

**Minutes of 1333<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 14.3.2025**

**Present**

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

Chairperson

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Vice-chairperson

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Dr C.M. Cheng

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong  
Transport Department  
Mr Horace W. Hong

Chief Engineer (Works)  
Home Affairs Department  
Mr Bond C.P. Chow

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr Gary C.W. Tam

Director of Lands  
Mr Maurice K.W. Loo

Director of Planning  
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Deputy Director of Planning/District  
Ms Donna Y.P. Tam

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Professor B.S. Tang

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Simon Y.S. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board  
Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr Jeff K.C. Ho

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee

## **Hong Kong District**

### **Agenda Item 1**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Further Representations on Proposed Amendment to the Draft Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/22 Arising from the Consideration of Representations on the Draft Outline Zoning Plan

(TPB Paper No. 10999)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The Chairperson said that the meeting would consider the further representations (FRs) on the Proposed Amendment to the draft Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H10/22 (the draft OZP) arising from the consideration of representations on the draft OZP by the Town Planning Board (the Board/TPB) on 1, 4 and 5.11.2024 and to decide whether to uphold the Board's decision on 29.11.2024 of rezoning the site between Pok Fu Lam Road and Victoria Road (the Site) for the proposed Global Innovation Centre (the Centre) by the University of Hong Kong (HKU) from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Global Innovation Centre" ("OU(Global Innovation Centre)") to "Undetermined" ("U").

2. The Secretary reported that after the issuance of TPB Paper No. 10999 (the Paper) on 7.3.2025, the Secretariat of the Board received four emails from three further representers, with one submitted by F1836 on 10.3.2025, two by F1841 on 12.3.2025 and one by F1835 on 13.3.2025. As the submissions were made outside the statutory period for FR, they should be treated as not having been made under section 6D(3) of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). They were also made outside the time allowed for submission of further responses to the departmental comments on the FRs. In any case, the similar concerns raised on the legal basis for rezoning the Site to "U" and partially meeting the representations, issues related to the Site/development proposal, the procedural matters, and the government responses were covered in the Paper. Regarding the allegation on the coverage, adequacy and accuracy of the Paper and its Annex VIII in reflecting the FRs, it should be noted that those documents were intended to provide a summary of the main points contained in the FRs to facilitate Members' discussion, and a full set of the FRs including their further views/responses were sent to Members and uploaded to TPB's website. Members noted the above.

[Mr Ryan M.K. Ip joined the meeting at this point.]

3. The Secretary continued to report that the relevant amendment incorporated in the draft OZP published on 22.3.2024 involved the rezoning of the Site from “Green Belt” (“GB”), “Residential (Group C) 6” (“R(C)6”) and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “OU(Global Innovation Centre)” to facilitate the development of the Centre by HKU for deep technology research. After hearing of the representations by the Board on 1, 4 and 5.11.2024, the Board decided on 29.11.2024 to partially meet some of the representations by rezoning the Site to “U” (i.e. the Proposed Amendment to the draft OZP). The Proposed Amendment to the draft OZP was exhibited on 13.12.2024. As representations and FRs had been submitted by HKU (R1 and F1), Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden (R265), The Conservancy Association (CA) (R3637) and MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) (R3662), the following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |                                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|----------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mr Stephen L.H. Liu<br>( <i>Vice-chairperson</i> ) | - co-owning with spouse properties in Pok Fu Lam;                                                                                                                                |
| Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong                                 | - being an independent non-executive director of MTRCL;                                                                                                                          |
| Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong                       | - having close relative living in Pok Fu Lam;                                                                                                                                    |
| Professor Roger C.K. Chan                          | - being an Honorary Associate Professor of Department of Urban Planning and Design of HKU;                                                                                       |
| Dr Venus Y.H. Lun                                  | - being a special project director of a research and development centre which was hosted by HKU and other two universities, and an external examiner of one of HKU’s programmes; |

