

1. The meeting was resumed at 9:10 a.m. on 4.1.2018.
2. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting:

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

Chairperson

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr H.F. Leung

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

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

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

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

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

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Agenda Item 1 (Continued)
[Open Meeting]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of Draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning
Plan No. S/K22/5

(TPB Paper No. 10365)

[The item was conducted in English and Cantonese.]

Group 2

3. Members' declarations of interests were made at the hearing sessions on 7.12.2017 and 14.12.2017. Since Ms Christina M. Lee had been appointed as a member of the Student Development Discipline Advisory Board of the Vocational Training Council (VTC), she also declared an interest in the item. The revised declaration of interests was placed on the visualizer for Members' information. Members noted that Messrs Ivan C.S. Fu, Franklin Yu, Patrick H.T. Lau, Stephen L.H. Liu, H.W. Cheung, K.K. Cheung, Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon, Miss Winnie W.M. Ng, Ms Janice W.M. Lai and Ms Christina M. Lee had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. For those Members who had no direct interests or involvement in the subject project, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions (Continued)

4. The Chairperson said that reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenters inviting them to the hearing, but other than those who were present or had indicated that they would attend the hearing, the rest had either indicated not to attend or made no reply. As reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenters, Members

agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations and comments in their absence.

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

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

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

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

Transport Department (TD)

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

Education Bureau (EDB)

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

Representers, Commenters and their representatives

R273/C311 - Tang Wing Chun District Councillor

R4075 - 劉鶴年

R5510 - Virginia K H Wong

Tang Wing Chun District Councillor - Representer and commenter and representers' representative

R297 - Stephen Ho

R457 - M Yeung

R482 - Ng Ching Man

R530 - Lisa Ng

R620 - Li Yee Ping

R634 - Viann Yuan

R701 - Au Sin Yee

R738 - Lo Wai Man

R808 - Lee Sau Wah

R904 - Yeung Kai Yuk

R1040 - Iris Lee

R1047 - M K Lee

R1407 - E Che

R1857 - 曾偉傑

R1858 - 曾嘉玲
R1970 - Cho Kwang Hyun
R2068 - Wing Pui Ling
R2278 - Miss Tse
R2416 - Agnes Pang
R2713 - Sarah Leung
R3173 - Chiu Chi Man
R3302 - 黃祖道
R3840 - Wong Janet
R3971 - 黃倩儀
R4467 - Wing Pui Ling
R5456/C488 - Li King Man
R5528 - 張浚曄
R5780 - Lie Sze Wan
R5942 - 黃翠瑩
R6061 - Poon Wing Lin
R6475 - 區倩頤
R6672 - Wong Hoi Chi
R7146 - Ching Tai Hing
R7779 - John Chan
R7803 - Annie Yung
R8447 - Peggy Li
R8622 - 張耀輝
R9223 - 朱建文
R9249 - Shailesh Kuwaderkar
R9371 - Lai Wai Hon Vicky
R10176 - Lau Sui Wai
R10549 - Look Pui Fan
R11051 - Law Ching Man
R11858 - 謝麗娥

R1859 - 曾嘉晉
R1985 - Eric Che
R2158 - 潘永濂
R2378 - William Poon
R2660 - Kristy Li Man Yan
R2725 - Tsang Kin Keung
R3233 - Chan Tsz Tik Sin
R3462 - 李旻殷
R3865 - Chu Kin Man
R4293 - Mak Shuk Han
R5411 - 劉麗萍
R5473 - Fong Nelson
R5669 - 李相坤
R5781 - Wu Wai Yee Annie
R5982 - Lai Oi Lin
R6071 - Ng Ho Ying Clara
R6480 - Li Au Yuet May
R6955 - Chase Li
R7455 - Lau Sai Leung
R7782 - Shanne G Ceria
R8130 - Yang Wei Xin
R8516 - Pat Chan
R9049 - 謝麗珍
R9246 - Shannaz Bhalla
R9298 - Kim Young Sim
R9808 - Connie Law
R10293 - 何有權
R10636 - Li Ka Kit
R11615 - Lau Sze Wai
R12083 - Ashrey G

Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront Concern Group -

Mr Fung Wah Sang - Representers' and commenter's

representative

R336 / C392 - Leung Yiu Por

Mr Leung Yiu Por

- Representer and commenter

R353 -馮慧儀

R368 - Wong Wai Chee Maria

R509 - Leung Ka Wun Elisa

R552 -戴傑文

R595 - Leung Man Ka

R650 - Fung Oi Lin Irene

R1059 - Lo Yip Chong Ralph

R1066 - Lee Yuen Lok

R1170 -李楠

R1401 - Lee Shui Wan

R1408 - Leung Pui Kwan Theresa

R1468 - Cheng Wing

R1562 - She Long Hei

R1609 - Fong Kwan Ting

R1740 - Law Shiu Wing

R1755 - Lo Suet Yee

R1940 - Agnes H K Choi

R2059 - Thomas Chan

R2143 -黃小卉

R2215 - Lau Pui Kei

R2269 -黃勝任

R2443 - Francis Chau

R2627 - Cheng Bik Hoi

R2679 - Chau Ka Ching Grace

R2897 - Cheng Leung Kit

R2898 - Choi Suk Yee

R2999 - Tang Wai Ming

R3156 -陳維朗

R3249 - Chung Man Yi

R3381 -汪菁菁

R4649 - Tam Wan In

R4651 -楊汗青

R4905 - Tang Ming Ming

R4958/C1397 - Tai Kit Man

R5372 - Leung Kin Chung

R5580 - Leung Wai Yin Michelle

R5613 - Ko Kam Hung

R5772 - Sze Wing Lam

R5779 - Ho Wing Kuen

R6221 - Chan Ka Lee

R6250 - Eddie Tsang

R6537 -杜月華

R6547 - Ho Chun Wai

R6886 - Chung Yee Wai

R6887 - Chau Kam Tim

R6977 - M C Fong

R7154 Lai Wang Yu

R7694 - Ip Ka Wing

R7733 - Look Pui Fan

R7776 -朱嘉恩

R8577 - J Lo

R8813 - Chung Man Yi

R8949 - Wong Kam Mui

R8995 -唐碧玲

R9178 - Linda So

R9463 - Look Pui Fan

R9569 - Denny Sze

R9697 - Mak Ka Chun

R10365 - 黃大安

R10733 - 洪進華

R10915 - Annilca Yiu

R11080 - 李志健

R11404 - 潘展鴻

R11729 - Man Wai Kuen

C326 - Shum Lai Fong

C473 - Ng Yiu Kuen

C513 - Lam Chung Sing

C705 - Law Wing Kai Ringo

C874 - Chung Chi Kwong

C886 - Christa Fong

C1005 - 鄧守雋

C1022 - 蔡凱晴

C1028 - Kwok Wai Hung Stephen

C1229 - Lam Lai Yi

C1340 - Chan Yuk Kee

C1422 - Magdalene Tang

Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront Concern Group -

Mr Lai Wang Yu

Mr Tse Chun Wah

R9284 - Wat Wai Sing

R9547 - 陳嘉慧

R9681 - Calvin Kan

R9973 - Dick Leung

R10557 - Wilson Fong

R10795 - Leung Man Ka

R10951 - 周鑑明

R11232 - Lee Yui Yuen

R11557 - Wai Sin Kei

R12027 - Goman Siu

C349 - Lee Yuen Lok

C510 - John Lo

C534 - Law Lok Yin

C761 - 李楠

C875 - Chu Lok Wai

C887 - Edward Tang

C1017 - F Hui

C1027 - Hui Miu Sheung

C1227 - Cheng Bik Hoi

C1230 - Cheng Man Hon

C1391 - Man Tsz Ho

- Representers' and Commenters'
representative

R2207 - Danny Lau

R2292 - Ed Tam

R5581 - 雷振修

R7435 - 辛錦齡

R9107 - Ng Yuk Chan

C966 - Alson Wing Hong Wong

C1348 - Catherine Ng

起動九龍東發展關注組 -

Mr Kwan Sik Jung Aron

- Representers' and Commenter's
representative

R2749 - 陳玉芝

R3102 - Leung Anthea

R5040 - Wong Mealhel

R7401 - 周少麗

R7759 - Chan Yuk Fen

R11839 - Kity

C610 - 陳玉芸

Ms Cheung Lok Lam

- Representers' and Commenter's
representative

R4843 - Ngai Ngok Pang

Mr Ngai Ngok Pang

- Representer

R5664 - Tse Chun Wah

R8977 - Samuel Fong

C1192 - Lai Wang Yu

C1248 - Fong Sing Sum

Hon Wu Chi Wai

- Representers' and Commenters'
representative

R6224/C1172 - 許麗華

C626 - 潘殷賢

C841 - Poon Kam Sing

C1283 - 潘穎賢

茶果嶺原居民權益協進會 -

Mr Law Ma Sing

- Representer's and Commenters'
representative

R7281 - Chen Kin Kwan

Mr Chen Kin Kwan

- Representer

R8561 - Zhang Zhe

Mr Xie Li - Representers' representative

R9207 - Ho Chi Wan

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representers' representative

R9970/C704 - Law Tak Wing

Mr Law Tak Wing - Representer

R10619 - Chan Wai Fong

C813 - Terence Tam

C929 - Thomas Li

Mr Tung Chung Leung Edmond] Representers' and Commenters'

Ms Lam Mei Chun May] representative

R11848/C703 - Yu Yuk Ching Fenda

Ms Yu Yuk Ching - Representer and Commenter

6. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that the video recording of the presentation made by the representative of PlanD on the first day of the Group 2 hearing (i.e. 7.12.2017) had been uploaded to the Town Planning Board (the Board)'s website for the meeting and would not be repeated in this session of the meeting. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, each representer/commenter or their representative was allotted 10 minutes for making presentation. There was a timer device to alert the representers/commenters or their representatives two minutes before the allotted 10-minute time was to expire and when the allotted 10-minute time limit was up. Question and answer (Q&A) sessions would be held after all attending representers/commenters or their representatives had completed their oral submissions on that day. Members could direct their questions to government representatives, representers/commenters or their representatives. After the Q&A sessions, the hearing of the day would be adjourned, and the representers/commenters or their representatives and the government representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. After hearing of all the oral submissions from the representers/

commenters or their representatives who attended the meeting, the Board would deliberate on the representations/comments in their absence, and inform the representers/commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

7. The Chairperson then invited the representers, commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their written submissions.

R4075 - 劉鶴年

R5510 - Virginia K H Wong

R273/C311 - Tang Wing Chun District Councillor

8. Mr Tang Wing Chun made the following main points:

Local views and public consultation

- (a) he was an elected Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC) member of Laguna City. The objection of the residents in Laguna City against the rezoning of the Cha Kwo Ling (CKL) Park to the proposed VTC campus was well-founded. The Government's attempt to provide flimsy consultation materials and cover up the fact that the subject site in Wai Yip Street / CKL Road (the Site) was a planned district open space (DO) in their consultation in October 2016 so as to obtain KTDC's support was unacceptable;
- (b) KTDC had been consulted twice and maintained its objection to the proposal. In the KTDC meeting on 2.3.2017, he moved a motion to object to the rezoning of the Site from "Open Space" ("O") to "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC"). Many members expressed views that the traffic and provision of community services issues arising from the various rezoning of sites for developments in the past should first be addressed before the proposal was considered. Just two days before expiry of the publication period of the representations to the draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K22/5 for comment (the publication period), a workshop was conducted on 2.8.2017 for the

Harbourfront Commission (HC) to consider a revised development proposal prepared by VTC. If it was not the Chairman who invited representatives of Laguna City to the workshop, the residents would not have knowledge about the revised scheme. Because the revised proposal had not been put up for discussion in KTDC, no comments from KTDC could be given at that stage. The second time when KTDC was consulted on the rezoning on 7.9.2017, it was after the publication period. A motion was moved personally by him to request the Government to implement the CKL Park in accordance with the original plan. The revised motion was ultimately passed by 22 votes. KTDC had all along supported the construction of the CKL Park and harbourfront promenade to meet the needs of the residents;

Legitimate expectation for a park

- (c) it had been shown on the Preliminary Outline Development Plan of the Kai Tak Planning Review and the relevant planning document in 2006 that the Site, which had been used for short-term waste recycling yards and barging points as well as works area of various government departments, was planned for the CKL Park. It was the legitimate expectation of the residents that the Site would be developed as a park after the short term uses were removed. In fact, the CKL waterfront area should be reserved not only for the residents of Laguna City, but people of Hong Kong as a whole as a leisure ground where people could appreciate the fireworks displayed in the Victoria Harbour; and
- (d) he did not object to building a school campus per se but there was no imminent need for the proposed VTC campus which had no need to be located in the waterfront. It could be located elsewhere, leaving the scenic harbourfront for open space and other facilities, such as library, art gallery and playground. A renege on the Government's promise to develop the CKL Park would disappoint the residents, and affect social harmony and the governance of the Government.

