

1. The meeting was resumed at 9:00 a.m. on 11.3.2014.
2. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting:

Mr Thomas T.M. Chow

Chairman

Mr Stanley Y.F. Wong

Vice-Chairman

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Dr C.P. Lau

Mr Roger K.H. Luk

Ms Anita W.T. Ma

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr F.C. Chan

Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Mr K.K. Ling

Presentation and Question Session

3. The following Government representatives were invited to the meeting:

- Mr Tom C.K. Yip - District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K),  
Planning Department (PlanD)
- Ms S.H. Lam - Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (2), PlanD
- Mr Wallace K.K. Lau - Principal Assistant Secretary (Higher  
Education), Education Bureau (EDB)

4. The following representers' representatives were invited to the meeting:

R25 – Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU)

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

- Professor Albert S.C. Chan )
- Mr Andy S.C. Lee )
- Ms Cindy Tsang )
- Mr Patrick S.L. Tam )
- Dr Daniel C.W. Tse )
- Professor Randy K. Chiu )
- Rev Dr Ip King Tak )
- Dr Alfred K.T. Tan )
- Ms Marianna W.C. Tsang )
- Mr Stephen W.O. Tang )
- Mr Yu Siu Chun ) Representers' representatives
- Professor Lu Aiping )
- Professor Bian Zhao Xiang )
- Mr Chung Shek Kwong )
- Mr Law Chi Shun )
- Ms Fannie Tang )

Miss Nana Lai )  
Ms Rachel Lo )  
Mr Todd Wan )  
Ms Stephanie Chan )  
Mr Fung King Him )  
Mr L.C. Lam )  
Ms Rowena Li )

5. The Chairman extended a welcome and invited the HKBU delegation to continue with their oral submissions.

6. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Professor Randy K. Chiu, a staff-elected Council Member of HKBU, made the following main points:

- (a) the points raised by the HKBU delegation the day before had already demonstrated that the rezoning of the ex-LWL site for residential use should not be pursued;
- (b) whether the ex-LWL site should be zoned for residential use or for educational use would depend on how the values of the society would be prioritized, i.e. how much weight should be put on education as opposed to housing;
- (c) the Government should not take a band-aid approach to address the housing problem. In view of the location, environmental constraints and size of the site, only a limited amount of flats would be provided at a very high per-unit cost and the selling prices were unlikely to be affordable to the general public;
- (d) as the residential flats to be provided at the ex-LWL site would unlikely serve people with a genuine housing need, developing the site for residential use rather than educational use would not serve its intended purpose but would sacrifice Hong Kong's ability to sustain its competitive

edge in the long run;

[Ms Anita W.T. Ma returned to join the meeting at this point.]

- (e) faced with the problems of an ageing population, a shortage of talent and difficulties in attracting foreign labour, Hong Kong had to strengthen the education and training of its own population to remain competitive. It was important for Hong Kong to put resources on education;
- (f) allocating the site for educational use would allow the community to reap benefits for many generations to come; and
- (g) the development of higher education required the support of both software (i.e. courses, researches and teachers) and hardware (i.e. classrooms and space). HKBU had a comprehensive plan on the use and development of the ex-LWL site for higher education purposes. To deprive HKBU of the ex-LWL site would significantly affect the value-added of HKBU's proposals.

7. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Rev Dr Ip King Tak, a staff-elected Court Member of HKBU, made the following main points:

- (a) HKBU had been expressing the desire to incorporate the ex-LWL site into its campus for the last 20 years;
- (b) the ex-LWL site was the only piece of land in close proximity to HKBU that could be made available for HKBU's long-term development;
- (c) as the ex-LWL site was adjacent to the existing School of Chinese Medicine, HKBU's long-term plan was to develop part of the site for CMTH use to enhance synergy and enable effective interaction between the medical students and patients. From the perspective of developing Chinese medicine in Hong Kong, it would be a loss if the site was used

for housing purposes instead of CMTH;

- (d) the campus of HKBU was the smallest in size amongst the eight UGC-funded institutions. In order to cater for its current needs, buildings on the campus were so packed and congested to the point of saturation;
- (e) as an institution with an emphasis on the study of humanities and whole person education, HKBU should provide an environment with plenty of outdoor space in order to stimulate students' contemplation on the issues and problems of society. However, outdoor space within the HKBU campus was seriously inadequate;
- (f) the proposed incorporation of the ex-LWL site into the campus of HKBU would create additional outdoor space within the campus which would not only enhance student creativity and enrich their lives, but also stimulate interaction between teachers and students and increase the exchange of views and ideas; and
- (g) the incorporation of the ex-LWL site would improve the overall integration of the HKBU campus.

8. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Dr Alfred K.T. Tan, a staff-elected Court Member of HKBU, made the following main points:

- (a) the ex-LWL site was ideal for the future development of HKBU, which would provide a new impetus for knowledge transfer from the university to the society;
- (b) the proposed CMTH was an essential part of HKBU's development strategy to provide dedicated services to the community. CMTH would create the best synergy among the stakeholders including the patients, professors, Chinese medical practitioners, students and the Government;

- (c) while the needs for special education might be satisfied by the provision of an alternative site, the development of a CMTH at the ex-LWL site would be the best use of limited resources as it would reduce wastage and duplication of resources and minimise travelling by students and professors to an off-campus site to serve the community;
- (d) in the long run, the benefits to the community from the transfer of knowledge that could take place at the ex-LWL site would greatly exceeded the financial gains from the sale of the site for residential use; and
- (e) the Board was urged to reserve the ex-LWL site for education purposes for the benefit of both HKBU and the community of Hong Kong.

9. Through a video recording, Professor Cindy Y.Y. Chu, a staff-elected Court Member of HKBU, made the following main points:

- (a) education of the future generation had always been a priority for traditional Chinese society. In the case of Hong Kong, the development of higher education was of particular importance;
- (b) without high quality education, there would be no future for Hong Kong as it would be unable to maintain its competitiveness; and
- (c) the Government should not sacrifice the long-term development of education for short-term goals. The use of the ex-LWL site by HKBU was for the long-term development of education, providing higher education to future generations.

10. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Professor Lu Aiping, Dean of Chinese Medicine of HKBU, made the following main points:

- (a) HKBU intended to develop the ex-LWL site for CMTH use a long time ago. The 2020 Vision of HKBU had identified the site for CMTH development;

[Mr Timothy K.W. Ma returned to join the meeting at this point.]

- (b) there was an old Chinese saying that ‘no matter how poor one might be, one should not be thrifty on education’. In this regard, there was no justification for the Government to rezone the ex-LWL site for residential use as the site had been originally planned for educational use, and education was for the long-term benefit of future generations;
- (c) as a place for cultural exchange between the east and west, Hong Kong had an important role to play in the development of Chinese medicine;
- (d) HKBU’s School of Chinese Medicine was the first institution in Hong Kong providing studies on Chinese medicine. It was also the largest institution for such studies in the whole of China;
- (e) as the ex-LWL site was the only site available in the vicinity of the HKBU campus, the development of CMTH on the site would be ideal. It would be the best use of the site;
- (f) medical schools all over the world were supported by their own teaching hospitals. In the Mainland, each university with Chinese medicine courses was supported by at least one CMTH. In this regard, there was a need for the HKBU School of Chinese Medicine to be supported by its own CMTH;
- (g) similar to medical training in the west, practical clinical experience was one of the basic requirements in the training of a Chinese medical practitioner. The most important role of CMTH was to provide students of Chinese medicine with the opportunity to acquire practical clinical

experience;

- (h) the study of Chinese medicine and the treatment of patients had progressed with the times. Patients nowadays no longer expected Chinese medical practitioners to provide treatment solely based on their own experience but would expect the practitioners to find the best way to treat their illnesses. This could only be done based on team work and in a CMTH environment where academic research could be conducted. The CMTH environment would also enable patients to stay in the hospital for daily treatment and observation;
- (i) from the medical education point of view, practical clinical training or internship was an important component in the training of a Chinese medical practitioner. Students of Chinese medicine in Hong Kong currently had to do their internships in the Mainland, causing problem due to differences in the medical system and the difficulties for students to be followed up by their own professors;
- (j) a CMTH would also be beneficial to the professors as they could exchange their views on the treatment of patients with both the students and with other Chinese medical practitioners;
- (k) a CMTH was different from a Chinese Medicine Hospital in that a major proportion of staff would comprise Chinese medical practitioners who were professors and students doing internships in a CMTH. Exchange of views and knowledge transfer would be much more frequent than that of a Chinese Medicine Hospital. Moreover, all three aspects of medical treatment, education and research would be provided in a CMTH;
- (l) Hong Kong could support a CMTH as there were a large number of graduates from Hong Kong's Chinese Medicine undergraduate programmes over the years, some of whom could become professors in future;



- (m) the development of a CMTH would be in the best interests of Hong Kong as it would complement the existing undergraduate programme for Chinese medicine and take forward the development of Chinese medicine as a pillar industry of the Hong Kong economy; and
- (n) as an international metropolis, there was a need for a CMTH in Hong Kong.

