

1. The meeting was resumed at 9:05 a.m. on 14.12.2017.
2. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting :

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)

Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Professor S.C. Wong

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban),

Transport Department

Mr Wilson W.S. Pang

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment),

Environmental Protection Department

Mr Richard W.Y. Wong

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 meeting 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.
4. The Secretary said that Members' declaration of interests was made at the hearing session held on 7.12.2017. Further declaration of interests had been received from Professor S.C. Wong, Mr H.W. Cheung, Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Mr H.F. Leung, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho and Mr Franklin Yu regarding the temporary occupation of part of the Vocational Training Council (VTC) campus site by the Construction Industry Council (CIC), which they were members of. As CIC was neither a presenter nor a commenter, Members' interests in the matter were considered indirect.
5. Members noted that Professor K.C. Chau, Dr Wilton W.T. Fok, Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Mr Sunny L.K. Ho, Ms Janice W.M. Lai, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Ms Christina M. Lee, Mr H.F. Leung, Mr Philip S.L. Kan, Mr K.K. Cheung, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho, Dr Lawrence K.C. Li, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, Professor T.S. Liu, Mr Franklin Yu had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. For those Members who had no direct interests or involvement in the subject project, the meeting agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions (Continued)

6. 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.

7. The following Government representatives, the representers/commenters and their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point :

Government representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

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

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

Education Bureau (EDB)

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

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)

Representers/Commenters and their Representatives

<u>R298 – Hui Kim Ming Cammie</u>	<u>R357 – Ho Wai Yan</u>
<u>R385 – Tse Siu Lin</u>	<u>R391 – Poon Tak Ming</u>
<u>R395 – Tsoi Shuk Mei</u>	<u>R418 – Leung Chi Keung</u>
<u>R422 – Ng Kwok Wai</u>	<u>R430 – Mintono Harry Nai Kit Chan</u>
<u>R497 – 朱彥權</u>	<u>R525 – Agnes Choi</u>
<u>R558 – Emily Wong</u>	<u>R576 – 楊振達</u>
<u>R639 – Li Wai Shan</u>	<u>R766 – Ng Ka Po</u>
<u>R832 – 黃金柳</u>	<u>R833 – Ho Tsun Lai</u>
<u>R901 – 何幸瑜</u>	<u>R903 – Lee Kar Lung</u>
<u>R1111 – Ernie Lee</u>	<u>R1320 – Fanny Louie</u>
<u>R1366 – Ng Po Shan</u>	<u>R1651 – Cecilia Leung</u>
<u>R1939 – 蔡炳俊</u>	<u>R1971 – Choi Yuk Sing</u>
<u>R2044 – Poon Kam Sing</u>	<u>R2128 – 曹慧仁</u>
<u>R2160/C1347 – 蔡頌謙</u>	<u>R2236 – Tsang Wai Yan</u>
<u>R2298 – Yu Wai Yi</u>	<u>R2322 – Isabel Chung</u>
<u>R2405 – Choi Heung Kwan</u>	<u>R2531 – Chan Wing Kwong</u>
<u>R2595 – Hu Chor Hoi</u>	<u>R2608 – 朱健明</u>
<u>R2642 – 朱高暘</u>	<u>R2684 – Eva Lam</u>
<u>R2718/C863 – Choi Yuk Sing</u>	<u>R3013 – 翁榕珍</u>
<u>R3195 – Y C Tam</u>	<u>R3359 – Chan Hiu Wah</u>
<u>R3786 – Fung Ying Lai Connie</u>	<u>R3968 – 蔡逸泓</u>
<u>R4206 – Colman Wong</u>	<u>R4594 – Wong Suk Chi</u>
<u>R5108 – 談雨就</u>	<u>R5128 – Chiu Mung Fei</u>
<u>R5560 – Elaine Ching</u>	<u>R5583 – Louie Mei Lan Fanny</u>
<u>R5631 – Chan Yuk Nam</u>	<u>R5636 – Choi Fai</u>
<u>R5637 – Chan Ka Wai Catherine</u>	<u>R5823 – Cheng Chui Ling</u>
<u>R6028 – Tung Wing Ying</u>	<u>R6109 – 伍樂軒</u>
<u>R6136 – Path Liu</u>	<u>R6142 – Chan Wing Kuen Kelly</u>
<u>R7612 – Chan Kam Chuen</u>	<u>R7613 – Ng Chi Kong</u>
<u>R7811 – Fred Yung</u>	<u>R8024 – Teresa Lam</u>

R8502 – 林國鴻

R8674 – 許九

R9416 – Sartimi

R9707 – May Chan

R10509 – To Wai Chan

R10643 – 陸靜嫻

R10906 – 崔惠英

R11469 – Hui Yuk Kui

R11518 – 秦妃娣

R11906 – Chan Ming Yiu Crystal

Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront

Concern Group –

Mr Poon Kam Sing

Mr Tse Chun Wah

R399 – Joanne Shek

R408 – Yau Kin Ming

Ms Chan Po King

R453 – Elle Luk

R463 – Fok Yin Chun

R472 – Lau Yue Kan

R710 – Lau Chun Tat

R915 – 劉月娟

R1018 – Wilson Yeung

R1147 – Ng Hok Chiu

R1887 – Mok Hang Yee

R2131 – 梁紹禧

R2285 – 巫映紋

R2435 – Chu Kam Ki

R2616 – Chan Nga Sau

R2872 – 朱益

R8507 – Lee Chu Yeung Carson

R9041 – 林伯源

R9460 – Larry Wong

R9987 – 蔡香君

R10601 – Ko Suk Ha

R10788 – Anges Choi

R11206 – Chung Ngai Man

R11471 – Erica Chow

R11556 – To Wai Cha

] Representers' and

] Commenters' Representatives

]

]

R407 – Pang Wing Chun

- Representers' Representative

R460 – Alan Tsang

R464 – Wong Po Chu

R622 – Luk Pang Kei

R806 – Aurea Lee

R976 – 王堅民

R1141 – Law Wai Fong

R1524 – James Ling

R1944 – C C Mak

R2145 – Yau Hiu Fung

R2433 – Cheung Shui Ying

R2523 – 林政賢

R2819 – Cheong Yeok Sun

R2966 – 何思蔚

<u>R2978 – Chow So Yu</u>	<u>R3224 – 黎影霞</u>
<u>R3242 – Wong Lai Ping</u>	<u>R3493 – Cheng Man Man</u>
<u>R3645 – Yau Hiu Kin</u>	<u>R3661 – Shireen Ho</u>
<u>R4333 – Ho Po Chun Dorothy</u>	<u>R4541 – Mak Chi Kwong</u>
<u>R4633 – Wong Chun Sun</u>	<u>R4634 – Wong Kwong Ki</u>
<u>R4635 – 張銳娥</u>	<u>R4636 – Wong Nga Man</u>
<u>R4637 – Tse So Fun</u>	<u>R5005 – 劉玉英</u>
<u>R5135 – Michelle Neoh</u>	<u>R5409 – Chung Kin Wai</u>
<u>R5410 – Chung Kin On</u>	<u>R5558 – 王澤虹</u>
<u>R5643 – 黃冠韻</u>	<u>R6056 – Marina Pun</u>
<u>R6130 – Cheung Wai Sum</u>	<u>R6659 – Wong Mei Kwan</u>
<u>R6976 – 黃浚銘</u>	<u>R7569 – Ku Wai Han</u>
<u>R7786 – 吳荷英</u>	<u>R8471 – Karen Chung</u>
<u>R8573 – 王澤喬</u>	<u>R8590 – 梁蔚深</u>
<u>R8976 – Ho Sze Wai</u>	<u>R9265 – 朱素清</u>
<u>R9445 – Yau Wing Kwong</u>	<u>R9446 – Fung Yin Mei</u>
<u>R9717 – C C Mak</u>	<u>R11325 – Lam Chun Yu</u>
<u>R11542 – Ma Wing Yee</u>	<u>R11868 – Lam Shu Li</u>
<u>R11984 – Maribel L Sarmiento</u>	<u>R12011 – Choo Soo Ching</u>
<u>R12016 – Ng You Hool Geoffrey</u>	<u>R12049 – Guida M Santos</u>
<i>Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront</i>] Representers' Representatives
<i>Concern Group –</i>]
Mr Luk Pang Kei]
Mr Li Wai Lam William]
<u>R557 – 張翠鳳</u>	<u>R602 – Tam Ka Tsun</u>
<u>R624 – Joseph Lee</u>	<u>R626 – Joseph Lee</u>
<u>R662 – Tang Karen</u>	<u>R664 – 陳燕嵐</u>
<u>R717 – Chow Kwok Wa Ray</u>	<u>R896 – Rocky Yee Lok Cheng</u>
<u>R1009 – Wong Siu Mei</u>	<u>R1034 – K W Leung</u>
<u>R1122 – Joseph Chan</u>	<u>R1165 – Yiu Man Lai</u>
<u>R1209 – Li Mo Chee</u>	<u>R1398 – Law Ho Kow</u>

