

**Minutes of the 1158<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 20.4.2018 and 8.5.2018**

**Present**

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 David Y.T. Lui

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer (Kowloon)

Transport Department

Mr Lee Chi Shing

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment)

Environmental Protection Department

Mr Tony W.H. Cheung

Assistant Director (Regional 1), Lands Department

Mr Simon S.W. Wang

Director of Planning

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Deputy Director of Planning/District

Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Mr Franklin Yu

Note: The following members newly appointed to the Town Planning Board with effect from 1 April 2018 were not invited to this meeting as the hearing sessions took place before their appointment:

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung (20.4.2018)

Ms April K.Y. Kan (8.5.2018)

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Miss Anissa W.Y. Lai

1. The following Members and the Secretary were present in the session on 20.4.2018 (2:30 p.m.) :

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 David Y.T. Lui

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer (Kowloon)  
Transport Department  
Mr Lee Chi Shing

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

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment)  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr Tony W.H. Cheung

Assistant Director (Regional 1), Lands Department  
Mr Simon S.W. Wang

Director of Planning  
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

**Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 1**

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1158<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 6.12.2017, 7.12.2017, 11.12.2017, 14.12.2017, 3.1.2018, 4.1.2018, 10.1.2018 and 11.1.2018

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

2. The minutes of the 1158<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 6.12.2017, 7.12.2017, 11.12.2017, 14.12.2017, 3.1.2018, 4.1.2018, 10.1.2018 and 11.1.2018 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

[Closed Meeting (Deliberation)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K22/5  
(TPB Papers No. 10364 and 10365)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

**Deliberation Session**

3. The meeting noted that, other than the minutes of meeting, the video recording of the hearing sessions held on 6.12.2017, 7.12.2017, 11.12.2017, 14.12.2017, 3.1.2018, 4.1.2018, 10.1.2018 and 11.1.2018 was sent to Members on 15.12.2017, 8.1.2018 and 16.1.2018 respectively.

4. The Secretary said that Members' declaration of interests on the item, as shown on the visualizer, was reported in the minutes of hearing sessions of the meeting on 6.12.2017, 7.12.2017, 11.12.2017, 14.12.2017, 3.1.2018, 4.1.2018, 10.1.2018 and 11.1.2018 and had been updated accordingly. The declaration of interests on the item on each group was as follows :

Group 1

- Mr Raymond K.W. Lee  
(as Director of Planning)
- being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and Building Committee of Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA)
- Mr Martin W.C. Kwan  
(as Chief Engineer (Works),  
Home Affairs Department)
- being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of SPC and the Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA
- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu
- having current business dealings with CK Hutchison Holdings Limited (CKH), AECOM Asia Co. Limited (AECOM), Urbis Limited (Urbis) and Masterplan Limited and past business dealings with HKHA
- Dr C.H. Hau
- having current business dealings with HKHA and AECOM and being an employee of the University of Hong Kong (HKU)
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu
- having past business dealings with HKHA, CKH and Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Limited
- Mr K.K. Cheung  
Mr Alex T.H. Lai
- ] their firm having current business dealings with  
] CKH, Kerry Group (Kerry), HKHA and HKU,  
] and hiring Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis  
] from time to time
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho
- having current business dealings with HKHA and past business dealings with AECOM; and his company having current business dealings with Urbis and personally knowing Mr Paul Zimmerman

- Professor S.C. Wong  
(*Vice-chairperson*) - being the consultant of AECOM and an employee of HKU
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with HKHA, AECOM and Urbis
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his spouse being an employee of the Housing Department but not involved in planning work and ex-employee of Kerry
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung - being the Chairman of the Accounting Advisory Board of School of Business, HKU
- Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang ] being a member of the Royal Hong Kong Yacht  
Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo ] Club  
(*Secretary*) ]

5. Members noted that as the proposed public housing developments in the draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) were related to the housing sites in general rather than housing projects proposed by HKHA, a direct conflict of interest did not arise. The meeting agreed that the above Members who had declared having interests associated with HKHA could stay in the meeting. Members noted Messrs Ivan C.S. Fu, Alex T.H. Lai, Stephen L.H. Liu, Franklin Yu and Wilson Y. W. Fung had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. Members agreed that Professor S.C. Wong, Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon, Mr K.K. Cheung, Dr C.H. Hau, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho, Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang and Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo, the Secretary, could stay in the meeting as they had no direct involvement in the project or the representation.

#### Group 2

- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having current business dealings with the Vocational Training Council (VTC) and Ove Arup Partners HK Limited (Arup), and being a council member of Construction Industry Council (CIC)
- Mr Franklin Yu - being the Director of a firm having current business

dealings with VTC, a member of Construction Workers Registration Board (CWRB) of CIC, and having past business dealings with Arup

- Professor S.C. Wong  
(*Vice-chairperson*) - being an adjunct Professor of the Technological and Higher Education Institute (THEi) which was a member institute of VTC, but the appointment was honorary and courtesy in nature, a council member of CIC and convenor of the Objections Board of CIC, and having current business dealings with Arup
- Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with Arup and CIC, and hiring Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having current business dealings with Arup and CIC, and hiring Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time; having past teaching work in the member institute of VTC
- Miss Winnie W.M. Ng - an ex-Council member of VTC
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu ] having past teaching work in the member institute of  
Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon ] VTC  
Mr Martin W.C. Kwan ]
- Mr Wilson Y. W. Fung - being a former member of the Accountancy Training Board of VTC
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - being the Chairman of the Board of the Construction Innovation and Technology Application Centre of CIC, and personally knowing Mr Paul Zimmerman

- Mr H.W. Cheung - being the Chairman of the Zero Carbon Building of CIC and past executive director of CIC
- Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo - her spouse being a director of the P&T Architects and Engineers Ltd., which was consultant of VTC, but not involved in project  
(Secretary)

6. Members noted that Messrs Ivan C.S. Fu, Franklin Yu, Stephen L.H. Liu, Wilson Y.W. Fung and Alex T.H. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As Professor S.C. Wong, Mr K.K. Cheung and Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo, the Secretary, 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 Messrs H.W. Cheung, Martin W.C. Kwan, Thomas O.S. Ho, Miss Winnie W.M. Ng and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon were remote or indirect, Members also agreed that they could be allowed to stay in the meeting.

Further Information submitted by Representers/Commenter

7. The Secretary reported that subsequent to the last hearing session on 11.1.2018, the Secretariat of the Town Planning Board (the Board) received a letter which was submitted to the Board by a representer (R273), Mr Tang Wing Chun, Member of the Kwun Tong District Council on 18.4.2018 providing further information. A copy of the letter was tabled for Members' reference. As the further information was submitted after the statutory publication periods, it was submitted out-of-time and should be treated as not having been made under the provision of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). Members noted and agreed.

8. The Secretary reported that on 20.4.2018, during the petition just before the meeting, the Secretariat received another letter from the Estate Owners' Committees of Laguna City (Phases 1, 2 & 4 and Phase 3) (R274/C312) dated 28.2.2018 expressing their concerns in respect of Amendment Items W1 to W7 (i.e. items related to VTC). The same letter was received by the Secretariat on 28.2.2018 and had already been considered by the Board in the meeting held on 9.3.2018, during which the Board agreed that the letter submitted out-of-time should also be treated as not having been made under the provision of the Ordinance. Members noted.

## Deliberation

9. The Chairperson said that deliberation of the two groups of representations and comments would be conducted separately. Deliberation on Group 1's representations and comments would be conducted first.

10. To facilitate deliberation, the Secretary briefly recapitulated the background in respect of representations/comments on the draft Kai Tak OZP as follows:

- (a) the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/5 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Ordinance on 17.2.2017. The amendments mainly incorporated the latest development proposals for Kai Tak Development (KTD) which were recommended under the Review Study of KTD and the proposed site for VTC in Cha Kwo Ling (CKL); and
- (b) during the plan exhibition periods, a total of 12,154 valid representations and 1,428 comments were received;

### Group 1

**(TPB Paper No. 10364)**

**(R3 to R11, R12(Part), R13, R14(Part) to R39(Part), R40 to R270, R433(Part), R12084 to R12151, R12153 to R12158, C1 to C257, C258 (Part), C259, C260 (Part) to C262 (Part), C1427 and C1428)**

11. The meeting noted that Group 1 involved 342 representations and 264 comments, including a supportive representation (R3 (Part)), 329 adverse representations and 262 adverse comments (R3 (Part), R4 to R11, R12(part), R13, R14 (Part) to R39 (Part), R40 to R270, R433 (Part), R12084 to R12143, R12147, and C1 to C257, C258 (Part), C259, C260 (Part) to C262 (Part)), and 13 representations and 2 comments providing general views (R12144 to R12146, R12148 to R12151, R12153 to R12158, C1427 and C1428). The representations and comments in Group 1 were mainly related to the land use zonings of various sites in Kai Tak City Centre (Areas 1 and 2), South Apron (Area 3) and Runway Area (Area 4).

12. The Secretary then went through the major points made by the representers and commenters of Group 1 in their written and oral submissions, and the responses of relevant government departments, as recorded in the relevant TPB paper and the minutes of meeting.

### Supportive Representation

13. The meeting noted that a representer (R3(Part)) supported the rezoning of two sites (Items G1 and H4) to “Open Space” (“O”) for open space development and the provision of water sports facilities. The supportive grounds had been noted by relevant government departments.

