



圖例 NOTATION				土地用途及面積一覽表 SCHEDULE OF USES AND AREAS				夾附的《註釋》屬這份圖則的一部分。 現經修訂並按照城市規劃條例第5條展示。 THE ATTACHED NOTES ALSO FORM PART OF THIS PLAN AND HAVE BEEN AMENDED FOR EXHIBITION UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE	
ZONES	地帶	COMMUNICATIONS	交通	USES	大約面積及百分比 APPROXIMATE AREA & % 公頃 HECTARES	% 百分比	用途	核准圖編號 S/H10/17 的修訂 AMENDMENTS TO APPROVED PLAN No. S/H10/17	
COMMERCIAL	C	MAJOR ROAD AND JUNCTION	主要道路及路口	COMMERCIAL	0.24	0.06	商業	AMENDMENTS EXHIBITED UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE	
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP A)	RA(A)	ELEVATED ROAD	高架道路	RESIDENTIAL (GROUP A)	32.05	7.79	住宅(甲類)	按圖城市規劃條例第5條 展示的修訂	
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP B)	RB(B)			RESIDENTIAL (GROUP B)	13.46	3.02	住宅(乙類)		
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP C)	RC(C)			RESIDENTIAL (GROUP C)	46.16	10.94	住宅(丙類)		
VILLAGE TYPE DEVELOPMENT	V	MISCELLANEOUS	其他	VILLAGE TYPE DEVELOPMENT	2.92	0.69	鄉村式發展		
GOVERNMENT, INSTITUTION OR COMMUNITY	GIC	BOUNDARY OF PLANNING SCHEME	規劃範圍界線	GOVERNMENT, INSTITUTION OR COMMUNITY	62.25	15.07	政府、機構或社區		
OPEN SPACE	O	BOUNDARY OF COUNTRY PARK	郊野公園界線	OPEN SPACE	21.79	5.28	休憩用地		
OTHER SPECIFIED USES	OU	PETROL FILLING STATION	加油站	OTHER SPECIFIED USES	34.58	8.37	其他指定用途		
GREEN BELT	GB			GREEN BELT	123.30	29.85	綠化地帶		
COUNTRY PARK	CP			COUNTRY PARK	53.48	12.71	郊野公園		
				MAJOR ROAD ETC.	28.07	6.31	主要道路等		
				TOTAL PLANNING SCHEME AREA	413.02	100.00	規劃範圍總面積		
								(參看附表) (SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)	
2018年9月27日 按照城市規劃條例第5條展示的 核准圖編號 S/H10/17 的修訂 AMENDMENTS TO APPROVED PLAN No. S/H10/17 EXHIBITED UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE ON 27 SEPTEMBER 2018				香港城市規劃委員會依據城市規劃條例擬備的薄扶林(港島規劃區第10區)分區計劃大綱圖 TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE, HONG KONG TOWN PLANNING BOARD HONG KONG PLANNING AREA No. 10 - POK FU LAM - OUTLINE ZONING PLAN				現經修訂並按照城市規劃條例第5條展示 PREPARED BY THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD	
Fiona LUNG SECRETARY TOWN PLANNING BOARD				圖則編號 PLAN No. S/H10/18					

**SCHEDULE OF AMENDMENTS TO
THE APPROVED POK FU LAM OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/H10/17
MADE BY THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD
UNDER THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE (Chapter 131)**

I. Amendments to Matters shown on the Plan

- Item A1 – Rezoning of a site adjacent to the Arcade Cyberport from area mainly shown as ‘Road’ with minor portions zoned as “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Cyber-Port” (“OU(Cyber-Port)”) and “Open Space” (“O”) to “OU(Cyber-Port)(1)”.
- Item A2 – Rezoning of an area currently occupied by the Cyberport Waterfront Park from “OU(Cyber-Port)” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “O”.
- Item B1 – Rezoning of pieces of land along the waterfront of Waterfall Bay and its park from area shown as ‘Road’ to “O”.
- Item B2 – Rezoning of an area to the south of Wah Kwai Estate and Ka Lung Court from area shown as ‘Road’ and “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) to “O”, and incorporation of an area along the waterfront into the planning scheme area and zoning it to “O”.
- Item C1 – Rezoning of a site at Sandy Bay from “O” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”).
- Item C2 – Rezoning of a strip of land along the University of Hong Kong Stanley Ho Sports Centre Complex and an existing pump house from “O” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “G/IC”.
- Item C3 – Rezoning of the site of the existing Hong Kong West Drainage Tunnel Western Portal from “O” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “G/IC”.
- Item C4 – Rezoning of the site of the existing Telegraph Bay Salt Water Pumping Station from “OU(Cyber-Port)” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “G/IC”.
- Item C5 – Rezoning of an area at Tin Wan Praya Road from area shown as ‘Road’ to “G/IC”, and incorporation of a small area at Tin Wan Praya Road into the planning scheme area and zoning it to “G/IC”.
- Item D – Rezoning of pieces of land along the coastal steep slopes at Sandy Bay from area shown as ‘Road’ to “Green Belt”.
- Item E – Excision of two sea areas along Sandy Bay and Waterfall Bay from the planning scheme area.

Showing the road scheme of the Interchange at Junction of Pok Fu Lam Road and Sassoon Road authorized under the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (Chapter 370) on the Plan for information. The authorized road scheme shall be deemed to be approved pursuant to section 13A of the Town Planning Ordinance.

II. Amendments to the Notes of the Plan

- (a) Deletion of the Sub-area 6 in the Remarks of the Notes for the “OU(Cyber-Port)” zone.
- (b) Incorporation of a new set of Notes for the “OU(Cyber-Port)(1)” zone.
- (c) Deletion of ‘Market’ from Column 2 in the Notes for the “Residential (Group B)” (“R(B)”), “Village Type Development” and “OU(Cyber-Port)” zones, and revision of ‘Shop and Services’ to ‘Shop and Services (not elsewhere specified)’ in Column 2 in the Notes for the “R(A)” and “G/IC” zones.
- (d) Deletion of ‘Printing and Reproduction Services’ from Column 2 in the Notes for the “OU(Cyber-Port)”.
- (e) Revisions to the exemption clause on maximum plot ratio and site coverage in the Remarks of the Notes for the “R(B)” and “Residential (Group C)” zones to clarify that exemption of caretaker’s quarters and recreational facilities are only applicable to those facilities for the use and benefit of all the owners or occupiers of the domestic building or domestic part of the building.

Town Planning Board

27 September 2019

METRO PLANNING COMMITTEE
OF THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD

MPC Paper No. 11/19
For Consideration by the
Metro Planning Committee on 6.9.2019

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO
THE APPROVED POK FU LAM
OUTLINE ZONING PLAN No. S/H10/17

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO
THE APPROVED POK FU LAM OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/H10/17**

1. Introduction

This paper is to seek Members' agreement that:

- (a) the proposed amendments to the approved Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H10/17 as shown on the draft OZP No. S/H10/17A (**Attachment II**) and the Notes of the draft OZP (**Attachment III**) are suitable for exhibition for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance); and
- (b) the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP (**Attachment IV**) should be adopted as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Town Planning Board (the Board) for various land use zonings of the OZP and is suitable for exhibition together with the draft OZP.

2. Status of the Current OZP

- 2.1 On 21.8.2018, the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) under section 9(1)(a) of the Ordinance approved the draft Pok Fu Lam OZP. On 31.8.2018, the approved Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/17 (**Attachment I**) was exhibited for public inspection under section 9(5) of the Ordinance.
- 2.2 On 2.7.2019, the CE in C referred the approved Pok Fu Lam OZP back to the Board for amendment under section 12(1)(b)(ii) of the Ordinance. On 19.7.2019, the reference back of the OZP was notified in the Gazette under section 12(2) of the Ordinance.

3. Proposed Amendments to the OZP (Plan A)

- 3.1 The proposed amendments mainly involve rezoning of a piece of government land which falls within an area mainly shown as 'Road' and with minor portions within the "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Cyber-Port" ("OU(Cyber-Port)") and "Open Space" ("O") zones to facilitate the proposed Cyberport Expansion.
- 3.2 Opportunity is also taken to amend the OZP in respect of the deletion of the obsolete alignment of the proposed Route 7 (currently known as Route 4) as shown on the OZP and to make associated adjustments to the planning scheme boundary and zoning amendments. Some technical amendments to the plan and Notes of the OZP are also included.

4. Proposed Cyberport Expansion

Background

- 4.1 At present, there are about 650 tenants in the office and co-working space in Cyberport. The overall occupancy rate of the Cyberport office space is around 93% in June 2019. Most of the tenants and co-working space users are involved in technology-related business operations, including information technology multinational corporations engaged in digital entertainment, e-commerce and development of smart living products, companies which use digital technology extensively in their operations as well as digital technology start-ups and incubatees.
- 4.2 Drawing upon the success of Cyberport and the anticipated growth of the innovation and technology (I&T) sector, additional space and facilities are required in a timely manner for existing tenants to grow, as well as to explore opportunities with new and emerging sectors such as financial technology (FinTech) and cyber security etc. However, the feasibility of in-situ intensification of Cyberport is limited as companies are currently operating in the existing buildings and their relocation (over 90% occupancy rate) would be difficult. There is also limited open area at Cyberport for further infill development to meet the proposed scale of development. Hence, a new site adjoining to the existing Cyberport has been identified for Cyberport 5 (the proposed development) which would allow the facilities such as offices, co-working space, conference venues and data services platform with specific operational requirements to be provided in a more comprehensive manner, creating a favourable and sustainable I&T ecosystem for technology companies and start-ups. The proposed development is scheduled to be completed by 2024 at the earliest.
- 4.3 To this end, the Financial Secretary has announced in the 2019-20 Budget that \$5.5 billion would be earmarked for the proposed development, which would serve to attract more quality technology companies and start-ups to set up their offices in Cyberport and provide a pathway for young people to pursue a career in I&T. To take forward the Budget initiative, amendment to the Pok Fu Lam OZP is necessary.

The Site and its Surroundings (Plans B1 to B5)

- 4.4 The site of the proposed development (the Site) (about 1.63ha) is a piece of government land which falls within an area mainly shown as 'Road' (as part of the obsolete alignment of the proposed Route 7) with minor portions within the sub-areas 1 and 6 of the "OU(Cyber-Port)"¹ and "O" zones. It is bounded by the

¹ The development restrictions of the sub-areas of "OU(Cyber-Port)" zone are as follows:

- Sub-area 1 is subject to a maximum 85 metres above Principal Datum (mPD) in height and a maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 92,500m²;
- Sub-area 2 is subject to a maximum 85mPD in height and a maximum GFA of 60,600m²;
- Sub-area 3 is subject to maximum 176mPD in height and a maximum GFA of 160,900m²;
- Sub-area 4 is subject to maximum 189mPD in height and a maximum GFA of 207,800m²;
- Sub-area 5 is subject to maximum 3 storeys (excluding carports and mechanical floor) and a maximum GFA of 14,800m²; and
- Sub-area 6 is subject to maximum 1 storey.

Hong Kong West Drainage Tunnel Western Portal to the north, the Cyberport Sewage Treatment Works and the Arcade Cyberport to the northeast, the Cyberport Waterfront Park to the southeast and the seawall along Telegraph Bay to the west (**Plan B2**). The Site is partly vacant (about 0.61ha) and partly occupied by the northern portion of the existing Cyberport Waterfront Park (about 1.02ha). It is accessible via Cyberport Road leading to Information Crescent.

- 4.5 The surrounding area of the Site comprises the existing Cyberport development (comprises mainly of office, hotel, residential and retail uses), which was completed in 2008, and the Cyberport Waterfront Park, which is mainly within an area intended originally for the proposed Route 7 and has been under the management and maintenance by the Hong Kong Cyberport Management Company Limited (HKCMCL) for passive recreational and landscaping purpose under a Short Term Tenancy (STT) since 2009.

Development Proposal (Drawings 1 to 8)

- 4.6 According to the HKCMCL's proposal, the proposed development at the Site will have a total gross floor area (GFA) of about 66,000m², which is equivalent to a plot ratio (PR) of about 4.125 based on a development site area of about 16,000m² (**Drawing 1**) and the proposed building height (BH) is approximately 61mPD (not exceeding 12 storeys (including basement)). The proposed development will provide office, co-working space, data services platform, a multi-function hall, e-sports, training and educational institution facilities as well as commercial and retail facilities.
- 4.7 At-grade public open space of about 5,000m² would be provided to enhance visual openness and facilitate air ventilation (**Drawing 8**). A new access road, which extends from the western end of Information Crescent, is proposed along the north-eastern boundary of the Site. Ancillary parking spaces and loading/unloading facilities will be provided in accordance with the requirements under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). To further enhance pedestrian connectivity, the Site and the adjoining Arcade Cyberport and Cyberport Waterfront Park would be connected through a pedestrian network comprising above-grade and at-grade connections.
- 4.8 The major development parameters to illustrate the land use mix serving as the basis for carrying out various technical assessments are summarised as follows:

Development Site Area	About 16,000m ²
GFA ¹	About 66,000m ²
- Office	- 29,400m ²
- Auditorium	- 1,400m ²
- Commercial	- 7,800m ²
- Data services platform	- 10,000m ²
- Others (circulation, services, covered green area, etc.)	- 17,400m ²
PR	About 4.125

Site Coverage (SC)	About 62%
BH	About 61mPD
No. of Storeys (including basement)	12
Public Open Space (at-grade)	About 5,000m ²
Parking Spaces	
- Private car	175
- Private car (for disabled)	4
- Motorcycle	22
Loading/Unloading Facilities	
- Heavy goods vehicle	8
- Light goods vehicle	17
- Car/taxi layby	3

Remark 1: The GFA breakdown is subject to detailed design.

- 4.9 The scale of the proposed development is to meet the operational requirements of Cyberport, including large floor plates for data services platform, higher flexibility to provide office space of different sizes to accommodate the needs of the I&T companies, and a multi-purpose conference hall with a capacity of around 1,000 people.
- 4.10 The Site is located at a waterfront location adjacent to the sub-area 1 of the “OU(Cyber-Port) zone which is subject to a maximum BH of 85mPD with variations in BHs of the existing buildings. The proposed BH of about 61mPD for the Site is considered compatible with the planned BH profile of the area descending from Pok Fu Lam Road towards the developments within the Cyberport (**Drawings 2a and 2b**).

Technical Aspects

- 4.11 HKCMCL has commissioned a feasibility study to undertake relevant technical assessments for the proposed development at the Site. Based on the findings of the study, the proposed development is technically feasible with no insurmountable problem. Details of the technical assessments are set out below.

Traffic and Transport

- 4.12 A traffic impact assessment (TIA) has been conducted to assess the traffic impact of the proposed development on the surrounding road network (including Pok Fu Lam Road, Victoria Road, Sassoon Road, Sha Wan Drive, Cyberport Road and Sandy Bay Road) in the design year of 2027. The assessed key links and junctions, and the junctions with proposed improvement/management measures are shown in **Drawing 3a**. The TIA has also reviewed the provision of public transport facilities and assessed the adequacy of pedestrian facilities as well as the traffic impact for special events (i.e. conference and exhibition events). The TIA is at **Annex A of Attachment V**.

- 4.13 In assessing the traffic impact, major committed/planned developments in the vicinity of the Site have been taken into consideration, including the proposed public housing developments at the five new government sites in Pok Fu Lam South (the major reception resources for the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate to be completed in phases in 2026/2027) and the Queen Mary Hospital Redevelopment (Main Block) (expected to be operated in 2024). To provide conservative estimates, the South Island Line (West) (SIL(W)) proposed under the Railway Development Strategy 2014 has not been assumed in the TIA.
- 4.14 According to the TIA, the proposed development will not induce insurmountable traffic impact after the implementation of the following traffic mitigation/improvement measures (**Drawings 3b to 3g**):
- (i) Junction of Pok Fu Lam Road and Sassoon Road – modifying the location of the central reserve and the traffic island on Sassoon Road to provide a waiting space for vehicles from Sassoon Road making a right turn to Pok Fu Lam Road (**Drawing 3b**);
 - (ii) Junction of Victoria Road and Sha Wan Drive – installing traffic lights to regulate and improve traffic flow; adding flare lanes at Victoria Road southbound/northbound approach for right/left turn movements; and relocation of the existing bus stop (**Drawings 3c and 3d**);
 - (iii) Junction of Pok Fu Lam Road, Victoria Road and Shek Pai Wan Road – changing the road marking of the proposed access road to a proposed public housing site at the middle lane from straightforward movement to allow left turn and right turn movements only; and adjusting the junction signals to allow more time for green light for the left turn movement from Shek Pai Wan Road to Victoria Road (**Drawings 3e and 3f**); and
 - (iv) Junction of Victoria Road and Sandy Bay Road – modifying the pedestrian facilities on Victoria Road and Sandy Bay Road; and adjusting the junction signals to enhance junction capacity (**Drawing 3g**).

Apart from the above junctions, the TIA has confirmed that all the other key junctions (**Drawing 3a**) in the vicinity of the Site will be performing satisfactorily during the AM and PM peak periods for both the 2027 Reference and Design scenarios.

- 4.15 The Cyberport is served by the existing public transport and Tenant Bus services. The assessment on the public transport services has confirmed that the spare capacities of the existing public transport and Tenant Bus services will be sufficient to cope with the anticipated demand from the proposed development.
- 4.16 Pedestrian impact assessment has been undertaken to assess the performance of the at-grade cautionary crossing across Cyberport Road along the major pedestrian desire line (**Drawing 4**). The results have indicated that the concerned cautionary crossing will be performing satisfactorily with sufficient spare capacity during the peak hour for both the 2027 Reference and Design scenarios.
- 4.17 The traffic and pedestrian impacts during the special event with an anticipated attendance of 1,000 participants in the auditorium at the proposed development

have also been assessed. The results have indicated that all the concerned junctions in the vicinity of the Site and the concerned crossing across Cyberport Road and concerned public footpaths will be performing satisfactorily during the peak period even with the additional traffic to be induced by the special event. Additional special bus services are recommended to provide additional public transport services for the participants of the special event.

- 4.18 The Commissioner for Transport has no objection to the above findings of the TIA. Besides, for Member's information, development in the Pok Fu Lam area is subject to the Pok Fu Lam Moratorium (PFLM), which is an administrative measure imposed on traffic grounds to prohibit excessive development of the area until there is an overall improvement in the transport network of the area. For the proposed development, partial lifting of the PFLM is required and this issue will be dealt with separately at the land grant stage by the Lands Department (LandsD) and the relevant policy bureau.

Environmental Aspect

- 4.19 The proposed development will be equipped with central air-conditioning system. Hence, no adverse vehicular emission and traffic noise impact is anticipated. As advised by the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP), since the proposed development is not incompatible with the surrounding environment and not polluting in nature, no insurmountable environmental problem is anticipated.

Utility Infrastructures

- 4.20 The sewerage impact assessment has confirmed that with the proposed upgrading of a sewer along Information Crescent, the capacity of the sewerage network would be sufficient to accommodate the increase in sewage flow generated from the proposed development. Relevant government departments, including Environmental Protection Department, Drainage Services Department (DSD), Electrical and Mechanical Services Department, Water Supplies Department (WSD), and Geotechnical Engineering Office of the Civil Engineering and Development Department, have no adverse comments on the proposed development from drainage, sewerage, water supply and infrastructural works perspectives.

Visual Aspect

- 4.21 A set of photomontages of the proposed development from the representative public viewing points is provided in **Drawings 5a to 5j** and the related Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) is at **Annex B of Attachment V**. The selected public viewing points include Cyberport Road, Information Crescent, Cyberport Waterfront Park, Victoria Road, Lamma Island and the East Lamma Channel (public ferry route).
- 4.22 According to the VIA, the proposed development is considered generally compatible and acceptable within the existing visual context at Cyberport. The preliminary building design of the proposed development has incorporated some design measures for enhancing visual permeability and visual interest (**Drawing 6**). The proposed development would constitute insubstantial to moderate visual impacts at most of the viewing points (e.g. Victoria Road

footpath, Information Crescent footpath, Cyberport Road footpath) due to long distance and screening by existing developments and trees (**Drawings 5c, 5d and 5g**). However, the viewing point at the Cyberport Waterfront Park will inevitably experience substantial visual impact even with the implementation of the design measures due to high sensitivity of the viewers, close proximity and direct angle of view towards the Site (**Drawing 5f**). In overall terms, the visual impact of the proposed development is considered to be moderately adverse. To further enhance the proposed development at the detailed design stage, visual mitigation measures including arrangement of building (such as permeable building design on ground and upper floors, terraced building design), sensitive architectural treatment, tree planting along site boundary, amenity landscape areas, and sensitively designed lighting, should be adopted.

Air Ventilation Aspect

4.23 According to the Air Ventilation Assessment (Expert Evaluation) (AVA EE) (**Annex C of Attachment V**), it is anticipated that the proposed development would create wind blockage and obstruct southwest wind direction from reaching the downwind areas including the podium of the Arcade Cyberport and Cyberport Road. To alleviate the potential impact on the surrounding wind environment, six mitigation measures are adopted in the preliminary building design (**Drawing 7**) as follows:

- (i) building setback of at least 17m at G/F along the northeastern boundary;
- (ii) approximate 18m wide empty bay at G/F with about 4.5m headroom;
- (iii) approximate 32m wide empty bay at G/F with about 4m headroom at the southeastern end aligning with Information Crescent;
- (iv) approximate 98m wide open space at the northwest of the Site;
- (v) approximate 36m wide communal garden at 3/F with about 3m to 8m headroom; and
- (vi) terraced building design with building height lowering towards the waterfront promenade and Cyberport Waterfront Park.

4.24 With incorporation of the above mitigation measures, no significant impact is anticipated to the surrounding pedestrian wind environment compared with the existing condition. A quantitative AVA shall be carried out by HKCMCL at the detailed design stage to ascertain that the future scheme would perform no worse off than the scheme in the AVA EE in terms of ventilation performance. The requirement for submission of quantitative AVA will also be incorporated into the land document for the proposed development.

Landscape Aspect

4.25 A group tree survey was conducted to estimate the quantities and assess the general condition of the existing trees and tree groups within the site. According to the survey, there are a total of 129 trees (with a Diameter Breast Height (DBH)) of 95mm or greater measured at 1300mm above ground) found within the Site. There is neither Registered Old and Valuable Trees nor rare/endangered tree species. According to the preliminary tree assessment, about 89 trees, which are in direct conflict with the construction of the proposed development, would be felled (including 1 dead tree). Since opportunities for compensatory tree planting within the Site are restricted by the building footprint and the operational

requirements for pedestrian and vehicular access, most of the compensatory tree planting would be carried out in the Cyberport Waterfront Park at a compensation ratio of 1:1 in terms of quantity. The size of the compensatory trees will be heavy standard with trunk DBH ranging from 75mm to 100mm. A detailed tree survey shall be carried out by HKCMCL at the detailed design stage.

- 4.26 The preliminary conceptual landscape master plan aims to maximise the greening area as far as possible to enhance the visual amenity of the proposed development and blend in with the adjacent developments and vegetated hillsides in the vicinity (**Drawing 8**). The proposed total site green coverage would exceed the minimum 20% requirement as set out in the Development Bureau Technical Circular (Works) No. 3/2012 - the Site Coverage of Greenery for Government Building Projects and the Practice Note for Authorised Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers - the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (PNAP APP-152). According to the Landscape Impact Assessment, the overall residual landscape impacts would be acceptable with the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, such as sensitive reinstatement of site boundaries, compensatory tree planting and amenity planting as well as the provision of at-grade public open space of about 5,000m².

Proposed Zoning Amendments

Amendment Item A1: Cyberport Expansion Site (Plans B1 to B5)

- 4.27 As explained in paragraphs 4.1 to 4.26 above, the Site (1.63ha), which is a piece of government land mainly shown as 'Road', is proposed to be rezoned to "OU(Cyber-Port)(1)" with a maximum BH restriction of 65mPD and a maximum GFA restriction of 66,000m². The "OU(Cyber-Port)(1)" zone is intended primarily to provide land for Cyberport expansion to cater for additional floor space for offices, conference venues and data services platform to attract technology companies and start-ups to set up their offices in Cyberport. Under the Notes of the "OU(Cyber-Port)(1)" zone, the requirement of provision of at-grade public open space of not less than 5,000m² will be stipulated. To provide design flexibility, a maximum BH restriction of 65mPD is proposed for the "OU(Cyber-Port)(1)" zone even though the BH of the current proposal is only up to 61mPD. It will also be specified in the ES of the OZP that a quantitative AVA will be conducted at the detailed design stage to ascertain that the future scheme would perform no worse off than the scheme in the AVA EE in terms of ventilation performance. The requirement for submission of quantitative AVA will also be incorporated into the land document for the proposed development.
- 4.28 In drawing up the schedule of uses of the "OU(Cyber-Port)(1)" zone, uses in line with the proposed development are proposed to be under Column 1, which are always permitted. This approach is different from that for the "OU(Cyber-Port)" zone, in which all uses were under Column 2, which require planning permission from the Board. It is because the proposed development is predominately I&T related offices and co-working space in nature, whereas the earlier phases of Cyberport involve a mix of land uses including offices, hotel and residential developments so that any development within the "OU(Cyber-Port)" zone needs to be governed by a Master Layout Plan to enable the Board to provide sufficient planning control on the development parameters.

Amendment Item A2: Cyberport Waterfront Park (Plans B1 to B5)

- 4.29 The site (4.53ha) is a piece of government land which falls within an area mainly shown as 'Road' (as part of the obsolete alignment of the proposed Route 7) and partly zoned "OU(Cyber-Port)" (mainly sub-area 6). Majority of the site is currently occupied by the existing Cyberport Waterfront Park, which is under the management and maintenance by HKCMCL for passive recreational and landscaping purpose under a STT.
- 4.30 Given the site is no longer required for the proposed Route 7, HKCMCL proposes to retain the Cyberport Waterfront Park as an open space with enhancements for public enjoyment, and will undertake its design, construction, maintenance and management responsibilities. A 800m long and 15m wide waterfront promenade will also be provided for public enjoyment. In view of the above, it is proposed to rezone this area to "O" to reflect the planning intention of the area.
- 4.31 The proposed "O" zone would also be connected to the existing "O" zone to the north towards Sandy Bay to reflect the planning intention of a continuous open space network with a possible walking trail along the coast of Pok Fu Lam.

5. Deletion of the Obsolete Alignment of Proposed Route 7 and Associated Zoning Amendments

- 5.1 Route 7 (currently known as Route 4) was originally proposed as a strategic link along the western coast of Hong Kong Island. The Government has decided that proposed Route 7 alignment as shown on the OZPs (including Pok Fu Lam, Kennedy Town & Mount Davis and Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau OZPs) would not be implemented. As such, the possible alignment of the proposed Route 7 as shown on the OZPs is obsolete and should be deleted. The obsolete alignment of the proposed Route 7 has already been deleted from the adjoining Kennedy Town & Mount Davis and Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau OZPs, which were gazetted on 26.3.2010 and 16.7.2010 respectively.
- 5.2 For the Pok Fu Lam OZP, the obsolete alignment of the proposed Route 7, which falls within an area shown as 'Road', together with some adjoining areas zoned "O", "Green Belt" ("GB") and "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC"), are proposed to be excised from the OZP to reflect the natural coastline or rezoned to "O", "G/IC" and "GB" to reflect the current conditions and the planning intention of the sites. The proposed amendments are elaborated in the following paragraphs.

Proposed Zoning Amendments

Amendment Item B1: Pieces of land along the waterfront of Waterfall Bay and its park (Plans C1 to C4)

- 5.3 The sites (0.34ha) fall within areas shown as 'Road' (as part of the obsolete alignment of the proposed Route 7). The sites consist of pieces of government land adjoining to the existing Waterfall Bay Park (zoned "O") and a planned "O" zone. The proposed rezoning to "O" is to reflect the planning intention of these sites.

Amendment Item B2: Area to the south of Wah Kwai Estate and Ka Lung Court (Plans C1, C5 to C8)

- 5.4 The area (2.07ha) falls mainly within an area shown as 'Road' (as part of the obsolete alignment of the proposed Route 7) with a minor portion zoned "R(A)" and an area not covered by the OZP. It is currently mainly used as a landscaping and recreational area for public enjoyment (known as the Kellett Bay Waterfront) and partly occupied by the existing ball courts of Wah Kwai Estate. The proposed incorporation of the residual area not covered by the OZP and the rezoning of the whole site to "O" is to reflect the current condition and the planning intention of the area.
- 5.5 For Members' information, the site was included in two rezoning applications (Nos. Y/H10/6 and Y/H10/7)² to rezone the application sites to "O" which was considered and agreed in principle by the Metro Planning Committee (the Committee) on 3.6.2011 but was considered pre-mature at that time to be incorporated into the OZP. The Planning Department (PlanD) was requested to review the Pok Fu Lam OZP and propose suitable land uses in association with the deletion of the obsolete road alignment for Route 7. As PlanD has now reviewed the OZP in association with the deletion of the road, the proposed rezoning of the concerned area is recommended under Item B2 (paragraph 5.4 above refers) and C5 (Plans D15 to D18, paragraph 5.11 below refers).

Amendment Item C1: A site at Sandy Bay (Plans D1 to D4)

- 5.6 The site (1.56ha) is a piece of government land which falls within an area partly zoned "O" and partly shown as 'Road'. The site is partly allocated to government departments for temporary works area and partly vacant, whereas a minor portion is currently occupied by DSD under government land allocations for the Sandy Bay Preliminary Treatment Works.
- 5.7 The proposed rezoning of the site to "G/IC" is to reflect the current condition of the treatment works and the planning intention of the remaining area to facilitate a proposed school development. According to the advice of the Education Bureau, there is a need to reserve the northern portion of the site for school use (e.g. international school) so as to cater for the long-term educational needs on Hong Kong Island. DEP advised that no insurmountable environmental problem related to the proposed school is anticipated. As the site is subject to the PFLM, the project proponent would be required to conduct a TIA to assess the traffic impact arising from the proposed school at the land allocation stage.

Amendment Item C2: Sites adjoining HKU Stanley Ho Sports Centre Complex (Plans D1, D5 to D7)

- 5.8 The site (0.40ha) falls within an area mainly shown as 'Road' (as part of the obsolete alignment of the proposed Route 7) and partly zoned "O". A large part of the site is a piece of government land currently used as a pedestrian walkway being managed by the University of Hong Kong (HKU). The walkway was

² The applicants of the subject s.12A planning applications proposed to rezone part of the application site from an area shown as 'Road' (as part of the obsolete alignment of the proposed Route 7) to "O" and incorporating part of the site which is currently not covered by the OZP into the OZP boundary and zone it as "O".

formed when the HKU developed its Sports Centre (zoned “G/IC”) and it is sandwiched between the HKU Sports Centre and a man-made sea wall. Given the pedestrian walkway is currently under the management of HKU, it is proposed to rezone the walkway to “G/IC” to tally with the adjoining “G/IC” zone. The southern-most portion of the site is occupied by a pump house for the Queen Mary Hospital which has been allocated to the Hospital Authority. It is proposed to rezone that portion of the site to “G/IC” to reflect the current condition and the planning intention of the area.

