

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

TPB Paper No. 10880
For Consideration by the
Town Planning Board on 10.2.2023

DRAFT POK FU LAM OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/H10/20

CONSIDERATION OF
REPRESENTATIONS NO. TPB/R/S/H10/20-R1 TO R1946
AND COMMENTS NO. TPB/R/S/H10/20-C1 TO C24

DRAFT POK FU LAM OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/H10/20

**CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS NO. TPB/R/S/H10/20-R1 TO R1946
AND COMMENTS NO. TPB/R/S/H10/20-C1 TO C24**

Subject of Representations (Amendment Items)	Representers (No. TPB/R/S/H10/20-)	Commenters (No. TPB/R/S/H10/20-)
<p><u>Item A</u> Rezoning of a site to the east of 3 Sassoon Road from “Green Belt” (“GB”) to “Government, Institution or Community (1)” (“G/IC(1)”).</p> <p><u>Item B</u> Rezoning of a site at 131 Pok Fu Lam Road from “G/IC” to “Residential (Group C)7” (“R(C)7”).</p>	<p>Total: 1,946</p> <p><u>Support (1,788)</u></p> <p><i>All Items (16)</i> R1927 to R1942: Individuals</p> <p><i>Item A (1,771)</i> R1 to R26: Various Departments and Offices of the University of Hong Kong (HKU), HKU Medical Alumni Association, and Medical Society of HKU R27: Queen Mary Hospital (QMH) R28: Gleneagles Hospital Hong Kong R29: Our Hong Kong Foundation R30: Hong Kong Cyberport Management Company Limited R31 to R47, R49 to R50: Various Patient Rights Groups R48: Caritas Wu Cheng-Chung Secondary School R51 to R1770, R1901: Individuals</p> <p><i>Item B (1)[#]</i> R1925: Ebenezer School and Home for the Visually Impaired Limited (Ebenezer)</p> <p><u>Oppose (16)</u></p> <p><i>All Items (1)</i> R1943: Individual</p>	<p>Total: 24</p> <p><u>Provide Comments to R1771 to R1900, R1903 to R1921, R1925, R1943 to R1946 (11)</u> C1 to C11: HKU and individuals (R133, R370, R382, R549, R883, R1352, R1496, R1593, R1755)</p> <p><u>Provides Comments to R1 to R23 (1)</u> C12: Chairman of Incorporated Owners of Royalton II (R1785)</p> <p><u>Supports R1785 (1)</u> C13: Incorporated Owners of Royalton</p> <p><u>Provides Comments to R1 to R1784, R1901, R1926 to R1943 (1)</u> C14: Individual (R1781)</p> <p><u>Provide Comments to R1 to R1784, R1901, R1925 to R1943 (3)</u> C15 to C17: Individuals (R1782, R1894, R1777)</p> <p><u>Provides Comments to Item A (1)</u> C18: Individual (R1943)</p> <p><u>Provides Comments to R12 and R1944 (1)</u></p>

Subject of Representations (Amendment Items)	Representers (No. TPB/R/S/H10/20-)	Commenters (No. TPB/R/S/H10/20-)
	<p><u>Item A (14)</u> R1771 to R1784: Individuals</p> <p><u>Item B (1)</u> R1926: Individual</p> <p><u>Provide Views on Item A (139)</u> R1785: Incorporated Owners of Royalton II R1786 to R1900, R1902 to R1924: Individuals</p> <p><u>Provide Views on all Items (3)</u> R1944: Southern District Councillor R1945 and R1946: Individuals</p>	<p>C19: Southern District Councillor (R1944)</p> <p><u>Provides Comments to R1925, R1944 to R1946 (1)</u> C20: Individual</p> <p><u>Provides Comments to R1926, R1943 to R1946 (1)</u> C21: Ebenezer (R1925)</p> <p><u>Support R1925 (2)</u> C22 and C23: Individuals</p> <p><u>Supports R1925 and Providing Comments on R1926 and R1946 (1)</u> C24: Individual</p>

Notes: The names of all representers and commenters are attached at **Annex III**. Soft copy of their submissions is sent to the Town Planning Board (the Board) Members via electronic means; and is also available for public inspection at the Board's website at https://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/plan_making/S_H10_20.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 Board's Secretariat for Members' inspection.

R1925 provides comments to Item A and also supports Item B.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 On 22.7.2022, the draft Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H10/20 (the Plan) at **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 to the OZP and its Notes is at **Annex II** and the locations of the amendment items are shown on **Plan H-1a**.
- 1.2 During the two-month statutory exhibition period, a total of 1,946 valid representations were received¹. On 21.10.2022, the representations were published for public comments. Upon expiry of the publication period, a total of 24 comments on the representations were received.
- 1.3 On 16.12.2022, the Board agreed to consider all the representations and comments of the Plan collectively in one group.
- 1.4 This Paper is to provide the Board with information for consideration of the representations and comments. The lists of representers and commenters are at

¹ On 16.12.2022, the Board noted 9 representations with the required identity information missing should be treated as not having been made pursuant to sections 6(2) and 6(3) of the Ordinance. As a result, there are 1,946 valid representations.

Annex III. The representers and commenters have been invited to attend the meeting in accordance with section 6B(3) of the Ordinance.

2. Background

Item A – Taking Forward the Decision of the Metro Planning Committee of the Board (MPC) on the s.12A Application No. Y/H10/13 for proposed academic buildings to the east of 3 Sassoon Road (about 1.64 ha)

- 2.1 On 26.11.2021, the MPC considered a s.12A application No. Y/H10/13 submitted by HKU for rezoning a site to the east of 3 Sassoon Road (**Plan H-1a**) from “GB” to “G/IC(1)” for proposed academic buildings of the expansion of the HKU Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine (HKUMed) campus. The MPC agreed to the s.12A application by rezoning the site to “G/IC(1)” restricting to a maximum building height (BH) of 164mPD to reflect the indicative scheme (**Drawings H-1 to H-9**).
- 2.2 HKU’s proposal for provision of communal open space of not less than 4,000m², interlinked building blocks with stepped BHs descending from north-western portion of 164mPD to south-eastern portion of 123mPD, multi-level pedestrian connections to Pok Fu Lam Road, Victoria Road and Northcote Close as shown in the indicative scheme are incorporated in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP to serve as guidance for detailed design.