- R1418 – Yeung Chun Wah
R1558 – 萬碧霞
R1874 – 黎綺珍
R2266 – 麥榮柱
R2529 – 戚劍儀
R2752 – 陳熹愉
R3012 – 胡麗華
R3299 – Yip Yu Hon
R3629 – Chan Chun Hung
R3946 – Tang Yiu Nam
R4933 – 馬愷悠
R5529 – 錢劍儀
R5991 – Yuen Ka Kin
R6072 – So Chun Ho
R6690 – Mok Chui Mei
R6974 – Fung Chun Ching
R7278 – Nora Abaya
R7842 – So Kai Tak
R8621 – Ng Suk Han
R8639 – 鄭鍾清
R8669/C1336 – Wong Wai Man
R9430 – 袁雅穎
R9436 – 袁泰國
R10114 – Ngai Shing Kwan
R10502 – 鄧紹敏
R11064/C1071 – Lee Wai Keam
R11272 – Chow Ka Yee
R11455 – Chan Yuen Yi
R12059 – Pauline Yu
C399 – Tang Karen
C433 – Law Ho Kow
- R1532 – Cheung Mun Ho
R1570 – 袁
R2226 – Mak Cheuk Hei
R2511 – 吳奇紅
R2551 – 溫煥嬋
R2922 – 袁嗣洋
R3172 – 譚麗坤
R3541 – Agnes Ku
R3688 – Leung Kam Wing
R4166 – Kwong Mei Chun Miki
R5450 – CY Wong
R5967 – Tang Man Wai
R6043 – 陳卓勳
R6237 – Tang Lai Hing Grace
R6943 – Ashley
R7233 – Lai Tak Wah
R7445 – 譚少馨
R8477 – Fong Chun Wai
R8638 – Hui Chuen Kit
R8640 – Au Yeung Lai Ha Rachel
R9408 – Mak Sui Sang Teresa
R9435 – 張瑞芝
R9964 – Tang Pak Lun
R10201 – Chan Wai Ho
R10771 – Lim Kin Wah
R11160 – Chan Yuk Ha
R11438 – Yip Yu Hon
R11727 – Tam Tsz Kiu
C360 – Chan Ka Keung
C400 – Chow Kwok Wa
C489 – Wong Siu Mei

<u>C492 – Leung Kam Wing</u>		<u>C595 – Pong Po Yin</u>	
<u>C717 – Chik Kar Kei Jackie</u>		<u>C799 – Tang Yiu Nam</u>	
<u>C812 – Simone So</u>		<u>C917 – Chik Kar Lai</u>	
<u>C1041 – Chik Kim Yi</u>		<u>C1149 – Pauline Yu</u>	
<u>C1327 – Lee Man Chun</u>		<u>C1357 – 李文俊</u>	
<u>C1361 – Lam Chi Yuen</u>			
<i>Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront</i>]	Representers' and	
<i>Concern Group –</i>]	Commenters' Representative	
Mr Tam Ka Tsun]		
<u>R950 – Alvin Wong</u>			
Mr Wong Kwan Nam Alvin	-	Representer	
<u>R1021 – W So</u>		<u>R1784 – So Sheung Ming</u>	
<u>R1786 – Tam Ka Ho</u>		<u>R2997 – T Fan</u>	
<u>C927 – Tam Ka Chai</u>		<u>C928 – Tam Kok Hung</u>	
Hon Kwong Chun Yu	-	Representers' and Commenters'	
		Representative	
<u>R1288 – Lo Ping Chiu</u>			
Mr Lo Ping Chiu	-	Representer	
<u>R1309 – Hui Yun Heung</u>			
Ms Hui Yun Heung	-	Representer	
<u>R2023 – Lo Man Ching</u>			
Ms Mary Mulvihill	-	Representer's Representative	

8. 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. She then invited the representers/commenters or their representatives to elaborate on their representations/comments.

9. As Hon Kwong Chun Yu would need to attend a LegCo meeting in the morning, he was invited to present first. Members noted that there was no objection from other representers for such arrangement.

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

R1021 – W So

R1784 – So Sheung Ming

R1786 – Tam Ka Ho

R2997 – T Fan

C927 – Tam Ka Chai

C928 – Tam Kok Hung

10. Hon Kwong Chun Yu made the following main points:

- (a) he lived in Tin Shui Wai North. Tin Shui Wai earned its nickname, ‘City of Sadness’, as there were many family tragedies. There was no open space for children to play in, and an “Open Space” zone near Wang Yat Square next to his residence was still a piece of vacant land. Tin Shui Wai youths were deprived of proper playing space in their golden childhood, and suffered from a high unemployment rate. He opined that all these stemmed from poor planning;
- (b) provision of open space was crucial to a community, and would affect the sense of belonging of the nearby residents to the community. The concerned site in Cha Kwo Ling (the CKL Site) was the last piece of land in the district for residents to breathe some fresh air;

- (c) the Site had been reserved for the proposed CKL Park since 2008, the development of which was withheld as the Site was needed as a works area for the nearby roadworks. In early 2017, PlanD suddenly proposed to rezone the Site for the development of VTC's campus. He opined that there was injustice in the plan amendment process as there was no local consultation until January 2017. As the proposed CKL Park was an important committed community facility/asset, there should have been a closer dialogue and consultation with the locals on the rezoning proposal. The waterfront site belonged to the locals;
- (d) the locals were not against development of an education institution per se, but had queries on (i) whether the Site was suitable for the proposed development, (ii) whether there were alternative site(s) for the purpose, and (iii) whether the Site, with its prime waterfront location, could be better utilized without destroying its scenic values. Whilst the VTC campus could be built elsewhere, there was no other waterfront site for the proposed CKL Park. He opined that there was scope for re-planning the Site;
- (e) many locals grew up, and had emotional ties, with the Site. The area was formerly part of the sea, where many post-war refugees lived on broken boats moored there before being resettled to public housing estates when the area was reclaimed for industrial development. The wider district had rich history with special features in the past, such as oil depot, quarries, animal rearing area for the ex-Lai Chi Kok Amusement Park, dragon boat racing, etc. He considered that the proposed CKL Park, with suitable incorporation of such local features as stilted houses, dragon boats, etc., could attract tourists and enhance nearby residents' knowledge about the district's history, in addition to its normal open space function;
- (f) Hong Kong was relatively backward in terms of animal-friendliness as compared to France, Amsterdam and Taiwan. The Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) had provided very few animal-friendly parks in the territory. The CKL Park would provide an opportunity for the development of an animal-friendly open space for the enjoyment of not only CKL/Kwun Tong residents, but animal lovers all over the territory; and

- (g) many good old places in the territory worthy of conservation had already been lost due to Hong Kong's rapid development. The VTC campus, once built, would be a permanent campus, and the Site, which was worthy of conservation, should be returned to the locals for waterfront park development. He requested Members to shelve the zoning amendment.

11. As the Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront Concern Group (the Concern Group) would have long presentations, Mr Tse Chun Wah suggested and the Chairperson agreed to let individual representers (No. R399, R950, R1288 and R1309) present first.

R399 – Joanne Shek

R407 – Pang Wing Chun

R408 – Yau Kin Ming

12. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Chan Po King made the following main points:

- (a) she lived in Quarry Bay, and was a heavy user of the Quarry Bay Park (QBP). A few years ago, a waterfront promenade had been added to the park, linking it all the way to Shau Kei Wan through Sai Wan Ho. She shared her experience on how interesting waterfront parks were from a user's point of view;
- (b) people of all ages would carry out their favorite activities in the park, such as fishing, tai chi practice, chess playing, or even jumping into the harbour to swim. The QBP was among the first parks to be equipped with disabled-friendly children play facilities. There were even Cherry trees planted in the park. She expected similar provisions in the proposed CKL Park;
- (c) a small section of the QBP near North Point Government Offices was a pet garden, which despite its inconvenient location, was also patronized by pet owners of other districts as there were few animal-friendly facilities in Hong Kong. As she understood it, virtually all District Councils (DCs) were pushing for the establishment of pet gardens in their district. If the proposed

CKL Park included a pet garden, it would be patronized by pet owners of the entire territory; and

- (d) she became a long-distance runner in recent years, and ran along QBP about three times a week. QBP provided a very scenic route of 6 to 10 km for long-distance runners, but could not accommodate any running events due to design limitations. At present, most long-distance running races (except the Standard Chartered Hong Kong Marathon) were held in the New Territories, and the majority part of the race was on bridges/highways, which was uninvolved as there was no cheering crowd en route. The proposed CKL Park, together with a waterfront promenade to Kai Tak, would provide an interesting 5 km route for fun runs (carnival-like races) in the urban areas.