Amendment Item C3: Hong Kong West Drainage Tunnel Western Portal (Plans D8 to D11)

- 5.9 The site (0.13ha) falls within an area mainly zoned “O” and partly shown as ‘Road’ (as part of the obsolete alignment of the proposed Route 7). It is currently occupied by the Hong Kong West Drainage Tunnel Western Portal at Telegraph Bay which has been allocated to DSD. It is proposed to rezone the site to “G/IC” to reflect the current condition and the planning intention of the area.

Amendment Item C4: Telegraph Bay Salt Water Pumping Station (Plans D8, D12 to D14)

- 5.10 The site (0.34ha) falls within an area zoned “OU(Cyber-Port)” and area shown as ‘Road’ (as part of the obsolete alignment of the proposed Route 7). It is currently occupied by the Telegraph Bay Salt Water Pumping Station which has been allocated to WSD. It is proposed to rezone the site to “G/IC” to reflect the current condition and the planning intention of the area.

Amendment Item C5: A site at Tin Wan Praya Road adjoining Wah Kwai Estate (Plans D15 to D18)

- 5.11 The site (0.04ha) falls mainly within an area shown as ‘Road’ (as part of the obsolete alignment of the proposed Route 7) and partly an area not covered by the OZP. The site together with the adjoining “G/IC” site on the Aberdeen and Ap Lei Chau OZP are currently occupied by a works area under a temporary land allocation to DSD. It is proposed to incorporate the residual area not covered by the OZP and rezone the whole site to “G/IC” so as to tally with the adjoining “G/IC” zone on the Aberdeen and Ap Lei Chau OZP.
- 5.12 As mentioned in paragraph 5.5 above, it is also related to the Committee’s previous decisions on the two s.12A planning applications for amendment to the OZP (Nos. Y/H10/6 and Y/H10/7).

Amendment Item D: Pieces of land along coastal steep slopes at Sandy Bay (Plans E1 to E3)

- 5.13 The sites (0.12ha) fall within areas shown as ‘Road’ (as part of the obsolete alignment of the proposed Route 7). They consist of steep slopes along the coast and the adjoining area is zoned “GB”. It is proposed to rezone the sites to “GB” to reflect their current condition and to tally with the adjoining “GB” zone.

Amendment Item E: Excision of sea areas along Sandy Bay and Waterfall Bay (Plans F1 to F3)

- 5.14 The proposed deletion of the obsolete alignment of the proposed Route 7 would involve the excision of two sea areas (10.47ha) along Sandy Bay and Waterfall Bay from the planning scheme area.

6. Provision of Government, Institution and Community (GIC) Facilities and Open Space

- 6.1 A table on the provision of major GIC facilities in the Pok Fu Lam area is at **Attachment VI**. Based on a planned population of about 102,820, there is no shortfall on major GIC facilities in the area.³
- 6.2 There are about 82.32ha of open space, including about 42.34ha local open space and 39.98ha district open space in the Southern District, which is able to meet the population-based standards under the HKPSG. While **Items A1, C1 to C3 and E** involve reduction of areas zoned as “O”, there will be a net increase of about 2.97ha of areas zoned “O” in the area, mainly due to the rezoning proposal of **Item A2**. Besides, an at-grade public open space of not less than 5,000m² will be provided within the Cyberport 5 (**Item A1**). Hence, the proposed amendment items will not have adverse impact on major GIC and open space provisions in the area.

7. Consultation with District Council

- 7.1 On 27.5.2019, HKCMCL consulted the District Development and Housing Committee (DDHC) of the Southern District Council (SDC) on the Cyberport expansion project. Members of DDHC expressed concerns about a number of aspects, including the need for improving transport facilities and pedestrian facilities in the area in parallel with the project, enhancement works at Cyberport Waterfront Park as well as public space of the area. Specifically, DDHC Members pressed for the expeditious construction of SIL(W) and the implementation of traffic mitigation measures. PlanD was also requested to consult SDC again and relay SDC’s views to the Board before submitting the proposed amendments to the OZP to the Board. A copy of the DDHC minutes is enclosed in **Attachment VII**. According to the prevailing practice, however, PlanD will consult the District Council on the amendments to the OZP after they have been agreed by the Committee.
- 7.2 At the request of DDHC, the Innovation and Technology Bureau (ITB) and HKCMCL further consulted DDHC on 18.7.2019 and provided supplementary information mainly on the aspects on the use of the office space and the Arcade Cyberport, traffic impact of the project, implementation of SIL(W), waterfront park and public space as well as pedestrian facilities. DDHC passed two motions

³ The population-based planning standards for elderly services and facilities were reinstated in the HKPSG on 28.12.2018. The revised standards reflect the long-term target towards which the provision of elderly services and facilities would be adjusted progressively. It may not be appropriate to compare the standards with the provision of elderly services and facilities for the existing population.

that “In consideration of the expansion of Cyberport, SDC requested for implementation of three associated projects which would improve the connection between Cyberport and the neighbouring communities, and provide greater convenience for everyone: The improvement of nearby road junctions; a pedestrian bridge over Waterfall Bay; and an elevated walkway along the shore between Telegraph Bay and Sandy Bay.” and “In consideration of the expansion of Cyberport, SDC requested for the improvement of the external transport links, implementation of the MTR SIL(W) project and provision of an MTR station and pedestrian links in the vicinity of Cyberport, so as to improve the connection between Cyberport and the neighbouring communities, and provide greater convenience to the public.”

- 7.3 On the request for improvement of nearby road junctions, ITB and HKCMCL advised that the TIA conducted for the Cyberport expansion project has indicated that the proposed development would have insignificant impact on the overall traffic condition of the district. Upon completion of the proposed improvement works at the four road junctions in the proximity of Cyberport, the traffic flow at the road junctions concerned are expected to meet the related requirements of the Transport Department.
- 7.4 As for the proposed pedestrian facilities to connect Cyberport with adjacent communities, while the relevant government department considers that the existing pedestrian access between Sandy Bay and Telegraph Bay as well as Waterfall Bay and Wah Fu Estate are sufficient to meet the pedestrian needs, the existing and planned open spaces along Kellett Bay, Waterfall Bay, Telegraph Bay and Sandy Bay allows the provision of a continuous open space network with a possible walking trail along the coast of Pok Fu Lam. Such intention is stated in the revised ES.
- 7.5 Regarding the concern on the implementation of SIL(W), as advised by the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB), the actual implementation of the SIL(W) is subject to the actual programme for the development in the Wah Fu area and redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate as well as the build-up of transport demand. Besides, to implement the SIL(W), it is also necessary to free up space within Wah Fu Estate for railway construction, including Wah Fu Station proposed in the preliminary conceptual scheme of the SIL(W). That said, for early planning of the SIL(W), THB has invited the MTR Corporation Limited in June 2019 to submit a proposal for SIL(W).

8. Other Technical Amendments and Minor Boundary Adjustments

- 8.1 Pursuant to section 13A of the Ordinance, road scheme authorized by the CE in C under the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (Chapter 370) shall be deemed to be approved under the Ordinance. To reflect the road scheme of the “Interchange at Junction of Pok Fu Lam Road and Sassoon Road” authorized by the CE in C on 12.12.1997 and completed in 2003, amendments have been made to the OZP. The inclusion of the authorized road scheme and deletion of the affected “G/IC” and “GB zones are not regarded as amendment items under the Ordinance and are for information only (**Plans G1 to G3**).

- 8.2 Opportunity has been taken to rectify minor discrepancies by slightly adjusting the zoning boundaries to reflect the existing developments and these adjustments would not have any material implications on the land use zonings.

9. Proposed Amendments to Matters shown on the Plan

The proposed amendments as shown on the draft Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/17A (**Attachment II**) are as follows:

Item A1 (about 1.63 ha)

- (a) Rezoning of the Site from “OU(Cyber-Port)”, “O” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “OU(Cyber-Port)(1)”.

Item A2 (about 4.53 ha)

- (b) Rezoning of the Cyberport Waterfront Park and a site adjoining the Site from “OU(Cyber-Port)” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “O”.

Item B1 (about 0.34 ha)

- (c) Rezoning of pieces of land along the waterfront of Waterfall Bay and its park from area shown as ‘Road’ to “O”.

Item B2 (about 2.07 ha)

- (d) Rezoning of an area to the south of Wah Kwai Estate and Ka Lung Court from “R(A)” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “O” and incorporation of land area into the planning scheme area and zoning that area as “O”.

Item C1 (about 1.56 ha)

- (e) Rezoning of a site at Sandy Bay from “O” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “G/IC”.

Item C2 (about 0.40 ha)

- (f) Rezoning of a site comprising a strip of land sandwiched between HKU Stanley Ho Sports Centre Complex and a man-made sea wall as well as an existing pump house of the Hospital Authority from “O” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “G/IC”.

Item C3 (about 0.13 ha)

- (g) Rezoning of the existing Hong Kong West Drainage Tunnel Western Portal from “O” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “G/IC”.

Item C4 (about 0.34 ha)

- (h) Rezoning of the existing Telegraph Bay Salt Water Pumping Station from “OU(Cyber-Port)” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “G/IC”.

Item C5 (about 0.04 ha)

- (i) Rezoning of a site at Tin Wan Praya Road adjoining Wah Kwai Estate from area shown as 'Road' to "G/IC", and incorporation of land area into the planning scheme area and zoning that area as "G/IC".

Item D (about 0.12 ha)

- (j) Rezoning of pieces of land along the coastal steep slopes at Sandy Bay from area shown as 'Road' to "GB".

Item E (about 10.47 ha)

- (k) Excision of two sea areas along Sandy Bay and Waterfall Bay from the planning scheme area.

10. Proposed Amendments to the Notes of the OZP

- 10.1 The proposed amendments to the Notes of the OZP (with additions in *bold and italics* and deletions in 'crossed-out') are at **Attachment III** for Members' consideration. The proposed amendments are summarised as follows:

Amendments to the Notes for the "OU(Cyber-Port)" zone

- 10.2 In relation to **Items A1 and A2**, the remarks of the "OU(Cyber-Port)" zone have been revised to delete the development restrictions for Sub-area 6.

Addition of a new set of Notes for the "OU(Cyber-Port)(1)" zone

- 10.3 In relation to **Item A1**, a new set of Notes for the "OU(Cyber-Port)(1)" zone with the respective maximum GFA and BH restrictions and the requirement of the provision of public open space have been incorporated into the OZP.

Technical amendments

- 10.4 The Board has promulgated a revised set of Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans on 11.1.2019 with 'Market' use being subsumed under 'Shop and Services' use. To effectuate such changes, updates have been made to the Notes of "Residential (Group A)", "Residential (Group B)" ("R(B)"), "Village Type Development", "G/IC" and "OU(Cyber-Port)" zones. Besides, amendment has been made to the Notes of "OU(Cyber-Port)" zone to delete 'Printing and Reproduction Services'.
- 10.5 Amendments have been made to the exemption clause on maximum PR and SC in the remarks for "R(B)" and "Residential (Group C)" zones to clarify that exemption of caretaker's quarters and recreational facilities are only applicable to those facilities for the use and benefit of all the owners or occupiers of the domestic building or domestic part of the building.

11. Revision to the Explanatory Statement of the OZP

The ES of the OZP has been revised to take into account the proposed amendments as mentioned in the above paragraphs. Opportunity has also been taken to update the general information for various land use zones to reflect the latest status and planning circumstances of the OZP. The proposed amendments to the ES of the OZP (with additions in ***bold and italics*** and deletions in 'crossed-out') are at **Attachment IV** for Members' consideration.

12. Plan Number

Upon exhibition for public inspection, the OZP will be renumbered as S/H10/18.

13. Consultation

Departmental Consultation

13.1 The proposed amendments have been circulated to the relevant bureaux/departments for comments. Their comments have been incorporated in the proposed amendments where appropriate. The consulted bureaux/departments include the following:

- Secretary for Development
- Secretary for Transport and Housing
- Secretary for Innovation and Technology
- Secretary for Education
- Director of Housing
- Commissioner for Transport
- Director of Civil Engineering and Development
- Director of Social Welfare
- Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene
- Director of Environmental Protection
- Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation
- Director of Leisure and Cultural Services
- Director of Fire Services
- Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services
- Government Property Administrator
- Commissioner of Police
- Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong West, Buildings Department
- District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West and South, LandsD
- Chief Estate Surveyor/Railway Development, LandsD
- Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department;
- Chief Highway Engineer/Hong Kong, Highways Department (HyD);
- Chief Engineer/Railway Development 2-2, HyD
- Chief Engineer/Construction, WSD
- Chief Engineer/Hong Kong & Islands, DSD
- District Officer (Southern), Home Affairs Department
- Chief Town Planner/Urban Design & Landscape, PlanD

Public Consultation

13.2 As mentioned in paragraphs 7.1 and 7.2 above, DDHC of SDC was consulted on 27.5.2019 and 18.7.2019 on the proposed Cyberport Expansion by ITB and HKCMCL. SDC will be consulted on the amendments prior to or during the exhibition period of the draft OZP depending on the meeting schedule of SDC.

14. Decision Sought

Members are invited to:

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Pok Fu Lam OZP and that the draft Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/17A at **Attachment II** (to be renumbered to S/H10/18 upon exhibition) and its Notes at **Attachment III** are suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised ES at **Attachment IV** for the draft Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/17A as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for the various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES will be published together with the OZP.

15. Attachments

Attachment I	Approved Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/17 (reduced size)
Attachment II	Draft Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/17A
Attachment III	Notes of the draft Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/17A
Attachment IV	Explanatory Statement of the draft Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/17A
Attachment V	Report on Technical Assessments to support Rezoning of the Cyberport Expansion
Attachment VI	Provision of Major Community Facilities in Pok Fu Lam Area
Attachment VII	Minutes of DDHC meeting dated 27.5.2019
Drawing 1	Concept Plan of the Proposed Cyberport Expansion
Drawing 2a	Existing and Planned Building Height Profile
Drawing 2b	Existing and Planned Building Height Profile (photomontage)
Drawing 3a	Locations of Surveyed Junctions and Road Links
Drawings 3b to 3g	Proposed Traffic Mitigation/Improvement Measures
Drawing 4	Major Pedestrian Desire Lines within Cyberport
Drawings 5a to 5j	Viewpoints and Photomontages of the Proposed Cyberport Expansion
Drawing 6	Visual Mitigation Plan of the Proposed Cyberport Expansion
Drawing 7	Wind Enhancement Features of the Proposed Cyberport Expansion

Drawing 8	Preliminary Conceptual Landscape Master Plan of the Proposed Cyberport Expansion
Plan A	Index plan (all amendment items)
Plans B1 to B5	Location plan, site plan, aerial photo and site photos for Amendment Items A1 and A2
Plans C1 to C8	Location plan, site plan, aerial photo and site photos for Amendment Items B1 and B2
Plans D1 to D18	Location plan, site plan, aerial photo and site photos for Amendment Items C1 to C5
Plans E1 to E3	Location plan, site plan and aerial photo for Amendment Item D
Plans F1 to F3	Location plan, site plan and aerial photo for Amendment Item E
Plans G1 to G3	Location plan, site plan and aerial photo for the interchange at junction of Pok Fu Lam Road and Sassoon Road

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
SEPTEMBER 2019

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 634th Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 6.9.2019

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Chairman

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairman

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban),
Transport Department
Mr Michael H.S. Law

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department
Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment),
Environmental Protection Department
Dr Sunny C.W. Cheung

Assistant Director (Regional 1), Lands Department
Mr Simon S.W. Wang

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Professor John C.Y. Ng

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms April K.Y. Kun

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Miss Denise M.S. Ho

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 9

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/17
(MPC Paper No.11/19)

24. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendment items were located at Cyberport. Some of the Innovation and Technology Bureau (ITB)'s representatives were from Hong Kong Cyberport Management Company Limited (HKCMCL) and Urbis Limited (Urbis). The following Members had declared interests on the item.

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho	}	his firm having current business dealings with Urbis; and
	}	
Mr Alex T.H. Lai	}	
Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong	-	being a personal friend of the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of HKCMCL.

25. The Committee noted that Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Alex T.H. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong had no involvement in the proposal, the Committee agreed that she could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

26. The following representatives from the Planning Department (PlanD), Transport Department (TD) and ITB were invited to the meeting at this point:

PlanD's representatives:

Mr Jerry Austin	-	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK);
Mr Mann M.H. Chow	-	Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK);

TD's representative:

Mr. T.H. Hung - Engineer/Southern, TD;

ITB's representatives:

Ms. Eva Y.L. Yam - Principal Assistant Secretary for Innovation and Technology (PAS(IT)), ITB;
Ms. Salina K.T. Mak - AS for Innovation and Technology (AS(IT)), ITB;
Mr. Peter Yan - CEO, HKCMCL;
Mr. Howard Cheng - Chief Operating Officer, HKCMCL;
Mr. Joel C.S. Chan - Group Director, P&T Architects and Engineers Ltd.;
Mr. Samuel C.Y. Tse - Associate Director, P&T Architects and Engineers Ltd.;
Ms. Anson Yim - Senior Planner, Urbis;
Mr. Stanley Chan - Director, OZZO Technology (HK) Limited; and
Mr. Steve Lo - Senior Environmental Consultant, Ramboll Environ Hong Kong Limited

27. The Chairman extended a welcome and invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the Paper. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, STP/HK, presented the proposed amendments as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

Background

- (a) a new site adjoining the existing Cyberport had been identified for Cyberport expansion (the proposed Cyberport expansion) which would allow the facilities with specific operational requirements to be provided in a more comprehensive manner, creating a favourable and sustainable innovation and technology ecosystem for technology companies and start-ups. The Financial Secretary had announced in the 2019-20 Budget that \$5.5 billion would be earmarked for the proposed development. To take forward the Budget initiative, amendment to the Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) was necessary;

- (b) Route 7 (currently known as Route 4) was originally proposed as a strategic link along the western coast of Hong Kong Island. The Government had decided that the proposed Route 7 would not be implemented. As such, the alignment of the proposed Route 7 as shown on the OZP was obsolete and should be deleted;

Proposed Amendments to the OZP

- (c) Amendment Item A1 – it was proposed to rezone a site (about 1.63 ha), which was a piece of government land mainly shown as ‘Road’ to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “(Cyber-Port) (1)” (“OU(Cyber-Port)(1)”) zone with a maximum building height restriction (BHR) of 65mPD, a maximum gross floor area (GFA) restriction of 66,000m² and provision of not less than 5,000m² at grade open space;
- (d) Amendment Item A2 – it was proposed to rezone a site (about 4.53 ha), which was a piece of government land mainly shown as ‘Road’ and partly zoned “OU(Cyber-Port)” to “Open Space” (“O”) zone to reflect the planning intention of the area;
- (e) Amendment Items C to E – proposed amendments related to the deletion of Route 7 as set out in paragraph 5 of the Paper;
- (f) other Technical Amendments and Minor Boundary Adjustments – to reflect the road scheme of the “Interchange at Junction of Pok Fu Lam Road and Sassoon Road” completed in 2003, amendments deemed to be approved under the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) incorporated into the OZP;
- (g) technical amendments to the Notes in respect to the promulgation of a revised set of Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans on 11.1.2019 and other amendments as appropriate;

Technical Assessments

- (h) various technical assessments had been conducted which demonstrated that the proposed Cyberport expansion would not induce unacceptable impacts on the local area in terms of traffic, environmental, visual, air ventilation and landscape aspects;

Departmental Consultation

- (i) relevant bureaux and departments consulted had no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed amendments;

Provision of Government, Institution or Community (GIC) facilities and Open Space

- (j) based on a planned population of about 102,820 persons, there was no shortfall on major GIC facilities in the area in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. While Items A1, C1 to C3 and E involved reduction of areas zoned as “O”, there would be a net increase of about 2.97ha of areas zoned “O” in the area, mainly due to the rezoning proposal of Item A2. Besides, an at-grade public open space of not less than 5,000m² would be provided within the proposed Cyberport expansion; and

Public Consultation

- (k) the HKCMCL consulted the District Development and Housing Committee (DDHC) of Southern District Council (SDC) on 27.5.2019, and ITB and HKCMCL consulted DDHC again on 18.7.2019. At the meeting on 18.7.2019, Members of DDHC indicated support for the project which could help the long-term development of innovation and technology (I&T) in Hong Kong. Some Members expressed concerns on the traffic conditions of the area, the enhancement works at Cyberport Waterfront Park and the public space provided by Cyberport. DDHC pressed for the

expeditious construction of South Island Line (West) (SIL(W)) and urged for improvements to transport and pedestrian facilities. In this regard, two motions were passed by the DDHC, one to urge for construction of the SIL(W) and the other for implementation of associated projects for improving connection between Cyberport and the neighbouring communities as well as implementation of traffic mitigation measures.

28. The Chairman suggested and Members agreed to first discuss the proposed Amendment Items A1 and A2 related to the proposed Cyberport expansion and then the proposed deletion of the obsolete alignment of Route 7 and its associated zoning amendments.

Amendment Items A1 and A2

Provision of Facilities at Cyberport and Relation with Local Community

29. In response to some Members' questions on the nature of the companies to be accommodated in the additional space provided by the proposed Cyberport expansion project, how the promotion of I&T industry in Cyberport would be related to the local community, Mr Peter Yan said that Cyberport had all along been playing an important role in promoting the overall I&T ecosystem in Hong Kong. Cyberport consisted primarily of companies which were involved in technology-related business operations and provided them with co-working spaces and incubator facilities. Ms Eva Y.L. Yam, PAS(IT), ITB, added that promoting I&T development was high on the government's policy agenda. Over the past two years, the government had invested over \$100 billion in the sector. Cyberport had been playing an important role in taking forward I&T development. HKCMCL had so far nurtured over 600 start-ups under its Cyberport Incubation Programme and three of which had become unicorns. The proposed Cyberport expansion was to attract more quality technology companies and start-ups to establish their offices in Cyberport and provide a pathway for young people to pursue a career in I&T industry which was important to Hong Kong's economy and could improve Hong Kong people's quality of life. On Cyberport's relation with the local community, HKCMCL had been working closely with the local community with a view to encouraging the use of I&T and creating synergy. HKCMCL was most willing to identify ways to further strengthen its cooperation with the local

non-governmental organisations as suggested by SDC. Cyberport would consider opening up the conference facilities in the proposed development for use by the local community.

30. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) the role of Cyberport in the I&T development in Hong Kong and its occupancy rate;
- (b) any overlap in provision of the proposed conference facilities and the existing ones; and
- (c) the estimated working population in relation to the proposed office space.

31. Mr Peter Yan made the following response:

- (a) regarding the role of Cyberport in Hong Kong as compared with other technology parks, Cyberport focused mainly on digital technology such as cloud and digital technology platform while other parks might focus on technology research, bio-tech or advance manufacturing development. Occupancy rate of the existing Cyberport office space was over 90%. To illustrate Cyberport's need for office space, he cited the example that while there were about 600 to 700 applications for the Cyberport Incubation Programme each year, Cyberport could only admit around 100 companies as a result of shortage of facilities;
- (b) for conference facilities, the largest existing function rooms, which could only accommodate about 300 persons, could not meet current demand. There were at least three invitations last year to host large-scale international events which Cyberport had to turn down due to the lack of appropriate conference venue. The proposed conference facilities with a capacity of a maximum of 1,000 persons were considered necessary to meet such demand; and
- (c) the additional office space was expected to accommodate approximately an

additional 2,000 employees and 1,000 technology firms and start-ups.

Other Elements in Cyberport

32. Some Members raised questions on whether there were any innovative elements, such as art, being incorporated in the Cyberport which could benefit the local people and contribute to promoting I&T, and what the government was doing to promote STEM (“Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics”) education. Ms Eva Y.L. Yam, PAS(IT), ITB, responded that the Education Bureau (EDB) had introduced STEM elements in the curriculum of primary and secondary schools. Specifically on I&T, the Government launched the Enriched IT programme in eight secondary schools to incorporate information technology (IT) elements on top of the current curriculum. Schools could also apply for funding to conduct extra-curricular activities. In view of the positive response of the programme, the IT Innovation Lab in Secondary Schools (the Lab) initiative would be implemented subject to funding approval by the Legislative Council. The Lab would provide funding to 500 publicly-funded secondary schools in Hong Kong to set up IT innovation labs for a maximum of \$1 million to procure IT equipment and professional services such as cloud service, and organise IT-related extra-curricular activities.

33. Mr Peter Yan supplemented that the proposed expansion project was to cater for the extension of the facilities of the current Cyberport. For example, the Cyberport Creative Micro Fund provided seed funding for entrepreneurs to help turn innovative ideas into prototypes. E-sports was an emerging sector in Hong Kong. HKCMCL had launched two schemes to provide financial assistance for the development of the e-sports industry. HKCMCL was working with one of its start-ups to further promote digital art. It would continue to find ways to incorporate technology on campus and in its facilities.

Development Control

34. A Member enquired whether the maximum GFA of 66,000m² with the breakdown of office uses and other commercial uses was indicative only and whether there would be adjustment on the breakdown. In response, Mr Jerry Austin, DPO/HK, said that maximum GFA restriction was not intended to provide control on detailed breakdown on different type of uses. Minor relaxation of GFA restriction might be considered by the

Town Planning Board (the Board) on application under section 16 of the Ordinance.

Traffic and Pedestrian Linkage

35. A Member raised a question on the development programme of SIL(W) and whether the existing traffic capacity could cater for the proposed Cyberport expansion. In response, Mr Jerry Austin, DPO/HK, said that as advised by the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB), the implementation of the SIL(W) would be subject to the programme for the development in the Wah Fu area and redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate as well as the build-up of transport demand. Assessment would be undertaken holistically to examine the overall impacts on the provision of SIL(W) as well as the proposed stations to the areas. For early planning of the SIL(W), THB had invited the MTR Corporation Limited in June 2019 to submit a proposal for SIL(W).

36. In response to some Members' question on pedestrian facilities in the area and pedestrian linkages from Cyberport to Telegraph Bay and Waterfall Bay, Mr Jerry Austin, DPO/HK said that the existing and planned open spaces along Kellett Bay, Waterfall Bay, Telegraph Bay and Sandy Bay already allowed the provision of a continuous open space network with a possible walking trail along the coast of Pok Fu Lam as pedestrian walkway was always permitted within the "O" zone. Ms Eva Y.L. Yam, PAS(IT), ITB, supplemented that better linkages between Cyberport and the nearby area would be welcomed. The proposed pedestrian links to Sandy Bay and Waterfall Bay Park as mentioned by the SDC members had been discussed at the district level for some time and much work had been done by SDC. As the two links were outside the boundary of the Cyberport, they should be considered separately from the Cyberport expansion project. Ms Eva Y.L. Yam indicated that meanwhile, ITB and Cyberport would further discuss with government bureaux and departments concerned on the proposed pedestrian links.

Visual Impact, Building Design and Air Ventilation

37. Some Members enquired whether there was any visual impact on the neighbourhood especially from Residence Bel-air. Mr Jerry Austin, DPO/HK, responded that according to the visual impact assessment (VIA) conducted by HKCMCL, the proposed Cyberport expansion would in general only constitute insubstantial to moderate visual

impacts at most of the viewing points due to long distance and screening by existing developments and trees. The Cyberport Waterfront Park was the only viewing point that would experience negative visual impact even with the implementation of the design measures.

38. A Member further enquired if the proposed BHR of 65mPD would allow stepped height profile for the area. In response, Mr Jerry Austin, DPO/HK said that the existing Cyberport Phases 1 and 2 were subject to BHR of 85mPD. For sub-area 3 and 4 which were mainly residential developments, the BHR was 185mPD. The proposed BHR of 65mPD had taken into account the stepped height profile for the area.

39. Some Members raised the following questions regarding the building design:

- (a) according to the cross-section plan as shown in the Paper, the proposed building with 65mPD might pose visual impact on the surrounding, whether there were any details provided on the building design; and
- (b) with reference to the Drawings of the Paper, whether the building design as shown in the indicative drawing was elongated along the shoreline without stepping height from uphill to waterfront.

40. In response, Mr Peter Yan and Mr Joel C.S. Chan, ITB's representatives, made the following points:

- (a) the ground floor of the proposed building would be made available as public space accessible to campus users and nearby residents. As suggested by a member of SDC, Cyberport was actively considering opening up the podium or even the roof of the proposed building as a viewing platform and for recreational use so that the public could enjoy a more diverse public space. While there would be a slightly adverse visual impact on the surrounding, there was a need to strike a balance on development need. HKCMCL would endeavour to improve the design of the building taking into consideration the comments received; and

- (b) referring to Drawing 2a of the Paper, the proposed building with stepping height from the waterfront towards the hinterland would reduce visual impact on the surrounding. Besides, there would be, among others, a 32m wide empty bay on G/F, permeable building design on ground and upper floors, and a 36m wide community garden on 3rd floor of the building. Nevertheless, the building design as shown in the Drawings of the Paper was indicative only. The detailed design would be modified taking into account different stakeholders' comments.

GIC Provision and Elderly Population

41. In response to a Member's question on planned GIC provision, Mr Jerry Austin, DPO/HK, said that in the Pok Fu Lam area, GIC facilities were generally sufficient in meeting local needs, except for the provision of kindergarten/nursery, clinic/health centre, residential care homes for the elderly and community care services facilities.

42. A Member enquired about the population of elderly in the district. Mr Jerry Austin, DPO/HK, explained that in 2014, there were about 12,000 elderly residents representing 15% of the population of the district. The elderly population was expected to increase to 21,500 or 23% in 2024.

Waterfront Promenade

43. In response to a Member's concern on the management and opening hours of the future waterfront promenade, Mr Peter Yan said that the future waterfront promenade within the Cyberport Waterfront Park would be managed by HKCMCL and it would be open to the public 24 hours a day. Members in general welcomed the arrangement.

44. In response to a Member's question, Mr Jerry Austin, DPO/HK, said that currently there was no provision of cycling track in the waterfront park. Whether cycling tracks would be provided would be subject to the detailed design of the park taking into account views of the local community. No assessment had been conducted on the possibility of providing marine access to the waterfront park.

