

**SCHEDULE OF AMENDMENTS TO
THE DRAFT KENNEDY TOWN & MOUNT DAVIS
OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/H1/20
UNDER THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE (Chapter 131)**

I. Amendments to Matter Shown on the Plan

- Item A – Revision of the building height restriction for the “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) zone at the junction of Pokfield Road and Smithfield from 120mPD to 130mPD.
- Item B – Revision of the building height restriction for the “R(A)” zone of Academic Terrace at 101 Pok Fu Lam Road from 140mPD to 160mPD.
- Item C – Revision of the building height restriction for the “Residential (Group B)” (“R(B)”) zone of Hillview Garden at 72 Hill Road from 60mPD to 120mPD.
- Item D – Revision of the building height restriction for the “R(B)” zone of The University of Hong Kong Pokfield Road Residences at 13, 15, 17, 19 and 21 Pokfield Road from 120mPD to 150mPD.
- Item E – Rezoning of the sites at 2 and 6-10 Mount Davis Road from “Residential (Group C)2” (“R(C)2”) to “R(B)1” and stipulation of building height restriction of 160mPD.
- Item F1 – Revision of the building height restriction for the area concerned from 29mPD to 120mPD for the “R(A)” zone at the western boundary of Smithfield Terrace at 71-77 Smithfield.
- Item F2 – Revision of the building height restriction for the area concerned from 60mPD to 140mPD for the “R(A)” zone at the western boundary of Smithfield Garden at 50 Smithfield.

II. Amendments to the Notes of the Plan

- (a) Revision to the Remarks of the Notes for “R(C)” zone to delete the “R(C)2” sub-zone.
- (b) Revision to the Remarks of the Notes for “R(A)” zone to reflect the revision of building height restriction of 60mPD and 29mPD for the sites at 50 and 71-77 Smithfield respectively.
- (c) Deletion of ‘Market’ from Column 2 use in the Notes for the “R(B)”, “Residential (Group E)” and “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Commercial, Leisure and Tourism Related Uses” zones.

- (d) Revision of 'Shop and Services' to 'Shop and Services (not elsewhere specified)' in Column 2 use in the Notes for the "R(A)" and "Government, Institution or Community" zones.

Town Planning Board

30 April 2021

**List of Representers in respect of the
Draft Kennedy Town and Mount Davis Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H1/21**

申述編號 <u>Representation No.</u>	申述人名稱 <u>Name of ‘Representer’</u>
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R1	The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R2	The University of Hong Kong
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R3	Ms Vicky Kao
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R4	Ms Wang Jianling
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R5	Ms Ho Pui Yin Yvonne
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R6	Mr Chan Ping Hung
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R7	Ms Ng Suk Han Christina
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R8	Ms Choy Pui Ying Trinni
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R9	Ms Chan Ka Yan
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R10	Ms Lam Wai Yin Michelle
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R11	Ms Cheung Kyra Yick Ching
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R12	Ms Chan Chi May
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R13	Ms Ma Wing Yin
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R14	Ms Ling Kay
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R15	Ms Fung Fei Cheung
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R16	Ms Leung Wing Sze
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R17	The Incorporated Owners of Nos. 6 & 10 Mount Davis Road
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R18	The Trustees of the Church of England in the Diocese of Victoria, HK
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R19	Michael Anatol Olesnický
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R20	Ronald Duxbury Taylor (Welgett Tree Limited)
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R21	Annette Kong (Comfort Art Limited)
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R22	Chan Fong Yim
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R23	Mr Thorsten Schroeder
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R24	RIPPINGALL, Susan Veronica
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R25	Hodel, Rene Josef
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R26	Mr Tan Nicholas Tsung Yuan
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R27	Alexander Schrantz
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R28	Jayne Kim Schrantz
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R29	中西區區議會 Central and Western District Council
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R30	Mary Mulvihill
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R31	其悅發展有限公司 Wally Concept Development Ltd.
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R32	正昌原料有限公司 Ching Cheong Material Ltd.
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R33	順昌原料有限公司 Soon Cheong Material Ltd.

申述編號 <u>Representation No.</u>	申述人名稱 <u>Name of ‘Representer’</u>
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R34	三興企業國際有限公司
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R35	譚麗明女士
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R36	Mr Leung Chit Yu
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R37	Ms Tong Chu Yung
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R38	Mr Wong Chi On Andy
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R39	Ms Chin Yee Man Doris
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R40	Mr Chiu Kam Hon
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R41	Ms Huang, Lin-Chun
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R42	李詠雯女士
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R43	張水妹女士
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R44	Hung Hing On
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R45	Chau Sung Yan Fionna
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R46	WONG, Kam Wah
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R47	Chan Wan Cheong Owen
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R48	Leung Yee Kwan
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R49	Mr Au Yeung King Hau
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R50	Ms Leung Joyce Nok Sze
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R51	Ms Yee Wai Ying Rosana
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R52	Mr Siu Cheuk Nam
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R53	Mr Yam Kin Nang
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R54	Ms Pu Xuedan
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R55	Ms Mak Man Wai
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R56	黃思朗先生
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R57	Ms Tsoi Suen Tin
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R58	Mr Yim Yui Kai
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R59	Mr Dai Lang
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R60	Mr Dai Yi
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R61	Ms Yim Hang Lei
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R62	Mr De Hoog Maarten Cornelis Jacob
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R63	Ms Chau Yuk Lan
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R64	Mr Leung Wai Lung
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R65	Mr Yeung Kin Kwan Alvan
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R66	Mr Wong Suen Hang
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R67	Ms Ng Mei Sze
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R68	Mr Wong Lai Shing
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R69	Mr Wong Suen Wing