9. Since some of the representers, commenters and their representatives requested to make their oral submissions first, with no objection from the attendees, the Chairperson acceded to the requests.

R2749 - 陳玉芝

R3102 - Leung Anthea

R5040 - Wong Mealhel

R7401 - 周少麗

R7759 - Chan Yuk Fen

R11839 - Kity

C610 - 陳玉芸

10. Ms Cheung Lok Lam made the following main points:

- (a) she was a community development officer of Laguna City. According to paragraph 229 of the Chief Executive (CE)'s 2017 Policy Address, the harbourfront was a precious natural asset in the urban area and the community was encouraged to make better use of the harbourfront so that it would become more vibrant and more quality open space would be provided for public enjoyment. With a view to retaining the CKL Park, residents of Laguna City had submitted a letter to CE in October 2017 enclosing a lot of information and professional advice for CE's consideration;

Traffic concerns

- (b) planning should be for the convenience of the residents with all the relevant issues being duly taken into account. The residents had repeatedly raised their concerns that the traffic conditions in Kwun Tong would not be able to support the proposed VTC campus which would bring in an addition of some 6,800 students and staff to the area. However, the Government had not taken the views of the residents seriously. Shing Yip Street, Wai Yip Street, Sin Fat Road and areas around the MTR Lam Tin Station were already very congested and the passenger lifts in Laguna City were heavily used during

peak hours. Any incidents occurred to the passenger lifts would be chaotic and an accident in Kwun Tong Bypass would cause traffic to a complete standstill for an hour. Besides, the shuttle bus services between the proposed VTC campus and the MTR Yau Tong Station would unlikely be a service welcomed by the students and staff. The MTR had in September 2017 offered shuttle bus service to the residents of Laguna City. However, due to the inconvenient drop-off point and long travelling time caused by slow moving traffic, people using the service dropped tremendously after they realized how ineffective the service was;

- (c) there were some 700,000 people living in Kwun Tong, the transportation infrastructure had reached its full capacity. During peak hours, people had to wait for three MTR trains before they could get on board or get stuck in road traffic for 45 to 60 minutes. Most of the students of the proposed VTC campus, who would finish their classes by 5 to 6 o'clock, would use public transport to go home, aggravating the evening peak traffic of Kwun Tong. There was no reason to put the proposed VTC campus in Kwun Tong;

Public consultation

- (d) the public consultation on the subject rezoning had not been done according to proper procedures and the Government had not provided detailed and satisfactory responses to the comments of the residents. The request of the residents was not to build the proposed VTC campus on the Site. Reducing the size of the campus and the student intake from 8,500 to 6,000 could not address the request. As regards the provision of 1 ha of land within the "G/IC" zone for public open space, it was uncertain how often the public could use the area as students of the proposed VTC campus also had the right to use it;

Need for open space

- (e) open space was desperately needed for people to relax, to escape from the hustle and bustle, particularly after work, and for good physical and mental

health. Being situated next to Laguna City and the commercial area of Kwun Tong, the Site would be an ideal place for a park for residents and workers; and

- (f) Members were requested to take into account the pledge in CE's 2017 Policy Address for a beautiful harbourfront before deciding whether to approve the proposed VTC campus at the Site.

R5664 - Tse Chun Wah

R8977 - Samuel Fong

C1192 - Lai Wang Yu

C1248 - Fong Sing Sum

- 11. Hon Wu Chi Wai made the following main points:

Future developments in the district

- (a) residential developments and redevelopments in the district were in the pipeline. A comprehensive residential development in Yau Tong Bay for some 6,500 units had been approved, the "Comprehensive Development Area" ("CDA") sites in the Yau Tong Industrial Area would be developed for another 3,500 units, Wing Shan Industrial Building was proposed for hotel development, and private and public housing developments in the ex-Kaolin Mine site and the "Undetermined" ("U") zone of CKL Tsuen as well as redevelopment of the old tenement housing in Fan Wa Street would likely take place in the coming years. An integrated planning for optimal use of land, taking into account, amongst others, the population intake and cumulative traffic generated by the various planned developments as well as the open space that needed to be provided/retained to meet the demand, was required. Such an approach should help decide whether the infrastructure of the district could support the proposed VTC campus, whether the proposed VTC campus would have adverse impact on the development/redevelopment of CKL Tsuen and the tenement housing, and whether the loss of the CKL Park, which was a district open space (DO), was desirable;

Better alternative site

- (b) even if the proposed VTC campus had to be provided in CKL, the “U” zone of CKL Tsuen would be a better alternative site, despite land resumption and clearance of squatters would inevitably be required, as it was within walking distance to the MTR Yau Tong Station near Yau Lai Estate. Students would find it convenient to walk to the MTR Yau Tong Station on foot rendering the long walk to the MTR Lam Tin Station via Laguna City unnecessary;
- (c) notwithstanding the above suggestion that the “U” zone was a better alternative site for the proposed VTC campus, he considered that there was no imminent need for re-provisioning of the Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education (IVE) in Cheung Sha Wan (IVE (Haking Wong)) and Kwun Tong (IVE (Kwun Tong));

Functions of the CKL Park

- (d) the CKL Park was an extension of Tsui Ping Nullah and a connection to the waterfront promenades forming a gathering node for Kwun Tong residents for leisure. To be in line with the planning intention of the Site, there was a need to keep the park for use of the residents after the recycling yards and barging points on the Site were removed; and
- (e) Members were requested to note that there was no imminent need to develop the proposed VTC campus, and consider adopting an integrated approach to planning the area holistically to keep the open space as required, to re-provision the relevant facilities at appropriate location and to make the best arrangement of land uses along CKL Road without jeopardising the planned developments in the pipeline.

