

**Summary of Further Representations (FRs) and the Planning Department’s (PlanD’s) Detailed Responses
in respect of the Proposed Amendments to the Draft Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H10/22 (the draft OZP)**

(1) The grounds and views of the 2 supportive further representations (FRs) and the responses as below:

Grounds and Views of Further Representations		PlanD’s Responses in Consultation with Government Bureaux/ Departments (B/Ds) Concerned
(FS1)	The proposed Global Innovation Centre of the University of Hong Kong (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 Innovation and Technology (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.	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 hearings, are noted.
(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 University of Hong Kong (HKU) campuses, Queen Mary Hospital (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 Further Amendment Item A Site (the Site).	

(FS3)	<p>HKU has received valuable feedback on the Centre’s development from various stakeholders during the Town Planning Board’s (the Board) 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.</p>	
(FS4)	<p>Support rezoning of the Site to an “Undetermined” (“U”) zone, which could allow time for HKU to review the development plan and consider the comments and suggestions made by Members of the Town Planning Board (TPB Members) and the public.</p>	

(2) The grounds and views of the 1,859 opposing further representations (FRs) and the responses as below:

Grounds and Views of Further Representations	PlanD’s Responses in Consultation with Government B/Ds Concerned
A. Strategic Planning, Site Selection and Alternative Locations	
(FA1) Although the development of the Centre was announced in the 2021 Policy Address (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	The 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 provided in the TPB Paper No. 10987 and recorded in the

	<p>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>	<p>minutes of the Board’s meetings, which are extracted below:</p> <p>According to the Innovation, Technology and Industry Bureau (ITIB), I&T is a major driver that can spur economic development and new quality productive forces. The Government promulgated the I&T Blueprint in late 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 emphasized in the I&T Blueprint can be realized in various forms, locations, and projects by different stakeholders. While the San Tin Technopole (including the Loop in the NM), being Government-initiated and funded infrastructural facilities and I&T projects, can provide new land for building a hub for clustered I&T development, they are by no means the only suitable and/or available platforms for achieving the Government’s I&T development goals.</p>
(FA2)	<p>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.</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.</p>
(FA3)	<p>The proximity of the Center 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 at the expense of the Pok Fu Lam</p>	<p>ITIB affirms that the Centre aligns with the policy goals to enhance Hong Kong's status as an international I&T hub while consolidating its strength in upstream basic research. ITIB also takes the view that the Centre is a distinct initiative pursued by HKU concerning mainly basic research in the upstream and related</p>

	community.	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 that the latter is not meant to supersede or substitute the former. <i>[Above extracted from response (a) of paragraph 6.2.6 and paragraph 9.3(a) of TPB paper no. 10987]</i>
(FA4)	There are alternative locations to consider, such as San Tin Technopole and the Loop, the “Residential (Group C) 6” (“R(C)6”) site adjacent to the “U” zone, Cyberport, land next to 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.	According to HKU, while the Site was considered the most suitable location, it would still consider alternative locations such as San Tin Technopole and the adjacent “R(C)6” site. Besides, HKU would review the necessity and floorspace requirements of various components of the Centre and explore the potential for shared facilities
(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 Pok Fu Lam Road (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.	In response to a Member’s question on whether the Board was obliged to follow the policy direction of the 2021 PA and accept HKU’s proposal, the Chairperson said 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. While PlanD would adopt a facilitating role in taking forward the rezoning proposal if such was given policy support and found technically feasible by B/Ds, it would be incumbent upon HKU as the project proponent to resolve all technical issues to the satisfaction of relevant government departments. 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. <i>[Above extracted from paragraphs 6(l) and 29 of the minutes of the meeting]</i>

on 29.11.2024]

Majority of TPB Members shared similar views regarding site selection for the Centre. Their views were that (a) not all representers who raised objections were against the Site or the development of the Centre in Pok Fu Lam. The crux of the matter was whether the development proposal was acceptable. HKU should provide strong justifications for choosing the preferred site and conduct adequate technical assessments on the revised development proposal to address local concerns; (b) there was a genuine need for Hong Kong to develop deep technology research facilities, and it was logical for HKU to develop the Centre near its Main Campus in Pok Fu Lam, where the research atmosphere was well-established with the presence of QMH and Cyberport, creating clustering and synergy effects and facilitating collaboration across the research and academic sectors. In particular, the advancement of financial technology often leveraged its proximity to universities; (c) HKU should consider alternative locations in Pok Fu Lam and other areas such as NM. If HKU concluded after review that the Centre should be in Pok Fu Lam, it should provide more justifications for why other locations were not ideal for the development of the Centre; (d) further clarification from HKU was required regarding the idea of establishing a self-contained facility while also promoting a synergy effect with the surrounding developments; (e) HKU should consider whether the Site or other sites in Pok Fu Lam, including but not limited to the adjoining undeveloped “R(C)6” site, were more suitable for achieving HKU’s objective while minimising impacts on neighbouring communities. From the planning perspective, it was desirable for HKU to integrate the Site with the adjoining “R(C)6” site to offer greater design flexibility, accommodate setbacks for road improvement/ widening to improve traffic flow,