申述編號 <u>Representation No.</u>	申述人名稱 <u>Name of ‘Representer’</u>
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R70	Ms Mak Wing Yee Winnie
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R71	Mr Lam Chik Shun Marcus
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R72	Ms Suci
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R73	Ms Yeni
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R74	Tari
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R75	Mr Lee, Ho Cheung
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R76	Mr Lee Jim Nin
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R77	Ms Lee, Long Ching
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R78	Mr Lee, Ho Fung
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R79	Mr Lee, Shu Luen
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R80	Ms Ng Choi Ling
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R81	Ms Ma Yuet Tim
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R82	Ms Cheung Wai Fun
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R83	Mr Jiang Heshi
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R84	Ms Li Jiayi
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R85	Mr Li Hanzhi
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R86	Ms Kwong Suk Mei
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R87	Ms Yeung Pui Man
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R88	Ms Lam Huen
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R89	Mr Ng Kie Lam
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R90	Mr Ng Cheuk Yu
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R91	鍾樂兒女士
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R92	Mr Leung Lap-chi, Michael
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R93	Ms LuYing Xia
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R94	Mr Mu Tian
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R95	Chin Shun Yee
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R96	陳曉榕女士
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R97	呂碧秀女士 Lui Pick Sau
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R98	Mr Yuen Wai Keung
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R99	Mr Choi Wai Tsun Eric
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R100	Chiu Marn Shing
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R101	Ms Fung Yoong
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R102	Pang Yau Brianna
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R103	Ms Chiu Cheuk Ying
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R104	Ms Hung Tsz Fong
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R105	Maisie Chan

申述編號 <u>Representation No.</u>	申述人名稱 <u>Name of ‘Representer’</u>
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R106	林志高
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R107	Lai Siu Lun
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R108	鍾詠兒
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R109	Ms Leung Kam Wing
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R110	Ms Cheng Yuen Yee
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R111	Ms Ceria Martina Tolentino
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R112	Ms Leung Chun Wing
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R113	Mr Siu Tak Kwong
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R114	Mr Ma Chun Po
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R115	Mr Lam Wing Keung
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R116	Ms Yue Ning Kong
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R117	Mr Dai Rui
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R118	Ms Li Zhaoxia
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R119	Mr Leung Siu Hang
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R120	李葉聯先生
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R121	李朗兒女士
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R122	林愷怡女士
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R123	李朗思女士
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R124	吳凱怡女士 Ms Ng Hoi Yee
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R125	Orque Nelna Duevo
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R126	Mr Ho Yeuk Fai
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R127	Ms Leung Suk Yee
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R128	Mr Law Tat Keung
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R129	Mr Ng Ming Lee Frederick
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R130	Ms Li Kam Sheung
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R131	Ms Ng Cheuk Yee
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R132	Ms Ng Cheuk Heng
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R133	Mr Chiu Ying Wah
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R134	老兆雄先生 Mr Lo Siu Hung Oswens
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R135	Mr Ng Chak Yin Aneurin
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R136	Mr Tam Kwong Shun Tommy
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R137	Ms Pang Mei Po
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R138	吳穎怡女士 Ms Ng Wing Yee
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R139	Ms Cheung Yuk Yee
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R140	Mr Tsoi Kam Bor
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R141	Ms Lee Kit Mei Rosanna

申述編號 <u>Representation No.</u>	申述人名稱 <u>Name of ‘Representer’</u>
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R142	Ms Ma Lee
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R143	Mr Hung Chiu Yeung
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R144	洪智皓先生
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R145	洪智楷先生
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R146	Chu Shun Hing
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R147	Yuen Oi Ting Katy
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R148	Ms Ana Young
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R149	梁國權先生
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R150	余培元先生
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R151	Ms Ji Ling Mei
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R152	Ms Yung Ham Hing
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R153	Ms Meng Ye
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R154	Sou Meng Kei
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R155	Mr Yung Tak Chun
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R156	陳碧蕊女士
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R157	王金亮先生
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R158	Mr Yung Tin Yuet
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R159	鄧錦河先生
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R160	Ms Tracy Ka Ki Yau
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R161	Ms Chung Yit Ching
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R162	Mr Cheng Wai Leung William
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R163	王曉媚女士
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R164	Fung Po Leung
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R165	Ms Tang Wan Chong
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R166	鍾雨蓁女士
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R167	Mr Chan David Hermeson
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R168	Mr Leung Yiu Kwong
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R169	Mr Ng Kin Wai
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R170	Ms Chung Yan
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R171	Mr Chan Wai Kwong
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R172	Ms Sze-to Siu Chuk
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R173	Ms Han Judy
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R174	Ms Yang May Wan
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R175	Mr Martin Paul Cahill
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R176	Mr Leung David
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R177	Ms Fung Yee Ling

