

1. The meeting was resumed at 9:00 a.m. on 7.12.2017.
2. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting:

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer (Hong Kong),
Transport Department
Mr Eddie S.K. Leung

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department
Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Richard W.Y. Wong

Deputy Director of Lands (General)
Ms Karen P.Y. Chan

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Agenda Item 1 (Continued)

[Open Meeting]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of Draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K22/5
(TPB Papers No. 10365)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese and English]

Group 2

(Representations No. R1, R2, R12, R14 to R39, R271 to R12083 and R12152, and Comments No. C258 and C260 to C1426)

3. The Secretary reported that the representation site was related to a proposed campus development by the Vocational Training Council (VTC). The following Members had declared interests on the item for having affiliations or business dealings with VTC (also R1/C263) and its consultant, Ove Arup Partners HK Limited (Arup); or having affiliations or business dealings with Ms Mary Mulvihill (C433).

- | | |
|--|---|
| Mr Ivan C.S. Fu | - having current business dealings with VTC and Arup |
| Mr Franklin Yu | - being the Director of a firm having current business dealings with VTC and having past business dealings with Arup |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | - being an external examiner of the Technological and Higher Education Institute (THEi) which was a member institution of VTC, and having current business dealings with Arup |
| Professor S.C. Wong
(<i>Vice-chairperson</i>) | - being an adjunct Professor of the THEi but the appointment was honorary and |

courtesy in nature, and having current business dealings with Arup

- | | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - his firm having current business dealings with Arup and hiring Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time; and having past teaching work in a member institute of VTC |
| Mr K.K. Cheung | - his firm having current business dealings with Arup and hiring Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time |
| Ms Janice W.M. Lai | - having current business dealings with Arup |
| Miss Winnie W.M. Ng | - being ex-Council Member of VTC |
| Mr Stephen L.H. Liu |] having past teaching work in a member institute of VTC |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon | |
| Mr Martin W.C. Kwan | |
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam | - having past business dealings with VTC |
| Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung | - being former member of the Accountancy Training Board of VTC |

4. Members noted that Messrs Ivan C.S. Fu, Franklin Yu and Patrick H.T. Lau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend this session of the meeting. As Professor S.C. Wong, Mr K.K. Cheung, Mr Alex T.H. Lai, Ms Janice W.M. Lai and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had no direct involvement with VTC and the project and their other interests were remote or indirect, Members agreed that they could be allowed to stay in the meeting. As the interests of Miss Winnie W.M. Ng, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, Dr Lawrence

W.C. Poon and Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung were remote or indirect, Members also agreed that they could be allowed to stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

5. The Chairperson said that reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenters inviting them to the hearing, but other than those who were present or had indicated that they would attend the hearing, the rest had either indicated not to attend or made no reply. As reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenters, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations and comments in their absence.

6. The following government representatives, and representers, commenters and their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

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

Mr Gary T.L. Lam - Town Planner/Kowloon (TP/K)

Transport Department (TD)

Miss Wendy W.T. Tang - Engineer/Kwun Tong 1 (E/KT1)

Representers/commenters and their Representatives

R1/C263 - Vocational Training Council

C264 - 張健輝

C265 - 吳宏斌

C266 - 彭錦釗

C267 - Tai Chark Tong

C268 - Agnes Koon

C269 - Kevin Lau Kin Wah

C270 - Sabrina Chao Sih Ming

C271 - Bianca Ma Kin San

C272 - Stella Kwan Mun Yee

VTC

Mr Leung Yam Shing]	Representer's and Commenters'
Mr Albert Lai]	representatives
Mr Daniel Yan]	
<i>Arup</i>]	
Ms Theresa Yeung]	
Ms Natalie Leung]	
Ms Minnie Law]	
<i>P&T Architects & Engineers Ltd.</i>]	
Mr Joel Chan]	
Ms Sally Chan]	

R271 - Hon Tam Man Ho Jeremy

R748 - Princess Bautista

R2358 - 梁惠君

R4603 - Betty Tse

R6276 - Ho Sze Lok Enoch

R6919 - Chung Kit Ching

R7042 - Chan Wai Hung

R7799 - David Ku

C627 - Lai Chi Wai

Hon Tam Man Ho Jeremy	-	Representer, and Representers' and Commenter's representative
Ms Ko Cheuk Yee	-	Representers' and Commenter's representative

R274 - Estate Owners' Committees of Laguna City (Phases 1, 2 & 4 and Phase 3)

R310 - Joyce Ma

R365 - Sin Mei Ling Ivy

R583 - Mandy Cheung

R694 - Chiu Chung Heung

R754 - Choy Shun Chiu

R811 - W S Cheung

R837 - Lee Wing Ho

R967 - Perry Yeung Chun Yin

R1060 - Yeung Yung Kun

R1064 - 麥春愉

R1171/C352 - Lee Wing Ho

R1273 - 康駿旗

R1347 - 陳志泓

R1453 - 趙沛權

R1704 - Ho Ka Lok

R1812 - Yeung Man Chung

R1851 - 陳美華

R1882 - 高樂和

- R1921 - 李知諺
- R2370 - Chau Wing Yan
- R2506 - 楊俊賢
- R2623 - Angela Hui
- R2797 - Li Hing Mui
- R3133 - 吳子彥
- R3265 - Lo Pak Ching
- R4089 - Lau Wai Yee
- R4393 - 凌贊美
- R5371 - Chan Wai Yi
- R5579 - Shum Ka Yee
- R6081 - Chiu Choi Mei
- R6103 - Cheng Wing Keung
- R6370 - Chan Kwok Yee Aug
- R7318 - Chan Wai Shun
- R7644 - Ko Kwok Keung
- R7715 - Edmond Tung
- R8487 - 鄭偉達
- R8662 - 張玉泉
- R9304 - Tse King Keung
- R9587 - Lai Siu Hong
- R9800 - Ho Chi Lam
- R9938 - 林曉黎
- R10320 - Fung Sau Wah
- R10475 - Ng Chung Tin
- R10727 - Yiu Heung Siu
- R10844 - 李志華
- R11242 - Lam Tze Heung
- R11519 - Wong Ying Chi
- Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront*
- Concern Group* -
- Mr Kau Kin Tak
- R2211 - Hui Tat Fat
- R2475/C624 - Ng Ching Nui
- R2611 - Jimmy Hui
- R2700/C1428 - Lai Wai Chun
- R3008 - 吳子諾
- R3152 - 陳仲豪
- R3318 - Lee Wing Yee Rankey
- R4156 - Ma Sau Lai
- R5347 - 周麗華
- R5571 - Chan Yuen Ping
- R5596 - Wo Ching Wing
- R6102 - Cheng Tsz King
- R6121 - 李泓翰
- R6413 - Chu Man Wah
- R7576 - Lam Ka Wai
- R7648 - Tang Man Lai
- R8073 - 岑軍治
- R8661 - Hui Pui Ying Connie
- R8969 - 黃寶佩
- R9464 - Wo Ching Wing
- R9659 - Yiu Heung Siu
- R9834 - 陳寶琮
- R10287 - 陳春霞
- R10473 - Chu Wing Cheong
- R10647 - Ye Chi Zhen
- R10742 - Maurice Wong
- R11063 - Amy Lui
- R11275 - 程大雄
- Representers' and Commenters' representative

R275/C327 - Sceneway Garden Estate Owners' Committee

R8499 - Ng Wing Sun

R8500 - 林國偉

R11890/C500 - Alex Law

C1248 - Fong Sing Sum

Sceneway Garden Estate Owners' Committee -

- Representers' and Commenters' representative

Mr Lam Yat Ming

R276 - Victoria Waterfront Concern Group

R304 - 謝振華

R6399 - Tse Ju Yan

R8671 - Tse Yan Lam

C476 - Tse Yan Lam Karissa

C584 - Chan Wing Kin Vincent

C1258 - Fan Chi Him

Ms Katty Law

- Representers' and Commenters' representative

R283 - Sit Tse Wing

R284 - Lee Ho Sum

R553 - Norman Law

R652 - 黃維義

R908 - Chan Yat Shu

R1032 - 羅起江

R1214 - 嚴有騰

R1222 - Benny Lau

R1896 - 嚴穎雯

R1969 - Chiu Wing Yee

R1977 - Chu Po Keung

R2092 - Yuen Chi Leung

R2177 - 劉展宏

R2221 - Leung Yuk Ching

R2283 - 陳雲冰

R2337 - Wong Wai Ming Raymond

R2614 - 嚴穎潔

R2969 - Jennifer Leung

R2972 - Au Yeung May Lan

R3179 - Chow Wa Chong

R3182 - Rick Chow

R3524 - 吳文根

R3734 - 何笑芬

R3763 - Chik Shuk Mei

R3880 - Li Mun Wah

R4546 - 郭啟全

R5093 - Chow Wa Cheong

R5103 - Ho Po Wa

R5204 - Man Che Wing

R6137 - 詹鳳玲

R6151 - Chan Yat Shu Jessie

R6171 - Lok Chee Hung

R6195 - Yim Mei Han

R6478/C1372 - Dominic Woo

R6686 - Chow Wa Cheong Rick

R6803 - Chu Wing Ching

- R6834 – Wu Cheuk Kuen
R7393/C1093 - Siu Wing Leung
R7666 - Lok Chun Sing
R7688 - Tam Ngo Ting
R8088 - Chan Ka Hung
R8811 - Amy Lam
R8835 - Wong Fung
R8943 - 劉志榮
R9136 - Lok Kar Yee
R9334 – Yung Man Kay
R10406 - 何玉嬋
R10861 - 劉松熹
R11434 – Ho Wai Ha
R11564 - 陳美鳳
R11694 - Li Wai Ling
C428 - Law Ka Wai Cora
C512 - Lam Cho Yu
C617 - Pun Suet Lin
C625 - Lee Lie Hsia
C745 - 鄧葵枝
C768 - 文玉燕
C770 - Ng Man Yee
C952 - Bliss Mark Anthony
C969 - 譚傲婷
C1025 - Yim Mei Han
C1157 - Man Che Wing
C1249 - Dennis FC Cheung
C1275 - 朱達輝
C1277 - 吳敏婷
Protect Cha Kwo Ling
Harbourfront Concern Group -
Ms Louie Po Ching
- R6930 - Lau Kam Wah
R7531/C865 - Louie Po Ching
R7674 - Andy Lo
R7762 - Paul Wong
R8584 - P.L. Tsui
R8832/C971 - Chanel Toong
R8854 - Tsui Wa Sang
R9085 - Frances Chaw
R9179 - Bancroft Tsoi
R10374 - Fong Lai Chi
R10420 - Yuen Yin Ping
R11279 - Hermen Hung
R11558 - 鍾海翠
R11565 - 何東玲
R11944 - Kevin Chu
C491 - Cheung Lai Na
C616 - Ho Shiu Miu
C618 - 陳偉成
C629 - Lau Tsz Kong
C767 - 朱昭庭
C769 - Leung Yuen Ming
C771 - Kwok Hoi Yan Hilda
C967 - Ho Wai Ha
C995 - 葉金燕
C1045 - Lai Kit Ha Amy
C1199 - Lam Siu Kin
C1266 - 林宇儔
C1276 - Yiu Ling Kit
C1278 - Wong Wai Ho
- Representers' and Commenters' representative

- R294 - Edward Tam
R479 - Au Yau Chi
R569 - Lau Lai Ching Jane
R648 - Poon Suet Ping
R732 - Au Yan Chi
R810 - 黃乃靈
R865 - 劉麗珠
R960 - Tse King Sun
R983 - Max Au
R1049 - 戚劍明
R1217 - 高允航
R1310 - Tsang Wai Nung
R1325 - Fan Yuk Shiu
R1504 - 冼美鳳
R1544 - Araya Miyako
R1546 - Chan Tse Chiu
R1588/C1243 - Chan Kwok Wo
R1600/C1123 - Yiu Yuk Kuen
R1900 - Ian Wong
R2028 - Luk Siu Cheung
R2239 - Tse Yuen Yu
R2323 - Jane Tam
R2399 - Anaya Miyako
R2479 - Pang Wing
R2860 - Wong Hau Fai
R2953 - 曾曼甄
R3022 - 劉麗冰
R3949 - Chan Shuk Kwan
R4456 - Wong Ming Nui
R4535 - Alex Wong
R5261 - 梁貫宇
- R444 - 劉麗珠
R546 - Fan Yuk Siu
R573 - Tam Kok Hung
R728 - 丘駿昇
R781 - 謝厚友
R827 - 劉貞
R882 - Fan Tsz Tim
R962 - 曾國華
R1027 - Chan Wa Sang
R1126 - Kevin Au
R1280 - 劉麗珠
R1315 - 梁玉燕
R1503 - Cheng Ngai Martin
R1541 - Iris Tsang
R1545 - Tse Siu Wan
R1564 - Araya Mikiko
R1599/C1176 - Chan Yuen Ying
R1601/C1000 - Chan Sze Ki
R2010 - Kin Fai
R2169 - W.Y. Lai
R2272 - 劉麗兒
R2362 - 劉國成
R2417 - Anaya Mikko
R2629 - Fan Chun Kin
R2933 - C.H. Wong
R3020 - 劉亨
R3548 - Y. Leung
R4376 - Chan King Yin
R4520 - 梁慧詩
R4666 - Miranda Fung
R5280 - Ng Wai Fai

