

1. The meeting was resumed at 9:00 a.m. on 10.1.2018.
2. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting :

Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) Chairperson

Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Professor S.C. Wong Vice-chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr H.F. Leung

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department

Mr Peter P.C. Wong

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment),

Environmental Protection Department

Mr Tong W.H. Cheung

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 the 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 No. S/K22/5 (the draft OZP).

4. The Secretary said that Members' declarations of interests were made at the hearing sessions on 7.12.2017, 14.12.2017 and 4.1.2018. Members noted that Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Ms Janice W.M. Lai, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Ms Christina M. Lee, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho, Mr K.K. Cheung, Miss Winnie W.M. Ng and 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, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions (Continued)

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

6. The following government representatives, the representer/commenters and their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point :

**Government representatives**

Planning Department (PlanD)

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

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

Transport Department (TD)

Miss Wendy W.T. Tang - Engineer/Kwun Tong 1(E/KT1)

**Representer/Commenters and their Representatives**

C260 - Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill

C517 - Wong Wai Lun

- Commenter and Commenter's  
representative

C263 - Vocational Training Council

C274 - Augustine Wong Ho Ming

C276 - Benjamin Lau Man Tung

C278 - Jane Curzon Lo

C280 - Brian Sun

*Vocational Training Council (VTC)) -* ]

Mr Leung Yam Shing ]

Mr Daniel Yan ]

*Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong* ]

*Limited -* ]

Ms Theresa Yeung, Ms Carmen Chu, ]

C273 - Jackson Leung Siu Yin

C275 - Stanley Cheung Tat Choi

C277 - David Ho Chi Shing

C279 - Eddie Lam Kin Wing

C281 - Johnny Yeung Chi Hung

] Commenters' representatives

Ms Natalie Leung, Ms Kathy Lo ]  
Dr Camby Se and Ms Minnie Law ]  
*P & T Architects & Engineers Limited* - ]  
Mr Joel Chan and Ms Sally Chan ]

C298 - Suen Wai Yee

Ms Leung Wing Oi - Commenter's representative

C299 - Yip Tak Wai

Ms Chu Yau Lai - Commenter's representative

C300 - 李志成

Ms Jessica Law - Commenter's representative

C315 - Luk Pang Kei

C333 - Vesta Engineering & Consulting Limited

C335 - A-Plus Construction Company Limited

C397 - Lo Shek Lun

C462 - Lam Chi Wai

C609 - Tsui Chun Ming

C685 - Marcela F Venal

C689 - Law Wai Fong

C719 - Ho Kin Sun

C720 - So Kum Oi

C726 - Chu Kam Ki

C730 - Ho Chi Cheung Donald

C818 - Chu Ka Chun

C853 - Lai Ching Yin Lucy

C868 - Chow So Yu

C883 - Tsang Yee Ping Johanna

C909 - Li Yee Ping

C910 - Lam Choi Lin

C936 - 朱益

C1042 - Ng Mei Wah

C1256 - Chan Po Yuk

C1257 - Cheng Wai Lun

C1301 - Li Yee Wan

C1302 - Cheung Ngan Fai

C1320 - Lau Che Kin

C1342 - Cheung Ka Hei

C1368 - Ho Sze Wai, Shireen

C1404 - 符繼明

C1409 - Pun Sui Ha

C1423 - Chan Wing Keung

Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront - Commenters' representative

Concern Group - Mr Luk Pang Kei

C332 - Element Trading HK Ltd.

C420 - Cecilia Leung

C438 - Ching Sik Wan Elaine

C614 - Chan Yuet Ying

C674 - Ng Kai Ming

C757 - Wan Yue Foon

C993 - Cheung Yu Hang

C1160 - Leung Siu Mui

C1234 - Chan Siu Sum

C1281 - Eddie Chik

C1354 - Suen Ching Shing

C1403 - Ng Lok Hin

Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront

Concern Group - Mr Poon Kam Sing

C412 - Chik Kim Ming

C435 - Choi Sheung Kwong

C485 - Elaine Ching

C652 - Choi Wing Fong

C675 - Ng Siu Fong

C802 - Adrian Pak Lun Lau

C1016 - Ng Siu Fung

C1225 - Chan Chung Wun

C1235 - C C Chung

C1282 - Koey Tang

C1363 - Fung Shui Fong

C1415 - Hui Kim Ming Cammie

- Commenters' representative

C334 - Long Billion Development Ltd

C337 - Silvertree Industrial Limited

C345 - Chan Chi Tak

C388 - Yim Chi Wah

C434 - Lee Siu Ling

C470 - Tam Suk Kuen Pat

C502 - Li Kai Kwong

C514 - Ng Mun Hong Eric

C524 - Li Sui Po

C537 - Kwong Heung

C560 - Fong Koon Ho

C567 - Siu Hon Tak

C585 - Li Yee Yan

C659 - Kong Long Yin

C690 - Lau Wing Tung

C733 - 李嘉林

C336 - Both Star Ltd.

C344 - Chiu Kit Ling Fanny

C382 - Choi Ki Sang

C423 - Chow Chui Yi

C439 - Leung Man Ka

C496 - Lo Kwan Yee

C503 - Li Tse Choi Wah

C515 - Chak Wan Chuen

C527 - Lee Yat Tsin

C558 - Kwong Pik Ki

C562 - Leung Chi Keung

C569 - Tung Man Yan Keith

C644 - Lau Yuk Fun Linda

C680 - Tse Sheung Ting

C708 - 劉世珍

C734 - Ruth Santilla

- C773 - 徐玉成
- C778 - Chan Siu Kwan
- C816 - Lai Kit Yee
- C820 - Choy May May
- C854 - Au Siu Fung
- C901 - Shek Lai Ching
- C903 - Szto On Tai
- C913 - Fung Kai Ming
- C932 - Heidi Fung
- C1004 - Ho Hiu Lam
- C1013 - Chan Wai Ming
- C1044 - 劉耀康
- C1114 - Wong Ling Fei
- C1139 - Chau Oi Fung
- C1152 - Choi Suk Yee
- C1155 - 梁淑應
- C1175 - Cheung Wing Hang
- C1187 - Chan Ka Fu
- C1189 - Chan Lai Kuen
- C1193 - Lau Yiu Hong
- C1197 - Yeung Mi Ling
- C1233 - Au Tsz Fung Antony
- C1272 - 李國超
- C1300 - Lau Wing Fat
- C1322 - Au Chung Wai
- C1338 - Tse Siu Lin
- C1379 - Candy Hui Yuk Fong
- C1393 - Ng Bin
- Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront  
Concern Group - Ms Chan Hiu Wah
- C355 - Pak Cho Kan
- C377 - Choi Shiu Hong
- C774 - Ngan Man Chu
- C809 - Beatrice Lo
- C819 - Shiu Wai Yin Ken
- C839 - Marpuah
- C860 - Lau Lan Sze Lassie
- C902 - Fu Wai Ling
- C904 - Christine Chan
- C923 - Kong Chung Yi
- C985 - Lim Cheng Siew
- C1012 - Yau Ming Kin
- C1021 - Wong Oi Ha
- C1113 - Au Tsz Him Matthew
- C1134 - Chan Choi Cheung
- C1147 - Choy Hung Kin
- C1154 - Lo Lin Oi
- C1158 - Maggie Wong
- C1186 - Ching Yee Han
- C1188 - Ng Kwok Wai
- C1190 - Hon Miu Ling
- C1194 - Ma Siu Yee
- C1209 - Chan Hiu Wah
- C1263 - Kwan Sui Kuen
- C1287 - Leung Kam Fung
- C1313 - 戚劍明
- C1337 - Lau Kam Ching
- C1356 - 戚劍儀
- C1382 - Chan Hons
- C1413 - Ng Fung Yee
- Commenter and Commenters'  
representative
- C369 - Yim Wai Fong
- C411 - Kwong Chun Ho

C425 - Tsang Wai Kit

C575 - Li Yat Ho Eddie

C921 - Wong Hui Kwan

C981 - Ceria Zayda Shanne G

C1424 - 黃少明

Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront  
Concern Group - Ms Chong Hoi Kwan  
and Mr Tse Chun Wah

C471 - Chong Hoi Kwan

C607 - Szeto Cheuk Yan

C933 - Hung Chi Fong

C1180 - Suen Kin Keung

C1425 - 楊少群

- Commenters and Commenters'  
representatives

C362 - Fok Yin Chun

C386 - Ching Sing Fai

C442 - Lam Yue Shek Edmund

C493 - Yip Ying Heung

C722 - Yuen Sin Hung

C764 - Yau Mei Ying

C877 - Chan Siu Wah

C957 - Wong Suen Suen

C1032 - Cheung Cheuk Lun Michael

C1054 - Wong Po Chun

C1084 - Fung Suk Yee Roxana

C1394 - Catherine Amul

Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront  
Concern Group - Mr Lam Yue Shek  
Edmund

C376 - Chau Wai Ching

C395 - Cheung Wing Hing

C444 - Lau Ming Leong Calvin

C666 - Yim Wai Ping

C753 - Lam Wai Hung

C795 - Silina Kwan

C955 - Fung Shun Wo

C958 - Tang Shu Ki

C1052 - Fung Ying Lin

C1063 - Choi Fung Man

C1219 - Flora W Y Lui

- Commenters' representative

C374 - Ng Wah Lok

Mr Ng Wah Lok

- Commenter

C404 - Ho Yung Kwong

Mr Ho Yung Kwong

- Commenter

C431 - Chow Dennis

C796 - Wong Wai Chee Maria



|                                   |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Ms Wong Wai Chee Maria            | - Commenter and Commenter's representative                |
| <u>C468 - Choi Lai Fei</u>        |   |
| Ms Choi Lai Fei                   | - Commenter   |
| <u>C475 - Tse Chun Wah</u>        |   |
| <u>C490 - Wong Olivia Sin Yee</u> |   |
| Mr Li Hon Shing Michael           | - Commenters' representative                              |
| <u>C479 - Yu Nga Shan</u>         |   |
| Ms Yu Nga Shan                    | - Commenter   |
| <u>C679 - Tony T F Tsui</u>       | <u>C775 - Denis Tsui</u>                                  |
| <u>R3087 - Eva Ngan</u>           |   |
| Mr Tony T F Tsui                  | - Commenter, Representer's and Commenter's representative |
| <u>C682 - Fung Hei Ting</u>       |   |
| Ms Fung Hei Ting                  | - Commenter   |
| <u>C740 - Ng Ho Ying</u>          |   |
| <u>C815 - 侯希彤</u>                 |   |
| Ms Ng Ho Ying                     | - Commenter and Commenter's representative                |

7. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that the video recording of the presentation made by the representative of PlanD on the first day of the Group 2 hearing (i.e. 7.12.2017) had been uploaded to the Town Planning Board's (the Board) website for the meeting and would not be repeated in this session of the meeting. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, each representer/commenter or their representative was allotted 10 minutes for making presentation. There was a timer device to alert the representer/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 representer/commenters or their representatives had completed their oral submissions on that day. Members could direct their questions to government representatives, representer/commenters or their representatives. After the Q&A sessions, the hearing of the day would be adjourned, and the representer/commenters or their representatives and the government representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. After hearing of all the oral submissions from the representer/commenters or their representatives who attended the meeting, the Board would deliberate on the representation/comments in their absence, and inform the representer/commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

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

C740 - Ng Ho Ying

C815 - 侯希彤

9. Ms Ng Ho Ying made the following main points :

- (a) she had been a resident of Laguna City and Kwun Tong for some 20 years. She objected to the cancellation of development of Cha Kwo Ling (CKL) Park and using the site for development of VTC Campus. The Government had not properly explained the rationale for not developing the CKL Park as originally planned;
- (b) there was no strong justification for using the site for VTC. If a central, urban location was indeed necessary for VTC, the Government would have to seek alternative sites for many other tertiary institutions;
- (c) development of the VTC Campus at the site would bring about adverse impact due to increase in flow of people, traffic and associated noise and worsening of shortage of car parking spaces and air ventilation. Low-density design should be adopted for developments along the waterfront and there was no strong

justification for VTC to occupy a waterfront location. The site should instead be used for construction of a promenade that could be enjoyed by the public;

