

1. The meeting was resumed at 9:05 a.m. on 20.3.2014.
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 Roger K.H. Luk

Dr W.K. Yau

Professor K.C. Chau

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Professor P.P. Ho

Mr F.C. Chan

Director of Lands

Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Presentation and Question Session

[Open Meeting]

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

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

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

R5551(Gadau, Marcus)

Mr Gadau, Marcus	Representer
------------------	-------------

R6717 (Tam Wing Sum)

Mr Tam Wing Sum	Representer
-----------------	-------------

R6922 (Mr Lee Kwong Wah)

Mr Lee Kwong Wah	Representer
------------------	-------------

R6959 (So Wing Kin)

Mr So Wing Kin	Representer
----------------	-------------

R7533 (Hong Kong Critical Geography Group)

Mr Tang Wing Shing	Representer's Representative
--------------------	------------------------------

R7832 (Mr Fu Ka Ho, Wright)

Mr Fu Ka Ho, Wright	Representer
---------------------	-------------

R7866 (Mr Mai Kwok Wah)

Mr Mai Kwok Wah	Representer
-----------------	-------------

R7917 (Wong Nga Chung)

Mr Wong Nga Chung Representer

R8321 (Lai Wing Chi)

Ms Lai Wing Chi Representer

R8347 (Law Wai Chi)

Ms Law Wai Chi Representer

R8926 (Mr Lam Chi Ming)

Mr Lam Chi Ming Representer

R13576 (Mak Tin Hing)

Ms Mak Tin Hing Representer

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

- (a) in view of the large number of representations and comments received and more than 2,800 representers/commenters had indicated that they would either attend in person or had authorised representatives, it was necessary to limit the time for making oral submissions;

- (b) each representer/commenter would be allotted a 10-minute speaking time. However, to provide flexibility to representers/commenters to suit their needs, there were arrangements to allow cumulative speaking time for authorised representatives, swapping of allotted time with other representers/commenters and/or requesting for extension of time for making the oral submission;

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

5. The Chairman said that the representative of PlanD would first be invited to make a presentation. After that, the representers/authorized representatives would be invited to make oral submissions. After the oral submissions, there would be a Q & A session.

6. He then invited Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, to brief Members on the representations and comments. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr Yip repeated the presentation that was made in the hearing session on 10.3.2014 as recorded in paragraph 17 of the minutes of 10.3.2014.

[Mr Dominic K.K. Lam returned to join the meeting at this point.]

7. The Chairman then invited the representers and representer's representatives to elaborate on their representations.

R5551 (Gadus, Marcus)

8. Mr Marcus Gadus confirmed that he had no oral submission.

R6717 (Tam Wing Sum)

9. Mr Tam Wing Sum made the following main points:

- (a) he objected to the rezoning of the southern portion of the former Lee Wai Lee campus of Hong Kong Institution of Vocational Education site (the Site) to “Residential (Group B)” zone. As many students, organizations and District Council members had expressed views on various aspects, he would focus mainly on the land use incompatibility aspect;

Land use incompatibility

- (b) the student activities such as performance and discussion forum, etc. in the open areas of the student hostel would cause noise nuisance to the future residential development if the Site was rezoned to “R(B)”. Complaints against the students by the future residents were inevitable;
- (c) curtain walls were commonly used in buildings to capture natural light or to add aesthetic value to the buildings. Glare caused by the reflection on the curtain walls and the night-time activities of the student hostel would adversely affect the residents;
- (d) droppings of pets kept by residents would cause environmental and public hygiene concerns, particularly during the summer months. Barking of dogs at night would also be an inevitable nuisance to the students and seniors in the home for the elderly;
- (e) occasional functions, such as festive gatherings, involving broadcasting, games and performance in the proposed residential development would in turn affect the student activities at the student hostel;
- (f) as there was a shortage of eating places in Kowloon Tong, the use of the university canteen by nearby residents might adversely affect the students and staff in using the canteen;
- (g) traffic generated by the proposed residential development would aggravate

the already congested traffic caused, amongst others, by the kindergartens in Kowloon Tong. There were only two mini-bus routes running in the area to provide connecting services to the Mass Transit Railway station. Traffic congestion had caused long queues at the mini-bus stands. Moreover, the additional traffic brought about by the proposed residential development would constitute a threat to the traffic safety of students of Mary Rose School and cause noise nuisance to the homes for the elderly in the area;

- (h) the land use incompatibility arising from the subject rezoning would have far-reaching implications. Members were requested to reject the rezoning of the Site to residential use; and
- (i) the whole site should be given to the Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU) for development of a Chinese medicine teaching hospital (CMTH) to optimize the use of the site, to meet the need of the aging population and to promote the Chinese culture and values.