11. Mr Law Chi Shun, a patient of the Chinese Medicine Clinic of HKBU, made the following main points:

- (a) although education and the medical industry were considered as pillar industries of the Hong Kong economy, the Government did not give much support to the development of Chinese medicine, which was mainly promoted by the universities and non-governmental organizations (NGOs);
- (b) even though Chinese medicine was recognised internationally as a medical approach for the treatment of illnesses, there was no CMTH in Hong Kong to enable students of Chinese medicine to carry out their internships and receive practical clinical training;
- (c) as the ex-LWL site was in close proximity to the HKBU School of Chinese Medicine, the development of the site for CMTH use would help create a synergy effect in terms of education and practical clinical training. CMTH was the most appropriate use of the site;
- (d) the development of CMTH would enhance Hong Kong's status as a centre for the study of Chinese medicine and attract more local students to study the subject;
- (e) with an ageing population, the demand for Chinese medical treatment

would increase significantly in the near future;

- (f) as a cancer patient of the Chinese Medicine Clinic of HKBU for seven years, he was a witness to the effectiveness of Chinese medicine as a treatment for cancer; and
- (g) the Government should support the development of Chinese medical studies.

12. Mr Chung Shek Kwong, a patient of the Chinese Medicine Clinic of HKBU, made the following main points:

- (a) the proposal to develop Hong Kong into a centre for Chinese medicine was first announced by the then Chief Executive, Mr Tung Chee Wah;
- (b) as a patient who suffered from chronic disease and needed treatment on a daily basis, the development of a Chinese Medicine Hospital was supported as patients could then stay in the hospital for treatment and minimize commuting;
- (c) the development of CMTH in the vicinity of HKBU would provide more opportunities for research and would be convenient for both the students and professors; and
- (d) as the ex-LWL site was located in the urban area and was readily available, developing the site into a CMTH would be the best option for the Government, patients, students and professors.

13. Dr Daniel C.W. Tse, Emeritus President of HKBU, made the following main points:

- (a) taking the University of Macau with its new campus and facilities as an example, the support of the Government would greatly facilitate the

development of a university;

- (b) the Government should consider the development of a public university as an important aspect of the long-term development of the community;
- (c) the shortage of land for the development of necessary facilities had always been a problem for HKBU;
- (d) when compared with international standards, the amount of land available for the City University of Hong Kong (CityU), Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU) and HKBU were severely inadequate. Of these three institutions, HKBU was the smallest and most deficient in land resources;
- (e) when considering the adequacy of the university's campus, the Government should not base its assessment solely on the average floor space per student but should also consider the critical size for a university campus that was required to let the university function effectively. Given the shortage in space in the HKBU campus, it was unreasonable for the Government not to consider granting to HKBU a site that was readily available and in close proximity to its campus;
- (f) while the proposed development of the ex-LWL site for special education might generate a synergy effect with another school for special education located in the vicinity (Mary Rose School), the loss of the site for higher educational purposes would be detrimental to HKBU and would severely limit its contribution to higher education;
- (g) countries all over the world were enhancing the competitiveness of their universities in order to improve the quality of their human resources and the effectiveness of their research and development. It was unwise of the Government to withhold such a small piece of land from HKBU. In doing so, it could adversely affect HKBU's ability, and in turn Hong Kong's ability, to enhance its competitiveness;

- (h) the proposed development of CMTH at the ex-LWL site was supported. HKBU was the first university in Hong Kong to offer a full-time undergraduate programme in Chinese medicine and the only institution in Hong Kong to offer a Bachelor of Pharmacy degree in Chinese Medicine. The medical services offered by HKBU graduates to the community were well received and much appreciated;
- (i) it was a regret that a CMTH was not yet available in Hong Kong to allow professors and students to conduct practical clinical training and research. The provision of a CMTH in Hong Kong would allow the study of Chinese medicine to develop to its full potential;
- (j) although the proposed development of a Chinese Medicine Hospital in Tseng Kwan O would greatly enhance the medical services provided by Chinese medical practitioners, it could not replace a CMTH; and
- (k) the allocation of the ex-LWL site to HKBU for the development of a CMTH would benefit not only the students of Chinese medicine, professors and patients but also the development of Chinese medicine as a pillar industry in the Hong Kong economy and Hong Kong's overall competitiveness.

14. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Ms Marianna W.C. Tsang, President of HKBU Century Club, made the following main points:

- (a) the HKBU Century Club was an alumni association with the aim of supporting the ongoing development of HKBU and its pursuit of higher education and whole person development;
- (b) the campus of HKBU was small and its facilities were inadequate. The university did not possess a standard swimming pool. Even the sports ground and the football field that HKBU used were shared with other

universities;

- (c) the 1,300 student hostel places to be provided in the northern portion of the ex-LWL site were inadequate to meet the needs of HKBU;
- (d) HKBU had not been allocated additional land to cater for the need arising from 3-3-4 academic reform;
- (e) the HKBU School of Chinese Medicine was in need of a CMTH to enable its students to take clinical internships;
- (f) as the undergraduate programme on Chinese Medicine was an approved, UGC-funded programme, the Government had the responsibility to provide HKBU with the land resources necessary to enable the course to develop to its full potential;
- (g) the Government should not confine itself to the short-term development needs of HKBU up to 2015 but should also consider its long-term development needs; and
- (h) the Government should reserve the ex-LWL site for HKBU so as to maximize the synergy effect and improve the overall learning environment for students;

15. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr Stephen W.O. Tang, President of HKBU Alumni Association, made the following main points:

- (a) while the current shortage of housing land needed to be addressed, the ex-LWL site would not help address the problem as the site would likely be developed for high-class housing rather than housing for people in need;
- (b) as the ex-LWL site had been zoned for “G/IC” use for many years, the

area generally lacked the basic supporting facilities for residential uses. The proposed development of the site for residential use would not bring about any synergy effect or planning merits;

- (c) while the provision of housing land was important, the provision of other community facilities such as sports grounds and hospitals were equally important for a balanced development of Hong Kong. The constant shift in the Government's policy demonstrated a lack of long-term vision for Hong Kong;
- (d) the proposed residential use of the ex-LWL site was opposed by the HKBU Alumni Association. The residential use was in fact not supported by either the Kowloon City District Council or the Legislative Council's Panel on Education;
- (e) while the Government's latest proposal was to reserve the ex-LWL site for special education purposes, no justifications were provided in support of the proposal;
- (f) since 2005, HKBU had been actively pursuing the ex-LWL site for development into a CMTH, which was lacking in Hong Kong;
- (g) while the development of Chinese medicine as a pillar industry in the Hong Kong economy had been set as an objective by the current and previous CEs, the proposal to rezone the ex-LWL site for residential use would not serve that objective; and
- (h) HKBU had been training Chinese medical practitioners who served the community. The proposed development of a CMTH at the ex-LWL site was to enhance the current services provided to the community. The continued development of Chinese medicine and the proposed development of a CMTH at the site was supported by the general public.

16. Mr Yu Siu Chun, an alumnus of School of Chinese Medicine of HKBU, made the following main points:

- (a) HKBU's bid for the ex-LWL site was not out of greed. As there was a lack of space in the HKBU campus, the bid for the ex-LWL site was due to the need for additional land to provide the necessary facilities to support the university;
- (b) contrary to EDB's claim that the current academic facilities in HKBU were adequate, there was a severe shortage of facilities such as function rooms for seminars and other activities;
- (c) the Chinese Medicine Hospital to be developed in Tseung Kwan O would be operated by an NGO. Based on the experience of clinics operated by NGOs, students of Chinese medicine in these clinics did not receive much practical clinical training with supervision but were required to treat patients round the clock;
- (d) the practical clinical experience for students having internships in the Mainland was not always relevant in the Hong Kong context as Chinese medical practitioners in the Mainland were allowed to use both Chinese and Western medicine in their treatment of the patients; and
- (e) Hong Kong students taking internships in the Mainland were sometimes excluded from classes which were restricted to Mainland students only. Hence, the development of a CMTH in Hong Kong was essential to provide practical clinical training for Hong Kong students.

17. Mr L.C. Lam then read out a statement from Mr Peter K.T. Chan, the Chairman of the Lung Tong Area Committee, who said that he supported the views expressed by HKBU and it was inappropriate of the Secretary for Development to make a statement supporting the rezoning of the ex-LWL site for residential use when the Board was still in the process of hearing the representations. Such an act would be seen as putting pressure

on the Board.

[The meeting took a break of 10 minutes.]

18. Mr Andy S.C. Lee informed the Chairman that the HKBU delegation would conclude their presentation. With a Powerpoint presentation, Ms Cindy Tsang, the planning consultant of HKBU, made the following points:

- (a) many stakeholders had expressed the view that the ex-LWL site should be rezoned from “R(B)” to “G/IC(9)”. To put the site to residential use would result in a piecemeal development along this part of Renfrew Road;
- (b) the ex-LWL site was an indispensable part of HKBU’s long-term development plan which was a comprehensive and well thought-out plan for the development of higher education;
- (c) the rezoning of the ex-LWL site for higher education purposes would enhance Hong Kong’s overall competitiveness;
- (d) it should be acknowledged that the ex-LWL site was the only site that could be made available to meet the expansion needs of HKBU. Once the site was developed for residential purposes, it would be irreversible; and
- (e) the Board should take into account public views and the long-term needs of HKBU and the community at large by rezoning the site back to “G/IC(9)”.

