

**Minutes of 1297th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 16.6.2023**

Present

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

Chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairperson

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Mr K.L. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories West)

Transport Department

Ms Carrie K.Y. Leung

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 Stephen L.H. Liu

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Dr Conrad T.C. Wong

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

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 Carmen S.Y. Chan (a.m.)

Ms Katherine H.Y. Wong (p.m.)

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1294th and 1295th Meetings held on 1.6.2023 and 2.6.2023 respectively

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The draft minutes of the 1294th and 1295th meetings held on 1.6.2023 and 2.6.2023 respectively were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[This item was conducted in Cantonese.]

(i) Approval of Draft Outline Zoning Plans

2. The Secretary reported that on 30.5.2023, the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) approved the draft Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) (re-numbered as No. S/H10/21) and the draft Mong Kok OZP (re-numbered as No. S/K3/36) under section 9(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The approval of the draft OZPs was notified in the Gazette on 9.6.2023.

(ii) Reference Back of Approved Outline Zoning Plans

3. The Secretary reported that on 30.5.2023, the CE in C referred the approved Sha Tin Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/ST/36, the approved Lam Tei and Yick Yuen OZP No. S/TM-LTYYY/12 and the approved Ping Shan OZP No. S/YL-PS/20 to the Town Planning Board (the Board) for amendment under section 12(1)(b)(ii) of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The reference back of the said OZPs was notified in the Gazette on 9.6.2023.

(iii) Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of Draft Tsuen Wan West Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TWW/20

4. The Secretary reported that the item was to seek Members' agreement on the hearing arrangement for consideration of representations and comments in respect of the Draft Tsuen Wan West Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TWW/20.

5. The Secretary reported that the draft OZP was to take forward the decision of the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Town Planning Board on two agreed s.12A applications (No. Y/TWW/5 and Y/TWW/7) for private housing developments in Tsuen Wan West. Levenson Limited, which was a subsidiary of Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (SHK), was the applicant of s.12A application No. Y/TWW/7 and AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Levenson Limited also submitted a representation (R2). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| Ms Lilian S.K. Law | - being a former ex-Executive Director and committee member of The Boys' & Girls' Clubs Association of Hong Kong which had received sponsorship from SHK; |
| Mr Franklin Yu | - his spouse being an employee of SHK; |
| Miss Winnie W.M. Ng | - being a Director of the Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited (KMB) and Long Win Bus Company Limited (Long Win), and SHK was one of the shareholders of KMB and Long Win; |
| Dr Conrad T.C. Wong | - his firm having current business dealings with SHK and AECOM; and |
| Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho | - his firm having current business dealings with SHK and AECOM. |

6. Dr Conrad T.C. Wong and Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho had tendered apologies for being not able to attend the meeting. Mr Franklin Yu had not yet arrived to join the meeting. As the item for agreement on hearing arrangement was procedural in nature, other Members who had declared interests should be allowed to stay in the meeting.

7. The Secretary reported that on 16.12.2022, the draft OZP, which involved mainly the rezoning of two sites for private residential developments, including a site to the west of Rhine Garden in Sham Tseng from “Government, Institution or Community” to “Residential (Group A) 5”, and a site abutting the roundabout of Castle Peak Road – New Ting Kau from “Comprehensive Development Area (1)”, “Green Belt” and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “Residential (Group B) 2” was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). During the two-month exhibition period, two valid representations were received. The representations were subsequently published for three weeks and three valid comments were received.

8. The Secretary said that in view of the similar nature of the representations and comments, the hearing of the representations and comments was recommended to be considered by the full Board collectively in one group. To ensure efficiency of the hearing, a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time would be allotted to each representer/commenter in the hearing session. Consideration of the representations and comments by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for July 2023.

[Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang joined the meeting at this point.]

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Kennedy Town & Mount Davis Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H1/23

(TPB Paper No. 10903)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

9. The Secretary reported that the amendment to the draft Kennedy Town & Mount Davis Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H1/23 was mainly to take forward the decision of the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board) on an agreed s.12A application No. Y/H1/2 submitted by the University of Hong Kong (HKU) for revising the building height (BH) restriction of a site at Pokfield Road for a proposed Sports and Academic Complex for the University of Hong Kong (HKU) Pokfield Campus. HKU had also submitted a representation and a comment (R1/C1). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Dr C.H. Hau | - He and his spouse being Principal Lecturers of HKU; |
| Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung | - being the Chairman of the Accounting Advisory Board of School of Business, HKU; |
| Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui | - having an honorary engagement with the HKU's Faculty of Social Sciences with the title "Fellow, Department of Social Work and Social Administration"; |
| Professor Roger C.K. Chan | - being an Honorary Associate Professor of HKU; |

- Professor John C.Y. Ng - being an Adjunct Professor of HKU;
- Dr Conrad T.C. Wong - 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;
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - owning a property in Pok Fu Lam; and
- Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong - having close relative living in Pok Fu Lam.

10. Members noted that Dr Conrad T.C. Wong, Dr Venus Y.H. Lun, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu and Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong had tendered apologies for being not able to attend the meeting and Dr C.H. Hau would join the meeting after Item 3. Members agreed that the interests of Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung, Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui, Professor Roger C.K. Chan and Professor John C.Y. Ng and Ms Lilian S.K. Law were indirect and they should be allowed to stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

11. The Chairperson said that notifications 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.

12. The following representatives of the Planning Department (PlanD), representers, commenters and their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

PlanD's Representatives

Mr Mann M.H. Chow - District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK)

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

Representers, Commenters and their Representatives

R1/C1 – The University of Hong Kong

Mr Sy Wai Yin] Representer's and commenter's
Ms Fan Mei] representatives

Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Ltd.

Ms Wu W.Y. Winnie]

R5/C2 – Lam Wai Yin Michelle

Mr Lee Yiu Chung - Representer's and Commenter's
representative

R31/C10 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer and Commenter

13. 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.

14. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representations and comments. 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 amendment to the OZP, the grounds/views of the representers and commenters, planning assessments and PlanD's views on the representations and comments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10903 (the Paper). The main amendment was to revise the BH restriction for a portion of the "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") zone at the junction of Pokfield Road (the Site) from 4 storeys to 115mPD and 155mPD.

[Mr Franklin Yu arrived to join the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

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

R1/C1 – The University of Hong Kong

16. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Fan Mei made the following main points:

- (a) HKU had been actively attracting top research talents and outstanding students. Over the past 10 years, the number of students and staff had increased by 63% (i.e. 36,000) and 36% (over 13,000) respectively. After the pandemic, students returned to campus to join physical academic activities. HKU Business School was the second largest faculty of the University with over 3,000 undergraduate students. In the 2022-2023 academic year, the student number increased by 39% and 40 more scholars had joined the faculty. As the existing facilities of the Main Campus and the Centennial Campus were already saturated, additional spaces for academic activities were needed. The Site was part of the HKU Main Campus and close to the Centennial Campus, which would create synergy with the existing academic facilities of HKU. Buildings and facilities within the Site on Pokfield Road had been in use for about 50 to 60 years (except the three student hostel blocks). The redevelopment would better utilise the Site by replacing dilapidated and outdated facilities with a campus that met the top-class

international university standards and optimising the land resources of that “G/IC” site;

- (b) the proposed Sports and Academic Complex comprised five buildings and would be developed in three phases with Phase 1 for an Academic Building and a multi-purpose Sports Centre; Phase 2 for residences for staff and visiting scholars; and Phase 3 for an Academic Tower with conference rooms. The proposed Sports and Academic Complex could accommodate about 7,000 staff and students with total gross floor area (GFA) of more than 90,000m² for academic use as well as for holding international conferences;
- (c) with design aspiration to construct a sustainable, green and smart campus, design features such as stepped BH design, provision of setback, and multi-level greening, would be adopted for the proposed Sports and Academic Complex to provide a better environment for students and nearby residents. Besides, the proposed Complex would enhance the pedestrian connectivity for residents of Pokfield Road by proposed road widening works at the junction of Pokfield Road/Smithfield, escalators connecting Smithfield and the proposed Complex, and elevated pedestrian walkway across Pok Fu Lam Road connecting the Site to St. John’s College and the Centennial Campus. These connectivity enhancement proposals had been agreed by the Transport Department (TD) from traffic engineering point of view. Lease modification procedures had commenced since November 2022;
- (d) the Central and Western District Council and various stakeholders had been consulted in the initial stage of the planning of the proposed development. During the s.12A application stage, consultation meetings had been held with nearby residents, including University Heights, Fulham Garden, Academic Terrace, residents in Kennedy Town, HKU students, etc. to introduce the proposal. An on-line workshop was held to collect public views on improvement to pedestrian facilities. After obtaining MPC’s agreement to the s.12A application, HKU had continued to consult and engage local residents/stakeholders on the project. The progress of the construction/development of the Site was also updated on the HKU website in a timely manner to notify the public about the

progress of the development. Management offices of nearby buildings had also been in contact with HKU; and

- (e) to conclude, a video was presented to show the schematics of the proposed development and to summarise the points presented above.

