

1. The meeting was resumed at 9:05 a.m. on 3.1.2018.
2. The following Members and the Secretary were present in the morning session of the resumed meeting:

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

Chairperson

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Ms Christina M. Lee

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

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

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)

Mr Elvis W.K. Au

Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon, Transport Department

Mr David C.V. Ngu

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Director of Planning

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 1 (Continued)

[Open Meeting]

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

(TPB Paper No. 10365)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

Group 2

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

4. The Secretary said that Members' declaration of interests had been made in the hearing sessions on 7.12.2017 and 14.12.2017.

5. Members noted that Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Mr Franklin Yu, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Miss Winnie W.M. Ng, Mr Dominic K.K. Lam, Mr H.F. Leung, Mr H.W. Cheung and Ms Janice W.M. Lai had tendered apologies for not attending this session of the meeting. The meeting agreed that the interests of the other Members were indirect and they should be allowed to 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's representatives, representers, commenters and their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

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

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

Education Bureau (EDB)

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

Representers/Commenters and their Representatives

R277/C258 – Designing Hong Kong Limited R2029 – M.C. Lo

C518 – Lai Kwan Ngai C1110 – Lo Man Ching

Mr Paul Zimmerman - Representer, Commenter and Representers' and Commenters' representative

R287 – Kwok Man Sun

R288 – Li Kai Kwong

R344 – Tung Man Yan Keith

R349 – A Goel

R355 – Sum Tin Lam

R449 – 吳滿康

R540 – Herman Kwan

R659 – Wong Chung Sing

R661 – Ma Hon Man

R691 – Chan Chin Ngai

R692 – Ng Cheuk Lam

R699 – Ho Mei Kuen

R727 – Ho Mei Ngan

R743 – Darius Engineer

R793 – 李廣煊

R795 – Cabia Chau

<u>R877 – Mak Shuk Ying</u>	<u>R995 – 張偉泉</u>
<u>R1015 – Yu Kwan Wei</u>	<u>R1036 – Hung Siu Wai</u>
<u>R1062 – Sally Chan</u>	<u>R1124 – K. K. Yu</u>
<u>R1187 – 鍾麗莎</u>	<u>R1195 – K.M. Fok</u>
<u>R1335 – S.S.K. Mak</u>	<u>R1367 – Fok Wing Yan</u>
<u>R1618 – 吳滿康</u>	<u>R1756 – Lui Graham</u>
<u>R1807 – Y.M. Tang</u>	<u>R1870 – 潘家行</u>
<u>R2103 – 余碧嫻</u>	<u>R2105 – 吳鳳儀</u>
<u>R2135 – 郭宇眉</u>	<u>R2286 – 孫振威</u>
<u>R2287 – 孫穎榕</u>	<u>R2288 – 孫業波</u>
<u>R2308 – Chan Wing Kong</u>	<u>R2331 – Leung Siu Fan</u>
<u>R2334 – Maggie Wong</u>	<u>R2962 – Ng Mun Hong</u>
<u>R2980 – Fok Lai Ha</u>	<u>R3072 – Chan Siu Fung</u>
<u>R3384 – Leung</u>	<u>R3468 – Larry Yiu Hak Wai</u>
<u>R3662 – Tranny Wong</u>	<u>R3757 – Hui Yuen Mei</u>
<u>R3761 – Alvin Li Man Lok</u>	<u>R3764 – Ho Wai Yee</u>
<u>R3816 – 李港生</u>	<u>R3929 – Maggie Wong</u>
<u>R4558 – Chung Sau Lan Shirley</u>	<u>R4562 – Fung Man Fai</u>
<u>R4621 – 潘培文</u>	<u>R4665 – Leung</u>
<u>R4669 – Poon Yin Ting</u>	<u>R4670 – Poon Pui Ping</u>
<u>R4671 – 曾思敏</u>	<u>R4676 – 陳惠仁</u>
<u>R5324 – Lau Hiu Lam</u>	<u>R5651 – Lo Ting Fai Danny</u>
<u>R5842 – Chow Ho Wai</u>	<u>R5936 – Evans Tung</u>
<u>R6025 – 麥粵榮</u>	<u>R6040 – Cheung Yuk Kwan</u>
<u>R6167 – Lau Chi Keung</u>	<u>R6183 – 陳永樂</u>
<u>R6474 – Yip Wing Lam</u>	<u>R6619 – Tung Yin Wong</u>
<u>R6634 – Siu Hon Tak</u>	<u>R6649 – 林炎淑</u>
<u>R6808 – Au Lai Fong</u>	<u>R6892 – Lau Wing Cheuk</u>
<u>R7768 – Wong See King</u>	<u>R7777 – Lau Sin Yan</u>
<u>R7810 – Wong Shek Nam</u>	<u>R7824 – Cheuk Hei Kiu</u>
<u>R7840 – Siu Hon Tak</u>	<u>R8046 – 陳</u>

<u>R8089 – Twinsen Dat</u>	<u>R8121 – Wong Chuem Por</u>
<u>R8278 – Law Kwok Tung</u>	<u>R8313 – Maggie Siu Ping Wong</u>
<u>R8551 – Joseph Yip</u>	<u>R8890 – Paul Cheuk</u>
<u>R9137 – Mack Kwong Ping Anthony</u>	<u>R9237 – Kiet Duong</u>
<u>R9288 – Ashwani Goel</u>	<u>R9684 – Tsang Ling Shan</u>
<u>R9820 – 周澤鋒</u>	<u>R10356 – 吳美蓮</u>
<u>R10372 – Li Chun Oi</u>	<u>R10507 – 區兆峯</u>
<u>R10716 – Tracy Leung Wai Yee</u>	<u>R10874 – Ho Kin Chung</u>
<u>R11038 – Wong Sin Yee Olivia</u>	<u>R11300 – Ooi Hio Kien</u>
<u>R11529 – Cheng Cha</u>	<u>R11580 – Lo Shiu Yin</u>
<u>R11937 – 郭頌民</u>	
Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront Concern Group - Ms Wong Sin Yee Olivia	- Representers and Representatives’ representative
<u>R308 – Y.T. Chan</u>	<u>R313 – 梁偉強</u>
<u>R493 – Leung Yiu Por</u>	<u>R570 – Tam Kok Hung</u>
<u>R609 – Lai Kit Yee</u>	<u>R618 – K.Y. Lai</u>
<u>R716 – Kwong Heung</u>	<u>R813 – Cheung Siu Yan</u>
<u>R828 – T.T. Lai</u>	<u>R842 – 陳德鑫</u>
<u>R939 – Wong Po Chun</u>	<u>R958 – Leung Man Ka</u>
<u>R1224 – Yan Lau</u>	<u>R1270 – Chik Kar Lai</u>
<u>R1336 – Cheng Wing Hung</u>	<u>R1754 – Lo Chun Tung</u>
<u>R1936 – Lee Sau Kwan</u>	<u>R1938 – Lo Chun Ting</u>
<u>R2001 – Ivan Leung</u>	<u>R2109 – 李靜芬</u>
<u>R2206 – Cora Ching</u>	<u>R2333 – Liu Wai Ngor Amy</u>
<u>R2356 – 李筱玲</u>	<u>R2368 – Chik Kar Kei Jackie</u>
<u>R2423 – C.W. Yim</u>	<u>R2440 – Edith Lam</u>
<u>R2514 – 李文俊</u>	<u>R2515 – 李日銘</u>
<u>R2545 – Ip Lun Shu</u>	<u>R2566 – Leung Wai Lun</u>
<u>R2584 – Liu Heung Ling Sally</u>	<u>R2592 – Chow Chui Yi</u>

<u>R2746 – 徐玉成</u>	<u>R2835 – Kwok Siu Mei</u>
<u>R2891 – 鄭誠</u>	<u>R2958 – Tam Shuk Kuen</u>
<u>R2968 – Ng Chung Fat</u>	<u>R3082 – Cynthia Kwok</u>
<u>R3126 – Wong Oi Yu</u>	<u>R3138 – 周卓宏</u>
<u>R3467 – Y.T. Chan</u>	<u>R3542 – 黃苓斐</u>
<u>R3820 – Ng Yuk King</u>	<u>R3907 – Peng Jui Hui</u>
<u>R3908 – Kwan Chui Wai Ching Krina</u>	<u>R3909 – Connie Mak</u>
<u>R4597 – Wong Ka Fai</u>	<u>R4645 – 李靜修</u>
<u>R4866 – 陳洪良</u>	<u>R4931 – Jean Chi</u>
<u>R5004 – Cheung Siu Nan</u>	<u>R5025 – 李靜嫻</u>
<u>R5120 – Lau Wai</u>	<u>R5275 – Yu Kwan Wang</u>
<u>R5462 – Albert Au</u>	<u>R5519 – Lau Ping Yuk</u>
<u>R5557 – Suki Lai</u>	<u>R5564 – Li Li</u>
<u>R5575 – Lo Wing Yan</u>	<u>R5591 – M.C. Leung</u>
<u>R5739 – 李曼麗</u>	<u>R5788 – Stephaine Law</u>
<u>R6002 – Lau Po Che</u>	<u>R6036 – Lo Pui Wa</u>
<u>R6044 – Lo Siu Ming</u>	<u>R6055 – Goretti Foo</u>
<u>R6096 – Kelvin Chan</u>	<u>R6097 – Tammy Yeung</u>
<u>R6408 – Kong Chi Nang</u>	<u>R6592 – 吳靜英</u>
<u>R6647 – 蘇慈妹</u>	<u>R6691 – Wong Nok Ying</u>
<u>R6810 – Chung Ming San Kay</u>	<u>R6813 – Lai Kit Mei</u>
<u>R6885 – Henry Ng</u>	<u>R6950 – Ring Law</u>
<u>R7475 – Kitty Lau Kit Fung</u>	<u>R7476 – Ka Cheung</u>
<u>R7477 – 陳巨秀</u>	<u>R7480 – K.M. Lai</u>
<u>R7605 – K.Y. Lai</u>	<u>R7781 – Ting Lai</u>
<u>R7901 – Stanley Tung</u>	<u>R8183 – Lau Po Che</u>
<u>R8335 – Wong Hiu Lai</u>	<u>R8581 – 歐子鋒</u>
<u>R8963 – Mavis Lo</u>	<u>R8975 – 歐陽國緯</u>
<u>R9055 – Cynthia Leung</u>	<u>R9952 – David Leung</u>
<u>R10157 – K.Y. Lai</u>	<u>R10227 – Ng Yuk King</u>
<u>R10455 – Eric Au Yeung</u>	<u>R11505 – 吳佩儀</u>