申述編號 <u>Representation No.</u>	申述人名稱 <u>Name of ‘Representer’</u>
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R178	Aleta Jonalyn Carino
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R179	王非先生
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R180	Ms Kong Ling
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R181	Mr Cheung Hon Siu
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R182	Ms Kuo Yan Ki
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R183	Fu Siu Pun
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R184	Mr Ng Ka Lam
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R185	Ms Chan Lai Kuen
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R186	Chiang Chor Wan
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R187	卓曉諾 Mr Geoffrey Hiu Nok Chuck
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R188	Ms Li Ngan Cheung Rallo
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R189	林菊初女士
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R190	Mr Lee Ho Chi
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R191	Mr Lee Kiu Ming
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R192	林頤年女士 Ms Irene Castilho
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R193	Lee Ho Wai
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R194	Lau Yuk Kam
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R195	Ms Tu Choi Nai Charlies
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R196	Ms Wong, Leona
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R197	Mr Kong, Tung Lam Allen
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R198	Ms To Fuk Ching May
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R199	Mr Choi Hon Kit
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R200	Ms Chung Yuet Mei Benetty
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R201	Choi Hiu Yan
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R202	Pang King Yin
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R203	Ms Kwan Ngan Kwan
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R204	Pang Shu Kiu
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R205	Chiu Yuen Ki, Yuki
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R206	Pang Ching Athena
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R207	Ms Lai Bik Ki
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R208	Ms Lai Pik Kwan
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R209	Mr Chan Kwok Ping
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R210	Mr Chan Cheuk Hang
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R211	黃居馮先生
TPB/R/S/H1/21-R212	李潤蓮女士

**List of Commenters in respect of the
Draft Kennedy Town and Mount Davis Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H1/21**

意見編號 <u>Comment No.</u>	提意見人名稱 <u>Name of ‘Commenter’</u>
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C1	The University of Hong Kong
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C2	Sham Oi Yee
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C3	Ho Mei Sum
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C4	Ng Suk Kei Grace
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C5	Lam Wai Yin Michelle
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C6	Cheung Kyra Yick Ching
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C7	Yeung Shuet Kwan, Shirley
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C8	Chan Siu Chun, Patricia
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C9	Herman Leung
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C10	Mr Yip Man Wah
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C11	Mr Lee Ying Kit
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C12	Ms Wan Wing Oi
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C13	Mr Chat Wen Ching
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C14	Mr Jeremy Cheung
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C15	Mr Chan Chung Tik
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C16	Mr Jerry Chen
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C17	Mr Kan Ka Ho Calvin
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C18	Mr Wu Pak Yan Martin
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C19	Ms Lau
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C20	Ms Chan Wai Chu
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C21	Ms Ying Pui Yan
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C22	Ms Tam Yee Ting
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C23	Mr Leung Cheuk Kwan Felix
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C24	Mr Koon Sun Fai
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C25	Mr Alfred Ng
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C26	Mr Wong H C
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C27	Lee Woon Luen
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C28	Lee Tin Fan
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C29	Tsang Sui Lan, Annabella
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C30	Liu Kin On Alfred
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C31	Au Ying Mei
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C32	Tong Yiu Pong
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C33	Dr Chu Yiu Leung Louis

意見編號 <u>Comment No.</u>	提意見人名稱 <u>Name of ‘Commenter’</u>
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C34	Yeung Man Keung
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C35	Cecilia Wong
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C36	Chan Kwok Wai
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C37	Au On Kwok, Zane
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C38	Fan Yat Hung
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C39	Fong Wai Kuen, Pauline
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C40	Sit Ka Hei
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C41	Cheung Siu Wah
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C42	Wong Lok Tung
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C43	Fan Wai-kan
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C44	William Marshall
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C45	Tsui Kam Sheung
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C46	Mr Ho Man In
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C47	Mr Chu Chor Yue
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C48	Ms Ng Candice Cheuk Yan
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C49	Alvin Chow
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C50	Chong Wai Chiu, James
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C51	Yip Hon Yu
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C52	Sze Kwan Shan
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C53	Mr Kong Ka Chun
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C54	Mr Wong Hok Tak
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C55	Ms Hau Ka Kei
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C56	Mr CH Kuo
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C57	Ms Tang Long Ying
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C58	Ms Chan Yan Hang
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C59	Yuen Ngo Sheung
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C60	Candice Chung
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C61	Norine Yin Lok Chu
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C62	Matthew POTTER
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C63	Chai Kwan Nam
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C64	Hui, Yin Kue Constance
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C65	Fan Man Si
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C66	Wong Long Hin Nichol
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C67	Matthew Hung
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C68	CHENG Sze Nga
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C69	Raymond Fu