### Adverse Representations and Comments

#### *General Issues*

#### Land Use Changes

14. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following main points on land use changes:

- (a) opposed the change in land use zoning in general;
- (b) the rezoning of “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) sites for other uses would affect the provision of community facilities as a whole; and
- (c) the rezoning proposals would result in an overall reduction of land zoned for “G/IC” and “O” which was not in line with the recommendation of “Hong Kong 2030+ : Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030” (HK 2030+) to increase community facilities and open space.

15. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) the amendments were made in response to the changing planning and social circumstances and would not undermine the original planning intention and major urban design concepts; and
- (b) there would still be adequate provision of open space and major community facilities in Kai Tak in general.

*Increase of Development Density and Building Height*

16. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following points :

- (a) the increase in development density and building height (BH) would create wall effect and urban heat island effect, which would have adverse impacts on the surrounding areas;
- (b) the BH would intrude the 20% building free zone for the ridgeline and deviate from the planning concept of the OZP. The developments would block the sea view and affect the development value;
- (c) there would be adverse environmental, air ventilation and visual impacts. The visual impact assessment (VIA) was inadequate as most strategic vantage points (VPs) were missing, new VPs were not taken into account and the photomontages were misleading; and
- (d) the increase in development intensity for the proposed developments would aggravate the traffic congestion problem in Kwun Tong. The findings of the traffic impact assessment (TIA) were not disclosed to the public. The capacity of the road network of the Runway Area could not cope with the traffic demand if the Environmentally Friendly Linkage System (EFLS) was not implemented.

17. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) the BHs would maintain the intended BH profile and were compatible with developments in the hinterland. It had already considered the impact on the ridgeline. The 20% building free zone of the ridgeline would not be infringed as viewed from the relevant VPs towards Lion Rock/Fei Ngo Shan ridgeline;
- (b) a total of 16 VPs were adopted in the VIA, which were considered sufficient for comprehensive visual assessment on the amendments. It was more important to protect the public views rather than views from private developments. The concerned government departments had no adverse comment on the proposed increase in development intensity;
- (c) technical assessments including air ventilation assessment (AVA), VIA and environmental review had been carried out for the KTD Review Study and it had been demonstrated that there would not be any adverse impacts, including traffic and air ventilation. Quantitative AVA would be required for individual sites during detailed design stage. If necessary, requirements for the submission of various technical assessment reports by the developer could be included at land disposal stage;
- (d) the environmental review concluded that the environmental impacts arising from the induced traffic would be insignificant; and
- (e) the TIA showed that the increase in development density would not cause significant traffic impacts. The traffic condition of Kowloon East would be greatly improved upon the completion of Route 6, including the Tseung Kwan O – Lam Tin Tunnel, Central Kowloon Route and Trunk Road T2. The TIA reports were available for public inspection upon request. Public engagement on EFLS had been carried out. A new dual two-lane Road D3 was proposed to improve the traffic of the

Runway Area and ferry service could be enhanced to alleviate the demand on road traffic.

Open Space and Community Facilities

18. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had said that there was insufficient provision of supporting infrastructure, open space and community facilities. The meeting noted that the relevant government departments had responded that the reduction in open space under the proposed amendments would be compensated by the proposed Heritage Park and new “O” zones, the provision of open space and major government, institution or community (GIC) facilities was generally sufficient, and the area of Metro Park would be around 20 ha after the proposed rezoning.

Housing Aspects

19. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following points :

- (a) the relaxation of plot ratio (PR) and BH restriction (BHR) would only contribute to more luxurious residential development and property speculation;
- (b) a balanced mix of public/private housing should be maintained by designating more sites for public housing and imposing sale/re-sale restrictions; and
- (c) to increase Home Ownership Scheme (HOS) sites and provide ‘first-time home buyers’ units.

20. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) the revised development intensity had already struck a balance between optimization of scarce urban land resources to meet the acute community

demand and compatibility with the overall development intensity;

- (b) two private housing sites under Item D2 had been converted for public housing development with about 6,000 flats. There would be a total supply of about 20,000 flats for public housing in KTD. The public/private housing mix of 40:60 was considered appropriate for KTD, which was a residential, commercial, tourism, sports and recreation hub;
- (c) public housing development should be located close to public facilities/transport services. The Runway Area was comparatively far away from major public transport facilities and thus considered not suitable for public housing development; and
- (d) the issue of sale/resale restrictions should be considered separately.

21. Regarding the above general issues raised by the representers and commenters, Members generally considered that the government's responses to the above-mentioned representations and comments were appropriate. The Chairperson said that the land use zoning of individual sites would be further considered when site specific views of representers and commenters were discussed later at the deliberation meeting.

#### *Kai Tak City Centre*

##### *Item D1 – rezoning of a site from “Residential (Group B)1” (“R(B)1”) to “R(B)6”*

22. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had suggested that the site at Item D1 should be designated for subsidized housing development. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had responded that four sites under Item D2 had already been rezoned from “R(B)1 to “R(B)4” for public housing development, and that the site under Item D1, forming a cluster with the adjacent sites for private commercial or residential developments, should more appropriately be retained for private housing development.

Item D2 – rezoning of sites from “R(B)1” to “R(B)4”

23. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following points on Item D2 :

- (a) opposed the sites for public housing;
- (b) the increase in development density would have adverse traffic and environmental impacts. There were inadequate public facilities/services to support the proposed development;
- (c) the proposed BH of 100mPD to 115mPD would cause wall effect and affect the air ventilation; and
- (d) the sites should be used for exhibition hall for technology and culture.

24. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) the sites under Item D2 were located close to railway stations and well served by public transport and retail/community facilities. According to the TIA, there would not be significant adverse traffic impact and the departments concerned had no adverse comment;
- (b) community facilities would be provided in the public housing development. The provision of major community facilities generally met the requirement of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG);
- (c) the BHR was generally compatible with those in the hinterland. Pedestrian streets were provided to facilitate air ventilation; and
- (d) ‘Exhibition Hall’ use was always permitted within the “Commercial” (“C”) zone. Moreover, a site zoned “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”)

annotated “Arts and Performance Related Uses” for such a use was located nearby.

Item E – rezoning of a site from “G/IC” to “C(8)”

25. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had said that the site under Item E should be retained as “G/IC” as there were adequate commercial sites. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had responded that the site was earmarked for government offices but it was no longer required. As there were sufficient “G/IC” sites in Kai Tak and the site was close to Kai Tak Station and the commercial cluster, it was rezoned to “C(8)” to strengthen the provision of quality commercial floorspace.

26. The Chairperson invited Members to express their views on the amendment items in Kai Tak City Centre raised by the representers and commenters.

27. In response to a Member’s question on the public/private housing mix, the Secretary said that the public/private housing mix for KTD on the OZP was about 40:60. However, the overall public/private housing mix for East Kowloon as a whole was about 60:40, which was in line with the current government policy. Another Member considered that those sites were suitable for residential development. Members generally considered that the residential zonings for the sites under Items D1 and D2 were appropriate, while noting that there were different views on whether public or private housing should be provided. Members generally considered that as these sites were considered suitable for residential use, the choice between public or private housing should be a matter for the Administration.

28. Regarding Item E, the Chairperson said and Members noted that although there were views that the site should be retained for development of GIC facilities, relevant government departments had no requirement for any GIC facilities at the site. Retaining the “G/IC” zone for that site would leave the site idling. However, rezoning it to “C(8)” would enhance the provision of commercial floorspace in Kwun Tong being part of Kowloon East which was being planned as the second core business centre in Hong Kong. A Member agreed that the site should be developed for commercial use in the interest of land use efficiency. There was demand for commercial and convention floorspace.

29. Members generally considered that the government's responses to the views raised by representers and commenters on the amendment items in Kai Tak City Centre were acceptable.

*South Apron*

*Item H1 – rezoning of a site from “G/IC” to “C(8)”*

30. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had said that rezoning the site (Item H1) for commercial use would attract additional traffic and aggravate the traffic congestion problem in the area.

31. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) the site was close to the Kowloon Bay Business Area. As there was no designated GIC use for the site, it was appropriate to rezone the site to meet the demand for quality commercial floorspace and to create greater synergy for the Core Business District 2 (CBD2); and
- (b) the TIA for KTD concluded that with the proposed junction improvement works and major strategic traffic infrastructure, there would not be significant adverse traffic impact. Elevated walkways would be provided to facilitate pedestrian movement between the business district and the waterfront.

*Item N1 – rezoning of a site from “C(2)” and “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) to “R(B)2”*

32. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following points :

- (a) the two adjacent industrial/godown sites with planning permission for residential use had not yet commenced and might be redeveloped for commercial use;

- (b) the rezoning should be deferred until redevelopment of the two adjacent godowns had commenced;
- (c) the site under Item N1 should be rezoned to “C” for commercial development with provision of application for residential use;
- (d) the domestic gross floor area (GFA) of the site should be reduced and redistributed to other residential sites; and
- (e) the southern portion of the site should be rezoned to “O” to form a more proper open space.

33. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) the amendment had already taken into consideration the development in the surrounding area. The rezoning of the site was intended to form a residential cluster with the two adjacent industrial/godown sites, for which planning permissions had been granted for residential development in 2012 and 2014;
- (b) the site was separated from the major commercial cluster of the South Apron;
- (c) there was no justification for the proposed transfer of domestic GFA to other residential sites; and
- (d) there was adequate open space in KTD and the site should be rezoned for residential development to maximize the development potential.

