

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

TPB Paper No. 10999
For Consideration by the
Town Planning Board on 14.3.2025

CONSIDERATION OF FURTHER REPRESENTATIONS
NO. TPB/R/S/H10/22-F1 TO F1861 ON PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO
THE DRAFT POK FU LAM OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/10/22 ARISING
FROM CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS
ON THE DRAFT OUTLINE ZONING PLAN

**CONSIDERATION OF FURTHER REPRESENTATIONS
NO. TPB/R/S/H10/22-F1 TO F1861 ON PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO
THE DRAFT POK FU LAM OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/H10/22 ARISING
FROM CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS
ON THE DRAFT OUTLINE ZONING PLAN**

Subject of Further Representations	Further Representatives (No. TPB/R/S/H10/22-) Total: 1,861
<p><u>Further Amendment Item A:</u> Rezoning of a site between Pok Fu Lam Road (PFLR) and Victoria Road from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Global Innovation Centre” (“OU(Global Innovation Centre)”) to “Undetermined” (“U”)</p> <p><u>Further Amendments to the Notes</u> Revision to the covering Notes to incorporate development restrictions for “U” zone</p> <p>Revision to the Schedule of Uses and the Remarks of the Notes for the “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) zone to delete all the provisions related to the “OU(Global Innovation Centre)” zone</p>	<p><u>Support Further Amendment Item A and Revisions to the Notes (Total: 2)</u></p> <p>F1: The University of Hong Kong (HKU) F2: Individual</p>
	<p><u>Oppose Further Amendment Item A and Revision to the Covering Notes, and Support Revision to the Schedule of Uses and the Notes for the “OU(Global Innovation Centre)” Zone (Total: 1)</u></p> <p>F3: The Ebenezer School and Home for the Visually Impaired Limited</p>
	<p><u>Oppose Further Amendment Item A and/or Revision to the Covering Notes (Total: 1,858)</u></p> <p>F4: Ebenezer New Hope School</p> <p><u>Companies and Incorporated Owners (IO) (5)</u> F5: Goreway Limited F6: Island South Property Management Limited F7: Chairman of IO of Woodbury Court F8: Chairman of IO of Royalton II F9: Chairman of Owners Corporation of Seascape</p> <p><u>Individuals (1,852)</u> F10 to F1861: Individuals</p>

Note: The names of all further representers are attached at **Annex III**. Soft copies of the submissions are sent to the Town Planning Board (the Board/TPB) Members (Members) via electronic means; and are also available for public inspection at the Board’s website at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/plan_making/S_H10_22.html and the Planning Enquiry Counters of the Planning Department (PlanD) in North Point and Sha Tin. A set of hard copies is deposited at the Board’s Secretariat for Members’ inspection.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 On 22.3.2024, the draft Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/22 (the draft OZP) (**Annex I**), which incorporated major zoning amendments including (i) rezoning a site between PFLR and Victoria Road from “Green Belt” (“GB”), “Residential (Group C)6” (“R(C)6”) and area shown as ‘Road’ to “OU(Global Innovation Centre)” to facilitate the development of the proposed Global Innovation Centre (the Centre) by HKU for deep technology research, (ii) rezoning land to reflect the existing alignment of Victoria Road, and (iii) rezoning land to reflect the as-built condition and the land grant boundary of Wah Fu Estate, was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). During the two-month exhibition period, a total of 3,677 valid representations were received.
- 1.2 After consideration of representations in three representation hearing sessions on 1, 4 and 5.11.2024, the Board decided on 29.11.2024 to partially meet 3,390 representations (**R55 (part), R206 (part), R251 to R3189, R3191 to R3372, R3374 to R3523, R3525 to R3615 and R3634 to R3659**) by proposing an amendment to the draft OZP to rezone the Further Amendment Item A Site (the Site) from “OU(Global Innovation Centre)” to “U” with corresponding revisions to the Notes of the draft OZP (the Proposed Amendments), and decided not to uphold the remaining opposing representations. Members generally considered that the grounds and proposals of the representations had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10987 as well as the presentation and responses made by the government representatives during the representation hearing. The TPB Paper No. 10987 and the minutes of the aforesaid meetings are deposited at the Board’s Secretariat for Members’ inspection. They are also available at the Board’s website¹.
- 1.3 On 13.12.2024, the Proposed Amendments to the draft OZP were exhibited for public inspection under section 6C(2) of the Ordinance. A set of the Schedule of Proposed Amendments, Amendment Plan No. R/S/H10/22-A1 and corresponding proposed amendments to the Notes (including covering Notes) and the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the draft OZP are at **Annex II**. Upon expiry of the three-week exhibition period on 3.1.2025, a total of 1,861 valid further representations (FRs) (**F1 to F1861**) were received.
- 1.4 On 18.10.2024 and 17.1.2025, the Board agreed to apply to the Secretary for Development (SDEV) for three extensions of the statutory time limits for submission of the draft OZP to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval for a total of six months from 23.10.2024 to 22.4.2025 under sections 8(7), 8(8)(a) and 8(8)(b) of the Ordinance. On 22.10.2024 and 3.2.2025, the SDEV agreed to the extensions².
- 1.5 In accordance with section 6F(1) of the Ordinance, the Board shall hold a meeting to consider the FRs. On 7.3.2025, the Board agreed to consider all the FRs

¹ TPB Paper No. 10987 and the minutes of the relevant Board meetings are available at the Board’s website at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/plan_making/S_H10_22.html.

² In accordance with section 8(4)(a) of the Ordinance, the Board is required to submit the draft OZP together with the schedule of the representations to the CE in C for approval within 5 months after the 2-month plan exhibition period, i.e. on or before 22.10.2024, unless SDEV agrees to extend the specified period. The Ordinance provides that SDEV may extend the 5-month period up to three times, for 2 months each time.

collectively in one group. This Paper is to provide the Board with information for the consideration of the FRs. The index of FRs is at **Annex III**.

2. Background

- 2.1 To develop Hong Kong into an international innovation and technology (I&T) hub as outlined in the ‘Outline of the 14th Five-Year Plan for National Economic and Social Development of the People’s Republic of China and the Long-Range Objectives Through the Year 2035’ (the National 14th Five-Year Plan)³, and to consolidate Hong Kong’s leading position in basic research, the 2021 Policy Address (PA) announced that the Government has accepted in principle the proposal from HKU to reserve a site in Pok Fu Lam for construction of deep technology research facilities. To take forward the PA initiative, HKU commissioned a rezoning study to formulate an Indicative Scheme for the Centre, which will include research, office, conference and exhibition uses, Scholars’ Residence/Staff Quarters, and other supporting facilities, while confirming its technical feasibility. With no adverse comments or objections to the development proposal and technical assessments of the Centre at the Site from relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds), the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Board agreed on 1.3.2024 to rezone the Site from “GB” (4.12ha), “R(C)6” (0.51ha) and area shown as ‘Road’ (0.09ha) to “OU(Global Innovation Centre)”, subject to a maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 222,720m² (including a maximum domestic GFA of 10,620m²) and a maximum building height (BH) of 158mPD. The draft OZP was subsequently exhibited for public inspection, as detailed in paragraph 1.1 above.
- 2.2 On 3.10.2024, HKU released a press statement to inform the public of its decision to take some time to strategically amend the development plan of the Centre to address stakeholders’ concerns reflected in the representations to the Board as much as practicable and to step up engagement with the community through various channels to improve the development proposal and provide timely project updates in the upcoming process. In view of the HKU’s decision, the Government issued a press release on the same day to welcome and agree to HKU to suitably revise the development scale and layout of the Centre in order to respond to stakeholders’ views, and to enhance its communication with the community and maintain positive interactions with stakeholders, in particular to explain the site selection of Pok Fu Lam and how the proposed development would benefit the neighbourhood. HKU’s commitment and the Government’s views on it are detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10987 and minutes of the meetings.
- 2.3 After thorough consideration of the representations and the oral submissions made by the representers and/or their representatives during the three-day representation hearing, as well as the views and responses of relevant B/Ds, the Board decided to accept the proposed rezoning of the Site from “OU(Global Innovation Centre)” to “U” in the interim to partially meet 3,390 representations. The major views of Members expressed during the deliberation on 29.11.2024 are as follows:
- (a) the “U” zoning was appropriate as an interim measure to allow time for HKU