Item B – Taking Forward the Decision of the MPC on the s.12A Application No. Y/H10/14 for proposed residential development at 131 Pok Fu Lam Road (about 0.65ha)

- 2.3 On 6.5.2022, the MPC considered a s.12A application No. Y/H10/14 submitted by the Ebenezer for rezoning the site currently occupied by the Ebenezer at 131 Pok Fu Lam Road from “G/IC” to “R(C)7” for proposed residential development. The MPC partially agreed to the s.12A application by rezoning the site to “R(C)7” with stipulation of a maximum PR of 1.9 and a maximum BH of 151mPD, and to address the concerns of Director of Environmental Protection (DEP), added the requirement for submission of layout plan together with relevant technical assessments on air quality, traffic noise and sewerage aspects under section 16 planning application for the Board’s approval. Such requirements are incorporated in the Notes and ES of the OZP.

Amendments to the Notes of the OZP

- 2.4 In relation to the above amendment items, the Notes of the “G/IC(1)” and “R(C)7” zones of the OZP have been revised to incorporate the maximum BH and layout plan submission requirements accordingly.

Amendments to the OZP

- 2.5 On 24.6.2022, the MPC agreed that the above amendments to the approved Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/19 was suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance for public inspection. The relevant MPC Paper No. 9/22 is available at the Board’s website² and the Secretariat for Members’ inspection, while the extract

² The MPC Paper No. 9/22 and the attachments are available at the Board’s website at https://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/meetings/MPC/Agenda/698_mpc_agenda.html

of the minutes of the MPC meeting is at **Annex V**. Subsequently, the draft Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/20 was gazetted on 22.7.2022.

3. Local Consultations

- 3.1 During the processing of the s.12A applications relating to Items A and B, public consultations were conducted in accordance with the provision of the Ordinance. The public comments on the applications were considered by MPC on 26.11.2021 and 6.5.2022 respectively.
- 3.2 During the exhibition period of the draft OZP, a paper was circulated to members of the Southern District Council (SDC) in August 2022. SDC members were invited to submit their comments on the amendments in writing to the Secretary of the Board during the exhibition period of the draft OZP. A member of the SDC submitted a representation (**R1944**) and a comment (**C19**).

4. The Representation Sites and their Surrounding Areas

4.1 The Representation Sites and their Surrounding Areas

Representation Site under Item A

- 4.1.1 Representation site under Item A (about 1.64ha) is zoned “G/IC(1)” for proposed academic buildings of HKUMed (**Plans H-2a to H-2d**) targeted for completion in 2027. The site is mainly steep vegetated slope with two watercourses. To its north across Pok Fu Lam Road is QMH. To its northwest along the Sassoon Road are clusters of HKU facilities. To its southwest are Caritas Wu Cheng-chung Secondary School, HKUMed campus, and low-rise residential developments along Northcote Close. To the immediate southeast is Ebenezer (Item B on **Plan H-3a**). To its northeast and east are medium-rise residential developments.
- 4.1.2 According to the indicative scheme submitted by HKU under the agreed s.12A application, the proposed development comprises four interlinked building blocks with stepped BHs descending from 164mPD (north-western portion) to 123mPD (south-eastern portion) and a total gross floor area (GFA) of about 43,000m² (plot ratio (PR) of 2.6). Not less than 4,000m² of communal open space accessible by the public will be provided. The indicative scheme of the proposed development are shown in **Drawings H-1 to H-9**.

Representation Site under Item B

- 4.1.3 Representation site under Item B (about 0.65ha) is zoned “R(C)7” for proposed residential development after relocation of the Ebenezer thereat to the new site in Tung Chung (**Plans H-3a to H-3e**). To the north and northeast across Pok Fu Lam Road are residential developments. To the immediate south is the Ebenezer New Hope School. Further south is vegetated slope zoned “R(C)6” restricted to a maximum BH of 137mPD. To the immediate north-west is the Item A site (**Plan 2a**).

- 4.1.4 According to the indicative scheme submitted by the applicant under the agreed s.12A application, the maximum PR and BH of the proposed residential development would be 1.9 and 151mPD, respectively, i.e. same as those of the existing school buildings on site. The indicative scheme of the proposed development are shown in **Drawings H-10 and H-11**.

4.2 Planning Intentions

The planning intentions of the zones in relation to the above representation sites are as follows:

- (a) The “G/IC” zone under Item A 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, organizations providing social services to meet community needs, and other institutional establishments.
- (b) The “R(C)” zone under Item B is intended primarily for low to medium-rise and low to medium-density residential developments where commercial uses serving the residential neighbourhood may be permitted on application to the Board.

5. The Representations

5.1 Subject of Representations

- 5.1.1 There are a total of 1,946 representations, including 1,788 supportive representations (**R1 to R1770, R1901, R1925, R1927 to R1942**), 16 adverse representations (**R1771 to R1784, R1926 and R1943**) and 142 representations providing comments (**R1785 to R1900, R1902 to R1924, R1944 to R1946**).
- 5.1.2 Among the 1,788 supportive representations, 16 (**R1927 to R1942**) support all amendment items, 1,771 (**R1 to R1770 and R1901**) support Item A, and one (**R1925**) supports Item B³. The supportive representations are submitted by various Departments and Offices of HKU, HKU Medical Alumni Association, Medical Society of HKU (**R1 to R26**), QMH (**R27**), Gleneagles Hospital Hong Kong (**R28**), Our Hong Kong Foundation (**R29**), Hong Kong Cyberport Management Company Limited (**R30**), Caritas Wu Cheng-Chung Secondary School (**R48**), various patient rights groups (**R31 to R47, R49 to R50**), Ebenezer (**R1925**) and individuals (**R51 to R1770, R1901**).
- 5.1.3 Among the 16 adverse representations, one (**R1943**) opposes all amendment items, 14 (**R1771 to R1784**) oppose Item A, and one (**R1926**) opposes Item B. The adverse representations were submitted by individuals.

³ **R1925** provides comments to Item A and also supports Item B.

- 5.1.4 Among the 142 representations providing views, 139 provide views (**R1785 to R1900, R1902 to R1924**) on Item A and 3 (**R1944 to R1946**) provide views on all items. Amongst these 142 representations, 133 (**R1787 to R1900, R1903 to R1921**) are largely based on the same standard letter.
- 5.1.5 The representations providing views are submitted by a member of the SDC (**R1944**), Incorporated Owners of Royalton II (**R1785**) and individuals.
- 5.1.6 The major grounds of representations as well as their major suggestions, and PlanD's responses, in consultation with the relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds), are summarised in paragraph 5.2 below.