<u>R11506 – Peng Ching Yu</u>	<u>R11625 – Chan Lap Chun</u>
<u>R10653 – Franky Wong Chun Ho</u>	<u>R11087 – Lai Ka Fai</u>
<u>R11088 – Li Sin Yi Cindy</u>	<u>R11653 – Wong Kit Ping</u>
Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront Concern Group - Mr Tam Kok Hung	- Representers and Representatives’ representative
<u>R341 – Ho Yung Kwong (Ring)</u>	- Representers
<u>R384 – Chan Lai Kuen</u>	<u>R386 – Chau Oi Fung</u>
<u>R409 – Chan Wai Ming</u>	<u>R425 – Cheng Ka Ka</u>
<u>R431 – Chan Choi Cheung</u>	<u>R452 – Yuen Hing Kwok David</u>
<u>R474 – Shek Po Lin</u>	<u>R631 – Andy Tse</u>
<u>R680 – Kitty Tang</u>	<u>R688 – Wong Shek Hin</u>
<u>R689 – Wong Fu Wing</u>	<u>R700 – Lau Wai Yi</u>
<u>R759 – Lee Yan Ho</u>	<u>R803 – Pat Yim</u>
<u>R885 – Tse King Cheung</u>	<u>R898 – Josephine Chan</u>
<u>R1117 – INIH</u>	<u>R1254 – Kwong Chun Ho</u>
<u>R1289 – Kwok Wai Chun</u>	<u>R1296 – Wong Po San</u>
<u>R1429 – 吳振波</u>	<u>R1573 – Wong Choi Ling</u>
<u>R2040 – Paul Chow</u>	<u>R2130 – 梁沛強</u>
<u>R2195 – Lee Wai Lin</u>	<u>R2200 – Chan Hau Chi</u>
<u>R2437 – Daniel Chan</u>	<u>R2555 – Chan Leong Yu</u>
<u>R2606 – 董紹榮</u>	<u>R2702 – Lee Siu Fung</u>
<u>R2717 – So Chi Mui</u>	<u>R2815 – Charlotte Chan</u>
<u>R2871 – 王寶珊</u>	<u>R3018 – 楊少群</u>
<u>R3205 – Chan Man Hong</u>	<u>R3770 – 吳小鳳</u>
<u>R3905 – Au Sing Hong</u>	<u>R4142 – Chow Man Yuen</u>
<u>R4152 – Kwong Chun Ho</u>	<u>R4167 – Suen King Ho</u>
<u>R4286 – 林寶蓮</u>	<u>R4287 – 劉仲祥</u>

<u>R4309 – Cheng Kit Mei</u>	<u>R4340 – Cheng Kwan Wai</u>
<u>R4379 – Wong Shui Yin</u>	<u>R5152 – Lam Man Tat</u>
<u>R5154 – Angel Chu</u>	<u>R5277 – Chong Chung Loi</u>
<u>R5341 – Sophie Luk</u>	<u>R5374 – 周</u>
<u>R5570 – So</u>	<u>R5595 – So Tze Yin</u>
<u>R5672 – Wong Shui Yin</u>	<u>R5778 – Melissa Chen</u>
<u>R5843 – Stephen Cheng</u>	<u>R5953 – Lee Nga Tung</u>
<u>R5990 – Chow Suet Ying</u>	<u>R6042 – Cheung Sau Kwan</u>
<u>R6336 – 林</u>	<u>R7000 – 何雅妍</u>
<u>R7379 – Anthony Sung</u>	<u>R7696 – Xu Yat Sing</u>
<u>R7783 – Yeung Choi Hung</u>	<u>R8401 – Ding Yuen Fong</u>
<u>R8723 – Vivien Lee</u>	<u>R8971 – Chong Hoi Kwan</u>
<u>R9661 – Tsang Yat Chor</u>	<u>R9664 – Lee On Kei</u>
<u>R9698 – Leung Yuen Kam</u>	<u>R9874 – 潘飛龍</u>
<u>R10074 – 周文元</u>	<u>R10083 – Ma Chiu Mo</u>
<u>R10091 – Josephine Jim</u>	<u>R10092 – Ryan Wong</u>
<u>R10150 – Lee Miu Yee</u>	<u>R10182 – Yung Lok Yi</u>
<u>R10285 – 周筱兵</u>	<u>R10470 – Fung Kum Ho</u>
<u>R10684 – Lau Ka Yan</u>	<u>R10692 – Wing Pui Lung</u>
<u>R10814 – Ng Fung Ming</u>	<u>R11314 – 林麗娟</u>
<u>R11380 – 李家紘</u>	<u>R11533 – 黃月蓉</u>

Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront

Concern Group -

Ms Chong Hoi Kwan]	Representer and Representers'
Mr Tse Chun Wah]	representatives

R536 – Choi Ki Sang

Mr Choi Ki Sang - Representer

R1790/C523 – Tse Shing Kwong

Mr Tse Shing Kwong]	Representer/Commenter and
Ms Tse Yau Sheung]	Representer/Commenter's representatives

Ms Lee Wai Ping]

R2184 – Wu Koon Keung

Mr Wu Koon Keung - Representer

R2380 – Chan I Fong

Ms Chan I Fong - Representer

R3654 – Lam Chi Wai

Mr Lam Chi Wai - Representer

R4250 – Lam Hau Yeung Stephen

R7137 – Ng Sau Wah

R8052 – Lai Chi Man

R10267 – Sin Yuen Sum Carol

R10268 – Hau Yuk Kee

Mr Li Wai Lam William - Representers' representative

R7677 – Leung Wai Ching

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer's representative

R9514/C313 – Incorporated Owners of Selwyn Factory Building

Mr Wong Kwan Nam - Representer/Commenter'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 Board's website for the meeting and would not be repeated in this session of the meeting. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, each representer/commenter or their representative was allotted 10 minutes for making presentation. There was a timer device to alert the representers/commenters or their representatives two minutes before the allotted 10-minute time was to expire and when the allotted 10-minute time limit was up. Question and answer (Q&A) sessions would be held after all attending representers/commenters or their representatives had completed their oral submissions on that day. Members could direct their questions to government representatives, representers/commenters or their representatives. After the Q&A

sessions, the hearing of the day would be adjourned, and the representers/commenters or their representatives and the government representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. After hearing of all the oral submissions from the representers/commenters or their representatives who attended the meeting, the Board would deliberate on the representations/comments in their absence, and inform the representers/commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

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

R277/C258 – Designing Hong Kong Limited

R2029 – M.C. Lo

C518 – Lai Kwan Ngai

C1110 – Lo Man Ching

10. Mr Paul Zimmerman made the following main points :

- (a) the representation was mainly concerned with the waterfront at Cha Kwo Ling (CKL). While reclamation had generally ceased since the enactment of the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (Cap. 531) in 2004, the waterfront sites should still be considered carefully with a view to maximizing the public's enjoyment;
- (b) although the design of the proposed Vocational Training Council (VTC) campus had been revised and open space would be provided within the proposed VTC campus, such open space would be provided on a different site level from the waterfront and would only be open to the public at specific hours to be decided by VTC. Hence, it could not be considered as a genuine public open space;
- (c) it was the duty of the Harbourfront Commission (HC) to advise the Government on enhancing and safeguarding the waterfront. When the HC was consulted on the new VTC campus, most of the HC members raised concerns on the building design of the VTC campus and enquired about the need for VTC to occupy a harbourfront site;

- (d) the Harbour Planning Principles (HPP) endorsed by Town Planning Board (the Board) stated that the community should be engaged in an early stage in the planning and development of the harbour and harbourfront through transparent and consensus building. However, none of that had taken place and the community was not involved in the planning of the proposed VTC campus at the CKL waterfront;
- (e) HPP also stated that the harbourfront should be physically and visually accessible, and the harbourfront area should be maximized for public's enjoyment. There was no urgent need to develop the proposed VTC campus on the CKL waterfront while alternative sites were available, e.g in Kam Sheung Road; and
- (f) the proposed VTC campus site was presented on the OZP in terms of a landuse zoning and the Board was not advised on its building design or the availability of alternative sites. Alternative building design with taller and slimmer buildings should be considered with a view to minimizing the visual blockage to the waterfront.

11. At the request of Mr Tse Chun Wah, Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront Concern Group, the Chairperson agreed that some representers/commenters could make their oral submissions first.