R336 / C392 - Leung Yiu Por

12. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr Leung Yiu Por made the following main points:

Background of current vocational and post-secondary education

- (a) in promoting vocational education, the former CE stated in his 2016 Policy Address that the Government would earmark a site in the urban district to develop a VTC campus with adequate capacity and state-of-the-art facilities. A site in CKL was then identified for the purpose and the location was reported in the CE's 2017 Policy Address;

Inadequacy of current vocational education

- (b) the prevailing vocational education relying on state-of-the-art campus and facilities and focusing mainly on intellectual training for a knowledge-based economy had deviated from the former emphasis on technical and prevocational skill development provided through prevocational secondary schools and technical schools;
- (c) the vocational education of Hong Kong was on the wrong track because:

Piecemeal recommendations

- (i) the recommendations of the Task Force on Promotion of Vocational Education (the Task Force), which steered towards the development of vocational education of the whole territory, were formulated only after four meetings of the Task Force and not thorough;

Declining emphasis on skill training

- (ii) the Task Force recommended rebranding vocational education as vocational and professional education and training with programmes

pitching at degree level to match the need of the global trend for a knowledge-based economy. It effectively shifted vocational education from skill training in the past to intellectual and professional nurturing to support international finance as well as the four pillars and six major industries. To facilitate the shift, state-of-the-art campuses and facilities were required. Getting used to the modern campus facilities, students who completed the training programmes were reluctant to take up jobs in the less pleasant working environment;

On-the-job apprenticeship training

- (d) vocational training should not be elite/professional training. Company-driven apprenticeship training, such as that practiced in Germany, to allow trainees to acquire the necessary qualification and experience for their future employment should instead be adopted. If the industry was large enough and had sufficient employment opportunities, it could provide its own training without relying on the resources provided by VTC;

Decline of vocational education and training

- (e) the decline in vocational training ascribed mainly to the meagre wages, long working hours, slim chance of promotion and unpleasant job nature that the trainees had to accept after they completed the programme. Taking health workers and care workers as examples, they received an hourly rate of HK\$45 and HK\$52.4 respectively and had to work 53 hours a week, which provided no incentives for people to get into the industries. The long working hours also forbade people to attend classes and complete assignments. As a result, the dropout rate of the training programmes was high. For instance, for the 851 trainees who had enrolled for the care services training courses organized by five institutions under the Navigation Scheme, only 266 completed the programme;

Way forward for vocational education and training

- (f) the Education Bureau (EDB) should help increase wages and promotional opportunities as well as reduce working hours to encourage people to receive vocational training. Vocational training should also be shifted from vocational and professional to vocational and general, and from VTC-driven to company-driven to promote the development of vocational skills of the general public;

Site selection

- (g) while the existing VTC campuses might be old and overcrowded, such problems were also found in the other institutions. Instead of reprovisioning the existing facilities, there was in-situ rebuilding or expansion of the institutions should be considered. An annex was also added to IVE (Sha Tin) for expansion of the institution. EDB should also explore ways to make full use of the vacant school premises;
- (h) planning of the harbourfront lacked vision. Hong Kong had only one Victoria Harbour and the use of the harbourfront should be planned carefully according to the established principles. Even if reprovisioning of the existing VTC campuses was required, the site should be near to where the students lived. As new towns clustered mainly in New Territories West, the proposed VTC campuses should be located there instead of the harbourfront site in CKL. The Government should provide full justifications for the use of the last harbourfront of Hong Kong for the proposed VTC campus if the VTC proposal was allowed to proceed;
- (i) the argument that students and staff of the proposed VTC campus would go to classes in flexible hours did not stand. The school hours of VTC institutions were from 8:30 am to 5 pm. Most staff and students went to and left the campus during peak hours; and
- (j) Members were requested to consider the matter from the general public's

perspective to decide the best use of the harbourfront.

R4843 - Ngai Ngok Pang

13. Mr Ngai Ngok Pang made the following main points:

No strong justification for the proposed VTC campus

- (a) there was no overriding justification for the proposed VTC campus to warrant a departure from the original planning intention of the Site for provision of open space for the public. The need to re-provision the two existing old and overcrowded VTC campuses did not stand because no proposal had been made to demolish the University of Hong Kong even though it was over 100 years old. In-situ improvement works, expansion and rebuilding were feasible alternatives. In view of the recent decline in student intake of the VTC institutions from some 50,000 students to some 30,000 students, there should not be any issue of crowdedness on the existing campuses and the need for re-provisioning the existing VTC campuses at the Site was not obvious;

Site selection

- (b) the Site was not an ideal location for re-provisioning the existing VTC facilities. It was not close to public transport. The nearest MTR station was some 20 to 30 minutes away on foot, and only three bus routes No. 219X, 40 and E22, which did not serve New Territories East, Tseung Kwan O, Sai Kung, Northwest New Territories and the Hong Kong Island, went to Laguna City / the Site and barrier-free access was unavailable;
- (c) he suspected that the Site would only be used for VTC facilities in the interim. It would subsequently be taken back for other developments on the excuse of insufficient student intake; and
- (d) Members were requested to note that there was no reason for the proposed

VTC campus. An approval of the proposal would only intensify the tension between the public and the Government.

R6224/C1172 - 許麗華

C626 - 潘殷賢

C841 - Poon Kam Sing

C1283 - 潘穎賢

14. Mr Law Ma Sing made the following points:

- (a) he was the Secretary of the concern group - 茶果嶺原居民權益協進會. If they were not informed by the residents of Laguna City, the some 600 households in CKL Tsuen of some 4,000 to 5,000 people and the some 20 tenement buildings in the area of another 4,000 to 5,000 residents would not have knowledge about the rezoning of the Site for the proposed VTC campus as they were not on the consultation list; and
- (b) the proposal would take up much area of the CKL waterfront and cause adverse traffic impact. To maintain good living standard of the local residents, Members were requested to help retain the CKL Park.

R7281 - Chen Kin Kwan

15. Mr Chen Kin Kwan made the following main points:

- (a) Hong Kong was renowned as the 'Oriental Pearl' and the harbourfront was a valuable asset. Loss of harbourfront land was irreversible and would be a loss to the 7 million of people in the territory;
- (b) although it was stated in CE's 2016 Policy Address that a VTC campus would be provided in the urban area, it did not say that it had to be in the harbourfront. The harbourfront should be safeguarded for suitable uses which could bring about long-term benefits to Hong Kong. There was no

reason for another VTC campus as student intake of VTC institutions was decreasing; and

- (c) Members were requested to assess if there was sufficient justification for the proposed VTC campus in the harbourfront and note that their decision would have long lasting impact on the future generations.

