

**DRAFT POK FU LAM OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/H10/18  
CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS NO. TPB/R/S/H10/18-1 TO 780  
AND COMMENTS NO. TPB/R/S/H10/18-C1 TO C32**

<b>Subject of Representations (Amendment Items)</b>	<b>Representers (No. TPB/R/S/H10/18-)</b>	<b>Commenters (No. TPB/R/S/H10/18-)</b>
<p><b><u>Item A1</u></b> Rezoning of a site adjacent to the Cyberport Arcade from area mainly shown as ‘Road’ with minor portions zoned as “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Cyber-Port” (“OU(Cyber-Port)”) and “Open Space” (“O”) to “OU(Cyber-Port)(1)”.</p> <p><b><u>Item A2</u></b> Rezoning of an area currently occupied by the Cyberport Waterfront Park from “OU(Cyber-Port)” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “O”.</p> <p><b><u>Item B1</u></b> Rezoning of pieces of land along the waterfront of Waterfall Bay and its park from area shown as ‘Road’ to “O”.</p> <p><b><u>Item B2</u></b> 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”.</p> <p><b><u>Item C1</u></b> Rezoning of a site at Sandy Bay from “O” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”).</p>	<p><b>Total: 780</b></p> <p><b><u>Support (101)</u></b></p> <p><b><u>All Items (5)</u></b> <b>R1 to R5:</b> Individuals</p> <p><b><u>Items A1 and/or A2 (95)</u></b> <b>R6 to R100:</b> 37 companies/ organisations and 58 individuals</p> <p><b><u>Support Item C1 and providing views on Item A1</u></b> <b>R101:</b> Individual</p> <p><b><u>Oppose (677)</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Oppose Item A1 with diverse views on other items (672)</u></b> <b>R102:</b> Mr. Paul Zimmerman (Southern District Council Member)</p> <p><b>R103:</b> The Incorporated Owners of Scenic Villas</p> <p><b>R104:</b> The Incorporated Owners of Baguio Villa, Hong Kong</p> <p><b>R107 to R775:</b> Individuals</p> <p><b><u>All Items (5)</u></b> <b>R776 to R780:</b> Individuals</p>	<p><b>Total: 32</b></p> <p><b><u>Providing responses to R101 to R780 (1)</u></b> <b>C1:</b> The Hong Kong Cyberport Management Company Limited (HKCMCL) (i.e. <b>R6</b>)</p> <p><b><u>Supporting R1 to R100 (30)</u></b> <b>C2 to C31:</b> Individuals</p> <p><b><u>Providing views (1)</u></b> <b>C32:</b> Individual (i.e. <b>R161</b>)</p>

Subject of Representations (Amendment Items)	Representers (No. TPB/R/S/H10/18-)	Commenters (No. TPB/R/S/H10/18-)
<p><b><u>Item C2</u></b> 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”.</p> <p><b><u>Item C3</u></b> Rezoning of the site of the existing Hong Kong West Drainage Tunnel Western Portal from “O” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “G/IC”.</p> <p><b><u>Item C4</u></b> 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”.</p> <p><b><u>Item C5</u></b> 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”.</p> <p><b><u>Item D</u></b> Rezoning of pieces of land along the coastal steep slopes at Sandy Bay from area shown as ‘Road’ to “Green Belt”.</p> <p><b><u>Item E</u></b> Excision of two sea areas along Sandy Bay and Waterfall Bay from the planning scheme area.</p>	<p><b><u>Providing Views (2)</u></b></p> <p><b>R105:</b> Island South Property Management Limited</p> <p><b>R106:</b> Individual</p>	

Note: The names of all representers and commenters are attached at **Annex V**. Soft copy of their submissions is sent to the Town Planning Board Members via electronic means; and is also available for public inspection at the Town Planning Board’s website at [https://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/whats\\_new/Website\\_S\\_H10\\_18.html](https://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/whats_new/Website_S_H10_18.html) and the Planning Enquiry Counters of the Planning Department (PlanD) in North Point and Sha Tin. A set of hard copy is deposited at the Town Planning Board Secretariat for Members’ inspection.

## 1. **Introduction**

- 1.1 On 27.9.2019, the draft Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H10/18 (**Annex I**) was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town

Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The Schedule of Amendments setting out the amendments is at **Annex II** and the locations of the amendment items are shown on **Plan H-1**.

- 1.2 During the two-month exhibition period, a total of 780 valid representations were received. On 17.1.2020, the representations were published for public comments, and in the first three weeks of the publication period, a total of 32 valid comments were received.
- 1.3 On 17.4.2020, the Town Planning Board (the Board) agreed to consider all the representations and comments collectively in one group. This paper is to provide the Board with information for consideration of the representations and comments. The representers and commenters have been invited to attend the meeting in accordance with section 6B(3) of the Ordinance.