R2184 – Wu Koon Keung

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

- (a) although the focus of the representations was related to a waterfront site in CKL, the issue concerned the overall planning of the harbourfront in Hong Kong;
- (b) it was the duty of the Government to maintain or enhance Hong Kong as one of the top-ranked international cities. Amongst those high-ranking

international cities, e.g. Sydney, their respective Government had planned their harbourfront well;

- (c) waterfront sites were scarce in Hong Kong and decisions for developing those sites should not be made hastily. Instead of meeting VTC's request for a campus site, careful consideration should be given to ensuring a quality harbourfront, stretching from Kai Tak to Lei Yue Mun, in a comprehensive manner, taking advantage of the Kai Tak Development and the cruise terminal;
- (d) the Government should take a broader view in planning the waterfront. The existing waterfront promenade stretching from Kowloon Bay to Kwun Tong Ferry Pier was providing a relaxing place for people of all ages. A well-planned harbourfront at CKL area would be an additional attraction which helped promote tourism in Hong Kong; and
- (e) as there was no urgency for developing the proposed VTC campus and a waterfront location was not essential for its operation, alternative sites should be explored.

R536 – Choi Ki Sang

13. Mr Choi Ki Sang made the following main points :

- (a) he was a resident of Laguna City but spoke for all Hong Kong's people as the harbourfront was an asset for all. The waterfront site was not owned by VTC and it should be retained for development of the CKL Park for the public's enjoyment as there were not many such open spaces in the urban area;
- (b) VTC could redevelop the sites occupied by those vacant premises owned by them for the proposed new facilities;

- (c) an existing liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) filling station would need to be relocated for the proposed VTC campus development. The original LPG filling station site now incorporated in the VTC development might be contaminated and would pose health hazards for the future VTC students; and
- (d) the originally planned CKL Park at the waterfront would be a good alternative location for fireworks viewing and the crowd viewing fireworks display no longer needed to concentrate at Wan Chai North and Tsim Sha Tsui during festivals.

R1790/C523 – Tse Shing Kwong

14. Mr Tse Shing Kwong made the following main points :

- (a) while VTC would operate a 60-room teaching hotel providing relevant training courses, a waterfront location was not essential for nor relevant to those training courses. It was not logical to sacrifice a waterfront site originally planned for CKL Park for the benefit of a small number of students at VTC;
- (b) there was no urgency and necessity for VTC to develop a campus of 3 to 5 ha in size in the urban area as it was expected that the number of students would be reduced in the next 10 years due to a low birth rate;
- (c) there would not be any direct gain to the Government nor the general public if the waterfront site was allocated to VTC. As an alternative to VTC campus development, the site could be disposed of for hotel, commercial or residential development to generate substantial revenue from land sale; and
- (d) the proposed VTC campus would occupy a waterfront site and block the sea view of developments in the hinterland. The site should be retained as the original planned open space development, which was valuable to Kowloon

East and the Territory. The Government should not make a hasty decision to meet VTC's demand at the expense of public interest.

R3654 – Lam Chi Wai

15. Mr Lam Chi Wai made the following main points :

- (a) he objected to the rezoning of the representation site from “O” to “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) and the allocation of the waterfront site to VTC;
- (b) he had lived in Kwun Tong and Laguna City for over 30 years and worked in the commercial/industrial district in Kwun Tong for over 15 years. From a local resident's perspective, there was inadequate open space in Kwun Tong and he wondered why the “O” site was rezoned;
- (c) with the significant increase in Kwun Tong's population in the past decade, its transformation from an industrial area to a business area, the redevelopment of Kwun Tong Town Centre and new developments in Yau Tong, traffic congestion often occurred in Kwun Tong from early hours till 7:00 p.m. or 8:00 p.m. The traffic impact assessment (TIA)'s conclusion that the proposed VTC campus would not have adverse impacts on the traffic was doubtful; and
- (d) there was no justification for the proposed VTC campus to be located in the urban area as there were university campuses in the New Territories. The Government should not allocate the waterfront site to VTC simply because the site met VTC's requirements. Allocating the site for CKL Park would benefit more people than the students in the proposed VTC campus.

R384 – Chan Lai Kuen

R386 – Chau Oi Fung

R409 – Chan Wai Ming

R425 – Cheng Ka Ka

R431 – Chan Choi Cheung

R474 – 石寶蓮

R680 – Kitty Tang

R689 – Wong Fu Wing

R759 – Lee Yan Ho

R885 – Tse King Cheung

R1117 – INIH

R1289 – Kwok Wai Chun

R1429 – 吳振波

R2040 – Paul Chow

R2195 – Lee Wai Lin

R2437 – Daniel Chan

R2606 – 董紹榮

R2717 – So Chi Mui

R2871 – 王寶珊

R3205 – Chan Man Hong

R3905 – Au Sing Hong

R4152 – Kwong Chun Ho

R4286 – 林寶蓮

R4309 – Cheng Kit Mei

R4379 – Wong Shui Yin

R5154 – Angel Chu

R5341 – Sophie Luk

R5570 – So

R5672 – Wong Shui Yin

R5843 – Stephen Cheng

R5990 – Chow Suet Ying

R6336 – 林

R7379 – Anthony Sung

R7783 – Yeung Choi Hung

R8723 – Vivien Lee

R9661 – Tsang Yat Chor

R452 – Yuen Hing Kwok David

R631 – Andy Tse

R688 – Wong Shek Hin

R700 – Lau Wai Yi

R803 – Pat Yim

R898 – Josephine Chan

R1254 – Kwong Chun Ho

R1296 – Wong Po San

R1573 – Wong Choi Ling

R2130 – 梁沛強

R2200 – Chan Hau Chi

R2555 – Chan Leong Yu

R2702 – Lee Siu Fung

R2815 – Charlotte Chan

R3018 – 楊少群

R3770 – 吳小鳳

R4142 – Chow Man Yuen

R4167 – Suen King Ho

R4287 – 劉仲祥

R4340 – Cheng Kwan Wai

R5152 – Lam Man Tat

R5277 – Chong Chung Loi

R5374 – 周

R5595 – So Tze Yin

R5778 – Melissa Chen

R5953 – Lee Nga Tung

R6042 – Cheung Sau Kwan

R7000 – 何雅妍

R7696 – Xu Yat Sing

R8401 – Ding Yuen Fong

R8971 – Chong Hoi Kwan

R9664 – Lee On Kei

R9698 – Leung Yuen Kam

R10074 – 周文元

R10091 – Josephine Jim

R10150 – Lee Miu Yee

R10285 – 周筱兵

R10684 – Lau Ka Yan

R10814 – Ng Fung Ming

R11380 – 李家絃

R9874 – 潘飛龍

R10083 – Ma Chiu Mo

R10092 – Ryan Wong

R10182 – Yung Lok Yi

R10470 – Fung Kum Ho

R10692 – Wing Pui Lung

R11314 – 林麗娟

R11533 – 黃月蓉

16. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Chong Hoi Kwan made the following main points :

- (a) she was a member of Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront Concern Group. The Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) and TIA reports in respect of the proposed VTC campus development were made available to the public for inspection on 18.2.2017 when the draft Kai Tak OZP was gazetted. However, it was revealed on 2.8.2017 that the building design of the proposed VTC campus would be revised. The revised technical reports with the revised scheme were made available for public inspection on 22.9.2017 after the deadline for making comments on the representations on 4.8.2017, which was unfair to the public as those technical reports would have implications on their representations and comments;

AVA

- (b) the AVA was not acceptable for the following reasons :
- (i) the AVA should compare different development options of the same development scale to identify the option with the least impact. However, the AVA for the proposed VTC campus compared two schemes with different development intensities. The original scheme (the baseline scheme) was inappropriate as the building

height (BH) exceeded the building height restriction (BHR) stipulated on the OZP. HC had also raised concerns on the site selection and massive building bulk. The development intensity of the baseline scheme was deliberately inflated to give a better air ventilation performance for the revised scheme, which adopted a lower plot ratio. The comparison of the two schemes was therefore invalid;

- (ii) the pedestrian footbridges linking the tower blocks were presented in the AVA model as 2-dimensional planes instead of 3-dimensional objects and the number of pedestrian footbridges was not updated. The methodology of the AVA was incorrect, resulting in inaccurate conclusion in favour of the revised scheme;
- (iii) the site spatial average velocity ratio (SVR) test points should be taken at the project site perimeter, for which the adjoining LPG filling station and an open space had been included but the new alignment of Wai Lok Street to the northwest of the VTC campus was omitted. Also, the local spatial average velocity ratio (LVR) test points which should be taken at open space and public roads had omitted the waterfront promenade, the new alignment of Wai Lok Street and the open space. The validity of the AVA report was dubious;
- (iv) the AVA indicated that there was no difference in air ventilation performance between the baseline scheme and the revised scheme for the annual east and east-northeast prevailing wind while there was a slight improvement for the southwest summer prevailing wind. However, the revised scheme would create a stagnant area on the northern side of the VTC building and most of the waterfront promenade under the annual prevailing wind, weak air movement at the waterfront promenade under the prevailing summer wind, with strong/gusty wind and turbulence at the

proposed open space. Pollutant from the adjacent LPG filling station as well as exhaust from the queuing vehicles within the LPG filling station and along CKL Road blowing into the proposed open space would cause health hazard for the park users;

- (v) ground decontamination works would be required at the existing LPG filling station to be vacated for the proposed VTC campus development while contamination would occur at the reprovisioned LPG filling station site;

TIA

- (c) the TIA was not acceptable for the following reasons :
 - (i) the proposed VTC campus would accommodate about 6,000 students, 800 staff, a 60-room teaching hotel and a 500-seat auditorium. The TIA made invalid assumptions that there would not be any traffic demand generated from hotel guest and participant of the 500-seat auditorium during peak hours;
 - (ii) the number of car parking spaces and loading/unloading (L/UL) bays to be provided in the proposed VTC campus at almost twice the requirement under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) was considered excessive although additional demand would be generated from the teaching hotel;
 - (iii) the queue of taxis waiting at CKL Road for refuelling at the existing LPG filling station was much longer than that presented in the TIA. As the reprovisioned LPG filling station would be bigger and attract more vehicles, the queuing situation would not be improved;
 - (iv) the TIA made inappropriate references to VTC campuses in Tsing