5.2 Supportive Representations

5.2.1 **Item A**

Major Supportive Ground(s) / View(s)	Representations
(1) The proposed development will increase teaching and learning space, provide more/better medical infrastructure and facilities to train medical manpower to ease the burden of the public health services. The proposed laboratories and research centres will also support HKUMed's teaching and research activities, and improve healthcare service in future.	R1 to R1770, R1901
(2) The proposed development is located in close proximity to/short walking distance from QMH and current Sassoon Road Medical Campus. It will enhance integration, interaction, consolidation, collaboration, coordination, facilitate doctors to attend to emergency cases, and reduce travelling time.	R12, R13, R16, R17, R18, R381, R385 to R391, R401, R402, R404 to R407, R415, R419, R429, R434, R438, R447, R540, R636, R642, R644, R645, R647, R649, R659, R661, R703, R710, R711, R848, R850, R858, R904, R928, R939, R949, R951, R980, R986, R993, R994, R1037, R1038, R1042, R1044, R1045, R1056, R1069, R1081, R1085, R1087, R1089, R1090, R1098, R1099, R1106, R1110, R1111, R1115, R1130, R1133, R1149, R1165, R1173, R1174, R1183, R1231, R1242, R1268, R1280, R1296, R1299, R1300, R1303, R1305, R1311, R1317, R1341, R1352, R1356, R1359, R1369, R1370, R1372, R1379, R1404, R1414, R1422, R1435, R1445, R1447, R1450, R1475, R1495, R1496, R1497, R1523, R1525, R1529, R1530,

Major Supportive Ground(s) / View(s)		Representations
		R1534, R1541, R1545, R1552, R1568, R1584, R1585, R1593, R1600, R1601, R1607, R1620, R1628, R1630, R1644, R1648, R1654, R1656, R1660, R1672, R1673, R1678, R1691, R1724, R1731, R1749, R1762, R1764, R1765, R1769
(3)	The proposed development will provide communal open space and improve public access.	R430, R440, R651, R658, R702, R904, R1065, R1209, R1313, R1387, R1606, R1626, R1633, R1691, R1754
(4)	The proposed development has sensible architectural design. It will not affect landscape area nearby and have minimal environmental, visual and air ventilation impacts.	R1116, R1195, R1243, R1302, R1495, R1691, R1708
(5)	The proposed development will bring junction improvement at Pok Fu Lam Road/Sassoon Road.	R1213
Response		
The supportive views above are noted.		

5.2.2 Item B

Major Supportive Ground(s) / Proposal(s)		Representation
(1)	The rezoning to residential development is a key milestone to the relocation process of Ebenezer. It will help to achieve long term objective of establishing new and improved services and facilities, and to provide long term financial security for the care and education of the visually impaired.	R1925
(2)	It is suggested to remove the requirement to submit layout plan from Notes and ES of the OZP. All technical requirements for proposed residential development have been addressed and accepted by relevant departments except environmental aspects, i.e. air quality and traffic noise, which could be addressed by proposed mitigation measures such as 20m buffer distance from Pok Fu Lam Road and single aspect building design. A sewerage impact assessment (SIA) was submitted in the s.12A application, and DEP and Chief Engineer/Hong Kong and Island, Drainage Services Department (CE/HK&I, DSD) had no adverse comment/ objection to the SIA. As the site is small with PR of 1.9 and building height restriction (BHR) of 151mPD, it is considered there is sufficient development control to ensure implementation of an acceptable development scheme and layout plan submission is not necessary.	

(3)	Alternatively, the requirement for submission of a layout plan could be deleted from the Notes of the “R(C)7” zone and the ES be amended such that the layout plan submission is only required to be submitted to the DEP for approval.
Responses	
(a)	The supportive view in (1) above is noted.
(b)	<p>In response to (2) and (3):</p> <p>As the lease governing the Site is virtually unrestricted and lease modification would not be required for the proposed residential development, DEP considered in the s.12A application that support could only be given for the proposed “R(C)7” zone if there was a mechanism to ensure the implementation of suitable design and measures to satisfy the relevant requirements under the HKPSG in terms of air quality and traffic noise. Furthermore, as SIA is not required for general building plan submission, the sewerage impacts should also be addressed at an early stage. Hence, the Board considered and agreed in the s.12A application that submission of a layout plan with an environmental assessment report and a SIA report under s.16 planning application is required to address the concerns of DEP on environmental aspects, such that the proposed residential development would be built in accordance with the approved layout plan.</p>

5.3 Adverse Representations

5.3.1 **Item A**

Major Grounds/Comment(s)/Suggestion(s)		Representations
<i>Land Use</i>		
(1)	HKU should provide justification on demand for and extent of expansion.	R1771 to R1776
(2)	HKU should utilise existing facilities and buildings along Sassoon Road and Pok Fu Lam Road for the proposed development; and explore other options such as Hong Kong Science and Technology Park at Pak Shek Kok and Lok Ma Chau Loop.	R1771, R1772, R1773
(3)	The site is located on a steep slope and is heavily vegetated by mature trees serving as an important green buffer and breathing space in Pok Fu Lam. The difficult topography and geotechnical conditions render the site technically challenging and costly.	R1771 to R1773, R1778
(4)	There are alternative and more appropriate sites in the area which can serve HKU’s need, and hence, seven alternative sites along Pok Fu Lam Road and Victoria Road for HKUMed’s expansion have been identified for consideration.	R1771
Responses		
(a)	<p>In response to (1):</p> <p>The Chief Executive announced in the 2018 Policy Address that the</p>	