R950 – Alvin Wong

13. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Wong Kwan Nam Alvin made the following main points:

- (a) he had lived in Laguna City for over 26 years. He expected a waterfront park at the Site, but was disappointed that it had yet to materialize after his sons had all grown up;
- (b) he was a university lecturer, and had done some research on urban planning. Urban planning, according to McGill University in Canada, was a process concerned with the welfare and communication of people, and protection and enhancement of the natural environment. According to a professor in New York, Christian Iaione, urban planning was about the provision of urban spaces and services of common interest;
- (c) citing New York City and Qianhai District of Shenzhen as examples, he emphasized the need to redefine the waterfront as a critical asset to reconnect Hong Kong people to the Victoria Harbour. The proposed CKL Park would serve this function for the residents of CKL/Laguna City; and
- (d) the Board should stick to its previous planning for the Site as a waterfront park.

R1288 – Lo Ping Chiu

14. Mr Lo Ping Chiu made the following main points:

- (a) he had lived in Laguna City since 1994. He hoped the Board would preserve the waterfront, which if lost, could not be re-provisioned. He alleged that there had not been any consultation on the zoning amendment;
- (b) the Site used to be a container storage area with containers being stacked up to 5 storeys high. When the containers were removed, he expected the Site to be developed into the CKL Park as planned. However, to his disappointment, massive buildings were now proposed to be erected at the Site;
- (c) while the benefits of the VTC campus to our younger generation were fully appreciated, he doubted whether a waterfront site was required. The VTC campus should be located in areas with a large number of youngsters and convenient transport linkage. On cluster of youngsters, there were not many youngsters in the nearby major residential developments of Laguna City and Sceneway Garden. On accessibility, there was only four lifts linking Laguna City to the Mass Transit Railway (MTR) Lam Tin Station. Their recent closure for maintenance had caused much inconvenience to the residents already. The addition of 6,500 VTC students would overstrain the already congested pedestrian linkage. Likewise, the design of the shopping mall and road network of Laguna City had not taken into account the VTC campus;
- (d) while the needs for development (such as housing) were fully appreciated, the quality of living was equally important. The quality of a city's development was reflected in its provision of open space, and there was no alternative site for the proposed CKL Park in East Kowloon; and
- (e) he requested Members to heed the calls of Kwun Tong/CKL/Laguna City residents for the Site to be developed into CKL Park as originally planned.

R1309 – Hui Yun Heung

15. Ms Hui Yun Heung made the following main points:

- (a) she had lived in Laguna City for over 10 years;

- (b) the waterfront belonged to, and should be enjoyed by, the people of Hong Kong. There was currently no waterfront park in East Kowloon, and the originally planned CKL Park was the only facility in the pipeline. She would have no objection to the loss of the planned waterfront park if there was a genuine need for a massive VTC campus to be located at the waterfront, but she saw no such need. Alternative site(s) for the VTC campus should be looked into; and
- (c) echoing Mr Lo Ping Chiu (R1288)'s presentation, she relayed the concerns of Laguna City, Sceneway Garden and CKL residents about the capacity of the area's infrastructures, particularly the pedestrian elevator linkage between MTR Lam Tin Station and Laguna City, in accommodating the additional staff and students of VTC. She further pointed out that CKL Road was too narrow to serve as a viable pedestrian link between the VTC campus and the MTR Yau Tong Station.

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

R453 – Elle Luk

R463 – Fok Yin Chun

R472 – Lau Yue Kan

R710 – Lau Chun Tat

R915 – 劉月娟

R1018 – Wilson Yeung

R1147 – Ng Hok Chiu

R1887 – Mok Hang Yee

R2131 – 梁紹禧

R2285 – 巫映紋

R2435 – Chu Kam Ki

R2616 – Chan Nga Sau

R2872 – 朱益

R2978 – Chow So Yu

R3242 – Wong Lai Ping

R3645 – Yau Hiu Kin

R460 – Alan Tsang

R464 – Wong Po Chu

R622 – Luk Pang Kei

R806 – Aurea Lee

R976 – 王堅民

R1141 – Law Wai Fong

R1524 – James Ling

R1944 – C C Mak

R2145 – Yau Hiu Fung

R2433 – Cheung Shui Ying

R2523 – 林政賢

R2819 – Cheong Yeok Sun

R2966 – 何思蔚

R3224 – 黎影霞

R3493 – Cheng Man Man

R3661 – Shireen Ho

R4333 – Ho Po Chun Dorothy

R4633 – Wong Chun Sun

R4635 – 張銳娥

R4637 – Tse So Fun

R5135 – Michelle Neoh

R5410 – Chung Kin On

R5643 – 黃冠韻

R6130 – Cheung Wai Sum

R6976 – 黃浚銘

R7786 – 吳荷英

R8573 – 王澤喬

R8976 – Ho Sze Wai

R9445 – Yau Wing Kwong

R9717 – C C Mak

R11542 – Ma Wing Yee

R11984 – Maribel L Sarmiento

R12016 – Ng You Hool Geoffrey

R4541 – Mak Chi Kwong

R4634 – Wong Kwong Ki

R4636 – Wong Nga Man

R5005 – 劉玉英

R5409 – Chung Kin Wai

R5558 – 王澤虹

R6056 – Marina Pun

R6659 – Wong Mei Kwan

R7569 – Ku Wai Han

R8471 – Karen Chung

R8590 – 梁蔚深

R9265 – 朱素清

R9446 – Fung Yin Mei

R11325 – Lam Chun Yu

R11868 – Lam Shu Li

R12011 – Choo Soo Ching

R12049 – Guida M Santos

16. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Luk Pang Kei made the following main points:

- (a) he was a professional and had worked in the construction industry for over 30 years. He had also lived in Kwun Tong for over 50 years. He had special emotional ties with the waterfront and parks;
- (b) he had gone through the consultant reports of the VTC campus, and found that the VTC campus did not comply with the Harbour Planning Principles (HPP), the Harbour Planning Guidelines (HPG) and the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) as the reports claimed;
- (c) members of his group had already pointed out that the VTC campus was not in line with the original planning intention of the site as a waterfront park. The VTC campus, an educational use, was not a use encouraged to be developed in

the waterfront areas under HPG. The zoning amendment violated Principle 8 of HPP which stated that the planning and development of harbourfront areas should maximize opportunities for public enjoyment, and was not in line with the Urban Design Guidelines for waterfront areas as stipulated in section 6.2.18 of chapter 11 of HKPSG;

- (d) while buildings were allowed in waterfront sites, they should be of low density with a small footprint and a graduated building height (BH) profile descending towards the harbour to avoid dominating the harbour. The massive VTC campus violated all those guidelines. On the contrary, the originally planned CKL Park entirely fulfilled HPP, HPG and HKPSG;
- (e) the photomontages submitted by VTC were misleading, and the heights of individual Laguna City blocks were different from those in the approved building plans, and rooftop structures of the VTC campus had not been shown;
- (f) according to a Kwun Tong DC document, the district needed a total of 72.86 ha of open space, but the existing provision was 59.44 ha only. The existing 13.42 ha open space deficit would worsen to 31.64 ha if PlanD's proposal to increase the per capita open space provision from 2 to 2.5 m² per person was to be taken on board. Although the 36.43 ha of planned open space in the district, when fully implemented, would result in a 4.79 ha surplus of open space provision, such surplus could not accommodate a 6% growth in population. Citing the subject zoning amendment as an example, he doubted the certainty on implementation of that 36.43 ha planned open space provision;
- (g) the subject site was the last piece of harbourfront land, and the originally planned CKL Park thereat was the result of a large scale public consultation. With the subject zoning amendment, residents would no longer have confidence in the public consultation system;
- (h) the VTC campus would only benefit 6,500 students, but the CKL Park would benefit 700,000 Kwun Tong residents;
- (i) while the CKL Park was reduced to a T-shaped plot of land, the permissible building volume at the site increased 5-fold, from the previous tunnel

ventilation shaft and administration building of the proposed Trunk Road T2 (0.98 ha at BH of 45 mPD) to the VTC campus (3.2 ha at BH of 60-70 mPD);