## **2. Background**

### **Cyberport Development**

- 2.1 In his 1999-2000 Budget Speech, the Financial Secretary revealed the Government's proposal to develop a "Cyberport" in Hong Kong. To facilitate the development of Cyberport at Telegraph Bay in Pok Fu Lam, the draft Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/7 was gazetted on 30.4.1999. After giving consideration to objections to the draft OZP, the Board decided not to propose any amendment to meet the objections. On 14.12.1999, the Chief Executive in Council, under section 9(1)(a) of the Ordinance, approved the draft Pok Fu Lam OZP, which was subsequently renumbered as S/H10/8.
- 2.2 The existing Cyberport development (comprising Cyberport 1 to 4 and Residence Bel-Air) is zoned "OU(Cyberport)"<sup>1</sup> on the Pok Fu Lam OZP (**Plan H-3b**). Any development within the area designated for the Cyberport development requires permission from the Board. Such application should be accompanied by the types of information including a comprehensive layout plan as set out in the Notes of the OZP. The first application No. A/H10/30 submitted by the then Secretary for Information Technology and Broadcasting (SITB) for the Cyberport development was approved with conditions by the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Board on 14.1.2000.
- 2.3 After approval of the first application No. A/H10/30, the Incorporated Owners of Baguio Villa approached the then SITB to raise their concerns on the approved scheme in connection with the visual impact of the Cyberport development in particular the linear office blocks (i.e. Cyberport 3)

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 92,500m<sup>2</sup>;
- Sub-area 2 is subject to a maximum 85mPD in height and a maximum GFA of 60,600m<sup>2</sup>;
- Sub-area 3 is subject to maximum 176mPD in height and a maximum GFA of 160,900m<sup>2</sup>;
- Sub-area 4 is subject to maximum 189mPD in height and a maximum GFA of 207,800m<sup>2</sup>; and
- Sub-area 5 is subject to maximum 3 storeys (excluding carports and mechanical floor) and a maximum GFA of 14,800m<sup>2</sup>.

**(Plan H-3b).** To further mitigate the possible visual impacts, the then SITB made amendments to the previously approved scheme by submitting another application for the Cyberport development (i.e. No. A/H10/34), which was approved with conditions by the MPC on 16.6.2000. The BHs of major portions of Cyberport 3 fronting Blocks 16 to 18 of Baguio Villa were reduced while the BH of the remaining portions of Cyberport 3 was increased to maintain the development potential of the Cyberport development as a whole **(Drawing H-7)**. In particular, the height of the linear office block straddled across Information Crescent was reduced from 49mPD to about 39mPD. The office buildings, shopping mall, hotel and residential towers/houses of the Cyberport development were completed in 2008.

- 2.4 During the planning process of the Cyberport development, the connectivity issue of Cyberport to the nearby waterfront areas was raised. HKCMCL subsequently proposed to make use of the existing walking trails and footpaths to further enhance the connection between the Cyberport and Waterfall Bay Park, which was considered acceptable.

### Cyberport Expansion

- 2.5 The Financial Secretary announced in the 2019-20 Budget that \$5.5 billion would be earmarked for the Cyberport expansion including the development of Cyberport 5 and the Cyberport Waterfront Park with enhancements, 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. The Cyberport expansion is scheduled to be completed by 2024 at the earliest. The concept plan of the Cyberport expansion is at **Drawing H-1**.
- 2.6 Amendments to the OZP were proposed to facilitate Cyberport 5. Opportunity was 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 were also included.
- 2.7 On 6.9.2019, the MPC considered and agreed that the proposed amendments to the approved Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/17 are suitable for public inspection under section 5 of the Ordinance. The relevant MPC Paper No. 11/19 is available at the Board's website at [https://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/papers/MPC/634-mpc\\_11-19.pdf](https://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/papers/MPC/634-mpc_11-19.pdf) and at **Annex III(a)**, and the minutes of the said MPC meeting is at **Annex III(b)**. Accordingly, the OZP renumbered to S/H10/18 was gazetted on 27.9.2019.

## **3. Consultation with the Southern District Council**

- 3.1 The District Development and Housing Committee (DDHC) of the Southern District Council (SDC) was consulted on 27.5.2019 and 18.7.2019 regarding the Cyberport expansion project by the Innovation and Technology Bureau (ITB) and HKCMCL. On 27.5.2019, members of DDHC expressed their concerns

on a number of issues, including the need for improving transport and pedestrian facilities in the area in parallel with Cyberport 5, enhancement works at Cyberport Waterfront Park as well as public space of the area. On 18.7.2019, the ITB and HKCMCL provided DDHC with supplementary information mainly on the use of the existing office space and the Cyberport Arcade, traffic impact of Cyberport 5, implementation of the South Island Line (West) (SIL(W)), proposed Cyberport Waterfront Park with enhancements and public space as well as pedestrian facilities. At the meeting, DDHC passed two motions 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.” Minutes of the DDHC meetings held on 27.5.2019 and 18.7.2019 are at **Annexes IV(a)** and **(b)** respectively.

- 3.2 On 23.9.2019, PlanD consulted DDHC on the proposed amendments to the OZP. DDHC had no objection to the proposed amendments but raised some views including BH of Cyberport 5 and provision of a continuous promenade along Pok Fu Lam south for HKCMCL and the Government to consider. Minutes of the DDHC meeting held on 23.9.2019 is at **Annex IV(c)**. The SDC members were invited to submit their comments on the amendments to the OZP in writing to the Secretary of the Board during the exhibition period of the OZP. During the statutory exhibition period of the OZP, a SDC member (Mr. Paul Zimmerman) (**R102**) submitted a representation.

#### **4. The Representation Sites and their Surrounding Areas**

##### **4.1 The Representation Sites (Plan H-2) and their Surrounding Areas**

###### ***Representation Site A1 (Cyberport 5 zoned “OU(Cyber-Port)(1)”) (Plans H-3a to 3e)***

- 4.1.1 The Representation Site A1 (1.63ha) is a piece of government land, which is bounded by the Hong Kong West Drainage Tunnel Western Portal to the north, the Cyberport Sewage Treatment Works and the Cyberport Arcade to the northeast, the existing Cyberport Waterfront Park to the southeast and the seawall along Telegraph Bay to the west. 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.

