKUMed, the 3D printing equipment had been subsequently accommodated in a very small room in QMH two years later. The use of that technology had since been extended to other HA hospitals. Medical school very often led and pioneered new treatment which required adequate and up-to-standard laboratories.

34. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Li Wai Tak Viktor, a medical student of HKUMed, made the following main points:

- (a) he supported Item A;
- (b) the number of medical graduates in HKUMed would increase from 235 in 2022 to 295 in 2028, and that was a strong justification for expansion of the HKUMed campus. Due to insufficient space, over a hundred students had to pack into one room for lessons and often there was no suitable venue for post-clinical discussions right after clinical training sessions;
- (c) medical and healthcare students needed to travel frequently to QMH for practical training. The close proximity to QMH could facilitate teachers and students to attend the practical sessions; and
- (d) apart from classroom lectures, conducting medical research in laboratories was an equally important part of medical training. Both the number and the standard of the laboratory equipment needed to be increased and upgraded so as to keep in pace with new medical technology and new medical challenges.

R1496/C9 – Lo Tong Kit

35. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Dr Paul Hunt, Director of Safety, HKU, made the following main points:

- (a) he supported Item A;
- (b) based on the records of HKU Safety Office, there had been no major incidents having effects beyond the laboratory to the surroundings since 1970s. Laboratory incidents such as the December 2022 incident mentioned by a representer might affect people working in the laboratories but seldom had impact beyond those laboratories. That said, lab leaks were still extremely rare. HKU had a good track record of responsible building design and operation from safety perspective;
- (c) HKU laboratories were designed to conduct teaching and research on small-scale activities, not involving any large-scale industrial production nor serving as chemical or vaccine manufacturing facilities. There would be minimal risk to people in the surrounding areas;
- (d) the firm that HKUMed currently engaged for design of the new laboratories was an internationally renowned firm with extensive experience in designing similar chemical laboratories and specialist containment facilities (e.g. University of Melbourne Doherty Institute, Pasteur Institute (Vietnam), etc.). HKUMed laboratories were subject to stringent international regulatory body inspection and clearances before they could be put into use;
- (e) on chemical safety, the main approach to achieve safety was to design laboratories up to international standards for exhaust ventilation. The main design principle was to use high performance exhaust ventilation to dilute airborne contaminants immediately at the exhaust to the point that they were no longer a hazard. As a result of that, the question of leakage and wind direction raised earlier by some representers was not relevant. More importantly, the

HKU's building management system would continuously monitor the proper functioning of those ventilation measures; and

- (f) on biological safety, HKU had an established track record of safely operating PC3 laboratories since 2005. A mixture of structural, mechanical and procedural safety measures would be adopted, instead of relying on one aspect of the system to maintain safety. The main design principle was to ensure that normal operation of the laboratories would not release material at all; in emergency, hazards should be trapped in laboratories by negative pressure design and removed by strong air filtration system; and all safety-critical systems were subject to regular monitoring.

36. As the presentations of PlanD's representative and the representers, commenters and their representatives had been completed, the Chairman said that the meeting would be adjourned for lunch break and the meeting would proceed with the Q&A session in the afternoon session.

[The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 12:50pm.]

37. The meeting was resumed at 2:00 p.m.

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

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Ms Doris P. L. Ho

Chairperson

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Conrad T.C. Wong

Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Mr K.L. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon
Transport Department
Mr Gary C.H. Wong

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

Secretary

Mr C.K. Yip

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/20

(TPB Paper No. 10880)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese, English and Putonghua.]

39. The government representatives, the representers, the commenters and their representatives were invited to the meeting. The Chairperson said that the presentation of the government representatives, representers, commenters and/or their representatives had been completed in the morning. Before proceeding to the Q&A session, she invited Ms Shirley Y.P. Kwan, Deputy Secretary for Health, Health Bureau (DS(H), HHB) to brief Members on the Government's medical and healthcare policy, and HHB's views on the HKU's project of academic buildings for the expansion of HKUMed campus (the Project).

[Professor Roger C.K. Chan rejoined the meeting during the Chairperson's opening remarks.]

40. Ms Shirley Y.P. Kwan, DS(H), HHB, said that due to ageing population and other relevant factors, escalating demand for medical and healthcare services in Hong Kong was anticipated. It was thus imperative to have sufficient medical and healthcare professionals (such as doctors and nurses) to cater for the needs of the society. As locally-trained healthcare professionals had all along been the backbone of Hong Kong's healthcare system, there was an imminent need to expand the capacity for professional healthcare training and enhance the associated teaching facilities in a timely manner. As announced in the 2018 Policy Address, about \$20 billion was earmarked to enable three universities to expand the relevant healthcare training capacity so as to accommodate the learning and research needs of medical related students, and in the 2022-23 Budget, an additional funding of about \$10 billion was earmarked to provide more comprehensive support to universities in enhancing their capacity and capability in order to further promote the development of life and health technology in Hong Kong. HHB fully supported the Project and looked forward to the Board's agreement on the

zoning amendments and subsequent LegCo's funding approval to facilitate the early implementation of the Project. HHB targeted to submit the Project to Public Works Subcommittee (PWSC) and Finance Committee (FC) of LegCo for funding approval in the fourth quarter of 2023. HKU's commitments to the Board in taking forward the Project according to the revised design presented at the meeting in the morning, including lowering the highest building height (BH) to not exceeding 161mPD, as well as provision of quality and accessible communal open spaces and multi-level pedestrian connections for public benefit, etc. would be duly reflected in the relevant submissions to LegCo, which were open public documents. HKU undertook to implement the Project as presented at the meeting, and HHB as well as relevant government departments would perform their gatekeeper roles in ensuring the Project to be taken forward according to HKU's open commitments following LegCo's approval.

[Mr K.L. Wong joined the meeting at this point.]

41. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members. Members could direct their questions to government representatives, the representers, the commenters or their representatives.

Physical Containment Level 3 (PC3) Laboratory

42. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there were any international standards/regulations on site selection/locational requirements, such as buffer distance from residential developments, for a PC3 laboratory; and
- (b) apart from safety control measures, whether there were any precautionary/design measures to ensure that the PC3 laboratory would not cause adverse impacts on the nearby residential developments, in respect of gas emission as well as environmental nuisance and light problem.

