

APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT OF PLAN
UNDER SECTION 12A OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

APPLICATION NO. Y/H10/15

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| <u>Applicant</u> | The Incorporated Owners of Yee On represented by Masterplan Limited |
| <u>Plan</u> | Approved Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H10/19 |
| <u>Application Site</u> | Nos. 1, 3, 5, 7, 9-11 and 13-15 Northcote Close, Pok Fu Lam, Hong Kong (Inland Lot (IL) Nos. 7671, 7888 and 7890) |
| <u>Site Area</u> | 5,052m ² |
| <u>Lease</u> | <p>IL 7671</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- private residential purpose- restricted to maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 1,237.041m² and maximum 4 storeys; and site coverage (SC) of 30% for 1 to 2 storeys building, 25% for 3 storeys building and 22.5% for 4 storeys building <p>IL 7888</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- not less than 15 flats for local Government servants- restricted to maximum 5 storeys above a carports storey at ground floor; and SC of 25% for 1 to 3 storeys building, 22.5% for 4 storeys buildings and 20% for 5 storeys building <p>IL 7890</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- private residential purpose excluding service apartment- restricted to maximum GFA of 1,306m², a 5 storeys block of 10 flats and roofed-over area of 2,870 square feet |
| <u>Zonings</u> | <p>“Residential (Group C) 1” (“R(C)1”) (about 98%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- maximum of 3 storeys including carports and maximum building height (BH) of 10.67m, or the height of the existing building, whichever is the greater- for a development with 3 domestic storeys, the maximum plot ratio (PR) and SC are restricted to 0.75 and 25% respectively, or the PR and SC of the existing building, whichever is the greater <p>“Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) (about 2%)¹</p> |
| <u>Proposed Amendments</u> | To rezone the application site (the Site) to “Residential (Group B)” (“R(B)”) or “G/IC” |

¹ The slight encroachment upon “G/IC” zone may be considered as minor boundary adjustment.

1. **The Proposal**

- 1.1 On 29.11.2021, the applicant submitted an application for amendment to the approved Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/19 to rezone the Site (**Plans Z-1 and Z-2**) from mainly “R(C)1” to either “R(B)” as Option 1 or “G/IC” as Option 2. The Site is currently occupied by five blocks of four to five storeys (above one storey of carports) low-rise residential developments built in the 1960s prior to the gazettal of the first Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/1 in 1986.
- 1.2 For Option 1, the applicant proposes to rezone the Site to “R(B)” zone for intensified residential development. The applicant did not propose any development restrictions for the proposed “R(B)” zone but according to the Notes of the OZP for “R(B)” zone, development with 20 domestic storeys or more is restricted to a maximum PR and SC of 5 and 25% respectively. The applicant provides an indicative scheme (**Drawings Z-1 to Z-5**) to illustrate a proposed residential development comprising four blocks with a domestic GFA of 25,260m² (PR 5) (total 300 flats), SC of 25% and BH of 168.1mPD (21 storeys above 2 storeys of carports).
- 1.3 For Option 2, the applicant proposes to rezone the Site to “G/IC” zone in view of the surroundings areas have been dominated by areas zoned “G/IC”, so as to provide a potential alternative site for proposed academic buildings for Faculty of Medicine of the University of Hong Kong (HKU), which was the subject of an application No. Y/H10/13² approved by the Metro Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Town Planning Board (the Board) on 26.11.2021, or other government, institution or community (GIC) uses. The applicant did not propose any development restrictions for the proposed “G/IC” zone but according to the Notes of the OZP for “G/IC” zone, ‘Educational Institution’ use is always permitted and there is no BH, PR or SC restrictions for the “G/IC” zone stipulated on the OZP. The applicant provides an indicative scheme (**Drawings Z-6 to Z-10**) to illustrate a proposed GIC development comprising two blocks with a GFA of 38,700m² (PR 7.66), SC of 60% and BH of 202.9mPD (21 storeys).
- 1.4 The major development parameters of the indicative scheme for each options are as follows:

| Development Parameters | Option 1: rezone to “R(B)” | Option 2: rezone to “G/IC” |
|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| Site Area | 5,052m ² | |
| GFA | not more than 25,260m ² and 1,263m ² for residents recreational club | about 38,700m ² |
| PR | not more than 5 | about 7.66 |
| SC | not more than 25% | not more than 60% |
| No. of Blocks | 4 | 2 |
| BH (Main Roof) | 168.1mPD | 202.9mPD |