- 4.1.2 The surrounding area of the site comprises the existing Cyberport development (comprises mainly of office, hotel, residential and retail uses) and the existing 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 HKCMCL for passive recreational and landscaping purpose under a Short Term Tenancy (STT) since 2009.
- 4.1.3 The Representation Site A1 is zoned “OU(Cyber-Port)(1)” and subject to a maximum BH restriction of 65mPD and a maximum GFA restriction of 66,000m<sup>2</sup>. There is also a requirement of provision of at-grade public open space of not less than 5,000m<sup>2</sup> under that zone. It has also been specified in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP that a quantitative Air Ventilation Assessment (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 (Expert Evaluation) (EE) in terms of ventilation performance. The requirement for submission of quantitative AVA will also be incorporated into the land document for Cyberport 5.

***Representation Site A2 (Cyberport Waterfront Park with Enhancement zoned “O”) (Plans H-3a to 3e)***

- 4.1.4 The Representation Site A2 (4.53ha) is a piece of government land and 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. To its immediate east is the sub-area 5 of the “OU(Cyber-Port)” zone which is currently occupied by the office blocks of Cyberport 4 and Residence Bel-air.
- 4.1.5 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.
- 4.1.6 The site is 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.

***Representation Site B1 (sites near Waterfall Bay Park zoned “O”) (Plans H-4a to 4d)***

- 4.1.7 The Representation Site B1 (0.34ha) consists of pieces of government land immediately adjoining to the existing Waterfall Bay Park.

***Representation Site B2 (a site near Wah Kwai Estate zoned “O”) (Plans H-4a, 4e to 4h)***

- 4.1.8 The Representation Site B2 (2.07ha) 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. To its immediate north is an area zoned “R(A)” which is currently occupied by Ka Lung Court and Wah Kwai Estate.

***Representation Site C1 (a site at Sandy Bay zoned “G/IC”)  
(Plans H-5a to 5d)***

4.1.9 The Representation Site C1 (1.56ha) is a piece of government land in which part of it is allocated to government departments for temporary works area and partly vacant, whereas a minor portion is currently occupied by the Drainage Services Department (DSD) under government land allocations for the Sandy Bay Preliminary Treatment Works.

4.1.10 To its immediate east is an area zoned “G/IC” which is currently occupied by existing Government, institution or community facilities, such as The Duchess of Kent Children’s Hospital, Tung Wah Group of Hospitals (TWGH) Fung Yiu King Hospital and TWGH Jockey Club Care & Attention Home for the Elderly. To the north of the site is also an area zoned “G/IC” which is currently occupied mainly by Sandy Bay Fresh Water Pumping Station.

***Representation Site C2 (a site adjoining the University of Hong Kong Stanley Ho Sports Centre Complex zoned “G/IC”) (Plans H-5a, 5e to 5g)***

4.1.11 The Representation Site C2 (0.40ha) is a piece of government land currently used as a pedestrian walkway being managed by the University of Hong Kong (HKU). The walkway was formed when HKU developed its Sports Centre (zoned “G/IC”) and it is sandwiched between HKU Sports Centre and a man-made sea wall. 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.

***Representation Site C3 (Hong Kong West Drainage Tunnel Western Portal zoned “G/IC”) (Plans H-5h, 5i to 5k)***

4.1.12 The Representation Site C3 (0.13ha) is currently occupied by the Hong Kong West Drainage Tunnel Western Portal at Telegraph Bay which has been allocated to DSD.

***Representation Site C4 (Telegraph Bay Salt Water Pumping Station zoned “G/IC”) (Plans H-5h, 5l to 5n)***

4.1.13 The Representation Site C4 (0.34ha) is currently occupied by the Telegraph Bay Salt Water Pumping Station which has been allocated to the Water Services Department.

***Representation Site C5 (a site at Tin Wan Praya Road zoned “G/IC”)  
(Plans H-5o to 5r)***

4.1.14 The Representation Site C5 (0.04ha) 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.

***Representation Site D (coastal steep slopes at Sandy Bay zoned “GB”)  
(Plans H-6a to 6c)***

4.1.15 The Representation Site D (0.12ha) consists of steep slopes along the coast and the adjoining area which is currently zoned “GB”.

***Representation Site E (excision of sea areas along Sandy Bay and Waterfall Bay) (Plans H-7a to 7c)***

4.1.16 The 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.

**4.2 Planning Intention**

4.2.1 The planning intention of the zones in relation to the above representation sites are as follows:-

- (a) The “OU(Cyberport)(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.
- (b) The “O” zone is intended primarily for the provision of outdoor open-air space for active and/or passive recreational uses serving the needs of local residents as well as the general public.
- (c) The “G/IC” zone is intended primarily for the provision of Government, institution or community facilities serving the needs of the local residents and/or a wider district, region or the territory. It is also intended to provide land for uses directly related to or in support of the work of the Government, organisations providing social services to meet community needs, and other institutional establishments.
- (d) The “GB” zone is primarily for the conservation of the existing natural environment amid the built-up areas/at the urban fringe, to safeguard it from encroachment by urban type development, and to provide additional outlets for passive recreational activities. There is a general presumption against development within this zone.