Yi and Kowloon Bay for non-private and private vehicle trips respectively. She suspected that these references were selected to produce favourable TIA results;

- (v) there was no explanation of why the peak hours were assumed at 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. respectively, and the peak hour from 3:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. for the adjoining LPG filling station had obviously not been taken into account. Also, the TIA had wrongly adopted the 3% increase in traffic between June and October observed in the 2014 Annual Traffic Census at Kwun Tong Bypass for the CKL waterfront area;
- (vi) it was estimated that 51% of students and staff of the proposed VTC campus would use shuttle bus service. Shuttle bus service running at a frequency of 4 minutes would be required to meet the demand, resulting in the requirement of 6 shuttle buses on the road simultaneously, which would have significant traffic impact on the road network. Besides, the impact of the illegal parking problem along CKL Road was also overlooked in proposing a shuttle bus stop at CKL Road outside the MTR Yau Tong Station. The shuttle buses departing from Yau Tong MTR Station would be required to go all the way to the roundabout at the junction of Ko Chiu Road and Lei Yue Mun Road to turn around for the return journey. The additional journey had not been taken into account;
- (vii) the increase in bus traffic to and from the bus terminus at Kwun Tong Ferry Pier generated by the proposed VTC campus had not been taken into account in the TIA as the bus routes did not go through those junctions being examined in the TIA. The TIA had also not taken into consideration the proposed Core Business District 2 (CBD2) development in Kwun Tong and the busiest section of Sin Fat Road was omitted in the pedestrian traffic survey in the TIA;

- (viii) there were discrepancies in the junction reserve capacities in various junctions between the current TIA of the proposed VTC campus and the TIA of the proposed CKL Koalin Mine site development carried out previously. In particular, the reserve capacity of 32% by 2026 at the Wai Yip Street/CKL Road junction with the proposed VTC campus was higher than that without the VTC campus; and

[Professor S.C. Wong arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (ix) the MTR Kwun Tong Line was operating at full capacity at present, and some stations had to adopt crowd management measures, such as intermittent closing of the entrance to the station, to disperse passengers at the platforms. The MTR would not be able to cope with the increase in traffic demand generated from the proposed VTC campus.

R341 – Ho Yung Kwong

17. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ho Yung Kwong made the following main points :

- (a) the Kowloon East development covering Kai Tak, Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay was visionary, particularly the proposed CBD2, which was now taking shape. There were many new developments near Kwun Tong Ferry Pier and commercial, hotel and residential developments in Kai Tak area;
- (b) as early as 2006, the then Secretary for Development announced that there should be a waterfront park at CKL. Such a vision was also shared in Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030 (HK2030+). It would be meaningless to have a good planning vision but not to execute that vision;

- (c) the proposed CKL Park located near the MTR Station would serve a population of 650,000 in Kwun Tong as well as residents from other districts. However, the CKL Park was taken away all of a sudden while about 1 ha of open space was proposed to be released from the VTC campus in the revised scheme;
- (d) according to the quality of life surveys of Monocle and Mercer, Hong Kong ranked 18 and 70 respectively in 2016. The relatively low ranking in the livability survey for Hong Kong had reflected the well-being of its residents. The Government could achieve a higher ranking for Hong Kong by leveraging our green and blue assets and developing CKL Park was a good opportunity to make good use of our harbour; and
- (e) the waterfront site should be protected from development and used for CKL Park for the enjoyment of the public. Once the site was allocated to VTC for campus development, the waterfront would be ruined.

[The meeting was adjourned for a short break.]

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai left, Ms Christina M. Lee and Mr Wilson Fung arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

R9514/C313 – Incorporated Owners of Selwyn Factory Building

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

- (a) Kwun Tong had undergone significant changes in the past 20 years from an industrial area to a business area with more service-oriented activities. That was acknowledged by the Government through the promulgation of CBD2 in Kwun Tong. Selwyn Factory Building had also undergone such a transformation;

- (b) office workers in Kwun Tong including those working in Selwyn Factory Building were expecting the implementation of CKL Park. Despite being located within the biggest constituency in Kwun Tong (namely District No. J01), owners in Selwyn Factory Building had not been consulted on the proposed VTC campus development at the site originally reserved for CKL Park;
- (c) many entrepreneurs started to realize that green space could relieve pressure of workers and provide open space/leisure facilities in offices. Journals from the Environmental Science and Medical Articles and Public Health Article 2017 revealed that exposure to natural green environment would reduce negative emotion, enhance energy levels, attention span and feelings of tranquility. Leisure activities in green spaces would have positive emotional effects and was beneficial to the physical and mental well-being of workers; and
- (d) the Central Park in Manhattan, New York occupied about 10% of the land area of the city and it was still expanding, it showed that green space was important in a densely populated city. Similarly, more green space was needed in Brooklyn while it was being developed into a silicon valley in New York. The Government should consider retaining the much needed CKL Park in developing Kowloon East into CBD2 for the workers there.

R287 – Kwok Man Sun

R344 – Tung Man Yan Keith

R355 – Sum Tin Lam

R540 – Herman Kwan

R661 – Ma Hon Man

R692 – Ng Cheuk Lam

R727 – Ho Mei Ngan

R793 – 李廣煊

R877 – Mak Shuk Ying

R288 – Li Kai Kwong

R349 – A Goel

R449 – 吳滿康

R659 – Wong Chung Sing

R691 – Chan Chin Ngai

R699 – Ho Mei Kuen

R743 – Darius Engineer

R795 – Cabia Chau

R995 – 張偉泉

R1015 – Yu Kwan Wei

R1062 – Sally Chan

R1187 – 鍾麗莎

R1335 – S.S.K. Mak

R1618 – 吳滿康

R1807 – Y.M. Tang

R2103 – 余碧嫻

R2135 – 郭宇眉

R2287 – 孫穎榕

R2308 – Chan Wing Kong

R2334 – Maggie Wong

R2980 – Fok Lai Ha

R3384 – Leung

R3662 – Tranny Wong

R3761 – Alvin Li Man Lok

R3816 – 李港生

R4558 – Chung Sau Lan Shirley

R4621 – 潘培文

R4669 – Poon Tin Ting

R4671 – 曾思敏

R5324 – Lau Hiu Lam

R5842 – Chow Ho Wai

R6025 – 麥粵榮

R6167 – Lau Chi Keung

R6474 – Yip Wing Lam

R6634 – Siu Hon Tak

R6808 – Au Lai Fong

R7768 – Wong See King

R7810 – Wong Shek Nam

R7840 – Siu Hon Tak

R8089 – Twinsen Dat

R1036 – Hung Siu Wai

R1124 – K. K. Yu

R1195 – K.M. Fok

R1367 – Fok Wing Yan

R1756 – Lui Graham

R1870 – 潘家行

R2105 – 吳鳳儀

R2286 – 孫振威

R2288 – 孫業波

R2331 – Leung Siu Fan

R2962 – Ng Mun Hong

R3072 – Chan Siu Fung

R3468 – Larry Yiu Hak Wai

R3757 – Hui Yuen Mei

R3764 – Ho Wai Yee

R3929 – Maggie Wong

R4562 – Fung Man Fai

R4665 – Leung

R4670 – Poon Pui Ping

R4676 – 陳惠仁

R5651 – Lo Ting Fai Danny

R5936 – Evans Tung

R6040 – Cheung Yuk Kwan

R6183 – 陳永樂

R6619 – Tung Yin Wong

R6649 – 林炎淑

R6892 – Lau Wing Cheuk

R7777 – Lau Sin Yan

R7824 – Cheuk Hei Kiu

R8046 – 陳

R8121 – Wong Chuem Por

R8278 – Law Kwok Tung

R8551 – Joseph Yip

R9137 – Mack Kwong Ping Anthony

R9288 – Ashwani Goel

R9820 – 周澤鋒

R10372 – Li Chun Oi

R10716 – Tracy Leung Wai Yee

R11038 – Wong Sin Yee Olivia

R11529 – Cheng Cha

R11937 – 郭頌民

R8313 – Maggie Siu Ping Wong

R8890 – Paul Cheuk

R9237 – Kiet Duong

R9684 – Tsang Ling Shan

R10356 – 吳美蓮

R10507 – 區兆峯

R10874 – Ho Kin Chung

R11300 – Ooi Hio Kien

R11580 – Lo Shiu Yin

19. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Wong Sin Yee Olivia made the following main points :

- (a) she was a former professional sportsman. From the perspective of a sportsman, CKL Park was needed in Kowloon East and the waterfront site should not be allocated to VTC for campus development;
- (b) she moved to Lam Tin a couple of years ago in anticipation of the planned CKL Park and a better living environment;
- (c) according to some surveys on public parks in Hong Kong by the International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 71% of park users were adults (over 20 years of age) and the elderly; 43% of those park users were frequent park visitors. Considering the total population (645,000 in 2016) and the number of adults/elderly (544,000 in 2016) in Kwun Tong, the demand for public open space was substantial. The demand would further increase due to the aging and increasing population;
- (d) Kwun Tong was among those districts with a lower than average personal and household income. Children did not have adequate after-school

activities. It was important that public open space, which was free-of-charge, was made available to them;

- (e) CKL Park was more suitable for the waterfront site for the following considerations :
- (i) People – there was an increasing trend in the number of people participating in sports events including Hong Kong Marathon, Hong Kong Cross Harbour Race and Run Our City. Public open space was required for practising;
 - (ii) Landscape – according to HKPSG, regional open space should be located close to major public transport routes and take advantage of natural landscape, waterfront, harbour views and/or views to special features. The waterfront site for CKL Park met the above locational requirements;
 - (iii) Accessibility – a research by Professor Tang Bo-sin in 2017 revealed that open space with waterfront access in Hong Kong were often located close to up-market, low-density housing areas and mixed commercial-business zones. CKL Park should be implemented in order that a waterfront park be also provided to serve the high-density development in Kwun Tong. Moreover, allocating the waterfront site to VTC for campus development and to relocate a LPG filling station to a nearby site was not in line with the Harbour Planning Guidelines for Victoria Harbour and Harbourfront Areas (HPG) which stated that a traffic-free environment along the harbourfront was encouraged;
 - (iv) Comfort – the open space to be provided within the VTC campus would not adequately meet the demand from the population in Kwun Tong in terms of spaciousness and comfort. The nearby LPG filling station with queuing taxis on streets would cause pollution

and pose traffic safety hazards;

- (v) Engaging – the planned CKL Park was the outcome of a 3-year public consultation from 2004 to 2006 while the public was not consulted on the VTC campus development. There were 11,838 representations and 1,121 comments objecting to the rezoning of the CKL Park site. Also, the site had been fenced off, which was not in line with the HPG that temporary uses along harbourfront areas should not affect public view or physical access to the harbour, nor should they have adverse traffic and environmental impacts on the locality;

- (vi) Sharing of spaces – according to surveys on public parks in Hong Kong, different age groups would use the park at different periods. The elderly made up to 73% of all park users before 7:00 a.m., and most of them would go to the park on foot. The provision of the planned CKL Park would not have adverse traffic impact on the area and would be accessible for the elderly in Kwun Tong area.

[Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang left this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (f) the HPG encouraged uses such as open space, retail, dining, recreation, leisure, cultural and tourism-related facilities along the harbourfront areas that would promote vibrancy and diversity and enhance public enjoyment. Educational use such as a VTC campus did not comply with the above criteria;

- (g) the waterfront site should not be allocated to VTC for campus development as it would only serve about 6,000 students. A waterfront site was not essential for the proposed VTC campus. VTC should consider in-situ redevelopment in the existing VTC campus instead; and

- (h) while it was stressed in the 2017 Policy Address that the Government

would take the views of the public and develop Hong Kong together, it should not give up the planned CKL Park so easily if it wished to maintain its credibility.

[The meeting was adjourned for a lunch break at 12:40 p.m.]

20. The meeting was resumed at 2:00 p.m. on 3.1.2018.

21. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting:

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

Chairperson

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-Chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Ms Christina M. Lee

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

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

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

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

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Agenda Item 1 (Continued)

[Open Meeting]

Group 2

Presentation and Question Sessions (Continued)

22. The following government representatives, and 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)

Representers, Commenters and their representatives

R287 – Kwok Man Sun

R288 – Li Kai Kwong

R344 – Tung Man Yan Keith

R349 – A Goel

R355 – Sum Tin Lam

R449 – 吳滿康

R540 – Herman Kwan

R659 – Wong Chung Sing

R661 – Ma Hon Man

R691 – Chan Chin Ngai

R692 – Ng Cheuk Lam

R699 – Ho Mei Kuen

R727 – Ho Mei Ngan
R793 – 李廣煊
R877 – Mak Shuk Ying
R1015 – Yu Kwan Wei
R1062 – Sally Chan
R1187 – 鍾麗莎
R1335 – S.S.K. Mak
R1618 – 吳滿康
R1807 – Y.M. Tang
R2103 – 余碧嫻
R2135 – 郭宇眉
R2287 – 孫穎榕
R2308 – Chan Wing Kong
R2334 – Maggie Wong
R2980 – Fok Lai Ha
R3384 – Leung
R3662 – Tranny Wong
R3761 – Alvin Li Man Lok
R3816 – 李港生
R4558 – Chung Sau Lan Shirley
R4621 – 潘培文
R4669 – Poon Tin Ting
R4671 – 曾思敏
R5324 – Lau Hiu Lam
R5842 – Chow Ho Wai
R6025 – 麥粵榮
R6167 – Lau Chi Keung
R6474 – Yip Wing Lam
R6634 – Siu Hon Tak
R6808 – Au Lai Fong
R7768 – Wong See King

R743 – Darius Engineer
R795 – Cabia Chau
R995 – 張偉泉
R1036 – Hung Siu Wai
R1124 – K. K. Yu
R1195 – K.M. Fok
R1367 – Fok Wing Yan
R1756 – Lui Graham
R1870 – 潘家行
R2105 – 吳鳳儀
R2286 – 孫振威
R2288 – 孫業波
R2331 – Leung Siu Fan
R2962 – Ng Mun Hong
R3072 – Chan Siu Fung
R3468 – Larry Yiu Hak Wai
R3757 – Hui Yuen Mei
R3764 – Ho Wai Yee
R3929 – Maggie Wong
R4562 – Fung Man Fai
R4665 – Leung
R4670 – Poon Pui Ping
R4676 – 陳惠仁
R5651 – Lo Ting Fai Danny
R5936 – Evans Tung
R6040 – Cheung Yuk Kwan
R6183 – 陳永樂
R6619 – Tung Yin Wong
R6649 – 林焯淑
R6892 – Lau Wing Cheuk
R7777 – Lau Sin Yan

- R7810 – Wong Shek Nam
R7840 – Siu Hon Tak
R8089 – Twinsen Dat
R8278 – Law Kwok Tung
R8551 – Joseph Yip
R9137 – Mack Kwong Ping Anthony
R9288 – Ashwani Goel
R9820 – 周澤鋒
R10372 – Li Chun Oi
R10716 – Tracy Leung Wai Yee
R11038 – Wong Sin Yee Olivia
R11529 – Cheng Cha
R11937 – 郭頌民
Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront - Representers and Representatives’
Concern Group – representative
Ms Wong Sin Yee Olivia
- R308 – Y.T. Chan
R493 – Leung Yiu Por
R609 – Lai Kit Yee
R716 – Kwong Heung
R828 – T.T. Lai
R939 – Wong Po Chun
R1224 – Yan Lau
R1336 – Cheng Wing Hung
R1936 – Lee Sau Kwan
R2001 – Ivan Leung
R2206 – Cora Ching
R2356 – 李筱玲
R2423 – C.W. Yim
R2514 – 李文俊
R2545 – Ip Lun Shu
- R7824 – Cheuk Hei Kiu
R8046 – 陳
R8121 – Wong Chuem Por
R8313 – Maggie Siu Ping Wong
R8890 – Paul Cheuk
R9237 – Kiet Duong
R9684 – Tsang Ling Shan
R10356 – 吳美蓮
R10507 – 區兆峯
R10874 – Ho Kin Chung
R11300 – Ooi Hio Kien
R11580 – Lo Shiu Yin
R313 – 梁偉強
R570 – Tam Kok Hung
R618 – K.Y. Lai
R813 – Cheung Siu Yan
R842 – 陳德鑫
R958 – Leung Man Ka
R1270 – Chik Kar Lai
R1754 – Lo Chun Tung
R1938 – Lo Chun Ting
R2109 – 李靜芬
R2333 – Liu Wai Ngor Amy
R2368 – Chik Kar Kei Jackie
R2440 – Edith Lam
R2515 – 李日銘
R2566 – Leung Wai Lun

R2584 – Liu Heung Ling Sally
R2746 – 徐玉成
R2891 – 鄭誠
R2968 – Ng Chung Fat
R3126 – Wong Oi Yu
R3467 – Y.T. Chan
R3820 – Ng Yuk King
R3908 – Kwan Chui Wai Ching Krina
R4597 – Wong Ka Fai
R4866 – 陳洪良
R5004 – Cheung Siu Nan
R5120 – Lau Wai
R5462 – Albert Au
R5557 – Suki Lai
R5575 – Lo Wing Yan
R5739 – 李曼麗
R6002 – Lau Po Che
R6044 – Lo Siu Ming
R6096 – Kelvin Chan
R6408 – Kong Chi Nang
R6647 – 蘇慈妹
R6810 – Chung Ming San Kay
R6885 – Henry Ng
R7475 – Kitty Lau Kit Fung
R7477 – 陳巨秀
R7605 – K.Y. Lai
R7901 – Stanley Tung
R8335 – Wong Hiu Lai
R8963 – Mavis Lo
R9055 – Cynthia Leung
R10157 – K.Y. Lai

R2592 – Chow Chui Yi
R2835 – Kwok Siu Mei
R2958 – Tam Shuk Kuen
R3082 – Cynthia Kwok
R3138 – 周卓宏
R3542 – 黃苓斐
R3907 – Peng Jui Hui
R3909 – Connie Mak
R4645 – 李靜修
R4931 – Jean Chi
R5025 – 李靜嫻
R5275 – Yu Kwan Wang
R5519 – Lau Ping Yuk
R5564 – Li Li
R5591 – M.C. Leung
R5788 – Stephaine Law
R6036 – Lo Pui Wa
R6055 – Goretti Foo
R6097 – Tammy Yeung
R6592 – 吳靜英
R6691 – Wong Nok Ying
R6813 – Lai Kit Mei
R6950 – Ring Law
R7476 – Ka Cheung
R7480 – K.M. Lai
R7781 – Ting Lai
R8183 – Lau Po Che
R8581 – 歐子鋒
R8975 – 歐陽國緯
R9952 – David Leung
R10227 – Ng Yuk King