- (j) VTC claimed that it needed 3 to 5 ha of urban land which was immediately available for its campus development. Originally, VTC claimed that a large footprint was required to accommodate heavy machineries at G/F of the campus. Later on, VTC changed its development scheme and claimed that a large footprint was needed for Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) Education. However, according to the publicly available floor layout, the proposed STEM Centre at UG/F occupied about 4,000 m² of floor space only, and part of the proposed STEM Centre was located at 1/F. That indicated that land requirement of 3 to 5 ha was no longer valid;
- (k) citing Zhu Hai College of Higher Education and Lingnan University in Tuen Mun as examples, the campus of tertiary education institutes like VTC did not require an urban location;
- (l) it was questionable as to why ‘immediately available land’ was a requirement when the development of the whole VTC campus had a projected time-frame of 10 years, and a lot of time was needed for plan amendment and to de-contaminate the existing Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG) filling station site;
- (m) while numerous alternative sites had been proposed by representers/commenters for the VTC campus, none of them were accepted by the Administration on the grounds that the proposed alternative sites were unsuitable or had been reserved for other uses. However, it should be noted that the Site had also been reserved for the CKL Park, and no alternative waterfront site was available to re-provision its loss;
- (n) a site at Pok Yin Road in Tai Po should be considered as an alternative site for the VTC campus. The site had an area of 3.2 ha, and was zoned “G/IC” and immediately available. It was located adjacent to the Chinese University, and directly accessible by the MTR East Rail Line. There was no need for any de-contamination work. To his understanding, the site was proposed to be

rezoned for residential development as the originally planned education use was no longer necessary; and

- (o) with the aid of the visualizer, the following queries were raised for the Administration's response:
- (i) what information was given to the Kwun Tong, Wong Tai Sin and Kowloon City DCs during the consultation in November 2016;
 - (ii) noting that various hospitals were currently being redeveloped in-situ, the Administration should not rule out in-situ redevelopment of VTC's Haking Wong and Kwun Tong campuses;
 - (iii) the student/teaching staff numbers of VTC were changed from 7,000/1,500 to 6,000/850 under the revised development scheme. The rationale for a reduction of 1,650 persons and a change in the student to teaching staff ratio should be explained;
 - (iv) the number of footbridges in the VTC campus;
 - (v) VTC proposed, in response to representations, to set aside 1 ha for development into public open space. In this case, whether a fresh round of site search should be conducted on the reduced site area requirement of 3.2 ha;
 - (vi) the reprovisioned LPG filling station would be located closer to the waterfront. Whether that would affect the residents' desire to use the waterfront promenade and whether there was any district park with a LPG filling station next to it;
 - (vii) the reason to classify the Laguna Park as a district park;
 - (viii) noting that zoning amendments were made in response to changing needs of the society through time, in light of the ageing population and the reduction in youngsters aged 15 to 24, how the cancellation of the CKL Park would respond to the needs of the ageing population in Kwun Tong;
 - (ix) the traffic situation of the section of CKL Road between Yau Tong MTR Station and the subject CKL site in 2027;
 - (x) bearing in mind the new commercial/residential developments in Kwun

Tong and Kai Tak, the additional traffic to be generated by the new VTC campus, the proposed VTC shuttle bus towards the Central Kowloon Route – Trunk Road T2, the Tseung Kwan O – Lam Tin Tunnel, and their interchange with the Eastern Harbour Crossing onto CKL Road;

- (xi) the total project costs of the new VTC campus; and
- (xii) the construction programme of the new VTC campus, including the waterfront area to be closed for construction works and for how long, and the relocation of the LPG filling station and the associated risks, if any.

[The meeting was adjourned for a short break.]

R557 – 張翠鳳

R624 – Joseph Lee

R662 – Tang Karen

R717 – Chow Kwok Wa Ray

R1009 – Wong Siu Mei

R1122 – Joseph Chan

R1209 – Li Mo Chee

R1418 – Yeung Chun Wah

R1558 – 萬碧霞

R1874 – 黎綺珍

R2266 – 麥榮柱

R2529 – 戚劍儀

R2752 – 陳熹愉

R3012 – 胡麗華

R3299 – Yip Yu Hon

R3629 – Chan Chun Hung

R3946 – Tang Yiu Nam

R4933 – 馬愷悠

R5529 – 錢劍儀

R5991 – Yuen Ka Kin

R602 – Tam Ka Tsun

R626 – Joseph Lee

R664 – 陳燕嵐

R896 – Rocky Yee Lok Cheng

R1034 – K W Leung

R1165 – Yiu Man Lai

R1398 – Law Ho Kow

R1532 – Cheung Mun Ho

R1570 – 袁

R2226 – Mak Cheuk Hei

R2511 – 吳奇紅

R2551 – 溫煥輝

R2922 – 袁嗣洋

R3172 – 譚麗坤

R3541 – Agnes Ku

R3688 – Leung Kam Wing

R4166 – Kwong Mei Chun Miki

R5450 – CY Wong

R5967 – Tang Man Wai

R6043 – 陳卓勳

<u>R6072 – So Chun Ho</u>	<u>R6237 – Tang Lai Hing Grace</u>
<u>R6690 – Mok Chui Mei</u>	<u>R6943 – Ashley</u>
<u>R6974 – Fung Chun Ching</u>	<u>R7233 – Lai Tak Wah</u>
<u>R7278 – Nora Abaya</u>	<u>R7445 – 譚少馨</u>
<u>R7842 – So Kai Tak</u>	<u>R8477 – Fong Chun Wai</u>
<u>R8621 – Ng Suk Han</u>	<u>R8638 – Hui Chuen Kit</u>
<u>R8639 – 鄭鍾清</u>	<u>R8640 – Au Yeung Lai Ha Rachel</u>
<u>R8669/C1336 – Wong Wai Man</u>	<u>R9408 – Mak Sui Sang Teresa</u>
<u>R9430 – 袁雅穎</u>	<u>R9435 – 張瑞芝</u>
<u>R9436 – 袁泰國</u>	<u>R9964 – Tang Pak Lun</u>
<u>R10114 – Ngai Shing Kwan</u>	<u>R10201 – Chan Wai Ho</u>
<u>R10502 – 鄧紹敏</u>	<u>R10771 – Lim Kin Wah</u>
<u>R11064/C1071 – Lee Wai Keam</u>	<u>R11160 – Chan Yuk Ha</u>
<u>R11272 – Chow Ka Yee</u>	<u>R11438 – Yip Yu Hon</u>
<u>R11455 – Chan Yuen Yi</u>	<u>R11727 – Tam Tsz Kiu</u>
<u>R12059 – Pauline Yu</u>	<u>C360 – Chan Ka Keung</u>
<u>C399 – Tang Karen</u>	<u>C400 – Chow Kwok Wa</u>
<u>C433 – Law Ho Kow</u>	<u>C489 – Wong Siu Mei</u>
<u>C492 – Leung Kam Wing</u>	<u>C595 – Pong Po Yin</u>
<u>C717 – Chik Kar Kei Jackie</u>	<u>C799 – Tang Yiu Nam</u>
<u>C812 – Simone So</u>	<u>C917 – Chik Kar Lai</u>
<u>C1041 – Chik Kim Yi</u>	<u>C1149 – Pauline Yu</u>
<u>C1327 – Lee Man Chun</u>	<u>C1357 – 李文俊</u>
<u>C1361 – Lam Chi Yuen</u>	

17. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Tam Ka Tsun made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of Laguna City, and graduated from the Institute of Vocational Education (IVE) (Lee Wai Lee) last year;

VTC students' expectation on the campus location

- (b) VTC was providing career orientation and on-the-job training to its students, many of whom came from low-income families, and would engage in part-time jobs. Hence, most of the students would prefer a practical campus in a convenient location as they might not be spending much time in the campus;
- (c) the campus of IVE (Haking Wong) was the most centrally located among the 17 VTC campuses. If that campus was relocated to CKL, most of the VTC courses would be shifted eastwards. That would mean very long commuting time and cost to VTC students, as many of them lived in the Northwest New Territories;
- (d) the Caritas Institute of Higher Education only required 30,000 m² of GFA for 3,200 students. The Open University of Hong Kong only required 21,500 m² of GFA for 2,400 students. VTC's GFA requirement of 180,000 m² for 6,000 students was extravagant;
- (e) many facilities (e.g. student canteen) in the combined campus of IVE (Lee Wai Lee) and the Hong Kong Design Institute (HKDI) were not functioning/usable by the students. He worried that the same would happen to the new VTC campus in CKL;
- (f) there would be a gradual drop in teenagers over the next ten years, and a corresponding drop in prospective students for VTC's courses. The need for such a huge VTC campus was doubtful;

Loss of Open Space for VTC students

- (g) setting aside 1 ha of the land within the new VTC campus as public open space was unfair to VTC students, who would need the open space for studying. Park activities of the local residents (e.g. dancing) would be a nuisance to VTC students;