意見編號 <u>Comment No.</u>	提意見人名稱 <u>Name of 'Commenter'</u>
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C70	Giuseppe Fu
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C71	Vicky Kao
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C72	Ho Pui Yin, Yvonne
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C73	Ng Suk Han Christina
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C74	Wong Lok Yiu
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C75	Huang Hezi
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C76	Brenda Lok
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C77	Holly Tang
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C78	Leung Po Lo
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C79	M. Tse
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C80	N Y Wong
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C81	P.Y. Wong
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C82	R. Wang
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C83	Lee Tsan Kui Dennis
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C84	Chang Suk Yee
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C85	Chan Mark
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C86	Kam Tsun Ka
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C87	Choy Pui Ying Trinni
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C88	Chan Kwo Wick
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C89	Liu Shuk Ling
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C90	Man Yi Hang Cathy
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C91	Mr Ng Kwong Hei
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C92	Lee Ka Kit
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C93	Sean Jasper Yu
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C94	Leung Chi Ming
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C95	Yu Ming To
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C96	Fan Tze Long
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C97	Wong Ho Tak
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C98	Leung Sen
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C99	Rashida Suffiad
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C100	Lee Tsz Shan
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C101	Chan Ki Lok
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C102	Lo Chun Kit
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C103	Lee Chan Hang
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C104	Mary Mulvihill
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C105	Ms Yau Ka Ki Tracy

意見編號 <u>Comment No.</u>	提意見人名稱 <u>Name of ‘Commenter’</u>
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C106	翰林軒業主委員會
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C107	順昌原料有限公司
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C108	Mr Geoffrey Hiu Nok Chuck
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C109	Mr Tam Kwong Shun Tommy
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C110	Ms Lu Si
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C111	Ms Lai Pik Kwan
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C112	Ms Tian Yilan
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C113	Ms Judy Han
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C114	Ms Ma Lee
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C115	Mr Hung Chi Ho
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C116	洪智楷先生
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C117	Mr Hung Chiu Yeung
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C118	Mr Lai Kin Wai Alexander
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C119	Ms Yuen Oi Ting Katy
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C120	Mr Yeung Hoi Wing
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C121	杜丰杰先生
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C122	Mr Wong Chi Pan
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C123	Mr Tim Ruan
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C124	Ms Ng Hoi Yee
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C125	Ms Cheung Yuk Yee
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C126	Mr Law Tat Keung
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C127	Ms Ng Wing Yee
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C128	Mr Ng Kin Wai
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C129	Ms Chau Yuk Lan
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C130	Mr Lo Siu Hung Oswens
TPB/R/S/H1/21-C131	Mr Li Tsun Fai

Summary of Representations

In respect of draft Kennedy Town & Mount Davis Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H1/21