	<p>Government will deploy sufficient resources to enhance healthcare services in view of increasing service demand arising from the growing ageing population as well as to support the Ten-Year Hospital Development Plan. Starting from the 2019/20 academic year, the number of healthcare-related publicly-funded first-degree intake places would increase by over 150 from about 1,780 to 1,930 (including 60 medical, 60 nursing, and 30 dental and allied health professions) to address the foreseeable tight manpower in the healthcare profession. The Government has earmarked about \$20 billion to enable University Grants Committee funded universities to expand relevant healthcare training capacity.</p> <p>In response to the Government's policies, the proposed development would accommodate various teaching and research facilities, laboratories, lecture theatres, offices and ancillary facilities for HKUMed to provide additional teaching and research spaces in order to increase the healthcare teaching capacities for medical and nursing students targeted for completion in 2027 as a medium term measure. The Secretary for Health reaffirmed policy support for the project and the associated zoning amendment.</p>
(b)	<p>In response to (2):</p> <p>The Site is located in close proximity to various existing GIC facilities, including QMH to its north, clusters of HKU facilities to its northwest along Sassoon Road and HKUMed to its southwest. From land use perspective, the proposed development at the representation Site A forming part of HKUMed is considered a suitable location in view of its proximity to the clusters of HKUMed facilities and QMH.</p> <p>According to the agreed s.12A application, all developable land in HKU campus has already been utilised and opportunities to decant existing facilities for redevelopment (e.g. Flora Ho Sports Centre Complex which was planned to be redeveloped for an academic building of the School of Business) has also been explored. There is currently no land available within HKU campus to accommodate the proposed development. The current medical school facilities, which were planned over 30 years ago, are inadequate to support the teaching, research and learning needs of the growing number of students and staff. Given the growing demand and complexity of medical care services, timely implementation of the proposed development is crucial.</p> <p>Temporary closure of existing academic facilities would have adverse impact on the current students and researchers. Therefore, development of a vacant site would be the most efficient and appropriate option. Upon reviewing available sites in close proximity to HKUMed, HKU reiterated that the representation Site A is considered as the only feasible option. HKU's (C1) further responses on the site selection and availability of suitable alternative sites are at paragraphs 6.3.1(1) to (5) below.</p>
(c)	<p>In response to (3):</p> <p>A geotechnical planning review report (GPRR) and landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA) were submitted in the s.12A application. Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (H(GEO), CEDD) has no geotechnical objection to the proposed development and considered that excavation would not affect the slope stability and the surroundings. Chief Town Planner/Urban Design</p>

	and Landscape, PlanD (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) has no objection to the application and considered that the proposed development is not incompatible with the landscape character of the surroundings.
(d)	<p>In response to (4):</p> <p>Item A is to take forward the decision of MPC on the agreed s.12A application to rezone the site from “GB” to “G/IC(1)”. HKU has explained in the MPC meeting on 26.11.2021 that the site is the only feasible option for the proposed academic buildings. The rezoning of the site from “GB” to “G/IC(1)” is considered appropriate.</p>

Major Grounds/Comment(s)/Suggestion(s)		Representations
Traffic Aspect		
(5)	The proposed development would cause adverse traffic impact on Pok Fu Lam Road, Victoria Road and Northcote Close, both at construction and operation stages.	R1771 to R1773, R1780
(6)	It is impractical and undesirable for the main pedestrian entrance of the proposed development to be located at the narrow pedestrian path at Pok Fu Lam Road.	
(7)	It is suggested not to proceed with the proposed development until there is a concrete plan for the new MTR station at QMH.	R1771 and R1944
Responses		
(e)	<p>In response to (5):</p> <p>According to the traffic impact assessment (TIA) submitted in the agreed s.12A application, the traffic impact induced by the proposed development would not cause any significant impact on the surrounding road networks. The proposed traffic improvement measures include improvement works at the junction of Pok Fu Lam Road/Sassoon Road (West). To minimise the potential traffic during construction period, HKU also proposes the construction vehicles to use alternative routes and bypass the critical junction at Pok Fu Lam Road/Sassoon Road, or not to operate during peak hours. Prior to the construction, HKU would submit construction TIA for Commissioner for Transport’s (C for T) approval. C for T has no objection in principle to the proposed development from traffic engineering perspective.</p>	
(f)	<p>In response to (6):</p> <p>According to the indicative scheme in the agreed s.12A application, building setback of 8m from Pok Fu Lam would be provided to enhance pedestrian flow at entrance of the proposed development. The proposed development is designed with planned link bridges (e.g. link bridge to 3 Sassoon Road and QMH), pedestrian access to student hostels at 6 Sassoon Road and HKUMed Building at 21 Sassoon Road as well as various access points (with public lifts) which would enhance the pedestrian networks amidst the huge level differences of the area (Drawing H-9). By the provision of both horizontal and vertical barrier-free connections, it will facilitate more direct and convenient pedestrian flows between QMH, Pok</p>	

	Fu Lam Road, Northcote Close, Victoria Road and existing student hostels and academic buildings along Sassoon Road.
(g)	<p>In response to (7):</p> <p>The Government is actively considering the project proposal for South Island Land (West) (SIL(W)) submitted by MTR Corporation Limited. The TIA submitted in the agreed s.12A application had demonstrated that the traffic impact induced by the proposed development would not cause any significant impact on the surrounding road networks under the ‘without SIL(W)’ scenario. There is no justification to withhold the development until formulation of concrete plan for the proposed MTR station.</p>

Major Grounds/Comment(s)/Suggestion(s)		Representations
<i>Landscape and Ecological Aspect</i>		
(8)	The proposed development would cause irreversible disturbance, loss of natural and visual amenity, natural habitat and woodland, which would have adverse landscape and ecological impacts to the area.	R1771 to R1773
Response		
(h)	<p>In response to (8):</p> <p>According to the tree preservation and removal proposal submitted in the agreed s.12A application (Drawing H-2), no Old and Valuable Tree (OVT) was found but four wall trees along Pok Fu Lam Road, including two potential OVTs were found. Existing vegetated areas in the centre and along the eastern and western parts of the site are proposed to be retained. The two watercourses at the centre and southern periphery of the site would not be affected. There are 731 existing trees within the Site, while 216, including the four wall trees, are proposed to be retained, 473 are proposed to be felled, three would be transplanted and remaining 39 would be removed. On the other hand, a total of 533 new tree plantings are proposed for compensation of the tree loss. Various landscape treatments are proposed to mitigate the potential landscape impact. While impact on the existing landscape resources within the Site is anticipated, CTP/UD&L, PlanD considers the proposed development is not entirely incompatible with the landscape character of the surrounding development.</p> <p>The ecological impact assessment submitted in the s.12A application concluded that there would be no significant adverse ecological impact arising from the proposed development. DAFC has no comment on the development from ecological aspect.</p>	

Major Grounds/Comment(s)/Suggestion(s)		Representations
<i>Visual and Air Ventilation Aspect</i>		
(9)	HKU has not made any changes on the building blocks and height to mitigate visual impact despite repeated concerns from residents, in particular the height of the proposed Block A including heating, ventilation and air condition (HVAC) outlets on the roof, blocking a significant portion of Royalton’s current open view.	R1772