Land Administration

45. A Member was concerned about the future land administration and selection of tenants in the proposed Cyberport expansion area. In response, Ms Eva Y.L. Yam, PAS(IT), ITB, said that the initial idea was that the site would be granted to HKCMCL under the prevailing practice. On the selection of tenants for the new office space, Mr Peter Yan said that the existing criteria would be deployed and the tenants should be I&T-related companies or those companies providing ancillary services in support of the I&T ecosystem.

Conclusion and Suggestions on Amendment Items A1 and A2

46. Members generally supported the proposed Amendment Item A since I&T industry was an important industry in Hong Kong. As the site was located along the shoreline of Pok Fu Lam district, detailed planning with stepped height profile was recommended to minimise the possible visual impact. ITB and HKCMCL should proactively interact with the local community to achieve a successful and welcoming development. Given the different working styles of I&T entrepreneurs, a Member suggested that sports facilities such as a gym could be included in the expansion project. Some Members added that there was room for improvement of ancillary facilities such as carpark, the variety of dining places and shops.

Amendment Items B1 to E

47. A Member asked whether there was any relation between the reduction of open space (by using existing Cyberport Waterfront Park for Cyberport expansion) under Item A1 and the proposed rezoning from areas shown as 'Road' to "O" under Items B1 and B2. In response, Mr Jerry Austin, DPO/HK, said that those areas zoned "O" were immediately adjoining the existing Waterfall Bay Park (under Item B1) and currently developed as an existing open space (Kellett Bay Park) under Item B2. The proposed rezoning of these sites to "O" was not meant to compensate for the loss of open space caused by the proposed Cyberport expansion.

48. Some Members raised questions on the reason for rezoning Item C2 from an area shown as 'Road' to "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") zone. In response,

Mr Jerry Austin, DPO/HK, said that a large part of the site was a piece of government land currently used as pedestrian walkway being managed by the University of Hong Kong (HKU). The site was formed when the HKU developed the sport centre (zoned “G/IC”) and the site was licenced to HKU for management. A Member further enquired if the nature of the site was similar to the waterfront promenade in Central and Kwun Tong. Mr Jerry Austin, DPO/HK supplemented that those waterfront promenade located in the Central and Kwun Tong were zoned “O” with supporting facilities while the site in question was only a 6m wide narrow footpath along the shoreline adjacent to the sports centre. Some Members were of the view that the sports grounds and the adjoining footpath should be considered as a whole and agreed that the site should be rezoned to “G/IC”.

49. A Member enquired on the planned Government facilities under Item C1. In response, Mr Jerry Austin, DPO/HK said the “G/IC” zone consisted of the existing Sandy Bay Preliminary Treatment Works Plant and a planned school development.

50. Regarding Item D, a Member asked whether a footpath could be constructed within the “Green Belt” zone. In response, Mr Jerry Austin, DPO/HK said that footpath was always permitted and application for the Board’s approval was not required.

51. Members had no comment on the other amendment items.

Conclusion

52. To sum up, the Chairman concluded that Members generally agreed to the proposed amendments.

53. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Pok Fu Lam OZP and that the draft Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/17A at **Attachment II** (to be renumbered to S/H10/18 upon exhibition) and its Notes at **Attachment III** are suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at **Attachment IV** for the draft Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/17A as an expression of the planning

intentions and objectives of the Board for the various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES will be published together with the OZP.

54. Members noted that, as a general practice, the Secretariat of the Board would undertake detailed checking and refinement of the draft OZP including Notes and ES, if appropriate, before their publication under the Ordinance. Any major revision would be submitted for the Board's consideration.

55. The Chairman thanked the representatives of PlanD, TD and ITB to attend the meeting to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 10

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting]

A/K10/261 Proposed Social Welfare Facility (Residential Care Home for the Elderly) in "Residential (Group B)" Zone, 349 Prince Edward Road West, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K10/261A)

56. The Committee noted that the applicant's representative requested on 19.8.2019 deferment of the consideration of the application for two months in order to allow time for preparation of further information to address the comments from government departments. This was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had submitted further information to respond to departmental comments.

57. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the

**Minutes of the 21st Meeting of the
District Development and Housing Committee (DDHC)
Southern District Council (2016-2019) (SDC)**

Date: 27 May 2019

Time: 2:30 p.m.

Venue: SDC Conference Room

Present:

Dr CHU Ching-hong, BBS, JP	(Chairman of SDC)
Mr CHAN Fu-ming, MH	(Vice-Chairman of SDC)
Mr LAM Kai-fai, MH	(Chairman of DDHC)
Dr MAK TSE How-ling, Ada, MH	(Vice-Chairlady of DDHC)
Mr AU Lap-sing, MH	
Mr AU Nok-hin	
Mr CHAI Man-hon	
Ms CHAN Judy Kapui	
Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying	
Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung, MH	
Mr CHU Lap-wai	
Mr FUNG Se-goun, Fergus	
Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH	
Mr LO Kin-hei	
Mr TSUI Yuen-wa	
Ms YAM Pauline	
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	
Mr LAW Kam-hung	
Ms LAW Siu-fong	
Ms TAM May-bo, Jeanette	
Dr WONG Yat-lung, Philip	

Absent with Apologies:

Mr CHOI Tsung-mang

Secretary:

Miss CHOW Cheuk-ying, Karen	Executive Officer (District Council) 2, Southern District Office, Home Affairs Department
-----------------------------	--

In Attendance:

Mrs MA CHOW Pui-fun, Dorothy, JP	District Officer (Southern), Home Affairs Department
Miss CHENG Wai-sum, Sum	Assistant District Officer (Southern), Home Affairs Department
Ms YIP Wai-see, Priscilla	Senior Executive Officer (District Council), Southern District Office, Home Affairs Department
Mr CHAN Ip-to, Tony	Senior Executive Officer (District Management), Southern District Office, Home Affairs Department
Mr WONG Wai-yin, Vincent	Senior Town Planner/HK 1, Planning Department
Ms TSE Wing-sheung, Doris	Senior Estate Surveyor/South (Atg.), Lands Department
Ms HA Chung-wan, Joanne	Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Southern, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr LING Chi-wai, Jimmy	Engineer 13 (South Development Office), Civil Engineering and Development Department
Ms LO Kit-sheun	Housing Manager/HKI7, Housing Department
Ms WONG Cho-kwan	Engineer/HK (Distribution 3), Water Supplies Department

Attending by Invitation (Agenda Item 2):

Mr Peter YAN	Chief Executive Officer, Hong Kong Cyberport Management Company Limited
Mr Howard CHENG	Chief Operating Officer, Hong Kong Cyberport Management Company Limited
Mr Joel CHAN	Architect & Director, P & T Group

Attending by Invitation (Agenda Item 3):

Mr SIT Fung-sing	Chief Engineer/Housing Projects 3, Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr YIP Wai-choi, James	Senior Engineer/1, Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr TONG Cheung	Engineer/2, Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr. CHUNG Kam-choi, Antony	Senior Architect 25, Housing Department
Mr LEUNG Hoi-kit, Frankie	Senior Civil Engineer 2, Housing Department
Mr HUNG Tsz-hin	Engineer/Southern 2

~~Part 1 – Items for Discussion~~

Agenda Item 1: Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 20th DDHC Meeting held on 25 March 2019

3. The Chairman said that prior to the meeting, the draft minutes of the aforesaid meeting had been circulated to all Members and relevant government department representatives. The Secretariat had not received any amendment proposals so far.

~~4. The minutes were confirmed by the Committee.~~

**Agenda Item 2: Cyberport Expansion Project
(Item raised by Hong Kong Cyberport Management Company Limited)
(DDHC Paper No. 11/2019)**

(Mr FUNG Se-goun, Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung, MH, Ms YAM Pauline and Ms CHAN Judy Kapui joined the meeting at 2:36 p.m., 2:40 p.m., 2:41 p.m. and 2:44 p.m. respectively.)

5. The Chairman welcomed the following representatives from the institutions concerned to the meeting:

Hong Kong Cyberport Management Company Limited (HKCMCL)

- (a) Mr Peter YAN, Chief Executive Officer;
- (b) Mr Howard CHENG, Chief Operating Officer; and

P & T Group

- (c) Mr Joel CHAN, Architect & Director.

6. The Chairman invited Mr Peter YAN, a representative of HKCMCL, to briefly introduce the paper.

7. With the aid of PowerPoint presentation, Mr Peter YAN briefed Members on the Cyberport expansion project, with details set out in DDHC Paper No. 11/2019 and Reference Information 1.

8. Mr CHAI Man-hon raised an enquiry on the rules of order as follows:

- (a) under Order 17(1) of the Southern District Council Standing Orders (the Standing Orders), any Member who wished to move a motion was required to give the Secretary notice 10 clear working days before a forthcoming meeting unless otherwise agreed by the Chairman. In addition, under Order 29 of the Standing Orders, unless agreed otherwise by the Chairman, a Member who wished to make a written statement at a meeting should send it to the Secretary 10 clear working days before the meeting. However, in the absence of a sufficiently early notice of the agenda items put forward by government departments or institutions to SDC or its Committees, Members might not be able to move a motion or make a written statement at a meeting in respect of the agenda items within the period specified under Orders 17(1) and 29 of the Standing Orders; and
- (b) according to the paper on the re-organisation of the Innovation and Technology Bureau (ITB) and creation of new directorate posts tabled for discussion at a meeting of the Legislative Council (LegCo) Panel on Information Technology and Broadcasting in November 2017, the Deputy Secretary for Innovation and Technology (2), the Principal Assistant Secretary for Innovation and Technology (3) and eight non-directorate posts deployed from the Office of the Chief Government Information Officer would form a new policy team in ITB to undertake, among others, the role of monitoring the operation of Cyberport. He pointed out that the MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) and the government departments concerned had in the past sent representatives to attend SDC meetings to discuss matters relating to the South Island Line (East) (SIL(E)). Hence, he commented that apart from the representatives of HKCMCL, ITB should have sent representatives to attend the meeting as well, so as to facilitate discussion of matters relating to Cyberport and the area in its vicinity. In this connection, he would like to be briefed on the above issues.

9. Dr CHU Ching-hong, BBS, JP raised an enquiry on the rules of order, saying that under Order 7(1) of the Standing Orders, unless otherwise agreed by the Chairman, the notice of a meeting, the agenda and relevant papers should be issued to Members six clear working days before the meeting. However, he noticed that the arrangements for recent meetings had failed to comply with the above requirement. He pointed out that despite the adverse impact of the drainage improvement works for Pok Fu Lam Village on residents in Chi Fu Fa Yuen, some of the information about the project was disclosed only when the project was discussed at the 19th meeting on 28 January 2019. Besides, it was not until the morning on

the date of the meeting that some information on agenda item 3 had been uploaded onto the SDC website. As such, he suggested exploring ways to enhance the arrangements.

10. The Chairman gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) under Order 17(1) of the Standing Orders, the Chairman could decide whether to accept a provisional motion moved by a Member who was unable to give the 10 clear working days' notice before the meeting, having regard to the urgency of the subject matter. He appreciated Mr CHAI Man-hon's concern about the difficulty to move a motion on the Cyberport expansion project due to the lack of sufficiently advance notice; and
- (b) as the government departments concerned had submitted discussion papers with relevant information in haste, Members had not been given sufficient time to go through them in detail, and residents were unable to convey to Members their wish in a timely manner. The practice was considered to be disrespectful to SDC. He requested the Southern District Office to urge the relevant government departments to submit papers to SDC and its Committees within the prescribed deadlines in the future.

11. Mr CHAI Man-hon raised an enquiry on the rules of order, saying that the government departments concerned had failed to send representatives to attend the meeting despite that some Members might raise enquiries on issues outside the purview of HKCMCL such as transport arrangements, etc. That practice was considered undesirable and unable to squarely address the enquiries from SDC. He also asked whether ITB would assume responsibility for co-ordinating the Cyberport expansion project.

12. The Chairman responded that HKCMCL had put forward the agenda item with the aim to listen to the preliminary views of SDC at this meeting. Before submitting a formal application to the Town Planning Board (TPB), HKCMCL would be required to consult SDC again with representatives of the government departments concerned in attendance.

13. Dr CHU Ching-hong, BBS, JP raised an enquiry on the rules of order, saying that HKCMCL would activate the statutory planning procedure specified under the Town Planning Ordinance after the meeting. Therefore, he suggested that the Planning Department (PlanD) forward details of this discussion for TPB's reference. The Chairman noted his suggestion.

14. With the aid of PowerPoint presentation, Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN briefed Members on the views from residents in Pok Fu Lam regarding the Cyberport expansion project. Details were set out in Reference Information 2.

15. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, Mr AU Nok-hin, Mr LO Kin-hei, Ms CHAN Judy Kapui, Dr MAK TSE How-ling, MH, Mr LAW Kam-hung, Dr CHU Ching-hong, BBS, JP, Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying, Mr TSUI Yuen-wa, Mr CHAN Fu-ming, MH, Mr CHAI Man-hon, Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH and Dr WONG Yat-lung raised the following comments and enquiries:

Stances on the Project

- (a) a number of Members supported the Cyberport expansion project which in their opinion was conducive to the long-term technological development of Hong Kong, while another Member wished to obtain more details regarding the project and expressed reservations at the current stage;
- (b) a Member enquired whether the Committee had to make a resolution on whether to support the Cyberport expansion project at the meeting despite that Members were only briefed on the preliminary proposal of the project. He also queried why HKCMCL having been managing Cyberport for over a decade, had not proposed enhancing the Waterfront Park until then;
- (c) a Member said that responses from nearly 900 residents in Pok Fu Lam to a questionnaire survey regarding the Cyberport expansion project had been received, among which over 50% objected to the project. The residents were particularly concerned whether HKCMCL had made optimal use of the existing office spaces in Cyberport;

Transport Facilities and Road Improvement Proposals

- (d) a number of Members emphasised the need for improving the transport facilities in the vicinity of Cyberport in parallel with the commencement of the expansion project, such as the expeditious construction of the South Island Line (West) (SIL(W)) to improve traffic in the western part of the Southern District. A Member enquired when the Government would commence the advance works for SIL(W) to address the traffic needs arising from the Cyberport expansion project, the population growth upon the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate, and the

redevelopment of the Queen Mary Hospital, etc. Another Member hoped that HKCMCL could join hands with SDC to press for the expeditious construction of SIL(W));

- (e) a Member said that some tenants of the Cyberport offices encountered difficulties in recruitment due to inconvenient transportation and the lack of a railway network in Cyberport. As a result, they had no choice but to move their offices to relatively more accessible areas such as Central and Sheung Wan. In terms of transport facilities, Cyberport was undesirable compared to the Science Park which shared the same aim of promoting the development of innovation and technology (IT);
- (f) a Member said that the public were often discouraged from participating in IT events in Cyberport due to inadequate transport facilities. For example, the visitor flow for the “Southern District National Day eSports Carnival” held in The Arcade Cyberport in 2018 was unsatisfactory. Some participants commented that there was no need to visit the relatively remote Cyberport when similar facilities were available in Mong Kok. As such, it was necessary to improve transport facilities in Cyberport before enhancing other facilities in Cyberport, which included the expeditious construction of SIL(W);
- (g) a Member said that residents in Pok Fu Lam were concerned about the traffic problems arising from the project and demanded HKCMCL to submit the relevant traffic impact assessment (TIA) report, and to explain the measures to improve the major road junctions in the vicinity and the arrangements for improving public transport services. Another Member suggested that a review on the service frequency of buses and mini-buses plying to and from Cyberport be conducted to assess whether adequate services were being provided;

Pedestrian Facilities

- (h) a number of Members pointed out that the connection between Cyberport and its neighbourhood should be taken into account when implementing the Cyberport expansion project. For instance, pedestrian facilities connecting Sandy Bay and Telegraph Bay as well as Waterfall Bay and Wah Fu Estate should be provided to increase visitor flow and relieve traffic load;

- (i) a Member asked whether a footbridge connecting Cyberport 5 and The Cyberport Arcade or the other phases would be constructed. He was of the view that it could relieve the burden on road traffic in the vicinity;

Cyberport Waterfront Park Enhancement Works and Loss of Public Space

- (j) a number of Members pointed out that Cyberport Waterfront Park was popular among residents in the district and urged HKCMCL to explain whether the Waterfront Park would become part of The Arcade and not be treated as public space upon expansion. Furthermore, it was noted that upon the expansion project, HKCMCL would be responsible for the daily management, maintenance and greening of the Waterfront Park in the long run. A Member asked for the details of the relevant arrangements;
- (k) a number of Members put forward improvement proposals for the Cyberport Waterfront Park, including the provision of a pier with shade and seating and additional ancillary facilities such as safety equipment, as well as the provision of a jogging track, a sports area and a family interactive area etc.;
- (l) a Member wished to know how much of the provision of \$5.5 billion earmarked in the 2019-20 Budget for the development of Cyberport 5 had been reserved for enhancing the Cyberport Waterfront Park, as well as the relevant enhancement measures, management and maintenance matters;
- (m) a number of Members pointed out that the existing site of the proposed project was a public space, and were worried about the possible reduction in public space in Cyberport as a result of the expansion project. They wished to know the actual area of the proposed project site and the area of the public space upon completion of the project to assess the expansion or reduction of public space arising from the Cyberport expansion project. They enquired whether there was any compensation proposal in case public space in Cyberport was reduced by the expansion project;
- (n) a Member noted that the ground area of Cyberport 5 would be open for public use and enquired whether the rooftop could be open to the public as a lookout tower;

Impacts on the Surrounding Environment, including Visual Impact

- (o) a Member said that the building of Cyberport 5 would affect the view and quality of life enjoyed by the residents of Baguio Villa and requested HKCMCL to submit the design drawings showing the visual impacts of the project;
- (p) as the Cyberport expansion project was expected to commence in 2021 and be completed in 2024, in view of the overlapping timeline for the project and the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate, and coupled with the narrow roads in the vicinity, a Member expressed concerns over the impacts of the works on the neighbourhood such as traffic congestion, noise nuisance and air pollution, etc. Another Member suggested that HKCMCL co-ordinate with the Housing Department (HD) to avoid adding to the traffic load in the vicinity. She would like to know the measures that could be taken to minimise the impacts of the works on the surrounding environment and asked for the specific works schedule;
- (q) a Member said that due to the lack of large restaurants in Cyberport, many tenant buses accessed the neighbourhood during lunch hour, thereby imposing burden on the traffic in the neighbourhood. The visitor flow in Cyberport upon expansion would increase, and if tenant buses were not subject to regulation, it could exert additional burden on the traffic load in the neighbourhood;

Titles and Management Matters

- (r) a Member enquired whether the entire Waterfront Park would be taken over by HKCMCL, and what were the terms and conditions to ensure that HKCMCL would not put forward further expansion in the Waterfront Park in the future;
- (s) a Member considered HKCMCL's management poor and rigid, pointing out that despite the wide road outside a supermarket at Cyberport, there were obstacles to hinder the picking up and dropping off of passengers by vehicles and access by the public. Moreover, some of the facilities in the Waterfront Park damaged by typhoon Mangkhut in 2018 had not yet been restored. He enquired whether Cyberport would continue to be managed by HKCMCL upon completion of the expansion project, or whether its management would be taken over by government departments or outsourced. Another Member suggested that HKCMCL establish a partnership with SDC and listen to Members' views to optimise the operation of the park;

IT Development

- (t) a Member pointed out that the Science Park and its neighbouring Chinese University of Hong Kong worked closely together to implement projects such as “Smart Region”, and suggested that Cyberport develop partnership programmes with the adjacent University of Hong Kong (HKU) to attract more technology firms and start-ups to Cyberport in a similar fashion as the collaborative efforts of SDC and the Department of Ophthalmology of the HKU Faculty of Medicine to promote ophthalmic examination services under the Signature Project Scheme of the Southern District;
- (u) a Member suggested that some offices in Cyberport 5 be reserved for use by social enterprises (SEs) so that grassroots students would have the opportunity to access relevant IT knowledge, which was conducive to the training of IT talents;
- (v) a Member suggested that liaison between Cyberport and the community be strengthened by, for instance, applying IT to non-governmental organisations and elderly centres in the Southern District to address problems such as dementia;

Other Comments

- (w) a Member said that matters relating to the Cyberport expansion project which involved \$5.5 billion public money, such as the construction of SIL(W) and pedestrian facilities, etc., would straddle the work of government departments or other institutions. To facilitate SDC’s discussion on the Cyberport expansion project, it was hoped that the government departments concerned or other institutions would appoint representatives to attend meetings of the Committee to discuss matters relating to the project. Another Member pointed out that TPB should not proceed with the consideration of the planning application with respect to the expansion project until SDC had fully discussed the subject again;
- (x) a Member said that based on the information from HKCMCL, the occupancy rate of Cyberport’s office space and Smart-Spaces had reached approximately 90% over the past three years. However, it was revealed in the media that some leasees of Cyberport’s office space did not engage in the information technology-related business, and that some offices had even been closed for a long time. He requested HKCMCL to give an account of the above situation;

- (y) a Member commented that there was a lack of intelligent facilities at Cyberport. Earlier on, its shopping mall merely comprised speciality stores offering baby products, furniture and luxury clothing rental service, etc. Moreover, the new automated store supplied mobile phone chargers and camera bags only, which was unable to render high-tech customer experience. She considered that HKCMCL should review the tenant mix of The Arcade and introduce more intelligent facilities such as automated restaurants and smart lampposts, etc., with a view to improving the image of Cyberport;
- (z) a Member wished to know the feasibility of transporting construction materials by sea, and pointed out that presumably the adoption of prefabricated building components could reduce construction lead time approximately by half. In this regard, she enquired HKCMCL whether the construction of an 11-storey building over a period of three years was a conservative estimate;
- (aa) a Member considered that SDC should take a tougher attitude toward late submission of discussion papers or relevant information and refuse discussion of agenda items put forward by government departments when submission deadlines were not met. It was envisaged that this approach could effectively address the situation where government departments were in too much of a hurry to submit discussion papers or relevant information; and
- (bb) given that the current site of Cyberport sat against the mountains and overlooked the sea, and that Cyberport was built on reclaimed land, exorbitant development and construction costs were incurred. A Member pointed out that in the past, the Government should have chosen a better option, such as Wong Chuk Hang, for the development of an IT hub during the site selection process.

16. Mr Peter YAN gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) he noted and thanked Members for their comments. To increase the pedestrian flow and tackle traffic congestion, HKCMCL had been committed to enhancing the transport services in Cyberport and the facilities in the Waterfront Park with a view to benefitting tenants and providing more public space for the residents in the Southern District;
- (b) the Cyberport Waterfront Park was currently managed by HKCMCL under a short-term tenancy arrangement. Upon the expansion of Cyberport, HKCMCL

would take over the daily management, maintenance and greening of the Cyberport Waterfront Park in the long run, thereby facilitating long-term enhancement works in the future;

- (c) HKCMCL hoped to increase the number of visitors to Cyberport and realise its mission of promoting IT through its key development projects, which included the promotion of the electronic sports (e-sports) industry. Based on relevant research reports and foreign experience, not only could organising e-sports competitions facilitate the promotion of the industry, but it could also attract a great deal of visitors and increase employment opportunities for young people. In light of the need for a suitable venue for organising e-sports competitions, HKCMCL was currently conducting enhancement works to convert the atrium of The Arcade into an e-sports arena up to international standards;
- (d) HKCMCL would strive to reduce the impact of expansion works on the surrounding environment, and consider the adoption of various environmental protection measures, such as transportation of construction materials by sea. HKCMCL was also currently discussing the matter with the government departments concerned;
- (e) maintenance of air ventilation had already been considered in the design of the project to provide a better and more comfortable space for the public; and
- (f) the site area of the proposed project development was approximately 1.6 hectares, consisting of one hectare of land for Cyberport 5. Upon completion of the project, the remaining 0.6 hectare would be included in the Cyberport Waterfront Park. Together with the proposed landscape enhancement area of approximately 4.8 hectares, the proposed project development would provide a total of 5.4 hectares of public space. In addition, part of the ground floor area of Cyberport 5 would be used as public space. HKCMCL would also actively consider Member's suggestion of opening the podium and rooftop of Cyberport 5 for the public as viewing areas. It was believed that the area of public space would remain more or less the same or even increase in the future.

17. Mr Howard CHENG gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) he understood that a number of Members were concerned about the transport services in Cyberport. HKCMCL was currently discussing with the relevant

institutions with a view to implementing traffic improvement measures that could increase passenger capacity without generating additional vehicular flow prior to the commencement of the expansion project;

- (b) he pointed out that as some of the tenant buses were currently operated by the tenants themselves, staff of other tenants were not allowed to take them even if seats were available. Therefore, HKCMCL considered operating all tenant buses to fully optimise the capacity of each tenant bus. It was estimated that an additional capacity of about 2 000 passengers could be provided without increasing the number of tenant buses. HKCMCL was currently discussing the implementation of such measure with the government departments concerned; and
- (c) HKCMCL was actively discussing with bus companies and mini-bus companies the ways to improve public transport services. For example, it was proposed that 19-seat mini-buses be employed for services between Cyberport and Kennedy Town MTR station so as to provide additional capacity for each mini-bus without increasing the number of vehicles. In addition, HKCMCL had also stepped up publicity of buses travelling via Wong Chuk Hang MTR Station.

18. Mr Joel CHAN gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) the consultancy team was discussing the TIA with the Transport Department (TD). During the assessment, the consultancy team had taken into account the new developments in the vicinity, such as the redevelopment works of Wah Fu Estate and the new academic building of HKU. It was preliminarily proposed that improvement works at four road junctions in the vicinity be carried out to alleviate traffic burden. Cyberport was awaiting TD's approval regarding details of the proposed improvement works such as location and type of work to be done. It was expected that the proposed amendments to the approved Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan (the OZP) in respect of the project would be submitted to the Metro Planning Committee of TPB before the end of 2019, by which time more information could be provided to Members; and
- (b) he pointed out that the construction of a building of seven to eight storeys and its foundation works would take about two years, whereas the construction of the basement in Cyberport 5 would generally take one year. As the Modular Integrated Construction method in Hong Kong was not yet mature, according to

the experience of Singapore, the construction time might not be shortened significantly. Therefore, it was estimated that the whole expansion project would take about three years.

19. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, Ms CHEUNG Sik-yong, MH, Mr LAW Kam-hung, Mr CHAI Man-hon, Mr LO Kin-hei, Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH, Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying and Mr TSUI Yuen-wa raised the following comments and enquiries:

Stances on the Project

- (a) a Member said that since the details of the Cyberport expansion project had not been provided at this meeting, it was inappropriate for SDC to express its stance on the project for the time being. Another Member pointed out that Cyberport was conducive to the development of information and communication technology as well as the nurturing of the youth, entrepreneurs and start-ups in Hong Kong, which created benefits for the society. Therefore, he supported the Cyberport expansion project;

Transport Facilities

- (b) a Member pointed out that Ocean Park's expansion in earlier years provided an opportunity for justifying the construction of SIL(E) which had eventually been implemented. She emphasised that there must be growth in the local population upon the completion of the Wah Fu Estate redevelopment project and the Cyberport expansion project, and the construction of a railway network could cater for the increased people flow without aggravating the burden on road traffic. Therefore, she commented that the Cyberport expansion project should be in line with the construction of SIL(W), and urged HKCMCL to support the construction of SIL(W) for prompt implementation of the project;

Pedestrian Facilities

- (c) a Member pointed out that it was necessary to ensure sufficient visitor flow in order to attract quality restaurants to establish in Cyberport. Hence, apart from the provision of \$5.5 billion for the expansion of Cyberport, the Government was urged to earmark additional funding to conduct associated improvement works, such as road improvement works, construction of MTR stations and pedestrian facilities connecting Cyberport with Sandy Bay and Wah Fu Estate, with a view

to increasing visitor flow in Cyberport and strengthening the connection between Cyberport and its neighbourhood;

- (d) a Member suggested enhancing the connectivity between The Cyberport Arcade and different phases of Cyberport for the public's convenience;

Public Space

- (e) a Member suggested opening the podium of Cyberport 5 as a public space for public enjoyment with reference to the examples of other local hotels like Kerry Hotel, Hong Kong;

IT Development

- (f) a Member hoped that HKCMCL could shoulder social responsibility by reserving spaces in the Cyberport campus for SEs to teach students relevant IT knowledge;
- (g) a Member requested HKCMCL to actively consider strengthening the connection between Cyberport and the community, for instance, by applying IT in elderly centres;

Other Comments

- (h) a number of Members pointed out that the details of the expansion project such as the TIA, impacts of the works on the residential landscape in the vicinity, the design and management of The Arcade and the park, traffic measures and road designs were not available yet. They requested HKCMCL to have comprehensive discussion and provide more details to SDC before PlanD submitted the proposed amendments to the OZP concerned to the Metro Planning Committee of TPB. Also, the government departments concerned including ITB and TD should send representatives to attend the meeting. A Member proposed that Members' comments be set out in table form to facilitate future follow-up work;
- (i) a Member suggested that apart from the development of the e-sports industry, day-to-day businesses such as supermarkets, pharmacies, restaurants and bars should also be provided in Cyberport to cope with residents' daily needs; and

- (j) a Member pointed out that the Cyberport expansion project was funded by public money and thus he requested HKCMCL to give an account of the payback period, rate of return and social benefits in respect of the project.

20. The Chairman said that it was not necessary for the SDC to decide whether or not to support the Cyberport expansion project at the meeting. Further discussion on the details could be conducted later.

21. Mr Peter YAN gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) HKCMCL would continue to maintain close liaison with SDC and provide the relevant information on the Cyberport expansion project in due course;
- (b) HKCMCL would follow up on the increase in public space at Cyberport 5 and the enhancement of connectivity within the campus after the meeting and take into consideration the relevant comments at the detailed design stage in the future;
- (c) the provision of \$5.5 billion proposed in the 2019-20 Budget would only be used for the construction of Cyberport 5 and the enhancement works for the Waterfront Park. Additional funding would be required for other enhancement works; and
- (d) HKCMCL had strengthened its co-operation with local organisations and would step up the relevant work, especially liaison with SEs in the Southern District.

22. Mr WONG Wai-yin, Vincent responded that PlanD was studying the proposed amendments to the OZP and would relay Members' views to the relevant sections of PlanD after the meeting. Members could express their views during the exhibition period when TPB agreed to gazette the proposed amendments to the OZP.

23. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN raised an enquiry on the rules of order, saying that since the expansion project involved district planning and amendments to the OZP, PlanD should have given a response in the first round of the discussion.

24. The Chairman said that Mr LAW Kam-hung had enquired about the reason for accepting the agenda item raised by HKCMCL. Under Orders 6(5) and 13(1) of the Standing Orders, the Chairman might approve agenda items raised by any member of SDC, government department, statutory or public body. Besides, the Financial Secretary had proposed in the 2019-20 Budget that a provision of \$5.5 billion had been earmarked for

expanding Cyberport. As such, he had approved the discussion of the agenda item at the meeting.