19. With a Powerpoint presentation, Mr Patrick S.L. Tam, the building consultant of HKBU, made the following points:

- (a) according to the Conceptual Master Plan for the integration of the ex-LWL site into the HKBU campus, a complex for whole person development would be developed in the northern part of the ex-LWL site with a student hostel with 1,700 places in the middle part and a CMTH in the southern



part;

- (b) the CMTH development would meet the needs of both the students of Chinese medicine and the community at large;
- (c) the existing HKBU campus was quite fragmented and the ex-LWL site was one of the obstacles that prevented better connection amongst the various parts of the campus. Should the ex-LWL site be granted to HKBU, the overall pedestrian connection within the HKBU campus would be much improved, benefitting the students and staff;
- (d) according to the Conceptual Master Plan, more outdoor space would be provided in the HKBU campus to enhance interaction between the students and teachers. The additional outdoor space would also benefit residents in the vicinity as these areas would be always open to the public;
- (e) allocating the ex-LWL site to parties other than HKBU would adversely affect the comprehensiveness of the future development and the value-added derived from HKBU's Conceptual Master Plan would be lost;
- (f) HKBU's Conceptual Master Plan was already well-developed and ready for immediate implementation;
- (g) the existing facilities of HKBU were fragmented and not up to standard when compared with other universities in Hong Kong or overseas. HKBU needed the ex-LWL site which was indispensable for its long-term development in accordance with its 'Vision 2020' strategic development blueprint; and
- (h) even though the role of the Board was only to determine the zoning of the ex-LWL site, the Board could make recommendations to the Government on the use of the site.

20. Professor Albert S.C. Chan, the President and Vice-Chancellor of HKBU, concluded the presentation with the following points:

- (a) from the perspectives of town planning, integration of the community, overall benefit to society and the long-term development of education, it would be inappropriate for the ex-LWL site to be developed for residential use. The conclusion was very clear and it would be a disgrace for Hong Kong if the site was so developed;
- (b) the Conceptual Master Plan for the development of the ex-LWL site included a CMTH with 200 hospital beds, a student hostel with 1,700 places and a complex for whole person development. The local community had been consulted and was in support of HKBU's proposal;
- (c) the ex-LWL site was the only site that could create a synergy effect for the long-term development of HKBU;
- (d) the submissions made by the HKBU delegation were representing the views of all the main stakeholders including the students and staff of HKBU, the local community, District Council members and patients of the Chinese Medicine Clinic of HKBU. They were in unanimous support of HKBU's proposal for a CMTH cum student hostel and a whole person development complex at the ex-LWL site;
- (e) the importance of a CMTH in support of HKBU's programme for Chinese medicine studies had already been presented; and
- (f) for the sake of the future of Hong Kong, the Board should make a recommendation to CE in C in support of HKBU's proposal.

21. As the HKBU delegation had completed its presentation, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

22. In response to the Vice-Chairman's enquiry on the number of student hostel places required by HKBU, Mr Andy S.C. Lee said that the number of student hostel places required was based on the assessment conducted by UGC, and the current proposal for 1,700 student hostel places at the ex-LWL site had been endorsed and supported by UGC. Mr Lee added that the proposed CMTH at the site would not result in any increase in HKBU's student hostel requirements.

23. The Vice-Chairman further enquired how the 3-3-4 academic reform had worsened the congestion problem in the HKBU campus. In response, Mr Andy S.C. Lee said that no additional land had been granted to HKBU to accommodate the additional students as a result of the 3-3-4 academic reform. To address the problem, some low-rise developments within the campus and the car park area for the joint university sports ground had been redeveloped respectively into a 13-storey building and a 3-storey building to accommodate the additional facilities required.

24. In response to the Vice-Chairman's enquiry on whether the inclusion of the northern part of the ex-LWL site into HKBU's campus would already meet their requirements, Mr Andy S.C. Lee said that, with an area of 0.64 ha, the site could only accommodate the 1,300 student hostel places that was agreed by EDB to be subsidized by the Government but not the additional 400 student hostel places which were supported by UGC but would be funded by HKBU using its own resources. As there was an existing shortfall in academic accommodation of about 2,000m<sup>2</sup> GFA (calculated up to the 2014/15 academic year), a site area of 0.78 ha would be required to provide 1,700 student hostel places and 2,000m<sup>2</sup> GFA of academic accommodation. These figures, however, did not include the new initiative mentioned in the 2014 Policy Address to increase the in-take of senior-year undergraduate places by 5,000 places amongst the UGC-funded institutions by 2018/19. Based on HKBU's initial assessment, additional academic accommodation of 4,000m<sup>2</sup> GFA would be required. Mr Patrick S.L. Tam supplemented that in order to meet the latest building standards and requirements, including the need for building separation and the provision of wind corridors, a site of 0.64 ha would not be large enough to accommodate 1,700 student hostel places. Upon considering the layout options for the entire ex-LWL site, it was recommended that the complex for whole person development be located in the northern part of the site so that it would be more centrally located within the

HKBU campus and that the new student hostels be located in the southern part of the site so that it would be near the existing student hostels.