		<p>and allow room for future expansion. This could reduce the site area and building bulk at the Site, particularly when viewed from Victoria Road, and provide opportunity for more compensatory planting. While developing the Centre at the “R(C)6” site with a building height (BH) restriction of 137mPD might be less controversial, it was still crucial to strictly control the plot ratio and BH to avoid adverse impacts on the surrounding area. Besides, HKU should fully address the noise impact of the Centre, in particular during the construction stage, on students with visual impairment at Ebenezer School. <i>[Above extracted from paragraphs 9(a) to (d) of the minutes of the meeting on 29.11.2024]</i></p> <p>Regarding TPB PG-No.10, responses for (FC1) below is also relevant.</p>
B. The “U” zoning		
(FB1)	<p><u>No Legal Basis</u></p> <p>The Board does not have the legal authority under section 6B(8) of the Town Planning Ordinance (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 a “U” zoning for the Site, there was no representation which could be considered as being met by the proposed “U” zoning. The decision to</p>	<p>The 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 provided in the TPB Paper No. 10987 and recorded in the minutes of the Board’s meetings, which are extracted below:</p> <p>A Member sought clarification on the Board’s options for decision-making under the Ordinance. PlanD replied that in accordance with section 6B(8) of the Ordinance, “<i>after considering any representation under this section, the Board must decide whether or not to propose amendment to the plan in the manner proposed by the representation; or to propose amendment to the plan in any other manner that, in the opinion of the Board, will meet the representation</i>”. HKU issued a press release to announce its decision to take some time to strategically</p>

<p>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 hearings.</p> <p>The Board's statutory duties include designating an appropriate zoning and setting development parameters for a site. By deciding on a “U” zoning, the Board failed to fulfill this duty, as the “U” zoning does not set appropriate development parameters. As per the recent High Court Judgment (HCAL</p>	<p>review and amend the development plan to address stakeholders’ opinions as much as practicable. HKU also endeavoured to step up engagement with the community through various channels to improve the proposal and provide timely project updates. In light of the above, PlanD proposed to rezone the Site to “U” in this interim period to serve as a stopgap arrangement pending completion of the review and further community engagement by HKU. PlanD further supplemented 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 was 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 thought fit that would meet the representations. <i>[Above extracted from paragraphs 36 and 37 of the minutes of the meeting on 5.11.2024]</i></p> <p>TPB Members acknowledged during the meetings that most representers supported the development of the Centre by HKU to consolidate Hong 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 hearings to consulting relevant stakeholders in strategically reviewing and amending its development plan to address their opinions as much as practicable. HKU would also explore the possibility of identifying alternative sites for the development of the Centre. <i>[Above extracted from paragraph 8 of the minutes of the meeting on 29.11.2024]</i></p> <p>PlanD supplemented that pending HKU’s review and further consultation, it was</p>
--	---

<p>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 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 TPB 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 Explanatory Statement (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</p>	<p>premature for the Board at this juncture to decide to adopt other zonings or impose any specific planning restrictions in the absence of a revised scheme. It was not the first time for the Board to adopt “U” zone as an interim zoning. <i>[Above extracted from paragraph 37 of the minutes of the meeting on 5.11.2024]</i> Designating a site as “U” zone on OZPs was not uncommon when the planning intention for a site was uncertain or while awaiting completion of a study or infrastructure facilities. It was considered prudent to rezone the Site to “U” in the interim period, allowing time for HKU to review its development plan and make amendments based on stakeholders’ feedback. <i>[Above extracted from paragraph 45(a) of the minutes of the meeting on 1.11.2024]</i></p> <p>During the deliberation session, TPB 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, conduct relevant technical assessments, further consult the local community and submit the revised proposal for consideration by the Government and the Board. The development of the Centre could facilitate the provision of deep technology research facilities in Hong Kong. The proposal of some representers 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. 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. Regarding the planning control under the “U” zone, TPB Members expressed that there would be adequate planning control under the “U” zoning any development would be require planning permission from the Board. <i>[Above</i></p>
---	--

<p>subject to HKU's review and assessment of alternative sites. The Site should therefore maintain its original “GB” zone and “R(C)6” zones, as this would better reflect the representers’ and TPB 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 was 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.</p>	<p><i>extracted from paragraph 25 of the minutes of the meeting on 29.11.2024]</i></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 members of the public would have the opportunity to submit written representations and attend hearings to express their views to the Board directly. <i>[Above extracted from paragraphs 6(xx) and 33 of the minutes of the meeting on 29.11.2024]</i> The ES for the “U” zone already reflects the above intention and situation.</p> <p>For the concerns about TPB’s ability to exercise independent planning judgment, the Chairperson of the Board has explained in the meetings, regarding the question on whether the Board was obliged to follow the policy direction of the 2021 PA and accept HKU’s proposal, 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</p>
---	--