43. In response, Dr Paul Hunt (R1496/C9's representative), HKU, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) there were no international standards/regulations on the locational requirements for establishment of a PC3 laboratory. It was quite common for PC3 laboratories to be located in proximity to residential developments/other major developments in urban areas. In view that a PC3 laboratory was a purpose-built facility constructed in compliance with international design and safety standards, its location being close to residential developments or not was not a prime consideration; and
- (b) while the PC3 laboratory would be fully contained and sealed within the building, multiple tiers of safety control measures would be adopted to ensure that no adverse impacts in respect of gas emission or leakage would be caused to the surrounding developments such as all gas to be filtered by High Efficiency Particulate Air Filters before leaving the laboratory, pressure gradient within the laboratory to be monitored constantly, and automatic shutdown of facilities in case of emergency leakage, etc.

44. With the aid of an artist's impression drawing, Mr Lim Wan Fung Bernard Vincent (R1523 and C3's representative), HKU, supplemented that there would not be many large windows designed for the Project, the limited number of windows would not face towards the residential developments and most of them would be closed at all times. The residents of nearby developments such as Royalton and Royalton II would only see the vertical greening on the building façade or the landscaped rooftops/podia. In case there was a need for gas emission, all gas would be well-filtered before leaving the laboratory. Besides, the exhaust outlets would only be located at the southern façade of the buildings which would be far away from the nearby residential developments. Hence, it was envisaged that the proposed PC3 laboratory would not cause environmental or light pollution to surrounding developments.

Building Height

45. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) noting that HKU had demonstrated efforts to further refine the layout to lower the BH of Block A to 161mPD, whether HKU had committed to adopt BH of 161mPD;
- (b) what the level of BH of 161mPD specifically referred to and whether there were any roof-top structures and if affirmative, the use and height of such structures; and
- (c) if HKU committed to adopt BH of 161mPD, how the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), in which the maximum BH of 164mPD was specified, should be interpreted.

46. Mr Lim Wan Fung Bernard Vincent (R1523 and C3's representative), HKU, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) to address nearby residents' concerns on the proposed BH, HKU had made its best endeavours to refine the layout to further reduce the maximum BH from 164mPD (as at the s.12A application stage) to 161mPD currently proposed. HKU had committed to adopt 161mPD as the maximum BH for the proposed development; and
- (b) according to the latest scheme, the BH of 161mPD was measured up to the main roof level and the roof-top structures were stairhoods, not exhaust outlets. The stairhoods were typically of about 3m in height. At the detailed design stage, essential electrical and mechanical facilities and water tanks might need to be placed on the roof, yet their sizes would be kept to the minimum. The BH of 148mPD for Block B was proposed having considered the level of the first residential floors of Royalton and Royalton II (i.e. 153mPD). Even with the roof-top structures of about 3m in height, the overall BH of Block B would only be about 151mPD, which was still lower than the level of the first residential floors of Royalton and Royalton II. HKU had already submitted a general building plan (GBP) enquiry to the Buildings Department (BD) with the proposed BH of 161mPD for Block A and 148mPD for Block B.

47. Regarding the ES of the OZP, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, PlanD, said that ES was a guiding document intended to facilitate the understanding of the OZP. As mentioned by HHB and HKU, HKU had undertaken to fulfil its commitments including the adoption of a maximum BH of 161mPD for Block A, and the latest scheme incorporated with the committed revisions would be duly reflected in the LegCo submissions subject to scrutiny by LegCo, HHB and relevant government departments.

Greenery, Landscape and Ecological Aspect

48. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) details of site coverage of greenery and whether there was scope to increase the green site coverage;
- (b) details of the proposed greenery area on the steep slope underneath the stilted building structure and the vertical greening on the building façade;
- (c) whether high maintenance cost was required for the healthy growth of vegetation in the greenery area underneath the stilted building structure and the vertical greening on the building facade in the long run, and any successful examples of sustainable greenery area underneath stilted building structure on steep slope;
- (d) what approach of greening to be adopted, whether it was biophilic design (like an urban forestry approach) or amenity design; and
- (e) details of the carbon neutrality elements (such as net zero carbon emission and planting trees as carbon sink) to be adopted in the Project and how carbon neutrality could be achieved.

49. In response, Mr Sy Wai Yin Jeffrey (C1's representative), HKU, and Mr Lim Wan Fung Bernard Vincent (R1523 and C3's representative), HKU, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) a minimum of 20% greening ratio meeting the requirements stipulated under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG) would be achieved for the Project. Additional landscaping/greening area and vertical greening would be provided, resulting in a total of greening ratio which would definitely be more than 20%. Besides, a considerable amount of existing trees would be preserved. A compensatory tree planting ratio of 1:1.13 would be provided to increase the amount of vegetation on the Item A site;
- (b) building structure would be lifted up from the steep slope through structural cores to minimize disturbance to the existing condition of the Item A site, where there were two existing watercourses running across the site and the natural habitat comprising plants of common species, thereby preserving a greenery area underneath the stilted building structure. A 40m-diameter courtyard would be provided at the entrance plaza of the proposed development from where the public could see the greenery area and watercourses underneath the building. It was a planning gain as compared to the originally inaccessible slope covered by unkempt vegetation, and it also demonstrated that a balance could be struck between development and preservation. Besides, suitable species of climbers would be considered for vertical greening;
- (c) as the greenery area underneath the stilted structure and the building façade generally faced towards the sun, natural sunlight could penetrate to facilitate healthy growth of vegetation. Besides, appropriate plant species and irrigation system would be adopted. HKU had previous experience, such as in the development of the Centennial campus, in developing on steep slope while minimising disturbance to the environment during construction, and HKU would continue to try its best endeavours to do so;
- (d) an approach of integrating the built environment with the nature was adopted. For example, Pok Fu Lam Road was the entrance point of the proposed development. Rows of trees would be preserved/planted along Pok Fu Lam Road. An entrance plaza with a 40m-diameter courtyard would be provided

for viewing the greenery area and watercourses underneath. Besides, different sizes of green pockets/open spaces at multi-levels would be provided. Stepped greenery/terrace deck and vertical greening would also be provided; and

- (e) it was HKU's and other seven universities' common target to achieve carbon neutrality by 2050. For new development projects including the Project, HKU targeted to attain a platinum rating under BEAM plus. For the existing buildings/new development projects, net-zero electricity generation, energy saving, green design elements, waste reduction, etc. had been/would be adopted.

50. Two Members suggested that installation of artificial lighting/more creative design/biodiversity theme might be considered for the greenery area underneath the stilted building structure. With regard to the Members' suggestions, Mr Lim Wan Fung Bernard Vincent (R1523 and C3's representative), HKU, welcomed the ideas and the design of the greenery area would be further refined and enhanced at the detailed design stage.