**5. The Representations and Comments on Representations**

**5.1 Subject of Representations**

5.1.1 There are a total of 780 valid representations, including 101 supportive



representations (**R1 to R101**), 677 adverse representations (**R102 to R104, R107 to R780**) and two representations (**R105 and R106**) providing views.

- 5.1.2 Among the 101 supportive representations, five (**R1 to R5**) submitted by individuals support all amendment items, 95 (**R6 to R100**) submitted by 37 companies/organisations including HKCMCL (**R6**) and 58 individuals support Item A1 and/or Item A2, and one submitted by an individual (**R101**) supports Item C1 with views on Item A1.
- 5.1.3 Among 677 adverse representations, five (**R776 to R780**) oppose to all amendment items and 672 (**R102 to R104 and R107 to R775**) object to Item A1 while some of them provide diverse views on other amendment items including Items A2, B1 and B2, C1 to C5, D and E. They are submitted by a SDC member (**R102**), the Incorporated Owners of Scenic Villas (**R103**), the Incorporated Owners of Baguio Villa (**R104**) and 674 individuals (**R107 to R780**). Among the 674 representations submitted by individuals, 668 are submitted in the form of standard proforma with individual representers providing additional comments on top. Samples of the representations in standard proforma are at **Annex VII**.
- 5.1.4 The remaining two representations are submitted by Island South Property Management (**R105**) and an individual (**R106**). Both provide views on Items A1 and A2 with **R106** also provides views on Item C1.
- 5.1.5 The major grounds of representations and comments as well as their proposals, and PlanD's responses, in consultation with the relevant government departments, are at **Annex VI** and summarised in the paragraphs 5.2 to 5.4 below.

## 5.2 Major Grounds and Responses to Supportive Representations

- 5.2.1 **R1 to R5** support all amendment items on the OZP. **R6 to R100** support Items A1 and/or A2. **R101** supports Item C1 with views on Item A1.

### 5.2.2 *Cyberport Expansion (Items A1 and A2)*

Major Grounds	Representations
<u><i>Need for Cyberport Expansion</i></u> (1) Existing space in Cyberport has already been utilised and is 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.	<b>R1, R6 to R8, R11, R14, R17, R31, R38, R43, R44, R46, R57, R86 and R96</b>

<p>(2) 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.</p>	<p><b>R1, 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, R94, R96 to R100</b></p>
<p>(3) 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.</p>	<p><b>R20, R28, R29, R32, R40 to R42, R51, R57, R59, R61, R86, R96, R98 and R99</b></p>
<p>(4) 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.</p>	<p><b>R6, R10, R36, R40 and R60</b></p>
<p>(5) 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.</p>	<p><b>R1, R2, R5, R16, R17, R19, R22, R23, R41 and R55</b></p>
<p>(6) Cyberport 5 would keep the competitive edge of Hong Kong's IT industry and provide opportunities for younger generation.</p>	<p><b>R96 to R100</b></p>
<p>(7) 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.</p>	<p><b>R3, R21, R62, R76 and R80</b></p>
<p><u><i>Traffic Issue of Cyberport 5</i></u> (8) Consider that there are deficiencies in the traffic impact assessment (TIA) prepared for Cyberport 5.</p>	<p><b>R101</b></p>
<p><u><i>Enhancement of Cyberport Waterfront Park</i></u> (9) Support the upgrading the temporary open space to permanent waterfront park and including using as pet garden.</p>	<p><b>R11, R35, R40, R48, R49, R58, R59, R63 to R67, R69, R70, R74, R77 to R79, R83, R84, R88, R90, R91 and R93</b></p>

(10) The improvement of the Cyberport Waterfront Park can benefit the local residents	<b>R4</b>
<b>Responses</b>	
(a) In response to (1) to (7), (9) and (10) above, the supportive views are noted.	
(b) In response to (8) above (i.e. the TIA for Cyberport 5), the response to the ground of adverse representations on traffic and transport of Cyberport 5 below is relevant (paragraph 5.3.3 (B) refers).	

### 5.2.3 *Proposed Use of GIC site at Sandy Bay (Item C1)*

Major Grounds	Representations
(1) While the rezoning to “G/IC” is supported, a possible way to resolve the traffic issue is to restrict the access to the school by school buses only.	<b>R101</b>
<b>Responses</b>	
(a) The supportive view is noted.	

## 5.3 Major Grounds/Proposals of and Responses to Adverse Representations and Representations Providing Views

5.3.1 **R776 to R780** oppose to all amendment items and **R102 to R104 and R107 to R775** object to Item A1 while some of them provide diverse views on other amendment items including Items A2, B1 and B2, C1 to C5, D and E.

5.3.2 **R105** and **R106** provide views on Items A1 and A2 with **R106** also provides views on Item C1.

