

1. The meeting was resumed at 9:15 a.m. on 25.3.2014.
2. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting:

Mr Thomas T.M. Chow

Chairman

Mr Stanley Y.F. Wong

Vice-chairman

Professor S.C. Wong

Dr C.P. Lau

Mr Roger K.H. Luk

Ms Anita W.T. Ma

Dr W.K. Yau

Professor K.C. Chau

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr F.C. Chan

Assistant Director (2), Home Affairs Department

Mr Eric K.S. Hui

Deputy Director of Lands (General)

Mr Jeff Y.T. Lam

Director of Planning

Mr K.K. Ling

Presentation and Question Session

[Open Meeting]

3. The following representatives of the Planning Department (PlanD) and Education Bureau (EDB), representers, representer's representatives and a commenter were invited to the meeting at this point:

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

Mr Wallace K.K. Lau - Principal Assistant Secretary (Higher Education) (PAS(HE)), EDB

R12 – Chan Ka Lok

Mr Chan Ka Lok - Representer

R17214 – 何鏡煒

Dr Ho Kang Wai, Eddie - Representer

R17344 – Wong Cheuk Yin

Ms Wong Cheuk Yin - Representer

R17424 – 鄭麗明

Professor Ng Yat Nam, Petrus] Representer's Representatives

Ms Lo Shu Ping]

R17755 – Keng Hiu Lam

Ms Keng Hiu Lam - Representer

R21149 – Law Cheuk Wah

Mr Law Cheuk Wah - Representer

C1663 – Hsiao Wen Luan

Ms Hsiao Wen Luan, Wendy - Commenter

4. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the hearing. He said that the meeting would be conducted in accordance with the Guidance Notes which had been provided to all representers/commenters prior to the meeting. Members had also agreed that the Chairman should have full discretion to make other necessary arrangements to ensure that the meeting would be conducted in an orderly and effective manner. In particular, he highlighted the following main points:

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

consideration.

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

6. The Chairman further explained that during the question and answer session, only Members of the Board would be invited to ask questions, which might require the representers or their representatives and Government representatives to respond. Representers or their representatives could choose whether to respond or not. He then invited PlanD's representative to brief Members on the representations and comments.

7. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, repeated the presentation which was made in the session of the Meeting on 10.3.2014 as recorded in paragraph 17 of the Minutes of 10.3.2014.

[Mr Dominic K.K. Lam returned to join the meeting during the presentation.]

8. The Chairman said that sufficient cause had been provided by the representer of R12 and he was allowed to make his oral submission for 30 minutes in this session. He also said that the oral submission of Ms Hsiao Wen Luan, Wendy, (C1663) was originally scheduled in the afternoon but Ms Hsiao had requested the Board to hear her submission in the morning session. Members agreed that the oral submission of C1663 could be advanced to the morning session, after completion of the oral submissions and question and answer session for the representers.

9. The Chairman then invited the representers and the representer's representatives to elaborate on their representations. The Chairman said that each presentation, except with time extension allowed, should be within 10 minutes and there was a timer device to alert the representers and representer's representatives 2 minutes before the allotted 10-minute time was to expire and when the allotted 10-minute time

limit was up. The presentation should be confined to an elaboration of the written submissions and any new information submitted/presented would not be taken into consideration by the Board.

R12 – Chan Ka Lok

10. Mr Chan Ka Lok made the following main points:

- (a) he first joined the Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU) as a teaching staff in 1998. At that time, the HKBU campus was small and his first office was in a 2-storey ex-British Army barracks building. His office had moved several times and it became smaller each time to make available space for common areas for the students;
- (b) Dr Daniel C.W. Tse, the former President and Vice-Chancellor of HKBU, had expressed on various occasions the view that the scope for further development of HKBU should be explored. In that regard, some innovative ideas and proposals had been formulated. For instance, before the construction of Kowloon Tong Fire Station at Baptist University Road, there had been proposals to build a composite fire station cum academic building on the site;
- (c) as the ex-Lee Wai Lee (LWL) site was located within a cluster of HKBU facilities, the relocation of the LWL Institute of Vocational Education (IVE) had presented an opportunity for expansion of HKBU. HKBU had been discussing with the Government over the years for allocation of the ex-LWL site to HKBU. There was therefore strong reaction from the staff and students of HKBU when it was announced that the southern portion of the ex-LWL site (the Site) would be included in the Land Sale Programme;
- (d) there was a shortage of student hostel places within the campus of HKBU. Under the principle of ‘Guaranteed One-year Residence

Scheme', some students had to live in hostels at off-campus locations such as Ma On Shan and shared use with other universities. There were also insufficient hostel places for exchange students and research students from the Mainland and overseas. Off-campus student hostels were inconvenient and could not help the students to enjoy life on campus;

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

- (e) the number of housing units that could be provided at the Site was small. Experience from other universities showed that student hostels located close to private residential developments would create disturbance and noise nuisance to the residents. Student hostel and private residential uses were not compatible with each other. Additional resources would be required to minimise the conflict between students and the residents such as by installing double-glazed windows and increasing management manpower;
- (f) there was concern that new residential development on the Site would generate additional traffic and entail adverse traffic impact on the surrounding areas. The traffic impact of the proposed residential development at the Site had not been adequately addressed in PlanD's presentation;
- (g) HKBU campus was already very congested. However, there had been an increasing demand and aspiration for provision of more public facilities and common spaces for students within the campus. More spaces were required to provide better facilities and learning environment for students;
- (h) there was a comprehensive plan for HKBU's expansion and future development. HKBU was more than willing to discuss with the Government on the future use of the Site with an aim to complementing

and sustaining the development of higher education in Hong Kong;

- (i) Chinese medicine was one of the key academic programmes identified for further development in HKBU. While the Site was the most suitable site for development of a Chinese Medicine Teaching Hospital (CMTH), it was reasonable for HKBU to identify other possible sites for such purpose in case the Site was not granted to HKBU;
- (j) the prevailing Government policy had not provided adequate support to the development of higher education. There were precedents that land originally reserved for tertiary educational use, such as the Site and the previously proposed private university site at Queen's Hill, had been rezoned for residential purpose. Changing the Site for residential use would limit the expansion of HKBU and the development of higher education in Hong Kong;
- (k) the Government's latest decision to exclude the Site from the Land Sale Programme was welcomed. The Board should take note that rezoning the Site to residential use would cause significant public reaction and irreversible damage to the society;
- (l) while the proposal of reverting the Site to "G/IC(9)" was supported, no detailed information and justifications had been provided by EDB for the proposed special school at the Site. The proposal seemed to be a retreat from the Government instead of a genuine need for a special school in the area; and
- (m) HKBU had been striving to sustain the future growth and development of the university. Given the difficulties encountered in finding space for expansion, HKBU had once considered moving away from Hong Kong in order to enable the long-term growth of the university and to sustain the provision of high quality educational services to the country. The Site was located in a cluster of HKBU facilities and would be a precious

solution space for HKBU's future expansion.

