

1. The meeting was resumed at 9:00 a.m. on 11.1.2018.
2. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting:

Permanent Secretary for Development  
(Planning and Lands) Chairperson

Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Professor S.C. Wong Vice-chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr H.W. Cheung

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon, Transport Department

Mr David C.V. Ngu

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)

Mr Elvis W.K. Au

Deputy Director of Lands (General)

Ms Karen P.Y. Chan

Director of Planning

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

**Kowloon District**

**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 Cantonese and English.]

Group 2

3. The Chairperson said that the meeting was to continue the hearing of the representations and comments in Group 2 in respect of the Draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K22/5 (the draft OZP).

4. The Secretary said that Members' declarations of interests were made at the hearing sessions on 7.12.2017, 14.12.2017, 4.1.2018 and 10.1.2018. Members noted that Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Ms Janice W.M. Lai, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Ms Christina M. Lee, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho, Mr K.K. Cheung, Miss Winnie W.M. Ng, Mr Franklin Yu, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu and Mr H.F. Leung 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)

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

6. The following government representatives, the 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)

## **Commenters and their Representatives**

C282 - Paul Chong

C283 - David Kwok

C284 - Wilson Lam

C285 - Terence Cheung

C286 - Edmond Lai

C289 - Joel Chan

C290 - Chan Lai Yan

C291 - Andrea Chan

C292 - Law Pui Lam

C293 - Sally Chan

*Vocational Training Council (VTC) –* ]

Mr Leung Yam Shing ]

Mr Albert Lai ]

Mr Daniel Yan ]

*Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong* ]

*Limited –* ]

Ms Theresa Yeung ] Commenters and Commenters’

Ms Carmen Chu ] Representatives

Ms Natalie Leung ]

Ms Kathy Lo ]

Ms Minnie Law ]

*P&T Architects & Engineers Ltd –* ]

Mr Joel Chan ]

Ms Sally Chan

]

C312 - Estate Owners' Committees of  
Laguna City (Phases 1, 2 & 4 and Phase 3)

C350 - Mak Chun Yu

C380 - Tang Hui Lun

C390 - Yeung Chun Yin

C393 - Ho Yau Kuen Stephen

C409 - Chan Fung Ming

C461 - Chan Chi Ping

C474 - Chan Wing Kiu

C701 - Chan Wai Yi

C707 - Jessica Ching

C710 - Choy Charn Lam

C713 - Chan Yuen Ping

C747 - Tse Yuen Shan

C827 - Wan Mei Fong

C851 - Leung Tsz Yim Gloria

C852 - Chan Wai Shun

C878 - Wu Sun Mui

C922 - Wong Chi Mei

C924 - Kwong Heung

C1043 - Michael Leung

C1051 - Chau Kit Shan

C1064 - 劉順萍

C1085 - Cheung Cheuk Lam Kelvin

C1106 - Ng Yee Kwan

C1127 - Wong Siu Tai

C1179 - Wong Chee Ki

C1268 - Yip Choi Luk

C1286 - Choi Miu Chu

*Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront Concern Group –*

Mr Kau Kin Tak

- Commenters' representative

C316 - Cheung Yick Wang Edwin

C372 - Yeung Chi Wai

C373 - Lee Kin Kau

C381 - Lam Tsz Wing

C451 - Wong Hau Ling

C464 - 程伯仁

C520 - 林綠

C582 - Chan Yuen Kwai Hing Pia

C615 - 羅淑嫻

C655 - Chan Kong Chiu Kenneth

C750 - 金文輝

C751 - 畢惠君

C789 - Ng Hok Chiu

C790 - Ng Kai Ming

C794 - 侯澤鸞

C806 - Chan Shing Chee Symphorosa

C832 - Wong Chak Kin

C833 - 羅翔譽

C834 - 羅詠柔

C835 - 林小英

C840 - Chow Cheuk Wang

C890 - 許昌翔

C891 - 許家豪

C899 - Yip Sau Lai

C918 - Pong Kwok Kee

C989 - 林小黎

C1048 - 李順娟

C1072 - Ko Yun Ling

C1246 - Lau Kit Him

C1359 - Anita Cheung Lau Yin

C1369 - Choy See Hang Sabrina

C1402 - Chau Chi Ming

*Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront Concern Group –*

Mr Cheung Yick Wang Edwin

Mr Wu Koon Keung

Mr Luk Pang Kei

C975 - Chau Yu Hin

C1038 - 易嘉澤

C1050 - Lam Shiu Kau

C1126 - Eliza Mok

C1317 - Lam Hoi Ka Karin

C1360 - Chau Kwan Nga Tiffany

C1395 - Tsang Ching Yee

] Commenter and Commenters'

] representative

]

C365 - Chan Po Ki

C413 - Tang Wai Kwan

C487 - Yeung Chi Hang

C548 - C H Wong

C586 - Cheung Shui Ying

C643 - Ngai Man Piu

C724 - Tse King Sun

C738 - 鄺香

C843 - Tsang Man Yan

C999 - Chik Kim Mei

C1068 - Ricky Tsang

C1220 - 曾國華

C1241 - Tsang Kwok Wah

C1293 - Eddie Chik

*Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront Concern Group –*

Mr Tse Chun Wah

C401 - Wong Kit Fong

C452 - Lam Yat Lung

C504 - Li Hoi Wah

C554 - Jean Chi

C641 - Leung Koon Yu Oberon

C714 - Cecilia Lam

C725 - Tse Hui Wah

C758 - Chung Yan Yan

C996 - Siti Khamidah

C1066 - 曾曼甄

C1069 - Choi Yik Ting

C1221 - 戚劍薇

C1274 - Lo Shao Hwa

C1294 - Koey Tang

- Commenters' Representative

C378 - Ng Ching Man

C458 - Au Sin Yee

C426 - Tsang Ka Ling

C459 - Poon Wing Lim

C463 - Tsang Ka Chun

C547 - 潘家行

C592 - Hau Hei Tung

C630 - 劉志成

C648 - Cheung Ka Chun Gordon

C728 - Wong Pik Man

C837 - Tsang Fan Chun

C1057 - Whang Bao Pei

C1080 - Cheung Yiu Fai

C1231 - 曾偉傑

C1349 - Leung Yuk Ching

C1407 - Lam Ka Wai

*Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront Concern Group –*

Mr Fung Wah Sang

C545 - 萬碧霞

C591 - 黃祖道

C606 - 侯諾憲

C639 - Hau Sai Leung

C667 - Szeto Ching Yan

C817 - Chow Suet Ying

C1002 - Ip Fai

C1058 - 李相坤

C1222 - Dai Yan Yan

C1269 - 荷英

C1396 - Lai Oi Lin

- Commenters' Representative

C260 - Mary Mulvihill

C517 - Wong Wai Lun

C715 - Ho Chi Wan

Ms Mary Mulvihill

- Commenter and Commenters'  
Representative

C872 - Ho Shuk Han

Ms Ho Shuk Han

- Commenter

C898 - Ng Yun Kuen

Mr Ng Yun Kuen

- Commenter

C901 - Shek Lai Ching

C1186 - Ching Yee Han

C1380 - Kan Chi Wai

Dr Hon Kwok Ka Ki

- Commenters' representative

C1350 - Lo Tak Wai

Mr Lo Tak Wai

- Commenter

7. 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's (the Board) website for the meeting and would not be repeated in this session of the meeting. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, each commenter or their representative was allotted 10 minutes for making presentation. There was a timer device to alert the 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 commenters or their representatives had completed their oral submissions on that day. Members could direct their questions to government representatives, commenters or their representatives. After the Q&A sessions, the hearing of the day would be adjourned.

8. The Chairperson then invited the commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their written submissions.

C260 - Mary Mulvihill

C517 - Wong Wai Lun

C715 - Ho Chi Wan

9. With the aid of the visualizer, Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

*Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG) Filling Station*

- (a) retaining the LPG filling station at harbourfront would infringe Harbour Planning Guidelines for Victoria Harbour and its Harbourfront Area (HPG) in particular on the need to allow safe passage of people and the elimination of incompatible land uses not conducive to public enjoyment of the facilities. The LPG filling station should be relocated outside the inner core of Victoria Harbour when opportunity arose. The current proposal, which not only

retained the LPG filling station but also enlarged its site area to twice of the existing size, was preposterous;

- (b) according to the discussion in various meetings of the Panel on Environmental Affairs of the Legislative Council (LegCo) and the written questions raised by some LegCo members between 2014 and 2016, it was noted that although LPG powered vehicles were less polluting, their catalytic converters should be replaced regularly to reduce emission of nitrogen oxides. However, 80% of LPG taxis were emitting excessively due to defective catalytic converters. Concentration of LPG as low as 2% would ignite in air. LPG would also travel along floors, downhill into gullies and settle in low spots as it was heavier than air. As many people liked to lie down on the ground in waterfront promenade, the proposed LPG filling station right next to the promenade would create adverse health impacts on the users there;
- (c) after the Government's launch of the LPG taxi scheme in 1999, LPG filling stations were set up with zero land premium with a view to providing LPG with regulated price to taxi drivers as an incentive for conversion to LPG. Currently, there were a total of 67 LPG filling stations, comprising 12 dedicated stations and 55 non-dedicated stations. Among them, 11 were on Hong Kong Island, 13 in Kowloon and 43 in the New Territories (NT) and islands. As 5 stations were located in Kowloon Bay area, there was no justification to retain the subject LPG filling station in a prime waterfront location;
- (d) the leases for LPG filling stations, which had a period of 21 years and were non-renewable, would expire in 2021/22. The lease for the subject LPG filling station should not be renewed and the site should be taken back for the provision of public open space (POS);

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

*Open Space Provision*

- (e) although request for a detailed breakdown of open space provision figure had repeatedly been made by representers, no details had been provided. The

delay in the provision of such crucial information was in breach of the obligation to provide reliable information to both Members of the Town Planning Board (the Board) and the general public. Members of the Board might not be able to carry out their duty of inquiry, which was an essential component of the hearing process in accordance with the court's judgement on the judicial review (JR) of the three OZPs in the NT;