		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. <i>[Above extracted from paragraph 29 of the minutes of the meeting on 29.11.2024]</i>
(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>	<p>Regarding the further representers' proposal, HKU has committed at the hearings to consult 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 accepted HKU's revised proposal, another round of statutory planning procedures would be required to rezone the site to an appropriate zoning. <i>[Above extracted from paragraphs 6(pp) and 39(c) of the minutes of the meeting on 29.11.2024]</i></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 to HKU. Moreover, the "U" zone risks signaling to developers and institutions that protected green spaces can be rezoned arbitrarily, creating piecemeal urban expansion into the green belt.</p>	<p>For the proposal of reverting the Site back to the original "GB" zoning, as explained by the Chairperson at the meeting, although the general presumption against development was applicable to all "GB" zones across all OZPs, with the objective of discouraging development in "GB" zones which had the planning function of serving as buffer between built-up areas and non-built up areas, there was no lack of examples in the past where "GB" zones were rezoned for appropriate uses, such as housing, and strong planning grounds were required to justify such land use changes, particularly the public interests that the rezoning proposals intended to achieve. Any development within a "GB" zone that would</p>
	<u>Proposals</u>	

(FB4)	<p>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.</p>	<p>have environmental impacts would need to be supported by relevant technical assessments with adequate and effective mitigation measures, and whether the environmental trade-offs were justified in meeting the needs of society. [<i>Above extracted from paragraph 62 of the minutes of the meeting on 4.11.2024</i>]</p>
(FB5)	<p>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. 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.</p>	
(FB6)	<p>If the proposed amendment to revert to the original zoning is not supported by the Board, F1808 to F1810 and F1835 to F1837 suggest that the covering Notes to be amended 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 Column 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</p>	

	<p>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.</p>	
<p>C. Land Uses Compatibility, Development Intensity, Visual Impact and Interface with Nearby Schools</p>		
<p>(FC1)</p>	<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</p>	<p>The 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 provided in the TPB Paper No. 10987 and recorded in the minutes of the Board’s meetings, which are extracted below:</p> <p>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. [<i>Above extracted from paragraph 39(b) of the minutes of the meeting on 29.11.2024</i>]</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 would 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. [<i>Above extracted from paragraph 6(s) of the minutes of the meeting on 29.11.2024</i>]</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</p>

	<p>criteria set forth in the Guidelines. The general presumption against development applies to all “GB” zones across all OZPs has also been confirmed by the Chairperson of the Board at the hearings. 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>	<p>applicable to the subject proposed amendments to the OZP. <i>[Above extracted from paragraph 6.2.7(b) of the TPB Paper No. 10987]</i></p> <p>The Chairperson of the Board explained that the general presumption against development is applicable to all “GB” zones across all OZPs, with the objective of discouraging development in “GB” zones which have the planning function of serving as buffer between built-up areas and non-built up areas. That said, there was no lack of examples in the past where “GB” zones were rezoned for appropriate uses, such as housing, and strong planning grounds were required to justify such land use changes, particularly the public interests that the rezoning proposals intended to achieve. Any development within a “GB” zone that would have environmental impacts would need to be supported by relevant technical assessments with adequate and effective mitigation measures, and whether the environmental trade-offs were justified in meeting the needs of society. <i>[Above extracted from paragraph 62 of the minutes of the meeting on 4.11.2024]</i></p> <p>HKU should critically review the necessity and floorspace requirements for various components of the Centre, including accommodation and conference facilities. Consideration should also be given to optimising the utilisation of the HKU’s existing premises/facilities to meet such needs. Noting the availability of vacant residential premises managed by HKU in Pok Fu Lam, the need for the accommodation component in the Centre should be justified. <i>[Above extracted from paragraphs 12(b), 33 and 34 of the minutes of the meeting on 29.11.2024]</i></p>
(FC2)	<u>Visual Impact</u>	The grounds regarding visual impact of the Centre were raised, responded to, and considered during the consideration of representations by the Board. Detailed

	<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>	<p>responses to these issues have been recorded in the minutes of the Board’s meetings, which are extracted below:</p> <p>Some TPB Members expressed the following views for HKU’s consideration when reviewing its proposal:</p> <p>HKU should enhance the design including reducing building density and bulk, lowering BH and providing building gaps from neighbouring buildings.</p> <p>Given the elongated configuration and steep terrain of the Site, HKU should take into account the topographical context to protect the natural environment and minimise adverse visual impacts in the revised proposal. The revised design should take into consideration public views from PFLR towards the sea as indicated by a representer (R260).</p> <p>As there would be substantial building bulk when viewed from Victoria Road, considerations should be given to reducing the building bulk along the Victoria Road frontage to avoid adverse visual impacts on the surrounding developments. Besides, the revised scheme should minimise the adverse impacts on the Ebenezer.</p> <p>HKU should enhance the design of the Centre, including reducing density and bulk, lowering BH and increasing setback from neighbouring buildings. [<i>Above extracted from paragraphs 15 and 33 of the minutes of the meeting on 29.11.2024</i>]</p>
(FC3)	<p><u>The Ebenezer School and the Ebenezer New Hope School (ENHS) (the Ebenezer)</u></p>	<p>TPB Members discussed the possible impact of the Centre on the Ebenezer at the hearings and the deliberation session, which are extracted below:</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>	<p>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.</p> <p>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. <i>[Above extracted from paragraphs 9(d), 15(c), 17, 26 and 33(h) of the minutes of the meetings on 29.11.2024]</i></p>
<p>D. Tree Preservation, Landscape and Ecology</p>		
(FD1)	<p>It is important to recognize the value of the 2,250 trees within the Site, regardless of the species. The removal of over 2,250 mature trees to accommodate the Centre would result in irreversible environmental degradation and destruction of significant natural habitats.</p>	<p>The 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 recorded in the minutes of the Board’s meetings, which are extracted below:</p> <p>Representative of HKU explained that owing to site constraints and conflicts with</p>