### 5.3.3 *Cyberport Expansion (Items A1 and A2)*

#### (A) *Development of Cyberport 5 (Item A1)*

Major Grounds / Proposals	Representations
(1) The existing Cyberport development is considered under-utilised. The existing space should be better used instead of building Cyberport 5.	<b>R164, R172, R190, R240, R258, R322, R376, R438, R497, R537, R558, R574, R724, R725 and R729</b>
(2) Object to use part of the existing Cyberport Waterfront Park for the development of Cyberport 5 ( <b>Plan H-9</b> ).	<b>R109, R161, R164 and R440</b>

(3) Cyberport 5 would bring adverse impact on the provision of open space.	<b>R780</b>
(4) Object to/concern about the proposed BH of 65mPD for Cyberport 5 and should ensure the BH of Cyberport 5 to be lower than that of the Cyberport Arcade (about 37mPD).	<b>R102 to R104, R106 to 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</b>
(5) The BH of Cyberport 5 should respect the nearby residential developments in particular Baguio Villa and the previously stated BH of the Cyberport in 2000 by the then SITB.	<b>R148, R189, R258, R331, R390, R401, R428, R462, R473, R537 and R727</b>
(6) Cyberport 5 would bring adverse impacts including visual and political.	<b>R776, R778 and R779</b>
(7) 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.	<b>R189</b>

#### Responses

- (a) In response to (1) above, 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 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.

(b) In response to (2) and (3) above, it is noted that Cyberport 5 will affect about 1ha of the existing Cyberport Waterfront Park (**Plan H-9**). 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 5,000m<sup>2</sup> 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<sup>2</sup>. Nonetheless, according to the requirements specified in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), there is no deficit in the provision of open space in the Pok Fu Lam area even with the Cyberport expansion (**Annex VIII**).

(c) In response to (4) to (5) and (7) above, 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 Cyberport 5 has taken into consideration the following factors:-

*Planned Building Height Profile*

(i) 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 (**Plan H-8**), 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 (**Drawings H-2a and H-2b**).

*Visual Aspect*

(ii) According to the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) for Cyberport 5, Cyberport 5 is considered generally compatible and acceptable within the existing visual context. The local viewing points<sup>3</sup> selected for VIA are shown in **Drawing H-6a**.

(iii) The preliminary building design of Cyberport 5 has incorporated some design measures for enhancing visual permeability and

<sup>2</sup> The main features of the enhanced Cyberport Waterfront Park include a promenade of about 800m long; re-paved footpath; pet-friendly facilities; smart facilities to help improve nearby residents' enjoyment of the park; re-turfing and landscaping; a new utility chamber, enhanced irrigation and sewerage system, toilets, drinking facilities, parasols and benches, new fencing and safety facilities along the waterfront; and improved landing steps with a canopy and additional protection barriers.

<sup>3</sup> The selection of local viewing points was made reference to the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 41 (TPB PG-No. 41) – Submission of Visual Impact Assessment for Planning Applications to the TPB and Chapter 11 on Urban Design Guidelines in the HKPSG.

visual interest (**Drawing H-6k**). 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 (**Drawings H-6b to 6e, and 6g to 6j**). 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 (**Drawing H-6f**). In overall terms, the visual impact of the 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 ES of the OZP.

*Air Ventilation Aspect*

- (iv) According to the AVA (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 (**Drawing H-3**). 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.
- (v) 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.

*Impact on the Nearby Residential Developments*

- (vi) It is stated in 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 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.

- (vii) 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 (**Plan H-8**). 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 (**Plan H-11**).
- (viii) Regarding the BH of Cyberport 5 should respect the previously stated BH of the Cyberport in 2000 as mentioned in paragraphs 2.2 to 2.3 above, it should be noted that while some portions of the office blocks were lower to minimise visual impacts, the height of the remaining portions was increased with a view to maintaining the development potential of the Cyberport development at that time. Besides, unlike in the past when Cyberport was first developed on a reclaimed land where there would be more room for manoeuvring, ITB considers that the Representation Site A1 is the only piece of land in the vicinity of the existing Cyberport campus for expansion with minimum possible adverse impact on the built environment as well as nearby residential developments. As the proposed scale of the Cyberport 5 is to meet the operational requirements of Cyberport, there is limited room for manoeuvring.

*Development Potential*

- (ix) As advised by ITB, further lowering the BH of Cyberport 5 would result in failure to deliver the required GFA of 66,000m<sup>2</sup> to serve as office space for around 100 technology firms and 750 start-ups and incubatees, and house conference 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 communities. 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.
- (c) In view of the above considerations, the proposed BH for Cyberport 5 is considered appropriate. Furthermore, there is no strong planning justification for restricting the BH of Cyberport 5 to the existing BH of Cyberport Arcade (**R189's** proposal).
- (d) In response to (6) above, 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 assessment.

**(B) Traffic and Transport of Cyberport 5 (Item A1)**

Major Grounds	Representations
(1) Object to putting parking and loading/unloading facilities and roads at the ground level of Cyberport 5 and such facilities should be provided in basement level instead ( <b>Drawing H-4</b> ).	<b>R102, R110 to R131, R133 to R160, R162 to R629, R631 to R673 and R675 to R775</b>
(2) Request for revision to the proposed road improvements <sup>4</sup> recommended by HKCMCL.	<b>R110 to R135, R137 to R146, R148 to R160, R162 to R375 and R377 to R775</b>
(3) Object to failure to consult the community on the proposed road improvements.	<b>R102</b>
(4) Concern about the potential traffic impact caused by Cyberport 5 and should consider expedite the implementation of SIL(W).	<b>R356, R376, R389, R450, R470 and R777</b>
(5) Concern about the possible cumulative traffic impact brought by Cyberport 5 and Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment.	<b>R105 and R106</b>

<sup>4</sup> According to the TIA for Cyberport 5, the proposed Cyberport 5 will not induce insurmountable traffic impact after the implementation of the following traffic mitigation/ improvement measures (**Drawings H-5a to 5g**):

- (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;
- (ii) junction of Victoria Road and Sha Wan Drive – installing traffic lights to regulate and improve traffic flow, and adding flare lanes at Victoria Road southbound/northbound approach for right/left turn movements;
- (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; adjusting the junction signals to allow more time for green light for the left turn movement from Shek Pai Wan Road to Victoria Road; 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.