- |                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mr Ben S.S. Lui                | - co-owning with spouse a property in Pok Fu Lam, his spouse owning a car parking space in Pok Fu Lam, and he and his spouse being directors of a company owning properties and car parking spaces in Pok Fu Lam; |
| Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui | - being an Adjunct Professor of Department of Social Work and Social Administration of HKU, and having close relative living in Pok Fu Lam;                                                                       |
| Dr Tony C.M. Ip                | - being an Adjunct Associate Professor of School of Biological Sciences of HKU, and having current business dealings with CA;                                                                                     |
| Mr Ryan M.K. Ip                | - being the vice-president cum co-head of Public Policy Institute of Our Hong Kong Foundation which had received donations from Kadoorie family and being acquainted with some representers;                      |
| Professor B.S. Tang            | - being an Honorary Professor of Department of Urban Planning and Design and Department of Real Estate and Construction of HKU;                                                                                   |
| Professor Simon K.L. Wong      | - his spouse being a programme director of Master in Statistics of HKU;                                                                                                                                           |
| Mr Simon Y.S. Wong             | - being a close relative of some representers and a further representer; and                                                                                                                                      |
| Mr Derrick S.M. Yip            | - having current business dealings with HKU, and being a member of the Advisory Board of the                                                                                                                      |

Gleneagles Hospital which was partnering with HKU to provide medical services.

4. Members noted that Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong, Dr Venus Y.H. Lun, Dr Tony C.M. Ip, Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui, Professor B.S. Tang, Professor Simon K.L. Wong, Messrs Simon Y.S. Wong and Derrick S.M. Yip would not attend/had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. Members agreed that as the interest of Professor Roger C.K. Chan was indirect, Mr Ryan M.K. Ip had no involvement in the project(s) under the sponsorship of Kadoorie family in relation to the Site and the submission of the relevant representation(s), and the residence of Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong's relative and the properties owned/co-owned by Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, and Mr Ben S.S. Lui, his spouse and his company had no direct view of the Site, they could stay in the meeting.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

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

Ms Janet K.K. Cheung	- District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK)
Ms Erica S.M. Wong	- Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong
Mr Ronald C.H. Chan	- Town Planner/Hong Kong (TP/HK)

6. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the arrangement of the meeting. There would be no hearing for the FRs. The Board would consider the FRs received, which were in form of written submissions, at the meeting. The representatives of PlanD would first be invited to brief Members on the background of the FRs and relevant departmental responses. A question and answer (Q&A) session would be held after PlanD's presentation and Members could raise their questions to PlanD's representatives. After the Q&A session, PlanD's representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. The Board would then deliberate on the FRs in closed meeting, and inform the further representers of the Board's decision in due course.

7. The Chairperson then invited the representatives of PlanD to brief Members on the FRs.

8. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ronald C.H. Chan, TP/HK, PlanD briefed Members on the FRs, including the background of the Proposed Amendment to the draft OZP, grounds/views/proposals of the further representers together with their further responses to departmental comments, government responses, planning assessments and PlanD's views as detailed in the Paper.

9. As the presentation of PlanD's representative had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

#### *Progress of the Project*

10. Noting HKU had mentioned in the representation hearing in November 2024 that they would take about one year to review and submit the revised development proposal for the Centre to the Board for consideration, two Members enquired about the progress of the project and what HKU had accomplished in the past 3 months. In response, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, DPO/HK, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) HKU issued a press release in October 2024 to inform the public that it would take some time to strategically amend the development proposal for the Centre to address stakeholders' concerns reflected in the representations to the Board as much as practicable, and to step up engagement with the community through various channels to improve the development proposal and provide timely project updates in the upcoming process;
- (b) at the representation hearing in November 2024, HKU committed to critically reviewing the suitability of the Site and other possible sites within and outside Pok Fu Lam area for the development of the Centre. If HKU concluded that the Centre should remain in Pok Fu Lam after the review, it would strategically review and amend its development proposal including reducing the density and bulk of the proposed development, increasing the setback area from



neighbouring buildings, designating more green spaces, etc., and conduct relevant technical assessments. HKU would further engage the local stakeholders before submitting the revised development proposal to the Government and the Board for consideration. Should the revised development proposal be considered acceptable, another round of statutory planning procedures would be required to rezone the Site to an appropriate zoning with specified development parameters to guide and facilitate the development of the Centre. According to the available information, HKU was currently in the course of reviewing site selection as well as scrutinising the suggestions and proposals received from relevant stakeholders, including nearby residents, to revise the development proposal. Also, it had already met representatives of the residents' concern group and the Ebenezer School and Home for the Visually Impaired (the Ebenezer);

- (c) HKU also announced the latest progress of the project on its dedicated website on 10.3.2025, stating that "In light of the Town Planning Board's discussion and community feedback, the project team is currently exploring different suggestions and proposals received from the Board Members and the public to revise the development plan, and conversations have already begun with community stakeholders. The project team will provide more updates in due course"; and
- (d) PlanD had been closely liaising with HKU on the project updates.