<p>(FD2)</p>	<p>Mature trees take decades to regrow, and newly planted saplings lack the ecological complexity required to support native fauna.</p>	<p>the development layout, it was anticipated that about 2,000 trees would inevitably be felled. Although only about 850 new trees would be planted, HKU put much emphasis on the quality of the compensatory trees. For example, more heavy standard trees with larger diameter at breast height rather than light standard trees would be planted, and the possibility of planting new trees in appropriate locations instead of simply putting them on the roof had been duly considered. Compensatory trees would also be planted in clusters to form natural habitats for birds/butterflies' foraging. Off-site tree planting had been explored but no suitable sites could be identified yet. Nevertheless, when revising the development proposal for the Centre, HKU would critically review the tree preservation and compensation proposals, and liaise with the concerned government departments to explore off-site tree planting options. [<i>Above extracted from paragraphs 69 of the minutes of the meeting on 5.11.2024</i>]</p> <p>TPB Members generally agreed that HKU should minimise tree felling and disturbance to the natural habitats, enhance tree compensation and provide more green spaces. The proposed tree compensation ratio of 1:0.48 was relatively low as compared to the 1:1 ratio generally adopted in development proposals previously considered by the Board. Noting that about 2,000 trees would be felled, a TPB Member opined that the revised proposal should strike a balance between environmental protection and development. Noting that the trees at the Site were common species, two TPB Members considered the proposed tree felling not unacceptable. Regarding the ecological impacts of the Centre, a Member said that according to the Ecological Impact Assessment, the ecological value of the woodland habitat at the Site was relatively low. Another Member considered that HKU should address the impact of the proposed development on yellow-crested</p>
--------------	---	--

		cockatoos (<i>Cacatua sulphurea</i>) (小葵花鳳頭鸚鵡). 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. [<i>Above extracted from paragraphs 18, 19 and 33 of the minutes of the meeting on 29.11.2024</i>]
E. Traffic and Transport		
(FE1)	Residents in Pok Fu Lam area are already facing daily congested traffic condition because of the developments in Wah Fu, QMH and the Cyberport. The Centre would cause further adverse traffic impact to the surrounding areas.	The 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 recorded in the minutes of the Board's meetings, which are extracted below:
(FE2)	Although the relevant government departments had no adverse comments on the Traffic Impact Assessment (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 traffic impact assessment conducted for the Centre.	Representative of HKU explained that: (1) the TIA was conducted based on assumed development parameters, including the assumption that the proposed development would accommodate 7,000 employees including about 1,500 research teams. Besides, the TIA had taken into account major planned and committed developments in the vicinity such as the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate and the Cyberport Expansion. The TIA did not factor in the SIL(W) for assessment under the conservative approach and hence had assumed no modal shift resulting from any new non-road public transport systems;
(FE3)	The Centre involves residential buildings and an excessive overall PR of 4.72, which violates the purpose of the Pok Fu Lam Moratorium (PFLM). This is inconsistent with approving the Centre but rejecting the redevelopment proposal of the Ebenezer School.	(2) the locations of the vehicular ingress/egress points and the capacity of the concerned road links and junctions in the vicinity were assessed. The TIA concluded that all assessed roads links and junctions, except for four junctions (J1, J8, J16 and J17), would operate satisfactorily during peak hours under the scenario with the proposed development. Junction improvements for J1 (i.e. increasing the
(FE4)	The proposed South Island Line (West) (SIL(W)), intended to alleviate congestion of the Southern District, will not be	

