

**Minutes of 1053rd Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on
10.3.2014, 11.3.2014, 17.3.2014, 20.3.2014, 25.3.2014, 26.3.2014**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Mr Thomas T.M. Chow

Chairman

Mr Stanley Y.F. Wong

Vice-chairman

Professor S.C. Wong

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Professor P.P. Ho

Professor Eddie C.M. Hui

Dr C.P. Lau

Mr Roger K.H. Luk

Ms Anita W.T. Ma

Dr W.K. Yau

Professor K.C. Chau

Mr H.W. Cheung

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H. T. Lau

Mr F.C. Chan

Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport and Housing
Miss Winnie M.W. Wong

Assistant Director (2), Home Affairs Department
Mr Eric K.S. Hui

Director of Lands/Deputy Director of Lands (General)
Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn/ Mr Jeff Y.T. Lam

Director of Planning
Mr K.K. Ling

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Miss Ophelia Y.S. Wong

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Professor Edwin H.W. Chan

Mr Rock C.N. Chen

Mr Maurice W.M. Lee

Ms Julia M.K. Lau

Mr Clarence W.C. Leung

Mr Laurence L.J. Li

Ms Bonnie J.Y. Chan

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Ms Christina M. Lee

Mr H. F. Leung

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection
Mr C.W. Tse

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms Brenda K.Y. Au

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Lily Y.M. Yam (morning sessions on 10.3.2014 and 17.3.2014 and afternoon session on 25.3.2014)

Mr Louis K.H. Kau (afternoon session on 10.3.2014 and morning sessions on 11.3.2014, 20.3.2014, 25.3.2014 and 26.3.2014)

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng (morning sessions on 10.3.2014 and 26.3.2014)

Ms Amy M.Y. Wu (afternoon session on 10.3.2014)

Mr Jerry J. Austin (morning session on 11.3.2014)

Ms Doris S.Y. Ting (morning session on 17.3.2014)

Mr Stephen K.S. Lee (morning session on 20.3.2014)

Mr Raymond H.F. Au (morning session on 25.3.2014)

Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Mr K. K. Lee (afternoon session on 25.3.2014)

1. The following members and the Secretary were present in the morning session on 10.3.2014:

Mr Thomas T.M. Chow

Chairman

Mr Stanley Y.F. Wong

Vice-chairman

Professor S.C. Wong

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Professor Eddie C.M. Hui

Dr C.P. Lau

Mr Roger K.H. Luk

Ms Anita W.T. Ma

Dr W.K. Yau

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H. T. Lau

Mr F.C. Chan

Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport and Housing
Miss Winnie M.W. Wong

Director of Lands
Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Director of Planning
Mr K.K. Ling

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

2. The Secretary reported that there were no matters arising.

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 2

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Kowloon Tong Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K18/17

(TPB Paper 9585)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

3. The following Members had declared interests on the item for having affiliation with HKBU, owning properties in the vicinity of the representation site at Renfrew Road (i.e. southern portion of the ex-Lee Wai Lee (LWL) site) (the Site), and/or having current business dealings with HKBU. As their interests were direct, they had not been invited to attend the meeting:

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| Mr Laurence L.J. Li | - being an ex-honorary member of the Court of the Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU) and was once involved in the discussion in the Court regarding the use of the Site. HKBU had submitted representation No. 25 (R25) and comment No. 4 (C4) |
| Mr Stephen H.B. Yau | - being the Chairman of the Social Work Advisory Committee of the Department of Social Work in HKBU |
| Ms Christina M. Lee | - owning properties on Durham Road and |

being a part-time student of HKBU since September 2013

- Mr Clarence W.C. Leung - owning a property near the junction of Durham Road and La Salle Road
- Ms Julia M.K. Lau - owning a share of a property near the junction of Hereford Road and Waterloo Road
- Mr H.F. Leung - having current business dealings with HKBU

4. The Chairman and the following Members had also declared indirect/remote interests on the item:

- Mr Thomas T.M. Chow] each owning a flat at Parc Oasis
- Mr H.W. Cheung]
- Ms Janice W.M. Lai - owning a flat on Earl Street with her spouse
- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having previous business dealings with HKBU in 2006

5. Members agreed that the interests of the Chairman, Mr H.W. Cheung and Ms Janice W.M. Lai for owning properties in Kowloon Tong that were not in close proximity to the representation sites and the interests of Mr Dominic K.K. Lam for having previous business dealings in 2006 with HKBU were remote or indirect. In the meeting on 24.1.2014 to discuss the subject hearing arrangement, Members had agreed that the Chairman should continue to chair the meeting and the other three Members should be allowed to stay in the meeting and participate in the discussion.

Meeting Arrangement

6. As requested by the Chairman, the Secretary briefly highlighted the meeting arrangement and said that the meeting was scheduled to be held in six sessions on 10.3.2014, 11.3.2014, 17.3.2014, 20.3.2014, 25.3.2014 and 26.3.2014. A total of 88 persons/organisations had registered to make oral submissions. About 30 persons were

scheduled to make oral submissions in each session and it was estimated that the oral submissions of the representers/commenters would be completed by 25.3.2014. More than 2,800 representers/commenters had indicated that they would attend in person or had authorised a representative to attend the meeting. Hence, there was a need to impose a time-limit on making oral submissions. The time limit of 10 minutes as previously used in the representation hearing in respect of the Central District (Extension) OZP would be adopted.

Invalid Representations

7. The Chairman said that after the Board's consideration of the Information Note on the Hearing Arrangement on 24.1.2014, three representations (R6618, R15008 and R15038 in Annex II-41 to 43 of the Paper) had been identified for the Board's agreement on whether they were invalid. Members noted that R6618 indicated that it was related to the rezoning of the Site but it did not indicate support or objection nor provide any views; and R15008 and R15038 indicated objection to the draft Kowloon Tong OZP but the grounds of representation were related to the draft Central District (Extension) OZP. Members agreed that the three representations should be regarded as invalid.

8. In response to the Chairman, the Secretary informed Members that a total of 25,884 representations were received during the exhibition period. However, 37 representers subsequently wrote to the Board withdrawing their representations or indicating that they had not submitted the representations and two representations were identical¹. Taking into account the above and the three representations ruled invalid by Members at the meeting, the total number of valid representations should be 25,843. During the publication period of the representations, a total of 2,981 comments were received and one comment (C2038) was subsequently withdrawn. The total number of valid comments was 2,980².

¹ The withdrawn/not having been made representations i.e. representations No. R2312, R3178, R3208, R6043, R7025, R7386, R7616, R7914, R8975, R9044, R9685, R11508, R12158, R12195, R12272, R12431, R12433, R12504, R13881, R13977, R14090, R15442, R16559, R18428, R18598, R20145, R21034, R21060, R21166, R21280, R21351, R23304, R23810, R23929, R24916, R24944 and R25520, were taken out. For R32 and R7945 that were identical, the latter was taken out.

² The withdrawn comment i.e. C2038 was taken out.

9. The Chairman said that all representations and comments as well as the “Guidance Notes on Attending the Meeting for Consideration of the Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Kowloon Tong Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K18/17” (Guidance Notes) were provided to Members prior to the meeting. Members had confirmed that they had no comment on the conduct of the meeting in accordance with the Guidance Notes or the meeting arrangement. Members also agreed that for matters that might not be covered by the Guidance Notes, the Chairman should have full discretion to make necessary arrangements to ensure that the meeting would be conducted in an orderly and effective manner.

10. The Chairman said that there would be a Question and Answer (Q & A) session in each session after the oral submissions. The HKBU delegation would make an oral submission that would span two days on 10.3.2014 and 11.3.2014, and there were two options for the Q & A session. An additional Q & A session might be held for those representers making oral submissions before HKBU. Alternatively, a Q and A session might be held after the HKBU’s oral submission on 11.3.2014 but the representers making oral submissions before HKBU would have to return to the meeting on the following day. Before the start of the meeting, he would ask the relevant representers whether they would prefer to have the Q & A session before or after HKBU had made its oral submission, and he would make a decision on that. Members agreed.

[Mr Patrick H.T. Lau arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

11. As sufficient notice had been given to the representers and commenters to invite them to attend the meeting, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations in the absence of the other representers and commenters who had indicated that they would not attend or had made no reply.

12. The following representatives of the Planning Department (PlanD) and Education Bureau (EDB), and the representers/commenters or their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Mr Tom C.K. Yip - District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K),
PlanD

Ms S.H. Lam - Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), PlanD
Mr Wallace K.K. Lau - Principal Assistant Secretary (Higher Education) (PAS/HE), EDB

R22 (Green Sense)

Ms Ho Ka Po - Representers' Representative

R25 (Hong Kong Baptist University)

(Please refer to Appendix A for a list of representers who had authorised the HKBU delegation as their representative.)

Professor Albert S.C. Chan]	
Mr Andy S.C. Lee]	
Ms Cindy Tsang]	
Professor Bernard V Lim]	
Dr Sujata Subbu Govada]	
Prof Bian Zhao Xiang]	
Dr Wilfred Y.W. Wong]	Representers' Representative
Ms Rowena Li]	
Mr Patrick SL Tam]	
Miss Michelle CM Fung]	
Mr Ahson HK Wong]	
Ms Fannie Tang]	
Ms Nana Lai]	
Ms Rachel Lo]	
Mr Todd Wan]	
Ms Stephanie Chan]	
Mr Fung King Nim]	
Mr L. C. Lam]	

13. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the hearing. He said that the meeting would be conducted in accordance with the Guidance Notes which had been provided to all representers/commenters prior to the meeting. Members had also agreed that the Chairman should have full discretion to make other necessary

arrangements to ensure that the meeting would be conducted in an orderly and effective manner. In particular, he highlighted the following main points:

- (a) in view of the large number of representations and comments received and more than 2,800 representers/commenters had indicated that they would either attend in person or had authorised representatives, it was necessary to limit the time for making oral submissions;
- (b) each representer/commenter would be allotted a 10-minute speaking time. However, to provide flexibility to representers/commenters to suit their needs, there were arrangements to allow cumulative speaking time for authorised representatives, swapping of allotted time with other representers/commenters and requesting for extension of time for making the oral submission;
- (c) the oral submission should be confined to the grounds of representation/comment in the written representations/comments already submitted to the Board during the exhibition period of the OZP/publication period of the representations; and
- (d) to ensure a smooth and efficient conduct of the meeting, the Chairman might request the representer/commenter not to repeat unnecessarily the same points of arguments which had already been presented by others at the same meeting. Representers/commenters should avoid reading out or repeating statements contained in the written representations/comments already submitted, as the written submissions had already been provided to Members for their consideration.

14. The Chairman said that the representatives of PlanD would first be invited to make a presentation. After that, the representers/authorised representatives would be invited to make oral submissions. After the oral submissions, there would be a Q & A session. Lunch break would be from about 12:45 pm to 2:00 pm and there might be one short break in the morning and one to two short breaks in the afternoon, as needed.