11. The same Members pointed out that the project review was proceeding slowly, and HKU had not achieved much progress in the past 3 months. The information available on HKU's website was scant, and it was doubtful whether HKU had enhanced its engagement efforts and gained a thorough understanding of stakeholders' concerns. They raised concern that on one hand, HKU could hardly submit the revised development proposal for the Centre to the Board for consideration within the one-year timeframe mentioned in the representation hearing, whilst on the other hand, the absence of a deadline for HKU to submit the revised proposal would adversely affect the long-term planning of the Site and the advancement of innovation and technology. In response, the Chairperson supplemented that as far as she understood, HKU had stepped up engagement with the community by initiating dialogues with

the stakeholders/residents and the Ebenezer in January and February 2025 respectively. As mentioned by DPO/HK, PlanD, HKU was in the process of reviewing the suitability of the Site and other possible sites within and outside Pok Fu Lam area, as well as exploring various suggestions and proposals received from the Members and the public to revise the development proposal. The Development Bureau/PlanD had been liaising with HKU and monitoring the project updates. Members' concern regarding the slow progress of the project review was noted and would be conveyed to HKU, and consideration could be given to reflecting this in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP to impress upon HKU to come up with a clear way forward for the Centre as soon as practicable.

#### *Designation of the "U" Zoning*

12. Noting the covering Notes of the OZP for the "U" zone stipulated that all uses or developments (except some public works to be implemented or co-ordinated by the Government) required planning permission from the Board and some further representers' concern that the development of the Centre could be pursued through a section 16 (s.16) application rather than going through OZP amendment under section 5 of the Ordinance, some Members enquired whether the development of the Centre could proceed through s.16 application, thereby bypassing another round of statutory planning procedures for proposed amendments to the OZP as committed by HKU in the representation hearing.

13. In response, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, DPO/HK, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, made the following main points:

- (a) the "U" zone was intended to allow HKU to review and adjust its original plan in response to stakeholders' views. The long-term use and development parameters of the Site would be determined after HKU submitted a revised development proposal, which would undergo government departments' examination and public consultation, and would be subject to another round of statutory planning procedures for proposed amendments to the OZP as committed in the representation hearing. As the previous development parameters were subject to change pending HKU's review, an interim zoning arrangement as a stop-gap measure to allow flexibility to take on board the

outcome of the review was considered appropriate. The above intention and arrangement had already been reflected in the ES of the OZP for the “U” zone;

- (b) to ensure adequate planning control during the interim period, according to the covering Notes of the draft OZP, all uses or developments within the “U” zone required planning permission from the Board, except for some public works to be implemented or co-ordinated by the Government; and
- (c) although any uses or developments within the “U” zone could go through a s.16 application under the provisions of the OZP, HKU would adhere to its commitment made in the representation hearing that the revised development proposal for the Centre would be subject to another round of statutory planning procedures for proposed amendments to the OZP.

14. In response to a Member’s follow-up question on how to interpret the statutory provision in the covering Notes of the OZP and the non-statutory requirements in the ES of the OZP when considering the development of the Centre in the “U” zone, Mr Ivan M.K. Chung, Director of Planning (D of Plan), made the following main points:

- (a) according to the Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans as promulgated by the Board, the clause stating that “all uses or developments except some public works to be implemented or co-ordinated by the Government require planning permission from the Board” was a standard provision currently adopted in the covering Notes of OZPs for the “U” zone. Indeed, it was not uncommon for the Board to adopt a “U” zone as an interim zoning, particularly when the planning intention for a site was uncertain or while awaiting completion of a study or infrastructure facilities. To ensure adequate planning control during the interim period, all uses or developments, except those public works to be implemented or co-ordinated by the Government, needed to go through s.16 application which would be subject to the scrutiny of the Board;
- (b) notwithstanding that the ES did not form part of the statutory plan, when the Board considered a proposed use or development in the “U” zone under a s.16

application, the Board would take into account the background and intention of the “U” zone specified in the ES in a comprehensive manner. Besides, if a proposed use or development in the “U” zone was excessive in scale and not in line with the intention of the “U” zone, it might necessitate a section 12A (s.12A) application for rezoning the site to an appropriate zoning; and

- (c) as mentioned by DPO/HK, PlanD, HKU committed in the representation hearing that the revised development proposal of the Centre would be subject to another round of statutory planning procedures for proposed amendments to the OZP. Any proposed development of the Site would be effected through rezoning in accordance with section 5 of the Ordinance whereby the public would have the opportunity to submit representations and to attend the representation hearing.

15. As a related issue, the Vice-chairperson enquired whether there was any difference in the public consultation procedures for s.16 and s.12A applications. In response, Mr Ivan M.K. Chung, D of Plan, explained that s.16 applications would be published for 3 weeks for public comment under the Ordinance. While such public consultation procedures for s.12A applications had been dispensed with under the Ordinance as amended in 2023, if a s.12A application was agreed by the Board, the proposal would eventually be incorporated into the relevant statutory plan in the form of proposed zoning amendment for the Board’s consideration under the plan-making process. Subject to the Board’s agreement, the draft plan incorporating the zoning amendment would then be exhibited under section 5 of the Ordinance for public inspection for 2 months and the public could make representations in respect of the draft plan and attend the representation hearing to express their views to the Board directly.

#### *Traffic and Transport*

16. Noting some representers’ comments regarding the rejection of the Ebenezer redevelopment proposal by the Board due to the Pok Fu Lam Moratorium (PFLM), and the perceived inconsistency in agreeing to development proposal for the Centre while rejecting Ebenezer’s redevelopment application, a Member enquired about the background of the Ebenezer application and whether there was inconsistency in considering both proposals from traffic perspective.

17. In response, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, DPO/HK, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, explained that the site where the Ebenezer situated had been rezoned from “Government, Institution or Community” to “Residential (Group C) 7” (“R(C)7”) with a building height restriction (BHR) of 151mPD to take forward a partially agreed s.12A application for a proposed residential development (Application No. Y/H10/14). During the consideration of the s.12A application, the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Board agreed to impose a requirement for the applicant to submit a layout plan through a subsequent s.16 application to address departmental concerns. Subsequently, a s.16 application for submission of layout plan and proposed minor relaxation of BHR for the permitted ‘flat’ use in the “R(C)7” zone (Application No. A/H10/97) was submitted, whereby the applicant proposed to relocate and replace the current in-lane bus stop on Pok Fu Lam Road by a bus layby to facilitate the provision of a new ingress/egress for the proposed residential development. The Commissioner for Transport commented that, inter alia, the proposed bus layby was not up to standard and could not address the traffic issues on Pok Fu Lam Road, and hence she did not support the application from traffic engineering perspective. The s.16 application was rejected by MPC at its meeting in August 2024 and the rejection reasons were that (a) the applicant failed to demonstrate that the proposed development as shown on the layout plan would have no adverse traffic impact on Pok Fu Lam Road; and (b) the applicant failed to demonstrate that there were sufficient planning and design merits to justify the proposed minor relaxation of BHR.

18. The Chairperson supplemented that although one of the rejection reasons for the Ebenezer’s s.16 application was on the traffic ground, it was not related to the issue of PFLM.

#### *Procedural Matters*

19. Noting some further representers’ comment that the Chinese translation of the meeting minutes was published only a few days before the submission deadline for FR, putting those who were not proficient in English at a disadvantage, a Member asked about PlanD’s responses to such comments and whether it was a general practice that the Chinese translation of the meeting minutes was only available at a later time.

