

**SCHEDULE OF AMENDMENTS TO  
THE APPROVED CENTRAL DISTRICT OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/H4/16  
MADE BY THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD  
UNDER THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE (Chapter 131)**

**I. Amendments to Matters shown on the Plan**

- Item A1 – Rezoning of the northern portion of the Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui (HKSKH) Compound at Lower Albert Road from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “G/IC(1)” and stipulation of a building height restriction of 135 metre above Principal Datum (mPD).
- Item A2 – Rezoning of the southern portion of the HKSKH Compound at Lower Albert Road from “G/IC” to “G/IC(1)” and stipulation of a building height restriction of 80mPD.

**II. Amendments to the Notes of the Plan**

- (a) Revision to the Remarks of the Notes for the “G/IC” zone to incorporate building height restrictions and minor relaxation clause for the “G/IC(1)” sub-zone.
- (b) Deletion of ‘Market’ from Column 1 of the Notes for the “Commercial” zone and from Column 2 of the Notes for the “Residential (Group B)” zone, and revision of ‘Shop and Services’ to ‘Shop and Services (not elsewhere specified)’ in Column 2 of the Notes for the “Residential (Group A)” and “G/IC” zones.

24 May 2019

Town Planning Board

**List of Representers in respect of  
Draft Central District Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H4/17**

<b>Rep. No. (TPB/R/S/H4/17-)</b>	<b>Name of 'Representer'</b>
1	Government Hill Concern Group
2	Kei Yan Primary School Alumni Concern Group
3	The Foreign Correspondents' Club, Hong Kong
4	Chan Tanya
5	Lee Cheuk Hei
6	Stephen Yang BARRY
7	Michelle Ga-Yun Lee
8	Lee Ho Wah, Hoover
9	Martin Allan MERZ
10	Hui Ka Siu Cassio
11	TERRY Edith Buchanan
12	TANG LAI MUI ROSEMARIE
13	Liu Wai Kei Ricky
14	Mak Hin Shing Ian
15	Sam Leung Tat Shun (梁達遜)
16	Gary Law Wai Ho
17	Yvonne Tsai (Tsai Yuen On Yvonne)
18	FONG YUEN WING
19	TANG Ho Yin
20	Kay Mei Ling, BEADMAN
21	Lung Chau Yue Tony
22	Wong Yeuk Ting
23	Lonneke Van Zundert
24	Chan Chi Keung Barry 陳志強
25	The Incorporated Owners of Glenealy Tower
26	TST Residents Concern Gp
27	伍凱欣
28	中西區區議員鄭麗琼
29	Mary Mulvihill
30	Chan Ping Yiu Alain
31	Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui Foundation
32	Pao Ping Wing
33	Central & Western District Council

**List of Commenters in respect of  
Draft Central District Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H4/17**

<b>Rep. No. (TPB/R/S/H4/17-C)</b>	<b>Name of 'Commenter'</b>
1	Kei Yan Alumni Concern Group
2	Tanya Chan
3	Lee Cheuk Hei
4	Mary Mulvihill
5	Law Ngar Ning Katty
6	Christine Lai Jing Wong
7	Brewer, John Robert
8	Sjoerd Aukes Hoekstra
9	Ho Yuen Ping
10	Genevieve James Moore
11	Wilhelmina Evelyn Moore
12	John Douglas Moore
13	Melanie Ann Moore
14	Roger Leslie Christian Emmerton
15	許智峯 Hui Chi Fung
16	TST Residents Concern Group
17	The Incorporated Owners of Glenealy Tower
18	Midgley, Jonathan Nicholas
19	Benny C.H. Chia
20	Mak Hin Shing Ian
21	Ricky Fong
22	Grace Ming Yan Kwong

**Summary of Representations**  
**in respect of the draft Central Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H4/17**