[Actual speaking time of R6717: 9 minutes]

R6922 (Mr Lee Kwong Wah)

10. Mr Lee Kwong Wah, on behalf of the Kowloon Chamber of Commerce (KCC), made the following main points:

- (a) KCC had 2,000 members in 52 affiliated organizations, of which 13 were Chinese herbalists and medicine associations, namely Hong Kong & Kowloon Chinese Medicine Merchants Association Limited, the Kowloon Chinese Herbalists Association Ltd., Hong Kong Chinese Herbalists Association Ltd., International General Chinese Herbalists and Medicine Professionals Association Ltd., Hong Kong Chinese Medicine Research Association, Association of Hong Kong and Kowloon Practitioners of Chinese Medicine Ltd., the Hong Kong Chinese Overseas Physician Association, the Hong Kong Medicine Dealers' Guild, China Society of

Practitioners of Chinese Medicine Ltd., Society of Practitioners of Chinese Herbal Medicine Ltd., Worldwide Chinese Medicine Modernization Alliance, the Hong Kong Professional Institute of Chinese Medicine Medicated Meal Food and the Hong Kong TCM Orthopaedic & Traumatic Association Ltd.;

- (b) at present, there was not a single specialized Chinese medicine hospital (CMH) in Hong Kong and the Chinese medicine development in Hong Kong was far behind that in the Mainland and Taiwan. In Taiwan, there were 13 general CMHs and over 3,000 recognized Chinese medicine clinics. Chinese medicine treatments had been covered by National Health Insurance (NHI) since 1995. About one-third of the population, i.e. over 8 million people visited a Chinese medicine clinic at least once a year. According to the latest statistics, expenditure of NHI accounted for only 6.5% of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of Taiwan. The total expenditure on health insurance in respect of Chinese medicine treatment was NT\$21,200 millions or HK\$5,600 millions equivalent, accounting for 3.78% of the total expenditure on health insurance in Taiwan. Chinese medicine had effectively lowered Taiwan's overall expenditure in medical treatments;

Educational undertakings of KCC

- (c) KCC had established several kindergartens and English primary and secondary schools in the 1960s and 1970s and hence KCC understood the importance of education to the development of Hong Kong. One of the goals of KCC was to promote economic development between the Mainland and Hong Kong and to strengthen exchanges among 3 places in Greater China. KCC had sponsored annually talent development in the eight universities in Hong Kong. Since 1988, KCC had held 16 rounds of management training programmes for university students from four cities, and had trained over 2,000 university students from 60 famous universities in Greater China;
- (d) to promote development of Chinese medicine and to facilitate experience

sharing among practitioners in the Chinese medicine field, the current directors of KCC co-organized with HKBU a forum on Chinese medicine. Renowned practitioners, professors and experts in Chinese medicine were invited to share their research findings. The first forum would be held in April 2014; and

- (e) to use the Site as a CMTH of HKBU could enhance integration of training and practice as well as promote management efficiency. Therefore, KCC, together with the 13 affiliated Chinese herbalists and medicine associations fully supported the use of the Site for the first CMTH in Hong Kong for the long-term benefit of Hong Kong.

[Actual speaking time of R6922: 6 minutes]

R6959 (So Wing Kin)

11. Mr So Wing Kin made the following main points:

- (a) although PlanD had proposed to revert the Site to “G/IC(9)” zone, Members were requested to provide comments to the Government on the specific GIC use of the site;
- (b) based on information available on the internet, it was noted that the land area and student population of the City University of Hong Kong (CityU) were 1,678,312 sq.ft. and 16,804 respectively while those for HKBU were 582,137 sq. ft and 10,614 respectively. Land area per student for CityU was about 100 sq. ft and that for HKBU was about 55 sq. ft. As both universities were subsidized by the Government, it was not understood why the land area to student ratio of HKBU was significantly lower and how EDB could still consider that there was sufficient land for the development of HKBU. To strike a better balance, the Site should be given to HKBU for development;
- (c) the Government claimed that there was a need of land for special education.