20. In response, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, DPO/HK, PlanD said that she understood that the English version of the minutes for the three representation hearing sessions held on 1, 4 and 5.11.2024, and the deliberation on 29.11.2024 were confirmed and made available on TPB's website on 29.11.2024 and 13.12.2024 respectively. The audio recordings were also uploaded to TPB's website on the same day. A press release summarising the Board's consideration and decision was issued in both English and Chinese by the Board on 29.11.2024. As per the established practice, members of the public could contact the Secretariat of the Board for enquiries regarding minutes of meetings. The Chinese version of the meeting minutes were also uploaded to TPB's website once available.

21. The Chairperson supplemented that it was the current practice for the English version of the meeting minutes to be prepared first, followed by the Chinese translation, which would take some time due to the translation process. The Secretariat of the Board would explore whether there was room for expediting the Chinese translation of the meeting minutes and uploading the Chinese version to TPB's website as soon as practicable.

22. As a related issue, another Member suggested drafting the meeting minutes in Chinese in the first instance since the presentation and discussion in the meetings were mainly conducted in Cantonese. The Chairperson remarked that the Member's suggestion could be further examined, and indeed, the Secretariat of the Board had been exploring the application of artificial intelligence technology in preparing the meeting minutes to streamline the process.

#### *Development Cost and Financial Viability*

23. Noting some further representers' comment that HKU did not provide the development cost and the financial viability of the project was doubtful, while the Government merely responded that financial viability was not a planning consideration of the Board, a Member said that more elaboration on the Government's responses to the further representers' views in respect of development cost and financial viability might be required, and the wording of the Government's responses might need to be fine-tuned as "financial viability was not a primary planning consideration of the Board".

24. In response, the Secretary explained that as mentioned in the Paper, there had been discussions on the development cost and financial viability in the deliberation session of the

representation hearing. HKU's and the Government's detailed responses to those issues had also been set out in TPB Paper No. 10987 and recorded in the minutes of the representation hearing. Besides, the summary of the major grounds/views/proposals in the FRs and the Government's responses (the Summary) was also presented in the Paper. Letters attaching the Summary had been issued to the further representers for their further responses, if any, on 14.2.2025. The purpose of the current meeting was to consider the FRs and to decide whether to uphold the Board's previous decision to rezone the Site to "U". The Member's concern on the development cost and financial viability of the project could be conveyed to HKU for follow-up where appropriate.

#### *Public Consultation*

25. A Member noted that a further representer (the Ebenezer) had requested meeting with the HKU project team several times and was eventually able to meet them in February 2025. Nevertheless, the meeting lasted for only about one hour and many issues had not been discussed. The HKU staff who attended the meeting gave the Ebenezer an impression that HKU was indifferent to their concerns, and that the consultation was not sincere. In response, the Chairperson said that the Member's concern regarding the consultation process would be conveyed to the management level of HKU for follow-up as appropriate.

#### *Others*

26. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether HKU had any plan to locate the Centre in the Northern Metropolis (NM) University Town; and
- (b) if HKU ultimately decided to use only part of the "U" zone for the development of the Centre, how the remaining portion of the "U" zone would be used.

27. In response, Ms Janet K.K. Cheung, DPO/HK, PlanD said that according to her understanding, HKU had not expressed any plan to locate the Centre in the NM University Town. Besides, subject to receiving the revised development proposal from HKU, PlanD would propose appropriate amendment(s) to the "U" zone. As previously mentioned, the

rezoning would undergo another round of statutory planning procedures in accordance with the Ordinance.

28. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson said that the Q&A session for the meeting was completed. She thanked PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting. The Board would deliberate on the FRs in closed meeting and would inform the further representers of the Board's decision in due course. PlanD's representatives left the meeting at this point.

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

[Messrs Ryan M.K. Ip and Timothy K.W. Ma left the meeting during the break.]

#### Deliberation Session

29. The Secretary reported that Mr Timothy K.W. Ma had declared an interest that he had some recent contact with a further representer (i.e. the Ebenezer). Members noted that Mr Ma had left the meeting and would not participate in the deliberation.

