

DRAFT CENTRAL DISTRICT OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/H4/17

INFORMATION NOTE AND HEARING ARRANGEMENT FOR CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS AND COMMENTS

1. Introduction

- 1.1 On 24.5.2019, the draft Central District Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H4/17 (the Plan) was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The amendments mainly involve rezoning of the Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui (HKSKH) Compound site from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “G/IC(1)” with stipulation of building height restrictions (BHRs) of 135mPD (northern portion) (**Item A1**) and 80mPD (southern portion) (**Item A2**). Amendments were also made to the Notes of the “G/IC” zone to set out the restrictions applicable to the “G/IC(1)” zone together with a minor relaxation clause. The Schedule of Amendments setting out the amendments incorporated into the OZP is at **Annex I** and the location of the amendment items is shown on **Plan P-1**.
- 1.2 During the two-month exhibition period, a total of 174 representations were received. Amongst them, 11 representations were made in accordance with the revised requirements set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 29B (TPB PG-No. 29B)¹ by providing the full name as shown on the Hong Kong Identity (HKID) card/passport and the first four alphanumeric characters of HKID card/passport number. The remaining 163 submissions were made with missing identity information or identity information in doubt (e.g. suspicious or incomplete name).
- 1.3 Considering that this is the first batch of amended OZPs subject to revised submission requirements under TPB PG-No. 29B, the Board agreed to allow the representers with the identity information in doubt or missing in their submissions a further opportunity to submit the required information and that if such representers failed or refused to provide such identity proof, the representations would be treated as not having been made. On 6.8.2019, the Secretariat sent out verification letters to the concerned parties but only 22 representers subsequently submitted the required information. As no response was received from the remaining submissions with identity information in doubt or missing, they should be considered as invalid and treated as not having been made pursuant to sections 6(2)(b) and 6(3)(b) of the Ordinance.

¹ According to TPB PG-No. 29B on Submission and Publication of Representations, Comments on Representations and Further Representations under the Town Planning Ordinance, which have taken effect since 1.1.2019, representers/commenters/further representers and their authorized agents are required to provide their full name as shown on the HKID card/passport and their HKID card/passport number (only the first four alphanumeric characters are required) in the submission. For submission with no full name, incomplete and/or illegible names or no HKID card/passport number, the representation/comment/further representation concerned may be treated as not having been made.

- 1.4 On 6.9.2019, 33 valid representations were published for public comments and, in the first three weeks of the publication period, 31 comments were received. Amongst them, 17 comments were made in accordance with the revised requirements set out in TPB PG-No. 29B. The remaining 14 submissions were made with missing identity information or identity information in doubt. On 2.10.2019, the Secretariat sent out verification letters to the concerned parties but only five commenters subsequently submitted the required information. As no response was received from the remaining submissions with identity information in doubt or missing, they should be considered as invalid and treated as not having been made pursuant to sections 6A(2) and 6A(3)(b) of the Ordinance.
- 1.5 The list of representers and commenters, and the summaries of representations and comments are shown in **Annexes II, III, IV and V** respectively for Members' reference. The location of the representation site is shown on **Plan P-2**.

2. The Representations and Comments

- 2.1 Among the 33 valid representations received, 24 representations (**R1 to R24**) object to Item A1, 8 representations (**R25 to R32**) object to both Items A1 and A2 and one representation (**R33**) provides views on the amendments. Out of the 32 adverse representations, 19 are in the form of standard representations (**R6 to R24**). The adverse representations are submitted by Government Hill Concern Group (**R1**), Kei Yan Primary School Alumni Concern Group (**R2**), the Foreign Correspondents' Club, Hong Kong (**R3**), Legislative Council (LegCo) Member (Hon Tanya CHAN (**R4**)), the Incorporated Owners of Glenealy Tower (**R25**), TST Residents Concern Group (**R26**), Central and Western District Council (C&WDC) Members (Ms NG Hoi-yan, Bonnie (**R27**) and Ms CHENG Lai-king (**R28**)), HKSKH Foundation (**R31**), and individuals. The representation providing views is submitted by the C&WDC (**R33**).
- 2.2 The grounds of adverse representation of **R1 to R30** are mainly related to the lack of necessity for a private hospital at the representation site; excessive height of the proposed hospital; adverse impacts on traffic, cultural landscape, heritage conservation, ecology, visual, trees, air quality and pedestrian accessibility; and the lack of relevant technical assessments. The grounds of adverse representation of **R31 and R32** are mainly related to the views that imposition of BHR on the representation site is contrary to private development rights; the BHR is too restrictive to allow innovative design; and the existing mechanism under the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance is justified to guide development of the preservation-cum-development proposal without imposition of further statutory controls.
- 2.3 The 22 valid comments on representations are submitted by **R2, R4, R5, R14, R25, R26, R29**, LegCo Member (Hon HUI Chi-fung) and individuals. **C1** (i.e. **R2**), **C2** (i.e. **R4**), **C3** (i.e. **R5**), **C4** (i.e. **R29**) to **C14** oppose **R31** and **C2 & C7 to C13** support **R1** and **C14** supports **R1 and R4**, **C15** supports **R25 to R30**, **C20** (i.e. **R14**) to **C22** supports **R2** and **C16** (i.e. **R26**) & **C17** (i.e. **R25**) to **C19** object to the proposed private hospital development at the representation site. The grounds of comments are similar to that of **R1 to R30**.

3. Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comments

- 3.1 Under section 2A of the Ordinance, the Town Planning Board (the Board) is empowered to appoint a Representation Hearing Committee (RHC) from among its members to consider representations and comments, propose amendments to the Plan to meet representations, consider further representations in respect of the proposed amendments, and consider whether to vary the proposed amendments upon consideration of any adverse further representations. Since the amendments incorporated in the Plan and the representations and comments received are of similar nature, it will be more efficient for the full Board to consider the representations and comments without resorting to the appointment of a RHC. The hearing could be accommodated in the Board's regular meeting and a separate hearing session would not be necessary. The arrangement would not delay the completion of the representation consideration process.
- 3.2 Under section 6B(6) of the Ordinance, the Board may determine whether the representations and the related comments shall be considered at the same meeting and whether they shall be considered individually or collectively. In view of the similar nature of representations and comments, it is recommended that the hearing of the representations and comments should be considered collectively in one group.
- 3.3 To ensure efficiency of the hearing, it is recommended to allot a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time to each representer/commenter in the hearing session.
- 3.4 Consideration of the representations and comments by the full Board under section 6B of the Ordinance is tentatively scheduled in December 2019.

4. Decision Sought

The Board is invited to consider whether:

- (a) to appoint a RHC for consideration of the representations and comments; and
- (b) the representations and comments should be considered in the manner as proposed in paragraph 3 above.

Attachments

Annex I	Schedule of Amendments to the approved Central District Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H4/16
Annex II	List of representers
Annex III	List of commenters
Annex IV	Summary of representations
Annex V	Summary of comments
Plan P-1	Amendments incorporated in the draft Central District OZP No. S/H4/17
Plan P-2	Location plan of the representation site