- (d) in 2015, during the consideration of representations and comments in respect of the Draft Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong, Lei Yue Mun Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K15/22, the then Director of Planning said that the car parking provision at the ex-Kaolin Mine (ex-KM) Site would be adjusted subject to the number and size of flats of the future developments in accordance with relevant guidelines and the Transport Department's (TD) requirements. The Police and TD would also monitor the traffic situation in the area and adopt suitable traffic management measures, including enforcement action against illegal parking and loading/unloading activities, as required;
- (e) with five car parks in the area recently terminated and two more going to stop service, there was an acute shortage of car parking spaces and it had resulted in severe illegal parking problems along CKL Road, Wai Yip Street and Wai Lok Street. Based on her observation at one night, there were more than 1,000 vehicles parked illegally along those roads. Enforcement actions were taken by the Police only upon complaint. In December 2016 there was a fire at CKL Tsuen and the access of fire engines was blocked by illegal parking. A person died in that fire;
- (f) the development of 6,800 residential units at the ex-KM Site was a mistake. The proposed development of VTC Campus would further worsen the traffic situation. She had doubts on the methodology for traffic surveys conducted by the consultants. The surveys failed to objectively reflect the traffic congestion in the area. PlanD said that there would be spare junction capacity for design years 2016, 2031 and 2036 upon completion of the junction improvements works related to the ex-KM Site development. However, there had been no real improvement to the parking problem in the area since 2015;
- (g) many of the promises on improvement measures made by the Government were not realised. No firm implementation programme was ever provided and as a result, the public could not monitor the Government's progress in meeting its pledge; and

- (h) disposition of the buildings in the VTC Campus would block the prevailing south-easterly/south-westerly wind in the summer and cause air ventilation impact/canyon effect to the Kwun Tong area and the ex-KM Site development resulting in air pollution problem. Noise from taxis going to the Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG) filling station near Laguna City as early as 5 a.m. in the morning and concrete mixer trucks had caused severe nuisances to the residents. Development of the proposed VTC Campus would worsen the situation.

C263 - Vocational Training Council

C273 - Jackson Leung Siu Yin

C274 - Augustine Wong Ho Ming

C275 - Stanley Cheung Tat Choi

C276 - Benjamin Lau Man Tung

C277 - David Ho Chi Shing

C278 - Jane Curzon Lo

C279 - Eddie Lam Kin Wing

C280 - Brian Sun

C281 - Johnny Yeung Chi Hung

10. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and the visualizer, Mr Leung Yam Shing made the following main points:

*Site location*

- (a) in response to the Government's request made in 2015, VTC had reviewed its space requirements across its various campuses. During the review, it was concluded that there was scope for consolidating some of the training programmes provided by the Institute of Vocational Education (IVE) (Kwun Tong) and IVE (Haking Wong) campuses to facilitate their redevelopment. As in-situ redevelopment was not viable, subsequently the current site at CKL was offered by the Government as a relocation site;
- (b) more than 50% of the students of IVE (Kwun Tong) and IVE (Haking Wong) currently lived in Kowloon City, Kwun Tong, Sham Shui Po, Wong Tai Sin and Yau Tsim Mong districts. Most of the IVE students came from grassroots or middle income families. A suitable campus location could reduce the travel time and cost required;

- (c) a suitable relocation site should be relatively large, with an area of about 3 to 5 ha, in an easily accessible urban location, preferably with a short lead time for development. VTC had not specifically requested a waterfront location;
- (d) in the revised proposal, the 50m-wide promenade between the proposed VTC campus site and the harbour would form part of a 6-km long waterfront promenade. A park of about 1 ha in area would also be provided next to the VTC campus for public enjoyment;

*Student population*

- (e) the current proposal was for relocation of IVE (Kwun Tong) and IVE (Haking Wong). While there were views that given the number of students in IVEs continued to drop hence there was no need for a new campus, it should be noted that the IVE campuses were currently congested with an average floor space of  $6.6\text{m}^2/\text{student}$ , whereas the standard should be around  $10\text{-}15\text{m}^2/\text{student}$ . The relocation site could alleviate the congestion, but even then the average floor space per student across all IVE campuses would still only be at around  $8.8\text{m}^2$ ;

*Student-teacher ratio*

- (f) it should be noted that the student-teacher ratio of IVEs, which had a fixed standard to follow, would not be affected by the relocation proposal;

*Building utilisation*

- (g) while some of the teaching equipment/machineries were required to be put on the science/technology/engineering/mathematics (STEM) education centre on the ground floor for practical reasons, there was scope to allow the open area on the ground floor to be used for community purposes. Unlike residential and commercial uses which could be accommodated in tall buildings with a smaller footprint, a horizontal building design was suitable for the VTC Campus as well as other educational institutions. Except for some subjects like business administration which would mostly utilise a classroom/computer room for teaching, most students would need to move from one place in the

building to another on an hourly basis. A horizontal building design not exceeding 12-13 storeys was considered suitable in this regard;

*Community engagement*

- (h) while it was impractical to expect VTC to open all facilities in the campus to the public and function like a place for recreational activities, VTC had vast experience in working with the community and would allow some of the facilities to be used for community purposes as appropriate;
- (i) VTC had conducted various community activities in its different campuses, for example eye check-up for the elderly and book fair at the Kwai Chung HealthTech centre, and STEM activities on robotics and bridge building that were opened to students of all schools in the area at its Tsing Yi centre. Different IVEs were also working in close partnership with many non-government organisations in their respective districts, serving and benefiting community members across all age groups;

*Development timeline*

- (j) the planning of the VTC Campus in CKL began in 2017. If progressing smoothly, development of the campus would take around 10 years with estimated completion in 2027 in order to meet the projected demand for vocational training. The VTC Campus at CKL was not intended to be a mere replacement of the IVE (Kwun Tong) and IVE (Hoking Wong) campuses. With the new facilities at the CKL campus, restructuring and optimization of the training programmes across all IVEs would become possible and it would bring benefits to all other IVEs and their students;
- (k) VTC had been operating for about 30 years and many of its existing IVEs (e.g. in Tsing Yi, Tuen Mun, Cheung Sha Wan and Tseung Kwan O) were in close proximity to major public/private residential estates. Based on his experience, there had been very little conflict between IVEs and residential uses and in fact, most of the community welcomed the facilities of their institutes;

- (l) while the current proposal included training/mock-up hotel and training café, the proposal was still under study and alternatives, such as providing just a few mock-up hotel rooms for training purpose, was also being considered. If VTC decided to proceed with developing a full-scale training hotel, separate approval would be sought from the Board; and
- (m) about 10,000 students graduated from high diploma programmes offered by VTC every year and those graduates formed an important workforce for the community and their contribution should be duly recognised. The VTC Campus should not be seen as a ‘bad-neighbourhood’ use and its development would not bring negative impact to the area. VTC had demonstrated its effort in addressing the community’s concern which was reflected in the revision in design of the campus building and provision of additional 1ha public open space and a 50m wide promenade outside the Campus. VTC would continue to work with the community to monitor the situation and take suitable actions to address the community’s concern.

11. Ms Theresa Yeung then supplemented the following main points with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation:

- (a) there were many overseas examples for similar vocational training institutes that had adopted a horizontal building design with ample open space provision, including the Chongqing Beijing Institute & Collaborative & Inno-accelerator cum Academy for Xiantao Big Data Valley in Chongqing, China, the George Brown College - Waterfront Campus in Toronto, Canada and the Institute of Technical Education – College Central and Headquarters in Singapore; and
- (b) these institutes often adopted building designs spreading horizontally providing ample open spaces around/within the building to facilitate gathering and exchange of ideas among students from various backgrounds. Some of the institutes also provided training facilities that simulated real life working environment for their students.

|                                       |                                    |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <u>C332 - Element Trading HK Ltd.</u> | <u>C412 - Chik Kim Ming</u>        |
| <u>C420 - Cecilia Leung</u>           | <u>C435 - Choi Sheung Kwong</u>    |
| <u>C438 - Ching Sik Wan Elaine</u>    | <u>C485 - Elaine Ching</u>         |
| <u>C614 - Chan Yuet Ying</u>          | <u>C652 - Choi Wing Fong</u>       |
| <u>C674 - Ng Kai Ming</u>             | <u>C675 - Ng Siu Fong</u>          |
| <u>C757 - Wan Yue Foon</u>            | <u>C802 - Adrian Pak Lun Lau</u>   |
| <u>C993 - Cheung Yu Hang</u>          | <u>C1016 - Ng Siu Fung</u>         |
| <u>C1160 - Leung Siu Mui</u>          | <u>C1225 - Chan Chung Wun</u>      |
| <u>C1234 - Chan Siu Sum</u>           | <u>C1235 - C C Chung</u>           |
| <u>C1281 - Eddie Chik</u>             | <u>C1282 - Koey Tang</u>           |
| <u>C1354 - Suen Ching Shing</u>       | <u>C1363 - Fung Shui Fong</u>      |
| <u>C1403 - Ng Lok Hin</u>             | <u>C1415 - Hui Kim Ming Cammie</u> |

12. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and the visualizer, Mr Poon Kam Shing made the following main points:

*Information on the VTC Proposal*

- (a) the VTC and PlanD had withheld important information from the Board. The residents only found out the proposal for development of VTC Campus in November 2016 from a Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC) member. A residents' forum was held in January 2017, however, there was no indication in the material provided by PlanD that the VTC Campus would be built on the land originally designated for development of CKL Park;
- (b) the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (the Task Force) and KTDC did not support the proposal. The KTDC was first consulted on the VTC Campus proposal in November 2017 under a very tight time constraint and there was no time for the KTDC Members to provide feedback. The majority of the KTDC members supported the development of CKL Park and a motion was subsequently passed on 7.8.2017 urging the Government to implement the CKL Park and waterfront promenade. There was no need for the VTC Campus to occupy a waterfront location and alternative sites should be considered;



- (c) since the first Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/1 was gazetted, the site had been designated for development of CKL Park and its implementation was pending the finalisation of plan for the Trunk Road T2. The need to meet the demand for vocational and professional education training should not jeopardise the benefits of the community and violate the policy in relation to harbourfront development. While VTC argued that the proposal had respected the relevant guidelines for harbourfront development, the proposal was not supported by the Task Force. The affected facilities at the harbourfront were also not properly reprovisioned. Many proposals for waterfront promenade in Hong Kong Island had been implemented. In comparison, the implementation progress of the waterfront promenade at CKL was too slow;
- (d) with the Energizing Kowloon East initiative already aggravated the traffic in the area, the proposed VTC Campus would bring additional adverse impact to the area. Other adverse impacts on air ventilation and heat island effect were also anticipated;

*Public Consultation*

- (e) the VTC Campus development in CKL was mentioned in the 2017 Policy Address. However, the relevant departments had not followed the stipulated guidelines on public consultation. It was stated in “Hong Kong: The Facts - Town Planning” that views from the public were essential considerations for the formulation of development strategies and preparation of plans. Various forms of public engagement e.g. public forums, workshops, exhibitions etc. were very important components of the process. According to a Legislative Council paper prepared by the then Constitutional Affairs Bureau in 2003 on guidelines on public consultation, relevant bureaux/departments were required to respond in a timely manner to public demands and to take public opinion into account when formulating public policies and programmes;
- (f) many of the residents in the area, including those living in various old tenement buildings along CKL Road fronting the proposed VTC Campus and those in the squatters nearby, would be affected by the proposal but they had not been consulted. Based on the information obtained from the Kwun Tong District