Doubtful information provided by VTC

- (h) VTC claimed that a 4.2 ha site was required to accommodate heavy machineries at G/F of the campus. However, no heavy machinery was seen at G/F of the Lee Wai Lee, Chai Wan and Tsing Yi campuses of IVE which were

currently offering courses involving heavy machineries. Instead, heavy machineries were placed on 4/F and 5/F of IVE (Lee Wai Lee). The G/F of IVE (Lee Wai Lee) and HKDI campus, under which the MTR tunnel ran, was accommodating lecture theatres, exhibition galleries, auditorium, and television studio. Due to technological advancement, heavy machineries could now be moved in pieces and assembled on-site. There was also a down-weight trend of heavy machineries;

- (i) he doubted the estimated peak flow of 1,300 persons to and from the campus for an educational institute with 6,850 staff and students in view of the flexible schedule of students and the remote residence of some students;
- (j) VTC claimed that three of its campuses (the Lee Wai Lee, Sha Tin and Kwai Chung campuses of IVE and HKDI) had facilities (auditorium, children education centre, elderly centre, tennis courts, basketball courts, etc.) open for use by the public. Both on-site observations and the Director of Audit's report in October 2017 revealed that some of the facilities (tennis courts) had not been open to the public, while others were left idle, under-utilized or being used as lecture rooms;

Conflicts between local residents and VTC students

- (k) students and local residents were often competing for transport facilities. Some public light bus terminus located in housing estates even had two separate queues for residents and students with priority given to the former;
- (l) citing the closed canteen of HKDI and IVE (Lee Wai Lee) as an example, students had to compete with the locals for dining facilities in nearby shopping malls during the lunch hours. Restaurants in Laguna City could only cater for the dining needs of the locals, not that of VTC students or office workers in the Kai Tak commercial developments;
- (m) students did not have time to enjoy the great sea view of the campus, but would be blamed by locals for taking away land for the waterfront park, which was a lose-lose situation; and

- (n) the Board was requested to identify an alternative site convenient to students for the development of the new VTC campus, and return the CKL Park to the residents.

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

18. The meeting was resumed at 1:55 p.m. on 14.12.2017.
19. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting :

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

Chairperson

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-Chairperson

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Principal Environment Protection Officer
(Metro Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Richard W.Y. Wong

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

Assistant Commissioner/Urban,
Transport Department
Mr Wilson W.S. Pang

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Agenda Item 1

Presentation and Question Sessions (Continued)

[Open Meeting]

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

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

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

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

Education Bureau (EDB)

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

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)

Representers/Commenters and their Representatives

R298 – Hui Kim Ming Cammie

R385 – Tse Siu Lin

R395 – Tsoi Shuk Mei

R357 – Ho Wai Yan

R391 – Poon Tak Ming

R418 – Leung Chi Keung

- R422 – Ng Kwok Wai
R497 – 朱彥權
R558 – Emily Wong
R639 – Li Wai Shan
R832 – 黃金柳
R901 – 何幸瑜
R1111 – Ernie Lee
R1366 – Ng Po Shan
R1939 – 蔡炳俊
R2044 – Poon Kam Sing
R2160/C1347 – 蔡頌謙
R2298 – Yu Wai Yi
R2405 – Choi Heung Kwan
R2595 – Hu Chor Hoi
R2642 – 朱高暘
R2718/C863 – 蔡育昇
R3195 – Y C Tam
R3786 – Fung Ying Lai Connie
R4206 – Colman Wong
R5108 – 談雨就
R5560 – Elaine Ching
R5631 – Chan Yuk Nam
R5637 – Chan Ka Wai Catherine
R6028 – Tung Wing Ying
R6136 – Path Liu
R7612 – Chan Kam Chuen
R7811 – Fred Yung
R8502 – 林國鴻
R8674 – 許九
R9416 – Sartimi
R9707 – May Chan
- R430 – Mintono Harry Nai Kit Chan
R525 – Agnes Choi
R576 – 楊振達
R766 – Ng Ka Po
R833 – Ho Tsun Lai
R903 – Lee Kar Lung
R1320 – Fanny Louie
R1651 – Cecilia Leung
R1971 – Choi Yuk Sing
R2128 – 曹慧仁
R2236 – Tsang Wai Yan
R2322 – Isabel Chung
R2531 – Chan Wing Kwong
R2608 – 朱健明
R2684 – Eva Lam
R3013 – 翁榕珍
R3359 – Chan Hiu Wah
R3968 – 蔡逸泓
R4594 – Wong Suk Chi
R5128 – Chiu Mung Fei
R5583 – Louie Mei Lan Fanny
R5636 – Choi Fai
R5823 – Cheng Chui Ling
R6109 – 伍樂軒
R6142 – Chak Wing Kuen Kelly
R7613 – Ng Chi Kong
R8024 – Teresa Lam
R8507 – Lee Che Yeung Carson
R9041 – 林伯源
R9460 – Larry Wong
R9987 – 蔡香君

R10509 – To Wai Chan

R10643 – 陸靜嫻

R10906 – 崔惠英

R11469 – Hui Yuk Kui

R11518 – 秦妃娣

R11906 – Chan Ming Yiu Crystal

Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront

Concern Group –

Mr Poon Kam Sing

Mr Tse Chun Wah

R453 – Elle Luk

R463 – Fok Yin Chun

R472 – Lau Yue Kan

R710 – Lau Chun Tat

R915 – 劉月娟

R1018 – Wilson Yeung

R1147 – Ng Hok Chiu

R1887 – Mok Hang Yee

R2131 – 梁紹禧

R2285 – 巫映紋

R2435 – Chu Kam Ki

R2616 – Chan Nga Sau

R2872 – 朱益

R2978 – Chow So Yu

R3242 – Wong Lai Ping

R3645 – Yau Hiu Kin

R4333 – Ho Po Chun Dorothy

R4633 – Wong Chun Sun

R4635 – 張銳娥

R10601 – Ko Suk Ha

R10788 – Anges Choi

R11206 – Chung Ngai Man

R11471 – Erica Chow

R11556 – To Wai Cha

- Representor, Representors' and
Commenters' Representative

- Representors' and Commenters'
Representative

R460 – Alan Tsang

R464 – Wong Po Chu

R622 – Luk Pang Kei

R806 – Aurea Lee

R976 – 王堅民

R1141 – Law Wai Fong

R1524 – James Ling

R1944 – C C Mak

R2145 – Yau Hiu Fung

R2433 – Cheung Shui Ying

R2523 – 林政賢

R2819 – Cheong Yeok Sun

R2966 – 何思蔚

R3224 – 黎影霞

R3493 – Cheng Man Man

R3661 – Shireen Ho

R4541 – Mak Chi Kwong

R4634 – Wong Kwong Ki

R4636 – Wong Nga Man

- R4637 – Tse So Fun
R5135 – Michelle Neoh
R5410 – Chung Kin On
R5643 – 黃冠韻
R6130 – Cheung Wai Sum
R6976 – 黃浚銘
R7786 – 吳荷英
R8573 – 王澤喬
R8976 – Ho Sze Wai
R9445 – Yau Wing Kwong
R9717 – C C Mak
R11542 – Ma Wing Yee
R11984 – Maribel L Sarmiento
R12016 – Ng You Hool Geoffrey
Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront
Concern Group –
Mr Luk Pang Kei

Mr Li Wai Lam William
- R557 – 張翠鳳
R624 – Joseph Lee
R662 – Tang Karen
R717 – Chow Kwok Wa Ray
R1009 – Wong Siu Mei
R1122 – Joseph Chan
R1209 – Li Mo Chee
R1418 – Yeung Chun Wah
R1558 – 萬碧霞
R1874 – 黎綺珍
R2266 – 麥榮柱
- R5005 – 劉玉英
R5409 – Chung Kin Wai
R5558 – 王澤虹
R6056 – Marina Pun
R6659 – Wong Mei Kwan
R7569 – Ku Wai Han
R8471 – Karen Chung
R8590 – 梁蔚深
R9265 – 朱素清
R9446 – Fung Yin Mei
R11325 – Lam Chun Yu
R11868 – Lam Shu Li
R12011 – Choo Soo Ching
R12049 – Guida M Santos

- Representer and Representers’ Representative
- Representers’ Representative
- R602 – Tam Ka Tsun
R626 – Joseph Lee
R664 – 陳燕嵐
R896 – Rocky Yee Lok Cheng
R1034 – K W Leung
R1165 – Yiu Man Lai
R1398 – Law Ho Kow
R1532 – Cheung Mun Ho
R1570 – 袁
R2226 – Mak Cheuk Hei
R2511 – 吳奇紅