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H4/17-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
1	Government Hill Concern Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose Amendment Item A1.</li> </ul> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building height restriction (BHR) is in itself inadequate to address the urban design concerns of the Town Planning Board (TPB) Members which have led to the OZP amendment.</li> <li>• Visionary town planning controls are necessary to protect this important heritage site.</li> <li>• The potential impact of BHR has not been adequately addressed in the OZP amendment paper, preventing TPB Members from making a fully informed decision.</li> <li>• Proposed building height (BH) is too high, too bulky and contravening heritage charters such as the Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites in China issued by ICOMOS China and approved by the State Administration of Cultural Heritage in 2015.</li> <li>• The proposed BHR reflects an existing development proposal, instead of reflecting a strategy for guiding this sensitive heritage precinct.</li> <li>• The two options for BHR compromised TPB Members'</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjust the boundary of the amendment items and rezone as "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Historical Site Preserved for Government and Religious Uses" with imposition of site-specific BHRs similar to the height of existing buildings.</li> <li>• Impose BHR of 80mPD and urban design controls on Amendment Item A1.</li> </ul>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H4/17-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
2	Kei Yan Primary School Alumni Concern Group	<p>considerations. TPB Members were not given the option to consider alternative BHR that is more suitable for the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Necessity for a private hospital at the site is not justified in view of the low demand/ utilization rate of private hospitals on Hong Kong Island, as well as the imminent need of other community facilities.</li> <li>Oppose Amendment Item A1.</li> </ul> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The claim by Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui (HKSKH) that the tall building is necessary to keep the historic buildings is irresponsible and all buildings within the site should be preserved as they are.</li> <li>The Former Sheng Kung Hui Kei Yan Primary School building compound, which is the landmark of Central and generates collective memory, should be preserved.</li> <li>The proposed hospital destroys the cultural landscape and does not respect the Bishop Hill context. Conservation management plan should be submitted, and the TPB should provide sufficient heritage conservation guidelines to control the proposed development at heritage sites.</li> <li>The intensity of the proposed development will have ecological impact. Tree assessment should be submitted for TPB's consideration.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adaptive reuse of the existing Ming Hua Theological College and Sheng Kung Hui Kindergarten as a theological youth hostel.</li> <li>Restrict the development area and height of the proposed private hospital.</li> <li>Provide open space as buffer to separate the proposed hospital and Bishop's House.</li> <li>Convert the Old Sheng Kung Hui Kei Yan Primary School to religious and cultural museum.</li> <li>Introduce a butterfly themed garden, preserve natural landscape and enhance vegetation diversity.</li> <li>Open up the gate of the complex adjacent to the Glenealy and convert</li> </ul>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H4/17-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
3	The Foreign Correspondents' Club, Hong Kong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed development will cause adverse traffic impact to the surrounding commercial and residential areas. The relevant traffic impact assessment (TIA) should be disclosed.</li> <li>Oppose Amendment Item A1.</li> </ul> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed high-rise development would be detrimental to the character and historical interest of the Government Hill.</li> <li>Hospital development at the site would seriously worsen traffic congestion and cause more air pollution and intensify the pedestrian access problem.</li> <li>Demolition and construction work at the site would have adverse impact on the patronage and operation of the representer's site.</li> </ul>	<p>football field to an entrance plaza.</p> <p>Nil.</p>
4 to 24	For the names of representers, please see <b>Annex II</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oppose Amendment Item A1.</li> </ul> <p><u>Grounds of representation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed BH is too high, too bulky and contravening heritage charters such as the Principles for the Conservation of Heritage Sites in China issued by ICOMOS China and approved by the State Administration of Cultural Heritage in 2015.</li> <li>Necessity for a private hospital at the site is not justified in view of the low demand/ utilization rate of private hospitals on Hong Kong Island, as well as the imminent need of other community facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adjust the boundary of the amendment items and rezone as "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Historical Site Preserved for Government and Religious Uses" with imposition of site specific BHRs similar to the height of existing buildings. (R4, R6 to R24 only)</li> <li>Impose BHR of 80mPD on Amendment Item A1.</li> </ul>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H4/17-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The BHR of 135mPD is detrimental to the character of the site and its precinct. The TPB should critically review an appropriate BHR and even consider other control parameters for the site.</li> <li>The TPB was not provided with sufficient information and technical assessments to consider the OZP amendments comprehensively. This compromises Members in making an informed decision.</li> </ul>	
25	The Incorporated Owners of Glenealy Tower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oppose all Amendment Items.</li> <li><u>Grounds of representation:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development of a hospital at this location is unnecessary and detrimental to the area.</li> <li>Hospital development at the site would cause serious traffic problem. The nature and height of the proposed hospital is inappropriate.</li> <li>The proposed high-rise hospital is out of character with its location, incongruous, unsafe and unsightly.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Nil.
26	TST Residents Concern Grp	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oppose all Amendment Items.</li> <li><u>Grounds of Representation:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed hospital is visually incompatible with the surrounding area (e.g. mosque and Sun Yat Sen Museum) and would seriously impact the historic atmosphere and ambience.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retain the existing BH and building bulk in order to preserve the current open and green setting of the site, which is compatible with the presence of some of the oldest buildings in Hong Kong.</li> </ul>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H4/17-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
27	伍凱欣	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object the privatization of the oldest community services compound in the city. Priority should be given to providing community services, nursery, day care and healthcare at the existing under-used sites.</li> <li>Necessity for a private hospital at the site is not justified in view of the low demand/ utilization rate of private hospitals on Hong Kong Island.</li> <li>Oppose all Amendment Items.</li> </ul> <p><u>Grounds of Representation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>She does not object the development of hospital, but in view of the potential traffic and conservation impact on Bishop Hill, the lack of TIA, environmental assessment and a comprehensive conservation plan, she objects to the proposed OZP amendments.</li> </ul>	Nil.
28	中西區區議員 鄭麗琼	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oppose all Amendment Items.</li> </ul> <p><u>Grounds of Representation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed giant development would have adverse impact to the holistic conservation of Bishop Hill.</li> <li>The amendments are considered tailor-made for HKSKH's plan, there is bias on the part of the Government and there is suspicion on transfer of benefits.</li> <li>Proposed BH is too high, too bulky and contravening heritage charters such as the Principles for the Conservation of Heritage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adjust the boundary of the amendment items and rezone as "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Historical Site Preserved for Government and Religious Uses" with imposition of site specific BHRs similar to the height of existing buildings.</li> <li>Impose BHR of 80mPD on Amendment Item A1.</li> </ul>



Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H4/17-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<p>Sites in China issued by ICOMOS China and approved by the State Administration of Cultural Heritage in 2015.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Necessity for a private hospital at the site is not justified in view of the low demand/ utilization rate of private hospitals on Hong Kong Island, as well as the imminent need of other community facilities.</li> <li>• The BHR of 135mPD is detrimental to the character of the site and its precinct. The TPB should critically review an appropriate BHR and even consider other control parameters for the site.</li> <li>• The TPB was not provided with sufficient information and technical assessments to consider the OZP amendments comprehensively. This compromises Members in making an informed decision.</li> </ul>	
29	Mary Mulvihill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose all Amendment Items.</li> </ul> <p><u>Grounds of Representation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is of high heritage and cultural importance. The proposed development would cut through the heart of the site, undermine and diminish the integrity of the historic buildings therein, and is totally incompatible with the surroundings (e.g. the Government House). The ambiance and setting of the site being overshadowed by an enormous wall is unacceptable.</li> <li>• The proposed private hospital at the site contradicts the spirit and intention of the original land grant.</li> </ul>	Nil.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H4/17-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Necessity for a private hospital at the site is not justified in view of the low demand/ utilization rate of private hospitals on Hong Kong Island.</li> <li>• The amendments are considered tailor-made for HKSKH's plan, there is bias on the part of the Government and there is suspicion on transfer of benefits.</li> <li>• TPB Members were given limited choice and were pressured to agree to the BHR of 135mPD because the proposed development claimed to be at an advanced stage.</li> <li>• The proposed development will bring serious traffic issue but there is a lack of TIA.</li> <li>• Government, institution and community sites are intended to serve the entire community. The current development plan which serves only the elite and commercial interests while there are significant deficits in essential services for the public will be strongly resisted.</li> </ul>	
30	Chan Ping Yiu Alain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose all Amendment Items.</li> </ul> <p><u>Grounds of Representation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed BH is too high. It has not considered the character and the significant historic value of the area.</li> <li>• The site is too small for a big private hospital. Development with similar scale to the former Hong Kong Central Hospital</li> </ul>	Nil.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H4/17-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
31	HKSKH Foundation	<p>would be more appropriate for this historic low-rise G/IC site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The traffic condition would be unsustainable.</li> <li>Oppose all Amendment Items.</li> </ul> <p><u>Grounds of Representation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HKSKH's preservation-cum-development proposal (PCDP) responds to Hong Kong's pressing need for healthcare as well as integrating with the adaptive reuse of graded heritage buildings within the Compound. Yet the OZP restrictions are too restrictive to allow innovative designs.</li> <li>The imposition of any BHR on the HKSKH Compound is contrary to long-standing development rights in the context of the unrestricted lease.</li> <li>The existing mechanism under the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance is justified to guide development of the PCDP without imposition of further statutory controls under the Town Planning Ordinance. The PCDP has adhered to the relevant guidelines, and HKSKH is committed to working with the Antiquities and Monuments Office to ensure preservation in a sustainable manner.</li> <li>The proposed private hospital can increase the capacity of the medical service and allow the public to have more affordable quality options. Any constraint towards achieving the number of storeys proposed in the PCDP would threaten the number of hospital beds and service capacity that could be provided.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revert the site to its previous "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") zoning without BHR.</li> <li>Impose BHR of 150mPD on the northern portion and 100mPD on the southern portion of the representation site.</li> </ul>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H4/17-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design of the PCDP has given due consideration to urban design and heritage preservation principles in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. Clear priority has been given to the conservation of graded historic buildings.</li> <li>• The PCDP must also comply with the practical requirements for development of a minimum 274-bed hospital (e.g. efficient patient/staff circulation and accommodation of specialized medical equipment).</li> <li>• From the visual appraisal under the OZP amendment paper, the proposed height under the PCDP is not incompatible with the surroundings from visual point of view.</li> <li>• The complex reality of heritage preservation-cum-development should be considered when deriving BHR for the site. Sufficient flexibility should be allowed for the potential changes to the PCDP due to various site constraints.</li> <li>• The imposition of BHR on Alford House and Ridley House is premature and unnecessary.</li> </ul>	