However, students with special needs were encouraged to receive education in ordinary schools as far as possible. Some of the 60 special schools had been reducing their number of classes since 2010. An example was the Ebenezer School and Home for the Visually Impaired; and

- (d) Members should take into account the long-term planning and educational development of Hong Kong in making a decision on the use of the Site and to recommend to the Government the specific GIC use at the Site so as not to repeat the mistake which had led to over 20,000 objections from the public.

[Actual speaking time of R6959: 6 minutes]

R7533 (Hong Kong Critical Geography Group)

12. Mr Tang Wing Shing made the follow main points:

- (a) the oral submission was to continue the representation made by Ho Man Ching (R2134) in the last session on 17.3.2014 on social justice;
- (b) the Government had been over-enthusiastic in identifying new sites for residential development without asking why there was such a need. The crux of the problem was social imbalance in land resource between the public sector and the private sector. Land, which should be for public use, was changed to private properties enjoyed only by the affordable few with the Government facilitating in the process;
- (c) the “Economist” this year reported that Hong Kong had once again been on the lead in the “crony capitalism” index after being ranked first in the Gini coefficient. The two indicators showed that economic monopoly had extended its realm to social hegemony, resulting in social injustice;
- (d) the problem of Hong Kong was originated from the land development system. Many people considered it fair for developers to reap profit.

However, land price was established by the collective efforts of the Government and the public in converting virgin land into serviced land. Land development was supported by infrastructural works which were funded by the Capital Works Reserve Fund (基本工程儲備基金). Properties were then sold in high prices by developers to the public who had contributed to raise the land value;

- (e) town planning in Hong Kong had been a catalyst to bring about the social injustice by putting land into different zones on statutory plans which enabled developers to know what to expect from their investments to capture all the advantages; and
- (f) the objection to the rezoning of the Site for residential use was not based on technical grounds but entirely on the adverse impacts on the overall development of Hong Kong and social injustice.

[Actual speaking time of R7533: 7 minutes]

R7832 (Mr Fu Ka Ho, Wright)

13. Mr Fu Ka Ho, Wright, made the following main points:

- (a) being a current student of HKBU, he now had an additional identity to raise concern on the rezoning of the Site to residential use. He had expressed his discontent as an ordinary citizen when the proposed amendment was discussed by the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) a year ago;
- (b) since PlanD had proposed to revert the Site to “G/IC(9)” and the HKBU delegation had illustrated in detail why they opposed the residential zoning, he would focus on the town planning system;
- (c) all along, the Board had no restriction on the speaking time of representers/commenters until the consideration of the representations and comments relating to the Central Military Dock. It was a severe

deprivation of the rights of the representers/commenters to speak;

- (d) it was originally considered that the collection of authorizations from representers/commenters for the HKBU delegation to speak on their behalf would increase the recognition of the delegation. It was later found out that the actual speaking time of the HKBU delegation was far less than that would be allowed by the number of authorizations collected. This was a deprivation of citizens' right of expression. Although the Board had become a rubber stamp and development proposals would finally be approved, to be present and to speak in the hearing would let the general public know that there were objecting views; and
- (e) the Board still had to handle many other planning issues, e.g. the developments in the North East New Territories and on Lantau Island and rezoning of the "Green Belt" sites. The Board was requested to play a proactive monitoring role over the Government and to pay due respect to public comments in making any decisions.

[Actual speaking time of R7832: 5 minutes]

R7866 (Mr Mai Kwok Wah)

14. Mr Mai Kwok Wah made the following main points:

- (a) the oral submission was made on behalf of Mission Healthy Greens. The organization had co-organized with HKBU on the low carbon campus initiatives to promote sustainability and help develop low carbon culture. He objected to rezoning the Site for private residential development;
- (b) the proposed private residential development, as pointed out earlier by another representer (R6717), would cause nuisances to nearby developments and traffic congestion. To maximize the use of the site, the proposed development would be large in bulk resulting in adverse visual, air ventilation and environmental impacts on the surrounding areas;

- (c) according to the TPB Paper, the expansion need of HKBU was based on the requirements up to 2014-15. This was a myopic estimation restricting the long-term development of the university;
- (d) HKBU was a prestigious university for whole person education (全人教育) and promotion of environmental protection. The university had won the Silver Award of “2011 Hong Kong Awards for Environmental Excellence” as the first low carbon campus in Hong Kong. The Government should let HKBU have the Site for its long-term development and optimize the use of the site;
- (e) regarding the proposal of developing a school for special education on the Site, the Government should consider using vacant schools instead from the environmentally friendly perspective. The vacant SKH Kei Sum Primary School and the Tai Po Government Secondary School might be considered for such purpose to lower construction cost and to facilitate schooling of students in different districts to reduce traffic; and
- (f) before a final decision on the land use of the Site was made, local views including those from the Kowloon City District Council (KCDC), HKBU and other stakeholders should be sought.