<p>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.</p>	<p>cycle time of traffic signals) and J8 (i.e. provision of staggered pedestrian crossing) were proposed in the TIA to ensure adequate junction capacity. Although junctions J16 and J17 were located further from the proposed development and the traffic generated/attracted by the proposed development at those two junctions was considered negligible, HKU had proposed junction improvement works. HKU had been liaising with Transport Department (TD) on the need for the proposed improvement measures such as setback of the development site and road and pavement widening, and would coordinate with TD on the future improvement works if necessary;</p> <p>(3) the development programme of the Centre outlined in the TIA extended only to 2029 with a design year of 2032. In view of the considerable long timeframe for the implementation of the Centre, HKU had committed to undertaking an updated TIA at the detailed design stage, a construction TIA, and a traffic review prior to project commissioning. The requirement for HKU to submit these additional assessments had been incorporated into the ES of the OZP; and</p> <p>(4) PFLR was a primary distributor road with two lanes in each direction, connecting the Western District and the Aberdeen areas. HKU had implemented a number of projects in the area and was familiar with the traffic pressure of the local road network including PFLR, and HKU would continue to make every attempt to mitigate the any adverse traffic impact on the local road network. For example, to avoid congestion from buses queuing at the bus stop on PFLR, setback would be proposed to provide space for extension of bus lay-by. All loading/unloading activities for the Centre would be conducted on-site to avoid tailbacks/blockages at the vehicular ingress/egress. Widening of the footpath and pedestrian crossing</p>
---	---

at PFLR near the vehicular ingress/egress of the Centre was proposed. By adopting an open campus policy and facilitating pedestrian connectivity between PFLR and Victoria Road, HKU would provide vertical pedestrian connection routes via lifts and escalators within the Centre, which would be open for public use. An internal walkway would also be provided to connect the proposed Centre with the HKU Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine (HKUMed) and its expansion at Sassoon Road.

HKU, as the project proponent, would be responsible for designing and implementing, at its own cost, any traffic improvement measures or works identified in the TIA and any follow-up assessments/reviews as necessary to address traffic impacts related to the Centre.

[Above extracted from paragraphs 26 and 27 of the minutes of the meeting on 5.11.2024]

PlanD explained at the meeting that PFLM is an administrative measure aimed at limiting excessive development in the Pok Fu Lam area for traffic management reasons. Any lease modification for redevelopment of sites with higher intensity in the area should be approved by the Executive Council, subject to fulfilling two conditions that (i) redevelopment would not result in insurmountable traffic impacts with proposed traffic improvement measures; and (ii) the proposal served the public interest. *[Above extracted from paragraph 67 of the minutes of the meeting on 4.11.2024]*

Below are the responses from government departments on the traffic and transport issues:

(1) the TIA confirmed that the proposed development would not create adverse

traffic impact on the local road network. Except four junctions (J1, J8, J16, and J17) where HKU had proposed junction improvement measures, all other junctions in the TIA would operate satisfactorily in the design year of 2032;

(2) the traffic survey had taken the existing ambulance traffic into account and additional verification survey was conducted in September 2023 after the epidemic. The Commissioner for Transport had no adverse comments on the TIA and its assumptions. According to HKU, an updated TIA covering the full completion year of the Centre would be undertaken at the detailed design stage and a construction TIA and a traffic review would be conducted prior to the project commissioning; and

(3) there were precedent cases for partial lifting of PFLM. Any lease modification for higher development intensity within area covered by PFLM would be subject to approval by the Executive Council.

[Above extracted from paragraph 6 of the minutes of the meeting on 29.11.2024]

Majority of TPB Members agreed that HKU should spend more efforts to address the representers' concerns on traffic and transport, and their major views and suggestions are as follows:

(1) HKU should address the traffic impacts of the Centre comprehensively with a view to minimising impacts on the neighbouring community and residential developments during both construction and operation phases. The traffic impact during the construction phase could be substantial due to the challenges associated with site formation on slope and the extended construction timeline for the three-

phased development. HKU might 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 Southern District Council (SDC) and local residents in the next round of public engagement to address local concerns at an early stage;

(2) PFLM was in place due to traffic concerns. Currently, there were problems of traffic congestion on PFLR and Victoria Road. Under the current indicative scheme, two vehicular accesses were located on Victoria Road and there was no internal vehicular connection between PFLR and Victoria Road to allow traffic diversion between the two roads under emergency situations. The Centre would generate additional traffic burden on Victoria Road, which was a two-lane single carriageway without much capacity for further improvement. Vehicular accesses on PFLR and Victoria Road and possible connection between the two roads should be carefully considered in the revised scheme with a view to minimising adverse traffic impact on the surrounding area;

(3) regarding the TIA in support of the revised development proposal, HKU might adopt the worst case scenario with more detailed information in the assessment to identify potential problems and propose mitigation measures to address traffic impact in a wider context. The TIA should take into account all known major planned and committed developments in the surroundings, address the traffic demand for daily commuting trips during peak hours, and propose traffic measures to cater for special events at the conference/exhibition facilities (about 40,000m²); and