15. The Chairman continued to say that the HKBU delegation would make an oral submission that would span two days on 10.3.2014 and 11.3.2014, and there were two options for the Q & A session. A Q & A session might be held for those representers making oral submissions before HKBU. Alternatively, the Q & A session might be held after HKBU's oral submission on 11.3.2014 but the representers making oral submissions before HKBU would have to return to the meeting on the following day. Members noted that for representers who were scheduled to make oral submissions before HKBU, only R22 (Green Sense) was present at the meeting. In response to the Chairman, Ms Ho Ka Po (R22) indicated that she would prefer the Board to hold the Q & A session after her oral submission. As there was no comment from the other attendees at the meeting, the Chairman acceded to Ms Ho's request.

16. Furthermore, the Chairman reminded the attendees to note that the meeting was to decide on the land use zoning of the Site and matters regarding the future allocation of the Site to any particular party fell outside the ambit of the Board. He then invited Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, to brief Members on the representations and comments.

17. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Mr Tom C.K. Yip made the following main points as detailed in the Paper:

Background

- (a) on 15.2.2013, the draft Kowloon Tong Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K18/17 (the OZP) was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPO). The amendments involved the following items:
 - (i) Amendment Item A was for rezoning of the Site, i.e. the southern portion of the ex-LWL site, from "Government, Institution or Community (9)" ("G/IC(9)") to "Residential (Group B)" ("R(B)");
 - (ii) Amendment Item B was for rezoning of the Bethel Bible

Seminary west site (the BBS-west site) from “G/IC(3)” to “R(C)9”; and

- (iii) Amendment Item C was for rezoning of the BBS-east site from “G/IC(3)” to “G/IC(12)”;
- (b) a total of 25,884 representations were received and all of them were related to Amendment Item A. However, 37 representers subsequently wrote to the Board withdrawing their representations or indicating that they had not submitted the representations and two representations were identical. Together with the three representations ruled invalid by the Board, the total number of valid representations should be 25,843;
- (c) on 21.5.2013, the representations received were published for 3 weeks for public comments. A total of 2,981 comments were received. One comment was subsequently withdrawn and the total number of valid comments was 2,980;
- (d) the background to Amendment Item A was summarized below:
 - (i) the Chief Executive announced on 30.8.2012 a package of short and medium-term measures to expedite the supply of subsidised and private housing units, and this included conversion of 36 “G/IC” and Government sites to residential use to meet the pressing demand for housing land. The Site was one of these sites;
 - (ii) the Site, previously zoned “G/IC(9)”, was a piece of Government land and formed part of the ex-LWL site of the Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education (IVE). In 2011, the LWL IVE was relocated to Tseung Kwan O. EDB had confirmed that the northern portion of the ex-LWL site (about 0.64 ha) would be retained for higher educational use by HKBU whereas the Site (about 0.88 ha) in the southern portion of the ex-LWL site could

be returned to the Government for other uses;

- (iii) PlanD had conducted a review of the requirement of Government, institution or community (GIC) land at the time of preparation of the OZP. Based on the planned population for the area (including the proposed “R(B)” zone at the Site) as well as the GIC provision in the area at that time, it was considered not necessary to reserve the Site for provision of local GIC facilities. With regard to other GIC facilities, relevant Government departments consulted confirmed then that the Site was not required for other GIC uses. Besides, adequate land was reserved for open space use; and
- (iv) having examined the development potential of the Site, the building height profile and development densities for the area, the Site was proposed to be rezoned to “R(B)” subject to a maximum building height of 50m and plot ratio of 4.5 to help meet the acute housing demand. The proposed parameters were considered broadly compatible with the planned stepped height profile on the two sides of Renfrew Road and plot ratios of the surrounding buildings, ranging from 3.1 to 5.8, in the area. In addition, as confirmed by concerned departments, the proposed residential development was acceptable from traffic, environmental, visual and air ventilation points of view and would not overload the existing infrastructure;
- (e) the existing conditions of the Site and its surrounding areas were highlighted as follows:
 - (i) the buildings on the ex-LWL site were currently used by HKBU and the Hong Kong Polytechnic University on a temporary basis until end of 2014 to meet the contingency need during the initial stage of implementation of the new academic structure. The Site abutted the buildings of HKBU on two sides. The HKBU

Communication and Visual Arts Building was located to its immediate south, and the HKBU Student Residence Halls and Kowloon Tong Fire Station were to its immediate east; and

- (ii) to the northeast and further north of the Site were the HKBU Baptist University Road campus and Renfrew Road campus with buildings mostly ranging from 10 to 13 storeys. The Kowloon Tong military camp, two elderly homes and a school were located to the west of the Site across Renfrew Road. To the further west and south of the Site were the low-rise and low-density residential developments in the Kowloon Tsai area. Kowloon Tsai Park was located to the further southeast across Hereford Road;

Metro Planning Committee (MPC)'s Considerations and Public Consultation

- (f) the MPC's considerations and public consultations held were as follows:
 - (i) on 21.12.2012, MPC considered the proposed amendments to OZP No. S/K18/16. MPC decided to defer consideration of the proposed rezoning of the Site pending the provision of more information on EDB's policy in assessing the expansion needs of HKBU and its justifications to release the Site for other uses;
 - (ii) on 25.1.2013, MPC further considered the proposed amendment to the OZP in respect of the Site with the attendance of representatives of EDB, the Food and Health Bureau (FHB), University Grants Committee (UGC) and PlanD at the meeting. A number of submissions from the Office of Hon. Wong Yuk Man, President and Vice-Chancellor of HKBU, Staff Representative and Court of HKBU, HKBU Student Union and HKBU Century Club Limited objecting to the proposed rezoning were submitted to and considered by MPC;
 - (iii) after deliberation, Members agreed that the proposed amendment

should be exhibited under section 5 of TPO so that stakeholders and members of the general public would have an opportunity to submit representations to the Board as provided for under TPO, and their views could be heard and considered by the full Board before the Board decided on the appropriate zoning for the Site;

- (iv) the Housing and Infrastructure Committee of the Kowloon City District Council (KCDC) was consulted on the OZP on 7.3.2013. All members unanimously objected to the rezoning of the Site for residential use and supported continuing the use of the Site for educational or other GIC uses; and
- (v) the Legislative Council (LegCo) Panel on Education discussed the rezoning of the Site at its meetings on 11.3.2013 and 10.6.2013. The Panel passed a motion on 11.3.2013 opposing the Government's changing of the educational use of the Site and including the Site in the Land Sale Programme for building medium-density luxury residential units, and urging the Government to retain the Site for GIC use;

Representations Relating to Amendment Item A

- (g) the representations were all related to Amendment Item A. 11 representations (R1 to R7, R6738, R6861, R8315, R8322) supported; two representations (R1192 and R2375) provided comments; and the remaining 25,830 representations objected to Amendment Item A;
- (h) the representations were submitted by five LegCo Members (Hon Lam Tai Fai (R9), Hon Yip Kin Yuen (R10), Hon Wong Pik Wan (R11), Hon Chan Ka Lok Kenneth (R12) and Hon Claudia Mo (R7860)); two Kowloon City District Council members (Mr Siu Leong Sing (R13) and Mr Ho Hin Ming (R14)); HKBU (R25) and its staff, affiliated associations, students, alumni and ex-staff; concern groups, different organisations and individuals. Many of them were submitted in

similar emails/letters;

Grounds of Supportive Representations (R1 to R7, R6738, R6861, R8315, R8322)

(i) the main grounds of the 11 supportive representations as detailed in paragraph 4.2.1 of the Paper were summarised below:

(i) the rezoning of the Site for residential use could help meet the urgent need for residential land. The proposed flat provision in Kowloon Tong could stabilise the property price and rent. If possible, it was better to rezone the Site to “R(A)”;

(ii) HKBU’s facilities were adequate. The shortage of student dormitory was due to enrolment of too many students from the Mainland; and

(iii) it was not necessary to build the proposed Chinese medicine hospital (CMH) at the Site. The Tsim Sha Tsui District Kai Fong Welfare Association site was a favourable site for building a Chinese Medicine Teaching Hospital (CMTH). There was no need for HKBU to have its own CMTH;

(j) the responses to the above grounds of the supportive representations as detailed in paragraphs 6.4.1 and 6.4.2 were:

(i) the views of the supportive representations were noted. However, as elaborated below, the Site was proposed to be reverted to “G/IC(9)” zone due to the Government’s latest intention to revert the Site for GIC use; and

(ii) it was noted that HKBU had indicated that they would no longer pursue the proposal to develop a CMTH at the Tsim Sha Tsui District Kai Fong Welfare Association site;

Representations Providing Comments (R1192 and R2375)

(k) R1192 objected to giving the Site to HKBU and opined that there was

no need for HKBU, the campus of which had already been expanded, to use the Site. R2375 was of the view that the Site should not be given to HKBU for building of a CMH;

- (l) the responses to the grounds of R1192 and R2375 were that the Board's role was to consider the appropriate zoning of the Site and it had no mandate to decide on the granting of the Site to a particular party for a specific GIC use. Whether the Site should be granted to HKBU or not fell outside the ambit of the Board. This was a land allocation issue to be considered by the Government under the prevailing land and education policies;

Grounds of Adverse Representations

- (m) the major grounds of the 25,830 adverse representations were highlighted in paragraph 4.2.3 and Annex VIb of the Paper. Concerned government bureaux/departments had been further consulted on the representations and comments and their latest assessments on the matter particularly in respect of the updated requirement for reserving the Site for GIC use were set out in the responses highlighted in paragraph 6.4.4 and Annexes VIb and VIc of the Paper. They were summarised below:

Loss of Land for GIC facilities

- (i) there was limited GIC land but a lot of alternatives for residential use in other locations. The rezoning would be an irreversible loss to the community. Residential use could only benefit a small number of people. The Site should be used for other appropriate uses, such as community centre, educational, medical and social welfare facilities as well as recreational use or park, to benefit more people;
- (ii) the original "G/IC" zoning of the Site was to serve as a buffer in the residential area to avoid excessive density. The "R(B)" rezoning violated the original intention;

(iii) the responses to the above grounds were:

- there was no need to reserve the Site for GIC or open space uses at the time when MPC considered the rezoning proposal in late 2012/early 2013. Due to the pressing need for housing land and that residential development was not incompatible with the surrounding uses of the Site, it was then proposed to be rezoned to “R(B)”;
- in processing the representations, PlanD had re-assessed the demand for GIC facilities in consultation with concerned government bureaux/departments. Although there was generally no shortage in planned major GIC facilities and open space in the Kowloon Tong area, upon re-assessment, EDB indicated that, during recent rounds of consultation, different quarters of the community had requested the Government to strengthen support for special education development. Hence, EDB had decided to carefully study the feasibility of using the Site for special school development;
- while residential use was considered suitable at the Site from land use compatibility viewpoint, in view of the latest response of EDB and the clear support of the local community and the general public for retaining the Site for GIC use, it was proposed that the Site be retained for GIC use and reverted to its original zoning of “G/IC(9)”;
- whether the Site should be reserved for special school or other educational uses, or other permitted uses under the “G/IC(9)” zone should be determined by EDB or the Government with reference to its policy priority. This was a matter outside the ambit of the Board;