R31/C10 – Mary Mulvihill

17. With the aid of visualizer, Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

- (a) she raised strong objection to the proposed development at the site as it would result in a mega wall development and would radically change the urban landscape in that locality;
- (b) one of the planning intentions of the existing/designated Government, institution and community (GIC) development on the Site was to serve as a breathing space or visual break within a high-rise and high-density environment. The proposed development as shown in the video was merely a wall-like building with long façade that totally undermined the planning intention for breathing space and visual break;
- (c) the issues on increase in traffic and pedestrian flows, visual and air ventilation impacts arising from the proposed development were ignored. It was expected that the air ventilation would be worsened as compared to the original low-rise development;
- (d) there would be fewer people of student age in Hong Kong and the Mainland for the coming decades and more courses would be offered on-line (i.e. asynchronous learning). Hence, there would be no need for additional facilities or classrooms and existing academic space could be converted to multi-function uses. Developing an annex of the university close to the border would be much more convenient for students and professors for exchange with the Mainland;
- (e) Flora Ho Sports Centre provided an important service for students but sports

facilities in the new development would be confined to left over spaces. The quality and quantity of sports facilities would be affected. The previous outdoor sports facilities on the Site were eliminated ;

- (f) there were 403 trees within the Site and only 35 would be retained and 125 compensation trees would be planted. However, the location of the proposed 370 new trees was not shown in any drawings submitted by HKU;
- (g) the proposed reprovisioning of Pokfield Road Sitting-out Area to a piece of government land in proximity zoned “Open Space” (“O”) at a much higher level in fact took over a public facility from the community for HKU’s benefit;
- (h) in recent years, access to universities was no longer free and open and the public was often strongly discouraged from entering the universities. Accesses were being blocked by management staff. Whether the proposed escalator would be opened to the public was questionable;
- (i) classrooms buried three floors underground with zero natural light and ventilation were unacceptable. The quality of life of students in the student village would be negatively impacted by erection of a tall wall in front of the student residences and no information was provided on impacts on ventilation and penetration of natural light to the student residences; and
- (j) the provision of elevated walkway instead of at-grade crossing would not provide convenience for pedestrians. Students should be encouraged to walk more rather than using escalators.

18. As the presentations of PlanD’s representative, the representer and commenter and their representative had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions to the representer/commenter and their representatives and/or the government representatives. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct question to the Board or for cross-examination between parties.

Pedestrian Connectivity

19. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) how pedestrians could travel to and from Smithfield and MTR Kennedy Town Station to Pok Fu Lam Road via the Site and whether the proposal actually could be realised;
 - (b) whether the escalator connecting Pok Fu Lam Road and Smithfield would be in single direction only; and
 - (c) whether there was a more direct access connecting Pok Fu Lam Road and Smithfield for residents of Fulham Garden.
20. In response, with the aid of PowerPoint slides, Ms Fan Mei and Ms Wu Wai Yin Winnie, representatives of R1/C1, made the following main points:
- (a) there were significant level differences between the Pokfield Campus and the Site at Pok Fu Lam Road and Smithfield. Escalators, elevators and landscaping walkways would be provided within the Site to facilitate pedestrian flow. Drawing H-12 of the Paper showed the pedestrian route comprising (i) improved road crossing at the Smithfield/Pokfield Road junction; (ii) a proposed escalator connecting Smithfield and the lowest ground level of the Site; (iii) the Landscaped Avenue on the lowest ground level from the west to the east; and (iv) an elevator to the Landscaped Terrace which led to Pok Fu Lam Road. The implementation of the proposed pedestrian facilities within Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the proposed Sports and Academic Complex were quite certain because the tender procedure for invitation of construction contractors had been completed;
 - (b) although a technical investigation had been conducted, the provision of a 2-way escalator was still under investigation as there was limited space for provision of the escalator between the Telephone Exchange and Caritas Mok Cheung Sui Kun Community Centre sites. Alternatively, taking the Central to Mid-Levels Escalator and Walkway System as an example, the direction of the escalator, i.e.

uphill/downhill, could be adjusted at designated hours to facilitate the key pedestrian flow; and

- (c) there would be an elevated walkway connecting St John's College and the Site across Pok Fu Lam Road, and residents of the nearby Fulham Garden could make use of the elevated walkway to cross Pok Fu Lam Road as the current at-grade pedestrian crossing was located further north. The proposed pedestrian route within the Site as indicated green in Drawing H-11 of the Paper was pleasant and with landscaping features. Residents from other nearby developments including University Heights could also benefit from the road and pedestrian connection improvements brought about by the proposed Sports and Academic Complex.

21. A Member asked whether alternative pedestrian connection would be provided to facilitate the uphill/downhill pedestrian flows. Ms Fen Mei, representative of R1/C1, responded that views from nearby residents (collected through an on-line workshop held before the s.12A application) regarding the pedestrian connection between Pok Fu Lam Road and Smithfield was considered by the MPC of the Board in May 2022. The pedestrian connection from the Site via Smithfield and Pokfield Road to MTR Kennedy Town Station was one of the possible options. Other options proposed in the on-line workshop such as an elevator connecting the HKU Pokfield Campus and Pokfield Path via Pokfield Road or using the staircase near Exit B of MTR Kennedy Town Station to connect to Pokfield Road had also been submitted to relevant government departments and the Central and Western District Council (C&W DC) for information. Although those options involved areas outside the Site, HKU would continue to explore the possibility to enhance the pedestrian connectivity in the area together with different parties. Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, supplemented that the Transport Department (TD) had consulted the C&W DC on the proposed escalator link from Pokfield Road along Pokfield Path to Smithfield in 2021 under the 'Hillside Escalator Links and Elevator Systems' project.

22. In response to two Members' concern on the public access to HKU Campus, Ms Fen Mei, representative of R1/C1, said that as confirmed by HKU in the MPC of the Board on 20.5.2022, HKU adopted an open campus principle, and members of the community could access the HKU campus, escalators and elevators connecting to/from the neighborhoods in reasonable hours. The proposed escalators and elevators linking up Pok Fu Lam Road and

Smithfield would operate from about 6:00am to 1:00am to align with the opening hours of MTR Kennedy Town Station. Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, supplemented that the provision of escalators, elevators, Landscaped Terrace and Landscaped Avenue would be overseen by Government through the vetting of general building plans or suitable conditions to be imposed under the land lease, to ensure that those facilities would be provided and opened for public use.

Pedestrian Walking Environment/Greening

23. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether landscaping features would be provided along the proposed pedestrian walkways within the Site; and
- (b) the findings of the tree survey, and the location of the compensation trees.

24. In response, with the aid of PowerPoint slides, Ms Fan Mei and Ms Wu W.Y. Winnie, representatives of R1/C1, made the following main points:

- (a) the Landscaped Avenue and Landscaped Terrace would be in the open air and not covered, but trees would provide shadings for pedestrians; and
- (b) according to the Tree Survey Report and Landscape Plan submitted in the s.12A application, there were 403 trees (including those in the area where the existing student hostels were situated) within the Lot (Inland Lot 7704 RP) and 365 of them would be felled. There were 385 trees within the Site and 35 trees would be retained. At a compensatory ratio of about 1:1, a total of 330 new trees would be planted within the Lot, including 118 at the at-grade landscape area on ground floor, sunken courtyard on LG1, Landscaped Terrace on LG2 and Landscaped Avenue on LG5; and 125 on building roofs of the Sports Complex and Academic Tower, etc. The soil depth for planting would be about 1.2m to 1.5m which fulfilled the landscaping design requirement. The overall greenery ratio would be 30%.

25. Mr Ivan M.K. Chung, Director of Planning (D of Plan) enquired on the total area of open space within the Site that would be opened for public use. In response, Ms Wu W.Y. Winnie, representative of R1/C1, said that there was no information on hand about the total area involved but the main area of open space for public use would be at the sunken courtyard in LG1 as well as the Landscape Avenue and Landscape Terrace as shown on Drawing H-5 of the Paper. Through provision of multi-level greeneries, students, staff and nearby residents could also enjoy the green elements of the Site.

26. A Member asked how HKU could ensure that the compensation trees could be well maintained over time. Ms Fan Mei, representative of R1/C1, responded that the Landscape Unit of the HKU Estate Office would take up the responsibility to maintain the landscaping of the Site regularly and trusted that their employees had professional knowledge to well maintain the trees and plants for the whole campus. The landscape master plan (Drawing H-5 of the Paper) showed that the locations selected for tree plantings could receive sufficient sunlight for healthy growth. Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, said that in the process of lease modification, a landscaping clause would be included to ensure that trees within the Site would be maintained properly and the lease conditions would be monitored and enforced by relevant government department. Ms Fan supplemented that there was a tree felling clause under the prevailing lease, which meant all tree felling required approval from the Director of Lands (D of Lands). Furthermore, an undertaking would be signed by HKU to properly maintain the trees and landscaping works within the Site.