Office, besides Laguna City there were about 21 residential buildings in the CKL area, some of which had incorporated owners' committee or mutual aid committee, however, many of them had not been consulted by relevant departments on the proposed VTC Campus. In comparison, public and local forums were arranged in the Stage 3 Public Participation of Kai Tak Planning Review in 2006 to solicit views of the wider community and the public could also provide written submission to PlanD;

- (g) as a principle for harbour planning laid down by the then Harbour-front Enhancement Committee, all sectors of the community should be engaged at an early stage and on an on-going basis in the planning, development and management of the Victoria Harbour and its harbour-front areas through transparent and inclusive consensus building processes;
- (h) the community was largely not aware of the proposal and the consultation carried out by PlanD was only targeted at a very selected group of audience such as district council members. In comparison, government departments such as the Lands Department and Food and Environmental Hygiene Department would consult the community on simple matters such as food licence or Short Term Tenancy applications. In the past, the Drainage Services Department had also engaged the community and residents of Laguna City on the Revitalisation of Tsui Ping River Project by arranging mailing of circulars, roving exhibitions and community workshops. No similar engagement activities were organised by PlanD and its consultant regarding the VTC proposal;
- (i) the concern group had distributed leaflets to the local community in Ngau Tau Kok, Kowloon Bay, Kwun Tong, Lam Tin and Yau Tong areas in September 2017 and found that many of them, except residents of Laguna City, were unaware of the planned CKL Park. PlanD had not thoroughly consulted the wider community in this regard;
- (j) according to the judgement for the judicial review (JR) on the Hoi Ha OZP, the Board had a duty to inquire. If the consultation process was flawed and ultra vires with procedural impropriety, it would be subject to JR;

*Public Views*

- (k) vast majority (about 99.98%) of the representers, as detailed in the Paper, as well as the KTDC and Kwun Tong South Area Committee were not supportive of the proposed VTC Campus. As pointed out by a KTDC Member who was also a member of the HC, it was not necessary to use the current site for development of a VTC Campus; and
- (l) VTC submitted the revised proposal to the HC on 2.8.2017 in an informal briefing. The procedure was improper and unjust and subject to challenge. According to a newspaper report in December 2017, VTC was already planning to seek funding from the Legislative Council (LegCo), before the statutory planning procedure was completed. The picture purported by VTC that it had taken due consideration of the public views on its proposal did not reflect the truth that development was not supported by the local community.

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

13. Since some of the commenters and their representatives requested to make their oral submissions first, with no objection from the attendees, the Chairperson acceded to the requests.

C374 – Mr Ng Wah Lok

14. Mr Ng Wah Lok made the following main points:
- (a) he had been living in Laguna City since 1998 and witnessed the transformation of CKL area since the scrap metal plant and cargo working area were relocated. He was currently living in a unit that enjoyed sea view and all along he had been told that the proposed VTC Campus site, directly facing his unit, was earmarked for development of a CKL Park;
  - (b) the VTC Campus was not compatible with the waterfront promenade which extended from Kai Tak to CKL. There was no convincing justification for using the current site for the VTC Campus; and

- (c) the Government should adopt a practical approach in finding an alternative location and there were plenty of options. For example, the VTC Campus could be relocated to the ex-KM Site instead of occupying a premium location at the harbourfront.

C468 - Ms Choi Lai Fei

15. Ms Choi Lai Fei made the following main points:

- (a) she had been working in Kwun Tong area for 40 years and her family moved to Laguna City because of its tranquillity. She was also expecting that the planned CKL Park would provide an easily accessible recreational outlet for her family;
- (b) the planned CKL Park would be the only major open space for the CKL and Lam Tin area. There were already 30,000 to 40,000 residents in Laguna City. With other residential developments underway, the population in the area would continue to rise. The traffic in the area was already congested and might not be able to cope with the population increase. There was also insufficient open space in the area. The CKL Park was mainly to serve the local residents. Development of the VTC Campus would take away a major asset of the community;
- (c) while providing vocational training was beneficial to the community as a whole, VTC should first utilise other IVEs or the vacant premises in Aberdeen for hospitality training. It was not necessary to develop a new VTC Campus at CKL; and
- (d) the development of CKL Park was already agreed by the Board. Overturning this decision and to allow the development of VTC Campus would be detrimental to the credibility of the Board.

C475 – Tse Chun Wah

C490 – Wong Olivia Sin Yee

16. Mr Li Hon Shing Michael made the following main points :
- (a) he was the Executive Director of the Federation of Hong Kong Hotel Owners (FHKHO), the former Vice-Chairman of VTC's Hotel, Catering and Tourism Training Board and also the Vice-Chairman of the Chinese Culinary Institute (CCI) Training Board. He had extensive experience in the operation of VTC and training and manpower development for the hospitality industry;
  - (b) he was also a resident of Sceneway Garden in Lam Tin. Many of the residents in the area, including those of Laguna City, utilised MTR Lam Tin Station for commuting. With the development of public housing estate in the area and the proposed VTC Campus, the MTR would be even more congested;
  - (c) there was no justification for expanding the capacity of VTC as there was insufficient enrolment in the existing IVEs. Furthermore, based on the feedback from the industry, only very few of the 5,000 students graduated each year from hospitality programme of various IVEs were recruited;
  - (d) VTC had already taken over the former Hospitality Industry Training and Development Centre, which was set up by FHKHO, and CCI, and formed a new International Culinary Institute. However, there was a general sense of disappointment among the industry for VTC in terms of its effectiveness in training and bringing a positive impact. The VTC now promoted continuous learning and students were encouraged to take up additional courses upon completion of the basic programme. As a result, the students had little opportunity to receive vocational training and the industry faced a severe shortage of manpower. The T Hotel, a training hotel with 30 rooms in Pok Fu Lam, was one of the examples of mismanagement by VTC; and
  - (e) IVE (Haking Wong), which occupied a very large site, had the potential for phased redevelopment. There was no need for a new VTC Campus at CKL

and the current proposal was merely a step to occupy more space without improving the quality of training.

17. Mr Dominic K.K. Lam said that he was involved in the design of the CCI but had no involvement in its operation. Members agreed that his interest was remote and he could continue to stay in the meeting.

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

C479 - Yu Nga Shan

18. Ms Yu Nga Shan made the following main points :

- (a) she was a mother of two and it was important for her children to have a recreational outlet. Currently there was no major park in Kowloon East. The Kwun Tong Promenade was very crowded on the weekends and many of the facilities were out of service due to high usage and insufficient maintenance. She was surprised when she found out that the planned CKL Park, which had gone through a series of consultation procedures with the Kwun Tong residents, would be replaced by the VTC Campus; and
- (b) while an open space would be provided near the VTC Campus, the nearby LPG filling station would also be expanded to three times of its existing size. She had grave concern over safety issue and air pollution associated with the LPG filling station and queuing vehicles. The LPG filling station and open space uses were not compatible and should not be located in such proximity.

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai left this session of the meeting at this point.]

C362 - Fok Yin Chun

C376 - Chau Wai Ching

C386 - Ching Sing Fai

C395 - Cheung Wing Hing

C442 - Lam Yue Shek Edmund

C444 - Lau Ming Leong Kalvin

C493 - Yip Ying Heung

C666 - Yim Wai Ping

C722 - Yuen Sin Hung

C764 - Yau Mei Ying

C877 - Chan Siu Wah

C957 - Wong Suen Suen

C1032 - Cheung Cheuk Lun Michael

C1054 - Wong Po Chun

C1084 - Fung Suk Yee Roxana

C1394 - Catherine Amul

C753 - Lam Wai Hung

C795 - Silina Kwan

C955 - Fung Shun Wo

C958 - Tang Shu Ki

C1052 - Fung Ying Lin

C1063 - Choi Fung Man

C1219 - Flora W Y Lui

19. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Lam Yue Shek Edmund made the following main points:

- (a) the Concern Group did not see the VTC Campus as a 'bad neighbour' use. They supported developing a diverse range of educational options in Hong Kong but objected to the change of land use from an open space to an educational facility at the current location;
- (b) the HC at its informal meeting of 2.8.2017 noted the design of VTC Campus had been revised and the number of blocks had been reduced from three to two. However, the Concern Group feared that if the subject site was rezoned to "G/IC", there would be no measure to prevent VTC from reverting to the original three-block design and the proposed open space in VTC Campus might also be deleted;
- (c) the site was originally planned for the CKL Park as it enjoyed a harbourfront location. It was an important piece of public resource. The plan for CKL Park should have been implemented years ago;
- (d) some of the figures presented by PlanD regarding the width of promenade at various park along the harbourfront might not be complete and many of the waterfront promenades in Hong Kong shared similar design elements. For example:

*Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park*

- (i) while the promenade was about 30m in width, the main portion of the park was about 150m-wide and it functioned as a focal point with a wide range of facilities provided. The promenade enjoyed a panoramic view of the harbour;

*Quarry Bay Park*

- (ii) the promenade was about 55m in width and the widest part of the park was about 85m. The layout of the park consisted of a promenade linking up the focal points at the end. It also enjoyed a panoramic view of the eastern portion of the harbour. However, the park was separated into two parts by the Island East Corridor which predated the development of the park;

*Wan Chai Harbourfront Park (under construction) and Victoria Park*

- (iii) it consisted of a 3.2 km promenade and a 10 ha park with five different themes connecting Wan Chai to North Point. Upon completion it would be integrated with the Victoria Park which could serve as a major focal point. The future connection between the promenade and focal point would be crucial in ensuring good accessibility;

*Aldrich Bay Promenade*

- (iv) despite being smaller in size compared to other parks, it was close to Quarry Bay Park. The layout was similar to the typical design with a 15m-wide promenade connected to a focal point at eastern end that was about 83m-wide;

*Siu Sai Wan Promenade*

- (v) the promenade was about 27m in width and the widest part of the park was about 100m. The focal point with an area of about 1.6ha provided various facilities for the public;



*West Kowloon Cultural District*

- (vi) it consisted of a 2 km promenade along a vibrant cultural quarter. The promenade enjoyed a panoramic view of the harbour and Hong Kong Island;

*Tsim Sha Tsui Promenade*

- (vii) the promenade was planned for expansion to about 2.6 ha in area. While the promenade was only about 21m in width, it could connect to the open area outside the Hong Kong Cultural Centre, which was a very popular tourist destination in Tsim Sha Tsui and venue for a wide range of activities including outdoor music performance, watching of fireworks etc.;

*Hung Hom Promenade*

- (viii) the promenade was under planning and its layout was similar to other waterfront promenades, with an open space of about 2.4 ha in area functioning as a focal point. It would also link up with the Tsim Sha Tsui Promenade and there would be an anchor/focal point at each end. Users of that promenade could enjoy one of the most panoramic and complete views of the harbour;

*Hoi Sham Park*

- (ix) the promenade under planning was about 20m in width. However, the adjacent open space which would function as a focal point was 140m wide and 5.4 ha in area upon expansion. Due to its location, its view would not be as wide as the other waterfront promenades;

*Kai Tak Runway Park*

- (x) the park was about 2.8 ha in area and had a largely rectangular layout. As the park was located at the corner of the runway, the view was mainly limited to the Kwun Tong area;

*Kwun Tong Promenade*

- (xi) the promenade was about 30m in width with a 60m wide area at the end. A major part of the promenade was underneath Kwun Tong Bypass and there were concerns on air quality due to the heavy traffic at the Kwun Tong Bypass. At the moment there was no focal point at the end of the promenade. When connected with the Kai Tak Development, the whole waterfront promenade would be around 11 km in length and the lack of focal point at the end of the promenade was inconsistent with planning principles adopted for other waterfront promenades. The VTC Campus site, if used for development of the CKL Park as originally planned, could function as a focal point of the Kwun Tong Promenade, which was typically crowded on weekends, and provide a panoramic view of the harbour for public enjoyment;
- (e) a major part of the Trunk Road T2 would be constructed as a tunnel in order not to obstruct the view along the harbour. However, the proposed buildings at the new VTC Campus would be 60-70 mPD in height, which would be visually-bulky and undesirable;
- (f) implementing the CKL Park would have multiple advantages over the proposed VTC Campus, including enhancing the vibrancy of the harbour, and providing various facilities along the harbourfront for enjoyment by the wider public. The LPG filling station should also be relocated to other suitable location due to air quality and safety concerns;
- (g) the vocational institute in Toronto, Canada located at a harbourfront setting, as mentioned earlier by the representative of VTC, was relatively low-rise with only a few storeys. Along the harbour, there were also music garden and harbourfront square which were all part of holistic and comprehensive planning of the waterfront; and
- (h) the most important elements for a park were good accessibility and the diversity of facilities it could provide for public enjoyment. The Board was tasked to promote the health, safety, convenience and general welfare of the

community through planning. The Victoria Harbour and the star ferry ride crossing the harbour were named by TripAdvisor in 2011 as the most highly-rated tourist attractions in Hong Kong. The harbourfront was an important landmark of Hong Kong that needed to be treasured. Land uses along the harbour should be well thought out and the originally planned CKL Park should be implemented as soon as possible.

