

1. The meeting was resumed at 9:10 a.m. on 11.12.2017.
2. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting :

Professor S.C. Wong

Chairperson
Vice-Chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

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

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

Chief Traffic Engineer (Kowloon),
Transport Department
Mr David C.V. Ngu

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. 10364 and 10365)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese and English]

Group 2

3. Members noted that the Chairperson had tendered apology for being unable to attend the meeting in the morning. The Vice-chairperson took up chairmanship of the meeting at this point.
4. The Vice-Chairperson said that the meeting was a continuation of the hearing session for Group 2 of the representations and comments in respect of the Draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP).
5. The Secretary said that Members' declaration of interests were made at the hearing session on 7.12.2017. No further declaration of interests had been received from Members since then. Members noted that Messrs Ivan C.S. Fu, Dominic K.K. Lam, Patrick H.T. Lau, K.K. Cheung, Thomas O.S. Ho, Stephen L.H. Liu and Franklin Yu, Ms Janice W.M. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend this session of the meeting.
6. The Vice-Chairperson said that reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenters inviting them to attend 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 that the Town Planning Board (the Board) should proceed with the hearing of the representations and comments in their absence.

Presentation and Question Sessions (Continued)

7. The following government representatives, the 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)

Education Bureau (EDB)

Miss Elaine T.L. Mak - Principal Assistant Secretary (Further
Education) (PAS (Further Education))

Transport Department (TD)

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

Representers/Commenters and their Representatives

R282 - Chik Kim Ming

R289 - 莫慧蓮

R342 - Wendylin Ordinario

R358 - Chan Chi Kwan

R451 - Arnasenthilvel

R458 - Philip Wong

R484 - Chau Kei Leung

R523 - Lee Hoi Ching

R533 - Rhoda Lee

R586 - Lee Yat Sau

R587 - 李麗儀

R596 - Joe Lee

R598 - Gabbi Lee & Joe Lee

R600 - Senthil Yanambakam

R621/C1303 - Ng Chik Ming

R792 - Chan Yuk May

R838 - Cheung Ming Yeung

R932 - Cheung Po Fong

R948 - Angela Shiao

R1155 - T L Cheung

R1495 - Christine Yeung

R1511 - Lo Wai Yuk

R1529 - She Hiu Suet

R1823 - 石寶珠

R1910 - Lau Kit Yee
R1989 - Fung Kwok Yue
R2026 - Lui Shing Fung
R2107 - 李妙娥
R2127 - 張嘉駿
R2148 - 黃碧雲
R2247 - Yan Sze Yuen
R2373 - Tina Wu Yim To
R2538 - 黃惠人
R2928 - 鄭金燕
R3616 - 陳燕如
R4867 - Chan Yuen Kai
R5461 - Anthony Tse
R5652 - 呂國良
R6287 - Li Min Ling
R7247 - 黃基
R7565 - 鍾宇泰
R7784 - Leung Yuk Wa
R8235 - Yan Sze Yuen
R8505 - Jacky Po
R8533 - Lam Chun Shing Jansen
R8642 - Lu Kuo Liang
R8645 - Sumie Li
R9004 - Leung Chui Ling
R9529 - 李綺萍
R9842 - 李妙嫻
R10376 - Siu Lai King
R10834 - 鍾洪
R11240 - Sung Hoi Yan Amy
R11368 - 丘德岩
R11696 - Lim Ngan Ning
C542 - Lo Wai Yuk

R1984 - Elisabeth Li
R1995 - Ho Man Bo
R2048 - Simon Cheung
R2126 - 張嘉熙
R2134 - 許嘉怡
R2222 - Li Ka Shun
R2328 - Law Lok Yin
R2536 - 黃可君
R2907 - Li Miu Ngo
R3157 - 陳警環
R3847 - Ternate Court Limited
R5443 - Cherry Lo
R5477 - Lu Tang Fung
R5784 - Kevin So
R6940 - 黃小玲
R7488 - Li Man Yan
R7578 - 鍾洪增
R8225 - Li Yee Wan
R8470 - Stella Luk
R8528 - 張啟深
R8596 - Lu San Fong
R8643 - Lu Sau Fong
R8727 - Maggie Chan
R9394 - Jasmine Wu
R9530 - Ng Chun Wing
R10141 - Lam Ping Tong Ronnie
R10499 - Tina Wu Yim To
R11067 - May Lam
R11327 - Yan Sze Yuen
R11587 - Chan Yeuk Sze
R12146 - Vidhya Syvakumar
C552 - Yau Tak Ngam

C665 - Tse Li Koon

C721 - Lam Yi Xiu Jane

C743 - Lam Sau Chun

C826 - Blancad Maribel Binayug

C941 - Lam Ping Tong Ronnie

C1040 - Cabico Constantino Filomena

C1273 - Lau Shi Yin

Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront
Concern Group – Mr Ng Chik Ming

C716 - Joanna Look

C731 - Ho Seung Ling Ankey

C754 - Lau Wai Hin

C879 - Cheung Wing Han

C951 - Look Pui Fan

C1070 - Lam Tai Fat

- Representor, Commenter and
Representers' and Commenters'
representative

R299 - Chan Ping Kuen

R404 - Szto On Tai

R477 - 曾亭僊

R625 - Cheung Yick Wang Edwin

R739 - 林詩穎

R1005 - Chu Chung Ming

R1344 - Ng Mei Ling

R1610 - C W Fung

R1691 - Derek Yan

R1800 - Wong Chui Ping

R1955 - Chan Wong Wing

R2080 - Yan Yuen Ming

R2139 - 程柏仁

R2213 - Keith Lee

R2522 - 林一龍

R2530 - 郭林婉君

R2626 - Chan Tak

R2695 - Karen Law

R2839 - Law Ka Wai

R3026 - 歐耀華

R3466 - Wong Hau Ling

R376 - Aaryan Prince

R467 - Jessica Cheng

R487 - 曾傑

R685 - Wong Oi Yin

R918 - Yan Kam Ip

R1088 - Anita Yan

R1567 - Doug Fung

R1637 - Lam Ching Yee

R1715 - Jacqueline Yan

R1948 - Chan Heung Yuet

R2005 - Joevy Soriamo

R2095 - 孔憲民

R2142 - 黃乃靈

R2494 - Ted Chow

R2524 - 林詩琪

R2544 - Yip Suet Ping

R2690 - Hung Hin Man

R2759 - 薛密

R3015 - 許昌翔

R3410 - 黃麗雪

R3527 - 羅碧蘭

- R3832 - Kam Wai Ho
R5272 - Wong Hau Ling Linda
R5446 - 郭筱媚
R5470 - Ko Yun Ling
R6744 - Kwok Lin Wan Jun
R7089 - Yip Ka Huen
R7484 - 張柳燕
R7529 - Tam Wai Ling
R7731 - Lam Wai Yin
R8610 - Sarah Yeung
R9988 - Jovey E Soriano
R10817 - Chan Chok Wah
R11432 - Wu Yiu Tak
R11626 - 高志威
R11676 - Lee Nga Ching
R11988 - Choy Sze Wai Evelyn
Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront - Representers and Representers' and
Concern Group – Mr Cheung Yick Commenter's representative
Wang Edwin
- R338 – Paul Kumar
Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representers' representative
- R381 - Kan Chi Wai
R394 - Cheung Kwai Sun
R400 - Hon Miu Ling
R403 - Lau Kam Ching
R411 - Ching Yee Han
R455 - Cecilia Kok
R611 - Lam Yue Shek Edmund
R695 - Ching Sing Fai
R796 - 呂思慧
- R5032 - Lau Yiu
R5318 - Cythia Kwok
R5464 - Lo Kai Sang
R5702 - Chan Ka Chung Davy
R6953 - Yeung Shing Chun
R7170 - Pun Yiu Yung
R7493 - Yuet Ming Chan
R7595 - Lee Mei Han
R8569 - Peter Lee
R9241 - Hima Prince
R10708/C1047 - 文明
R11103 - Wong For Kiu
R11503 - Man Lee Shing
R11655- Chan Cheuk Wang
R11935 - Chow Hau Yin
- R383 - Hui Yuk Fong
R398 - 傅惠玲
R402 - Lam Cheung San
R405 - Lau Tsz Yin Bea
R412 - Lai Kam Wah
R580 - Edwin Lui
R693 - Cheuk Po Yu
R715 - 何詠初
R875 - Yuen Fat Sun

R912 - Chim Sau Yin
R1192 - Kwok Chor Wo
R1194 - Fok Ho Chung
R1286 - Yu Lai Wan
R1514 - Kanchana Kaewklom
R1679 - Chow Lok Yan
R1947 - Catherine Amul
R2038 - Tsang Pak Lin Patricia
R2124 - 張芯瑜
R2176 - Amy Poon Sun Fan
R2240 - W H Cheung
R2296 - 何敬源
R2469 - Mak Wing Sai
R2909 - Silina Kwan
R2924 - Chui Shut Ha
R2988 - Law Wing Kai
R3486 - Cho Yi Yi
R4087 - Leung Sau Ping
R4237 - 張麗芬
R4364 - Silna Kwan
R4457 - Fiona Choi
R5937 - Chu Hok Fung
R6058 - Chan Lai Sheung
R6727 - Cheng Man Hung
R8691 - 甘家輝
R9777 - WH Cheung
R10296 - Gamin Lee
R11342 - 陳楚明
R11648 - 黃麗瑤

R942 - Fung Suk Yee Roxana
R1193 - Kwok Pui Shan Sophia
R1267 - Choi Fung Man
R1483 - Rinky Chan
R1547 - 姚綺玲
R1759 - Mandy Yiu
R1998 - Ho Yuen Tung
R2123 - 張芯臻
R2152 - 楊煥生
R2208 - Ng Cheong Keong
R2268 - 馮英蓮
R2388 - 陳瑞芳
R2863 - Y Y Ho
R2914 - 周國偉
R2981 - Fung Ying Lin
R3112 - Ng Mei Kuen
R3859 - Tso Ming Yin
R4158 - Lee Pui Yan
R4251 - Chan Chun Bong
R4412 - Ho Kwok Chu
R4935 - Cheung
R6022 - Au Yiu Choi
R6629 - 張國豪
R8193 - YY Ho
R9250 - Katherine Kan
R10013 - Carmen Tso
R10810 - 陳兆華
R11552 - 劉明亮

Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront - Representer and Representers'
Concern Group— Mr Lam Yue Shek representative
Edmund