34. The Chairperson and some Members would like to be reminded of the following facts concerning the amendment items in South Apron :

- (a) whether the two planning permissions granted for the redevelopment of

the industrial building/godown were still valid;

- (b) with respect to the representer's proposal to rezone the southern portion of the site to "O", whether a waterfront promenade could still be provided if the site was zoned for residential development;
- (c) whether some representers had proposed to provide water sports facilities at the open space located to the south of the site;
- (d) any redevelopment proposal for the remaining site zoned "C(2)" at Cheung Yip Street;
- (e) noting that there was dangerous goods (DG) godown within the existing Kerry D.G. Warehouse site and that there was no redevelopment programme despite the planning approval granted, whether from planning point of view there would be any compatibility issue if a residential development was allowed near the DG godown; and
- (f) whether the future residential development at the site would affect the air ventilation of the Children's Hospital located to the northwest, as pointed out by some representers.

35. In response, Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, Director of Planning (D of Plan) and the Secretary made the following points :

- (a) the planning permissions for the redevelopment of the two industrial building/godown were still valid;
- (b) a waterfront promenade would be provided to connect the existing open space at the South Apron Corner irrespective of whether the site was developed for residential use. There was adequate open space provision in Kai Tak;
- (c) the request for the provision of water sports facilities was mainly related

to the waterfront area along Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC) to be discussed later;

- (d) there was no redevelopment proposal for the existing industrial building at the remaining “C(2)” site at Cheung Yip Street;
- (e) the existing DG godown would be relocated upon the redevelopment of Kerry D.G. Warehouse in accordance with the approved scheme covered by the relevant planning permission. The proposed rezoning of the Item N1 site to “R(B)2” taken into account the redevelopment of the Kerry D.G. Warehouse and the DG godown therein. Given that the Item N1 site would be used as a works area for the construction of Trunk Road T2, residential development at the site would not take place in the near future and the redevelopment of Kerry D.G. Warehouse would probably have commenced by then; and
- (f) the Children’s Hospital was located within a site zoned “G/IC” to the northwest of the Item N1 site. An AVA had been carried out under the KTD Review Study on the assumption that the Item N1 site would be developed for residential use. The AVA concluded that the air ventilation of the Children’s Hospital would not be affected as the prevailing wind in Hong Kong was mainly from the southwest. The subject site was not located within any identified wind corridor.

36. The Chairperson considered that the “R(B)2” zoning for the Item N1 site on the OZP reflected the long-term planning intention. The Government could schedule the land disposal of the site for implementation at an appropriate time taking into account the progress of the redevelopment of the DG godown.

37. After deliberation, Members generally considered that the government’s responses to the views raised by representers and commenters on the amendment items in South Apron were appropriate.

*Runway Area*

*Items O, P, Q, R, S and T – rezoning of sites to “R(B)” subzones, “C” subzones or “O”*

38. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following point :

- (a) with prime harbour view and good connectivity, more sites in the Runway Area should be reserved for commercial and tourism related uses;
- (b) opposed the relaxation of PR and BH;
- (c) the PRs of the residential sites were greater than those in the inland sites, which had deviated from the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines (HPPG);
- (d) the development density or PR should be reduced and the original BHR of 80mPD should be retained. The GFA from some “C” zones should be redistributed to the residential sites;
- (e) excessive tall buildings and monotonous built-form would have adverse visual impact and affect the property value of developments in the hinterland; and
- (f) it was likely that future developers would maximize the sea view with minimal building separations within sites. Residential sites should be re-arranged with greater building separation and variation in BH.

39. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) the zonings had been rationalized in the light of the “Kai Tak Fantasy” initiative to set up a tourism/entertainment hub at the runway, acute housing demand and public views. The development density had been

optimized to increase housing supply and provision of quality commercial floorspace;

- (b) sites away from the Tourism Node (TN) were rezoned to residential use while a site in close proximity was rezoned to “C”. The “C” sites would create synergy with the tourism cluster;
- (c) an undulating BH profile with building separation and BH variation was desirable. The revised BH profile was formulated with reference to the original planning concept, relevant design guidelines, and views collected at consultations. With low-rise blocks fronting the waterfront, a diversified building mass and an intimate scale of development for the pedestrian along the promenade could be created. The BH profile for the Runway Area was considered acceptable in visual terms and compatible with developments in other parts of KTD and the hinterland areas;
- (d) the development intensity was commensurate with the established planning theme and urban design concepts. On this aspect, consultation with the Harbourfront Commission and public engagement had been carried out. The average domestic PR were generally 6.5 in inland and 6 in the Runway Area, while those in the hinterland were mostly 7.5; and
- (e) non-building areas (NBA) was designated with the longest frontage to enhance visual permeability. The design concept of lower buildings near the waterfront could be incorporated in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP to provide guidance in drafting relevant lease conditions.

Items S, T, U1, U2, U3 and V1 – rezoning of sites to “C”, “R(B)” subzones, “G/IC” or ‘Road’/Pedestrian Precinct/Street

40. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following point :

- (a) the rezoning would reduce the area for the Metro Park. These sites should be rezoned to “O” to provide design flexibility for the Metro Park and allow the provision of water sports; and
- (b) the proposed pumping station should be provided underground.

41. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) the zoning would not have any material impact on the design of the Metro Park nor the waterfront promenade. The reduction in the area of the Metro Park would partly be compensated by the rezoning for the proposed Heritage Park in Kai Tak City Centre and other open space. There was about 98 ha of open space in KTD including 20 ha in the Metro Park, and such provision was considered adequate; and
- (b) some facilities of the pumping station had to be erected above ground for operational and maintenance needs.

42. In response to a Member’s question on the provision of walkways/ramp near Item U3 to connect the Metro Park to other parts of the Runway Area, Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, D of Plan said that a section of Road D3 would be decked over to provide pedestrian connection at a landscaped deck. Mr Lee Chi Shing, Chief Traffic Engineer (Kowloon), Transport Department (TD) added that part of the Item U3 was a cul-de-sac of Road L12D while the remaining part was a connecting road to the waterfront. Those roads had been included in the development plan gazetted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD).

43. The Vice-Chairperson noted that some representers had proposed to re-align Road D3 southward in order that more land could be provided at the waterfront for construction of a spectators’ stand for the water sports, but he doubted whether the proposed road re-alignment would be feasible. The Chairperson said that the proposed road re-alignment would dissect the Metro Park and the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) did not support such a re-alignment from open space management point of view.

While such a proposal would provide a wider waterfront for water sports, it might not be preferable for Metro Park users. In any case, the final alignment of Road D3 would be subject to gazetting under the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (Cap. 370) and whichever road scheme eventually authorised under that statutory process would deem to be approved on the OZP.

44. The Vice-Chairperson would like to be reminded whether the development intensity and the BH profile would have any implication on the 20% building free zone of the ridgeline. In response, the Secretary said that according to a photomontage extracted from the KTD Review Study, the 20% building free zone of the ridgeline would not be affected.

45. In response to the Chairperson's question on whether the development intensity for waterfront sites would be greater than that for sites in the hinterland, as claimed by some representers, the Secretary re-capitulated that the average domestic PR for the Runway Area was about 6, whereas those in the Kai Tak hinterland and Kowloon area was about 6.5 and 7.5 respectively.

46. The Chairperson considered that given the abundant provision of open space in KTD, rezoning part of the area under Items S, T, U1, U2, U3 and V1 to "O" for additional open space would not be necessary.

47. Taking into account all the views put before them, Members generally considered that the amendment items in the Runway Area were appropriate.

#### *Road D3 and Water Sports Facilities*

##### *Item V2 – rezoning of a section of Road D3 from 'Road' to "O(2)"*

48. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following point on provision of water sports facilities :

- (a) KTAC was suitable for water sports activities and a 'Water Arena' for related events could be created. A Water Sports Park with supporting land-based facilities should be provided;

- (b) the alignment of Road D3 should be shifted southward to allow better use of the Metro Park and the waterfront area;
- (c) the landscaped deck should be extended by re-arranging the accesses to the development sites along Road D3; and
- (d) the “O” zone fronting KTAC along Road D3 was only 20m wide, which did not meet the required width of 50m for water sports facilities, e.g. a spectators’ stand.

49. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) suitable sites for water sports facilities would be identified later, subject to confirmation on whether the KTAC water quality would reach the required standard;
- (b) water sports/water recreation use was always permitted within the “O” zone along the waterfront;
- (c) a study conducted by the Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO) was examining the possibility of providing a site for water sports activities in the Runway Area;
- (d) the current alignment of Road D3 had maximized the length of the landscaped deck to enhance connectivity and allowed more land in the northern portion. Further extension of the landscaped deck would require a revision to the road alignment and would delay the construction programme;
- (e) the alternative alignment as proposed by some representers would shorten the landscaped deck and affect the layout of the Metro Park. The proposed re-alignment was not supported by LCSD. The deck connecting the northern and southern portions of the Metro Park would

only be about 70m wide and less desirable for pedestrian movement. It was technically feasible to provide a spectators' stand on the deck of Road D3 under the original alignment;

- (f) the waterfront promenade would be constructed with Road D3. Modification works might be carried out at the designated location at a later stage.