[Actual speaking time of R7866: 5 minutes]

R7917 (Wong Nga Chung)

15. Mr Wong Nga Chung made the following main points:

- (a) as an alumnus of HKBU, he witnessed how the achievements of the university in the past decades had earned the recognition of the Government. HKBU had run the first School of Communication in Hong Kong and established the first School of Chinese Medicine. In the past 10 years, the School of Chinese Medicine had built up its status despite a

shortage of physical space and funds. It was particularly renowned for its researches in cancer, bone and joint diseases treatments;

- (b) various Chinese medicine research institutes and laboratories had been established through collaborations with universities and sponsorship from the local governments in the Mainland. One of which was the HKBU Branch of State Key Laboratory of Chemo/Biosensing and Chemometrics of Hunan University for development on systems biology of Chinese medicine syndrome diagnosis. If it was not for the outstanding achievement of HKBU in Chinese medicine research, no national research institute would be established in HKBU. If additional land could be made available for HKBU to develop a CMTH, Chinese medicine development in HKBU would continue to excel; and

- (c) besides, the mission of Professor LU Aiping, Dean of Chinese Medicine, was not only to foster local talents in the field but also to promote Chinese medicine treatments in the international arena. If funding and land were available for HKBU to develop a CMH, Hong Kong people would be further benefited from the medical achievement of HKBU. In view of the strong national support and the promising future of the Chinese medicine development of HKBU, Members were requested to reserve the Site and any other site available for HKBU's long-term development.

[Actual speaking time of R7917: 6 minutes]

R8321 (Lai Wing Chi)

16. Ms Lai Wing Chi made the following main points:

- (a) she objected to the rezoning of the Site to residential use. It was noted that the Housing and Infrastructure Committee (HIC) of KCDC on 7.3.2013 and Legislative Council (LegCo) Panel on Education on 11.3.2013 also objected to the rezoning;

- (b) EDB had indicated that 500 places of special education were required in Kowloon and a 24-classroom school for special education was proposed for the Site. Although the Government's proposal of allocating more resources for special education was supported, whether the Site was the only option for such purpose was doubtful;
- (c) whether public consultation on the use of the Site for special education had been conducted and whether the site was considered to be the optimal site for special education by stakeholders were not known. As R7866 had suggested, vacant schools in Kowloon could provide more readily available premises for students with special needs;
- (d) the proximity of the ex-LWL site to the main campus of HKBU had made it ideal for the expansion of HKBU;
- (e) it was noted from the MPC meetings on 21.12.2012 and 25.1.2013, the KCDC HIC meeting on 7.3.2013 and the LegCo Panel on Education meetings on 11.3.2013 and 10.6.2013 that EDB had no requirement for the Site for educational purposes. It was not understood why in a period of eight months from June 2013 to February 2014, EDB had changed its view that the Site was required for special education. If it was not because of the over 25,000 representations received by the Board, the site would have been sold for residential development and the site would not be available for special education use. If the Government could make such an abrupt change within eight months, she wondered how the long-term development of a university could be considered;
- (f) EDB had explained in the LegCo Panel on Education meeting on 10.6.2013 that under the prevailing policies and calculation criteria, the Government had reserved the northern portion of the ex-LWL site for use by HKBU so that its publicly-funded academic space and student hostel entitlements up to the 2014-2015 academic year could be fully met. The Government's decision on the long-term development needs of HKBU basing on the spatial requirement of the university in 2014-15 was myopic and

unreasonable;

