

DRAFT POK FU LAM OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/H10/18

INFORMATION NOTE AND HEARING ARRANGEMENT FOR CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS AND COMMENTS

1. Introduction

- 1.1 On 27.9.2019, the draft Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H10/18 (the Plan) was exhibited for public inspection under Section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The amendments mainly involve rezoning of a site adjacent to the Cyberport Arcade from area mainly shown as “Road” with minor portions zoned as “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Cyber-Port” (“OU(Cyber-Port)”) to “OU(Cyber-Port)(1)” to facilitate the Cyberport expansion (**Item A1**); the rezoning of an area currently occupied by the Cyberport Waterfront Park from “OU(Cyber-Port)” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “Open Space” (“O”) (**Item A2**); and deletion of the obsolete alignment of the proposed Route 7 (currently known as Route 4) with the associated adjustments to the planning scheme boundary and zoning amendments (**Items B1 and B2, C1 to C5, D and E**). Amendments were also made to the Notes and Explanatory Statement of the OZP to reflect the above and to update the general information of various land use zonings and the planning area, where appropriate. The Schedule of Amendments setting out the amendments incorporated into the OZP is at **Annex I** and the location of the amendment items is shown on **Plan P-1**.
- 1.2 During the two-month exhibition period, a total of 780 representations were received. On 17.1.2020, the representations were published for public comment and, in the first three weeks of the publication period, a total of 32 comments were received. All of the representations and comments are in line with the revised requirements as set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 29B (TPB PG-No. 29B)¹. The list of representers and commenters, and the summaries of representations and comments are shown in **Annexes II, III, IV and V** respectively for Members’ reference. The locations of the representation sites are shown on **Plan P-2**.

2. The Representations and Comments

- 2.1 There are a total of 780 representations, including 101 supportive representations (**R1 to R101**), 677 adverse representations (**R102 to R104, R107 to R780**) with 672 representations also providing supporting views on selected amendment items

¹ According to TPB PG-No. 29B on Submission and Publication of Representations, Comments on Representations and Further Representations under the Town Planning Ordinance, which have taken effect since 1.1.2019, representers/commenters/further representers and their authorized agents are required to provide their full name as shown on the HKID card/passport and their HKID card/passport number (only the first four alphanumeric characters are required) in the submission. For submission with no full name, incomplete and/or illegible names or no HKID card/passport number, the representation/comment/further representation concerned may be treated as not having been made.

and two representations (**R105 and R106**) providing views. The views of the representations are briefly summarised as follows:

Supportive Representations

- (a) Among the 101 supportive representations, five representations (**R1 to R5**) submitted by individuals support all amendment items, 95 representations (**R6 to R100**) submitted by 37 companies/organisations including Hong Kong Cyberport Management Company Limited (HKCMCL) and 58 individuals support Item A1 and/or Item A2, and one representation submitted by an individual (**R101**) supports the rezoning principle of Item C1 and provides adverse view on Item A1.
- (b) The main grounds of representations supporting Items A1 and A2 are that existing space in Cyberport has already been utilised; expansion of Cyberport can provide and allocate more land resources to meet the high demand for space and resources required for the growth of Information Technology sector; it can enhance the provision of necessary space and facilities for office, co-working space, incubates and starts-up in the IT sector; and the upgrading of the temporary waterfront park is supported. **R101** provides view that there are deficiencies in the traffic impact assessment prepared for the Cyberport expansion.