Item H2 – rezoning of a site from “G/IC”, “O” and ‘Road’ to “C(1)”

50. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following point on Item H2 :

- (a) the rezoning would affect development of an International Water Sports Centre;
- (b) a commercial node in the waterfront location was not necessary;
- (c) existing “O” sites were too small and not contiguous for water sports facilities; and
- (d) the site should be rezoned back to “G/IC” or “O” for water sports facilities or rezoned to “C(9)” and required the future developer to provide a water sports centre.

51. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) the water quality at the KTAC had yet to reach the required standard for secondary contact. In the circumstances, the Board in considering the representations and comments in respect of the previous version of OZP, considered it premature to incorporate a water sports centre, but the ES was amended to make it clear that the opportunity to accommodate water sports/recreational activities could be explored;

- (b) water sports use was always permitted in “O” zone. EKEO was conducting studies and proposing to co-use the water body for both berthing and recreation, and exploring possibility of a water sports site; and
- (c) the 20m wide waterfront promenade and deck above Road D3 could provide supporting facilities for water sports.

52. The Chairperson said that in general, it was the Government’s intention to accommodate water sports/activities in KTAC and Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter (KTTS), although suitable location(s) for the provision of on-shore storage and supporting facilities was yet to be identified. The choice of suitable locations would be subject mainly to resolution of the water quality and the types of activities to be conducted.

53. In response to the Chairperson and a Member’s questions on whether water sports activities were permitted along the waterfront of the KTAC and the improvement measures to the water quality, Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, D of Plan made the following points :

- (a) ‘Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture’ was always permitted in “C” zone and ‘Water Sports/Water Recreation’ use was always permitted in “O” zone;
- (b) a three-pronged approach was adopted to improve the water quality at KTAC/KTTS, comprising (i) rectification of expedient connections and interception of polluted discharges from hinterland into KTAC/KTTS; (ii) localized maintenance dredging within KTAC and in-situ bio-remediation treatment of sediments at KTAC/KTTS; and (iii) to enhance the flushing effect by improving the water circulation at KTAC/KTTS; and
- (c) while it was noted that there had been progressive improvement to the water quality in KTTS which might allow secondary contact recreational use, the water quality in KTAC had yet to reach the required standard.

54. The Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson, and some Members had the following views on the concerns/views regarding Road D3 and water sports facilities raised by the representers and commenters :

- (a) as flexibility for providing water sports and recreational activities had been allowed in the OZP, whether water sports facilities would be provided along the KTAC would be an issue of implementation depending mainly on the availability of policy support for the granting of a specific site at there;
- (b) KTAC was considered suitable for water sports activities by the representers and commenters. The on-shore storage and supporting facilities should either be located at the north or south-eastern corners of KTAC. While both “O” sites under Item H4 and adjoining Item N1 could be considered, the area of the site under Item H4 might be too small for such purposes. As regards the “O” sites adjoining Item N1, there was concern that provision of water sports facilities there might impose constraints to any possible future expansion of the proposed Children’s Hospital nearby. It was also noted that the representers and commenters had proposed to rezone Item H2 to “C(9)” requiring the developer of the future commercial development to provide a water sports centre at the lower floors. However, other “O” and “C” sites along the promenade facing KTAC could also be considered, if found suitable;
- (c) in addition to water quality, transport facilities, supporting infrastructure, convenience should also be taken into account. In terms of location, sites at the north-western corner of KTAC would be better as it was next to the Kai Tak Sports Park, more accessible to the water and by spectators;
- (d) provided that the problem of water quality had been resolved, there should be adequate opportunities to reserve space, through the relevant land allocation or lease conditions, at sites or proposed developments in areas zoned “O” or proposed development zoned “C” along the KTAC;
- (e) to facilitate the development of water sports in Hong Kong, the concerned

government departments such as LCSD should be requested to positively consider the possibility of incorporating water sports facilities in designing sites zoned “O”. The Home Affairs Bureau (HAB), the policy bureau of sports activities, and Lands Department (LandsD), the land sale agent, should be requested to consider the possibility to include the provision of water sports facilities in the land sale conditions of the commercial site(s) under Item H2 as identified by the representers and commenters. In view of the provisions in the OZP, there was no need to amend the OZP to meet the concerned representations;

- (f) Item V2 involved a section of Road D3 adjoining the Metro Park for a proposed landscaped deck atop the submerged section of the road to provide better connectivity between the Metro Park and the waterfront promenade fronting KTAC. As shown on Plan H-11 of the TPB Paper No. 10364 regarding the design of Road D3, it was considered technically feasible to provide a spectators’ stand on top of the at-grade deck over the underpass section of the road. The provision of facilities could be considered at the detailed design stage by CEDD; and
- (g) while the development of water sports facilities in the runway area was supported, such facilities should serve members of the public and should not be exclusive facilities with restricted membership.

[Mr Stephen H.B. Yau and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho left the meeting at this point.]

55. Mr Simon S.W. Wang, Assistant Director (Regional 1), LandsD said that provided that policy clearance had been obtained and concerned premium/cost to be reimbursed to the purchaser had been ascertained, it was feasible to include the requirement of provision of water sports facilities in the land sale or land grant conditions of the sites along the KTAC.

56. Members generally considered that the major grounds of the representations and comments had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in the TPB Paper No.

10364 and the presentations and responses made by the government representatives at the meeting.

57. After further deliberation, the Board noted the supportive view of Representation No. R3 (Part) and general views of Representations No. R12144 to R12146, R12148 to R12151 and R12153 to R12158. The Board also, at this point and insofar as the representations under Group 1 were concerned, decided not to uphold the remaining view of Representation No. R3 (Part) and the views of Representations No. R4 to R11, R12 (Part), R13, R14 (Part) to R39 (Part), R40 to R270, R433 (Part), R12084 to R12143 and R12147.

[The meeting adjourned for a short break of 10 minutes.]

## **Group 2**

**(TPB Papers No. 10365)**

**(Representations No. R1, R2, R12 (Part), R14 (Part) to R39 (Part), R271 to R432, R433 (Part), R434 to R12083 and R12152 and Comments No. C258 (Part), C260 (Part) to C262 (Part) and C263 to C1426)**

58. The meeting noted that the representations and comments of Group 2 were related to Items W1 to W7 concerning the Cha Kwo Ling (CKL) Waterfront and mainly regarding the proposed campus development by the VTC. Group 2 involved 11,840 representations and 1,168 comments, including 2 and 46 supportive representations and comments respectively (R1 and R2, and C263 to C308), 11,838 and 1,121 adverse representations and comments respectively (R12 (Part), R14 (Part) to R39 (Part), R271 to R432, R433 (Part), R434 to R12083, R12152, C258 (Part), C260 (Part) to C262 (Part), and C263 to C308, and C310 to C1426), and a comment expressing no objection (C309).

59. The Secretary then went through the major points made by the representers and commenters of Group 2 in their written and oral submissions, and the responses of relevant government departments, as recorded in the relevant TPB paper and the minutes of meetings.

## **Supportive Representations and Comments**

60. The meeting noted that a representer (VTC) and some commenters (VTC and the

Chairperson of various boards of VTC, companies and individuals) supported the proposed amendments on the following grounds :

- (a) the amendments provided a clear planning intention and certainty for the proposed VTC campus that met with its requirements on adequate size, suitable location, and early site availability. This would provide conducive environment for vocational training;
- (b) the amendments provided appropriate zoning control on the development scale to be compatible with the harbourfront setting and surrounding environment;
- (c) the proposed VTC campus would serve the societal need and could relieve the congestion problem in existing VTC facilities;
- (d) a revised scheme was submitted with reduced development intensity and provision of public open space (POS) in response to local concerns. The assessments had confirmed that the VTC campus would not have significant adverse impacts on the surrounding areas; and
- (e) shuttle bus services and adequate on-site transport facilities would be provided to alleviate public concern on traffic impact.

61. The supportive grounds had been noted by relevant government departments.

#### Adverse Representations and Comments

##### *Need of New VTC Campus*

62. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following points on the need of a new VTC Campus :

- (a) the existing facilities of VTC were adequate and the utilisation rate of some campuses were low and there were insufficient students, hence there was no immediate need to re-provision the existing campuses;

- (b) according to the Census projections, there would be a decrease of school leavers in the years 2023 to 2025;
- (c) VTC should consider in-situ redevelopment of its existing campuses; and
- (d) VTC, as the project proponent, stated that the two existing campuses were overcrowded and aged, a new modernised campus was necessary. Given the long lead time in planning, design and construction, there was a need to identify a readily available site to enable early implementation of the campus. The utilisation rate varied with campus and in different periods of the year. The evening school of the Morrison Hill campus was always full and usage of some classrooms and workshops in day schools was over 95%.

63. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) the proposed VTC campus was to re-provision the two existing campuses in Cheung Sha Wan and Kwun Tong (the Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education (IVE) (Haking Wong) and IVE (Kwun Tong)). With a site area of 1 ha and 1.2 ha respectively, the two campuses fell short of the site area requirement of 3 to 5 ha; and
- (b) according to the Education Bureau (EDB), there was an overall drop in student intake of tertiary educational institutions in 2016-17, but it was expected to increase after 2023 and there was a need for the re-provision. Policy support to the proposed VTC campus had been rendered.