[Actual speaking time of R12: 28 minutes]

R17214 – Dr Ho Kang Wai, Eddie

11. Dr Ho Kang Wai, Eddie, made the following main points:

- (a) as a graduate and a retired staff of HKBU as well as a member of the Kowloon City Baptist Church, he was very familiar with the history and development of HKBU;
- (b) the planning of Hong Kong should be based on the needs of the society. HKBU had been developed under the traditional spirits of 'to strive unlimitedly self-improvement' and 'mutual help in the community'. In the past, expansion of HKBU had been achieved through the efforts of the former Vice-chancellors and the staff. At the same time, HKBU had been actively contributing to the community by offering their space and facilities such as the Joint Sports Centre, the Creative Arts Centre and the Chinese medicine programme to serve the public in need;

[Ms Anita W.T. Ma left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

- (c) HKBU had all along been striving to explore new opportunities, such as the provision of new academic programmes, to serve the community and to sustain Hong Kong as a knowledge-based society and an education hub by providing training for human resources; and
- (d) HKBU was a university that belonged to the people of Hong Kong and its growth and development should be supported.

12. A time extension of 4 minutes was applied by Dr Ho as he required more time to complete his presentation. The Chairman acceded to his request. Dr Ho continued to

make the following points:

- (a) as some of the HKBU facilities were ageing and inadequate, additional space was required to enable the growth and development of the university. For example, a standard all-weather swimming pool would be required to support the physical education programme of HKBU;
- (b) the area located to the east of Waterloo Road in Kowloon Tong was mainly occupied by GIC facilities including hospital, church, school and government uses, etc. when HKBU was first established in the 1960s. Residential use on the Site was not compatible with the general character of the locality; and
- (c) as HKBU was a source of human resource development for Hong Kong, HKBU's vision should be embraced by the Government. The concerned parties, including HKBU, EDB and the University Grants Committee, should sit together to discuss a mutually accepted proposal for the Site with a view to sustaining the development and growth of HKBU and Hong Kong.

[Actual speaking time of R17214: 14 minutes]

[Ms Janice W.M. Lai and Dr Wilton W.T. Fok left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

R17344 – Wong Cheuk Yin

13. Ms Wong Cheuk Yin made the following main points:

- (a) the development of luxury, medium-density flats at the Site could not address the housing needs of the grassroots and could not solve the problem of housing land shortage. PlanD's proposal to revert the zoning of the Site to "G/IC" was supported;

- (b) HKBU's proposal for a CMTH at the Site would not be in conflict with the Government's proposal for a Chinese Medicine Hospital (CMH) in Tseung Kwan O. In view of the increasing demand from the community for Chinese medicine services and hence the need for teaching and training facilities for the field, both the CMTH and CMH were required;
- (c) the allocation of public resources for special education purpose was supported. However, there was no detailed proposal for the special school to be located on the Site. The location and design of the proposed special school should be carefully considered in consultation with the relevant stakeholders before a decision was made;
- (d) a short video of Mrs Peggy Lam Pei Yu-dja, who made the following main points, was shown:
 - (i) tertiary education was a long-term investment for Hong Kong. However, there was a shortage of space amounting to 80,000m² net operational floor area for the eight UGC-funded institutions;
 - (ii) the proposed residential use at the Site was not justifiable as it would reduce the land available for higher education purpose and could not address the housing supply problem for the grassroots;
 - (iii) the ex-LWL site was surrounded by HKBU facilities on three sides and should be developed as an integral part of the university. The site should not be allocated to LWL IVE in the first place and should now be allocated to HKBU;
 - (iv) HKBU was reputable in the Chinese medicine discipline. The Site should be developed for a CMTH to provide clinical training and practising for Chinese medicine students; and

- (v) the Government should not act against the community in the light of the strong objection to residential use at the Site from KCDC and the local residents; and
- (e) the proposed “G/IC” zoning for the Site was supported. The detailed land use of the site should be formulated in consultation with the relevant stakeholders and local residents.

[Actual speaking time of R17344: 10 minutes]

R17424 – 鄭麗明 represented by Ng Yat Nam, Petrus and Lo Shu Ping

14. A time extension of 10 minutes was applied by Professor Ng Yat Nam, Petrus, as he had a Powerpoint presentation to explain the grounds of representations in detail. The Chairman acceded to Professor Ng’s request.

15. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Professor Ng made the following main points:

- (a) he was the head of the Department of Social Work in HKBU;
- (b) HKBU was a public university with a religious background. In such sense, HKBU was also a public resource;

[Dr Wilton W.T. Fok returned to join the meeting at this point.]

- (c) there were three basic questions which should be asked in considering the use of the Site. They were (i) whether residential use or higher education use was more beneficial to the long-term development of Hong Kong; (ii) how to make most benefits from the Site for sustainable development of Hong Kong; and (iii) why should the Site be allocated to HKBU for CMTH purpose;

Which was the More Beneficial Use?

- (d) a harmonic and healthy community was based on a reasonable and fair distribution of resources. Land was a scarce resource in Hong Kong. Before any rezoning of educational land for other uses, the sustainable development aspect of the proposed use should be carefully considered as it would have implications on both the present and future generations;
- (e) under the trend of globalisation and internationalisation, the training and development of human resources with higher educational level was important to sustain the competitiveness of Hong Kong;
- (f) as land was an important public resource, its use and development should be sustainable, i.e. to bring about social, environmental and economic benefits;
- (g) the Site should be planned and used wisely with due regard to the long-term vision and sustainability of Hong Kong. A strategic vision and planning would be required so as to derive maximum benefits in particular for human resource training. The ex-LWL site should be planned and used to sustain the long-term development of the local community and HKBU so as to maximise economic and social benefits;
- (h) the Site would achieve most social and economic benefits by allocating it to HKBU for higher education purpose as it was surrounded on three sides by HKBU buildings and was geographically an integral part of the HKBU cluster;
- (i) the use of the ex-LWL site in whole for student hostel and CMTH would represent a fair and reasonable distribution of land resources given the existing problem of inadequate student hostel places and the need for a CMTH in Hong Kong;

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

- (j) Renfrew Road was a single-lane dual carriageway and the area to its east was generally occupied by GIC and HKBU facilities. The proposed residential use at the Site might induce adverse environmental and traffic impacts on the locality due to the increase in traffic. There would also be additional demand for public transport facilities;
- (k) whether the development would be sustainable for the neighbourhood was one of the most important considerations in the land use planning of the Site;

[Mr Eric K.S. Hui returned to join the meeting at this point.]

How to Make Most Benefits from the Site for Sustainable Development?

- (l) The economy of Hong Kong required a workforce with high level of education and skills. To this end, education institutions should be provided with adequate resources. The higher education sector was recognised by the Government as one of the areas where Hong Kong enjoyed a competitive advantage;
- (m) allocating the Site for higher educational use would contribute to sustainable development of Hong Kong as education was a major means to enrich human resources, reduce inequality and poverty and enhance the competitiveness of Hong Kong at the international level;
- (n) the university admission rate in Hong Kong was about 20.5%, which was grossly lower than that of Taiwan, Mainland China, Singapore, United Kingdom and the United States. As the Secretary for Education had targeted to raise the university admission rate to about 33% in 2015, the universities should be provided with sufficient resources to achieve such target and to cater for the increased number of students;

- (o) the Site was geographically an integral part of the HKBU cluster. From the sustainable development perspective, it would be used most efficiently if the whole site was allocated to HKBU for long-term development;

Why should the Site be allocated to HKBU for CMTH purpose?