<u>R5606 - Isa Wu</u>	<u>R5670 - 林潤慈</u>
<u>R5676 - Cheung Chi Ming</u>	<u>R6117 - Lee Siu Keung</u>
<u>R6366 - 陳根敏</u>	<u>R6508 - Chan Kin Fai</u>
<u>R6558 - Wong Sze Wing</u>	<u>R6779 - Terry Chan</u>
<u>R6821 - Lam Suk Fun</u>	<u>R6898 - King Sun Tse</u>
<u>R7002 - 劉麗嫦</u>	<u>R7541 - Li Hoi Wah</u>
<u>R7787 - 孫妹</u>	<u>R8051 - Christina Tsang</u>
<u>R8322 - Chou Oi Kan</u>	<u>R8600 - 陳麗華</u>
<u>R8798 - Tse Hui Wah</u>	<u>R8966 - 張再群</u>
<u>R8979 - Ho Tung Wan</u>	<u>R9556 - Lum Hon Kei</u>
<u>R9734 - Chan Chung Chak Daniel</u>	<u>R9818 - Hung King Yung Karen</u>
<u>R9900 - Chung Yan Yan</u>	<u>R10012 - 劉月成</u>
<u>R10085 - 李笑瓊</u>	<u>R10086 - Leung Wai Sze</u>
<u>R10233 - Tse Hoi Wah</u>	<u>R10461 - 吳潔權</u>
<u>R10704 - Chan Chi Ching</u>	<u>R10763 - Wong Sze Wing May</u>
<u>R11157 - 徐佩君</u>	<u>R11266 - Fane Yuk</u>
<u>R11647 - Chan Lai Pin</u>	<u>R11756 - 鄭佩英</u>
<i>Protect Cha Kwo Ling</i>	- Representers' and Commenters'
<i>Harbourfront Concern Group -</i>	representative
Mr Tse Chun Wah	
<u>R433 - Mary Mulvihill</u>	<u>R5668 - 何志雲</u>
Ms Mary Mulvihill	- Representer and Representer's
	representative
<u>R566/C978 - Lau Lai Lai</u>	<u>R878 - Lily Lau</u>
<u>C596 - Leung Yuk Yin</u>	<u>C976 - Lau Lai Sheung</u>
Ms Tse Suk Chun	- Representers' and Commenters'
	representative

7. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that government's representatives would be invited to brief Members on

the representations and comments. The representers/commenters or their representatives would then be invited to make oral submissions in turn. To ensure the efficient operation of the meeting, each representer/commenter or his/her representative would be allotted 10 minutes for making oral submission. There was a timer device to alert the representers/commenters or their representatives two minutes before the allotted time was to expire, and when the allotted time limit was up. A question and answer (Q&A) session would be held after all attending representers/commenters or their representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to government's representatives, representers/commenters or their representatives. After the Q&A session, the hearing would be adjourned and government's representatives, the representers/commenters or their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. After hearing all the oral submission from the remaining representers/commenters or their representatives who would attend the meeting, the Town Planning Board (the Board) would deliberate on the representations and comments in their absence and inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

8. The Chairperson then invited government's representative to brief Members on the representations and comments.

9. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, PlanD briefed Members on the representations and comments, including the background of the proposed amendments, public consultation, views and proposals of the representers and commenters, planning assessments and PlanD's views on the representations and comments, as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10365 (the Paper).

10. The Chairperson then invited the representers, commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their representations and comments.

[Mr David Y.T. Lui arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

R1/C263 - Vocational Training Council

C264 - 張健輝

C265 - 吳宏斌

C266 - 彭錦釗

C267 - Tai Chark Tong

C268 - Agnes Koon

C269 - Kevin Lau Kin Wah

C270 - Sabrina Chao Sih Ming

C271 - Bianca Ma Kin San

C272 - Stella Kwan Mun Yee

11. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Leung Yam Shing and Ms Teresa Yeung made the following main points:

- (a) VTC welcomed the proposed land allocation by the Government at the site for the VTC campus, which was considered appropriate in terms of site area, location and availability for timely provision of the much needed vocational and professional education and training (VPET) facilities in Hong Kong by 2027/28;
- (b) VTC supported Amendment Item W1 with stipulation of building height restrictions (BHRs) of 60mPD and 70mPD within the subject “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zone;

Background of VTC

- (c) the mission of VTC was to provide a valued choice to school leavers and working adults to acquire values, knowledge and skills for lifelong learning and enhanced employability, and to provide valued supports to industries for their manpower development. Established in 1982, VTC was the largest VPET provider in Hong Kong, and provided valuable credentials for some 250,000 students each year through a full range of pre-employment and in-service programmes with internationally recognised qualifications;
- (d) VTC drew strength from the number of its member institutions, breadth of programmes and variety of accredited qualifications to provide a teaching and learning approach that was practical, hands-on and outcome-based to learners of all ages and abilities. The VTC was supported by five Functional Committees and 21 Training Boards which advised VTC on manpower trends and industry development needs;

- (e) VTC had been offering a range of education programmes consisting of specialized contents in vocational skills or professional knowledge for different levels of students. Its curriculum development had made reference to the projected workforce requirements and close linkages had been maintained with a number of enterprises with a view to providing a high-quality supply of human resources to meet the societal needs and support Hong Kong's economic development;

Need for a New VTC Campus

- (f) to support the work of VTC and to meet the training needs, adequate facilities were required. According to VTC's strategic development plan, there was a need for timely development of a new campus with sufficient size in the urban area to support the continued development of VPET in Hong Kong and to facilitate the provision of multi-disciplinary and cross-field education. Against this background, as stated in Policy Address, the Government supported the earmarking of a site in the urban area to develop a VTC campus;
- (g) the new VTC campus would serve to re-provision two existing overcrowded and aged campuses in Cheung Sha Wan (Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education (IVE)(Haking Wong)) and Kwun Tong (IVE (Kwun Tong)). Given the constraints of the two existing campuses including the low floor-to-floor height, low structural loading and narrow spaces; the scope for modifications and campus extension would be limited, and the cost for repair and maintenance was high. Those two sites would be returned to the Government for other uses upon completion of the new VTC campus;
- (h) the proposed VTC campus would not only bring direct benefits to its 6,000 full-time students per year, but also help relieve the current congestion problem at other existing VTC facilities which were being used by a total of 50,000 students and staff. At present, the average

space per students at VTC institutions was only about 6.6 m² which was much lower than the average of 10 m² to 15 m² per students for the eight University Grants Committee (UGC) funded institutions in Hong Kong and about 15 m² per student at the Institute of Technical Education (ITE) of Singapore. Adequate space for VTC students were necessary to provide the much needed student amenities and outdoor spaces to achieve a more balanced and fulfilling campus life and align with the global trend of high quality VPET infrastructure;

Revised Scheme for VTC Campus

- (i) VTC had maintained close dialogue with the stakeholders, district councillors and local residents with a view to gauging public views on the proposed VTC campus and exploring opportunities to meet the needs of the local community. In response to the views/representations of the local residents and concerned stakeholders, VTC had formulated a revised indicative scheme for the VTC campus with reduced scale, improved visual permeability and visual compatibility, and no adverse traffic impact would be caused;

- (j) as compared with the original scheme, the revised scheme involved reductions in site area from 4.2 ha to 3.2 ha, plot ratio (PR) and gross floor area (GFA) by 22% and number of blocks from three to two as well as further set back from Laguna City with a width of about 92m. Moreover, a public open space (POS) of 1 ha would be provided at the north-western part of the VTC campus site which would be handed back to the Government for management and maintenance upon completion;

Provision of Open Space

- (k) under the revised scheme, the proposed POS would integrate well with the planned waterfront promenade to its southwest of about 3.2 ha with a length of 660 m and a width of 50 m. Moreover, a larger site for

reprovisioning the existing 7-a-side soccer pitch with enhanced facilities including two basketball courts and a spectator stand would be provided. Coupled with the existing Laguna Park of about 3 ha, there would be a total of about 8.2 ha of open space in the area to serve the local residents;

Visual and Urban Design Considerations

- (l) the revised scheme for the VTC campus would adopt a graded BH profile descending towards the harbour and varying BHs of 60 mPD and 70 mPD along the harbour-front which allowed for greater visual interest and permeability. The revised scheme was in line with the harbour-front design concept in the Kai Tak area;
- (m) the proposed VTC campus was visually compatible with its surroundings. The visual impact assessment (VIA) had concluded that the proposed VTC campus would have no adverse visual impact as viewed from a number of vantage points accessible by the public;

Air Ventilation

- (n) in terms of air ventilation, various measures including building separation between blocks, setback from Wai Yip Street/waterfront promenade, podium free design, semi-outdoor link bridge(s) had been adopted taking into account the major air paths and existing developments in order to improve permeability of the development and minimize the potential adverse air ventilation impact on the surrounding pedestrian wind environment. According to the air ventilation assessment (AVA), the overall performances of the existing condition of the VTC campus site and the original scheme on pedestrian wind environment were comparable under both annual and summer conditions. For the revised scheme, its overall performances on pedestrian wind environment were comparable with the original scheme under the annual condition, while the overall pedestrian wind

environment would be slightly enhanced under the summer condition;

Traffic

- (o) the direction of traffic flow generated by the proposed VTC campus would be opposite to that of Laguna City, and the classes of VTC would be spread throughout the day instead of concentrating in particular periods of time. Moreover, some of the students and staff would access the proposed VTC campus by public transport;
- (p) direct shuttle bus service between the new VTC campus and MTR Yau Tong Station would be provided so as to divert the traffic and pedestrian flow of students and staff away from the Laguna City area. The proposed shuttle bus stop would be located at the lay-by of about 150m in length along Cha Kwo Ling Road outside Exit B2 of MTR Yau Tong Station. Adequate transport facilities including bus lay-bys and taxi lay-bys would also be provided within the campus to avoid traffic congestion in the surrounding road network;
- (q) a traffic impact assessment (TIA) had been conducted taking into account proposed highway infrastructure projects and planned major developments in the future. According to the TIA, all critical junctions in the vicinity of the site were anticipated to operate satisfactorily with spare capacity in the AM and PM peaks. The findings of the TIA were acceptable to the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) and it was anticipated that the new VTC campus would not cause insurmountable traffic problems;
- (r) while many VTC's member institutions such as those in Tsing Yi and Chai Wan were located close to residential neighbourhoods, no adverse impact were entailed by the institutions on the nearby road network and local communities; and

Other Merits

- (s) VTC had been operating collaboration programmes such as child care and elderly community services in its Kwai Chung and Sha Tin institutions to serve the nearby residents. Opportunities would also be taken to provide collaboration programmes and community services at the proposed VTC campus for the benefits of the local community.

12. Members noted that Hon Tam Man Ho, Jeremy (R271) had been engaged by some urgent business in the Legislative Council and would make his presentation in the afternoon session.

13. Ms Tse Suk Chun, A Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC) Member, requested to make her oral submission first as she had some urgent commitment. As no objection to the proposed arrangement was raised by other attendees, Members agreed to accede to her request.

R566/C978 - Lau Lai Lai

R878 - Lily Lau

C596 - Leung Yuk Yin

C976 - Lau Lai Sheung

14. Ms Tse Suk Chun made the following main points:

- (a) she objected to the proposed new VTC campus;
- (b) at present, the MTR Yau Tong Station and the road network in Yau Tong were already very busy especially during peak hours. In view of the future developments in Yau Tong and its surrounding areas, the proposed shuttle bus service would create additional burden on the local road network and result in unacceptable traffic impact; and
- (c) while there was no objection to VTC's development plan, she had reservation on selection of the site.