R447 - Lion

R1342 - Lau Chun Fung

C977 - So Lai Yin

Mr Cheng Keng Jeong

R507 - Jacky Yau

R584 - Maze Wan

R593 - Chelsea Yau Choi Lam

R669/C869 - Elina Luk

R848 - Fung Yeuk Hang

R1050 - Doris Sin Yat Sum

R1138 - Lau Wing Shing

R1496 - Marcus Cheng

R1792 - Veronica Cheung

R2089 - Yu Choi Heung

R2300 - 劉天祿

R2581 - 劉婉萍

R2743 - 林時純

R3263 - Leung Yui Tun

R4143 - Tang Yuk Ngor

R4631 - Tsoi Hok Keung

R4882 - Choi Sing Hei

R5463 - Tang Yin Wa

R5639 - Leung Chi Keung

R5918 - Chow Wai Han

R6094 - Hung Chi Ho

R6939 - 尹嘉怡

R7446 - Tse Wai On

R7693 - Tsoi H K Benny

R9006 - Cheng Wing Tat

R9121 - Pugi

R10072 - Stanley

R448 - Lau Lai Lai

R11859 - So Shen Ming

- Representers' representative

R574 - Christine Wong

R590 - Alexander Yau

R594 - Maze Wan

R745 - Chan Sau Wan

R949 - Sin Yuk Yan

R1051 - Lam May Chu

R1216 - Hung Ching Nga Carrie

R1693 - Edmond Cheng

R2015 - Lam Shek Chung

R2243 - Wong Wai Lam

R2572 - S C Lam

R2697 - Kenneth Cheung

R2814 - Chang Sau Har Belinda

R4085 - 陳志聰

R4514 - Alex Yau Tai Lam

R4835 - Kin Keung Cheung

R5127/C916 - 邱泰霖

R5520 - Lo Kwok Cheung

R5673 - Jacky Yau

R5977 - Lee Mei Ling

R6371 - 張慧琳

R7203 - Lau Choi Fung

R7620 - Agnes Wan

R8370 - Li Wan Yim

R9047 - Marc Just Sorribas

R9259/C317 - Yau Tai Lam

R10139 - Alexzander Yau

<u>R10199 - Tse King Bo</u>	<u>R10815 - Leung Yui Jun</u>
<u>R11061 - Lam Chun Wai</u>	<u>R11267 - Chung Keung</u>
<u>R11574 - Tsoi Hok Keung</u>	<u>R11635 - Raymond Chan</u>
<u>R11658 - Leong Lok Fan</u>	<u>R11920/C1007 - Yau Chun Shu</u>
<u>R12043 - Wan Maze</u>	<u>C318 - Yau Choi Lam</u>
<u>C319 - So Yau Chi</u>	<u>C320 - Chi Shih Feng</u>
<u>C321 - Ho Un Ieng</u>	<u>C353 - Chan Choi Chi</u>
<u>C417 - Wong Mei Fan Ody</u>	<u>C466 - Law Ka Yan Karen</u>
<u>C506 - Tse Yau Him</u>	<u>C530 - Ng Ka Wing</u>
<u>C577 - Maze Wan</u>	<u>C608 - Chong Chung Loi</u>
<u>C649 - Tse Yau Sheung</u>	<u>C650 - Ho Siu Man Carter</u>
<u>C712 - Cheung Pak Man</u>	<u>C755 - Lau Yuen Yee</u>
<u>C782 - Mok Chor King</u>	<u>C1059 - Wong Siu Wan</u>
<u>C1079 - Wong Siu Ling</u>	<u>C1153 - Wu Po Hing</u>
<u>C1156 - Chau Kit Wai</u>	<u>C1165 - Ng Sau Fong</u>
<u>C1207 - Ng Siu Leung</u>	<u>C1213 - Cheung William Wai Lam</u>
<u>C1288 - Cheung Kwok Hung</u>	
Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront Concern Group – Ms Chan Po Ki	- Representers' representative
<u>R524/C1053 - 雷葆真</u>	<u>R2596 - 潘穎賢</u>
<u>R8220/C1206 - Shirley Louie</u>	<u>C483 - Vikkie Fung</u>
Mr Anthony Bux	- Representers' and Commenters' representative
<u>R532 - Chan Ka Keung</u>	<u>C340 - Cheung Tsui Fung</u>
Mr Chan Ka Keung] Representer and Commenter
Ms Cheung Tsui Fung]
<u>R565 - Stephen Tam</u>	<u>R567 - Candy</u>
<u>R572 - Tam Ka Chai</u>	<u>R7047 - So Sheung Wing</u>
<u>R7991 - So Sheng Ming</u>	
Mr Mok Kin Shing 莫建成	- Representers' representative

8. The Vice-Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. PlanD's representative had briefed Members on the background to the representations and comments on the first day of the Group 2 hearing (i.e. 7.12.2017). PlanD's representative would not repeat the presentation in the subsequent hearing sessions. A video clip recording the presentation had been uploaded to the dedicated link of the Board's website.

9. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, each representer/commenter or his representative would be allotted 10 minutes for making presentation. There was a timer device to alert the representers/commenters or their representatives 2 minutes before the allotted 10-minute time was to expire, and when the allotted 10-minute 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 representatives, representers/commenters or their representatives. After the Q&A session, the hearing would be adjourned, and the representers/commenters or their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. After hearing all the oral submissions from the remaining representers/commenters or their representatives who would attend the meeting, the Board would deliberate on the representations and comments in their absence, and inform the representers and commenters of decision of the Board in due course.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

10. The Vice-Chairperson then invited the representers/commenters or their representatives to elaborate on their representations/comments.

R565 - Stephen Tam

R567 - Candy

R572 - Tam Ka Chai

R7047 - So Sheung Wing

R7991 - So Sheng Ming

11. Mr Mok Kin Shing, a Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC) Member, made the following main points:

- (a) KTDC was concerned about the future development in the surrounding area of Laguna City and Cha Kwo Ling (CKL) area. The additional 8,500 students

and staff of the proposed VTC campus together with the future population of those committed/planned developments in the area, e.g. ex-Kaolin Mine site, Yau Lai Estate and Lei Yue Mum Estate, etc. would further increase the pedestrian flow and aggravate the existing traffic problem of the area. Provision of direct shuttle bus services between the VTC campus and Yau Tong MTR Station would worsen the existing traffic congestion in the area;

- (b) there was insufficient open space in the Kwun Tong District and a strong demand for harbourfront open space to serve an existing population of about 670,000 in Kwun Tong. The Government had committed to develop the CKL park in the waterfront area in 2006. It was inappropriate to develop a VTC campus which was incompatible with the waterfront setting; and
- (c) there were insufficient recreational, community and infrastructure facilities to serve the planned population of about 800,000 in the district. The impact of the planned development/infrastructure projects together with the proposed VTC campus on the local traffic, community facility, and living environment of the district should be comprehensively considered. The proposed new road and improvement measures which were planned 10 years ago might not be able to cope with the planned developments and redevelopments in the area.

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng arrived to join this session of the meeting during the presentation of Mr Mok.]

R447 - Lion

R448 - Lau Lai Lai

R1342 - Lau Chun Fung

R11859 - So Shen Ming

C977 - So Lai Yin

12. Mr Cheng Keng Jeong, a KTDC Member, made the following main points:

- (a) there was more than 700,000 planned population in Kwun Tong District and a number of new commercial, residential, educational and tourism facilities would be developed in the district. Apart from the proposed Trunk Road T2

which was planned 10 years ago, there was no provision of other mass public transport facilities to cope with the increase in traffic and transport demand;

- (b) the frequent signalling faults at MTR Kwun Tong Line reflected that the infrastructure capacity of the area might have reached its limit. The proposed direct shuttle bus services between the proposed VTC campus and Yau Tong MTR Station for diversion of vehicular traffic might not be practical;
- (c) the average open space per person in Kwun Tong was amongst the lowest in Hong Kong and the local residents had a need for more public open space. The proposed VTC facilities, which would take away the originally planned waterfront open space, should be provided in other district; and
- (d) the revised scheme of the VTC campus, which was lately submitted, was not thoroughly discussed by KTDC. Consideration should be given to restarting the public consultation for the revised scheme.

R524/C1053 - 雷葆真

R2596 - 潘穎賢

R8220/C1206 - Shirley Louie

C483 - Vikkie Fung

13. Mr Anthony Bux, a KTDC Member, made the following main points:

- (a) his profession was related to risk management compliance. He criticized that the Government seldom conducted risk analysis for its projects, as a result, the District Councils (DCs) had to carry out follow up/remedial action;
- (b) he considered that a park rather than a school at waterfront would be more sensible and reasonable and hence he objected to the proposed VTC campus;
- (c) in the KTDC meeting dated 2.3.2017, a number of DC Members objected to the proposal and expressed their concerns. He noted that some opinions or concerns raised in the meeting were not covered in the TPB Paper No. 10365. Their concerns included

- (i) the CKL park was planned in 1994 but yet to be implemented as the area was reserved for construction of Trunk Road T2;
 - (ii) the waterfront should be planned in a comprehensive manner;
 - (iii) KTDC had clearly indicated objection to the proposed rezoning from “O” to “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) for the proposed VTC campus, which would generate adverse traffic impact;
 - (iv) the proposal had not reflected KTDC and the local’s aspirations of a continuous waterfront promenade in the area connecting to Lei Yue Mun;
- (d) the Secretary for Transport and Housing recently stated that the operation of Kwun Tong Line had reached its design capacity resulting in the temporary closure of some entrances of the Choi Hung MTR Station. The proposed VTC campus would further aggravate the existing traffic problem; and
- (e) the views of KTDC were ignored by the Government. Members were urged to take into account KTDC’s objection to the proposal in making a decision.

R282 - Chik Kim Ming

R342 - Wendylin Ordinario

R451 - Arnasenthilvel

R484 - Chau Kei Leung

R533 - Rhoda Lee

R587 - 李麗儀

R598 - Gabbi Lee & Joe Lee

R621/C1303 - Ng Chik Ming

R838 - Cheung Ming Yeung

R948 - Angela Shiao

R1495 - Christine Yeung

R1529 - She Hiu Suet

R1910 - Lau Kit Yee

R1989 - Fung Kwok Yue

R289 - 莫慧蓮

R358 - Chan Chi Kwan

R458 - Philip Wong

R523 - Lee Hoi Ching

R586 - Lee Yat Sau

R596 - Joe Lee

R600 - Senthil Yanambakam

R792 - Chan Yuk May

R932 - Cheung Po Fong

R1155 - T L Cheung

R1511 - Lo Wai Yuk

R1823 - 石寶珠

R1984 - Elisabeth Li

R1995 - Ho Man Bo

R2026 - Lui Shing Fung

R2107 - 李妙娥

R2127 - 張嘉駿

R2148 - 黃碧雲

R2247 - Yan Sze Yuen

R2373 - Tina Wu Yim To

R2538 - 黃惠人

R2928 - 鄭金燕

R3616 - 陳燕如

R4867 - Chan Yuen Kai

R5461 - Anthony Tse

R5652 - 呂國良

R6287 - Li Min Ling

R7247 - 黃基

R7565 - 鍾宇泰

R7784 - Leung Yuk Wa

R8235 - Yan Sze Yuen

R8505 - Jacky Po

R8533 - Lam Chun Shing Jansen

R8642 - Lu Kuo Liang

R8645 - Sumie Li

R9004 - Leung Chui Ling

R9529 - 李綺萍

R9842 - 李妙嫻

R10376 - Siu Lai King

R10834 - 鍾洪

R11240 - Sung Hoi Yan Amy

R11368 - 丘德岩

R11696 - Lim Ngan Ning

C542 - Lo Wai Yuk

C665 - Tse Li Koon

C721 - Lam Yi Xiu Jane

R2048 - Simon Cheung

R2126 - 張嘉熙

R2134 - 許嘉怡

R2222 - Li Ka Shun

R2328 - Law Lok Yin

R2536 - 黃可君

R2907 - Li Miu Ngo

R3157 - 陳警環

R3847 - Ternate Court Limited

R5443 - Cherry Lo

R5477 - Lu Tang Fung

R5784 - Kevin So

R6940 - 黃小玲

R7488 - Li Man Yan

R7578 - 鍾洪增

R8225 - Li Yee Wan

R8470 - Stella Luk

R8528 - 張啟深

R8596 - Lu San Fong

R8643 - Lu Sau Fong

R8727 - Maggie Chan

R9394 - Jasmine Wu

R9530 - Ng Chun Wing

R10141 - Lam Ping Tong Ronnie

R10499 - Tina Wu Yim To

R11067 - May Lam

R11327 - Yan Sze Yuen

R11587 - Chan Yeuk Sze

R12146 - Vidhya Syvakumar

C552 - Yau Tak Ngam

C716 - Joanna Look

C731 - Ho Seung Ling Ankey

C743 - Lam Sau Chun

C754 - Lau Wai Hin

C826 - Blancad Maribel Binayug

C879 - Cheung Wing Han

C941 - Lam Ping Tong Ronnie

C951 - Look Pui Fan

C1040 - Cabico Constantino Filomena

C1070 - Lam Tai Fat

C1273 - Lau Shi Yin

14. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ng Chik Ming made the following main points:

- (a) he had been residing at Laguna City for more than 5 years and he would retire in 3 years. He decided to purchase the unit at Laguna City mainly due to the planned CKL park and promenade at waterfront;
- (b) before purchasing a flat at Laguna City, he had checked the proposed land uses along the CKL waterfront and noted that the proposed CKL park was clearly indicated on the concept plan of the executive summary of Kai Tak Planning Review published in June 2006, which had undergone a thorough public consultation involving a lot of stakeholders including KTDC, Transport Advisory Committee and Harbour Business Forum, etc. He also noted that the proposed CKL park and waterfront promenade was mentioned in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the draft Kai Tak OZP No. SK/22/4;
- (c) he felt deceived by the Government when he was informed by the management committee of Laguna City in January 2017 that the site of CKL park would be rezoned for the proposed VTC campus, which would occupied at a site of 4.2ha at a building height (BH) of 70mPD. The Drainage Services Department (DSD) had recently introduced to Laguna City residents its proposal of the sewage treatment plant (STP) with rooftop park. Although those proposed DSD facilities would meet the requirement of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Ordinance, they did not necessarily be a good design;
- (d) there was a lack of large and quality open space in the Yau Tong and CKL areas. Many of the sites planned for open spaces were small and/or fenced off whereas those developed ones were very small without any facilities;

- (e) residents of Laguna City had raised their concerns to the KTDC, Harbourfront Commission (HC) and some Legislative Council (LegCo) Members. KTDC did not support the proposed VTC campus and two motions were passed on 2.3.2017 and 7.9.2017 respectively objecting to the rezoning of the site from “O” to “G/IC” for VTC campus and urging the Government to implement the CKL park and promenade and further consult Laguna City residents. Those LegCo Members also objected to the VTC campus and raised concern on the reliability of traffic impact assessment (TIA) and adverse traffic impact, the need of a VTC, insufficient public consultation, and open space shortfall in Kwun Tong. Besides, HC also considered the proposed VTC campus not acceptable mainly for the reasons of reduction in open space and the massive building bulk which was incompatible with the waterfront setting; and
- (f) the public’s strong objection to the proposed VTC campus was clearly reflected by the receipt of more than 10,000 representations and 1,200 authorized letters by the Board. He requested Members to retain the CKL park at the waterfront.

R299 - Chan Ping Kuen

R404 - Szto On Tai

R477 - 曾亭儷

R625 - Cheung Yick Wang Edwin

R739 - 林詩穎

R1005 - Chu Chung Ming

R1344 - Ng Mei Ling

R1610 - C W Fung

R1691 - Derek Yan

R1800 - Wong Chui Ping

R1955 - Chan Wong Wing

R2080 - Yan Yuen Ming

R2139 - 程柏仁

R2213 - Keith Lee

R2522 - 林一龍

R376 – Aaryan Prince

R467 - Jessica Cheng

R487 - 曾傑

R685 - Wong Oi Yin

R918 - Yan Kam Ip

R1088 - Anita Yan

R1567 - Doug Fung

R1637 - Lam Ching Yee

R1715 - Jacqueline Yan

R1948 - Chan Heung Yuet

R2005 - Joevy Soriamo

R2095 - 孔憲民

R2142 - 黃乃靈

R2494 - Ted Chow

R2524 - 林詩琪

R2544 - Yip Suet Ping

R2626 - Chan Tak

R2695 - Karen Law

R2839 - Law Ka Wai

R3026 - 歐耀華

R3466 - Wong Hau Ling

R3832 - Kam Wai Ho

R5272 - Linda (Wong Hau Ling)

R5446 - 郭筱媚

R5470 - Ko Yun Ling

R6744 - Kwok Lin Wan Jun

R7089 - Yip Ka Huen

R7484 - 張柳燕

R7529 - Tam Wai Ling

R7731 - Lam Wai Yin

R8610 - Sarah Yeung

R9988 - Jovey E Soriano

R10817 - Chan Chok Wah

R11432 - Wu Yiu Tak

R11626 - 高志威

R11676 - Lee Nga Ching

R11988 - Choy Sze Wai Evelyn

R2530 - 郭林婉君

R2690 - Hung Hin Man

R2759 - 薛密

R3015 - 許昌翔

R3410 - 黃麗雪

R3527 - 羅碧蘭

R5032 - Lau Yiu

R5318 - Cythia Kwok

R5464 - Lo Kai Sang

R5702 - Chan Ka Chung Davy

R6953 - Yeung Shing Chun

R7170 - Pun Yiu Yung

R7493 - Yuet Ming Chan

R7595 - Lee Mei Han

R8569 - Peter Lee

R9241 - Hima Prince

R10708/C1047 - 文明

R11103 - Wong For Kiu

R11503 - Man Lee Shing

R11655 - Chan Cheuk Wang

R11935 - Chow Hau Yin

15. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Cheung Yick Wang Edwin made the following main points:

- (a) unlike Hong Kong Island, there was a lack of waterfront promenade and open space in East Kowloon. With the Government's initiative to energize Kowloon East, he had high expectation on the development of the area, which would be transformed to a modern business area with a high quality environment. He hoped the waterfront area would be optimally planned for public enjoyment;

Planning for CKL waterfront

- (b) the planned development of a CKL park/open space at the CKL waterfront was indicated in a number of government documents such as the outline master development plan of Comprehensive Feasibility Study for the Revised Scheme of South East Kowloon Development conducted by the Territory Development Department (TDD) in 2001, the ES of the then Kai Tak (South) OZP No. S/K21/3 in 2002, the preliminary outline development plan of Kai Tak Planning Review in 2006, outline concept plan of South East Kowloon Development Comprehensive Planning and Engineering Review in 2006, the Kai Tak Development EIA in 2008 and the ES of the Kai Tak OZPs No. S/K22/2 and S/K22/3 in 2007 and 2011 respectively. Moreover, the Government also confirmed that the development of CKL park in its replies to LegCo questions in 1999, 2001 and 2008;
- (c) the planning of the CKL waterfront including the provision of CKL park had undergone a number of comprehensive consultations with KTDC, professionals, local residents and general public. There was a government commitment and strong public consensus regarding the provision of a CKL park in the area. Deletion of the CKL park was a significant change to the planning of East Kowloon and there should be a comprehensive public consultation on the revised proposal. The public consultation for the subject amendments was inadequate and insufficient information was provided to KTDC during the consultation;
- (d) the CKL waterfront was occupied by various temporary uses, including a soccer pitch, a car park, a construction site for Trunk Road T2, a training ground of the Construction Industry Council (CIC), an amenity area by LCSD, a marine refuse collection point of the Marine Department, and a contractor depot of the Buildings Department, etc., in order to better utilize the fragmented waterfront space pending the comprehensive development of the CKL waterfront. A video was played to show the existing situation of the CKL waterfront which was characterised by a number of temporary uses and the vacant site reserved for STP extension. He said that the site reserved for STP extension at CKL waterfront with 308 trees had been fenced off since

1990s. The site should have been used as a temporary open space for the local residents;

- (e) in 2008, the Government in its reply to LegCo explained that the CKL park could not be constructed at that time due to the construction works for Trunk Road T2 between 2011 to 2016. While it was confirmed that the ventilation building and administration building of the Trunk Road T2 would no longer be developed at the waterfront area, there should be an opportunity to review the land uses of the waterfront area and the proposed CKL park should be implemented expeditiously. However, a comprehensive planning for the waterfront was only conducted when the need to provide a VTC campus at the waterfront emerged;
- (f) while a 11km waterfront promenade was indicated on the latest conceptual master plan of Energizing Kowloon East (version 5.0) connecting To Kwa Wan and CKL, the waterfront promenade which was a corridor linking up various open space nodes could not serve as an open space. Open spaces should not be treated individually but should be planned as an open space system linked by the waterfront promenade. The CKL park was one of the important nodes in the open space system;
- (g) in the absence of detailed breakdown on the provision of open space by types and areas, he doubted on the sufficiency of open space provision in Kwun Tong as mentioned by PlanD;

Traffic Impact of VTC Campus

- (h) while the TIA conducted by VTC had revealed that the existing road capacity would be sufficient to cater for the proposed VTC campus, he doubted about the credibility of the TIA and the traffic model as the TIA had not considered cumulative impacts from some committed/planned developments and redevelopments in the area;
- (i) the proposed VTC campus would cause a large increase in pedestrian flow. The large pedestrian flow in opposite directions would cause severe congestion along the footpath and footbridge during peak hours. The impact of the

proposal on the carrying capacity of the four lifts connecting Laguna City and Lam Tin MTR Station might have been underestimated as the travelling time required for each cycle would be lengthened by passengers from opposite direction. Moreover, Yau Tong MTR Station, which was located at the downstream of Kwun Tong Line and a very busy interchange station for those MTR lines, would not be able to cater for the additional passengers from VTC. The proposed shuttle bus service between Yau Tong MTR Station and the new VTC campus would increase traffic flow and create serious impacts on the local roads;

Need for VTC Campus

- (j) it was unreasonable for VTC to request a site of 4.2 ha when the net site area requirement of the proposed VTC campus was 3.2 ha only. Being a vocational institution, it was inappropriate for VTC to take the campus of the University of Hong Kong, Chinese University of Hong Kong and tertiary education institutions in Singapore as a benchmark for its campus planning. Moreover, in anticipation of the decreasing number of students by 2023 and the offering of more degree courses by other educational institutions, the existing VTC campuses might already be sufficient to accommodate the future needs. Moreover, noting from VTC that only 20% of its students would go to the VTC campus during the morning peaks, he doubted whether VTC had operational needs to set up such a large new campus. VTC should also consider in-situ redevelopment of its existing campuses or to identify an alternative site with a smaller site area and less stringent BHR;
- (k) there were already two vocational education facilities in Kwun Tong to serve a youth population of 8.7% (as at 2016) whereas no such facility was provided in Yuen Long District which had the highest number of young people (about 9.1%) in Hong Kong. VTC should consider other areas in need, e.g. Yuen Long with the highest youth population or West Kowloon with a lot of ethnic minorities, as alternative sites for the VTC campus. He questioned whether the two existing VTC campuses in Kwun Tong and Cheung Sha Wan to be re-provisioned to the CKL site were planned for residential/commercial uses after the sites were returned to the Government; and

- (l) Members were urged to create a vision for the CKL waterfront and to decide on the best use of the waterfront in the long run.