³ The National 14th Five-Year Plan, approved by the National People’s Congress in March 2021, supports Hong Kong in enhancing, establishing, and developing into, among other things, an international I&T centre.

to review and adjust the development proposal for the Centre and consult the local community in response to the views expressed by the representers;

- (b) as part of the review, HKU should consider alternative sites in Pok Fu Lam and other areas. If HKU concluded after review that the Centre should be in Pok Fu Lam, HKU should consider whether the Site or other sites, including but not limited to the adjoining “R(C)6” site, was more suitable for achieving HKU’s objective;
- (c) HKU should critically review the necessity and floorspace requirements for various components of the Centre, including accommodation and conference facilities, and consider optimising the utilisation of HKU’s existing premises/facilities to meet such needs;
- (d) HKU should enhance the design of the Centre, including reducing density and bulk, lowering building height and increasing setback from neighbouring buildings;
- (e) it was necessary for HKU to minimise traffic impacts on the neighbouring community and residential developments during the construction and operation phases. HKU should consider advancing the construction Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) with proposed mitigation measures to address local residents’ concerns;
- (f) the environmental impacts, tree felling, disturbance to natural habitats and safety concerns associated with the laboratories should be properly addressed by HKU. Tree compensation should be enhanced and more green spaces should be provided;
- (g) additional planning and design merits and facilities that might benefit the local community should be incorporated into the revised development proposal;
- (h) there was a need for HKU to conduct bottom-up and two-way communication with the stakeholders including local residents, the Ebenezer and green groups at the next round of public engagement; and
- (i) given the pressing need to develop the Centre, HKU should prepare a timeline together with the revised proposal for consideration by relevant B/Ds.

2.4 In view of the above, the Board considered it inappropriate to revert the zoning of the Site to “GB”, maintain the “OU(Global Innovation Centre)” zoning, or propose other specific zoning before the HKU’s submission of a revised proposal. Thus, it was prudent to rezone the Site to “U” in the interim, serving as a stopgap arrangement pending the HKU’s completion of the review. A press release was issued by the Board on 29.11.2024 to explain the above considerations and decision on the representations⁴.

⁴ The press release issued by the Board is available at <https://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/202411/29/P2024112900435.htm>

3. The Site and Its Surrounding Areas

The Site and Its Surrounding Areas (Plans FH-1 to FH-4f)

- 3.1 The Site (a piece of government land of about 4.72ha) is an elongated vegetated slope between PFLR and Victoria Road with a level difference of about 80m and five channelised watercourses running through it. Its surrounding areas are predominately occupied by educational facilities of HKU, government, institutional and community facilities such as Queen Mary Hospital (QMH), the Ebenezer School (which is intended to be redeveloped for private residential development after the relocation of the Ebenezer School to Tung Chung) and the Ebenezer New Hope School (ENHS) as well as residential developments on the slopes along PFLR and Victoria Road. Since the Board's decision of rezoning the Site to "U", there has been no change in planning circumstances to the Site and its surrounding areas.

"U" Zone

- 3.2 The "U" zone is an interim land use zoning with planning control measures pending determination of the long-term use and development parameters of the Site after the HKU's submission of a revised proposal, which would go through public consultation and the Government's examination, and be subject to another round of statutory town planning procedures for rezoning. To ensure adequate control during the interim period, according to the covering Notes of the draft OZP, all uses or development within the "U" zone require planning permission from the Board, except some public works to be implemented or coordinated by the Government.

4. The Further Representations

4.1 Subject of Further Representations

- 4.1.1 Among the 1,861 valid FRs received, two submitted by HKU and an individual (**F1** and **F2**) support Further Amendment Item A and the revisions to the covering Notes to incorporate development restrictions for "U" zone, as well as the revision to the Schedule of Uses and the Notes for the "OU" zone to delete all provisions related to the "OU(Global Innovation Centre)" zone. One submission from the Ebenezer School and Home for the Visually Impaired Limited (**F3**) opposes Further Amendment Item A and the revision to the covering Notes and supports the revision to the Schedule of Uses and the Notes for the "OU(Global Innovation Centre)" zone. There are 1,858 submissions opposing Further Amendment Item A and/or the revision to the covering Notes, including one from the ENHS (**F4**), five from companies and IOs (**F5** to **F9**), and 1,852 from individuals (**F10** to **F1861**).
- 4.1.2 The major grounds, views and proposals of the FRs, and PlanD's responses in consultation with the relevant B/Ds, are summarised in paragraphs 4.2 and 4.3 below. The major grounds and views of the FRs are indexed at **Annex IV**.

4.2 Major Grounds, Views, and Proposals of and Responses to FRs

Supportive FRs (2)

4.2.1 The major grounds and views from the two supportive FRs (**F1** and **F2**) are summarised below.

Major Grounds/ Views	
(FS1)	The Centre, which will attract talents and researchers from various fields worldwide to share their knowledge, will be the first research facility in Hong Kong dedicated to upstream deep technology. It aligns with the local and national policy goals to develop Hong Kong into an international I&T hub while consolidating its strength in upstream basic research. The Centre will complement industry-oriented activities in other I&T hubs in Hong Kong and the Greater Bay Area.
(FS2)	The Centre aims to provide an enabling environment for scholars and academics to engage in transdisciplinary frontier research, such as sustainable energy, quantum technology, and artificial intelligence. Its strategic location near the HKU campuses, QMH and Cyberport will foster synergies amongst these institutions and create a self-sustainable research and development ecosystem in the area. Given the urgency to fostering I&T development, it is more reasonable to develop the Centre close to the HKU campuses, ensuring that its operations and research are well-supported by the scholars already working at HKU, thereby generating prompt, tangible and transferrable research results. HKU has conducted technical assessments for the Centre, demonstrating that there are no insurmountable technical problems or impacts arising from the proposed development at the Site.
(FS3)	HKU has received valuable feedback on the Centre's development from various stakeholders during the representation hearing in November 2024 and has taken note of concerns regarding environmental impact or other technical aspects of the project. HKU is currently assessing the feasibility of the suggestions and proposals received and will step up efforts to engage with stakeholders. The proposed scheme will be strategically amended, such as reducing the density of the development, increasing the setback area from neighbouring buildings, designating more green space, etc., to minimise adverse impacts on the surroundings and the community. Technical assessments will be conducted again as necessary. Additionally, HKU will pay special attention to construction planning to further minimise impacts on the neighbourhood.
(FS4)	Support rezoning of the Site to an "U" zone, which could allow time for HKU to review the development plan and consider the comments and suggestions made by Members and the public.
Responses	
(a)	The supportive views, consistent with those stated in the supportive representations related to the Original Amendment Item A and

	expressed by HKU's representatives at the representation hearing, are noted.
--	--

Opposing FRs (1,859)