- R10455 – Eric Au Yeung
R11506 – Peng Ching Yu
R10653 – Franky Wong Chun Ho
R11088 – Li Sin Yi Cindy
Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront - Representers and Representatives’
Concern Group – representative
Mr Tam Kok Hung
- R384 – Chan Lai Kuen
R409 – Chan Wai Ming
R431 – Chan Choi Cheung
R474 – Shek Po Lin
R680 – Kitty Tang
R689 – Wong Fu Wing
R759 – Lee Yan Ho
R885 – Tse King Cheung
R1117 – INIH
R1289 – Kwok Wai Chun
R1429 – 吳振波
R2040 – Paul Chow
R2195 – Lee Wai Lin
R2437 – Daniel Chan
R2606 – 董紹榮
R2717 – So Chi Mui
R2871 – 王寶珊
R3205 – Chan Man Hong
R3905 – Au Sing Hong
R4152 – Kwong Chun Ho
R4286 – 林寶蓮
R4309 – Cheng Kit Mei
R4379 – Wong Shui Yin
R5154 – Angel Chu
- R11505 – 吳佩儀
R11625 – Chan Lap Chun
R11087 – Lai Ka Fai
R11653 – Wong Kit Ping
R386 – Chau Oi Fung
R425 – Cheng Ka Ka
R452 – Yuen Hing Kwok David
R631 – Andy Tse
R688 – Wong Shek Hin
R700 – Lau Wai Yi
R803 – Pat Yim
R898 – Josephine Chan
R1254 – Kwong Chun Ho
R1296 – Wong Po San
R1573 – Wong Choi Ling
R2130 – 梁沛強
R2200 – Chan Hau Chi
R2555 – Chan Leong Yu
R2702 – Lee Siu Fung
R2815 – Charlotte Chan
R3018 – 楊少群
R3770 – 吳小鳳
R4142 – Chow Man Yuen
R4167 – Suen King Ho
R4287 – 劉仲祥
R4340 – Cheng Kwan Wai
R5152 – Lam Man Tat
R5277 – Chong Chung Loi

<u>R5341 – Sophie Luk</u>		<u>R5374 – 周</u>	
<u>R5570 – So</u>		<u>R5595 – So Tze Yin</u>	
<u>R5672 – Wong Shui Yin</u>		<u>R5778 – Melissa Chen</u>	
<u>R5843 – Stephen Cheng</u>		<u>R5953 – Lee Nga Tung</u>	
<u>R5990 – Chow Suet Ying</u>		<u>R6042 – Cheung Sau Kwan</u>	
<u>R6336 – 林</u>		<u>R7000 – 何雅妍</u>	
<u>R7379 – Anthony Sung</u>		<u>R7696 – Xu Yat Sing</u>	
<u>R7783 – Yeung Choi Hung</u>		<u>R8401 – Ding Yuen Fong</u>	
<u>R8723 – Vivien Lee</u>		<u>R8971 – Chong Hoi Kwan</u>	
<u>R9661 – Tsang Yat Chor</u>		<u>R9664 – Lee On Kei</u>	
<u>R9698 – Leung Yuen Kam</u>		<u>R9874 – 潘飛龍</u>	
<u>R10074 – 周文元</u>		<u>R10083 – Ma Chiu Mo</u>	
<u>R10091 – Josephine Jim</u>		<u>R10092 – Ryan Wong</u>	
<u>R10150 – Lee Miu Yee</u>		<u>R10182 – Yung Lok Yi</u>	
<u>R10285 – 周筱兵</u>		<u>R10470 – Fung Kum Ho</u>	
<u>R10684 – Lau Ka Yan</u>		<u>R10692 – Wing Pui Lung</u>	
<u>R10814 – Ng Fung Ming</u>		<u>R11314 – 林麗娟</u>	
<u>R11380 – 李家絃</u>		<u>R11533 – 黃月蓉</u>	
Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront Concern Group –]]	Representer and Representatives’ representatives	
Ms Chong Hoi Kwan]]		
Mr Tse Chun Wah]]		
<u>R2184 – Wu Koon Keung</u>			
Mr Wu Koon Keung	-	Representer	
<u>R2380 – Chan I Fong</u>			
Ms Chan I Fong	-	Representer	
<u>R4250 – Lam Hau Yeung Stephen</u>		<u>R7137 – Ng Sau Wah</u>	
<u>R8052 – Lai Chi Man</u>		<u>R10267 – Sin Yuen Sum Carol</u>	
<u>R10268 – Hau Yuk Kee</u>			

Mr Li Wai Lam William - Representers' representative

R7677 – Leung Wai Ching

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer's representative

23. The Chairperson then invited the representers, commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their representations and comments.

R308 – Y.T. Chan

R313 – 梁偉強

R493 – Leung Yiu Por

R570 – Tam Kok Hung

R609 – Lai Kit Yee

R618 – K.Y. Lai

R716 – Kwong Heung

R813 – Cheung Siu Yan

R828 – T.T. Lai

R842 – 陳德鑫

R939 – Wong Po Chun

R958 – Leung Man Ka

R1224 – Yan Lau

R1270 – Chik Kar Lai

R1336 – Cheng Wing Hung

R1754 – Lo Chun Tung

R1936 – Lee Sau Kwan

R1938 – Lo Chun Ting

R2001 – Ivan Leung

R2109 – 李靜芬

R2206 – Cora Ching

R2333 – Liu Wai Ngor Amy

R2356 – 李筱玲

R2368 – Chik Kar Kei Jackie

R2423 – C.W. Yim

R2440 – Edith Lam

R2514 – 李文俊

R2515 – 李日銘

R2545 – Ip Lun Shu

R2566 – Leung Wai Lun

R2584 – Liu Heung Ling Sally

R2592 – Chow Chui Yi

R2746 – 徐玉成

R2835 – Kwok Siu Mei

R2891 – 鄭誠

R2958 – Tam Shuk Kuen

R2968 – Ng Chung Fat

R3082 – Cynthia Kwok

R3126 – Wong Oi Yu

R3138 – 周卓宏

R3467 – Y.T. Chan

R3542 – 黃苓斐

R3820 – Ng Yuk King

R3907 – Peng Jui Hui

R3908 – Kwan Chui Wai Ching Krina

R3909 – Connie Mak

<u>R4597 – Wong Ka Fai</u>	<u>R4645 – 李靜修</u>
<u>R4866 – 陳洪良</u>	<u>R4931 – Jean Chi</u>
<u>R5004 – Cheung Siu Nan</u>	<u>R5025 – 李靜嫻</u>
<u>R5120 – Lau Wai</u>	<u>R5275 – Yu Kwan Wang</u>
<u>R5462 – Albert Au</u>	<u>R5519 – Lau Ping Yuk</u>
<u>R5557 – Suki Lai</u>	<u>R5564 – Li Li</u>
<u>R5575 – Lo Wing Yan</u>	<u>R5591 – M.C. Leung</u>
<u>R5739 – 李曼麗</u>	<u>R5788 – Stephaine Law</u>
<u>R6002 – Lau Po Che</u>	<u>R6036 – Lo Pui Wa</u>
<u>R6044 – Lo Siu Ming</u>	<u>R6055 – Goretti Foo</u>
<u>R6096 – Kelvin Chan</u>	<u>R6097 – Tammy Yeung</u>
<u>R6408 – Kong Chi Nang</u>	<u>R6592 – 吳靜英</u>
<u>R6647 – 蘇慈妹</u>	<u>R6691 – Wong Nok Ying</u>
<u>R6810 – Chung Ming San Kay</u>	<u>R6813 – Lai Kit Mei</u>
<u>R6885 – Henry Ng</u>	<u>R6950 – Ring Law</u>
<u>R7475 – Kitty Lau Kit Fung</u>	<u>R7476 – Ka Cheung</u>
<u>R7477 – 陳巨秀</u>	<u>R7480 – K.M. Lai</u>
<u>R7605 – K.Y. Lai</u>	<u>R7781 – Ting Lai</u>
<u>R7901 – Stanley Tung</u>	<u>R8183 – Lau Po Che</u>
<u>R8335 – Wong Hiu Lai</u>	<u>R8581 – 歐子鋒</u>
<u>R8963 – Mavis Lo</u>	<u>R8975 – 歐陽國緯</u>
<u>R9055 – Cynthia Leung</u>	<u>R9952 – David Leung</u>
<u>R10157 – K.Y. Lai</u>	<u>R10227 – Ng Yuk King</u>
<u>R10455 – Eric Au Yeung</u>	<u>R11505 – 吳佩儀</u>
<u>R11506 – Peng Ching Yu</u>	<u>R11625 – Chan Lap Chun</u>
<u>R10653 – Franky Wong Chun Ho</u>	<u>R11087 – Lai Ka Fai</u>
<u>R11088 – Li Sin Yi Cindy</u>	<u>R11653 – Wong Kit Ping</u>

24. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Tam Kok Hung made the following main points:

- (a) the Kwun Tong Promenade was not located close to the residential

areas and was inconvenient to the general public especially the elderly people on wheelchairs;

- (b) there was a polyclinic at Sin Fat Road which was frequently used by the elderly people in the low-income group. The planned Cha Kwo Ling (CKL) Park would provide an accessible open space at the waterfront to serve the elderly people;
- (c) there was no genuine need for the new Vocational Training Council (VTC) campus. According to the population data provided by the Census and Statistics Department, it was estimated that the birth rate and working population would be in decline after 2018 while the population of elderly people was on a rising trend. There was a possibility that the student intake of VTC would become insufficient by 2035 and it would be too late to close down the proposed VTC campus or implement any remedial action by then. The need for a waterfront open space to serve the aging population was more imminent than that of a new VTC campus;
- (d) if the birth rate increased in the future as claimed by VTC, the expansion of other universities and tertiary institutions might also be necessary. Besides, while the consultant of VTC claimed in the hearing session held on 7.12.2017 that VTC graduates were welcome by the business sector, he would be interested to know if the consultant had employed any VTC graduates;
- (e) in the light of the extensive public transport network in Hong Kong, it would not be necessary to locate the new VTC campus in the urban area. As EDB often encouraged students to study or participate in exchange programmes in the Mainland, the VTC should consider building the new campus in the Big Bay area;
- (f) given the pleasing environment of the new VTC campus at a waterfront

location, there was concern if the VTC graduates would find it difficult to adapt to the not-so-pleasant working environment in the future;

- (g) Kwun Tong Promenade was only a residual space upon construction of the Kwun Tong Bypass. Although the Kwun Tong District had been developed vastly since the 1980s, the Government had not provided any open space or breathing space for the residents;
- (h) the waterfront of Cha Kwo Ling had been occupied by polluting uses in the past including public cargo handling area, waste recycling facilities, government supplies warehouse and liquefied Petrol Gas (LPG) filling station. While the residents were pleased to learn about the proposal for CKL Park in 2014, such proposal had been overturned by the current amendments to the Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). The proposed VTC campus would deprive the residents of East Kowloon of their long-awaited benefits. The revised scheme of the VTC campus could in no way compensate for the residents' loss;
- (i) the findings of the traffic impact assessment (TIA) report were arbitrary. The new VTC campus would certainly bring about adverse traffic impacts to the surrounding areas. The proposed shuttle bus service would also create additional burden on the road network in Yau Tong;
- (j) the traffic condition in Kwun Tong had been poor. Many transport operators were unwilling to carry out deliveries on weekdays due to the congested road network; and
- (k) there were many other suitable alternative locations for the new VTC campus. The decision to shelve the planned CKL Park should be reconsidered in particular for benefits of the future generations.