Vehicular Traffic Arrangement

27. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the vehicular traffic arrangement along Pok Fu Lam Road to the Site; and
- (b) the transport arrangement during mega events or international conferences at the Site.

28. In response, with the aid of PowerPoint slides, Ms Fan Mei and Ms Wu W.Y. Winnie, representatives of R1/C1, made the following main points:

- (a) there would be an ingress/egress on Pok Fu Lam Road and two bus lay-bys were proposed at the Academic Tower within the building setback area of the Site, which would minimise impact on both pedestrian and vehicular traffic along Pok Fu Lam Road. The proposal had been discussed and agreed by the TD; and
- (b) for mega events or conferences, shuttle bus service would be provided to pick up guests/visitors at designated locations to minimize taxi/private car trips to the Site. Visitors would be encouraged to take public transport rather than using their own vehicles.

Road Widening at Pokfield Road/Relocation of Pokfield Road Sitting-out Area

29. In response to the Chairperson, Vice-chairperson and a Member, Ms Fan Mei, representative of R1/C1, said that the development of the Site brought about the opportunity for road widening works to improve the existing pedestrian and vehicular traffic conditions at the junction of Pokfield Road and Smithfield, which involved relocation of the Pokfield Road Sitting-out Area that was the only available space on Government Land. The affected sitting-out area would be reprovisioned to the south of the Telephone Exchange site along Smithfield, which was further uphill as shown in Drawing H-10 of the Paper. The relocation site for the sitting-out area was indicated in the pedestrian connectivity proposal during the previous public consultation stage. Visitors could reach the relocated sitting-out area by taking the proposed escalator connecting Smithfield and the Site. Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, supplemented that the relocation site fell within an area zoned "O". As the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) had no implementation plan for open space development at that piece of land at the moment, they welcomed the proposal to re-provision the Pokfield Road Sitting-out Area to that part of the "O" zone and would offer assistance on the design of the sitting-out area.

30. A Member asked whether objections received for the road widening works, if any, or relocation of the sitting-out area would affect the implementation programme of the Site including all the pedestrian connectivity as proposed. In response, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, said that relevant government departments would follow the established statutory procedure to handle objections/complaints regarding the gazettal of road widening works for Pokfield Road, if any, and de-gazettal and relocation of the Pokfield Road Sitting-out Area. As the road widening works would benefit the residents nearby, strong objections to the

proposal were not expected. After the s.12A application was agreed by the MPC of the Board, relevant government departments including the LCSD, Lands Department, TD and HKU etc. had worked closely on the preparatory work for the road widening works, relocation/reprovision of Pokfield Road Sitting-out Area and the management issue of the escalators and elevators in parallel.

Air Ventilation and Natural Lighting Aspects

31. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the findings of the air ventilation assessment (AVA) and whether there was any design feature of the development to enhance the local air flow; and
- (b) the response to R31's concern on the three floors of underground classroom without natural light and ventilation.

32. In response, with the aid of PowerPoint slides, Ms Fan Mei and Ms Wu W.Y. Winnie, representatives of R1/C1, made the following main points:

- (a) a quantitative AVA was conducted to support the s.12A application. The proposed scheme for the Site had incorporated (i) chamfered design at building corners of the drum ramp; (ii) building setback on G/F and podium setback along Pokfield Road; and (iii) stepped BH design for podium to facilitate air flow. The performances of the proposed scheme (with incorporation of the above features and BH at 155mPD) on pedestrian wind environment were in general comparable with the baseline scheme (with the existence of the 4-storey Flora Ho Sports Centre at 100mPD) under the annual prevailing wind and had an improvement under summer prevailing wind; and
- (b) the main access of the proposed development was located at Pok Fu Lam Road where ground floor (G/F) was defined. As there was a significant level difference between Pok Fu Lam Road (80mPD) and Pokfield Road (50mPD), building floors between the two roads were defined as lower ground (LG) levels. According to the building design, windows would be provided on each lower

ground floor (i.e. LG1 to LG3). Although there were no lighting and ventilation requirements for classrooms under the Buildings Ordinance, the facilities for the use of staff and students would be carefully positioned and orientated to allow natural lighting as much as possible in order to provide an ideal teaching/learning environment for users.

Building Height

33. Noting that the BH profile of nearby developments ranged from 160 to 170mPD and the BH restrictions at the Site were 115mPD and 155mPD, a Member asked whether there was scope to further increase the BH within the Site so that a slimmer building might be built with better air ventilation and natural lighting. In response, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, said that the BHs of 115mPD and 155mPD covering Phase 1 (Academic Building and Sports Complex) and Phase 3 (Academic Tower) respectively of the Pokfield Campus were proposed by HKU at the s.12A application, and were agreed by the MPC. Whilst some surrounding developments, such as University Heights at 170mPD and the Phase 2 development (the staff quarters) at 150mPD were taller, the two buildings in Phase 1, though lower in BH, already had rather large building bulk. Ms Fan Mei, representative of R1/C1, further responded that the redevelopment proposal for the Pokfield Campus was divided into three phases to resolve the imminent need for accommodating the increasing number of students and staff for the university. Originally, the s.12A application was solely for revising the BH restriction on the OZP for Phase 3 of the development from 4-storey to 155mPD. Although the design of the proposed development for Phase 1 development complied with the BH restriction stipulated on the OZP (i.e. 4 storeys) and that stipulated under the land lease, the BH restriction was proposed to be stipulated on the OZP in the terms of mPD (i.e. 115mPD) for consistency sake. There had been considerations to propose a BH at 160mPD for the Academic Tower which would be comparable to the BH of the neighboring University Heights (170mPD). However, after considering the concern raised by residents of University Heights and the operation need of the university, it was considered more appropriate to keep the BH at 115mPD. Phase 1 and Phase 2 (the staff quarters) developments were in advanced stage and piling works had started according to the proposal, and there was no room to further revise the BHs.

Others

34. A Member asked about the liaison work with the concerned parties that had been conducted since the approval of the s.12A application in May 2022. In response, Ms Fan Mei, representative of R1/C1, said that after the Board's agreement on the s.12A application, eight meetings with various stakeholders, including nearby residents, management offices, Caritas Mok Cheung Sui Kun Community Centre, etc, were conducted to report and further discuss the development progress of the Site and any complaints were dealt with in a timely manner.

35. In response to the Vice-chairperson's question about student number forecast, Ms Fan Mei, representative of R1/C1, said that the university had a vision to enhance its future growth to support the government's initiative of innovation development by nurturing talents for Hong Kong's continuous development in the coming 10 years.

36. 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/commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representers/commenters, their representatives and government's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[Messrs K.L. Wong and Andrew C.W. Lai joined the meeting during the Q&A Session.]

Deliberation Session

37. The Chairperson said that the amendment was to take forward an agreed s.12A application for the proposed Academic and Sports Complex at the Pokfield Campus of HKU. She then invited views from Members.

38. Members generally had no objection to the BH restrictions of 115mPD and 155mPD (Amendment Item A) for the "G/IC" zone.

39. Some Members appreciated that HKU had followed up on some concerns raised in previous meetings, including further improving the pedestrian connectivity and design,

engaging the affected locals, and enhancing benefit of the proposed development to the community. Two Members were of the view that HKU could have considered more innovative ideas to improve the pedestrian connection, landscaping design, tree planting and the maintenance works for enhancing the current proposal. A Member suggested that HKU should continue to have regular meetings with nearby residents and stakeholders to report on the development progress of the Site and address their concerns in a timely manner.

40. A Member who had no objection to the amendment item considered that further increase in the BH by say 5m (i.e from 155mPD to 160mPD) could enhance the permeability and air ventilation of the development.

41. Some Members expressed that although HKU had tried to improve the uphill/downhill pedestrian connectivity through provision of escalators and elevators, the existing pedestrian circulation system, in particular the staircase/escalators provided next to The Belcher's was not well utilised. As the proposed escalators were outside the HKU campus, the management and maintenance issues needed to be addressed. HKU should take the opportunity to create a more interesting walkable environment for the community and further explore better pedestrian connectivity options not only for campus users but also for nearby residents.

42. In view of Members' concerns on the integrated landscape and greening design, communal open space for public and students/staff and setback requirement at Pok Fu Lam Road under the proposed scheme, Mr Ivan M.K. Chung, D of Plan, suggested that elaborations on those aspects could be incorporated in the Explanatory Statement of the "G/IC" zone for the Site. Members agreed.

43. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally agreed with the OZP amendment and that the OZP should not be amended to meet the adverse representations and that all grounds of the representations and comments had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in the Paper and the presentations and responses made by the government representatives at the meeting. As the Site was located at a prime location that could serve as a connector, HKU should continue to further enhance their proposal including pedestrian connectivity, pedestrian walking environment, tree planting, natural air ventilation and natural sunlight and areas to be opened for public enjoyment to cater for the community needs.

44. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) noted the supportive views of **R1 to R30** and decided not to uphold R31 to R33 and considered that the draft Kennedy Town & Mount Davis Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reason:

“the revision of building height restriction from 4 storeys to 115mPD and 155mPD for a portion of the “Government, Institution or Community” zone is considered appropriate and would facilitate the integrated development of sports, recreational and academic facilities at The University of Hong Kong (HKU) Pokfield Campus to support the continuous development/future expansion of HKU. Relevant technical assessments in the agreed s.12A application confirmed that the proposed development incorporating suitable design and mitigation measures would not cause adverse visual, air ventilation, vehicular traffic, pedestrian connectivity and landscape impacts on the surrounding areas (**R31 to R33**).”

45. The Board also agreed to amend the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the draft Kennedy Town & Mount Davis OZP No. S/H1/23 (the OZP) as follows:

Paragraph 8.6.3 of the ES of the OZP

“The HKU’s Pokfield Campus at the junction of Pok Fu Lam Road and Pokfield Road would be redeveloped as new sports and academic complex. To optimise the development potential, development within this “G/IC” site is restricted to maximum building heights of 115mPD and 155mPD as stipulated on the Plan. Multiple pedestrian connections to Pok Fu Lam Road, Pokfield Road and Smithfield would be provided by HKU *with integrated landscaping and greenery design to enhance the walking environment, particularly along the Landscaped Avenue, Landscaped Terrace and sunken courtyard, which would be opened for public enjoyment. A 5m to 8m wide setback from Pok Fu Lam Road would be provided for better local ventilation.* To enhance the flow of pedestrian and to provide high benefits to the vehicular traffic circumstance, footpath widening at the junction of Pokfield Road/Smithfield and new bus lay-bys at Pok Fu Lam Road would be provided by HKU in consultation with respective Government bureau/departments.”

46. The Board 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 10-minute break. Dr C.H. Hau joined and Professor Roger C.K. Chan left the meeting during the break.]

General

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting]

Draft Town Planning Board Guidelines for Application for Transfer of Plot Ratio under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance
(TPB Paper No. 10907)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

47. The Secretary reported that the Transfer of Plot Ratio (TPR) mechanism was one of the recommendations under the District Study for Yau Ma Tei (YMT) and Mong Kok (MK) (the YM Study) commissioned by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA). AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) was the consultant of the YM Study. The following Members had declared interests on the item for having affiliation/business dealings with the URA or AECOM and/or owning properties in the YMT and MK areas:

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

Mr Andrew C.W. Lai - being a non-executive director of the URA
(as Director of Lands) Board and a member of its Committee and
owning/co-owning with spouse properties in
YMT and MK;

- Mr Timothy K.W. Ma - being a member of the Land, Rehousing & Compensation Committee of URA, a director of the Board of the 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 and AECOM; being a director of a company owning properties and his spouse also owning a flat in YMT/MK;
- Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang
(*Vice-Chairperson*) - being 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 the Urban Renewal Fund;
- Ms Lilian S.K. Law - being a former director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund and a member of HKHS which currently had discussion with URA on housing development issues, and her close relative owning property in MK;
- 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;
- Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho - having current business dealings with AECOM;
- Dr C.H. Hau - having past business dealings with AECOM; and
- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his spouse being a director of a company owning properties in YMT.

48. Members noted that Dr Conrad T.C. Wong, Messrs Timothy K.W. Ma, Vincent K.Y. Ho and Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered apologies for being not able to attend the meeting. As the item was on the Town Planning Board Guidelines covering TPR mechanism and proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), Members agreed that the interests of other Members only needed to be recorded and they should be allowed to stay in the meeting and participate in the discussion.

49. The following representatives of PlanD were invited to the meeting at this point:

- Ms Winnie B.Y. Lau - Assistant Director/Metro (AD/M)
- Mr Derek P.K. Tse - District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK)

50. The Chairperson extended a welcome and invited the representatives of PlanD to brief Members on the item. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Winnie B.Y. Lau, AD/M, briefed Members on the background of formulation and mechanism of the proposed TPR Scheme as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10907 (the Paper).

51. As the presentation by PlanD was completed, the Chairperson invited questions and comments from Members.

52. Members showed appreciation of the government's efforts to take forward the implementation mechanism for the TPR Scheme which was an innovative planning tool recommended in the YM Study that would help to speed up the urban renewal process. A Member also expressed support that full ownership of the Sending Site (SSs) and Receiving Site (RS)(s) by the project proponent(s) was not a pre-requisite for making planning application as that could facilitate developer(s) to assess the development potential of their targeted application sites prior to acquisition of the properties.

Potential Applicants for the TPR Scheme

53. Some Members asked whether URA or large-scale developers were the target applicants of TPR Schemes. The Chairperson explained that the formulation of the TPR Scheme was mainly targeted to incentivise the private sector which was the major driving force for urban renewal. She further explained that, for example, if a developer owned a pencil-like old building without elevator on a small site, redevelopment of the site to fulfil current building regulations would result in very low usable gross floor area (GFA), and thus, the site would have low potential for redevelopment. Through the TPR Scheme, the developer could consider transferring the plot ratio (PR)/GFA of the small site to a larger site at more strategic and accessible locations for redevelopment. Although it was difficult to predict the market response, the Government considered that it was worthwhile to try the new planning tool in the YMT and MK areas (the YM areas) on a pilot basis. Ms Winnie B.Y. Lau, AD/M, supplemented that although URA could make use of the TPR Scheme, they would likely prepare a Development Scheme Plan (DSP) to facilitate TPR among their concerned development sites for submission to the Board for consideration under the current practice, for example, the DSP for Nga Tsin Wai Road/Carpenter Road redevelopment, which covered a wider area for redevelopment involving transfer of GFA among link sites and realignment of existing road network in the Kowloon City area.

54. Noting Members' concerns on the insufficient incentives provided to facilitate the urban renewal process, the Chairperson said that the Development Bureau (DEVB) had proposed streamlining the compulsory sale regime by lowering the threshold for compulsory sale applications. The proposed amendments to the Land (Compulsory Sale for Redevelopment) Ordinance would be submitted to the Legislative Council for consideration in the second half of 2023. Besides, DEVB, PlanD and URA were further enhancing the 'Street

Consolidation Area' (SCA) concept proposed under the YM Study where a number of roads was proposed for closure for pedestrian and open space use through rationalization of the road network, so that the adjoining small street blocks could be amalgamated to form a more comprehensive redevelopment area. The road areas would be included in the development sites for GFA calculation, thus providing more incentive for enhancing development potential of these sites and urban renewal.

55. Some Members raised the following questions:

Criteria for the TPR Scheme

- (a) the rationale for allowing relaxation of PR/GFA up to 30% for RS(s);
- (b) the reasons for allowing only 2 sites as RSs under the same application;
- (c) whether there was scope to relax the restriction to confine the SSs and RSs within the same OZP;
- (d) how the TPR Scheme could facilitate medium/small size developers' involvement in the urban renewal process in the YM areas;
- (e) whether the deteriorated buildings within SS could be kept even though the remaining PR of the SS had been transferred to a RS;
- (f) if the s.16 application for TPR Scheme proposed transfer of the PR/GFA for the RS by 30%, whether the Board could approve a lower relaxation of PR/GFA if considered more suitable;

PR/GFA calculation

- (g) clarification on how the grandfathered GFA as stated in Appendix B of Annex 1 of the Paper was calculated;
- (h) whether the bonus PR, as defined in the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R),

obtained for the existing development on the SS could be transferred to the RS, and whether the future development on that RS could be granted with bonus PR under B(P)R in the building plan submission stage;

- (i) if the RS involved two sets of PR restrictions for domestic and non-domestic uses, how the maximum of 30% relaxation of PR would be defined;
- (j) whether maximum PR/GFA relaxation of 30% for RS could be considered 'minor';
- (k) whether relaxation above 30% of the PR/GFA was allowed for the RS due to other planning or design merits;
- (l) whether the PR/GFA for the RS under the TPR scheme could exceed the permissible PR restriction in the First Schedule to the B(P)R;

Urban Design

- (m) whether there was an overall urban design plan to guide the future redevelopment in the YM areas;
- (n) should the Master Renewal Concept Plan (MRCP) and the OZP restrictions be considered in TPR Scheme;
- (o) what the considerations on open space/green elements under the TPR Scheme in YM area were;

Surrounding Environment

- (p) in relation to increase in the development intensity in RSs under the TPR Scheme, whether the impacts on traffic and environment aspects had been considered;
- (q) whether there would be measures to facilitate a smooth redevelopment process in the YM areas especially on traffic aspect should a number of applications under

the TPR Scheme were to commence construction works at the same time;

Others

- (r) number of buildings in the YM areas that were in single ownership;
- (s) whether there would be a central register of all SSs and RSs under the TPR Scheme for easy reference by the public; and
- (t) whether potential SS(s) could be treated as 'commodity' for trading in the property market.