30. The Chairperson invited views from Members. Members generally supported rezoning the Site from "OU(Global Innovation Centre)" to "U" and expressed the following views/observations/suggestions:

#### *Designation of the "U" Zoning*

- (a) it was prudent to maintain the "U" zoning for the Site at the current stage as this would allow time for HKU to review the development proposal for the Centre, conduct relevant technical assessments, further consult the local community and submit a revised proposal for consideration by the Government and the Board;
- (b) while noting that any proposed development at the Site would be effected through rezoning in accordance with section 5 of the Ordinance whereby the public would have the opportunity to submit representations and the Board would conduct hearings to deal with the representations before deciding



whether to accept the rezoning proposal, such intention and arrangement should be clearly disseminated to the public and explicitly reflected in the ES of the OZP;

- (c) the designation of the “U” zoning should not be interpreted as an indication that the Site had already been allocated to HKU for the development of the Centre;

#### *Progress of the Project*

- (d) it was disappointed that HKU proceeded with the project review at a slow pace, which would adversely affect the long-term planning and use of the Site. Apart from initiating conversations with some stakeholders, including the Ebenezer, it appeared that HKU had yet to make a decision on site selection and commence the revision of the development proposal. HKU should be urged to expedite the review process;
- (e) there was an urgent need to request HKU to come up with a clear way forward for the development of the Centre within a reasonable time. HKU should be invited to report to the Board on the latest development of the project, which should include a development timeline for the project as well as an update on engagement with stakeholders;
- (f) while it might be challenging for HKU to work out the revised development proposal for the Centre instantly, HKU should not remain stagnant and should provide a clear indication of its site selection as soon as practicable;

#### *Public Consultation*

- (g) the Board reaffirmed that constructive engagement with stakeholders was of utmost importance and expected HKU to enhance its engagement with the community;

*Procedural Matters*

- (h) most issues raised in the FRs, including the further responses to departmental comments by the further representers, were similar to those raised in the representations and were duly deliberated by the Board at the representation hearing. It was acknowledged during the representation hearing that most representers supported the development of the Centre by HKU to consolidate Hong Kong's leading position in deep technology research while their objections/concerns were mainly related to site selection, land use compatibility, development intensity, traffic and other technical impacts as well as the lack of proper consultation. During the deliberation session on 29.11.2024, Members generally supported the rezoning of the Site to "U" and considered that the interim "U" zoning was appropriate to allow time for HKU to review the development proposal of the Centre, conduct relevant technical assessments, further consult the local community and submit a revised proposal for consideration by the Government and the Board. The Board was fully entitled to propose an amendment to the OZP in a way it thought fit that would meet/partially meet the representations;
- (i) there were no procedural improprieties in handling the FRs, including following the administrative arrangements set out in the TPB Guidelines No. 29C;

*Traffic and Transport*

- (j) there was concern on the traffic impacts of the development of the Centre in the Pok Fu Lam area, particularly on Victoria Road and Pok Fu Lam Road as well as on local residents and the Ebenezer. HKU should duly address the potential traffic impacts brought by the proposed development during the construction and operational stages;
- (k) the assessment area of the traffic impact assessment should be expanded to cover a wider context and appropriate traffic improvement measures such as improvement to road junction(s), construction of new road, widening of

Victoria Road, etc. should be further explored in the traffic impact assessment;

*Others*

- (l) concerns on tree preservation/felling should be properly addressed by HKU; and
- (m) noting that the Cyberport had recently indicated interest in relocating some of its facilities to NM, HKU should consider the suitability of Cyberport's current location/premises for the Centre so as to create synergy effect with HKU's existing campuses.

31. The Vice-chairperson made the following main points:

- (a) most issues in the FRs were similar to those raised in the representations and were duly deliberated by the Board at the representation hearing;
- (b) concurring with Members' suggestion, HKU should be invited to report to the Board on the development timeline for the project. HKU should also inform the Board of its decision on site selection with detailed justifications; and
- (c) noting that the Government had announced the proposed MTR South Island Line (West) (SIL(W)) with key stops in the Pok Fu Lam area, the traffic condition in the Pok Fu Lam area would be further improved upon implementation of SIL(W).

32. The Chairperson further informed Members that as regards the procedural matters, in accordance with section 6B(8) of the Ordinance, the Board had the authority to amend the OZP in other manner that, in its opinion, would meet the representations. The legal advice obtained from government lawyers confirmed that it was legally proper for the Board to propose rezoning the Site to "U" to partially meet the representations.