- 4.2.2 A total of 1,859 FRs (**F3 to F1861**) oppose Further Amendment Item A and/or the revision to the covering Notes and one of them also supports the revision to the Schedule of Uses and the Notes for the "OU(Global Innovation Centre)" zone (**F3**). Among the 1,859 opposing FRs, 1,789 were submitted by individuals in standard formats (**F10 to F1798**).
- 4.2.3 The Further Amendment Item A is to rezone the Site from "OU(Global Innovation Centre)" to "U". The intention and rationale for rezoning the Site to "U" have been elaborated in the TPB Paper No. 10987 and during representation hearing meetings and deliberation session which were recorded in the minutes.
- 4.2.4 Majority of the grounds/views in the opposing FRs are similar to those raised during the representation stage, which have been responded to in the TPB Paper No. 10987 and considered by the Board in the three representation hearing meetings on 1, 4 and 5.11.2024, as well as the deliberation session on 29.11.2024. The B/Ds consulted have no further comments on the FRs, as B/Ds' comments have been detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10987 and recorded in the minutes of the meetings. Major grounds/views/alternative proposals in these opposing FRs, and government responses are summarised in paragraphs 4.2.5 to 4.2.14 below.
- 4.2.5 *Strategic Planning, Site Selection and Alternative Locations*

Major Grounds/ Views	
(FA1)	<p>Although the development of the Centre was announced in the 2021 PA, the Centre (currently being planned and developed in the Pok Fu Lam area) does not align with national, regional and territorial planning and development strategies (particularly the Northern Metropolis (NM) Development Strategy) and the subsequent PAs which strongly advocate for establishing Hong Kong's future international I&T hub in the NM.</p> <p>Placing the Centre outside this I&T hub is inconsistent with the Board's decision to overrule objections to the San Tin Technopole OZP, which aims to create a critical mass to foster I&T development, meet the increasing demand of land for I&T development, and deepen collaboration with the Mainland and the world.</p>
(FA2)	The policy direction to reserve a site in Pok Fu Lam for constructing deep technology research facilities by HKU has unnecessarily influenced the Board's statutory function to consider the siting of the Centre independently and professionally.
(FA3)	The proximity of the Centre to HKU's existing campus is not essential in this advanced technology era of 5G and 6G. There are many

	successful examples of satellite campuses of top universities around the world. The convenience of HKU's location should not override the 'Town Planning Board Guidelines for Applications for Development within the "Green Belt" Zone under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance' (TPB PG-No.10) and should not be at the expense of the Pok Fu Lam community.
(FA4)	There are alternative locations to consider, such as San Tin Technopole and the Loop, the "R(C)6" site adjacent to the "U" zone, Cyberport, land next to the International School Foundation, and the Stanley Ho Sports Centre. HKU should also explore better utilization of its premises with low occupancy rates. However, HKU did not adequately evaluate these alternative locations and premises.
(FA5)	A FR (F5) strongly objects to the Board's conclusion that HKU should consider whether the "R(C)6" site adjoining the "U" zone would be more suitable for the Centre. There is insufficient justification for locating the Centre in a residential area. The Centre would negatively impact the visual landscape of PFLR. Relocating the Centre to the "R(C)6" site is unlikely to mitigate the impacts on neighbouring communities, accommodate setbacks for road improvement to enhance traffic flow, reduce building bulk, or provide opportunities for more compensatory planting.
Responses	
(a)	<p>In response to (FA1) to (FA5):</p> <p>According to the Innovation, Technology and Industry Bureau (ITIB), I&T is a major driver that can spur economic development and create new quality productive forces. The Government promulgated the Hong Kong Innovation and Technology Development Blueprint (the I&T Blueprint) in end-2022, setting out four development directions and eight major strategies, which include enhancement to the I&T ecosystem and promotion of interactive development across the upstream, midstream and downstream sectors.</p> <p>The strategic directions of the I&T Blueprint can be realized through various forms, locations, and projects by different stakeholders. The San Tin Technopole, the Loop, and Cyberport are by no means the only suitable and/or available platforms for achieving the Government's I&T initiatives.</p> <p>To position Hong Kong as an international hub for I&T, the 2021 PA has indicated the Government's in-principle acceptance of HKU's proposal to reserve a site in Pok Fu Lam for the construction of facilities dedicated to deep technology research. ITIB affirms that the Centre aligns with the policy goals to enhance Hong Kong's status as an international hub for research and development while consolidating its leadership in basic research, and respects the choice of site and development proposal put forward by the HKU. ITIB also takes the view that the Centre is a distinct initiative pursued by HKU concerning mainly focused basic research in the upstream and related</p>

	<p>teaching/academic facilities near its existing campus, while government-initiated initiatives such as San Tin Technopole in the NM have different foci and functions in the I&T ecosystem and are not intended to supersede or substitute for the Centre.</p> <p>According to HKU, while the Site is considered the most suitable location, it would also explore alternative locations, such as San Tin Technopole and other sites in Pok Fu Lam area (where the research atmosphere is well-established with the presence of QMH and Cyberport, which create clustering and synergy effects, facilitating collaboration across the research and academic sectors). Besides, HKU will review the necessity and floorspace requirements of various components of the Centre and explore the potential for shared facilities.</p> <p>Regarding the question on whether the Board was obliged to follow the policy direction of the 2021 PA and accept HKU's proposal, the Chairperson of the Board explained in the meetings that even though the proposed development originated from the 2021 PA, the Executive Council's subsequent agreement-in-principle for the land grant to HKU was conditional upon HKU being able to secure the Board's approval for the rezoning proposal amongst other things. Hence, the Board with its statutory functions was fully entitled to consider the rezoning proposal independently and professionally. HKU, as the project proponent of the Centre, is obligated to resolve all technical issues to the satisfaction of relevant government departments and address public concerns. The Board, as a statutory body, would exercise its independent judgement to consider the amendments to the OZP and the representations in the interest of society as a whole.</p> <p>In reviewing its proposal and advancing the project, HKU should consider alternative locations in Pok Fu Lam and other areas, such as the NM. If HKU concludes after review that the Centre should be in Pok Fu Lam, it should assess whether the Site or another area, including but not limited to the adjoining undeveloped "R(C) 6" site, would be more suitable for achieving HKU's objectives while minimising impacts on neighbouring communities.</p> <p>The above grounds and views regarding strategic planning, site selection, and alternative locations were raised, responded to, and considered during the consideration of representations by the Board. Detailed HKU's and Government's responses to these issues have been previously provided in the TPB Paper No. 10987 and recorded in the minutes of the meetings, which are extracted in Annex V.</p> <p>Regarding TPB PG-No.10 raised in (FA3) above, responses for (FC1) below are also relevant.</p>
--	--

4.2.6 The “U” Zoning

Major Grounds/ Views	
(FB1)	<p><u>No Legal Basis</u></p> <p>The Board does not have the legal authority under section 6B(8) of the Ordinance to propose an amendment to the plan that only “partially” meets a representation. The Ordinance clearly states that the Board must decide whether or not to propose amendment to the plan in the manner proposed in the representation, or to propose amendment to the plan in any other manner that, in the Board’s opinion, will meet the representation. Since no representer proposed that the plan be amended to include an “U” zoning for the Site and PlanD’s proposal of rezoning the Site to “U” was not a representation, there was no representation which could be considered as being met by the proposed “U” zoning. The decision to rezone the Site to “U” therefore has no legal basis under section 6B(8) of the Ordinance.</p> <p>The agreement between the HKU and the Hong Kong Government, as suggested by the two press releases on 3.10.2024, raises concerns about the Board’s ability to exercise independent planning judgement.</p> <p>Additionally, the minutes of the meetings do not adequately describe the Board’s decision-making process or explain how the representations had been “partially met” by the proposed amendment. The Board must clearly demonstrate that it has considered all relevant submissions and provide adequate reasons for not accepting the submissions made. The decision also erroneously states that some representations had been “partially met” by rezoning the Site to “U”, even though the representers had clearly requested to retain the “GB” and “R(C)6” zones and made no reference to the “U” zoning in their representations. In fact, the representers had stated that they were against the “U” zoning during the representation hearing.</p> <p>The Board’s statutory duties include designating an appropriate zoning and setting development parameters for a site. By deciding on an “U” zoning, the Board failed to fulfil this duty, as the “U” zoning does not set appropriate development parameters. As per the recent High Court Judgment (HCAL 1258/2023), “traditional administrative law principles include that a decision-maker exercising a statutory power must ask himself the right question and take reasonable steps to acquaint himself with the relevant information to enable him to answer it correctly”. If the Board did not feel it could set appropriate development parameters for the Site, its only option was to decide not to propose an amendment to the plan.</p> <p>The High Court’s recent decision to overturn development at the Fanling Golf Course established a critical legal precedent for safeguarding land with ecological interest. The court ruled that rezoning decisions must adhere to stringent environmental assessments and comprehensive public consultation processes. Rezoning the Site to “U” without addressing environmental risks or</p>