[The meeting adjourned for a short break of 5 minutes.]

R274 - Estate Owners' Committees of Laguna City (Phases 1, 2 & 4 and Phase 3)

R310 - Joyce Ma

R583 - Mandy Cheung

R754 - Choy Shun Chiu

R837 - 黃芬妮

R1060 - Yeung Yung Kun

R1171/C352 - Lee Wing Ho

R1347 - 陳志泓

R1704 - Ho Ka Lok

R1851 - 陳美華

R1921 - 李知諺

R2370 - Chau Wing Yan

R2506 - 楊俊賢

R2623 - Angela Hui

R2797 - Li Hing Mui

R3133 - 吳子彥

R3265 - Lo Pak Ching

R4089 - Lau Wai Yee

R4393 - 凌贊美

R5371 - Chan Wai Yi

R5579 - Shum Ka Yee

R6081 - Chiu Choi Mei

R6103 - Cheng Wing Keung

R6370 - Chan Kwok Yee Aug

R7318 - Chan Wai Shun

R7644 - Ko Kwok Keung

R7715 - Edmond Tung

R8487 - 鄭偉達

R8662 - 張玉泉

R9304 - Tse King Keung

R9587 - Lai Siu Hong

R9800 - Ho Chi Lam

R365 - Sin Mei Ling Ivy

R694 - Chiu Chung Heung

R811 - W S Cheung

R967 - Perry Yeung Chun Yin

R1064 - 麥春愉

R1273 - 康駿旗

R1453 - 趙沛權

R1812 - Yeung Man Chung

R1882 - 高樂和

R2211 - Hui Tat Fat

R2475/C624 - Ng Ching Nui

R2611 - Jimmy Hui

R2700/C1428 - Lai Wai Chun

R3008 - 吳子諾

R3152 - 陳仲豪

R3318 - Lee Wing Yee Rankey

R4156 - Ma Sau Lai

R5347 - 周麗華

R5571 - Chan Yuen Ping

R5596 - Wo Ching Wing

R6102 - Cheng Tsz King

R6121 - 李泓翰

R6413 - Chu Man Wah

R7576 - Lam Ka Wai

R7648 - Tang Man Lai

R8073 - 岑軍治

R8661 - Hui Pui Ying Connie

R8969 - 黃寶佩

R9464 - Wo Ching Wing

R9659 - Yiu Heung Siu

R9834 - 陳寶琮

R9938 - 林曉黎

R10320 - Fung Sau Wah

R10475 - Ng Chung Tin

R10727 - Yiu Heung Siu

R10844 - 李志華

R11242 - Lam Tze Heung

R11519 - Wong Ying Chi

R10287 - 陳春霞

R10473 - Chu Wing Cheong

R10647 - Ye Chi Zhen

R10742 - Maurice Wong

R11063 - Amy Lui

R11275 - 程大雄

15. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Kau Kin Tak made the following main points:

- (a) he was the chairman of the Estate Owners' Committees of Laguna City (Phase 3) and a member of the Protect Cha Kwo Ling harbourfront Concern Group. His presentation was made on behalf of the residents of Laguna City and Kwun Tong district;

Insufficient Public Consultation

- (b) according to a paper on 'Guideline on Public Consultation' discussed at the Legislative Council Panel on Constitutional Affairs in 2003, it was the Government's policy to be open, transparent and accountable to the public when undertaking public consultation. While the key principles of public consultation should include timeliness, provision of available options, a wider scope of consultation and presentation of all relevant information, public consultation on the OZP amendments was grossly inadequate and those principles had not been followed in the consultation exercise;
- (c) the proposed amendments were not made known to the residents of Laguna City and Kwun Tong District before the KTDC was consulted in November 2016. Moreover, limited information and fact of the amendments had been provided by the Government during the public consultation. In fact, the residents of Laguna City had not been

directly consulted by the Government on the proposed amendments until they requested PlanD and VTC to conduct a briefing in January 2017, and many residents of East Kowloon were not aware of the proposed amendments even after gazetting;

- (d) at the KTDC meeting held on 2.3.2017, DC members raised concerns on the adverse traffic, visual and air ventilation impacts, excessive development scale, and insufficient supporting facilities and open space in Kwun Tong District. KTDC passed a motion objecting to the proposed rezoning of the subject “Open Space” (“O”) site to “G/IC”. Although the extract of the relevant minutes of the KTDC meeting had been annexed to the TPB Paper, the minutes could not accurately reflect the sentiments and views expressed by the DC members;
- (e) the proposed amendments were discussed at the meeting of the Kwun Tong South Area Committee (KTSAC) of KTDC held on 3.3.2017. While no representative from PlanD nor VTC was present at the meeting, the KTSAC wrote a letter on 18.4.2017 to the Board to express members’ concerns on adverse traffic impact and air ventilation impact of the proposed VTC campus, insufficient supporting facilities and reduction in open space provision in Kwun Tong District. The letter was however not attached to the TPB Paper;
- (f) although VTC had subsequently submitted a revised scheme for the proposed VTC campus to the Board, the relevant stakeholders had not been consulted on that scheme. Only a briefing session with the Harbourfront Commission (HC) members on the revised scheme was held on 2.8.2017, with the attendance of representatives of VTC, PlanD and the Estate Owners’ Committees of Laguna City;

Adverse Impacts of OZP Amendments

- (g) Kwun Tong had all along been subject to adverse environmental impacts from such polluting uses as the Kai Tak Airport, public cargo

handling area, recyclable workshops, sewage treatment facilities and liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) filling station. For the existing LPG station at the Cha Kwo Ling, although the Government had envisaged that it would not entail adverse traffic impact before it was put in place, in reality after its completion long queues of taxis were lining up outside the LPG filling station every day. If the LPG filling station site was to be enlarged under the OZP amendments, it was anticipated that the associated traffic and environmental impacts on the surrounding area would aggravate. Furthermore, as the existing sewage pumping station was to be retained under the OZP proposals, its air quality and odour impacts on the surrounding local residents would persist;

- (h) the current population of Kwun Tong was about one million, including about 700,000 residents and 300,000 working population and school attendees. In view of the future developments and transformation of the East Kowloon area, the population would increase further in the future. However, given that Kwun Tong was planned as a self-sustaining district, it was envisaged that the existing road network and public transport facilities would not be able to accommodate the future developments and population growth. As the proposed VTC campus would induce additional burden on the road network, the findings of the TIA was questionable;

Need for CKL Park

- (i) although the existing and planned provisions of open space in Kwun Tong were in compliance with the relevant standards and guidelines, the open spaces were mostly small in size. There were also fewer waterfront parks in Kowloon compared to that of Hong Kong Island. There was therefore a strong demand for a large and high quality public park and accessible harbourfront open space in Kwun Tong;

[Mr Stephen L.H. Liu left this session of meeting at this point.]

- (j) since the publication of Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/4, the Government had promised to develop the subject site, zoned “O” on the then OZP, for Cha Kwo Ling Park (CKL Park) and integrate it with the adjoining waterfront promenade for improvement of amenities and enhancement of the harbourfront. However, the promise had now been broken by the OZP amendments. While there were many alternative sites for the VTC campus, the waterfront location of CKL Park was irreplaceable;
- (k) the Kwun Tong District comprised many elderly people and was among the poorest districts in Hong Kong. The deletion of CKL Park would deprive the Kwun Tong residents of the right to enjoy the waterfront and might be seen as a discrimination against the residents;
- (l) the Leisure and Cultural Services Department had once applied for funding to implement CKL Park but the programme of implementation had been delayed to tie in with the construction of Trunk Road T2. The delay was caused by government’s bad planning;
- (m) while the CKL Park was planned after extensive public consultation under the Kai Tak Planning Review in 2006, relevant stakeholders were not consulted on the deletion of the CKL Park prior to the publication of the OZP amendments; and
- (n) the local residents were angry and helpless to learn that the “O” site was to be rezoned to “G/IC” for the proposed VTC campus. Planning was for people and thus the sentiments of people should be taken into account in the planning process. The Board should exercise its professional judgment and take on board the sentiments of local residents before making a decision.

16. The Secretary informed the meeting that the Estate Owners’ Committees of Laguna City (Phases 1, 2 & 4 and Phase 3) had submitted a letter to the Board prior to the meeting, the content of which was similar to the presentation of Mr Kau Kin Tak. Members noted.

R275/C327 - Sceneway Garden Estate Owners' Committee

R8499 - Ng Wing Sun

R8500 - 林國偉

R11890/C500 - Alex Law

C1248 - Fong Sing Sum

17. Mr Lam Yat Ming made the following main points:

- (a) he was the Chairman of the Owners' Committee of Sceneway Garden and had lived in Kwun Tong for over 40 years;
- (b) he was surprised to learn that the CKL waterfront area which possessed such good views and environment would be used for the proposed VTC campus;
- (c) the OZP amendments would not only affect the residents of Laguna City but also those of Kwun Tong and Lam Tin;
- (d) while the Kwun Tong promenade had already been heavily used and often overcrowded, the planned CKL Park would be the only waterfront park which could provide breathing space and activity area for the residents of Kwun Tong in particular those in the low income group;
- (e) the existing and planned public facilities in Kwun Tong and Lam Tin would not be sufficient to support the future population growth in the area;
- (f) Exits A and D of MTR Lam Tin Station were already subject to serious congestion. For Exit A at Sceneway Garden, the congestion problem had worsened recently as the number of operating escalators had been reduced from three to two due to renovation and maintenance works. Moreover, during the undertaking of maintenance works at Exit D near Laguna City several months ago, many people had chosen to access Laguna City via the podium of Sceneway Garden which had led to residents' concern about crime and security issues by trespassers. With the increase in population upon completion of the ex-Kaolin Mine

development and VTC campus in the future, the patronage of MTR would likely increase and hence aggravating the congestion problem. Additional barrier free access and escalator facilities should be provided at MTR Lam Tin Station;

- (g) although shuttle bus would be provided for the VTC campus, the bus frequency was uncertain and most students and staff might still choose to access the campus via MTR Lam Tin Station. At present, there was only one GMB route No. 23C serving between MTR Lam Tin Station and the VTC campus site but the GMBs were often fully loaded given the infrequent service. As such, the traffic impact generated by the VTC campus would be insurmountable;
- (h) the existing open spaces in Kwun Tong were mostly small in size. There was also a shortage of sports pitches including those for baseball and soccer in the district. The proposal to re-provision the existing temporary soccer pitch with a permanent one at a smaller site was unattractive and could not meet the demand for high quality sports facilities;
- (i) it was understood that the student intake of VTC institutions was declining and some of its halls of residence had been left vacant. As there were already eight UGC funded universities in Hong Kong, the need for additional land for the new VTC campus was highly doubtful;
- (j) according to a local resident working in the hotel industry and serving as a Board member in the VTC, less than 20% of the graduates of VTC hotel and catering related courses could get employed in the local hotel industry. The need for a training hotel at the VTC campus site was therefore questionable; and
- (k) if VTC institutions were experiencing a genuine shortage in space, the IVE (Haking Wong) and IVE (Kwun Tong) sites should not be returned to the Government. The proposed re-provisioning of the two campuses

at the expense of the planned CKL Park, which resembled a deal between VTC and the Government to release those two sites for private housing or other land uses, was unacceptable.