- (p) the proposed CMTH would be a non-profit making organisation which would offer training facilities for new practitioners for Chinese medicine, and provide medical service to meet community needs including those of the less privileged sectors;
- (q) CMTH and CMH were fundamentally different in nature as they would serve different purposes and had different needs and requirements. The proposed CMTH could co-exist with the CMH in Tseung Kwan O as it would not only provide venue for clinical training but also facilitate clinical research;
- (r) the proposed CMTH, as part of the HKBU facilities, would be open to the general public and become a public resource to serve the community. The CMTH would be more beneficial to the society than a private luxury housing development;
- (s) the proposed special education use at the Site was without adequate grounds and should be carefully considered. The Government should adopt a comprehensive approach in the planning and provision of special education facilities. Under the prevailing ‘integrated education’ approach, children with special educational needs should be encouraged to attend mainstream schools where collaborative teaching, diverse curriculum and cooperative learning could be implemented to meet the different needs of students;

- (t) the proposed CMTH could also provide service to children with special needs such as those suffering from autism, convulsion, attention deficit and hyperactivity disorder; and
- (u) in conclusion, the Site should be reserved for higher education purpose to enhance the competitiveness of Hong Kong. It was a community asset and should be used in accordance with the principles of sustainable development. The proposed CMTH could optimise the use of the Site and would bring maximum benefits for the community.

[Actual speaking time of R17424: 20 minutes]

R17755 – Keng Hiu Lam

16. Ms Keng Hiu Lam made the following main points:

- (a) she was working in the medical sector;
- (b) as there was no CMTH in Hong Kong, Chinese medicine students had to undertake their internships in the Mainland. The medical system, rules and procedures of the Mainland were different from those of Hong Kong, and what students learnt in the Mainland could not be applied fully in Hong Kong. After graduation, the students would require further clinical practice in Hong Kong before they became Chinese medicine practitioners. The proposed CMTH by HKBU would enable Chinese medicine students to undertake their internships in Hong Kong more conveniently and thus improve learning;
- (c) a CMTH with in-patient service in Hong Kong would greatly reduce medical expenses as well as time and travel costs, and enhance the convenience, efficiency and effectiveness of treatment for patients. It could also provide a platform for joint medical experts' consultation regarding patients suffering from rare or special diseases. Joint

consultation could often result in new feasible treatments for patients;

- (d) the proposed CMTH by HKBU and the CMH in Tseung Kwan O could co-exist. In order to meet the community needs for Chinese medicine services, a CMTH was urgently required as it would provide local clinical training, clinical research and integrated treatment by Chinese and Western medicines;
- (e) the proposed CMH site in Tseung Kwan O, which was located away from the urban centre, would be inconvenient to the students, teaching staff and patients;
- (f) clinical research was an important element of the Chinese medical system and it could only be provided at a CMTH. Clinical research would enhance the effectiveness of treatment and the development of Chinese medicine for the benefits of patients;
- (g) a CMTH would present new economic opportunities for Hong Kong as the provision of high quality Chinese medical services could attract patients from the Mainland and overseas to receive treatment in Hong Kong. The number of patients and business turnover of HKBU's Chinese medical service had increased over ten times in the past ten years;
- (h) the CMTH should best be located at the Site, which was adjacent to the Chinese Medicine Building of HKBU, as this would create synergy with the existing facilities of HKBU and enhance the effectiveness of treatment; and
- (i) as it was the right place and the right time for development of a CMTH, the Site should be allocated to HKBU.

R21149 – Law Cheuk Wah

17. Mr Law Cheuk Wah made the following main points:

- (a) his friend, Mr Ha Siu Kong, was a Chinese medicine practitioner and a researcher expertised in ancient Chinese medicine methods. Mr Ha had been providing free Chinese medical services and medicines to the public and had offered help to over 200,000 patients. Mr Ha also invented new medical treatment methods and equipment and had successfully cured many patients suffering from serious illness including SARS; and
- (b) more resources should be devoted to the field of Chinese medicine.

[Actual speaking time of R21149: 4 minutes]

18. As the presentation from the government representative, representers and representer's representatives had been completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

19. A Member asked whether there was any information on how the Government had guided the development of HKBU in the past. Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, said that under Government's higher education policy, there were objective assessments on the demand for teaching space and student hostel places to guide the development of universities. With the aid of a slide, Mr Yip said that in order to meet the development needs of HKBU, the Government had allocated additional land to HKBU in the past and hence the campus area of HKBU was expanding. The HKBU Baptist University Road Campus to east of Renfrew Road was a relatively new campus area granted by the Government to HKBU for its development and expansion. Land was also granted for the development of the Academic and Administration Building and the Communication and Visual Arts Building completed in 2010.

20. Mr Yip continued to say that the Government and UGC had all along

supported UGC-funded institutions in the development of publicly-funded academic facilities and student hostels in accordance with well-established policies and calculation criteria. To cater for the outstanding demands, EDB was liaising with those institutions with a shortfall of hostels and academic facilities, with a view to exploring the feasibility of constructing hostels or academic facilities in various locations in Hong Kong. For HKBU, EDB had decided to reserve the northern part of the ex-LWL site (about 0.64 ha) for higher education use and reaffirmed its commitment to meet all of HKBU's outstanding requirements for publicly-funded academic space and student hostel places under the prevailing policies and calculation criteria. Moreover, in 2013, the Government agreed to allocate the site of the former Royal Air Force Officer's Mess at Kwun Tong Road in Kowloon Bay to HKBU for teaching purpose. In conclusion, the Government had all along provided support to HKBU in its development and redevelopment of academic facilities and student hostels. Mr Wallace K.K. Lau, PAS(HE), EDB, supplemented that the site in Kowloon Bay was granted to HKBU for provision of visual arts teaching facilities upon request by HKBU. Dr Ho Keng Wai, Eddie, (R17214) clarified that the site in Kowloon Bay was leased to HKBU and the lease had recently been renewed for 10 years.

21. The Chairman asked whether the proposed special school at the Site would still be required under the principle of 'integrated education' as mentioned by Professor Ng Yat Yin, Petrus (representative of R17424). Mr Wallace Lau said that purpose-built special schools were still needed even under the 'integrated education' approach because not all children with special educational needs could be integrated into mainstream schools. It was estimated that there was a deficit of about 500 new special school places in Kowloon owing to the implementation of new curriculum and the extension of schooling for special schools students. In that regard, two new special schools would be required to meet the demand for new special school places. The Site had been identified as a suitable location for further consideration of providing a new special school. Professor Ng Yat Yin, Petrus, said that although a deficit of 500 special school places was identified, it was the prevailing trend for parents to let their children with special educational needs attend mainstream schools rather than special schools. In fact, many mainstream schools already had classes and curricula specifically designed for students with special educational needs. As for mentally handicapped children who might require

purpose-built special schools, their number had been declining due to medical advancement.

22. A Member asked the representer of R17755 to elaborate on the implementation of integrated treatment by Chinese and Western medicines in the proposed CMTH. Ms Keng Hiu Lam said that the provision of integrated treatment was one of the missions of the proposed CMTH. While the proposed CMTH was still at conceptual stage and would be subject to detailed design, it was envisaged that certain Western medical services, as required under the current medical legislation, would have to be provided at the CMTH.

23. Dr Ho Keng Wai, Eddie, (R17214) said that he was a Council member of the Hong Kong Baptist Hospital (HKBH). A meeting had recently been held between the managements of HKBH and HKBU and he understood that HKBH would adopt a positive attitude to cooperate with HKBU in providing medical services at the proposed CMTH, provided that the CMTH was located at the Site and not in Tseung Kwan O. A Chinese medicine research institute cum clinic had once been jointly set up by HKBH and HKBU about 10 years ago. This partnership lapsed in recent years as HKBU had set up an independent clinic in the light of its rapid development in the Chinese medicine programme. Nevertheless, the cooperation between HKBH and HKBU could resume if a CMTH was to be provided in Kowloon Tong. As an inventory measure, the medical care staff of HKBH would also be required to learn Chinese medicine methodologies with a view to enhancing the effectiveness of medical treatment for patients. Dr Ho further said that it was not necessary to locate a new special school in Kowloon Tong as it could be provided elsewhere. In contrast, the basic components of a CMTH were already in place at HKBU. The Government should adopt a more visionary approach for the development of a CMTH at the Site which would be for the overall benefits of Hong Kong.