- (f) she doubted if the planned open space provision figures were only produced to meet the planning standard of 1 m<sup>2</sup> per person. In fact, some of the planned open spaces such as the extension of the waterfront promenade in front of Cha Kwo Ling (CKL) Village might not be realized in our lifetime. The surplus in district open space (DO) provision of 0.07 ha was very marginal. The open space provision of 2.5 m<sup>2</sup> per person (including both local open space (LO) and DO) as recommended in the "Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030" ("HK 2030+") had been ignored;
- (g) while no details on the planned open space was provided, she believed that the 1 ha of POS to be provided by Vocational Training Council (VTC) should have been counted towards the planned open space provision. If the land was zoned "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") rather than "Open Space" ("O") and located within VTC's campus, there was no guarantee that VTC would return the POS to the community and the land would be used as genuine POS for the enjoyment of the general public. Noting the numerous lease violation cases and the Government's failure to take lease enforcement action, VTC might renege on its promise and build on the whole "G/IC" site and it would take decades to resolve the issue. As the 1ha of land would be zoned as "G/IC", it should not be counted towards open space provision;
- (h) as the waterfront site for the CKL Park (the Site) had been zoned as "O" for many years, Kwun Tong residents had legitimate expectation that a sizable park would be developed. However, instead of taking advantage of the scaling back of the proposed sewerage treatment facilities to provide a larger park, the POS was reduced to small pieces of land scattered along a heavily trafficked road. The adjacent LPG filling station would attract a large number

of taxis which would block the entrance to the harbourfront. To count the waterfront promenade as part of the CKL Park was misleading as the former was meant to be standalone project long promised to the community. The current rezoning proposal would result in a net loss of open space to the community;

*Justifications for VTC*

- (i) VTC's proposal to construct a large campus on a prime waterfront site on the spurious claim that a horizontal development would add prestige to VTC and encourage more enrolment from students in the urban area was unjustified;
- (j) although VTC stated that majority of its students in the two existing aged campuses were from the local areas, it had not provided solid data on enrolment. There was some imbalance in the geographical distribution of VTC facilities, with most of the existing campuses located in Kowloon and Hong Kong Island. New facilities should be provided in the NT to cater for the growing population there and provide an equitable opportunity territory wide. Although it was stated in the VTC Ordinance that skills training should be provided to persons with a disability, VTC failed to provide such training opportunity in NT East;
- (k) the proposed VTC campus at CKL would attract students from the NT and create burden on the transport network. The Transport Department (TD) should be asked to explain why a facility that should be put in the NT with counter-flow of the commuting traffic was currently proposed in the urban area;

*Alternative Sites*

- (l) VTC should consider constructing its campus at the "G/IC" site in Yau Ma Tei as proposed by some representers. Although the western portal of the Central Kowloon Route (CKR) would pass through the site, it was technically feasible to construct the campus on top of a platform over the portal of CKR;

- (m) another site at Pok Yin Road in Tai Po was proposed by some representers as an ideal location for the proposed VTC Campus as it was zoned “G/IC” and had a suitable site area. However, it was noted that the site had been put in the 2017-18 Land Sale Program before the statutory procedures for the amendment of the relevant OZP were completed, as a result of which Members of the Board might be under pressure to approve the rezoning proposal, and such a procedural arrangement might possibly be subject to JR;

*Technical Assessments*

- (n) no relevant technical assessment report was provided in the Town Planning Board paper for public inspection. There was grave concern that the proposed VTC development with a 70 mPD curtain wall next to the waterfront promenade would cause air ventilation and light pollution problems, which would affect the enjoyment of the waterfront promenade by the public;
- (o) according to the air ventilation assessment for the ex-Kaolin Mine site, area to the west of Laguna City was indicated as the planned CKL Park and waterfront promenade with a wind corridor from the sea to the inland area. As the Site was located in the entrance of sea breeze, its land use and building height (BH) were crucial to the wind environment of the wider area including the ex-Kaolin Mine site;
- (p) the proposed junction improvement works could not help resolve the serious traffic problems in Kwun Tong district. Besides, the enforcement of the Police could not be taken as a kind of solution as they were not responsible for solving traffic problems and would only respond to complaints;
- (q) the cumulative impact of the proposed developments on the surrounding areas, such as the new residential and commercial developments in Kai Tak, the conversion of industrial buildings to office use, the rezoning of the “O” and “G/IC” sites for public housing development and the Kowloon Bay Central Business District development, had been downplayed. It was noted that concern on traffic problems had been raised by LegCo and District Council (DC) members, employees at the new business area as well as local residents.

Members of the Board should not accept the piecemeal mitigation measures and approve the proposed amendments to the OZP unless a comprehensive traffic improvement plan for Kai Tak and Kwun Tong was provided;

*VTC's Facilities*

- (r) it was noted that VTC had put up a virtual hotel concept with 300 rooms instead of 60. Given there were strong objections from local hoteliers against the Icon Hotel in Tsim Sha Tsui operated by the Hong Kong Polytechnic University, the hoteliers in Kwun Tong might have concern on VTC's hotel, which could offer rooms with sea view at a similar room rate;
- (s) given a new institute of healthcare would be opened in 2020 in Ho Man Tin, there might be an oversupply of similar training facilities. New healthcare training facilities should be provided in the NT to support new hospitals there. Besides, VTC should be asked to clarify its plan to train healthcare expertise for the Mainland;
- (t) she doubted if VTC's proposal to open up its facilities for public use would be realized given the bad experiences in other similar cases; and

*Opportunity*

- (u) given the narrow strip of waterfront promenade in Ngau Tau Kok could not cater for the needs of the community, the opportunity to provide a magnificent waterfront park in CKL should not be squandered. The waterfront park would not only serve the local community, but also provide a venue for world-class events. While majority of the Site should be rezoned as "O", low-rise government, institution or community (GIC) facilities such as refreshment kiosks could be provided at its south-east corner. The LPG filling station should be relocated outside the harbourfront area while the sewage treatment plant (STP) could be maintained at the existing location.

C901 - Shek Lai Ching

C1186 - Ching Yee Han

C1380 - Kan Chi Wai

10. Dr Hon Kwok Ka Ki, LegCo Member, made the following main points:

- (a) he attended the Board's meeting in 2004 regarding the Central and Wan Chai Reclamation issues. After the court's judgement, the Government admitted that large-scale reclamation in Victoria Harbour was not in line with the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance and a number of measures including avoiding incompatible structures on both sides of Victoria Harbour had been proposed to enhance the harbourfront area;

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (b) the need of VTC to re-provision two existing overcrowded and aged campuses could not justify the taking away of a waterfront site originally reserved for the construction of CKL Park, which was well acknowledged by the LegCo. The Victoria harbourfront site, which was unique and important, should be used for the enjoyment of the Hong Kong people as a whole;
- (c) Kwun Tong district, with a population of more than 650,000, was one of the most densely populated areas in Hong Kong. The open space provision in Kwun Tong district was about 1m<sup>2</sup> per person, which was far below the standard of 2.5m<sup>2</sup> per person as recommended under the "HK 2030+";
- (d) lots of land including brownfield sites, Hung Shui Kiu new development area (NDA), Yuen Long South and NT East had been identified for development. Some "G/IC" sites in Kai Tak and San Po Kong had also been proposed to be rezoned for commercial and residential uses. He doubted if the site previously reserved for CKL Park was the only available site for the proposed VTC campus;
- (e) a planning mistake in the past had resulted in an incompatible industrial building to be built at Quarry Bay's harbourfront area. Similar mistake should not be repeated again. The West Kowloon Cultural District was originally planned for a large park but subsequently turned into a cultural

district with lots of commercial and residential developments and little area left at the waterfront for public use. The Central harbourfront area would also be filled with commercial developments later. Given not many waterfront sites were left, the Government should avoid developments which would result in a permanent destruction and irreversible loss of a valuable harbourfront site;

- (f) while waterfront park was an important breathing space for the grass roots, there was a lack of such facility in East Kowloon. The Site was important for the development of a waterfront park which would not only meet the needs of the people in CKL area, but also the people in East Kowloon and the whole territory; and
- (g) the Government should not adopt an easy way out by putting a use that did not require a harbourfront location at a valuable harbourfront site. The Development Bureau (DEVB) should liaise with the Education Bureau (EDB) to identify a more suitable alternative site to facilitate the long-term development of VTC. VTC should also refuse a harbourfront site given the grave concern on the protection of the Victoria harbourfront areas. The Site should be maintained as “O” to facilitate an early implementation of a waterfront park.

C282 - Paul Chong

C283 - David Kwok

C284 - Wilson Lam

C285 - Terence Cheung

C286 - Edmond Lai

C289 - Joel Chan

C290 - Chan Lai Yan

C291 - Andrea Chan

C292 - Law Pui Lam

C293 - Sally Chan

11. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Joel Chan made the following main points:

- (a) the views from Laguna City and from the opposite side of Victoria Harbour to the proposed VTC campus could be better visualized by the model and photomontages presented to the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (the Task Force) of the Harbourfront Commission (HC). The mock-up rendering prepared by some representatives might not be able to truly

reflect the latest development parameters and façade design of the Revised Scheme for the proposed VTC campus;

- (b) according to the Revised Scheme, there would be two building blocks with a separation distance of about 50 m and a pedestrian walkway in between for access to the waterfront promenade. To address the visual and air ventilation concerns, the proposed VTC campus would be shifted towards the harbourfront area leaving a distance of about 100 m from the nearest block of Laguna City; and
- (c) the proposed VTC campus would be set back from the shoreline by 58 m (i.e. 50 m wide waterfront promenade plus a setback of 8m from its south-western site boundary), which was greater than the proposed BH of 56 m for the western block and comparable to the proposed BH of 66 m for the eastern block. The proportion between the width of the waterfront promenade and the adjacent BH was much better than those in Kwun Tong (waterfront promenade of 30 m wide and adjacent BH of about 100 m) and Hung Hom (waterfront promenade of 20-30 m wide and adjacent BH of 70-80 m). The LPG filling station would also be set back from its south-western site boundary by about 15 m with a reduced covered area. The façade design of the proposed VTC campus would be further enhanced at the detailed design stage and the Task Force and District Council (DC) would be consulted in due course.

12. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Carmen Chu made the following main points in response to the queries of some representers/commenters on the traffic impact assessment (TIA):

- (a) pedestrian assessment at Sin Fat Road: apart from the survey point mentioned by some representers, another survey point located on the western side of Sin Fat Road had also been identified for pedestrian assessment. The result at both survey points revealed that there was sufficient capacity for pedestrian flow after the construction of the new VTC campus; and
- (b) trip rate reference case: the TIA had taken into account the vehicle and pedestrian trip rates of all existing VTC campuses. As the Kowloon Bay

campus had the highest vehicle trip rate and was located in the same district, and the Tsing Yi campus had the highest pedestrian trip rate with the number of students comparable to the proposed CKL campus, the vehicle and pedestrian trip rates in Kowloon Bay and Tsing Yi campuses respectively had been taken as reference cases.

13. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Theresa Yeung said that the air ventilation assessment (AVA) was conducted in accordance with the relevant technical circular and accepted by PlanD. The site spatial average velocity ratio (SVR) test points should not be confined to the perimeter of VTC campus site boundary as claimed by some representers, but positioned at the project site boundary including the proposed VTC campus, the reprovisioning of the LPG filling station and the soccer pitch, as well as two new basketball courts. SVR test points had also been provided in the surrounding area including the Laguna Park.

14. Mr Leung Yam Shing made the following main points in response to the views raised by commenters:

*VTC's Curriculum*

- (a) enrolment and employment: the accusations that there was under-enrolment in VTC's programmes and the graduates had a low employment rate could not be agreed to. On average about one-fourth of the students who took the Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary Education Examination would enrol in VTC's programmes. There was an over-enrolment in particular in the hotel and catering management programme. The employment rate of the graduates was higher than 70% in general and 90%-100% in hotel and catering related programmes;
- (b) degree programme: among the total enrolment of 18,000 students per year, about 1,000 students were enrolled under degree programme (less than 8%);

*Needs of VTC Campus*

- (c) location: while VTC was prepared to consider alternative site(s) if such were available, it was noted that no alternative site meeting the site requirement was available. The Site was considered suitable for the reprovisioning of

the two existing aged campuses which were located in Kowloon for more than 30 years. It was unfair to make the assumption that a site with sea view should not be reserved for VTC campus. VTC campuses were located in various districts in Hong Kong. VTC also had plan to provide new campuses in NDAs;

- (d) site requirement: the site requirement of 3 to 5 ha was to facilitate a horizontal development of the VTC campus which was essential for the cross-subject programmes such as engineering and health care with emphasis on practical experiences. The reduction in gross floor area (GFA) from 231,000 m<sup>2</sup> to 180,000 m<sup>2</sup> was a positive response to the comments received. Given a construction time of 10 years was required, a readily available site was important to ensure completion of the new campus by 2027;

#### *Design and Use of VTC Campus*

- (e) POS: the 1ha of POS in the western part of the Site would be implemented by VTC in accordance with relevant requirements and handed back to the Government for management and maintenance after completion. A permanent soccer pitch and two basketball courts with spectator stand would also be provided in the adjacent area. It was unfair to accuse that VTC would not return the POS to the public or the VTC students would occupy the adjacent public areas as no such complaint had been received in other existing campuses before;
- (f) opening up of facilities: as the VTC campus was mainly used for education purpose, its facilities would not be opened up for public use. However, VTC would continue its contribution to the community by providing services to the elderly and the youth;
- (g) hotel: the training hotel would provide 60 guest rooms, not 300 rooms as alleged by some representers. A simulated hotel might be developed for training purpose;
- (h) building bulk and permeability: a number of measures had been adopted to reduce building bulk and improve air ventilation and visual permeability such

as reducing the building footprints and reserving 1ha of the western part of the Site as POS;

*Technical Assessment*

- (i) the technical assessments, which were conducted in accordance with relevant guidelines, had been scrutinized and accepted by relevant government departments; and

*Consultation*

- (j) the design of the VTC campus had been enhanced taking into account the comments received. VTC would continue to communicate with the local residents and the Task Force of HC with a view to ensuring the proposed development would be commensurate with the surrounding environment.

C872 - Ho Shuk Han

15. Ms Ho Shuk Han made the following main points:

- (a) being a mother, she was concerned with the provision of POS and recreational facilities for the children. Should the proposed VTC campus be proceeded with, there was no alternative site in the Kwun Tong district for the provision of a waterfront park, which was in great demand in the district. The Government's original intention to provide a waterfront park in each district could not be realized and the local residents would be very disappointed as they had been expecting for a waterfront park for more than 10 years; and
- (b) the 50m wide waterfront promenade could not be considered as part of the waterfront park. Given the VTC campus did not need to be located in a harbourfront area, the Board was urged to maintain the original use of the Site as a waterfront park.

C898 - Ng Yun Kuen

16. Mr Ng Yun Kuen made the following main points:

- (a) reserving a valuable harbourfront site for the development of VTC campus was not justified. As the future population would mostly reside in the NDAs, he doubted why a site in the Kwun Tong district was identified for the proposed VTC campus;
- (b) Lam Tin MTR station and the adjacent road network were currently operating at their full capacity. They would not be able to cope with the increase in traffic demand generated from the proposed VTC campus; and
- (c) CKL Park could provide recreational facilities for the enjoyment of more than 600,000 people in East Kowloon and should be accorded with a higher priority. Alternative sites such as vacant school and ex-Kaolin Mine sites should be considered for the proposed VTC campus.

C1350 - Lo Tak Wai

17. Mr Lo Tak Wai made the following main points:

- (a) having lived in East Kowloon since four years old and the Laguna City for many years, he was very familiar with the area. His opposing views were not aimed to protect his own interest;
- (b) being a tailor, he was well aware that a piece of valuable cloth should not be used to make an ordinary school uniform. The same logic should be applied for the harbourfront site. As no more suitable site could be identified for waterfront park, the Site should not be reserved for uses which did not require a harbourfront location. He doubted if the Site was the only site in East Kowloon that could meet VTC's requirement. If the proposed VTC campus was proceeded with amid the strong local objections, the future students might need to bear the burden of the decision and suffered from the unfriendly treatment from the local residents;
- (c) the Government and the Board had the responsibility to allocate the limited land resources in an open and fair manner for the use of the general public. A cautious approach had already been adopted for new developments in Country Parks. Given the land along Victoria Harbour was more valuable and the

development was irreversible, any decision on the land use of the Site should be made with extra care taking into account the needs of the residents in East Kowloon; and

- (d) although there were a number of parks in the CKL area, they were not located in the harbourfront. The Site at a prominent harbourfront location should be used as a waterfront park for the enjoyment of the general public.

C312 - Estate Owners' Committees of  
Laguna City (Phases 1, 2 & 4 and Phase 3)

C380 - Tang Hui Lun

C393 - Ho Yau Kuen Stephen

C461 - Chan Chi Ping

C701 - Chan Wai Yi

C710 - Choy Charn Lam

C747 - Tse Yuen Shan

C851 - Leung Tsz Yim Gloria

C878 - Wu Sun Mui

C924 - Kwong Heung

C1051 - Chau Kit Shan

C1085 - Cheung Cheuk Lam Kelvin

C1127 - Wong Siu Tai

C1268 - Yip Choi Luk

C350 - Mak Chun Yu

C390 - Yeung Chun Yin

C409 - Chan Fung Ming

C474 - Chan Wing Kiu

C707 - Jessica Ching

C713 - Chan Yuen Ping

C827 - Wan Mei Fong

C852 - Chan Wai Shun

C922 - Wong Chi Mei

C1043 - Michael Leung

C1064 - 劉順萍

C1106 - Ng Yee Kwan

C1179 - Wong Chee Ki

C1286 - Choi Miu Chu

18. With the aid of the visualizer, Mr Kau Kin Tak made the following main points:

- (a) he was the Chairman of the Estate Owners' Committees of Laguna City (the OC) (Phase 3) and a member of the Kwun Tong South Area Committee (KTSAC) of Kwun Tong DC. He represented the objecting views against the proposed rezoning of the Site from "O" to "G/IC" for the proposed VTC campus;
- (b) although the Site was originally planned for the development of a waterfront park to meet the needs of the people in East Kowloon after consultation, it had

not been implemented due to the proposed Trunk Road T2 project. As such, if a site previously reserved for the ventilation shaft and administration building of Trunk Road T2 was no longer required, the land released should be used for the development of the waterfront park;

- (c) the Site, which was within the harbour limit of Victoria Harbour, should be planned with extra care. It was noted that the Task Force of HC had reached a consensus at its meeting on 5.4.2017 that it could not support the rezoning proposal for the development of a VTC campus at CKL waterfront. In an informal briefing session held on 2.8.2017, VTC presented a revised scheme to some of the Task Force members. He had also attended the briefing session as one of the representatives of the OC. A letter from the Secretariat of the Task Force summarizing the major views of the members was at Annex III of the Paper. As the briefing session was informal in nature with the attendance of only ten members and not all of the attendees had provided comment, their views could not be taken as the stance of the Task Force. He considered that the Task Force's stance of not supporting the VTC campus made on 5.4.2017 had not changed;
- (d) the proposed VTC campus was very bulky and not in line with the Harbour Planning Principles. The large site area of 3 to 5 ha to facilitate a horizontal development was not convincing. VTC should critically review if the site requirements were reasonable and delete the non-essential facilities such as the proposed community facilities and hotel. Should the site area requirement be reduced, it would be easier to find an alternative site in the urban area. He doubted if the reprovisioning proposal was to pave the way to release the existing aged campuses for land sales;
- (e) the Site was the last piece of sizable land in East Kowloon's harbourfront and any incompatible development at the Site was irreversible. Given land resource was a valuable asset to Hong Kong people, it should be better utilized for the development of a waterfront park as breathing space in the densely developed area. The 50m wide waterfront promenade formed part of the

original plan and should not be considered as a compensation to the local residents for the proposed VTC campus; and

- (f) although the rezoning proposal had great implication to the Kwun Tong district, there was a lack of consultation and the KTSAC had not been consulted. VTC had not provided sufficient information to facilitate an informed discussion on the proposed campus development. The Board was urged to listen to the voice of the public and consider the rezoning proposal from a wider perspective.

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

[Mr H.W. Cheung and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point. Mr Dominic K.K. Lam left this session of the meeting at this point.]