² According to the approved application No. Y/H10/13, HKU proposed to rezone an area of about 1.6ha to the east of 3 Sassoon Road from “Green Belt” (“GB”) to “G/IC” with proposed GFA of about 43,000m².

| Development Parameters | Option 1: rezone to “R(B)” | Option 2: rezone to “G/IC” |
|-------------------------------|---|---|
| No. of Storeys | 21 storeys above 2 storeys of carports | 21 storeys |
| No. of Units | 300 | - |
| Average Unit Size | 84.3 m ² | - |
| Private Open Space | not less than 1,012m ² | |
| Parking Spaces | 200 (for private car) 4 (for motorcycle) | 40 (for private car) 2 (for heavy goods vehicle) |
| Loading and Unloading Bays | 3 (for heavy goods vehicle) | 2 (for heavy goods vehicle) |

1.5 In support of the application, the applicant has submitted the following documents:

- (a) Application form received on 29.11.2021 (Appendix I)
- (b) Supplementary Planning Statement (SPS) (Appendix Ia)
- (c) Supplementary Information received on 29.11.2021 providing clarifications on development parameters and replacement pages for the SPS (Appendix Ib)
- (d) Further Information (FI) received on 4.2.2022 providing responses to departmental comments and junction analysis* (Appendix Ic)
- (e) FI received on 4.4.2022 providing responses to departmental comments# (Appendix Id)
- (f) FI received on 8.4.2022 providing response to public comment from HKU# (Appendix Ie)

Remarks:

* accepted but not exempted from publication and recounting requirements

accepted and exempted from publication and recounting requirements

2. **Justifications from the Applicant**

The justifications put forth by the applicant in support of the application are detailed in the SPS at **Appendices Ia** and **Ib**. They are summarised as follows:

Inefficient Use of the Site and Redevelopment of Surrounding Buildings

- (a) the existing residential buildings at the Site, built in 1960s, are outdated for modern standards. The Site is prime for redevelopment and current development intensity is well below that of the surrounding buildings. Higher density residential development or GIC development would be appropriate;
- (b) the existing HKU buildings (e.g. Hong Kong Jockey Club Clinical Research Centre Laboratory Block and HKU Jockey Club Building for Interdisciplinary Research) have visually dominated both ends of the Northcote Close, making the existing buildings out of place. Assuming the HKU buildings along Sassoon Road near the Site will be redeveloped to taller buildings, this would make the existing residential developments at the Site further out of context with the surroundings. Therefore, higher PR than the existing development would be

appropriate for the area;

Alternative to the HKU “GB” zone Development

- (c) by rezoning the Site to “G/IC” zone, it could provide an alternative site to the HKU rezoning application (No. Y/H10/13). The Site could accommodate all the proposed GFA as indicated in the HKU rezoning application;

Additional Decanting Site for HKU

- (d) by rezoning the Site to “G/IC” zone, it would provide an additional site for HKU to decant any remaining uses from the premises along Sassoon Road for smoother transition in uses when redeveloping the existing university buildings;

Other GIC Uses

- (e) by rezoning the Site to “G/IC” zone, the owners would not be restricted to sell the Site to the HKU. There are many different GIC uses that may be appropriate for the Site as permitted under “G/IC” zone of the OZP;

Visual and Traffic

- (f) the application is appropriate as the surrounding context has changed. Increasing the development potential of the Site would be more visually compatible with the surrounding buildings without negative visual impact; and
- (g) the traffic statement (Appendix 3 of **Appendix Ia**) demonstrates that the traffic generated by either options are insignificant and should not cause significant traffic impact to the surrounding road network.

3. Compliance with the “Owner’s Consent/Notification” Requirements

The applicant is the Incorporated Owners of Yee On for the residential development in 13-15 Northcote Close (IL 7890) (**Plan Z-2**). The applicant is not a “current land owner” but has complied with the requirements as set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Satisfying the “Owner’s Consent/Notification” Requirements under Sections 12A and 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 31A) by posting site notice and giving notification. Detailed information would be deposited at the meeting for Members’ inspection.

4. Previous Application

There is no previous application at the Site.

5. Similar Application

There is no similar application for amendment to OZP from “R(C)1” to “R(B)” or “G/IC” within the Pok Fu Lam OZP.

6. The Site and Its Surrounding Areas (Plans Z-1 to Z-3 and Site Photos on Plans Z-4 to Z-5)

6.1 The Site:

- (a) is currently occupied by five blocks of four to five storeys (above one storey of carports) low-rise residential developments; and
- (b) is accessible via Northcote Close.