24. A Member asked the representer of R17214 why the partnership between HKBH and HKBU or CMTH should be on the condition that the CMTH was located at the Site, but not in Tseung Kwan O. The Member also asked whether the partnership of HKBH should be with HKBU or the proposed CMTH. Dr Ho Keng Wai, Eddie, said that the CMTH was proposed by HKBU. The preliminary idea was that HKBH would enter into a partnership with HKBU if the CMTH was set up at the Site. Owing to a lack of

space in HKBH, some of the administrative functions, back-of-house facilities and the nurse school had been relocated to other locations such as Kwun Tong and Fanling. Only medical care services were retained at the hospital site in Kowloon Tong. Since accessibility was a prime consideration in the medical care field, HKBH was only able to provide support to the CMTH at the Site which was in vicinity of HKBU. If the CMTH was to be provided in Tseung Kwan O, HKBU would have to find another hospital partner for cooperation. Dr Ho also said that there had been a close relationship between HKBU and HKBH as they were both first set up in Kowloon Tong under the management of the Hong Kong Baptist Convention. Although cooperation between HKBH and HKBU was less after the latter became a public university, they would have no difficulties in entering into a close partnership again as they shared similar vision and mission in serving people.

25. In response to the question of a Member, the Chairman said that the Board was only required to decide on the zoning of the Site at this meeting, i.e. whether “Residential” or “G/IC” zoning was more appropriate, but not the specific GIC use.

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

26. Noting that Professor Ng Yat Yin, Petrus, the representative of R17424, had claimed that residential use on the Site would entail adverse traffic impact on the surroundings, the Chairman asked whether any assessment had been carried out to assess the traffic implications of the proposed residential or GIC uses on the Site. Professor Ng responded that no traffic impact assessment (TIA) had been conducted and the claim was made based on his observation. Renfrew Road was a single-lane dual carriageway which was not very wide. If a residential development was built on the Site, additional traffic would be generated and additional transport facilities would be required along Renfrew Road to serve the future residents, thus causing traffic congestion. The Chairman noted that there were existing bus stops and minibus stops along Renfrew Road. Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that the Site was originally zoned “G/IC(9)” on the previous version of the OZP. In proposing to rezone the Site for residential use, relevant Government departments including the Transport Department (TD) had been consulted. TD advised that since the Site was located at a convenient location well served by public transport facilities, the proposed medium-density residential use on the Site providing some 495 flats would not

entail adverse traffic impact on the local road network and hence a TIA was not required. Mr Yip also said that no adverse traffic impact would be envisaged if the zoning of the Site was reverted back to “G/IC(9)”. Professor Ng said that since a population of about 1,600 would be resulted from the proposed 495 flats on the Site, its traffic impact should be greater than that of GIC uses.

27. Given that hospital use would also generate a large amount of traffic, a Member asked whether any assessment on the traffic impact of the possible hospital use at the Site had been carried out. Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that ‘Hospital’ use was one of the uses which were always permitted in the “G/IC(9)” zone, and no detailed TIA had been conducted for individual uses at this stage. Nevertheless, it was envisaged that the traffic pattern of hospital use would be different from other GIC uses such as schools because its peak hours would be around the patient-visiting periods rather than the before and after the school hours. Mr Yip said that according to TD’s advice, the traffic condition in this part of Kowloon Tong was relatively good compared with the other parts of the district. The traffic condition would be kept under monitoring by TD and a TIA might be required at the land grant stage when there was a detailed development proposal for the Site.

28. A Member asked the representers and representer’s representatives whether any assessment had been conducted regarding the implications on the future development of HKBU if the Site was not granted to HKBU. Professor Ng Yat Yin, Petrus, representative of R17424, said that the history of development for HKBU was unique. Unlike other universities such as the University of Hong Kong to which a large piece of land was granted for university development in the outset, HKBU had to fight hard to find space for its expansion on an incremental basis. Since land available for expansion was very limited around the HKBU campus, the Site was seen as the last opportunity for HKBU’s expansion in the Kowloon Tong area. If further expansion space could not be identified, HKBU might have to move away from Kowloon Tong and this would involve a huge amount of cost and resources and also pose additional burden on the society.

29. Quoting the University of London as an example, the Chairman said that it was not uncommon for different colleges of a city university scattering around the city as the university expanded. He asked whether the Site was regarded as necessary or desirable

for the expansion of HKBU. Professor Ng Yat Yin, Petrus, representative of R17424, said that HKBU was adopting the same approach as the University of London in expanding its campus. The Chairman further said that some of the college facilities of the University of London such as student residences were located quite far away from the main campus of the university.

30. Dr Ho Keng Wai, Eddie, representer of R17214, said that as in the cases of Polytechnic University and the City University, the expansion of higher education institutions could only be materialised by the joint efforts of the university, the Government and the community. While the Site was not critical for the survival of the HKBU, the expansion need of the university would best be met by utilising the Site for an integrated development. Comprehensive planning was required to make the most benefits of the scarce land resources and the proposed use of the Site for a special school was not good planning. The Government should allow sufficient space for HKBU's expansion and development. The Board was requested to avoid making an irreversible decision and support the development of higher education in Hong Kong.

[Mr Jeff Y.T. Lam returned to join the meeting at this point.]

31. In response to a Member's question, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that initially, the campus of HKBU was located to the north of HKBH near Waterloo Road. After HKBU became a university in the 1990s, there was a need to expand its teaching and student hostel facilities and hence the area to the east of Renfrew Road was granted by the Government to HKBU incrementally for its expansion. Mr Yip said that LWL IVE was established in 1979, before the surrounding area, comprising mainly vacant land and former British Army barracks then, was granted to HKBU to cater for its expansion need. The area had therefore gradually become part of the HKBU campus. The most recent piece of land granted to HKBU in the area was the site located to the south of the Site which was previously zoned "Open Space" on the OZP. HKBU applied to the Board in 2005 for rezoning that site to "G/IC" for development of the Communication and Visual Arts Building, which was agreed by the Board.

32. As all the representers and representer's representatives attending the session

had completed their presentations and Members had no further question to raise, the Chairman thanked the representers and representer's representatives for attending the hearing. They all left the meeting at this point.

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

[Dr Wilton W.T. Fok left the meeting at this point.]