Responses	
(a)	In response to (1) above, parking and loading/unloading facilities of Cyberport 5 will be provided in accordance with the requirements specified in 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 ( <b>Drawing H-4</b> ). 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 necessary to provide ground-level access road serving as an emergency vehicular access to Cyberport 5.
(b)	In response to (2) and (3) above, according to the TIA, Cyberport 5 will not cause unacceptable traffic impact on the road network with the implementation of the necessary road junctions improvement measures in the proximity of Cyberport ( <b>Drawings H-5a to 5g</b> ). The Transport Department (TD) considers the TIA acceptable. Besides, as 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, partial lifting of the PFLM is required for Cyberport 5. In considering the partial uplifting of the PFLM, it is necessary to demonstrate to the relevant authority that the existing transport infrastructure, together with the recommended improvements of a number of existing junctions, would be capable of coping with the traffic generated from Cyberport 5. This would be dealt with separately at the land grant stage by the Lands Department and relevant policy bureau. Regarding the request for revision to the proposed road improvements and consultation on the proposed road improvements, it should be noted that on 18.7.2019, ITB and HKCMCL consulted DDHC of the SDC on the Cyberport expansion including its proposed road improvement 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 (Cap. 370), there will be public consultation during the statutory process.
(c)	In response to (4) above, 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 redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate as well as the build-up of transport demand. Besides, to implement the SIL(W), it is 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).
(d)	In response to (5) above, the TIA submitted 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.

***(C) Cyberport Waterfront Park with Enhancements (Item A2)***

Major Grounds	Representations
(1) Support formalising waterfront area of Cyberport as open space.	<b>R110 to R146, R148 to R160, R162 to R546 and R548 to R775</b>
(2) Request for the budget and programme of the proposed Cyberport Waterfront Park with enhancements.	<b>R110 to R128, R130 to R132, R134 to R146, R148 to R160, R162 to R435 and R437 to R775</b>
(3) Concerned about the management of and facilities to be provided in the proposed Cyberport Waterfront Park with enhancements, such as sports and community facilities, children and elderly facilities, and “pet restricted area”.	<b>R322, R396, R547, R732 and R765</b>
Responses	
(a) In response to (1) above, the supporting views are noted.	
(b) In response to (2) and (3) above, the Representation Site A2 is currently occupied by the existing Cyberport Waterfront Park, which is under the management and maintenance by HKCMCL under a STT. 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 “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 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.

#### 5.3.4 *Proposed Use of GIC site at Sandy Bay (Item C1)*

Major Grounds	Representations
(1) Object to another school at Sandy Bay on traffic grounds.	<b>R102, R112, R129, R132, R137 to R142, R144, R146 to R156, R158 to R160, R162 to R315, R317 to R569, R571 to R629, R631, R633 to R763 and R765 to R775</b>
(2) Consideration should be given to the traffic impact brought by the proposed school development at Sandy Bay as the existing traffic is already congested.	<b>R103 and R104</b>
(3) Concern about the adverse traffic impact that may bring from the proposed school development at Sandy Bay.	<b>R106</b>
(4) Oppose to Item C1 and the proposed school development should be a quality, affordable and equitable education that will benefit to people of Hong Kong.	<b>R161</b>
Responses	
(a) In response to (1) to (4) above, the rezoning of the Representation Site C1 to “G/IC” is to reflect the current condition of the treatment works and the long term planning intention of the remaining area for GIC uses including a proposed school site as requested by the Education Bureau (EDB). As advised by EDB, there is a need to reserve a site for school use to cater for the long-term educational needs on Hong Kong Island. Besides, as mentioned in paragraph 4.1.10 above, the Representation Site C1 is surrounded by other existing G/IC developments, which are also zoned “G/IC” on the OZP. Hence, the “G/IC” zone for the Representation Site C1 is considered appropriate.	
(b) As advised by 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. As mentioned in the Response (b) in paragraph 5.3.3(B) above, development in Pok Fu Lam area is subject to PFLM, partial uplifting of PFLM is required for any school development at the site in future. In 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.

### 5.3.5 *Waterfront Connectivity (Various Items)*

Major Grounds / Proposals	Representations
(1) Support deletion of Route 7 along the waterfront and the provision of a continuous waterfront promenade along the coast of Pok Fu Lam.	<b>R102, R110 to R146, R148 to R775</b>
(2) Request for a waterfront promenade along Sandy Bay.	<b>R110 to R132, R134 to R145, R148 to R160, R162 to R375, R377 to R514, R516 to R613 and R615 to R775</b>
(3) Consider that the pedestrian link from the Cyberport to Waterfall Bay Park has yet to be implemented, and urge to reserve land for the waterfront promenade proposed by the then SITB <sup>5</sup> .	<b>R102 to R104</b>
(4) Propose that an area over the sea between Telegraph Bay and Sandy Bay should be designated for an elevated link; and a strip of land in front of the pump house of the Hospital Authority, the HKU Stanley Ho Sports Centre Complex, the Sandy Bay Preliminary Treatment Works, and along the Sandy Bay rocky beach should be designated as a public waterfront promenade and zoned “O” ( <b>Plan H-10</b> ).	<b>R102</b>

<sup>5</sup> The then SITB briefed the Information Technology and Broadcasting Panel of LegCo on 29.4.1999 on the Cyberport development and mentioned that a landscaped promenade had been planned along the coast forming a district open space system joining up with the Sandy Bay in the north and the proposed Waterfall Bay Park in the south.