- R2529 – 戚劍儀
R2752 – 陳熹愉
R3012 – 胡麗華
R3299 – Yip Yu Hon
R3629 – Chan Chun Hung
R3946 – Tang Yiu Nam
R4933 – 馬愷悠
R5529 – 錢劍儀
R5991 – Yuen Ka Kin
R6072 – So Chun Ho
R6690 – Mok Chui Mei
R6974 – Fung Chun Ching
R7278 – Nora Abaya
R7842 – So Kai Tak
R8621 – Ng Suk Han
R8639 – 鄭鍾清
R8669/C1336 – Wong Wai Man
R9430 – 袁雅穎
R9436 – 袁泰國
R10114 – Ngai Shing Kwan
R10502 – 鄧紹敏
R11064/C1071 – Lee Wai Keam
R11272 – Chow Ka Yee
R11455 – Chan Yuen Yi
R12059 – Pauline Yu
C399 – Tang Karen
C433 – Law Ho Kow
C492 – Leung Kam Wing
C717 – Chik Kar Kei Jackie
C812 – Simone So
C1041 – Chik Kim Yi
- R2551 – 溫煥嬋
R2922 – 袁嗣洋
R3172 – 譚麗坤
R3541 – Agnes Ku
R3688 – Leung Kam Wing
R4166 – Kwong Mei Chun Miki
R5450 – CY Wong
R5967 – Tang Man Wai
R6043 – 陳卓勳
R6237 – Tang Lai Hing Grace
R6943 – Ashley
R7233 – Lai Tak Wah
R7445 – 譚少馨
R8477 – Fong Chun Wai
R8638 – Hui Chuen Kit
R8640 – Au Yeung Lai Ha Rachel
R9408 – Mak Sui Sang Teresa
R9435 – 張瑞芝
R9964 – Tang Pak Lun
R10201 – Chan Wai Ho
R10771 – Lim Kin Wah
R11160 – Chan Yuk Ha
R11438 – Yip Yu Hon
R11727 – Tam Tsz Kiu
C360 – Chan Ka Keung
C400 – Chow Kwok Wa
C489 – Wong Siu Mei
C595 – Pong Po Yin
C799 – Tang Yiu Nam
C917 – Chik Kar Lai
C1149 – Pauline Yu

C1327 – Lee Man Chun

C1357 – 李文俊

C1361 – Lam Chi Yuen

Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront

Concern Group –

Mr Tam Ka Tsun

- Representer, Representers' and
Commenters' Representative

R1575 – Lee Ho Fai Albert

Mr Lee Ho Fai Albert

- Representer

R2023 – Lo Man Ching

Ms Mary Mulvihill

- Representer's Representative

21. The Chairperson extended a welcome and invited the representers, commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their representations and comments.

R298 – Hui Kim Ming Cammie

R357 – Ho Wai Yan

R385 – Tse Siu Lin

R391 – Poon Tak Ming

R395 – Tsoi Shuk Mei

R418 – Leung Chi Keung

R422 – Ng Kwok Wai

R430 – Mintono Harry Nai Kit Chan

R497 – 朱彥樺

R525 – Agnes Choi

R558 – Emily Wong

R576 – 楊振達

R639 – Li Wai Shan

R766 – Ng Ka Po

R832 – 黃金柳

R833 – Ho Tsun Lai

R901 – 何幸瑜

R903 – Lee Kar Lung

R1111 – Ernie Lee

R1320 – Fanny Louie

R1366 – Ng Po Shan

R1651 – Cecilia Leung

R1939 – 蔡炳俊

R1971 – Choi Yuk Sing

R2044 – Poon Kam Sing

R2128 – 曹慧仁

R2160/C1347 – 蔡頌謙

R2236 – Tsang Wai Yan

R2298 – Yu Wai Yi

R2322 – Isabel Chung

<u>R2405 – Choi Heung Kwan</u>	<u>R2531 – Chan Wing Kwong</u>
<u>R2595 – Hu Chor Hoi</u>	<u>R2608 – 朱健明</u>
<u>R2642 – 朱高暘</u>	<u>R2684 – Eva Lam</u>
<u>R2718/C863 – 蔡育昇</u>	<u>R3013 – 翁榕珍</u>
<u>R3195 – Y C Tam</u>	<u>R3359 – Chan Hiu Wah</u>
<u>R3786 – Fung Ying Lai Connie</u>	<u>R3968 – 蔡逸泓</u>
<u>R4206 – Colman Wong</u>	<u>R4594 – Wong Suk Chi</u>
<u>R5108 – 談雨就</u>	<u>R5128 – Chiu Mung Fei</u>
<u>R5560 – Elaine Ching</u>	<u>R5583 – Louie Mei Lan Fanny</u>
<u>R5631 – Chan Yuk Nam</u>	<u>R5636 – Choi Fai</u>
<u>R5637 – Chan Ka Wai Catherine</u>	<u>R5823 – Cheng Chui Ling</u>
<u>R6028 – Tung Wing Ying</u>	<u>R6109 – 伍樂軒</u>
<u>R6136 – Path Liu</u>	<u>R6142 – Chak Wing Kuen Kelly</u>
<u>R7612 – Chan Kam Chuen</u>	<u>R7613 – Ng Chi Kong</u>
<u>R7811 – Fred Yung</u>	<u>R8024 – Teresa Lam</u>
<u>R8502 – 林國鴻</u>	<u>R8507 – Lee Che Yeung Carson</u>
<u>R8674 – 許九</u>	<u>R9041 – 林伯源</u>
<u>R9416 – Sartimi</u>	<u>R9460 – Larry Wong</u>
<u>R9707 – May Chan</u>	<u>R9987 – 蔡香君</u>
<u>R10509 – To Wai Chan</u>	<u>R10601 – Ko Suk Ha</u>
<u>R10643 – 陸靜嫻</u>	<u>R10788 – Anges Choi</u>
<u>R10906 – 崔惠英</u>	<u>R11206 – Chung Ngai Man</u>
<u>R11469 – Hui Yuk Kui</u>	<u>R11471 – Erica Chow</u>
<u>R11518 – 秦妃娣</u>	<u>R11556 – To Wai Cha</u>
<u>R11906 – Chan Ming Yiu Crystal</u>	

22. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Poon Kam Sing made the following main points:

- (a) he was the incumbent chairperson of the Owners' Committee of Phase 1, 2 and 4 of Laguna City and a member of the Protect Cha

Kwo Ling Harbourfront Concern Group (the Concern Group). He was a retired civil servant and had been living in Kwun Tong and Laguna City for more than 40 years and 26 years respectively. He had very strong sense of belonging to Kwun Tong, in particular, Cha Kwo Ling (CKL);

Returning the Harbourfront to People

- (b) according to a press release issued on 8.2.2004 by the then Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau, the Government would return the harbourfront to people for their use and enjoyment and would provide an easily accessible and beautiful harbourfront for the enjoyment of all;
- (c) a video was played to demonstrate that the Government's stance of returning the harbour to the people was reiterated by the Chief Executive in her election campaign;

Public Consultation and Procedure

- (d) the public consultation conducted for the rezoning of the waterfront site for Vocational Training Council (VTC) campus was insufficient and ineffective and was not in line with the "Guidelines on Public Consultation" prepared by the then Constitutional Affairs Bureau in 2003. The scope of consultation was limited as many local residents were not aware of the proposal. The public or District Councils were not given sufficient and essential information relating to the proposal and the consultation process was improper;
- (e) after the Review Study of Kai Tak Development was considered by the Board on 24.10.2016, the Wong Tai Sin District Council (WTSDC), Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC) and Kowloon City District Council (KCDC), Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront

Development (the Task Force) of the Harbourfront Committee (HC) and HC were consulted between November and December 2016. Shortly after a local consultation forum with Laguna City residents held on 10.1.2017 which was attended by representatives of PlanD and VTC, the proposed amendments to the approved Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K22/4 were considered by the Board on 20.1.2017. During the exhibition period of the OZP, the three DCs and the Task Force were consulted. WTSDC and KCDC had no adverse comment on the proposed amendments. At the KTDC meeting held on 2.3.2017, members considered that there was a lack of sufficient information for them to make an informed decision on the rezoning proposal and passed an extempore motion to object against the rezoning of the “O” site at Wai Yip Street/CKL Road to “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”). Before the Task Force meeting held at 5.4.2017, representatives of the Owners’ Committee were invited to attend a pre-meeting with the Task Force on 4.4.2017 for the latest proposal of VTC;