25. The Vice-Chairman commented that it was too simplistic to say that there was a shortage of space for HKBU based only on its site area. While the amount of space available depended on the development intensity and height of buildings within the campus, the space requirements of different subjects tended to vary. In response, Mr Andy S.C. Lee said that the HKBU campus was the smallest amongst the UGC-funded institutions in Hong Kong, with an area of only 5.4 ha. Even with the inclusion of the northern part of the ex-LWL site, the HKBU campus would only be about 6 ha while the largest UGC-funded institution in Hong Kong had a campus size of 137 ha and the campus of CityU, which was also in Kowloon Tong, was 11 ha. Even though the internal floor space of HKBU might be adequate for accommodating its facilities, the overall campus size was important for the whole person development of its students. In this regard, Professor Albert S.C. Chan supplemented that one of the most important elements of university education was the interaction between teachers and students within the campus. The lack of outdoor space within the campus would severely limit such interaction. Mr Andy S.C. Lee continued to say that outdoor space was a luxury for HKBU as only one small piece of grassland was provided within the campus for students.

26. In response to the Vice-Chairman's enquiry on whether the proposed Chinese Medicine Hospital to be developed in Tseung Kwan O could be used as a training hospital for HKBU's students, Mr Andy S.C. Lee said that no details had been provided on the mode of operation or services to be provided by the proposed Chinese Medicine Hospital. In this regard, HKBU was not in a position to consider whether the proposed hospital could serve as a training hospital. Professor Albert S.C. Chan said that while the proposed development of a Chinese Medicine Hospital in Tseung Kwan O was supported, the proposed hospital could not serve as a training hospital as it was not in close proximity or easily accessible to any of the universities providing undergraduate programmes on Chinese Medicine. The inconvenient location would adversely affect student-patient interaction and student-teacher interaction in the hospital.

27. The Vice-Chairman enquired whether HKBU would have an alternative plan if

the southern part of the ex-LWL site was not granted to them. In response, Mr Andy S.C. Lee said HKBU would need to apply for minor relaxation of the building height restriction in order to accommodate 1,700 student hostel places in the northern part of the ex-LWL site. Other development needs of HKBU could not be met as there were no effective solutions. Professor Albert S.C. Chan supplemented that HKBU had already explored all possibilities and no alternative could be identified.

28. In response to the Vice-Chairman's enquiry, Mr Wallace K.K. Lau, EDB, said that there were about 10,000 students in HKBU in the 2012/13 academic year with 1,400 students in the Faculty of Arts, 2,300 students in the School of Business, 400 students in the School of Chinese Medicine, 1,500 students in the School of Communication, 1,800 students in the Faculty of Science, 2,500 students in the Faculty of Social Sciences and 420 students in the Academy of Visual Arts. For resource and land allocation to UGC-funded institutions, the Kaiser formula had been adopted where the space requirement per student and the requirements for supporting facilities had been taken into account. Mr Andy S.C. Lee supplemented that the Kaiser formula was mainly concerned with the calculation of a university's internal floor space requirements.

29. On the facilities to be provided in the northern part of the ex-LWL site, Mr Wallace K.K. Lau said that HKBU's proposal comprised three components, i.e. 1,338 UGC-funded student hostel places, 2,600m<sup>2</sup> GFA of academic accommodations and 300-odd HKBU-funded student hostel places. As the 300-odd HKBU-funded student hostel places might be offered to self-financing students, EDB considered that in developing the site, priority should be given to providing facilities that were required by UGC-funded students (i.e. about 1,400 student hostel places and 2,600m<sup>2</sup> GFA of academic accommodations). Nevertheless, EDB had no objection to the additional provision of student hostel places within the same site if suitable architectural solutions could be found. In response, Mr Andy S.C. Lee said that the Government had previously granted land to other UGC-funded institutions for the provision of student hostels for self-financing students and EDB did not forbid HKBU from providing the additional 300-odd student hostel places using its own resources.

30. In response to a Member's enquiry on the utilization of the Joint Sports Centre

which seemed to be idle most of the time, Mr Andy S.C. Lee said that the Joint Sports Centre was shared among HKBU, CityU and PolyU, with time slots allotted equally between them. According to HKBU's records, there was a high utilization rate of the Joint Sports Centre during the time slots allotted to HKBU.

31. The same Member enquired whether the HKBU campus in Shek Mun could be used for the relocation of the School of Chinese Medicine and the provision of a CMTH. In response, Mr Andy S.C. Lee said that the Shek Mun campus was already saturated and could not be used as a replacement site for the two facilities.

[Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn returned to join the meeting at this point.]

32. In response to the same Member's enquiry, Professor Albert S.C. Chan clarified his previous remark on 'disgrace' and said that it would be a very sad day in the history of educational development in Hong Kong if the ex-LWL site, which had originally been planned for educational use, was to be used for housing development. HKBU's request was for the ex-LWL site to be rezoned from "R(B)" to "G/IC" and HKBU would continue to discuss with the Government on whether the site should be put to special or higher educational use.