R2207 - Danny Lau

R2292 - Ed Tam

R5581 - 雷振修

R7435 - 辛錦齡

R9107 - Ng Yuk Chan

C966 - Alson Wing Hong Wong

C1348 - Catherine Ng

16. Mr Kwan Sik Jung Aron made the following main points:

Site selection

- (a) although he did not object to building a school campus per se, he objected to the use of urban land for the proposed VTC campus and the allocation of government land without proper monitoring. In terms of population distribution and sources of potential students, the proposed VTC campus should be located in the New Territories;
- (b) apart from the assessments on environment and traffic, an additional assessment on optimal use of land was required in designating land uses. VTC did not need a waterfront site, and land of lower value could be considered for the purpose. As shown on a plan on the visualizer, land zoned “Green Belt” (“GB”) to the north and south of the ex-Kaolin Mine site which met the site requirement of VTC could be used for the proposed VTC campus. Being located close to the MTR Yau Tong Station, the “GB” zone to the south of CKL Tsuen near CKL Road would obliterate the need of

students to walk to the MTR Lam Tin Station via Laguna City;

- (c) another site, which was 20 to 30 ha in area, zoned “Residential (Group A)” and close to MTR station, in Kwu Tung was suggested to be considered for the proposed VTC campus. Although 6 to 7 ha of the plot of land had been earmarked for public housing development, there should still be sufficient land for the VTC campus. Since land in Kwu Tung would only cost about HK\$4,000 per square foot, from optimal land use point of view, it would be more preferable to build the proposed VTC campus there than in the “GB” zone adjoining the ex-Kaolin Mine site in CKL where land would cost about HK\$7,000 to 8,000 per square foot;

Public consultation and local views

- (d) while the Site fell within the planning scheme boundary of Kai Tak OZP, it was located to the west of Wai Yip Street, wholly within Kwun Tong and CKL and had no direct connection with Kai Tak. Residents of Kwun Tong and CKL should have been consulted on the impacts of the proposed development on them. As representatives of the local residents and concern groups, he and the other attendees objected to the use of the Site for the proposed VTC campus;
- (e) as regards the hearing of the views of the locals and KTDC in the planning process, Members should note that in response to a query on why no consultation with CKL Tsuen had been conducted when CKL Tsuen was rezoned from “Residential (Group A)4” to “U”, PlanD said that there was no statutory requirement for consultation with the local residents, and KTDC had agreed to the rezoning. For the current case, residents of Laguna City and KTDC, which represented the interests of the community at large, had all along objected to the proposed VTC campus. Given that KTDC’s views were highly valued in the rezoning matter of CKL Tsuen, it would only be fair if KTDC’s objection to the subject rezoning was duly respected;

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai left this session of the meeting at this point.]

Heritage preservation

- (f) a venue under short term tenancy adjoining the Tin Hau Temple in CKL had been used for holding cultural and religious activities and was the only place outside Cheung Chau in Hong Kong that had held a Piu Sik (飄色) parade in commemoration of the birth of Tin Hau. Due to proximity of the Site to CKL Tsuen, it was a suitable reprovisioning site for the cultural and religious activities upon clearance of CKL Tsuen for future developments. The reprovisioning would help keep the tradition and might turn the Site into a tourist attraction. On the other hand, there was no justification to build on the Site the proposed VTC campus, which did not require a waterfront location and could be located elsewhere, sacrificing the interest of the 700,000 residents in Kowloon East or the seven million people of Hong Kong for the benefits of some 8,000 VTC students and staff. From the public interest point of view, the Site should not be used for the proposed VTC campus;

Compatibility

- (g) as stated in a letter dated 11.5.2015 in response to a development proposal in CKL Tsuen on the visualizer, PlanD considered that development in CKL had to take into account the visual amenity of the harbourfront and be compatible with the land uses in the surrounding areas. As a general guideline, new development should have due regard to the height profile of 80 to 92 mPD in Laguna City. The proposed VTC campus would become a massive wall in the harbourfront and would block the views of the harbour. The Board's decision would be subject to judicial review (JR) if it approved the building height (BH) of the proposed VTC campus to exceed 30 mPD noting that the "G/IC" zone to the south and the sewage treatment plant to the north of the Site in the waterfront was subject to a building height restriction (BHR) of 30 mPD and 15 mPD respectively; and
- (h) Members were requested to take into account the optimal use of land, local

views and public interest towards development in the waterfront in considering the representations and comments.

R9970/C704 - Law Tak Wing

17. Mr Law Tak Wing made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of Laguna City and objected to the proposed VTC development. CKL residents had long expected the implementation of the CKL Park. They were disappointed when they learned about the rezoning of the CKL Park to other uses;
- (b) the Site for the proposed VTC campus was not close to public transport. He usually got caught in traffic in Ngau Tau Kok for half an hour or even an hour if there was traffic accident on his way home after work. The traffic condition in Kwun Tong Bypass was no better as it was heavily used by the Tseung Kwan O residents. The proposed provision of shuttle bus services would be of little help if issues relating to road traffic and MTR services were not resolved. All roads in Kwun Tong had been operating in excess of their capacity. The East Kowloon Cultural Centre site at Lower Ngau Tau Kok Estate close to the MTR Kowloon Bay Station would be a better alternative Site for the proposed VTC campus; and
- (c) Members were requested to reconsider if the Site would be better used for leisure and cultural uses than for the proposed VTC campus.

R10619 - Chan Wai Fong

C813 - Terence Tam

C929 - Thomas Li

18. Mr Tung Chung Leung Edmond made the following main points:

- (a) the Zero Carbon Building (ZCB) in Kowloon Bay should have been built on the Site leaving the ZCB site, with more eating places and public

transport in the vicinity, for the proposed VTC campus. A swap of the uses would result in better use of land;

- (b) if the proposed VTC campus could be accommodated in taller buildings, there could be alternative sites. As the traffic in Kwun Tong was already very congested, the location of a massive and tall VTC campus in CKL was not desirable;
- (c) like the waterfront in Shau Kei Wan and North Point, the CKL harbourfront should be used for public gathering and enjoyment as well as preserving the harbour amenity; and
- (d) it was reasonable for the residents of Laguna City to expect implementation of the CLK Park upon removal of the temporary uses, such as the recycling yards. A huge VTC campus at the waterfront would definitely have adverse impact on air ventilation, traffic and visual amenity.