[The meeting was adjourned for a 5-minute break.]

R338 – Paul Kumar

16. With the aid of a visualiser, Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:
 - (a) she was a member of the Tsim Sha Tsui Residents Concern Group. The concern group aimed at protecting and promoting the interests of minority residents. They found the proposed VTC campus not for public interest. They supported a CKL waterfront park of a size and quality compatible with those at other locations. It was not acceptable that the Government rezoned some “GIC” sites for land sale while rezoning open space to provide community facilities;
 - (b) according to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), requirements for post-secondary colleges needed to be determined on a territory-wide basis in the light of long-term education policies, demographic changes and manpower demand. The new campus of 3.5 ha was initiated by VTC and not the outcome of careful and detailed study by the Education Bureau (EDB) on the future demand for particular skills and training. EDB had not performed its duty. Moreover, the development plans for new towns in the New Territories and the need to cater for the incremental increase in population in those areas were not taken into account;
 - (c) the Design Institute in Tseung Kwan O opened in 2010 costing \$1 billion dollars was a warning to the Government that VTC’s new campus would be another mega building costing at least \$1.5 billion dollars;
 - (d) there was no convincing rationale to support the proposed VTC campus. The Board had rejected a planning application No. A/K9/269 for the operation of a primary school on the Hung Hom waterfront on 22.9.2017. One of the

rejection reasons was that the proposed educational use was not in line with the planning intention for the harbourfront area and would not enhance the attractiveness and vibrancy of the waterfront promenade;

- (e) there were other alternative sites, including
 - (i) the site zoned “Commercial (8)” under Amendment Item E to Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/4 as there was no VTC facility in Kowloon City. The site originally formed part of a government, institution and community (GIC) cluster and could be amalgamated with one of the adjoining GIC sites to provide a large campus to meet VTC’s operational requirement. It was located next to the Kai Tak MTR Station and on Prince Edward Road with a lot of bus services linking West and East Kowloon;
 - (ii) the existing VTC campus at Cheung Sha Wan, which VTC proposed to close down. It was the only VTC campus serving Sham Shui Po and Yau Tsim Mong with a high percentage of ethnic minorities and deprived youth who had little chance of getting into university. However, the Government’s intention was to rezone GIC sites in the district for commercial or residential uses;
 - (iii) the residential site under Amendment Item A to Tai Po OZP No. S/TP/26: the site had a site area of 3.81ha and was located at Pok Yin Road/Yau King Lane. It was originally zoned “G/IC”, subject to a maximum BHR of 47mPD on the OZP and originally reserved for tertiary educational institution and associated uses. While there was only one small VTC in Shatin, EDB had no objection to releasing the site to facilitate other development on the ground that there was no expansion plan for the Chinese University of Hong Kong or the Hong Kong Education University, and no implementation programme for other educational use;
 - (iv) sites at Tong Yan San Tsuen, Yuen Long. There were a large-scale residential development being planned but the district was deficient in almost all types of GIC facilities and open space. Moreover, there was no VTC campus in Yuen Long. More community services should be

provided there to avoid repeating the social problems of the Tin Shui Wai, the City of Sadness;

- (f) she queried the development direction of VTC. She noticed from the local newspaper that VTC had entered into an agreement with New Frontier, an investment firm, to train healthcare workers for the Mainland China. She was also concerned about the proposal to provide hotel accommodation in the new VTC campus as there were many irregularities exposed by the Audit Commission on the operation of hotels on sites zoned “G/IC”;
- (g) Hong Kong tax payers were concerned about the high unsuccessful rate of educational facilities. The Centennial College under the University of Hong Kong was an example that an education facility had failed to attract the intended quota of students. The Audit Commission also made critical comments on the management of VTC’s Tseung Kwan O Design Institute. The Government continued to spend money but failed to monitor those educational facilities. The methodology adopted for plot ratio calculation for the new VTC campus was expected to be the sort of problem the Audit Commission was concerned about;
- (h) Members had a duty to ask relevant questions. A recent High Court ruling had found that the Board had failed to properly inquire into the matters raised by the representers/commenters. According to Annex IV of TPB Paper No. 10365, the planned provision of district open space was 17.6 ha. She requested PlanD to provide the detailed breakdown of open space. The representers had a right to have full access to relevant data, so that they could conduct an independent investigation; and
- (i) the CKL waterfront should be developed into a quality open space for the enjoyment of residents in Kwun Tong.

R532 - Chan Ka Keung

C340 - Cheung Tsui Fung

17. Mr. Chan Ka Keung and Ms Cheung Tsui Fung made the following main points:

- (a) the CKL park had been planned at the waterfront for many years before he moved to Laguna City in 2008. Although it was announced in the 2016 Policy Address that a new VTC campus would be developed in the urban area, the Owners' Committee of Laguna City was only consulted in early 2017. There were a lot public consultations conducted for the CKL park in the past and the Government should not change the plan abruptly;
- (b) the revised scheme of two-block design prepared by VTC was not acceptable as it would cause significant visual impact on Laguna City residents. Moreover, photomontages prepared were based on viewpoints at Hong Kong Island across Victoria Harbour and from hinterland towards the waterfront, which could not reflect the actual impact on the surrounding residents;
- (c) the proposed 150 carparks together with the additional 200 carparks from the developments at the ex-Kaolin Mine site would generate adverse traffic impact on the area. They also questioned the rationale for the proposed carpark provision;
- (d) provision of direct shuttle bus services between the new VTC campus and Yau Tong MTR Station could not help relieve the pedestrian congestion of the walkway connecting Lam Tin MTR Station and Laguna City. The proposed VTC campus would be within a short walking distance from Lam Tin MTR Station, and it was more direct for VTC staff and students to go to the VTC campus from Lam Tin MTR Station instead of taking shuttle buses. Moreover, since the land around Lam Tin MTR Station Exit D was a piece of private land, there would be no room for widening the exit to accommodate the increase in pedestrian flow;
- (e) there was concern that the proposed 1 ha public open space within the new VTC campus would not be developed; and
- (f) as a resident living in the Kwun Tong area for more than 40 years, she had a strong connection with the area, and found the waterfront area a relief for her and her friends. She questioned the rationale of locating a school at waterfront and considered that there was alternative site for the VTC campus.

She requested a waterfront part be developed for the East Kowloon and Hong Kong residents.

R507 - Jacky Yau

R584 - Maze Wan

R593 - Chelsea Yau Choi Lam

R669/C869 - Elina Luk

R848 - Fung Yeuk Hang

R1050 - Doris Sin Yat Sum

R1138 - Lau Wing Shing

R1496 - Marcus Cheng

R1792 - Veronica Cheung

R2089 - Yu Choi Heung

R2300 - 劉天祿

R2581 - 劉婉萍

R2743 - 林時純

R3263 - Leung Yui Tun

R4143 - Tang Yuk Ngor

R4631 - Tsoi Hok Keung

R4882 - Choi Sing Hei

R5463 - Tang Yin Wa

R5639 - Leung Chi Keung

R5918 - Chow Wai Han

R6094 - Hung Chi Ho

R6939 - 尹嘉怡

R7446 - Tse Wai On

R7693 - Tsoi H K Benny

R9006 - Cheng Wing Tat

R9121 - Pugi

R10072 - Stanley

R10199 - Tse King Bo

R11061 - Lam Chun Wai

R574 - Christine Wong

R590 - Alexander Yau

R594 - Maze Wan

R745 - Chan Sau Wan

R949 - Sin Yuk Yan

R1051 - Lam May Chu

R1216 - Hung Ching Nga Carrie

R1693 - Edmond Cheng

R2015 - Lam Shek Chung

R2243 - Wong Wai Lam

R2572 - S C Lam

R2697 - Kenneth Cheung

R2814 - Chang Sau Har Belinda

R4085 - 陳志聰

R4514 - Alex Yau Tai Lam

R4835 - Kin Keung Cheung

R5127/C916 - 邱泰霖

R5520 - Lo Kwok Cheung

R5673 - Jacky Yau

R5977 - Lee Mei Ling

R6371 - 張慧琳

R7203 - Lau Choi Fung

R7620 - Agnes Wan

R8370 - Li Wan Yim

R9047 - Marc Just Sorribas

R9259/C317 - Yau Tai Lam

R10139 - Alexzander Yau

R10815 - Leung Yui Jun

R11267 - Chung Keung

R11574 - Tsoi Hok Keung

R11658 - Leong Lok Fan

R12043 - Wan Maze

C319 - So Yau Chi

C321 - Ho Un Ieng

C417 - Wong Mei Fan Ody

C506 - Tse Yau Him

C577 - Maze Wan

C649 - Tse Yau Sheung

C712 - Cheung Pak Man

C782 - Mok Chor King

C1079 - Wong Siu Ling

C1156 - Chau Kit Wai

C1207 - Ng Siu Leung

C1288 - Cheung Kwok Hung

R11635 - Raymond Chan

R11920/C1007 - Yau Chun Shu

C318 - Yau Choi Lam

C320 - Chi Shih Feng

C353 - Chan Choi Chi

C466 - Law Ka Yan Karen

C530 - Ng Ka Wing

C608 - Chong Chung Loi

C650 - Ho Siu Man Carter

C755 - Lau Yuen Yee

C1059 - Wong Siu Wan

C1153 - Wu Po Hing

C1165 - Ng Sau Fong

C1213 - Cheung William Wai Lam

18. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Chan Po Ki made the following main points:

- (a) she moved to East Kowloon about 10 years ago and had a daughter of 6 years old. Her educational background was social services and family therapy and she was currently working at an insurance company at East Kowloon;
- (b) with the transformation of East Kowloon into a business area, many banking and insurance companies had moved into the area. Most of those companies provided regular shuttle bus services between their offices and various locations including Lam Tin, Kowloon Bay and MTR stations for their staff. Together with the provision of more than four kindergartens/nurseries near Lam Tin MTR Station or in Laguna City, the existing traffic and pedestrian flow in that area were already very congested during the peak hours. The increase in frequency of public transportation could not relieve the traffic problem. It was anticipated that the traffic situation would be further worsened upon the completion of other developments in the area, such as the developments at the ex-Kaolin Mine site;

- (c) as stated in the Board's website, town planning in Hong Kong aimed to promote the health, safety, convenience and general welfare of the community. Planning should cater for the needs and well-beings of individual, family and community as well as for the next generation providing sufficient facilities and allowing balanced lifestyle. According to a recent survey, one seventh of children in Hong Kong were having symptoms of depression/ anxiety. Hong Kong needed more public open space for people's physical and mental well-being. For the Kwun Tong district, there was a need to provide more and quality public open space to serve the needs of the local residents. There was insufficient play area for kids in the district. The only waterfront open space in the area was underneath the flyover which was not a suitable location. The waterfront open space was always congested, with a lot of activities happening there, e.g. taking wedding and graduation photos, doing exercises and having picnics, etc. Space of similar nature should be provided at the CKL waterfront to meet the needs of East Kowloon residents. Moreover, the liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) filling station at the CKL waterfront, which had attracted a long queue of taxis and caused serious air pollution, was incompatible with the waterfront land uses. A holistic planning for the entire CKL waterfront should be carried out by the Government;
- (d) the poverty rate in Hong Kong hit a record high in 2016. There were 1.35 million poor population in Hong Kong, accounting for about one fifth of the total population. One third of the ageing population was considered poor. Sham Shui Po was the poorest district in Hong Kong, followed by Kwun Tong with 24.3% of its residents living below the poverty line. While the median monthly domestic household income of Kwun Tong District was the lowest, the public funding on medical resources per resident was the lowest in Hong Kong. Kwun Tong was characterised by a concentration of public housing developments and a high percentage of poor population, the Government should provide more support to the Kwun Tong community;

[Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon and Mr Alex T.H. Lai left this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (e) the Government should take into account the genuine needs of the local residents for a quality waterfront open space when planning the CKL waterfront. When the Government knew that the tunnel ventilation shaft and administration building of the Trunk Road T2 were no longer required in 2013, a comprehensive review on the land uses of the waterfront area should have been conducted;
- (f) there was no justification for developing a VTC campus at the CKL waterfront. Alternative sites and in-situ redevelopment of the existing VTC campuses to meet the operational need should be explored. Moreover, the Government should request more information from VTC to assess whether it was necessary to provide hotel accommodation and 150 carparking spaces in the proposed VTC campus; and
- (g) the Government was requested to reconsider the planning of CKL waterfront in a holistic manner and to return the waterfront open space to the residents of Kwun Tong.