R276 - Victoria Waterfront Concern Group

R304 - 謝振華

R6399 - Tse Ju Yan

R8671 - Tse Yan Lam

C476 - Tse Yan Lam Karissa

C584 - Chan Wing Kin Vincent

C1258 - Fan Chi Him

18. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Ms Katty Law made the following main points:

- (a) she was a member of the Victoria Waterfront Concern Group;
- (b) there had been a strong commitment by the Government to plan the harbourfront for public enjoyment. The planned CKL Park was intended not only to serve the residents of Kwun Tong but also the whole population of Hong Kong. To implement the planned CKL Park would be a good gesture of the Government to honour that commitment to the people of Hong Kong on harbourfront planning;
- (c) the site was situated at a prime waterfront location with beautiful panoramic views of Hong Kong Island, Kowloon and Victoria Harbour in between. It could readily be linked up with the waterfront promenade network and was an ideal location for a high quality leisure and recreational space for enjoyment by the general public and enhancement of the harbourfront;
- (d) when planning the use of harbourfront sites, the Harbour Planning Principles should be duly applied in that Victoria Harbour and its harbourfront areas should be enhanced to become attractive, vibrant, accessible and sustainable, and protected and preserved for Hong Kong people and visitors as a special public asset. Moreover, the planning, development and management of the Victoria Harbour and its

harbourfront areas should maximise opportunities for public enjoyment. Land required for and the impact from infrastructure developments, utility installations and land uses incompatible with the Harbour Planning Principles should be minimised;

- (e) given its prime location, the subject site should be planned for the best interest of the public and for enjoyment by most Hong Kong people. While there would be alternative sites suitable for the new VTC campus, the waterfront location of CKL Park was irreplaceable. There were no strong justifications to support the need for the VTC campus to occupy a waterfront location;
- (f) as compared to Hong Kong Island, there were fewer waterfront parks in Kowloon. The rationale for replacing the planned CKL Park with the VTC campus were unclear and illogical;
- (g) since the existing developments in East Kowloon had been densely built, there was a strong demand for a waterfront park by the residents which would become a valuable asset to them;
- (h) the functions of CKL Park could not be replaced by the narrow POS proposed by VTC. Taking Tai Po Waterfront Park, Cyberport Waterfront Park and Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park as examples, high quality waterfront parks could help create economic and social benefits and become an important and popular asset for all people of Hong Kong. There were also ample examples of having parks around the harbour for the enjoyment of citizens and visitors in other cities;
- (i) there was a lack of public consultation on the OZP amendments. Local stakeholders were not consulted prior to the publication of the proposed amendments. The views of the DC members and the residents were ignored as PlanD insisted on pursuing the OZP amendments despite their objections. The OZP amendments were of great concern by the local residents and their views should be duly respected; and

- (j) the people of Hong Kong had entrusted the Government to carry out the planning of land uses on their behalf for the welfare of the society. The commitment to build the CKL Park was a serious one that had been made by the Government for more than 10 years and was a reflection of the Government's credibility. The OZP amendments in respect of the subject site were clearly irrational and had disappointed the local residents and the general public. She hoped that the Board would listen to the voice of the people and the Government would keep its promise to implement the CKL Park.

[The meeting was adjourned for a lunch break at 12:40 p.m.]

Agenda Item 1

Presentation and Question Sessions (Continued)

[Open Meeting]

21. The following government representatives, representers, commenters and their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

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

Mr Gary T.L. Lam - Town Planner/Kowloon (TP/K)

Transport Department (TD)

Miss Wendy W.T. Tang - Engineer/Kwun Tong 1 (E/KT1)

Representers, Commenters and their representatives

R1/C263 - Vocational Training

C264 - 張健輝

Council

C265 - 吳宏斌

C266 - 彭錦釗

C267 - Tai Chark Tong

C268 - Agnes Koon

C269 - Kevin Lau Kin Wah

C270 - Sabrina Chao Sih Ming

C271 - Bianca Ma Kin San

C272 - Stella Kwan Mun Yee

Vocational Training Council

] Representer's and Commenters'

Mr. Leung Yam Shing

] representatives

Mr. Albert Lai

]

Mr. Daniel Yan

]

Ove Arup & Partners

]

Ms Theresa Yeung]
Ms Natalie Leung]
Ms Minnie Law]
P&T Architects & Engineers Ltd]
Mr Joel Chan]
Ms Sally Chan]

R274 - Estate Owners' Committees of Laguna City (Phases 1, 2 & 4 and Phase 3)

<u>R310 - Joyce Ma</u>	<u>R365 - Sin Mei Ling Ivy</u>
<u>R583 - Mandy Cheung</u>	<u>R694 - Chiu Chung Heung</u>
<u>R754 - Choy Shun Chiu</u>	<u>R811 - W S Cheung</u>
<u>R837 - 黃芬妮</u>	<u>R967 - Perry Yeung Chun Yin</u>
<u>R1060 - Yeung Yung Kun</u>	<u>R1064 - 麥春愉</u>
<u>R1171/C352 - Lee Wing Ho</u>	<u>R1273 - 康駿旗</u>
<u>R1347 - 陳志泓</u>	<u>R1453 - 趙沛權</u>
<u>R1704 - Ho Ka Lok</u>	<u>R1812 - Yeung Man Chung</u>
<u>R1851 - 陳美華</u>	<u>R1882 - 高樂和</u>
<u>R1921 - 李知諺</u>	<u>R2211 - Hui Tat Fat</u>
<u>R2370 - Chau Wing Yan</u>	<u>R2475/C624 - Ng Ching Nui</u>
<u>R2506 - 楊俊賢</u>	<u>R2611 - Jimmy Hui</u>
<u>R2623 - Angela Hui</u>	<u>R2700/C1428 - Lai Wai Chun</u>
<u>R2797 - Li Hing Mui</u>	<u>R3008 - 吳子諾</u>
<u>R3133 - 吳子彥</u>	<u>R3152 - 陳仲豪</u>
<u>R3265 - Lo Pak Ching</u>	<u>R3318 - Lee Wing Yee Rankey</u>
<u>R4089 - Lau Wai Yee</u>	<u>R4156 - Ma Sau Lai</u>
<u>R4393 - 凌贊美</u>	<u>R5347 - 周麗華</u>
<u>R5371 - Chan Wai Yi</u>	<u>R5571 - Chan Yuen Ping</u>
<u>R5579 - Shum Ka Yee</u>	<u>R5596 - Wo Ching Wing</u>
<u>R6081 - Chiu Choi Mei</u>	<u>R6102 - Cheng Tsz King</u>
<u>R6103 - Cheng Wing Keung</u>	<u>R6121 - 李泓翰</u>
<u>R6370 - Chan Kwok Yee Aug</u>	<u>R6413 - Chu Man Wah</u>
<u>R7318 - Chan Wai Shun</u>	<u>R7576 - Lam Ka Wai</u>

R7644 - Ko Kwok Keung

R7715 - Edmond Tung

R8487 - 鄭偉達

R8662 - 張玉泉

R9304 - Tse King Keung

R9587 - Lai Siu Hong

R9800 - Ho Chi Lam

R9938 - 林曉黎

R10320 - Fung Sau Wah

R10475 - Ng Chung Tin

R10727 - Yiu Heung Siu

R10844 - 李志華

R11242 - Lam Tze Heung

R11519 - Wong Ying Chi

Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront Concern Group -

Mr Kau Kin Tak

R7648 - Tang Man Lai

R8073 - 岑軍治

R8661 - Hui Pui Ying Connie

R8969 - 黃寶佩

R9464 - Wo Ching Wing

R9659 - Yiu Heung Siu

R9834 - 陳寶琮

R10287 - 陳春霞

R10473 - Chu Wing Cheong

R10647 - Ye Chi Zhen

R10742 - Maurice Wong

R11063 - Amy Lui

R11275 - 程大雄

- Representers' and Commenters'
representative

R275/C327 - Sceneway Garden Estate Owners' Committee

R8499 - Ng Wing Sun

R11890/C500 - Alex Law

Sceneway Garden Estate Owners' Committee -

Mr Lam Yat Ming

R8500 - 林國偉

C1248 - Fong Sing Sum

- Representers' and Commenters'
representative

R271 - Hon Tam Man Ho Jeremy

R2358 - 梁惠君

R6276 - Ho Sze Lok Enoch

R7042 - Chan Wai Hung

C627 - Lai Chi Wai

Hon Tam Man Ho Jeremy

R748 - Princess Bautista

R4603 - Betty Tse

R6919 - Chung Kit Ching

R7799 - David Ku

- Representer and Representers' and
Commenter's representative

- R283 - Sit Tse Wing
R553 - Norman Law
R908 - Chan Yat Shu
R1214 - 嚴有騰
R1896 - 嚴穎雯
R1977 - Chu Po Keung
R2177 - 劉展宏
R2283 - 陳雲冰
R2614 - 嚴穎潔
R2972 - Au Yeung May Lan
R3182 - Rick Chow
R3734 - 何笑芬
R3880 - Li Mun Wah
R5093 - Chow Wa Cheong
R5204 - Man Che Wing
R6151 - Chan Yat Shu Jessie
R6195 - Yim Mei Han
R6686 - Chow Wa Cheong Rick
R6834 - Wu Cheuk Kuen
R7393/C1093 - Siu Wing Leung
R7666 - Lok Chun Sing
R7688 - Tam Ngo Ting
R8088 - Chan Ka Hung
R8811 - Amy Lam
R8835 - Wong Fung
R8943 - 劉志榮
R9136 - Lok Kar Yee
R9334 - Yung Man Kay
R10406 - 何玉嬋
R10861 - 劉松熹
R11434 - Ho Wai Ha
R11564 - 陳美鳳
- R284 - Lee Ho Sum
R652 - 黃維義
R1032 - 羅起江
R1222 - Benny Lau
R1969 - Chiu Wing Yee
R2092 - Yuen Chi Leung
R2221 - Leung Yuk Ching
R2337 - Wong Wai Ming Raymond
R2969 - Jennifer Leung
R3179 - Chow Wa Chong
R3524 - 吳文根
R3763 - Chik Shuk Mei
R4546 - 郭啟全
R5103 - Ho Po Wa
R6137 - 詹鳳玲
R6171 - Lok Chee Hung
R6478/C1372 - Dominic Woo
R6803 - Chu Wing Ching
R6930 - Lau Kam Wah
R7531/ C865 - Louie Po Ching
R7674 - Andy Lo
R7762 - Paul Wong
R8584 - P L Tsui
R8832/C971 - Chanel Toong
R8854 - Tsui Wa Sang
R9085 - Frances Chaw
R9179 - Bancroft Tsoi
R10374 - Fong Lai Chi
R10420 - Yuen Yin Ping
R11279 - Hermen Hung
R11558 - 鍾海翠
R11565 - 何東玲

R11694 - Li Wai Ling

C428 - Law Ka Wai Cora

C512 - Lam Cho Yu

C617 - Pun Suet Lin

C625 - Lee Lie Hsia

C745 - 鄧葵枝

C768 - 文玉燕

C770 - Ng Man Yee

C952 - Bliss Mark Anthony

C969 - 譚傲婷

C1025 - Yim Mei Han

C1157 - Man Che Wing

C1249 - Dennis FC Cheung

C1275 - 朱達輝

C1277 - 吳敏婷

Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront Concern Group -

Ms Louie Po Ching

R294 - Edward Tam

R479 - Au Yau Chi

R569 - Lau Lai Ching Jane

R648 - Poon Suet Ping

R732 - Au Yan Chi

R810 - 黃乃靈

R865 - 劉麗珠

R960 - Tse King Sun

R983 - Max Au

R1049 - 戚劍明

R1217 - 高允航

R1310 - Tsang Wai Nung

R11944 - Kevin Chu

C491 - Cheung Lai Na

C616 - Ho Shiu Miu

C618 - 陳偉成

C629 - Lau Tsz Kong

C767 - 朱昭庭

C769 - Leung Yuen Ming

C771 - Kwok Hoi Yan Hilda

C967 - Ho Wai Ha

C995 - 葉金燕

C1045 - Lai Kit Ha Amy

C1199 - Lam Siu Kin

C1266 - 林宇儔

C1276 - Yiu Ling Kit

C1278 - Wong Wai Ho

- Representor, Commenter, and
Representers' and Commenters'
representative

R444 - 劉麗珠

R546 - Fan Yuk Siu

R573 - Tam Kok Hung

R728 - 丘駿昇

R781 - 謝厚友

R827 - 劉貞

R882 - Fan Tsz Tim

R962 - 曾國華

R1027 - Chan Wa Sang

R1126 - Kevin Au

R1280 - 劉麗珠

R1315 - 梁玉燕

- R1325 - Fan Yuk Shiu
R1504 - 冼美鳳
R1544 - Araya Miyako
R1546 - Chan Tse Chiu
R1588/C1243 - Chan Kwok Wo
R1600/C1123 - Yiu Yuk Kuen
R1900 - Ian Wong
R2028 - Luk Siu Cheung
R2239 - Tse Yuen Yu
R2323 - Jane Tam
R2399 - Anaya Miyako
R2479 - Pang Wing
R2860 - Wong Hau Fai
R2953 - 曾曼甄
R3022 - 劉麗冰
R3949 - Chan Shuk Kwan
R4456 - Wong Ming Nui
R4535 - Alex Wong
R5261 - 梁貫宇
R5606 - Isa Wu
R5676 - Cheung Chi Ming
R6366 - 陳根敏
R6558 - Wong Sze Wing
R6821 - Lam Suk Fun
R7002 - 劉麗嫦
R7787 - 孫妹
R8322 - Chou Oi Kan
R8798 - Tse Hui Wah
R8979 - Ho Tung Wan
R9734 - Chan Chung Chak Daniel
R9900 - Chung Yan Yan
R10085 - 李笑瓊
- R1503 - Cheng Ngai Martin
R1541 - Iris Tsang
R1545 - Tse Siu Wan
R1564 - Araya Mikiko
R1599/C1176 - Chan Yuen Ying
R1601/C1000 - Chan Sze Ki
R2010 - Kin Fai
R2169 - W Y Lai
R2272 - 劉麗兒
R2362 - 劉國成
R2417 - Anaya Mikko
R2629 - Fan Chun Kin
R2933 - C H Wong
R3020 - 劉亨
R3548 - Y Leung
R4376 - Chan King Yin
R4520 - 梁慧詩
R4666 - Miranda Fung
R5280 - Ng Wai Fai
R5670 - 林潤慈
R6117 - Lee Siu Keung
R6508 - Chan Kin Fai
R6779 - Terry Chan
R6898 - King Sun Tse
R7541 - Li Hoi Wah
R8051 - Christina Tsang
R8600 - 陳麗華
R8966 - 張再群
R9556 - Lum Hon Kei
R9818 - Hung King Yung Karen
R10012 - 劉月成
R10086 - Leung Wai Sze