#### *Site Requirement*

64. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following points on site requirements of the proposed VTC Campus :

- (a) in light of the extensive public transport network, an urban location for

the new VTC campus was not justified. Noting that about 53% of young people living in the New Territories, the geographical distribution of students should be taken into account;

- (b) the site area requirement of 3 to 5 ha was not valid. Smaller sites in urban area could be identified if adopting a higher building height;
- (c) the required GFA of the proposed campus should be 144,000m<sup>2</sup> instead of the proposed 180,000m<sup>2</sup>;
- (d) the requirement for a readily available site was questionable if the project time-frame would be 10 years;
- (e) VTC had responded that :
  - (i) more than 50% of the students of the two existing campuses lived in Kowloon, a suitable location in Kowloon for the new campus would reduce travel time and cost;
  - (ii) the development intensity of VTC institutes was generally about a PR of 5 and the current proposed PR from 4.3 to 5.5 for the campus development was in line with the overall intensity of VTC developments. Though the PR of the new campus was about 5.6 after excluding the POS area, the overall GFA had actually been reduced in VTC's revised scheme;
  - (iii) the average net operation floor area (NOFA) per student of the existing IVE campuses was 6.6m<sup>2</sup>. The designed NOFA per student of the new campus was 15m<sup>2</sup>. It was targeted to raise the average overall NOFA per student for all campuses to 10 to 12m<sup>2</sup> in the long run;
  - (iv) due to the high mobility of VTC students to various classrooms/facilities, changing development in technical education, and increasing requirement of workshop and outreach

facilities, a horizontal design would be more suitable than vertical high-rise campus building; and

- (v) given the long lead time in planning, design and construction, a readily available site was needed to enable early implementation.

65. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) according to VTC's site requirements, i.e. a site area of 3 to 5 ha, in urban area and readily available, the site was currently the only suitable and available site identified;
- (b) the new campus was to re-provision two existing VTC campuses in Kowloon. The proposed location in East Kowloon was appropriate and there were existing VTC campuses in the New Territories; and
- (c) EDB considered that VTC's accommodation requirements commensurate with other post-secondary education institutions and was reasonable. The proposed floor area per student for the new VTC development was on par with the provision of other institutions.

#### *Selection of Site*

66. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following points on the selection of site for the new VTC campus :

- (a) vocational training could not override public and social needs for harbourfront open space. VTC had no operational need nor sufficient justification for a harbourfront campus;
- (b) the school sites at the ex-Kaolin Mine had been rezoned for residential use, it was not reasonable to rezone a waterfront area for the proposed VTC campus;

- (c) the proposed VTC campus was incompatible with surrounding land uses such as residential developments and waterfront setting;
- (d) there were many alternative sites such as vacant government/school sites, industrial sites, open space, sites in Kai Tak, sites zoned “Green Belt” and “Village Type Development”, and the CKL Tsuen. Redevelopment of existing VTC campuses should also be considered. There was no detailed explanation on why those suggested alternative sites could not be used for the proposed VTC campus; and
- (e) VTC stated that there was a strong societal demand for vocational training. While VTC had not requested specifically a waterfront location, the site was conveniently located and could offer much needed training opportunities. A modern campus with quality learning facilities would provide a good study environment and would enhance synergy and provide state-of-the-art facilities which were pivotal to enhancing the professional image and high-quality education. A horizontal building design not exceeding 12-13 storeys was considered suitable.

67. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) the site was appropriate in terms of site area, location and availability. The two existing campuses were aged and outdated with inadequate space, a new modernised campuses was required. Timely development of a new campus with sufficient size in the urban area was needed to support the continued development of VTC;
- (b) locating the VTC campus at harbourfront would promote vibrancy and diversity of uses in the area, cater for social needs, and support the transformation of East Kowloon;
- (c) the ex-Kaolin Mine site had already been rezoned for residential and related uses after a planning review in 2014 for the provision of 2,200

residential units for completion starting from 2021;

- (d) the proposed VTC campus was an educational use which was not incompatible with the surrounding residential developments and the waterfront setting. Appropriate building and landscape design were proposed to ensure integration with the surrounding; and
- (e) for the various alternative sites suggested by representers/commenters, most of them could not meet the site selection requirements in terms of size and location, or were committed for other uses.

*Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines (HPPG)*

68. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following points relating to harbour planning:

- (a) the proposed VTC campus was not in line with HPPG in which harbourfront buildings should be of small footprint to provide a human scale environment and allowing visual permeability, the harbourfront areas should maximise opportunities for public enjoyment and adopting a BH profile descending towards the harbour;
- (b) the Urban Design Guidelines of HKPSG stated that waterfront sites should be for cultural, tourism-related, recreational and retail activities;
- (c) the proposed VTC campus in the CKL harbourfront was not in line with the development theme of KTD; and
- (d) the proposed VTC campus violated the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO) and failed to meet the overriding public need test.

69. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) the HPPG did not prohibit buildings on the waterfront. Land uses which would cater for the economic, social and environmental needs and were compatible with the harbourfront environment should be encouraged to achieve a balanced mix of land uses;
- (b) a total of 5.2 ha of land was maintained for open space and harbourfront promenade uses for public enjoyment. The VTC project would facilitate early implementation of part of the open space and public passageway would be reserved to facilitate accessibility to the waterfront;
- (c) the VTC campus could provide diversity of uses and enhance vibrancy at the harbourfront. With appropriate building design, the development would not be incompatible with the surrounding uses, waterfront setting and development themes of Kai Tak; and
- (d) the VTC campus would not involve reclamation, the PHO was not applicable.

### *Technical Issues*

#### Traffic and pedestrian flow

70. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following points on traffic and pedestrian flow:

#### *General*

- (a) additional student/staff and the training hotel of the VTC campus would generate adverse impacts on traffic condition, road network, public transport and pedestrian facilities. Together with the future residential/commercial developments in Kwun Tong, the cumulative impact would worsen the current overloaded transport system;
- (b) the TIA was not acceptable, the traffic flow and public transport demand

were incomprehensive and incorrect, some committed/planned developments had not been considered, road junctions were not adequately covered, the proposed mitigation measures were not adequate, inappropriate references to other VTC campus were made, and the cumulative traffic impact had been downplayed;

- (c) VTC stated that the campus would be akin to a post-secondary education institution, the travelling pattern would not be concentrated during peak hours. The trip rates adopted were based on the survey at the existing Tsing Yi campus which had similar class structure and course programme with the proposed VTC campus;

#### *MTR Services*

- (d) the MTR Lam Tin Station was the major railway station providing pedestrian access to the VTC campus. The station was overcrowded and the existing traffic and illegal parking near the station had caused traffic congestion and affected the pedestrian safety. The road network, pedestrian facilities and transport infrastructure in the area should be reviewed, and instead of Lam Tin Station, the MTR Yau Tong Station or water routes should be made use to divert traffic;
- (e) the MTR Yau Tong Station was a very busy interchange station and would not be able to cater for the additional passengers and shuttle bus services. The Kwun Tong Line was operating at full capacity and could not cope with the demand generated from the proposed VTC campus and ex-Kaolin Mine development;

#### *Road Traffic*

- (f) all the roads in Kwun Tong had been operating in excess of their capacity. There were insufficient mini-bus service and car parking spaces, and terminating the existing temporary car park at Wai Lok Street would cause illegal parking. The 150 and 200 carpark spaces

proposed at the VTC campus and ex-Kaolin Mine site respectively would generate adverse traffic impact;

*Pedestrian Facilities*

- (g) the VTC campus would increase the pedestrian flow causing severe congestion and conflict. The impact on the carrying capacity of the passenger lifts connecting Laguna City and MTR Lam Tin Station had been under-estimated and they could not cater for the additional flow. There would be no alternative route if the lifts were malfunction;
- (h) the footpaths of CKL Road at Laguna City were too narrow to serve as a pedestrian link between the VTC campus and the MTR Lam Tin Station, the addition VTC students would overstrain the already congested pedestrian route;
- (i) it was unfair for the residents of Laguna City to bear the additional maintenance cost of the lifts connecting MTR Lam Tin Station. The additional pedestrian flow would cause security issues;
- (j) VTC had responded that :
  - (i) the number of student/staff were reduced from 8,500 to 6,800 and about 20% of student/staff would arrive during morning peak and more than half would take shuttle bus. The walking trips would be minimal and distributed among various routes to the three nearby MTR stations. The shuttle bus services to divert students/staff to MTR Yau Tong Station would help minimise additional pedestrian using the lifts and public passageway; and
  - (ii) students/staff of VTC would only travel along the public areas in Laguna City.