Responses	
(a)	In response to (1) above, the supporting views are noted.
(b)	In response to (2) and (4) above, 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 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. It is therefore considered not necessary to designate land as waterfront promenade and zoned “O” as proposed by <b>R102 (Plan H-10)</b> . 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.
(c)	In response to (3) above, 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.

#### 5.4 Comments on Representations

5.4.1 The 32 comments on representations are submitted by HKCMCL (**C1**) and 31 individuals (**C2 to C32**). It is noted that **C1** (i.e. **R6**) and **C32** (i.e. **R161**) are also representers themselves.

5.4.2 **C1** provides responses to address the concerns raised by the **R101** to **R780** on the Cyberport expansion. **C2 to C31** provide support to **R1** to **R100**. **C32** recapitulates the concerns about the adverse impacts due to Cyberport 5.

Major Comments on Representations	Comments
(1) Reiterating the needs for Cyberport 5 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.	<b>C1</b>

<p>(2) The proposed BH of 65mPD for Cyberport 5 has taken into account numbers of factors, including given due regard to urban design guidelines; the visual impact assessment 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 expansion of Cyberport, maintain Cyberport 5's development potential and retain as much green open space as possible.</p> <p>(3) 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> <p>(4) Regarding the proposed waterfront promenade from Waterfall Bay Park to Telegraph Bay and Sandy Bay, HKCMCL welcomes the proposed enhanced linkages between Cyberport and the neighbouring area. HKCMCL considers that it is more appropriate to deal with the implementation matter separately from the current OZP amendment exercise as these linkages fall outside the boundary of Cyberport.</p>	
<p>(5) Supporting the Cyberport expansion and the major grounds of these supporting comments are similar to those raised in the supportive representations.</p>	<p><b>C2 to C31</b></p>
<p>(6) Recapitulates the concerns on the provision of open and recreational space in the area and development at the waterfront location of Cyberport.</p>	<p><b>C32</b></p>
<p><b>Responses</b></p>	
<p>(a) <b>C1's</b> responses to representations and <b>C2 to C31's</b> supportive views are noted.</p> <p>(b) The grounds of <b>C32's</b> comments in relating to Cyberport 5 are largely similar to those raised in the adverse representations, the responses to the adverse representations in paragraph 5.3.3 are relevant.</p>	

## 6. Departmental Consultation

6.1 The following government bureaux/departments have been consulted and their comments have been incorporated in the above paragraphs and **Annex VI**, where appropriate:

- (a) Secretary for Development
- (b) Secretary for Transport and Housing
- (c) Secretary for Innovation and Technology
- (d) Secretary for Education
- (e) Director of Housing
- (f) Commissioner of Transport
- (g) Chief Highway Engineer/Hong Kong, Highways Department (HyD)
- (h) Director of Environmental Protection
- (i) Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene
- (j) Director of Social Welfare
- (k) Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation
- (l) Director of Leisure and Cultural Services
- (m) Commissioner of Police
- (n) Chief Building Surveyor/HKW, Buildings Department
- (o) District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West & South, Lands Department
- (p) Project Manager (HKI&I), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
- (q) Chief Engineer/Special Duties (Works), CEDD
- (r) Chief Engineer/Railway Development, HyD
- (s) Chief Engineer/Hong Kong & Islands, Drainage Services Department
- (t) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department
- (u) District Officer (Southern), Home Affairs Department
- (v) Chief Town Planner/Urban Design & Landscape, PlanD

## 7. Planning Department's Views

7.1 The supportive views of **R1 to R100** and **R101(part)** are noted.

7.2 Based on the assessments in paragraphs 4 and 5 above, and for the following reasons, PlanD does not support the remaining part of representation **R101** as well as **R102 to R780** and considers that the OZP should not be amended to meet the representations:

### Cyberport Expansion (Items A1 and A2)

- (a) The development of Cyberport 5 and its BH of 65mPD for the Representation Site A1 is considered appropriate having regard to all relevant factors including the planned BH profile for the area, the need for the proposed Cyberport expansion project, and its visual and air ventilation impacts on the surroundings (**R102 to R104, R106 to R108, R110, R113 to R125, R128 to R130, R132 to R143, R145 to R151, R153 to R160, R162 to R184, R186 to R363, R365 to R776, R778 and R779**).

- (b) Further restricting the BH for the Representation Site A1 to 37mPD is not supported as it would significantly affect the development potential of Cyberport 5 to meet the operational requirements of Cyberport (**R189**).
- (c) The parking and loading/unloading facilities for Cyberport 5 will largely be accommodated in basement and their provisions will be in accordance with the requirements specified in the HKPSG. The access road on ground level serves as an EVA for Cyberport 5 and will comply with requirements as set out by relevant government departments (**R102, R110 to R131, R133 to R160, R162 to R629, R631 to R673 and R675 to R775**).
- (d) The TIA for Cyberport 5 is considered acceptable by TD and it has demonstrated that the Cyberport 5 will not cause unacceptable traffic impact on the road network with the implementation of the necessary junction improvement measures. The 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 (Cap. 370), there will be public consultation at that stage (**R101, R102, R105, R106, R110 to R160, R162 to R775 and R777**).
- (e) While Cyberport 5 will affect about 1 ha of existing Cyberport Waterfront Park, the Cyberport expansion project will provide a total of about 5ha of open space for public enjoyment (i.e. the at-grade public open space of 5,000m<sup>2</sup> within Cyberport 5 and the enhanced Cyberport Waterfront Park of about 4.5ha as public open space). Besides, there is no deficit in the overall provision of open space in the area in accordance to the requirements as set out in the HKPSG. Therefore, Cyberport 5 would not affect significantly the provision of open space in the area (**R109, R161, R164, R440 and R780**).