	<p>community objections exposes the project to judicial review, which could result in costly litigation, further delaying development programme and wasting public resources.</p> <p>Given the strong views of the representers and Members on the suitability of the Site for development of the Centre, it is highly unlikely that the Centre would be redesigned to be acceptable at the Site. It is therefore premature to rezone the Site to “U”. The way the relevant parts of the ES on the “U” zone are written is considered inappropriate, as it implies and determines the use of the Site to be for the Centre, even though the final site location is still subject to HKU’s review and assessment of alternative sites. The Site should therefore maintain its original “GB” and “R(C)6” zones, as this would better reflect the representers’ and Members’ concerns. This course of action does not preclude HKU from seeking a change to the plan when it has completed its reassessment of the proposal and conducted consultations with the community. If, after HKU’s review, this site is still deemed the most suitable for the development of the Centre, the revised proposal would be required to undergo statutory town planning procedures for amendments to the OZP.</p> <p>There is no explanation in the minutes why an interim “U” zoning for ‘stopgap’ is required, and why the “U” zoning is preferable in case HKU is now reviewing other alternative sites.</p> <p>It is misleading to say that designating a site as “U” zone on OZPs is not uncommon when the planning intention for a site is uncertain or while awaiting completion of a study or infrastructure facilities. In fact, this “U” zone is neither situated in an area where there is no current zoning, nor its current land use does not comply with the current zoning. On the Pok Fu Lam OZP, the current approved “GB” zoning is totally compatible and appropriate to the Site’s current use. Therefore, rezoning the Site to “U” is considered unnecessary, and the Site should revert to its original “GB” and “R(C)6” zones until a revised proposal is put forth for consideration.</p>
(FB2)	<p><u>Inadequate Development Control</u></p> <p>Under the covering Notes of the draft OZP, all uses or developments except some public works coordinated or implemented by Government require planning permission from the Board. While other uses, such as the proposed Centre, would require permission from the Board, this could be obtained through a section 16 application, rather than through sections 5 and 6 of the Ordinance.</p>
(FB3)	<p><u>Setting Adverse Precedent</u></p> <p>The “U” zoning for the Site may send the wrong impression that all trees in this zone are already slated for removal, and it sets a dangerous precedent. It may also undermine public involvement in the planning process, conveying the message that inadequate engagement with the Pok Fu Lam community will still result in a zonal change favourable</p>

	to HKU. Moreover, the “U” zone risks signalling to developers and institutions that protected green spaces can be rezoned arbitrarily, creating piecemeal urban expansion into the green belt.
Proposals	
(FB4)	F3 to F5, F7 to F1794, F1799 to F1810, F1815 to F1845, F1848 to F1851, F1853 to F1855 and F1857 to F1859 propose to revert the Site back to the original “GB” and “R(C)6” zones.
(FB5)	Should the Board consider “U” zoning appropriate for the Site, F3 proposes to revert a small portion of the Site directly adjoining and in front of the Ebenezer School and the ENHS to the “GB” zone (Drawing FH-1). The remaining portion of the Site can be retained as the proposed “U” zone, and a 35m set-back from the boundaries of the Ebenezer School and ENHS, along with a maximum BH of 130mPD in front of the two schools, are proposed to be included in the revised ES (Annex VI).
(FB6)	If the proposed amendment to revert to the original zoning is not supported by the Board, F1808 to F1810 and F1835 to F1837 suggest amending the covering Notes to stipulate that permission sought from the Board for the development at the Site should be by means of OZP amendment via section 5 of the Ordinance. F5 also proposes to delete the provision in the covering Notes that permits development in the “U” zone through section 16 application to the Board. The ES is proposed to be amended to indicate that no development is permissible without another round of OZP amendment as a precondition, except with respect to Columns 1 and 2 of the “GB” zoning. If the Board does not support the above proposal, F5 further proposes to impose a BH restriction of 137mPD (including roof top structures and without a minor relaxation clause) and introduce the requirement for a Layout Plan and Visual Impact Assessment submission under the section 16 application.
Responses	
(a)	<p>In response to (FB1) to (FB6):</p> <p>In accordance with section 6B(8) of the Ordinance, “<i>after considering any representation under this section, the Board must decide whether or not (a) to propose amendment to the plan in the manner proposed in the representation; or (b) to propose amendment to the plan in any other manner that, in the opinion of the Board, will meet the representation.</i>”. It has been explained at the representation hearing that the Board, after considering the representations, could decide whether to amend the zoning of the Site on the OZP in accordance with the Ordinance. If the decision is to amend the OZP, the Board could follow the proposals of the representers. Alternatively, the Board could amend the OZP in a way as it thinks fit that will meet the representations.</p> <p>Members acknowledged during the meetings that most representers supported the development of the Centre by HKU to consolidate Hong</p>

	<p>Kong's leading position in deep technology research, while their objections/concerns were mainly related to site selection and hence land use compatibility, development intensity, impacts on traffic, visual, landscape, ecological, environmental, geotechnical, public health and safety aspects, as well as the lack of proper consultation. HKU has committed in its press release and at the representation hearing to consulting relevant stakeholders in strategically reviewing and amending its development plan to address their opinions as much as practicable. HKU will also explore the possibility of identifying alternative sites for the development of the Centre.</p> <p>Pending HKU's review and further consultation, it is premature for the Board at this juncture to revert the zoning of the Site to "GB", maintain the "OU(Global Innovation Centre)" zoning, or propose other zoning/impose any specific planning restrictions in the absence of a revised scheme from HKU. Thus, it is considered prudent to rezone the Site to "U" in the interim period, serving as a stopgap arrangement pending the HKU's completion of the review. Indeed, it is not the first time for the Board to adopt an "U" zone as an interim zoning, particularly when the planning intention for a site was uncertain or while awaiting completion of a study or infrastructure facilities.</p> <p>During the deliberation session, Members generally supported the proposed amendment of the Site from "OU(Global Innovation Centre)" to "U", and expressed that the interim "U" zoning was appropriate to allow time for HKU to review the development proposal of the Centre, conduct relevant technical assessments, further consult the local community, and submit the revised proposal for consideration by the Government and the Board. Members also opined that the development of the Centre could facilitate the provision of deep technology research facilities in Hong Kong. The proposal to revert the Site to "GB" and "R(C)6" was not a viable solution as such an arrangement would only shift the problem elsewhere. Members considered that the "U" zoning would provide an opportunity for HKU to strategically review the development proposal, including exploring the feasibility of integrating the Site with the adjoining "R(C)6" site and retaining some areas within the original "GB" site.</p> <p>The "U" zoning is appropriate as an interim measure to allow time for HKU to review and adjust the development proposal for the Centre and consult the local community in response to the views expressed by the representers. As part of the review, HKU should consider alternative sites in Pok Fu Lam and other areas. If HKU concludes after review that the Centre should be in Pok Fu Lam, it should consider whether the Site or other sites is more suitable for achieving its objectives. HKU should also submit a revised development proposal supported by technical assessments to demonstrate the feasibility of the proposal for consideration by relevant B/Ds. Should the revised proposal be found acceptable by the Government, PlanD would propose appropriate zoning amendment(s) to the OZP. Subject to the Board's agreement, the rezoning would then undergo another round of statutory planning procedures in accordance with the Ordinance, during which</p>
--	--