- (g) the Site was the last piece of land in the vicinity of HKBU which could satisfy the short to medium-term development needs of HKBU. There was no reason why the Government should not consider the proposal made by HKBU;
- (h) with respect to the use of the Site for special school, there had not been consultation with the stakeholders in the area, including the nearby schools, homes for the elderly, DC members, etc. Although HKBU had requested since 2005 for using the whole ex-LWL site to cater for the new 3-3-4 educational reform and the long-term development needs of the university, there was no further communication between the Government and HKBU. HKBU had had no knowledge of the rezoning proposal before it was discussed by the MPC;
- (i) the inclusion of the Site in the application list had also skipped the 2-month public consultation period in the statutory plan-making process. Although the representative of PlanD had said that the inclusion of the site in the application list would give the public a clearer message on the land sale programme, the general perception that the Site was ready for disposal had in fact caused more confusion;
- (j) the removal of the Site from the application list and the proposed reversion of the site from “R(B)” to “G/IC(9)” zone for special education were not known to the public until the TPB Paper for this hearing was issued. Again, no public consultation had been conducted; and
- (k) should the Government have consulted the stakeholders in the area before the submission of the proposed amendments to the OZP to the MPC for consideration, the 15 months of planning procedure involving the processing of 25,834 representations could have been saved. If Members agreed to revert the Site to “G/IC” zoning, the Government should consult the stakeholders in the surrounding areas regarding the proposed use of the

site for educational purpose.

[Actual speaking time of R8321: 7 minutes]

R8347 (Law Wai Chi)

17. Ms Law Wai Chi was glad to learn that the Government would use the Site for educational use. She supported the use of the site for construction of HKBU's CMTH. To build a Chinese medicine hospital (CMH) in Tseung Kwan O (TKO) was too far for the elderly to travel. It was considered that granting the site to HKBU for development was the most preferred option.

[Actual speaking time of R8347: 1 minute]

R8926 (Mr Lam Chi Ming)

18. Mr Lam Chi Ming made the following main points:

- (a) he objected to rezoning of the Site to "R(B)";
- (b) the objections of KCDC HIC and the LegCo Panel on Education to the use of the Site for residential development had already provided sufficient grounds to reject the rezoning;
- (c) the use of the Site for residential development would cause traffic concerns and subject the site to nuisances caused by student activities;
- (d) from the planning point of view, granting the Site to HKBU for development was justified as the land area to student ratio of HKBU was only half of that of CityU. There was insufficient land for HKBU's future development;
- (e) there was a general demand for more degree places in the university for associate degree graduates. The Site was the last piece of land in the

vicinity of HKBU for development. It should be reserved for HKBU to implement its development plan, including the provision of more university places for associate degree graduates;

- (f) HKBU was the first university that offered Chinese medicine programme. He did not agree with the representative of PlanD's claim that a teaching hospital needed not be close to the university, as both Prince of Wales Hospital and Queen Mary Hospital, which offered practical clinical training to medical students were close to the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK) and the University of Hong Kong (HKU) respectively. As such, there was no reason why a CMTH could not be in close proximity to HKBU to create synergy and enhance communication. It would also facilitate exchange of experience and knowledge of Chinese and western medicines with the presence of many hospitals in urban Kowloon. The proposed CMH in TKO was not close to CUHK, HKU or HKBU, which were the only three universities in Hong Kong that offered Chinese medicine programmes, rendering no benefit to any students of these universities;
- (g) TKO was mainly a community for young couples. As most patients of Chinese medicine were seniors living in the urban areas, such as Kowloon City, Yau Ma Tei and Mong Kok, the proposed CMH in TKO would not be convenient to the patients. The traffic generated by the CMH would also aggravate the already congested traffic in the TKO area;
- (h) it was wondered whether parents of students with special needs had been consulted on the proposed special school in Kowloon Tong. Since traffic in the area was very heavy, it would easily cause traffic accidents to road users, particularly the special school's students;
- (i) it was strange for the Government to introduce a new special school in Kowloon Tong as it was against EDB's policy of encouraging integration of special and ordinary education;
- (j) as pointed out by other representers, there were vacant schools available for

special education elsewhere. The vacant schools were readily available and could expedite the provision of special schools to meet the demand; and

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

(k) he then read out a letter dated 7.3.2014 from Hon Federick FUNG Kin-kee, which covered the following points:

- (i) educational development in Hong Kong was very much a concern. It was encouraging that HKBU had good mission and strategy for development;
- (ii) education was the foundation for the development of a society. Only a complete and spacious campus with appropriate facilities could provide quality whole person education to students to achieve the strategic goals;
- (iii) the ex-LWL site adjoining the campus of HKBU was ideal for construction of a student hostel and a CMH to help actualize HKBU's vision and for the betterment of the society;
- (iv) sites were still available elsewhere in Hong Kong for residential development. There was no need to build residential blocks next to the university hostel, restricting future expansion of HKBU; and
- (v) Members were requested to pay due regard to the public opinions and reject the proposal of rezoning the Site to residential use.