56. In response, with the aid of PowerPoint slides, Ms Winnie B.Y. Lau, AD/M, made the following main points:

Criteria for the TPR Scheme

- (a) the maximum relaxation of PR/GFA by 30% for the RS under the TPR Scheme had made reference to the policy for relaxation of PR restriction for public housing sites up to 30% as appropriate, which was approved by the Executive Council. Planning application under the TPR Scheme should be supported by technical assessments;
- (b) more than two RSs under the same planning application might diffuse the intended impact of the GFA transfer from SS to more strategic/accessible locations for higher intensity developments;
- (c) confining the SS and RS of the concerned planning application under the same OZP could broadly maintain the overall development quantum of the respective planning areas of MK and YMT. This arrangement could avoid the possible concentration of RSs in the planning area with comparatively higher land value (in this case being MK) that might overload the local transport network and infrastructure. The TPR mechanism would be further reviewed subject to market response and experience gained from the pilot scheme. Confining the

RS and SS to be within the same OZP would also be easier to operate at the pilot scheme stage and had balanced the need for certainty and flexibility;

- (d) setting a minimum site area of 1,000m² for RSs had taken into consideration the size of street blocks in the YM areas, the site area conducive to a reasonably sized development with more efficient layout and amenities, and the likelihood of developers, in particular the medium/small scale ones, to participate in the TPR Scheme;
- (e) the deteriorated buildings within SS had to be demolished under the TPR Scheme, except historic buildings graded by the Antiquities Advisory Board or those buildings the applicants considered worthy of preservation with justifications set out in the application and accepted by the Board;
- (f) as the TPR mechanism was implemented through the planning application submitted under s.16 of the Town Planning Ordinance, the Board would consider the submitted development scheme as a whole including the proposed extent of relaxation of PR/GFA, and decide whether to approve or reject the application, but not to approve a PR/GFA lower than that submitted;

PR/GFA calculation

- (g) the grandfathered GFA as stated in Appendix B of Annex 1 of the Paper was further explained using Example 2 in which for a site with area of 1,000m² and subject to maximum PR of 9 or the PR of the existing building, whichever is the greater, the maximum GFA according to the PR restriction for the site would be 9,000m² and, if the GFA for the existing dilapidated building to be demolished was 10,000m², the grandfathered GFA was 1,000m²;
- (h) as the bonus PR was part of the total PR of the existing building on the SS, the total PR of the building including bonus PR would be transferrable to the RS under the TPR Scheme. Regarding the future development on the RS, bonus PR granted under Regulation 22(1) or (2) of B(P)R by the Building Authority would be allowed if there was a provision in the Remarks under the Notes of OZP of the

concerned zone covering the RS permitting the maximum PR be exceeded by the bonus PR;

- (i) the calculation of the maximum 30% relaxation of the PR would be based on the permitted total PR as stipulated on the OZP, e.g. the total PR of 9 for “R(A)” zone;
- (j) there was no definition of minor relaxation for planning applications. Whether a relaxation was minor depended on the context and circumstances of a given case. It would be up to the Board to decide taking account of all relevant factors in connection with a specific application, including site circumstances, individual merits, policy initiatives, technical feasibility, etc.;
- (k) the relaxation of PR allowed under the TPR Scheme was capped at 30% as specified in the Guidelines;
- (l) following the spirit of the Joint Practice Notes No. 4 on “Development Control Parameters Plot Ratio/Gross Floor Area” (revised in 2021) regarding the streamlined arrangement amongst the Buildings Department (BD), Lands Department (LandsD) and Planning Department (PlanD), the Building Authority might favourably consider to exercise discretion under section 42 of the Buildings Ordinance to grant modification to permit the PR restriction stipulated in the First Schedule to B(P)R to be exceeded to a level on par with the maximum PR/GFA restriction under the planning regime, i.e. including the proposed PR/GFA as permitted under an approved planning application for the TPR Scheme;

Urban Design

- (m) the MRCP under the YM Study generally set out the overall strategy with Development Nodes (DNs), open space settings, green corridors, pedestrian network, etc. to guide the regeneration of the YM areas;
- (n) any developments should comply with the development parameters and restrictions as stipulated on the relevant statutory OZP. To take forward the proposals under the YM Study, amendments to the MK OZP had been completed

and amendments to the YMT OZP were being processed. As stated in the Guidelines, reference could be made to the MRCP Framework for piloting the TPR Scheme and identification of suitable SS(s) and RS(s);

- (o) according to the recommendations of the YM Study, each DN should provide a minimum 30% of the site area as open space and green linkages were proposed to connect open space/park in the YM areas;

Surrounding Environment

- (p) URA had conducted comprehensive baseline review covering various aspects including traffic, pedestrian flow, sewerage, drainage, and environment in the YM Study. Apart from TPR, the YM Study also recommended SCA to better utilise the unnecessary local road sections as open space as mentioned above. Besides, the 'Park n' Walk' concept was also proposed to encourage drivers to park their vehicles in large underground public car parks in DNs and other large sites and walk to their destination in inner streets. These proposals would on one hand facilitate urban redevelopment and on the other hand increase the transport/pedestrian capacities in the YM areas, and create a better environment to the community;
- (q) a district wide transport and pedestrian study had been conducted under the YM Study under which, concerned road junctions/sections had been identified with improvement measures suggested to enhance the vehicular traffic flows and the pedestrian environment. In addition, all the s.16 applications under the TPR Scheme would be considered by the Board on a case-by-case basis and each application had to be supported by relevant technical assessments, including Traffic Impact Assessment, to the satisfaction of relevant government departments;

Others

- (r) according to Diagram 2.3 of the YM Study Information Booklet prepared by URA, the building blocks in entirely grey colour on the diagram were those with

lower redevelopment potential which might not be financially viable for redevelopment in general. There was no information about the ownership pattern of the buildings within the YM areas on hand but the number of those under single ownership should not be much;

- (s) setting up a record of the RSs and SSs approved under TPR Schemes could be considered, as that would provide more information for the public (including minority owners and developers); and
- (t) there were overseas examples for the option of trading SS(s) as a ‘commodity’ but this would not be considered at the current stage and it might involve legislation amendment.

Land Premium

57. On the questions regarding land premium as raised by some Members, Mr Andrew C.W. Lai, Director of Lands, said that a TPR Scheme would involve developments on two or more sites. In order to ensure that the design features, Government, institution and community (GIC) facilities and other elements at the RS(s) and SS(s) that the developer had promised to deliver could be realized, relevant condition(s) would be incorporated into the land leases. For example, for preservation of historic buildings or provision of Residential Care Homes for the Elderly (RCHE) at the SS, relevant conditions such as opening hours of the historic building for public enjoyment and development scale of the RCHE, would be included in the land lease upon consultation with relevant government departments to ensure realization of the social/planning gains in the approved planning application under the TPR Scheme. Furthermore, the completion of the public facilities at the SS had to tie in with the granting of pre-sale consent/issuance of certificate of compliance/consent to assign as appropriate in respect of the new development at the RS(s). As for the concerns raised by the Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong (REDA) in paragraphs 5.3 to 5.4 of the Paper, the considerations for premium assessment under TPR Schemes were conducted in accordance with the established premium assessment practices. If the RS was under an unrestricted lease, there would be no scope for LandsD to charge land premium even if there would be an increase in PR. On the other hand, if lease modification/land exchange was required for an approved TPR Scheme and new development restrictions on user, building height or permissible GFA on

RS were included, that might involve premium payment for the RS(s) and/or SS(s) which would be charged and assessed at full market value reflecting the enhancement in land value before (i.e. the land value under the existing lease) and after (i.e. the land value under the modified lease) the implementation of the approved TPR Scheme. For the GIC facilities to be included in the SS(s), they might not be subject to premium payment if such facilities were required by relevant government departments.

58. A Member suggested that it would be more reasonable and fair to follow the established practice to evaluate SS(s) and RS(s) individually, rather than based on standard rates as proposed by REDA. Another Member hold a different view that standard premium rate could be applied for each type of land use zones to provide certainties for developers to better estimate the land value for redevelopment projects.

Implementation/Management of Open Space and GIC Facilities

59. As a number of SSs scattered in different locations within YM areas would be turned into open space/park or for GIC uses, some Members expressed concern on whether the developers would well construct and properly maintain the public facilities in the SSs. In response, Ms Winnie B.Y. Lau, AD/M, said that to ensure enforceability of the applicant/developer's commitments and obligations under the approved application, relevant planning conditions, including the need to apply for lease modification or land exchange and necessary approval of building plans/building works for both the SS(s) and RS(s) as a bundle, would be imposed. If there would be provision of GIC facilities at the SS(s), relevant lease conditions would ensure provision of the GIC facilities be completed before granting of pre-sale consent/issuance of certificate of compliance/consent to assign as appropriate in respect of the new development at the RS(s). If the GIC facilities would be handed back to the government upon completion, the design and timing of completion would be specified under the lease. Similar conditions would also be imposed into the lease for provision of open space/park at the SSs.

Social Aspect

60. Two Members said that buildings with low redevelopment potential in the YM areas often had a lot of sub-divided flats and asked whether acquisition of those sites might

affect existing residents/owners. The Chairperson said that DEVB was well aware that expediting the urban renewal process might affect minority owners and low income tenants residing in the YM areas. Once the Land (Compulsory Sale for Redevelopment) Ordinance was amended to lower the thresholds for compulsory sale applications, support to the affected residents, such as setting up dedicated office to provide emotional support and counselling services by social workers as well as professional/expert services on property valuation, would be strengthened.