C1663 – Hsiao Wen Luan, Wendy

33. Ms Hsiao Wen Luan, Wendy, made the following made points:
- (a) she was a professor working in the School of Chinese Medicine in HKBU and the former Vice-head of School;
 - (b) there were worries that the education system of Hong Kong had failed as she had heard a lot about the bad behaviours of the younger generation;
 - (c) according to a professor of the University of California, Los Angeles, who had written a number of books and 300 theses focusing on the education for university students, campus life particularly student residence was the most critical element in the education of university students;
 - (d) the provision of student hostels within the campus would allow the students to enjoy their university life and provide them with a better learning environment. Locating student hostels at off-campus locations, such as Ma On Shan and Tseung Kwan O in the case for HKBU, was undesirable;
 - (e) there should be comprehensive planning for the growth and development of universities. Education was a long-term investment for the society, and any damage done today might only be realised many years later;

- (f) there would be both teaching and clinical practice elements in a CMTH. The CMH proposed by the Government in Tseung Kwan O would be inconvenient to both staff and students. The Government should actively consider allocating the Site to HKBU for a CMTH as it was located adjacent to the HKBU campus and would be beneficial to both the staff and students of the Chinese medicine programme; and
- (g) the decision of the Board would have an important bearing on the development of Chinese medicine and higher education in Hong Kong;

[Actual speaking time of C1663: 9 minutes]

34. The Chairman invited questions from Members.

35. Quoting the example of the University of Hong Kong, a Member said that it was not necessary for the medical school and the teaching hospital to be located in the university main campus. This Member asked the commenter whether there was a possibility that the School of Chinese Medicine of HKBU could move to a site near the future CMTH at another location such that the existing School of Chinese Medicine site could be utilised to meet other development needs of HKBU. Ms Hsiao Wen Luan, Wendy, said that lecturers of the School of Chinese Medicine were not only teaching students in the Chinese Medicine programme but also other HKBU students under general education courses. As such, relocating the School of Chinese Medicine away from the HKBU campus might have certain detrimental effects on the operation of the university.

36. As the commenter attending the session had completed her presentation and Members had no further question to raise, the Chairman thanked the commenter and the government representatives for attending the hearing. They all left the meeting at this point.

37. The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

38. The meeting was resumed at 2:30 p.m. on 25.3.2014.

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

Mr Thomas T.M. Chow

Chairman

Mr Stanley Y.F. Wong

Vice-chairman

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Professor P.P. Ho

Mr Roger K.H. Luk

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr F.C. Chan

Director of Lands

Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Director of Planning

Mr K.K. Ling

Presentation and Question Session [Open Meeting]

40. The following representatives of the Planning Department (PlanD) and the Education Bureau (EDB), commenters and commenters' representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

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

Mr Wallace K.K. Lau – Principal Assistant Secretary (Higher
Education) (PAS(HE)), EDB

C4 (Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU))

[Please refer to Appendix B for a list of commenters who had authorised the HKBU delegation as their representative.]

Mr Cai Zhuo]	
Ms Marianna W.C. Tsang]	
Professor Randy K. Chiu]	Commenters' Representatives
Dr Kevin Yue]	
Mr Stephen W.O. Tang]	
Ms Kong Wing Ying Amy]	

C8 (H.Q. Zhang)

Dr H.Q. Zhang – Commenter

C36 (Michael Kwok)

C1823 (Kenneth Wong)

Mr Kenneth Wong – Commenter and
Commenter's Representative

C521 (Lau Pak Shing)

Mr Lau Pak Shing – Commenter

C610 (Aaron Tse)

Mr Tse Chung On Aaron – Commenter

C1028 (Lam Long Chau)

Ms Ng Wai Chuen – Commenter's Representative

C1413 (Yeung Ha Chi)

Mr Yeung Ha Chi – Commenter

C1521 (Ho Hin Ming, Kowloon City District Council (KCDC) Member)

Mr Ho Hin Ming – Commenter

C1737 (Gigi Chan)

Ms Gigi Chan – Commenter

41. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the hearing. He said that the meeting would be conducted in accordance with the Guidance Notes which had been provided to all representers/commenters prior to the meeting. Members had also agreed that the Chairman should have full discretion to make other necessary arrangements to ensure that the meeting would be conducted in an orderly and effective manner. In particular, he highlighted the following main points:

- (e) in view of the large number of representations and comments received and more than 2,800 representers/commenters had indicated that they would either attend in person or had authorised representatives to attend the meeting, it was necessary to limit the time for making oral submissions;
- (f) each representer/commenter would be allotted a 10-minute speaking time. However, to provide flexibility to representers/commenters to suit their needs, there were arrangements of allowing cumulative speaking time for authorised representatives, swapping of allotted time with other representers/commenters and/or requesting for extension of

time for making the oral submission;

- (g) the oral submission should be confined to the grounds of representation/comment in the written representations/comments already submitted to the Board during the exhibition period of the outline zoning plan (OZP)/publication period of the representations; and
- (h) to ensure a smooth and efficient conduct of the meeting, the Chairman might request the representer/commenter not to repeat unnecessarily the same points of arguments which had already been presented by the others at the same meeting. The oral submissions made should avoid reading out or repeating statements contained in the written representations/comments already submitted, as the written submissions were already provided to Members for their consideration.

42. The Chairman said that the representative from PlanD would first be invited to make a presentation and, after that, the commenters/authorised representatives would be invited to make oral submissions. After the oral submissions, there would be a question and answer session. There would be one to two short breaks in the afternoon, as needed.

43. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Tom Yip, DPO/K, repeated the presentation that was made in the hearing session on 10.3.2014 as recorded in paragraph 17 of the minutes of 10.3.2014.

[Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn and Professor P.P. Ho returned to join the meeting during DPO/K's presentation.]

44. The Chairman then invited the commenters and commenters' representatives to elaborate on their comments. For the efficient conduct of the meeting, the Chairman asked the commenters and their representatives not to repeat unnecessarily long the same points that had already been presented by previous representers/commenters.

C4 (HKBU)

45. Mr Cai Zhuo made the following main points:

- (a) he was a committee member of the HKBU Postgraduate Association;
- (b) the Board was urged to fully take into account the views of all stakeholders and make a decision for the best benefit of HKBU and the community; and
- (c) HKBU had the smallest site area among the eight University Grants Committee (UGC)-funded universities in Hong Kong. The campus severely lacked space for the students to organise activities. As the site of the former Lee Wai Lee Campus of the Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education (the ex-LWL site) was next to the HKBU campus, it would be the optimal use of the site if it was allocated to HKBU for development. HKBU might develop not only a Chinese Medicine Teaching Hospital (CMTH) at the site but also other uses that would benefit the students and staff.

46. Ms Marianna W.C. Tsang made the following main points:

- (a) she was the chairperson of the HKBU Century Club which was an alumni organisation of HKBU;
- (b) the proposal to rezone the southern portion of the ex-LWL site (the Site) for residential development was short-sighted. It would be more appropriate to retain the Site for educational use for the long-term benefit of the community;
- (c) HKBU had since 2005 requested the Government to allocate the ex-LWL site to it for implementation of the 3-3-4 academic reform and for its long-term development. Nevertheless, no additional land had been provided to HKBU to cater for the 3-3-4 academic reform, making the campus even more congested. It was unreasonable not to allocate the Site

to HKBU;

- (d) the Site was not suitable for residential use as it was immediately next to the existing student hostels of HKBU which could generate noise nuisance to the nearby residents. The proposed residential use at the Site was not in line with the planning of the area and would create confrontation between the neighbouring uses;
- (e) while there was a keen housing demand, the development of student hostel and CMTH could address the needs of the students and patients. There was no strong ground for using the Site for residential use which did not require a specific location;
- (f) the ex-LWL site next to the HKBU campus was the only available site for expansion of HKBU. The allocation of the Site to HKBU to facilitate its long-term development was most sensible and was also for the benefit of the long-term development of tertiary education in Hong Kong; and
- (g) while the Government's commitment to special education development was supported, it was questionable whether the use of the Site for the development of a special school was the most appropriate arrangement. The optimal development option for the Site should be thoroughly discussed among the Government and various stakeholders. As the development of a special school at the Site was only at the inception stage, it would take a very long time to develop the special school. The conversion of existing vacant school premises in other locations for special education purpose would be much more cost-effective. On the other hand, if the Site was allocated to HKBU, it was estimated that the new facilities for HKBU could be completed within 5 years. While the development of the Site by HKBU could bring about synergy effect, there was no locational benefit of using the Site for the development of a special school.