	<p>members of the public would have the opportunity to submit written representations and attend representation hearing to express their views to the Board directly. The ES for the “U” zone already reflects the above intention and arrangement.</p> <p>Regarding the planning control under the “U” zone, Members noted at the meeting that there would be adequate planning control under the “U” zoning, as any development in the “U” zone would require planning permission from the Board.</p> <p>For the concerns about the Board’s ability to exercise independent planning judgement, the Chairperson of the Board explained in the meetings that the Board with its statutory functions was fully entitled to consider the rezoning proposal independently and professionally. HKU, as the project proponent of the Centre, is obligated to resolve all technical issues to the satisfaction of relevant government departments and address public concerns. The Board, as a statutory body, would exercise its independent judgement to consider the amendments to the OZP and the representations in the interest of society as a whole.</p> <p>Regarding the further representers’ proposal, HKU has committed at the representation hearing to consulting relevant stakeholders in strategically reviewing and amending its development plan, including reducing the density of the proposed development and bulk of the building(s), increasing the setback area from neighbouring buildings, designating more green spaces, etc. to address stakeholders’ opinions as much as practicable. If the Government accepts HKU’s revised proposal, another round of statutory planning procedures will be required to rezone the site to an appropriate zoning.</p> <p>The above grounds and views regarding the designation of “U” zoning at the Site were raised, responded to, and considered during the consideration of representations by the Board. Detailed HKU’s and Government’s responses to these issues have been previously provided in the TPB Paper No. 10987 and recorded in the minutes of the meetings, which are extracted in Annex V.</p>
--	--

4.2.7 *Land Uses Compatibility, Development Intensity, Visual Impact and Interface with Nearby Schools*

Major Grounds/ Views	
(FC1)	<p><u>Land Uses Compatibility and Development Intensity</u></p> <p>Pok Fu Lam is a low-density, green residential area on Hong Kong Island. Defined by tranquil surroundings and extensive greenery, it represents a rare and valuable urban landscape. This setting offers residents a peaceful, community-focused living environment. The Centre is a high-density, large-scale development which is incompatible with the area’s existing residential character. Protecting the existing green belt is crucial for preserving the hallmark of Pok Fu Lam.</p>

	<p>The surrounding educational, institutional, hospital, and residential uses do not justify the development of “GB”. The Board should follow the directive in the 2023 PA that no more “GB” areas would be used for large-scale development.</p> <p>According to the TPB PG-No. 10, there is a general presumption against development in a “GB” zone, which should be justified by very strong planning grounds and subject to other criteria. HKU’s Centre at the original “GB” site has to meet the stringent criteria set forth in the Guidelines. The general presumption against development that applies to all “GB” zones across all OZPs has also been confirmed by the Chairperson of the Board at the representation hearing. By zoning the Site to “U” in the interim, the Board effectively allows HKU to bypass the Guidelines. The rezoning of the Site to “U” undermines the integrity of the “GB” zone and opens the door to speculative development that prioritizes institutional convenience over environmental preservation. This shift represents a dangerous precedent, weakening the presumption against development.</p> <p>The Site is characterized by a rich and dense presence of trees and should be accurately classified as “GB”. As no cogent planning justifications have been presented for the removal of the “GB” zone as stipulated in TPB PG-No. 10 (e.g. essential need and no alternative site), the legitimate expectation for the continuance of the “GB” zoning remains.</p> <p>The bulk of the proposed Centre could be significantly reduced by removing unnecessary uses such as residential buildings which HKU has surplus staff quarters.</p>
(FC2)	<p><u>Visual Impact</u></p> <p>It is important to preserve the public views and visual amenity obtained from PFLR as stipulated in paragraph 5.2 of the ES of the OZP. There are legitimate expectations on the protection of public views from PFLR. Therefore, any future development should not adversely affect the existing public views obtained from PFLR, with distanced open views across the Site, and across the adjoining “R(C)6” Site where the 137mPD BH restriction should remain unchanged.</p>
(FC3)	<p><u>The Ebenezer School and the ENHS (the Ebenezer)</u></p> <p>The relocation of the Ebenezer School was discussed at the deliberation session. It should be noted that the timeline for the relocation of Ebenezer School to Tung Chung is uncertain. The services for the visually impaired will continue to be provided at the Ebenezer School and the ENHS. They would be subject to significant adverse noise and vibration impact for the whole of the site formation and construction period of the Centre.</p>

	<p>The Centre is less than 15m from the boundary of the ENHS and would be detrimental to the safety and quality of the learning environment for the students and boarders with visual impairment, intellectual and physical disabilities due to the development of the Centre. There is no plan for the relocation and change of use for the ENHS site (which is currently zoned “G/IC”), while it will remain under Ebenezer’s ownership and will continue to serve the visually impaired.</p>
Responses	
(a)	<p>In response to (FC1):</p> <p>The Centre is considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. The Board agreed that, in planning terms, the proposed use at the Site is not incompatible with the surrounding educational, institutional, hospital and residential uses.</p> <p>According to HKU, the main research uses should be complemented by supporting facilities (e.g. scholars’ residences) to attract talents. That said, HKU will strategically review and amend the development plan, e.g. making better use of the site, reducing density and bulk, lowering BH, increasing setback from neighbouring buildings, etc.</p> <p>The TPB PG-No.10 outlines the assessment criteria for considering section 16 planning applications for developments within “GB” zones, which is not applicable to the subject proposed amendments to the OZP. Moreover, the responses for (FB1) in relation to reverting the Site to “GB” zoning is also relevant.</p> <p>The above grounds and views regarding land use compatibility and development intensity were raised, responded to, and considered during the consideration of representations by the Board. Detailed HKU’s and Government’s responses to these issues have been previously provided in the TPB Paper No. 10987 and recorded in the minutes of the meetings, which are extracted in Annex V.</p>
(b)	<p>In response to (FC2):</p> <p>Some Members pointed out that HKU should enhance the design including reducing building density and bulk, lowering BH and providing building gaps from neighbouring buildings. It should take into account the topographical context to protect the natural environment and minimise adverse visual impact in the revised proposal. The revised design should take into consideration public views from PFLR towards the sea. Considerations should be given to reducing the building bulk along the Victoria Road frontage to avoid adverse visual impacts on the surrounding developments.</p> <p>The above grounds and views regarding visual impact were raised, responded to, and considered during the consideration of representations by the Board. Detailed HKU’s and Government’s responses to these issues have been previously provided in the TPB</p>

	Paper No. 10987 and recorded in the minutes of the meetings, which are extracted in Annex V .
(c)	<p>In response to (FC3):</p> <p>Members discussed the possible impact of the Centre on the Ebenezer School and the ENHS at the representation hearing and the deliberation session. The Board expressed that HKU should fully address the noise impact of the Centre, in particular during the construction stage, on students with visual impairment at the Ebenezer. The revised scheme should minimise the adverse impacts on the Ebenezer. HKU should engage more proactively with the Ebenezer at the early design stage to better understand their needs and address their concerns. HKU should also engage in continuous discussions with the Ebenezer regarding the design constraints and approaches to minimise noise impacts on its students with visual impairment. There was a need for HKU to conduct bottom-up and two-way communication with the stakeholders including local residents, the Ebenezer and green groups at the next round of public engagement.</p> <p>The above grounds and views regarding the possible impact of the Centre on the Ebenezer School and the ENHS were raised, responded to, and considered during the consideration of representations by the Board. Detailed HKU's and Government's responses to these issues have been previously provided in the TPB Paper No. 10987 and recorded in the minutes of the meetings, which are extracted in Annex V.</p>