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/H4/17-)	Representer	Subject of Representation	Representer's Proposal
32	Pao Ping Wing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose all Amendment Items.</li> </ul> <p><u>Grounds of Representation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The imposition of any BHR on the HKSKH Compound is contrary to development rights of the owner.</li> <li>• If BHRs have to be imposed, the BHRs under Amendment Items A1 and A2 are supported.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revert the site to its previous "G/IC" zoning without BHR.</li> </ul>
33	C&WDC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enclosed the minutes of a previous C&amp;WDC meeting, which outlines the diverse views of the Members regarding the problem of traffic congestion in the area, demand for private hospital, design, intensity and impact of the proposed hospital development and BHR.</li> </ul>	Nil.

**Summary of Comments**  
**in respect of the draft Central Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H4/17**

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H4/17-)	Commenter	Related Representation	Gist of Comments
C1 (i.e. R2)	Kei Yan Alumni Concern Group	R31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui (HKSKH) should provide a conservation management plan (CMP) that expounds the new life of the proposed historic building.</li> <li>• Apart from the façade, HKSKH should also preserve the building structure and interior of Bishop's House Extension of which conditions are excellent.</li> <li>• HKSKH Bishop Hill is a sensitive historic zone that the entire cultural landscape, histories and urban fabrics should be preserved to enhance the bonding and consistency of the Central and Western Heritage Trail.</li> <li>• The concerns and collective memory of Kei Yan Alumni Concern Group has not been taken into account that the educational compound including the Grade 2 Old Kei Yan Primary School may cease to stay against bigger cultural landscape in Central.</li> <li>• Reusing the existing buildings which are in excellent condition is most sustainable and it can reduce construction waste and pollution.</li> <li>• As under Basic Law Article 7, the site is "State property" that the Government can cite the Lands Resumption Ordinance to resume the Bishop Hill site for the purpose of heritage conservation.</li> <li>• HKSKH should provide environmental impact assessment, traffic impact assessment (TIA), visual impact assessment and CMP to demonstrate its strategy to strike a balance between urban design, conservation and development for the collective good. It should also conduct comprehensive investigation for Bishop</li> </ul>