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

20. The meeting was resumed at 1:50 p.m. on 10.1.2018.

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

Professor S.C. Wong Vice-chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr H.F. Leung

Dr F.C. Chan

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport) 3

Transport and Housing Bureau

Mr Andy S.H. Lam

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)

Mr Elvis W.K. Au

Assistant Director (Regional 1)

Lands Department

Mr Simon S.W. Wang

Director of Planning

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

**Agenda Item 1** (Continue)

[Open Meeting]

Group 2

Presentation and Question Sessions (Continue)

22. The following government representatives and consultants, as well as 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/K (TP/K)

*Transport Department (TD)*

Miss Wendy W.T. Tang Engineer/Kwun Tong 1 (E/KT1)

**Commenters and their Representatives**

C260 - Mary Mulvihill

C517 - Wong Wai Lun

Ms Mary Mulvihill

Commenter and Commenter's  
representative

C263 - Vocational Training Council

C273 - Jackson Leung Siu Yin

C274 - Augustine Wong Ho Ming

C275 - Stanley Cheung Tat Choi

C276 - Benjamin Lau Man Tung

C277 - David Ho Chi Shing

C278 - Jane Curzon Lo

C279 - Eddie Lam Kin Wing

C280 - Brian Sun

C281 - Johnny Yeung Chi Hung

|   |                                      |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| <i>Vocational Training Council -</i>            | ]                                    |
| Mr Leung Yam Shing                              | ]                                    |
| and Mr Daniel Yan;                              | ]                                    |
| <i>Ove Arup &amp; Partners Hong Kong Ltd -</i>  | ]                                    |
| Ms Theresa Yeung, Ms Carmen Chu, Ms             | ] Commenters' representatives        |
| Natalie Leung, Ms Kathy Lo, Dr Camby            | ]                                    |
| Se, and Ms Minnie Law;                          | ]                                    |
| <i>P&amp;T Architects &amp; Engineers Ltd -</i> | ]                                    |
| Mr Joel Chan and Ms Sally Chan                  | ]                                    |
| <br>  |                                      |
| <u>C315 - Luk Pang Kei</u>                      | <u>C333 - Vesta Engineering and</u>  |
| <u>C335 - A-Plus Construction Company</u>       | <u>Consulting Limited</u>            |
| <u>Limited</u>                                  | <u>C397 - Lo Shek Lun</u>            |
| <u>C462 - Lam Chi Wai</u>                       | <u>C609 - Tsui Chun Ming</u>         |
| <u>C685 - Marcela F Venal</u>                   | <u>C689 - Law Wai Fong</u>           |
| <u>C719 - Ho Kin Sun</u>                        | <u>C720 - So Kum Oi</u>              |
| <u>C726 - Chu Kam Ki</u>                        | <u>C730 - Ho Chi Cheung Donald</u>   |
| <u>C818 - Chu Ka Chun</u>                       | <u>C853 - Lai Ching Yin Lucy</u>     |
| <u>C868 - Chow So Yu</u>                        | <u>C883 - Tsang Yee Ping Johanna</u> |
| <u>C909 - Li Yee Ping</u>                       | <u>C910 - Lam Choi Lin</u>           |
| <u>C936 - 朱益</u>                                | <u>C1042 - Ng Mei Wah</u>            |
| <u>C1256 - Chan Po Yuk</u>                      | <u>C1257 - Cheng Wai Lun</u>         |
| <u>C1301 - Li Yee Wan</u>                       | <u>C1302 - Cheung Ngan Fai</u>       |
| <u>C1320 - Lau Che Kin</u>                      | <u>C1342 - Cheung Ka Hei</u>         |
| <u>C1368 - Ho Sze Wai, Shireen</u>              | <u>C1404 - 符繼明</u>                   |
| <u>C1409 - Pun Sui Ha</u>                       | <u>C1423 - Chan Wing Keung</u>       |
| <i>Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront</i>        | - Commenter and Commenters'          |
| <i>Concern Group -</i>                          | representative                       |
| Mr Luk Pang Kei                                 |                                      |
| <br>  |                                      |
| <u>C332 - Element Trading HK Ltd.</u>           | <u>C412 - Chik Kim Ming</u>          |
| <u>C420 - Cecilia Leung</u>                     | <u>C435 - Choi Sheung Kwong</u>      |
| <u>C438 - Ching Sik Wan Elaine</u>              | <u>C485 - Elaine Ching</u>           |

C614 - Chan Yuet Ying

C674 - Ng Kai Ming

C757 - Wan Yue Foon

C993 - Cheung Yu Hang

C1160 - Leung Siu Mui

C1234 - Chan Siu Sum

C1281 - Eddie Chik

C1354 - Suen Ching Shing

C1403 - Ng Lok Hin

*Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront*

*Concern Group -*

Mr Poon Kam Sing

C334 - Long Billion Development Ltd

C337 - Silvertree Industrial Limited

C345 - Chan Chi Tak

C388 - Yim Chi Wah

C434 - Lee Siu Ling

C470 - Tam Suk Kuen Pat

C502 - Li Kai Kwong

C514 - Ng Mun Hong Eric

C524 - Li Sui Po

C537 - Kwong Heung

C560 - Fong Koon Ho

C567 - Siu Hon Tak

C585 - Li Yee Yan

C659 - Kong Long Yin

C690 - Lau Wing Tung

C733 - 李嘉林

C773 - 徐玉成

C778 - Chan Siu Kwan

C816 - Lai Kit Yee

C820 - Choy May May

C652 - Choi Wing Fong

C675 - Ng Siu Fong

C802 - Adrian Pak Lun Lau

C1016 - Ng Siu Fung

C1225 - Chan Chung Wun

C1235 - C C Chung

C1282 - Koey Tang

C1363 - Fung Shui Fong

C1415 - Hui Kim Ming Cammie

- Commenter and Commenters'  
representative

C336 - Both Star Ltd.

C344 - Chiu Kit Ling Fanny

C382 - Choi Ki Sang

C423 - Chow Chui Yi

C439 - Leung Man Ka

C496 - Lo Kwan Yee

C503 - Li Tse Choi Wah

C515 - Chak Wan Chuen

C527 - Lee Yat Tsin

C558 - Kwong Pik Ki

C562 - Leung Chi Keung

C569 - Tung Man Yan Keith

C644 - Lau Yuk Fun Linda

C680 - Tse Sheung Ting

C708 - 劉世珍

C734 - Ruth Santilla

C774 - Ngan Man Chu

C809 - Beatrice Lo

C819 - Shiu Wai Yin Ken

C839 - Marpuah

C854 - Au Siu Fung

C901 - Shek Lai Ching

C903 - Szto On Tai

C913 - Fung Kai Ming

C932 - Heidi Fung

C1004 - Ho Hiu Lam

C1013 - Chan Wai Ming

C1044 - 劉耀康

C1114 - Wong Ling Fei

C1139 - Chau Oi Fung

C1152 - Choi Suk Yee

C1155 - 梁淑應

C1175 - Cheung Wing Hang

C1187 - Chan Ka Fu

C1189 - Chan Lai Kuen

C1193 - Lau Yiu Hong

C1197 - Yeung Mi Ling

C1233 - Au Tsz Fung Antony

C1272 - 李國超

C1300 - Lau Wing Fat

C1322 - Au Chung Wai

C1338 - Tse Siu Lin

C1379 - Candy Hui Yuk Fong

C1393 - Ng Bin

*Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront*

*Concern Group -*

Ms Chan Hiu Wah

C355 - Pak Cho Kan

C377 - Choi Shiu Hong

C425 - Tsang Wai Kit

C575 - Li Yat Ho Eddie

C921 - Wong Hui Kwan

C860 - Lau Lan Sze Lassie

C902 - Fu Wai Ling

C904 - Christine Chan

C923 - Kong Chung Yi

C985 - Lim Cheng Siew

C1012 - Yau Ming Kin

C1021 - Wong Oi Ha

C1113 - Au Tsz Him Matthew

C1134 - Chan Choi Cheung

C1147 - Choy Hung Kin

C1154 - Lo Lin Oi

C1158 - Maggie Wong

C1186 - Ching Yee Han

C1188 - Ng Kwok Wai

C1190 - Hon Miu Ling

C1194 - Ma Siu Yee

C1209 - Chan Hiu Wah

C1263 - Kwan Sui Kuen

C1287 - Leung Kam Fung

C1313 - 戚劍明

C1337 - Lau Kam Ching

C1356 - 戚劍儀

C1382 - Chan Hons

C1413 - Ng Fung Yee

- Commenter and Commenters'  
representative

C369 - Yim Wai Fong

C411 - Kwong Chun Ho

C471 - Chong Hoi Kwan

C607 - Szeto Cheuk Yan

C933 - Hung Chi Fong



C981 - Ceria Zayda Shanne G

C1424 - 黃少明

*Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront*

*Concern Group -*

Ms Chong Hoi Kwan

Mr Tse Chun Wah

C1180 - Suen Kin Keung

C1425 - 楊少群

] Commenters and Commenters'

] representatives

]

]

C362 - Fok Yin Chun

C386 - Ching Sing Fai

C442 - Lam Yue Shek Edmund

C493 - Yip Ying Heung

C722 - Yuen Sin Hung

C764 - Yau Mei Ying

C877 - Chan Siu Wah

C957 - Wong Suen Suen

C1032 - Cheung Cheuk Lun Michael

C1054 - Wong Po Chun

C1084 - Fung Suk Yee Roxana

C1394 - Catherine Amul

*Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront*

*Concern Group -*

Mr Lam Yue Shek Edmund

C376 - Chau Wai Ching

C395 - Cheung Wing Hing

C444 - Lau Ming Leong Calvin

C666 - Yim Wai Ping

C753 - Lam Wai Hung

C795 - Silina Kwan

C955 - Fung Shun Wo

C958 - Tang Shu Ki

C1052 - Fung Ying Lin

C1063 - Choi Fung Man

C1219 - Flora W Y Lui

- Commenter and Commenters'

representative

C404 - Ho Yung Kwong

Mr Ho Yung Kwong

- Commenter

C431 - Chow Dennis

C796 - Wong Wai Chee Maria

Ms Wong Wai Chee Maria

- Commenter and Commenter's

representative

C682 - Fung Hei Ting

Ms Fung Hei Ting

- Commenter

C740 - Ng Ho Ying

C815 - 侯希彤

Ms Ng Ho Ying

- Commenter and Commenter's  
representative

C431 – Dennis Chow

C796 – Wong Wai Chee, Maria

23. Ms Wong Wai Chee, Maria made the following main points:

- (a) she had been living in Laguna City in East Kowloon for a long time. She was not just concerned about the proposed Vocational Training Council (VTC) development but she wanted the Board to note that protection of the view of the Victoria Harbour was essential to the society;
- (b) according to VTC's presentation in that morning, VTC was invited by the Government in 2015 to draw up a strategic development plan for its campuses and that VTC did not request for development of a campus at a harbourfront site;
- (c) there was no urgency to develop a new campus. Many alternative sites over the territory was considered suitable for the VTC development. Using a harbourfront site for school use were not justified. Although PlanD said that one of VTC's requirements was a site which would be available for early development, there were many vacant school sites that were available immediately;
- (d) VTC had many other campuses. She doubted on the rationale behind the redevelopment of the existing campuses at the Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education (IVE) (Haking Wong) and IVE (Kwun Tong). The two sites would probably be used for residential development to increase government revenue and to meet the flat supply target. The requirement of an urban location was also not justified. VTC had recently revised their development scheme indicating that their proposal had not yet been

finalised, and could be changed further. VTC had also showed that they had made reference to the international trend on campus design, such as those in Toronto, Chinese cities and Singapore. However, there was an unlimited land supply in China for large scale campuses, but it would not be applicable to a city like Hong Kong with scarce land resource. Town planning in Hong Kong should respect the citizen's need. The Victoria Harbour was the property of Hong Kong citizen and not just to serve 6,000 students;