[The meeting was adjourned for a lunch break at 12:25 p.m.]

19. The meeting was resumed at 1:45 p.m. on 11.12.2017.
20. 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 H.W. Cheung	
Mr Stephen H.B. Yau	
Dr F.C. Chan	
Mr Peter K.T. Yuen	
Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung	
Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong	
Chief Traffic Engineer (Kowloon) Transport Department Mr David C.V. Ngu	
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	

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)

Education Bureau (EDB)

Miss Elaine T.L. Mak - Principal Assistant Secretary(Further
Education) (PAS (Further Education))

Transport Department (TD)

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

Representers/Commenters and their Representatives

R282 - Chik Kim Ming

R289 - 莫慧蓮

R342 - Wendylin Ordinario

R358 - Chan Chi Kwan

R451 - Arnasenthilvel

R458 - Philip Wong

R484 - Chau Kei Leung

R523 - Lee Hoi Ching

R533 - Rhoda Lee

R586 - Lee Yat Sau

R587 - 李麗儀

R596 - Joe Lee

R598 - Gabbi Lee & Joe Lee

R600 - Senthil Yanambakam

R621/C1303 - Ng Chik Ming

R792 - Chan Yuk May

R838 - Cheung Ming Yeung

R932 - Cheung Po Fong

R948 - Angela Shiao

R1155 - T L Cheung

R1495 - Christine Yeung

R1511 - Lo Wai Yuk

R1529 - She Hiu Suet

R1823 - 石寶珠

R1910 - Lau Kit Yee

R1984 - Elisabeth Li

R1989 - Fung Kwok Yue

R1995 - Ho Man Bo

R2026 - Lui Shing Fung

R2048 - Simon Cheung

R2107 - 李妙娥
R2127 - 張嘉駿
R2148 - 黃碧雲
R2247 - Yan Sze Yuen
R2373 - Tina Wu Yim To
R2538 - 黃惠人
R2928 - 鄭金燕
R3616 - 陳燕如
R4867 - Chan Yuen Kai
R5461 - Anthony Tse
R5652 - 呂國良
R6287 - Li Min Ling
R7247 - 黃基
R7565 - 鍾宇泰
R7784 - Leung Yuk Wa
R8235 - Yan Sze Yuen
R8505 - Jacky Po
R8533 - Lam Chun Shing Jansen
R8642 - Lu Kuo Liang
R8645 - Sumie Li
R9004 - Leung Chui Ling
R9529 - 李綺萍
R9842 - 李妙嫻
R10376 - Siu Lai King
R10834 - 鍾洪
R11240 - Sung Hoi Yan Amy
R11368 - 丘德岩
R11696 - Lim Ngan Ning
C542 - Lo Wai Yuk
C665 - Tse Li Koon
C721 - Lam Yi Xiu Jane
C743 - Lam Sau Chun

R2126 - 張嘉熙
R2134 - 許嘉怡
R2222 - Li Ka Shun
R2328 - Law Lok Yin
R2536 - 黃可君
R2907 - Li Miu Ngo
R3157 - 陳警環
R3847 - Ternate Court Limited
R5443 - Cherry Lo
R5477 - Lu Tang Fung
R5784 - Kevin So
R6940 - 黃小玲
R7488 - Li Man Yan
R7578 - 鍾洪增
R8225 - Li Yee Wan
R8470 - Stella Luk
R8528 - 張啟深
R8596 - Lu San Fong
R8643 - Lu Sau Fong
R8727 - Maggie Chan
R9394 - Jasmine Wu
R9530 - Ng Chun Wing
R10141 - Lam Ping Tong Ronnie
R10499 - Tina Wu Yim To
R11067 - May Lam
R11327 - Yan Sze Yuen
R11587 - Chan Yeuk Sze
R12146 - Vidhya Syvakumar
C552 - Yau Tak Ngam
C716 - Joanna Look
C731 - Ho Seung Ling Ankey
C754 - Lau Wai Hin

- C826 - Blancad Maribel Binayug
C941 - Lam Ping Tong Ronnie
C1040 - Cabico Constantino
Filomena
C1273 - Lau Shi Yin
Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront - Representers' and
Concern Group - Commenters' representative
Mr Ng Chik Ming
- R299 - Chan Ping Kuen
R404 - Szto On Tai
R477 - 曾亭億
R625 - Cheung Yick Wang Edwin
R739 - 林詩穎
R1005 - Chu Chung Ming
R1344 - Ng Mei Ling
R1610 - C W Fung
R1691 - Derek Yan
R1800 - Wong Chui Ping
R1955 - Chan Wong Wing
R2080 - Yan Yuen Ming
R2139 - 程柏仁
R2213 - Keith Lee
R2522 - 林一龍
R2530 - 郭林婉君
R2626 - Chan Tak
R2695 - Karen Law
R2839 - Law Ka Wai
R3026 - 歐耀華
R3466 - Wong Hau Ling
R3832 - Kam Wai Ho
R5272 - Wong Hau Ling Linda
R5446 - 郭筱媚
- C879 - Cheung Wing Han
C951 - Look Pui Fan
C1070 - Lam Tai Fat
- R376 - Aaryan Prince
R467 - Jessica Cheng
R487 - 曾傑
R685 - Wong Oi Yin
R918 - Yan Kam Ip
R1088 - Anita Yan
R1567 - Doug Fung
R1637 - Lam Ching Yee
R1715 - Jacqueline Yan
R1948 - Chan Heung Yuet
R2005 - Jovey Soriamo
R2095 - 孔憲民
R2142 - 黃乃靈
R2494 - Ted Chow
R2524 - 林詩琪
R2544 - Yip Suet Ping
R2690 - Hung Hin Man
R2759 - 薛密
R3015 - 許昌翔
R3410 - 黃麗雪
R3527 - 羅碧蘭
R5032 - Lau Yiu
R5318 - Cythia Kwok
R5464 - Lo Kai Sang

- R5470 - Ko Yun Ling
R6744 - Kwok Lin Wan Jun
R7089 - Yip Ka Huen
R7484 - 張柳燕
R7529 - Tam Wai Ling
R7731 - Lam Wai Yin
R8610 - Sarah Yeung
R9988 - Jovey E Soriano
R10817 - Chan Chok Wah
R11432 - Wu Yiu Tak
R11626 - 高志威
R11676 - Lee Nga Ching
R11988 - Choy Sze Wai Evelyn
Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront
Concern Group -
Mr Cheung Yick Wang Edwin
- R338 - Paul Kumar
Ms Mary Mulvihill
- R381 - Kan Chi Wai
R394 - Cheung Kwai Sun
R400 - Hon Miu Ling
R403 - Lau Kam Ching
R411 - Ching Yee Han
R455 - Cecilia Kok
R611 - Lam Yue Shek Edmund
R695 - Ching Sing Fai
R796 - 呂思慧
R912 - Chim Sau Yin
R1192 - Kwok Chor Wo
R1194 - Fok Ho Chung
R1286 - Yu Lai Wan
- R5702 - Chan Ka Chung Davy
R6953 - Yeung Shing Chun
R7170 - Pun Yiu Yung
R7493 - Yuet Ming Chan
R7595 - Lee Mei Han
R8569 - Peter Lee
R9241 - Hima Prince
R10708/C1047 - 文明
R11103 - Wong For Kiu
R11503 - Man Lee Shing
R11655 - Chan Cheuk Wang
R11935 - Chow Hau Yin
- Representers' and Commenter's
representative
- Representer's representative
- R383 - Hui Yuk Fong
R398 - 傅惠玲
R402 - Lam Cheung San
R405 - Lau Tsz Yin Bea
R412 - Lai Kam Wah
R580 - Edwin Lui
R693 - Cheuk Po Yu
R715 - 何詠初
R875 - Yuen Fat Sun
R942 - Fung Suk Yee Roxana
R1193 - Kwok Pui Shan Sophia
R1267 - Choi Fung Man
R1483 - Rinky Chan

<u>R1514 - Kanchana Kaewklom</u>	<u>R1547 - 姚綺玲</u>
<u>R1679 - Chow Lok Yan</u>	<u>R1759 - Mandy Yiu</u>
<u>R1947 - Catherine Amul</u>	<u>R1998 - Ho Yuen Tung</u>
<u>R2038 - Tsang Pak Lin Patricia</u>	<u>R2123 - 張芯琛</u>
<u>R2124 - 張芯瑜</u>	<u>R2152 - 楊煥生</u>
<u>R2176 - Amy Poon Sun Fan</u>	<u>R2208 - Ng Cheong Keong</u>
<u>R2240 - W H Cheung</u>	<u>R2268 - 馮英蓮</u>
<u>R2296 - 何敬源</u>	<u>R2388 - 陳瑞芳</u>
<u>R2469 - Mak Wing Sai</u>	<u>R2863 - Y Y Ho</u>
<u>R2909 - Silina Kwan</u>	<u>R2914 - 周國偉</u>
<u>R2924 - Chui Shut Ha</u>	<u>R2981 - Fung Ying Lin</u>
<u>R2988 - Law Wing Kai</u>	<u>R3112 - Ng Mei Kuen</u>
<u>R3486 - Cho Yi Yi</u>	<u>R3859 - Tso Ming Yin</u>
<u>R4087 - Leung Sau Ping</u>	<u>R4158 - Lee Pui Yan</u>
<u>R4237 - 張麗芬</u>	<u>R4251 - Chan Chun Bong</u>
<u>R4364 - Silna Kwan</u>	<u>R4412 - Ho Kwok Chu</u>
<u>R4457 - Fiona Choi</u>	<u>R4935 - Cheung</u>
<u>R5937 - Chu Hok Fung</u>	<u>R6022 - Au Yiu Choi</u>
<u>R6058 - Chan Lai Sheung</u>	<u>R6629 - 張國豪</u>
<u>R6727 - Cheng Man Hung</u>	<u>R8193 - YY Ho</u>
<u>R8691 - 甘家輝</u>	<u>R9250 - Katherine Kan</u>
<u>R9777 - WH Cheung</u>	<u>R10013 - Carmen Tso</u>
<u>R10296 - Gamin Lee</u>	<u>R10810 - 陳兆華</u>
<u>R11342 - 陳楚明</u>	<u>R11552 - 劉明亮</u>
<u>R11648 - 黃麗瑤</u>	
Mr Jacky Yau] Representers' representatives
Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront]
Concern Group -]
Mr Lam Yue Shek Edmund]
<u>R507 - Jacky Yau</u>	<u>R574 - Christine Wong</u>
<u>R584 - Maze Wan</u>	<u>R590 - Alexander Yau</u>
<u>R593 - Chelsea Yau Choi Lam</u>	<u>R594 - Maze Wan</u>