25. The Chairman concluded as follows:

- (a) given the numerous items to be discussed at the meeting, he had advised before the meeting HKCMCL to give a simple and concise presentation. It was emphasised that the Cyberport expansion project aimed to attract more quality technology companies and start-ups to set up their offices in Cyberport and provide a pathway for young people to pursue a career in IT, thereby bringing benefits to Hong Kong, about which Members had no dispute;
- (b) Members had expressed their views on the Cyberport expansion project, including aspects such as catering facilities, business environment, transport services and whether the actual outcome might be different from the original intention of the expansion. They had also requested HKCMCL and the government departments concerned to note and follow up on their views;
- (c) it was the first time that HKCMCL had consulted SDC on the preliminary proposal for the expansion of Cyberport. While Members understood the intention of expanding Cyberport, they commented that certain issues should be addressed first. For instance, a number of Members had pressed for the expeditious construction of SIL(W) and implementation of traffic mitigation measures. SDC was dissatisfied with the Government for failing to proactively follow up on the construction of SIL(W), and thus urged HKCMCL and the government departments concerned such as PlanD to relay SDC's views to the Government. SDC would not rule out the possibility of objecting to the expansion of Cyberport should the Government fail to seriously consider the construction of SIL(W);
- (d) the agenda item mainly involved HKCMCL's brief on the preliminary proposal of the expansion of Cyberport and the relevant matters. To facilitate the progress of the project, the policy bureaux and departments concerned such as TD must send representatives to attend future meetings for discussing the expansion of Cyberport next time to conduct in-depth discussion on the project and collect Members' views; and

- (e) owing to the 2019 District Council (DC) Election to be held in November 2019, the last meeting of the Committee was scheduled for September 2019. PlanD was requested to note the timetable for the related town planning procedures and ensure that the Cyberport expansion project would not be hastily endorsed during the DC suspension period and before the commencement of the new DC term. PlanD was also requested to consult SDC again and relay SDC's views to TPB before submitting the proposed amendments to the OZP to TPB.

26. Mr Peter YAN supplemented as follows:

- (a) he stressed that the expansion of Cyberport would be beneficial to Hong Kong as it could attract more quality technology companies and start-ups to set up their offices in Cyberport and provide a pathway for young people to pursue a career in IT, enabling the long-term development of IT enterprises which would provide new impetus for the economy of Hong Kong. In addition, the expansion project would create more than 2 000 jobs; and
- (b) as to whether Cyberport could nurture talents by virtue of its advantage of close proximity to HKU, Cyberport had been co-operating with organisations including HKU to promote the nurturing of talents. For instance, administration courses offered by HKU had been held in Cyberport 4. Cyberport would enhance its work in this aspect in the future.

27. The Chairman said that given the tight meeting schedule, HKCMCL could provide further information such as the nurturing of talents at future meetings.

~~**Agenda Item 3: Site Formation and Infrastructure Works for Public Housing Developments at Pok Fu Lam South and Proposed Public Housing Developments in Pok Fu Lam South**
(Item raised by the Civil Engineering and Development Department and Housing Department)
(DDHC Paper No. 12/2019)~~

~~(Mr AU Lap-sing, MH, Mr CHU Lap-wai, Mr FUNG Se-goun and Ms TAM May-bo, Jeanette left the meeting at 6:26 p.m., 6:29 p.m., 6:41 p.m. and 6:44 p.m. respectively.)~~

**Minutes of the 22nd Meeting of the
District Development and Housing Committee (DDHC)
Southern District Council (2016-2019) (SDC)**

Date: 18 July 2019

Time: 2:30 p.m.

Venue: SDC Conference Room

Present:

Dr CHU Ching-hong, BBS, JP	(Chairman of SDC)
Mr CHAN Fu-ming, MH	(Vice-Chairman of SDC)
Mr LAM Kai-fai, MH	(Chairman of DDHC)
Dr MAK TSE How-ling, Ada, MH	(Vice-Chairlady of DDHC)
Mr AU Lap-sing, MH	
Mr AU Nok-hin	
Mr CHAI Man-hon	
Ms CHAN Judy Kapui	
Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying	
Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung, MH	
Mr CHU Lap-wai, MH	
Mr FUNG Se-goun, Fergus	
Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH	
Mr LO Kin-hei	
Mr TSUI Yuen-wa	
Ms YAM Pauline	
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	
Mr CHOI Tsung-mang	
Mr LAW Kam-hung	
Ms LAW Siu-fong	
Dr WONG Yat-lung, Philip	

Absent with Apologies:

Ms TAM May-bo, Jeanette

Secretary:

Miss CHOW Cheuk-ying, Karen

Executive Officer (District Council) 2,
Southern District Office, Home Affairs Department

In Attendance:

Mrs MA CHOW Pui-fun, Dorothy, JP	District Officer (Southern), Home Affairs Department
Miss CHENG Wai-sum, Sum	Assistant District Officer (Southern), Home Affairs Department
Ms YIP Wai-see, Priscilla	Senior Executive Officer (District Council), Southern District Office, Home Affairs Department
Mr CHAN Ip-to, Tony	Senior Executive Officer (District Management), Southern District Office, Home Affairs Department
Mr WONG Wai-yin, Vincent	Senior Town Planner/HK 1, Planning Department
Ms KO Wing-yee, Amii	Senior Estate Surveyor/South (District Lands Office, Hong Kong West and South), Lands Department
Mr AU YEUNG Wai-ming	Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Southern, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr LING Chi-wai, Jimmy	Engineer 13 (South Development Office), Civil Engineering and Development Department
Ms LO Kit-sheung	Housing Manager/HKI7, Housing Department
Ms WONG Cho-kwan	Engineer/HK (Distribution 3), Water Supplies Department

Attending by Invitation (Agenda Item 2):

Mr WONG Chung-lai, Frank	Project Director, Prudential Surveyors International Limited
Mr NG Sai-hee, Victor	Advisor, Prudential Surveyors International Limited
Ms ZHU Wei-han, Vivian	Team member (Planning and Transport), Prudential Surveyors International Limited
Mr WONG Wing-chun, Ben	Research Officer, Prudential Surveyors International Limited
Mr KWAN Chun-hei, Zac	Research Officer, Prudential Surveyors International Limited
Mr LEUNG Siu-chee	Marine Manager/Licensing & Port Formalities (3), Marine Department
Mr TAM Wai-man	Senior Assistant Shipping Master/South, Marine Department
Mr LI Hui-fung, Kevin	Senior Transport Officer/Southern, Transport Department
Mr CHEUNG Kwok-fai, Ivan	Senior Engineer/Southern, Transport Department

~~Mr LI Yick-chun Engineer/Housing & Planning 2,
Transport Department~~

Attending by Invitation (Agenda Item 3):

Ms YAM Ya-ling, Eva	Principal Assistant Secretary for Innovation & Technology (3), Innovation and Technology Bureau
Ms MAK Kai-ting, Salina	Assistant Secretary for Innovation & Technology (3A), Innovation and Technology Bureau
Mr Peter YAN	Chief Executive Officer, Hong Kong Cyberport Management Company Limited
Mr Howard CHENG	Chief Operating Officer, Hong Kong Cyberport Management Company Limited
Mr Joel CHAN	Architect & Director, P & T Group
Ms CHEUNG Lai-yung	Managing Director, Ozzo Technology (HK) Limited
Mr CHEUNG Kwok-fai, Ivan	Senior Engineer/Southern, Transport Department
Mr HUNG Tsz-hin	Engineer/Southern, Transport Department

Attending by Invitation (Agenda Item 4):

Ms CHOI King-chi, Angie	Public Relations Manager - Projects & Property, MTR Corporation Limited
Ms KWAN Siu-yi, Christine	Director, DLN Architects Limited
Ms LEE Wing-kei, Fiona	Associate, DLN Architects Limited
Mr FONG Hiu-fung, Jason	Estate Surveyor/RD/U3 (Railway Development Section/Urban Office), Lands Department
Mr CHEUNG Kwok-fai, Ivan	Senior Engineer/Southern, Transport Department

Attending by Invitation (Agenda Item 6):

Mr WAI Kam-fat, Danny	Chief Health Inspector (Southern) 1, Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
Mr LAU Wai-cheung	Senior Health Inspector (Cleansing/Pest Control), Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Opening Remarks:

The Chairman welcomed Members and standing government representatives to the meeting.

~~Committees to be responsible for following up the recommendation would be subject to the structure of the next term SDC; and~~

- (d) Members commended the Consultant for making every effort to collect views from the Council, the stakeholders and the public, draw up the revised planning strategy and development options in a timely manner, and render professional services despite the limited resources and tight timeframe.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat uploaded the finalised planning strategy and development options onto the SDC homepage and have forwarded them to the relevant government departments for follow up. The electronic version was also sent to the Committee Members accordingly.)

Agenda Item 3: Matters Arising – Cyberport Expansion Project
(Includes agenda item on “Supplementary Information on the Cyberport Expansion Project” raised by Innovation and Technology Bureau and Hong Kong Cyberport Management Company Limited and motion on “Associated Works of Cyberport Expansion” moved by Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN)
(DDHC Paper No. 18/2019)

49. The Chairman welcomed the following representatives from the departments and organisations concerned to the meeting:

ITB

- (a) Ms YAM Ya-ling, Eva, Principal Assistant Secretary for Innovation & Technology (3);
(b) Ms MAK Kai-ting, Salina, Assistant Secretary for Innovation & Technology (3A);

Hong Kong Cyberport Management Company Limited (HKCMCL)

- (c) Mr Peter YAN, Chief Executive Officer;
(d) Mr Howard CHENG, Chief Operating Officer;

P&T Group

(e) Mr Joel CHAN, Architect & Director;

Ozzo Technology (HK) Ltd.

(f) Ms CHEUNG Lai-yung, Managing Director; and

TD

(g) Mr HUNG Tsz-hin, Engineer/Southern 2.

50. The Chairman said that the Committee had discussed the “Cyberport Expansion Project” (the Project) at the last meeting. Since Members wished to obtain further details, ITB and HKCMCL had provided supplementary information on the Project. Moreover, Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN had moved a motion on the “Associated Works of Cyberport Expansion”, which was seconded by Mr CHAI Man-hon. Besides, the Secretariat had received an amendment motion moved by Mr CHU Lap-wai, MH and seconded by Mr AU Lap-sing, MH at the meeting. Given that the above agenda item, original motion and amendment motion revolved around the same subject, it was suggested that the items be discussed jointly.

51. The Chairman read out the original motion and amendment motion, as follows:

(a) “Original Motion”:

(Moved by Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN and seconded by Mr CHAI Man-hon)

“In consideration of the expansion of Cyberport, the Southern District Council requests the implementation of three associated projects which will improve the connection between Cyberport and the neighbouring communities, and provide greater convenience for everyone: the improvement of nearby road junctions; a pedestrian bridge over Waterfall Bay; and an elevated walkway along the shore between Telegraph Bay and Sandy Bay.”

(b) “Amendment Motion”:

(Moved by Mr CHU Lap-wai, MH and seconded by Mr AU Lap-sing, MH)

“In consideration of the expansion of Cyberport, the Southern District Council requests improvement of nearby road junctions as well as taking forward the

construction of the SIL(W) with stations and pedestrian connections constructed in the vicinity of Cyberport, which will improve the connection between Cyberport and the neighbouring communities, and provide greater convenience for everyone.”

52. The Chairman invited the representatives of ITB and HKCMCL to brief Members on the content of the paper.

53. During her presentation of the paper, Ms Eva YAM said that fostering the development of innovation and technology (I&T) was an important policy area of the Government. Not only could I&T propel economic development, it could also enhance the livelihood of the people, such as facilitating the public’s access to transport and elderly care services. As such, the Government had injected more than \$100 billion in I&T development over the past two years. Cyberport played an integral role in the overall I&T development. Transforming ideas into products and solutions, start-ups were also an important component of I&T development. So far, Cyberport had nurtured over 600 start-ups, three of which had become “unicorns” within the industry. Since the existing office space and common area of Cyberport were almost fully utilised, the Government intended to expand the Cyberport campus to provide more office space.

54. Ms Eva YAM continued that in response to Members’ views expressed at the last meeting regarding the implementation of SIL(W) and the improvement of pedestrian connections between Cyberport and its vicinity, she had provided a reply with details set out at Annex 1 to DDHC Paper No. 18/2019 and Reference Information 1. She stressed that as the Project was still at the conceptual stage, Members were welcomed to provide views on the project design, works programme and future operation, etc., so that HKCMCL could take their comments into account at the detailed design stage later on. ITB would consult SDC on the detailed design before seeking funding approval from the LegCo.

55. Mr Peter YAN briefed Members on the occupancy of office space and The Arcade as well as information relating to the Waterfront Park and public space in Cyberport, with details set out at Annex 1 to DDHC Paper No. 18/2019. Moreover, he illustrated the visual impact of the proposed development on the surrounding areas with the aid of PowerPoint presentation as detailed in Reference Information 1.

56. With the aid of PowerPoint presentation, Mr Joel CHAN briefed Members on the traffic impact of the Project and the proposed road improvement works, with details set out in Reference Information 1.

57. The Chairman asked Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN to present the original motion first.

58. With the aid of PowerPoint presentation, Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN presented the original motion, with details set out in Reference Information 2. He remarked that:

- (a) he expressed support for the amendment motion;
- (b) among the views collected from 900 residents in Pok Fu Lam, 56% of the respondents were against the Project;
- (c) in view of the concern expressed by residents about the current low occupancy rate of Cyberport's office space, he had already recommended that HKCMCL should strengthen the communication with residents so as to respond to their views and remove such misunderstandings;
- (d) additional photomontages had been provided by HKCMCL to illustrate the visual impact of the proposed Project on the surrounding areas, but not Baguio Villa. He requested HKCMCL to provide photomontages that represented what would be seen at Cyberport from the rooftop of President Tower at Baguio Villa;
- (e) residents had expressed concern as to whether there would be a reduction in public space in Cyberport as a result of the expansion works. In addition, regarding the intended uses and design of the Waterfront Park adjacent to the Cyberport campus, he was of the view that HKCMCL should review the relevant process and make better arrangements to facilitate the participation of residents through the engagement of the community in the planning process, instead of merely showing residents the drawings prepared beforehand;
- (f) apart from the Project, the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate and Queen Mary Hospital as well as the expansion of The University of Hong Kong

(HKU) would also bring about traffic impacts. Therefore, he wished to obtain the relevant traffic impact assessment (TIA) report, so that sufficient information could be made available for him to comment on the traffic improvement works proposed by HKCMCL;

- (g) HKCMCL had failed to address residents' aspiration for the future planning of The Arcade. He said that the existing services provided by The Arcade had been unable to meet the needs of residents. He continued that residents wished for more daily necessity stores in the shopping mall upon completion of the expansion project. In this connection, he requested HKCMCL to provide information on the detailed planning of the shopping mall;
- (h) given that the Government had earmarked \$5.5 billion for the expansion of Cyberport, through the motion, he would like to urge the Government to consider carrying out the associated works. He continued that as the Project would have significant implications on the district, the Government should carry out the associated works in one go, although consideration might also be given to obtaining funding approval for these projects separately and coordinating the timing of construction projects. Besides, despite that some of the proposed works had been included in the DMW programme under the purview of SDC, it was highly probable that those projects would fail to materialise due to the high cost of those projects which might exceed funding ceiling. He highlighted that the Project would enhance the connectivity between the Cyberport waterfront and Wah Fu Estate, thereby benefiting local residents. As such, he hoped that the Government would carefully consider his suggestions;
- (i) he said that only after making reference to the relevant TIA reports could he comment on the design of road improvement works proposed by HKCMCL. Nevertheless, he commented on the following road improvement works: (i) adding footpaths along Sassoon Road; (ii) widening Sha Wan Drive junction; (iii) widening the junction of Victoria Road and Sandy Bay Road; (iv) improving the junction of Victoria Road and Cyberport Road; (v) cutting back the slope to make space for the construction of layby for a bus stop at Cyberport Road opposite to Residence Bel-Air Phases 4 to 6; and (vi) improving the design of roads and tackling illegal parking near The Arcade. He suggested further

deliberating the above improvement works upon receipt of the TIA report concerned after the meeting; and;

- (j) it had been revealed in a study conducted by TD in support of the “Walk in Hong Kong” initiative that apart from traffic demand, waterfront layouts should also take visual appeal into account. Similarly, the PlanD’s “Urban Design Guidelines for Hong Kong” laid down that the design of waterfront areas should take such factors as connectivity and visual appeal into account. As the Cyberport campus was located at the waterfront, the findings and guidelines released by the above departments and the design direction recommended by the Harbourfront Commission should be taken into consideration in implementing the Project.

59. The Chairman asked Mr CHU Lap-wai, MH to present the amendment motion.

60. During his presentation of the amendment motion, Mr CHU Lap-wai, MH remarked that:

- (a) he did not object to the original motion. Indeed, amendments had been moved to the original motion with the aim of providing supplementary information that highlighted the need to improve the external transport network, as well as clarifying the position of the Committee for the early implementation of SIL(W);
- (b) during its previous discussions on the major development projects in the Southern District such as the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate, the Committee had stressed the need to consider such projects in conjunction with the implementation of SIL(W). Instead of merely serving the interests of individual development projects, the railway project was as a whole conducive to the development of the entire Southern District. For instance, more than half of the residents in the Southern District, including those living in Ap Lei Chau and Wong Chuk Hang, had directly benefited from the commissioning of the SIL(E). Nevertheless, residents in Aberdeen and Pok Fu Lam still needed to take feeder buses to MTR stations;

- (c) he was delighted to know that the Government had invited MTRCL to submit a proposal for the construction of SIL(W) in June 2019. Nevertheless, he was of the view that the Government should change its mindset. Instead of considering the construction of SIL(W) having regard to population growth upon the intake of residents at the redeveloped Wah Fu Estate, the Government should implement both projects concurrently; and
- (d) the residents' prime concern was the possible traffic problems arising from the additional people flow as a result of the Project, especially those associated with the external transport network. It had been mentioned in the paper ways to enhance the external transport network, which included negotiation with franchised bus and minibus operators on improvement measures. Yet, apart from the aforesaid measures, the Government should expedite the implementation of SIL(W). It was imperative for the Government to include a "Cyberport Station" when determining the railway alignment and provide comprehensive pedestrian connections, with a view to enhancing connectivity between Cyberport and the neighbouring communities.

61. The Chairman asked Members to give their views, including whether or not they supported the Project as well as their comments on the original motion and amendment motion.

62. Mr LAW Kam-hung, Dr CHU Ching-hong, BBS, JP, Mr CHAN Fu-ming, MH, Dr MAK TSE How-ling, MH, Mr CHAI Man-hon, Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, Mr LO Kin-hei, Ms YAM Pauline and Mr TSUI Yuen-wa raised the following comments and enquiries:

Intentions Expressed on Cyberport Expansion Project

- (a) a number of Members expressed support for or had no objection to the Project;
- (b) a Member pledged support for the Project. Considering that the project was able to create job opportunities, encourage sustainable entrepreneurship in the I&T sector and attract more patrons to Cyberport. She had high hopes for the Project;

Intentions Expressed on the Proposed Motions

- (c) a Member said that traffic arrangements were a key consideration factor in determining whether or not to support the Project. Instead of opposing to the Project, both the original motion and amendment motion had indeed highlighted the conditions necessary for a successful project;
- (d) a number of Members supported the amendment motion because it covered a more comprehensive range of areas;
- (e) a Member commented that the objective of the original motion was different from that of the amendment motion. As the latter had primarily aimed to push for the implementation of SIL(W), presumably the Committee would express support for it in the hope of enlisting the help of HKCMCL to achieve the goal in a concerted effort. Yet, the original motion had proposed specific measures to enhance connectivity between the Cyberport and its surrounding areas with a view to seeking funding approval for the implementation of the Project. Following its failed attempts to seek funding for the works proposed during past discussions on the connectivity of the area concerned, SDC would like to take the opportunity to secure funding commitment for the associated works. Therefore, fellow Members should support the original motion as well;

SIL(W)

- (f) a Member said that owing to the difficulties encountered in attracting talented jobseekers to work in the inaccessible Cyberport, quite many tenants had relocated their offices to the neighbourhood of MTR stations. Judging from that, the implementation of SIL(W) was crucial to the future development of Cyberport. As far as he knew, the Government had invited MTRCL in June 2019 to submit a proposal for the SIL(W) project. Given that MTRCL had been invited to submit proposals for a number of new railway projects at the same time, he urged HKCMCL to help strive for the early implementation of SIL(W). Moreover, the Government should also conduct consultation on railway alignment and site selection for the stations as early as practicable. Regarding the prioritisation of

railway projects, another Member understood from previous experience that SIL(W) was likely to be accorded top priority;

- (g) a Member said that HKCMCL seemed to suggest that it had nothing to do with the implementation of SIL(W). As a matter of fact, to strive for the construction of Ocean Park Station, the Ocean Park had joined hands with SDC in its fight for the implementation of SIL(E) in the past. Therefore, HKCMCL should make reference to the above example. Given that the people flow towards the Ocean Park had been greatly boosted upon commissioning of SIL(E), another Member expected similar benefits to Cyberport upon commissioning of SIL(W);
- (h) a Member said that when attending the opening ceremony of an event taking place at Cyberport earlier, he was delighted to see that many eSports related venues and high-tech gadget stores had sprouted in The Arcade. However, to boost people flow, it was essential to improve traffic connections. Given that the risk of congestion was higher for land transport than railway, she wished for early implementation of the SIL(W) to enhance development of Cyberport;
- (i) a Member said that currently, HKCMCL and its tenants had provided their staff with shuttle bus services operating between Cyberport and the vicinity of Aberdeen Centre, which had created pressure on the road network in Aberdeen. Upon completion of the Project, the additional people flow towards Cyberport would exert even greater pressure on the road network in the surrounding areas. Therefore, it was considered that the construction of SIL(W) would help alleviate the above traffic problem. Another Member considered that the railway link conducive to tackling the overall traffic problems in the district;
- (j) a Member said that SIL(W) was an essential project for the western part of the Southern District. As railway alignment and spatial distribution of railway stations, etc. would have implications on future projects, including the associated works to enhance connectivity between Cyberport and the surrounding areas as proposed in the original motion, she expressed concern about the prioritisation of various works projects, and requested the departments concerned to clarify;

Other Traffic Matters

- (k) a Member enquired about the anticipated flow of people and goods, and number of parking spaces in car parks upon completion of the Project, as well as details of the relevant TIA report;
- (l) a Member said that the road improvement works proposed by HKCMCL were merely minor remedial works which would not completely resolve related traffic problems. Another Member opined that the road improvement works proposed by HKCMCL were white elephants and the information was insufficient, and that in particular, the road improvement works for the junction of Victoria Road and Pok Fu Lam Road would not be able to cope with the future traffic demand generated from the redeveloped Wah Fu Estate. However, a Member was of the view that HKCMCL had put a lot of thoughts into the design of the road improvement works and she hoped that those works would dovetail the commissioning of SIL(W);

Open Space

- (m) a Member asked Cyberport not to fence off the lawn of the Waterfront Park during the expansion works. At present, the lawn was under-utilised and there were insufficient recreational facilities. He hoped Cyberport could tap the potential of the lawn to provide public open space through effective planning;
- (n) a Member said that a suggestion to provide more open space was put forward at the last meeting. He was delighted with HKCMCL's positive response at this meeting, including active consideration being given to allowing public access to the rooftop of Cyberport 5;

Enhancing Connectivity with Surrounding Areas

- (o) with the aid of PowerPoint presentation, a Member briefed fellow Members on the proposal for enhancing connectivity between Cyberport and the surrounding areas, with details set out in Reference Information 2. He said that SDC had passed the motion "Urge the HK Government to start implementing section by section a promenade linking Kennedy Town

to Aberdeen, as far as practicable along the waterfront” in 2011. Rather than merely coping with the needs of local pedestrians, the pedestrian link in question was intended to enable members of the public to enjoy waterfront facilities. Also, given that guidelines on the improvement of waterfront sites had been stipulated in the “Urban Design Guidelines for Hong Kong” and promulgated by the Harbourfront Commission respectively, he hoped that reference would be made to the aforesaid guidelines in the planning of the Project;

- (p) he continued that the proposed pedestrian bridge connecting Cyberport and Waterfall Bay could shorten the distance between the two places by 1.1 kilometres, thereby saving 16 minutes of walking time and reducing the likelihood of accidental fall from the cliff. Though the project had already been included in the DMW programme under the purview of SDC, it was envisaged that its cost would exceed the funding ceiling of a DMW project. Furthermore, the proposed elevated walkway along the shore between Telegraph Bay and Sandy Bay could provide a barrier-free access for the convenience of the public travelling to and from Cyberport. Not only could the public and Cyberport benefit, the traffic burden could also be alleviated. Besides, the walkway could connect the Waterfront Park in Cyberport to the HKU’s sports facilities at Sha Wan Drive. In fact, a similar elevated walkway had been provided in Deep Water Bay. Such associated works were relatively simple and less costly;
- (q) he further commented that he had moved the original motion to request the Government to enhance the connectivity between Cyberport and its surrounding areas. If the Project was a private development, the developer would have definitely sought to attract visitors from the surrounding areas of Cyberport via a well-connected transport network, instead of being deterred by the tedious land acquisition procedures involving different government departments. He requested the Government to consider his suggestions and carry out the associated works as soon as possible;
- (r) a Member said that the implementation of the associated works, e.g. pedestrian access, etc. in tandem with the major project for the expansion of Cyberport as proposed in the original motion would bring benefits to the Southern District and members of the public. Another Member

expressed support for the proposal for enhancing connectivity between Cyberport and its neighbouring communities;

- (s) given the circuitous links between different phases of Cyberport at present, a Member enquired whether a footbridge would be constructed to connect Cyberport 5 with The Arcade or other phases. If implemented, it would reduce the inconvenience caused to visitors and residents;
- (t) a Member said that given that the Government had proposed to earmark funding for the expansion of Cyberport, if the associated works proposed in the original motion were to be carried out concurrently, additional funding would have to be sought. In fact, there had been similar cases in the past. Citing the construction of the Hong Kong Science Park (HKSP) and the Pak Shek Kok Promenade as an example, the Government announced construction of the project in 1999. The site with an area of 1 100 square metres (m²) originally reserved for landscaping and recreational purposes was only rezoned for the development of a promenade and cycling track in 2003. Funding approval was given for the project costing more than \$200 million. In view of the similar nature of HKSP and Cyberport, the above example could serve as a useful reference. In addition, a provision of \$82.2 million had been sought from the LegCo in the 2017-18 financial year for the construction of a waterfront promenade on an open space site with a total area of 6 700 m² adjacent to the Hong Kong Children's Hospital (HKCH). The project encompassed installation of benches, tree planting and associated landscaping works, as well as construction of a children's playground and public toilets, etc. Both examples illustrated that should there be a shortfall of facilities, the Government should consider carrying out works for provision of additional facilities at the planning stage to address public needs. All in all, the associated works proposed in the original motion could enhance the connectivity and accessibility of pedestrian links in the district for the benefit of the public. Even if the projects might not be implemented in parallel with the Cyberport Expansion Project, it was hoped that the Government would consider implementing them by seeking additional funding or initiating the projects separately;

Collection of Views

- (u) a Member said that as local residents were more familiar with the actual situation in the district, such as environmental hygiene nuisances and air pollution issues, etc., he suggested that HKCMCL set up a community liaison group for holding regular meetings with local stakeholders, so as to gauge the views of the residents, the SDC and the Area Committee concerned. Such arrangement was conducive to working out solutions in a more effective and comprehensive manner. Another Member agreed with the above suggestion, saying that as the community liaison groups for the expansion of the Ocean Park and the construction of SIL(E) were proven to be successful, the related arrangement was worthy for consideration;

Information Provided

- (v) a Member said that the presentation materials provided by HKCMCL were a little too general and the photomontages were not satisfactory, Cyberport had yet to provide visual materials with either a tech-savvy appeal or three-dimensional effects;
- (w) a Member was aware that the presentation materials prepared by HKCMCL were a little simple due to the short interval between the announcement of earmarking \$5.5 billion for the expansion of Cyberport as proposed in the 2019-20 Budget and the meeting. Notwithstanding that, HKCMCL had tried its best to prepare the information for submission to the Committee; and

Other Comments

- (x) a Member said that given the on-going commitment of Cyberport to promoting the development of digital technology in Hong Kong, Cyberport should consider how technology might be integrated into everyday life. However, HKCMCL had not mentioned that in the paper. To ensure effective implementation, he suggested Cyberport conduct pilot projects and collaborate with non-governmental organisations (NGOs) or other business organisations in the district, e.g. the Ocean Park.

63. Ms Eva YAM gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) she thanked Members for their valuable input and support for the Project;
- (b) in view of Members' strong wish for the implementation of SIL(W), ITB would relay Members' views to and maintain close liaison with the THB. In view of the great pedestrian flow and benefits expected to be brought to Cyberport upon completion of SIL(W), it was believed that HKCMCL would support the SIL(W) project;
- (c) ITB and Cyberport were actively examining the TIA report on the Project with TD. Pending finalisation of its details, the report was not available for Members' perusal for the time being. PlanD would submit a rezoning application in relation to the expansion project in due course. The TIA report would be put in the public domain as it would be a supporting document for application. Members were welcomed to discuss its details with ITB;
- (d) she believed that HKCMCL had taken note of Members' comments on details of the works programme, including no fencing-off of the Waterfront Park during the construction period, etc., and that it would be willing to consider setting up a community liaison group to gauge public views, including comments on the design of the Waterfront Park;
- (e) with the presence of a number of start-ups in Cyberport, many of them should be willing to promote their products and services in the district in partnership with the community to enable the integration of technology into everyday life; and
- (f) ITB noted Members' proposals for constructing a pedestrian bridge over Waterfall Bay and an elevated walkway along the shore between Telegraph Bay and Sandy Bay. Such proposed works and the Project should be dealt with separately. ITB would actively follow up with the departments concerned.