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H4/17-)	Commenter	Related Representation	Gist of Comments
			<p>Hill on geotechnical and structural feasibility issue to ensure safety issue. The adjacent residential and commercial zone should not be used as a reference for the maximum building height restriction of the Bishop Hill site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site should be nominated for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) world heritage site to promote the history of Hong Kong. The preservation-cum-development proposal (PCDP) suggested by HKSJKH would completely destroy the Bishop Hill cultural landscape.</li> <li>• The PCDP will be privately operated and will very possibly not bring benefit to the patients in the district if they cannot afford the exorbitant rates.</li> <li>• The building height restrictions (BHRs) of the adjacent residential and commercial zone should not be used as a reference for the development of Bishop Hill.</li> <li>• HKSJKH should proactively propose Alford House and Ridley House to Antiquities Advisory Board and Antiquities &amp; Monuments Office for historic building grading and revitalize them for community service in order to demonstrate their hidden historical value as well as to illustrate the glory of HKSJKH religious and education contributions in Hong Kong.</li> </ul>
<b>C2</b> (i.e. R4)	Tanya Chan	<b>R1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area where the heritage compound locates should not have development with excessive building height (BH).</li> <li>• Development with similar scale to the former Hong Kong Central Hospital (HKCH) would be more appropriate.</li> </ul>

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H4/17-)	Commenter	Related Representation	Gist of Comments
C3 (i.e. R5)	Lee Cheuk Hei	R31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although the existing mechanism under Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance (AMO) (Cap.53) already provides guidance to PCDP, there should also be other controls taking the community into consideration to avoid excessive development.</li> <li>• It is obvious that the Town Planning Board (TPB) has made this significant decision without comprehensive information.</li> </ul>
C4 (i.e. R29)	Mary Mulvihill	R31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal neglects the traffic condition on the area and the special value of the heritage.</li> <li>• Necessity for a private hospital at the site is not justified in view of the low utilization rate of private hospitals in the surroundings.</li> <li>• Although the existing mechanism under AMO (Cap.53) already provides guidance to PCDP, there should also be other controls taking the community into consideration to avoid excessive development.</li> <li>• The proposed private hospital would only cater the rich and promote medical tourism instead of providing medical service to the public.</li> <li>• There are surplus of hospital beds on Hong Kong Island.</li> <li>• “Government, Institution or Community” (“GIC”) sites must be used for genuine community services that cater the majority. Compared with a private hospital, district health centres that provide medical service to the elderly who can be discharged from hospital, would be more effective to relieve the pressure of growing ageing population.</li> <li>• Such amendment may set as a precedent case for other applications for minor relaxation of BH.</li> </ul>



Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H4/17-)	Commenter	Related Representation	Gist of Comments
C5 to C14	For the names of commenters, please see Annex III	R1 (C7 to C14 only)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed development is shifting the discourse of heritage preservation of individual buildings while ignoring the impact and the integrity of the compound as a whole.</li> <li>The proposed development of 135mPD with reflective façade is incompatible with the surrounding area.</li> <li>Maintaining existing BH is a reasonable mean to protect Bishop Hill which is an important heritage and address the urban design concerns of the TPB Members.</li> <li>The proportionality test of private property rights is important and issues including the significant built heritage and historic ambience of the site are of public interests, and hence it should be taken into consideration by the TPB.</li> <li>R1's development proposal does not prevent redevelopment of the site. A more appropriate alternative would be a low-rise government, institution and community (GIC) building such as housing welfare facilities on a scale similar to the former HKCH. This would reduce the need for hospitalisation and benefit government budgeting and patient's wellbeing.</li> <li>The narrow and heavily congested roads within the area cannot possibly sustain any large-scale building or large hospital. There is a compelling need to restrict any redevelopment on the site to a small-scale development.</li> </ul>
		R1 and R4 (C14 only)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is the only "G/IC" site on the OZP suitable for general community services. Developing it into a private hospital would remove the site from public domain.</li> </ul>
		R31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is unsuitable for development of any large building due to its steep terrain, narrow road access and its location within an important low-rise heritage area. The construction of the proposed hospital would destroy the heritage</li> </ul>