- (e) the proposed public open space of 1 ha to be provided by VTC would probably be occupied by students of VTC most of the time. Besides, the proposed waterfront promenade with a width of 50m was insufficient to accommodate the necessary facilities and activities of the local residents. The comparison with the existing width of Tsim Sha Tsui East promenade was not appropriate; and
- (f) the Board should listen to their request to provide a prominent and proper scale open space. The site was zoned "Open Space" ("O") for years without an implementation programme. There were large harbourfront parks in other parts of Hong Kong but not in East Kowloon. The Government was transforming Kowloon East, developing the area into a second Central Business District, and together with the Cruise Terminal, many visitors and businesses would be attracted to Kowloon East. Making a better use of the Kowloon East harbourfront site would be important.

C315 - Luk Pang Kei

C335 - A-Plus Construction Company  
Limited

C462 - Lam Chi Wai

C685 - Marcela F Venal

C719 - Ho Kin Sun

C726 - Chu Kam Ki

C818 - Chu Ka Chun

C333 - Vesta Engineering and  
Consulting Limited

C397 - Lo Shek Lun

C609 - Tsui Chun Ming

C689 - Law Wai Fong

C720 - So Kum Oi

C730 - Ho Chi Cheung Donald

C853 - Lai Ching Yin Lucy

C868 - Chow So Yu

C909 - Li Yee Ping

C936 - 朱益

C1256 - Chan Po Yuk

C1301 - Li Yee Wan

C1320 - Lau Che Kin

C1368 - Ho Sze Wai, Shireen

C1409 - Pun Sui Ha

C883 - Tsang Yee Ping Johanna

C910 - Lam Choi Lin

C1042 - Ng Mei Wah

C1257 - Cheng Wai Lun

C1302 - Cheung Ngan Fai

C1342 - Cheung Ka Hei

C1404 - 符繼明

C1423 - Chan Wing Keung

24. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Luk Pang Kei of the Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront Concern Group made the following main points and recapitulated some points he made on 3.1.2018:

- (a) a change of land use should be assessed on the criteria whether there would be gain or loss to the community as a whole. Public interest should be protected;

[Mr Elvis W.K. Au arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

*Harbour Planning and Urban Design Guidelines*

- (b) whether public interest was protected should be assessed on the basis of whether the concerned guidelines had been violated. The new 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). Principle 8 of HPP stated that the planning and development of harbourfront areas should maximize opportunities for public enjoyment. In terms of land use planning aspect of HPG, harbourfront sites were to provide vibrancy, diversity, enjoyment for all, and various facilities. The proposed VTC campus, an educational use purely for students, was not a use encouraged in the waterfront areas under HPG, nor would it provide space, recreation and leisure, focal point, gathering place, etc. Section 6.2.18 of Chapter 11, Urban Design

Guidelines of HKPSG stated that waterfront sites should be for cultural, tourism-related, recreational and retail activities but the proposed VTC campus would not provide them;

[Mr Andy S.H. Lam arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (c) while buildings were allowed in harbourfront sites, they should be of human scale, low density with a small footprint and a graded building height (BH) profile descending towards the harbour to avoid dominating the harbour. The massive VTC campus violated all the guidelines while the originally planned Cha Kwo Ling (CKL) Waterfront Park would be in line with HPP;
- (d) besides, HPG had eight different aspects and harbourfront development was not only related to urban design and physical linkage as emphasised by the government departments;

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

#### *Open Space*

- (e) according to Chapter 4 of HKPSG, the open space provision was 2 m<sup>2</sup> per person. PlanD had proposed to increase the provision by 25% to 2.5 m<sup>2</sup> per person. According to a report of HK2030+ study, the provision of open space in the Kwun Tong District was on the low side. Referring to the information on open space in Kwun Tong District provided by PlanD at the meeting, it should be noted that the distribution of existing and planned open space were greatly uneven. The northern part of East Kowloon had 17 ha existing and 5 ha planned open space, whereas the southern part where the representation site was located had 7 ha existing and 11 ha planned open space;
- (f) according to Kwun Tong DC, the district needed a total of 72.86 ha open space, but the existing provision was 59.44 ha. only. The existing 13.42 ha

deficit would worsen to 31.64 ha if the proposal to increase the open space provision to 2.5 m<sup>2</sup> per person was to be taken on board. Although there was a number of planned open space, the slow implementation programme could hardly meet the new demand from the growing population;

- (g) besides, the proposed open space was not equivalent to a waterfront park which would create a node for a wider population;

*Impacts on the Community*

- (h) the zoning amendments had reduced the provision of open space which would have adverse impact on public health, including physical, social, emotional, spiritual, environmental, and mental health. The shape of the open space site would affect the type of facilities that could be provided therein, and in turn, affect its function and activities for the community;
- (i) the CKL Waterfront Park would change from a well-configured to a T-shaped plot of land made up by fragmented pieces. Making reference to various parks and gardens of similar scale over the territory, their common facilities included a central lawn/plaza/garden/square etc., serving as a node for gathering and performance, as well as areas for leisure and recreation activities, and/or heritage related, and special features. As a result of the amendment, what remained would be a narrow promenade and park, a soccer pitch, and a leftover strip of land which were separated by road with busy taxi traffic that would cause safety concern;

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (j) as result of the proposed amendment, the community had to bear a T-shaped park with poor layout and limited facilities. That would result in a reduced waterfront, disappearance of gathering node, and mass buildings standing next to the community. The site was the last piece of harbourfront park, loss of it would defeat public interest and would have adverse impacts on public enjoyment, quality of health, and social cohesion;

- (k) VTC claimed that it required 3 to 5 ha. of urban land which should be immediately available for its campus development. At first, VTC said that a large site was required to accommodate heavy equipment and machineries. VTC further said that a large footprint was needed for Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) Education. However, according to the proposed floor layout, the proposed STEM Centre at UG/F occupied about 4,000 m<sup>2</sup> of floor space only, and part of it was located on 1/F. The revised proposal indicated that locating the equipment on G/F was not necessary. Using similar government buildings as a reference for calculating the net operation floor area (NOFA) requirement, it was estimated that the total gross floor area (GFA) of the VTC campus would be 144,000 m<sup>2</sup> (i.e. 6,000 students x 15m<sup>2</sup> x 1.6) only instead of the proposed 180,000 m<sup>2</sup>;
- (l) the locational requirement in the urban area was not justified. Requirements for tertiary educational institutions were determined on a territory-wide basis. Citing Zhu Hai College of Higher Education and Lingnan University in Tuen Mun as examples, there was no need to locate the campus in the urban area. Besides, students of the existing Haking Wong campus would then have to travel a long way to CKL. Even if an urban location was required, redevelopment of the existing VTC campuses should be considered;
- (m) his proposal for an alternative campus site at Tai Po Pok Yin Road met the site area requirements of VTC. That location was more suitable for educational use; and
- (n) the proposed amendment would 'kill' the last piece of land available for waterfront park and it would be an irreversible loss.

C682 - Fung Hei Ting

25. Ms Fung Hei Ting made the following main points:

- (a) she opposed rezoning the site for development of a VTC campus as it would adversely affect the originally planned CKL waterfront park;
- (b) most of the current programmes offered by VTC including diploma, associate degree, higher diploma, degree and top-up degree programmes were also provided by other tertiary educational institutions or accredited universities. Though there was a need in vocational training, it was not necessarily to have a campus in an extensive scale and providing many overlapping courses. For example, the proposed training hotel component was not needed as it was already provided in the Pokfulam campus and other institutes. There were also other tertiary educational facilities in Kwun Tong, and no need for an additional one. The Pokfulam Complex of VTC was newly completed, there was no strong justification to rush for a new campus in CKL;
- (c) as a student of the Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts (HKAPA), she had often visited its Bethanie heritage campus in Pokfulam which was just next to the VTC Pokfulam Complex. The distance from the Mass Transit Railway (MTR) station to the Bethanie heritage campus was similar to that of the proposed CKL site. She usually got off at MTR Kennedy Town station and took a mini-bus to the Bethanie heritage campus, and very often had to wait for 20 minutes together with the students going to the VTC Pokfulam Complex. The CLK site would need shuttle bus service to link it up with MTR Yau Tong station and she doubted about the capacity of the shuttle buses. Provision of tertiary educational institutions was territorial based, travel between districts was very common and should not cause hardship to students;
- (d) the demand for harbourfront open space in the CKL district had been very strong as there were insufficient open space provided in the Kwun Tong District. More open space would be required upon the population intake of the Kwun Tong Town Centre redevelopment project. She noted that many new towns had a comprehensive cycle track network, but there was only a small scale cycle park in Kowloon Bay. The residents in Kwun



Tong had a legitimate expectation for a sizable promenade park with cycling facilities. A harbourfront park would probably be developed into a tourism node but the proposed VTC campus would privatize the site solely for VTC's use; and

- (e) according to her experience in HKAPA which also involved large sized equipments, VTC's site area requirement of 3 to 5 ha was questionable. Besides, she doubted the need for VTC to accommodate heavy equipments and machineries.

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

26. At this point, Mr H.F. Leung said that he had worked with the Technological and Higher Education Institute (THEi) of VTC previously. Members noted the interest of Mr Leung was indirect and agreed that he should be allowed to stay at the meeting.