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

R297 - Stephen Ho

R482 - Ng Ching Man

R620 - Li Yee Ping

R701 - Au Sin Yee

R808 - Lee Sau Wah

R1040 - Iris Lee

R1407 - E Che

R1858 - 曾嘉玲

R1970 - Cho Kwang Hyun

R2068 - Wing Pui Ling

R2278 - Miss Tse

R2416 - Agnes Pang

R2713 - Sarah Leung

R3173 - Chiu Chi Man

R457 - M Yeung

R530 - Lisa Ng

R634 - Viann Yuan

R738 - Lo Wai Man

R904 - Yeung Kai Yuk

R1047 - M K Lee

R1857 - 曾偉傑

R1859 - 曾嘉晉

R1985 - Eric Che

R2158 - 潘永濂

R2378 - William Poon

R2660 - Kristy Li Man Yan

R2725 - Tsang Kin Keung

R3233 - Chan Tsz Tik Sin

R3302 - 黃祖道

R3840 - Wong Janet

R3971 - 黃倩儀

R4467 - Wing Pui Ling

R5456/C488 - Li King Man

R5528 - 張浚曄

R5780 - Lie Sze Wan

R5942 - 黃翠瑩

R6061 - Poon Wing Lin

R6475 - 區倩頤

R6672 - Wong Hoi Chi

R7146 - Ching Tai Hing

R7779 - John Chan

R7803 - Annie Yung

R8447 - Peggy Li

R8622 - 張耀輝

R9223 - 朱建文

R9249 - Shailesh Kuwaderkar

R9371 - Lai Wai Hon Vicky

R10176 - Lau Sui Wai

R10549 - Look Pui Fan

R11051 - Law Ching Man

R11858 - 謝麗娥

R3462 - 李旻殷

R3865 - Chu Kin Man

R4293 - Mak Shuk Han

R5411 - 劉麗萍

R5473 - Fong Nelson

R5669 - 李相坤

R5781 - Wu Wai Yee Annie

R5982 - Lai Oi Lin

R6071 - Ng Ho Ying Clara

R6480 - Li Au Yuet May

R6955 - Chase Li

R7455 - Lau Sai Leung

R7782 - Shanne G Ceria

R8130 - Yang Wei Xin

R8516 - Pat Chan

R9049 - 謝麗珍

R9246 - Shannaz Bhalla

R9298 - Kim Young Sim

R9808 - Connie Law

R10293 - 何有權

R10636 - Li Ka Kit

R11615 - Lau Sze Wai

R12083 - Ashrey G

19. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr Fung Wah Sang made the following main points:

- (a) he had been a civil engineer for over 40 years. The rezoning of the Site of over 3 ha from “Open Space” (“O”) for CKL Park to “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) for a proposed VTC campus warranted careful study as a piece of valuable harbourfront land was involved;

History and principles to protect the Victoria Harbour

- (b) to provide land for economic development, Hong Kong had to reclaim land from the Victoria Harbour. The Kai Tak Runway, Kowloon Bay and CKL were formed through reclamation in the 1950s. A large-scale reclamation at Wan Chai North for the provision of 28.5 ha of land for trunk road, promenade and Harbour Park, amongst others, was proposed in 1999 and had aroused a lot of discussion and queries in relation to the need for such a large-scale reclamation. According to the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO) enacted in 1997, the harbour was to be protected and preserved as a specified public asset and a natural heritage of Hong Kong people, and for that purpose there should be a presumption against reclamation in the Victoria Harbour. A judgment of the Court of Final Appeal (CFA) of a JR handed down in January 2014 on the draft Wan Chai North OZP had led to abandonment of the proposed Wan Chai North reclamation. As stated in the judgment of the JR, reclamation in the Victoria Harbour was subject to three tests, namely (i) compelling, overriding and present public need; (ii) no viable alternative; and (iii) minimum impairment to the harbour;

Application of the three tests

- (c) although CKL had been reclaimed, the three tests proposed for reclamation of the Victoria Harbour was borrowed to assess the proposed uses of the Site at CKL waterfront, i.e. the CKL Park and the VTC campus;

Overriding public interest

- (d) demand for waterfront site for festive events and fireworks was acute as evidenced by the intensive use of the Kowloon East promenade under Kwun Tong Bypass during festive seasons. There was an overriding public interest to provide the CKL Park in the waterfront to meet the aspiration/demand of the population while noting that VTC had not required a waterfront site for its campus;

Availability of alternatives

- (e) there was no alternative waterfront site in the Victoria Harbour for the harbourfront park while non-waterfront sites meeting the VTC's requirements could be made available for the proposed VTC campus;

Minimum impairment

- (f) the CKL Park would have no impact on the waterfront save beautifying it whereas the proposed VTC campus with huge buildings at the entrance to the harbour would cause irrecoverable impairment;
- (g) as the three tests showed, the proposed VTC campus was not suitable to be located on the Site;

CKL Park vs the proposed Harbour Park in Wan Chai North

- (h) although the proposed Harbour Park in Wan Chai, which involved reclamation, was abandoned due to the judgment of the JR case, it showed the Government's determination to provide a harbour park despite a huge sum of public fund might be involved. The Site, which was shown as CKL Park both on a landscape plan of the approved Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/2 and in the Kai Tak Planning Review, did not require reclamation. If the Government was so eager to provide a harbourfront park in Wan Chai North, there was no reason for the Government to abandon its plan to provide the harbourfront park in CKL for public enjoyment. To abandon the plan, the Government would be subject to criticism of favouritism and the differential treatment would also lead to social dichotomy and disharmony;

Control on campus design

- (i) despite the proposed VTC campus might be able to comply with the

Harbour Planning Principles (HPP) and the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), it was doubtful if the Board could control the design of the proposed VTC campus once the zoning of the Site was approved; and

Requirement of the campus

- (j) it was uncommon for VTC to specify the area of land, i.e. 3 to 5 ha instead of the gross floor area (GFA) requirement for the proposed campus development. Taking a hospital project as an example, regardless of the size of the site, as far as the site could accommodate a hospital of the specified GFA, it could be considered for development. The same principle should be applied to the development of the proposed VTC campus. He suspected that the proposed surrender of 1 ha of “G/IC” land for public open space in the revised scheme was just a means to juggle around the plot ratio of the proposed VTC campus and as the area concerned was still zoned “G/IC”, VTC might be able to take back the land later for other purposes.