R4250 – Lam Hau Yeung Stephen

R8052 – Lai Chi Man

R7137 – Ng Sau Wah

R10267 – Sin Yuen Sum Carol

R10268 – Hau Yuk Kee

25. With the aid of the visualiser, Mr Li Wai Lam William, made the following main points:

- (a) public consultation of the OZP amendments had not been conducted in accordance with the ‘Guideline on Public Consultation’ promulgated by the then Constitutional Affairs Bureau in 2003 which was applicable to government’s public consultation process. In the present case, some concerned stakeholders, including a local residents’ group of CKL and the business operators in Kwun Tong who were either directly or indirectly affected by the OZP amendments, had not been consulted by PlanD. Moreover, public opinion surveys had not been carried out to ascertain public views on the OZP amendments, and the Government had not organised any public events such as media briefing or luncheon speech to explain the proposals to the general public;
- (b) according to the judgment of a judicial review (JR) application handed down in 2004, the Court held that the ‘Sedley Principles’ should be followed in public consultation process, i.e. proper consultation should be undertaken at a time when proposals were still at a formative stage; sufficient reasons for the proposal should be given to allow those consulted to give due consideration and response; adequate time should be given for consideration and response; and the result of consultation should be conscientiously taken into account when the ultimate decision was taken. In the current case, procedural impropriety might arise as the revised scheme of the VTC campus submitted as a comment on representation had not been published for public inspection. Moreover, inadequate time had been allowed for the public to make comments and responses on the revised scheme;
- (c) in the JR application in respect of the Hoi Ha, Pak Lap and So Lo Pun OZPs, the Court had ruled that the Board’s decision was made based on

inaccurate facts. The Court's ruling was applicable to the current case, as representers and commenters had raised doubts over the accuracy of the baseline design, building model, assumptions of the TIA report and air ventilation assessment (AVA) report, and proved that there was a genuine need for CKL Park;

- (d) the waterfront areas were treasured in other cities such as Singapore and Barcelona. Given the Government's plan to develop East Kowloon into another Core Business District (CBD), it would be more appropriate to develop the subject site as CKL Park to serve the local residents as well as the workers in East Kowloon;
- (e) there were other sites suitable for development of the new VTC campus, including a site zoned "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") at Pok Yin Road on the Tai Po OZP which was originally reserved for tertiary educational use;
- (f) the Open University of Hong Kong had been granted a site for developing a new nursing and healthcare complex, which would be completed in 2020 and provide a supply of over 2,000 fresh graduates for the healthcare sector each year. He doubted whether healthcare education programme should still be provided in the new VTC campus;
- (g) the proposed re-provisioning of the two existing campuses, i.e. the Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education (IVE)(Haking Wong) and IVE (Kwun Tong) sites, at the expense of the CKL Park site, was suspected to be a deal made between VTC and the Government to release those two sites for housing development;
- (h) according to media reports, New Frontier, an investment company, had entered into partnership with a few institutions in Hong Kong to train healthcare workers for the Mainland, and experts from VTC would provide training courses for carers in healthcare institutions under New

Frontier. It could therefore be inferred that the new VTC campus would be used for training healthcare workers for the Mainland;

- (i) under the VTC Ordinance (Cap.1130), if the VTC performed any of its functions outside Hong Kong for the training or education of a person, no subsidy should be made available by the Government towards the performance of such functions and no subsidy provided by the Government to the VTC should be used to subsidize the performance of such functions;
- (j) the LPG filling station was incompatible with the reprovisioned soccer pitch as the former would pose potential safety concerns on the users of the latter; and
- (k) the number of large parks and open spaces were limited in Kwun Tong. The CKL Park should be built to provide a sizeable and accessible open space at the waterfront for enjoyment by couples and families alike. If the subject site was used for the proposed VTC campus, the Government would break its promise to implement CKL Park and limit the usage of the waterfront by the general public. The CKL Park would be much superior than the small public open space proposed by VTC which was located next to the LPG filling station.

[Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang returned to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

26. 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 she 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. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

VTC Ordinance

27. In response to the question of the Chairperson, Mr Li Wai Lam William (representative of R4250 and others) clarified that the alleged partnership between VTC and New Frontier would not result in a contravention of the VTC Ordinance if VTC's functions were carried out in Hong Kong. That said, he still believed it would be a relevant consideration in deciding whether such a prime site should be allocated for the VTC campus.

Public Consultation

28. A Member asked the representers and their representatives why the public consultation process for the OZP amendments was considered improper. In response, Mr Li Wai Lam William said that the revised scheme for the VTC campus had not been published for public inspection.

29. In response to the enquiry of the Chairperson, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, PlanD said that in accordance with the Town Planning Ordinance, the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/5 was exhibited for public inspection for two months and representations from VTC as well as concern groups, owners' committees, local residents and members of the general public had been received. Upon publication of the representations, VTC had submitted a comment in response to the adverse representations including a revised scheme for the new VTC campus which proposed to reduce the total gross floor area by 22% and the number of building blocks from three to two, and to provide a public open space (POS) of one hectare within the subject site. The revised scheme was submitted by VTC under its comment on representations and did not form part of the gazetted draft OZP. The Board should decide whether to make amendments to the draft OZP after taking into consideration the grounds and proposals put forward under all the representations and comments.

30. A Member asked whether VTC could make further changes to the revised scheme for the new VTC campus after the OZP amendments were approved. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that under the OZP amendments, the subject site was rezoned to

“G/IC” with stipulation of building height restrictions (BHRs) and was intended for development of the new VTC campus. The revised scheme for the VTC campus with reduced gross floor area (GFA) and additional POS was always permitted under the “G/IC” zoning and would not warrant further amendments to the OZP. However, should the Board consider appropriate, relevant design requirements for the VTC development could be stipulated in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP to guide the future development at the detailed design stage.

31. In response, Ms Chong Hoi Kwan (R8971) said that since the design of the VTC campus as well as the provision and configuration of the proposed POS could still be subject to further changes, the Board should consider whether the “G/IC” zoning for the subject site was appropriate. Ms Mary Mulvihill (representative of R7677) said that given the significant difference in land usage between the original scheme and the revised scheme, approving the OZP amendments based on the comment submitted by VTC might set an undesirable precedent for other private developers to follow suit. If the Board was only required to decide whether the “G/IC” zoning was appropriate for the subject site, the discussion on air ventilation and traffic impacts of the new VTC campus would appear to be unnecessary.

Air Ventilation Aspect

32. Some Members raised the following questions relating to air ventilation :
- (a) given that there could be different design schemes for the new VTC campus, why the assessment of air ventilation impact was required at the current stage;
 - (b) how the air ventilation performance of the proposed VTC campus was assessed, and whether AVA comparing the original and revised schemes with different development intensities was appropriate;
 - (c) why the BH of one of the schemes under assessment had exceeded the BHR stipulated on the OZP; and

- (d) whether the number of test points used in the AVA was adequate.

33. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip made the following main points with the aid of the visualizer/some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) an AVA was required to assess the air ventilation impact of the proposed development on the surrounding and to identify possible good design elements which had to be retained in the detailed design. Subject to the Board's decision, appropriate requirements for good design elements could be stipulated in the ES of the OZP and reflected in the relevant land lease to ensure that they would be duly incorporated in the future building design;
- (b) the AVA reports were conducted in accordance with the requirements set out under the Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau Technical Circular (TC) No. 1/06 issued by the Government;
- (c) in support of the OZP amendments for the subject site, VTC submitted an AVA report (First AVA) comparing the air ventilation impacts of three development schemes: (i) the existing scheme which represented the existing condition, (ii) an intermediate scheme which adopted a single block design with a BH of 70mPD, and (iii) the original scheme comprised of 3 building blocks;
- (d) according to the First AVA, the intermediate scheme was formulated as one of the options to assess and compare the air ventilation performance of different building designs. The BH of that scheme was assumed at 70mPD at that time before the BHR was proposed on the OZP. Such BH now exceeded the BHR of 60mPD for part of the subject site on the OZP;
- (e) three sets of test points, i.e. perimeter test points along the site boundary, overall test points at the pedestrian walkways and open spaces in the

surrounding, and special test points along the waterfront promenade, at the reprovisioned soccer pitch and within the VTC site, had been allocated to assess the air ventilation performance of each development scheme. According to the findings of the First AVA, the overall performances of the existing scheme, intermediate scheme and original scheme on pedestrian wind environment in terms of site spatial average velocity ratio (SVR), local spatial average velocity ratio (LVR) and special test points were generally comparable;

- (f) in support of the revised scheme with 2 blocks which had a different BH profile as compared to the original scheme, VTC had submitted another AVA report (Second AVA) to compare the air ventilation performance of the two schemes. Again, three sets of test points, i.e. perimeter test points, overall test points and special test points, had been allocated for assessment purpose; and
- (g) a comparison between the original scheme and the revised scheme was considered acceptable as it could demonstrate the difference in air ventilation performance between the development which complied with the restrictions under the amended OZP and the revised scheme proposed by VTC in response to public views. According to the findings of the Second AVA, the overall performances of the two schemes on pedestrian wind environment were similar.