64. Mr Peter YAN gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) while that residents' request for visual openness could not be fully taken into account at the present stage, the Project would not cause a significant

visual impact on a number of key public viewing points, as reflected in the previously shown photomontages. HKCMCL would continue to collect views from residents, with a view to mitigating the impact on them;

- (b) HKCMCL would step up communication with residents for collecting views on enhancing facilities at the Waterfront Park, so as to facilitate the participation of residents in the Southern District in the design of communal facilities therein;
- (c) improvement works were underway at The Arcade. To honour the spirit of contractive obligations, HKCMCL was progressively enhancing shopping facilities to meet residents' needs having regard to the order of expiration of existing tenancies;
- (d) HKCMCL would step up community liaison work, including the setting up of a community liaison group through deployment of additional resources and manpower, and maintain close liaison with SDC for collecting further views from Members;
- (e) he shared the Member's view that Cyberport should enhance co-operation with NGOs. In light of the fact that Cyberport had joined hands with Aberdeen Kaifong Welfare Association and schools in the Southern District, etc. in the past, he was confident that HKCMCL was able to promote a wider use of Cyberport-based technology in the district through close liaison and interface with SDC in the future. In addition, for better community co-ordination, SDC was welcomed to refer any enquiries from local organisations interested in partnership with Cyberport to HKCMCL;
- (f) in response to a Member's enquiry about the pedestrian links between different phases of Cyberport, he pointed out that there was a plan to construct a pedestrian access connecting Cyberport 5 and The Arcade, whilst the latter had already been connected to other phases of Cyberport. Upon completion of the proposed pedestrian access, Cyberport would become an interconnected building cluster that provided greater accessibility; and

- (g) regarding the construction of HKSP and the Pak Shek Kok Promenade as well as the waterfront promenade adjacent to HKCH mentioned by a Member, HKCMCL would make reference to those examples accordingly.

65. Regarding the Member's proposal on the construction of a pedestrian bridge over Waterfall Bay, Mr AU YEUNG Wai-ming replied that the DFMC had approved funding for the conduct of a project feasibility study at its meeting on 29 September 2016, and the procedures for obtaining funding approval and engaging consultant had been completed in March 2017. Having completed site investigation and preliminary consultation with relevant government departments, the consultant was seeking the comments from the Advisory Committee on Appearances of Bridges and Associated Structures on the preliminary design proposal, so as to ensure design viability. The progress of the project concerned would be reported to DFMC in due course.

66. Dr MAK TSE How-ling, MH enquired whether Waterfall Bay fell outside the boundary of Cyberport, and said that that piece of information was relevant to the feasibility of providing a pedestrian bridge over Waterfall Bay as proposed in the original motion. Ms Eva YAM responded that Waterfall Bay did not fall within the boundary of Cyberport.

67. Mr CHAI Man-hon and Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (a) regarding the examples concerning HKSP and Pak Shek Kok as well as HKCH cited by him previously, a Member supplemented that likewise, the associated facilities as stated in the finalised proposals had not been included in their respective project scopes at the outset. Citing the construction of HKSP and the Pak Shek Kok Promenade as an example, he said that to attract visitors and talents, space had been set aside for leisure, beautification and connection purposes during the construction of HKSP Phases 1 and 2, which was known as the Pak Shek Kok Promenade. Another example was the promenade occupying an area of 6 700 m² adjacent to HKCH. The final cost for the construction of promenade, playground, public park, sitting-out facilities and public toilets, etc. was \$82.2 million only, which showed that constructing a promenade might not be so costly;

- (b) another example was projects carried out by MTRCL. He pointed out that it was necessary to dovetail construction works within the railway boundaries (e.g. construction of stations, installation of railway tracks and procurement of trains, etc.) with the provision of ancillary facilities at railway stations (e.g. bus stop, taxi stand, pedestrian access and footbridge, etc.). He said that the two works programmes should be implemented concurrently even though they might not be directly related. He continued that though the projects proposed in the original motion fell outside the development scope of Cyberport 5, the construction activities should be synchronised as they were in fact interrelated. As a matter of fact, the Government also had gained experience in implementing associated works during the same period. For the above reasons, he considered that the Government should seek funding approval for the projects proposed in the original motion in one go, or even more linkage facilities should be included. Lastly, he called on fellow Members to support the original motion;
- (c) a Member said that the original motion had focused on the road works and pedestrian links in the vicinity, whereas the amendment motion was about the implementation of SIL(W). Given that both the original motion and the amendment motion were about the associated works of the Project, he suggested that the Chairman split his conclusion into two parts, namely Members' views on the Project, and their views on the original motion and amendment motion;
- (d) a Member was delighted to note that HKCMCL had responded to Members' request for additional photomontages to illustrate the visual impact of the proposed Project on the surrounding areas. However, he reiterated that photomontages illustrating the visual impact of the Project on Baguio Villa had yet to be available. As a SDC Member of the local constituency, he had the responsibility to act as a channel of communication between the residents and HKCMCL. As such, he requested HKCMCL to provide photomontages that represented what would be seen at Cyberport from the rooftop of President Tower at Baguio Villa; and
- (e) a Member wished to obtain the relevant TIA report as soon as possible to facilitate discussion with the departments concerned on the proposed road

junction improvement works, otherwise it would be difficult to make amendment after the report has been submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) for perusal and public consultation concluded. He also suggested that ITB consult relevant stakeholders on the road improvement works concerned as soon as possible. In fact, among the inhabitants in the district, seasoned highway engineers were available to provide expert advice. He would welcome the consultant approaching him for more information.

68. The Chairman said that since the original motion and amendment motion had not contradicted each other, both motions would be put to vote.

69. The Chairman asked Members to vote on the amendment motion first, to be followed by the original motion. Mr CHAI Man-hon requested to vote by open ballot. 19 Members (not including the Chairman) were present at the time of voting.

70. The amendment motion was carried with 19 votes for it (namely Dr CHU Ching-hong, BBS, JP, Mr CHAN Fu-ming, MH, Ms CHAN Judy Kapui, Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung, MH, Mr FUNG Se-goun, Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH, Ms YAM Pauline, Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, Mr LAW Kam-hung, Mr CHOI Tsung-mang, Ms LAW Siu-fong, Mr AU Nok-hin, Mr CHAI Man-hon, Mr LO Kin-hei, Mr TSUI Yuen-wa, Mr AU Lap-sing, MH, Mr CHU Lap-wai, MH, Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying and Dr MAK TSE How-ling, MH), zero vote against it and zero abstention.

71. The original motion was carried with eight votes for it (namely Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, Mr LAW Kam-hung, Mr CHOI Tsung-mang, Ms LAW Siu-fong, Mr AU Nok-hin, Mr CHAI Man-hon, Mr LO Kin-hei and Mr TSUI Yuen-wa), zero vote against it and 11 abstentions (namely Dr CHU Ching-hong, BBS, JP, Mr CHAN Fu-ming, MH, Ms CHAN Judy Kapui, Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung, MH, Mr FUNG Se-goun, Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH, Ms YAM Pauline, Mr AU Lap-sing, MH, Mr CHU Lap-wai, MH, Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying and Dr MAK TSE How-ling, MH).

72. In closing, the Chairman concluded as follows:

- (a) it was envisaged that the Project was not only conducive to attracting more technology companies and start-ups to set up their offices in Cyberport but could also provide a pathway for young people to pursue a career in I&T. While the Committee supported the Project in principle,

the voting results of the original motion and amendment motion showed that the Committee had grave concern over its implications on traffic conditions and livelihood of the people. In particular, the implementation of SIL(W) was the prime concern of the Committee. He urged ITB to note Members' strong wish for the construction of that railway link;

- (b) the construction of SIL(W) was supposed to be an integral part of the Project. As such, HKCMCL should, apart from modifying the design of the relevant roads and junctions, learn from the Ocean Park's persistent endeavor in pushing for the successful implementation of SIL(E), and urge for the early implementation of SIL(W);
- (c) furthermore, it was proposed in the original motion and amendment motion to enhance the connectivity between Cyberport and the neighbouring communities. Though the associated works were beyond the scope of the Project, they were closely related to it. Having assessed the impacts of the Project on the Southern District from a macroscopic perspective, the Committee stressed that it was imperative for the Government to address those impacts and work out solutions; and
- (d) lastly, he urged HKCMCL and the departments concerned to submit the TIA report, address Members' views, set up a community liaison group and relay Members' views to TPB.

Agenda Item 4: Follow up the Progress of the Provision of Pedestrian Walkways, Public Open Space, Construction of Connection Point to Facilitate Linkage of MTR Shopping Mall with Footbridge and Provision of Performance Venue in the Wong Chuk Hang Comprehensive Development Area
(Item raised by Mr TSUI Yuen-wa)
(DDHC Paper No. 19/2019)

(Mr LAW Kam-hung, Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung, MH, Mr CHU Lap-wai, MH, Mr AU Lap-sing, MH and Ms YAM Pauline left the meeting at 5:40 p.m., 6:00 p.m., 6:21 p.m., 6:30 p.m. and 6:36 p.m. respectively.)

**Minutes of the 23rd Meeting of the
District Development and Housing Committee (DDHC)
Southern District Council (2016-2019) (SDC)**

Date: 23 September 2019

Time: 2:30 p.m.

Venue: SDC Conference Room

Present:

Dr CHU Ching-hong, BBS, JP	(Chairman of SDC)
Mr CHAN Fu-ming, MH	(Vice-Chairman of SDC)
Mr LAM Kai-fai, MH	(Chairman of DDHC)
Dr MAK TSE How-ling, Ada, MH	(Vice-Chairlady of DDHC)
Mr AU Lap-sing, MH	
Mr AU Nok-hin	
Mr CHAI Man-hon	
Ms CHAN Judy Kapui	
Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying	
Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung, MH	
Mr CHU Lap-wai, MH	
Mr FUNG Se-goun, Fergus	
Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH	
Mr LO Kin-hei	
Mr TSUI Yuen-wa	
Ms YAM Pauline	
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	
Mr LAW Kam-hung	
Ms LAW Siu-fong	

Absent with Apologies:

Mr CHOI Tsung-mang
Ms TAM May-bo, Jeanette
Dr WONG Yat-lung, Philip

Secretary:

Mr LEE Lok-him, Milton

Executive Officer (District Council) 2,
Southern District Office, Home Affairs Department

In Attendance:

Mrs MA CHOW Pui-fun, Dorothy, JP

District Officer (Southern), Home Affairs Department

Miss CHENG Wai-sum, Sum

Assistant District Officer (Southern),
Home Affairs Department

Ms YIP Wai-see, Priscilla

Senior Executive Officer (District Council),
Southern District Office, Home Affairs Department

Mr CHEUNG Wai-chun, William

Executive Officer I (District Management), Southern
District Office,
Home Affairs Department

Mr CHOW Man-hong, Mann

Senior Town Planner/HK 5, Planning Department

Ms TSE Wing-sheung, Doris

Senior Estate Surveyor/South (Acting) (District Lands
Office, Hong Kong West and South),
Lands Department

Mr AU YEUNG Wai-ming

Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support)
Southern, Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Ms TENG Ka-yee, Carrie

Engineer/1 (South),
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Ms LO Kit-sheung

Housing Manager/HKI7, Housing Department

Ms WONG Cho-kwan

Engineer/HK (Distribution 3),
Water Supplies Department

Attending by Invitation (Agenda Item 2):

Mr KAU Kin-hong, Louis

District Planning Officer/Hong Kong,
Planning Department

Mr CHOW Man-hong, Mann

Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong 5, Planning
Department

Attending by Invitation (Agenda Item 3):

Mr SO Wing-kin

Engineer/Southern 1, Transport Department

Attending by Invitation (Agenda Item 4):

Mr WAI Kam-fat, Danny

Chief Health Inspector (Southern) 1,
Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Ms LI Lai-ha, Liz

Senior Health Inspector (Cleansing & Pest Control)
Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Opening Remarks:

The Chairman welcomed Members and standing government representatives to the meeting.

2. The Chairman invited Members to note that to facilitate smooth proceeding of the meeting, according to Order 15(3) of the SDC Standing Orders, all persons attending or sitting in the meeting should switch off all devices which might emit sound, and should not use any telecommunications devices for conversation during the course of the meeting. Each Member would be allotted a maximum of two 3-minute slots to speak in respect of each agenda item. According to the Secretary's estimation, the meeting would finish at 5:10 p.m. at its earliest. Members should inform the Secretariat staff if they had to leave the meeting early.

Items for Discussion

Agenda Item 1: Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 22nd DDHC Meeting held on 18 July 2019

3. The Chairman said that prior to the meeting, the draft minutes of the aforesaid meeting had been circulated to all Members and relevant government department representatives. The Secretariat had not received any amendment proposals so far.

~~4. The minutes were confirmed by the Committee.~~

**Agenda Item 2: Proposed Amendments to the Approved Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/17
(Item raised by Planning Department)
(DDHC Paper No. 22/2019)**

(Ms CHAN Judy Kapui, Mr AU Nok-hin, Mr FUNG Se-goun and Ms YAM Pauline joined the meeting at 2:44 p.m., 2:45 p.m., 2:52 p.m. and 2:57 p.m. respectively.)

5. The Chairman welcomed Mr KAU Kin-hong, Louis, District Planning Officer/Hong Kong and Mr CHOW Man-hong, Mann, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong 5 of the Planning Department (PlanD) to the meeting.

6. The Chairman invited the representatives of PlanD to briefly introduce the paper.

7. Mr Louis KAU said that PlanD submitted the proposed amendments to the Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/17 (the OZP) to the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Town Planning Board (TPB) for consideration on 6 September 2019 and MPC agreed that the proposed amendments to the OZP are suitable for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance. The amendments would be gazetted and exhibited for public inspection on 27 September 2019 for two months.

8. Mr Mann CHOW, with the aid of PowerPoint presentation, briefed Members on the proposed amendments to the OZP, mainly the proposed amendments made to facilitate Cyberport Expansion, deletion of the obsolete alignment of Route 7 and the associated proposed amendments, and some technical amendments to the OZP and its Notes.

9. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, Mr CHAI Man-hon, Dr MAK TSE How-ling, MH, Mr LAW Kam-hung, Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying and Dr CHU Ching-hong, BBS, JP raised the following comments and enquiries:

Proposed Amendment Items

(a) Cyberport Expansion (Amendment Item A1):

- (i) a Member said that according to the Urban Design Guidelines for Hong Kong, it was recommended that the height of buildings in any proposed development along the waterfront should be lower than that of inland buildings to form a building compound with a gradual height profile, thereby minimising obstruction of views caused to inland buildings by those on the waterfront. However, the proposed building height of the Cyberport Expansion was not in line with this recommendation;

- (ii) a Member commented that the Cyberport Expansion would have an impact on local traffic. However, there was a lack of communication among the Transport Department (TD), the Hong Kong Cyberport Management Company Limited (HKCMCL), and this Committee/the community. It resulted in discrepancy between the planned traffic improvement works and the residents' expectations. He hoped that PlanD would explain whether the planned traffic improvement works had already been finalised or consultation was still required;
 - (iii) a Member worried that the provision of a car park and access road at grade would result in a reduction of public open space. He thus requested for provision of the said facilities underground;
- (b) Pieces of land along the waterfront of Waterfall Bay and its park (Amendment Item B1):
 - (i) a Member enquired whether the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate would be affected by the rezoning of several pieces of land adjoining the existing Waterfall Bay Park to "Open Space" ("O");
- (c) Area to the south of Wah Kwai Estate and Ka Lung Court (Amendment Item B2):
 - (i) a Member welcomed PlanD's proposal of rezoning the area to the south of Wah Kwai Estate and Ka Lung Court to "O". This area served as a tree transplanting site during the construction of the South Island Line (East). It was currently under the management of the MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) and would be handed over to the Government in 2021. According to the past experience, she anticipated that the Housing Department (HD) would then take up the management of the site. However, she considered that as the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) put a heavier emphasis on the management of park facilities, such as provision of playgrounds for children and fitness equipment for elders, it would be better for LCSD to take up the management of the site. She understood that procedurally, HD might be required to take up the management of the site first after handover of the site to the

Government, but she hoped that it would be put under the management of LCSD ultimately;

(d) Hong Kong West Drainage Tunnel Western Portal (Amendment Item C3):

- (i) a Member said that the site of the western portal of Hong Kong West drainage tunnel would be rezoned to “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”). She enquired about the actual use of the site;

(e) Excision of sea areas along Sandy Bay and Waterfall Bay (Amendment Item E):

- (i) a Member enquired on the reasons for excising the sea areas along Sandy Bay and Waterfall Bay from the OZP, for example, whether environmental factors such as changes in the shoreline or reclamation necessitated this amendment;

Other Proposed Amendments to the OZP

- (f) a Member said that SDC had conducted a Consultancy Study for the Promenade from Kennedy Town to Aberdeen and proposed constructing a promenade to connect Kennedy Town and Cyberport. The implementation of the proposal put forth in the consultancy study might be affected by the proposed amendments to the OZP. The Member commented that PlanD should consider the development of the promenade when mapping out the long-term planning for the Southern District. Another Member said that besides the aforementioned consultancy study, funding had been granted under the District Minor Works programme of SDC for conducting a number of works for connecting the waterfront of Pok Fu Lam. He was disappointed that the proposed amendments to the OZP and its Explanatory Statement as well as the papers submitted to the MPC did not reflect SDC’s views on enhancing the connectivity of the waterfront. Nevertheless, he noted that the link between Cyberport Waterfront Park and Sandy Bay was mentioned in paragraph 7.7.2 of the Explanatory Statement of the OZP;

- (g) a Member said that the obsolete alignment of the Route 7 should have

been deleted earlier. The Member commented that the proposed planning design with coastal roads as axes was outdated and therefore supported the amendment. Also, the Member said it was fortunate that the Government did not implement the project concerned in the Southern District, or else the residents could not enjoy the waterfront;

- (h) a Member said that the Government was unlikely to develop Route 7 again in future. Instead, the Government would focus on implementing the South Island Line (West) (SIL(W)) project. As it was not necessary to construct a carriageway on the site concerned for the development of Route 7, he recommended that the relevant departments should construct a promenade for public use. If a coastal walking trail or cycle track could be constructed to link up the waterfront of Wah Kwai Estate and Kennedy Town, it would help boost the overall image of Hong Kong;
- (i) a Member said that PlanD proposed to rezone some sites of the OZP as "G/IC". The Member enquired about the types of facilities which could be set up on these sites after rezoning and whether the land use was already restricted at the present stage. For example, he enquired whether construction of obnoxious facilities was forbidden or approval from TPB should be secured for such purpose. Another Member commented that PlanD proposed to rezone some sites of the OZP from "Road" to "G/IC". It showed that the Government attached great importance to community development;

Other Comments

- (j) a Member said that HKCMCL had consulted the Committee on the Cyberport Expansion Project and received support from the Committee. However, the Committee requested that the implementation of SIL(W) must be confirmed. He enquired whether PlanD would relay this strong demand of the Committee to TPB. Another Member enquired whether PlanD had reserved sufficient land for the future development of SIL(W); and
- (k) a Member said that while the Government had shelved the Route 7 project, the railway could not replace roads completely, e.g. roads were essential to coaches and goods vehicles. Also, in view of the upcoming East

Lantau Metropolis development, the vehicular flow to and from the Southern District via the west of Hong Kong Island would increase. He thus enquired of PlanD about the future traffic and transport planning.

10. Mr Louis KAU gave a consolidated response as follows:

Proposed Amendment Items

(a) Cyberport Expansion (Amendment Item A1):

- (i) the Urban Design Guidelines for Hong Kong recommended that buildings along waterfronts should have lower height than buildings located inland. As for the Cyberport Expansion Project, it was subject to a maximum building height of 65 metres above Principal Datum, while the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Cyberport” zone behind it was subject to a maximum building height of 85 metres above Principal Datum. As such, a varying building height profile had been adopted. While some Members said that the Arcade, Cyberport would have a lower height than the extended portion to be constructed in future, the Cyberport development as a whole had adopted a varying building height profile, according to the maximum building heights stipulated in the OZP;
- (ii) regarding the traffic impact, the consultant of HKCMCL had submitted the traffic impact assessment report which included several proposed road improvement schemes. Some Members had expressed their views on the proposals in detail. PlanD would forward the views to HKCMCL for consideration and discussion with TD. Since the proposed road improvement schemes were still in the design stage, gazettal of and public consultation on the projects might be required in accordance with the Road (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance when the works were implemented, depending on their scope and the actual needs;

(b) Cyberport Waterfront Park (Amendment Item A2):

- (i) the Cyberport Expansion Project would occupy an area of about 1 ha within the existing space of Cyberport Waterfront Park, while HKCMCL had undertaken to provide at-grade public open space of not less than 5 000 square metres as well as public open space of about 4 000 square metres on different floors of the extended portion. Therefore, the Cyberport Expansion Project would result in a loss of only several hundred square metres of public open space, which would pose a minor impact on the entire public open space. HKCMCL had also undertaken to enhance the existing public open space so as to provide better facilities for public use;
 - (ii) PlanD was of the view that waterfront areas should be open for public use wherever possible. Therefore, HKCMCL proposed to provide a 15-metre wide promenade and connect the existing public open space to the planned “O” zone in the north so as to form a connected waterfront promenade. Besides, among the various proposed amendments to the OZP, PlanD had rezoned some coastal areas to “O” to reflect the aspirations of the public and SDC as well as the planning intention of connecting the waterfront of Pok Fu Lam. The implementation of the aforesaid planning intention would depend on detailed study and the resource allocation of the relevant departments;
- (c) Pieces of land along the waterfront of Waterfall Bay and its park (Amendment Item B1):
- (i) the proposed amendment to the OZP would not affect the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate;
- (d) Area to the south of Wah Kwai Estate and Ka Lung Court (Amendment Item B2):
- (i) the rezoning of the area to the south of Wah Kwai Estate and Ka Lung Court to “O” would only affect land use planning. The OZP imposed no restrictions on the management rights and obligations. PlanD was aware of the residents’ demand for leisure facilities. Regarding a Member’s suggestion that the area should be managed

by LCSD in future, PlanD would forward the view to the relevant departments after the 2-month public consultation period;

- (e) Hong Kong West Drainage Tunnel Western Portal (Amendment Item C3):
 - (i) rezoning the site at the western portal of Hong Kong West drainage tunnel to “G/IC” was to reflect its current use as a drainage tunnel portal by the Drainage Services Department (DSD);
- (f) Excision of sea areas along Sandy Bay and Waterfall Bay (Amendment Item E):
 - (i) the sea areas along Sandy Bay and Waterfall Bay were originally reserved for the construction of the proposed Route 7. As the Government had decided not to implement the alignment as shown on the OZP, there was no need to reserve the sea areas for the construction of roads, hence it was proposed to excise relevant area from the OZP;

Other Proposed Amendments to the OZP

- (g) most rezoning of sites to “G/IC” in the proposed amendment items was to reflect the existing uses of the sites, except the following two: (i) a site at Sandy Bay was reserved for a proposed school development (e.g. international school) at the request of the Education Bureau (EDB), but there was no implementation timetable; and (ii) a site at Tin Wan Praya Road near Wah Kwai Estate was a temporary works area of DSD and there was no specific proposed use of the site. Under the OZP, uses always permitted in “G/IC” zones did not include obnoxious facilities. Before the construction of such facilities as sewage treatment or filtration facilities, refuse transfer stations, etc., TPB’s approval of the relevant planning application must be obtained first. Under the existing mechanism, the OZP could ensure sites zoned as “G/IC” would not cause unnecessary nuisance to the neighbouring residents;

Other Comments

- (h) when submitting the proposed amendments to the OZP to TPB, PlanD had relayed the SDC's views, including the motions on the Cyberport Expansion Project passed by DDHC earlier on which requested taking forward the construction of SIL(W) as soon as possible. TPB had also noted the SDC's concern over the impact of the Cyberport Expansion Project on the neighbouring pedestrian and traffic connections. Upon confirmation of the construction of SIL(W) in future and should the relevant ancillary facilities, such as air outlets, exhaust outlets, etc., be required, PlanD would make corresponding arrangements on the OZP; and
- (i) when exploring the development of East Lantau Metropolis, the Government would take into consideration the traffic connection between East Lantau Metropolis and Hong Kong Island. SDC's views would be consulted as appropriate.

11. Mr AU Nok-hin, Mr CHAI Man-hon, Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN and Mr LAW Kam-hung raised the following comments and enquiries:

Proposed Amendment Items

- (a) Cyberport Expansion (Amendment Item A1):
 - (i) a Member asked PlanD to respond to the comment that the heights of buildings at the proposed Cyberport 5 ran counter to the development recommendations given in the Urban Design Guidelines for Hong Kong;
 - (ii) reiterating that the provision of an at-grade car park and road link would affect the Waterfront Park users, a Member requested that the facilities should be provided underground;
- (b) A site at Sandy Bay (Amendment Item C1):
 - (i) a Member said that as a number of local school sponsoring bodies had expressed views on whether an additional international school should be established in the Southern District, he wished to know

the rationale behind PlanD's recommendation of the reservation of a site at Sandy Bay for the development of an international school and whether PlanD had considered and compared other development uses, such as reserving the site for development by the University of Hong Kong;

- (ii) another Member said that there were several schools in the vicinity of the site, which was located at a dead-end road. Without the support of railway, establishing a new international school would add to the traffic burden of the area. He thus considered it absurd to reserve the site for an international school. Moreover, the site included part of the waterfront area of Sandy Bay. As SDC intended to construct a promenade at the waterfront area of Sandy Bay, he suggested to reserve a waterfront area along Sandy Bay and to Telegraph Bay for the future promenade;

Other Proposed Amendments to the OZP

- (c) a Member said that in view of the idea of public enjoyment of the waterfront as advocated by some members of the public, he suggested reserving part of the waterfront site for the future development of a promenade, which could facilitate connection of the various waterfront areas in the district and development of a complete promenade, so that the public could have more opportunities to enjoy the waterfront;
- (d) using the approved Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K22/6 as an example, a Member said that TPB had imposed definite restrictions on area shown as "Comprehensive Development Area" which required reservation of some areas adjoining the waterfront for the construction of promenades. He considered that the requirement could serve as a frame of reference. TPB should impose similar conditions or restrictions on future proposed developments within the area covered by the OZP to ensure that the relevant government departments or project proponents would provide promenades for public enjoyment when implementing the development projects. Moreover, when planning for the connection of promenades in different sites, PlanD could draw reference from the past SDC papers and the ideas of the proposed projects that had been discussed by SDC for the alignment of the promenade;

- (e) a Member said that fellow Members and the PlanD representative who attended this meeting would vacate the office someday, while the OZP would continue to exist and serve as a planning guideline for the district. He thus requested that it should be explicitly specified in the proposed amendments to the OZP that the waterfront area must be used for developing a promenade in future. Another Member reiterated that the site originally reserved for the construction of Route 7 should be rezoned for the purpose of constructing a promenade; and
- (f) a Member enquired whether the OZP had included all waterfront sites and whether there were specified land uses and planning intentions for these sites, such as pumping stations and sewage infrastructure, etc. He was worried that there were still some sites without planning intentions in the waterfront area.

12. Mr Louis KAU gave a consolidated response as follows:

Proposed Amendment Items

- (a) Cyberport Expansion (Amendment Item A1):
 - (i) while some Members mentioned that the Arcade, Cyberport had a lower building height than the building in the extended portion to be constructed in future, the Cyberport development on the whole was higher than the extended portion. The overall design was thus a varying building height profile, in line with the Urban Design Guidelines for Hong Kong;
 - (ii) PlanD would relay a Member's suggestion of providing an underground car park and road link to HKCMCL for consideration and study;
- (b) A site at Sandy Bay (Amendment Item C1):
 - (i) PlanD rezoned a site at Sandy Bay to "G/IC" and reserved it for the proposed school development at the request of EDB. According to the established mechanism, PlanD would review the site reservation

after three years and the bureau and department concerned would be enquired whether the site reservation was still necessary. If not, PlanD would release the site for other uses;

Other Proposed Amendments to the OZP

(c) Before any proposed development restrictions are imposed on the OZP by PlanD, comprehensive study should be conducted. Since relevant departments had not conducted a detailed technical study for the alignment and design of the promenade at Sandy Bay, it was currently difficult to explicitly specify the amount of land to be reserved for the alignment of a promenade on the OZP. He appreciated Members' comments on and aspirations for the connectivity of promenade and emphasised that PlanD agreed to open waterfront areas for public enjoyment wherever possible. If it was confirmed that the site at Sandy Bay would be used for school development, PlanD would request specification in the conditions of land grant that suitable area had to be reserved for a waterfront promenade. However, the alignment and design of the waterfront promenade had yet to be confirmed; and

(d) in response to a Member's suggestion of rezoning the sites originally reserved for the construction of Route 7 directly for the purpose of constructing a waterfront promenade, he said that as relevant departments had not conducted technical study on the suggestion, the sites could not be rezoned as suggested at present.

13. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN said that PlanD had not responded to his concern that the development of an international school at a site at Sandy Bay would further add to the traffic burden of the area.

14. Mr AU Nok-hin said while he understood that PlanD reserved the site for the proposed international school at the request of EDB, he was dissatisfied that EDB always tried to seek land in the Southern District for establishing international schools whenever it failed to identify suitable sites in other districts. He was of the view that education should not be commercialised. Establishing an international school in Pok Fu Lam would aggravate the local traffic burden directly. It was also expected that the proposed Lantau Tomorrow project would bring additional vehicular flow on the western part of Hong Kong Island. The Government should thus duly consider the

traffic impact caused by the establishment of an international school. Moreover, some local schools located in the district were of the view that the establishment of an international school would give rise to enrolment difficulties of local schools. In this connection, he urged PlanD to relay his comments to EDB.

15. Dr CHU Ching-hong, BBS, JP said that before EDB requested reservation of a site for the proposed international school, it should consult SDC and explain the related traffic impact and mitigation measures. As a matter of fact, apart from a theme park located in the Southern District, more than one quarter of the international schools in Hong Kong were located in the Southern District. The vehicular flow generated had posed a heavy burden on the local traffic. In view of the public housing developments in Pok Fu Lam South which would result in an increase of residential units by 11 900 and population by 35 000, as well as other development projects in the district, he considered it unwise to establish another international school in the Southern District. Moreover, many students residing in other districts studied in international schools located in the Southern District, which meant that the international schools in the Southern District did not exclusively serve the residents in the district. He considered that this was an unreasonable planning.

16. Dr CHU Ching-hong, BBS, JP further said that SDC had conducted the Consultancy Study for the Promenade from Kennedy Town to Aberdeen before and forwarded the study report to the relevant departments for consideration. He could not understand why PlanD said that a study has to be conducted before reserving a site on the OZP for the development of a waterfront promenade. He hoped that PlanD could make reference to the aforesaid study report and then reserve a site for the promenade. The Secretariat would provide the study report for PlanD's reference in due course.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat provided PlanD with the report of the Consultancy Study for the Promenade from Kennedy Town to Aberdeen on 24 September 2019).

17. Mr Louis KAU responded that the development in Pok Fu Lam was governed by the Pok Fu Lam Moratorium, which was an administrative measure. In case the site was confirmed for school development in future, the policy bureau and project proponent concerned had to assess its associated traffic impact. He believed that EDB would consult SDC regarding the matter in a timely manner and reiterated that the rezoning was to prepare for the long-term land use at EDB's request. There

was no definite plan and implementation schedule at the current stage.