- (iv) education was important to the next generation and future development of Hong Kong. It could benefit more people and should be accorded with priority. The authority should not sacrifice long-term educational need for short-term economic benefit;
- (v) there was a shortage of land for educational/higher educational purposes. According to Government statistics, the shortage amounted to 80,000m² net operational floor area for the eight UGC-funded institutions. Besides, student hostel places of tertiary education institutions were inadequate;
- (vi) the Site was surrounded by university campus and was in close proximity to two universities. It was more suitable for higher educational use;
- (vii) the responses to the above grounds were that the Government and UGC had all along been supporting UGC-funded institutions in the development of publicly-funded academic facilities and student hostels in accordance with well-established policies and calculation criteria; and EDB was in discussion with some of the institutions with a shortfall of hostels and academic facilities, with a view to exploring the feasibility of constructing hostels or academic facilities in various places in Hong Kong;

HKBU Expansion Needs

- (viii) the HKBU campus (around 5.4 ha) was the smallest among the eight UGC-funded institutions. It had not been allocated additional land for developing necessary facilities for the implementation of the 3-3-4 academic reform and had to build new facilities on campus or construct additional floors in existing buildings. HKBU campus was already congested to the point of saturation;
- (ix) the Site could be most efficiently used by allocating it to HKBU

for its long-term development. The Site was surrounded on three sides by HKBU buildings and was geographically an integral part of HKBU. The expansion of HKBU to the Site would consolidate the University's activities at one location and allow HKBU to provide a better environment, the much-needed facilities and increased activity space for the students. The Site was important for HKBU's long-term development. It was extremely difficult for HKBU to find land nearby to expand in the future;

- (x) student hostel places in HKBU were inadequate. The Government said that the northern portion of the ex-LWL site was adequate to meet HKBU's need under the existing educational policy. This reflected the short-sightedness of the Government, ignoring the long-term development of higher education. Living in a student hostel was part of university life. Off-campus hostels could not help students to enjoy campus life and required additional cost to students. The Site should be used for construction of student hostel;
- (xi) HKBU had been liaising with the Government over the future use of the Site for several years. HKBU had neither indicated to the Government nor come to any agreement with the Government that HKBU required only half of the land nor was it ready to withdraw its request for the whole ex-LWL site. HKBU should be given a fair opportunity to apply for use of the whole ex-LWL site;
- (xii) the responses to the above grounds were:
 - EDB had decided to reserve the northern part of the ex-LWL site for higher education use and reaffirmed its commitment to meet all of HKBU's outstanding requirements for publicly-funded academic space and student hostel places under the prevailing policies and

calculation criteria;

- regarding the view that HKBU had the smallest campus amongst the eight UGC-funded institutions, EDB advised that different institutions had varying geographical conditions (such as proportion of usable land within campus, geographical locations, development parameters of the respective lots, topology of campus buildings, etc), and it was not appropriate to make a simplistic comparison of site areas amongst different institutions; and
- the Site was currently a piece of Government land and had never been included in HKBU's campus area. The Government had no policy to allocate a piece of Government land to an individual institution simply because it was adjacent to the institution;

Chinese Medicine Hospital/Chinese Medicine Teaching Hospital

- (xiii) Chinese medicine was effective in treating chronic and refractory diseases. Given the aging population in Hong Kong, the need for Chinese medicine was imminent. Without a CMTH, there would not be a systematic Chinese medicine education. A CMTH could provide venue for clinical training, facilitate clinical research, and contribute to the advancement, standardisation and modernisation of Chinese medicine, integration of Chinese and western medicine and enhancement of professionalism of the Chinese medicine industry. Without in-patient service, the development of Chinese medicine, especially treatment for emergency and critical illness, was limited;
- (xiv) a CMTH should best be located at the Site which was adjacent to the School of Chinese Medicine Building of HKBU as this would enhance the effectiveness of the treatment. Teaching hospital of renowned Chinese medicine universities were built near their

campuses;

(xv) HKBU had been reputable for the Chinese medicine discipline. Building a CMTH by HKBU on the Site would enhance the development of Chinese medicine and public health to the benefits of patients;

(xvi) a CMTH would enable Chinese medicine students to conduct their internships in Hong Kong. Chinese medicine students currently had to do internship in the Mainland. The medical system of the Mainland was different from that of Hong Kong, and what students learnt in the Mainland could not be applied to Hong Kong. This created many problems. A CMTH could support not only HKBU, but also Chinese medicine students from other institutions;

(xvii) the responses to the above grounds were:

- as announced by the Chief Executive in his 2014 Policy Address, the Government had, after considering the Chinese Medicine Development Committee (CMDC)'s recommendation, decided to reserve a site in Tseung Kwan O to set up a CMH. The Government would study feasible mode of operation and regulatory details for CMH;
- with regard to the proposal of setting up a CMTH on the Site by HKBU, EDB was of the view that three UGC-funded institutions currently offering Chinese medicine programmes at undergraduate and postgraduate levels had already established arrangements for students of these programmes to take their clinical training in local Chinese medicine clinics or in the Mainland;
- CMTH was not an academic facility eligible for funding under the prevailing policy. In line with the prevailing

policy, land was not directly allocated to individual institutions for self-financing operation. FHB considered that it was not a must to have the teaching hospitals within or close to the university campus and that the proposed CMH at Tseung Kwan O would support all three universities offering Chinese medicine programmes in teaching, clinical training and research purpose;

Not Suitable for Proposed Residential Use

(xviii) some representers considered that the Site was not suitable for residential use. Their main grounds were that the development of luxury flats failed to address the society's urgent need for smaller flats; if the Site was to be used for residential purpose, it should be for development of public housing to resolve grass-root housing problem; the residential use on the Site was not compatible with the surrounding educational use, future residents on the Site would complain against noise from the nearby student hostels while the proposed luxury housing would generate additional traffic, create air and noise pollution which would adversely affect the general environment of the area; and there was a need for a comprehensive plan to address the housing problem rather than ad hoc projects on scattered small sites;

(xix) the responses to the above grounds were that the Site was considered suitable for both GIC and residential uses, but it was proposed that the Site be reverted to "G/IC(9)" zone to meet the latest need for GIC uses as explained above. On the proposal for public/subsidised housing on the Site, public housing development, which was normally with higher development intensity, was considered not compatible with the low to medium-density environment in the area;

Public Consultation

(xx) the Government should consult stakeholders including HKBU and its students and consider their views. There was inadequate consultation and transparency of the public consultation process should be enhanced;

(xxi) it was misleading to the public and procedurally wrong to include the Site in the Land Sale Programme while the public consultation on the rezoning was still underway;

(xxii) the responses to the above grounds were:

- the publication of the amendment under section 5 of TPO was a statutory public consultation procedure. On 25.1.2013, the MPC decided to exhibit the rezoning amendment to provide a statutory channel for the stakeholders and general public to submit their views to the Board for consideration before making a final decision on the zoning of the Site;
- during the 2-month plan publication period, the KCDC was consulted and the concerned stakeholders including HKBU, local community and the general public were provided with opportunity to submit representations to the Board for consideration. All the representations and comments received were submitted to the Board for consideration, and the representers and commenters had opportunity to attend the TPB meeting and to be heard by the Board; and
- it was the established practice of the Government to include all anticipated Government sites that were expected to become available in a certain year, including those which were pending completion of various processes and town planning procedures, into that year's

Land Sale Programme. This could provide clear information about the anticipated land supply to the market. The concerned sites would only be put up for sale after completion of the necessary processes (in this case, the completion of the statutory planning process). In view of the latest Administration's intention of retaining the Site for GIC uses, the Site had been taken out from the Land Sale Programme for 2014/15;

Representers' Proposals

- (n) a large majority of representers proposed that the Site should be reverted to "G/IC(9)"/ "G/IC" zone or reserved for GIC uses;
- (o) many of the representers also suggested that the Site should be reserved for HKBU for educational use and/or a CMTH; for development of a CMH/CMTH; and/or for development of other GIC facilities, e.g. recreational facilities, social welfare facilities, elderly facilities, etc;
- (p) the responses to the representers' proposals were that based on the considerations set out above, PlanD supported reverting the zoning of the Site to "G/IC(9)". With regard to the various proposals of the representers to reserve the Site for educational/higher educational, community, CMH/CMTH/medical or other specific GIC uses, these uses were permitted under the proposed "G/IC(9)" zone. As a general principle, the role of the Board was to consider the appropriate zoning of the Site taking into account various factors. Land allocation of the "G/IC" site for a particular user fell outside the ambit of the Board and should be considered by the Government with reference to its policy priority;

Comments on Representations

- (q) the 2,980 valid comments on representations were submitted by a LegCo Member Hon Albert Chan Wai-yip (C15), HKBU (C4) and its affiliated associations, Lung Tong Area Committee (C3), concern

groups and individuals. All of them supported the representations that objected to Amendment Item A; raised objection to the rezoning of the Site for residential use; and/or suggested retention of the “G/IC(9)” zoning for the Site;

- (r) the major grounds of the comments and the responses highlighted in paragraphs 5 and 6.5 and Annex VII of the Paper were similar to those raised by the adverse representations as summarised above;

Representations Relating to Items B and C

Background

- (s) the background for Amendment Items B and C were:
 - (i) on 7.9.2012, MPC partially agreed to a section 12A application (No. Y/K18/6) relating to the BBS site at 45 and 47 Grampian Road to facilitate redevelopment of the seminary;
 - (ii) on 21.12.2012, MPC agreed to the rezoning of the BBS-west site from “G/IC(3)” to “R(C)9” for low-rise residential development (Amendment Item B) and the BBS-east site from “G/IC(3)” to “G/IC(12)” (Amendment Item C) for seminary redevelopment with the requirement for in-situ preservation of the existing Grade 2 building, i.e. Sun Hok Building; and
 - (iii) on 7.3.2013, the Housing and Infrastructure Committee of KCDC was consulted and they had no adverse comment on these amendment items;

Grounds of Representations

- (t) R5, submitted by an individual, supported Amendment Items B and C. R8, submitted by an individual, opposed Item B;
- (u) R5 supported Amendment Item B on grounds of supporting provision

of more flats and inclusion of the “Hong Kong property for Hong Kong people” clause for the BBS-west site. R5 considered that it was better to rezone the BBS-west site to “R(A)”, if possible. R5 supported Amendment Item C on the ground of supporting preservation of historic building with character;