(4) the Centre would generate additional burden on existing public transport

		<p>facilities and exacerbate traffic problems of the local road network. To cater for anticipated increase in demand for transport services for researchers, staff, visitors and students in the Centre and the medical campus of HKU, HKU might make reference to the arrangement of Cyberport and Hong Kong Science and Technology Parks by providing shuttle bus services during peak hours to mitigate traffic impact. On-site bus parking spaces were required for such arrangement. Besides, in the section 12A application to facilitate residential development at the Ebenezer site, the TD requested site boundary setback to facilitate the conversion of the existing bus stop on PFLR to a bus lay-by and footpath widening. Similar arrangement might be considered in the revised scheme for the Centre.</p> <p><i>[Above extracted from paragraph 13 of the minutes of the meeting on 29.11.2024]</i></p>
F. Environmental and Safety Concerns		
(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>	<p>The 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 Board’s meetings, which are extracted below:</p> <p>Although the submission from HKU does not provide specific information regarding the carbon impact of the proposed development, HKU has committed to ensuring a minimum of 30% overall greenery coverage and communal open space of at least 12,000m² within the Site to enhance landscaping and greening of the proposed development.<i>[Above extracted from paragraph 24(a) of the minutes of the meeting on 5.11.2024]</i></p> <p>The environmental impacts and tree felling should be properly addressed by HKU.</p>

		<p>Tree compensation should be enhanced and more green spaces should be provided. <i>[Above extracted from paragraph 33 of the minutes of the meeting on 29.11.2024]</i></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>	<p>The grounds 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 recorded in the minutes of the Board's meetings, which are extracted below:</p> <p>HKU's representative explained 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 to some representers was not inflammable, usually used for cooling purpose. All those facilities in the Centre would comply with relevant government legislation, regulations, and international environmental and safety standards. In the HKU and HKUMed campuses, there were some existing similar laboratories, located near the residential neighbourhoods, operating under stringent safety regulations for many years, without major incidents of lab leaks/risks according to HKU's records. HKU was extremely responsible and had a good track record in responsible building design and risk management. <i>[Above extracted from paragraph 41 of the minutes of the meeting on 4.11.2024]</i></p> <p>HKU's representative also explained 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</p>

		<p>dangerous goods. Reference would be made to the top-class international and national research facilities in respect of stringent safety management. [<i>Above extracted from paragraph 77 of the minutes of the meeting on 1.11.2024</i>]</p> <p>Nonetheless, in view of the residents’ concerns, HKU committed to revisiting the location of the nitrogen tank and to further assessing the potential risk of the nitrogen tank when revising the development proposal for the Centre. [<i>Above extracted from paragraph 65 of the minutes of the meeting on 5.11.2024</i>]</p> <p>The Board expressed that as the types of laboratories in the Centre were an area of public concern about safety, careful consideration should be given to the location and risk management of those facilities. [<i>Above extracted from paragraph 12(c) of the minutes of the meeting on 29.11.2024</i>]</p>
<p>G. Drainage and Utility</p>		
(FG1)	<p>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.</p>	<p>The grounds and views regarding potential flooding was raised, responded to and considered during the consideration of representations by the Board. Detailed responses to this issue have been set out in response (a) of paragraph 6.2.12 of the TPB Paper No. 10987, which are extracted below:</p> <p>HKU has conducted a Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) for the proposed development. The DIA concludes that the existing drainage infrastructure is adequate to handle the anticipated water flow resulting from the proposed development, and no upgrading works are required.</p>
<p>H. Geotechnical and Development Costs</p>		

<p>(FH1)</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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 set out in the TPB Paper No. 10987, and recorded in the minutes of the Board's meetings, which are extracted below:</p> <p>The elevation of the Site ranges from approximately +67 to +133mPD, featuring sloping natural terrain. According to the submitted Geotechnical Planning Review Report (GPRR), the proposed site formation works are considered geotechnically feasible, and no insurmountable issues are anticipated from the geotechnical perspective. Ground investigation works will be conducted within the Site. Stability of all slopes (both man-made and natural terrains) and retaining walls within or near the site affecting or being affected by the proposed development will be assessed. Any necessary remedial or upgrading works will be proposed and carried out as necessary during the detailed design stage. The Head (Geotechnical Engineering Office), Civil Engineering and Development Department has no objection to the proposed development. [<i>Above extract from paragraph 6.2.11, Responses (a) of the TPB Paper No. 10987</i>]</p> <p>Representatives of HKU explained that some bored piles would indeed be required for slope cutting according to the preliminary design in the GPRR. About one-third of all the bored piles along the whole site would be used for Phase 1. HKU acknowledged the time and impact associated with large-scale excavation. While adopting a terraced building design, they would improve the design and layout and adjust the bulk of the development when more detailed ground investigation information was available. As Ebenezer School expressed concerns on the impact</p>
--------------	---	---