33. Noting that the Emeritus President of HKBU, Dr Daniel C.W. Tse, was the Chairman of the Chinese Medical Council of Hong Kong from 1997 to 2001, a Member enquired the reason why the need for establishing a CMTH had not been made at that time. In response, Professor Albert S.C. Chan said that Hong Kong was not yet ready for a CMTH at that time as the School for Chinese Medicine had only just started. However, as the undergraduate programme had been in operation for more than a decade, the time had become ripe for establishing a CMTH in Hong Kong to improve the internship of its Chinese medicine students.

34. A Member enquired how the Conceptual Master Plan presented by the HKBU delegation could be implemented as the proposal was based on the entire ex-LWL site but in reality only the northern part of the ex-LWL site would be granted to HKBU. In response, Mr Andy S.C. Lee said that the objective of the Conceptual Master Plan was to provide the

Board with a comprehensive vision on how the northern and southern parts of the ex-LWL site could be put to their best use if both sites were made available to HKBU for educational purposes. The division of the site into two parts was in fact artificial, particularly when the southern part of the site was now proposed by PlanD to be rezoned from “R(B)” back to “G/IC(9)”. Mr Lee added that the proposal to develop the southern part of the ex-LWL site into a CMTH was considered by HKBU to be the most appropriate and in the best interest of Hong Kong.

35. In response to a Member’s enquiry on whether new courses would be provided if the southern part of the ex-LWL site was given to HKBU, Professor Albert S.C. Chan said that the current plan was to develop 1,700 student hostel places, a CMTH and a complex for whole person development at the ex-LWL site. One of the facilities that could be provided in the whole person development complex was a Centre for Chinese Studies, with an emphasis on Chinese calligraphy and painting (with the donations from Professor Jao Tsung-i), in order to give students exposure to these art forms. The complex could also provide academic accommodations for the proposed addition of 1,000 senior-year undergraduate places for the articulation of sub-degree graduates, as agreed with EDB.

36. In response to the same Member’s enquiry on the discussions that had taken place between EDB and HKBU, Mr Wallace K.K. Lau said that since 2005, HKBU had submitted 7 different conceptual proposals to EDB on the use of the ex-LWL site. The proposed uses included *inter alia* accommodations to meet the additional requirements generated by the 3-3-4 academic reform; a Chinese medicine academic and research centre; a CMTH; a film academy; a student hostel; a cultural exchange centre; a complex for creativity; a swimming pool and associated fitness centre; and the Conceptual Master Plan that had been presented to the Board in the current hearing. EDB had difficulty in assessing the proposals as they were all conceptual in nature without sufficient supporting details or justifications. In response, Mr Andy S.C. Lee said that HKBU’s proposals had consistently comprised student hostels, a CMTH and a humanities-related centre which had been named differently as a cultural exchange centre, a complex for creativity, etc. It was unfortunate that HKBU did not have the opportunity to discuss its conceptual proposals with EDB and work out the details in the process.

37. A Member enquired whether EDB had been in discussion with HKBU on its development plans and whether HKBU had considered other options to meet its expansion needs such as finding another site for its campus. In response, Professor Albert S.C. Chan said that the medium-term needs of HKBU would be met if the ex-LWL site was granted to HKBU. As for long-term plans, HKBU had made a suggestion for the Government to develop a new campus for HKBU in the Lok Ma Chau Loop in return for HKBU giving up its existing campus in Kowloon Tong. However, the Government had yet to make a decision on the matter. Mr Wallace K.K. Lau said that EDB had been in continuous discussion with HKBU on its development plans. However, any expansion proposals would need to be substantiated with detailed proposals and justifications. Mr Lau did not agree that HKBU's expansion needs could only be met by incorporating sites near its campus. In fact, HKBU had recently been awarded a 10-year tenancy for the use of a site at Kai Tak as a studio for visual arts. According to HKBU, the Kai Tak campus was for post-graduate or community arts and for the carrying out of activities such as glass-making which could not be done in the Kowloon Tong campus. In response, Mr Andy S.C. Lee said that besides the campus at Kowloon Tong, HKBU did have other campuses such as the one at Shek Mun and the one at Kai Tak. It was natural for a university to have more than one campus as different sites had been available to meet the university's needs at different times. The Kai Tak campus was used by the Academy of Visual Arts and was originally meant to be temporary premises for the academy. However, as the buildings on the site were historic buildings with an ambience that was suitable for the development of arts, the site had become an icon for the academy. In this regard, HKBU decided to seek approval for the permanent use of the site.

38. A Member enquired whether CMTH could be incorporated into the existing Baptist Hospital which was adjacent to the HKBU campus. In response, Professor Albert S.C. Chan said that the suggestion had been explored and was found to be not feasible due to the lack of space within the Baptist Hospital compound and other operational difficulties. Nevertheless, as the ex-LWL site was in close proximity to Baptist Hospital, the development of the site into a CMTH would allow the integrated use of Chinese and Western medicine in the treatment of patients of both hospitals.