- (v) R8 opposed Amendment Item B mainly on grounds that scarce GIC land for public use would be reduced due to rezoning of the BBS-west site for residential use, with provision of only 44 luxury flats which could not solve the shortage of public housing or small flats, and there were no planning justifications to rezone the BBS-west site for residential use. The Government should compensate the loss of GIC land by rezoning a residential site for GIC use. C1, submitted by an individual, supported R8’s objection to Amendment Item B;
- (w) the responses to the representations in respect of Items B and C were:
 - (i) R5’s support on Amendment Items B and C was noted. Regarding R5’s view that it was better to rezone the BBS-west site under Item B to “R(A)”, the proposed “R(C)9” zoning was appropriate in view of the surrounding low to medium-density residential developments which were zoned “R(C)”; and
 - (ii) as for R8’s view that Amendment Item B would reduce GIC land and could not solve the shortage of public housing or small flats, the above responses to grounds of representations for Amendment Item A, under the headings on ‘Loss of Land for GIC Facilities’ and ‘Not Suitable for Proposed Residential Use’ were relevant. Adequate land had been reserved for GIC uses to meet the demand in Kowloon Tong; and

PlanD’s Views

- (x) PlanD’s views on representations relating to Amendment Item A were:
 - (i) supportive representations - the supportive views of R1 to R7,

R6738, R6861, R8315 and R8322 were noted. While the Site was considered suitable for both GIC and residential uses as explained above, it was proposed that the Site be reverted to “G/IC(9)” zone to meet the latest need for GIC use;

- (ii) representations providing comments - the views provided by R1192 and R2375 of not supporting giving the Site to HKBU were noted but as elaborated above, land allocation of the “G/IC” site to a specific organisation fell outside the ambit of the Board; and
 - (iii) adverse representations - the Plan should be amended to meet/partially meet the adverse representations by reverting the zoning of the Site from “R(B)” to “G/IC(9)” and amending the Notes of the OZP accordingly as indicated in Annex IX of the Paper. In tandem with the proposed amendment to the Plan, the Explanatory Statement should also be revised as proposed in Annex IX of the Paper; and
- (y) PlanD’s views on the representations relating to Amendment Items B and C were:
- (i) the part of R5 in support of Amendment Items B and C was noted; and
 - (ii) the part of R8’s representation opposing Amendment Item B was not supported and the Plan should not be amended to meet the representation in respect of Amendment Item B.

18. Members noted that an e-mail from Designing Hong Kong Limited (R21) was tabled at the meeting. At the request of the Chairman, the Secretary highlighted the main points in the e-mail. She said that due to District Council meeting and other prior obligations, Mr Paul Zimmerman indicated that he was not able to attend the hearing. Designing Hong Kong Limited was in full support of the decision of the Government to withdraw the Site from the Land Sale Programme and they recommended that the Board

revert the Site to a “G/IC” zoning as set out in paragraph 6.4.5 of the Paper. They urged the Board to support the recommendation in the Paper and to carefully consider the implications of the proposed changes to the land uses and land allocations prior to revising the OZP.

R22 – Green Sense

19. Ms Ho Ka Po made the following main points:

- (a) they supported reverting the zoning of the Site to “G/IC”. It was noted that the Government had taken the Site out from the Land Sale Programme and PlanD had recommended in the Paper to revert the zoning of the Site to “G/IC”;
- (b) they did not support rezoning the Site to “R(C)” for luxury housing. There was a military site (some 10ha in area) in the vicinity of the Site that was underutilised. The Government had recently proposed to rezone many other pieces of land zoned “G/IC” and “Green Belt” (“GB”) for residential use; however, rezoning land for development of luxury housing was not justified;
- (c) the Site was located within a larger cluster of educational uses and it should be retained for educational or other GIC uses;
- (d) the Government took out the Site from the Land Sale Programme prior to the Board’s commencement of the representation procedures for the OZP. There was a concern that the statutory representation procedure was being by-passed; and
- (e) the future user of the Site should consider reusing some of the existing buildings on the Site to reduce construction waste.

[Actual speaking time of R22: 5 minutes]

20. As R22 had completed her oral submission, the Chairman invited questions from Members. Members had no question to raise.

21. Members noted that three documents from HKBU were tabled at the meeting which included a list of speakers that would make oral submissions, an album with wishing cards gathered by HKBU from related stakeholders, and a booklet on the master plan for comprehensive development of the ex-LWL site. The Chairman invited the HKBU delegation (R25) to make their oral submission and reminded them that their oral submission should be based on the grounds and proposals in the written representation that was submitted to the Board.

R25 – Hong Kong Baptist University

22. Professor Albert S.C. Chan, the President and Vice-Chancellor of HKBU, gave an introduction and made the following main points:

- (a) HKBU had formed a delegation to make an oral submission at the meeting. The delegation comprised 45 persons, including current and former Presidents and Vice-Chancellors, current and former Council Chairmen, representatives of staff, students and alumni, stakeholders in the local community, a district councillor, and staff and patients receiving Chinese medicine treatment in HKBU clinics. The HKBU delegation had obtained authorisations from a large number of representers/commenters who held similar views as HKBU's, to represent them to make the oral submission. Hence, the HKBU delegation was highly representative of the views of the major stakeholders;
- (b) the wishing cards in the album tabled were signed by individual members of the HKBU community as well as stakeholders in the local community expressing their views on the future use of the ex-LWL site;
- (c) the delegation would explain the master plan for comprehensive development of the entire ex-LWL site as an expansion of the HKBU

campus; and

- (d) building luxury housing on the Site would not meet the demand for more affordable housing in Hong Kong. PlanD's recommendation in the Paper to revert the Site to "G/IC(9)" zoning was supported, which would be in line with the public views in the representations and comments. The Board should allow the Site to be used for educational purpose.

23. HKBU showed a 10-minute video at this juncture. The video featured views expressed by major stakeholders who opposed rezoning the Site for residential use and supported allocation of the Site to HKBU. The main points were highlighted below:

- (a) Rev Dr Ip King Tak, the Reverend of HKBU and an alumni of HKBU, said that the Government should have more long-term planning for education in Hong Kong. HKBU had requested the Government for use of the ex-LWL site since 1996. The rezoning of the Site for residential use had neglected the needs of HKBU. HKBU had not been consulted on the matter;
- (b) some local residents considered that the development of luxury housing on the Site would increase adverse impacts on traffic and air pollution. The existing traffic infrastructure as well as public transport services would not be adequate to support additional residential developments on the Site. The 40-storey The Palace on Broadcast Drive was cited to illustrate the point that the increase in development intensity on the Site would affect the low-density living environment in Kowloon Tong. The site was suitable to be developed as a CMTH and that would provide more opportunities for Chinese Medicine students;
- (a) Mr Ho Hin Ming, a member of KCDC, indicated that the Site was surrounded by the student hostels and educational facilities of HKBU and was not suitable for luxury housing development. Local residents needed more open space and indoor space (such as a community centre)

for recreation and sports. The site was close to HKBU's existing School of Chinese Medicine and would be a suitable location for a CMTH that would benefit the locals;

- (b) Dr Choi Yuen Wan said that land resource was very valuable in Hong Kong and the Government needed to strike a balance between land needed for affordable housing and land to support higher education. It was important for the Government to invest in higher education to nurture the future generation. There was a lack of space on the HKBU campus and the Site was the only piece of educational land that was adjacent to HKBU and might be made available for HKBU's future development. Providing HKBU with a piece of land adjoining its campus would allow better communication and interaction for the HKBU community. The provision of another site far away from the main campus could not serve such purpose. The Site should be provided to HKBU for its future development in an integrated manner;
- (c) a student indicated that HKBU had the smallest campus amongst the eight UGC-funded institutions. There was insufficient space within the HKBU campus for students to gather and hold discussions on projects. The lack of education space would affect their learning;
- (d) a patient and his relative currently using the HKBU Chinese medicine facilities supported the development of a CMH in Hong Kong and a CMTH on the Site. A CMTH would provide comprehensive care to patients and it was urgently needed in Hong Kong; and
- (e) Mr Ricky Wong, Associate Vice-President of HKBU, said that HKBU practised whole person education, which emphasised all-rounded education for students and services to the community. However, a lack of space in HKBU had limited activities that could be provided to support whole person education for students. The CMTH that would provide teaching and medical services was one of the ways in which HKBU could reach out and serve the community. The ex-LWL site

was part of the master plan for HKBU's future development, if the site was to be rezoned for residential use, it would greatly affect their future development.

24. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Professor Albert SC Chan continued the oral submission and made the following main points:

- (a) HKBU opposed rezoning the Site for residential use, which would have irreversible impacts on HKBU's future development;
- (b) HKBU had the smallest campus in terms of absolute land area and land area per student amongst the eight UGC-funded institutions. HKBU was not allocated additional land for the 3-3-4 academic reform and had to intensify developments on the existing campus to cope with that. The campus had become very congested and HKBU was unable to provide more hostels for the additional students;
- (c) the Government's policy to allocate land to UGC-funded institutions based on the number of students was unfair to small and medium-sized universities because some facilities needed a critical mass before it could operate efficiently and effectively;
- (d) the ex-LWL site was very important to HKBU's future development as it was the only piece of land adjacent to the existing campus would be available for extension of the HKBU campus. If the entire ex-LWL site was allocated to HKBU, it could be comprehensively planned and HKBU could make the best use of the Site. In fact, since 2005, HKBU had continuously conveyed to the Government, through formal and informal channels, that they wished to be allocated the ex-LWL site for its future development;
- (e) HKBU adopted the motto of whole person education for its students. Through their strategic development plan 'Vision 2020', HKBU aimed to improve the facilities on the campus and to nurture their students to

have international perspective and be knowledgeable and ethical; and

- (f) he welcomed the recommendation in the Paper to revert the zoning of the Site to “G/IC” and urged Members to agree to that. Their consultant would further explain HKBU’s comprehensive plan for the ex-LWL site, which would demonstrate that HKBU could utilise the ex-LWL site to its best.

25. Mr Andy S.C. Lee, the Vice-President (Administration) and Secretary of HKBU, continued with the oral submission and made the following main points:

- (a) HKBU considered that the ex-LWL site should be retained for educational use;
- (b) the Board had received more than 25,800 representations and about 3,000 comments in respect of the Plan, about 99.95% of the representations and all the comments opposed rezoning the Site for residential use;
- (c) the messages on a few wishing cards written by HKBU staff, a student, alumni and a secondary school student were read out. The main views were that the Site should be retained for educational use and should be allocated to HKBU for its future development; building a CMTH would benefit the community as a whole; and the Site was located among school developments and it would be incompatible to build luxury housing on the Site;
- (d) the matter was discussed by the Housing and Infrastructure Committee of KCDC in two of its meetings and all DC members who spoke at the meetings opposed rezoning the Site to residential use and supported allocation of the Site to HKBU. The LegCo Panel on Education discussed the matter and passed a motion urging the Government to retain the Site for GIC uses (including educational);

- (e) based on their 10-year strategic development plan set out in ‘Vision 2020’, HKBU had included developments on the ex-LWL site in its master plan. Under ‘Vision 2020’, HKBU aimed to become the best institution to provide whole person education in Asia. To further whole person education in the university, there was a need for better quality and quantity of educational space to provide quality teaching and learning and innovative research. The building of a CMTH would be part of their plan to provide more dedicated service to the community;
- (f) the master plan featured development of a complex for whole person development, a 1700-bed student hostel and a 200-bed CMTH on the ex-LWL site. The UGC supported the student hostel development in the northern portion of the ex-LWL site. HKBU had consulted the local community and KCDC members about the master plan and all of them supported it; and
- (g) Members were urged to consider the imminent needs of the community and HKBU and to retain the Site under a “G/IC” zone. The Government was also urged to allocate the Site to HKBU who would be able to develop and utilise the Site most effectively.

26. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Ms Cindy Tsang, planning consultant of HKBU, continued the oral submission and made the following main points:

- (a) they welcomed the Government’s recommendation to retain the ex-LWL site for long-term GIC uses;
- (b) the ex-LWL site was surrounded by buildings of HKBU on three sides and the Government had agreed to allocate the northern portion of the ex-LWL site to HKBU for a student hostel development. HKBU was a major stakeholder on the matter to rezone the Site, but they were not aware of the rezoning until the draft Plan was considered by MPC. At that time, HKBU had already submitted an objection letter to the Board

stating that the ex-LWL site was needed for the university's long-term development. Notwithstanding, MPC still decided to gazette the Plan for public consultation. It was evident now that there was overwhelming public opposition to the rezoning of the Site for residential use, including unanimous objection from the LegCo Panel on Education, the KCDC and over 25,800 representatives;

- (c) the Strategic Plan HK2030 pointed out that, in order to meet the needs of the future generation, Hong Kong must ensure an adequate supply of land to facilitate long-term planning and sustainable development needs. Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 16 for "Application for Development/Redevelopment within "Government, Institution or Community" Zone for Uses other than Government, Institution or Community Uses under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance" (TPB PG-No.16), stated that before a site was rezoned from "G/IC" to other uses, the Board must consider long-term GIC needs. There was definitely a long-term need for GIC uses on the ex-LWL site;
- (d) the Government's initial proposal to release the Site for residential use was based on EDB's advice. Under EDB's current practices, space requirements for each institution were assessed based on triennium forecasts. Hence, when EDB advised the Board that there was no agreement for HKBU to take up the whole ex-LWL site, they only based their advice on the 2014/2015 timeframe and not the long-term needs of HKBU, which should be a consideration of the Board according to TPB PG-No. 16;
- (e) should there be a recognised need for HKBU to expand its campus, it was most logical for HKBU to utilise the whole ex-LWL site, which was directly linked to the existing campus on three sides. HKBU had prepared a master plan to demonstrate how the HKBU campus expansion could fully utilise the ex-LWL site; and
- (f) they supported reverting the Site to "G/IC(9)" zone and urged the

Government to continue to liaise with HKBU for the long-term use of the Site.

27. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Mr Bernard Lim, architectural consultant of HKBU, continued the oral submission and made the following main points:

- (a) in the past, the Board had rezoned land to facilitate the expansion of university campuses. These included rezoning the previous service reservoir for the Centennial Campus of the University of Hong Kong; rezoning a piece of land from “Open Space” to “G/IC” for the Phase 8 development of the Polytechnic University; and rezoning a piece of land from residential use to “G/IC” for the Creative Media Centre of the City University of Hong Kong. These rezonings had allowed those universities to be developed in a more integrated manner, thereby enhancing the comprehensiveness and integration of their campus developments;
- (b) the existing campus of HKBU was very fragmented, with buildings scattered on various plots of land at Waterloo Road, Renfrew Road and Hereford Road. HKBU had the smallest campus area among the UGC funded institutions in terms of absolute land area and land area per student. In the past, HKBU was granted land in a piecemeal manner and the land granted was only sufficient to satisfy the imminent needs at the time. There was little communal open space in the campus and pedestrian connectivity within the campus was poor;
- (c) the ex-LWL site was surrounded by the HKBU campus on three sides. UGC had agreed to allocate the northern part of the ex-LWL site to HKBU for a student hostel development. As for the southern portion of the ex-LWL site, PlanD had already recommended that it should be reverted to a “G/IC” zoning. A special school and an elderly home were located to the south-west of the ex-LWL site and a fire station was located near the south-east corner of the ex-LWL site. With this site context, residential use was not a compatible use on the Site. In

addition, a residential development with the development intensity stipulated on the plan would create wall effect and other adverse impacts on the locality;

- (d) according to official figures, in 2014/2015, the space requirement for HKBU was 2,000m² (net operational floor area). In the 2014 Policy Address, it was stated that from the 2015/16 academic year and in the triennium that followed, the intake of senior-year undergraduate places in UGC-funded institutions would progressively increase and by the 2018/19 academic year, more sub-degree graduates would be able to take up the subsidised degree programmes each year. As such, HKBU's aggregate space for 2014/2015 and 2015/16 and beyond would greatly increase. The Government should allocate the ex-LWL site to HKBU to fulfil these foreseeable needs rather than allocating more distant sites to HKBU later;
- (e) HKBU had prepared a master plan to demonstrate how the ex-LWL site could be comprehensively developed and be integrated with the main campus. Although the Board was not responsible for allocation of a site to a particular institution, the Board should consider this from the perspective of how the area could be comprehensively planned to bring gains to the local area;
- (f) the master plan proposed three buildings on the ex-LWL site, these were, from north to south, a complex for whole person development, a 1,700-bed student hostel and a 200-bed CMTH. These developments were proposed in their respective locations so that they would create synergy with other uses on the existing campus. The complex for whole person development would create synergy with the International House and Academic and Administration Building as well as the School of Continuing Education Tower to its north and east respectively; the student hostel would create synergy with the existing student hostel to its immediate east; and the proposed CMTH would have synergy with the existing School of Chinese Medicine on campus

as well as the elderly home to the south-west;

- (g) the master plan proposed a system of pedestrian network that would improve connections within the existing campus, especially providing better connection with the existing Communication and Visual Arts Building at the southern edge of the campus. The master plan was drawn up following the building height restrictions stipulated on the OZP and a stepped building height profile was adopted to create visual interests. Green building design would be adopted to enhance air ventilation. Landscaping was proposed along Renfrew Road, in communal open space between the buildings and as well as in sky gardens. The communal open space would also be open to the public and some facilities within the university would be available for holding activities for the general public. Hence, the master plan would not only meet the needs of HKBU, it would also bring benefit to the community; and

- (h) while the Board was not responsible for allocating the piece of land to a particular institution, the Board was still urged to provide suggestion to the Government on the appropriate future use of the Site. The ex-LWL site was suitable for GIC use. For comprehensive planning and design, the ex-LWL site should be allocated to a single party and should not be segregated for different uses.

[The meeting took a 10-minute break.]

[Mr Patrick H.T. Lau left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

28. HKBU continued with the oral submission and showed the video recording of Mr David T.Y. Mong, who was a resident in Kowloon Tong. He said that while there was a need for affordable housing for the general public, it was not appropriate to build luxury housing on the Site. For the future generation, it was necessary to provide more space for higher education development. HKBU had the smallest campus amongst the eight UGC-funded institutions. If the ex-LWL site was allocated to HKBU, it would

highly benefit the long-term development of the university.

29. Dr Sujata Govada continued with the oral submission and made the following main points:

- (a) she was a professional in town planning and urban design who had lived in Hong Kong for more than 20 years;
- (b) she welcomed the recommendation in the Paper to revert the zoning of the Site to “G/IC”. While it was understood that there was a need for more housing land in Hong Kong, not every piece of land available should be rezoned for residential use;
- (c) the HKBU campus was developed over the years in an incremental and fragmented manner, as such, there was no ‘heart’ to the campus. The ex-LWL site was a great opportunity for HKBU to create a ‘heart’ for its campus. The master plan of HKBU for development of a complex for whole person development, a student hostel as well as a CMTH on the ex-LWL site should allow a comprehensive campus development;
- (d) the establishment of a CMTH was supported as it would benefit the long-term development of Chinese medicine in Hong Kong; and
- (e) the developments proposed in the master plan would provide benefits to the university and the local community as well as to Hong Kong’s city development. There was a genuine need to allow HKBU to utilise the entire ex-LWL site. If this opportunity was foregone, it could not be reversed.

[Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn arrived to join and Dr C.P. Lau left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

30. The HKBU delegation continued with the oral submission and Ms Rowena Li read out a letter on behalf of Dr Wong Po Yan, the former Chairman of the Board of

Governors and the Council of HKBU, covering the following main points:

- (a) retaining the Site for educational use would enable it to be put to optimal use for the wider benefit of Hong Kong;
- (b) the ex-LWL site was surrounded by the HKBU campus and was the only piece of land available for the university's long-term development near the existing campus;
- (c) despite steps to expand the campus in the past, the site area that HKBU currently occupied was still very limited;
- (d) to enable HKBU to live up to its inherent potential of providing the younger generation with world-class education and a place for conducting outstanding research, the Government should take a long-term view and consider seriously the future development of the university; and
- (e) sacrificing a piece of land that was crucial to HKBU's future development to the commercial interests of the housing market was not constructive nor synergistic with the needs of the Hong Kong community.

31. The HKBU delegation continued with the oral submission and showed the video recording of Dr Peter K.K. Wong, who was a stakeholder in the local community. He was in support of HKBU's motto for whole person education. The ex-LWL site should not be rezoned for residential use. Investment in higher education was very important for the long-term development of Hong Kong. The Government should not sacrifice the long-term benefits of education for short-term financial returns on the sale of the Site. With the increase in number of students, there was insufficient educational space and facilities as well as hostel places in the university. Members were urged not to zone the Site for residential use and that the entire ex-LWL site should be allocated to HKBU so that they could develop a more integrated campus.

[Dr C.P. Lau returned to join the meeting at this point.]

32. Ms Rowena Li then read out a letter on behalf of Dr Moses M.C. Cheng, the former Chairman of Council and Court of HKBU, covering the following main points:

- (a) opposed rezoning the Site for residential use;
- (b) investment in education offered the society the best returns and there was an urgent need to allow continuous development of local universities. The Government's figures indicated that higher educational institutions were short of 80,000m² of operational floor area. The Site could not be sacrificed for residential development. Every single piece of land designated for educational use was precious for the future generations of students;
- (c) quality education required more than just indoor space. Students needed sports and recreation grounds, open space and hostels. The ex-LWL site was most ideal for HKBU due to its close proximity. Due to the mismatch in timing for relocation of the LWL College, some of HKBU's much needed additional facilities were cramped into the existing campus. That was based on the understanding that when the ex-LWL site became available, the HKBU could have more space for expansion. In fact, HKBU had applied for additional space for its future development more than two decades ago but the Government had always indicated that the ex-LWL site was needed for other purposes. The ex-LWL site, being surrounded by the HKBU campus, was the only site adjacent to the existing campus zoned for "G/IC" purpose that could be made available for HKBU to expand;
- (d) during his chairmanship of the Council and Court of HKBU, he steered the setting up of Hong Kong's first UGC-funded double-degree Chinese medicine undergraduate programme at HKBU in 1998. There was an imminent need to establish a CMTH in Hong Kong. 15 years had passed since the launching of the Chinese medicine

programme, but their students continued to have to do internships in the Mainland. Other Asian countries not only had CMTH and many of them were built on or adjacent to university campuses. The ex-LWL site was adjacent to HKBU's School of Chinese Medicine, which would make it convenient for students to do internships and for teachers and Chinese medicine practitioners to attend to patients, thus enhancing the effectiveness of the treatment. The Site was well served by public transport and building a CMTH there would be convenient to the patients and their relatives;

- (e) noise generated from campus and student activities would make the ex-LWL site not desirable for residential development; and
- (f) rezoning the Site would not resolve the problem of shortage of affordable housing. It would only result in undesirable deprivation of a precious piece of land for educational use and for building a CMTH that would be for the well being of Hong Kong people. The KCDC and LegCo Panel on Education also opposed rezoning the Site for residential use. Members were urged to revert the zoning of the Site to "G/IC".

33. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Professor Bian Zhao Xiang, Associate Vice-President and Director of Clinical Division of the School of Chinese Medicine of HKBU, continued with the oral submission and made the following main points:

- (a) he was a member of the Chinese Medicine Practice Subcommittee established under the Chinese Medicine Development Committee. Hong Kong needed a CMTH. HKBU established the first Chinese Medicine programme in 1998. Since there was no CMTH in Hong Kong, their students had to do their internships in the Mainland. The two places had different systems in the use of Chinese medicine. The Mainland system integrated Chinese and Western medical treatments whereas the Hong Kong system segregated these treatments. While

the students would also gain valuable experience from doing internship in the Mainland, there was an urgent need for establishment of Hong Kong's own CMTH. Allocation of the ex-LWL site to HKBU for the establishment of a CMTH would benefit Chinese Medicine development in Hong Kong;

- (b) the proposed CMTH would be operated on a non-profit making basis. HKBU currently operated 15 Chinese Medicine clinics in Hong Kong, eight of these were self-financed and seven were operated in collaboration with the Hospital Authority. These clinics were also operated on a non-profit making basis and they offered free or discounted medical treatments to the lower income patients. The proposed CMTH would provide mainly Chinese medicine treatment and supplemented with Western medicine treatment. The proposed CMTH would be a 200-bed hospital that would be built in phases;
- (c) the Government's plan for building a CMH in Tseung Kwan O was welcomed, and it would likely be in operation in five to eight years. Nevertheless, a CMH and CMTH served different functions. A CMH would mainly provide medical treatment while a CMTH would provide integrated treatment, education and research in Chinese medicine. A CMTH would provide Chinese medicine students with more comprehensive training and would be beneficial for the long-term development of Chinese medicine in Hong Kong;
- (d) the ex-LWL site was most suitable to be allocated to HKBU to allow it to develop an integrated campus. Building a CMTH at the ex-LWL site would provide convenience to Chinese medicine students and staff, and it would also be a convenient location for patients and their relatives as Kowloon Tong was well served by public transport. The CMTH at the ex-LWL site would allow collaboration with the university's School of Chinese Medicine; and
- (e) Hong Kong might be faced with housing problem. However,

enhancing the long-term development of education and medical sectors was equally important. He welcomed the recommendation in the Paper to revert the Site to “G/IC” zoning and urged the Government to allocate the ex-LWL site to HKBU to facilitate development of the CMTH.

34. Dr Wilfred Y.W. Wong, former Chairman of the Council of HKBU, continued with the oral submission and made the following main points:

- (a) HKBU had to accommodate the additional floor space required due to the 3-3-4 academic reform by additions to the existing buildings, no additional land had been allocated to HKBU and the ex-LWL site was not yet available;
- (b) rezoning the Site for residential use would create a loss-loss situation as luxury housing built on the Site would not help meet the demand for more affordable housing but HKBU would lose the opportunity to expand its campus on the only “G/IC” site left in its vicinity;
- (c) the Government had made a right decision to take out the Site from the Land Sale Programme. This would allow more time for the Government and relevant stakeholders to discuss about the most appropriate use for the Site;
- (d) HKBU had the smallest campus amongst the eight UGC-funded institutions. They did not have their own sports ground and had to share such facility with other institutions;

[Professor S.C. Wong left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

- (e) a longer term view should be taken to consider HKBU’s needs in the future 20 years. The ex-LWL site should be allocated to HKBU to meet its long-term development needs.

35. Mr Andy S.C. Lee of the HKBU delegation said that they had completed their presentations for the morning session.

36. The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 11:50 am.

37. The meeting was resumed at 2:05 p.m. on 10.3.2014.

38. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting:

Mr Thomas T.M. Chow

Chairman

Mr Stanley Y.F. Wong

Vice-chairman

Professor S.C. Wong

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Professor P.P. Ho

Dr C.P. Lau

Mr Roger K.H. Luk

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Deputy Director of Lands (General)

Mr Jeff Y.T. Lam

Director of Planning

Mr K.K. Ling

Presentation and Question Session

[Open meeting]

39. The following Government representatives and representers' representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

- | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Mr Tom C.K. Yip | - | District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K),
Planning Department (PlanD) |
| Mr Wallace K.K. Lau | - | Principal Assistant Secretary (Higher
Education), Education Bureau (PAS/EDB) |

R25 – Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU)

(Please refer to Appendix A for a list of representers who had authorised the HKBU delegation as their representative.)

- | | | |
|----------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| Professor Albert S.C. Chan |] | |
| Mr Andy S.C. Lee |] | |
| Mr Cheng Yan Kee |] | |
| Dr Lau Wah Sum |] | |
| Professor Ng Ching Fai |] | |
| Mr Joseph H.M. Ho |] | |
| Ms Leung Yerk Kwan |] | |
| Mr Sin Chun Man |] | |
| Ms Chui Man Tak |] | |
| Mr Cheung Chui Hoi |] | |
| Mr Ho Ting Hin |] | |
| Miss Michelle C.M. Fung |] | |
| Mr Ahson H.K. Wong |] | Representers' representatives |
| Mr Casey C.H. Mak |] | |
| Mr Bert M.H. Lam |] | |
| Miss Blanche S. Xu |] | |
| Mr Chiu King Long |] | |

Mr Herbert F.H. Cheung]
Mr Ricky K.K. Chung]
Mr Pine P.Y. Lo]
Mr Jenson C. Zhang]
Miss Mandy M.P. Chan]
Mr David C.H. Sum]
Miss Ginny Y. Deng]
Ms Fannie Tang]
Ms Nana Lai]
Ms Rachel Lo]
Mr L.C. Lam]
Ms Rowena Li]

40. The Chairman extended a welcome and then invited the representers' representatives to elaborate on the representations. Members noted that copies of some online wishes and cards from the public were tabled by R25 at the meeting.

R25 – HKBU

41. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr Cheng Yan Kee, the Chairman of HKBU Council (the Council), made the following main points:

- (a) the Council appreciated the Government earmarking the northern portion of the ex-Lee Wai Lee (LWL) site for higher educational use and for meeting the shortfall of student hostel places of HKBU;
- (b) the Council would further liaise with the Government and hoped that the southern portion of the ex-LWL site (the Site) could be allocated to HKBU for its long-term development including the establishment of a Chinese Medicine Teaching Hospital (CMTH) proposed under HKBU's strategic development plan 'Vision 2020';
- (c) the rezoning of the Site for residential use was incompatible with the HKBU's campus environment. The Board should seriously consider

the objections of HKBU, the locals, the District Council and the LegCo Panel on Education;

- (d) HKBU had all along strived for the development of quality teaching, innovative research and services to the community. Additional land was required for such purpose;
- (e) no additional land had been allocated to HKBU for the 3-3-4 education reform. The Site was important for HKBU's expansion. HKBU had prepared a campus master plan for the ex-LWL site to demonstrate the most efficient use of the site; and
- (f) the Council appreciated the Government's latest plan to reserve the Site for special school development. The Council would liaise closely with the Government on the future use of the site.

[Mr Timothy K.W. Ma returned to join the meeting at this point.]

42. Dr Lau Wah Sum, the former Chairman of the Council (1990-1996), made the following main points:

- (a) from 1984 to 1990, he was a Council member and the treasurer of the Hong Kong Baptist College. In 1994, the Hong Kong Baptist College was granted university status and became HKBU. From 1990 to 1996, he was Chairman of the Council of Hong Kong Baptist College/HKBU;
- (b) in the late 1980s, the then Governor of Hong Kong, Sir Edward Youde, conceived an idea of planning for another university, i.e. the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (HKUST), and invited him to be the treasurer of the planning committee. He then became a Council member and the treasurer of HKUST for many years;

[Mr Ivan C.S. Fu returned to join the meeting at this point.]

- (c) at that time, the Government also had the vision to upgrade the University of Hong Kong and the Chinese University of Hong Kong into world-class universities, and to strengthen professionally-oriented education in the Hong Kong Polytechnic University. The latter had contributed to the prosperous industrial development in the past 30 years;
- (d) HKUST had gained a high international status within 20 years. One major contributing factor was that it had a large and well-equipped university campus which allowed frequent interactions among teachers and students, and provided space for them to conduct researches and seminars. Besides, land was also available around the campus to meet expansion needs;
- (e) the mission of HKBU was to provide liberal arts education to its students. Over the years, many students who graduated from the Department of Music and the School of Communication had become renowned persons in the society. There was an increasing demand from the new generations for liberal arts education. New curricula on Chinese medicine, visual arts and creative arts were provided by HKBU. Unfortunately, due to insufficient space, all these curricula had to be provided outside the main campus, e.g. at the Jockey Club Creative Arts Centre in Shek Kip Mei;
- (f) Professor Jao Tsung-i, a world-renowned master of Sinology, had donated a lot of his masterpieces and cultural relics to HKBU for the establishment of the Academy of Sinology. With the mission to promote the study of Sinology, Chinese traditional culture and virtues, it was strongly believed that HKBU would soon become a world-class university for liberal arts education;
- (g) the existing HKBU Academic Community Hall (AC Hall) was already very old. A new AC Hall with modern facilities for music and drama performance and exhibition should be developed;

- (h) in the long run, the existing military camp area might provide an opportunity for the expansion of the HKBU campus. Should the Chinese Government consider that HKBU should be developed as a world-class liberal arts university, it might agree to release the military camp area currently occupied by the Garrison to HKBU in future. Besides, as the former Chairman of the then Land Development Corporation, he considered that the Hong Kong SAR Government could also consider resuming private land near HKBU for its future development; and
- (i) he urged the Government to allocate the Site to HKBU to help its development into a world-class university for liberal arts education and the promotion of whole person education.