C355 - Pak Cho Kan

C369 - Yim Wai Fong

C377 - Choi Shiu Hong

C411 - Kwong Chun Ho

C425 - Tsang Wai Kit

C471 - Chong Hoi Kwan

C575 - Li Yat Ho Eddie

C607 - Szeto Cheuk Yan

C921 - Wong Hui Kwan

C933 - Hung Chi Fong

C981 - Ceria Zayda Shanne G

C1180 - Suen Kin Keung

C1424 - 黃少明

C1425 - 楊少群

27. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Chong Hoi Kwan of the Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront Concern Group made the following main points:

- (a) she recapitulated the main points she made on 3.1.2018 and made further comments on DPO's previous responses:

Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA)

- (i) DPO's previous responses that the AVA had made comparison

between the existing condition and proposed design scheme. However, according to the Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau Technical Circular No. 1/2006 on Air Ventilation Assessments (TC No. 1/2006), the AVA should enable comparison of different design options of the same development scale in external air ventilation terms and to identify the option with the least impact as well as potential problem areas for design improvements. The AVA conducted for the proposed VTC campus had compared two schemes with different development intensities. Besides, the AVA had made mistake to consider some open space test points as special test point and had missed out many test points. Hence, the AVA was invalid;

- (ii) the site spatial average velocity ratio (SVR) test points should be taken at the project site perimeter. However, it was noted from the AVA report that the adjoining liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) filling station and the open space outside the VTC development had been included, but the realigned street at the western site boundary 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 and the proposed open spaces. As such, the assumption and modelling method of the AVA were incorrect. The model using the enlarged site area would lead to poor ventilation performance, resulting in inaccurate conclusion in favour of the revised scheme;
- (iii) the AVA indicated that there was no difference in air ventilation performance between the baseline scheme and the revised scheme for the annual east prevailing wind while there was a slight improvement for the southwest summer prevailing wind. The results were non-representable and incorrect. The revised scheme would create stagnant wind environment on the northern side of the VTC building and most of the promenade under the annual prevailing wind, weak air movement at the promenade under the

prevailing summer wind, and with strong wind gust and turbulence at the proposed open space;

- (iv) the pedestrian footbridges linking the tower blocks were presented in the AVA model as 2-dimensional planes instead of a 3-dimensional object and could not represent the actual building mass;
- (v) the test points along the promenade and at the existing soccer pitch should not be taken as special test points, which should be positioned in areas where special localised problems were likely to appear, as they would not be included in the LVR and SVR calculations. According to the TC No. 1/2006, overall test points should be evenly distributed and in the open spaces, streets and project and assessment areas with pedestrians frequently access. As there was no wind gust in the existing local environment along the promenade and at the soccer pitch, special test points thereat were not necessary. On the contrary, no special test points were adopted in the open space and roads with frequent pedestrian movements. The SVR should include perimeter test points and not project site boundary, concerned road junctions, main entrances and corners. The site boundary of new campus had been revised, while test points at the realigned street for SVR calculation and at the open spaces including the promenade and streets for LVR calculation respectively were missing. As more than 30 points were omitted, the AVA was incomplete; and
- (vi) the Harbourfront Commission (HC) had also raised concerns on the building design and development parameters of the development and considered a massive building at the harbourfront location not desirable;

#### Traffic Issues

- (vii) DPO's previous responses that queuing of taxis at CKL Road waiting for refuelling would be resolved by providing a new LPG filling station with waiting area sufficient for five queues each accommodating nine taxis. Thus, the vehicle waiting spaces would be increased from 24 to 69. According to the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) submitted by VTC, the maximum queuing length observed at Wai Yip Street was 275m which equalled to about 46 taxis. However, as shown in the photos taken in various periods of 2017, the actual queue was much longer with at least 450m in length. As the reprovisioned LPG filling station would likely attract more vehicles, the queuing situation would even get worse;
  
- (viii) in response to their query on whether the condition of CKL Road was suitable for the proposed routing of shuttle bus, the government representative then said that according to the TIA report, the Transport Department had no adverse comment on the proposed routing and that illegal parking problem along CKL Road would be enforced by police. However, it was noted that the proposed shuttle bus pick up/drop off point at MTR Yau Tong station was blocked by illegal parking all the time. The proposed shuttle bus service running at an interval 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 CKL Road;
  
- (ix) whether the road junctions were adequately covered in the TIA was questionable. The government representative had said that as there was still reserve capacity at the road junctions, traffic impacts would not be significant. By overlaying the routes of buses, mini-buses, shuttle buses, and taxi queue, a number of the routes had gone through junctions which had not been examined in the TIA. Besides, the TIA had not taken into consideration the proposed Core Business District 2 (CBD2) development in

Kowloon East. The assumptions of the TIA were thus not sufficient nor representative;

- (x) there were discrepancies in the reserve capacities in various junctions between the current TIA of the proposed VTC campus and the TIA carried out previously which indicated the reserve capacity of the relevant road junctions were lower than those in the current TIA;
- (xi) hence, assumptions in the current TIA were invalid, and the traffic and pedestrian flows were under-estimated;
- (xii) the Kwun Tong MTR station was already operating at full capacity requiring crowd management measures, such as intermittent closing of the entrance to the station, to reduce passengers staying at the platforms. The MTR would not be able to cope with the increase in traffic demand generated from the proposed VTC campus; and
- (xiii) VTC had said that there was no significant problem associated with locating a campus next to a large residential development. Members should be reminded of the Tsing Yi incidents. Due to the large number of students of the two VTC campuses in Tsing Yi using the mini-bus route No. 88C, the transport services for local residents had been affected even with continued increase in frequency. As a result, the estate management in 2010 implemented a queuing arrangement to give priority to residents during p.m. peak hours to solve the problem, though the measure had been cancelled now;

[Mr H.F. Leung left this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (b) in short, whether the technical assessments submitted by VTC were accurate, reliable and reflecting the actual conditions were doubtful:

Harbour Planning Guidelines

- (i) the proposed VTC campus did not meet the urban design aspect of the HPG in terms of permeability and development intensity. According to HPG, building mass should be carefully articulated to allow visual permeability, and openings/void should be introduced between and within buildings to frame harbourfront views. In future, when walking along the promenade adjoining the proposed VTC campus, the openings between blocks of the development would only be a pedestrian walkway with poor visual permeability;
- (ii) HPG stipulated that harbourfront buildings should be of small footprint as far as possible to avoid creating an impermeable “wall” along the harbourfront. Locating the massive VTC campus along the harbourfront would block sea/land breezes and prevailing winds;
- (iii) developments fronting directly onto Victoria Harbour should adopt a lower development density to provide a human scale environment, which was commensurate with the harbourfront setting. With a building frontage of about 103 m and 95 m and a width of 110 m along the harbourfront, the proposed VTC campus would have the largest building footprint in the area. Together with the adjacent proposed pumping station, they would occupy a large part of the harbourfront. According to her own computer simulation, pedestrians travelling along the future promenade in front of the proposed VTC campus would be walking along a high wall. VTC’s development would not be in human scale and thus was not acceptable;
- (iv) as regard diversity of uses under the land use planning aspect, HPG recommended that incompatible land uses, which were not conducive to public enjoyment/harbourfront enhancement, should be relocated outside the inner core of Victoria Harbour. A

traffic-free environment along the harbourfront was encouraged to allow 'pedestrian preferential' movements to promote ease of access. The proposed building blocks of VTC campus would interrupt the physical linkage between the harbourfront and the local residents living in the area. As a school campus, the VTC development would not contribute to public enjoyment nor harbourfront enhancement. The proposed LPG filling station was also an incompatible land use at the harbourfront;

- (v) harbourfront developments should be for uses that would enhance vibrancy, diversity, physical linkage and public enjoyment such as open space, sitting out areas, retail, food and beverage stores, recreation and leisure activities including cycling, running, jogging, and holding events;
- (vi) regarding the BH, HPG suggested that developments within and around the harbourfront areas should generally adopt a gradation of height profile with building height descending towards the Harbour to avoid dominating the Harbour and to increase permeability to the water body. Locating at the harbourfront with a BH of 60 to 70 mPD, the proposed VTC campus did not adopt a gradation of BH profile nor was its BH descending towards the harbour;
- (vii) the proposed CKL park was a park committed by the Government to be built at the waterfront and would provide a diversity of uses and open space meeting the land use planning aspects of HPG to promote vibrancy and diversity and to enhance public enjoyment along the harbourfront areas. Public space for recreation and leisure uses should be created wherever possible and passive recreation and leisure activities should be provided where practical. Harbourfront open space should be planned to integrate with adjacent waterfront promenades and supporting retail/dining facilities to create a focal point and public gathering place for both local residents and tourists. Use of vacant land for temporary

public open space purposes pending permanent development was encouraged to maximise opportunities for public enjoyment. Diversity of activities was of key importance to enhancement of harbourfront spaces;

- (viii) although members of the Harbourfront Commission (HC) in general agreed that the revised scheme was an improvement, some members still requested further exploration of reduction in BH, identification of an alternative location for the proposed campus, and questioned whether public interest would be best served with the VTC campus at such location;

*The proposed LPG filling station*

- (c) the proposed reprovisioned LPG filling station with a total of 69 taxis waiting spaces was an incompatible land use at the harbourfront. Besides, emission and pollutants as well as exhaust from the vehicles queuing to the LPG filling station and in CKL Road would cause health hazard for the park users. With the proposed VTC campus, the situation would get even worse in that the proposed VTC buildings would block the air movement and the pollutants would return to the inland area causing adverse impacts on the proposed 1 ha open spaces and the neighbourhood such as the existing Laguna Park. According to the Hong Kong Transient Emission Test deployed by the Environmental Protection Department (EPD), LPG taxis contributed to a significant amount of urban pollution. Emissions included carbon monoxide (CO), hydrocarbon (HC), and nitrogen oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>). According to the emission profiles of Hong Kong's vehicular fleet, roadside pollution was mainly caused by vehicles. The emissions of respirable suspended particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>) and NO<sub>x</sub> were both significant for taxis and LPG public light bus (PLB);
- (d) as indicated in the Audit Report on 'Monitoring and Reporting of Air Quality' issued in 2012, EPD advised that if worn-out emission-reduction catalytic devices were not replaced, emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> by LPG vehicles



would increase by at least ten times. In 2012, emissions from LPG taxis and light buses accounted for about 40% of the total vehicular NOx emissions on heavy-traffic roads. Concentration of NO<sub>2</sub> were often correlated with other toxic pollutants, and used as a surrogate for the pollutant mixture. Based on the Air Quality Guidelines of the World Health Organisation, experimental studies indicated that NO<sub>2</sub> at short-term concentrations exceeding 200 µg/m<sup>3</sup> was a toxic gas with significant health effects including bronchitic symptoms, reduced lung function, and respiratory symptoms. As reported by Apple Daily, NO<sub>2</sub> in Kwun Tong had already reached 202 µg/m<sup>3</sup> which exceeded the 200 µg/m<sup>3</sup> health safety limit;

- (e) as such, the LPG filling station was not in line with HPG on public enjoyment, harbourfront enhancement, traffic free environment, vibrancy, and diversity of uses and would cause health and safety problems;

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung left this session of the meeting at this point.]

*The Revised Scheme*

- (f) VTC had previously claimed that a large footprint was required to accommodate heavy equipment and machineries on the ground floor of the campus. Later on, VTC said that a large footprint was needed for STEM Education. However, the proposed STEM Centre was located on UG/F and 1/F and did not necessarily be located on the ground floor;
- (g) according to the revised scheme, 1 ha of public open space within the “G/IC” zone would be provided by VTC and be handed back to the Government for management and maintenance. However, it appeared that part of the 1ha land was to serve as the buffer zone to fulfill the minimum separation distance requirement between the VTC building and the proposed LPG filling station. Besides, should the 1 ha open space be excluded from plot ratio (PR) calculation, the actual PR of the revised scheme was 5.63 instead of 4.3 as said; and

- (h) to sum up, the proposed change of use from open space to GIC use was not acceptable in terms of local air ventilation, air quality, and local traffic condition. The proposed amendment did not align with HPG principles relating to public interest, diversity of use, human scale, building mass and BH. The Board was requested to uphold their representations, to rezone the site to “O” for implementing the CKL Park, and relocating the LPG filling station so as to ensure a safe, vibrant and diverse harbourfront for public enjoyment.

[Mr H. W. Cheung left this session of the meeting at this point.]

C334 - Long Billion Development Ltd

C337 - Silvertree Industrial Limited

C345 - Chan Chi Tak

C388 - Yim Chi Wah

C434 - Lee Siu Ling

C470 - Tam Suk Kuen Pat

C502 - Li Kai Kwong

C514 - Ng Mun Hong Eric

C524 - Li Sui Po

C537 - Kwong Heung

C560 - Fong Koon Ho

C567 - Siu Hon Tak

C585 - Li Yee Yan

C659 - Kong Long Yin

C690 - Lau Wing Tung

C733 - 李嘉林

C773 - 徐玉成

C778 - Chan Siu Kwan

C816 - Lai Kit Yee

C820 - Choy May May

C854 - Au Siu Fung

C336 - Both Star Ltd.