4.2.8 *Tree Preservation, Landscape and Ecology*

Major Grounds/ Views	
(FD1)	Many further representers disagree with the assertion that the 2,250 trees within the Site have no value simply because they are common species. It is important to recognize their value, regardless of how common the species are and whether or not they are registered. The removal of over 2,250 mature trees to accommodate the Centre would result in irreversible environmental degradation and destruction of significant natural habitats.
(FD2)	Mature trees take decades to grow, and newly planted saplings lack the ecological complexity required to support native fauna.
Responses	
(a)	<p>In response to (FD1) and (FD2):</p> <p>The Board considered that tree felling and disturbance to natural habitats should be properly addressed by HKU. Tree compensation should be enhanced and more green spaces should be provided. HKU also committed at the representation hearing that it would critically review the tree preservation and compensation proposals, and liaise</p>

	<p>with the concerned government departments to explore off-site tree planting options.</p> <p>The above grounds and views regarding tree preservation, landscape and ecology were raised, responded to, and considered during the consideration of representations by the Board. Detailed HKU's and Government's responses to these issues have been previously provided in the TPB Paper No. 10987 and recorded in the minutes of the meetings, which are extracted in Annex V.</p>
--	--

4.2.9 *Traffic and Transport*

Major Grounds/ Views	
(FE1)	Residents in the Pok Fu Lam area are already facing daily congested traffic conditions because of the developments in Wah Fu, QMH and the Cyberport. The Centre would cause further adverse traffic impacts to the surrounding areas.
(FE2)	Although the relevant government departments had no adverse comments on the TIA submitted by HKU for the Centre, it cannot be taken for granted that the TIA and its assumptions would not be inaccurate or over optimistic. There was also no construction TIA conducted for the Centre.
(FE3)	The Centre involves residential buildings and an excessive overall plot ratio of 4.72, which violates the purpose of the Pok Fu Lam Moratorium. This is inconsistent with approving the Centre but rejecting the redevelopment proposal of the Ebenezer School.
(FE4)	The proposed South Island Line (West), intended to alleviate congestion in the Southern District, will not be operational until at least 2034. Approving the Centre before its operation risks locking the area into years of excessive congestion and strain on existing infrastructure, resulting in increasing traffic bottlenecks, noise pollution, deteriorating road and pedestrian safety conditions, and affecting ambulance services.
Responses	
(a)	<p>In response to (FE1) to (FE4):</p> <p>Members considered that it is necessary for HKU to minimize traffic impacts on the neighbouring community and residential developments during the construction and operation phases. HKU might also consider advancing the construction TIA and some of the traffic studies so that it could provide more information on the findings and mitigation measures to stakeholders in the next round of public engagement to address local concerns at an early stage. HKU committed that the TIA would be revised after the development plan of the Centre was strategically amended.</p>

	<p>The above grounds and views regarding traffic and transport impacts were raised, responded to, and considered during the consideration of representations by the Board. Detailed HKU's and Government's responses to these issues have been previously provided in the TPB Paper No. 10987 and recorded in the minutes of the meetings, which are extracted in Annex V.</p>
--	---

4.2.10 *Environmental and Safety Concerns*

Major Grounds/ Views	
(FF1)	<p>Hong Kong's climate strategy emphasizes carbon neutrality by 2050 and enhancement of urban greenery as key pillars of resilience against climate change. The development of the Centre on "GB" land contradicts these objectives by promoting deforestation, increasing carbon emissions, and degrading air quality.</p>
(FF2)	<p>The proposed Biosafety Level 3 laboratory of the Centre raises significant public health concerns. High-risk pathogen research in close proximity to residential areas poses unacceptable biohazard risks. Such facilities should be located in industrial zones or purpose-built I&T hubs like the NM, away from dense residential populations.</p> <p>HKU's proposal is inherently fraught with issues that are a far cry from public expectations, as demonstrated by their insensitivity in planning for a nitrogen tank right behind a residential block.</p>
Responses	
(a)	<p>In response to (FF1):</p> <p>The above grounds and views regarding environmental and climate change were raised, responded to and considered during the consideration of representations by the Board. Detailed HKU's and Government's responses to these issues have been recorded in the minutes of the meetings, which are extracted in Annex V.</p>
(b)	<p>In response to (FF2):</p> <p>HKU affirmed at the representation hearing that the research activities to be carried out in the Centre would be mainly computer operations (e.g. Fintech research) in dry laboratory facilities. The nitrogen tank which was of concern was not inflammable, usually used for cooling purpose. It also explained at the representation hearing that the Safety Office of HKU was responsible for ensuring a safe and healthy environment for the University Community. There were clear safety guidelines, including dangerous goods storage and handling of incidents. HKU would follow the relevant regulations and requirements stipulated by the Fire Services Department for the storage of dangerous goods. Reference would be made to the top-class international and national research facilities in respect of stringent safety management. Nonetheless, in view of the residents' concerns, HKU committed to revisiting the location of the nitrogen</p>

	<p>tank and to further assessing the potential risk of the nitrogen tank when revising the development proposal for the Centre.</p> <p>The above grounds and views regarding health and safety concerns were raised, responded to, and considered during the consideration of representations by the Board. Detailed HKU's and Government's responses to these issues have been previously provided in the TPB Paper No. 10987 and recorded in the minutes of the meetings, which are extracted in Annex V.</p>
--	--

4.2.11 *Drainage and Utility*

Major Grounds	
(FG1)	The Centre would involve large-scale excavation and construction works, removal of existing vegetation, leading to slope failures during heavy rainfall which would lead to potential downstream flooding along PFLR.
Responses	
(a)	The grounds and views regarding potential flooding was raised, responded to and considered during the consideration of representations by the Board. Detailed HKU's and Government's responses to these issues have been previously provided in the TPB Paper No. 10987 and recorded in the minutes of the meetings, which are extracted in Annex V .

4.2.12 *Geotechnical and Development Costs*

Major Grounds/ Views	
(FH1)	It will take over 10 years to complete the Centre and the slopes would be disturbed and become unstable during the construction period. The long construction period, extensive slope stabilization, excavation and building of retaining structures exponentially increase development costs and risk of landslides upon the neighbourhood, including Baguio Villa. The steep slopes and narrow access roads will not allow multiple construction works to be carried out simultaneously at the Site.
(FH2)	Given Hong Kong's ongoing structural deficit of HK\$100 billion, it is unacceptable for a publicly owned educational facility to pursue unnecessary, extravagant construction in an unsuitable and costly location.
(FH3)	HKU did not provide development costs and the financial viability of the project is doubtful. HKU should look for an alternative, more appropriate site which can save the construction costs, which are likely to be funded by public money. The ballpark costs and construction programme have not been undertaken, nor was the required consultation undertaken.

Responses	
(a)	<p>In response to (FH1):</p> <p>Necessary remedial or upgrading slope works would be proposed during the detailed design stage. The grounds and views regarding geotechnical and slope safety were raised, responded to and considered during the consideration of representations by the Board. Detailed HKU's and Government's responses to these issues have been previously provided in the TPB Paper No. 10987 and recorded in the minutes of the meetings, which are extracted in Annex V.</p>
(b)	<p>In response to (FH2) and (FH3):</p> <p>There was discussion on the development costs and financial viability in the deliberation session. Detailed HKU's and Government's responses to these issues have also been set out in the TPB Paper No. 10987, which are extracted in Annex V. While a member was concerned about the financial viability of the proposed development and queried whether the project was cost-effective, another Member remarked that financial viability was not a planning consideration of the Board. According to ITIB, the Centre is a self-financing project initiated by HKU rather than a government-led/financed I&T infrastructure or public works item.</p>