Other Suggestions

61. A few Members said that SS(s) in small size would be turned into open area and it was predicted that the number of scattered pocket open areas in the YM areas would be increased. Hence, proper management and maintenance of the sites might need to be assured. In view of the possible situation, a Member suggested setting up an agent to make good use of and well manage those small SS(s) for the youth and incubators as the YM areas used to be a gathering place for young people.

62. A Member shared the urban renewal examples in two urban redevelopment projects in Mainland, i.e. Yuexiu district (越秀區) and Yongqingfan (永慶坊) in Guangzhou. The latter had adopted an 'embroidery approach' for renewing the urban fabric (繡花式城市肌理更新). For buildings that were unable to be acquired or residents there were not willing to move out, those buildings were retained in-situ through retrofitting works to co-exist with nearby new developments.

Refinement of the Draft Guidelines

63. Two Members suggested to refine the draft Guidelines as below:

- (a) to avoid misunderstanding that relaxation of PR/GFA up to 30% would be applicable to any land parcels in YM areas, the Guidelines should state clearly that allowing relaxation of PR/GFA up to 30% if considered justified by the Board, was only applicable to planning applications submitted under the TPR scheme through s.16 planning applications; and

- (b) in order to have a more comprehensive consideration of the planning gains to be demonstrated by the applicant(s) of TPR Schemes, it was suggested to include the adoption of greening and design measures advocated in the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines as one of the planning gains to be considered in section 2.5 of the Guidelines at Annex 1 of the Paper.

[Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung left the meeting during the discussion session.]

64. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally agreed with the framework for TPR applications in the draft Guidelines and their concern and suggestions raised were noted. The Guidelines would be reviewed in 2025 taking into account the market response and experience of the pilot scheme to see if more flexibility could be allowed as suggested by Members. She further said that the draft Guidelines would be refined by the Secretariat of the Board to reflect Members' comments stated in paragraph 63 above, and would be circulated for Members' endorsement before the draft Guidelines was promulgated. Members agreed.

65. After deliberation, the Board agreed that the draft set of Guidelines in Annex 1 of the Paper, subject to refinement by the Secretariat of the Board to reflect the comments in paragraph 63 above, was suitable for promulgation

[Post-meeting Note: The refined set of Guidelines including:

- (i) last sentence of paragraph 1.1 :

This set of Guidelines is currently applicable to *such applications within* the Yau Ma Tei OZP and Mon Kok OZP *only*¹.' with a footnote '*1. For the avoidance of doubt, the requirements in this set of guidelines, including allowing transfer of PR/GFA up to 30% if considered justified by the Board, are only applicable to planning applications submitted under section 16 of the Ordinance according to this set of guidelines*'; and

- (ii) paragraph 2.5 :

(h) adopt greening and design measures advocated in the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines;

- ~~(h)~~(i) help preserve building(s) with conservation value on the SS and/or RS or complement its setting; and/or
- ~~(i)~~(j) provide any other justifiable planning gains.

was circulated to Members on 20.6.2023 and agreed to be suitable for promulgation in due course.]

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

[The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 2:15pm.]

67. The meeting was resumed at 3:15 p.m.

68. 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 Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairperson

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West
Transport Department
Ms Carrie K.Y. Leung

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

Sha Tin, Tai Po & North District

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/NE-LT/749

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Agriculture” Zone and area shown as ‘Road’, Government Land in D.D.19, Chung Uk Tsuen, Lam Tsuen, Tai Po
(TPB Paper No. 10905)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

69. The following representative of the Planning Department (PlanD) was invited to the meeting at this point:

Ms Margaret H.Y. Chan - District Planning Officer/Shu Tin, Tai Po
& North District (DPO/STN)

70. The Chairperson extended a welcome and informed Members that the applicant and his representative had indicated that they would not attend the meeting. She then invited PlanD’s representative to brief Members on the review application.

71. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Margaret H.Y. Chan, DPO/STN, PlanD, briefed Members on the background of the review application including the application site, the proposed development, the consideration of the application by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board/TPB), departmental and public comments received on the review application, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10905. PlanD maintained its previous view of not supporting the application.

72. As the presentation of PlanD’s representative had been completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

73. As Members had no question to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedure for the review application had been completed. The Board would further deliberate on the review application. The Chairperson thanked PlanD's representative for attending the meeting. She left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

74. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally agreed with the decision of the RNTPC and that the review application should be rejected.

75. After deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application on review for the following reasons:

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” zone, which is primarily to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes. It is also intended to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention;
- (b) the proposed development does not comply with the Interim Criteria for consideration of application for New Territories Exempted House/Small House in New Territories in that the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed development located within water gathering grounds would be able to be connected to the existing sewerage system and would not cause adverse impact on the water quality in the area; and
- (c) land is still available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zones of Chung Uk Tsuen, Fong Ma Po, Tong Min Tsuen and San Uk Tsai which is primarily intended for Small House development. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within the “V” zones for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructure and services.”

General

Agenda Item 6

[Open Meeting]

Land Use Proposal of San Tin Technopole

(TPB Paper No. 10906)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

76. The Secretary reported that the Feasibility Study on the First Phase Development of the New Territories North (NTN) - San Tin/Lok Ma Chau Development Node (the Study) was jointly commissioned by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) and Planning Department (PlanD) with AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) as the consultant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| Dr C.H. Hau | - being a member of the Urban Forestry and Diversity Focus Group of CEDD on the study related to the Artificial Islands in the Central Waters; being an honorary professional advisor on wetland conservation and biodiversity enhancement associated with the development of NTN of CEDD; conducting contract research projects with CEDD; and having past business dealings with AECOM; |
| Dr Conrad T.C. Wong | - having current business dealings with AECOM; and |
| Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho | - having current business dealings with AECOM. |

77. Members noted that Dr Conrad T.C. Wong and Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the item was a briefing to Members on

the land use proposal for the San Tin Technopole, the interests of Dr C.H. Hau only needed to be recorded and he could stay in the meeting and participate in the discussion.

78. The following government representatives and the consultants (the Study team) were invited to the meeting:

Northern Metropolis Coordination Office, Development Bureau (NMCO, DevB)

Mr Vic C.H. Yau - Director

CEDD

Mr Chris K. P. Wong - Project Manager (North)

Mr Gavin C.P. Wong - Chief Engineer/North 4(CE/N4)

PlanD

Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang - Deputy Director of Planning/Territorial (DD/T)

Ms April K.Y. Kun - Assistant Director of Planning/Territorial

Ms Irene W.S. Lai - Chief Town Planner/Studies and Research 1
(CTP/SR1)

AECOM

Mr Kelvin Cheng]

Mr Kelvin Law] Consultants

Mr Martin Law]

Mr Andrew Ip]

79. The Secretary reported that a letter was received from the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society in respect of the land use proposal of San Tin Technopole (the Technopole) on 15.6.2023, and the letter had been tabled at the meeting for Members' reference.

80. The Chairman extended a welcome and invited the Study team to brief Members on the TPB Paper No. 10906 (the Paper).

81. Mr Vic C.H. Yau, Director/NMCO, DevB, gave an introduction saying that the Technopole, located at the heart of the Northern Metropolis (NM), was one of the major developments within the NM. The planning vision and position of the Technopole were to support Hong Kong to be developed into an international Information and Technology (I&T) centre and as a hub for clustered I&T development that would create synergy with Shenzhen's I&T zone. It would contribute to the development of I&T enterprises in Hong Kong.

82. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Irene W.S. Lai, CTP/SR1, PlanD, and Mr Gavin C.P. Wong, CE/N4, CEDD, briefed Members on the planning vision and positioning of the Technopole, the Recommended Outline Development Plan (RODP), land use budget and key planning parameters, the key planning features, Smart, Green and Resilient (SGR) Initiatives, transport connection, technical assessments and development schedule as detailed in the Paper.

[Ms Carrie K.Y. Leung left the meeting during the presentation.]

83. As the presentation by PlanD and CEDD had completed, the Chairperson invited questions and comments from Members.

Planning and Urban Design

84. The Vice-chairperson and some Members had the following views and questions:

- (a) while the good urban design objectives for the Technopole were appreciated, how these design objectives, such as developing carbon neutral community and enhancing internal walkability, would be achieved, and how the unique identity of the Technopole could be nurtured through planning and design;
- (b) noting that San Tin Highway and Fanling Highway would segregate the Technopole into northern and southern parts, which were planned as I&T Park and San Tin Town Centre (STTC) respectively, whether there were any design measures to ensure such physical segregation would not hinder the connectivity and integration within the Technopole;

- (c) noting that there were existing villages in the central part of the Technopole, how the new developments could integrate with these villages;
- (d) noting that the sites in Phase 1 (mainly I&T Park) would be occupied in 2031 while the anticipated population intake in Phase 2 (STTC) would only commence in 2034, whether there would be a mismatch in employment opportunity and population intake given the three-year gap, and whether there were measures to bridge the gap; and
- (e) whether there was a plan to provide underground recycling or refuse collection facilities within the Technopole.