Visual Impact

51. Two Members had the following questions:

- (a) whether there was any requirement to take into account the private view/right to view when considering HKU's proposed development; and
- (b) whether there were any photomontages/perspective drawings that could show the views from the Royalton.

52. In response, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, PlanD, said that in considering HKU's proposed development, the submitted Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) assessed the visual impact on public viewers from key strategic and popular viewing points. There was no requirement to assess private views in VIA. The applicants of the Item A site and Item B site had submitted VIAs in their respective s.12A applications and the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD, had no adverse comment on the VIAs and considered that no

significant visual impacts were anticipated.

53. In response to the question about viewing from the Royalton, with the aid of some perspective drawings on the PowerPoint slides, Mr Lim Wan Fung Bernard Vincent (R1523 and C3's representative), HKU, said that the disposition of Block B had taken into account the direct view from Royalton to the sea, and the proposed BH of Block B (i.e. 148mPD) was designed taking into consideration the level of the first residential floors of Royalton and Royalton II (i.e. 153mPD). Although the proposed BH of Block A of 161mPD might slightly block part of the view from lower residential floors of Royalton II, HKU respected the residents' concern on the visual impact and had refined the building design and layout by providing more stepped greenery podia and further-rounded building corners to enhance the visual aesthetics.

Pedestrian Connectivity

54. A Member asked whether additional pedestrian flow arising from the proposed development had been assessed and what pedestrian facilities were proposed. In response, Mr Lim Wan Fung Bernard Vincent (R1523 and C3's representative), HKU, said that the Item A site was located between Pok Fu Lam Road (at 138mPD) and Victoria Road (at 70mPD)/Northcote Close (at 93mPD), where there was a great level difference. The pedestrian connectivity of the Item A site with the surrounding area would be enhanced through the provision of both horizontal and vertical connections, including lift towers from Victoria Road and Northcote Close to Pok Fu Lam Road, multi-level accesses to Sassoon Road (at 123mPD) and Pok Fu Lam Road (at 138mPD) via the communal open spaces on G/F and 3/F, and a link bridge on 4/F connecting to HKU's academic building at No. 3 Sassoon Road (at 144mPD) where there was an existing footbridge leading to the QMH.

Need for the Submission of Master Layout Plan (MLP) for the Board's Approval

55. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) why submission of MLP was required for the Item B site but not for Item A site; and

- (b) under what circumstances the submission of MLP for the Board's approval would be required.

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

- (a) Item B was related to a s.12A application for rezoning the Item B site to "R(C)7". The Director of Environmental Protection (DEP), in considering the s.12A application, indicated that support could only be given for the proposed rezoning if there was a mechanism to ensure the implementation of suitable design and measures to address the air quality and traffic noise problems, i.e. the provision of a 20m-buffer distance from Pok Fu Lam Road according to the requirements of Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). Given that the Item B site was governed by a virtually unrestricted lease that lease modification would not be required for the proposed residential development thereat, other mechanisms needed to be put in place to ensure that the future developer would implement the design and mitigation measures agreed by government departments. Hence, the Board, in agreeing to the s.12A application, required the submission of a layout plan with an environmental assessment report under s.16 planning application to address the concerns of DEP on environmental aspects, such that the proposed residential development would be built in accordance with the approved layout plan. Item A was also related to a s.12A application for rezoning the Item A site to "G/IC(1)". The Item A site was located on government land and HKU's proposed development at the site would be governed by a land instrument to be prepared by the Lands Department (LandsD) under which specific requirements could be incorporated as conditions with binding effect. For instance, DEP, in considering the s.12A application, noted that there was a proposed gas boiler at the Item A site and the requirement for the submission of an air quality impact assessment would be incorporated in the future land document to govern the Project to be implemented in compliance with the relevant requirements. There was no differential treatment between Item A and Item B; and

- (b) whether submission of MLP was required mainly depended on the zoning of the site, any requirements from relevant departments and any statutory mechanism to control the proposed development. For example, under normal circumstances, it was not necessary for submission of MLP if the site falling within “Residential (Group A)” zone was proposed for residential development, for which the development scheme could be governed by existing mechanisms. For other types of developments, if relevant government departments had concerns on the proposed developments, such as air quality and noise problems, which could not be controlled by lease or other mechanisms, the requirement for the submission of MLP for the Board’s approval might be considered.

57. Mr Lim Wan Fung Bernard Vincent (R1523 and C3’s representative), HKU, supplemented that, the Item A site was for academic use with central air-conditioning system and it was not subject to traffic noise nuisance like residential use that required detailed assessments. In fact, all departmental comments had been resolved at the s.12A application stage and there were no adverse departmental comments on the rezoning proposal of the Item A site. In addition, the development parameters (such as maximum BH of 161mPD) and other requirements (such as building separation from the adjacent site) had been incorporated in the latest scheme as presented in the meeting, which would also be duly reflected in the LegCo submissions and subject to further scrutiny by LegCo, HHB and relevant government departments.

58. On a related issue about lease control, a Member enquired, apart from development parameters and the requirements for submission of technical assessments, whether advisory comments, such as opening the campus for public use, could be incorporated in the lease conditions. In response, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, PlanD, said that advisory comments would normally not be incorporated in the lease, and relevant requirements could be governed by existing mechanisms where appropriate.

Technical Aspects

59. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether detailed technical assessments were required to support the OZP amendments;
- (b) if unexpected technical problem, e.g. geotechnical issue, was identified in the later stage that rendered the planning and design merits of HKU's latest committed revisions to the development scheme not implementable, whether the affected stakeholders could still have channels to express their views or be informed/consulted; and
- (c) whether it was necessary to submit detailed geotechnical report at the planning stage to ascertain that the Project was geotechnically feasible.

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

- (a) the current OZP amendments were to take forward two s.12A applications previously agreed by the Metro Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Board. In the s.12A application stage, the applicants of the Item A site and Item B site had respectively submitted relevant technical assessments to support their rezoning proposals, and relevant government departments consulted had indicated no adverse comments on the assessments or no objection to the rezoning proposals;
- (b) the expert departments in the Government would carefully scrutinize the Project and ensure that the Project would be implementable from technical perspective including geotechnical aspect; and
- (c) a geotechnical planning review report was submitted in the s.12A application for the Item A site. The Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department had no objection to the rezoning proposal from geotechnical point of view and considered that the proposed excavation would not affect the slope stability and the surroundings.

61. The Chairperson supplemented that if there was unexpected geotechnical problem rendering the Project not implementable or substantial changes to the Project were required, the

Government had a role to play, such as HHB would ensure that HKU would properly consult/inform the affected stakeholders.