*Proposed Shuttle Bus*

- (k) the proposed shuttle bus services running through the CKL Road would worsen traffic congestion;
- (l) given the existing congestion problem, the proposed shuttle bus service would unlikely be welcomed by students and staff;
- (m) the proposed shuttle bus pick-up/drop-off point at MTR Yau Tong Station was blocked by illegal parking all the times, police enforcement could not be taken as a kind of solution; and
- (n) VTC stated that the problems of loading/unloading near MTR Yau Tong Station was due to illegal parking of construction vehicles rather than limitation in road capacity for traffic flow. It could be resolved through traffic management measures. Upon completion of the major developments in the area, illegal parking of construction vehicles would ease;

71. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

*General*

- (a) the TIA concluded that the proposed development would not impose significant traffic impact. VTC campus was akin to a post-secondary education institution, the travelling pattern would not be concentrated during peak hours. TD had no adverse comments on the TIA;
- (b) according to TD, all large-scale planned developments had been taken into account in the traffic model of the TIA. CEDD had committed to implement junction improvement works in the vicinity and with those improvement measures, the critical junctions would operate satisfactorily;

- (c) factors including road network, land uses and development, the estimated times of arrival and departure, and routing had been taken into account in the TIA;

#### *MTR Services*

- (d) the MTR Yau Tong Station had sufficient capacity to cater for shuttle bus services and accommodate additional pedestrian flow;
- (e) the MTR Corporation Limited would adopt management measures in passenger distribution on individual railway lines and at concerned stations;

#### *Road Traffic*

- (f) the Government would implement Route 6 comprising the Tseung Kwan O – Lam Tin Tunnel, the Central Kowloon Route and the Trunk Road T2 which would substantially divert traffic from the road networks and thus would effectively alleviate traffic congestion in Kowloon East. There would be associated improvements in the traffic network and at major road junctions in Kwun Tong;
- (g) VTC would provide 150 ancillary parking spaces. The Government would adopt measures to increase the supply of public car parking spaces where feasible or when opportunity arose;

#### *Pedestrian Facilities*

- (h) there were existing at-grade pedestrian footpath to connect the proposed VTC campus and MTR Lam Tin Station without using the lifts or passing through the private area of Laguna City. Pedestrians could also use the alternative route along Sin Fat Road if the lifts were malfunction;
- (i) to enhance the connectivity and accessibility of the waterfront, detailed pedestrian connections would be worked out in consultation with TD and

relevant stakeholders at the implementation stage;

*Proposed Shuttle Bus*

- (j) the TIA had taken into account all the existing modes of road transport including the proposed shuttle bus services; and
- (k) a pick-up/drop-off point would be provided at an existing lay-by of 150m long at the MTR Yau Tong Station with sufficient capacity to accommodate additional pedestrian flow.

*Environmental and Landscape Impacts*

72. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following points on environmental and landscape impacts:

- (a) the Environmental Assessment (EA) submitted by VTC was questionable as the proposed mitigation measures for the air conditioning equipment on VTC roof might induce adverse impact and conflict between local residents and VTC;
- (b) the proposed VTC campus and additional vehicles would worsen the air and noise pollution;
- (c) noise barriers should be installed along CKL Road between Yau Tong and Kwun Tong;
- (d) construction works would cause chaos, inconvenience and health issues, and removal of mature trees; and
- (e) VTC stated that according to the preliminary tree survey conducted, there was no Old and Valuable Tree in the site. VTC would seek prior approval in accordance with the prevailing requirements should there be a need to remove any trees, and provide compensatory planting as appropriate.

73. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) had no adverse comment on the EA. The VTC campus was not a noise pollution source and would not induce significant traffic noise and air pollution at CKL Road. The development would be setback from Wai Yip Street and CKL Road. The EA indicated that adverse noise impact was not anticipated with the implementation of noise mitigation measures; and
- (b) the air quality and noise impacts from construction were under control of relevant pollution control ordinances and guidelines. With the implementation of suitable mitigation measures, unacceptable short-term environmental impacts during construction were not anticipated.

#### *Visual Impact*

74. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following points on visual impact :

- (a) the VTC campus, even with the reduction in building blocks from three to two, was massive and the proposed building bulk and BH were unacceptable and would have adverse visual impact;
- (b) the VIA had not considered impact on residents of Laguna City as no viewpoint in Laguna City was proposed; and
- (c) alternative building design with taller and slimmer buildings should be considered with a view to minimising the visual blockage to the waterfront.

75. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) to respect the waterfront setting, the VTC campus had adopted a stepped

BH profile of 60 to 70mPD to create visual interests and to ensure compatibility with the surrounding area. The revised scheme would enable a more responsive design to the surroundings as the quality of both physical and visual permeability would be enhanced;

- (b) according to the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 41 on submission of VIA for planning applications, a total of seven vantage points at publicly accessible locations were selected in the VIA to assess the possible visual impacts of the proposed VTC development. The selected points had covered Laguna Park and area in the middle of Laguna City. It was not practical to protect private views without giving due regard to making good use of land resources and balancing other relevant considerations; and
- (c) to address the visual concerns, the proposed VTC campus would be shifted towards the harbourfront area leaving a distance of about 100m from the nearest block of Laguna City and only one footbridge would be built to connect the two VTC buildings.

#### *Air Ventilation*

76. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following points on air ventilation:

- (a) the VTC campus would be taller than the private housing near Wing Fook Street and almost higher than the level of the ex-Kaolin Mine site, blocking sunlight and air ventilation. It would affect air ventilation and penetration of prevailing wind to hinterland, and health of the residents in Laguna City and CKL Tsuen;
- (b) according to the then Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau Technical Circular No. 1/2006 on Air Ventilation Assessments (AVA) (TC No. 1/2006), the AVA should compare different design options of the same scale and to identify the option with the least impact and potential

problem areas for design improvements. A comparison of air ventilation performance between the baseline scheme and revised scheme had not been conducted. The development intensity of the baseline scheme was inflated to give a better air ventilation performance of the revised scheme;

- (c) the conclusion of the AVA was invalid and not acceptable as some specific test points were wrongly located or omitted and the assessment was incomplete;
- (d) the revised scheme would create stagnant wind environment on the northern side of the VTC building and weak air movement at the promenade under the prevailing summer wind, with strong wind gust and turbulence at the proposed POS;
- (e) the AVA showed that vehicle emissions would either remain within the liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) filling station or be blown to the park areas;
- (f) VTC had responded that :
  - (i) for the revised scheme, its overall performance were comparable with the original scheme as well as the existing conditions under the annual wind condition, while slightly enhanced under the summer wind condition. Focus areas, including the open spaces and waterfront promenade, were designated to examine the ventilation performance of those areas;
  - (ii) to ensure good air ventilation performance, the disposition of buildings had taken into account the two existing major air paths. The passageway between the two towers had also been modelled in the AVA and the result showed that the wind-blocking effect of the passageway between the two towers would not be obvious; and

- (iii) the special test points of promenade were not included in the velocity ratios calculation, which was in line with TC No. 1/2006. As the waterfront promenade was subject to strong wind, including it in the velocity ratio assessments might average down the surrounding impacts and distort the result, but they would be used as additional information.

77. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) the AVA was conducted in accordance with the requirements under TC No. 1/2006. The comparison between the two schemes was acceptable as it could demonstrate the difference in air ventilation performance between the intended development and the revised development scheme. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (PlanD) had no adverse comment on the AVA;
- (b) various measures, including a building gap, were adopted to improve permeability and minimize the potential adverse air ventilation impact. The building bulk had been reduced and POS had been increased in the revised scheme; and
- (c) according to the findings of the AVA for the revised scheme, the overall performance of the two schemes on pedestrian wind environment was similar.

### *Community Facilities*

78. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had said that the users of VTC would overload the existing facilities and adversely affect the local residents as there were insufficient commercial/recreational/community facilities in East Kowloon to cater for the increased population. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had responded that sufficient ancillary facilities would be provided within the VTC campus

and major commercial facilities were available at the adjacent MTR Stations and the Kwun Tong Business Area.

### Open Space

#### *Provision of Open Space*

79. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following points on the provision of open space:

- (a) Kowloon had less harbourfront parks, there was an imbalance in provision in favour of Hong Kong Island. There was insufficient open space in Kwun Tong and a strong demand for harbourfront open space. The northern part of Kwun Tong had most existing open space, whereas the southern part covering CKL area had mainly planned open space;
- (b) according to the Hong Kong 2030+, the average open space per person in Kwun Tong was amongst the lowest in Hong Kong. It had recommended to increase the standard of open space by 25% from 2m<sup>2</sup> to 2.5m<sup>2</sup> per person, however, the current OZP amendments had reduced the provision of planned open space which was not acceptable; and
- (c) though there was a surplus in the planned open space, it could not accommodate the future population growth and VTC would unlikely allow public to use part of its campus.

80. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) sufficient land was reserved in relevant districts for open space in accordance with the requirements in HKPSG. Waterfront promenade and parks were planned on both sides of Victoria Harbour;
- (b) for Kwun Tong District which had a planned population of about

720,000, the existing and planned provisions of both district open space (DO) and local open space (LO), amounted to 137 ha and 96 ha respectively, were more than sufficient to meet the HKPSG requirements of about 72 ha each for DO and LO;

- (c) the Hong Kong 2030+ Study proposed to increase the open space provision standard to 2.5m<sup>2</sup> per person which had already been achieved in the planning of new development areas/major redevelopment projects. PlanD would continue to strive for achieving that target in the built-up areas wherever possible; and
- (d) there were 4.2 ha open space reserved at the CKL waterfront area. Together with the 1 ha of POS to be provided by VTC, the amount of POS provision of 5.2 ha at CKL waterfront would remain unchanged. Coupled with the existing Laguna Park, about 8.2 ha of POS would be provided.

### *CKL Park*

81. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following points regarding the CKL Park:

#### *Importance of CKL park*

- (a) the CKL Park with an area of 2.3 ha was planned in the previous OZPs, the current rezoning had ignored the need of residents for a park and would adversely affect the living environment, life quality, public health, and hosting the annual Tin Hau Festival;
- (b) open space was important to kids, the number of children between 0 to 5 years old in Kwun Tong was higher than the territorial average;
- (c) there were alternative sites for VTC, while waterfront location for CKL Park was irreplaceable.