		<p>of low-frequency vibration, the use of bored piles would be avoided as far as possible. In view of the time, cost and impact, the extent of rock excavation would be minimised. To address the anticipated delays often associated with construction on slopes, HKU would allow additional buffer time when planning the construction works at the detailed design stage. <i>[Above extracted from paragraph 32 of the minutes of the meeting on 5.11.2024]</i></p> <p>Necessary remedial or upgrading slope works would be proposed during the detailed design stage. <i>[Above extracted from paragraph 6(ll) of the minutes of the meeting on 29.11.2024]</i></p>
(FH2)	<p>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.</p>	<p>The grounds and views regarding development costs and financial viability 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 set out in the TPB Paper No. 10987, and recorded in the minutes of the Board's meetings, which are extracted below:</p>
(FH3)	<p>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 ball park costs and construction programme have not been undertaken, nor was the required consultation undertaken.</p>	<p>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. HKU has indicated that the Centre will operate as a non-profit, multi-disciplinary research entity, supervised by a Board of Directors and an Executive Committee. HKU is working out the detailed capital and recurrent costs associated with the proposed development, as well as identifying potential funding sources (such as private donations and internal resources). At the previous MPC meeting held on 1.3.2024, HKU's representatives also assured that funding would be secured from both private and public sectors domestically and overseas. The proposed</p>

		<p>development would also be financed through research grants awarded to future users of the Centre. <i>[Above extracted from paragraph 6.2.11, Responses (b) of the TPB Paper No. 10987]</i></p> <p>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. <i>[Above extracted from paragraph 24 of the minutes of the meeting on 29.11.2024]</i></p>
I. Other Matters		
(FI1)	The development of the Centre would lead to property devaluation by compromising privacy, increasing noise pollution, and diminishing the overall quality of life.	Property price is not a relevant planning consideration and falls outside the scope of the OZP. <i>[Above extracted from paragraph 6.2.15, Responses (d) of the TPB Paper No. 10987]</i>
(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.	<p>The grounds and views regarding whether the Centre would bring any benefits to the community was raised, responded to and considered during the consideration of representations by the Board. Detailed HKU's responses to this issue have been recorded in the minutes of the Board's meetings, which are extracted below:</p> <p>Representative of HKU expressed that the Centre would bring planning gains to the community. The design of the Centre sought to balance the operational requirements for accommodating research facilities that required expansive floor plates while achieving responsive building design and visual openness. Building separation and layout had been meticulously oriented to maximise air and visual permeability, while the height and bulk of the buildings would be compatible with the surrounding environment, creating a stepping height profile in the area. On the</p>

		<p>traffic aspect, on-site drop-offs and setback for providing space for bus lay-by extension were proposed. Upgrading of the concerned road junctions would be conducted if necessary. To enhance the landscaping and greening of the proposed development, HKU had committed to providing a minimum of 30% overall greenery coverage and communal open space of not less than 12,000m², thereby contributing to a quality landscape setting for use by the general public that benefited both the environment and the community. In addition to the intention to retain existing trees as much as practicable, new tree planting in clusters to recreate the habitat, and vertical greening or edge planting to soften the building form would be planned. Newly planted tree species would be carefully selected to sustain and attract biodiversity. 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. Members of the public could also pass through the Centre via lifts and escalators between PFLR and Victoria Road. <i>[Above extracted from paragraph 24 of minutes of the meeting on 5.11.2024]</i></p> <p>TPB Members expressed that additional planning and design merits and facilities that might benefit the local community should be incorporated into the revised development proposal. <i>[Above extracted from paragraphs 15(a) and 33(g) of minutes of the meeting on 29.11.2024]</i></p>
<p>J. Public Consultation</p>		
(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</p>	<p>The 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 this issue have been set out in the TPB Paper No. 10987 and recorded in the minutes of the Board's</p>

<p>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>	<p>meetings, which are extracted below:</p> <p>HKU explained that it consulted the Development Planning Committee of the SDC on 17.1.2024 and briefed SDC members on the development parameters of the Centre. To engage stakeholders and local community, two briefing sessions were conducted in Cyberport on 13 and 14.5.2024. Besides, a dedicated website had been set up to provide the public with the most up-to-date information and news of the Centre. During the review process of the development plan of the Centre, consideration would be given to disseminate information related to the proposal via a single channel/platform. A proactive approach would also be adopted to engage local residents and stakeholders in the community with a view to addressing their needs and concerns. HKU would also strengthen liaison with the SDC and explore options to establish direct contact with local residents. HKU would endeavour to enhance engagement with the community, including not only neighbourhood stakeholders but also green groups, through a comprehensive public engagement exercise so as to improve the development proposal for the Centre. <i>[Above extracted from paragraphs 47 and 78 of the minutes of the meeting on 1.11.2024, paragraph 42 of the minutes of the meeting on 4.11.2024, and paragraph 74 of the minutes of the meeting on 5.11.2024]</i></p> <p>TPB Members generally considered that there was room for improvement in HKU’s public consultation and community engagement efforts. Since many representers had expressed dissatisfaction with the lack of communication and respect by HKU during the previous project planning process, HKU should engage the local community more proactively in revising the development proposal. The consultation exercise should commence at an early stage and adopt a two-way</p>
--	---

<p>and bottom-up approach to address various concerns raised by stakeholders, including local residents, the Ebenezer and green groups. The focus should be on the design of the Centre and mitigation measures to alleviate potential adverse impacts, e.g. provision of more communal open space and addressing construction traffic. 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. <i>[Above extracted from paragraph 26 of the minutes of the meeting on 29.11.2024]</i></p>

(3) The major grounds and views of the further representations are indexed at **Annex Ia**.