62. Mr Lim Wan Fung Bernard Vincent (R1523 and C3's representative), HKU, supplemented that HKU had conducted desktop study about the geotechnical condition of the Item A site including rock types and depth of rock layers, and it was confirmed that the proposed excavation works would not reach the bedrock level and hence, not affecting the slope stability.

Concerns of the Ebenezer School and Home for the Visually Impaired (the Ebenezer) and Mitigation Measures during Construction Period

63. Some Members were concerned about the impacts on the visually-impaired students of the Ebenezer during the construction period and asked about the details of the mitigation measures to be carried out by HKU. Two of the Members also asked the representatives of the Ebenezer to elaborate on the Ebenezer's concerns/special assistance required during the construction period.

64. Mr Lim Wan Fung Bernard Vincent (R1523 and C3's representative), HKU, and Mr Sy Wai Yin Jeffrey (C1's representative), HKU, said that a 32-m buffer distance from the Ebenezer (i.e. the Item B site) would be provided. During the construction period, quieter construction equipment and methods, as well as noise mitigation and dust control measures would be applied. Pre-fabricated components would also be adopted in the construction to minimize on-site construction works. On pedestrian safety issue, it was observed that most of the students/staff of the Ebenezer would travel on Pok Fu Lam Road and thus the ingress/egress for construction trucks was proposed at Sassoon Road and Victoria Road in order to minimize the safety risk. To create a more comfortable environment for the pedestrians, consideration would be given to providing green hoardings around the construction site during the construction period. HKU would continue to maintain good communication and regular contact with the Ebenezer and other affected stakeholders in the vicinity. Advance notice about the construction dates would be given to the Ebenezer and the affected stakeholders, and special arrangements could also be made for special school days.

65. Dr Yuk Tak Fun (R1925/C21's representative) said that they hoped that HKU would keep them updated of the progress of the Project and informed them in advance if there were

any construction works, closure of roads and relocation of bus stops, etc. as the visually-impaired students/school staff needed to take extra time to familiarize themselves with the commuting routes. Besides, their students were extremely sensitive to noise such as that from piling works and they hoped that advanced quiet construction equipment and methods would be adopted. Whilst noting a 32m-buffer between HKU's proposed development and the Ebenezer' site, they hoped that more greenery could be provided in the buffer area as a green and spacious natural environment was important for visually-impaired students/school staff to cultivate sensory integration with the environment.

66. Mr Ian Brownlee (R1925/C21, C20, C22, C23 and C24's representative), the representative of the Ebenezer, reiterated his views as presented in the morning session and said that the notional scheme prepared by HKU in the s.12A application was to support the rezoning application and it should not be interpreted that the notional scheme was approved by the Board and such notional scheme was implementable. Impacts on the Ebenezer were still unknown, and hence the requirement for the submission of MLP for the Board's approval should also be applicable for the Item A site. The concerns of the Ebenezer had not been properly addressed.

Consultation with the Stakeholders

67. A Member, having noted the claim of the representative of Royalton that they had not been properly consulted, asked what HKU would do to improve the consultation process to achieve a better collaboration with the affected stakeholders. In response, Professor Lau Chak Sing Wallace (R540 and R525/C1's representative), HKU, and Professor Chan Ying Shing (R636, R133/C2's representative), HKU, said that HKU had always cared about the views of stakeholders and was dedicated to continue communicating with the affected stakeholders. It was committed that regular liaison/consultation with the affected stakeholders would be carried out, and newsletter be issued to keep them updated of the progress of the Project. Mr Lim Wan Fung Bernard Vincent (R1523 and C3's representative), HKU, supplemented that a consultation meeting with the affected stakeholders was held on 16.12.2022 and the views collected had helped them to refine/enhance the layout.

68. Two Members asked Mr Xu Zhigang (R1771 and C13's representative) (Incorporated Owners of Royalton), and Mr Paul Zimmerman (R1944/C19 and R1802's representative) whether their concerns had been addressed and their worries relieved, or they

were satisfied with the Project after listening to HKU's explanation on the need for the Project, further enhancement/refinement made to the layout, further BH reduction, the consultations conducted and the commitment on better communication in future, etc., and if not, what their concerns/doubts were.

69. In response, Mr Paul Zimmerman (R1944/C19 and R1802's representative), reiterated his views as presented in the morning session and said that there was no guarantee that HKU's proposal could be materialized as it was just an artist's impression. The difficult topography and geotechnical conditions rendered the site technically challenging and there was no detailed information to ascertain that the Project was geotechnically feasible. There was no mechanism to ensure that the revised indicative scheme would be duly implemented since HKU was not required to submit a MLP to the Board for approval.

70. In response, Mr Xu Zhigang (R1771 and C13's representative), the representative of Incorporated Owners of Royalton, reiterated his views as presented in the morning session and queried whether the Item A site was the only suitable location for the PC3 laboratory. He also raised concerns mainly on the issues of air quality (i.e. the sea breeze would blow the pollutants emitted from the laboratory directly to the nearby residents), pedestrian safety (i.e. visually-impaired persons and elderly were seen using Sassoon Road/Victoria Road where future construction trucks might travel on). With regard to the consultation issue, Mr Xu said that residents in the area were dissatisfied with the consultation arrangement as HKU only gave a very short notice about the consultation meeting and the date and venue of the consultation meeting were fixed by HKU. Besides, they had not been informed of the changes in the layout and they just knew the refined layout in the meeting.

HKUMed's Future Projects in the Vicinity

71. Two Members asked about HKUMed's future projects at Sassoon Road and whether HKU had any proposals to develop the "Green Belt" ("GB") site next to the Ebenezer. In response, Professor Chan Ying Shing (R636 and R133/C2's representative), HKU, said that the expansion project of HKUMed came in the short term and medium to long term. Medium-term projects included the Project, a student residence hall and a simulation laboratory which would be completed in 2027 while one of the long-term projects covered the redevelopment of an old building at No. 7 Sassoon Road for a teaching and research building. Professor Lau

Chak Sing Wallace (R540 and R525/C1's representative), HKU, and Mr Sy Wai Yin Jeffrey (C1's representative), HKU, supplemented that there was very preliminary discussion on using the "GB" site to the west of the Ebenezer for HKU's other projects and not much information could be provided at the current juncture. In any case, such proposal involved a separate project in the long term.

[Mr Timothy K.W. Ma joined and Mr Ben S.S. Lui left the meeting during the Q&A session.]

72. 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, the commenters and their representatives and the government's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[Mr Stephen L.H. Liu left the meeting at this point.]