6.2 The surrounding areas have the following characteristics:

- (a) it is surrounded by various existing HKU developments in areas zoned “G/IC”, such as HKU Jockey Club Building for Interdisciplinary Research and Patrick Manson Building in the north and Hong Kong Jockey Club Clinical Research Centre Laboratory Block to its southwest. The Caritas Wu Cheng-chung Secondary School is to its south; and
- (b) several low-rise residential developments in areas zoned “R(C)1” along Sassoon Road to its further southwest.

7. Planning Intention

The planning intention of the “R(C)” zone is intended primarily 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.

8. Comments from Relevant Government Departments

- 8.1 The following Government departments have been consulted and their views are summarised as follows:

Policy

8.1.1 Comments of the Secretary for Food and Health (SFH):

- (a) raises objection to the applicant’s proposal of an alternative site for proposed academic buildings for the HKU Faculty of Medicine, but no comment on Option 1 and Option 2 for other GIC facilities;
- (b) HKU has no academic development plan in the Site proposed by the applicant. HKU was neither approached by the applicant prior to the application nor involved in this application. In fact, the Site is considered inadequate to accommodate the teaching and learning requirements set out by HKU for their medium-term healthcare teaching facilities projects;

- (c) by way of background, as stated in the 2018 Policy Address, the Government will increase the number of healthcare training places in preparation for the tight manpower situation of the healthcare profession. To expand the capacity for relevant professional healthcare training of the University Grants Committee-funded universities, the Government has earmarked about \$20 billion for short-, medium- and long-term works projects to upgrade and increase the teaching facilities. Amongst others, HKU has proposed, as a medium-term project, the construction of a new academic buildings at the “GB” area to the east of 3 Sassoon Road; and
- (d) the Legislative Council approved the funding proposal of the consultancy study for the construction of new academic buildings on an extension site to the east of 3 Sassoon Road at its Finance Committee meeting on 8.10.2021.

Land Administration

8.1.2 Comments of the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West and South, Lands Department (DLO/HKW&S, LandsD):

- (a) the proposed developments/development intensity under Option 1 and Option 2, as suggested by the indicative schemes of the applicant, do not comply with the existing lease conditions; and
- (b) under the Pok Fu Lam Moratorium, LandsD will not process lease modification applications which will result in greater development intensity, unless the Chief Executive in Council orders otherwise. In this respect, no such application for the Site has been received by LandsD so far.

Transport

8.1.3 Comments of the Commissioner for Transport (C for T):

raises objection to the application as the applicant did not provide sufficient information in the traffic impact assessment for the planning application. Detailed comments are as follows:

- (a) an appropriate vehicular access proposal for both Options 1 and 2 should be considered and included in the application to ensure that the proposed development is technically feasible from traffic engineering perspective. In addition, the assessment of the capacity, estimated traffic flow and maneuvering of vehicles in the nearby road network/junctions is required. In particular, for this case, in the view that the proposed development will generate additional traffic flow on Northcote Close, the applicant should critically review the existing road layout of Northcote Close against with the estimated traffic flow, and advise if any road improvement works would be required at Northcote Close in the planning

application;

- (b) the information of the provisions of the internal transport facilities for both Options 1 and 2 is still outstanding in applicant's submission. The applicant should demonstrate the proposed internal transport facilities are in compliance with Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines and could be accommodated within the Site; and
- (c) the applicant is required to provide the relevant traffic information as stated above for further review.

Urban Design and Visual

8.1.4 Comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD (CTP/UD&L, PlanD):

the Pok Fu Lam area is generally hilly, sloping from the east towards the sea in the west. The Site is currently occupied by low-rise residential developments and surrounded by medium-rise to high-rise GIC developments and low-rise to medium-rise residential developments with mixed BHs, interspersed with stretches of natural vegetated slopes. Compared with the current low-rise residential developments on the Site, both the proposed residential development (Option 1) and the proposed GIC development (Option 2) constitute a pronounced increase in scale and development intensity. However, there is no sufficient information in the submission to demonstrate that the proposals would not induce significant adverse visual impact on the surrounding areas.