18. In closing, the Chairman said the following:

- (a) PlanD's proposed amendments to the OZP were mainly to facilitate the Cyberport Expansion and make associated adjustments to the planning scheme boundary and amendments to land use zonings. He considered it a timely act for PlanD to consult DDHC on the proposed amendments to the OZP at its last meeting within the current term of SDC. Otherwise, it would complete the public consultation without consulting SDC. PlanD's timely consultation showed respect to SDC. He urged PlanD to relay DDHC's views to TPB;
- (b) DDHC did not object to the proposed amendments relating to the Cyberport Expansion Project and other technical amendments to the OZP. But several Members had expressed concern over a number of issues, including the problems generated by the proposed international school project which SDC strongly opposed. He requested PlanD to note DDHC's comments, which should be relayed to the relevant bureau and department;
- (c) he was pleased to learn that PlanD would give a holistic consideration on connecting the promenades at the waterfront area of Pok Fu Lam and hoped that PlanD would make reference to the recommendations given in the report of the Consultancy Study for the Promenade from Kennedy Town to Aberdeen. Even though there would be staff turnover in PlanD, it must ensure that the results of previous studies conducted by SDC would be preserved and continue to be followed up; and
- (d) given that the SIL(W) was not mentioned in the proposed amendments to the OZP, he hoped that PlanD would make corresponding arrangement in the proposed amendments so as to take forward the implementation of the railway project.

~~Agenda Item 3: Amendment to Land Licence of Holy Spirit Seminary and~~

List of Representers in respect of the
Draft Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/18

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'	Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H10/18-1	Pan Wai Lim	TPB/R/S/H10/18-25	Asian Institute of Intelligent Buildings
TPB/R/S/H10/18-2	Terry Shum	TPB/R/S/H10/18-26	Aurecon
TPB/R/S/H10/18-3	Julia Sham	TPB/R/S/H10/18-27	Hong Kong Qingdao Association
TPB/R/S/H10/18-4	Samuel Pau	TPB/R/S/H10/18-28	LeDo Media Technology Company Limited
TPB/R/S/H10/18-5	William Pau	TPB/R/S/H10/18-29	Hong Kong New Generation Cultural Association
TPB/R/S/H10/18-6	Hong Kong Cyberport Management Company Limited	TPB/R/S/H10/18-30	Kamakura Foods Limited
TPB/R/S/H10/18-7	香港青聯科技協會	TPB/R/S/H10/18-31	DSG Finance Holdings (Hong Kong) Limited
TPB/R/S/H10/18-8	GRWTH Limited	TPB/R/S/H10/18-32	Genius Development Workshop Company Limited
TPB/R/S/H10/18-9	Cyber Games Arena Limited	TPB/R/S/H10/18-33	OneDegree Hong Kong Limited
TPB/R/S/H10/18-10	Kowloon E-Stadium Limited	TPB/R/S/H10/18-34	VAR Live International Limited
TPB/R/S/H10/18-11	Stephen Ka Men Lau	TPB/R/S/H10/18-35	Hidden Boss Limited
TPB/R/S/H10/18-12	KPMG (Advisory) Hong Kong Limited	TPB/R/S/H10/18-36	Ember Entertainment Limited
TPB/R/S/H10/18-13	Communications Association of Hong Kong Limited	TPB/R/S/H10/18-37	LYNK
TPB/R/S/H10/18-14	Hong Kong Wireless Technology Industry Association	TPB/R/S/H10/18-38	Starling Labs Limited
TPB/R/S/H10/18-15	Hong Kong Computer Society	TPB/R/S/H10/18-39	Find Solution AI Limited
TPB/R/S/H10/18-16	HK Tramways	TPB/R/S/H10/18-40	Studio-R Company Limited
TPB/R/S/H10/18-17	Federation of Hong Kong Industries	TPB/R/S/H10/18-41	Hong Kong Next Generation Internet Society
TPB/R/S/H10/18-18	Esperanza	TPB/R/S/H10/18-42	CPD101 Limited
TPB/R/S/H10/18-19	The Association of Cloud and Mobile Computing Professionals	TPB/R/S/H10/18-43	Leung Kin Man (Michael)
TPB/R/S/H10/18-20	Benefit Vantage Limited	TPB/R/S/H10/18-44	Ho Bianca Caroline
TPB/R/S/H10/18-21	MTR Corporation Limited	TPB/R/S/H10/18-45	Mak Tang Pik Yee Agnes
TPB/R/S/H10/18-22	Hong Kong New Emerging Technology Education Association	TPB/R/S/H10/18-46	Chan Wai Leung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-23	The Hong Kong Association for Computer Education	TPB/R/S/H10/18-47	Hung Wai Man
TPB/R/S/H10/18-24	Omega International Health Service Limited	TPB/R/S/H10/18-48	Grace Chan
		TPB/R/S/H10/18-49	Jensen Chan
		TPB/R/S/H10/18-50	Marco Chan

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H10/18-51	何傑輝
TPB/R/S/H10/18-52	Chan Hon Chuen, Ken
TPB/R/S/H10/18-53	Lau Kin Yee Miriam
TPB/R/S/H10/18-54	Sunny Lee Wai Kwong
TPB/R/S/H10/18-55	Ng Chak Man
TPB/R/S/H10/18-56	Wong Kam Fai
TPB/R/S/H10/18-57	Lie Kin Fu Tiger
TPB/R/S/H10/18-58	Chan Hoi Sze Sharen
TPB/R/S/H10/18-59	Chan Oi Lee
TPB/R/S/H10/18-60	Chan Oi Ying Addie
TPB/R/S/H10/18-61	Chan Wui Cheong Kay
TPB/R/S/H10/18-62	Chan Yiu Ming
TPB/R/S/H10/18-63	Cheung Man Wing Sandy
TPB/R/S/H10/18-64	Ho On Shing
TPB/R/S/H10/18-65	Ho Siu Ching
TPB/R/S/H10/18-66	Ho Siu Pik
TPB/R/S/H10/18-67	Ho Siu Yin
TPB/R/S/H10/18-68	Ho Sum Man
TPB/R/S/H10/18-69	Ho Wing Kwan
TPB/R/S/H10/18-70	Lai Kwai Lan
TPB/R/S/H10/18-71	Leung Kai Bond
TPB/R/S/H10/18-72	Lo Chun Ho
TPB/R/S/H10/18-73	Lo Ngai Long
TPB/R/S/H10/18-74	Man Wai Lan
TPB/R/S/H10/18-75	Pak Yuen Ting Ellie
TPB/R/S/H10/18-76	Pang Wai Lim
TPB/R/S/H10/18-77	Poon Polly
TPB/R/S/H10/18-78	Sin Pik Wah
TPB/R/S/H10/18-79	Fong Pui Sze
TPB/R/S/H10/18-80	Ho Siu Yuk
TPB/R/S/H10/18-81	Ng Kwok Wing
TPB/R/S/H10/18-82	Wan Kui Man
TPB/R/S/H10/18-83	陳杏仙
TPB/R/S/H10/18-84	Kwan Yiu Wing Philip
TPB/R/S/H10/18-85	Stefanie Teng Wei Chiun
TPB/R/S/H10/18-86	Lam Hoi Ming Walden
TPB/R/S/H10/18-87	Ng Shu Pui Eric
TPB/R/S/H10/18-88	Joy Lam
TPB/R/S/H10/18-89	Veronique Guilloton
TPB/R/S/H10/18-90	Yuen Chui Fan
TPB/R/S/H10/18-91	Chan Kar Lok
TPB/R/S/H10/18-92	Chan Pik Chi Daphne
TPB/R/S/H10/18-93	Man Sau Lin

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H10/18-94	Tang Shuk Ming
TPB/R/S/H10/18-95	Yeung Chuen Sing
TPB/R/S/H10/18-96	互聯網專業協會
TPB/R/S/H10/18-97	So Tung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-98	So Siu Wah
TPB/R/S/H10/18-99	So Wai Wo
TPB/R/S/H10/18-100	Andrea Vilan Catalonia
TPB/R/S/H10/18-101	Ronald Taylor
TPB/R/S/H10/18-102	Paul Zimmerman
TPB/R/S/H10/18-103	The Incorporated Owners of Scenic Villas
TPB/R/S/H10/18-104	The Incorporated Owners of Baguio Villa, Hong Kong
TPB/R/S/H10/18-105	Island South Property Management Limited
TPB/R/S/H10/18-106	Edmund Tsze Shing Li
TPB/R/S/H10/18-107	Kenneth Lai
TPB/R/S/H10/18-108	Kenneth Lai
TPB/R/S/H10/18-109	Chan, Bik Yan Jeannie
TPB/R/S/H10/18-110	Seung Pil Ko
TPB/R/S/H10/18-111	Wells Steven Peter
TPB/R/S/H10/18-112	Wong Ka Fook Clifford
TPB/R/S/H10/18-113	Marcus Shaw
TPB/R/S/H10/18-114	Chin Ho Benjamin Chui
TPB/R/S/H10/18-115	Paul Tao
TPB/R/S/H10/18-116	Moore Andrew Paul
TPB/R/S/H10/18-117	Pang Daren Shun Hei
TPB/R/S/H10/18-118	Pang Ayden Yin Hei
TPB/R/S/H10/18-119	Ng Yat Kwan Freda
TPB/R/S/H10/18-120	Pang Shiu Bun Bunny
TPB/R/S/H10/18-121	Xu Shaoyun
TPB/R/S/H10/18-122	Talbert, Bryan Francis
TPB/R/S/H10/18-123	Lam Sing Cheers Margaret
TPB/R/S/H10/18-124	Li Wen Han
TPB/R/S/H10/18-125	Miu Lee Peggy Roberta
TPB/R/S/H10/18-126	Toong, Darrel See-Jeun
TPB/R/S/H10/18-127	McLennan, Justin John
TPB/R/S/H10/18-128	Yau Cheuk Lam

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H10/18-129	Khurana Vishal
TPB/R/S/H10/18-130	Lui Kar Chung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-131	Brett Alexander Jason Bishop
TPB/R/S/H10/18-132	Lee Yuen Yee Cecilia
TPB/R/S/H10/18-133	Lam Tsun
TPB/R/S/H10/18-134	王天兵
TPB/R/S/H10/18-135	俞芳
TPB/R/S/H10/18-136	Hanifa Ramjahn
TPB/R/S/H10/18-137	Se Hyun Paik
TPB/R/S/H10/18-138	So Yuen Man
TPB/R/S/H10/18-139	Udit Bhatia
TPB/R/S/H10/18-140	Wong Ching Kong Clifford
TPB/R/S/H10/18-141	Yam Wai Yu Wendy
TPB/R/S/H10/18-142	Leung Ming Yuen Simon
TPB/R/S/H10/18-143	Ho Lily Ling Chuck
TPB/R/S/H10/18-144	Tsang Siu Kai Matthew
TPB/R/S/H10/18-145	C.J. Wysocki
TPB/R/S/H10/18-146	Ng Wing Man
TPB/R/S/H10/18-147	Jovan Milic
TPB/R/S/H10/18-148	Ip Sau Fong Nancy
TPB/R/S/H10/18-149	Chui Tak Yiu
TPB/R/S/H10/18-150	Lau Ka Fai Joseph
TPB/R/S/H10/18-151	Chan Tsz Kin Anthony
TPB/R/S/H10/18-152	Lam Robert Fung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-153	Tan, Nicholas Tsung Yuan
TPB/R/S/H10/18-154	Li Wai Ling
TPB/R/S/H10/18-155	No Wai Suen Yvonne
TPB/R/S/H10/18-156	Yue, Lup Gay Arthur Mathew
TPB/R/S/H10/18-157	Cheung Ting Yee
TPB/R/S/H10/18-158	Gerardus Maria H.A.
TPB/R/S/H10/18-159	Cheung Ka Lok
TPB/R/S/H10/18-160	Lo Kai Yuen Harrison
TPB/R/S/H10/18-161	Mary Mulvihill
TPB/R/S/H10/18-162	Wong Tsz Ho
TPB/R/S/H10/18-163	Guy Connell
TPB/R/S/H10/18-164	Chow Pak Tim
TPB/R/S/H10/18-165	Rani Bharwani
TPB/R/S/H10/18-166	Ho Chung Wai Ambrose
TPB/R/S/H10/18-167	John Kearns
TPB/R/S/H10/18-168	Diana Hung

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H10/18-169	Yeung Kai Yuen
TPB/R/S/H10/18-170	So Mei Ha
TPB/R/S/H10/18-171	Chan Wai Ho
TPB/R/S/H10/18-172	Edward Sung Lai Lam
TPB/R/S/H10/18-173	Orla Colette Thomas
TPB/R/S/H10/18-174	Grabowski Ernst Gerrit Alexander
TPB/R/S/H10/18-175	Bjoern Petter Waldemar Sternby
TPB/R/S/H10/18-176	Lai Ming Wai Rebecca
TPB/R/S/H10/18-177	Craig George Blurton
TPB/R/S/H10/18-178	So Che Fung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-179	Ann Cody White
TPB/R/S/H10/18-180	Hu Shuxin
TPB/R/S/H10/18-181	Ng Wai Chu Deborah
TPB/R/S/H10/18-182	Gidumal, Sunil Mohandas
TPB/R/S/H10/18-183	Emily Davis
TPB/R/S/H10/18-184	Lam Oi Kun Vanessa
TPB/R/S/H10/18-185	Andrew Thomas William Pickford
TPB/R/S/H10/18-186	Paul Berriman
TPB/R/S/H10/18-187	Percy, Christopher Mark
TPB/R/S/H10/18-188	Kashish Sanjay Sakhrani
TPB/R/S/H10/18-189	Miu Chun Yan
TPB/R/S/H10/18-190	William Liang
TPB/R/S/H10/18-191	Choy Wing Sze
TPB/R/S/H10/18-192	Maryann Jones
TPB/R/S/H10/18-193	Knight, Robert John Sando
TPB/R/S/H10/18-194	Kwok Oi Lung Roy
TPB/R/S/H10/18-195	Siewert, Patrick Thomas
TPB/R/S/H10/18-196	Wright Alison Audrey
TPB/R/S/H10/18-197	Hon Hing Tong Patricia
TPB/R/S/H10/18-198	Timothy Trevor Hendrik Storey
TPB/R/S/H10/18-199	Lloyd Chao
TPB/R/S/H10/18-200	Sakhrani Arjan Heera
TPB/R/S/H10/18-201	Mitchell, Timothy James
TPB/R/S/H10/18-202	Brenda Gayle Gill
TPB/R/S/H10/18-203	Jochen Krug
TPB/R/S/H10/18-204	Cassandra Lister

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H10/18-205	Hung Liao Shirley
TPB/R/S/H10/18-206	Liu Zhen Rong Daryl
TPB/R/S/H10/18-207	Law Wing Hung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-208	Tang Wing On
TPB/R/S/H10/18-209	Li, Huanting Timothy
TPB/R/S/H10/18-210	Lai Yat Ming
TPB/R/S/H10/18-211	呂定昌
TPB/R/S/H10/18-212	Punam de Manny
TPB/R/S/H10/18-213	Lam Long Sum Raphael
TPB/R/S/H10/18-214	Krusche, Arnd
TPB/R/S/H10/18-215	Manoj Buxani
TPB/R/S/H10/18-216	Bate Alison Jane
TPB/R/S/H10/18-217	Wong Shui Ki Keith
TPB/R/S/H10/18-218	Leonard Venetia Helen
TPB/R/S/H10/18-219	Harris, Joselyn
TPB/R/S/H10/18-220	Kaz Kempers
TPB/R/S/H10/18-221	Tess Lyons
TPB/R/S/H10/18-222	Cheung Danny Wai Kin
TPB/R/S/H10/18-223	Dorfman, Gershon
TPB/R/S/H10/18-224	Tubiana, Felix Avner Ernest
TPB/R/S/H10/18-225	Zimmern, Richard Pierre Morkel
TPB/R/S/H10/18-226	Boecke, Volker
TPB/R/S/H10/18-227	Chui Kit Yee Gloria
TPB/R/S/H10/18-228	Elaine Butterfield
TPB/R/S/H10/18-229	Gili Soledad
TPB/R/S/H10/18-230	Bullock Peter Charles Edward
TPB/R/S/H10/18-231	Yuen Keith Sik Kee
TPB/R/S/H10/18-232	Wat Kai Cheong Dennis
TPB/R/S/H10/18-233	Ma Tengying
TPB/R/S/H10/18-234	Gill, Robin Clive
TPB/R/S/H10/18-235	Chow Yuen Man Louise
TPB/R/S/H10/18-236	Winter, Dean
TPB/R/S/H10/18-237	Richard Griffiths
TPB/R/S/H10/18-238	Elizabeth Isler
TPB/R/S/H10/18-239	Suzan Salnikow
TPB/R/S/H10/18-240	Ling Yuk Yin Judy
TPB/R/S/H10/18-241	Ashley Billington
TPB/R/S/H10/18-242	Dolson, Beverly Cynthia
TPB/R/S/H10/18-243	Rosemarie Delphine Kriesel

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H10/18-244	Wong Ho Ming
TPB/R/S/H10/18-245	David Edward Owens
TPB/R/S/H10/18-246	Sandy Currie
TPB/R/S/H10/18-247	Luo Peng
TPB/R/S/H10/18-248	Fiona Martin
TPB/R/S/H10/18-249	Robertson Charles Alexander
TPB/R/S/H10/18-250	Nunan Catherine Jean
TPB/R/S/H10/18-251	Wong Yuen Ting
TPB/R/S/H10/18-252	Li Lai Kuen
TPB/R/S/H10/18-253	Chung, Napoleon King
TPB/R/S/H10/18-254	Jennifer Jade Earnshaw
TPB/R/S/H10/18-255	Luk Wing Chung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-256	Ben Burger
TPB/R/S/H10/18-257	Wright John Charles
TPB/R/S/H10/18-258	Konn, David Simon
TPB/R/S/H10/18-259	Janice Pakchung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-260	Tso Yuk Keung Eugene
TPB/R/S/H10/18-261	Andrew Nicholson
TPB/R/S/H10/18-262	Tong, Gillian
TPB/R/S/H10/18-263	Henning Voss
TPB/R/S/H10/18-264	Michelle W Yu
TPB/R/S/H10/18-265	Oceane Lao
TPB/R/S/H10/18-266	Lee Kwo Yan
TPB/R/S/H10/18-267	James Ho Piao Chuang
TPB/R/S/H10/18-268	Tso Wai Han
TPB/R/S/H10/18-269	Choonbrg Han Ching
TPB/R/S/H10/18-270	Malam Paul Nicholas
TPB/R/S/H10/18-271	Cheung Pui Yin Edwina
TPB/R/S/H10/18-272	Tian Jing
TPB/R/S/H10/18-273	Knight Stephen John
TPB/R/S/H10/18-274	Mickie Tan Chi Wong
TPB/R/S/H10/18-275	Duck Francesca
TPB/R/S/H10/18-276	Guo Ying
TPB/R/S/H10/18-277	Chan Kam Hung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-278	Yip Cheuk Wai
TPB/R/S/H10/18-279	Wai Cheong Shum
TPB/R/S/H10/18-280	John Hetherington
TPB/R/S/H10/18-281	Badri, Tasneem Hozefa
TPB/R/S/H10/18-282	Ooi Lam, Mei Fong Isabel
TPB/R/S/H10/18-283	Miu Leung Shan Bernard

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H10/18-284	Chung Ling Chun Janet
TPB/R/S/H10/18-285	John Wacker
TPB/R/S/H10/18-286	Serje, Ronald Kenneth
TPB/R/S/H10/18-287	Patil, Somashekhar Bhimagouda
TPB/R/S/H10/18-288	Lee Tin Yan
TPB/R/S/H10/18-289	Eric Jungers
TPB/R/S/H10/18-290	金碩
TPB/R/S/H10/18-291	Li Shuqing
TPB/R/S/H10/18-292	Stoute Tracey Masanda
TPB/R/S/H10/18-293	Poon Pui Wah Irene
TPB/R/S/H10/18-294	Frances Ho
TPB/R/S/H10/18-295	Emma Hurlston-Tseng
TPB/R/S/H10/18-296	Parazzi, Amanda Linda
TPB/R/S/H10/18-297	Clayton Zara Louise
TPB/R/S/H10/18-298	Elaine Oi Lam Fong Mo
TPB/R/S/H10/18-299	Claire Goodchild
TPB/R/S/H10/18-300	Li Karen Kwai Har
TPB/R/S/H10/18-301	Laurel Elizabeth Dillon
TPB/R/S/H10/18-302	Mounier, Arnaud Francois
TPB/R/S/H10/18-303	Reema Khanna
TPB/R/S/H10/18-304	Leong Su Cheng Julie
TPB/R/S/H10/18-305	Staffan Gosta Lofgren
TPB/R/S/H10/18-306	Debra Elaine Meiburg
TPB/R/S/H10/18-307	Chan Alvin Christopher Hung Kit
TPB/R/S/H10/18-308	Manoj Kumar Arora
TPB/R/S/H10/18-309	Frances Marie Gordon
TPB/R/S/H10/18-310	Keong Chun Sing
TPB/R/S/H10/18-311	Yu Ming Kuen Iris
TPB/R/S/H10/18-312	Jesu, Raffaele Amerigo
TPB/R/S/H10/18-313	Wong Shiu Keung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-314	Fong Yuen Ting
TPB/R/S/H10/18-315	Guo Shaomu
TPB/R/S/H10/18-316	Chau Stephanie Yitung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-317	Lim Ching Yee Julie
TPB/R/S/H10/18-318	Milan Manohar Kamekar
TPB/R/S/H10/18-319	Jenny Hong
TPB/R/S/H10/18-320	Wong Chi Hung

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H10/18-321	Fung Wai Ha
TPB/R/S/H10/18-322	Tsai Hsiao-Fen
TPB/R/S/H10/18-323	Khemlyani Linda Melanie
TPB/R/S/H10/18-324	Shukla Aarti Ashish
TPB/R/S/H10/18-325	Emma Archer-Perkins
TPB/R/S/H10/18-326	Tung Oi Chun Gloria
TPB/R/S/H10/18-327	Pong Wing Yan
TPB/R/S/H10/18-328	Neil Andrew Morrison
TPB/R/S/H10/18-329	Cheng Tze Yeung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-330	Jan Torka
TPB/R/S/H10/18-331	Yue Kar Suen Sophia
TPB/R/S/H10/18-332	Yau Wai Chi
TPB/R/S/H10/18-333	Rittner Guenther Siegfried
TPB/R/S/H10/18-334	Cathy Mullin
TPB/R/S/H10/18-335	Stefanie Hemshall
TPB/R/S/H10/18-336	James Marc Lee Segal
TPB/R/S/H10/18-337	Li Pak Lin Sandy
TPB/R/S/H10/18-338	Liu Samuel Nian
TPB/R/S/H10/18-339	Julia Liu
TPB/R/S/H10/18-340	Jennifer Ganz
TPB/R/S/H10/18-341	Cheng Ka Leung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-342	Farmer Nigel Laurence
TPB/R/S/H10/18-343	Yeung Chung Chi Eva
TPB/R/S/H10/18-344	Graeme Pyott
TPB/R/S/H10/18-345	Wong Fung Mei Jacky
TPB/R/S/H10/18-346	Chan Sau Kan, Luciana
TPB/R/S/H10/18-347	Chan Ip Hing
TPB/R/S/H10/18-348	Lam Sonia
TPB/R/S/H10/18-349	Leung, Ronald Yat Yin
TPB/R/S/H10/18-350	Li Ho Hin Kelvin
TPB/R/S/H10/18-351	Paul Anthony McMahon
TPB/R/S/H10/18-352	Sandra Theresa Collins-De-Lange
TPB/R/S/H10/18-353	De Lange Daniel Donald
TPB/R/S/H10/18-354	Andrew Mo
TPB/R/S/H10/18-355	Christine Tan
TPB/R/S/H10/18-356	Tseng Hing Fung Franklin
TPB/R/S/H10/18-357	B Chang
TPB/R/S/H10/18-358	Mallett Shuk Kwan Diby

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H10/18-359	White, Linda Ann
TPB/R/S/H10/18-360	Lau Tat Ying Terry
TPB/R/S/H10/18-361	Cheung Chow Tong Doris
TPB/R/S/H10/18-362	Paul Kwong
TPB/R/S/H10/18-363	Tang Wai Ling Willie
TPB/R/S/H10/18-364	Leow Po Lin
TPB/R/S/H10/18-365	Yuen Hei Wai
TPB/R/S/H10/18-366	Wong Pui Yung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-367	Kristen Si Wing Lam
TPB/R/S/H10/18-368	Candace Nok Yan Lam
TPB/R/S/H10/18-369	Debbie Suk Ching Kui
TPB/R/S/H10/18-370	Natalie May Lynne Ackerman
TPB/R/S/H10/18-371	Zhou Meng
TPB/R/S/H10/18-372	Lai Chi Wai
TPB/R/S/H10/18-373	Polson James Brian
TPB/R/S/H10/18-374	McMahon, Yvonne
TPB/R/S/H10/18-375	Larissa Downes
TPB/R/S/H10/18-376	David S. Lee
TPB/R/S/H10/18-377	Li Ho Wing
TPB/R/S/H10/18-378	Lim Edwin Ee Yeong
TPB/R/S/H10/18-379	Tsui Hung Sang Hudson
TPB/R/S/H10/18-380	Hon Yuk Sheung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-381	Poon Wai Ka Veronica
TPB/R/S/H10/18-382	Ann Allason Bridgewater
TPB/R/S/H10/18-383	Calvin James Hsu
TPB/R/S/H10/18-384	Roger Cole
TPB/R/S/H10/18-385	Rueger Anna Sovia
TPB/R/S/H10/18-386	Lau Suet Kum
TPB/R/S/H10/18-387	Jamieson Grant Andrew
TPB/R/S/H10/18-388	Chan Wing Yee
TPB/R/S/H10/18-389	Mead Christopher David
TPB/R/S/H10/18-390	Lakshman Perera Samaranayake
TPB/R/S/H10/18-391	Rachel Ridley
TPB/R/S/H10/18-392	Sylvia Hui Wan Ling
TPB/R/S/H10/18-393	Taylor, Alison Deborah
TPB/R/S/H10/18-394	Liza Green
TPB/R/S/H10/18-395	Chan Wai Yin
TPB/R/S/H10/18-396	Graham Bernard Moore

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H10/18-397	Trevor Hughes
TPB/R/S/H10/18-398	Mangho Amrita Brij
TPB/R/S/H10/18-399	Liu Kwok Fai
TPB/R/S/H10/18-400	Lok Shuk Cheong
TPB/R/S/H10/18-401	Mark Hardy
TPB/R/S/H10/18-402	Graeme Martin
TPB/R/S/H10/18-403	Juliana Cheney
TPB/R/S/H10/18-404	Andrea Sainz de Vicuna
TPB/R/S/H10/18-405	Ma Kin Heng Alexander
TPB/R/S/H10/18-406	Dermawan Kurnia
TPB/R/S/H10/18-407	A.D.M. Dudgeon
TPB/R/S/H10/18-408	Wilson Veh-Chi
TPB/R/S/H10/18-409	Charles Quentin Drew
TPB/R/S/H10/18-410	de Courcy Hughes, Alicia Louise
TPB/R/S/H10/18-411	Sakhrani Sanjay Arjan
TPB/R/S/H10/18-412	Emma Karenza Rochfort Bradshaw
TPB/R/S/H10/18-413	Lucrezia Corti
TPB/R/S/H10/18-414	Liu, Frederick Thomas
TPB/R/S/H10/18-415	Au Hoe Chi Angel
TPB/R/S/H10/18-416	Kwok Tse Wai David
TPB/R/S/H10/18-417	Ardyce Yik
TPB/R/S/H10/18-418	Dang Susan Linh Man
TPB/R/S/H10/18-419	Natalie Rie
TPB/R/S/H10/18-420	Leung Jam Ming
TPB/R/S/H10/18-421	Ng Tong Yow
TPB/R/S/H10/18-422	Yan, Oi Wah Peggy
TPB/R/S/H10/18-423	Janet Tso
TPB/R/S/H10/18-424	Ryan Jeffrey Preston
TPB/R/S/H10/18-425	Mariyah Hatim Hoosenally
TPB/R/S/H10/18-426	Peter Fortune
TPB/R/S/H10/18-427	Peter Firtubw
TPB/R/S/H10/18-428	Asanka Samaranayake
TPB/R/S/H10/18-429	Smith Janice
TPB/R/S/H10/18-430	Silkstone Dorothy
TPB/R/S/H10/18-431	Siau Hsiao Hui
TPB/R/S/H10/18-432	Lo Sau Woon Diana
TPB/R/S/H10/18-433	Silvia Carius
TPB/R/S/H10/18-434	Maria Soledad Escobar Hartard
TPB/R/S/H10/18-435	Lee Ming Shum Maria
TPB/R/S/H10/18-436	Robertson, Michael Ian
TPB/R/S/H10/18-437	Chan Lai Ning Hidi Chan

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H10/18-438	Chan Yuen Mi Nancy
TPB/R/S/H10/18-439	Andrew Douglas
TPB/R/S/H10/18-440	Birkett Pamela Mary
TPB/R/S/H10/18-441	Hamish Peddie
TPB/R/S/H10/18-442	Mireya Garcia
TPB/R/S/H10/18-443	Chow Kin Mink Alvin
TPB/R/S/H10/18-444	Elaine Anna Kwong
TPB/R/S/H10/18-445	Tsai Hsiao-Fen
TPB/R/S/H10/18-446	Amanda Whitfort
TPB/R/S/H10/18-447	Leung Chu Hei
TPB/R/S/H10/18-448	Wong Sau Yan
TPB/R/S/H10/18-449	Li Chee Lan Lina
TPB/R/S/H10/18-450	Fisher Tracey Victoria
TPB/R/S/H10/18-451	Greene, Jerry Lee
TPB/R/S/H10/18-452	Ravi Mohandas Gidumal
TPB/R/S/H10/18-453	Shum Jennifer Wei Huen
TPB/R/S/H10/18-454	Dickinson, Miles Jonathan
TPB/R/S/H10/18-455	Kanagawa, Julie Kazumi
TPB/R/S/H10/18-456	Kenneth Abrla
TPB/R/S/H10/18-457	Mcpherson Donald Bradley
TPB/R/S/H10/18-458	Hans Georg Schlaikier
TPB/R/S/H10/18-459	Winnie Wai Yin Hau
TPB/R/S/H10/18-460	Christina Lovisa Charlotte Sternby
TPB/R/S/H10/18-461	King Ruth
TPB/R/S/H10/18-462	Leung Ho Yin Denis
TPB/R/S/H10/18-463	Donna Wacker
TPB/R/S/H10/18-464	Hardy Eugenia
TPB/R/S/H10/18-465	Tam Miu Lin, May
TPB/R/S/H10/18-466	Liu Zhanyun
TPB/R/S/H10/18-467	Mcgregor David
TPB/R/S/H10/18-468	Alice Corrigan
TPB/R/S/H10/18-469	Scher, Mark Evan
TPB/R/S/H10/18-470	Mandy Irene Leung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-471	David Thomas Gibb
TPB/R/S/H10/18-472	Ning Patricia Yeung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-473	Yeung Sum
TPB/R/S/H10/18-474	Li Wai Kam Irene
TPB/R/S/H10/18-475	Mak Po Chi
TPB/R/S/H10/18-476	Yu Yim
TPB/R/S/H10/18-477	Nneka A Chike-Obi Cummings