Adverse Representations

- (c) All 677 adverse representations (**R102 to R104, R107 to R780**) object to Item A1 while some of them providing diverse views on various amendment items including Items A2, B1 and B2, C1 to C5, D and E. They are submitted by a Southern District Council member (**R102**), the Incorporated Owners of Scenic Villas (**R103**), the Incorporated Owners of Baguio Villa (**R104**) and 674 individuals (**R107 to R780**). Among the 674 individuals (except **R161** and **R776 to R780**), 668 representations are submitted in the form of standard proforma with individual representers providing additional comments on top.
- (d) The main grounds of the representations opposing Item A1 are that the proposed building height of Cyberport 5 should be lower than the structures behind and respect the neighbouring residential development; objecting to ground-level parking and access road; requesting for revision to the proposed road improvements; doubt the need of Cyberport 5 as the existing Cyberport is under-utilised; and the existing Cyberport waterfront park is affected.
- (e) The main grounds of the representations opposing Item C1 are mainly on traffic grounds due to the proposed school development at Sandy Bay.
- (f) The other views of the representations related to Items B1 and B2, C2 to C5, D and E include supporting deletion of Route 7 and the designation of selected areas to "O"; supporting the provision of a continuous waterfront promenade along the coast of Pok Fu Lam; objecting to some waterfront areas not being designated for waterfront promenade; and requesting for a waterfront promenade along Sandy Bay.

- (g) **R102** and **R189** have also made proposals, including designation of an area over the sea between Telegraph Bay and Sandy Bay for an elevated link; designation of a strip of land in front of the pump house of the Hospital Authority, the HKU Stanley Ho Sports Centre Complex, the Sandy Bay Preliminary Treatment Works, and along the Sandy Bay rocky beach as a public waterfront promenade and zoned “O”; and restriction of the maximum building height of Cyberport 5 to 37mPD (the height of the Cyberport Arcade) to prevent wall effect and adverse visual impact.

Representations Providing Views

- (h) The two representations providing views on Items A1 and A2 are submitted by Island South Property Management (**R105**) and an individual (**R106**). They raise concern on the possible cumulative traffic impact brought by the Cyberport expansion and Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment. **R106** is also of the view that the proposed building height of Cyberport 5 should not be taller than the structures behind.
- 2.2 The 32 comments on representations are submitted by HKCMCL (**C1**) and 31 individuals (**C2 to C32**). It is noted that **C1** (i.e. **R6**) and **C32** (i.e. **R161**) are also representers themselves. HKCMCL provides responses to address the concerns raised by the representations relating to Items A1 and A2. As for the remaining 31 comments, 30 commenters (**C2 to C31**) support **R1 to R101** in supporting Cyberport expansion while one (**C32**) opposes the proposed development at the waterfront of Cyberport.

3. Arrangement for Consideration of Representation and Comments

- 3.1 Under section 2A of the Ordinance, the Town Planning Board (the Board) is empowered to appoint a Representation Hearing Committee (RHC) from among its members to consider representations and comments, propose amendments to the Plan to meet representations, consider further representations in respect of the proposed amendments, and consider whether to vary the proposed amendments upon consideration of any adverse further representations. Since the amendments incorporated in the Plan and the representations and comments received are of similar nature, it will be more efficient for the full Board to consider the representations and comments without resorting to the appointment of a RHC. The hearing could be accommodated in the Board’s regular meeting and a separate hearing session would not be necessary. The arrangement would not delay the completion of the representation consideration process.
- 3.2 Under section 6B(6) of the Ordinance, the Board may determine whether the representations and the related comments shall be considered at the same meeting and whether they shall be considered individually or collectively. In view of the similar nature of representations and comments, it is recommended that the hearing of the representation and comments should be considered in one group.
- 3.3 In view of the large number of the representations and comments received and to ensure efficiency of the hearing, it is recommended to allot a maximum 10 minutes presentation time to each representer/commenter in the hearing session.

3.4 Consideration of the representations and comments by the full Board under section 6B of the Ordinance is tentatively scheduled in May/June 2020.

4. Decision Sought

The Board is invited to consider whether:

- (a) to appoint a RHC for consideration of the representations and comments; and
- (b) the representations and comments should be considered in the manner as proposed in paragraph 3 above.

5. Attachments

Annex I	Schedule of Amendments to the approved Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/17
Annex II	List of representers
Annex III	List of commenters
Annex IV	Summary of representations
Annex V	Summary of comments
Plan P-1	Amendments incorporated in the draft Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/18
Plan P-2	Location plan of the representation sites

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT
APRIL 2020**