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



39. Noting that some representers in previous sessions suggested that local community facilities including *inter alia* a public library, a community hall and a centre for the elderly should be provided at the ex-LWL site, the Chairman enquired whether these uses could be incorporated into HKBU's proposals. In response, Mr Andy S.C. Lee said that HKBU had consulted the local community, including District Council members, who generally supported the HKBU's Conceptual Master Plan for the ex-LWL site. As the university's campus was a public space, the public were welcome to use the outdoor space within the campus at any time. Although students and staff would have priority in using the indoor facilities, some of these facilities could also be made available to the public during certain periods of time. While it would not be possible for HKBU to provide a public library and a community hall at the ex-LWL site, the provision of services for the elderly or some events co-organized with the local community could be considered. Indeed, the proposed CMTH would be a facility serving the local community.

40. In response to the Chairman's enquiry on whether student hostels were a noise nuisance, as suggested by some representers in previous sessions, Mr Andy S.C. Lee concurred that some activities carried out in the student hostels could generate a lot of noise. In fact, there had been complaints on noise nuisance lodged by residents living in the vicinity of student hostels of other universities. In this regard, the ex-LWL site was not suitable for residential use as the existing student hostels adjacent to the site might become a noise nuisance to the future residents.

41. In response to the Chairman's enquiry on the suitability of developing the site for subsidized housing, as suggested by some representers in previous sessions, Mr Andy S.C. Lee said that while there was a need to provide more subsidized housing to meet the demand, it was doubtful whether such use was the most appropriate use for the ex-LWL site as it was a very valuable site for educational purposes.

42. The Chairman enquired about the problem of students and teachers having difficulty in finding a place in the canteen for lunch due to outsiders using the canteen, as raised by some students in previous sessions. In response, Mr Andy S.C. Lee said that HKBU would make the necessary arrangements to ensure that students and staff would have

priority in using the canteen during lunch hours.

43. A Member enquired whether the GIC facilities provided were adequate for residents of Kowloon Tong and Kowloon City. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip made reference to Annex VIII of the TPB Paper and said that with a planned population of about 29,000 in the Kowloon Tong area, the provision of GIC facilities was generally adequate with a surplus provision of schools and clinics. While there was a shortfall in post office provision, post office would be usually provided in premises in government, commercial and commercial/residential buildings. Noting a representer's request for a public library in Kowloon Tong, Mr Yip said that according to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), a district library would be required for every 200,000 persons. In this regard, there was no requirement for a district library in Kowloon Tong. On the other hand, with a planned population of about 450,000 persons in Kowloon City, it would only require the provision of 2.5 libraries and 5 libraries had already been provided/planned. According to HKPSG, community halls should be provided on a need basis, as assessed and advised by the Director of Home Affairs. With 4 existing community halls/centres (3 being operated by NGOs) and 2 under planning, the provision of community halls in Kowloon City was generally adequate. HKPSG also specified that the provision of various facilities for the elderly should be determined by the Director of Social Welfare. With 11 centres providing various services to the elderly in Kowloon City, the provision was considered to be adequate.

44. In response to the same Member's enquiry on the proposed school for special education, Mr Wallace K.K. Lau said that owing to the implementation of the new secondary school curriculum for special schools and the need to extend the educational years for special education, there would be a net increase in the demand for special school places. Apart from reprovisioning of existing special schools, new sites for the development of additional special schools had to be identified. In this regard, the southern part of the ex-LWL site was considered suitable for the provision of a 24-classroom school for special education to meet the demand in Kowloon. However, the detailed development parameters of the proposed special school such as the building height and plot ratio had yet to be determined. In response to the Chairman's further enquiry, Mr Wallace K.K. Lau said that the proposed special school was mainly to serve the local demand in the Kowloon

region.

45. A Member enquired about the funding arrangements between the existing medical schools and their teaching hospitals, i.e. Queen Mary Hospital for the University of Hong Kong and Prince of Wales Hospital for the Chinese University of Hong Kong. In response, Mr Wallace K.K. Lau said that UGC did not provide any funding to the two hospitals for students taking clinical training at the hospitals. It was only an administrative arrangement between the two hospitals and professors of the two universities to allow the professors to bring students for observation or teaching purposes when treating certain clinical cases.

46. In response to a Member's enquiry, Professor Albert S.C. Chan said that HKBU would support the proposed special school development if the justifications provided by EDB confirmed that a special school was the best use of the site. However, no information had been provided by EDB to justify the need for developing the ex-LWL site for special education use.

47. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairman thanked the Government representatives and the HKBU delegation for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

48. The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.