R353 - 馮慧儀

R368 - Wong Wai Chee Maria

R509 - Leung Ka Wun Elisa

R552 - 戴傑文

R595 - Leung Man Ka

R650 - Fung Oi Lin Irene

R1059 - Lo Yip Chong Ralph

R1066 - Lee Yuen Lok

R1170 - 李楠

R1401 - Lee Shui Wan

R1408 - Leung Pui Kwan Theresa

R1468 - Cheng Wing

R1562 - She Long Hei

R1609 - Fong Kwan Ting

R1740 - Law Shiu Wing

R1755 - Lo Suet Yee

R1940 - Agnes H K Choi

R2059 - Thomas Chan

R2143 - 黃小卉

R2215 - Lau Pui Kei

R2269 - 黃勝任

R2443 - Francis Chau

R2627 - Cheng Bik Hoi

R2679 - Chau Ka Ching Grace

R2897 - Cheng Leung Kit

R2898 - Choi Suk Yee

R2999 - Tang Wai Ming

R3156 - 陳維朗

R3249 - Chung Man Yi

R4649 - Tam Wan In

R4905 - Tang Ming Ming

R5372 - Leung Kin Chung

R5613 - Ko Kam Hung

R5779 - Ho Wing Kuen

R6250 - Eddie Tsang

R6547 - Ho Chun Wai

R6887 - Chau Kam Tim

R7154 - Lai Wang Yu

R7733 - Look Pui Fan

R8577 - J Lo

R8949 - Wong Kam Mui

R9178 - Linda So

R9463 - Look Pui Fan

R9569 - Denny Sze

R9697 - Mak Ka Chun

R10365 - 黃大安

R10733 - 洪進華

R10915 - Annilca Yiu

R11080 - 李志健

R11404 - 潘展鴻

R11729 - Man Wai Kuen

C326 - Shum Lai Fong

C473 - Ng Yiu Kuen

C513 - Lam Chung Sing

C705 - Law Wing Kai Ringo

C874 - Chung Chi Kwong

C886 - Christa Fong

C1005 - 鄧守雋

C1022 - 蔡凱晴

C1028 - Kwok Wai Hung Stephen

R3381 - 汪菁菁

R4651 - 楊汗青

R4958/C1397 - Tai Kit Man

R5580 - Leung Wai Yin Michelle

R5772 - Sze Wing Lam

R6221 - Chan Ka Lee

R6537 - 杜月華

R6886 - Chung Yee Wai

R6977 - M C Fong

R7694 - Ip Ka Wing

R7776 - 朱嘉恩

R8813 - Chung Man Yi

R8995 - 唐碧玲

R9284 - Wat Wai Sing

R9547 - 陳嘉慧

R9681 - Calvin Kan

R9973 - Dick Leung

R10557 - Wilson Fong

R10795 - Leung Man Ka

R10951 - 周鑑明

R11232 - Lee Yui Yuen

R11557 - Wai Sin Kei

R12027 - Goman Siu

C349 - Lee Yuen Lok

C510 - John Lo

C534 - Law Lok Yin

C761 - 李楠

C875 - Chu Lok Wai

C887 - Edward Tang

C1017 - F Hui

C1027 - Hui Miu Sheung

C1227 - Cheng Bik Hoi

C1229 - Lam Lai Yi

C1230 - Cheng Man Hon

C1340 - Chan Yuk Kee

C1391 - Man Tsz Ho

C1422 - Magdalene Tang

20. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr Lai Wang Yu made the following main points:

- (a) he was an interior designer, a part-time instructor on environment and interior design, a member of the 'Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront Concern Group' and Owners' Committee of Laguna City, and had been living in Kwun Tong for about 30 years;

Design principles

- (b) safety, practicality, beauty and harmony were the four principles of design. The aqueducts of the old Roman times to bring water to cities to cool air and provide water for fountains performed a practical function and helped create a beautiful environment. With respect to harmony, if the design was not acceptable to people in the surrounding areas, it might have to be abandoned;
- (c) the proposed VTC campus did not comply with the design principle of safety. Wind played an important role in design safety. The Site was important for penetration of wind to Kwun Tong and Kowloon East. The prevailing summer and winter winds in Hong Kong were from southwest and northeast respectively. The proposed VTC campus would block wind penetration into the inland part of Kwun Tong. While retention of the CKL Park was essential for good air ventilation of Kwun Tong, the need to provide the proposed VTC campus at the Site was not imminent as student intake was declining and the existing VTC institutions were still in operation. Although it was claimed that there were over 100 sites of open space in Kwun Tong, many of them had been fenced off and left vacant for many years;

- (d) the location of a LPG filling station in the waterfront next to soccer pitch and basketball courts was another safety concern. The future LPG filling station was three times the size of the existing one. As the price of LPG was low, it would definitely attract a lot of taxis to the area;
- (e) the massive and tall VTC buildings at the waterfront were against the principle of beauty. The buildings near CKL Tsuen were only 20 to 30 m high. The proposed VTC campus was taller than those buildings and was hence not in conformity with HPP. VTC had not required a waterfront site. The campus could be located anywhere as long as the land requirement of 3 to 5 ha was met. It was also noted that the design of the proposed VTC campus could be flexible. In view of strong local objections, VTC put forth a revised scheme in 3.5 weeks;
- (f) the revised VTC campus was also not in harmony with the surrounding developments. The mistake of building the Harbourfront Landmark, which was four times taller than the surrounding developments, at the waterfront of Hung Hom should not be repeated. It was also noted that a tall building in West Lake, Hangzhou was pulled down because it was not in harmony with the surroundings;

Traffic concerns

- (g) the MTR stations were very crowded during peak hours on Fridays. Even with special arrangements to regulate passenger circulation, it would take about 15 minutes to get in/out of the stations. The provision of shuttle bus would not solve the traffic issues. Shing Yip Street, Hung To Road and Hoi Yuen Road were very congested in the evening peak hours. There were many more road junctions than those listed by the VTC consultant that had congestion problem and the claim that the four passenger lifts in Laguna City could handle the future VTC students was not convincing; and
- (h) Members were requested to note that the proposed VTC campus was not in

line with the design principles and find out if there was still missing information in the Government's/consultant's submission which was essential for the Board's consideration.

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

22. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions:

Site selection

- (a) why the Site but not the other places, e.g. in the New Territories, was selected for the proposed VTC campus;
- (b) whether the statistics on where students lived reflected the current or the future profile and why an urban location was important when student intake of VTC institutions was on a territorial basis;
- (c) why the requirement for the proposed VTC campus was based on land area but not GFA;
- (d) the planned use and potential GFA upon redevelopment of the two existing VTC sites in the urban area to be handed over to the Government;

CKL Tsuen

- (e) why areas adjoining CKL Tsuen were not suitable for the proposed VTC campus, and whether there was timetable for the land use review of the "U" zone of CKL Tsuen;

- (f) whether there were places of cultural or heritage value in the area;
- (g) the details of the letter issued by PlanD as mentioned by Mr Kwan Sik Jung Aron, representative of various representers and comments, in his presentation;

Technical concerns

- (h) whether all relevant factors and considerations had been fully covered in the consultant's report;
- (i) whether the TIA had taken into account future developments in the area and the traffic condition of Kwun Tong in comparison with the other districts;

Others

- (j) why a larger site was reserved for reprovisioning the existing LPG filling station; and
- (k) whether the three tests for harbour reclamation were applicable to the current rezoning.

