

Urgent Return receipt Expand Group Restricted Prevent Copy

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 2024-12-15 星期日 18:19:43
To: tpbpd/PLAND <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>
Subject: Further Representation Relating of Proposed Amendments to the draft Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/22

To
The Secretary, Town Planning Board,

FURTHER REPRESENTATION RELATING TO PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAFT POK FU LAM OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/H10/22 MADE BY THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD UNDER THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE (Chapter 131)

I am writing **in objection** of the proposed amendment, specifically the rezoning of a site between Pok Fu Lam Road and Victoria Road from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Global Innovation Centre” (“OU(Global Innovation Centre)”) to “Undetermined” (“U”). I strongly urge the Town Planning Board to rezone the said site back to “Green Belt”(“GB”).

I would like to express my continued support for the mission and objectives of the Global Innovation Centre (GIC). I believe that the proposed GIC has the potential to be a significant catalyst in transforming Hong Kong into an international innovation and technology hub. However, I have concerns regarding the message conveyed by the Town Planning Board through this amendment. It suggests that large organisations, such as HKU, can deprioritize meaningful engagement and consultation with the Pok Fu Lam community while still receiving further protections and reserved site status. This undermines the importance of genuine public involvement in the planning process.

Below are the reasons I believe the TPD should instead rezone the said site back to “Green Belt”(“GB”)

- 1. Accurate Classification of Current Site Conditions:** The site is characterized by a rich and dense presence of trees. As the plans for HKU are being revised, it is essential to accurately classify this site, as it is important for all stakeholders to recognise that any new plans for this site will still necessitate the removal of mature trees and disruption of the natural environment. Zoning the site as “Undetermined” sends the wrong impression that all trees in this zone are already slated for removal, and it is a dangerous precedent to set.
- 2. Encouragement of Genuine Public Consultation:** The TPD has noted the importance for HKU to conduct constructive engagement with stakeholders, and has expressed hope that HKU will enhance its communication with the community. Changing the zoning to "Undetermined" contradicts this objective, as it suggests that inadequate engagement with the Pok Fu Lam community will still result in a zoning change favourable to HKU. A return to "Green Belt" zoning would better encourage HKU and other stakeholders to foster meaningful two-way communication.

3. Addressing Residents' Concerns Regarding Setback Areas: HKU has indicated its intention to increase the setback area from neighbouring buildings. This means that site boundaries will require adjustment. Rezoning the entire area back to "Green Belt," in alignment with surrounding sites, would help alleviate many residents' concerns regarding the future classification of the setback area.

In conclusion, as HKU's comprehensive amendment of the GIC plan will take time, reverting the zoning of this site to "Green Belt" would convey a strong positive message to the public that their concerns are being acknowledged. This action would also provide a significant incentive for all parties to engage in more genuine collaboration moving forward. In contrast, zoning the site as "Undetermined" implies that public consultation may be deprioritized, allowing large organizations to reserve sites without fully addressing community input. This is not a message I believe the TPD wants to send.

Yours Sincerely,

Han

HKID Details : [REDACTED] Name : Loke Han Pin

Urgent Return receipt Expand Group Restricted Prevent Copy

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 2024-12-16 星期一 08:36:19
To: tpbpd/PLAND <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>
Subject: Further Representation on Pokfulam OZP No.S/H10/22
Attachment: Further representations for TPB.doc

Dear Sir/Madam,
Please find attached my Further Representation.
Kindly confirm receipt and that it is in good order.
Yours faithfully,
Roger Nissim

Further Representation on Pokfulam OZP No.S/H10/22

Email to : tpbpd@pland.gov.hk

16th December 2024

1. Given the very short time available these comments are made on the basis of all the information and feedback given in the lead up to, and during, the TPB hearings on 1,4 &5th November 2024 and the minutes thereof, together with your Press Release dated 29th November 2024.
2. I am concerned that the tone of the Press Release implies that HKU already own the land in question when in fact, as explained to the Board, there has been no legal ownership conveyed to HKU either by private treaty grant, short term tenancy or licence hence the land remains Government land and so remains fully under your control. There seems to be an inexplicable effort to bend over backwards to accommodate HKU's desire to build here which the proposed 'U' zoning perpetuates inspite of the earlier 3,677 representations that were received with over 90% against the project which, in effect, means that the public interest has been ignored.
3. Of the many representations made, R3320 on 5/11/24 was particularly significant, as it gave a figure of around \$863m for the cost of site formation excluding the subsequent building costs for the GIC itself. This figure, which was prepared by a Professional geotechnical engineer with over 25 years experience mainly in foundation and site formation works, was not challenged with HKU stating in the subsequent Q&A that it had no specific comments on the assumptions made by R3320. It is clear that HKU had not done their homework on this vital piece of information which would obviously make development of this site financially unviable. Indeed in the private sector a sum of this magnitude would make the development of this site a non-starter, particularly in todays difficult economic climate! Before proceeding any further TPB should be asking HKU who is going be paying this huge sum? Certainly not government and there must be serious doubts regarding private donors who should be questioning whether or not their money was going to be wisely spent?
4. Since 1986 up until 2024 this site had been zoned GB for the very good reason that it is up to 80m high, steep sloping, covered with mature vegetation including over 2000 trees which fully justified its original zoning, together with the accompanying presumption against development. As no cogent planning justifications have been presented for the removal of this presumption the legitimate expectation for the continuance of the GB zoning remains.
5. It is interesting to note that in the CE's 2023 Policy Address it states 'As we have already identified enough land for housing, industry and other developments for the coming 30 years the Government has no plans for the time being to further use "Green Belt" areas for large scale development.' Given the serious geotechnical constraints of this site and the availability of suitably zoned alternative Government sites, why was this policy not adhered to, or reference made to your own PG No. 10, in the 2024 rezoning exercise?
6. In the same vein the CE's 2024 Policy Address makes a strong case for HK's future International Innovation & Technology (I&T) Park to be focused in the Lok Ma Chau Loop and/or the San Tin Technopole so they can be immediately adjacent to, interact and develop synergy with, Shenzhen's already highly developed I&T zone. Government has sufficient flat land in the Lok Ma Chau Loop which it can grant to HKU now for their GIC which can be built there, without any of the expensive development complications of the Pokfulam site, in support of the CE's stated policy objective's which include expanding Research & Development, as well as being overall better value for money.
7. Accordingly I object to the proposed 'U' zoning and feel strongly that the original 'GB' should be reinstated as being the rightful zoning and also being in the public interest.

Roger Nissim, FRICS, FHKIS
Land & Planning Consultant

HKID – NISSIM, Roger Anthony, [REDACTED]