8.1.5 Comments of the Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2, Architectural Services Department (CA/CMD2, ArchSD):

it is noted that proposed residential development (Option 1) comprises four blocks with BH of 168.1mPD and the proposed GIC development (Option 2) comprises two blocks with BH of 202.9mPD, which are about 65.5% and 99.8% higher than the maximum BH of 101.57mPD permissible under the current "R(C)1" zone (i.e. 90.9mPD at Northcote Close plus 10.67m). It is considered undesirable from visual impact point of view.

Environmental, Drainage and Sewerage

8.1.6 Comments of the Director of Environmental Protection:

no environmental information has been provided in the application submission. As the Site is in the vicinity of Pok Fu Lam Road and Sassoon Road which are Primary Distributor and District Distributor Roads respectively, the proposed residential development under Option 1 may be subject to potential road traffic noise impact. Also, the additional sewage loadings due to the proposed intensified residential development or the proposed academic development may bring about

potential sewerage impact on the downstream sewers and need any necessary upgrading of the sewers. To facilitate the consideration of environmental acceptability of the proposals, the applicant is requested to provide technical assessments on traffic noise impact and sewerage impact for the proposals.

8.1.7 Comments of the Chief Engineer/Hong Kong & Islands, Drainage Services Department:

it is noted that the applicant will only provide sewerage impact assessment should the application be accepted. However, without the sewerage impact assessment, a conclusion would not be drawn whether there would be any adverse impacts on the existing public drainage system, and whether any improvement works would be required. The same rationale applies to drainage impact assessment. Detailed comments at **Appendix II**.

Water Supplies

8.1.8 Comments of the Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department (CE/C, WSD):

the applicant shall submit a water supply impact assessment (WSIA) report for both options for WSD's consideration. It is noted that the applicant would complete the WSIA report in due course should the application be accepted. The applicant is reminded that the adequacy of water supply to the Site is subject to the acceptance of WSIA by WSD.

Geotechnical

8.1.9 Comments of the Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (H(GEO), CEDD):

Geotechnical Planning Review Report (GPRR) should be submitted with the application (not after the approval of the application). However, such report is not included in the submission and therefore H(GEO),CEDD is unable to provide comment on the application. Detailed comments at **Appendix II**.

8.2 The following Government departments have no objection to/no comment on the application:

- (a) Secretary for Education;
- (b) Chief Highway Engineer/Hong Kong, Highways Department;
- (c) Chief Engineer/Railway Development 2-2, Railway Development Office, Highways Department;
- (d) Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong West, Buildings Department;
- (e) Project Manager (South), CEDD;
- (f) Director of Fire Services;
- (g) Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services;
- (h) Director of Leisure and Cultural Services;

- (i) Commissioner of Police; and
- (j) District Officer (South), Home Affairs Department.

9. Public Comments Receiving During Statutory Publication Periods

- 9.1 During the statutory public inspection periods, a total of 228 public comments were received, including 8 supporting and 220 opposing. A full set of public comments received on the application is deposited at the Secretariat of the Board for Members' inspection and reference.
- 9.2 The supporting comments (samples at **Appendix IIIa**) were submitted by a Southern District Council Member, the Incorporated Owners of the Aurora Building (i.e. 1, 3 and 5 Northcote Close, IL 7671) and individuals. Their major views are summarised as follows:
- (a) the Site is surrounded by high density institutional uses of the medical school of HKU along Sassoon Road and the new complex at "GB" (Application No. Y/H10/13). The low density residential developments at the Site is no longer compatible in scale nor appropriate with the changing surroundings;
 - (b) the planned HKU developments will overshadow the low-rise properties at the Site, depriving them of sunlight and views of greenery; and
 - (c) the application allows better land use in view of shortage of developable land, open a pathway for HKU to acquire the site for expansion, to ensure a holistic and integrated development for the area. The proposed development intensity has minor impact on the surrounding GIC uses.
- 9.3 The opposing comments (samples at **Appendix IIIb**) were submitted by HKU and individuals. Their major views are summarised as follows:
- (a) the Site is considered not a feasible alternative to HKU proposed academic buildings as it is unable to accommodate the building footprint and GFA required;
 - (b) support early implementation of the HKU's proposed academic buildings previously approved by the Board in view of the shortage of medical facilities and staffs, and object to the proposed "G/IC" zone for using the Site as alternative for HKU's proposed academic buildings due to multiple ownerships and unable to meet the imminent training need;
 - (c) the higher density residential development would bring adverse traffic, environmental and visual impacts to the area; and
 - (d) lack of technical assessments and justifications for higher density residential development.