- (f) for the local consultation forum with Laguna City residents on 10.1.2017, upon the residents’ request, PlanD provided one A4-size page of information note to the residents on 9.1.2017, which was considered too flimsy. The representatives of PlanD simply mentioned that VTC’s proposed scheme had fulfilled all relevant planning requirements for waterfront developments;
- (g) on 2.8.2017, shortly before the end of the publication period of representations for public comment, VTC presented a new indicative scheme (New Scheme) with a reduced scale of development in an informal briefing session with HC members, with the attendance of the representatives of Laguna City. During the informal briefing session, VTC compared the impacts of the New Scheme with the previously submitted scheme (Original Scheme), instead of the scenario of having no VTC development. Though the proposed

gross floor area (GFA) of the New Scheme had been reduced, the scale of the proposed VTC campus was still considered massive and would substantially block the views of most residents of Block 23 of Laguna City. It was unfair to consult the HC on the New Scheme at such a late stage and the public had no chance to comment on the New Scheme. Though VTC had agreed to reduce the building over area by providing 1 ha for public open space (POS) within the site, the resultant plot ratio (PR) based on the reduced development site area would be higher than the Original Scheme;

- (h) the Concern Group had contacted members of the Legislative Council representing Kowloon East and relevant District Councillors. They had also visited residents in CKL and Kwun Tong district and found that many people in the area had no idea of VTC's proposal and supported the development of CKL Park. The CKL Park, linking up with the waterfront promenade in Kwun Tong, would definitely benefit the residents in Kwun Tong area;
- (i) it was found that many appendices and plans were missing in the Chinese version of the TPB Paper No. 10365. It was unfair as some representers might not be able to make their representations without sufficient information;
- (j) it was clearly stated in the "Hong Kong: The Facts – Town Planning" that views from the public were essential considerations for the formulation of development strategies and preparation of plans. Public engagement in the form of public forums, workshops, exhibitions etc. had become a very important component of the planning process. Given the rezoning involved a site previously planned for CKL Park which was a district park, PlanD should consult not only the residents of Laguna City, but also the wider district;

Potential Legal Challenges

- (k) there was recently a judgment of a judicial review which the Court had quashed the decision of Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) and the Board in respect of the draft OZPs concerning Hoi Ha, Pak Lap and So Lo Pun areas. Those cases were similar to that of Kai Tak OZP and the Board might be subject to legal challenges if it failed to make proper enquiry and the decision was based on insufficient consultation and information;
- (l) the proposed VTC campus would lead to adverse visual and traffic impacts on the surrounding areas, which should be taken into account when the Board made any decision;
- (m) it was also questionable why a harbourfront location was required for the proposed VTC campus. Noting that the site area required for the proposed VTC campus had been reduced to 3.2 ha, it appeared that the site area could be further adjusted as long as the proposed GFA remained unchanged;

Discriminating the Residents of Kwun Tong

- (n) it appeared that PlanD was discriminating the residents in Kwun Tong, and the median household income was low. Kwun Tong also had the largest number of elderly people in Hong Kong. It was questionable why PlanD proposed such a large-scale development in the waterfront of CKL which was the last piece of waterfront area in East Kowloon. A video was shown to demonstrate the Government's vision to develop the waterfront into a lively, accessible and vibrant open space for public enjoyment. The proposed VTC campus at the CKL waterfront was not in line with the Government's vision;

- (o) a 50 m wide waterfront promenade at CKL could not replace the function of a CKL Park which was a recreation node for the local residents. The development of a quality waterfront open space would meet the aspiration of the residents; and
- (p) it was the responsibility of the Board to protect the harbourfront of Hong Kong. The designation of the CKL Park on the OZP had gone through an extensive public consultation process. The CKL Park could be an important breathing space and urban lung in East Kowloon.

R1575 – Lee Ho Fai Albert

23. Mr Lee Ho Fai Albert made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of Laguna City and opposed the proposed VTC campus at the CKL waterfront location;
- (b) the site area for the proposed VTC campus was about 4.2 ha and would occupy a large stretch of land along the CKL waterfront;
- (c) with the building height (BH) ranging from 11 to 14 storeys and a PR of 5.5, the proposed VTC development was massive and would have adverse visual impact on the surrounding areas and the Victoria Harbour as a whole;
- (d) town planning should be for the long-term development. The purpose of waterfront planning was to promote a vibrant and easily accessible waterfront which could be considered as a tourist node, an important element of our cityscape and a place of recreation for people. As shown in many overseas examples, the waterfront could be a precious asset to the city. As such, it was not desirable for the proposed VTC campus to occupy the waterfront location,

which would defeat the above purposes;

- (e) the Government should consider to provide open space, playground, cycle track, and restaurants along the waterfront;
- (f) most of the residents in Laguna City expected that there would be a CKL Park at the waterfront. The proposed VTC campus would not only affect their property prices, but also deprive them of the waterfront park; and
- (g) the proposed VTC campus could be relocated to the new development areas in the New Territories or the unused government land, which would not lead to any adverse visual impact.

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

25. The Chairperson invited the Secretary to explain the distribution arrangement of the TPB Paper and whether there was any discrepancy between the Chinese and English versions of the Paper. The Secretary said that both the Chinese and English versions of the Paper and all attachments were made available for public viewing on the Town Planning Board website since 29.11.2017. A hard copy of the Paper would normally be issued to concerned representers/commenters upon request. For those who requested to have a Chinese version of the Paper, they would receive a full version of the English paper attaching all appendices supplemented with the Chinese translation of the main paper and containing only appendices which were translated into Chinese. In other words, all the representers/commenters asking to receive the Chinese version of the Paper were

also provided with a full set of the attachments, albeit that some were attached to the English version of the Paper. That said, the Chairperson noted the concerns of the representers and agreed that the Secretariat could clarify the arrangement in future to avoid confusion. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

Open Space and Waterfront Park

26. The Chairperson, the Vice-chairperson and some Members raised the following questions.

- (a) the planning for the future CKL waterfront and the POS to be provided within the VTC site; and the future connection to Metro Park in Kai Tak;
- (b) the classification of a waterfront open space as a promenade or a park; and whether the VTC site was originally planned for a district open space (DO);
- (c) how to ensure the POS would be provided in the VTC site;
- (d) whether only those POS which were zoned “O” could be counted towards the provision of open space for a district;
- (e) whether the POS within the VTC site was included into the site area for PR calculation; and
- (f) the provision of open space in Kwun Tong or Yau Tong districts.

27. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, with the aids of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the currently proposed POS along the CKL waterfront was about 5.2 ha, including a promenade with a length of about 660 m and a width

of 50 m, an 1 ha open space to be provided within the VTC site as well as a turfed soccer pitch and two basketball courts with an area of more than 7,000 m². The Government intended to provide a continuous waterfront promenade in Kowloon from West Kowloon Cultural District to Yau Tong. The CKL waterfront promenade, with a width of about 50 m, would be the widest one in Kowloon. As illustrated in the design and layout of other waterfront promenades in Hong Kong, those waterfront promenades usually linked up with parks, which were similar to that proposed in CKL. A variety of leisure and recreational facilities such as children's playgrounds, basketball courts, jogging trails, spectator stands, fitness stations, pebbles path, etc could be provided within the waterfront parks and promenades;

- (b) as revealed in the naming of waterfront open space by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD), it appeared that there was no hard and fast rule on the classification of waterfront promenade and waterfront park. The design of a waterfront open space with sufficient width to facilitate the provision of more recreational facilities was more important for the CKL waterfront. The CKL Park planned at the VTC site was regarded as a DO as the area was large and could accommodate both active and passive recreational facilities. In this regard, the existing Laguna Park was also regarded as a DO. The classification of an open space as a DO or local open space (LO) would largely depend on the size and functions. The area of the "O" zone at Wai Yip Street and the POS to be provided in the VTC site as currently proposed could be classified as a DO given the size of about 1.9 ha and active recreational facilities including soccer pitch and basketball court to be provided;
- (c) VTC's proposal of providing 1 ha POS had been accepted by LCSD. VTC would be responsible for building the POS and hand it back to

LCSD for maintenance and management. Following the established practice, VTC would liaise with LCSD on the design of the POS and consult the public. The requirement of providing the 1 ha POS could be stipulated in the Explanatory Statement of the OZP and the future land grant to ensure its implementation. Also, the VTC campus would be funded by Government resources through Resource Allocation Exercise and scrutinised by the Finance Committee of Legislative Council. VTC's proposal of providing 1 ha POS would be subject to public scrutiny;

- (d) not all POS would be zoned "O" on OZPs in Hong Kong, for example, some football pitches were located within sites zoned "G/IC". In some cases, there might be requirements in approved planning briefs and lease conditions requiring the applicant/project proponents to provide some POS in private residential and commercial developments. Citing the "Comprehensive Development Area" ("CDA") developments in Yau Tong Bay and Yau Tong Industrial Area as examples, the future developers would be required to provide a 15-20 m wide waterfront open space which would be handed over to LCSD in future. These open spaces would normally be counted towards the open space provision even though the site was zoned "CDA";
- (e) there was no PR control for the "G/IC" zone according to the Notes of the OZP. The PR of the proposed VTC campus was about 5.6 if the area for POS was excluded. However, the overall GFA of the New Scheme had been reduced as compared with the Original Scheme; and
- (f) according to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), in the urban areas, the standard for provision of open space was 1 m² of DO and 1 m² of LO per person. The planned provision of open space in Kwun Tong District, the Kai Tak OZP

and the CKL, Yau Tong, Lei Yue Mun OZP (where Laguna City is located) had all exceeded the requirements in HKPSG.