47. Professor Randy K. Chiu made the following main points:

- (a) he was a professor of HKBU and a member of the HKBU Council;
- (b) it was essential for Hong Kong to maintain a good human resources base for sustaining its competitiveness. The provision of quality tertiary education was of paramount importance in this regard, but the lack of land rendered the development of tertiary education unsustainable;
- (c) while the proposed residential use at the Site could somewhat meet Hong Kong's housing need, it would sacrifice the long-term development need of tertiary education and hindered the training of quality human resources;
- (d) UGC was unfair to HKBU as it did not provide new sites for HKBU to implement the 3-3-4 academic reform, which resulted in an increase of total student number by one-third as a whole, but it did give new sites to other universities to cater for the reform. HKBU was required to redevelop or intensify its existing buildings within the campus and there were insufficient dormitories for its students;
- (e) the proposed rezoning of the Site to residential use was not merely a land use change but a change in Hong Kong's core values. The proposed residential development at the Site would not benefit the general public but would take away a rare site in the urban area suitable for tertiary education purpose; and
- (f) the Board was urged to allocate the Site to HKBU for its training of quality human resources in the long term.

48. The Chairman clarified that the jurisdiction of the Board did not include the allocation of land to any particular person or party, and said that the commenters should focus on the land use issues rather than the land allocation issue in the subsequent oral submissions.

49. Dr Kevin Yue made the following main points:
- (a) he was an associate director and associate professor of the Teaching Division of the School of Chinese Medicine of HKBU;
 - (b) in the 1990s, the United Kingdom expanded and popularised tertiary education in the country in order to maintain its competitiveness among the neighbouring countries in Europe. Hong Kong also followed suit at that time. Investment in tertiary education was important for Hong Kong for maintaining its competitiveness;
 - (c) the general public had a growing demand for Chinese medicine and they should be given a choice on the adoption of Chinese or Western medicine or both. Although the Government intended to reserve a site in Tseung Kwan O for the development of a Chinese Medicine Hospital (CMH), the Site was more suitable for such a purpose as it could integrate a CMTH with a CMH. The location a CMTH next to the School of Chinese Medicine of HKBU could bring about synergy effect of supporting each other and contribute to the training of Chinese medicine experts in Hong Kong; and
 - (d) there was no consultation with the stakeholders, including HKBU, KCDC and the nearby residents, when the Site was proposed to be rezoned for residential use in 2012 and when the site was proposed to be rezoned back for government, institution or community (GIC) use recently. The Government should have better communications with the stakeholders.
50. Mr Stephen W.O. Tang made the following main points:
- (a) he was the Chairman of the HKBU Alumni Association;
 - (b) the HKBU Alumni Association considered that the rezoning of the Site for residential use could not address the housing need of the general public.

The Association concurred with the view of HKBU that the Site should be retained for educational purpose;

- (c) the majority of the public views were against the rezoning proposal for residential use. The Government should not take away sites intended for educational use for housing development; and
- (d) the Government should thoroughly consult the public on the future use of the Site. HKBU would support any use of the Site if it was accepted by the community.

51. Mr Stephen W.O. Tang then showed a video of the students and staff of HKBU who were in support of allocating the Site for HKBU's development.

[Actual speaking time of C4: 29 minutes]

C8 (H.Q. Zhang)

52. Dr H.Q. Zhang made the following main points:

- (a) he was the director and associate professor of the Teaching Division of the School of Chinese Medicine of HKBU;
- (b) the tertiary education attainment rate of Hong Kong was less than 20% which was the lowest among the four Asian Little Dragons (viz. Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore and South Korea). The Government should not curb its investment in tertiary education;
- (c) although Hong Kong's medical service was once at the most advanced level in Asia, its position had been overtaken by Taiwan in recent years. HKBU had strived very hard to establish its School of Chinese Medicine, but it still lacked a proper premises for its students to practise and the students had to travel a long way to Guangzhou to gain practical experience. On the other hand, other tertiary institutions such as the University of Hong Kong, the

Chinese University of Hong Kong and the Hong Kong Polytechnic University had their teaching hospitals and/or hotels located near their main campuses. Due to the long neglect of Chinese medical education and the lack of a CMH, the death rate from infection of SARS in Hong Kong was high in 2003. Hong Kong should invest more on Chinese medical education. However, the proposal to build a CMH in Tseung Kwan O could not help HKBU's development of Chinese medical education; and

- (d) the allocation of the Site for special education but not to HKBU for its development of a CMTH was a misplacement of resources.

[Actual speaking time of C8: 10 minutes]

C36 (Michael Kwok)

C1823 (Kenneth Wong)

53. Mr Kenneth Wong made the following main points:

- (a) he was a professor of the Department of Geography of HKBU and a resident of Kowloon Tong;
- (b) as Kowloon Tong was a built-up area, there was no strong request from the residents and developers for identifying new housing sites in the district. As such, it was not necessary to rezone the Site from GIC to residential use. The ground of developing private housing at the Site for facilitating households to upgrade their flats, as claimed by the Government, was not justifiable. It would only spoil the integrity of the whole area designated for educational use;
- (c) as it was very difficult to find a new GIC site in the urban area, the reserved GIC sites should be retained as far as possible. Any proposed land use change to a reserved GIC site must be for the public interest and supported with reasonable grounds. Nevertheless, the Government had not consulted the relevant stakeholders on the proposed land use change of the Site, and,

worse still, it included the site into the land sale programme during the statutory public consultation period of the OZP amendments;

- (d) the Government's decision to retain the Site for GIC use and to remove the site from the land sale programme was welcomed. However, he wondered why the Site was suddenly proposed for special education use by the Government without convincing reasons and why the need for special education use had not been raised at the outset;
- (e) as a member of HKBU, he fully supported HKBU to strive for obtaining the Site for its long-term development; and
- (f) as a scholar, he considered that the allocation of a GIC site, which was a public resource, should be based on the principles of openness, fairness and greatest public benefit. There was no need to allocate the Site to any party immediately. All stakeholders, including HKBU, EDB and other institutions, should be allowed to submit their land use proposals for the Site and all proposals should be considered and treated fairly by the Government. The Site should be allocated to the party who could make the most optimum use.

54. Mr Kenneth Wong also made the following main points on behalf of Mr Michael Kwok (C36):

- (a) there were school, elderly home and military camp uses around the Site, and the Site was also enclosed by HKBU buildings on its three sides. Residential use at the Site was not compatible with the surrounding environment and the character of the area;
- (b) the proposed use of the Site for the development of medium-density housing could not address the acute housing demand of Hong Kong as the general public could not afford the high housing price in this location. It would only benefit the private developers;

- (c) the construction of residential development at the Site would generate traffic impact, noise and air pollution, affecting the environment and health of the nearby residents, students and teaching staff;
- (d) as the Site was close to the student hostels of HKBU, the future residential development at the site would be subject to noise nuisance caused by the activities of the students, which was undesirable to both the residents and the students; and
- (e) although there was no objection to the proposal of developing a special school, it was questionable why the Site should be used for such use. There should be other vacant school premises or suitable sites for such development. On the other hand, the Site was the only available site in the area for sustaining the long-term development of HKBU. The allocation of the site to HKBU could maintain the integrity of the HKBU campus.