Deliberation Session

73. For those Members who did not join the whole or most part of the morning session of the meeting, the Chairperson invited them not to participate in the discussion of OZP amendments. Members noted.

74. The Chairperson then recapitulated that both Item A and Item B were to take forward two s.12A applications previously agreed by the Committee and made the following main points:

- (a) for Item A site, HKU presented at the meeting their latest scheme which had incorporated further refinements to address the concerns of the affected stakeholders, including lowering the proposed maximum BH from 164mPD to 161mPD; proposing enhanced greenery with the provision of green rooftops/podia, stepped greenery/terrace deck and vertical greening, etc.; adjustment to the disposition/orientation of the buildings; and maintaining a 32m-wide buffer area with the Ebenezer, etc.;

- (b) regarding the requirement for submission of a layout plan through s.16 application for the Item B site, it should be noted that the Item B site was a private land governed by a virtually unrestricted lease that lease modification would not be required for the proposed residential development. In other words, the Government could impose no control in the lease to ensure that the future developer of the Item B site would implement suitable design and mitigation measures to address the environmental concerns in terms of air quality and traffic noise. The submission of a layout plan through s.16 application under the planning regime was considered a feasible mechanism to ensure that the future developer of the Item B site would fulfil the relevant requirements;
- (c) with regard to the concerns on how to ensure the latest scheme presented by HKU in the meeting be implemented as proposed, the Chairperson said that today's meeting was a public hearing and HKU's commitments would be recorded in the minutes of the meeting for public inspection. Besides, the Item A site was a government land which would be granted to HKU for the proposed development and relevant requirements would be incorporated in the land document as appropriate to govern the future development. Furthermore, as HKU's proposed development was a public works project, funding approval by LegCo was required. HKU's commitments would be duly reflected in the relevant LegCo funding submissions and LegCo would perform its gatekeeper role in scrutinizing the Project, and that HHB and relevant government departments would closely monitor to ensure that the Project would be taken forward according to the committed designs; and
- (d) as regards HKU's communication with the affected stakeholders, HHB, being the policy bureau for the Project, would oversee the Project as well as the communication between HKU and the affected stakeholders. It was trusted that there was room for HKU to further improve the consultation with the affected stakeholders and to this end, the HKU senior management had committed openly to strengthen communication with stakeholders including nearby residents and the Ebenezer.

75. While Members generally supported or had no objection to the amendment items, including the land uses and development parameters under Items A and B, and the relevant Notes of the OZP, they had the following views and suggestions in respect of Item A:

Need for HKU's Proposed Development at the Item A Site

- (a) it was agreed that there was an established need for the Project at the Item A site. The site was suitable for the Project as it was strategically located close to QMH (HKUMed's flagship teaching hospital) and within short walking distance from existing HKUMed campus, thus creating synergy with QMH and HKUMed campus. Given the growing demand for and complexity of medical care services in Hong Kong, timely implementation of the Project was crucial;

Indicative Development Scheme

- (b) the latest scheme presented by HKU had addressed Members' concern when considering the relevant s.12A application. The proposed development parameters, including the development intensity and BH, were appropriate and compatible with the surrounding developments;
- (c) while in the highly developed context of Hong Kong that it was not practical to protect private views without stifling development opportunity, it was appreciated that HKU had demonstrated its effort to address the concerns of the affected stakeholders on the potential visual impact by further refining the indicative scheme, including reduction in the proposed BH, enhanced greenery with provision of green rooftops/podia and stepped greenery/terrace deck, etc.;
- (d) it was not necessary for HKU to submit a MLP for the Board's approval when relevant requirements could be incorporated in the land document where appropriate;

Provision of Greenery, Open Space and Pedestrian Connections

- (e) the Project would be designed with the provision of quality communal open spaces and enhanced pedestrian connections, which would bring benefit to the community;
- (f) the Item A site was currently an inaccessible steep slope covered with unkempt vegetation. The Project with the adoption of few structural cores to support the stilted building structure while preserving/enhancing the greenery area and watercourses on the sloping ground underneath would not only maintain the green character of the original “GB” zone but also demonstrate that a balance had been struck between development and preservation;
- (g) while appreciating the design concept of providing enhanced greenery, including but not limited to a greenery area underneath the stilted building structure and vertical greening on the building facade, it was doubted how those presented in the artist’s impression could be materialized and how preserving the Item A site as a green character of the original “GB” zone could be fully achieved;
- (h) sustainable greening, for instance for healthy growth of vegetation on the greenery area underneath the stilted building structure and the vertical greening on the building façade, should be achieved through the formulation of a comprehensive and integrated greening strategy including but not limited to selection of suitable plant species, appropriate management and maintenance methods, etc., and biophilic design should be incorporated;
- (i) the 20% greening ratio was only a basic requirement and there were opportunities for HKU to further enhance the greenery provision to achieve a greening ratio of at least 30% or even higher;

- (j) relevant requirements for sustainable greening/biophilic design/integrating the development with the environment should be suitably translated and incorporated in the land document where appropriate;
- (k) there was only a footbridge linking the Item A site and the QMH, and there were only two decks for communal open space. Pedestrian connectivity should be improved and more communal open spaces should be provided;

Consultation

- (l) it was noted that HKU should be able to enhance its communications with the locals in the early planning stage; and the concerns of the Ebenezer during the construction stage of the Project needed to be sufficiently addressed;
- (m) HKU should pay extra care to alleviate the concerns of the visually-impaired students of the Ebenezer, particularly those on pedestrian safety and construction noise. Appropriate mitigation measures, e.g. advanced and more quiet construction equipment and methods like silent piling should be adopted during the construction period. Special assistance should also be provided to the Ebenezer when needed; and
- (n) better consultation/liaison with the affected stakeholders should be carried out. HKU might consider to take the lead to set up liaison groups among HKU, Royalton, Royalton II and the Ebenezer, under which regular meetings would be held to keep them informed of the progress of the Project and to further enhance the development scheme collaboratively.

76. Regarding the development control on the Project from the land administration perspective, Mr Andrew C.W. Lai, Director of Lands, explained that when preparing the relevant land document, LandsD would incorporate draft basic terms and conditions, such as site boundary, use, development intensity, etc. and circulate it to relevant bureaux/departments (B/Ds) for comments and inclusion of special conditions as necessary. If the concerned B/Ds had other requirements, which should be clear and implementable, such requirements could be incorporated as special conditions in the land document, and the relevant B/Ds would be named

as the approving authorities for scrutinizing and monitoring the submission and/or implementation by the grantee in relation to such requirements.