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H1/21-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
R1	Organisation (The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong (REDA)) (See Annex II)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports all amendment items. • The relevant reassessments and justifications for the amendment items are supported. Such justifications include enabling the subject sites to accommodate the permissible gross floor area or plot ratio under the Building (Planning) Regulations, or as stipulated on the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) for future redevelopment, and to also meet the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SDBG) requirements. • The Pok Fu Lam Moratorium (PFLM) was a short term administrative measure to limit the traffic for new development until transportation infrastructure had been improved. Given the planned implementation of additional railway infrastructure to serve the general Pok Fu Lam area and confirmation of permitted development densities on statutory plans covering there area, there is no longer any logical reason to prevent the development of zoned sites up to the permitted maximum that has already been determined and included in the OZP. 	To achieve the redevelopment of all sites in the relevant area in conformity with the zoning of the site, the Town Planning Board (the Board) is invited to support the removal of the administrative PFLM on land exchanges and lease modifications.
R2	Institute (The University of Hong Kong (HKU)) (See Annex II)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports Amendment Item D. • The objective of the OZP Amendment to increase the building height restriction (BHR) to 150mPD is to enable HKU to accommodate more incoming scholars from around 	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H1/21-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<p>the world, supporting HKU's ongoing Global Professoriate Recruitment Campaign to recruit outstanding young researchers and scholars, and the continuously expanding ranks of academic staff in different faculties and departments. Facilitating continuous development on higher education is an adequate reason to justify the change of BHR to 150mPD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• With the proposed development at the site, HKU aspires to provide contemporary, multi-function amenities with residential towers to deliver a well-rounded campus experience for our staff and university visitors living in the iconic Pokfield Road Campus.• The proposed towers will feature architectural designs that aptly responds to the nearby landscape: building heights (BHs) will be similar to the existing buildings in the neighbourhood and other developments under planning to maintain the skyline. The residential towers for staff match the overall profile of the Pokfulam neighbourhood.• The amendment will also bring benefits to the vicinity through enabling better connectivity, more landscape and green space for an enhanced visual ambience. A new walking path in the Pokfield Campus linking the site with other HKU campuses will provide an alternative method to cross Pokfulam Road (the plan of a new footbridge connecting the Pokfield Road Campus and the Centennial Campus is being developed).	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H1/21-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Design considerations such as incorporating green elements such as green roof and vertical greening, adjusting building alignment to maintain ventilation and necessary distance from adjacent buildings, will preserve the character and greenery in the surrounding neighbourhood.• The Pokfield Road Campus's site access strategy for pedestrians and vehicles will address potential traffic impact in coping with the 150mPD scheme by separating walking paths and vehicular access. Public parking spaces will be provided on-site to prevent illegal parking on the surrounding roads, thus minimizing the impact of the amendment on local traffic.• The proposed OZP amendment to 150mPD in "Residential (Group B)" ("R(B)") zone will help meet the needs and enhance the streetscape, ambience and accessibility of the area.	
R3 to R16	Individuals (See Annex II)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support Amendment Item D.• The amendment would provide a better environment for HKU. (R3)• The staff quarters available at HKU are insufficient and the redevelopment plan to provide more accommodation for HKU staff are much needed to enhance the attractiveness and competitiveness of HKU in attracting and retaining staff recruited locally and from overseas. (R4, R11, and R13 to R16)	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H1/21-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The amendment to Item D will allow HKU to provide more residential units to cater for the needs of its growing number of professoriate, teaching and research staff. (R4, R11, and R13 to R16)• Insufficient/shortage of staff quarters has been a continuing hindrance to recruitment, especially international recruitment, of academic and research staff for the University. That impacts upon the competitiveness of the University in recruiting and retaining talents locally and from all over the world, which in turn impacts upon the competitiveness of the local higher education sector and the society as a whole. (R5 and R7)• The amendment allows HKU to provide more accommodation for junior academic staffs that are long-awaited. (R5 to R7, R12, and R14 to R16)• HKU faces a severe shortage of land available for campus development. The development potential of the available land lot should be optimised to deliver long-term and maximum benefits to the University and the society. (R6 to R8 and R12)• The capacity and amenities of Pokfield Road Residences, which was built over 50 years ago, can no longer meet the University's future needs. Redeveloping Pokfield Road Residence into contemporary, multi-function residential towers is the best option. (R6, R7, and R12)	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H1/21-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While there could be some impact to neighbouring developments, the Board should consider the positive potential of the Pokfield Road Campus development in enhancing the overall environment, accessibility and green streetscape of the Pokfield Road and Pokfulam Road junction. (R6, R7, and R12) HKU alumni looked forward to seeing their alma-mater to organise more academic exchange programmes. The lack of sufficient accommodation units managed by HKU on campus increases the administrative and financial burden of hosting visiting professor and academic conference attendees. Availability of guests lodging is often subject to price fluctuation and peak season demand, which comes at high cost to the public resources. (R9 and R10) Revising the BHR to 150mPD will enable more flexibility and convenience for academic exchange programme visitors who require staying near the HKU campuses. (R9 and R10) 	