《薄扶林分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/H10/22》建議修訂
主要進一步申述理由／意見索引

Proposed Amendments to the Draft Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/22
Index of Major Grounds / Views of Respective Further Representations

主要進一步申述理由／意見

Major Grounds / Views of Respective Further Representations

進一步申述 Further Representation (編號 No. TPB/R/S/H10/22-)	
F1	FS1, FS2, FS3, FS4
F2	FS4
F3	FA4, FB1, FC1, FC3, FJ1
F4	FA1, FA4, FB3, FC1, FC3
F5	FA2, FA5, FB1, FB2, FC1, FC2
F6	FA4, FB1, FC1, FE1, FJ1
F7	FA4, FB1, FC1, FH2, FJ1
F8	FA4, FC1, FD1, FE1, FH2
F9	FA3, FA4, FB1, FC1, FD1, FE2, FE3, FH1
F10 to F20	FA4, FB1, FC1, FD1, FE1, FH2
F21	FA4, FB1, FC1, FD1, FE1, FH1, FH2
F22 to F67	FA4, FB1, FC1, FD1, FE1, FH2
F68	FA1, FA2, FA3, FA4, FB1, FB3, FC1, FD1, FE1, FE2, FE3, FH1, FH2, FH3, FJ1
F69 to F665	FA4, FB1, FC1, FD1, FE1, FH2
F666	FA4, FB1, FC1, FD1, FE1, FH1, FH2
F667 to F783	FA4, FB1, FC1, FD1, FE1, FH2
F784	FA1, FA4, FB1, FB3, FC1, FD1, FD2, FE1, FE2, FE3, FE4, FF1, FF2, FG1, FH1, FH2, FH3, FI1, FI2, FJ1
F785 to F1794	FA4, FB1, FC1, FD1, FE1, FH2
F1795	FE1
F1796	FC1, FD1, FE1, FH2
F1797, F1798	FE1
F1799, F1800	FA4, FB1, FC1, FD1, FH2
F1801 to F1803	FA4, FB1, FC1, FD1, FE1, FH2
F1804 to F1807	FA4, FB1, FC1, FD1, FH2
F1808 to F1810	FA1, FA2, FA4, FB1, FB2, FB3, FC1, FE3, FH3, FJ1

F1811 to F1814	FA1, FA4, FB1, FC1, FE3, FF2, FJ1
F1815 to F1821	FA4, FB1, FC1, FH2
F1822, F1823	FA3, FB1, FC1, FD1, FE1, FE2, FE3, FH1, FJ1
F1824	FA1, FA3, FB1, FC1, FD1, FE1, FE2, FE3, FH1, FJ1
F1825, F1826	FA4, FB1, FC1, FD1, FE1, FE3, FH1, FJ1
F1827	FA1, FA3, FB1, FC1, FD1, FE1, FE2, FE3, FH1, FJ1
F1828, F1829	FC1, FD1, FE1, FH1, FH2
F1830	FC1, FE1, FH1, FH2
F1831	FB1, FB3, FC1, FJ1
F1832	FC1, FD1, FD2, FE1
F1833	FB1, FC1, FJ1
F1834	FA1, FB1, FC1, FE3, FH3
F1835	FA1, FA4, FB1, FB2, FB3, FC1, FE3, FH1, FJ1
F1836	FA1, FA4, FB1, FB2, FB3, FC1, FH1, FJ1
F1837	FA1, FA4, FB1, FB2, FB3, FC1, FD1, FH1, FJ1
F1838	FA1, FA4, FB1, FB3, FC1, FD1, FH3
F1839	FB1, FC1
F1840	FD1
F1841	FA1, FA4, FB1, FB3, FC1, FD1, FD2, FE1, FE2, FE3, FE4, FF1, FF2, FG1, FH1, FH2, FH3, FI1, FI2, FJ1
F1842	FA1, FH1
F1843	FA1, FA4, FB1, FC1, FE1, FH3
F1844	FA4, FB1, FC1, FD1, FE1, FF1, FH2
F1845	FA4, FC1, FD1, FD2
F1846	FC1, FE1, FJ1
F1847	FB1, FC1
F1848	FA1, FA4, FB1, FC1, FD1, FE1, FH2
F1849	FA4, FC1, FD1, FD2, FE1, FH2
F1850	FA1, FA4, FB1, FC3, FD1, FE1, FE3, FH1
F1851	FA1, FB1, FE3, FE4, FH3
F1852	FA1, FA3, FA4, FB1, FC1, FE3, FF2
F1853	FC1, FD1, FD2, FE1
F1854	FA1, FB2, FC1
F1855	FB1
F1856	FA4, FC1, FD1
F1857	FA4, FB1, FC1, FD1, FH1, FH2
F1858, F1859	FA4, FB1, FC1, FH2
F1860, F1861	FC1, FD1