[Actual speaking time of R8926: 9 minutes]

R13576 (Mak Tin Hing)

19. Ms Mak Tin Hing made the following main points:

- (a) she was a current HKBU student;
- (b) she supported the Board to revert the zoning of the Site to “G/IC”;
- (c) the Board should reflect on why so many adverse representations were received in respect of the rezoning of the Site to residential use and why so many supported rezoning the Site back to “G/IC”. PlanD should make concrete recommendation regarding the future use of the Site, instead of just saying that the actual use of the Site would be determined by the Government; and
- (d) Members were requested to consider whether the Site could be allocated to HKBU for development. Although EDB had said that sufficient land had been provided to HKBU for the new 3-3-4 education reform, HKBU still needed land for its future expansion and to implement its conceptual development plan.

[Actual speaking time of R13576: 3 minutes]

20. As the presentation from the Government representative, representers and representer’s representative had been completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

21. In response to the Chairman’s question on whether there were actual figures of traffic accidents to demonstrate that the provision of a special education in the area would be inappropriate, Mr Lam Chi Ming (R8926) clarified that he did not say that there were actually many traffic accidents, but the heavy traffic of the area might pose a threat to people with disability and might lead to traffic accidents.

Special education

22. Two Members asked why there was a change in a period of 8 months from no “G/IC” use for the Site to that it was required for a special school, whether EDB had any long-term strategy for special education, and whether the Government had changed its policy of encouraging integration of ordinary and special education.

23. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that the Government had announced a package of measures to expedite housing land supply in August 2012 including, among others, converting suitable “G/IC” sites to residential use. In considering whether a site was suitable for rezoning, two major factors would be examined. The first one was whether there was sufficient provision of GIC facilities in the area. Only if the site was not required for any GIC use, PlanD would consider to convert the site to other use. The second factor was whether the site was suitable for residential development in terms of land use compatibility with the surrounding developments, and whether there would be any adverse environmental, air ventilation, traffic and infrastructural impacts, etc. arising from such development. Based on the planned population of the area, the GIC provision was generally sufficient to meet the requirements under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. Relevant bureaux/departments consulted, including EDB, had also confirmed that the site was not required for GIC uses at that time. On the basis of the above, the relevant proposed amendment to the OZP was submitted to MPC for consideration in December 2012. Upon receipt of the representations and comments in respect of the OZP, Government bureaux/departments were consulted again. EDB, upon its re-assessment, advised that during their recent rounds of consultation, various quarters of the community had requested the Administration to strengthen support for special education development and they would explore the feasibility of using the Site for special school development.

24. As regards the policy for special education, Mr Wallace K.K. Lau said that there had not been any change in policy. There was an ongoing estimation and assessment on the need for special education and EDB had been liaising with the public and people in the special education field regarding the requirements. In regular consultations with stakeholders, it was found that there was demand for further and enhanced support to special education. Owing to the implementation of the new secondary school curriculum and policy for extending educational years for special education, there was a new demand for around 500 special school places in the Kowloon region including TKO. That would be equivalent to about two new special schools. EDB had been trying to identify sites in the relevant districts to meet the new demand. The Site was initially considered suitable for development of a special school to meet the demand in Kowloon subject to further study, and no other suitable alternative site was currently available.

25. In response to a Member's question on whether a new special school was required as some of the existing special schools were already shrinking their number of classes, Mr Wallace K.K. Lau said that there were different requirements for students with different special needs, for example, some special schools would require boarding facilities. Although some individual schools were reducing their classes, the overall demand for special education support was rising. New schools would still be required.