(10)	HKU did not provide any schematic design on what the development will look like when viewed from Pok Fu Lam Road.	R1771 to R1773
(11)	The proposed development would block the seaward side wind to the built-up cluster in the northeast side of Pok Fu Lam Road.	
(12)	The seasonal northeast and northwest wind will blow pollutants (including potentially dangerous chemicals and biohazards from the HVAC outlet) directly to nearby residents.	R1772
(13)	It is suggested to restrict development within the site to a maximum BH of 148mPD with the exception for the north-western portion which can have a maximum BH up to 164mPD.	R1785

Responses

(i)	<p>In response to (9), (10) and (13):</p> <p>According to the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 41 (TPB PG-No.41), it is not practical to protect private views without stifling development opportunity and balancing other relevant considerations in the highly developed context of Hong Kong. In the interest of the public, it is far more important to protect public views, particularly those easily accessible and popular to the public or tourists.</p> <p>According to the visual impact assessment (VIA) submitted in the agreed s.12A application, key public view points from QMH (Drawing H-7), Cyberport, HKU Stanley Ho Sports Ground, Pok Fu Lam Road (Drawing H-8), Victoria Road, High West and Hong Kong Hiking Trail have been assessed. The VIA concluded that the overall visual impact is moderately adverse. It is noted that various good design features, including setback from Pok Fu Lam Road, building gap between Blocks A and B, permeable podiums, diversity of building forms with height variation, articulation of building edges, variation in facades and landscape treatment, etc. would be incorporated to reduce the perceivable building mass, enhance visual permeability and create visual interest. The proposed development would follow the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines by providing adequate building separation, building setback of about 8m from Pok Fu Lam Road and site coverage of greenery of minimum 20%.</p> <p>According to the indicative scheme in the agreed s.12A application, the proposed development comprises 4 interlinked building blocks with BHs varying from 123mPD to 164mPD (Drawing H-1). The proposed BH of Block B (i.e. 148mPD) was designed considering the level of the first residential floor of Royalton and Royalton II (i.e. 153mPD) on the opposite side of Pok Fu Lam Road. This is considered compatible with the descending height profile (northeast to southwest) from the QMH buildings with BH of about 200mPD to the residential developments along Northcote Close with BHs ranging from 110.5mPD to 125mPD (Plan H-2a). Hence, the Board agreed that a maximum BH of 164mPD be stipulated in the Notes of the OZP for the “G/IC(1)” zone while the</p>
-----	---

	interlinked building blocks with stepped BH design in the indicative scheme be incorporated in the ES of the OZP to guide the development whilst allow design flexibility. CTP/UD&L, PlanD considers the proposed development is not out-of-context and generally maintains the existing stepped BH profile descending towards the seaside.
(j)	<p>In response to (11):</p> <p>According to the air ventilation assessment (expert evaluation) (AVA(EE)) submitted in the agreed s.12A application, the prevailing wind are from E, NEN and NE annually and summer winds are mainly from SSW, S and SSE directions. Residential developments on the opposite side of Pok Fu Lam Road have a higher elevation and could be reached by summer prevailing winds from the sea without much obstruction from the proposed development. The indicative scheme has adopted various good design features (Drawing H-1) listed in response 5.3.1 (i) above. While the proposed development would involve certain blockage effect on the surrounding areas, CTP/UD&L, PlanD considers that with the proposed good design features, no significant air ventilation impact arising from the proposed development is anticipated.</p>
(k)	<p>In response to (12):</p> <p>The operation of the medical research facilities is subject to relevant laws and regulations. The modus operandi of the HKU medical research facilities is further responded to by HKU (C1) in paragraph 6.3.1(10) below.</p>

Major Grounds/Comment(s)/Suggestion(s)		Representations
<i>Other Technical Concerns (Environmental, Health and Safety, Light Pollution)</i>		
(14)	There is risk from the proposed research labs and animal facilities if there are mechanical failures, human failures (e.g. improper waste disposal), and critical events. HKU fails to assess biosafety and environmental contamination risks derived from possible leakage via aerosols, drainage, sewerage, transport and people movement, leading to health and safety concerns to staff, students, patients and local residents.	R1771 to R1774, R1780
(15)	The proposed development would have light pollution to the surroundings.	R1771
Responses		
(l)	<p>In response to (14):</p> <p>According to environmental review submitted in the agreed s.12A application, chemical wastes from the proposed development would be properly disposed of in accordance with the Waste Disposal Ordinance. The modus operandi of the HKU medical research facilities is further responded to by HKU (C1) in paragraph 6.3.1(11) below.</p> <p>DEP has no objection to the application from environmental planning perspective. To address concerns from DEP, an air quality impact assessment should be conducted during detailed design stage, which</p>	

	would be incorporated in the land document where appropriate subject to agreement of the land authority.
(m)	<p>In response to (15):</p> <p>According to the responses prepared by HKU (C1), relevant considerations, including reducing the opening sizes of windows, adjusting window orientations, and adopting smart solutions like motion sensor lights, will be incorporated in the detailed design of the proposed development.</p>

Major Grounds/Comment(s)/Suggestion(s)		Representations
<i>Lack of Local Consultation with Residents</i>		
(16)	HKU has not provided details of the proposed development to address the concerns of nearby residents. There is significant differences between the layout plan provided by HKU in 2021 and final layout.	R1771 to R1776
(17)	HKU should consult the nearby residents on the detailed design of the academic building. The Board should conduct public hearing and require the submission of MLP for community to comment.	R1771 to R1782, R1784 to R1899
Response		
(n)	<p>In response to (16) and (17):</p> <p>The s.12A application was published for public comments and the Board has considered the comments at the meeting on 26.11.2021. The draft OZP incorporating the proposed amendments in relation to the Site were published pursuant to section 5 of the Ordinance. Representations and comments regarding the amendments have been received during the respective statutory publication periods. All the representations and comments will be considered by the Board at this meeting and persons who made the representations and comments have been invited to attend the meeting to present their views to the Board. The statutory procedures in consulting the public for plan-making have been duly followed.</p> <p>Regarding the request for submission of MLP, it is noted that relevant departments have no objection to/no adverse comments on the s.12A application. As the proposed development and the submitted technical assessments in the agreed s.12A application were generally acceptable, and appropriate development restrictions have been incorporated in the OZP, the suggested requirement for submission of MLP for consideration by the Board is considered not necessary.</p> <p>Comment submitted by HKU (C1) in paragraph 6.3.1(15) below regarding consultations with surrounding residents is relevant.</p>	