R10233 - Tse Hoi Wah

R10461 - 吳潔權

R10704 - Chan Chi Ching

R10763 - May Wong

R11157 - 徐佩君

R11266 - Fane Yuk

R11647 - Chan Lai Pin

R11756 - 鄭佩英

Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront Concern Group -

Mr Tse Chun Wah

- Representers' and Commenters'
representative

R433 - Mary Mulvihill

R5668 - 何志雲

Ms Mary Mulvihill

- Representer and Representer's
representative

22. The Chairperson extended a welcome to the government representatives, representers, commenters and their representatives. She then invited the representers, commenters and their representatives to give their oral submissions.

R283 - Sit Tse Wing

R284 - Lee Ho Sum

R553 - Norman Law

R652 - 黃維義

R908 - Chan Yat Shu

R1032 - 羅起江

R1214 - 嚴有騰

R1222 - Benny Lau

R1896 - 嚴穎雯

R1969 - Chiu Wing Yee

R1977 - Chu Po Keung

R2092 - Yuen Chi Leung

R2177 - 劉展宏

R2221 - Leung Yuk Ching

R2283 - 陳雲冰

R2337 - Wong Wai Ming Raymond

R2614 - 嚴穎潔

R2969 - Jennifer Leung

R2972 - Au Yeung May Lan

R3179 - Chow Wa Chong

R3182 - Rick Chow

R3524 - 吳文根

R3734 - 何笑芬

R3763 - Chik Shuk Mei

R3880 - Li Mun Wah

R4546 - 郭啟全

R5093 - Chow Wa Cheong

R5103 - Ho Po Wa

R5204 - Man Che Wing

R6137 - 詹鳳玲

R6151 - Chan Yat Shu Jessie

R6195 - Yim Mei Han

R6686 - Chow Wa Cheong Rick

R6834 - Wu Cheuk Kuen

R7393/C1093 - Siu Wing Leung

R7666 - Lok Chun Sing

R7688 - Tam Ngo Ting

R8088 - Chan Ka Hung

R8811 - Amy Lam

R8835 - Wong Fung

R8943 - 劉志榮

R9136 - Lok Kar Yee

R9334 - Yung Man Kay

R10406 - 何玉嬋

R10861 - 劉松熹

R11434 - Ho Wai Ha

R11564 - 陳美鳳

R11694 - Li Wai Ling

C428 - Law Ka Wai Cora

C512 - Lam Cho Yu

C617 - Pun Suet Lin

C625 - Lee Lie Hsia

C745 - 鄧葵枝

C768 - 文玉燕

C770 - Ng Man Yee

C952 - Bliss Mark Anthony

C969 - 譚傲婷

C1025 - Yim Mei Han

C1157 - Man Che Wing

C1249 - Dennis FC Cheung

C1275 - 朱達輝

C1277 - 吳敏婷

R6171 - Lok Chee Hung

R6478/C1372 - Dominic Woo

R6803 - Chu Wing Ching

R6930 - Lau Kam Wah

R7531/C865 - Louie Po Ching

R7674 - Andy Lo

R7762 - Paul Wong

R8584 - P L Tsui

R8832/C971 - Chanel Toong

R8854 - Tsui Wa Sang

R9085 - Frances Chaw

R9179 - Bancroft Tsoi

R10374 - Fong Lai Chi

R10420 - Yuen Yin Ping

R11279 - Hermen Hung

R11558 - 鍾海翠

R11565 - 何東玲

R11944 - Kevin Chu

C491 - Cheung Lai Na

C616 - Ho Shiu Miu

C618 - 陳偉成

C629 - Lau Tsz Kong

C767 - 朱昭庭

C769 - Leung Yuen Ming

C771 - Kwok Hoi Yan Hilda

C967 - Ho Wai Ha

C995 - 葉金燕

C1045 - Lai Kit Ha Amy

C1199 - Lam Siu Kin

C1266 - 林宇儔

C1276 - Yiu Ling Kit

C1278 - Wong Wai Ho

23. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Ms Louie Po Ching made the following main points:

- (a) she represented 'Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront Concern Group' (the Concern Group). Although education was important for the continued development of Hong Kong, she had concerns on the need to establish a huge campus for Vocational Training Council' (VTC) at the representation site at Wai Yip Street/Cha Kwo Ling Road (the Site);
- (b) according to a recent report in Sing Tao Daily, VTC said that the number of secondary school leavers would continue to decrease from 62,000 in 2016 to 43,000 in 2022 which represented a 30% decrease. However, VTC indicated in its presentation that the number of secondary school leavers would increase gradually from 2023/2024 onwards. As the demand for vocational and professional education and training was great, there was a need for the proposed VTC campus. To verify the statements, she conducted a research on the demand for VTC education on the assumptions that the target students of the proposed VTC campus were aged 15 to 24 and the new campus would be in operation by years 2023 to 2025;

Need for a VTC Campus

- (c) the number of people in the age group of 15 to 24, as stated in the Hong Kong Population Projections 2017-2066 published by the Census and Statistics Department, was 615,300, 628,600 and 643,900 in 2023, 2024 and 2025 respectively, representing a respective decrease of 21.4%, 20% and 18% as compared with 783,000 people in 2016;
- (d) on the other hand, there would be a significant increase in the number of elderly by 45.1%, 52% and 59% in years 2023, 2024 and 2025 respectively, as compared with 2016;
- (e) the above demographic trend showed that the need for a park to meet the

leisure and recreation needs of the growing population of the aged was more imminent than a VTC campus as people aged between 15 to 24 was decreasing;

[Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang returned to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

Site selection for the VTC campus

- (f) even if a VTC campus was required, its location in the urban area should be justified. Using the running of a retail chain business as an analogy, it was important for VTC to strategically locate its new campus in a district with a high youngster population taking into account the geographical distribution of its existing facilities. According to the Population & Household Statistic (District Council District 2016), 16% of young people aged 15 to 24 were found in the Hong Kong Island, 31% in Kowloon and 53% in the New Territories. Most of them lived in Sha Tin (9.2%), Yuen Long (9.1%) and Kwun Tong (8.7%). However, the geographical distribution of those potential secondary school leavers did not correspond to the locations of the 16 relevant vocational training facilities, namely the VTC institutions, the Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education (IVE) and the Technological and Higher Education Institute of Hong Kong (Thei) in the territories. Only one (6.3%) of the relevant vocational training facilities was found in Sha Tin, zero (0%) in Yuen Long and two (12.5%) in Kwun Tong. It was also noted that although there were only 7.2% of young population in Kwai Tsing, four (25%) of the VTC institutions concerned were found in the district. For Wan Chai which had the least young population (2%), two (12.5%) of the relevant vocational training facilities (one VTC campus and one IVE) were found there;
- (g) as some districts in the New Territories with a high percentage of people aged between 15 to 24 fell short of VTC facilities, locating another VTC campus at the Site in Kwun Tong but not in the New Territories was unreasonable. People in Yuen Long and Sha Tin had to make long trips to the urban area to attend school. It was a waste of people's time and

money and unnecessarily increased the carbon footprint;

- (h) the Site for the proposed VTC campus was not close to Mass Transit Railway (MTR) stations. Students had to take a long uncovered walk of some 20 minutes from the MTR station to the campus. The traffic congestion problems in the area had already been very serious;
- (i) being situated in the Victoria harbourfront, the Site could be made a favourite spot for people to visit and to appreciate fireworks in the harbour during festive occasions. Putting the proposed VTC development at such a prime location which would block a major view to the harbour was inappropriate. As an alternative, renovating the existing vacant schools for the proposed VTC campus would be more cost effective, and the Site could be retained for the development of the Cha Kwo Ling (CKL) Park for leisure and enjoyment of a larger population;

Unfair distribution of harbourfront parks in Hong Kong

- (j) there were six harbourfront parks in the Hong Kong Island, namely, the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park, the Tamar Park, the Victoria Park, the Quarry Bay Park, the Hang Fa Chuen Playground and the Siu Sai Wan Promenade but only three in Kowloon, namely, the Hoi Sham Park, the Nursery Park/Art Park in the West Kowloon Cultural District and the Runway Park and the latter two were yet to be developed. In terms of area, about 38.2 ha (69.6%) of the total harbourfront park areas were in the Hong Kong Island which had a population of about 1.2M while about 16.75 ha (30.4%) were in Kowloon with a population of about 2.2M. Hence, there was an uneven sharing of harbourfront park with about 32,000 people sharing 1 ha of harbourfront park in the Hong Kong Island and 132,000 people sharing the same in Kowloon. Although the situation would be slightly improved upon the completion of the Metro Park in the Kai Tak Development (KTD), there would still be 54,402 people sharing 1 ha of harbourfront park in Kowloon. Moreover, it was unreasonable that Kwun Tong, which accounted for about 18.7% of the

territory's population, was not provided with a harbourfront park;

- (k) Kwun Tong was the most densely populated district in Hong Kong, with a population density of 57,530 persons/km² in 2016. To meet the recreation needs of the residents in Kwun Tong, the originally planned CKL Park should be kept. The park together with the Kwun Tong Public Pier, the Kwun Tong Promenade and the green corridors and parks in KTD would form a continuous open space network. It was unfair to take away the only harbourfront park from the local residents;

The Government to honour its promise

- (l) although VTC said in its submission that the sports and recreational space within the campus would be shared with the community through various collaboration programmes and projects, it was doubtful if they would keep their promise. As reported in the Oriental Daily, VTC had in the past failed to effectively share their sports facilities and auditorium in its Tseung Kwan O campus with the public as promised. Despite the public could make booking for use of the VTC auditorium, the usage rate remained low because the premises were closed for maintenance for 2.5 to 4 months annually. Moreover, the booking system for the concerned facilities was not user-friendly. There was no online or same day booking, booking could only be made by groups, and multi-purpose hall could only be booked as a whole but not by segments, etc; and

The Chief Executive (CE)'s promise

- (m) the CE had also said earlier in 2017 that the Victoria Harbour would be beautified for the enjoyment of the Hong Kong people and each district should look after its part of the harbour with public participation to reflect the character of the area. The Government should not renege on its promise but should build the CKL Park according to the original plan as soon as possible.

[Mr Thomas O.S. Ho arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

24. The Chairperson reminded the representers or their representatives to be concise in their oral submission and not to repeat points which had already been mentioned by the other representers so as to allow more time for the Question and Answer (Q&A) session.

[The meeting was adjourned for a short break of 5 minutes at this point.]