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H10/18-478	Macintosh, Terri-Lynn Kirsten
TPB/R/S/H10/18-479	Amit Sharon
TPB/R/S/H10/18-480	Itay Michael Sharon
TPB/R/S/H10/18-481	Tsang Suk Kwan
TPB/R/S/H10/18-482	Sahay, Nirupam
TPB/R/S/H10/18-483	Chow Kwok Po Man, Lina
TPB/R/S/H10/18-484	Francis Lim
TPB/R/S/H10/18-485	Jamshed Safdar
TPB/R/S/H10/18-486	Linda Davy
TPB/R/S/H10/18-487	Jennifer Wes Saran
TPB/R/S/H10/18-488	Sarah Saran
TPB/R/S/H10/18-489	Cedric Roux
TPB/R/S/H10/18-490	Vallabhi Khurana
TPB/R/S/H10/18-491	Ho Siu Wah
TPB/R/S/H10/18-492	Aakriti Singh
TPB/R/S/H10/18-493	Maria Mc Carthy
TPB/R/S/H10/18-494	Sanjukta Sharma
TPB/R/S/H10/18-495	Matisse Koo
TPB/R/S/H10/18-496	Marine Koo
TPB/R/S/H10/18-497	Anushka Daldas
TPB/R/S/H10/18-498	Tsang Cheuk Hin Thomas
TPB/R/S/H10/18-499	Lee, Olive Yvonne On Yee
TPB/R/S/H10/18-500	Winston Wing Ho Koo
TPB/R/S/H10/18-501	Dina Gidwani
TPB/R/S/H10/18-502	Sonali Gidwani
TPB/R/S/H10/18-503	Gidwani Gaurav Girish
TPB/R/S/H10/18-504	Lee Man Ho Joseph
TPB/R/S/H10/18-505	Gidwani Girish Gul
TPB/R/S/H10/18-506	Lau Wai Fong
TPB/R/S/H10/18-507	Kei Ka Man Karen
TPB/R/S/H10/18-508	Ho Ka Yu Naomi
TPB/R/S/H10/18-509	Ho Ka Ki Janet
TPB/R/S/H10/18-510	Blaza Bragas
TPB/R/S/H10/18-511	Tang Kwong Mo
TPB/R/S/H10/18-512	Soong Fung Gue
TPB/R/S/H10/18-513	Mandel Tang
TPB/R/S/H10/18-514	Fong Chun Hon
TPB/R/S/H10/18-515	Chen Zhiwei
TPB/R/S/H10/18-516	Doyle, George Fenwich

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H10/18-517	Terri Donlon
TPB/R/S/H10/18-518	Atiya Jamshed
TPB/R/S/H10/18-519	Vaughn Woods
TPB/R/S/H10/18-520	Ku Pik Wah
TPB/R/S/H10/18-521	Ng Vincent
TPB/R/S/H10/18-522	Li Tsz Ching Veronica
TPB/R/S/H10/18-523	Chan Tsz Yan Heidi
TPB/R/S/H10/18-524	Jessica Williams
TPB/R/S/H10/18-525	Chan Tin Long Terrence
TPB/R/S/H10/18-526	Coupe, Christophe Dominique Michel
TPB/R/S/H10/18-527	Vicki Melinda Mendelssohn
TPB/R/S/H10/18-528	James Leung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-529	Yung Ha Kuk Victor
TPB/R/S/H10/18-530	Bunyan Sean Brendan
TPB/R/S/H10/18-531	Hong Xiaobo
TPB/R/S/H10/18-532	Bindiya Suraj Rupani
TPB/R/S/H10/18-533	Cheung Lok Yee Alice
TPB/R/S/H10/18-534	Po Kam Hi John
TPB/R/S/H10/18-535	Susan Elizabeth De Heinrich
TPB/R/S/H10/18-536	Woo Hon Man Herman
TPB/R/S/H10/18-537	Fortune John Alfred
TPB/R/S/H10/18-538	Low Ehwa Sandra
TPB/R/S/H10/18-539	Fung Mei Ling
TPB/R/S/H10/18-540	Macer, Joanne Clare
TPB/R/S/H10/18-541	Elaine Carole Young
TPB/R/S/H10/18-542	Chong Yee Ling
TPB/R/S/H10/18-543	Dipa Ramchand Burkhardt
TPB/R/S/H10/18-544	Cheung, Chau Li Sherry
TPB/R/S/H10/18-545	Tang Nap Wong Sammy
TPB/R/S/H10/18-546	Har Chun Kit Johnson
TPB/R/S/H10/18-547	Fung Shuk Ming
TPB/R/S/H10/18-548	Piovesana Alessandra
TPB/R/S/H10/18-549	Matthew McNair
TPB/R/S/H10/18-550	Li Wai King Vicky
TPB/R/S/H10/18-551	Amin, Nihal Francis Xavier
TPB/R/S/H10/18-552	Julia Wong
TPB/R/S/H10/18-553	Schmidl Juhi Henry
TPB/R/S/H10/18-554	Lock Yue Wah

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H10/18-555	Angela Hancock
TPB/R/S/H10/18-556	Elaine Chan
TPB/R/S/H10/18-557	Wan, Mengqi
TPB/R/S/H10/18-558	Chu Siu Lan Venus
TPB/R/S/H10/18-559	Judy Sun
TPB/R/S/H10/18-560	Whitehead Robert John
TPB/R/S/H10/18-561	Yu Jakie
TPB/R/S/H10/18-562	K S Kwok
TPB/R/S/H10/18-563	Fong Chi Meng Nelson
TPB/R/S/H10/18-564	Rosanna Lam
TPB/R/S/H10/18-565	Lau Man Yee Joyce
TPB/R/S/H10/18-566	Cheng Peter Pak Hou
TPB/R/S/H10/18-567	Chan Suk Yee Charmaine
TPB/R/S/H10/18-568	So Ki Hin
TPB/R/S/H10/18-569	Queenie Cheng
TPB/R/S/H10/18-570	Lui Hau Man Phoebian
TPB/R/S/H10/18-571	Ho Cheuk Fai Jacky
TPB/R/S/H10/18-572	Leong Ling Chi Daniel
TPB/R/S/H10/18-573	Lee Yau Nang Ian
TPB/R/S/H10/18-574	Man On Man Amy
TPB/R/S/H10/18-575	Chow Ling
TPB/R/S/H10/18-576	Chen Hsiao Ju
TPB/R/S/H10/18-577	Alexandra Marie Kotewall Choa Tan
TPB/R/S/H10/18-578	Gregory Laurence De' Eb
TPB/R/S/H10/18-579	Roxanne Daruwalla
TPB/R/S/H10/18-580	Dray, Rudi Alan
TPB/R/S/H10/18-581	Mak Wing San
TPB/R/S/H10/18-582	Abeyratne, Chiaki
TPB/R/S/H10/18-583	Peter Michael D'Almada Remedios
TPB/R/S/H10/18-584	Lau Tat Yuen
TPB/R/S/H10/18-585	Tin Ting Miranda Wai Tak
TPB/R/S/H10/18-586	Chow Mat Idy
TPB/R/S/H10/18-587	Margaret Lam
TPB/R/S/H10/18-588	Alexander Howarth Yat Kay Cheung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-589	Chan Kai Yu Rudy
TPB/R/S/H10/18-590	Chow V So Tai Miriam
TPB/R/S/H10/18-591	Page Alice Rose

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H10/18-592	Fang Fang Fendi
TPB/R/S/H10/18-593	Denise Cheung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-594	Denise Cheung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-595	Liu Eva
TPB/R/S/H10/18-596	Jonathan Trevor Moore
TPB/R/S/H10/18-597	Tam Man Tai Victor
TPB/R/S/H10/18-598	Wing, Yee Wei Amy
TPB/R/S/H10/18-599	Birkett Pamela Mary
TPB/R/S/H10/18-600	Budge Kathleen Ann
TPB/R/S/H10/18-601	Budge John Robertson
TPB/R/S/H10/18-602	Carol Linda DeCandido
TPB/R/S/H10/18-603	Cautherley, George William Hunter
TPB/R/S/H10/18-604	Chau-Yip Kitty Cheung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-605	Cheung Tin Yin Tina
TPB/R/S/H10/18-606	Cheung Wing Tim
TPB/R/S/H10/18-607	Chu Yin Hing
TPB/R/S/H10/18-608	Clair Price
TPB/R/S/H10/18-609	Freyer Nicolas Paul Christian
TPB/R/S/H10/18-610	Haydee Crisalene Alupay
TPB/R/S/H10/18-611	Ho Kwok Wai
TPB/R/S/H10/18-612	Edie Ai-Ming Hu
TPB/R/S/H10/18-613	Hui Ka Chun
TPB/R/S/H10/18-614	Jasmin Antonio Mehta
TPB/R/S/H10/18-615	Jerome Pang
TPB/R/S/H10/18-616	Joanna Hew-Yan Yip
TPB/R/S/H10/18-617	Karl Johan Philip Lagerkranser
TPB/R/S/H10/18-618	Khoo Cheng Kwee
TPB/R/S/H10/18-619	Kwan Ying Ngai
TPB/R/S/H10/18-620	Kwong Chi Yan Lorraine
TPB/R/S/H10/18-621	Lai, Siu Ping Terry
TPB/R/S/H10/18-622	Lai Wang Leong
TPB/R/S/H10/18-623	Wong Pik Ling Alice
TPB/R/S/H10/18-624	Lam Ching Lok Gary
TPB/R/S/H10/18-625	Lam Hok Chung Rainier
TPB/R/S/H10/18-626	Casin Lam Kit Fong
TPB/R/S/H10/18-627	Lam Sau Yee Jenny
TPB/R/S/H10/18-628	Lau Wai Yee Pansy
TPB/R/S/H10/18-629	Lavina Khatwani
TPB/R/S/H10/18-630	Lee Tim Wai Timothy

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H10/18-631	Lenk Robert John
TPB/R/S/H10/18-632	Leung Bing Shin
TPB/R/S/H10/18-633	Leung Ka Man
TPB/R/S/H10/18-634	Kai Chuen Li
TPB/R/S/H10/18-635	Long Tien Ian
TPB/R/S/H10/18-636	Louisa Caraffi
TPB/R/S/H10/18-637	Madeleine Green
TPB/R/S/H10/18-638	Nadkarni, Suyash Rajesh
TPB/R/S/H10/18-639	Natasha Tait
TPB/R/S/H10/18-640	Ng Kwok Ho Michael
TPB/R/S/H10/18-641	Krieger Patricia Rosemary
TPB/R/S/H10/18-642	Pereira Erle Benedict
TPB/R/S/H10/18-643	Pereira Kathryn Zita
TPB/R/S/H10/18-644	Pereira Melissa Lucy Conception
TPB/R/S/H10/18-645	Pong Chi Kin Joshua
TPB/R/S/H10/18-646	Priyanka Mahtani
TPB/R/S/H10/18-647	Qiu Hui
TPB/R/S/H10/18-648	Shuper Mark Stefan
TPB/R/S/H10/18-649	Simon de Courcy Hughes
TPB/R/S/H10/18-650	Siu Michelle Chi Ging
TPB/R/S/H10/18-651	Sun Man
TPB/R/S/H10/18-652	Sung, Ye Wan Yvonne
TPB/R/S/H10/18-653	Tam, Philip Fai Hung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-654	Tong Chi Kit Vincent
TPB/R/S/H10/18-655	Rachel Tong
TPB/R/S/H10/18-656	Grace Tso
TPB/R/S/H10/18-657	Linne Tsu
TPB/R/S/H10/18-658	U Ka Yan Gracia
TPB/R/S/H10/18-659	Vanessa Jane Pepper
TPB/R/S/H10/18-660	Watt Robert Andrew
TPB/R/S/H10/18-661	Wong Chun Wing Alfred
TPB/R/S/H10/18-662	Wong Tat David
TPB/R/S/H10/18-663	Yiu Wai Chung, Michael
TPB/R/S/H10/18-664	Zhang Yueming
TPB/R/S/H10/18-665	黃育苓
TPB/R/S/H10/18-666	Chan Chun Hong
TPB/R/S/H10/18-667	Chan Chun On
TPB/R/S/H10/18-668	Chow Wai Ming
TPB/R/S/H10/18-669	Christopher Justice
TPB/R/S/H10/18-670	KW Lam
TPB/R/S/H10/18-671	Lam Yue Fung

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H10/18-672	Lee Lok Yan
TPB/R/S/H10/18-673	Tseng Bao Ji Alexander
TPB/R/S/H10/18-674	Ng Sai Yee
TPB/R/S/H10/18-675	Andrew Lister
TPB/R/S/H10/18-676	Angelica L Lofgren
TPB/R/S/H10/18-677	Anupama Rao Poduri
TPB/R/S/H10/18-678	Barry R Gausden
TPB/R/S/H10/18-679	Chan Ka Yee
TPB/R/S/H10/18-680	Chan Kui Man
TPB/R/S/H10/18-681	Chan Ngah Yee Agnes
TPB/R/S/H10/18-682	Chan Ngoi Lung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-683	Chauvet Alice Phuong
TPB/R/S/H10/18-684	Chin Shui Kei
TPB/R/S/H10/18-685	Bonnie Chow
TPB/R/S/H10/18-686	Chu Tak Man
TPB/R/S/H10/18-687	Chua Hwai Hwee
TPB/R/S/H10/18-688	Chui Man Wah
TPB/R/S/H10/18-689	Clint, James Edward
TPB/R/S/H10/18-690	Fong Sui Tung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-691	Heenu Nagrani
TPB/R/S/H10/18-692	Helen Bramley
TPB/R/S/H10/18-693	Ho, Zenon Jianfeng
TPB/R/S/H10/18-694	Kwong Yu Hin
TPB/R/S/H10/18-695	Lee Chi Sang Canty
TPB/R/S/H10/18-696	Lee Man Fung Kelvin
TPB/R/S/H10/18-697	Lee Tin Wai
TPB/R/S/H10/18-698	Leung Kwok Keung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-699	Li Mavis Qiwen
TPB/R/S/H10/18-700	Ma Jieyun
TPB/R/S/H10/18-701	Mak Ka Hei
TPB/R/S/H10/18-702	Mak Yin Fan Fannie
TPB/R/S/H10/18-703	Mark Stamper
TPB/R/S/H10/18-704	Nam Siu Wai Sylvia
TPB/R/S/H10/18-705	Ng Lai Ging Pauline
TPB/R/S/H10/18-706	Pashmina Vivek Chhada Bhagnari
TPB/R/S/H10/18-707	Pau Wai Chu Mimi
TPB/R/S/H10/18-708	Sarony Neville Leslie
TPB/R/S/H10/18-709	Philip John Shaw
TPB/R/S/H10/18-710	Sarah Shaw
TPB/R/S/H10/18-711	Sit Hung Jessica
TPB/R/S/H10/18-712	So Chi Chung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-713	Stephanie Tibbatts
TPB/R/S/H10/18-714	Sy Yee Lok Christine
TPB/R/S/H10/18-715	Tang Lai I Margarida
TPB/R/S/H10/18-716	Thomas Simon Adler
TPB/R/S/H10/18-717	Wong Jen Jeah Jesse

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H10/18-718	Wong Wai Hung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-719	Wong Yuan Hang
TPB/R/S/H10/18-720	Yu Ka Fai
TPB/R/S/H10/18-721	Christopher Kin Leung Yu
TPB/R/S/H10/18-722	Yuen Sui Hung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-723	Edward Holden Bell
TPB/R/S/H10/18-724	Yung Siu Lin
TPB/R/S/H10/18-725	Cheng, Rosa Maria
TPB/R/S/H10/18-726	Madhuri Mantena
TPB/R/S/H10/18-727	Li Shin Ming Charmaine
TPB/R/S/H10/18-728	Chu Martin Joseph
TPB/R/S/H10/18-729	Chak Kin Man
TPB/R/S/H10/18-730	De Brackinghe, Norman Willaim
TPB/R/S/H10/18-731	Heller Gillis Lockwood
TPB/R/S/H10/18-732	Nicola Ann Clarke
TPB/R/S/H10/18-733	Saw Eng Tiong
TPB/R/S/H10/18-734	Krieger, Lionel John
TPB/R/S/H10/18-735	周元正
TPB/R/S/H10/18-736	Balkrishnan Subramanyan
TPB/R/S/H10/18-737	Birkett, Stephen Scott
TPB/R/S/H10/18-738	Chan Kwok Suen
TPB/R/S/H10/18-739	Chan Tak Chung Jocelyn
TPB/R/S/H10/18-740	Chan Yee Lam
TPB/R/S/H10/18-741	Chan Yeuk Lam
TPB/R/S/H10/18-742	Chau Chung
TPB/R/S/H10/18-743	Kalyani Gurumani Subramanyan
TPB/R/S/H10/18-744	Margaret Kutt
TPB/R/S/H10/18-745	Lau Calvin Lik Hang
TPB/R/S/H10/18-746	Lee Steere, Joanne Marie
TPB/R/S/H10/18-747	Tay Li Leng
TPB/R/S/H10/18-748	Leung Wing Yee Marie Teresa
TPB/R/S/H10/18-749	Dominique Erica Lofgren
TPB/R/S/H10/18-750	Maja Minic
TPB/R/S/H10/18-751	Ng Ho Yin
TPB/R/S/H10/18-752	Potgieter Melanie Joyce
TPB/R/S/H10/18-753	Reading, Graeme John
TPB/R/S/H10/18-754	Georgia Natalie Reading

Representation No.	Name of 'Representer'
TPB/R/S/H10/18-755	Reading Virginia Anne
TPB/R/S/H10/18-756	Saw Ngai Mun Edmund
TPB/R/S/H10/18-757	Saw Tam, Wing Fai Tina
TPB/R/S/H10/18-758	Shaw Bun
TPB/R/S/H10/18-759	Shek Wai William
TPB/R/S/H10/18-760	Shum Bill Chi King
TPB/R/S/H10/18-761	Simmons Dirk Vincent
TPB/R/S/H10/18-762	Tam Ping Fai Rosemary
TPB/R/S/H10/18-763	Yuen Katrina Cie
TPB/R/S/H10/18-764	Bizos, Fiona Meg
TPB/R/S/H10/18-765	Patrick Wong
TPB/R/S/H10/18-766	Soughan, Anthony P
TPB/R/S/H10/18-767	Leung Wing Kiu Rose Catherine
TPB/R/S/H10/18-768	Choi Hing Wan Herman
TPB/R/S/H10/18-769	Fung Cheung Li John
TPB/R/S/H10/18-770	Lee Yan Wai James
TPB/R/S/H10/18-771	Leung Wai Hing
TPB/R/S/H10/18-772	Ma Chin Ching
TPB/R/S/H10/18-773	Marzo, Stephen Jeffrey
TPB/R/S/H10/18-774	Prachi Parekh
TPB/R/S/H10/18-775	Pranav Parekh
TPB/R/S/H10/18-776	Da Rosa David Augusto
TPB/R/S/H10/18-777	Da Rosa Jose Auguto Maria
TPB/R/S/H10/18-778	Da Rosa Rosa Fatima Pereira
TPB/R/S/H10/18-779	Da Rosa Chow Shun Yee Bonnie
TPB/R/S/H10/18-780	Lai David

List of Commenters in respect of the
Draft Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/18

<u>Comment No.</u>	<u>Name of 'Commenter'</u>
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C1	Hong Kong Cyberport Management Company Limited
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C2	Chan Hun Sin
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C3	Chan Oi Lee
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C4	Chan Yiu Ming
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C5	Fong Pui Sze
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C6	Ho Kit Fai
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C7	Ho Siu Ching
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C8	Ho Sum Man
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C9	Ho Wing Kwan
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C10	Lai Kwai Lan
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C11	Lo Chun Ho
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C12	Man Wai Lan
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C13	Pak Chung Yin
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C14	Pak Yuen Ting Ellie
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C15	Cheung Man Wing Sandy
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C16	Lo Ngai Long
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C17	Wan Kui Man
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C18	Chan Hoi Sze Sharen
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C19	Ho On Shing Desmond
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C20	Kwan Yiu Wing Philip
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C21	Knight Bradford Caleb
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C22	Leung Kai Bond
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C23	Mak Wan Po
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C24	Sin Pik Wah
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C25	Yuen Chui Fan
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C26	Catalonia, Andrea vilan
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C27	Chan Wui Cheong Kay
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C28	Ho Siu Pik
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C29	Pang Wai Lim
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C30	So Wai Wo
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C31	Chan Oi Ying Addie
TPB/R/S/H10/18-C32	Mary Mulvihill

**Summary of Representations and Comment and the Planning Department's Responses
in respect of draft Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H10/18**

(1) The grounds and proposals of the representers (TPB/R/S/H10/18-1 to 780) as well as responses are summarised below:

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H10/18-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
1 to 5	Individuals (See Annex V)	<p>(a) Support all amendment items.</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representations</u></p> <p>(b) More land resources should be allocated to foster innovative and technology industry, contribute to nurturing start-ups, while bringing insignificant impact to environment (R1).</p> <p>(c) Cyberport 5 can make significant contribution to nurture start-ups (R1); foster economic development and increase government revenue (R2 and R5); boost up the local economy, attract people from other districts and expedite the implementation of South Island Line (West) (R3).</p> <p>(d) The improvement of the Cyberport Waterfront Park can benefit the local residents (R4).</p>	(i) Noted.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H10/18-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
6 to 95	Companies/ Organisations or Individuals (See Annex V)	<p>(a) Support Amendment Items A1 and A2.</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representations</u></p> <p>(b) Existing space in Cyberport has already been utilised and unable to meet the growing demand to support the industry of Information Technology (IT). Cyberport 5 can provide and allocate more land resources to meet the high demand for space and resources required for IT sector (R6 to R8, R11, R14, R17, R31, R38, R43, R44, R46, R57, R86 and R96).</p> <p>(c) Cyberport 5 would enhance the provision of necessary space and facilities for office, e-sports, co-working space, FinTech, incubatees and start-ups in the IT sector, thus creating synergy effect for the development in the sector (R6, R9, R10, R12, R13, R15, R18, R21, R24 to R27, R30, R31, R33, R34, R37, R39, R45, R47, R52 to R54, R56, R57, R68, R71 to R73, R81, R82, R85, R92 and R94).</p> <p>(d) Cyberport 5 would provide a platform for the more conventional business to “digitalise” and modernise their business models and service offerings in line with Hong Kong’s development into a more knowledge-based economy (R6).⁷</p>	(i) Noted.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H10/18-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
		<p>(e) Cyberport 5 would attract more local and overseas talent, creating a stronger cyber-ecosystem and keeping the competitive edge of Hong Kong's IT industry in face of challenges from other cities (R20, R28, R29, R32, R40 to R42, R51, R57, R59, R61, R86, R96, R98 and R99).</p> <p>(f) Cyberport 5 and the enhancement of Cyberport Waterfront Park would allow provision of better environment for work and enjoyment of the workers in the area, enhancing their creativity and the interaction with the community (R6, R10, R36, R40 and R60).</p> <p>(g) Growth of the area will attract more development and justify more resources to enhance and improve the transport development of the region, and justify further railway expansion to support the development of the whole area (R21, R62, R76 and R80).</p> <p>(h) Better place to nurture and pool talents of the IT sector which would boost the economic development of Hong Kong in different industries, bringing benefits to Hong Kong (R16, R17, R19, R22, R23, R41 and R55).</p>	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H10/18-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
		<p>(i) Cyberport 5 would strengthen the important role of Hong Kong in the Guangdong – Hong Kong – Macao Greater Bay Area (R7, R47 and R56).</p> <p>(j) Support the upgrading the temporary open space to permanent waterfront park and including using as pet garden (R11, R35, R40, R48, R49, R58, R59, R63 to R67, R69, R70, R74, R77 to R79, R83, R84, R88, R90, R91 and R93).</p> <p>(k) Cyberport 5 would provide sizable multi-function hall/facilities for conference and large-scale events (R11 and R44).</p> <p>(l) The Hong Kong Cyberport Management Company Limited (HKCMCL) should make use of this opportunity to improve the park, pier and promenade for its employees, local residents and visitors (R31).</p>	
96 to 100	Organisation or Individuals (See Annex V)	<p>(a) Support Amendment Item A1. <u>Grounds of Representations</u></p> <p>(b) Cyberport 5 would enhance the provision of necessary space and facilities for office, e-sports, co-working space, incubatees and start-ups in the IT sector, thus creating</p>	(i) Noted.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H10/18-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
		<p>synergy effect for the development in the sector.</p> <p>(c) Cyberport 5 would keep the competitive edge of Hong Kong's IT industry and provide opportunities for younger generation.</p> <p>(d) Cyberport 5 would promote smart development of Hong Kong and strengthen the important role of Hong Kong in the Guangdong – Hong Kong – Macao Greater Bay Area (R96).</p>	
101	Individual (See Annex V)	<p>(a) While the rezoning to “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) is supported (Amendment Item C1), a possible way to resolve the traffic issue is to restrict the access to the school by school buses only.</p> <p>(b) There are deficiencies in consideration of various factors in the traffic impact assessment (TIA) prepared for Cyberport 5.</p>	<p>(i) Noted.</p> <p>(ii) According to the TIA for Cyberport 5, Cyberport 5 will not cause unacceptable traffic impact on the road network with the implementation of the necessary junction improvement measures in the proximity of Cyberport. The Transport Department (TD) considers the TIA acceptable.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H10/18-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
102	Paul Zimmerman, Southern District Council Member	(a) Oppose Amendment Item A1. <u>Grounds of Representations</u> (b) Object to the proposed building height (BH) of 65mPD for Cyberport 5 and should ensure the BH of Cyberport 5 is lower than that of the Cyberport Arcade.	<p>(i) While the proposed BH for Cyberport 5 is 65mPD which is taller than the height of the adjacent Cyberport Arcade (i.e. 36.5mPD), the proposed BH for the Representation Site A1 (i.e. Cyberport 5) has taken into consideration the following factors:-</p> <p><u>Planned Building Height Profile</u></p> <p>(ii) In terms of planned BH profile of Cyberport, the Representation Site A1 is located adjacent to the sub-area 1 of the "OU(Cyber-Port)" zone which is subject to a maximum BH of 85mPD. While there are variations in BHs of the existing buildings, which are ranging from about 36.5mPD to 80.7mPD, the proposed BH of 65mPD for the Representation Site A1 is generally in line with the stepped height profile. As advised by the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design & Landscape, the proposed BH for Cyberport 5 is also considered generally compatible with the planned BH profile of the area descending from Pok Fu Lam Road towards the waterfront.</p> <p><u>Visual Aspect</u></p> <p>(iii) According to the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) for Cyberport 5, Cyberport 5 is considered</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H10/18-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
			<p>generally compatible and acceptable within the existing visual context.</p> <p>(iv) The preliminary building design of Cyberport 5 has incorporated some design measures for enhancing visual permeability and visual interest. Cyberport 5 would constitute insubstantial to moderate visual impacts at most of the viewing points due to long distance and screening by existing developments and trees. However, the viewing point at the Cyberport Waterfront Park will inevitably experience substantial visual impact even with the implementation of the design measures due to close proximity and direct angle of view towards Cyberport 5. In overall terms, the visual impact of Cyberport 5 is considered to be moderately adverse. To further minimise the visual impact of Cyberport 5 at the detailed design stage, various mitigation measures including arrangement of building (such as appropriate setback distance, terraced building design, and permeable building design on ground and upper floors), sensitive architectural treatment, tree planting along site boundary, amenity landscape areas, and sensitively designed lighting would be adopted. The above mitigation measures regarding the arrangement of building have also been stated in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H10/18-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
			<p>(v) <i>Air Ventilation Aspect</i> According to the AVA (Expert Evaluation) (EE) for Cyberport 5, to alleviate the potential impact on the surrounding wind environment, mitigation measures including suitable block disposition, building setback, building gap and terraced building design would be adopted. With incorporation of the above mitigation measures, no significant impact is anticipated to the surrounding pedestrian wind environment compared with the existing condition. The above mitigation measures have been stated in the ES of the OZP.</p> <p>(vi) A quantitative AVA would also be carried out at the detailed design stage of Cyberport 5 to ascertain that the future scheme would perform no worse off than the scheme in the AVA (EE) in terms of ventilation performance. The requirement for submission of quantitative AVA will be incorporated into the land document for Cyberport 5. Such requirement is also stated in the ES of the OZP.</p> <p>(vii) <i>Impacts to the Nearby Residential Developments</i> It is stated in the TPB PG-No. 41 that in the highly developed context of Hong Kong, it is not practical to protect private views without stifling development opportunity and balancing other relevant considerations. In the interest of the</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H10/18-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
			<p>public, it is far more important to protect public views. While preserving the views of private developments should not be taken as a primary planning consideration, the site selection and proposed BH of Cyberport 5 have already given due consideration to the built environment as well as the nearby residential developments.</p> <p>(viii) Lower and Upper Baguio Villa are located on platforms at levels ranging from about 20mPD to 90mPD with roof levels ranging from 60mPD to 163mPD. It is noted that blocks 16 to 18 of Lower Baguio Villa are located nearest to Cyberport 5. However, the Representation Site A1 for Cyberport 5 is considered the farthest possible that allowing horizontal distance apart (about 300m) between Cyberport 5 and Lower Baguio Villa. Besides, views of majority residents from Baguio Villa, in particular the sea views along Information Crescent, as well as from other residential developments in the area could still be largely preserved.</p> <p><u>Development Potential</u></p> <p>(ix) As advised by Innovation and Technology Bureau (ITB), further lowering the BH of Cyberport 5 would result in failure to deliver the required GFA of 66,000m² to serve as office space for around 100 technology firms and 750 start-ups and incubatees, and house conference</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H10/18-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
			<p>venues, data services platform and other facilities that will provide convenience for campus users. There are strong demands for office and co-working space from the Information and Communications Technology and start-up community. The proposed BH of 65mPD is considered to have struck a balance between the need for expansion of Cyberport and the need to minimising the visual impact on the surrounding area.</p>
		<p>(c) Object to putting parking and loading/unloading facilities at ground level.</p>	<p>(x) Parking and loading/unloading facilities of Cyberport 5 will be provided in accordance with the requirements specified in Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) and subject to compliance of the relevant design requirements for parking and loading/unloading facilities as set out by relevant government departments. Majority of the parking and loading/unloading facilities are accommodated in the basement level under the indicative scheme. Only a small portion of parking facilities is located on the ground level which is to provide convenience for those with disabilities and the elderly. Besides, to meet the Buildings Department's requirements, it is also necessary to provide ground-level access road serving as an emergency vehicular access to Cyberport 5.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H10/18-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
		(d) Object to failure to consult the community on the proposed road improvements.	(xi) It should be noted that on 18.7.2019, ITB and HKCMCL consulted District Development and Housing Committee of the Southern District Council (SDC) on the Cyberport expansion including its proposed road improvements works. Details of the proposed junction improvements will be further reviewed at the detailed design stage. As the road improvement works would require gazettal under the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance, there will be public consultation during the statutory process.
		(e) Object to another school at Sandy Bay on traffic grounds (Amendment Item C1).	(xii) As advised by Education Bureau (EDB), the project proponent of the school development is required to conduct TIA to ensure that there is no adverse impact on the local traffic before the commencement of the school development. If necessary, EDB would also suggest the school to supplement additional traffic measures such as staggering school hours with nearby schools to reduce traffic flow, encouraging staff and students to take public transport, etc. TD also advises that a TIA shall be conducted by the project proponent to assess the nature and extent of traffic impacts arising from the construction and operation phases of the school development. Besides, development in Pok Fu Lam area is subject to Pok Fu Lam Moratorium (PFLM), partial uplifting of PFLM is required for any school development at the site in future. In