43. Professor Ng Ching Fai, the former President and Vice-Chancellor of HKBU, made the following main points:

- (a) during his term as President of HKBU, he had advocated that the ex-LWL site should be allocated to HKBU for the development of CMTH and the Academy of Film but no formal response was given by the Government;
- (b) HKBU had been providing quality higher education for the interest of the community. However, the Government had ignored the long-term development of HKBU by relying on the 2014-2015 projection to assess the space requirement of HKBU; and
- (c) he welcomed the Government's latest plan to reserve the Site for educational use. The Board should retain the Site as "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") use. This would allow time for the Government to consider proposals from different parties including HKBU on the future use of the Site for the best interest of the community.

44. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr Joseph H.M. Ho, the Chairman of the Housing and Infrastructure Committee of the Kowloon City District Council (KCDC), made the following main points:

- (a) it was not justified for the Board to rezone the Site for residential use to meet the pressing housing demand. As the Site was located in Kowloon Tong, residential development on the Site would not be affordable to the general public;
- (b) PlanD considered that based on the planned population for the area, it was not necessary to reserve the Site for provision of local government, institution or community (GIC) facilities. This was not true. There was currently a severe shortfall of GIC facilities in Kowloon City. Though there were two new public housing estates in Kai Tak, no community hall or space for non-governmental organizations was provided in Kai Tak;
- (c) the Site was not suitable for residential use which was incompatible with the nearby fire station, student hostel and school uses. It should be reserved for GIC or educational use; and
- (d) he supported the Government's decision to take the Site out from the Land Sale Programme. However, it would take too long for the Government to review and implement the future use of the Site. The Government should consider inviting HKBU to undertake the review, as HKBU already had a good proposal for the development of a complex which could accommodate CMTH, social and community facilities. Besides, KCDC should be further consulted on the future use of the Site.

45. Ms Leung Yerk Kwan, a local resident, made the following main points:

- (a) she had been living in the Broadcast Drive area for more than 40 years. Despite the high rates she paid for her property, there was no provision

of community facilities in Kowloon City, such as community hall, elderly centre and indoor sports centre;

- (b) as there was no community hall in Kowloon City, she had to attend a Taiji course on an uncovered playground which was susceptible to weather conditions. It was also too far away for the elderly to travel to other districts to attend courses; and
- (c) the Site should be developed for a complex building with the provision of community facilities such as elderly centre and CMTH. The residents particularly the elderly could then enjoy one-stop medical services in the hospital. Students of the School of Chinese Medicine could also do their internship in the CMTH.

46. Mr Sin Chun Man, a local resident, made the following main points:

- (a) he had been living in the Broadcast Drive area since 1969;
- (b) the Site was not suitable for residential use which was incompatible with the adjacent military camp and school uses. It was also not suitable for residential use from the fung shui perspective;
- (c) a Chinese Medicine Hospital (CMH) should be provided at the Site which was adjacent to the existing Chinese Medicine Building of HKBU; and
- (d) it was hoped that an elderly centre and other community facilities would also be provided to cater for the needs of the large population in the area. The Site should be retained for educational and community uses.

47. Ms Chui Man Tak, a local resident, made the following main points:

- (a) she was living in the Broadcast Drive. There was a lack of library facility in the area and the collection of books in the existing libraries in

the nearby areas could not meet the public demand; and

- (b) the Site should be developed into an integrated complex with the provision of a public library.

48. Mr Cheung Chun Hoi, an alumnus of the School of Chinese Medicine of HKBU, made the following main points:

- (a) HKBU was the first local institution offering Chinese medicine education in Hong Kong. However, in the past 17 years, it did not have its own CMTH which should serve as a practice base for its students;
- (b) the students of the School of Chinese Medicine had to travel to the Mainland (e.g. Guangzhou, Shanghai and Beijing) to do their internships and practices, and had to tackle many problems such as accommodation and cultural differences. Without a CMTH in Hong Kong, students and graduates had no chance to apply what they had learnt to serve the community of Hong Kong;
- (c) a CMTH was different from a CMH. A CMTH would provide training and research opportunities for students and enable students to do their internships. As a pioneer in the development of Chinese medicine in Hong Kong, HKBU had the ability to develop a CMTH to serve the community. Besides, if a CMTH could be located near to School of Chinese Medicine in HKBU, it would be more convenient and would benefit all students, teachers and patients; and
- (d) HKBU was a UGC-funded institution, not a private university. It aimed to serve the community by providing education and training. However, the Government had not allocated sufficient land to HKBU for its development. Currently, there was a severe shortfall of activity space within the campus. HKBU had been looking for land nearby for its expansion for years with a view to providing a better campus environment, space for much needed facilities and the ever increasing

student activities. It was hoped that the Board could consider the needs of HKBU and the views expressed by the alumni of the School of Chinese Medicine.

49. Mr Ho Ting Hin, an alumnus of the School of Chinese Medicine of HKBU, made the following main points:

- (a) he was graduated from the School of Chinese Medicine of HKBU in 2011 and was currently a Chinese medicine practitioner;
- (b) the Site was not suitable for residential use. It should be retained for educational use which was of more imminent need and would have long-term benefits to the community. Medical education was essential by providing the necessary knowledge, skills and training to talented persons to serve the community;
- (c) a CMTH was important for the future development of the Chinese medicine industry in Hong Kong. Through practising in a CMTH, Chinese medicine students could gain more knowledge, skills and clinical experience on different types of diseases and patients. It also provided a training ground for Chinese medicine doctors and venue for medical research and development;
- (d) in the Mainland, every CMH had a CMTH which was usually located in close proximity to a university offering Chinese medicine curriculum. Nevertheless, there was no CMH nor CMTH in Hong Kong;
- (e) a CMTH should best be located at the Site which was adjacent to HKBU. It would enhance the efficiency of medical treatment by minimizing the need for travel of doctors and staff who were mainly professors and teachers in the university as well as students who were doing their internships; and
- (f) the Board should retain the Site for educational use and for the

development of CMTH.

[Dr C.P. Lau left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

50. Miss Michelle C.M. Fung, President of Student Union (2013-2014) of HKBU, made the following main points:

- (a) the Government's ground for not retaining the Site as "G/IC" zone was that there was already sufficient land for the development of the eight University Grants Committee-funded (UGC-funded) institutions. This reflected the lack of a long-term vision of the Government on the planning and development of higher education. For the long-term development of higher education, more land was required for hardware development including school buildings, student hostels and other supporting facilities so that the higher educational institution could expand its curricula and admit more students;
- (b) it was not justified to rezone the Site for residential use to tackle the pressing housing problem. Development of low to medium-rise luxury housing, instead of public housing, at the site would not be affordable to young people and the general public. The Government was planning in favour of private developers at the expense of public interest;
- (c) the local residents considered that there were insufficient community facilities in the area. However, the Government ignored the public need and did not carry out adequate public consultation on the use of the Site before its rezoning;
- (d) there were currently about 2,000 hectares of unused land in Hong Kong and other short-term land uses such as car parks and container storages. The Government should consider optimizing the use of these sites to tackle the housing problem, rather than rezoning the existing "G/IC" sites and public housing sites for the development of private housing; and

- (e) the Board should be fair in its decision on the use of the Site taking into account public views and the need for education and community uses.

51. Mr Ahson H.K. Wong, the President of Student Union Council (2013-2014) of HKBU, made the following main points:

- (a) since 2005, the HKBU students had been fighting for using the ex-LWL site for HKBU development. On 12.4.2012, about 200 students staged a protest at the Central Government Offices (CGO) to express their views to the Chief Executive (CE). On 20.5.2012, more than 100 teachers and students staged sit-ins overnight in the campus. Letters were also submitted to CE, EDB and DC members to express their views. Nevertheless, disregarding the views of the students, the Government rezoned the Site from “G/IC” to residential use on 21.12.2012;
- (b) unlike other universities, there was no increase in the number of student hostel places in HKBU after the 3-3-4 educational reform. The Government only agreed to allocate the northern portion of the ex-LWL site to HKBU but it was too small to accommodate 1,700 student hostel places;
- (c) on 8, 11, 24 and 25.1.2013, more than 500 teachers and students of HKBU, with the support of some DC members, protested at CGO and to the Board objecting to the rezoning of the Site; and
- (d) the Government should review its land policy and carry out adequate public consultation before planning the land uses in Hong Kong.

52. Mr Anson H.K. Wong then presented a five-minute music video with a song showing various functions and activities held by students in fighting for the use of the Site by HKBU.

53. Mr Casey C.H. Mak, the Editor-in-chief of Student Union Editorial Board

(2013-2014) of HKBU, made the following main points:

- (a) he objected to the rezoning of the Site from “G/IC” to “Residential (Group B)” (“R(B)”) for luxury housing which would be to the benefit of private developers;
- (b) since 2003, with the implementation of the “Individual Visit Scheme”, more than 100 hectares of land had been rezoned from “Residential” to “Commercial” for hotels and other tourism-related facilities. Hence, it was illogical for the Government to state that there was a shortage of residential land and that “G/IC” and “Green Belt” (“GB”) sites had to be rezoned for residential use to meet housing demand;
- (c) the HKBU campus was the smallest among the eight UGC-funded institutions. It had not been allocated additional land for accommodating the necessary facilities for the implementation of the 3-3-4 education reform. So, new facilities had to be catered for by constructing additional floors on existing buildings within the campus;
- (d) the HKBU campus was already very congested. There was severe shortage of activity space within the campus. There was no single venue that could hold an event with over 1,000 persons. Students had to compete for space to hold functions and activities. There was also no space for further expansion and development, e.g. CMTH and the Academy of Film;
- (e) over the years, teachers, students and student associations of HKBU were actively looking for land for the expansion of HKBU. However, there were difficulties in finding new land as HKBU was located within the urban area and surrounded by military camps and hill slope. With the relocation of Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education (IVE) to Tseung Kwan O, the ex-LWL site became a precious site to meet the short to medium-term expansion of HKBU; and

- (f) the rezoning of the Site for residential use would be detrimental to the educational development and would affect Hong Kong as a whole. In the past, residential sites had been rezoned for “G/IC” use, e.g. the student hostels of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University in Ho Man Tin. With the same logic, the Site should be retained as “G/IC” zone and allocated to HKBU for its expansion.

54. For the efficient conduct of the meeting, the Chairman asked the representers’ representatives not to repeat unnecessarily long the same points that had already been presented by previous representers or their representatives.