R17 to R18	<p>Organisations</p> <p>(The Incorporated Owners of Nos. 6 & 10 Mount Davis Road; and The Trustees of the Church of England in the Diocese of Victoria, HK)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support Amendment Item E. The justifications for doing so are contained in TPB Paper No. 10720 and are supported in this representation. The PFLM was a short term administrative measure to limit the traffic for new development until transportation infrastructure had been improved. Given the planned implementation of additional railway infrastructure to serve the general Pok Fu Lam area and confirmation of permitted 	<p>To achieve the redevelopment of the site in conformity with the zoning of the site, the Board is invited to support the removal of the administrative PFLM on land exchanges and lease modifications.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H1/21-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
	(See Annex II)	development densities on statutory plans covering there area, there is no longer any logical reason to prevent the development of zoned sites up to the permitted maximum that has already been determined and included in the OZP.	
R19 to R28	Companies or Individuals (See Annex II)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Amendment Item E. • Planning on Hong Kong Island has generally adopted the approach of allowing lower buildings on the downhill side of the road and higher buildings on the uphill side of the road. The zoning for 2-6 & 10 Mount Davis Road introduced in 2011 changed this approach. The amendment now being proposed correct this. (R19, R20, and R24 to R28) • It was illogical unfair, unreasonable and in 2011 to impose different zonings and development restrictions on sites with similar characteristics. The previous approach of having all uphill sites on Mount Davis Road to be zoned as “R(B)”, with the same development rights and restrictions, was appropriate. The currently proposed amendment correct this. (R19, R20, and R24 to R28) • The zoning for 2-6 & 10 Mount Davis Road, introduced in Plan S/H1/18, was to reflect the current as-built conditions. This was a wrong approach to implement long-term planning aims. This amendment now being proposed correct this. (R19, R20, and R25) • The resulting development intensity for 2-6 & 10 Mount Davis Road under “R(B)” is still in line with the Residential 	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H1/21-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<p>Density Zone III in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guideline (i.e. plot ratio of 3 for developments of 17 storeys and over). (R19, R20, and R25 to R28)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The “high landscape value” of the slopes of Mount Davis will not be affected by the change of zoning of 2-6 & 10 Mount Davis Road from “R(C)2” to “R(B)1” and a BH of 160m, namely to medium-rise; the majority of the existing developments on the north side of Mount Davis Road are already medium rise. (R19, R20, and R24 to R28) • The view of ridge line of Mount Davis, when viewed from near the Queen Mary Hospital, will be maintained with a BH of 160mPD for 6-10 Mount Davis Road. (R19 and R25) • The imposition of the original “R(C)2” zoning to 2 & 6-10 Mount Davis Road gave disproportionate interference with property rights as it adversely affected the long term value of the site which had been purchased by the owners. (R23, and R25 to R28) 	
R29	Central and Western District Council (See Annex II)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects all amendment items. • Raises concern on Item C that the proposed increase of BHR is incompatible with the surrounding Government, Institution or Community (“G/IC”) and Open Space (“O”) sites and hinders the ventilation along Hill Road. • Claims that the government had worked together with HKU on the amendment item(s) to facilitate the redevelopment scheme at Pokfield Road. 	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H1/21-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The landscape and view from Pok Fu Lam Road to Pokfield Road would be impacted severely with the BHR relaxation; and some sea views and mountain views would be blocked from certain angles. • The proposed amendments have conflict to the purpose of safeguarding the landscape, visual impact and air ventilation, and hence, the health of the residents in the community. 	
R30	Individual (See Annex II)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects all Amendment items. • It was not justified to revise the BHR of various zones solely to achieve the SBDG. • Could not see the justification for the proposed amendments. The air ventilation assessment (AVA) indicates strong negative impact on ventilation with Amendment Items C and D. • Item D will probably be the focus of a single development, multi towers atop massive podium. Proposals would create an extensive wall effect on a site that is surrounded by schools and community facilities. While the towers would be separated, the podium would block ventilation at street level. • Item C has a school on one side and a garden and academic G/IC buildings on the other. The height of the current development is compatible with the surroundings. The 	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H1/21-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<p>major air airflow diagrams show that ventilation would be significantly impeded by additional high wall effect.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Amendment Item D, university facilities are essentially G/IC and it is shocking that HKU is allowed to claim everything in maximum when they redevelop. The AVA did not mention the redevelopment plans of Flora Ho Sports Centre and its impacts. For Amendment Item E, the two subject sites fall within the "Landscape Protection Area" "Development Areas with High Landscape Value", and the planning intention should be maintaining a low BH profile and development intensity, as agreed by the Board in 2011. The Representation site also falls within the PFLM area, which prohibits excessive development of the area until there is an overall improvement in the transport network in the PFLM area. Furthermore, there is a significant impact on the panorama on the skyline from Pok Fu Lam Road near Queen Mary Hospital and other viewpoints, unlike what it was written in the Visual Impact Assessment. For Amendment Items F1 and F2, even localised improvements are essential for achieving an overall improvement of the local environment and tackling climate change. 	
R31 to R212	Companies or Individuals (See Annex II)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to Amendment Item D The proposed amendment has no public interest on alleviating the existing housing shortage problem but only providing short term lodging for overseas staff. (R31 to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To combine the swimming pool and the accommodation into one building (R42 and R56); increase the seperation