Proposed “GIC” Site at Sandy Bay (Item C1)

- (f) The proposed “G/IC” zone for Representation Site C1 is to reflect the as-built condition of the existing sewerage facilities and the long term planning intention of the area for provision of G/IC facilities including a school site. Besides, the site is surrounded by other existing G/IC developments, which are also zoned “G/IC” on the OZP. Hence, the “G/IC” zone for the Representation Site C1 is considered appropriate. The concerns on the potential traffic impact of the proposed school development can be dealt with under the established mechanism (**R102 to R104, R106, R112, R129, R132, R137 to R142, R144, R146 to R156, R158 to R315, R317 to R569, R571 to R629, R631, R633 to R763 and R765 to R775**).

Waterfront Connectivity (Various Items)

- (g) The areas along the coast of Pok Fu Lam are mainly zoned “O” and “G/IC”. As the provision of open space and road (including footbridge)



is always permitted on land falling within the boundaries of the OZP, it is considered not necessary to rezone the waterfront areas to “O” for the purpose of providing a continuous waterfront promenade (**R102 to R104, R110 to R132, R134 to R145, R148 to R160, R162 to R375, R377 to R514, R516 to R613 and R615 to R775**).

## **8. Decision Sought**

- 8.1 The Board is invited to give consideration to the representations and comments taking into consideration the points raised in the hearing session, and decide whether to propose/not to propose any amendment to the Plan to meet/partially meet the representations.
- 8.2 Should the Board decide that no amendment should be made to the draft OZP to meet the representations, Members are also invited to agree that the draft OZP, together with their respective Notes and updated ES, are suitable for submission under section 8 of the Ordinance to the CE in C for approval.

## **9. Attachments**

<b>Annex I</b>	Draft Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/18 (reduced size)
<b>Annex II</b>	Schedule of Amendments to the Approved Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/17
<b>Annex III(a)</b>	MPC Paper No. 11/19 (without attachments)
<b>Annex III(b)</b>	Minutes of the MPC Meeting held on 6.9.2019 (Extracted)
<b>Annex IV(a)</b>	Minutes of DDHC, SDC Meeting on 27.5.2019 (Extracted)
<b>Annex IV(b)</b>	Minutes of DDHC, SDC Meeting on 18.7.2019 (Extracted)
<b>Annex IV(c)</b>	Minutes of DDHC, SDC Meeting on 23.9.2019 (Extracted)
<b>Annex V</b>	List of Representers (R1 to R780) and Commenters (C1 to C32) in respect to Draft Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/18
<b>Annex VI</b>	Summary of Representations and Comments and Responses
<b>Annex VII</b>	Samples of representations in standard proforma
<b>Annex VIII</b>	Provision of Open Space and Major Community Facilities in Pok Fu Lam Area
<b>Drawing H-1</b>	Concept Plan of the Cyberport Expansion
<b>Drawing H-2a</b>	Existing and Planned Building Height Profile
<b>Drawing H-2b</b>	Existing and Planned Building Height Profile (Photomontage)
<b>Drawing H-3</b>	Wind Enhancement Features of the Cyberport 5
<b>Drawing H-4</b>	Proposed car parking and loading/unloading facilities in Cyberport 5
<b>Drawing H-5a</b>	Locations of Surveyed Junctions and Road Links
<b>Drawings H-5b to 5g</b>	Proposed Traffic Mitigation/Improvement Measures
<b>Drawings H-6a to 6j</b>	Viewpoints and Photomontages of the Proposed Cyberport Expansion

<b>Drawing H-6k</b>	Visual Mitigation Plan of the Cyberport Expansion
<b>Drawing H-7</b>	Extract Plans from Approved Mater Layout Plan of Planning Applications Nos. A/H10/30 and A/H10/34
<b>Plan H-1</b>	Amendments incorporated in the draft OZP No. S/H10/18
<b>Plan H-2</b>	Location Plan of Representations and Comments
<b>Plans H-3a to 3e</b>	Location plan, site plan, aerial photo and site photos for Amendment Items A1 and A2
<b>Plans H-4a to 4h</b>	Location plan, site plan, aerial photo and site photos for Amendment Items B1 and B2
<b>Plans H-5a to 5r</b>	Location plan, site plan, aerial photo and site photos for Amendment Items C1 to C5
<b>Plans H-6a to 6c</b>	Location plan, site plan and aerial photo for Amendment Item D
<b>Plans H-7a to 7c</b>	Location plan, site plan and aerial photo for Amendment Item E
<b>Plan H-8</b>	The Building Height of Sub-areas 1 and 2 of Cyberport development
<b>Plan H-9</b>	Cyberport Waterfront Park
<b>Plan H-10</b>	Proposals from R102
<b>Plan H-11</b>	Photomontages of Cyberport 5

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT**  
**JUNE 2020**