[Professor P.P. Ho arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

55. Mr Bert M.H. Lam, a representative of the Lee Wai Lee Concern Group, made the following main points:

- (a) he objected to the rezoning of the Site from “G/IC” to “R(B)”;
- (b) the current flat price at Kowloon Tong was very high. Future development of 495 luxury flat units at the Site would not be affordable to the general public nor address the pressing housing demand of low and medium-income groups. There was in fact a structural housing problem in Hong Kong, i.e. there was a wide income gap between the rich and the poor, and housing price was not affordable;
- (c) it was not justified for the Government to claim that the housing supply problem was due to shortage of land. There were currently about 2,000 ha of land reserved by the Government including about 600 ha in Sha Tin and Tsuen Wan. However, only about 17 ha of land were released under the Application List system last year;
- (d) according to the Town Planning Board Guidelines for Application for Development/Redevelopment within “G/IC” Zone for Uses other than GIC Uses under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB

PG-No.16), some GIC developments, especially the low-rise and low-density ones, were to serve as breathing space within a high-rise and high-density environment. As such, the Site should be retained as “G/IC” for such purpose;

- (e) the rezoning of the site to “R(B)” would increase the future population and living density of the area and more GIC uses would be required as breathing space;
- (f) there was also a need to retain the Site as “G/IC” to meet the current shortfall of GIC uses in the Kowloon City district, e.g. community centre and post office;
- (g) to cater for the future development needs, the Board should not determine the land use zoning of the Site without taking into account the future user of the Site, e.g. whether it should be allocated to HKBU or other institutions for special education;
- (h) it was irrational to assess the value of a site by the future revenue generated from the sale of that site;
- (i) the planning and redevelopment of the Site should also take into account the provision of adequate supporting facilities, e.g. eating places, to cater for the needs of HKBU students as well as the secondary school students and local residents nearby;
- (j) the future development of higher education, Chinese medicine and housing should all be taken into account in the planning of the Site. The Government should assess carefully whether the site in Tseung Kwai O proposed for CMH was more suitable than the Site. The planning horizon should be on a long-term basis, not just five to ten years;
- (k) while additional space was available adjacent to the existing campus

areas of the other UGC-funded universities for their expansion, the ex-LWL site was the only remaining site left for the expansion of HKBU; and

- (l) both the LegCo Panel on Education and the Housing and Infrastructure Committee of KCDC had raised objection to the rezoning of the Site for residential use. The Board should take into account public views in determining the zoning of the Site.

56. Miss Blanche S. Xu, another representative of the Lee Wai Lee Concern Group, made the following main points:

- (a) she was a member of 「天下為公」, an association focusing on the land use planning issues in Hong Kong;
- (b) low-income groups could not afford the high price and rent of flats and there were many street sleepers in the city, e.g. in Sham Shui Po. As such, the Site should not be rezoned for the development of medium-density or luxury housing in the interest of private developers. It should be developed for other uses;
- (c) should the Site be retained as “G/IC”, it could be developed for a wide range of GIC uses, such as community centre, school for special education, etc. for the enjoyment of the local residents and students;
- (d) the rezoning of the Site for residential use would impose pressure on the existing transport, infrastructure and other supporting facilities in the area;
- (e) as there was insufficient activity space within the HKBU campus for students to gather and hold functions, students could not fully enjoy their university life. The area allowed for self-studying in the library was also very small. Apart from roof gardens, there was no green space within the campus;

- (f) as compared with other universities with scope for further expansion in their adjoining areas, there was no space adjacent to the HKBU campus available for its further expansion, except the ex-LWL site;
- (g) it was hoped that the Site could be allocated to HKBU for future development such as student hostels and other facilities so that the students and the general public could enjoy these facilities.

57. Mr Chiu King Long, the President of Student Union Hall Council of Y.P. Cai Hall (2014-2015) of HKBU, made the following main points:

- (a) the Student Union Hall Council of Y.P. Cai Hall objected to the rezoning of the Site for residential use;
- (b) there would be many conflicts between the students living in the student hostels and the nearby local residents, should the Site be rezoned for residential use. It was because as part of the hall life, many activities would be held for the students and would cause nuisances to the residents nearby;
- (c) hall life could be regarded as part of the whole person education pursued by HKBU. It was hoped that the Site could be allocated to HKBU, e.g. for the development of student hostels, CMH or other integrated uses. There would be long-term benefits to both HKBU and the general public; and
- (d) the development of the Site for luxury housing would not solve the housing problem of Hong Kong.

58. Mr Herbert F.H. Cheung, the President of Hall Council, C. L. Soong Hall (2014-2015) of HKBU, made the following main points:

- (a) the current layout of the HKBU campus in Kowloon Tong was

unsatisfactory and the school buildings were separated from each other. For instance, it was very inconvenient for the students to access the main campus at Renfrew Road and the Communication and Visual Arts Building. The latter was also separated from the main campus by a fire station;

- (b) the buildings of HKBU were scattered in Kowloon and the New Territories. Some students living in student hostels had to travel to the Kai Tak campus and the transportation was very inconvenient. Similarly, should new curricula be provided in future, students might also need to travel to other buildings outside the main campus; and
- (c) the Site was surrounded by Mary Rose School to the west, Communication and Visual Arts Building to the south and the HKBU Student Residence Halls and a fire station to the east. The redevelopment of the Site for residential use would have significant impact on the students and local residents. The Board should carefully consider the future use of the Site on a fair basis.

59. Mr Ricky K.K. Chung, the President of Student Union Hall Council of C.N. Yang Hall (2014-2015) of HKBU, made the following main points:

- (a) the Student Union Hall Council of C.N. Yang Hall strongly objected to the rezoning of the Site for residential use. It was noted that about 90% of the 20,000 representations objected to the rezoning. Objections were also received from different sectors of the community;
- (b) the campus of HKBU was the smallest among all UGC-funded universities. The average amount of land per student was also the lowest. There was a severe shortage of student hostel places and educational facilities within the campus. The problem became more serious after the 3-3-4 education reform;
- (c) the campus area of the City University of Hong Kong (about 15.6 ha),

which was also located in Kowloon Tong, was three times larger than that of HKBU;

- (d) education was an integral part of the future development of Hong Kong. Despite the Government's intention to promote higher education, the inadequate provision of facilities for higher education was against this intention;
- (e) since 2003, 106 school sites had been left vacant under the Government's education reform. Among them, only 53 sites had been developed for other uses and 17 sites designated for other uses. The Government should make use of those vacant school sites for housing development, rather than using the Site;
- (f) it was very difficult for HKBU to find an adjoining site in Kowloon Tong for its expansion. The ex-LWL site was the only remaining site;
- (g) apart from insufficient provision of educational facilities, there was also a lack of open space and sports ground for students within the HKBU campus. It was also difficult for students to find space to discuss projects. A good campus environment was important for the personal development of students;
- (h) the rezoning of the Site for medium-density luxury housing would not solve the pressing housing problem. It would only cater for the need of the rich, rather than that of the low or middle-income groups. Besides, developing scattered housing sites could not address the structural housing problem;
- (i) should the Site be developed for residential use, the large-scale functions held by the HKBU student hostels, e.g. orientation camps and music concerts, would create noise nuisances to the future residents; and
- (j) although the northern portion of the ex-LWL site was reserved for

HKBU, it was not big enough to accommodate 1,700 student hostel places and associated student hostel facilities. Student hall life was part of the university education. It could help promote the whole person education. However, there was currently a lack of space to carry out functions and activities in the student hostels.

60. Mr Pine P.Y. Lo, the President of Student Union Hall Council of S.R. Zhou Hall (2014-2015) of HKBU, made the following main points:

- (a) he welcomed the allocation of the northern portion of the ex-LWL site to HKBU for the development of students hostels so as to alleviate the current shortfall of hostel places;
- (b) however, the Student Union Hall Council of S.R. Zhou Hall strongly objected to the rezoning of the Site for residential use. There was currently a lack of hostel facilities in HKBU and it was difficult for students to find places to hold functions. More facilities would be provided to the students, should the Site be allocated to HKBU;
- (c) the redevelopment of the Site for only a limited number of housing units could not resolve the housing problem. Besides, a high-rise and high-density residential development at the Site would create wall effect to the surroundings and adverse impact on air ventilation. This would affect the health of the students living in the hostels;
- (d) hall life was part of the university education. Functions and activities would be held at the hostels frequently which would create noise nuisances to the nearby residents, especially during night time; and
- (e) the future residential development at the Site would generate more traffic into the area and lead to adverse impact on the safety of the students living at the hostels. Allocating the Site to HKBU would help facilitate a better planning of the campus and resolve the current conflict between pedestrians and traffic.

[The meeting was adjourned for a 10-minute break.]

61. Mr Jenson C. Zhang, a representative of Postgraduate Association of HKBU, made the following main points:

- (a) the postgraduates of HKBU and the Postgraduate Association were very concerned about the future educational development of HKBU and the future use of the Site;
- (b) there was great demand for educational resources and hostel places from postgraduates, e.g. facilities for the postgraduates of School of Chinese Medicine to conduct research and experiment. Besides, large function areas were also essential to enhancing academic exchange between HKBU and other educational institutes in the Mainland; and
- (c) it was hoped that the Site would be allocated to HKBU for its future educational development.

62. Miss Mandy M.P. Chan, a student representative of School of Chinese Medicine of HKBU, made the following main points:

- (a) there was currently no CMH nor CMTH in Hong Kong. Students of the School of Chinese Medicine had to undertake their internships and practices in Guangzhou. That was very undesirable as the medical system and skills, types of diseases and living pattern of patients in the Mainland were very different from those in Hong Kong. Students could not apply what they learnt from Hong Kong in the Mainland hospitals;
- (b) there was strong competition for internship in the CMH in Guangzhou as there were three universities sharing the facilities. The learning opportunities of Hong Kong students were limited;

- (c) the teachers in School of Chinese Medicine of HKBU were all very experienced in local practices. Students hoped that they could learn directly from them by practising in a local CMTH and could serve the local community;
- (d) the development of a CMH or CMTH would be in the interests of the patients and the general public. After visiting doctors in the out-patient clinic, patients could stay in the hospital for further treatment, if necessary;
- (e) the development of a CMH or CMTH was in line with the Government's policy to develop Hong Kong as a Chinese Medicine Port; and
- (f) the campus of HKBU was the smallest among the eight UGC-funded universities. No additional land was allocated to HKBU after the 3-3-4 educational reform. There were currently insufficient educational facilities within the campus e.g. classrooms and other activity space for students to hold functions and discussions.

63. Mr David C.H. Sum, a student representative of School of Chinese Medicine of HKBU, made the following main points:

- (a) he referred to a story about David and the giant Goliath in the Bible. About 3,000 years ago, David, a shepherd boy, defeated the giant Goliath in a war between Israelites and Philistines. Without wearing armor nor using any weapon, David used a sling to defeat the giant Goliath. While people generally considered that David was weaker than Goliath, David was in fact stronger than Goliath as the latter suffered from pituitary adenoma and could not see clearly;
- (b) by analogy, the Chinese medicine was symbolized by David. This was because even without using advanced technology, Chinese medicine could cure serious diseases and was sometimes more effective than Western medicine;

- (c) similarly, HKBU was also symbolized by David. Although the number of students in HKBU was the smallest among the local universities and that HKBU did not have experience in developing the Western medicine education, this did not mean that HKBU did not have the ability to develop the Chinese medicine education and a CMTH. Rather, the CMTH would gain the full support from HKBU for its development; and
- (d) in the Bible story, the King of Israel allowed David to fight for Israelites despite he was only a shepherd boy. Similarly, although HKBU did not have a high international status, the Government and the public should not look down on HKBU. The Board should give HKBU an opportunity for developing its CMTH at the Site.

64. As all the presentations of the representers' representatives scheduled for this session had completed, the meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.