23. In response, Ms Elaine T.L. Mak, PAS(Further Education), EDB made the following main points:

Site selection

- (a) the proposed VTC campus was for reprovisioning of IVE (Haking Wang) and IVE (Kwun Tong) which were over 40 years old. About half of the students lived in the nearby areas of the two VTC institutions and they wished the reprovisioning site to be located in the urban area. VTC had campuses in Tuen Mun, Tsing Yi and Sha Tin to meet the needs of the districts concerned and campus improvement programmes were also

available to upgrade the existing facilities;

- (b) the statistics reflected the current profile to which reference for future planning could be made. Although student intake of VTC institutions was on a territorial basis, it was noted that students living in the urban area preferred to select institutions in the urban area. The provision of a state-of-the-art campus in the urban area was to meet the need of the students and was important in promoting vocational and professional education and training as part of diversified education and to gain people's confidence in such education; and
- (c) although there was an overall drop in student intake of VTC institutions in year 2016-17 along with the other tertiary educational institutions, student intake was expected to increase after 2023 and there was a need to re-provision the existing institutions.

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

Site selection

- (a) As indicated by VTC due to special design and operation needs of a state-of-the-art campus, a site of 3 to 5 ha available for early development in the urban area was required;
- (b) the GFA of the two existing VTC campuses to be handed over to the Government was about 40,000 m² in aggregate and the site for IVE (Haking Wang) was about 1 ha and that for IVE (Kwun Tong) was about 1.2 ha. While BHR for IVE (Haking Wang) was 8 storeys, there was no BHR for IVE (Kwun Tong). The future use and future GFA of the two sites were subject to review and no such information was currently available;

CKL Tsuen

- (c) the "U" zone of CKL Tsuen, which was designated in end 2015, was 4.6 ha

in area, consisting of private lots and government land with squatters and was subject to development constraints imposed by historic buildings found in the area and the Tseung Kwan O - Lam Tin Tunnel. Timetable for the review of the “U” zone was yet to be confirmed. As detailed land use of the “U” zone was subject to review and the “GB” zones around CKL Tsuen were mainly sloping land, land in the two zones was not suitable for the proposed VTC campus;

- (d) in relation to places of cultural and heritage value, Tin Hau Temple and the Law’s Mansion in CKL Tsuen were Grade 3 historic buildings. It was noted that there were traditional cultural activities, such as dragon boat racing, organized by the residents in the past;

- (e) as regards the letter issued by PlanD on 11.5.2015, it was a coordinated reply of relevant government departments on a development proposal in CKL Tsuen and the adjoining areas submitted by the CKL villagers in December 2014. The proposed development, as shown on the photomontages placed on the visualizer, comprised 13 residential towers of 30 to 65 storeys, 4 village housing blocks of 20 storeys, a 63-storey high hotel, a 42-storey service apartment building and other facilities, such as a marina club which involved reclamation, and with a total GFA of 630,000 m². No visual impact and air ventilation assessment nor justification for reclamation of the Victoria Harbour had been provided to support the proposed development. The proposal with the tallest building of 200 mPD was substantially taller than the Laguna City development. In terms of development intensity and BH, the proposed development was not compatible with developments in the surrounding areas and the TIA report submitted was not acceptable to TD. The information provided in the letter was only comments on the proposal submitted from the planning point of view. The Government had not said that development was not allowed in the harbourfront across the board. Consultation had been conducted in accordance with the established procedures when CKL Tsuen was rezoned to “U” and the relevant documents were attached to the relevant TPB Paper concerned;

Technical concerns

- (f) in relation to the planning considerations of the proposed VTC development, VTC had submitted relevant technical assessments, such as visual impact assessment, air ventilation assessment, environmental impact assessment and TIA. Departments concerned, including the Environmental Protection Department (EPD), TD and PlanD, had no adverse comments on the assessments and considered the assessments and the relevant reports acceptable and that the proposed development would not have significant adverse impacts on the area;
- (g) the TIA conducted by VTC had taken into account the planned developments in the area, including the residential developments near CKL Tsuen, Yau Tong Bay and the Yau Tong Industrial Area, as well as the cumulative traffic impacts for the design year of 2026;

Others

- (h) in respect of the LPG filling station, the site area of the existing one occupied an area of about 2,500 m² while the proposed new LPG filling station would be about 5,900 m² in size. Both the existing and the new stations had 24 gas nozzles. A larger site was reserved for the new LPG filling station, as shown on a plan on the visualizer, to provide a taxi holding area for 45 taxis with the site to address the current tailing back problem of taxis onto Wai Lok Street causing traffic congestions in Wai Yip Street and CKL Road. The arrangement was in accordance with the findings of the TIA. As regards the safety issue of the LPG filling station, a buffer distance of 55m from residential/school developments and 15m from leisure facilities would be provided to comply with the HKPSG requirements. Less pollutant would be emitted from LPG vehicles comparing to traditional fueled vehicles. It was also understood that most of the pollutants of LPG filling station would be vapourized and soil contamination of LPG filling station, if any, would be less than the traditional petrol-filling stations making any subsequent decontamination works easier. In order to mitigate the visual

impact, appropriate measures such as greening and fencing, would be incorporated in the design of the new LPG filling station; and

- (i) concerning the three tests of harbour reclamation, according to PHO, the harbour was to be protected and preserved as a special public asset and there was a presumption against reclamation in the Victoria Harbour. The judgment of a JR in the early 2000s laid down the three tests for proposed reclamation in the Victoria Harbour. The three tests were not applicable to the proposed VTC campus development which would not involve any reclamation.

25. Miss Wendy W.T. Tang, E/KT1, TD, supplemented that all the large-scale planned developments in the vicinity of the campus site had been included in the traffic model of the TIA. The proposed shuttle bus service for the proposed VTC campus and the traffic conditions of the MTR Yau Tong Station had also been taken into account. Loading/unloading activities along CKL Road outside MTR Yau Tong Station would be subject to review where appropriate to ensure smooth traffic flow in the area. In order to relieve the traffic condition in Kowloon East, traffic management measures had been undertaken to enhance the traffic network and condition at major roundabouts and road junctions. Appropriate junction improvement works would also be carried out to facilitate the Anderson Road Quarry site, Anderson Road public housing development, the ex-Kaolin Mine site and Kwun Tong Town Centre. In the long run, Route 6 (comprising the Tseung Kwan O – Lam Tin Tunnel, the Central Kowloon Route), which would serve to substantially divert traffic from the road networks of Kowloon East and thus effectively alleviate traffic congestion in the district.

26. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing session on the day was completed. The Board would deliberate on the representations and comments in closed meeting after all the hearing sessions were completed and would inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representers, commenters, their representatives, and the Government representatives for attending the hearing. They all left the meeting at this point.

27. This session of the meeting was adjourned at 12:55 p.m.