10. Planning Considerations and Assessments

- 10.1 The applicant proposes to rezone the Site to either “R(B)” for intensified residential development (Option 1) or “G/IC” for GIC development (Option 2). The Site is currently occupied by five blocks of four to five storeys (above one storey of carports) low-rise residential developments built in the 1960s, which is prior the gazettal of the first statutory plan in 1986.

Technical Feasibility

- 10.2 The “R(C)1” zone is restricted to a maximum height of 3 storeys including carports and a maximum BH, PR and SC of 10.67m, 0.75 and 25% respectively and intended primarily for low to medium-rise and low to medium-density residential developments. Compared with the existing low-rise residential developments ranging four to five storeys at the Site, the applicant proposed to increase the development intensity of the Site for both proposed residential development with 21 storeys above 2 storeys of carports (PR 5 and SC 25%) (Option 1) and proposed GIC development with 21 storeys (PR 7.66 and SC 60%) (Option 2). While both residential and GIC uses are considered not incompatible comparing with the existing residential developments at the Site and surrounding GIC developments as mentioned in paragraph 6.2(a) above from land use perspective, CTP/UD&L and CA/CMD2, ArchSD considered the applicant’s proposals would constitute a pronounced increase in both scale and development intensity, and are undesirable from visual impact point of view respectively.
- 10.3 The applicant has submitted a traffic impact assessment and considered that there is no significant traffic impact as a result of the rezoning proposals. However, C for T objected to the application and considered the applicant did not provide sufficient information in applicant’s traffic impact assessment. Relevant technical assessments including traffic noise impact, water supplies, drainage, sewerage and geotechnical aspects have not been submitted to demonstrate the rezoning proposals under both Options 1 and 2 would not induce significant adverse impacts to the surroundings.

GIC use under Option 2

- 10.4 The applicant proposed that the Site could be used as alternative site for HKU development. SFH objected applicant’s proposal of an alternative site for proposed academic buildings for the HKU Faculty of Medicine. SFH also indicated that HKU has no academic development plan in the Site and the Site is considered inadequate to accommodate the teaching and learning requirements set out by HKU.
- 10.5 Apart from possible HKU development, the applicant indicated that the Site could be used for other GIC uses. The Site is surrounded by various existing GIC developments as mentioned in paragraph 6.2(a) above, rezoning the Site to “G/IC” is considered not incompatible from land use perspective. However, the applicant did not provide development proposals or strong justifications for other specific GIC uses to be accommodated at the Site.

Public Comments

- 10.6 Regarding the views of the public comments received as mentioned in paragraph 9 above, the planning assessments in paragraphs 10.2 to 10.5 above and departmental comments in paragraph 8 above are relevant and the applicant has submitted a response to the public comment from HKU (**Appendix Ie**).

11. Planning Department's Views

- 11.1 Based on the assessments made in paragraph 10 and having taken into account the public comments mentioned in paragraph 9 above, the Planning Department does not support the application for the following reasons:
- (a) the applicant failed to demonstrate in the submission that the rezoning proposals for “R(B)” or “G/IC” would not have adverse impacts to the surroundings; and
 - (b) there is no strong reason to rezone the application site to “R(B)” zone for intensified residential development or “G/IC” zone for GIC development.
- 11.2 Alternatively, should the Committee decide to agree or partially agree to the application, an amendment to the approved Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/19 would be submitted to the Committee for approval prior to gazetting under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance.

12. Decision Sought

- 12.1 The Committee is invited to consider the application and decide whether to agree, partially agree, or not to agree to the application.
- 12.2 Should the Committee decide not to agree or to partially agree to the application, Members are invited to advise what reason(s) for the decision should be given to the applicant.

13. Attachments

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Appendix I | Application form received on 29.11.2021 |
| Appendix Ia | SPS |
| Appendix Ib | Supplementary information received on 29.11.2021 |
| Appendix Ic | FI received on 4.2.2022 |
| Appendix Id | FI received on 4.4.2022 |
| Appendix Ie | FI received on 8.4.2022 |
| Appendix II | Detailed departmental comments |
| Appendices IIIa and IIIb | Public comments |
| Drawings Z-1 to Z-5 | Indicative scheme for Option 1 |
| Drawings Z-6 to Z-10 | Indicative scheme for Option 2 |

| | |
|-------------------------|---------------|
| Plan Z-1 | Location plan |
| Plan Z-2 | Site plan |
| Plan Z-3 | Aerial photo |
| Plans Z-4 to Z-5 | Site photos |

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT
APRIL 2022**