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H4/17-)	Commenter	Related Representation	Gist of Comments
			<p>areas in Central.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no information on the potential visual and traffic impacts of the proposed development on the Government House or Wyndham Street provided to the TPB for discussion.</li> <li>• TPB members were given limited choice and were pressured to agree to the draft 135mPD BHR because the proposed development claimed to be at an advanced stage.</li> <li>• There is no consideration of alternative GIC facilities other than the proposed hospital such as district welfare facilities for children, elderly or person with disabilities. Development with similar scale to the former HKCH would be more appropriate for this historic low-rise “G/IC” site.</li> <li>• There is already another private hospital close to the site (Canossa Hospital) operating well below its full capacity. It is unnecessary to have another private hospital nearby.</li> <li>• Greater BHR and consideration of redevelopment potential of the Vicarage, Alford House and Ridley House as stated in R31 would bring greater development pressure on the site. In view of the heritage significance of the site and the existing traffic congestion in the area, a BHR of 80mPD for the entire site would be appropriate.</li> </ul>
<b>C15</b>	許智峯 Hui Chi Fung	<b>R28</b>  <b>R25 to R30</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It facilitates the conservation of Bishop Hill and the urban landscape.</li> <li>• TIA and other technical assessments were not conducted by the applicant.</li> </ul>

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H4/17-)	Commenter	Related Representation	Gist of Comments
<b>C16</b> (i.e. R26)	TST Residents Concern Group	Provides views to the OZP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The TPB and the Administration have a duty to ensure that the existing "G/IC" sites are used for genuine community services. The public needs district health centres urgently.</li> </ul>
<b>C17</b> (i.e. R25)	The Incorporated Owners of Glenealy Tower	Provides views on the OZP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The large-scale hospital development at the site would seriously worsen traffic congestion and bring adverse impacts to the residents nearby.</li> <li>There is no shortage of hospital beds in Central Hong Kong.</li> <li>The site is a heritage area with old low-rise buildings which should be respected.</li> </ul>
<b>C18</b>	Midgley, Jonathan Nicholas	Provides views on the OZP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The degree of advancement of the proposed hospital should be irrelevant to the OZP amendment.</li> <li>The proposed 25-storey hospital development would worsen the traffic congestion.</li> <li>There is no shortage of hospital beds in Central.</li> </ul>
<b>C19</b>	Benny C.H. Chia	Provide views on OZP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The large-scale hospital development at the site would seriously worsen traffic congestion and affect the vehicular circulation.</li> <li>There is no shortfall of private medical facilities in the area in accordance with the latest government report.</li> <li>The proposed development violates the conservation policy in Policy Report by CE and also spoils the landscape of the tourist popular area.</li> </ul>

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/H4/17-)	Commenter	Related Representation	Gist of Comments
C20 (i.e. R14) to C22	For the names of commenters, please see Annex III	R2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The alumni who have collective memory of the use and the form of the existing development at the site should be respected.</li> <li>• Any major redevelopment on the site will result in an irreversible detrimental impact on the fabric and ambience of the historical site and the surroundings.</li> <li>• The proposal by HKSJKH is not a PCDDP as it proposes to demolish the Welfare Council, Kindergarten and Ming Hua Theological College which have contributed to the character of the site.</li> <li>• The adaptive reuse proposal suggested by R2 including the surrounding sites is reasonable and logical that it has been proven to be good means in managing heritages (e.g. Tai Kwun and PMQ).</li> <li>• The unrestricted lease does not warrant TPB members to provide incentives in exchange of the BHR introduction.</li> </ul>