77. Mr Ivan M.K. Chung, Director of Planning, suggested that while the submission of MLP was considered not required for Item A, elaborations on the two aspects Members had concern on, i.e. the provision of a 32m-wide buffer area from the Ebenezer, and integrated design of the Project with the environment, could be incorporated in the ES of the OZP. Members agreed.

Conclusion

78. The Chairperson said that Members generally appreciated HKU's effort in refining the layout and design as presented in the latest scheme but considered that HKU could further improve the Project in respect of the following aspects:

- (a) more greenery, not only achieving the 20% greening ratio, should be provided, and sustainable greening should also be pursued. Consideration could be given to the requirement of submission of a landscape master plan under the relevant land document, where appropriate;
- (b) more communal open spaces and enhanced pedestrian connectivity should be considered; and
- (c) while Royalton's concerns had generally been addressed, the Ebenezer's concern, in particular the mitigation measures during the construction stage, had not been duly addressed. It was suggested that HKU should further enhance the design and layout of the Project taking into account the views collected at today's meeting and incorporate the further refined layout with more concrete proposals in the LegCo funding submission for LegCo and public scrutiny.

79. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally supported the OZP amendments, and agreed that there was no need to amend the draft OZP to meet the adverse representations and that all grounds and proposals of the representations and comments had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10880 and the presentation and

responses made by the government representatives at the meeting.

80. After deliberation, the Board noted the supportive views of **R1 to R1770, R1901, R1925(part), R1927 to R1942** and the views provided in **R1785(part) to R1900(part), R1902, R1903(part) to R1921(part), R1922 to R1924, R1944, R1945(part) and R1946 (part)** and decided not to uphold **R1771 to R1784, R1785(part) to R1900(part), R1903(part) to R1921(part), R1925(part), R1926, R1943, R1945(part) and R1946(part)**, and agreed that the draft OZP should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

Item A

“(a) the rezoning of the site from “Green Belt” to “Government, Institution or Community (1)” with maximum building height of 164mPD for the proposed academic buildings is considered appropriate, and other restrictions and requirements for submission of master layout plan for consideration by the Board is considered not necessary. Relevant technical assessments for the indicative scheme in the agreed s.12A application confirmed that the proposed development would not induce insurmountable impacts in respect of development intensity, traffic, landscape, ecological, visual, air ventilation, geotechnical, environmental, drainage and water supply aspects (**R1771 to R1784, R1785(part) to R1900(part), R1903(part) to R1921(part), R1925(part), R1926, R1943, R1945(part) and R1946(part)**); and

Item B

(b) the rezoning of the site from “Government, Institution or Community” to “Residential (Group C)7” for proposed residential development is considered appropriate. As the lease governing the site is virtually unrestricted, the submission of a layout plan together with an environmental assessment report to examine the air quality and traffic noise, and a sewerage impact assessment report for consideration of the Board is required to ensure proper implementation of suitable design and mitigation measures for the proposed residential development (**R1925(part) and R1926(part)**).”

81. The Board also agreed to amend the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the draft Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/20 (the OZP) as follows:

Paragraph 7.6.4 of the ES of the OZP

“ A “G/IC(1)” site to the east of 3 Sassoon Road is reserved for expansion of the HKU’s Faculty of Medicine campus by a total gross floor area of not more than 43,000m². Development within this site is restricted to a maximum building height of 164mPD. Interlinked building blocks with stepped building heights descending from north-western portion of 164mPD to south-eastern portion of 123mPD would be adopted taking into account the local topography and characteristics. *A setback area of not less than 32m in width from the adjacent “R(C)7” zone shall be provided.* Multi-level pedestrian connections to Pok Fu Lam Road, Victoria Road and Northcote Close would be provided. Communal open space of not less than 4,000m² would also be provided and accessible by the public. *Integrated design with the environment should be adopted for the greening and landscaping of the proposed development.*”

82. Members also agreed that the draft OZP, together with its Notes and updated Explanatory Statement, were suitable for submission under section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

[The meeting was adjourned for a 5-minute break. Messrs Ivan M.K. Chung, Andrew C.W. Lai, Wilson Y.W. Fung, Franklin Yu, Ricky W.Y. Yu, Timothy K.W. Ma, K.L. Wong and Dr Conrad T.C. Wong left the meeting during the break.]

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Submission of the Draft Urban Renewal Authority Ming Lun Street/Ma Tau Kok Road Development Scheme Plan No. S/K22/URA1/A and Draft To Kwa Wan Road/Ma Tau Kok Road Development Scheme Plan No. S/K22/URA2/A Prepared under Section 25 of the Urban Renewal Authority Ordinance

(TPB Paper No. 10881)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

83. The Secretary reported that the TPB Paper No. 10881 (the Paper) involved two Development Scheme Plans (DSPs) (i.e. Draft Urban Renewal Authority Ming Lun Street/Ma Tau Kok Road DSP No. S/K22/URA1/A and Draft To Kwa Wan Road/Ma Tau Kok Road DSP No. S/K22/URA2/A) which were located in Ma Tau Kok/Kowloon City and submitted by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Ivan M.K. Chung - being a non-executive director of the URA Board and
(as Director of a member of its Committee;
Planning)

Mr Andrew C.W. Lai - being a non-executive director of the URA Board and
(as Director of Lands) a member of its Committee;

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma - being a member of the Land, Rehousing &
Compensation Committee of URA, a director of the
Board of Urban Renewal Fund, and a member of the
Supervisory Board of Hong Kong Housing Society
(HKHS) which currently had discussion with URA
on housing development issues;

- Dr Conrad T.C. Wong - having current business dealings with URA; his companies owning four properties in Ma Tau Kok and his daughter owning a property in Kowloon City;
- Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang - being a former Deputy Chairman of the Appeal Board Panel of URA;
- Mr Ben S.S. Lui - being a former Executive Director of URA;
- Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu - being a director of the Board of Urban Renewal Fund, and a director and chief executive officer of Light Be (Social Realty) Co. Ltd. which was a licensed user of a few URA's residential units in Sheung Wan;
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung - being a former director of the Board of Urban Renewal Fund;
- Ms Lilian S.K. Law - being a former director of the Board of Urban Renewal Fund and a member of HKHS which currently had discussion with URA on housing development issues;
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being a member of HKHS which currently had discussion with URA on housing development issues;
- Mr K.L. Wong - being a member and an ex-employee of HKHS which currently had discussion with URA on housing development issues; and
- Ms Winnie W.M. Ng - her company owning two properties in Ma Tau Kok.