R669/C869 - Elina Luk
R848 - Fung Yeuk Hang
R1050 - Doris Sin Yat Sum
R1138 - Lau Wing Shing
R1496 - Marcus Cheng
R1792 - Veronica Cheung
R2089 - Yu Choi Heung
R2300 - 劉天祿
R2581 - 劉婉萍
R2743 - 林時純
R3263 - Leung Yui Tun
R4143 - Tang Yuk Ngor
R4631 - Tsoi Hok Keung
R4882 - Choi Sing Hei
R5463 - Tang Yin Wa
R5639 - Leung Chi Keung
R5918 - Chow Wai Han
R6094 - Hung Chi Ho
R6939 - 尹嘉怡
R7446 - Tse Wai On
R7693 - Tsoi H K Benny
R9006 - Cheng Wing Tat
R9121 - Pugi
R10072 - Stanley
R10199 - Tse King Bo
R11061 - Lam Chun Wai
R11574 - Tsoi Hok Keung
R11658 - Leong Iok Fan
R12043 - Wan Maze
C319 - So Yau Chi
C321 - Ho Un Ieng
C417 - Wong Mei Fan Ody
C506 - Tse Yau Him

R745 - Chan Sau Wan
R949 - Sin Yuk Yan
R1051 - Lam May Chu
R1216 - Hung Ching Nga Carrie
R1693 - Edmond Cheng
R2015 - Lam Shek Chung
R2243 - Wong Wai Lam
R2572 - S C Lam
R2697 - Kenneth Cheung
R2814 - Chang Sau Har Belinda
R4085 - 陳志聰
R4514 - Alex Yau Tai Lam
R4835 - Kin Keung Cheung
R5127/C916 - 邱泰霖
R5520 - Lo Kwok Cheung
R5673 - Jacky Yau
R5977 - Lee Mei Ling
R6371 - 張慧琳
R7203 - Lau Choi Fung
R7620 - Agnes Wan
R8370 - Li Wan Yim
R9047 - Marc Just Sorribas
R9259/C317 - Yau Tai Lam
R10139 - Alexzander Yau
R10815 - Leung Yui Jun
R11267 - Chung Keung
R11635 - Raymond Chan
R11920/C1007 - Yau Chun Shu
C318 - Yau Choi Lam
C320 - Chi Shih Feng
C353 - Chan Choi Chi
C466 - Law Ka Yan Karen
C530 - Ng Ka Wing

<u>C577 - Maze Wan</u>	<u>C608 - Chong Chung Loi</u>
<u>C649 - Tse Yau Sheung</u>	<u>C650 - Ho Siu Man Carter</u>
<u>C712 - Cheung Pak Man</u>	<u>C755 - Lau Yuen Yee</u>
<u>C782 - Mok Chor King</u>	<u>C1059 - Wong Siu Wan</u>
<u>C1079 - Wong Siu Ling</u>	<u>C1153 - Wu Po Hing</u>
<u>C1156 - Chau Kit Wai</u>	<u>C1165 - Ng Sau Fong</u>
<u>C1207 - Ng Siu Leung</u>	<u>C1213 - Cheung William Wai Lam</u>
<u>C1288 - Cheung Kwok Hung</u>	
Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront Concern Group - Ms Chan Po Ki	- Representers' and Commenters' representative
<u>R532 - Chan Ka Keung</u>	<u>C340 - Cheung Tsui Fung</u>
Mr Chan Ka Keung	- Representer and Commenter's representative
<u>R9253 - Janice Chan</u>	
Ms Janice Chan	- Representer

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.

<u>R381 - Kan Chi Wai</u>	<u>R383 - Hui Yuk Fong</u>
<u>R394 - Cheung Kwai Sun</u>	<u>R398 - 傅惠玲</u>
<u>R400 - Hon Miu Ling</u>	<u>R402 - Lam Cheung San</u>
<u>R403 - Lau Kam Ching</u>	<u>R405 - Lau Tsz Yin Bea</u>
<u>R411 - Ching Yee Han</u>	<u>R412 - Lai Kam Wah</u>
<u>R455 - Cecilia Kok</u>	<u>R580 - Edwin Lui</u>
<u>R611 - Lam Yue Shek Edmund</u>	<u>R693 - Cheuk Po Yu</u>
<u>R695 - Ching Sing Fai</u>	<u>R715 - 何詠初</u>
<u>R796 - 呂思慧</u>	<u>R875 - Yuen Fat Sun</u>
<u>R912 - Chim Sau Yin</u>	<u>R942 - Fung Suk Yee Roxana</u>
<u>R1192 - Kwok Chor Wo</u>	<u>R1193 - Kwok Pui Shan Sophia</u>

<u>R1194 - Fok Ho Chung</u>	<u>R1267 - Choi Fung Man</u>
<u>R1286 - Yu Lai Wan</u>	<u>R1483 - Rinky Chan</u>
<u>R1514 - Kanchana Kaewklom</u>	<u>R1547 - 姚綺玲</u>
<u>R1679 - Chow Lok Yan</u>	<u>R1759 - Mandy Yiu</u>
<u>R1947 - Catherine Amul</u>	<u>R1998 - Ho Yuen Tung</u>
<u>R2038 - Tsang Pak Lin Patricia</u>	<u>R2123 - 張芯臻</u>
<u>R2124 - 張芯瑜</u>	<u>R2152 - 楊煥生</u>
<u>R2176 - Amy Poon Sun Fan</u>	<u>R2208 - Ng Cheong Keong</u>
<u>R2240 - W H Cheung</u>	<u>R2268 - 馮英蓮</u>
<u>R2296 - 何敬源</u>	<u>R2388 - 陳瑞芳</u>
<u>R2469 - Mak Wing Sai</u>	<u>R2863 - Y Y Ho</u>
<u>R2909 - Silina Kwan</u>	<u>R2914 - 周國偉</u>
<u>R2924 - Chui Shut Ha</u>	<u>R2981 - Fung Ying Lin</u>
<u>R2988 - Law Wing Kai</u>	<u>R3112 - Ng Mei Kuen</u>
<u>R3486 - Cho Yi Yi</u>	<u>R3859 - Tso Ming Yin</u>
<u>R4087 - Leung Sau Ping</u>	<u>R4158 - Lee Pui Yan</u>
<u>R4237 - 張麗芬</u>	<u>R4251 - Chan Chun Bong</u>
<u>R4364 - Silna Kwan</u>	<u>R4412 - Ho Kwok Chu</u>
<u>R4457 - Fiona Choi</u>	<u>R4935 - Cheung</u>
<u>R5937 - Chu Hok Fung</u>	<u>R6022 - Au Yiu Choi</u>
<u>R6058 - Chan Lai Sheung</u>	<u>R6629 - 張國豪</u>
<u>R6727 - Cheng Man Hung</u>	<u>R8193 - YY Ho</u>
<u>R8691 - 甘家輝</u>	<u>R9250 - Katherine Kan</u>
<u>R9777 - WH Cheung</u>	<u>R10013 - Carmen Tso</u>
<u>R10296 - Gamin Lee</u>	<u>R10810 - 陳兆華</u>
<u>R11342 - 陳楚明</u>	<u>R11552 - 劉明亮</u>
<u>R11648 - 黃麗瑤</u>	

23. Mr Jacky Yau made the following main points:

- (a) he was a civil engineer and a resident of Laguna City. He found the development proposal unacceptable as the technical assessments were not conducted in accordance with the public interest and the parameters were

biased towards the Vocational Training Council's (VTC) proposal;

- (b) reprovisioning two existing VTC campuses at a prominent waterfront site with high land value at Wai Yip Street (the Site) was unjustified. It could not help consolidate the existing facilities of VTC but would make the VTC campus further away from the location of the students;
- (c) provision of a first class hotel at the Site did not mean it could provide the first class vocational training for students. It was not the hardware but the software that mattered; and
- (d) the Government did not honour its promise to provide a waterfront park at the Site, which had gone through a bottom-up consultation exercise. The current rezoning proposal for a 'white elephant' project had followed a top-down approach without proper consultation of the local community.

24. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Lam Yue Shek, Edmund made the following main points :

- (a) he was a resident of Laguna City and a member of the Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront Concern Group (the Concern Group);

Background

- (b) a total of 11,840 representations and 1,168 comments with respect to amendment items W1 to W7 were received and majority of them (over 99%) opposed the proposed amendments. The Town Planning Board (the Board) was urged to listen to the views of the representers/commenters;

Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines

- (c) Vision and Mission Statement for Victoria Harbour and its Waterfront Areas, and the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines were formulated by the then Harbourfront Enhancement Committee with a view

to advising the Secretary for Development (SDEV) on the use of the harbourfront. Although the Cha Kwo Ling (CKL) Park was in line with the Harbourfront Planning Principles and Guidelines, it was a pity that it had not been implemented by the two former SDEVs during their terms of office;

- (d) with respect to the proposed amendments to the draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K22/5 (the draft OZP), it was noted in the news articles that the Chairman and some members of the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (the Task Force) of the Harbourfront Commission (HC) considered that the planning of Kai Tak harbourfront area was not in line with the Harbour Planning Guidelines;

Diversity of Uses

- (e) according to the Harbour Planning Guidelines, diversity of uses was one of the major land use planning considerations for the harbourfront areas. Uses to promote vibrancy and diversity and to enhance public enjoyment such as open space, retail, dining, recreation, leisure, cultural, and tourism-related facilities should be encouraged along the harbourfront areas while incompatible uses which were not conducive to public enjoyment/harbourfront enhancement should be relocated outside the inner core of Victoria Harbour;
- (f) a number of waterfront parks such as Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park, West Kowloon Cultural District and Quarry Bay Park had been developed in accordance with the Harbour Planning Guidelines with a variety of facilities for the enjoyment of the general public. Apart from the facilities, the view to the Victoria Harbour and the diversity of uses were the most valuable intangible experiences to the park users. He doubted why the Site would be developed for a VTC campus instead of the proposed CKL Park. The lack of a waterfront park in Kowloon East would frustrate the planning intention of providing continuous area along the harbourfront on both sides of Victoria Harbour for public enjoyment;