C316 - Cheung Yick Wang Edwin

C373 - Lee Kin Kau

C451 - Wong Hau Ling

C520 - 林綠

C615 - 羅淑嫻

C750 - 金文輝

C789 - Ng Hok Chiu

C794 - 侯澤鸞

C832 - Wong Chak Kin

C834 - 羅詠柔

C840 - Chow Cheuk Wang

C891 - 許家豪

C918 - Pong Kwok Kee

C989 - 林小黎

C1048 - 李順娉

C1072 - Ko Yun Ling

C1246 - Lau Kit Him

C372 - Yeung Chi Wai

C381 - Lam Tsz Wing

C464 - 程伯仁

C582 - Chan Yuen Kwai Hing Pia

C655 - Chan Kong Chiu Kenneth

C751 - 畢惠君

C790 - Ng Kai Ming

C806 - Chan Shing Chee Symphorosa

C833 - 羅翔譽

C835 - 林小英

C890 - 許昌翔

C899 - Yip Sau Lai

C975 - Chau Yu Hin

C1038 - 易嘉澤

C1050 - Lam Shiu Kau

C1126 - Eliza Mok

C1317 - Lam Hoi Ka Karin

C1359 - Anita Cheung Lau Yin

C1360 - Chau Kwan Nga Tiffany

C1369 - Choy See Hang Sabrina

C1395 - Tsang Ching Yee

C1402 - Chau Chi Ming

19. Mr Wu Koon Keung made the following main points:

- (a) the Site for the development of VTC campus was not irreplaceable. VTC's claim that the release of the two existing aged campuses in Kowloon should be replaced by a new campus in the same area so as to maintain its coverage area was unjustified. He noted that many post-secondary educational institutions would choose larger sites in the NDAs to facilitate the provision of state-of-the-art facilities in their new campuses. VTC should explore other alternative sites in the NDAs; and
- (b) the Site was the last piece of waterfront site in East Kowloon which had stunning view of sunset and could be promoted as an icon for Hong Kong. Hong Kong had a good reputation in its liveability and had very often been ranged as the top 10 cities in the world. Apart from functional requirements, Hong Kong should pay more attention to other liveability indicators such as quality of life and greening. As Victoria Harbour was one of the world's most renowned harbours, Hong Kong should not easily give up such a precious waterfront park with spectator view for development. The Site should be used for the development of CKL Park to promote sustainable development of the harbourfront.

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

*CKL Cultural Heritage*

- (a) background information on the historic and heritage value of CKL, which was collected by research, site visits and interviews of the villagers, was provided for Members' reference;
- (b) CKL village was a well-preserved remaining village among the 13 indigenous villages in the New Kowloon. There were a number of relics in CKL/Sai Tso

Wan area including a temple worshipping 5 gods/generals (五神廟), a public village building (四山公所), fung shui stone and dragon boat, which reflected the unique culture and heritage of the villagers living by the sea;

- (c) the mountains in the New Kowloon had provided rocks to support the construction industry and made significant contribution for the early development of Hong Kong. The Kaolin Mine site (previous known as Rocky Hill) was located near the proposed CKL Park. The New Kowloon area was administrated by 新安縣 of Guangdong and the clan chiefs of the four mountains appointed by officials of Kowloon Walled City were administrators of the mines in CKL, Sai Tso Wan, Lei Yue Mun and Ngau Tau Kok. A government gazette in 1904 showed that tax had been collected from the mining industry of the four mountains;
- (d) the maps in 1908 and 1926 showed the Government's intention to develop the Kowloon and New Kowloon areas. In 1937, the New Kowloon area was established and the villages were no longer regarded as indigenous villages. Since 1939, Hong Kong was undergoing an urbanization process and there was reclamation works to facilitate the relocation of an oil depot to Sai Tso Wan after 1945. With the introduction of Metroplan in 1990s and the three generations of new town development, the distinction between urban and rural areas had become blurred. CKL village had an important role to play in the preservation of the cultural heritage of the area;

#### *CKL Harbourfront*

- (e) a video clip about a site visit to CKL harbourfront area showed that the Site was green and tranquil. With the magnificent harbour view and fresh air, it was an ideal location for the development of a waterfront park with recreational facilities for the enjoyment of the people in East Kowloon. Low-rise GIC facilities for the elderly could also be provided to facilitate their integration with the community. The LPG filling station, which would attract the queueing of taxis and cause air pollution, should be relocated outside the harbourfront area;

*The Provision of POS*

- (f) the DPO's claim that the provision of POS would remain at 5.2 ha in the rezoning proposal was not agreeable. The bulk of the 5.2 ha POS came from part of the 11-km long waterfront promenade. As the 50m-wide waterfront promenade was originally planned as a regional open space and a continuous corridor between To Kwa Wan and CKL, slicing up a section of 660 m of the waterfront promenade arbitrarily and lumping it into the calculation of 5.2 ha of POS was not legitimate. He noted that the planning of the waterfront promenade in the CKL area had not changed over the years and its provision was not related to the proposed VTC campus. If it was excluded from the calculation, the open space provision in the area would be substantially reduced. Besides, the 1ha of POS to be provided by the VTC formed part of the "G/IC" site for the proposed VTC campus. He doubted if the lumping of part of the waterfront promenade and the open space in the "G/IC" site into the calculation of POS provision was merely for the sake of matching the numbers;
- (g) as CKL Park was clearly indicated in the previous OZP, a more legitimate comparison in the amount of open space provision should be made between the originally planned CKL Park and the proposed soccer pitch;
- (h) the quality of the POS was drastically downgraded after the rezoning proposal. The harbour-facing side of CKL Park was about 300 m, which would be reduced to about 63m in the proposed open space to be provided by VTC. There was no sea view from the proposed soccer pitch as it was blocked by the LPG filling station to its south;
- (i) the layout for the harbourfront area was proposed with a view to fulfilling relevant guidelines rather than meeting the needs of the local residents. The LPG filling station was wrongly located next to the prominent waterfront promenade to meet the buffer distance requirement from the residential area. As the lease for the LPG filling station would expire in 2021, he considered it an opportunity to review the need and location of the station;

- (j) the vision for the planning of Kai Tak such as “city in the park”, “Kai Tak glamour” and “sports by the harbour” should not be overlooked. The planning intention for CKL Park to enhance the vibrancy of the harbourfront through the integration of park and waterfront promenade formulated in 2004-2006 should not be disregarded. Otherwise, it would result in a freaky waterfront layout with poor urban design;
- (k) there was insufficient transparency regarding the proposed recreational facilities in the waterfront POS, which was agreed between the VTC and the Leisure and Cultural Services Department. It was unclear why the soccer pitch and basketball courts were included in the POS, whether other options of recreational facilities had been explored, whether the current proposal would cause further fragmentation of the POS, and whether DC had been consulted;

*Traffic*

- (l) the Site was very close to the proposed Lam Tin interchange, which would link up the proposed Tseung Kwan O – Lam Tin Tunnel, the proposed Central Kowloon Route and the Eastern Harbour Crossing. The vehicular flow in those networks would affect the traffic condition near the Site. In particular, the traffic from Tseung Kwan O to/from the Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay Business Areas would be diverted to Wai Yip Street and affect VTC’s proposed shuttle bus services to/from Yau Tong MTR station. VTC’s shuttle bus service would also increase traffic flow and create serious impacts on the local road network;
- (m) TD’s claim that the traffic condition in the area could be addressed by junction improvement works was not agreeable. It would only increase the pressure for enforcement actions to be taken by other authorities. The traffic disaster could be avoided by better land use planning;

*Informal Briefing Session for the Task Force*

- (n) he was one of the representatives of the OC who attended the informal briefing session for the Task Force held on 2.8.2017. He noted that only two vocal members had provided comments on VTC’s revised scheme. There was no

recording nor minutes for the informal briefing session, except a letter from the Secretariat of the Task Force summarizing the major views of the attendees. He noted that the views raised in the informal briefing session had not been fully recorded, and the Secretariat of the Task Force was staffed by personnel of the Development Bureau. He doubted why a formal meeting was not arranged for members to make a decision on VTC's Revised Scheme in a proper manner;

#### *Community Collaboration*

- (o) VTC proposed to provide POS and facilities for public access in the name of community collaboration to justify its development in the harbourfront area. However, the originally planned CKL Park was also a POS and could be implemented without VTC's involvement. As VTC had failed to engage the community in the current proposal, he doubted if a good community engagement could be achieved in future;

#### *Location of VTC Campuses*

- (p) the existing VTC campuses were not evenly distributed in Hong Kong. While there was an over-provision of VTC campuses in East Kowloon, no campus was available in Sha Tin and Yuen Long, the major population growth areas with a higher percentage of young population. VTC's claim that half of the students of Wong Hak King campus came from the vicinity might not reflect the true picture;
- (q) as the two existing VTC campuses were developed to cater for the population distribution 30 years ago, it could not cater for the needs of population distribution in 2026. Given the future population would concentrate in the NDAs and in NT North, VTC should consider providing a new campus there to serve the local residents as well as cross-border commuting students;
- (r) as the students' enrolment figure was dictated by the location of VTC campuses, it was important for VTC to provide new campus in the NDAs such as Yuen Long/Tin Shui Wai and Sheung Shui/Fanling/Tai Po so as to meet the needs of students living there. If the new campus was located in East

Kowloon, it would discourage students living in the NDAs to apply for VTC due to long daily commuting trip;

- (s) although it was stated in the VTC Ordinance that skills training should be provided to persons with disability, there was a lack of such training in the NT. VTC should provide an integrated campus in the NT to comply with the requirements of the VTC Ordinance;
- (t) according to EDB, the three criteria for accepting VTC's locational requirement in the urban area included improving vocational training, integrating the campuses and providing state-of-the-art facilities for the students. However, there was a missing link as to why the campus should be located in the urban area;
- (u) the land use planning for a "G/IC" site in the harbourfront should be different from that in the inland area. He doubted if the VTC campus needed to be located in a harbourfront "G/IC" site and EDB's policy support for VTC's locational requirement had been misinterpreted. For a vocational training school, the quality of education was more important than the location of the campus;
- (v) he noted that a consultancy report regarding the proposed establishment of the Government Flying Service Kai Tak Division (GFSKTD) had been submitted to the Task Force for consideration. The report was prepared by Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited, which was the same consultant for the proposed development of the VTC campus. He doubted why 19 locational options had been provided for GFSKTD but none was provided for the proposed VTC campus. The thinking process for the identification of the Site for the proposed VTC campus was unclear;

[Dr Wilton W.T. Fok arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (w) it was stated in the Town Planning Ordinance that town planning in Hong Kong was to promote the health, safety, convenience and general welfare of the community. Comparing the provision of a waterfront park with a VTC campus in the harbourfront area, it was very obvious that a waterfront park

could help to achieve the four objectives while a VTC campus could not due to the above-mentioned problems;

*Conclusion*

- (x) EDB should re-examine where the needs of vocational training came from. As Sha Tin and Yuen Long had the highest concentration of young population while no VTC facility was available, new VTC campus should be provided in those areas to save the traveling time of the students; and
- (y) CKL Park should be provided at the Site not only for the enjoyment of the people in East Kowloon, but also for the Hong Kong people as a whole.