84. Members noted that Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang and Ms Winnie W.M. Ng had tendered apologies for not being able to attend the meeting and Messrs Ivan M.K. Chung, Andrew C.W. Lai, Timothy K.W. Ma, Ben S.S. Lui, Ricky W.Y. Yu, Wilson Y.W. Fung and K.L. Wong, and Dr Conrad T.C. Wong had already left the meeting. As Mr Daniel K.S. Lau and Ms Lilian S.K. Law had no involvement in the DSPs, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

85. The following representatives of the Planning Department (PlanD) and URA were invited to the meeting at this point:

PlanD's Representatives

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Ms Vivian M.F. Lai | - District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K) |
| Ms Helen H.Y. Chan | - Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K) |
| Ms Lucille L.S. Leung | - Town Planner/Kowloon (TP/K) |

URA's Representatives

| | |
|--------------------|-------------------|
| Mr Wilfred C.H. Au | - Director |
| Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan | - General Manager |
| Ms Y.T. Li | - Senior Manager |

86. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the meeting. She then invited the representatives of PlanD and URA to brief Members on the Paper.

Draft Development Scheme Plans (DSPs)

87. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Helen H.Y. Chan, STP/K, PlanD, briefed Members that URA had submitted two draft DSPs (i.e. Draft Ming Lun Street/Ma Tau Kok Road DSP No. S/K22/URA1/A (also named the KC-018 project) and Draft To Kwa Wan Road/Ma Tau Kok Road DSP No. S/K22/URA2/A (also named the KC-019 project)) to the Board for consideration in accordance with section 25(5) of the Urban Renewal Authority Ordinance (URAO). She then briefed Members on the DSPs as detailed in the Paper, including the background, the current status and surrounding context of the two development scheme (DS) sites (i.e. Site KC-018 and Site KC-019, or collectively, the Sites), and the

proposed zoning and development parameters on the draft DSPs.

88. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, URA, made the following main points:

- (a) URA commenced the statutory planning procedures for two DSs in To Kwa Wan/Ma Tau Kok, i.e. the KC-018 and KC-019 projects in October 2022. The whole redevelopment included Site KC-018 and Site KC-019. Site KC-018, also known as “5 Streets”, covered an area predominantly occupied by dilapidated residential buildings while Site KC-019 was occupied by two aged industrial buildings, namely Newport Centre Phase 1 and Phase 2;
- (b) in implementing the two DSs, a ‘planning-led, district-based’ approach to urban renewal would be adopted and a number of objectives set out in the 2011 Urban Renewal Strategy would be achieved, including (i) restructuring and re-planning of the concerned urban areas; (ii) designing more effective and environmentally friendly local transport and road networks; (iii) rationalising land uses within the concerned urban areas; (iv) redeveloping dilapidated buildings into new buildings; (v) providing more open space and community/welfare facilities; and (vi) enhancing the townscape with landscape and urban design;
- (c) URA’s planning vision and strategy for the DSs included (i) enabling comprehensively designed waterfront developments and helping to achieve the Government’s vision in shaping a world-class waterfront promenade; (ii) enhancing the connectivity between the old To Kwa Wan/Ma Tau Kok area and the new Kai Tak Development Area (KTDA); and (iii) restructuring and re-planning the existing road and pedestrian networks to enhance connectivity and walkability of the area;
- (d) the current challenges faced by URA in implementing the DSs were that (i) the existing waterfront sitting-out area within “5 Streets” was relatively narrow with a width of only about 2.5 metres and in an unwelcoming setting; (ii) part of the existing waterfront area was being fenced off and inaccessible;

(iii) pedestrian access to the waterfront was obstructed due to the on-street parking along the waterfront; (iv) the existing busy road traffic coupled with frequent on-street parking on Ma Tau Kok Road had led to poor walking environment; (v) To Kwa Wan Road was mainly a six-lane carriageway, except that the section abutting the western boundaries of Site KC-018 and Site KC-019 was four-lane which was the remaining section pending the completion of the widening works of To Kwa Wan Road;

- (e) in addition to fulfilling the requirements stipulated under the Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (the OZP), i.e. provision of a 20m-wide waterfront promenade along the eastern boundaries of the two sites, a 10m-wide non-building area (NBA) each along the southern boundary of the respective sites, and a 2-storey retail belt fronting the waterfront promenade as well as designating the areas along the western boundaries of the two sites for road use, URA's planning proposals were intended to introduce more planning gains to the community. It was proposed to re-design and re-plan the 10m-wide NBA along the southern boundary of Site KC-019 by incorporating its adjoining land to form an at-grade open-air Waterfront Plaza (with a minimum width of 25 m) at the centre of the whole redevelopment. The Waterfront Plaza with landscaping, sitting-out area, retail shops and eating places would not only strengthen the east-west connectivity but also reinforce the vibrancy of the waterfront area;
- (f) as regards the proposed development parameters, both DSs would adopt a total plot ratio (PR) of 7.5 (domestic PR of 6.5 and non-domestic PR of 1). The KC-018 project would provide about 1,280 small and medium-sized flats, about 10,500 m² non-domestic gross floor area (GFA) for commercial/retail uses and 1,000 m² GFA for Government, institution and community (GIC) uses. The KC-019 project would provide about 950 small and medium-sized flats, about 7,820 m² non-domestic GFA for commercial/retail uses and 500 m² GFA for GIC uses;
- (g) in respect of greenery provision, not less than 30% greenery would be provided at-grade and at multi-levels in the whole redevelopment. Besides,

the proposed 20m-wide waterfront promenade would connect with the adjoining planned waterfront promenade and its design would be in line with the Civil Engineering and Development Department's proposal of Kai Tak GreenWay Network (shared use by pedestrians and cyclists) within KTDA; and

- (h) URA had consulted the Harbourfront Commission's Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (KTTF) and the Kowloon City District Council (KCDC) on 18 and 27 October 2022 respectively. Members of KTTF and KCDC generally welcomed the proposed redevelopment.

89. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Helen H.Y. Chan, STP/K, PlanD, continued to brief Members on the planning assessment of the draft DSPs, as detailed in paragraph 11 of the Paper, that PlanD had no objection to the draft DSPs.

90. As the presentations of the representatives of PlanD and URA had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson reminded Members that according to the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 29B, the Board's decision on the DSPs would be kept confidential for three to four weeks after the meeting and would be released when the DSPs were exhibited for public inspection. Members were reminded to exercise due care when asking questions in the open session of the meeting so as to avoid inadvertent divulgence of their views on the DSPs' boundaries to the public. She then invited questions from Members.