C344 - Chiu Kit Ling Fanny

C382 - Choi Ki Sang

C423 - Chow Chui Yi

C439 - Leung Man Ka

C496 - Lo Kwan Yee

C503 - Li Tse Choi Wah

C515 - Chak Wan Chuen

C527 - Lee Yat Tsin

C558 - Kwong Pik Ki

C562 - Leung Chi Keung

C569 - Tung Man Yan Keith

C644 - Lau Yuk Fun Linda

C680 - Tse Sheung Ting

C708 - 劉世珍

C734 - Ruth Santilla

C774 - Ngan Man Chu

C809 - Beatrice Lo

C819 - Shiu Wai Yin Ken

C839 - Marpuah

C860 - Lau Lan Sze Lassie

C901 - Shek Lai Ching

C903 - Szto On Tai

C913 - Fung Kai Ming

C932 - Heidi Fung

C1004 - Ho Hiu Lam

C1013 - Chan Wai Ming

C1044 - 劉耀康

C1114 - Wong Ling Fei

C1139 - Chau Oi Fung

C1152 - Choi Suk Yee

C1155 - 梁淑應

C1175 - Cheung Wing Hang

C1187 - Chan Ka Fu

C1189 - Chan Lai Kuen

C1193 - Lau Yiu Hong

C1197 - Yeung Mi Ling

C1233 - Au Tsz Fung Antony

C1272 - 李國超

C1300 - Lau Wing Fat

C1322 - Au Chung Wai

C1338 - Tse Siu Lin

C1379 - Candy Hui Yuk Fong

C1393 - Ng Bin

C902 - Fu Wai Ling

C904 - Christine Chan

C923 - Kong Chung Yi

C985 - Lim Cheng Siew

C1012 - Yau Ming Kin

C1021 - Wong Oi Ha

C1113 - Au Tsz Him Matthew

C1134 - Chan Choi Cheung

C1147 - Choy Hung Kin

C1154 - Lo Lin Oi

C1158 - Maggie Wong

C1186 - Ching Yee Han

C1188 - Ng Kwok Wai

C1190 - Hon Miu Ling

C1194 - Ma Siu Yee

C1209 - Chan Hiu Wah

C1263 - Kwan Sui Kuen

C1287 - Leung Kam Fung

C1313 - 戚劍明

C1337 - Lau Kam Ching

C1356 - 戚劍儀

C1382 - Chan Hons

C1413 - Ng Fung Yee

28. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Chan Hiu Wah of the Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront Concern Group made the following main points:

*Liveable City*

- (a) she had been living in Kwun Tong for over 30 years and was a mother of a two years old son. According to the 2017 Policy Address, a liveable city was where people would be happy, hopeful, confident about the future and had a sense of belonging. In addition to housing, transport network,

countryside, harbour, sustainable environment, heritage, as well as culture, recreational/sports activities and social order were all indispensables to make up a quality city;

- (b) the “Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030” (Hong Kong 2030+), a comprehensive strategic study to update the territorial development strategy which had advocated to plan for a liveable, competitive and sustainable Asia’s World City, championing sustainable development. The topical paper, ‘Planning and Urban Design for a Liveable High-Density City’ released in October 2016 was relevant;
- (c) the major indexes on liveability included the Economic Intelligence Unit’s Liveability Survey, Mercer’s Quality of Living Survey, and Monocle’s Quality of Life Survey. The performance of Hong Kong had taken cognisance of the Mercer’s survey in 2016, which was an annual survey from professionals and specialists on a quantitative set of “quality of life determinants”. Based on Mercer’s survey, the performance of Hong Kong remained moderate. The target of Hong Kong was to move from the ranking of 70 to 25 comparable with Singapore;
- (d) livability seemed to be a brand image of Hong Kong. To strengthen Hong Kong as a unique place would help maintain our identity and attractiveness, and sense of belonging. The Victoria Harbour and its setting were Hong Kong’s icon;

#### *Victoria Harbour*

- (e) the key directions to build Victoria Harbour as the brand signature were (i) to preserve, enhance and/or create views towards the Victoria Harbour; (ii) to develop the harbourfront as a sustainable, accessible, vibrant, attractive and enjoyable place; (iii) to promote recreational, tourism, water leisure and other uses in line with the Vision Statement, HPP and HPG at the Harbourfront area; (iv) to promote a ‘water-friendly’ culture with water dependent and waterfront-related uses along the harbourfront; and (v) to

ensure planning of the Victoria Harbour was in line with HKPSG;

[Dr F.C. Chan left this session of the meeting at this point.]

*The Cha Kwo Ling Waterfront*

- (f) changing a planned open space at the harbourfront to a mega size VTC campus with at a BH of 70m was not in line with the above-mentioned directions. A proposed temporary school in Hung Hom were rejected by the Board as it was not in line with the planning intention to enhance the attractiveness and vibrancy of the Hung Hom waterfront;
- (g) ‘water-friendly’ culture should be promoted at the CKL Waterfront. Locating a VTC campus and a LPG filling station on the site would adversely affect the provision of ‘water-friendly’ activities;
- (h) according to PlanD, there would be a waterfront promenade, a soccer pitch and basketball courts would be provided on the remaining “O” zone. It was doubtful if those facilities could help to build a brand signature for the harbourfront;

*The Han Gang Example*

- (i) the Han Gang river project was a signature open space development in Korea. The importance of Han Gang in Seoul was similar to the Victoria Harbour in Hong Kong. Han Gang was about 514 km long and 1 km wide. It had been developed into an area for sports and relaxation. The Han Gang Park consisted of 12 districts, each with its own unique characteristics and facilities. The Banpo bridge moonlight rainbow fountain show was a water spraying show with music and lights. The Yeouido area was a popular films shooting site. Bam Isle was a designated ecological preservation area where birds could be observed. Ttukseom was a windsurfing and water-skiing centre. Cycling and river cruises were also popular in Han Gang;

- (j) the background for the comprehensive development at Han Gang were three-folded, (i) to restore the ecology of the river ecosystem, (ii) to improve accessibility of the riverside parks, and (iii) to provide recreational facilities;

*Open Space*

- (k) there were queries why the number of Mainland visitors had been increasing without a rebound in the retail sector. She noted from the articles in the People's Daily earlier that Country Parks in Hong Kong had increasingly become a visiting spot by Mainland visitors instead of shopping;
- (l) as the CKL site was the last piece of harbourfront open space in Kwun Tong, the Government should consider an alternative site for the VTC campus. Education was very important, however, it should be provided at the right place;
- (m) open space was very important to family with kids as they were frequent users of the park facilities. The number of children between 0-5 years old had been increasing yearly and was about 5% of the total population in Hong Kong whereas it was about 9% in the Kwun Tong District;
- (n) according to 2016 By-census, Kwun Tong had the highest population density as well as a higher elderly population among districts. The percentage of children in Laguna City and percentage of elderly in Yau Tong West were much higher than the territorial and Kwun Tong averages. With a population of 45,542 in the two areas, an area of 9 ha was required for open space development according to HKPSG;
- (o) according to a topical paper of Hong Kong 2030+, the 'Green and Blue Space Conceptual Framework', Kwun Tong was identified as a district with a relatively low vegetation cover and should be given priority to

improvement. The District Open Space (DO) per person of six districts including Kwun Tong was below  $1\text{m}^2$  per person. The current standard of  $2\text{m}^2$  per person in HKPSG was thus proposed to be increased to  $2.5\text{m}^2$  per person under Hong Kong 2030+. Although PlanD had said that after including the planned provision, there was a surplus provision of DO in Kwun Tong, the open spaces near Laguna City and in Yau Tong West areas were mostly planned open space in small scale without implementation programme;

- (p) the Hong Kong 2030+ also recommended that local open spaces should be located within a reachable walking distance of no more than 400 m from residential homes, and homes should also be positioned within 3 km of a country park. As the open space requirements for Laguna City were not met, the proposed CKL Park should be retained;

#### *Environment*

- (q) placing a LPG filling station at a harbourfront location was the most ridiculous land use arrangement. There was no reason to sacrifice an open space for a LPG filling station. According to 'A Clean Air Plan for Hong Kong' published in 2013, taxi and LPG PLB with defective emission-reduction devices accounted for almost 40% of the roadside NO<sub>x</sub>. The proposed new LPG filling station with a size three times that of the existing one would adversely affect public enjoyment of the park and facilities;
- (r) as reported in Apple Daily recently, NO<sub>2</sub>, a major roadside air pollutant in Hong Kong, was two times that of the WHO's annual average limit. As a result, the risk of short-term death would increase. Vehicle emission was one of the major sources of NO<sub>2</sub>. As the Kwun Tong Promenade was just below the Kwun Tong Bypass, the NO<sub>2</sub> concentration was high and exceeded the WHO's hourly average concentration of  $200\ \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ . The fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) was about  $17\text{-}22\ \text{mg}/\text{m}^3$ ;

*Traffic Aspects*

- (s) the MTR Kwun Tong line was overcrowded during peak hours. Passengers often had to wait for more than two trains to get on board. Recently, some of the trains running from Tiu Keng Leng Station would go direct to Wong Tai Sin Station during rush hours. The transport service would probably get worse with more new developments in the Kwun Tong area. The MTR would not be able to cope with the increase in transport demand;
- (t) with the additional shuttle bus service proposed by VTC and the current road capacity in Yau Tong, the traffic condition would get worse; and
- (u) it was not justified to build a VTC campus at a harbourfront site to serve only 6,500 students while the proposed CKL Park would serve a population of 650,000 in Kwun Tong.

29. As the presentation from the government's representatives and commenters or their representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the question-and-answer (Q&A) session. The Vice-Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions and the Vice-Chairperson would invite the government's representatives, 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 Vice-Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

[Mr Peter K.T. Yuen and Mr Elvis W.K. Au left this session of the meeting at this point.]

Traffic Issues

30. The Vice-Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions on traffic aspect:

- (a) what the assumptions of the TIA submitted by VTC were, whether the TIA had taken into account the future developments in the area such as the



proposed CBD2, and what the traffic conditions of the Kwun Tong area were in comparison with the other districts;

- (b) in view of the number of taxi queuing to the LPG filling station, whether there were measures to ensure a through traffic for the shuttle bus and other vehicular traffic to access to the proposed VTC campus from Kwun Tong; and
- (c) in view of the severe illegal parking problem outside MTR Yau Tong Station as mentioned by the commenters, whether proper vehicle drop off point near the station would be available, and how the queuing of proposed shuttle bus service and taxi near the LPG filling station would be avoided.

31. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, PlanD and Miss Wendy W.T. Tang, E/KT, TD, made the following main points:

- (a) the TIA submitted by VTC concluded that the proposed development would not impose adverse traffic impact on the surrounding road network. There were short to long-term measures to address the traffic problems of the Kwun Tong area :
  - (i) in the short term, to relieve the traffic condition in Kowloon East area, the Government had implemented a number of local traffic management measures including road widening, junction and roundabout enhancement, and traffic management measures;
  - (ii) regarding the traffic condition in Kwun Tong areas, large-scale planned developments such as Anderson Road Quarry Development, Anderson Road Public Housing Development, the ex-Kaolin Mine site and Kwun Tong Town Centre Redevelopment Project had proposed road and junction improvement measures to support the development implementation;
  - (iii) in the long run, the Government would implement Route 6,

comprising the Tseung Kwan O – Lam Tin Tunnel, the Central Kowloon Route and the Trunk Road T2 which would substantially divert traffic from the road networks of Kowloon East and thus effectively alleviate traffic congestion in the district;

- (iv) to ease railway passenger flow, the MTRCL would adopt various management measures in the light of passenger distribution on individual railway lines and at concerned stations;
- (b) VTC proposed to provide direct shuttle bus services between the proposed VTC campus and MTR Yau Tong Station travelling along the waterfront section of CKL Road to minimize the traffic impacts. The traffic conditions around the MTR Yau Tong Station had been taken into account. TD would keep monitoring the traffic condition of the loading/unloading activities at that area; and
- (c) a holding area would be provided within the proposed LPG filling station site to temporarily accommodate the vehicles queuing up for the LPG filling service, thereby minimizing the impact caused to the road traffic in the vicinity.