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H1/21-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<p>R36, R41 to R208, R211, and R212)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further heightens the existing traffic burden along Smithfield Road and Pokfield Road, which are already over the maximum capacity. (R31 to R35, R38, R41 to R208, R211, and R212) • Causes wall effect, which blocks the ventilation and induces heat island effect. (R31, R37, R38, and R40 to R212) • Imposes impacts to the owners of the buildings along Pokfield Road and Pok Fu Lam Road and even the entire Sai Wan district. (R31 to R35, R41 to R207, R211, and R212) • HKU as a world top institute should focus on high-tech development, but not fighting interests with the public. (R42) • Affects the view and ventilation. (R39, R75, and R77 to R80) • The increase of 30m in BH, on top of the existing short distance with University Heights would further heightens the chimney effect, and hence, deteriorating the ventilation and heat in the lower floors. (R97) • Blocks the natural lighting and mountain view, especially of the flats on lower floors in University Heights. (R100 to R101, R192 to R193, and R207) 	<p>from University Heights (R56).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To lower the BHR of the proposed staff quarters from 120mPD to 90mPD or lower (R40, R211 and R212). • To build an indoor swimming pool atop the accommodation (R211).

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H1/21-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is a waste of resources to have no one living in the proposed tall building which is so close to University Heights; light and air pollution and greenhouse effect incurred by the increasing use of air conditioner and lighting in the common area of the proposed building impose negative impacts to the environment within the neighbourhood. (R100) It is unnecessary to increase the BH as reflected based on the high vacancy rate of the existing staff quarter of low BH. (R101 and R137) The property depreciates, which imposes harm to the economy of Sai Wan district. (R103) Disrespects the view of ridgeline and destroys the environment. (R126) Incompatible with the surroundings in terms of the outlook. (R127) According to the public information released by HKU in 2020, the information indicated that the concerned building will only be around 10+floors (120mPD). (R128 and R138) Based on the aforementioned information, an apartment on upper floor in University Heights was purchased in order to secure a hill-side view that is not blocked by the concerned building. The amendment affects stakeholders who bought the apartments based on the released information. 	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H1/21-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<p>Questions the handling of the compensation. (R128)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the proposed BH relaxation up to 150mPD does not tally with the 120mPD as mentioned in the public information released by HKU in 2020. It is considered as a handling lacking of integrity, disrespectful of other stakeholders and of irresponsibility. (R138) • Involves the transfers of benefits among stakeholders. (R149) • Privacy issues, noise pollution, light pollution, air pollution by the exhaust from the air conditioners and sewerage pollution leading to chimney effect are incurred due to the close distance with University Heights, harming the health of the residents. (R189 to R190, R192 to R193, R205, R207, and R208) • Heightens the burden on traffic and community amenities, and hence, posing safety issues to children and elderly living nearby and the increasing pedestrians along the narrow pedestrian path at Pokfield Road. (R189, R190, R192, and R193) • No imminent demands for residential units to accommodating guests. The original BHR of 120mPD is already sufficient to build flats. (R36) • There is a student village in Lung Wah Street which is close to the proposed HKU Pokfield Road Campus. The proposed HKU Pokfield Road Campus already adds 	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H1/21-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<p>congestion loading to Pokfield Road, so does the increased heights of the proposed guesthouse located in the said location. (R36)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new building belongs to the HKU and is constructed out of public money. The taller the building, the higher would be the construction costs. Given such a bad economic environment at the moment, it is inappropriate to spend more public money while there is a more cost effective alternative which can also give the same building area. (R167) • The original BHR of 120mPD would already enable the HKU to construct buildings more than double its existing height. The further relaxation would provide a building of three times the current buildings which might not be necessary, given the fact that the taller the building, the more residential units in the neighbouring buildings would be adversely affected in terms of both the amount of natural light and also air ventilation. (R167) • There is a high density area (Amendment Item A) which would only be relaxed from 120mPD to 130mPD while this “R(B)” site is meant to be medium density only but is proposed to be relaxed from 120mPD to 150mPD which is also inappropriate. (R167) • Provides views on the extent of the proposed scheme is stretching too wide and too tall, which affects the greenery and the environment and is considered as unnecessary. (R137) 	

Summary of Comments

In respect of draft Kennedy Town & Mount Davis Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H1/21

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H1/21-)	Commenter	Related Representations	Gist of Comments
C1	Institute (HKU) (see Annex III)	Providing responses to R29 to R212	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports Amendment Item D based on the followings: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> attracting and retaining academic talents; optimising the use of available land resources; and providing benefits to the community. In response to representers' concerns, HKU provides responses as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the building design of the proposed staff quarters has been amended to address the residents' concern after two meetings were held between HKU and residents of University Heights in late November 2020 and early February 2021; HKU also commissioned an air ventilation assessment (AVA) for the proposed staff quarters. With the adoption of the design features, the "R(B)" site is expected to have a satisfactory wind environment, and no significant air ventilation impact arising from the new staff quarters is anticipated; and a traffic impact assessment (TIA) has been conducted to evaluate their impact on the nearby junctions and adequacy of pedestrian facilities; and the results indicated that the new staff quarters with a building height (BH) of 150mPD will bring no significant adverse traffic impact to the existing conditions.
C2 to C9, C27 to C29, C31, C33 to C36, C38, C40, C42, C51, C52, C59, C60, C68 to C74, C84, C87, C98, and C99	Individuals (see Annex III)	R2 and R29 to R212	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support Amendment Item D. HKU currently has limited available space for campus development and must utilise its existing land resources to meet its development needs. HKU's staff quarters are insufficient considering the increasing number of regular academic staff and visiting professors, especially junior scholars (whom are relocating to Hong Kong with their spouse and family) face challenges in finding affordable lodging near HKU campuses. Increasing the BH for Item D will enable the University to provide much-needed residential facilities.

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H1/21-)	Commenter	Related Representations	Gist of Comments
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is compatible with the overall profile of the district, visual quality and surrounding landscape.
C17 to C22, C24, C26, C30, C32, C37, C39, C41, C43 to C46, C49, C50, C53, C54, C56 to C58, C61 to C67, C75, C83, C85, C86, C88, C90, C92 to C97, and C100 to C103	Individuals (see Annex III)	R2 and R29 to R212	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support Amendment Item D. Balance the need of the HKU to optimise the site's development potential while due considerations are given to the community and the planning and design process, such as visual impact, traffic flow and air ventilation. To meet the needs of the community, various design adjustments have been adopted. The increased BH of Item D will be compatible with the overall height profile, landscape, and development pattern in the surrounding landscape; while the impact on the penetration of natural light and air is expected to be minimal. Invited the Board to consider Item D, which will enhance landscape elements and visual interest to the streetscape while contributing to a pedestrian-friendly environment.
C76 to C82	Individuals (see Annex III)	R2 and R29 to R212	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support Amendment Item D. By increasing the BH of Item D, the new campus will be able to host more visiting scholars to HKU when more academic programmes resume. Through providing more green open space, landscape podium and sitting areas, the neighbourhood will benefit from the enhanced environment and convenience from new pedestrian facilities, such as footbridge, escalators and elevators. Item D will be a part of the Pokfield Campus development which will uplift the streetscape at Pokfield Road for the benefit of the community.
C10 to C16, C23, C25, C47, C48,	Individuals (see Annex III)	R2 and R29 to R212	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support Amendment Item D.