[Actual speaking time of C36 and C1823: 18 minutes]

55. The Chairman reiterated that the allocation of land to a specific party was not under the purview of the Board, and said that the commenters could bear this point in mind in the subsequent oral submissions. Mr Kenneth Wong said that although the allocation of land was not under the purview of the Board, the Board could suggest to the Government the reasons for allocating the Site to HKBU.

C521 (Lau Pak Shing)

56. Mr Lau Pak Shing made the following main points:

- (a) he was an alumnus of HKBU;
- (b) timing was important. If the Site could not be allocated to HKBU at this critical moment, it would gravely affect the future development of HKBU. The Board's decision on the Site would be part of the history of HKBU. The Board would be blamed by the future generations if it did not make the

right decision at the moment; and

- (c) the Government was irrational and unreasonable in this case. The Site of 0.88 ha meant little to the community but a lot to the long-term development of HKBU. However, the Government neglected the importance of the Site to HKBU. While the Government's proposal to revert to the "G/IC" zoning for the Site was appreciated, the need of HKBU should be catered for.

[Actual speaking time of C521: 8 minutes]

C610 (Aaron Tse)

57. Mr Tse Chung On Aaron made the following main points:

- (a) he was a staff member of HKBU;
- (b) the proposal to rezone the Site for residential use was not supported as the development was piecemeal and not compatible with the character of Kowloon Tong. The development of about 500 flats on the Site of 0.88 ha would inevitably result in wall effect and generate adverse air ventilation and traffic impacts, affecting the health of the elderly people living in the nearby elderly homes and students in the vicinity;
- (c) the community was currently short of housing units for the lower-income group. The proposed residential units at the Site would not be affordable to the general public and could not address the housing need of the lower-income group;
- (d) while the Government aimed to increase the number of top-up degree places in 2016, it was not in line with the policy if additional land for tertiary education was not provided for. The most desirable arrangement was to provide land in the vicinity of existing tertiary institutions to cater for their future development. It would be most reasonable if the Site, which

was adjoining the HKBU campus, was allocated to HKBU for its development. Although HKBU had approached the Government on the allocation of the whole ex-LWL site since 2005, the Government did not give any response to the request of HKBU;

- (e) as regards EDB's recent proposal of developing a 24-classroom special school at the Site, it was considered that the proposed special school could be accommodated in other suitable areas in Kowloon and there was no imminent need of using the Site for the special school. The special school proposal of EDB was only at a preliminary stage and the prospective users were not consulted on the suitability of the Site for a special school;
- (f) the views of 4 HKBU alumni supporting the allocation of the Site to HKBU for the development of a CMTH and a student hostel were read out; and
- (g) with 99.9% out of the over 28,000 representations and comments against the zoning of the Site for residential use, the opinion of the general public was very clear. Most of the representations and comments urged for retaining the zoning of the Site as "G/IC" and allocating the Site to HKBU for its development. The Government was also asked to consult the relevant stakeholders on the best use of the Site.

[Actual speaking time of C610: 7 minutes]

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

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

C1028 (Lam Long Chau)

58. Ms Ng Wai Chuen made the following main points:

- (a) she was a resident of Kowloon Tong;

- (b) from her experience, the location of educational use close to residential use was undesirable as schools would generate noise and traffic impacts and affect the lives of residents. As such, the Government should avoid placing residential use next to a school or a student hostel to avoid conflicts between the users; and
- (c) as the Site was enclosed by HKBU buildings on its three sides, it was appropriate to retain the “G/IC” zoning and not to rezone it for residential use.

[Actual speaking time of C1028: 5 minutes]

C1413 (Yeung Ha Chi)

59. Mr Yeung Ha Chi made the following main points:

- (a) he was a student of the Department of Geography of HKBU;
- (b) he referred to the representations of Ms Ho Man Ching (R2134) and Mr Tang of the Hong Kong Critical Geography Group (R7533) which provided commentaries on the planning and land policy of Hong Kong through the subject case on the rezoning of the Site;
- (c) the Government was pursuing every means to increase the supply of housing land in Hong Kong, including the rezoning of sites zoned “G/IC”, “Green Belt” (“GB”) and “Open Space”. Many of the proposed housing sites were small and piecemeal. It gave a wrong impression to the public that the housing problem in Hong Kong stemmed from the lack of new housing land. However, the housing problem in Hong Kong was not simply due to the lack of housing land but also the types of housing to be provided and the unjust allocation of public resources;
- (d) the Board should consider rezoning proposals and planning applications from a wider perspective and not just on a case-by-case basis. If the

increase in housing supply through rezoning of sites in various areas for residential use could not resolve Hong Kong's housing problem, there was no ground for the Board to accept such rezoning proposals;

- (e) the housing problem in Hong Kong arose mainly from the unbalanced provision of private and public housing. The lower-income group could not afford to live in decent housing. There were many vacant residential units in Hong Kong but the less well-off people could not afford those units. The increase in housing supply through the rezoning of the Site would only worsen the situation. It only benefited the Government and the developer but was of no help to the people in real need;
- (f) the rezoning of "G/IC" and "GB" sites to private residential use was a process of re-allocation of public resources, which turned the land that belonged to all people to one accessible to a smaller group in the society. This gave rise to a problem of spatial injustice. The Government might even need to spend public money to form and service the sites to make them suitable for development, but the money could have been allocated to other more beneficial uses of the community such as medical and education;
- (g) it appeared that the Board had only focused on the site-specific and technical considerations to assess development proposals and was too reliant on the comments provided by the Government departments, but would seldom look at the cases from a holistic angle. As more and more rezoning cases for residential use would be submitted to the Board for consideration in the near future, the Board was urged to consider the cases in a holistic manner and be more critical on the comments provided by the Government departments; and
- (h) he put forth the following questions to the Board: (i) was there any public consultation conducted regarding the policy to rezone the "G/IC" and "GB" sites for residential use; (ii) when did EBD plan to use the Site for a special school; (iii) why was the proposed residential site not given to the Hong Kong Housing Authority direct for the development of public housing but

put in the land sale programme for private development; and (iv) how was the 10-minute speaking time for the representers and commenters set.

[Actual speaking time of C1413: 10 minutes]

60. The Chairman said that the hearing session was for the commenters to make their oral submissions but not for them to raise questions to Members. As regards the 10-minute speaking time, the Chairman explained that since over 28,000 representations and comments were received in respect of the OZP, and many would attend the meeting, special arrangements for the hearing had to be made. The Board was bound by the Ordinance to complete the plan-making process within a statutory time limit. Having taken into account all relevant circumstances and matters, the Board collectively decided to impose a 10-minute time limit on the oral submission of each representer/commenter. Nevertheless, flexibility was provided for the Board to exercise its discretion to extend the speaking time of individual representer/commenter upon request with justifications and to allow the authorised representative to use the cumulative time allotted to all the persons he represented to make his oral submission.

C1521 (Ho Hin Ming, KCDC Member)

61. Mr Ho Hin Ming relayed the complaint of some representers and commenters that documents relating to the hearing of the representations and comments were delivered to them around midnight, which was very disturbing. The Chairman said that the Secretariat would follow up with the delivery arrangements separately.