33. The Chairperson concluded that Members agreed to uphold its previous decision of rezoning the Site from "OU(Global Innovation Centre)" to "U". The Chairperson suggested

and Members agreed on the following:

- (a) the ES of the OZP would be revised to better reflect the intention and arrangement of the “U” zone that any proposed development of the Site would be effected through proposed amendment to the OZP in accordance with section 5 of the Ordinance, and to impress upon HKU to come up with the way forward for the development of the Centre within a reasonable time and to duly address the potential traffic impacts during the construction and operational stages; and
- (b) HKU should be invited to report to the Board on the latest development of the project within 3 months, which should include its decision on site selection with detailed justifications, a development timeline for the project as well as an update on engagement with stakeholders.

34. After deliberation, the Board noted the supportive views of **F1 and F2**, and decided not to uphold F3 to F1861 and agreed that the draft Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan (the draft OZP) should be amended by the Proposed Amendment for the following reason:

“taking into account the University of Hong Kong’s announcement that it has decided to take some time to strategically review and amend the development plan of the Global Innovation Centre, including reducing the density of the proposed development and bulk of the building(s), increasing the setback area from the neighbouring buildings, designating more green spaces, etc. to address stakeholders’ opinions as much as practicable, and its indication that the project team will endeavour to step up engagement with the community through various channels so as to improve the development proposal and provide timely project updates in the upcoming process, the Site between Pok Fu Lam Road and Victoria Road is appropriate to be rezoned to “Undetermined” as an interim land use zoning to allow the University of Hong Kong to review its proposal and adjust it in response to stakeholders’ views. The long-term use and development parameters of the site would be determined after the University of Hong Kong’s submission of a revised proposal supported by relevant technical assessments, which would go through government departments’ examination and public consultation, and would be subject

to another round of statutory planning procedures for proposed amendments to the OZP.”

35. The Board agreed to revise paragraph 7.9.2 of the Explanatory Statement of the draft OZP as follows:

“7.9.2 Subsequently, in view of HKU’s decision to take some time to strategically amend the development plan of the Centre, e.g. reducing the density of the proposed development and bulk of the building(s), increasing the setback area from neighbouring buildings, designating more green spaces, etc., to address stakeholders’ opinions as much as practicable, and to step up engagement with the community through various channels so as to improve the development proposal, the land has been rezoned from “OU” annotated “Global Innovation Centre” to “U”. The “U” zone is intended to allow HKU to review its original plan, ~~and adjust it in response to stakeholders’ views.~~ ***conduct relevant technical assessments including, but not limited to, assessment on potential traffic impacts during construction and operational stages, further consult the local community and submit a revised proposal for consideration by the Government and the Board within a reasonable time.*** ~~As the~~The long-term use and development parameters of the site would be determined ~~after HKU’s submission of a revised proposal, which would go through public consultation and the Government’s examination, and would be subject to another round of statutory town planning procedures for proposed amendments to the OZP.~~ ~~As the development parameters are subject to changes pending~~ ***subject to*** HKU’s review, an interim zoning arrangement as a stop-gap measure to allow flexibility to take on board the outcome of the review is necessary. ***Any proposed development of the Centre at the site would be effected through rezoning in accordance with section 5 of the Ordinance whereby the public would have the opportunity to submit representations and the Board would conduct hearing to deal with the representations before deciding whether to accept the rezoning proposal.***”

36. The Board also agreed that the draft OZP as amended by the Proposed Amendment,

together with its Notes and Explanatory Statement incorporating the above amendment, was suitable for submission under section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

37. The Chairperson suggested and Members agreed that a press release to inform the public of the Board's decision and the major considerations and suggestions made by the Members would be issued after the meeting.

## **Agenda Item 2**

[Open Meeting]

### **Any Other Business**

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

38. This was the last Town Planning Board (the Board) meeting attended by Mr Ivan M.K. Chung, Director of Planning, before his retirement. The Chairperson, on behalf of all Members, expressed gratitude and extended a vote of thanks to Mr Chung for his invaluable contributions to the Board over the years.

39. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 11:20 a.m.