Major Grounds/Comment(s)/Suggestion(s)		Representations
<i>Others</i>		
(18)	The proposed 4,000m ² of public open space located within the proposed development at item A is not	R1943

	convenient and not attractive for residents in the surroundings.	
(19)	HKU should develop new research and educational facilities close to the border in order to facilitate better integration of Hong Kong with the Greater Bay Area.	
Responses		
(o)	<p>In response to (18):</p> <p>According to the indicative scheme in the agreed s.12A application, the 4,000m² of communal open space will be provided on the G/F and 3/F of the proposed academic buildings. There will be provision of both horizontal and vertical barrier-free connections, including lift towers from Victoria Road and Northcote Close, multi-level connections to Sassoon Road and Pok Fu Lam Road. Residents and visitors in the surrounding areas could enjoy the communal open space with the enhanced pedestrian connection.</p>	
(p)	In response to (19), response 5.3.1 (b) above is relevant.	

5.3.2 Item B

Major Ground(s)		Representation
(1)	The Ebenezer has important contribution to the society and should be retained.	R1926 and R1945
(2)	The representer questioned whether Pok Fu Lam has sufficient GIC facilities.	R1943
(3)	The Government could acquire the Ebenezer site at market value for HKUMed’s expansion to reduce the amount of “GB” to be affected.	
Responses		
(a)	In response to (1): As explained by Ebenezer in the agreed s.12A application, the existing school buildings were built over 60 years ago, and the existing facilities and services are in an urgent need of upgrade. However, due to the constraints of the Site, much-needed improvements are only achievable at a larger, more accessible and suitable site. The Ebenezer will be relocated to Tung Chung with modern and purpose-built facilities. There will be no interruptions to the services provided to the visually impaired students and residents throughout their relocation process.	
(b)	In response to (2): In accordance with the HKPSG requirements and concerned B/D’s assessments, the planned provision for GIC facilities in Pok Fu Lam area is generally adequate to meet the demand of the overall planned population, except for child care services facilities, community care services facilities, and day rehabilitation services (Annex V). HKPSG requirements for social welfare facilities are a long-term goal and the actual provision would be subject to the consideration of relevant B/Ds in the planning and development process as appropriate, and as detailed	

	design proceeds. PlanD and Social Welfare Department (SWD) will also work closely to ensure that more community facilities can be included in new and redevelopment proposals from both public and private sectors in Southern District. SWD has all along adopted a multi-pronged approach, and maintained close liaison with relevant government departments, to identify suitable accommodation for the provision of welfare facilities, so as to meet the ongoing welfare service needs of different districts.
(c)	<p>In response to (3):</p> <p>As the indicative scheme and technical assessments submitted in the agreed s.12A application were considered generally acceptable, the Board agreed to rezone the current Ebenezer site to “R(C)7” for the proposed residential development. The Government will not acquire the current Ebenezer site for HKUMed’s expansion. Comment 6.3.2 (1) submitted by Ebenezer (C21) below is relevant.</p>

5.4 Representation Providing Views

5.4.1 **Item A**

Major Comment(s)/Suggestions		Representations
Site Selection		
(1)	HKU should consider alternative sites, e.g. Pauline Chan Building and flat land next to Victoria Road.	R1907 and R1909
Urban Design		
(2)	Detailed design may be different from the indicative development scheme submitted under s.12A application. The Board should require the submission of MLP for evaluation and approval.	R1785 to R1900, R1903 to R1921, R1945 to R1946
(3)	HKU is urged to consult residents on the detailed design of the proposed development.	R1785, R1786, R1905, R1906, R1908 and R1918
(4)	It is suggested to amend paragraph 7.6.4 of the ES as “Taking into account the local topography and characteristics, development within this site is restricted to a maximum BH of 148mPD with exception for the north-western portion which can have a maximum BH up to 164mPD.”	R1785
(5)	To include requirement for submission of MLP and to ensure the requirements in the ES on communal open space and blocking arrangement are complied with.	R1925
(6)	To include requirement of a minimum 32-metre wide non-building area (NBA) between Block B and eastern boundary of the Site of Item A.	
Other Technical Aspects		
(7)	The residents in the surroundings are concerned over the potential traffic, environmental, visual impacts and construction nuisances from the proposed development.	R1904, R1906, R1910, R1913, R1917 to R1920

(8)	The catchment area of MTR SIL(W) QMH station should be extended to Victoria Road vicinity for students (e.g. Kennedy School), users at Sandy Bay sports ground and graveyard visitors to ease traffic congestion along Victoria Road	R1915
Responses		
(a)	In response to (1), response 5.3.1 (b) above is relevant.	
(b)	In response to (2) to (6), responses 5.3.1 (i) and (n) above are relevant. As the proposed development and the submitted technical assessments in the s.12A application were generally acceptable, and appropriate development restrictions had been incorporated in the ES of the OZP, the requirement for the NBA of 32m is considered not necessary.	
(c)	In response to (7), responses 5.3.1 (e), (i) and (l) above are relevant. The noise generated from the construction of the proposed development will be subjected to the prevailing laws and regulations.	
(d)	In response to (8): The suggestion is not related to the amendment items. Nevertheless, the Government is actively considering the project proposal for SIL(W) submitted by MTRCL, and will take into account all stakeholders' views.	

5.4.2 Other Suggestions

Major Comment(s) / Suggestion(s)		Representation
(1)	The Board should not approve the draft plan until all planned/proposed developments in the Pok Fu Lam area are considered, including the Deep Technology Research Centre, redevelopment projects by HKU along Sassoon Road, MTR QMH Station, redevelopment of QMH and potential development in the Kong Sin Wan Valley "R(C)" site.	R1944
Response		
(a)	In response to (1): The Board has duly considered relevant factors including any committed projects during the s.12A applications. Items A and B are to take forward the decision of MPC on the two agreed the s.12A applications. The OZP would be reviewed and amended as needed when new project proposals and assessments are available to cope with changing circumstances.	