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

- (g) as compared with the proposed VTC campus, the CKL Park which he and other representers had in mind could help to meet the Harbour Planning Guidelines in the following aspects:
 - (i) vibrancy and diversity: VTC campus would only be open to about 6,800 staff and students and would increase the commuting traffic during peak hours. CKL Park, which was planned as a district open space (DOS) for Kwun Tong district with a population of 650,000 to 700,000 (about 100 times the users of VTC), could enhance the vibrancy and diversity of the district;
 - (ii) recreation and leisure uses: CKL Park would be open to the general public for a variety of leisure and recreation uses with minimum restrictions while the VTC campus was mainly for teaching purposes and the facilities would only be used by the staff, students and the hirers of venues;
 - (iii) focal feature: CKL Park could be developed as a focal feature to enhance the image of the CKL and Kwun Tong areas while VTC campus would not be compatible with the harbourfront uses;
 - (iv) continuous waterfront promenade: CKL Park could be well integrated with the adjacent pier and waterfront promenade to form a large cultural and recreational precinct extending to the Kai Tak area. Developing a VTC campus, however, would only aggravate the fragmentation of open space provision in the CKL waterfront area (the Area); and
 - (v) public aspiration: CKL Park, which could enhance the attractiveness of Victoria Harbour, was welcome by the public while the proposed VTC campus was opposed by 99.9% of the representers;

- (h) the proposed VTC campus at the harbourfront area was not in line with the Harbour Planning Principles and the Harbour Planning Guidelines. Given there were a number of waterfront parks in other districts along the Victoria Harbour, he doubted why such park was not provided in Kowloon East. The overcrowding of the waterfront promenade in Kwun Tong had demonstrated the need of a waterfront park in Kowloon East. The need of the local residents was not a corridor-shape waterfront park, but a quality public open space (POS) which could facilitate the public's interaction with the harbour and promote a water-friendly culture. The Site was the only available space in Kowloon East for the development of a people-oriented district waterfront park, i.e. CKL Park, to promote diversity of uses in the harbourfront in accordance with the Harbour Planning Guidelines;

Urban Design

- (i) according to the Harbour Planning Guidelines, developments fronting directly onto Victoria Harbour should adopt a lower development density to provide a human scale environment and harbourfront buildings should be of small footprint. Excessively tall building structure along the harbourfront might adversely affect the image of the harbour and should be avoided;
- (j) the floor plan for the proposed VTC campus could not fully reflect the reality as Blocks 1A, 1B and 1C were not separated entities but a large single building block, and the green area between Blocks 1 and 2 was not greenery but four footbridges linking up two blocks. As demonstrated by a mock-up rendering, the proposed VTC campus was in fact a huge building in one-piece with a length of 237m, width of 110 m and height of 60-70 m for the provision of 180,000 m² gross floor area (GFA). It was not in line with the Harbour Planning Guidelines in that it was a massive development in the harbourfront and the open area below the building was more akin to a tunnel, and its linkage with the waterfront promenade was undesirable;

- (k) a comparison between the proposed VTC campus and some existing developments could help show the scale of the development. Its development bulk in terms of GFA was equivalent to 11 blocks of the adjacent Laguna City, 1.2 times of the MegaBox including the two office blocks, 1.5 times of the Hong Kong Children's Hospital and 1.4 times of the Central Government Complex in Tamar;
- (l) according to the New Scheme submitted by VTC, 1 ha of land would no longer be required by VTC and could be reserved as POS. As such, he doubted if VTC's original site area requirement of 3 to 5 ha was well justified and the proposed zoning amendment for the Site from "Open Space" ("O") to "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") was well-thought-out;

Case Study

- (m) Science Park was a successful low-rise development along Tai Po waterfront with plenty of landscaped areas and amenities such as sitting out areas and outdoor spaces (22,650 m² in Phase 1) accessible by the public. A comparison between the development parameters of Phases 1 and 2 of Science Park and the proposed VTC campus demonstrated that the latter was not commensurate with the waterfront setting in the following aspects:
 - (i) site area: Phases 1 and 2 of Science Park had a site area of 15ha, plot ratio (PR) of 1.5 and GFA of 225,000 m². Although Science Park had a GFA similar to that of the VTC campus under the Original Scheme (i.e. 231,000 m²), its site area was 3.5 times that of the 4.2 ha required for the proposed VTC campus under the Original Scheme;
 - (ii) GFA: if a PR of 1.5 was adopted at the Site, the GFA would be 63,000 m², which was about one third of the currently proposed GFA of 180,000 m²; and

- (iii) building footprint: the footprint of buildings in Science Park were about 0.14 - 0.27 ha while the footprint of the VTC campus was 0.28 (Block 2) and 0.93 (Block 1);

Alternative Site

- (n) a site at Ngo Cheung Road in Yau Ma Tei was identified as a possible alternative site for the proposed VTC campus. Based on the assumptions of construction floor area of 216,000 m² (i.e. using a conversion factor of 1.2 times GFA of 180,000 m²), PR of 15, building height (BH) of 100 mPD, floor-to-floor height of 4m and excluding GFA concession under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines, a proposed development with 24 storeys could accommodate the proposed GFA in an area of about 1.8 ha;
- (o) as the Yau Ma Tei site was an inland site zoned "G/IC", compliance with the Harbour Planning Guidelines and changes in land use zoning were not required. The development would have a greater BH and a smaller footprint. Given the site was only 450 m from the Yau Ma Tei Mass Transit Railway (MTR) station, it was within the walking distance and no shuttle bus service would be required. The site was currently used as a temporary car park and ready for development. Although there was a liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) filling station at the site, the relocation issue should be similar to that of the CKL site; and

Conclusion

- (p) the need of the local community was not fragmented open space provision, a corridor-shape waterfront park nor a bulky VTC campus at the harbourfront. The previously promised CKL Park, which complied with the objectives of sustainable development, should be provided to link up with the adjacent pier and waterfront promenade for the provision of a people-oriented, vibrant and diversified waterfront park for the enjoyment of the public. The Board was urged to think carefully as the decision of developing a VTC campus at the last piece of waterfront site in Kowloon

East would be irreversible.

25. As the presentation 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 the Chairperson 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.

Public Open Space

26. Some Members raised the following questions to the government representatives:

- (a) the background of the CKL Park proposal, including the previous consultation and the Government's commitment as claimed by some representers;
- (b) the accessibility of the sewage treatment plant's (STP) landscaped deck and its linkage with the waterfront promenade;
- (c) whether Laguna Park was open to the public; and
- (d) the provision of DOS and local open space (LOS) in the area, and whether the planned open spaces were included in the open space provision figures.

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

- (a) in 1990s, a large scale development was once proposed in Kai Tak Development (KTD) with extensive reclamation in the adjacent water bodies. In view of the subsequent judgment of the Court of Final Appeal in 2004 stating that the presumption against reclamation in the

harbour could only be rebutted by establishing an overriding public need for reclamation, the planning of KTD was revisited. The “Kai Tak Planning Review” was then commissioned in 2004 with the objective to formulate a new development scheme for Kai Tak and three stages of extensive public engagement activities had been conducted between 2004 and 2006. A number of open spaces in different parts of KTD had been proposed, including the CKL Park. The land use proposals for KTD, including the CKL waterfront area, had been incorporated into the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/1 which was exhibited for public inspection in November 2006. For the CKL waterfront, the area zoned “O” remained unchanged in the approved Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/4 exhibited in 2012. As planning was a continuous process, the Government commenced the Review Study of KTD (the Review) in 2013 with a view to enhancing the land use proposals of KTD in response to changing planning circumstances and society needs, including increasing residential and commercial land supply to meet the acute housing needs and promote Kowloon East as a second central business district, provision of a heritage park and allowing a variety of water sports/recreational activities in the adjoining water bodies. In the CKL waterfront area, as the sites previously reserved for the extension of the Kwun Tong Sewage Pumping Station (KTSPS) and the ventilation shaft and administration building of the proposed Trunk Road T2 were no longer required, there was an opportunity to review the land uses of the Area to facilitate the development of the VTC campus. Taking into account the revised scheme submitted by VTC, the same area of POS (i.e. 5.2 ha) as in the previous approved OZP could be maintained, including a waterfront promenade (a length of 660 m and a width of 50 m) with the southern part widened, a permanent soccer pitch to replace the existing temporary one with a larger site area and enhanced facilities, and 1 ha of POS to be constructed by VTC and handed back to the Government for management and maintenance under the New Scheme. There was no change in planning intention to develop a sizable open space in the CKL waterfront area;

- (b) the proposed landscaped deck above STP would be open to public with linkages to the POS on ground level;
- (c) Laguna Park was managed by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department and was open to the public round-the-clock. It was a DOS same as the proposed CKL Park; and
- (d) according to Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, DOS had a larger site area for the provision of active and passive recreation to serve a wider district population while LOS was relatively smaller for the provision of passive recreation for local residents close to home. A number of DOS and LOS in the Kwun Tong District were shown in the PowerPoint slide. Taking into account both existing and planned open spaces, there would be surplus of open space provision in Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong, Lei Yue Mun (K15) and Kai Tak (K22) planning scheme areas, as well as Kwun Tong District Council (DC) area. The planned open spaces would be provided by relevant government department according to resources availability and implementation priority.

28. A Member asked the usage rate of Laguna Park and whether the visitors were mainly residents of Laguna City. In response, Mr Cheung Yick Wang, Edwin (Representers' and Commenter's representative) said that Laguna Park was developed by Cheung Kong Property Holdings Limited and handed back to the Government afterwards. As the park was undergoing refurbishment works such as repaving floor brick, there were not many visitors from the CKL area at the moment. Although he did not have figures on usage rate at hand, it was noted that workers in Kwun Tong Business Area would visit the park at lunch time, and local residents would take it as a passageway to the medical facilities to its north-east, and Wai Yip Street/Kwun Tong Pier to its south-west. As Laguna Park was already in existence at the time of the planning of CKL Park, it should have been included in the open space provision figures. Mr Lam Yue Shek, Edmund (Representers' representative) pointed out that the waterfront area was originally reserved for CKL Park as a DOS along the Harbour to cater for the needs of the whole Kwun Tong area, not only the area around Laguna

City. Mr Jacky Yau (Representers' representative) supplemented that in estimating the usage rate of CKL Park, it would be more appropriate to make reference to that of the waterfront promenade near Kwun Tong Pier, which was very popular at weekends and weekdays' evening with many visitors coming from a wide area.

29. Noting the representers' accusation that the Government had breached the promise of providing a CKL Park, a Member asked what the local residents' expectation on the CKL Park was. In response, Mr Cheung Yick Wang, Edwin said that according to his understanding, CKL Park was originally planned in the area zoned "O" (about 23,020 m²) to the east of the "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Petrol Filling Station" ("OU(PFS)") zone under the approved Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/4. Although CKL Park was connected with the waterfront promenade, it did not form part of the promenade, or vice versa. CKL Park was a DOS while the waterfront promenade was a regional open space with the aim to link up the whole harbourfront area in Hong Kong. The current proposal under the draft OZP was not satisfactory as the open spaces were fragmented and the soccer pitch was segregated from the waterfront by the "OU(PFS)" zone. The Government should keep its promise and pursue a better planning at the waterfront area by providing a CKL Park with the same area.

30. Ms Mary Mulvihill (Representer's representative) added that the local residents' expectation was a big and integrated POS. However, the Government was playing with the concepts/figures by including the waterfront promenade in calculating the total amount of 5.2ha of POS in the Area. Besides, Items W5 and W7, with significant area forming part of the planned waterfront promenade, should not be considered as part of the CKL Park. Dividing a large and integrated POS into small pieces segregated by LPG filling station and road was not satisfactory. The Board should look at what was good for Hong Kong.