28. Mr Luk Pang Kei, R622, indicated that the elongated shape of the waterfront promenade would impose constraints on the types of facilities to be provided. Though PlanD claimed that the area of the proposed POS would amount to 5.2 ha after taking into account the 1 ha to be released by VTC and located in the “G/IC” zone, the area that was zoned “O” on the OZP was 4.2 ha only. Also, the configuration of the proposed POS which was fragmented into small areas was not desirable and was not conducive to serving as a gathering place/recreational node. Moreover, it was undesirable to locate an open space in close proximity to the Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG) station. Ms Mary Mulvihill, the representative of R2023, opined that as that part of the POS located in the area zoned “G/IC” would allow the erection of building structures, for so long as the area was not zoned “O” on the OZP it would lead to a deficit of open space in CKL. Moreover, the handing over of POS to LCSD in future for management might require another round of OZP amendments to rezone that part of the POS back to “O”.

29. Mr Poon Kam Sing, R2044, pointed out that the waterfront promenade was previously designated as a regional open space (RO) and queried why PlanD currently classified it as DO. Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, responded that according to the HKPSG, open spaces could be classified as RO, DO and LO which were non-statutory land use zone classification in accordance with sizes and functions. In calculating the open space provision, 50% of the RO could be counted as DO in the Metro Area. The relevant extracts of the HKPSG were shown on the visualiser for illustrative purpose. Mr Yip further said that, the CKL waterfront promenade was regarded as a RO and only 50% of its area was included in the calculating the DO provision. The current planning for the CKL waterfront involving only change in location of open space, which would not affect the overall provision of open space.

Views of HC on VTC's Proposal

30. Noting that the representers/commenters and PlanD had adopted different interpretation of HC's views on VTC's proposal, a Member asked for clarification on the views of HC. Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, responded that at the Task Force's meeting held on 5.4.2017, members raised concerns on VTC's Original Scheme including the development scale of VTC complex, and the reduction of POS by 1 ha. After consideration, the Task Force indicated that the rezoning proposal for the proposed VTC campus could not be supported at that stage. The views of the Task Force were detailed in Annex III d of the Paper. In response, the VTC proposed to introduce a new indicative scheme (New Scheme) with a reduction in GFA and number of blocks and provision of 1 ha of POS. An informal briefing session with HC members was held on 2.8.2017. In brief, the HC members generally considered the New Scheme had shown improvement on air ventilation and visual permeability. It was also clarified in the briefing session that the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines (HPPG) did not prohibit buildings on the waterfront, and each use and design should be assessed on its individual merits. Some HC members considered that the revised development scale acceptable, the New Scheme had fulfilled the requirement of HPPG, and the use for education institute was more appropriate than other possible uses such as residential and commercial uses. However, some HC members still considered the building bulk and footprint massive and there were rooms for further improvement, and questioned whether public interest would be best served by allowing the VTC campus at the location.

31. Mr Tom C.K. Yip continued to say that there was a number of principles under the HPPG to guide the planning of the harbourfront. First, it was necessary to ensure that the harbourfront was accessible by the public and available for use by the public to enjoy the harbour and carry out leisure and recreational activities. Second, the waterfront development should be compatible with the surrounding areas in terms of visual quality, landscape and air ventilation. The proposed VTC campus would have no conflict with the planned waterfront promenade in front of the site, and appropriate building height, building setback, building gap, landscaped

design had been proposed to ensure integration with the waterfront setting and surrounding areas. As such, he considered that the proposed VTC campus was in line with the principles of the HPPG.

32. Ms Mary Mulvihill, the representative of R2023, said that the Chairperson of HC had previously mentioned to her that HC members' views on VTC's campus were divided and no conclusion was reached. She further said that the Chairperson of HC would write to the Board to clarify the stance. The Chairperson drew Members' attention that, in considering the views of HC, reference should be made to the letters summarizing the views of HC as attached in Annex III of the Paper.

Reprovisioning of LPG filling station

33. A Member raised concern on the reasons for reserving a larger site for the reprovisioning of the LPG filling station. Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, responded that additional area was reserved for the LPG filling station in order to allow adequate waiting spaces within the station to avoid vehicles queuing along the public road, and a separation distance of 55 m from high-rise residential and educational uses and 15 m from the POS as required under HKPSG. During the detailed design stage, mitigation measures could be adopted along the edge of the LPG filling station so as to address the interface between the LPG filling station and the POS.

Visual Impact

34. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) the separation distance between the proposed VTC building and site boundary from Blocks 23 and 38 of Laguna City as well as from the Cha Kwo Ling Building nearby; and
 - (b) whether the BH profile of the proposed VTC campus met the HPPG

and HKPSG.

35. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, made the following main points:
- (a) based on VTC's New Scheme, the western and eastern blocks would be setback from Wai Yip Street and CKL Road by 42 m and 20 m respectively. The separation distance between the VTC buildings and Blocks 23 and 28 of Laguna City and the residential developments at Fan Wa Street were about 90 m, 130 m and 40 m respectively. Moreover, to address the local concern on possible visual impact, only one footbridge would be built to connect the two VTC buildings. Also, a building gap of 47 m between the two building blocks of the VTC campus would be provided to enhance the visual permeability and air ventilation. Should the Board have any suggestion on the future design of the VTC campus, such design requirements could be stipulated in the Explanatory Statement of the OZP and the land grant in order to ensure that such design requirements would be implemented to alleviate the local concerns on visual impacts; and
 - (b) according to the HPPG and HKPSG, waterfront developments should not be of uniform height and a varying BH profile with BH descending towards the Harbour should be created for the waterfront development. A stepped BH profile of 70 to 60 mPD from south to north was adopted in the proposed VTC campus, which was considered visually compatible with Laguna City to its north, with building height profile ranging 80 to 92 mPD. The currently proposed CKL waterfront including the VTC campus was generally in line with the HPPG in the overall terms.
36. Mr Luk Pang Kei, R622, remarked that the massive structure of the VTC campus with a BH of 60 mPD was not compatible with the waterfront setting nor creating a stepped BH profile, but a steep gradation towards the waterfront.

Site Selection

37. The Chairperson, the Vice-chairperson and a Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether a site with an area of 3.2 ha in Tai Po as proposed by a representer was a suitable site for the proposed VTC campus;
- (b) why in-situ redevelopment of the existing VTC campuses was not considered; and
- (c) noting that some of the VTC campus was underutilised, whether there was a need for the new VTC campus in the CKL waterfront from educational policy point of view.

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

- (a) the concerned site proposed by a representer was located at the junction of Yau King Lane and Pok Yin Road in Tai Po. The VTC requested for a site in urban areas and the Tai Po site was therefore not considered. The Tai Po site had recently been rezoned from “G/IC” to “Residential (Group B)9” for residential development; and
- (b) as the old campuses of VTC were aged and outdated, scattered across the territory and crowded with inadequate space for students, a new modernized campus was required by the VTC to provide state-of-the-art facilities for inter-disciplinary learning and to provide a conducive learning environment for the students. According to VTC’s strategic development plan, there was a need for timely development of a new campus with sufficient size in the urban area to support the continued development of Vocational and Professional Education and Training (VPET) in Hong Kong. The

old campuses in Cheung Sha Wan (Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education (IVE) (Haking Wong) (about 1 ha) and Kwun Tong (IVE (Kwun Tong)) (about 1.2 ha) were too small to effectively create the synergy effect.

39. On the need of a new VTC campus, Ms Elaine T.L. Mak, PAS(Further Education), EDB, said that a review on the VPET was conducted in 2014. It had been the Government's policy to enhance the quality of VPET in order to attract more young people to pursue VPET as a valued choice. A modern campus with quality learning facilities for the VTC commensurate with other post-secondary education institutions would enhance synergy and provide state-of-the-art facilities which would be pivotal to enhancing the professional image and high-quality education provided by VPET. EDB had rendered policy support to the proposed VTC development. EDB and VTC would continue to consider how to better utilise VTC's facilities to benefit VPET students.

[Messrs Dominic K.K. Lam, Stephen L.H. Liu and Peter K.T. Yuen left this session of the meeting at this point.]

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

41. This session of the meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.