6. Comments on Representations

- 6.1 The 24 comments are submitted by HKU (C1), Chairman of Incorporated Owners of Royalton II (C12), Incorporated Owners of Royalton (C13), SDC District Councilor (C19), Ebenezer (C21) and individuals (C2 to C11, C14 to C18, C20, C22 to C24). It is noted that 18 commenters (C2 to C12 (i.e. R133, R324, R370, R382, R549, R883, R1352, R1496, R1593, R1755, R1785 respectively), C14 to C19 (i.e. R1781, R1782, R1894, R1777, R1943 and R1944 respectively) and C21 (i.e. R1925) are also representers themselves.

- 6.2 The comments made by **C1 to C11** are identical and provide responses to the concerns raised by the adverse representers for Amendment Item A (i.e. **R1771 to R1900, R1903 to R1921, R1925, R1943 to R1946**). **C12 to C20** support the requirement to submit MLP for Item A. **C12** agrees with **R1785** to make amendment of the ES of the OZP to stipulate the BHRs. The content of **C13** is the same as **R1771**. **C14 to C18** and **C20** provide comments on Item A which are largely similar in nature/identical to the concerned representations, which are covered in paragraphs 5.3.1 and 5.4.1 above. Ebenezer (**C21**) provides responses to the concerns raised by the adverse representers for Amendment Item B (i.e. **R1926, R1943 to R1946**). **C22 to C24** support **R1925**. **C24** also provides comments on **R1926** and **R1946**.
- 6.3 The major concerns raised in the comments, which have not been mentioned in the representations above, are summarised below:

6.3.1 Item A

Major Comments		Comments
<i>Site Selection and Intensity</i>		
(1)	The proposed development intensity was formulated based on the facilities required by the university to meet the needs of existing students and staff, as well as the number of student intake of health-care related publicly-funded first-year first-degree that HKU had to provide. The number of student intake was based on the Healthcare Manpower Projection prepared by the Government. The forecast and the funding from the UGC for the first-year first-degree student intake was adopted as the basis in formulating the floor space and facilities in the proposed development.	C1 to C11
(2)	The actual floor space provided to the current staff and students was already in great deficit and the proposed development was much needed to alleviate the problem.	
<i>Availability of Suitable Alternative Sites</i>		
(3)	The proposed development forming part of HKUMed is a logical extension of the medical facilities from land use perspective. The proposed development is essential to be located close to existing HKUMed facilities and the QMH due to necessary operational needs. Hospital and facilities in the medical school, including facilities for teaching and learning, research, laboratories and accommodation for student and medical staff, were integral components and had to be located in close proximity. This locational criteria was internationally recognised. The strategic location of the Site would allow the proposed development to create synergy with existing facilities of HKUMed and the QMH. It could also address other concerns including the convenience and safety for staff and students, who might be working on shifts or with clinical attachments which required them to carry out duties at the hospital at unusual hours where public transport services were limited.	C1 to C11

(4)	The alternative sites suggested by R1785 and others are not suitable because of inadequate physical space to accommodate the proposed academic buildings and ancillary facilities, steep slope, proximity to Lung Fu Shan Country Park, located far away from QMH, and reserved for or occupied by other uses.	
(5)	Given the imminent need to commence the proposed facilities in 2027/2028, exploring the use of rock caverns for accommodating the proposed facilities is impractical as a long time period is required to conduct feasibility study and identify suitable rock caverns.	
<i>Design and technical aspects</i>		
(6)	The proposed indicative scheme was formulated under all-thought-out planning and engineering feasibility considerations. Various good building design features and extensive landscaping are proposed to blend into the local setting. There are no adverse comment to/no comment from relevant government departments on tree preservation and removal, landscape and visual, traffic, environmental review, air ventilation, ecological, drainage, sewerage, water supply and geotechnical impacts.	C1 to C11
(7)	A total area of not less than 4,000m ² is proposed for publicly accessible and landscaped public open space.	
(8)	According to the AVA, building structures at the northeast of the site are located at higher level than that of the proposed development. The overall disposition allows summer prevailing wind (e.g. S and SSW) from the sea to reach these areas without much obstruction.	
(9)	Various mitigation measures would be incorporated to minimise the visual impact, including careful design and position of building footprint, planting of new trees and implementing new buildings and structures which are sensitively integrated into the existing environment.	
<i>Health & Safety Failures and Risks</i>		
(10)	HKU complies with all statutory regulations such as Occupational Safety and Health Ordinance, Dangerous Goods Ordinance, Waste Disposal Ordinance, Prevention and Control of Disease Ordinance, Prevention and Control of Disease Regulation, and adheres to international standards of safety, health, radiation protection, and fire precautions. The University Safety Office is also charged to ensure compliance with relevant legislations, the University Health and Safety Policy and current international best practice, and provide specialist professional guidance on all aspects of biological safety. Before new facilities are commissioned, HKU Safety Office deploys its own in-house team of independent experts with considerable experience of inspection and testing regimes to certify specialist facilities and equipment. Members of this team verify that new facilities and equipment are performing to their design specifications to protect those working within	C1 to C11

	and the general public by performing or independently witnessing commissioning tests.	
(11)	The design also ensures that any waste materials produced within the facility are disposed of responsibly, legally and without impact on local residents or the environment. Liquid chemical wastes will be collected for contract disposal. Over the past 20 years, no major incidents involving members of the public have occurred in the research laboratories or other related facilities in HKU.	
(12)	HKU has obtained accreditation from AAALAC International, a US-based non-profit organisation for assessment of facilities involving laboratory animal research, and followed closely its safety and ethics protocols. HKU is stringent in setting out policies on all aspects of animal care, use, housing and management to achieve international standards. The facilities will be re-evaluated every three years in order to maintain the accreditation status.	
<i>Suggested Submission of Master Layout Plan (MLP) to the Board</i>		
(13)	The requirement is considered not necessary as the proposed development and technical assessments submitted in the s.12A application were considered generally acceptable by relevant government departments. Appropriate restrictions on BH, provision of communal open space and interlinked building blocks with stepped BH concept in the indicative scheme have been incorporated in the ES of the OZP. Moreover, as the development is fully funded by the Government with full support from the Health Bureau and Education Bureau, the proposal was submitted to the Panel on Health Services and Panel on Education in May 2021, and would be submitted to the Legislative Council (LegCo) for funding approval. There is a well-established mechanism which ensures the project is viable, economical, in compliance with all relevant requirements, and would not cause nuisance to the neighbourhood.	C1 to C11
(14)	HKU, as a public university in Hong Kong, will strictly follow the above governance accordingly to implement the project as presented to the LegCo and the Board. To impose a requirement for submission of a MLP or 'Layout Plan' in the OZP to oversee the development by the Board is repetitive of the vetting process, overload the Board, delay the tight implementation programme (target for completion in 2027), increasing construction costs and public spending, and impacting healthcare service provision in Hong Kong.	
<i>Consultation with Surrounding Residents</i>		
(15)	Public consultation had been undertaken during the statutory publication period for s.12A application and under the current round of OZP Amendment. With respect to the public consultation held with the Incorporated Owners of Royalton and Royalton II in June 2021, written reply in response to the concerns received was provided in July	C1 to C11