85. In response, Mr Vic C.H. Yau, Director/NMCO, DevB, Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang, DD/T, PlanD and Mr Gavin C.P. Wong, CE/N4, CEDD, made the following main points:

- (a) the existing developments and physical constraints in the area had been taken into account in formulating the broad land use planning and urban design framework for the Technopole. Although San Tin Highway and Fanling Highway lied between the northern and southern portions of the Technopole, efforts had been made to enhance the north-south connection through a comprehensive network of pedestrian walkway and cycle track system and public spaces. These design elements would be further studied during the detailed planning and design stage following the framework outlined under the RODP;
- (b) the concept of embracing urban-rural integration had been adopted in the planning of the Technopole. The existing village zones in the surroundings would be retained and benefit from the comprehensively planned government, institution and community (GIC) facilities and improved infrastructure services brought about by the development. To achieve harmony in design between the villages and neighbouring developments, open space, cycle tracks and amenities would be provided in the bordering areas of the villages to minimise the interface issue. The

cultural heritage resources of the existing villages could also add cultural diversity and create a unique character for the Technopole;

- (c) the Technopole would be implemented in two phases, with first population intake starting from 2031 for Phase 1 (I&T Park and some residential sites) and bulk population intake starting from 2034 for Phase 2 (STTC). Notwithstanding this, the improved transport connection, e.g. Kwu Tung Station of the Northern Link (NOL) to be commissioned around 2027, and the population of the Kwu Tung North New Development Area, with intake starting from 2026/27, would support the I&T Park. The proposed talent accommodation within the Technopole would also provide accommodation support; and
- (d) the suggestion to incorporate recycling facility was noted. With the concept of 'Single Site, Multiple Uses' advocated in the planning and design of infrastructure facilities in the Technopole, CEDD could proactively liaise with relevant bureaux/departments on any possible options to incorporate the suggested recycling facility which could be accommodated underground or in the form of semi-sunken design such that the aboveground space could be developed for other uses to optimise land utilization.

Transport Connection

86. Some Members had the following views and questions:

- (a) whether the proposed transport infrastructure could facilitate the external connection of the Technopole with the Shenzhen I&T zone and wider areas;
- (b) whether there were measures to facilitate cross-boundary travel at various control points near the Technopole;
- (c) the rationale for the s-shaped alignment of the proposed NOL Spur Line as shown on the RODP and the location of the proposed station near Chau

Tau which was not at the central part of the Technopole; and

- (d) noting the large area (about 627 ha) of the Technopole with a planned population of about 165,000, whether it was necessary to provide an internal mass transit system to supplement the pedestrian and cycling network.

87. In response, Mr Vic C.H. Yau, Director/NMCO, DevB, and Mr Gavin C.P. Wong, CE/N4, CEDD, made the following main points:

- (a) in terms of external connection, the Technopole would be connected with other parts of Hong Kong and Shenzhen with a comprehensive railway network (including the existing Lok Ma Chau (LMC) Spur Line with LMC Station, the planned NOL Main Line with San Tin Station, and the proposed NOL Spur Line to Huanggang with stations near Chau Tau and at the Hong Kong-Shenzhen Innovation and Technology Park) and major road connections (including San Tin Highway and Fanling Highway in the east-west direction, San Sham Road to Huanggang Port in the north and future Northern Metropolis Highway connection in the southeast);
- (b) the existing cross-boundary facility at the Futian Control Point / LMC Spur Line Control Point provided convenient connection with Shenzhen for the Technopole, and co-location arrangement of immigration and custom control would be implemented at the new Huanggang Port to facilitate cross-boundary travel. The Government was also considering an additional cross-boundary facility at the Loop to facilitate cross-boundary movements;
- (c) the alignment, location of station and feasibility of implementing the proposed NOL Spur Line were subject to study by the Highways Department (HyD). While detailed information on the proposed NOL Spur Line was not available at the current stage, the proposed NOL Spur Line might be put underground according to HyD's preliminary advice; and

- (d) there would also be a comprehensive network of cycle track and pedestrian walkway system connecting various development sites, public spaces and activity nodes of the Technopole. Besides, major residential clusters of STTC would be located near the planned railway stations in San Tin and near Chau Tau. These railway stations would be within walking distance of the residential clusters. Future residents could make use of the mass transit system for commuting. In addition, talent accommodation units were proposed in the I&T Park to minimise travelling of employees of the enterprises.

I&T Park

88. Some Members had the following views and questions :

- (a) the demand for I&T land should be policy-driven and the planning process for which should not be supply-led. Noting that the consultancy study on the development plan of the Technopole (ITIB's Study) to be conducted by the Innovation, Technology and Industry Bureau (ITIB) had not yet commenced, what the justifications were for reserving a large area of land (about 300 ha) for the I&T Park comparable to that of the I&T zone in Shenzhen;
- (b) at present, there was a lack of manufacturing industry in Hong Kong. The I&T Park could provide land for downstream industrial production to support the I&T enterprises and optimise land utilization within the Park. The presence of an industrial base would be essential to the success of the I&T Park;
- (c) whether supporting infrastructure such as road network would be in place before the enterprises commenced operation in the I&T Park. In addition to availability of land and infrastructure, whether there were incentives to attract the enterprises to invest at the I&T Park;

- (d) whether the proposed plot ratio (PR) of 6 was appropriate for the I&T Park, noting that the proposed PR was much higher than that of the Science Park and similar developments overseas where I&T developments were often of low-rise character;
- (e) whether there would be connection between the I&T Park and local universities with a view to creating synergy. Considerations should be given to promote commercialization so as to provide opportunities for the universities to apply their research findings;
- (f) whether the I&T Park and the I&T zone in Shenzhen were competing or creating synergy with each other. Noting that the Technopole would contribute to the development of the South-North dual engine in Hong Kong(finance – I&T), it was necessary to clearly define the role of the Technopole as a hub for I&T development to avoid confusion. The role of the Technopole should also be differentiated from the existing local I&T developments such as Science Park and Cyberport to avoid potential competition;
- (g) whether the target potential enterprises at the I&T Park would be homegrown or international;
- (h) whether the proposed talent accommodation at the I&T Park would be provided by the Government or by the relevant enterprises; and
- (i) the theme of the I&T Park should be clearly defined to achieve the vision of the Technopole, which could be realised through land disposal. Noting that the land disposal methods other than open tendering would be considered taking into account the industry-specific policy of ITIB, whether there was information on land disposal methods.

89. In response, Mr Vic C.H. Yau, Director/NMCO, DevB, made the following main points:

- (a) the ITIB had been consulted during the planning of the I&T Park. In view of the current shortage of land for I&T development, particularly space for downstream stages of I&T value chain such as testing and production activities, ITIB advised that the proposed 300 ha was reasonable. The area of the I&T zone in Shenzhen as a neighbouring city where the I&T industry had seen good development served as a reference. ITIB's Study would identify the specific I&T uses to be accommodated within the I&T park. While ITIB's Study would soon commence, it was necessary to kick-start the planning process in parallel to ensure timely supply of land for I&T developments, taking into account that the time required for other procedures in the development process, such as statutory environmental impact assessment (EIA) procedures, funding approval from the Finance Committee of Legislative Council, and design and construction, would be substantial;
- (b) the proposed I&T Park was designed to provide flexibility in land allocation for I&T developments of different scale and fields (e.g. research, education and advanced manufacturing), as well as different stages of the I&T value chain (e.g. research and development and test production). It was intended that a wider range of permitted uses which were compatible with I&T uses could be allowed under the relevant zonings to allow land use flexibility;
- (c) it was agreed that provision of infrastructure was essential to developments. Accordingly, the essential infrastructure such as roads would be in place in a timely manner to support the I&T Park. Although the planning and construction of railway facilities would involve a longer timeframe, the NOL Main Line, with San Tin Station connecting to Kwu Tung Station, would commence operation in 2034, and that was around the time the bulk population intake started;
- (d) the proposed PR of 6 was the upper limit for developments within the I&T Park and development intensity for individual land parcel might be varied and was subject to further study. One of the principles was that the land

parcels adjoining the existing villages and the proposed Sam Po Shue Wetland Conservation Park (WCP) would have lower development intensity for better integration with the surroundings;

- (e) there could be education facilities within the proposed I&T Park. It could be further explored in ITIB's Study to consider whether there could be scope for cooperation between I&T enterprises and universities/ educational institutions. It was one of the visions of the NM to provide land for development of tertiary education facilities, which could create synergy with the I&T Park;
- (f) the I&T Park and the I&T zone in Shenzhen could create synergy for development of a collaborative innovation system of the I&T industry. Developments within the I&T Park would be of a larger scale and in different nature from those in the Science Park or other local I&T developments. The role of the Technopole in I&T development of Hong Kong and its complementarity with the existing local I&T developments could be dealt with under ITIB's Study;
- (g) ITIB's study would also address the target potential enterprises or industries for the I&T Park;
- (h) the nature of the talent accommodation in the I&T Park was akin to staff quarters; and
- (i) the land disposal methods for the Technopole would be subject to the recommendations of ITIB's Study. As an alternative to open tendering, restricted tendering for enterprises with relevant experience in specific I&T uses, or direct land grant to selected enterprises might also be considered.