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H10/18-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
			<p>considering the partial uplifting of PFLM, the project proponent should demonstrate to the relevant authority that the existing transport infrastructure, together with the recommended improvements (if any), would be capable of coping with the traffic generated from the proposed school development. Hence, the concerns on the traffic impact of the proposed school development would be dealt with under the established mechanism.</p>
		<p>(f) Support Amendment Item A2 on the condition that programme and funding is confirmed for consultation, design, enhancement, maintenance and operation of the Cyberport Waterfront Park; and to ensure reflecting the above in the ES of the OZP.</p>	<p>(xiii) Noted. The Representation Site A2 is currently occupied by the existing Cyberport Waterfront Park, which is under the management and maintenance by HKCMCL under a Short Term Tenancy. Given the site is no longer required for the proposed Route 7, the Cyberport Waterfront Park would be retained as an open space with enhancements for public enjoyment, and HKCMCL will undertake its design, construction, maintenance and management responsibilities. Rezoning of the Representation Site A2 to "Open Space" ("O") is to reflect the planning intention of the area for open space use. Any views for enhancement of the Cyberport Waterfront Park from the local community (such as provision of sports and community facilities as well as children and elderly facilities or designation of "pet restriction area") will be further reviewed and considered at the detailed</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H10/18-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
			<p>design stage of the Cyberport expansion project. During the DC consultation on 18.7.2019, HKCMCL has also committed to set up community liaison group and maintain close liaison with SDC on Cyberport expansion project including the detailed design of the Cyberport Waterfront Park with enhancements. The enhancement works will take place concurrently with the construction of Cyberport 5 and the HK\$5.5 billion funding earmarked in the 2019-20 Budget has also covered the cost of enhancing the Cyberport Waterfront Park.</p>
		<p>(g) Support Amendment Items B1 and B2, C3 to C5, D and E.</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representations</u></p> <p>(h) Support deletion of Route 7 along the waterfront.</p> <p>(i) Support a continuous waterfront promenade along the coast of Pok Fu Lam.</p> <p>(j) Object to some of the waterfront areas not being designated for waterfront promenade.</p>	<p>(xiv) Noted.</p> <p>(xv) Noted.</p> <p>(xvi) According to the covering Notes of the OZP, the provision of open space and road (including footbridge) is always permitted on land falling within the boundaries of the OZP. Hence, along the coast of Pok Fu Lam, which is mainly zoned "O" and "G/IC", the provision of a continuous open space network with a possible walking trail</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H10/18-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
			<p>is always permitted. Such intention has also been stated in the ES of the OZP that opportunity may be given to explore whether a walking trail could be developed along planned open space to enhance the connectivity along the coast of Pok Fu Lam. Besides, as advised by TD, it is considered that the existing pedestrian access between Sandy Bay and Telegraph Bay as well as Waterfall Bay and Wah Fu Estate are sufficient to meet the pedestrian needs.</p>
		<p>(k) To implement the previously proposed waterfront promenade by the then Secretary for Information Technology and Broadcasting (SITB).</p>	<p>(xvii) While better connections between Cyberport and the nearby area are welcomed, ITB considers that the concerned connections raised in the representations does not fall within the boundary of Cyberport expansion project and it is more appropriate to deal with the implementation of these connections separately from the current OZP amendment exercise. Meanwhile, ITB would liaise with relevant government departments with a view to identifying ways to address the local community demands on the connectivity. ITB is also willing to help facilitating any feasible proposals and other matters cutting across different government departments.</p>
		<p>(l) To ensure the Cyberport Arcade can operate as a local mall to serve the local residents.</p>	<p>(xviii) Noted. This is not related to the subject of the amendment item.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H10/18-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
		<p><u>Representer's Proposals</u></p> <p>(m) To designate the 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 (Amendment Item C2), and along the Sandy Bay rocky beach (Amendment Item C1) as a public waterfront promenade and zoned "Open Space".</p> <p>(n) To designate an area over the sea between Telegraph Bay and Sandy Bay for an elevated link.</p>	<p>(xix) Response (xvi) above is relevant.</p> <p>(xx) Ditto.</p>
103	The Incorporated Owners of Scenic Villas	<p>(a) Oppose Amendment Item A1.</p> <p><u>Grounds of representations</u></p> <p>(b) Object to the BH of 65mPD for the Cyberport 5 and should ensure the BH of Cyberport 5 is lower than the structures behind.</p>	<p>(i) Responses (i) to (ix) to R102 above are relevant.</p>
104	The Incorporated Owners of Baguio Villa, Hong Kong	<p>(c) Provide views on Amendment Item C1 that consideration should be given to the traffic impact brought by the proposed school development at Sandy Bay as the existing traffic is already congested.</p> <p>(d) To implement the previously proposed waterfront promenade by the then SITB.</p>	<p>(ii) Response (xii) to R102 above is relevant.</p> <p>(iii) Response (xvii) to R102 above is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H10/18-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
		(e) To ensure the Cyberport Arcade can operate as a local mall to serve the local residents.	(iv) Response (xviii) to R102 above is relevant
105	Island South Property Management Limited	(a) Providing views on Amendment Items A1 and A2. (b) Concern the possible traffic impact due to overlapping development schedule of Cyberport Expansion and Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment.	(i) The TIA for Cyberport 5 has not included Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment as its details are yet to be available and its redevelopment is beyond the design year of Cyberport 5 (i.e. 2027). For Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment, the Housing Authority has committed to conduct a series of technical studies including TIA nearer the clearance and redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate, and submit the results to relevant authorities, including TD for approval. The TIA of Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment will consider the cumulative impact of the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate and other relevant known developments in its vicinity including Cyberport 5.
106	Individual (See Annex V)	(c) BH of Cyberport 5 should not be taller than the structures behind (R106). (d) Provide views on Amendment Item C1 that in view the existing traffic condition, an additional international school in the Sandy bay will create adverse impact (R106).	(ii) Responses (i) to (ix) to R102 above are relevant. (iii) Response (xii) to R102 above is relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H10/18-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
107 to 160, 162 to 775	Individuals (See Annex V)	<p>(a) Oppose to Amendment Item A1.</p> <p><u>Grounds of representations</u></p> <p>(b) The BH of Cyberport 5 should be lower than the Cyberport Arcade (R107, R108, R110, R113 to R125, R128 to R130, R132 to R143, R145 to R151, R153 to R160, R162 to R184, R186 to R363 and R365 to R775).</p> <p>(c) The BH of Cyberport 5 should respect the neighbouring residential development, in particular Baguio Villa, and the previously stated BH of the Cyberport as mentioned in 2000 (R148, R189, R258, R331, R390, R401, R428, R462, R473, R537 and R727).</p> <p>(d) Object to putting carpark and roads at ground level (R110 to R131, R133 to R160, R162 to R629, R631 to R673 and R675 to R775).</p> <p>(e) Request for revision to the proposed road improvements recommended by the HKCMCL (R110 to R135, R137 to R146, R148 to R160, R162 to R375 and R377 to R775).</p> <p>(f) Concern the potential traffic impact cause by Cyberport 5 and should consider expedite the implementation of South Island Line (West)</p>	<p>(i) Responses (i) to (ix) to R102 above are relevant.</p> <p>(ii) Ditto.</p> <p>(iii) Response (x) to R102 above is relevant.</p> <p>(iv) The details of the proposed junction improvements will be further reviewed at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>(v) The Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) advises that the implementation of SIL(W) is subject to the actual programme for the development in the Wah Fu area and</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H10/18-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
		<p>(SIL(W)) (R356, R376, R389, R450 and R470).</p> <p>(g) The existing Cyberport development is considered under-utilised and should better use the existing space instead of building Cyberport 5 (R164, R172, R190, R240, R258, R322, R376, R438, R497, R537, R558, R574, R724, R725 and R729).</p>	<p>redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate as well as the build-up of transport demand. Besides, to implement the SIL(W), it is also necessary to free up space within Wah Fu Estate for railway construction. That said, for early planning of the SIL(W), THB has already invited in June 2019 the MTR Corporation Limited to submit a proposal for SIL(W).</p> <p>(vi) As advised by ITB, the feasibility of in-situ intensification of Cyberport is limited as companies are currently operating in the existing buildings and their relocation (over 90% occupancy rate in June 2019) would be difficult. There is also limited open area at Cyberport for further infill development to meet the proposed scale of expansion. Hence, the Representation Site A1, being the only available site in the vicinity of the existing Cyberport, was identified for Cyberport 5 which would allow the facilities such as offices, co-working space, conference venues and data services platform with specific operational requirements to be provided in a more comprehensive manner, creating a favourable and sustainable I&T ecosystem for technology companies and start-ups. Cyberport 5 could also create synergies with the adjoining Cyberport campus so as to bring overall improvements to the area at large. The proposed scale of Cyberport 5 is to meet the operational requirements of</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H10/18-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
		<p>(h) Object to use part of the existing Cyberport Waterfront Park for the development of the proposed Cyberport 5 (R109, R164 and R440).</p>	<p>Cyberport, including large floor plates for data services platform, higher flexibility to provide office space of different sizes to accommodate the needs of the I&T companies, and multi-purpose conference venues.</p> <p>(vii) It is noted that Cyberport 5 will affect about 1ha of the existing Waterfront Park. However, the Cyberport expansion project will provide a total of about 5ha of public open space for public enjoyment (i.e. the at-grade public open space of 5,000m² within Cyberport 5 and the enhanced Cyberport Waterfront Park of about 4.5ha as public open space). HKCMCL is committed to take up management and maintenance responsibilities of the enhanced Cyberport Waterfront Park in which the quality of the park in terms of landscaping and provision of additional facilities would be greatly improved. Nonetheless, according to the requirements specified in the HKPSG, there is no deficit in the provision of open space in the Pok Fu Lam area even with the Cyberport expansion.</p>
		<p>(i) Support Amendment Item A2.</p> <p><u>Grounds of representations</u></p> <p>(j) Support formalising waterfront area as open space (R110 to R146, R148 to R160, R162 to R546 and R548 to R775).</p>	<p>(viii) Noted.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H10/18-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
		(k) Request for the budget and programme of Cyberport Waterfront Park enhancement (R110 to R128, R130 to R132, R134 to R146, R148 to R160, R162 to R435 and R437 to R775).	(ix) Response (xiii) to R102 above is relevant.
		(l) To provide sports and community facilities as well as children and elderly in the proposed Cyberport Waterfront Park (R322, R396, R547 and R732).	(x) Ditto.
		(m) To designate "pet restricted area" in the proposed Cyberport Waterfront Park (R765).	(xi) Ditto.
		(n) Object to another school at Sandy Bay on traffic grounds (Amendment Item C1).	(xii) Response (xii) to R102 above is relevant.
		(o) Support Amendment Items A1, B1 and B2, D and E; and provide views on Amendment Items C2 to C5.	
		<u>Grounds of representations</u> (p) Support deletion of Route 7 along the waterfront (R113 to R131, R133 to R146, and R162 to R775).	(xiii) Noted.
		(q) Request a waterfront promenade along Sandy Bay (R110 to R132, R134 to R145, R148 to	(xiv) Response (xvi) to R102 above is relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H10/18-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
		<p>R160, R162 to R375, R377 to R514, R516 to R613 and R615 to R775).</p> <p>(r) Support a continuous waterfront promenade along the coast of Pok Fu Lam (R110 to R146, R148 to R160, R162 to R375, R377 to R625 and R627 to R775).</p>	(xv) Noted.
		<p><u>Representer's Proposal</u></p> <p>(s) Blocks 16-18 of Baguio Villa would no longer have a view and subject to poorer ventilation due to Cyberport 5. It is proposed that the maximum BH of Cyberport 5 should be restricted to 37mPD (the height of the Cyberport Arcade) to prevent creating a "wall" enclosing the Cyberport complex and Lower Baguio Villa (R189).</p>	(xvi) Responses (i) to (ix) to R102 above are relevant. Furthermore, there is no strong planning justification to restrict the BH of Cyberport 5 to the existing BH of Cyberport Arcade.
161	Individual (See Annex V)	<p>(a) Oppose Amendment Item A1.</p> <p><u>Grounds of representation</u></p> <p>(b) Object to the development of any building on the waterfront.</p>	(i) Response (vii) to R107 to R160 and R162 to R775 above is relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H10/18-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Response to Representation
776 to 780	Individuals (See Annex V)	(c) Oppose Amendment Item C1. <u>Grounds of representation</u> (d) Proposed school development should be a quality, affordable and equitable education that will benefit to people of Hong Kong.	(ii) Noted.
		(e) Support Amendment Items A2, B1 and B2, D and E.	(iii) Noted.
		(f) Support Amendment Items C2 to C5 based on the understanding that they are designated for community services.	(iv) Noted.
		(a) Oppose all amendment items. <u>Grounds of Representations</u> (b) Bringing adverse impact to the Southern District (R776). (c) Overloading the traffic capacity (R777). (d) Bringing political risks to the Government (R778). (e) Adverse visual impact (R779). (f) Adverse impact on the provision open space (R780).	(i) Relevant technical assessments have been conducted for the Cyberport 5. Based on the findings of the assessments, Cyberport 5 is technical feasible with no insurmountable technical impacts in terms of traffic, landscape, environment, visual and air ventilation. Relevant government departments have also accepted the findings of the assessments.

- (2) The 32 valid comments on representations were submitted by some of the representer themselves (R6 and R161) and individuals.

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H10/18-)	Related Representation	Gist of Comments	Response to Comment
C1 (i.e. R6)	Provides responses to R101 to R780	<p>(a) Reiterating the needs for Cyberport expansion in regards of the high occupancy rate in the past few years, growing numbers of IT start-ups, high demand for co-working space and needs for conference venue. With the intention to zone the waterfront area for open space use, the proposed site for Cyberport 5 is the only piece of land available in the vicinity of existing Cyberport for expansion.</p> <p>(b) The proposed BH of 65mPD for Cyberport 5 has taken into account numbers of factors, including given due regard to urban design guidelines; the VIA demonstrated that Cyberport 5 would in general constitute only non-substantial visual impacts on the neighbourhood; and has adopted numbers of mitigation measures to reduce visual impact on the residential buildings nearby. The proposed BH and scale of Cyberport 5 is considered appropriate with consideration of the needs for Cyberport expansion, maintain Cyberport 5's development potential and retain as much green open space as possible.</p> <p>(c) Regarding the proposed road improvement works, a TIA has been conducted with</p>	(i) Noted.

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H10/18-)	Related Representation	Gist of Comments	Response to Comment
		<p>proposed road improvement measures. The TD has reviewed the TIA and has no adverse comment on it. Besides, HKCMCL and ITB consulted with the Southern District Council on Cyberport expansion including the proposed road improvement works on 18 July 2019.</p> <p>(d) Most of the car parking and loading bay provisions will be located below the ground level and fully occupied the basement of Cyberport 5. The ground-level parking can facilitate access for people with disabilities and elderly. To meet the Buildings Department's requirement, it is necessary to provide ground-level access roads and roundabout of which serves as required emergency vehicular access.</p> <p>(e) The enhancement of the waterfront park in front of Cyberport is part of Cyberport expansion project and will take place concurrently with the construction of Cyberport 5. The cost of enhancing the waterfront park is covered by the funding earmarked in the 2019-20 Budget Speech. The detailed costing and works programme is subject to detailed design and will be made available to the community.</p>	

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H10/18-)	Related Representation	Gist of Comments	Response to Comment
		(f) Regarding the proposed waterfront promenade from Waterfall Bay Park to Telegraph Bay and Sandy Bay, they welcome the proposed enhanced linkages between Cyberport and the neighbouring area. They considered that it is more appropriate to deal with them separately from the current OZP amendment exercise as these linkages fall outside the boundary of Cyberport.	
C2 to C31	Support R1 to R100	(a) Support the representations. (b) Support the Cyberport expansion and provide similar views as the R1 to R100.	(i) Noted.
C32 (i.e. R161)	Nil	(a) Oppose development at the waterfront of Cyberport. (b) The community wants to preserve the dwindling supply of open and recreational space. (c) The brownfield and degraded sites can be used for science and technology parks.	(i) Response (vii) to R107 to R160 and R162 to R775 above is relevant. (ii) The provision of open space in Pok Fu Lam OZP is sufficient to meet the requirements of the HKPSG. (iii) Noted. The location of Cyberport 5 could create synergies with the adjoining Cyberport campus so as to bring overall improvements to the area at large.

TPB/R/S/H10/18-146

☐ Urgent ☐ Return receipt ☐ Sign ☐ Encrypt ☐ Mark Subject Restricted ☐ Expand personal&public groups



Pok fu Lam outline Zoning plan S/H10/18
27/11/2019 09:00

From:

To:

tpbpd@pland.gov.hk

Cc:

FileRef:

1 attachment



IMG_3653.jpg

從我的 iPhone 傳送

薄扶林與域多利道交界

YOUR VIEW? CONSULTATION DEADLINE 27 NOVEMBER 2019 你的意見？公眾諮詢截止日期：2019年11月27日

Tick boxes below. Email to Town Planning Board at tpbpd@pland.gov.hk.
Fax it to 2877 0245. Alternatively, use the online petition at www.paulzimmerman.hk.
請剔以下格仔；將意見書電郵至城規會：tpbpd@pland.gov.hk或傳真至
2877 0245。你亦可參與我們的網上聯署：www.paulzimmerman.hk。

Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan S/H10/18 薄扶林分區計劃大綱第18號

- ☒ **Object** to height of Cyberport 5. Should be lower than Arcade.
反對數碼港5期的樓宇高度。新大樓應較現有商場為低。
- ☒ **Object** to parking and roads in park – put all in basement.
反對將停車場及連接路設於地面，應全放入地庫。
- ☒ **Support** formalizing Cyberport Waterfront as Open Space.
支持將數碼港的海濱正式劃為休憩用地。
- ☒ **Request** a budget and program for Waterfront enhancement.
要求提供改善海濱公園的具體方案及財務預算。
- ☒ **Object** to building another school at Sandy Bay on traffic grounds.
反對於大口環興建另一所學校（基於交通理由）。
- ☒ **Request** changes to the proposed road improvements.
修訂道路改善方案。
- ☒ **Support** removing the coastal highway Route 7.
支持刪除沿海的7號幹線。
- ☒ **Support** a continuous promenade along the coast of Pokfulam.
支持註明薄扶林沿岸地段為海濱長廊。
- ☐ **Request** a waterfront promenade along Sandy Bay.
要求落實大口環海濱長廊。

Name

姓名

Ng Wing Man

Email/Fax

電郵/傳真

HKID (first 4 digits, e.g. A123)

身份證頭4個字：例如A123



網上聯署
ONLINE PETITION

司馬文
PAUL

www.paulzimmerman.hk

ZIMMERMAN

2019.10.20, 400 copies. Candidates' Office: 217-5 China Hong Kong Free Trade Council, 2/F, Wing Wo Street, Lower Port Kowloon.

Questions or comments

查詢或意見

www.paulzimmerman.hk

9096 3070

tpbpd

寄件者: [REDACTED]
寄件日期: 03日10月2019年星期四 15:23
收件者: tpbpd@pland.gov.hk
主旨: Representation regarding the draft Pok Fu Lam OZP S/H10/18 就薄扶林分區計劃大綱草圖 S/H10/18提交申述

TPB/R/S/H10/18-201

To: Town Planning Board By email: tpbpd@pland.gov.hk

Broken Promises – Draft Outline Zoning Plan for Pok Fu Lam S/H10/18

In 2000, when government discussed Cyberport with the Town Planning Board and the Legislative Council, they promised:

- 1) A building profile that limits visual impacts, and
- 2) A landscaped promenade linking Sandy Bay and Waterfall Bay park.

Now 20 years later, government plans to build Cyberport 5 higher than the adjacent Arcade. This will impact the view for residents. Moreover, the promised links to Sandy Bay and Waterfall Bay park have yet to be build.

Below are my detailed comments on the draft Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan S/H10/18.

致 城市規劃委員會
電郵: tpbpd@pland.gov.hk

政府未有履行承諾 - 薄扶林分區計劃大綱草圖 S/H10/18

政府於 2000 年在城市規劃委員會及立法會討論數碼港項目時承諾:

- 1) 為減低對居民景觀的影響，採用特定的建築物高度輪廓。
- 2) 興建海濱長廊將大口環及瀑布灣公園連接起來。

約 20 年後的今天，政府提出興建數碼港 5 期，新大樓比旁邊數碼港商場為高，會影響居民的景觀。另外承諾多時的海濱長廊（連接至大口環及瀑布灣公園）至今仍然未兌現。

以下是我就《薄扶林分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/H10/18》提出的意見:

- **Object** to height of Cyberport 5. Should be lower than Arcade.
反對數碼港 5 期的樓宇高度。新大樓應較現有商場為低。
- **Object** to parking and roads in park – put all in basement.
反對將停車場及連接路設於地面，應全放入地庫。
- **Support** formalizing Cyberport Waterfront as Open Space.
支持將數碼港的海濱正式劃為休憩用地。
- **Request** a budget and program for Cyberport Waterfront enhancement.
要求提供改善海濱公園的具體方案及財務預算。
- **Object** to building another school at Sandy Bay on traffic grounds.
反對於大口環興建另一所學校（基於交通理由）。
- **Request** a waterfront promenade along Sandy Bay.
要求落實大口環海濱長廊。
- **Support** removing the coastal highway Route 7.
支持刪除沿海的 7 號幹線。
- **Support** a continuous promenade along the coast of Pokfulam
支持註明薄扶林沿岸地段為海濱長廊
- **Request** changes to the necessary road improvements.
修訂道路改善方案。

其他意見（如有） Other comments (if any)

Name 姓名 : MITCHELL, Timothy James

HKID number (First 4 digits) 身份証頭四位數字: [REDACTED]

Email 電郵地址 : [REDACTED]

Powered by MachForm

Provision of Open Space and Major Community Facilities in Pok Fu Lam Area
薄扶林區的休憩用地及主要社區設施供應

Type of Facilities 設施種類	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) 《香港規劃標準與準則》	HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population) 《香港規劃標準與準則》要求 (按規劃人口計算)	Provision 供應		Surplus/ Shortfall (against planned provision) 剩餘/短缺 (與已規劃供應比較)
			Existing Provision 現有供應	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision) 已規劃供應 (包括現有供應)	
District Open Space 地區休憩用地	10 ha per 100,000 persons [#] 每 100,000 人 10 公頃 [#]	9.97 ha 公頃	9.25 ha 公頃	14.44 ha 公頃	+4.47 ha 公頃
Local Open Space 鄰舍休憩用地	10 ha per 100,000 persons [#] 每 100,000 人 10 公頃 [#]	9.97 ha 公頃	14.72 ha 公頃	18.44 ha 公頃	+8.47 ha 公頃
Secondary School 中學	1 whole-day classroom for 40 persons aged 12-17 每 40 名 12-17 歲青少年設一個全日制學校課室	95 classrooms 個課室	201 classrooms 個課室	201 classrooms 個課室	+106 classrooms 個課室
Primary School 小學	1 whole-day classroom for 25.5 persons aged 6-11 每 25.5 名 6-11 歲兒童設一個全日制學校課室	113 classrooms 個課室	148 classrooms 個課室	178 classrooms 個課室	+65 classrooms 個課室
Kindergarten/ Nursery 幼兒班與幼稚園	34 classrooms for 1,000 children aged 3 to 6 每 1,000 名 3-6 歲以下幼童設 34 個課室	51 classrooms 個課室	40 classrooms 個課室	40 classrooms 個課室	-11 classrooms 個課室
District Police Station 警區警署	1 per 200,000 to 500,000 persons 每 200,000 至 500,000 人設一間	0	0	0	0
Divisional Police Station 分區警署	1 per 100,000 to 200,000 persons 每 100,000 至 200,000 人設一間	0	0	0	0
Hospital 醫院	5.5 beds per 1,000 persons 每 1,000 人設 5.5 個床位	565 beds 個床位	2,220 beds 個床位	2,220 beds 個床位	+1,655 beds 個床位

Type of Facilities 設施種類	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) 《香港規劃標準與準則》	HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population) 《香港規劃標準與準則》要求 (按規劃人口計算)	Provision 供應		Surplus/ Shortfall (against planned provision) 剩餘/短缺 (與已規劃供應比較)
			Existing Provision 現有供應	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision) 已規劃供應 (包括現有供應)	
Clinic/Health Centre 普通科診療所/健康中心	1 per 100,000 persons 每 100,000 人設一間	1	0	0	-1@
Magistracy (with 8 courtrooms) 裁判法院 (8 個法庭)	1 per 660,000 persons 每 660,000 人設一間	0	0	0	0
Child Care Centres 幼兒中心	100 aided places per 25,000 persons~ 每 25,000 人設 100 個資助服務名額~	398	86	186	-212
Integrated Children and Youth Services Centre 綜合青少年服務中心	1 for 12,000 persons aged 6-24 每 12,000 名 6-24 歲兒童/青年設一間	1	1	1	0
Integrated Family Services Centre 綜合家庭服務中心	1 for 100,000 to 150,000 persons 每 100,000 至 150,000 人設一間	0	0	0	0
District Elderly Community Centres 長者地區中心	One in each new development area with a population of around 170,000 or above 每個人口約為 170,000 人或以上的新發展區設一間	N.A.	0	0	N.A.
Neighbourhood Elderly Centres 長者鄰舍中心	One in a cluster of new and redeveloped housing areas with a population of 15,000 to 20,000 persons, including both public and private housing 每個人口為 15,000 人至 20,000 人的新建和重新發展的住宅區(包括公營及私營房屋)設一間	N.A.	2	2	N.A.

Type of Facilities 設施種類	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) 《香港規劃標準與準則》	HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population) 《香港規劃標準與準則》要求 (按規劃人口計算)	Provision 供應		Surplus/ Shortfall (against planned provision) 剩餘/短缺 (與已規劃供應比較)
			Existing Provision 現有供應	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision) 已規劃供應 (包括現有供應)	
Community Care Services (CCS) Facilities 社區照顧服務設施	17.2 subsidised places per 1,000 elderly persons aged 65 or above~^ 每 1,000 名年滿 65 歲或以上的長者設 17.2 個資助服務名額~^	522	175	175	-347
Residential Care Homes for the Elderly (RCHE) 安老院舍	21.3 subsidised beds per 1,000 elderly persons aged 65 or above~ 每 1,000 名 65 歲或以上的長者設 21.3 個資助床位~	647	405 ^Δ	495 ^Δ	-152
Library 圖書館	1 district library for every 200,000 persons 每 200,000 人設一間分區圖書館	0	1	1	+1
Sports Centre 體育中心	1 per 50,000 to 65,000 persons 每 50,000 至 65,000 人設一個	1	0	0	-1 [◇]
Sports Ground/ Sport Complex 運動場/ 運動場館	1 per 200,000 to 250,000 persons 每 200,000 至 250,000 人設一個	0	0	0	0
Swimming Pool Complex – standard 游泳池場館 – 標準池	1 complex per 287,000 persons 每 287,000 人設一個場館	0	0	0	0
Post Office 郵政局	Accessible within 1.2km in urban area 在市區設於 1.2 公里的範圍內	N.A. 不適用	3	3	N.A. 不適用

Note 註:

薄扶林區的規劃人口約為 99,720 人。若連同暫住人口，總數將約為 102,820 人。

The planned population of Pok Fu Lam is about 99,720. If including transient population, the overall figure is about

102,820.

- # The requirements exclude planned population of transients and the provision is based on the information as at May 2019. 有關要求不包括流動居民，供應所根據的資料為截至 2019 年 5 月。
- @ No shortfall of clinic/health centre in the Southern District with 3 existing clinics/health centres. 現時南區共有三間普通科診療所／健康中心，供應並無不足。
- ◇ Surplus provision of 1 sports centre in the Southern District with 6 existing sports centres. 現時南區共有六個體育館，即有一個體育館的剩餘供應。
- △ Figures are provided by Social Welfare Department (as at January 2019). The figures refer to the number of subsidised RCHE places only. 資料由社會福利署提供（截止 2019 年 1 月）。只反映資助安老院床位數目。
- ^ The planning standard of community care services (CCS) facilities (including both centre-based and home-based) is population-based. There is no rigid distribution between centre-based CCS and home-based CCS stated in the Elderly Services Programme Plan. Nonetheless, in general, 60% of CCS demand will be provided by home-based CCS and the remaining 40% will be provided by centre-based CCS. 這些設施屬於以中心為本的社區護理服務。社區照顧服務設施(包括中心為本及家居為本)的規劃標準是以人口為基礎。《安老服務計劃方案》對中心為本及家居為本的社區照顧服務的分配沒有硬性的規定。不過，一般來說，家居為本的服務及中心為本的服務分別滿足六成和四成社區照顧服務方面的需求。
- ~ This is a long-term goal and the actual provision would be subject to the consideration of the Social Welfare Department in the planning and development process as appropriate. 此乃長遠目標，在規劃和發展過程中，社會福利署會就實際提供的服務作出適當考慮。