	2021. Separate meetings were held with Ebenezer and Caritas Wu Cheng-chung Secondary School in August 2021 to discuss and exchange ideas for the project. Revision to the development scheme was subsequently made for the s.12A application after taking all concerns into account. In 2022, HKU also conducted discussions with the Vice-chairman of the SDC and representatives of the residents of Royalton and Royalton II to seek their views on the proposed development. In view of the outstanding concerns, HKU is currently actively exploring the opportunity for conducting another round of consultation in early 2023, with the hope of allaying the community's concerns.	
Response		
(a)	The comments are noted.	

6.3.2 Item B

Major Comments		Comment
(1)	The construction of Ebenezer’s new facilities and its relocation in Tung Chung site are bounded by an Agreement for Exchange with the landowner of the Tung Chung Site. The suggestion to sell the land of Ebenezer to the Government would lead to the loss of the Tung Chung relocation site. The relocation process would be further delayed and the development of the improved services and facilities that the visually impaired community desperately needs would be hindered.	C21
(2)	During the s.12A application, TIA and environmental assessment (EA) were submitted and relevant government departments had no adverse comment on the technical assessments. The TIA and EA had included some future committed developments which are still at a very early stage of planning and development and the necessary detailed development parameters are still not available for inclusion in the relevant technical impact assessments. It is not practical or necessary to approve the draft OZP only after all of the planned developments have been considered.	
(3)	The proposed rezoning would be great value to the visually impaired community as it would enable the relocation of Ebenezer and the provision of new, improved services and facilities for the visually impaired people.	
Response		
(b)	The comments are noted.	

7. Departmental Consultation

The following government B/Ds have been consulted and their comments have been incorporated in the above paragraphs, where appropriate:

- (a) Secretary for Education;

- (b) Secretary for Health;
- (c) Secretary for Innovation, Technology and Industry;
- (d) University Grants Committee;
- (e) Antiquities and Monuments Office, Development Bureau;
- (f) Commissioner for Heritage's Office;
- (g) District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West and South, Lands Department;
- (h) Chief Architect, Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department;
- (i) Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong East and Heritage, Buildings Department;
- (j) Commissioner for Transport;
- (k) Chief Highway Engineer/Hong Kong, Highways Department;
- (l) Railway Development Office, Highways Department;
- (m) H(GEO), CEDD;
- (n) Project Manager (South), CEDD;
- (o) Director of Environmental Protection;
- (p) Chief Engineer/Hong Kong and Island, Drainage Services Department;
- (q) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department;
- (r) Director of Social Welfare;
- (s) Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation;
- (t) Director of Leisure and Cultural Services;
- (u) Director of Fire Services;
- (v) Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services;
- (w) Commissioner of Police;
- (x) District Officer (South), Home Affairs Department; and
- (y) CTP/UD&L, PlanD.

8. Planning Department's Views

- 8.1 The supportive views of **R1** to **R1770**, **R1901**, **R1925(part)**, **R1927** to **R1942** and the views provided in **R1785(part)** to **R1900(part)**, **R1902**, **R1903(part)** to **R1921(part)**, **R1922** to **R1924**, **R1944**, **R1945(part)** and **R1946 (part)** are noted.
- 8.2 Based on the assessments in paragraph 5 above, PlanD does not support representations **R1771** to **R1784**, **R1785(part)** to **R1900(part)**, **R1903(part)** to **R1921(part)**, **R1925(part)**, **R1926**, **R1943**, **R1945(part)** and **R1946(part)** and considers that the OZP should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

Item A

- (a) The rezoning of the site from "GB" to "G/IC(1)" with maximum building height of 164mPD for the proposed academic buildings is considered appropriate, and other restrictions and requirements for submission of master layout plan for consideration by the Board is considered not necessary. Relevant technical assessments for the indicative scheme in the agreed s.12A application confirmed that the proposed development would not induce insurmountable impacts in respect of development intensity, traffic, landscape, ecological, visual, air ventilation, geotechnical, environmental, drainage and water supply aspects (**R1771** to **R1784**, **R1785(part)** to **R1900(part)**, **R1903(part)** to **R1921(part)**, **R1925(part)**, **R1926**, **R1943**, **R1945(part)** and **R1946(part)**).

Item B

- (b) the rezoning of the site from “G/IC” to “R(C)7” for proposed residential development is considered appropriate. As the lease governing the Site is virtually unrestricted, the submission of a layout plan together with an environmental assessment report to examine the air quality and traffic noise, and a sewerage impact assessment report for consideration of the Board is required to ensure proper implementation of suitable design and mitigation measures for the proposed residential development (**R1925(part)** and **R1926(part)**).

9. Decision Sought

- 9.1 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.
- 9.2 Should the Board decide that no amendment should be made to the Plan to meet the representations, Members are also invited to agree that the Plan, together with its Notes and updated Explanatory Statement, are suitable for submission under section 8 of the Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

10. Attachments

Annex I	Draft Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/20 (reduced size)
Annex II	Schedule of Amendments to the Approved Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/20
Annex III	List of Representers and Commenters
Annex IV	Extract of the Minutes of MPC Meeting held on 24.6.2022
Annex V	Provision of Major GIC Facilities and Open Space in Pok Fu Lam Area
Drawings H-1 to H-9	Indicative Scheme of the Proposed Development Under Item A
Drawings H-10 and H-11	Indicative Scheme of the Proposed Development Under Item B
Plan H-1a and H-1b	Location Plans of Representation Sites
Plans H-2a to H-2d	Site Plan, Aerial Photo and Site Photos of Item A
Plans H-3a to H-3e	Site Plan, Aerial Photo and Site Photos of Item B

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT
FEBRUARY 2023**