26. In response to the Chairman's and two other Members' questions on the criteria for identifying sites for special education and whether existing vacant schools in Kowloon could be used for special education, Mr Wallace K.K. Lau said that in view of the new demand of around 500 special school places in the Kowloon region, EDB had conducted a site search for suitable sites in Kowloon for the purposes, including the vacant schools. However, as these students required access assistance and other special requirements, it was not easy to identify suitable sites. The vacant school premises were usually small and might not be able to meet the specific site area and design requirements of special schools. Besides, location of the school was also an important factor to be considered. It should be close to where the students lived. Mr Lau further said that EDB would only commence detailed feasibility study on a special school at the Site after the Board had made a decision on the zoning of the site in order not to pre-empt the Board's decision.

Sufficiency of land for HKBU's development

27. In response to a Member's question on why there was a different land area to student ratio for CityU and HKBU and whether there was sufficient land for HKBU's development, Mr Wallace K.K. Lau advised that there were eight universities in Hong Kong subsidised by the University Grants Committee (UGC). Different universities had varying geographical conditions and it was not appropriate to make a simple comparison of the site area among these universities. UGC would take into account the number of students and the programmes offered (including the need of space for laboratories, classrooms, libraries and public facilities, etc.) to assess the floor areas required for a university. The northern part of the ex-LWL site had been reserved for HKBU's expansion to meet all of HKBU's outstanding requirements for academic space and student hostel places under the prevailing policies and calculation criteria, i.e. about 1,400 hostel places and 2,600m² of teaching space. With this provision, HKBU would be the only one out of the three downtown universities that had all its space requirements met. Besides, additional academic space of 22,000m² in

Kwun Tong had recently been agreed to be leased by the Academy of Visual Arts of HKBU for 10 years.

28. A Member asked whether it was true that land requirement for HKBU, as alleged, was based on HKBU's needs up to 2014/2015, without taking into account its longer term needs and whether there was sufficient land within HKBU for its future development. In response, Mr Wallace K.K. Lau advised that EDB and UGC would take into account the long-term development needs of universities. Given the demographic structure of Hong Kong over the next decade and no major change in education policy, the demand for higher educational facilities would be stable in the long term. Due to different geographical conditions, different universities would have different amount of land reserve for future expansion. Some universities, such as CUHK, which covered a larger area would have more space for development as compared to the universities in city centre. However, with the reservation of the northern part of the ex-LWL site (about 6,400m²) for HKBU, it would be sufficient for HKBU's future development.

Nuisance caused by pets

29. The Chairman pointed out that pet lovers were usually considerate and asked Mr Tam Wing Sum (R6717) to clarify if environmental hygiene concerns caused by pets would actually be a concern if the Site would be put to residential use. He further queried whether there would be any land use incompatibility if the Site was used for special education. In response, Mr Tam Wing Sum said that although many people would take good care of their pets, the odour of droppings by pets on streets could not be eliminated completely. Possible environmental hygiene concern should be a factor for Members to consider whether to keep the "R(B)" zoning for the Site. With respect to a special school, there was no information on the special school to be provided at the site for him to form a view on its compatibility.

Location of CMH

30. A Member asked, other than HKBU, which universities had offered Chinese medicine programmes under the subsidies of UGC; what was the internship arrangement for the Chinese medicine students; and whether the future TKO CMH would provide Chinese medicine internship. The same Member also asked Mr Lam Chi Ming (R8926) whether only seniors would seek Chinese medicine treatment.

31. In response, Mr Wallace K.K. Lau said that other than HKBU, CUHK and HKU offered Chinese medicine programmes and there were already established arrangements for students of these universities to take their clinical training in local Chinese medicine clinics or in the Mainland. According to information provided by the Food and Health Bureau, the proposed TKO CMH would provide some internship opportunities to students in the Chinese medicine programmes of the local universities.

32. Mr Lam Chi Ming said that Chinese medicine treatment would become more popular over time. However, for the time being, seniors were more receptive to such treatments. Even if the numbers of young and senior patients were the same, preference should be give to seniors in considering the location of a CMH. Besides, if a CMH was far away from its patients, it would generate additional traffic. To locate a CMH close to universities offering Chinese medicine programmes would bring about positive externalities, enabling sharing of resources and better communication between the hospital and the universities. The proposed CMH in TKO would not be close to any of the three universities that offered Chinese medicine programmes.

33. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairman thanked the representers and representer's representatives and the Government representatives for attending the meeting. They all left the meeting at this point.

34. As no more representers or their representatives had arrived to attend the session of the meeting, the meeting was adjourned at 11:15 a.m.