R294 - Edward Tam

R479 - Au Yau Chi

R569 - Lau Lai Ching Jane

R648 - Poon Suet Ping

R732 - Au Yan Chi

R810 - 黃乃靈

R865 - 劉麗珠

R960 - Tse King Sun

R983 - Max Au

R1049 - 戚劍明

R1217 - 高允航

R1310 - Tsang Wai Nung

R1325 - Fan Yuk Shiu

R1504 - 冼美鳳

R1544 - Araya Miyako

R1546 - Chan Tse Chiu

R1588/C1243 - Chan Kwok Wo

R1600/C1123 - Yiu Yuk Kuen

R1900 - Ian Wong

R2028 - Luk Siu Cheung

R2239 - Tse Yuen Yu

R2323 - Jane Tam

R2399 - Anaya Miyako

R2479 - Pang Wing

R444 - 劉麗珠

R546 - Fan Yuk Siu

R573 - Tam Kok Hung

R728 - 丘駿昇

R781 - 謝厚友

R827 - 劉貞

R882 - Fan Tsz Tim

R962 - 曾國華

R1027 - Chan Wa Sang

R1126 - Kevin Au

R1280 - 劉麗珠

R1315 - 梁玉燕

R1503 - Cheng Ngai Martin

R1541 - Iris Tsang

R1545 - Tse Siu Wan

R1564 - Araya Mikiko

R1599/C1176 - Chan Yuen Ying

R1601/C1000 - Chan Sze Ki

R2010 - Kin Fai

R2169 - W Y Lai

R2272 - 劉麗兒

R2362 - 劉國成

R2417 - Anaya Mikko

R2629 - Fan Chun Kin

<u>R2860 - Wong Hau Fai</u>	<u>R2933 - C H Wong</u>
<u>R2953 - 曾曼甄</u>	<u>R3020 - 劉亨</u>
<u>R3022 - 劉麗冰</u>	<u>R3548 - Y Leung</u>
<u>R3949 - Chan Shuk Kwan</u>	<u>R4376 - Chan King Yin</u>
<u>R4456 - Wong Ming Nui</u>	<u>R4520 - 梁慧詩</u>
<u>R4535 - Alex Wong</u>	<u>R4666 - Miranda Fung</u>
<u>R5261 - 梁貫宇</u>	<u>R5280 - Ng Wai Fai</u>
<u>R5606 - Isa Wu</u>	<u>R5670 - 林潤慈</u>
<u>R5676 - Cheung Chi Ming</u>	<u>R6117 - Lee Siu Keung</u>
<u>R6366 - 陳根敏</u>	<u>R6508 - Chan Kin Fai</u>
<u>R6558 - Wong Sze Wing</u>	<u>R6779 - Terry Chan</u>
<u>R6821 - Lam Suk Fun</u>	<u>R6898 - King Sun Tse</u>
<u>R7002 - 劉麗嫦</u>	<u>R7541 - Li Hoi Wah</u>
<u>R7787 - 孫妹</u>	<u>R8051 - Christina Tsang</u>
<u>R8322 - Chou Oi Kan</u>	<u>R8600 - 陳麗華</u>
<u>R8798 - Tse Hui Wah</u>	<u>R8966 - 張再群</u>
<u>R8979 - Ho Tung Wan</u>	<u>R9556 - Lum Hon Kei</u>
<u>R9734 - Chan Chung Chak Daniel</u>	<u>R9818 - Hung King Yung Karen</u>
<u>R9900 - Chung Yan Yan</u>	<u>R10012 - 劉月成</u>
<u>R10085 - 李笑瓊</u>	<u>R10086 - Leung Wai Sze</u>
<u>R10233 - Tse Hoi Wah</u>	<u>R10461 - 吳潔權</u>
<u>R10704 - Chan Chi Ching</u>	<u>R10763 - May Wong</u>
<u>R11157 - 徐佩君</u>	<u>R11266 - Fane Yuk</u>
<u>R11647 - Chan Lai Pin</u>	<u>R11756 - 鄭佩英</u>

25. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr Tse Chun Wah made the following main points:

- (a) he had consulted some architects and engineers on the responses made by PlanD in TPB Paper No. 10365 (the Paper) and they opined that many of the responses made in the Paper were not well founded;

Planning for Harbourfront Site

- (b) the siting of a VTC campus in the harbourfront area was not in line with the vision of the Victoria Harbour, which was to enhance Victoria Harbour and its harbourfront areas to become an attractive, vibrant, accessible and sustainable world-class asset;
- (c) the Site was originally reserved for the CKL Park and it should not be used for educational purpose. The proposed VTC campus would break the continuity and use of an open space network from Hoi Sham Park and the future Metro Park to Kwun Tong and Lei Yue Mun. The current planning of the Site was not in line with the established planning principles;
- (d) the Conservancy Association had raised objection to the amendment as the rezoning had reneged the Government's promise to develop a CKL Park, which was a land use proposal having gone through stages of public consultation from 2004 to 2006, and it was not in line with Principle 8 of the Harbour Planning Principles in that the VTC campus, which was an infrastructure development, should not occupy a waterfront site;
- (e) the use of billions of dollars to build the proposed VTC campus was a misuse of resources which was unsustainable and the harbourfront lost would not be recoverable;
- (f) it was stated in the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/4 that the Site, which was designated as CKL Park, was a multifunction recreational space and a node, not just a harbourfront promenade;

Insufficient public consultation

- (g) public consultation in relation to rezoning the Site was insufficient. Except for the residents of the Laguna City, other residents in Kwun Tong district including those of Sceneway Garden, the villagers and seafood stall owners of CKL Tsuen, and tenants of the old tenement housing in Yau Tong near the

Site were not aware of the amendment. Since the Site was originally planned for a district open space (DO), the public consultation should have been conducted on a district-wide basis;

- (h) the large number of adverse representations relating to the rezoning had reflected the magnitude of strong local objection to the proposal. The number of objections would be larger if other residents in the district were consulted;

Need for Open Space

- (i) since Kwun Tong was a very poor community with a large proportion of elderly population, the Government should promptly implement the planned CKL Park to meet the community need;
- (j) it was unreasonable to assess the adequacy of open space provision in Kwun Tong together with that in KTD. The provision of the Metro Park in Kai Tak, which was too far away for the enjoyment of the Kwun Tong residents, could not compensate for the shortfall in Kwun Tong, the population of which would soon grow from 650,000 to 700,000;
- (k) the local residents were unfairly treated by the Government as revealed in the allocation of medical resources. Kwun Tong, being a district with the second highest percentage (24.3%) of poor people in Hong Kong, was allocated the least medical resources in the territory. A further attempt to remove the CKL Park was blatantly unfair. According to the Audit Report on Development and Management of Parks and Gardens 2013, Kwun Tong had a shortfall of about 0.74 ha in open space. To take away the planned CKL Park from Kwun Tong, an already deprived community, was unjustifiable;
- (l) the Government threatened that the CKL harbourfront would continue to be left idle if the proposed VTC campus was not proceeded with. Such a strategy was not acceptable to the local residents;

Comments on the Paper

- (m) paragraph 2.3 - while the provision of a CLK Park and a CLK waterfront promenade was clearly indicated in previous consultation documents, it appeared that PlanD had avoided mentioning the planned CKL Park in this area in recent occasions, such as its consultations with the Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC) and local residents. The CKL Park was also not mentioned in the Paper. As the Site was earmarked for DO, the residents had a reasonable expectation that the Government would proceed to construct the DO after the recent removal of the recycling uses in the waterfront. The residents were greatly disappointed to learn that a VTC campus would be built on the Site;
- (n) paragraphs 2.5 and 6.3.5 - it was difficult to comprehend PlanD's arguments that the planning intention for the development of a major open space at the area remained unchanged. The rezoning of the original "O" site, planned for a CKL Park, to "G/IC" for the mega VTC campus was a substantial change in terms of land use and visual impact. Moreover, the Government had changed its commitment to the local residents as the Area should be provided with a CKL Park and a CKL waterfront promenade as originally planned instead of only a waterfront promenade as currently proposed. A park which served as a DO was different from a promenade in nature and function;
- (o) paragraphs 6.3.10 and 6.3.15 - the rationale for reprovisioning the existing LPG filling station to another site in the same harbourfront area and the increase in its site area from 2,000 to 5,900 m² was unreasonable. With a much larger LPG filling station, more taxis would be attracted to the area thus aggravating the existing traffic congestion at CKL Road. Apart from the reason of making way for the proposed VTC campus, there were no planning justifications for the reprovisioning of the LPG filling station to the promenade which was against the harbour planning principles and would contaminate one piece of land after another in the harbourfront area in Kowloon East;

[Messrs Wilson Y.W Fung and Alex T.H. Lai left and Mr H.W. Cheung arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

Site Requirement

- (p) given VTC's claim that a waterfront site was not necessary for its campus, a smaller site, with an area of say 2 ha, which was easier to identify in the urban area, might be sufficient to meet its floor area requirement if the BH of the alternative site was less stringent;
- (q) the method adopted in calculating the plot ratio (PR) for the revised scheme of the VTC facilities, as presented to the Harbourfront Commission (HC) in a workshop held in August 2017, was questionable. Although the Site had actually been reduced from 4.2 to 3.2 ha after deducting 1 ha for public open space, the calculation of the PR of the Site was still based on the original site area of 4.2 ha resulting in a large reduction of PR from 5.5 to 4.3. The calculation method was unusual and might have been adopted to disguise the actual development intensity of the proposed VTC at a PR of 5.63 (based on a reduced site area). It was also doubtful if the campus needed 150 car parking spaces. The traffic so generated would aggravate the traffic congestion problems of Kwun Tong;

Availability of alternative sites

- (r) although more than 20 alternative sites for the VTC campus had been proposed by the representers, PlanD simply responded in paragraph 6.3.7 of the Paper that those sites were not suitable as they could not meet the site selection requirements in terms of size and location, or that they had been committed for other uses. There was no detailed explanation on how each of the alternative sites suggested could not be used for the proposed VTC campus;
- (s) there were a number of "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC")

sites in KTD and Kowloon Bay which could be used for the proposed VTC campus, yet they were rezoned to “Commercial” (“C”) while the Site was rezoned from “Open Space” (“O”) to “G/IC”. Such rezoning was unfair to the residents. The Government should not just focus on promoting economic development and neglect the general welfare of the public. It should consider if there was an urgent and overriding need for such a mega-sized VTC campus in the waterfront, which was the last harbourfront in Kowloon East;

Optimal Use of the Site

- (t) according to the Kai Tak Planning Review Stage 3 Consultation Digest, KTD was proposed to be developed as the “Heritage, Green, Sports and Tourism Hub of Hong Kong”. The proposed development of a VTC campus in the CKL harbourfront was not in line with the development theme of KTD. A green CKL Park, which was a community park, a DO and a public outlet for fresh air and leisure activities, should be provided at that strategic waterfront location serving as a pleasant gateway to Hong Kong. The construction of the proposed campus on the Site would not promote the vibrancy of the harbour;
- (u) there was no imminent need to build a VTC campus at the Site, in particular when VTC had publicly stated that the student population had decreased in the past ten years and the number would continue to decrease from 62,000 in 2017 to 43,000 in 2022. The erection of such a state-of-art flagship campus on the Site was not necessary. The Kwun Tong harbourfront area should be reserved for use by its 700,000 residents, not just the some 6,000 students of the VTC campus;
- (v) currently the waterfront areas along Kowloon East and under the flyovers of Kwun Tong By-pass were popular recreation spots for people, particular on Sundays and festive occasions, despite it was segregated from the main residential areas of Ngau Tau Kok and Kwun Tong by industrial establishments. The demand for open space in Kowloon East was acute.

The retention of the CKL Park could provide a breathing space for some 700,000 people living in Kwun Tong, not just some 6,000 VTC students;

Objections from Kwun Tong District Council

- (w) KTDC twice objected to the construction of a VTC campus in the harbourfront area. In the KTDC meeting on 2.3.2017, 27 out of the 29 DC members present at meeting supported the motion against the construction of the proposed VTC campus in the CKL harbourfront. On 7.9.2017, another motion requesting the Government to implement the CKL Park was also passed by the majority members of KTDC. Members also expressed views that the CKL Park and the proposed VTC campus could not co-exist; the CKL Park should be retained as the average provision of open space per person in Kwun Tong was the lowest in Hong Kong; the development of the VTC campus would lead to the permanent loss of the harbourfront site which would have far-reaching impact on the future generation;

Objections from Harbourfront Commission

- (x) the Task Force on Kai Tak Waterfront Development (the Task Force) of the HC was consulted on 5.4.2017. The Task Force did not support the massive VTC structure at the prominent waterfront Site as it was not in line with the Harbour Planning Principles. Members were concerned about the design, land use, height, scale and intensity of the proposed VTC campus; the reduction in the open space provision; the lack of justification for using a waterfront area for the proposed VTC campus; the adverse visual and traffic impact of the proposed VTC facility on the surrounding area; and the setting of an undesirable precedent. Besides, a waterfront promenade of a uniform width of 50m was not interesting and would not help provide a vibrant harbourfront;
- (y) a revised scheme of the VTC facility, with a reduction in PR from 5.5 to 4.3 and the provision of 1 ha of public open space in the VTC campus, was submitted to the HC for consideration in a workshop setting held on 2.8.2017.