62. Mr Ho Hin Ming then made the following main points:

- (a) he was a KCDC Member and the Chairman of the Housing and Infrastructure Committee (HIC) of KCDC;
- (b) when HIC of KCDC was consulted on the proposal to rezone the Site from “G/IC(9)” to “R(B)” by the Government, all 19 KCDC Members attending the meeting were unanimously against the rezoning proposal. All the 13

KCDC Members who spoke at the meeting were in support of developing a CMH and community facilities at the Site;

- (c) the Chief Executive in his meeting with the Chairmen and Vice-chairmen of the 18 DCs pointed out that the purpose of rezoning land in various districts for residential use was to cater for the housing need of the general public. However, as presented by PlanD's representative at the HIC meeting, the proposed residential development at the Site was for facilitating households to upgrade their flats. Since residential development at the Site would not be affordable to the general public, the rezoning proposal was not supported by KCDC Members. There were other sites within the district which were suitable for providing housing to the general public;
- (d) the Site was not suitable for residential use as it was surrounded by buildings and student hostels of HKBU on its three sides. There were precedents that locating private housing and student hostel use in close proximity to each other would induce conflicts between the residents and students. One example was the conflict between the residents of Royal Peninsula and the students at the student hostel of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University, which sometimes required mediation by the Police;
- (e) the retention of the Site for GIC use could allow the community to explore the suitable uses that could be provided at the Site. There were less and less GIC sites in the Kowloon City district. The Government overlooked the need for GIC facilities in the district and had not formally consulted the community on the facilities required. The district had only one community hall in Hung Hom and one Government residential care home for the elderly. There were no Government elderly centre and no CMH. There was also inadequate provision of indoor recreation centre and dental clinic. As there were many non-governmental organisations in the district which were currently accommodated in private premises, the Site could be used for providing operation and activity spaces for such organisations;

- (f) if the Site was used for private housing development, it would bring about adverse air ventilation, traffic and environmental impacts on the surroundings and result in the loss of a needed GIC site for community use;
- (g) as regards EDB's recent proposal of using the Site for special school use, KCDC had not been consulted on the proposal. It was considered that the proposed special school could be accommodated in existing vacant school premises; and
- (h) as regards the proposed CMH in Tseung Kwan O, it was considered that the Tseung Kwan O site would be more suitable for residential use than the Site.

[Actual speaking time of C1521: 10 minutes]

C1737 (Gigi Chan)

63. Ms Gigi Chan made the following main points:

- (a) she was an alumnus of HKBU;
- (b) from her boarding experience in the student hostel, the location of residential use next to a student hostel would cause many conflicts between the residents and students. It would bring inconvenience to the students of HKBU if a medium-density residential development was built next to HKBU; and
- (c) HKBU had since 2005 sought the allocation of the whole ex-LWL site for its development due to the lack of space in the existing campus. The future use of the Site should be carefully considered taking into account the long-term development of tertiary education in Hong Kong and the need of the community. The relevant stakeholders including HKBU should be consulted on how the Site could be made use of to its best.

64. Ms Gigi Chan then showed the videos of two alumni of HKBU, Mr Chiu Kwok Hung Justin and Mr Lau Chun Kong Ryan, who were in support of allocating the Site for HKBU's development in view of the shortage of space in the existing campus.

[Actual speaking time of C1737: 5 minutes]

65. As the presentation from the Government representative, commenters and commenters' representatives had been completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

66. In response to the question from a Member on what uses KCDC would suggest to be accommodated in the Site, Mr Ho Hing Ming (C1521) said that KCDC had not had any discussion on the future use of the Site. If the Government proposed to retain the site for GIC use, it could bring its land use proposals to KCDC for consultation.

67. In response to the Chairman's question on how to accommodate the various community uses, such as the aforementioned community hall, elderly centre, elderly home, indoor recreation centre and dental clinic, together with a CMH and the teaching facilities of HKBU at the Site, Mr Ho Hing Ming (C1521) said that he did not consider that there would be any conflict between the various GIC uses on the same site, and HKBU could be asked to incorporate various community uses into their development. It might take about five years to complete the development if HKBU was allocated with the Site. However, if the project was to be undertaken by the Government which would need to go through a cumbersome procedure including consultation with the different departments on the GIC uses to be provided, it might take over a decade for completion.

68. The Chairman said that due to the limited site area of the Site and the development restrictions, it would not be possible to accommodate all the proposed community uses together with HKBU's facilities. In response to the Chairman's question, Mr Ho Hing Ming (C1521) said that he would consider from the DC point of view that community facilities should prevail over HKBU's educational facilities at the Site.

69. The Vice-chairman said that there was an unusual argument from some commenters that the student hostel of a university would not be compatible with residential uses in its vicinity as it could result in conflict between the residents and students. He asked if the commenters could elaborate on the nature of the conflict and whether other uses or developments, such as special school, would be compatible with student hostel. In response, Ms Gigi Chan (C1737) said that the students would very often organise student activities in the hostel and sometimes the activities were carried out overnight. There was inevitably noise made by students arising from the activities, which might disturb the residents nearby and cause their complaints. As the Site was already next to a student hostel and there was another proposed student hostel to be built to its north, it could be expected that the future residential use at the Site could be subject to even more nuisance from the student hostels than the current situation.

70. The Chairman asked if a residential care home for the elderly or a community hall which also organised activities from time to time would be compatible with a neighbouring student hostel of HKBU. In response, Mr Ho Hing Ming (C1521) said that there should be no problem to build a community hall or a dental clinic next to a student hostel as the users of the community hall or clinic would not stay overnight, and the students could even organise activities in the community hall. As the community hall could be built with noise insulation design, the activities in the community hall and student hostel would not affect each other. As regards the elderly home, due to the habit of the elderly people who often went to bed early and woke up in early morning, the student activities in the midnight might not cause much nuisance to the elderly people.

71. In response to a Member's question on why she considered that the activity noise from the student hostel in the midnight would affect the nearby residents if student hostel was also subject to compliance with the environmental legislation on noise control after 11 p.m., Ms Gigi Chan (C1737) said that while student hostel should comply with environmental legislation at all times, it would help avoid any possible conflict if residential use was not planned immediately next to student hostel at the outset. Mr Ho Hing Ming (C1521) also said that the conflict between residential use and student hostel use had been discussed at KCDC meetings many times and the most notable conflict was between Royal Peninsula and the student hostel of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University

for which the Police had been called to resolve the conflict. As such, it was undesirable to locate new residential use next to existing student hostels.

72. A Member asked Ms Gigi Chan (C1737) how the students in the hostel would react if the nearby residents asked them to lower their noise during activities. Ms Gigi Chan (C1737) said that she chose not to respond to the question.

[Professor P.P. Ho left the meeting at this point.]

73. On the provision of students hostels, Mr Wallace K.K. Lau, PAS(HE), EDB, said that under the education policy, student hostels formed an integral part of a university for students to experience university life. Students studying 4-year full-time courses at UGC-funded universities would have an opportunity to reside in student hostels for at least one year. The noise nuisance problem from student hostels on the nearby residents was not limited to the Kowloon City district. Noise mitigation measures could be incorporated into the building design of new student hostels to minimise potential noise nuisance to neighbouring uses, such as using solid walls to face residential uses in the vicinity.

74. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairman thanked the remaining commenters, commenters' representatives and the Government representatives for attending the meeting. They all left the meeting at this point.

75. As no more commenters or commenters' representatives had arrived to attend the session, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.