[The meeting was adjourned for a lunch break at 12:30 p.m.]

21. The meeting was resumed at 1:55 p.m. on 11.1.2018.
22. 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

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr H.W. Cheung

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Chief Transport Engineer/Kowloon, Transport Department  
Mr David C.V. Ngu

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

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)  
Mr Elvis W.K. Au

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

Director of Planning  
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Vice-Chairperson

**Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 1** (Continued)

[Open Meeting]

Group 2

Presentation and Question Sessions (Continued)

23. The following government representatives, the 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)

Mr Rick K.W. Liu - Senior Transport Officer/Kwun Tong (STO/KT)

**Commenters and their Representatives**

C282 – Paul Chong

C283 – David Kwok

C284 – Wilson Lam

C285 – Terence Cheung

C286 – Edmond Lai

C289 – Joel Chan

C290 – Chan Lai Yan

C291 – Andrea Chan

C292 – Law Pui Lam

C293 – Sally Chan

*Vocational Training Council (VTC) – ]*

Mr Leung Yam Shing ]

Mr Albert Lai ]

Mr Daniel Yan ]

*Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd – ]*

Ms Theresa Yeung ]

Ms Carmen Chu ] Commenters and Commenters’

Ms Natalie Leung ] Representatives

Ms Kathy Lo ]

Dr Camby Se ]

Ms Minnie Law ]

*P&T Architects & Engineers Ltd – ]*

Mr Joel Chan ]

Ms Sally Chan ]

C312 – Estate Owners’ Committees of  
Laguna City (Phases 1, 2 & 4 and Phase 3)

C350 – Mak Chun Yu

C380 – Tang Hui Lun

C390 – Yeung Chun Yin

C393 – Ho Yau Kuen Stephen

C409 – Chan Fung Ming

C461 – Chan Chi Ping

C474 – Chan Wing Kiu

C701 – Chan Wai Yi

C707 – Jessica Ching

C710 – Choy Charn Lam

C713 – Chan Yuen Ping

C747 – Tse Yuen Shan

C827 – Wan Mei Fong

C851 – Leung Tsz Yim Gloria

C852 – Chan Wai Shun

C878 – Wu Sun Mui

C922 – Wong Chi Mei

C924 – Kwong Heung

C1043 – Michael Leung

C1051 – Chau Kit Shan

C1064 – 劉順萍

C1085 – Cheung Cheuk Lam Kelvin

C1106 – Ng Yee Kwan

C1127 – Wong Siu Tai

C1268 – Yip Choi Luk

*Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront*

*Concern Group –*

Mr Kau Kin Tak

Mr Ho Yung Kwong

C1179 – Wong Chee Ki

C1286 – Choi Miu Chu

]

] Commenters' Representatives

]

]

C316 – Cheung Yick Wang Edwin

C373 – Lee Kin Kau

C451 – Wong Hau Ling

C520 – 林綠

C615 – 羅淑嫻

C750 – 金文輝

C789 – Ng Hok Chiu

C794 – 侯澤鸞

C832 – Wong Chak Kin

C834 – 羅詠柔

C840 – Chow Cheuk Wang

C891 – 許家豪

C918 – Pong Kwok Kee

C989 – 林小黎

C1048 – 李順娟

C1072 – Ko Yun Ling

C1246 – Lau Kit Him

C1359 – Anita Cheung Lau Yin

C1369 – Choy See Hang Sabrina

C1402 – Chau Chi Ming

*Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront*

*Concern Group –*

Mr Cheung Yick Wang Edwin

Mr Luk Pang Kei

Mr Wu Koon Keung

C372 – Yeung Chi Wai

C381 – Lam Tsz Wing

C464 – 程伯仁

C582 – Chan Yuen Kwai Hing Pia

C655 – Chan Kong Chiu Kenneth

C751 – 畢惠君

C790 – Ng Kai Ming

C806 – Chan Shing Chee Symphorosa

C833 – 羅翔譽

C835 – 林小英

C890 – 許昌翔

C899 – Yip Sau Lai

C975 – Chau Yu Hin

C1038 – 易嘉澤

C1050 – Lam Shiu Kau

C1126 – Eliza Mok

C1317 – Lam Hoi Ka Karin

C1360 – Chau Kwan Nga Tiffany

C1395 – Tsang Ching Yee

]

]

]

] Commenters' Representatives

]

Ms Chong Hoi Kwan ]

Mr Ricky Lee ]

C365 – Chan Po Ki

C413 – Tang Wai Kwan

C487 – Yeung Chi Hang

C548 – C H Wong

C586 – Cheung Shui Ying

C643 – Ngai Man Piu

C724 – Tse King Sun

C738 – 鄭香

C843 – Tsang Man Yan

C999 – Chik Kim Mei

C1068 – Ricky Tsang

C1220 – 曾國華

C1241 – Tsang Kwok Wah

C1293 – Eddie Chik

*Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront*

*Concern Group –*

Mr Tse Chun Wah ]

C401 – Wong Kit Fong

C452 – Lam Yat Lung

C504 – Li Hoi Wah

C554 – Jean Chi

C641 – Leung Koon Yu Oberon

C714 – Cecilia Lam

C725 – Tse Hui Wah

C758 – Chung Yan Yan

C996 – Siti Khamidah

C1066 – 曾曼甄

C1069 – Choi Yik Ting

C1221 – 戚劍薇

C1274 – Lo Shao Hwa

C1294 – Koey Tang

]

] Commenters' Representative

]

C378 – Ng Ching Man

C458 – Au Sin Yee

C463 – Tsang Ka Chun

C547 – 潘家行

C592 – Hau Hei Tung

C630 – 劉志成

C648 – Cheung Ka Chun Gordon

C728 – Wong Pik Man

C837 – Tsang Fan Chun

C1057 – Whang Bao Pei

C1080 – Cheung Yiu Fai

C426 – Tsang Ka Ling

C459 – Poon Wing Lim

C545 – 萬碧霞

C591 – 黃祖道

C606 – 侯諾憲

C639 – Hau Sai Leung

C667 – Szeto Ching Yan

C817 – Chow Suet Ying

C1002 – Ip Fai

C1058 – 李相坤

C1222 – Dai Yan Yan

<u>C1231 – 曾偉傑</u>	<u>C1269 – 荷英</u>
<u>C1349 – Leung Yuk Ching</u>	<u>C1396 – Lai Oi Lin</u>
<u>C1407 – Lam Ka Wai</u>	
<i>Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront</i>	]
<i>Concern Group –</i>	] Commenters' Representative
Mr Fung Wah Sang	]

<u>C260 – Mary Mulvihill</u>	
<u>C517 – Wong Wai Lun</u>	
<u>C715 – Ho Chi Wan</u>	
Ms Mary Mulvihill	- Commenters' Representative

<u>C658 – Lai Wai Yan</u>	
Mr Lai Wai Yan	] Commenter and Commenter's
Ms Louie Po Ching	] Representative

<u>C872 – Ho Shuk Han</u>	
Ms Ho Shuk Han	- Commenter

<u>C884 – Chair Siu Fan</u>	
Ms Chair Siu Fan	- Commenter

<u>C898 – Ng Yun Kuen</u>	
Mr Ng Yun Kuen	- Commenter

24. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She then invited the commenters or their representatives to elaborate on their comments on representations.

25. Mr Tse Chun Wah requested and with no objection from the attendees, the Chairperson agreed to let some commenters present first.

C884 – Chair Siu Fan

26. Ms Chair Siu Fan made the following points :

Cha Kwo Ling Park

- (a) she expressed strong dissatisfaction against the rezoning of the Cha Kwo Ling (CKL) Park site (the Site) for development of VTC's campus, and considered it unacceptable;
- (b) there was widespread consultation in 2007 by the Government on the development of the CKL Park, and a consensus had been reached. The CKL Park was clearly shown on plan in 2012. As a Kowloon East resident, she had been anticipating this very important park development;
- (c) the CKL Park's implementation had been delayed for almost 10 years, and suddenly, the Site was rezoned in 2016 without consultation. The Government had broken its promise, but there was no mechanism to monitor the Government's action;
- (d) in addition, there was no way in which an ordinary citizen like her could conceive that rezoning of the Site from "Open Space" ("O") to "Government, Institution, or Community" ("G/IC") would mean the development of a mega campus;
- (e) the open space to be built by VTC was piecemeal and not the same as the originally planned CKL park. She urged the Government/the Board to keep its promise and implement the planned CKL park;

Traffic Impacts

- (f) the proposed VTC campus would bring traffic pressure to the area, and even VTC's own report admitted that there would be congestion at several road junctions in the area;
- (g) CKL Road was a congestion black spot with frequent taxis queueing, occupying the entire northbound lane, to enter the Liquefied Petroleum Gas

(LPG) filling station. Other drivers had to overtake dangerously to pass through that road section;

- (h) there was no bus route along CKL Road towards Yau Tong because of the narrow width of the road, and VTC's proposal to provide shuttle bus service between the campus and Yau Tong Mass Transit Railway (MTR) Station was not viable;
- (i) there would be 150 car parking spaces and 50 hotel rooms in the proposed VTC campus development, which would generate traffic on the already congested road network;

#### Environmental Impacts

- (j) VTC's environmental impact assessment (EIA) concluded that the proposed campus would not have any adverse impact on the environment. However, none of the photomontages therein showed the views from CKL/Laguna City residents, and that their views would be blocked by the mega campus development. As an ordinary citizen, she would not have the resources to rebut the EIA report, and would be forced to lodge a judicial review (JR); and

#### Need for the Proposed VTC Campus

- (k) the number of VTC students had declined dramatically from 50,000 to 40,000, and VTC forecasted that figure to drop further to 30,000 upon completion of the proposed campus. Instead of expanding its campus in the light of declining student intake, VTC should review its operation and delete some of the non-value-added courses to cope with the changes in the society.