32. In response, Ms Carmen Chu, representatives of VTC (C263) made the following main points with the aid of the visualizer/some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) according to the swept path analysis for shuttle bus in the TIA, shuttle bus would use the CKL Road vehicular access point which was at a sufficient distance away from the junction of Wai Yip Street. With proper implementation of traffic management measures and traffic signs, the taxi queues at Wai Yip Street would not block the access of the shuttle bus from CKL Road;
- (b) the TIA had taken into account the committed improvement measures to be implemented at the junctions in the vicinity, and the planned and committed developments and redevelopments in the surrounding areas

including Kwun Tong Business Area and CBD2 such assumptions had not been expressly stated in the report. According to the TIA, the critical junctions in the vicinity and roundabout in Yau Tong were anticipated to operate satisfactorily with spare capacity during the peak periods. Hence, the proposed shuttle bus service could operate smoothly; and

- (c) it was observed that the problems of loading and unloading near Yau Tong station was due to illegal parking of construction vehicles rather than limitation in road capacity for traffic flow. Such issue could be resolved through traffic management measures. Besides, upon completion of the major large-scale developments in the area, illegal parking of those construction vehicles would likely cease.

#### Air Ventilation Aspect

33. The Vice-Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions relating to air ventilation :

- (a) how the air ventilation performance of the proposed VTC campus was assessed; whether the AVA for the proposed VTC campus comparing two schemes with different development intensities instead of with the existing condition was considered appropriate; and how the VTC campus could result in a better air environment than the existing condition without development;
- (b) whether the inclusion of the LPG filling station site into the project boundary for AVA would affect the reliability of the findings;
- (c) whether the inclusion of more test points in the AVA would affect the finding of the assessment; and
- (d) whether the pedestrian footbridges linking the tower blocks presented as 2-dimensional planes or a 3-dimensional object in the AVA model would affect the result of the assessment.

34. In response, Ms Theresa Yeung and Dr Camby Se representatives of VTC (C263) made the following main points with the aid of the visualizer/some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) the AVA was conducted by professional persons and had followed the requirements set out under TC No. 1/2006 issued by the Government;
- (b) to ensure good air ventilation performance, the disposition of buildings had taken into account the two existing major air paths, which were in line with both the annual and summer winds. Due to the downwash effect, the proposed campus buildings, would capture the mid to high-level winds towards the pedestrian level. Various design measures had been adopted to minimize the potential adverse air ventilation impact. Under the revised scheme, the building bulk was reduced and the area of open space was increased. There were improvements in wind environment mainly along the site boundary. The proposed development would only redistribute winds though it might result in wind shadow which could be addressed by building design measures;
- (c) based on TC No. 1/2006, 30 to 50 perimeter test points were required to be positioned on the site boundary for SVR, while 50 to 80 overall test points evenly distributed and positioned would be used together with the perimeter test points for LVR. Special test points should be positioned in areas of concern but should be excluded from the calculation, i.e. exposed sites such as those located along waterfront. As the waterfront promenade was subject to strong wind, they would not be included in the SVR and LVR assessments since they might distort the result, but would be used as additional information. As shown in figures 32 and 33 of the AVA report submitted, 35 perimeter test points, 70 overall test points and 34 special test points were allocated for the assessment to truly reflect the wind condition. The Urban Design and Landscape Section of PlanD had no adverse comment on the AVA as the existing conditions of the site and both development schemes proposed had been assessed. The overall performances of the existing conditions and the original scheme on

pedestrian wind environment were comparable under both annual and summer wind conditions. For the revised scheme, its overall performances were comparable with the original scheme as well as the existing conditions under the annual wind condition, while slightly enhanced under the summer wind condition. The longer façade of the revised scheme would also capture more wind towards the pedestrian level and would enhance the wind environment along site boundary;

- (d) according to their assessment, the findings of the AVA would not have significant deviation even if the special test points along the promenade were included into the LVR calculation in the subject case. However, inclusion of the test points at the reprovioned open space was not appropriate. Focus areas, including the open spaces mentioned by the commenters and the waterfront promenade, were designated to examine the ventilation performance of those areas; and
- (e) as the site was located at the leeward side of the existing developments under annual wind condition, the proposed development would not have significant impact on air ventilation to the surrounding area.

35. With the aid of a PowerPoint slide, Mr Tom C.K. Yip supplemented that the AVA submitted by VTC had followed the requirements set out under TC No. 1/2006 regarding the number of test points. The allocation of test points was in line with TC No. 1/2006.

36. In response, Ms Chong Hoi Kwan (C471) said that as the project boundary had included LPG filling station and the adjoining open space which were not part of the VTC project, and as there would be no substantial building structure in those area, a diminishing result was inevitable and had affected the validity of the findings. Besides, in view of the size of the site, even a minor variation of the test points would affect the assessment result significantly. As such, whether there would be any change in ventilation performance by additional test points could not be ascertained without actual quantitative assessment.

#### Open Space Development

37. The Vice-Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions relating to open space development :

- (a) with reference to Plan H-1 of the TPB Paper No. 10365 (the Paper), whether the area of open space at the representation site would be reduced as a result of the OZP amendment; and
- (b) whether the design of the proposed 1 ha public open space to be provided by VTC within the proposed VTC campus would integrate with other open space along the promenade in Kowloon East to form a continuous open space network, and who would be required to take up the management responsibility of the open space.

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

- (a) despite the rezoning of the representation site had slightly reduced the area of “O” zone on the OZP at CKL waterfront from 5.2 ha to 4.2 ha, there was still sufficient planned provision of open space according to HKPSG. As compared with the previous OZP No. S/K22/4, the harbourfront promenade would be maintained with its southeastern part to be widened from 10 m to 50 m, the inland portion of the “O” zone would be relocated north-westward. Together with the 1 ha of public open space to be provided within the proposed VTC campus, the total amount of open space provision of 5.2 ha at CKL waterfront would remain unchanged although the configuration of the open spaces would be different; and
- (b) according to the current arrangement, the proposed 1 ha public open space within the site as well as the adjacent open space for a soccer pitch with other facilities such as basketball courts, spectator stand, would be constructed by VTC. They would be handed back to the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) for management and maintenance, and the land ownership of the concerned public open space would remain under the Government. With a width of 50m, the proposed waterfront

promenade was wider than many other existing promenades. Together with the 1 ha public open space, various types of facilities could be accommodated. Although the design of the 1 ha open space and adjacent land zoned “O” had not been finalised, VTC would work closely with LCSD to ensure an integrated design and consult relevant authorities.

#### The Liquefied Petroleum Gas Filling Station

39. In response to a Member’s question on whether air quality assessment was required for the enlarged LPG filling station, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that a preliminary environment review had been conducted for the OZP amendment. While the LPG filling station was not included as a pollution source in the review, it was considered that there was less pollutant generated from a LPG filling station than a Petrol Filling Station (PFS) in general. Besides, it was observed that the taxi queue in the LPG filling station only occurred at specific periods of time of a day.

#### Site Suitability and the VTC Development

40. Some Members raised the following questions relating to the proposed VTC campus :

- (a) whether the subject site was the most suitable site being identified that would meet the requirements of VTC and whether redevelopment of existing campus was feasible;
- (b) whether there was any space requirement standard for tertiary educational institutions and the general development intensity for the VTC facilities;
- (c) what the relationship between NOFA and GFA regarding the proposed development was; and
- (d) to what extent the three overseas examples quoted by VTC would be relevant to the site selection for the new VTC campus.

41. In response, Mr Leung Yam Shing and Ms Theresa Yeung made the following main points:

- (a) the campuses of VTC under different member institutes were currently located in 36 sites throughout the Territory. The new VTC campus proposed at the site would serve to re-provision two existing overcrowded and aged campuses of IVE (Haking Wong) and IVE (Kwun Tong). Considering the requirements of a site of 3 to 5 ha in the urban area and the availability for early development, the Site was considered as most suitable for the purpose. The proposed VTC campus had to be located in the urban area to cater for the geographical distribution of their existing students and the need to replace the two campuses in Kowloon. VTC would continue to explore other new sites for further development of new campus to meet the increasing need for tertiary education;
- (b) as regards the feasibility to redevelop the existing two IVE campuses, as both campuses had an area of about one ha, besides, the IVE (Kwun Tong) was also located near hillslope, the existing campus sites were insufficient for provision of state-of-the-art facilities. Early site availability was also very important as about ten years would be required for planning and building a new campus. The subject site which would be available in time to allow the new campus to be completed by 2027;
- (c) with a GFA of 180,000 m<sup>2</sup>, the PR of the proposed VTC campus was about 4.3. It was a suitable intensity as well as in line with the general development intensity of other VTC campuses. To accommodate a GFA of 180,000 m<sup>2</sup>, the site area required would be about 3 to 5 ha. The original size of the site offered by Government was 4.2 ha. To address the local concerns, VTC had proposed to reduce the development scale and provide 1 ha of public open space in the project. A site with an area of less than 3 ha. would fall short of the needs of VTC;
- (d) the average floor space occupied by each VTC student was about 6.6 m<sup>2</sup> in the existing VTC campuses. While about 90,000 m<sup>2</sup> in the proposed new



campus were space for student use (50% of the total GFA), the average floor space (in NOFA) of teaching facilities for each student was about 10.5 to 12 m<sup>2</sup>. It was intended to increase the overall average floor space for each student from 6.6 m<sup>2</sup> to 8.8 m<sup>2</sup> per student. Such provision was still below the average of 10 to 15 m<sup>2</sup> per student for other tertiary educational institutions in Hong Kong;

- (e) due to high mobility requirements of VTC students to various classrooms, laboratories and other facilities, and changing development in technical education to a more interdisciplinary and community related nature, as well as increasing requirement of workshop and outreach facilities, a horizontal design for the campus building would be more suitable than a vertical high-rise building; and
- (f) the overseas examples mentioned earlier were new technical institutions completed in recent years and were used to demonstrate for Members' reference the contemporary design of technical institutions and that a horizontal development was adopted to meet the need of interdisciplinary teaching, changing mode of operation and flexible classroom design.

#### Other Aspects

42. The Vice Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions :
- (a) whether the letters issued by HC as mentioned by the commenters were included in the information submitted for Members' consideration; and
  - (b) whether plan making process regarding the Tai Po site suggested by the commenters had been completed.
43. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip made the following main points with the aid of the visualizer:
- (a) the Kai Tak Task Force of the HC was consulted on 5.4.2017 and members

of HC were further consulted on 2.8.2017 at an informal briefing. PlanD had summarised the views of HC members in the Paper, and both letters issued by the HC secretariat were attached at Annexes III(e) and III (f) of the Paper; and

- (b) the amendments to the draft Tai Po OZP which involved the rezoning of a site at Pok Yin Road from “G/IC” to “Residential (Group B) 9” (“R(B)9”) to facilitate housing development was exhibited for public inspection in mid-2017, however, the representations and comments on the draft OZP were not yet heard by the Board.

[Dr Lawrence K.C. Li and Mr Simon S.W. Wang left this session of the meeting during the Q&A session.]

44. As Members had no further question to raise, the Vice-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 Vice-Chairperson thanked the commenters, their representatives, and the Government representatives for attending the hearing. They all left the meeting at this point.

45. This session of the meeting was adjourned at 6:40 p.m.