34. In response, Ms Chong Hoi Kwan (R8971) said that the accuracy of the findings of the AVA reports was questionable. First, a comparison of the air ventilation performance between the baseline scheme and the revised scheme had not been conducted in the AVAs in accordance with the requirements of TC No. 1/06. Second, the boundary test points were not positioned along the boundary of the VTC campus site but rather at that of a larger area comprising also the LPG filling station and the soccer pitch. Hence, some test points which should be located along Wai Lok Street had not been taken into account in the assessment. Moreover, those test points along the waterfront, which should be regarded as open space, should be included as overall test points in the assessment of LVR. Rather, they

were taken as special test points in the AVA such that more favourable result might be obtained for VTC.

35. Mr Wu Koon Keung (R2184) commented that the discussion should focus on the planning of the CKL waterfront in the context of the long-term development of Hong Kong before going into the technical aspects of the proposed developments.

Open Space Development

36. A Member raised the following questions relating to open space development :

- (a) whether the open space provision in Kwun Tong district was adequate; and
- (b) what the conditions of the existing and planned open spaces were.

37. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip made the following main points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) according to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), the standards for provision of open space were 1m² of district open space (DO) and 1m² of local open space (LO) per person. For Kwun Tong District which had a planned population of about 720,000, the existing and planned provisions of both DO and LO, which amounted to 137 ha and 96 ha respectively, were more than sufficient to meet the HKPSG requirements of about 72 ha each for DO and LO. Taking into account the proposed one-hectare POS to be released from the VTC site which would make the POS provision at the CKL waterfront remain the same, the total provision of open space in the district would not be affected by the OZP amendments;
- (b) as shown in the PowerPoint slides indicating the location of the open spaces, the existing and planned open spaces were fairly distributed

across Kwun Tong District, and a list of the existing open spaces had been prepared for the Board's reference;

- (c) while all the existing open spaces were accessible to the general public, the implementation of some of the planned open spaces were subject to resource availability and development programme of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department; and
- (d) for the planned open spaces, their existing conditions varied and some of them had been occupied by other uses. For example, the planned "O" site at Wing Fuk Street, which had an area of about 1,600m² comprising some private land, was currently occupied by temporary structures and some trees; while the "O" site at Fan Wa Street, which had an area of about 400m², was currently fenced off and covered by vegetation.

38. At the request of the Chairperson, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that the relevant information on the provision and distribution of open spaces in Kwun Tong District would be uploaded to the Board's website for information of the general public after the meeting.

39. Mr Wu Koon Keung (R2184) said that the planned CKL Park was located at a prime site along the waterfront and its quality could not be replaced by the provision of open space at other locations.

40. Ms Chong Hoi Kwan (R8971) said that most of the planned open spaces were concentrated in the CKL area. In the light of the deletion of the planned CKL Park, she was concerned that more planned open spaces in CKL would be deleted in the future.

LPG Filling Station

41. Some Members raised the following questions on the LPG filling station:

- (a) whether the operator of the existing LPG filling station had submitted representation or comment in respect of the OZP amendments; and

- (b) whether there were other alternative sites available for reprovisioning of the LPG filling station.

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

- (a) the company of the existing LPG filling station had not submitted representation or comment in respect of the OZP amendments;
- (b) there were two existing dedicated LPG filling stations in East Kowloon, one at CKL and the other in Kowloon Bay. The relevant bureau had confirmed that the subject LPG filling station had to be retained; and
- (c) currently, there were no other suitable alternative sites identified for the LPG filling station. While the lease term of the existing LPG filling station would expire in 2021, appropriate conditions requiring enhancement of the operation would be imposed in the new term. If alternative sites could be identified in the future for relocation of the LPG filling station, corresponding amendment to the OZP could be made. The relevant government bureaux and departments would also liaise with the existing operator for the appropriate arrangement.

43. Ms Mary Mulvihill (representative of R7677) said that in order to reduce pollution, LPG vehicles should be phased out and replaced by vehicles using renewable energy. The reprovisioning of the existing LPG filling station with a larger site was considered unacceptable.

Average Floor Space per Student

44. A Member asked whether the average floor space of 30m² per student in the new VTC campus as provided by some representers was correct. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that the figure of 30m² per student was derived by dividing the total GFA of 180,000m² by 6,000 students. According to VTC, the average floor space should be calculated based on

net operational floor area (NOFA) which included only those areas usable by students such as lecture rooms, canteen and libraries etc. while those areas occupied by car parks, elevators and plant rooms would not be included. Based on such approach and the information provided by VTC, the average floor space allocated to each student in the new VTC campus was about 12.5m². Ms Elaine T.L. Mak, PAS (Further Education), EDB, said that the same approach had been adopted in calculating the average floor space per student for new developments of other tertiary educational institutions. The proposed floor area per student for the new VTC development was on par with the provisions of other institutions.

45. Ms Chong Hoi Kwan (R8971) said that underground car park and mandatory plant rooms would not be accountable for GFA calculation. Assuming an efficiency rate of 65% for the new VTC campus, the average floor space per student under VTC's revised scheme would be about 20m² which was unreasonably high.

Traffic Issues

46. A Member asked the representers when the traffic queuing into the existing LPG filling station would occur in a day. In response, Mr Tse Chun Wah (representative of the Protect CKL Harbourfront Concern Group) said that the LPG filling station was dedicated for the use of taxi and minibus only. Traffic queues to the LPG filling station usually started at the driver-changing period at around 3:15 to 3:30 p.m. and peaked at 4 to 5 p.m. Since there were only two developed LPG filling stations in East Kowloon where LPG was sold at a lower price, the traffic queue outside the existing station in CKL could last for a long period until midnight. Moreover, as coaches and construction vehicles were often parked at CKL Road, in reality, the traffic condition in the area could be even worse than that shown in the photos presented by some representers.

47. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions on traffic aspect:

- (a) whether the TIA had taken into account the future developments in the Kwun Tong district;

- (b) whether there was any defined boundary for assessment of traffic impact; and
- (c) the proposed shuttle bus route between the new VTC campus and MTR Yau Tong Station, and whether they would generate adverse traffic impact on the related road network.

48. In response, Miss Wendy W.T. Tang, E/KT1, TD and Mr Tom C.K. Yip made the following main points with the aid of the visualiser and some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) according to the TIA conducted by VTC, in order to assess the traffic impact of the VTC development, the assessment area had been delineated and the concerned critical road junctions had been indicated in the TIA report which were considered acceptable by TD;
- (b) a number of factors had been taken into account in the traffic model of the TIA which included the surrounding road network, land uses and developments, the estimated times of arrival and departure, and the route selected. Those land uses and developments that had been considered in the assessment were detailed in paragraph 4.2 of the TIA report;
- (c) VTC had proposed to provide direct shuttle bus services between the proposed VTC campus and MTR Yau Tong Station. The shuttle buses would travel along the waterfront section of CKL Road to MTR Yau Tong Station, where the shuttle buses would return to the VTC campus via the Ko Chiu Road roundabout and CKL Road; and
- (d) there would be sufficient space within the VTC campus for vehicle manoeuvring and bus bays would be provided for pick up / drop off of staff and students. Outside the MTR Yau Tong Station, there was an existing vehicle lay-by of 150m in length along the dual-carriageway of CKL Road, which should be adequate to cater for the proposed pick up / drop off activities. Moreover, illegal parking at the lay-by would be

subject to enforcement action by relevant departments.

49. Ms Chong Hoi Kwan (R8971) said that according to the information of the Google Maps, there was a central divider outside the proposed ingress/egress of the VTC campus and hence barring those shuttle buses leaving the campus from direct right turn onto CKL Road. Moreover, the assessment of traffic impact at only nine junctions in Kwun Tong was considered inadequate and it was not clear why the Kwun Tong Business Area had not been taken into account in the TIA report. In response, Miss Wendy W.T. Tang referred to a drawing in the TIA report and said that the said central divider was located further eastward along CKL Road. The TIA had taken into account the existing and planned developments in the surrounding areas.

Need for VTC Campus

50. The Chairperson raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there was an imminent need for the new VTC campus; and
- (b) why the new VTC campus had to be located in the urban area.

51. In response, Ms Elaine T.L. Mak and Mr Tom C.K. Yip made the following main points:

- (a) with a view to mapping out a strategy and recommendations to promote vocational education, the Task Force on Promotion of Vocational Education was set up in 2014. Considering that some of the VTC institutions and facilities were outdated which could not meet the current standards of vocational education and the aspirations of the general public, the Government had lent policy support to develop a modernised VTC campus with adequate capacity and state-of-the-art facilities. Given the long lead time involved in the planning, design and construction of the new campus, there was a need to identify a readily available site to enable early implementation of the VTC

campus; and

- (b) as one of the main considerations of the new VTC campus was to re-provision the two existing campuses in Kowloon, the proposed location of the new VTC campus in East Kowloon was considered appropriate. There were already existing VTC institutions in the New Territories.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong left this session of meeting during the Q&A session.]

52. 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.

53. This session of the meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.