[Mr Stephen L.H. Liu arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

C378 – Ng Ching Man

C426 – Tsang Ka Ling

C458 – Au Sin Yee

C459 – Poon Wing Lim

C463 – Tsang Ka Chun

C545 – 萬碧霞

C547 – 潘家行

C591 – 黃祖道

C592 – Hau Hei Tung

C606 – 侯諾靈

C630 – 劉志成

C639 – Hau Sai Leung

C648 – Cheung Ka Chun Gordon

C667 – Szeto Ching Yan

C728 – Wong Pik Man

C817 – Chow Suet Ying

C837 – Tsang Fan Chun

C1002 – Ip Fai

C1057 – Whang Bao Pei

C1058 – 李相坤

C1080 – Cheung Yiu Fai

C1222 – Dai Yan Yan

C1231 – 曾偉傑

C1269 – 荷英

C1349 – Leung Yuk Ching

C1396 – Lai Oi Lin

C1407 – Lam Ka Wai

27. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Fung Wah Sang made the following points :

- (a) the Site was reclaimed in the 1950s, and formed part and parcel of the Victoria Harbour. It was put into various temporary uses or left vacant ever since;
- (b) it had been shown that VTC did not need a 3 to 5 ha site or a piece of harbourfront land for educational use. On the other hand, the general public, Kowloon East residents in particular, demanded the implementation of the CKL Park. Retaining the “O” zoning of the Site would therefore create a win-win situation;
- (c) the considerations in the Court of Final Appeal’s Judgment in 2004 in relation to the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance were relevant in that the designated use of that scarce resource, the last piece of harbourfront land, should not be changed without sufficient reason, given that the rezoning decision would be irreversible;
- (d) whilst Hong Kong Island residents could exercise under the sun in Tamar Park and Sun Yat-sen Memorial Park, Kowloon East residents could only exercise under the Kwun Tong Bypass. The existing Kwun Tong Promenade was also narrow and over-crowded. There was a compelling social need for a harbourfront park in Kowloon East, and there was no other viable alternative for the CKL Park;

- (e) on the contrary, there was a lot of viable alternative sites for the proposed VTC campus. To that end, the Protect CKL Harbourfront Concern Group (the Concern Group) had identified two sites, Tat Yeung Road, Lai King and Pok Yin Road, Tai Po, for the proposed VTC campus;
- (f) the proposed VTC campus would cost about \$9 billion (2016 prices), the unit construction cost of which was comparable to that of a 5-star hotel. Of that \$9 billion, some \$200 to 500 million would be spent on relocating Wai Lok Street, the existing soccer pitch, and the LPG filling station. A more inland location for the proposed VTC campus would avoid such relocation costs and substantially lower the construction costs due to shallower foundation and no need for waterproofing of the campus basement; and
- (g) the Board's Vision Statement for Victoria Harbour was 'to make Victoria Harbour attractive, vibrant, accessible and symbolic of Hong Kong – a harbour for the people and a harbour of life.' There was an emphasis on people-centric planning. The proposed VTC campus, blocking several hundred metres of the visual access to the harbourfront, would be contrary to the Board's goal of maintaining visual access to the harbourfront.

C658 – Lai Wai Yan

28. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Lai Wai Yan made the following main points:

- (a) he was a Laguna City Phase 3 resident, and among those mostly affected by the proposed VTC campus development, which would block the sole air ventilation entrance of Laguna City;
- (b) many of the existing open spaces in Kwun Tong, e.g. Laguna Park and the Kwun Tong Promenade, were sub-optimal as they were too close to and polluted by vehicle emissions of major roads like the Kwun Tong Bypass. He anticipated a more decent and proper open space like those in other districts would be provided;
- (c) the open space within the proposed VTC campus could not play the role of a district open space as there would not be enough space to host family and games

events for a few hundred people. The originally planned CKL Park, on the other hand, would have a better configuration to host sizable events, and would be more easily accessible by residents of the wider area including new development areas like the Yau Tong Comprehensive Development Areas (CDAs) and the ex-Kaolin Mine sites;

- (d) 52% of the territory's population resided in the New Territories, and Kwun Tong was the most densely populated district in the territory. There was very little logic or need to build the proposed VTC campus at the Site;
- (e) the Shatin to Central Link would be commissioned in 2019 (Tai Wai to Hung Hom Section) and completed in 2021 (Hung Hom to Admiralty Section), making Sha Tin/Tai Po as accessible as CKL. Hence, there was no need for the proposed VTC campus to be located in the urban areas;
- (f) the SkyHigh Creative Partners in Tin Shui Wai, established by the Commercial Radio Hong Kong and the Hong Kong Jockey Club, was a very successful example to demonstrate that VTC did not need an urban location; and
- (g) there were hotels in remote areas like Tuen Mun and Tin Shui Wai, and so VTC's argument that its educational hotel had to be located near tourist areas was unfounded.

C365 – Chan Po Ki

C413 – Tang Wai Kwan

C487 – Yeung Chi Hang

C548 – C H Wong

C586 – Cheung Shui Ying

C643 – Ngai Man Piu

C724 – Tse King Sun

C738 – 鄺香

C843 – Tsang Man Yan

C999 – Chik Kim Mei

C1068 – Ricky Tsang

C401 – Wong Kit Fong

C452 – Lam Yat Lung

C504 – Li Hoi Wah

C554 – Jean Chi

C641 – Leung Koon Yu Oberon

C714 – Cecilia Lam

C725 – Tse Hui Wah

C758 – Chung Yan Yan

C996 – Siti Khamidah

C1066 – 曾曼甄

C1069 – Choi Yik Ting

C1220 – 曾國華

C1221 – 戚劍薇

C1241 – Tsang Kwok Wah

C1274 – Lo Shao Hwa

C1293 – Eddie Chik

C1294 – Koey Tang

29. With the aid of some slides, Mr Tse Chun Wah made the following main points:

- (a) since the Board had a legal duty to promote the health, safety, convenience and general welfare of the community, the Board should consider the rezoning in that context;
- (b) the Government had a very comprehensive planning for the harbourfront until it broke its promise to develop that last piece of harbourfront land into the VTC campus in 2016;
- (c) Mr Vincent NG Wing-shun concluded the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (the Task Force) meeting in April 2017 that the CKL Park was a promise not only to the citizens of Hong Kong but the Harbourfront Commission (HC) as well, and hence, the Task Force could not support the rezoning proposal for the development of a VTC campus at CKL waterfront;
- (d) what VTC had been showing to the Board was the conceptual design of the proposed campus. There was no mentioning of the CKL Park in the documents;

Safety to the Community

- (e) the size of the LPG filling station would be tripled from 2,000 to 5,900 m<sup>2</sup>. There would be over 100 taxis queueing within and outside the station, causing more pollution and hazard. The mega LPG filling station was an inappropriate facility in an unsuitable location that would jeopardize the function and safety of the waterfront area;
- (f) the relocated Wai Lok Street would bisect the open space into two parts. VTC's shuttle buses would also manoeuvre near the eastern park entrance.

Both would pose much traffic threats to park users who were mainly children and elderly;

- (g) the originally proposed CKL Park was a safer place for children and elderly, worry-free from pollutants and traffic accidents;

#### Health to the Community

- (h) VTC's Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) showed that vehicle emissions would either remain within the LPG filling station or be blown to the park areas. There was no environmental review report for the LPG filling station;
- (i) essential public facilities were sacrificed for the development of VTC campus, and elderly, youngsters and children would need a park rather than a VTC campus at the waterfront. VTC's proposed community engagement to provide an elderly centre and shared use of its campus facilities was only a partial compensation, bearing in mind VTC admitted that priority would be given to its students in using the campus facilities;
- (j) because of the highly restricted space and the need to re-provision one soccer pitch and two basketball courts, the open space provided by VTC could not host a variety of events like other open spaces around the harbour;
- (k) there was an uneven distribution of open space, tilting towards commercial districts. Most open spaces within residential districts remained undeveloped. The 50m wide promenade was insufficient for Kwun Tong district in view of its large population. The CKL Park, on the other hand, could provide the much needed buffer space for youths in Kowloon East;

#### Convenience to the Community

- (l) the assumptions that 20% of VTC's students/staff would travel to the proposed VTC campus during the morning peak hour (peak hour factor), and whether the traffic of the forthcoming second Core Business District (CBD2) in Kowloon East had been included in the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) were highly questionable. Whilst Members had raised very specific questions in previous hearing sessions regarding the validity of the traffic assumptions and details of

the traffic mitigation measures, TD's answers were broad-brush and ambiguous;

- (m) Laguna City residents were responsible for the operation and maintenance costs of the four lifts connecting to Lam Tin MTR Station. It would not be fair to force Laguna City residents to bear the increased operation and maintenance costs due to shared use of those lifts by VTC students/staff;
- (n) existing minibus services in the area were barely enough to cater for the traffic needs of residents. The ex-Kaolin Mine development and the proposed VTC campus would add to the demand for minibus services, and worsen the demand-supply situation;
- (o) although the total area of open space remained the same, the waterfront park would become fragmented upon rezoning, and the number of entrances would be reduced, making the park less accessible to the public;

#### Welfare to the Community

- (p) CKL had a long history, the culture and heritage of which had however been neglected in the planning process. The Village Representative of CKL Tsuen had expressed his wish for the annual Tin Hau Festival to be hosted in the CKL Park, but the open space to be built by VTC could not possibly host the event;

#### Others

- (q) there were inconsistencies in the net operating floor area (NOFA) per student given by VTC, PlanD and Education Bureau (EDB) varying from 10 to 16 m<sup>2</sup> per student. The Gross Floor Area (GFA) to NOFA ratio of 2.0 adopted for the VTC campus also appeared to be substantially higher than that of the Central Government Complex at Tamar which was only 1.6;
- (r) VTC had indicated during the hearing that if the total permissible GFA was less than 180,000 m<sup>2</sup>, VTC would proceed to identify an alternative site. The alternative site in Tai Po could meet VTC's requirement; and

- (s) VTC admitted during the hearing that it had not taken geographical distribution of its students' residence into account in its site selection process. VTC's site requirements were also too harsh, and the Board/Government should be in a position to bargain with VTC to relax either its locational, size or GFA requirements.