4.2.13 *Other Matters*

Major Grounds	
(FI1)	The development of the Centre would lead to property devaluation by compromising privacy, increasing noise pollution, and diminishing the overall quality of life.
(FI2)	While the Centre may contribute to academic research and innovation development, the tangible benefits to the Pok Fu Lam community remain unclear and unquantified. The project primarily serves HKU's institutional interests and convenience rather than addressing pressing community needs.
Responses	
(a)	<p>In response to (FI1):</p> <p>Property price is not a relevant planning consideration and falls outside the scope of the OZP.</p>
(b)	<p>In response to (FI2):</p> <p>HKU explained at the representation hearing that the Centre would incorporate design elements that would benefit the community, including terraced building design to blend in with the surrounding landscape, abundance of greenery, provision of vertical lifts, escalators and internal walkway to improve connectivity and accessibility of the neighbourhood. Upgrading of the concerned road junctions would be</p>

	<p>undertaken if necessary. Similar to the main campus of HKU, landscape plaza and courtyard were proposed at the podium level for events and leisure activities for public use.</p> <p>Members also pointed out at the meetings that the revised development proposal should incorporate additional planning and design merits and facilities that could benefit the local community.</p> <p>The grounds and views regarding whether the Centre would bring any benefits to the community were raised, responded to and considered during the consideration of representations by the Board. Detailed HKU's and Government's responses to these issues have been previously provided in the TPB Paper No. 10987 and recorded in the minutes of the meetings, which are extracted in Annex V.</p>
--	--

4.2.14 Public Consultation

Major Grounds	
(FJ1)	<p>HKU has a poor reputation for engaging with the public. This provides no confidence that HKU would, or even could, undertake the necessary meaningful community engagement as required by the planning procedures. It has made no attempt or effort to contact the residents of Baguio Villa, the Ebenezer School, or other members of the community to consult the views of affected stakeholders.</p> <p>The technical studies for the Centre were not professionally conducted and failed to consider the concerns of local residents.</p>
Responses	
(a)	<p>HKU committed at the representation hearing to enhancing engagement with the community, including local residents, neighbourhood stakeholders, green groups and Southern District Council, through a comprehensive public engagement exercise so as to improve the developmental proposal for the Government's scrutiny⁵.</p> <p>The above grounds and views regarding insufficient public consultation were raised, responded to and considered during the consideration of representations by the Board. Detailed HKU's and Government's responses to these issues have been previously provided in the TPB Paper No. 10987 and recorded in the minutes of the meetings, which are extracted in Annex V.</p>

- 4.3 The summary of the above major grounds/views/alternative proposals in the FRs, along with relevant departmental comments on the FRs, was issued to the further representers for their responses, if any, on 14.2.2025. A copy of the letter issued

⁵ HKU project team is currently exploring different suggestions and proposals received from the TPB Members and the public to revise the development plan, and conversations have already begun with some community stakeholders. In this process, the project team will continue to engage with them as and when appropriate.

to the further representers is attached at **Annex VII**. A total of 30 replies from the further representers have been received. Among these, 15 replies maintained their FR as previously submitted, and the remaining 15 replied with further responses to the departmental comments⁶. The summary of the further responses from these 15 further representers is provided at **Annex VIII**. These further representers reiterated, supplemented, and/or further elaborated their grounds and views, mainly focusing on the following three aspects:

The Proposed “U” Zoning

- 4.3.1 A number of points raised by the further representers are related to (i) the lack of a legal basis for the Board to propose the “U” zoning to partially meet the representations; (ii) the deficiencies of the “U” zoning; and (iii) the lack of reasons or justifications for an interim zoning, as any alternative site ultimately deemed more suitable could render the interim zoning abortive, resulting in additional procedures to restore the original “GB” zoning. A further representer also argues that it is inconceivable that all responsible B/Ds have no further comments on the FRs, which are related to the “U” zone, as this zoning was not previously part of the draft OZP. Additionally, the responses provided by government departments do not adequately address the FRs, which were made prior to the introduction of the “U” zoning.
- 4.3.2 With regard to the above points made by the further representers, it should be noted that the intention and rationale for rezoning the Site to “U”, as well as the development controls and way forward for the “U” zoning have been fully explained in the TPB Paper No. 10987 and elaborated during the representation hearing meetings and deliberation session, as recorded in the minutes. Members generally supported the proposed amendment of the Site to the “U” zone and expressed that the interim “U” zoning is appropriate to allow time for HKU to review the development proposal of the Centre, conduct relevant technical assessments, further consult the local community, and submit the revised proposal for consideration by the Government and the Board. These points are similar to those raised in the representations and during the representation hearings. The responses in paragraph 4.2.6(a) above are relevant.

HKU’s Global Innovation Centre Proposal

- 4.3.3 The further representers also raise views mainly in relation to (i) the absence of a comprehensive consideration of alternative sites; (ii) inconsistency with national and regional strategic objectives, including those outlined in the NM Strategy; (iii) the lack of comprehensive technical assessments on environmental, visual, urban design, transport and traffic, ecological, drainage, slope safety, and risk aspects to reaffirm the technical feasibility of the Centre; (iv) financial unviability; and (v) the failure to engage affected parties and insufficient public consultation on HKU’s Global Innovation Centre proposal. These points are similar to

⁶ Soft copies of the replies with further responses are sent to the Members via electronic means; and are also available for public viewing at the Board’s website at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/plan_making/S_H10_22.html and the Planning Enquiry Counters of the PlanD in North Point and Sha Tin. A set of hard copies is deposited at the Board’s Secretariat for Members’ inspection.

those raised in the representations and during the representation hearings. The responses in paragraphs 4.2.5 to 4.2.14 above are relevant.

Procedural Matters

- 4.3.4 There are also further queries not related to the Proposed Amendments published on 13.12.2024 but concerning the statutory procedure for handling FRs and relevant provisions in the Ordinance. A further representer argues that there is no provision in the Ordinance allowing the Board to provide written comments on the FRs to the further representers at any time. Therefore, the preparation and circulation of the letter and its attachments (**Annex VII**) may be *ultra vires* and should not have occurred. Additionally, there is no legal provision for actively seeking the withdrawal of representations from further representers. Section 6E(2) of the Ordinance states that “*The person may, by written notice to the Board, withdraw the representation or further representation (as the case requires)*”. The withdrawal process should be initiated by the further representer themselves. The TPB’s provision of a reply slip with the option to withdraw a FR in this context is seen as misleading. Another further representer points out that the Chinese translation of the meeting minutes was published only a few days before the submission deadline for FR, putting those who are not proficient in English at a disadvantage.
- 4.3.5 It should be noted that, according to the Ordinance, as amended in 2023, there will be no hearing for FRs but the Board will hold a meeting to consider the FRs received. To facilitate the Board’s consideration, the TPB Guidelines No. 29C set out an administrative arrangement to be adopted in cases where FRs oppose the Further Amendments. Specifically, where appropriate, comments on the FRs from government departments concerned and written responses from the further representers on the comments received from relevant government departments will be sought. Such mechanism is formulated with reference to the arrangement under the Lands Resumption Ordinance (Cap. 124), which aligns the mechanism for handling representations/oppositions under development-related legislation⁷. The letter, attaching a summary of the FRs and relevant departmental comments on the FRs together with a reply slip issued to the further representers on 14.2.2025 (**Annex VII**), serves this purpose. As stated in the said letter, the further representers may choose whether or not to reply.
- 4.3.6 The English version of the minutes for the three representation hearing sessions held on 1, 4 and 5.11.2024, and the deliberation on 29.11.2024 were confirmed and made available at the Board’s website on 29.11.2024 and 13.12.2024 respectively. The audio recordings were also uploaded to the Board’s website on the same day. A press release summarising the Board’s considerations and decision was issued in both English and Chinese by the Board on 29.11.2024⁴. As per established practice, members of the public can contact the Secretariat of the Board for enquires

⁷ LegCo Paper No. CB(1)292/2023(01):
<https://www.legco.gov.hk/yr2022/english/bc/bc08/papers/bc0820230331cb1-292-1-e.pdf>

regarding minutes of meetings.