*Implementation of open space*

- (d) although there was a number of planned open space in Kwun Tong, the slow implementation programme could hardly meet the new demand from the growing population;
- (e) the Government had threatened that the CKL Park would be left idle if the VTC campus project could not proceed; and
- (f) there was no guarantee that VTC would return the POS to the community and to be used as genuine POS for the enjoyment of the general public.

82. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

*Importance of CKL Park*

- (a) the current amendment to the CKL waterfront only changed the configuration of the open space and would not affect the overall provision of open space. Together with the 1 ha of POS to be provided by VTC, the amount of POS provision of 5.2 ha at CKL waterfront would remain unchanged;
- (b) there was scope for re-configuring and consolidating the various pieces of open space into more coherent layout of open space at the detailed design stage given that open space and road were uses always permitted in all zones on the OZP. Depending on the design, a wide variety of facilities could be provided along the CKL waterfront;

*Implementation of open space*

- (c) the implementation of planned open space was subject to resource availability and development programme; and

- (d) the rezoning provided an opportunity for early implementation of part of the open space by VTC (about 1.9 ha) including provision of a permanent soccer pitch with a larger site area and enhanced facilities. VTC had agreed to hand back the POS to government for management and maintenance upon completion.

*Design and Layout of Open Space*

83. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following points on design and layout of open space:

- (a) the massive VTC campus would reduce the quality of open space and privatize open space;
- (b) instead of a narrow promenade, an open space of sufficient depth was needed and a promenade could not replace the function of CKL Park as a recreation node. The CKL Park would be changed from a well-configured plot to a T-shape corridor park with poor layout and limited facilities which would reduce waterfront enjoyment and could not serve as a gathering node;
- (c) the proposed POS should be linked by the waterfront promenade and easily accessible;
- (d) it was doubtful whether the Board could control the design of the proposed VTC campus and the layout of POS once the zoning amendments were approved;
- (e) there was no justification to retain the LPG filling station in a prime waterfront location as it was incompatible with the waterfront setting and not conducive to public enjoyment of the waterfront facilities. The design and layout of the POS would be better if the LPG filling station was relocated upon the expiration of the lease and the site be rezoned to “O”; and

- (f) the larger LPG filling station would attract more vehicles and aggravate the existing queuing situation, worsen traffic congestion in CKL Road, causing environmental impact and health and safety concerns.

84. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) there was no development programme for the subject open space and the VTC campus project would facilitate early implementation for part of it. The VTC campus would include landscaped area and setback from the waterfront promenade and various design measures to integrate with the open space and waterfront environment and facilitate connection to adjacent developments;
- (b) most waterfront promenades on both side of the harbour were less than 50m in width, and the CKL waterfront promenade with a width of about 50m would be the widest one in the Kowloon area. Depending on the design, a wide variety of recreational facilities could be provided along the CKL waterfront;
- (c) the amendments would preserve the waterfront for public enjoyment; public passageway would be reserved to facilitate accessibility to the waterfront;
- (d) if required, appropriate design requirements could be stipulated in the ES and reflected in the land lease to ensure that VTC's commitments would be incorporated in the subsequent implementation of the development;
- (e) the Environment Bureau (ENB) and EPD had confirmed the need to retain the subject dedicated LPG filling station in CKL, and no other suitable location in the vicinity could be identified for reprovisioning of the LPG filling station. The proposed location was acceptable taking into account the relevant traffic and technical considerations. According to the Quantitative Risk Assessment conducted, the resultant risk levels were acceptable in accordance with the HKPSG. The closest

distance from the nearest residential block would be more than 140m;

- (f) the LPG filling station had moved northwards and internalised its queueing area to address residents' concern and to minimise the adverse traffic impact on Wai Yip Street. The proposed location was the optimal option to provide sufficient separation distance and minimise potential adverse impacts;
- (g) the proposed site for the LPG filling station would be larger than the existing one in order to provide a holding area for 45 taxis within the site, so as to minimise the need for queueing outside the site and improve the traffic condition; the number of dispensers would remain unchanged; and
- (h) currently there was no other suitable site identified for the LPG filling station, upon expiration of the lease in 2021, appropriate conditions requiring enhancement of the operation would be imposed.

#### Public Consultation and Procedure

85. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following points on public consultation and procedure:

- (a) there was a lack of public consultation and proper consultation should be undertaken in the plan formulation stage. The revised scheme, submitted as a comment which had not been published for public inspection, might involve procedural impropriety. The locals had not been consulted on the revised scheme nor prior to the OZP amendments;
- (b) the rezoning was procedurally unfair and unjust. There was no public consensus to develop Kai Tak into an education hub and the Government did not keep its promises of providing CKL Park;
- (c) the Board failed to make inquiry, take into account relevant considerations, and provide solution to the problems/issues;

- (d) Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC) objected twice to the proposed VTC campus in the CKL harbourfront. The views of DC were not duly respected;
- (e) only an informal briefing on the revised scheme with the Harbourfront Commission (HC) was given at a late stage and there was no record nor minutes for the briefing. The public had no chance to comment; and
- (f) VTC had stated that it was the dialogue with members of HC which led to the revised design. Representatives from VTC had been attending meeting with residents to listen to their views, and would maintain dialogue with the local residents. DCs would be consulted on the design of the POS and local views on the campus design and traffic arrangement would be considered.

86. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) the statutory and administrative procedures in public consultation had been duly followed;
- (b) taking into account public view, VTC had reduced the development scale and proposed to provide a POS under the revised scheme;
- (c) the views raised by HC, DCs and locals were relayed to the Board for consideration. In considering the OZP amendments, the Board had duly considered the views of stakeholders; and
- (d) the revised scheme was submitted by VTC as comment on representations and did not form part of the gazetted draft OZP.

### Representers' Proposals

87. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following proposals:

- (a) to rezone the VTC site to “O” for CKL Park to provide recreational facilities and to connect the promenade with Kai Tak and Lei Yue Mun;
- (b) to rezone part of the VTC site to “G/IC” for parking, refreshment kiosks and elderly facilities;
- (c) to rezone the Sewage Treatment Plant site to “O”;
- (d) to retain the original BH of the VTC site or reduce it to 10mPD for consistency with the surrounding waterfront land uses;
- (e) the VTC development should utilise underground space and provide public carpark at the basement;
- (f) to provide direct link between VTC campus and MTR Lam Tin Station by subway;
- (g) to develop a monorail system connecting Kai Tak Cruise Terminal, Kwun Tong, Lam Tin and Lei Yue Mun so as to alleviate traffic problems and enhance attractiveness; and
- (h) VTC stated that to enhance the connectivity and accessibility of the waterfront, detailed pedestrian connections would be worked out in consultation with TD and relevant stakeholders. A half-sunken basement design had been adopted, they could further consider the possibility at the detailed design stage. Suitable facilities such as lecture theatres would be placed at the basement level.

88. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) there was sufficient provision of open space in the district, the POS provision of 5.2 ha at CKL waterfront would remain the same;
- (b) the VTC would provide sufficient ancillary parking spaces, there was no

plan to develop public car park and facilities for the elderly in the CKL waterfront. TD would adopt various measures to increase the supply of public car parking spaces where feasible or when opportunity arose. The provision of refreshment kiosk was always permitted;

- (c) the sewage treatment plant site was zoned “Other Specified Uses” annotated ‘Sewage Treatment Plant with Landscaped Deck Above’ to provide land for the facility and was not an amendment item under the current draft OZP;
- (d) the original BH and the proposed 10mPD were considered inadequate to accommodate the required GFA of VTC campus and not optimising scarce land resources;
- (e) there were existing at-grade pedestrian accesses and footpaths to connect the VTC campus and MTR Lam Tin Station; and
- (f) CEDD was conducting a feasibility study on the provision of an EFLS for Kowloon East. The EFLS would enhance the connectivity between areas.

89. After going through the major grounds and issues, Members generally agreed that the major key consideration was related to whether GIC uses/buildings of a scale proposed for the VTC campus should be allowed at the concerned waterfront site. Whether the GIC use should be a new VTC campus and the rationale of VTC’s site requirements might not be the main considerations for the Board. The Chairperson then invited Members to express their views and suggested that the discussion could focus on the following aspects :

- (a) whether, as a matter of principle, it would be acceptable to accommodate a G/IC facility on the waterfront site;
- (b) whether there would be any insurmountable technical issues in respect of the specific GIC use being proposed for the site; and
- (c) whether the site configuration and layout design of the proposed VTC

campus and POS were acceptable.

*Accommodating a G/IC Facility at the Waterfront Location*

90. Noting that there were other “O” zones on the OZP, the provision of open space within the district was sufficient and to better utilize the limited land resources, some Members considered that the waterfront site could be used for developments, whether or not for the VTC campus was another matter, and reserving the entire site for a public open space was not necessary but a waste of public resources. Some Members considered that the development at the waterfront should respect the waterfront setting, ensure visual compatibility with the surrounding developments, promote air and visual permeability and facilitate pedestrian access to the waterfront. The Chairperson added that many development sites in the KTD, such as South Apron and Runway Area, were located much closer to the waterfront compared with the subject VTC site.