At the workshop, Members were misled to focus on discussing the differences between the original and revised schemes of the proposed VTC campus but not on the availability of alternative sites. It was doubtful if the revised scheme was adequate to address members' concerns since members were concerned not only about the scale but also the nature of the proposed development and whether the CKL waterfront would be used for its original purpose. Moreover, the conduct of consultation by way of workshop might be procedurally improper in that the workshop was not open to public and members were not required to vote if they supported the revised scheme;

- (z) according to the latest information, the 1 ha of land to be built by VTC as public open space would be taken up by the Drainage Services Department as a temporary works area for 5 years, which would delay the development programme of the public open space. Such information was not made known to the Task Force when the VTC proposal was discussed;

Conclusion

- (aa) the CE had announced that instead of having a single harbourfront authority comprising non-officials to look after the harbourfront, it would rather have a district-based setting that could look after certain parts of the harbourfront that would reflect characteristics of that particular district and that would give people more opportunity to participate; and
- (bb) the community was very dissatisfied with the Board's decision to rezone the Site for VTC development. Members were requested to consider the welfare of the community of some 700,000 people before making a decision on the representations. The campaign to protect the CKL park was well supported by a number of LegCo Members, DC members, various concern groups, owners' corporation of residential developments nearby and other local organisations, some of them would also give oral presentation at other sessions of the meeting.

R271 – Hon Tam Man Ho Jeremy

R748 - Princess Bautista

R2358 - 梁惠君

R4603 - Betty Tse

R6276 - Ho Sze Lok Enoch

R6919 - Chung Kit Ching

R7042 - Chan Wai Hung

R7799 - David Ku

C627 - Lai Chi Wai

26. Hon Tam Man Ho Jeremy made the following main points:

Site selection

- (a) although it was stated in the 2016 Policy Address that a site in the urban district had to be identified to develop a VTC campus with adequate capacity and state-of-the-art facilities, the waterfront location and site area requirements of 3 to 5 ha were not specified. If the proposed VTC campus was not located at the waterfront site, a smaller site in other locations, which was subject to a less stringent BH restriction, would be sufficient to meet the latest GFA requirement of the proposed VTC campus of about 180,000 m²;
- (b) he learned from a previous meeting with VTC in January 2017 that a larger site area was required to facilitate the accommodation of large-scale machinery on the ground floor. However, in February 2017, it was noted from a section plan of the proposed VTC campus that the ground floor of the proposed development was used for an interactive zone, a training hotel, café, banking centre, etc. whereas those workshops and laboratories where machineries were to be put was located on the first floor. In response to his written enquiry, VTC explained that the change in floor use was due to the need to place a community health care learning centre on the ground floor to facilitate easy access of the elderlies in the district. However, the explanation was not satisfactory in that the provision of health care learning centre was not mentioned by VTC before and no information was provided on its floor area requirement and why other uses on the ground floor such as café and banking facilities could not be accommodated on the upper floors. As the need for placing heavy machinery on the ground floor did not stand and VTC had subsequently prepared a revised scheme which required a

smaller site area, there should be scope for VTC to further adjust the design and layout of its proposed campus buildings to accommodate the floor space of 180,000 m² and 150 car parking spaces, and hence alternative sites should be available in the other urban areas for such use;

- (c) the current VTC campuses were mainly located in the urban areas with one in Sha Tin and one in Tuen Mun. Since the VTC facilities were vocational training institutes, they should be located close to the residences of the students. Noting that there were already large VTC institutes in Kowloon Bay and Tseung Kwan O, another VTC institute in CKL was not justified. It was also unreasonable to rezone the Site which was in the harbourfront from “O” to “G/IC” while rezoning other “G/IC” sites in KTD to “C”. Alternative GIC uses of the “G/IC” sites with no development programme should first be contemplated before they were rezoned for non- GIC uses;
- (d) the proposed VTC campus in CKL was to reprovise the two existing campuses in Cheung Sha Wan and Kwun Tong, and the Government would likely rezone the two sites to other uses, such as commercial development when they were returned to the Government. As a result, there would be an overall loss in the open space provision in the territory. Although housing and economic developments were important, the Government should also take good care of the general welfare of the public;
- (e) the construction of the proposed VTC campus at the Site would contravene the Harbour Planning Principles in that the development was not conducive to integrating Victoria Harbour with the hinterland in a comprehensive manner with ample unrestricted and convenient visual and physical access for pedestrians to and along the harbour as well as the harbourfront areas. To be in line with the principle, it was considered that only small scale structures, such as indoor recreation centre, refreshment kiosks and public convenience, should be allowed in the waterfront. The proposed VTC campus was a massive development;

Demand for VTC facilities

- (f) it was revealed in the Education Bureau (EDB)'s reply to his written enquiry that the student intake of the VTC institutes had been reduced in recent years. Taking into account the Government's recent education initiatives to allocate HK\$5 billion to assist students taking self-financing degree programmes, the demand for VTC education was expected to be further reduced. Besides, based on his own experience, the utilisation rate of VTC campuses in Kwai Tsing and Lai Chi Kok was very low in the evening and there appeared to be no justification from the demand side to construct the proposed VTC campus;

Traffic concerns

- (g) he and other representers had raised concern on the insufficient carrying capacity of the four existing passenger lifts in Laguna City, in particular during the peak hours, to cater for the additional pedestrian flow arising from the proposed VTC campus as detailed in paragraph 4.2.2 (q) of the Paper. However, the Government made no direct response to this and VTC subsequently put forward the necessary mitigation measures to provide direct shuttle bus services between the VTC campus and MTR Yau Tong Station. It was doubtful if VTC had conducted survey on the use of the lifts, assessed the impacts and devised contingency plans in case of malfunctioning of the lifts. Besides, upon completion of the residential development at the ex-Kaolin Mine site, the usage rate of the passenger lifts was anticipated to increase. An increase in outsiders using the lifts might also give rise to security problems;
- (h) the Government had not given a detailed account on the possible traffic impacts caused by the training hotel facility within the proposed VTC campus and how the local transportation network could support some 11 to 22 shuttle buses to meet the hourly need of some 1,100 students during the peak hours. The public had not been notified of a hotel development at the outset and the provision of hotel facility was not included in the Traffic

Impact Assessment. Moreover, there was concern that the hotel facility might be expanded in future given its prominent waterfront location;

Use of harbourfront

- (i) Kai Tak and Kwun Tong were two separate districts which belonged to different constituencies under the Legislative Council and DC elections. It was unreasonable to combine Kai Tak and Kwun Tong in the calculation of open space provision. According to the Audit Commission's Report, Kwun Tong was short of open space which was contrary to the Government's claim that open space provision in Kwun Tong was sufficient. While there was no breakdown of the spatial distribution of open spaces in Kwun Tong, it was found that many of the planned open spaces had remained vacant and fenced off;
- (j) the CKL Park and CKL promenade forming part of the continuous open space network linking up To Kwa Wan and Kowloon East, which were two separate items as shown on the preliminary concept plan of the Kai Tak Planning Review Stage 3 consultation digest, were supported by the public in various rounds of public consultations of KTD and were zoned "O" on the OZP. The Site should have been developed into the CLK Park years ago according to its original planned use. There was no reason to revoke the Government's previous decision by rezoning the Site to "G/IC";

Procedural fairness

- (k) the public consultation on the proposed OZP amendments was inadequate in that many of the residents in CKL, especially those lived in squatters, licensed and tenement housing, had no idea about the rezoning of the Site from "O" to "G/IC" until at the very late stage. Only residents of Laguna City were involved in the public consultations. The public was aware of the revised VTC campus scheme only after the statutory consultation period of the draft OZP had expired and no consultation with the public on the revised scheme had ever been made. It was noted from Drawings H-1a and H-2a of

the Paper that there were changes to the layout and massing of the building blocks in the revised scheme resulting in different visual and air ventilation impacts. Local views on the revised scheme should have been sought. It was procedurally unfair to consult only the HC but not the local residents on the revised scheme;

- (l) the Kwun Tong residents were in dire need for a quality waterfront park for leisure and recreational activities. Some of the venues at the waterfront area underneath the flyover in Kowloon East area, previously provided by Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO) for use by the general public and local residents for organising activities at no cost, were subject to rental payment upon the transfer of management responsibilities of the facilities to HKALPS Limited in mid 2017. That had further affected the use of the waterfront area by the local residents. KTDC raised objection to the construction of the proposed VTC campus at the Site in the two rounds of consultation and the rezoning was not supported by the public at large. The ex-Kaolin Mine area near Laguna City, which was previously zoned “G/IC” for schools, had been rezoned for residential use to meet housing needs. It was unfair to rezone again the waterfront area from “O” to “G/IC” which would take away the long-awaited waterfront open space from the residents; and
- (m) taking into account all the relevant considerations, he objected to the proposed VTC development at the Site. Members were requested to consider that the proposed VTC campus could be located elsewhere.

R433 - Mary Mulvihill

R5668 - 何志雲

27. Ms Mary Mulvihill requested government representatives to indicate their presence as she considered that members of the public attending the Board’s hearing had reasonable expectation that government officials appointed by the CE be present in order to listen to the views of the community. In response, the Chairperson said there were government representatives as official members of the Board and other government officers attending the hearing session to answer questions of Members.

[Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang left this session of the meeting at this point.]

28. Ms Mary Mulvihill reminded Members that it was their duty to consider all the relevant factors and enquired into the matter before making a decision. She then made the following main points:

Traffic concerns

- (a) Kwun Tong was one of the most densely populated and poorest districts in the territory. The number of residents and the level of commercial/business activities were expected to rise with completion of various proposed public/private housing estates and commercial developments in Kwun Tong. The resultant additional commuters would worsen the current overloaded transport system;

Need for community facilities

- (b) Kwun Tong was in great need for an urban park such as the Victoria Park, the Sun Yat Sen Park, the Tamar Park, the Kowloon Park and the planned Metro Park in KTD. All of those parks were on or close to the harbour. Districts in the inland area were also provided with large parks such as the one in Tsuen Wan. The CKL Park, which was promised years ago, was not materialized because of inertia of the administration and the use of the Site for temporary works area. The OZP, if approved, would deprive the community of Kowloon East of the only site suitable for an urban park;
- (c) the existing soccer pitch in the Site was a very nice grass pitch. It would be removed together with the trees and greenery around it and reprovisioned to a site of the same size by VTC. Other than the soccer pitch, the VTC proposed to provide basketball courts and a stadium in the site concerned. Given that the reprovisioning site was about the same size as the current one, she doubted how all the proposed facilities could be provided within the site. Besides, the site was zoned "O" where only minimal structures should be

provided. The development of a stadium within the “O” zone was considered incompatible;

- (d) the CE in her Policy Address delivered in October 2017 had promised the provision of a number of community facilities, such as elderly and children facilities. Given that part of the harbourfront site was zoned “G/IC”, low-rise and low-density GIC facilities such as elderly care centre, were considered compatible with the public park use in terms of spatial relief and air ventilation but not huge development, such as the proposed VTC campus;
- (e) for a wealthy community as Hong Kong, it was reasonable for the public to expect to enjoy a certain level of public services and recreational facilities. The Board should ensure that each district would have sufficient GIC facilities, particularly those for the elderly, to meet the demand. The rezoning of many “G/IC” sites to other uses had made the implementation of the facilities difficult;

Unreasonable proposed uses in the waterfront

- (f) a LPG filling station on the Site had attracted hundreds of idling taxis everyday causing hygienic problems and environmental impacts on the area. Those idling taxis emitted fumes and bottles of urine were disposed of by the drivers along the roads causing hygienic concerns to the area. With the future relocation of the LPG filling station, taxis coming from CKL Road and Wai Yip Street would pass the stadium and public open space constructed by VTC causing pollution to the people using the facilities;
- (g) the CKL harbourfront was perhaps the best waterfront in Kowloon East. It currently enjoyed unobstructed sea view and good air ventilation. Members were invited to visit the Site to see by themselves and find out what would be lost with the construction of the proposed development. The New World development in Tsim Sha Tsui had already interrupted part of the harbourfront view of Hong Kong;

Procedural fairness

- (h) to follow the High Court judgment with respect to the Hoi Ha, Pak Lap and So Lo Pun OZPs, the Board should properly inquire into the matter in considering the representations and comments. Although she supported VTC for providing vocational training to the community, relevant figures and data should be provided to support the proposed VTC campus. The Government should be asked to provide a breakdown of open space provision in Kwun Tong in terms of their location, size and current status, such as how much of them was actually usable and not being used as works area. The Board should also ask the Government to elaborate on the reasons why the alternative sites for the proposed VTC development, as proposed by the representers/commenters, were considered not feasible. She had proposed a possible alternative site of the same size in Tai Po which was zoned “G/IC”. The site was close to transportation link and situated next to a sports ground near the Hong Kong Science Park and the Chinese University of Hong Kong where synergy effect could be created. It was unreasonable to rezone “G/IC” sites to commercial or housing developments on the one hand and rezoning open space for GIC uses on the other;

Reliability of the data provided

- (i) the information provided by the Government had been inflated or deflated to suit their purpose and the negative impacts were downplayed. The MTR Kwun Tong Station was overcrowded. Employees in the area found the transportation system in the area not adequate to cope with the demand. Since Kowloon East was to be developed as a new Core Business District (CBD), new commercial developments were coming in and so did new residential developments. The cumulative effect of all those developments on traffic and public transport facilities had to be assessed. While CBD could create jobs in Kowloon East, the proposed VTC campus could be located elsewhere;

Conclusion

- (j) Members were requested to follow the High Court judgment, respect public opinion and demand solid facts and data to be provided by the Government to substantiate their claims before a decision was made. Members should also query why the Government had to rely on the proposed VTC development to provide the open space, when it should have shouldered the responsibility direct; and
- (k) the optimal use of the Site would be an urban park providing both open space and community facilities. With good planning and an open mindset, the Site could fulfil its original planning intention and incorporate many of the community services laid down in the current Policy Address. Members were requested to share her vision.