- 4.3.7 There were queries regarding whether the summary attached to the 14.2.2025 letter (**Annex VII**) has adequately captured all the views, concerns, and suggestions raised in the FRs. It should be noted that soft copies of the FRs and their further responses have been sent to the Members via electronic means for their consideration. The summary of grounds and views provided in the FRs, as attached to the 14.2.2025 letter (**Annex VII**), along with our responses, is re-produced in paragraphs 4.2.5 to 4.2.14 above. The summary is intended to facilitate discussions among Members, who can refer to the full set of FRs for complete details.

5. Overall Assessment

- 5.1 The grounds and views regarding site selection, compatibility of land use and development intensity, visual impact, tree preservation, landscape, ecology, traffic and transport, environmental impact, health and safety concern, drainage and utility, geotechnical and slope safety, development cost and financial viability, and public consultation in the FRs were raised, responded to and considered during the consideration of the representations by the Board. B/Ds consulted have no further comment on the FRs as their comments have been detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10987 and recorded in the minutes of representation hearing. There has been no change in planning circumstances to the Site and its surrounding areas since the Board decided to rezone the Site from “OU(Global Innovation Centre)” to “U” on 29.11.2024.
- 5.2 As explained in paragraphs 2 and 4.2.6(a) above, the “U” zoning is considered appropriate for the Site as an interim measure to allow time for HKU to review and adjust the development proposal for the Centre and consult the local community in response to the views expressed by the representers/further representers. The Centre with mainly research and academic uses at the Site is considered not incompatible with the surrounding educational, institutional, hospital and residential uses. ITIB also reaffirms that the Centre aligns with the policy goals to enhance Hong Kong’s status as an international hub for research and development while consolidating its strength in upstream basic research. The technical assessments conducted by HKU confirmed the technical feasibility of the Centre and the relevant B/Ds had no objection to or adverse comments on the proposal. In view that the opposing representations mainly related to site selection, land use compatibility, development intensity, impacts on traffic, visual, landscape, ecological, environmental, geotechnical, public health and safety aspects, as well as the lack of proper consultation, and HKU has decided to take some time to strategically review and amend the development plan of the Centre. Against the above, the Board decided to propose an amendment to the draft OZP to rezone the Site from “OU(Global Innovation Centre)” to “U”, which intends to serve as a stopgap arrangement pending HKU’s completion of the review. HKU would consider reducing the density of the proposed development and bulk of the building(s), increasing the setback area from neighbouring buildings, designating more green spaces, etc. to address stakeholders’ opinion as much as practicable. HKU would also explore the possibility of identifying alternative sites for the development of the Centre. Moreover, HKU announced that the project team would endeavour to step up engagement with the community through various

channels so as to improve the development proposal and provide timely project updates in the upcoming process. HKU is expected to review its proposed development to suitably revise its scale and layout in order to specifically respond to stakeholders' concerns. HKU should also enhance its communication with the community and maintain positive interactions with stakeholders, in particular to explain the site selection of Pok Fu Lam as the site and how the proposed development would benefit the neighbourhood.

- 5.3 As clearly explained at the deliberation session on 29.11.2024, if the Government accepts HKU's revised proposal after completion of its review and further engagement with the community, another round of statutory procedures to rezone the Site to an appropriate zoning with specified development parameters to guide and facilitate the development of the Centre will be required. The public will have the opportunity to submit written representations and attend representation hearing to express their views to the Board directly in accordance with the procedures set out in the Ordinance.

6. Departmental Consultation

The following B/Ds have been consulted and they have no further comment on the FRs:

- (a) Secretary for Innovation, Technology and Industry;
- (b) Secretary for Development;
- (c) Secretary for Education;
- (d) Head (Invigorating Island South Office), Development Bureau (DevB);
- (e) Executive Secretary (Antiquities and Monuments), DevB;
- (f) Commissioner for Transport;
- (g) Commissioner of Police;
- (h) Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation;
- (i) Director of Environmental Protection;
- (j) Director of Fire Services;
- (k) Director of Social Welfare;
- (l) Director of Leisure and Cultural Services;
- (m) Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services;
- (n) Director of Housing;
- (o) Project Manager (South), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD);
- (p) Head of the Geotechnical Engineering Office, CEDD;
- (q) District Officer (Southern), Home Affairs Department;
- (r) District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West and South, Lands Department;
- (s) Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong West, Buildings Department;
- (t) Chief Architect/Advisory and Statutory Compliance, Architectural Services Department ;
- (u) Principal Government Engineer/Railway Development, Railway Development Office, Highways Department (HyD);
- (v) Chief Highway Engineer/Hong Kong, HyD;
- (w) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department;
- (x) Chief Engineer/Hong Kong & Island, Drainage Services Department;
- (y) Chief Town Planner//Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD; and
- (z) Chief Town Planner/Housing and Office Land Supply, PlanD.

7. Planning Department's Views

- 7.1 The supportive views provided in **F1** and **F2** are noted.
- 7.2 Based on the assessments in paragraphs 4 and 5 above, PlanD does not support **F3** to **F1861** and considers that draft OZP should be amended by the Proposed Amendments:

taking into account the University of Hong Kong's announcement that it has decided to take some time to strategically review and amend the development plan of the Global Innovation Centre, including reducing the density of the proposed development and bulk of the building(s), increasing the setback area from neighbouring buildings, designating more green spaces, etc. to address stakeholders' opinions as much as practicable, and its indication that the project team will endeavour to step up engagement with the community through various channels so as to improve the development proposal and provide timely project updates in the upcoming process, the Further Amendment Item A Site is appropriate to be rezoned to "Undetermined" as an interim land use zoning to allow the University of Hong Kong to review its plan and adjust it in response to stakeholders' views. The long-term use and development parameters of the site would be determined after the University of Hong Kong's submission of a revised proposal, which would go through public consultation and the Government's examination, and would be subject to another round of statutory town planning procedures for proposed amendments to the OZP.

8. Decision Sought

- 8.1 The Board is invited to give consideration to the FRs and decide whether to amend the draft OZP by the Proposed Amendments or by the proposed amendment(s) as further varied during the consideration of FRs.
- 8.2 Members are also invited to agree that the draft OZP (amended by the Proposed Amendments or the proposed amendment(s) as further varied), together with their respective Notes and the ES, are suitable for submission under section 8 of the Ordinance to the CE in C for approval.

9. Follow-up Action

- 9.1 Should the Board decide to amend the draft OZP by the Proposed Amendments or the proposed amendment(s) as further varied, such amendment(s) shall form part of the draft Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/22. In accordance with section 6H of the Ordinance, the OZP shall thereafter be read as including the amendment(s). The amendment(s) shall be made available for public inspection until the CE in C has made a decision in respect of the draft OZP in question under section 9 of the Ordinance.
- 9.2 Administratively, the Building Authority and relevant government departments will be informed of the decision of the Board and will be provided with a copy/copies of the amendment(s).

10. Attachments

Annex I	Draft Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/22 (Reduced Size)
Annex II	Schedule of Proposed Amendments, Amendment Plan and Proposed Amendments to the Notes and Explanatory Statement of the draft Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/22
Annex III	Index of Further Representations
Annex IV	Index of Major Grounds/ Views of Further Representations
Annex V	Summary of Further Representations and the Planning Department's Detailed Responses
Annex VI	Proposed Explanatory Statement Submitted by Further Representer No. F3
Annex VII	Letter Issued by the Town Planning Board to Further Representers on 14.2.2025
Annex VIII	Summary of Further Representers' Further Views and Responses
Drawing FH-1	Drawing Submitted by Further Representer No. F3
Plan FH-1	Location Plan of Further Representation Site
Plan FH-2	Site Plan
Plan FH-3	Aerial Photo
Plans FH-4a to FH-4f	Site Photos

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
MARCH 2025