31. Mr Jacky Yau supplemented that being a civil engineer, he was familiar with the works to be carried out in the Area. It was a reasonable expectation that if the tunnel ventilation shaft and administration building for Trunk Road T2 was no longer required, the land would be used for POS instead of another bulky building at the waterfront area. Although the proposed BH of the VTC campus was 70 mPD, the actual height would be much higher taken into account the electrical and mechanical facilities at the roof-top, which would totally block the sea views of Laguna City (about 80 mPD). While the property value of Laguna City would be adversely affected, no compensation would be given to the property

owners.

32. The Chairperson asked the representers how changes in the layout of the POS, while keeping the overall site area of the POS unchanged, would affect the vibrancy and diversity of the waterfront park. In response, Mr Lam Yue Shek, Edmund said that normally a park should have a certain size to have different facilities put together to perform the park's function and a promenade could not be considered as a park. In the original plan, the proposed waterfront park was linked with the proposed waterfront promenade in CKL as well as the Kwun Tong waterfront promenade and pier to its north-west. However, the waterfront park was fragmented under the current proposal, just like a flat with living room, bedroom and kitchen being put in different locations in separate building blocks. Mr Cheung Yick Wang, Edwin supplemented that the most important element of a waterfront park was its frontage on Victoria Harbour. The original CKL Park was linked with the waterfront promenade with a wider area facing Victoria Harbour while the 1ha POS to be provided by VTC had a harbour frontage of only 63m. The location of the soccer pitch was not satisfactory as its sea view was blocked by the LPG filling station. A better layout should be adopted for the waterfront park to prevent fragmentation.

33. In response to the Chairperson's question on the views of the Task Force as set out in an attachment to the TPB paper, Ms Mary Mulvihill said that according to her understanding, the Task Force did not support the rezoning proposal for the proposed VTC campus. The public had not been provided with adequate information on open space provision, such as break down figures on size and uses/status of the existing and planned open spaces to facilitate an informed discussion. The current proposal would only result in fragmented open spaces separated by roads and surrounded by taxis with possible hygiene problems, which was not up to the expectation of the general public.

34. In response to the Chairperson's question, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that more detailed information on the open space provision in the Kwun Tong District could be compiled and provided for the consideration of the Board at the subsequent meetings.

Traffic Issues

35. The Chairperson and a Member asked whether the traffic impact assessment (TIA) conducted by VTC had taken into account the existing shuttle bus services in the area.

In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, said that the TIA conducted by VTC included a traffic survey which had taken into account all of the existing modes of road transport including the shuttle bus services. As the existing shuttle bus services mainly served the residential and business areas in Kwun Tong, their routes and peak hours might not overlap with those proposed by VTC. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Miss Wendy W.T. Tang, E/KT1, TD, said that VTC's mode of operation was akin to a post-secondary education institution and the arrival/departure pattern of its students/staff would not be concentrated during morning/evening peak hours. According to the TIA report of VTC's New Scheme, direct shuttle bus services between VTC campus and MTR Yau Tong Station via CKL Road waterfront section would be provided. The picking-up/dropping-off point at Yau Tong Station would be provided at an existing lay-by with sufficient capacity to accommodate passenger queueing area. A picking-up/dropping-off point would also be provided within VTC campus to minimize traffic impacts on CKL Road. Traffic survey conducted for the TIA report to assess the existing traffic condition had already taken into account the existing shuttle bus services at CKL Road waterfront section.

36. In response to a Member's enquiry on the reason for the LPG filling station to be located to the south of the soccer pitch near the waterfront promenade, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that if the location of the LPG filling station was swapped with the soccer pitch, it might not be able to meet the requirement for a separation distance of 55m from the high-rise residential developments. Besides, as the LPG filling station was very popular, more manourvering spaces were required for the queuing of the taxis to prevent tailback in the main road. Taking into account the operational requirements, no other site could be made available in the nearby area to serve as a suitable alternative for the relocation of the LPG filling station. The proposed location would provide sufficient separation distance and minimize potential adverse traffic impacts.

Needs of VTC Campus

37. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the accommodation requirements raised by VTC were reasonable and had been vetted by relevant government department;

- (b) whether the option of in-situ redevelopment of the two existing VTC campuses in Cheung Sha Wan and Kwun Tong had been explored;
- (c) the future use of the above two existing VTC campus sites; and
- (d) the courses offered by VTC and whether those courses were to cater for the needs of the local students.

38. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, made the following main points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) 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)). With the new campus, VTC would be able to improve the facilities and re-organize the courses to meet the needs of the students, thus enhancing the synergy effect to provide high-quality education. The requirements of VTC, i.e. a 3 to 5 ha site in the urban area for the accommodation of about 180,000 m² GFA, was supported by EDB;
- (b) the site area of the two existing VTC campuses in Cheung Sha Wan and Kwun Tong were about 1 ha and 1.2 ha respectively, which fell short of the requirement of VTC. Besides, a temporary re-provisioning site would be required to ensure the continuous operation of the schools even if the in-situ redevelopment option was considered adequate; and
- (c) the two existing VTC campus sites were zoned "G/IC". Should the re-provisioning of the VTC campuses to the CKL site be confirmed, those existing sites would be vacated in around 2026-27 and their future uses would be reviewed in due course.

39. In response, Miss Elaine T.L. MAK, PAS (Further Education), EDB, made the following main points:

- (a) EDB considered that the accommodation requirements raised by VTC, which were commensurate with other post-secondary education institutions, were reasonable to provide a good study environment and enhance the vocational and professional education and training to the students. The new campus was designed for about 6,000 full-time students, which was similar to the existing number of students in the two existing campuses; and
- (b) the new VTC campus would continue to provide government subvented full-time higher diploma/diploma courses including those originally offered by the two existing campuses in Cheung Sha Wan and Kwun Tong, covering areas such as design, applied science, business administration, engineering, hotel, tourism and information technology. According to the Government's policy, VTC's role in delivering the subvented programmes was to provide training to local students.

Design of VTC Campus

40. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) the height of the footbridge between the two blocks of the proposed VTC campus; and
- (b) how the development bulk for the proposed VTC campus would compare to that for a number of existing developments mentioned by the representers.

41. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, made the following main points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) there was only one footbridge between Blocks 1 and 2 under VTC's New Scheme. The footbridge would be provided at height about seven to eight storeys above ground as demonstrated in the

photomontage; and

- (b) it was more appropriate to compare the proposed VTC Campus with government, institution or community (GIC) uses as the design requirements for commercial uses were different from those for GIC uses. Reference on development bulk could be made to the Hong Kong Children's Hospital near Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter, which had a site area of about 2.16 ha, a GFA of about 120,000 m² (PR of 5.5) and a BH of about 60 mPD. Although Hong Kong Children's Hospital had a smaller site area than the VTC site, its development scale/bulk in terms of site area and building mass/height was generally in proportion to the proposed VTC campus.

42. In response, Mr Lam Yue Shek, Edmund (Representers' representative) clarified that a comparison was made to Science Park with the aim to demonstrate the visual effect of putting the proposed VTC campus on Science Park. There was no intention to say that the proposed VTC campus was larger than the Science Park.

Public Consultation

43. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) views of relevant DCs on the proposed amendments to the OZP; and
- (b) the factors for consideration regarding whether a waterfront site was suitable for VTC's development noting the local objections.

44. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, made the following main points:

- (a) two stages of public consultation had been conducted for the proposed amendments to the OZP. On 24.10.2016, after consideration of the proposals of the Review, the Board agreed to proceed with consultation with the concerned DCs. The Kwun Tong, Wong Tai Sin and Kowloon City DCs were consulted between November and December

2016. The views collected together with the proposed OZP amendments were considered by the Board on 20.1.2017. After the exhibition of the draft OZP for public inspection on 17.2.2017, the three DCs were consulted again between March and April 2017. At the Kwun Tong DC meeting held on 2.3.2017, 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. Kwun Tong DC also passed an extempore motion to object to the rezoning of the “O” zone at Wai Yip Street/CKL Road to “G/IC”. On 7.9.2017, Kwun Tong DC passed a motion to request the Government to build the CKL Park and waterfront promenade; and

- (b) the statutory plan-making process under the Town Planning Ordinance had provided an opportunity to consult the community, and all of the comments received had been submitted to the Board to facilitate a thorough and informed discussion. In the current proposal, the major considerations included whether the proposed amendments would adversely affect the size and quality of the POS, and whether the proposed VTC campus would induce adverse traffic, visual, air ventilation and landscape impacts. To address the concerns, VTC had conducted a number of technical assessments to demonstrate that the proposed development would not induce insurmountable impacts on the surrounding environment, and relevant government departments had no adverse comments on those technical assessments. Taking into account all available information, PlanD was of the view that the proposed VTC campus would not adversely affect the POS provision nor cause adverse impacts on the surrounding environment. It would in fact facilitate an early implementation of part of the planned open spaces.

Alternative Sites

- 45. A Member asked if the following sites raised by the representers could be

considered as alternative sites for the proposed VTC campus:

- (a) the site under Item E which was rezoned from “G/IC” to “Commercial (8)” (“C(8)”); and
- (b) the site in Yau Ma Tei which was currently used as a temporary car park.

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

- (a) the site under Item E was previously earmarked for a joint-user government office building but the Government Property Agency advised that the site was no longer required and could be released for other purposes. Given the site was not required for other GIC uses and was close to the future Shatin-to-Central Link Kai Tak Station and the commercial cluster in Kai Tak City Centre, it was rezoned from “G/IC” to “C(8)” with a maximum PR of 8. The area for the site was only about 8,800 m², which fell short of VTC’s site area requirement of 3 to 5 ha; and
- (b) the site in Yau Ma Tei, which fell within areas zoned as “G/IC” and shown as ‘Road’, had a site area of about 2 ha which could not meet VTC’s site area requirement. Besides, as the western portal of the Central Kowloon Route (CKR) would pass through the site, there were site constraints for topside development.

47. Mr Jacky Yau (Representers’ representative) supplemented that although the western portal of the CKR had imposed constraints for topside development at the Yau Ma Tei site, it should be noted that no technical issue would be insurmountable from civil engineering point of view given the previous experiences.

Ex-Kaolin Mine Site

48. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the development proposals at the ex-Kaolin Mine Site; and
- (b) whether the TIA conducted by VTC had taken into account the new developments at the ex-Kaolin Mine Site.

49. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, made the following main points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) the ex-Kaolin Mine Site, which was located at an uphill area to the south-east of the Area, had been rezoned for residential and related uses after a planning review in 2014 for the provision of some 2,200 residential units to accommodate about 6,000 population. The proposed developments at the ex-Kaolin Mine Site were scheduled for completion by phases starting from 2021; and
- (b) the Civil Engineering and Development Department had committed to implement improvement works at four junctions in the vicinity before the first population intake of the ex-Kaolin Mine Site in around 2021. The TIA submitted by VTC had already taken into account the planned population and the junction improvement works in relation to the proposed developments at the ex-Kaolin Mine Site.

[Mr Stephen H.B. Yau left this session of the meeting during the Q & A session.]

50. 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.

51. This session of the meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.