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

30. As all the presentations from the commenters and their representatives had been completed, the Chairperson invited Members to raise questions.

31. The Vice-Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions :

Open Space

- (a) the open space provision in Kwun Tong and its level of provision as compared to other districts;
- (b) whether the proposed increase of open space standard under the Hong Kong 2030+ Study had been taken into account;
- (c) noting that the revised design of the proposed VTC campus would separate the open space into different land parcels, whether they could be combined to form a more integrated open space;
- (d) whether the land not zoned "O" could be used for a park;
- (e) noting that there was no deficit of planned open space provision in the area, whether there was any priority for developing the CKL Park;

Harbourfront Park and Waterfront Promenade

- (f) whether the Site was the only site remained for development of a harbourfront park, as claimed by some representers; and
- (g) whether all the existing harbourfront parks had a 50m wide waterfront promenade, and what kind of facilities could be provided along the promenade.

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

- (a) the planned population (which was higher than the existing population) of Kwun Tong district was 728,000, which would require about 146 ha of open space according to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) provision standard of 2 m<sup>2</sup> per person. There were a total of 233 ha of existing and planned open space in Kwun Tong, which was equivalent to about 3 m<sup>2</sup> per person. The figure was on the high side as compared to other districts;
- (b) the Hong Kong 2030+ Study proposed to increase the open space provision standard to 2.5 m<sup>2</sup> per person. Such standard could already be achieved in the planning of new development areas/major redevelopment projects. PlanD would continue to strive for achieving that target in the built-up areas wherever possible;
- (c) there could be scope for re-configuring and consolidating the various pieces of open space into a larger one at the detailed design stage, given that open space and road were uses always permitted in all zones on the OZP. VTC's consultants might look into the technical feasibility at the detailed design stage;
- (d) not all parks were zoned "O", notably stadiums and parks on top of service reservoirs were zoned "G/IC". Two football courts to the north of Kwun Tong Swimming Pool were also zoned "G/IC". Local open space within public housing estates were zoned "Residential (Group A)". Those open spaces and parks could still serve its function although not zoned "O";
- (e) the total area of public open space in the CKL waterfront remained at 5.2 ha before and after the rezoning, all parts of which would be under the Leisure and Cultural Services Department's (LCSD's) management;
- (f) the Site was reserved on the first OZP for the area in 2006 for the development of a park. While LCSD had no implementation programme to date, it would implement the planned open spaces according to its resources and priority, and seek funding accordingly. The rezoning exercise provided an opportunity for early implementation of the open space as VTC had agreed to implement about

1.9 ha of the open space and hand it back to LCSD for management and maintenance upon completion;

Waterfront Promenade/Park

- (g) the Government had planned and constructed a series of harbourfront parks on both sides of the Victoria Harbour. In Kai Tak alone, there would be two large harbourfront parks, namely Metro Park and Runway Park, of 20 ha and 10 ha respectively;
- (h) of all the waterfront promenades around the Victoria Harbour, only a section of the promenade at the Quarry Bay Park had a width of more than 50 m. Most of the harbourfront promenades had a width narrower than that of the promenade proposed for the CKL waterfront; and
- (i) the Kwun Tong Promenade, excluding the areas under the Kwun Tong Bypass, had an average width of about 25 m. Depending on the design, a wide variety of facilities could be provided along the CKL promenade.

33. In response to Members' question, Ms Carmen Chu, VTC's representative, supplemented that it should be technically feasible to relocate Wai Lok Street northwards to achieve a better integration of the open space.

34. The Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions :

Reprovisioning of VTC Campus and New Campus Design

- (a) VTC's reason for requiring a reprovisioning site in the urban area, and whether there would be any effect or impact on VTC's operation if the reprovisioning site was not in the urban area;
- (b) noting that the number of prospective students would decrease in coming few years, why VTC did not consider carrying out improvement works in its existing campuses;
- (c) whether the VTC campus at the Site would be open to the public or with restricted access;

- (d) in terms of the massing of the VTC campus, whether consideration had been given to accommodating more floorspace in the basement;
- (e) putting aside the cost factor, whether the operation of VTC would allow more levels of basement;
- (f) the NOFA and GFA of the existing campuses and new campus of VTC;

Alternative Site

- (g) whether the site in Tai Po as proposed by some representers was suitable as an alternative site for the VTC campus, and whether this site had been considered in the site selection exercise; and

Other Institutions

- (h) whether other institutions had made a similar request for the Site.

35. In response to Members' questions, Mr Leung Yam Shing, VTC's representative, and Mr Joel Chan, C289, made the following points :

Reprovisioning of VTC Campus and New Campus Design

- (a) VTC had no intention to occupy a piece of waterfront land or a piece of core urban land. The Government instructed VTC to review its campuses, and the Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education (IVE) Haking Wong and Kwun Tong campuses were among the oldest (over 30 years old). The sites of these two campuses were relatively small and the redevelopment potential was limited. VTC only intended to consolidate two small campuses into a bigger campus, and requested a site search for the new campus. VTC would return the two urban campus sites upon completion of the proposed CKL campus;
- (b) VTC's students came from all parts of the territory, and most of them did reside in the same district as the campus, e.g. over 80% of the students in IVE Tuen Mun lived in Tuen Mun and Yuen Long, over 50% of the students in IVE Haking Wong and Kwun Tong lived in Tsim Sha Tsui, Yau Ma Tei, Mong Kok, Kowloon City, Wong Tai Sin and Kwun Tong;

- (c) the number of Form 6 graduates had decreased from over 60,000 in 2012 to some 40,000 in 2017. From the population data given to VTC by EDB, the downward trend would be stabilized by 2022, and it would increase to over 50,000 from 2024 onwards;
- (d) the Government required VTC to comprehensively review all its campuses, and the proposed VTC campus at CKL was only part of VTC's comprehensive campus improvement plan;
- (e) VTC had made reference to Singapore in its campus planning. Singapore was much smaller than Hong Kong, and yet its Institute of Technical Education, the equivalent of VTC in Hong Kong, had established three large campuses, as a consolidation, in the eastern, western and central parts of Singapore;
- (f) VTC would always be interested in campus development in New Development Areas such as Hung Shui Kiu and Tung Chung;
- (g) the ground floor of VTC's newer campuses, e.g. the Hong Kong Design Institute, was open for public access during school operation hours;
- (h) VTC's priority would be provision of educational services. Some of its campuses were developed as Technical Schools, which were akin to primary/secondary school campus setting. At present, none of the primary and secondary schools in Hong Kong was designed with free public access. VTC's experience was that although the general public might have access to its campuses, a 24-hour open campus would pose management, cleaning and insurance problems;
- (i) the passageway between the two towers of the proposed CKL campus would be open for public use during office hours;
- (j) VTC's current proposal included one level of a half sunken basement for environmental reason (natural ventilation). Suitable educational facilities like lecture theaters had already been placed at the basement level;
- (k) if more levels of basement were involved, it would be more difficult to obtain funding approval, in view of the much higher construction costs due to more

stringent fire safety/means of escape requirements and excavation, etc. Besides, most educational facilities could not be placed at the second and lower levels of basement. Notwithstanding that, VTC would consider the possibility of placing suitable facilities in the basement at the detailed design stage;

- (l) in general, the GFA to NOFA ratio for campus development was about 1.6. The difference between GFA and NOFA was mainly the floor spaces used for car parking and machinery rooms, or being double-counted due to high headrooms. The average NOFA per student of the nine existing IVE campuses was 6.6 m<sup>2</sup>. The NOFA per student of the proposed CKL campus was designed to be 15 m<sup>2</sup>. In the long term, VTC hoped that the average NOFA per student of all its campuses could be improved to around 10 to 12 m<sup>2</sup>; and
- (m) in the subject CKL campus project, the GFA to NOFA ratio was taken as 2.0 in the first place by assuming that no GFA exemption would be granted by the Building Authority (BA). As such, with a NOFA of about 90,000 m<sup>2</sup>, the GFA of the subject project was estimated to be about 180,000 m<sup>2</sup>. The same ratio had been assumed for the Hong Kong Design Institute in Tseung Kwan O. At the building plan submission stage, the accountable GFA could be less after BA had granted the GFA exemptions.

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

Alternative Site

- (a) the Tai Po site proposed by the Concern Group was rezoned from “G/IC” to “Residential (Group B) 9” in August 2017, and the Board had yet to hear the related representations/comments. The Tai Po site was included in the 2017/18 Land Sale Programme, but its actual sale would only be effected upon completion of all statutory planning processes;
- (b) PlanD had not considered the Tai Po site suggested by the Concern Group as VTC requested an urban site to re-provision two existing campuses in the urban area;

### Other Institutions

- (c) various tertiary institutions had made requests for sites for the expansion of their campuses at different times. Whilst the site requirements varied from institute to institute, most institutes would require land near their existing campuses for expansion. The Hong Kong Baptist University, the Hong Kong Polytechnic University and the Open University of Hong Kong were recent examples. The Government would cater for the different needs of different institutes as far as possible during the planning process.

37. Mr Leung Yam Shing supplemented that VTC had not considered the Tai Po site which was only made known to them during the hearing. He had taken a look at the geographical distribution of VTC students' residence, and noticed that many of them lived in Yuen Long (11%) and Kwun Tong (10.9%). The rest were distributed throughout the territory. The Yuen Long students were served by the Youth College in Tin Shui Wai and IVE Tuen Mun campus. All in all, VTC preferred to be relocated within the same district upon redevelopment of its campuses.

38. The Vice-Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions :

### Air Ventilation Assessment

- (a) how to determine the test points required for AVA, and any special test points for the LPG filling station;
- (b) whether the proposed passageway between the two towers of the new VTC Campus had been considered in the AVA;
- (c) whether the AVA was acceptable by the concerned department;

### Traffic Aspects

- (d) whether the traffic arising from surrounding developments and local traffic improvement works had been taken into account, and what the programme was for such improvement works;
- (e) at the strategic level, whether the planned road works, including Central Kowloon Route (CKR), Trunk Road T2 and Tseung Kwan O-Lam Tin (TKO-LT) Tunnel, had been considered in the TIA, and what the timeline was

for the implementation of those road works;

- (f) how the peak hour factor was determined in the TIA;
- (g) noting that there was a considerable amount of concrete mixer trucks travelling along CKL Road, whether there was any plan for removal of the concrete batching plants in the area;

#### LPG Filling Station

- (h) the reason for reprovisioning the existing LPG filling station with an enlarged site; and
- (i) whether it was possible to relocate the LPG filling station outside the waterfront area.