91. Some Members also considered that the proposed VTC development, which was a GIC use, in particular, an educational use for young people, was appropriate at the waterfront location as it would enhance the vibrancy and diversity of use. The Vice-Chairperson supplemented that most of the campuses of tertiary institutions were open to the general public, and the proposed VTC campus, if adopting an open campus design, could enhance the vibrancy of the waterfront. Some Members concurred with the Vice-Chairperson’s views and considered that if the site was developed for a new VTC campus, VTC should provide adequate open space with good accessibility and connectivity within its campus in keeping with the vision to connect people to the harbourfront.

92. Some Members had concerns on the location of the LPG filling station, which was considered not compatible with the waterfront setting and queried whether it could be relocated to other sites. Noting that the LPG filling station had already existed in the area and there was no other suitable site identified, the Vice-Chairperson questioned the possibility of relocating the LPG filling station. Another Member also suggested that the LPG filling station at the site was probably required to meet the need of the taxi industry. In response, the Chairperson said that, as confirmed by ENB, the LPG station was required in East Kowloon. As there was no replacement site, it might not be possible to relocate it to other

sites in short to medium term. However, opportunity could be taken to explore alternative sites in the long run.

93. Members generally considered that the CKL harbourfront site could accommodate the development of a G/IC facility and the proposed “G/IC” zoning was appropriate.

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung and Dr C.H. Hau left the meeting at this point.]

#### *Technical Issues*

94. A Member considered that the proposed VTC development would not result in adverse impact on traffic and pedestrian flow, environment, landscape, visual and air ventilation as confirmed by the technical assessments which were accepted by concerned government departments. Another Member opined that, although some representers questioned the findings of all the technical studies, those findings would be considered acceptable as long as the technical studies were conducted in accordance with the required guidelines and standards. Noting that the technical assessments submitted by VTC were accepted by concerned departments, Members generally considered that the proposed VTC development would not have insurmountable technical problems.

#### *Site Configuration and Layout Design*

95. Some Members considered that the current building design of the revised scheme of the proposed VTC campus was too conservative. The design of the proposed VTC campus should be responsive to the societal expectation in view of the waterfront location. It was important to ensure the proposed VTC development would be compatible and integrated with the surrounding areas and be easily accessible to the general public. It could be an open campus and more creative design should be adopted for enhancing the vibrancy of the waterfront. Making reference to the case of HSBC Headquarters in Central, consideration could be given to open up the ground floor level of the proposed VTC campus for the public enjoyment and for better linkage with the open spaces in the vicinity.

96. Some Members suggested that the proposed VTC development could be further improved by better utilisation of underground space for uses such as lecture theatres, and by

promoting multiple and community related uses of the proposed development in order to connect with the community and create more public space on the ground level.

97. Regarding the building height of the proposed VTC development, while a Member considered that a more stringent building height control should be adopted for the waterfront location, another Member opined that staggered building height profile should be considered in order to avoid walled-building development.

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng left the meeting at this point.]

98. Members generally considered that the POS to be provided by VTC should be integrated with the waterfront promenade. In order to have a more integrated open space development, some Members suggested to explore the possibility to swap the reprovisioned open space at Wai Yip Street with the relocated LPG filling station and realignment of the new road (Item W4). The Chairperson further questioned whether the new road under Item W4 could be realigned closer to the sewerage treatment plant to the northwest. In response, Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, D of Plan indicated that the current road alignment would allow more space for accommodating the vehicles queuing up for the LPG filling service. The existing road pattern was taken into account in designing the alignment of the new road leading to the LPG filling station. At that time, it was not envisaged that a POS was proposed in the VTC campus. Should the Board consider the revised scheme of the proposed VTC campus acceptable in principle by providing a 1 ha POS, the alignment of the new road could be further reviewed. According to the Covering Notes of the OZP, 'road' and 'open space' were uses always permitted on the OZP. Another Member, however, opined that swapping the LPG filling station with the reprovisioned open space at Wai Yip Street might lead to objection from the nearby residents as the LPG filling station would then be closer to the residential blocks of Laguna City.

99. In response to a Member's enquiry regarding consultation with the Harbourfront Commission (HC), Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, D of Plan said that the HC was an advisory body to the Government on all matters relating to harbourfront planning and development. The VTC had revised the scheme after consulting the HC and taking into account public views. The VTC would further consult the HC on the detailed design of the proposed VTC campus.

100. Some Members considered that form and function of the development should not be regarded as separate issues. The proposed VTC campus could be seen as an opportunity for opening up a harbourfront area which had no development programme yet. The proposed development would bring about planning gains to the place rather than being seen as a loss to the community. A Member was of the opinion that the VTC campus development should be set back much further from the harbourfront to allow for a generous width for the promenade. It was noted that the Kwun Tong Promenade was always overcrowded on weekends because it was attracting not only local residents but also visitors from across the territory. With a responsive design and layout, the proposed educational use would probably add value to the community in terms of accessibility, connectivity and diversity of uses, and the development might also turn out to be a landmark in the area. A Member added that a further reduction in the proposed GFA of the VTC campus would probably allow a better design and most welcome by the local residents. In this regard, Members noted that there was no GFA restriction imposed under the OZP.

101. In gist, the Chairperson said that Members in general had no objection to the “G/IC” zoning to facilitate the proposed VTC campus which would be for educational use at the waterfront site of CKL, but considered that there was scope for improvements in the design of the development to achieve better accessibility and connectivity with the waterfront and the community. A more responsive building design and site configuration in relation to the proposed POS and the access road to the adjoining LPG filling station should be explored at the implementation stage. However, as the site was zoned “G/IC” on the OZP, the proposed VTC development, as an educational institution, was always permitted and planning permission from the Board was not required. The Board would not have control on the subsequent design of the VTC campus and POS.

[Dr Lawrence K.C. Li left the meeting at this point.]

102. The Chairperson said that the detailed design of the site could be overseen by concerned departments in the implementation and land grant stages following the approval of the OZP. The requirement of providing the 1 ha POS, as proposed by VTC, could be stipulated in the ES of the OZP and the conditions of future land grant to ensure its implementation and handing back to Government for public enjoyment. Besides, the VTC campus would be funded by government resources and scrutinised by the Finance Committee

of Legislative Council. VTC's proposal of providing 1 ha POS and the detailed design of the campus would be subject to public scrutiny. Mr Simon S.W. Wang, Assistant Director (Regional 1), LandsD, said that VTC would be required to apply to LandsD for land grant to use the site for development. LandsD would consult the concerned government departments, including PlanD and EDB for comments. PlanD could convey the Board's concerns on design aspects, and a 'Design, Disposition and Height' clause could be incorporated into the lease conditions to address the concerns. Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, D of Plan supplemented that according to the current "G/IC" zoning, there was no submission requirement for the Board's approval on the design of a development proposal which was always permitted. Nonetheless, the requirement on submission of a layout plan for LandsD's approval could be considered for inclusion into the land grant conditions. Besides, EDB could be advised to consult the Board, if considered appropriate, on the proposed design of the VTC campus and POS, and Members could then provide comments on the design of the scheme. Members also noted that although views on building design could be very subjective, the development scheme could still be assessed by the Board on the basis of established design principles and guidelines.

103. With regard to the proposed LPG filling station, the Chairperson said that it was to facilitate reprovisioning of the existing LPG filling station at a nearby location. Noting that ENB had confirmed the need to retain the subject dedicated LPG filling station in the CKL area, and currently there was no other suitable reprovisioning site in the vicinity, Members agreed that the proposed LPG filling station should be retained to meet the demand of LPG filling service in East Kowloon. However, if alternative sites could be identified in the future for relocation of the LPG filling station, corresponding amendment to the OZP could then be made.

104. While noting that there should be scope for VTC to explore a revised layout and configuration involving also the sites in the adjoining area, including the open space at Wai Yip Street and the access road leading to the LPG filling station, Members generally considered that at this stage there was no material basis for the Board to prescribe a specific layout as no assessment had been conducted to ascertain the feasibility of a revised layout and realignment of the relocated Wai Lok Street. Given the understanding that both provision of open space and road would be always permitted under the OZP, Members in general agreed that the layout and configuration of the sites in the area could be further improved in the

detailed design stage, with a view to achieving a more coherent layout of the public open space for this waterfront site.

105. Given the strong local sentiments against the proposed VTC campus, a Member asked whether local consultation could be arranged when the development scheme from VTC was submitted for government consideration. In response, Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, D of Plan said that EDB and VTC could be advised to conduct local consultation prior to finalization of the development scheme and to consult the Board on any further revisions to the scheme.

[Dr F.C. Chan left the meeting at this point.]

106. While the land use proposals regarding Items W1 to W7 on the draft OZP in relation to CKL harbourfront were considered acceptable, Members were generally of the views that the design and configuration of the sites should be properly and proactively addressed by VTC in the detailed design stage. Members also agreed that the requirement of providing the 1 ha POS by VTC should be stipulated in the ES of the OZP and subsequent land grant to ensure its implementation.

107. After further deliberation, Members generally agreed in-principle that Items W1 to W7 concerning the CKL Waterfront on the draft OZP were acceptable subject to a proper record of the Board's deliberation with the decision properly explained to the public and concerns addressed by imposing the appropriate requirements in the ES of the OZP. The Board therefore agreed to defer the decision on the representations pending the preparation of draft minutes of the meeting, a draft press statement on the Board's decision on the representations and comments, and proposed amendments to the ES in respect of the OZP by the Secretariat and the deliberation session would be resumed on a date to be confirmed.

108. The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m..