Development Parameters

91. A Member enquired about the domestic PR and non-domestic PR of Grand Waterfront, a residential development located to the south of the Sites, and the rationale for the domestic PR of 6.5 and non-domestic PR of 1 adopted for the DSs, and queried why a higher PR could not be adopted in view of the Sites being situated in the urban area.

92. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD, said that the domestic PR and non-domestic PR of Grand Waterfront were 7.5 and 1 respectively. For the Sites, the proposed domestic PR and non-domestic PR were 6.5 and 1 respectively. The domestic PR proposed

for the Sites had been suitably increased from 5 for the original “CDA” zone to 6.5 with a view to maximising the development potential. The proposed domestic PR of 6.5 was in line with the building density guidelines for the new development areas in the main urban areas as set out in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines as well as those of HKHS’s planned dedicated rehousing estate (DRE) to the immediate north of the Sites and other residential developments in KTDA. Mr Wilfred C.H. Au, URA, supplemented that URA welcomed a higher PR for the Sites, yet it was necessary to strike a balance between the development intensity and BH profile in the subject waterfront area. Should the PR be further increased for the Sites, the resultant BH might not be compatible with the surrounding stepped BH profile, which descended gradually from the south (e.g. Grand Waterfront of 176mPD) to the north (e.g. HKHS’s planned DRE of 100mPD). On the other hand, if the PR was increased while keeping the BH of 120mPD unchanged, bulkier building blocks would be resulted that might bring about visual impacts, in particular for views from the hinterland towards the waterfront.

Waterfront Plaza, Waterfront Promenade and Connectivity

93. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the design of the proposed Waterfront Plaza with a narrow entrance area fronting the waterfront promenade would limit the view or visual openness from the hinterland towards the waterfront, and whether the Waterfront Plaza and the waterfront promenade could be better integrated to form a larger public park;
- (b) how an integrated design of the Waterfront Plaza, which involved both DSs, could be achieved if the two DSs were to be developed separately by different developers;
- (c) whether the management and maintenance (M&M) responsibility of the Waterfront Plaza would be transferred to individual owners of the future developments at the Sites;
- (d) the connectivity between the Sites and “13 Streets” and cattle depot to the west;

- (e) whether the design of the Waterfront Plaza/waterfront promenade would be pet-friendly and rain shelter/covered walkway would be provided; and
- (f) the connection between the subject waterfront promenade at the Sites and other waterfront promenades in the area, and how far the waterfront promenade could be extended to.

94. Messrs Wilfred C.H. Au and Mike Y.F. Kwan, URA, made the following main points:

- (a) the Waterfront Plaza would not be merely a public passageway to the waterfront promenade. URA had been investigating to widen the entrance area fronting the waterfront promenade in order to create a more integrated public area in the harbourfront setting and to offer broad views of the Victoria Harbour. However, taking into account the retail belt to be provided along the Waterfront Plaza/waterfront promenade, it was necessary to strike a balance as the provision of a larger entrance area might unavoidably reduce the area dedicated for the retail belt. URA would further refine the design of the Waterfront Plaza at the detailed design stage and Members' suggestions would be taken into consideration;
- (b) development agreements would be signed between URA and the developers under which URA could scrutinize and monitor the design and development of the Waterfront Plaza to ensure that a coherent and integrated design would be achieved;
- (c) URA would co-ordinate with the Lands Department to ensure that, under future lease and Deeds of Mutual Covenant (DMC) of the future developments at the Sites, the M&M responsibility of the Waterfront Plaza would be assigned to the communal portion of the developments, rather than individual domestic owners;
- (d) the "13 Streets" area was one of the proposed redevelopment priority areas recommended by the then District Urban Renewal Forum (DURF) and there

was no implementation programme to date. To link up the Sites and the wider neighbourhood in the inner area of To Kwa Wan, URA had explored the provision of a footbridge connection between Site KC-019 and the “13 Streets” area over the future six-lane To Kwa Wan Road, and an opening at the podium level of the future development at Site KC-019 would be reserved for such purpose. Besides, connectivity between the inner area of To Kwa Wan area would be enhanced with the proposed Waterfront Plaza in place in future; and

- (e) inclusive design would be adopted such that the Waterfront Plaza/waterfront promenade would not only be pet-friendly but also be designed for all ages and all walks of life. Besides, apart from providing rain protection facilities, climate resilience study would be carried out at the detailed design stage to identify climate-related risks, and appropriate design elements would be incorporated, e.g. appropriate seawall design for protection from erosion against wave and coastal flooding.

95. Regarding the connection and extension of the waterfront promenade, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD, said that the waterfront promenade at the Sites would be connected with the planned waterfront promenade in KTDA to the north/northeast, contributing as part of the continuous waterfront promenade between Ma Tau Kok and Cha Kwo Ling. The waterfront promenade could be further extended southwards to Hoi Sham Park, Hung Hom, Tsim Sha Tsui and West Kowloon. Although there was no waterfront promenade at the Grand Waterfront site, it was the Government’s vision to connect different parts of the waterfront areas as far as practicable and open the waterfront areas for public use.

Social Impact

96. A Member noted from the Social Impact Assessment submitted by URA that there was a considerable amount of singleton elderly residing at the Sites, and asked about the assistance, other than the social service teams, that URA would offer to those affected elderly and enquired whether they were eligible for applying for the ‘Flat-for-Flat Scheme’, and whether inter-generational living had been taken into account in the DSs.

97. In response, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, URA, said that according to the freezing survey conducted by URA, among the affected elderly households, 80 households were singleton and 31 households were doubleton. These figures were relatively high when compared to those of other urban renewal projects. URA understood that the affected households, in particular the singleton/doubleton elderly, were likely to experience doubts and worries about the redevelopment. Apart from the urban renewal social service teams, URA had implemented a 'Project Engagement Programme' (夥伴同行計劃), under which a special team of URA staff was formed to visit the affected households to explain to them the policies in details, helping them to understand the programme and progress of the redevelopment projects, and compensation and rehousing arrangements, etc. Extra care and specific explanations would be offered to the affected households with special needs. Regarding the 'Flat-for-Flat Scheme', it should be noted that it was only applicable to those domestic owner-occupiers (i.e. the domestic property was occupied by the owner), but not for domestic tenants. Mr Wilfred C.H. Au, URA, supplemented that URA was still investigating the idea of inter-generational living and such idea would be adopted in future urban renewal projects where appropriate.

98. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson thanked the representatives of PlanD and URA for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[Mr Sandy H.Y. Wong left the meeting during the question and answer session.]

99. The deliberation session was recorded under confidential cover.

Agenda Item 5

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

Any Other Business

100. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 6:15 p.m.