39. In response, Dr Camby Se and Ms Carmen Chu, VTC's representatives, made the following points :

#### Air Ventilation Assessment

- (a) test points of the AVA were proposed in accordance with the Development Bureau's (DEVB's) Technical Circular (TC) on AVA. As the AVA aimed at assessing the impacts of the proposed VTC campus on its surrounding areas, the test points were placed along the periphery and outside the Site. However, special test points were also placed within the open space portions of the Site and along the waterfront promenade to assess their ventilation performance. As the wind speed along waterfront areas was generally higher, the special test points along the waterfront promenade, which tended to average down any surrounding impacts, were excluded from the assessment in the peripheral and surrounding test points according to the TC on AVA. The TC on AVA did not require any special test points for the LPG filling station;
- (b) the passageway between the two towers of the proposed VTC campus had been modelled in the assessment. As the AVA was assessing the wind speeds at 2 m above ground, the wind-blocking effect of the passageway between the two

towers, at more than 15 m above ground, would not be obvious in the assessment;

#### Traffic Aspects

- (c) additional traffic arising from the surrounding developments and local traffic improvement works to be implemented by the agents of surrounding developments had already been taken into account in the TIA for the proposed VTC campus;
- (d) the section of CKL Road near the Tin Hau Temple would be re-configured into a large roundabout (Lam Tin Exchange) under the TKO-LT Tunnel project, bringing significant improvements to the area's road network. The positive traffic effects brought by the TKO-LT Tunnel had already been reflected in VTC's TIA; and
- (e) the student/staff trip generation and attraction rate for the proposed VTC campus during the peak hour were based on the survey at IVE Tsing Yi campus which had similar class structure and course programme as the proposed VTC campus.

40. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip and Miss Wendy W.T. Tang made the following points :

#### Air Ventilation Assessment

- (a) the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD considered that VTC's AVA was properly done according to the requirements and guidelines stipulated in DEVB's TC on AVA, and its results were acceptable;

#### Traffic Aspects

- (b) the Government was progressively taking forward the construction of Route 6 which comprised the CKR, Trunk Road T2 and TKO-LT Tunnel. When completed, Route 6 would divert much east-west traffic off the local road networks thereby alleviating traffic congestion in the district. TKO-LT

Tunnel was tentatively scheduled for completion by 2021/22, which would be earlier than the completion of the proposed VTC campus;

- (c) major redevelopment projects in Kwun Tong were taken into consideration in the TIA prepared by VTC. There would be associated improvements in the traffic network and at major road junctions;
- (d) in connection with the ex-Kaolin Mine development, the pavements along Sin Fat Road were widened in March 2017. There would be junction improvement, pedestrian facility improvement and traffic signal enhancement works at the junctions of CKL Road/Wai Yip Street, Wai Fat Road/Shing Yip Street/CKL Road, Sin Fat Road/CKL Road and Wai Yip Street/Wai Fat Road to improve the relevant traffic capacities. Those local improvement works were targeted for completion by the Civil Engineering Development Department (CEDD) in 2021/22;
- (e) the Kwun Tong Town Centre (KTTC) redevelopment was a major project, and a number of traffic management measures would be implemented at the local traffic network and several major road junctions. Those measures included an additional left-turning lane into Hip Wo Street would be added to the Kwun Tong roundabout, and widening certain sections of Hip Wo Street to relieve the traffic conditions in KTTC, Hip Wo Street and Kwun Tong Road. Those works were targeted for completion by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) in phases between 2021 and 2024;
- (f) in connection with the redevelopment of the Yau Tong CDAs, the junction of CKL Road/Ko Fai Road was targeted to be signalized by 2021 to improve the traffic flow in the vicinity;
- (g) DEVB's Energizing Kowloon East Office was studying a series of pedestrian environment and traffic improvement proposals to improve the traffic conditions of the forthcoming CBD2 in Kowloon East, including pedestrian facilities improvement and the re-configuration of the Hoi Yuen Road/Wai Yip Street roundabout into a signalized junction. Those improvement works would be completed in phases by the government in due course;

- (h) whilst there was no proof that the concrete mixer trucks along CKL Road were related to the concrete batching plants in Yau Tong, the said concrete batching plant site was zoned “CDA” on the Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong, Lei Yue Mun OZP. Planning permission had been granted for the “CDA(1)” site for its redevelopment into residential use. Planning permission had also been granted for redevelopment of the “CDA(5)” site into commercial/residential uses, and the planning application for redevelopment of the “CDA(3)” site was under processing. There were two other “CDA” zones to encourage the redevelopment of the Yau Tong industrial area into residential use, though there was no development programme for these two sites for the time being;

#### LPG Filling Station

- (i) the location of LPG filling station was subject to a 55 m buffer distance from high-rise residential/educational uses as stipulated in the HKPSG. While the area of the proposed reprovisioned LPG filling station was almost tripled that of the existing station, the number of dispensers remained at 24. The larger site area was intended to accommodate on-site queueing of 45 vehicles awaiting fueling to minimize queueing on CKL Road. It was meant to improve the current queueing arrangement and hence the traffic situation around the area, not for increasing service capacity of the station;
- (j) the subject LPG filling station was one of the 12 dedicated LPG filling stations in Hong Kong offering LPG to taxis and minibuses at regulated prices. Two of these were in Kowloon East, including the subject one at CKL and another in Kowloon Bay. In addition, there were filling stations dispensing both petrol and LPG operated on commercial principles; and
- (k) PlanD had, in the rezoning exercise, looked into the possibility of relocating the LPG filling station elsewhere. Nevertheless, both the Environment Bureau and the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) confirmed the need to retain the subject dedicated LPG filling station in the CKL area, and there was a lack of reprovisioning site in the vicinity. The LPG filling station had moved northwards and internalized its queueing area to address residents’ concern.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong left this session of the meeting at this point.]

41. On the traffic issue, Mr Tse Chun Wah, C475 and representative of the Concern Group, said that there were concrete mixer trucks and seafood trucks queueing along CKL Road. Solving the traffic problem would require vacating both the concrete batching plants and seafood restaurants at the ground floor of the tenement buildings to the south of Laguna City.

42. Some Members raised the following questions in relation to public consultation and local concerns :

- (a) what the view of the HC was on the rezoning proposal, and the representation of the Task Force; and
- (b) how VTC would resolve the conflict with local residents and address their concerns, if the proposal was approved.

43. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that similar to the Planning Committees under the Board, the Task Forces were formed under HC. The Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (the Task Force) of the HC had written to the Board twice, expressing views on the rezoning, which had already been incorporated into the Paper and relayed to the Board in the previous hearing sessions.

44. Mr Tse Chun Wah said that a member of HC did not expect the informal briefing in August 2017 to be a consultation exercise for the subject rezoning proposal.

45. In response, Mr Leung Yam Shing made the following points :

- (a) VTC had dialogues with members of HC which led to the revised design. The Kwun Tong District Council had also been consulted a few times, and he had attended meetings with residents to listen to their views;
- (b) VTC did worry about not being able to proceed with the campus development due to the large number of requests from the local residents, but would maintain the dialogue with the local residents. He sincerely hoped that the requests would be reasonable and rational; and

- (c) VTC had not fully utilized the maximum permissible plot ratio of 6.0. It had refrained from adopting a wall-design, and a visual and ventilation corridor would be provided within the Site. VTC had experience in campus development, and there had not been any complaint against the appearance of any of VTC's campuses.

46. Noting the Concern Group's sentiment against the proposed VTC campus development and its desire for the development of the CKL Park, the Chairperson and Mr Raymond KW Lee, the Director of Planning, asked the Concern Group for any specific zoning proposal for the Site.

47. In response, Ms Mary Mulvihill, C260, made the following points :

- (a) the land originally zoned "O" should be retained;
- (b) the sewage treatment plant site released by the Drainage Services Department (DSD) should be rezoned to "O";
- (c) the LPG filling station should be terminated and the site should be rezoned to "O" since there was no need to have dedicated LPG filling stations. Any subvention of the taxi trade could be done electronically in the form of charge cards to be issued to taxi drivers;
- (d) the southeastern end of the Site could be rezoned to "G/IC" for parking, refreshment kiosks, and elderly facilities; and
- (e) Kwun Tong was in deficit of district open space, and the CKL Park should be implemented immediately.

48. Mr Cheung Yick Wang Edwin, C316 and representative of the Concern Group, concurred with Ms Mary Mulvihill's zoning proposal and supplemented the following points :

- (a) there were over 300 trees at the sewage treatment plant site;
- (b) without the proposed VTC campus, there was no need to re-provision the temporary soccer pitch;
- (c) the realigned Wai Lok Street would no longer be necessary; and

- (d) the enlarged “O” site could be flexibly planned for some passive and active uses.

49. Ms Chong Hoi Kwan, C471 and representative of the Concern Group, also agreed with Ms Mary Mulvihill’s zoning proposal, while re-capitulating her objection against the rezoning and requesting for an “O” zoning for the entire site.

50. In response to the Chairperson’s enquiry as to whether the area of the open space under Ms Mary Mulvihill’s zoning proposal would be substantially larger than that of the original CKL Park, Mr Tom C.K. Yip advised that the size of the open space proposed by the Concern Group would amount to over 8 ha.

51. Mr Tse Chun Wah pointed out that the OZP No. S/K22/5 was a VTC-centric plan, while the OZP No. S/K22/4 was a CKL Park-centric plan. He considered that the CKL Park could be better designed if the LPG filling station was relocated elsewhere. He also requested the Board to re-plan the land released from the previously planned sewage treatment plant and tunnel administration building sites based on the OZP No. S/K22/4.

52. Mr Luk Pang Kei, R622 and representative of the Concern Group, requested the implementation of the originally planned CKL Park first. The land released from the sewage treatment plant and administration building sites could then be re-planned in accordance with the HKPSG and the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines.

53. 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 commenters, their representatives, and the government representatives for attending the hearing. They all left the meeting at this point.

54. The session of the meeting was adjourned at 6:08 p.m.