Ecological Aspect

90. Some Members had the following views and questions:

- (a) whether there was information on wetland/fishponds affected by development of the Technopole including their locations, area, and whether there were compensation arrangements for the loss of wetland and fishponds;
- (b) whether there was information on the key conservation elements of the proposed Sam Po Shue WCP, and whether there were special features that needed to be conserved;
- (c) noting that wetland/fishponds (about 90 ha) within the Wetland Conservation Area (WCA) designated under the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 12C for ‘Application for Developments within Deep Bay Area under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’ would be affected by the Technopole development, the Government should demonstrate to the Board that there would be “no-net-loss in wetland” arising from the Technopole development. Although the planning of the Technopole would safeguard the flight path of migratory birds, it would destroy some habitats of migratory birds. Information should be provided to justify the need for affecting a large area within WCA;
- (d) noting that the relevant EIA process had already gone halfway, whether the project area shown in the EIA Project Profile submitted to the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) had included the wetland/fishponds to be affected by the development of Technopole, and whether it was necessary to adjust the assessment period and sampling method to cater for the latest increase in project area and the study area (i.e. the area within 500m from the project boundary); and
- (e) as part of the public engagement exercise, the Government should provide more information on the proposed Sam Po Shue WCP such as its indicative boundary and proposed measures to follow the ‘no-net-loss in wetland’ principle.

91. In response, Mr Vic C.H. Yau, Director/NMCO, DevB, and Mr Gavin C.P. Wong, CE/N4, CEDD, made the following main points:

- (a) about 90 ha of fishponds would be affected by the development of the Technopole and they were mainly located at the northern part of the Technopole near Sam Po Shue and LMC Control Point. According to the Government's New Proactive Conservation Policy, private wetlands and fishponds with ecological value would be resumed and developed into a WCP System. The Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) was conducting a strategic feasibility study to determine the exact locations, areas, management model and key conservation elements of the various parks proposed to be established under the WCP System, e.g. the proposed Sam Po Shue WCP, extension of the Hong Kong Wetland Park, etc. Subject to the findings of AFCD's study, some abandoned fishponds near Sam Po Shue might be rehabilitated for inclusion into the WCP System. It was envisaged that AFCD would announce details on the proposed WCPs around late 2023; and
- (b) the formulation of the proposed boundary of the I&T Park had taken into account the flight path of migratory birds as well as topography of the surroundings with hilly areas to the east and south. An EIA was being conducted for the development of the Technopole and the EIA report would be submitted to EPD in due course. According to statutory procedures under the EIA Ordinance, the EIA report would be arranged for public inspection as part of the process.

92. Mr Terence S.W. Tsang, Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment), EPD, said that the proposed project area of the Technopole had been increased from about 350 ha to 610 ha. According to the EIA study brief, the assessment area for ecological impact should cover an area within 500m from the project boundary. Hence, with the increase in the project area, the assessment area would be expanded accordingly in order to fulfill the requirements of the Study Brief. In addition, despite the increase in project area of the Technopole, all the potential environmental issues to be assessed in the EIA study had already been covered in the current Study Brief, whereas the study approach and details of the methodology such as

sampling, duration and frequency of the survey, still remained valid. It was noted that CEDD and AFCDD were working closely during the EIA process on measures to compensate wetland/fishponds affected by the Technopole development. In considering ecological compensation under the EIAO, one should not only focus on the area of wetland/fishponds but also on their ecological functions. The Government would take a proactive role in the strategic planning of the proposed Sam Po Shue WCP with a view to enhancing the overall ecological functions of the wetland/fishponds in the area.

Cultural Aspect

93. Noting that there would be a landmark Cultural and Recreational Complex with major performance venues, museum, library, swimming pool complex, and flexible public event spaces in the central part of San Tin Town Centre, a Member enquired about the nature and scale of those facilities. Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang, DD/T, PlanD, responded that the proposed Cultural and Recreational Complex (about 15 ha) would provide various cultural facilities to create a cultural hub. The planned uses included a museum (about 4 ha), a performance venue (about 5 ha), an outdoor performance area (about 3 ha), a major library and a swimming pool complex. According to LCSD's advice, the proposed cultural facilities in the NM would sustain Hong Kong's role as an East-meets-West centre for international cultural exchange.

94. In view of a large number of existing/planned cultural facilities in West Kowloon and East Kowloon, the same Member doubted the need for large-scale cultural facilities in the Technopole, and enquired whether the proposed landmark Cultural and Recreational Complex would be sustainable. Otherwise, resources should be allocated to other more suitable uses. In addition, it would be necessary to define the position and relative importance of the cultural, recreational and sports elements in the planning process. The Government should not focus solely on physical entities such as performance and sports facilities but also on the cultural spirit representing the area.

95. A Member opined that I&T and cultural uses were not incompatible. Consideration might be given to developing cultural facilities to complement the unique local characteristics, e.g. ecological aspect. From the regional planning perspective, the proposed cultural facilities should not only cater for the needs of the planned population (about 165,000)

in the Technopole but those in the NM as a whole. Mr Vic C.H. Yau, Director/NMCO, DevB, supplemented that according to the Culture, Sports and Tourism Bureau (CSTB)'s advice, cultural facilities should be provided in the NM to enrich the metropolitan life and to complement the residential and industrial developments. The Study team would follow up with CSTB regarding the positioning and target group of individual facility.

Others

96. Some Members had the following questions and comments:

- (a) whether there was information on the proposed urban farm shown on the RODP;
- (b) the provision of medical facilities should be district-based to avoid over-dependence on the Northern Hospital and problems associated with transport connection; and
- (c) planning of GIC facilities should be based on the age profile of the future population in the Technopole.

97. In response, Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang, DD/T, PlanD, said that the proposed urban farm was AFCD's new initiative to set up high-tech green houses and related facilities to increase agricultural production, assist agricultural development and promote greening. The proposed urban farm in an open environment in the Technopole was a pilot scheme. AFCD would also explore incorporation of urban farms on rooftop or podium of buildings.

98. A Member opined that the development of Technopole should be articulated from a regional planning perspective. Given its strategic location in the NM being in the "Hong Kong-Shenzhen Close Interaction Circle" of the "Twin Cities, Three Circles" under the Northern Metropolis Development Strategy, the planning of the Technopole should not be defined or justified solely from the perspective of demand and supply of I&T land. The role of the Technopole could be defined taking into account the role of Hong Kong as an international I&T hub and the need for cooperation among I&T developments in Technopole and Shenzhen. Besides, from regional planning perspective, the wetlands/fishponds affected by the Technopole, for instance, could be compensated in other parts of the NM. The Study

Team should introduce such concept clearly during the public engagement process.

99. Mr Andrew C.W. Lai, Director of Lands, said that the subject briefing was to seek Members' views on the broad development framework for the Technopole. The ITIB had been consulted on the planning of the Technopole. Detailed assessments on the demand for I&T land and specific cultural facilities would be conducted by relevant policy bureaux and departments prior to consideration of the rezoning proposals by the Town Planning Board (the Board). He added that the ITIB announced in December 2022 the 'Hong Kong I&T Development Blueprint' which set out medium-term and long-term targets for development in different I&T fields, e.g. artificial intelligence and life technology. At present, Hong Kong's gross domestic expenditure on research and development was less than 1% of gross domestic product. The ITIB had already formulated various policies to attract I&T enterprises from the Mainland and overseas to Hong Kong. Hence, much more I&T land would need to be provided for meeting the upcoming demand.

Conclusion

100. The Chairperson said that details of various facilities to be provided within the Cultural and Recreational Complex would be subject to further study by CSTB which would consider how best such facilities should be positioned and planned to strengthen cooperation and create synergy with other cities of the Greater Bay Area. Regarding the I&T Park, the ITIB would soon commence their study and details on the specific I&T uses would be available around late 2023 tentatively. The subject briefing was an integral part of the public engagement exercise to gauge views from Members. Following that, the land use proposals would be refined and translated into the statutory plan for submission to the Board for consideration in early 2024. Timing wise, it was necessary to start the preparatory work including public engagement and EIA to facilitate subsequent amendments to plan and land resumption in order to provide land for I&T development in a timely manner. Site formation works in the Technopole were expected to commence in late 2024 with formed sites coming on stream in 2026 the earliest.

101. The Chairperson concluded the discussion. The Board noted the land use proposal of the Technopole.

102. The Chairperson thanked the Study team for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung left the meeting during the discussion session.]

Procedural Matters

Agenda Item 7

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

103. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 5:50 p.m.