[The meeting was adjourned for a short break of 5 minutes at this point.]

29. As the presentations from the representers/commenters and their representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions and would invite the representers/commenters, their representatives and/or the government representatives to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board or for cross-examination between parties. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

Provision and Design of Open Space

30. The Vice-chairperson and some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) the nature and type of open space promised by the Government to be provided at the Site, if any;
 - (b) whether there was sufficient open space within the Kwun Tong district;

- (c) whether the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) would take over the management of the 1 ha of public open space and the soccer pitch to be constructed by VTC; and
- (d) the pedestrian access arrangement to the CKL waterfront.

31. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, with the aid of the visualizer and Powerpoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) based on the concept plan and the preliminary Outline Development Plan (ODP) of the KTD Review conducted by PlanD between 2004 and 2006, a CKL promenade, a CKL Park, a LPG filling station, a proposed sewage treatment plant and a ventilation shaft were planned at the southern end of the Kwun Tong waterfront. The land uses of the ODP were subsequently incorporated into the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/1 in 2006 and had remained unchanged prior to the current OZP amendments. As compared with the previous OZP No. S/K22/4 with respect to the provision of public open space, the waterfront promenade would be maintained with its southeastern part to be widened from 10 to 50 m. The inland portion of the “O” zone would be relocated northwestward to accommodate a soccer pitch and basketball courts. Together with the 1 ha of public open space to be provided by VTC within the “G/IC” site, the total area of open space provision would remain unchanged although certain adjustments had been made to the location and layout of the “O” zone. The Government had not reneged on its promise in relation to the provision of the open space in that waterfront area;
- (b) sufficient open space had been planned for the Kai Tak area, CKL/Yau Tong/Lei Yue Mun area as well as the Kwun Tong district in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). There would be a surplus of DO and local open space in Kwun Tong for its planned population of about 720,000. Although there was an existing shortfall of DO as only about 59 ha of existing DO was provided in Kwun Tong, if the planned provision was included, the total provision of DO in

Kwun Tong would be about 96 ha which was more than the HKPSG requirement of 72 ha;

- (c) according to the agreement between VTC and LCSD, the public open space to be constructed by VTC would include the soccer pitch, the two basketball courts and the 1 ha of open space; upon the completion of these facilities comprising the public open space, LCSD would take over their management and maintenance. Moreover, VTC would work closely with LCSD on the design of such facilities; and
- (d) there were two existing pedestrian crossings at Wai Yip Street near Laguna City which connected the hinterland with the waterfront area. To enhance the connectivity and accessibility of the waterfront, detailed pedestrian connections to the waterfront area would be worked out in future in consultation with TD and other relevant stakeholders.

32. In response to the Chairperson's question on whether the rezoning for the site in question had resulted only in a changed layout rather than a reduction in area for the proposed open space called CKL Park, Mr Tse Chun Wah, representative of various representers and commenters, said that the nature of the waterfront open space would be totally different between the two OZPs and the quality of the open space had been deteriorated in the current version. In the previous version, there were a CKL promenade and a CKL Park, and the proposed sewerage treatment works, which was low-rise in nature, would not break the continuity of the harbourfront. However, in the current version, a VTC campus of about 60 to 70 m high was put in the middle of the waterfront and the 1 ha of open space promised to be provided by VTC only had a narrow harbour-side frontage which was not an effective layout. Such layout would block the sea views of the waterfront and pose constraints on the activities to be carried out. The massive VTC campus together with an enlarged LPG filling station would not be conducive to a vibrant and interesting harbourfront.

33. Ms Mary Mulvihill (R433) said that no matter whether the Site was for educational purpose, i.e. the proposed VTC campus, or leisure use, the LPG filling station should not be located in the CKL waterfront as the effluents and toxins emitted by the hundreds of taxis queueing up for cheap fuel with idling engines would cause environmental

and hygienic problems and be harmful to the waterfront users.

Demand for and Requirements of the proposed VTC campus

34. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the site area requirement for the proposed VTC campus could be adjusted if the BH restriction of the Site was relaxed; and whether a modification of the design of the VTC campus could reduce the site area requirement of the proposed VTC campus;
- (b) any set standards in the development intensity for the existing VTC facilities; and
- (c) as the population size of the 15 to 24 age group would decrease in 2023, 2024 and 2025 and student intake of VTC had decreased in recent years, whether there was still a need for the proposed VTC campus.

35. In response, Mr Leung Yam Shing of VTC (R1) made the following main points:

- (a) due to high mobility requirements of students to various classrooms, laboratories, and sports and recreational facilities as well as the need to accommodate equipment and machinery, the average BH of the vocational institutions was usually more than 10 storeys. As regards the site area requirement (about 3 ha) for the proposed VTC campus in CKL, according to the initial development schemes, it was proposed to provide a community health centre and a STEM Education Centre on the ground floor to serve the elderly and to accommodate the necessary heavy machinery respectively;
- (b) the development intensity of VTC institutions was generally of a PR of 5. The current PR of the development schemes for the proposed VTC campus which ranged from 4.3 to 5.5 was in line with the overall development intensity of the VTC developments;

- (c) although there was a decrease in secondary school leavers over the past few years and the estimated number would be dropped to about 42,000 in 2023, it was projected that the number of secondary school leavers would gradually increase after 2023 due to an increase in the number of primary one and secondary one students in 2017;
- (d) the proposed VTC campus in CKL was to re-provision the two existing overcrowded and obsolete VTC campuses in Cheung Sha Wan and Kwun Tong and to develop a larger campus with state-of-the-art facilities. The campuses in Cheung Sha Wan and Kwun Tong would be returned to the Government upon completion of the proposed campus in the Site and hence the net increase in site area allocated to VTC would be about 1 ha only;
- (e) at present, VTC had about 50,000 whole day students and the average floor space occupied by each student was about 6.6 m². With the proposed VTC campus in CKL, the average floor space for each student would increase to about 8.6 m². Yet such a provision was still below the average floor space of 10 m² per student for primary and secondary schools, and 12 to 15 m² per student for other tertiary educational institutions; and
- (f) the three criteria in the site selection process put forward by VTC for its new campus included a location in the urban area, a site of about 3 to 5 ha and an early implementation programme. Waterfront location was not one of the selection criteria. The reason why the proposed VTC campus should be located in the urban area was mainly due to the need to match with the geographical distribution of the existing students as the majority of them were resided in Kowloon West and Kowloon Central (including Wong Tai Sin, Lok Fu) where the public housing estates were concentrated. VTC also had campuses in the New Territories to meet the need of the students there.

36. In response to a representer's comment that the usage rate of VTC evening school was low, Mr Leung said that the utilization rate of the VTC facilities varied from campus to campus and in different periods of the year. The evening school of the Morrison Hill campus

was always full. As for the day school of the VTC campuses, usage of some of the classrooms and workshops was over 95%.

37. Noting the representers' concern on the development intensity of the proposed VTC campus, the Vice-chairperson asked whether there was any standard provision for GIC facilities in terms of PR. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that different GIC facilities had different requirements. The development intensity of the GIC facilities in terms of PR and BH would depend on the nature of use and its operational requirements.

Alternative Sites for VTC Campus

38. The Vice-Chairperson asked whether alternative sites were available for the proposed VTC campus. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, with the aid of visualizer, made the following main points:

- (a) policy support to conduct a site search for the proposed VTC campus had been given by EDB. In accordance with the site search requirements as set out by VTC, for the time being the Site was the only suitable and readily available site identified for the purpose. Notwithstanding the above, the suitability of the alternative sites proposed by the representers for the VTC campus had also been carefully assessed. All the proposed sites were either unable to meet the site selection requirements in terms of size, location and site availability or had been committed for other uses;
- (b) the assessment for some of the proposed alternative sites were highlighted as follows:
 - (i) Site 1 of KTD (Figure 33 of R274) – its area of about 8,800 m² fell short of the site area requirement. Moreover, the site had been rezoned for commercial use due to its close proximity to the future MTR Kai Tak Station and the commercial node nearby;
 - (ii) Sites 3 and 4 of KTD (Figure 33 of R274) – the area was designated for the Kai Tak Sports Park;

- (iii) Site 5 of KTD (Figure 33 of R274) – the site would only be ready for development in 2026 as the area would be used for government works area for the construction of Trunk Road T2. Besides, the site being in close proximity to the Kowloon Bay Business Area was considered more suitable for commercial use to form part of the CBD2 as advocated by EKEO;
- (iv) Site 6 of KTD (Figure 33 of R274) – already designated for the new acute hospital;
- (v) an open space at Wang Chiu Road near Richland Gardens – the site had already been rezoned for public housing development;
- (vi) vacant school premises of St Joseph’s Anglo-Chinese School – the site was only some 3,000 m² in area and had been reserved for other educational uses;
- (vii) a site in Mei Foo – the site was designated for sports stadium use;
- (viii) the Kowloon Bay Vehicle Examination Centre and a site near Kwun Tong Ferry Pier – the sites had been respectively included as part of the Kowloon Bay Action Area 1 and the Kwun Tong Action Area by EKEO, mainly planned for commercial developments; and
- (ix) sites in Tai Po, Lok Ma Chau Loop and “Village Type Development” zones in the New Territories – those sites were not located in the urban area.

Capacity of Passenger Lifts

39. In response to Members’ question concerning the capacity of the four passengers lifts in Laguna City, Ms Theresa Yeung, representative of R1 and various commenters, said that the site survey conducted (i.e. the capacity of each lift and the estimated number of

passengers that each lift could carry per hour) had confirmed that there was spare capacity of the four passenger lifts in Laguna City to cope with the demand generated from the future students of the VTC campus as the students and residents were generally commuting in opposite directions during the peak hours.

Others

40. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the future use of the two VTC campuses to be returned to the Government;
- (b) the types of vehicles the LPG filling station was serving; and
- (c) the planned use of the ex-Kaolin Mine site.

41. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip made the following main points:

- (a) the two campuses (i.e. IVEs in Cheung Sha Wan and Kwun Tong) that would be returned to the Government were zoned “G/IC” on the respective OZPs. The future uses of the two sites would be worked out at a later stage upon confirmation of their relocation programme;
- (b) the existing LPG filling station was serving mainly taxis; and
- (c) the ex-Kaolin Mine site fell within the Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong, Lei Yue Mun OZP to the east of the Site. It was currently mainly zoned “Residential (Group B)” for residential development with a BH restriction ranging from 90 to 110 mPD.

[Messr H.W. Cheung and Dominic K.K. Lam left this session of the meeting during the Q & A session.]

42. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing session on the day was completed. The Board would deliberate on the representations and

comments in closed meeting after all the hearing sessions were completed and would inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representers, commenters, their representatives, and the Government representatives for attending the hearing. They all left the meeting at this point.

43. This session of the meeting was adjourned at 6:40 p.m..