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H1/21-)	Commenter	Related Representations	Gist of Comments
C55, C89, and C91			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new campus will come with new facilities (e.g. footbridge connecting Pokfield Road to HKU main campus and Lung Fu Shan), restaurants and open space which will benefit the community. (C10, C48, and C55) • This amendment will optimise land resources for redeveloping the aging sports centers and staff quarters. (C11 and C91) • Oppose to R29 to R212 based on grounds of ventilation and visual impacts. The BH of Item D is still lower than the adjacent University Heights (with BH of 170mPD), which might have already blocked the views of other buildings next to it. (C12 and C13) • Oppose to R29 to R212 that the accommodation to be built by HKU for its staff on the site would not be able to “resolve housing shortage” and benefit the wider public. (C14 and C15) • The BH is compatible with the overall height profile, landscape and development pattern in the surroundings and in line with the current regulations on new buildings; while its impact on the penetration of natural light and air ventilation is expected to be minimal. (C16 and C25) • The amendment will facilitate academic exchange and nurture local talents. (C47)
C104	Individual (see Annex III)	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes all amendment items. • Makes query on R1 on the point that the proposed amendments can maintain an efficient, fair and sustainable urban development. • Points out HKU admitted “there will be some impacts to neighboring developments’ from the HKU redevelopment.

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H1/21-)	Commenter	Related Representations	Gist of Comments
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Points out a number of “Green Belt” sites were allocated for student hostels and buildings on campus and were redeveloped into many times from their original size. The Board has a duty to give equal weight to the views of the residents in the district (who bought homes in the city fringes for better environment but in wall effect with these amendments in the inner city).
C105	Individual (see Annex III)	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes Amendment Items A and D. The increase of BH of Item D from proposed 120mPD to 150mPD greatly impacts the residents in the area. There is no strong need in the dormitories for their business school.
C106	Organisation (The Owners Committee of University Heights) (see Annex III)	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes Amendment Item D. Has no public interest on alleviating the existing housing shortage problem. Further heightens the existing traffic burden along Smithfield Road. Causes wall effect; and hence, blocking the ventilation. Impacts the owners of the buildings along Pokfield Road and Pok Fu Lam Road and even the entire Sai Wan district.
C107	Corporation (Soon Cheong Material Ltd.) (see Annex III)	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes Amendment Item D.

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H1/21-)	Commenter	Related Representations	Gist of Comments
C108 to C130	Individuals (see Annex III)	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose Amendment Item D. • Has no public interest on alleviating the existing housing shortage problem. (C109, C114 to C117, C122, C125, C127, and C129) • Further heightens the existing traffic burden along Smithfield Road, Pokfield Road and within the whole area. The number of road accidents would also be increased given the sharp blind turns and the large number of school children around. (C109, C119, C123, and C125) • Causes wall effect and blocks air ventilation; hence, imposing disturbances to the existing residents and those living in HKU buildings. (C109, C111, C113 to C117, C119, C121, C122, C124 to C126, and C130) • The increase in the BH would impact the view and natural lighting of the flats in University Heights due to the short distance between the site of Item D and University Heights (C110, C113, C118, C121, and C130). • The amendment will destroy the surrounding environment. (C114 to C117 and C120) • The amendment will affect the surrounding natural environment/landscape, which is the habitat of some special bird species. (C110, C124, and C127) • Impacts the owners of the buildings along Pokfield Road and Pok Fu Lam Road and even the entire Sai Wan district. (C109, C125, and C129) • The relaxation of BH of Item D would cause interference with the property value and the private property market which is unfair for the recent flat purchasers. (C110, and C114 to C117)

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H1/21-)	Commenter	Related Representations	Gist of Comments
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Induces privacy issue. (C110) • HKU does not fully utilise the site coverage of the land lot, hence, it is unnecessary to increase the building up to 150mPD. (C111) • There would be a reduction in the number of face-to-face teaching after the global pandemic. The lodging facilities for overseas visitors are not necessary. (C111) • Planning Department pointed out at the C&W District Council meeting that an effective wind path should be 15m wide; however, the distance between the proposed staff quarters and University Heights is only 5.5m, which is not up to standards. (C111) • Wishes the view from the apartment would have no balcony and suggests HKU to use white colour for the proposed development. (C113) • Impacts the Feng Shui. (C114 to C117) • The newly built Pokfield Road accommodation would affect the building structure of University Heights and cause damage to the slope foundation. (C118 and C123) • The amendment may lead to a congested environment in the vicinity. (C127)
C131	Individual (see Annex III)	R1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes R1