

2nd Meeting of the Harbourfront Commission
Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development
23 November 2010 (Tuesday) at 2:30 p.m.
at Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices,
333 Java Road, Hong Kong

Minutes of Meeting

Present

Mr Vincent Ng	Chairman, Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development
Mrs Margaret Brooke	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr Leung Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Mr Lam Kin-lai	Representing Conservancy Association
Prof Carlos Lo	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Andy Leung	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Patrick Lau	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr Tam Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Dr Sujata Govada	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Dr Chan Fuk-cheung	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Winston Chu	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr Nicholas Brooke	
Mr Benjamin Cha	
Ms Lily Chow	
Ms Gracie Foo	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands) 1, Development Bureau
Mr Andy Yau	Principal Assistant Secretary (Works) 2, Development Bureau
Mr Clement Lau	Assistant Commissioner 4, Tourism Commission
Mr To Kam-biu	Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department
Mr Stephen Tang	Head(Kai Tak Office), Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr Paul Cheung	Assistant Director(Leisure Services)1,

Mr Eric Yue Leisure and Cultural Services Department
District Planning Officer/Kowloon,
Planning Department

Mr Ronald Leung Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Ms Ann So

In attendance

Ms Maisie Chan Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour),
Development Bureau

Mr Peter PC Mok Senior Engineer/2 (Kowloon),
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Ms Selina Li Senior Executive Officer (Planning)6,
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

For Item 3

Hong Tai Yuen Limited

Mr Ricky Wong Managing Director

Mr Charles Chiu Project Manager

Mr Matthew Chan Project Design Manager

Ms Carol Choy Assistant Manager – Development

Ronald Lu & Partners (Hong Kong) Ltd

Mr Kelvin Ip Director

Ms Carmen Cheung Senior Architect

PlanArch Consultants Ltd

Ms Betty Ho Director

Mr Cheng Pui-kan Assistant Town Planner

For Item 4

Mr Tong Kin-shing Senior Engineer/Project Management 2,
Drainage Services Department

Miss Ida HK Lau Engineer/Project Management 3,
Drainage Services Department

Action

The Chairman welcomed all to the meeting. He informed Members that the meeting should end by 5pm.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 1st meeting

1.1 **The Chairman** informed Members that the Secretariat has not received any proposals for amendments since the minutes were circulated. He added that while **Mr Paul Zimmerman** and **Dr Peter Cookson-Smith** commented on cycling facilities, the comments were not related to amendments to the minutes. He invited CEDD to take into account the comments at a suitable juncture in the future. The minutes were then confirmed.

Item 2 Matters Arising

2.1 **The Chairman** informed Members that at the last meeting, the Secretariat was asked to follow up on the collection of the following information – a list of Kai Tak’s infrastructure projects, information on Cruise Terminal, and a contour map showing the depth of Victoria Harbour. The information has been circulated among Members the previous day.

2.2 **Mr Stephen Tang** informed Members that there is a website (<http://www.ktd.gov.hk>) where latest information such as various projects and their progress as well as details of public engagement activities is available. He added that CEDD would apply for funding and invite tenders in 2011 for odour abatement to Kai Tak Approach Channel and Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter through bio-mediation, as well as for further infrastructure works in north apron.

2.3 **Mr Andy Leung** opined that a map showing the locations of the various projects would provide Members with a better overall view.

2.4 **Mr Stephen Tang** informed Members that such a map could be difficult to apprehend due to technical complexity. He understood that there were several projects which Members were more focused on, and more information could be provided specifically on these projects.

2.5 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** opined that a master plan in simplified

form which shows the interrelationship among projects and the critical paths would facilitate Members' deliberation on overall planning.

2.6 **The Chairman** opined that it was important for Members to be provided with a framework and roadmap given the scale and timeframe of Kai Tak Development.

2.7 **Mr Stephen Tang** informed Members that CEDD would work out a master plan highlighting major projects.

2.8 **Mr Winston Chu** referred to Paragraph 5 of the minutes of the last meeting. He noted that an information paper has been provided by the Tourism Commission for the follow-up item "a list of studies and reports relied on in choosing the present scale, location and design of the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal", and enquired as to whether there were other relevant studies or reports in addition to the study in 2005 mentioned in the information paper.

2.9 **Mr Clement Lau** informed Members that Tourism Commission had provided information to facilitate Members' better understanding on the background leading to the current mode of development of the cruise terminal. The information paper was presented in a concise and succinct way, seeking to facilitate Members' easy understanding. The footnote of the paper had listed out relevant reference documents. As explained in the paper, while the study in 2005 contributed to the current mode of development of the cruise terminal, Mr Clement Lau drew Members' attention to the Kai Tak Planning Review in 2006, the deliberation on the Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan by Town Planning Board in 2007, the Expression of Interest exercise as well as consultation with the cruise industry.

2.10 **Mr Clement Lau** said that the current mode of development of the Cruise Terminal was a result of a series of deliberations and participation from various stakeholders of the community, and as concluded in the 2006 Kai Tak Planning Review, the current configuration was the best compromise having regard to all relevant considerations. He added that land had been reserved for development of a 3rd berth subject to future demand in the long term, and the

Harbourfront Commission would be consulted on the relevant use in due course if the 3rd berth was considered necessary.

2.11 **Mr Clement Lau** added that an Advisory Committee on Cruise Industry, comprising representatives from the cruise industry and travel agents, had been formed to advise the Administration on the strategic development of cruise industry in Hong Kong as well as the long-term market demand.

2.12 **The Chairman** asked Mr Winston Chu to inform Members of his point(s) of concern regarding the cruise terminal to facilitate the discussion.

2.13 **Mr Winston Chu** enquired whether there were other studies and reports relied on in choosing the present scale, location and design of the cruise terminal.

2.14 **Mr Clement Lau** echoed the Chairman's view and sought to ascertain whether Mr Winston Chu was concerned about the adequacy of the current mode of development of the cruise terminal to meet the future demand.

2.15 **Mr Winston Chu** opined that the cruise terminal is an important development at Kai Tak.

2.16 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** suggested that Tourism Commission could further report on the cruise terminal in due course.

2.17 **The Chairman** summarized that Mr Winston Chu was not satisfied with the information provided by the Tourism Commission.

2.18 **The Chairman** reminded Members that a certain degree of focus would be required to facilitate the effectiveness of the meeting, and time should not be spent excessively on discussing the sufficiency of information provided by Tourism Commission. He urged Mr Winston Chu to state clearly his point(s) of concern to facilitate Tourism Commission's follow-up.

2.19 **Mr Winston Chu** enquired whether there were other studies and reports relied on in choosing the present scale, location and design of the cruise terminal.

2.20 **The Chairman** asked the Tourism Commission to consider how best to follow up Mr Winston Chu's request.

2.21 **Mr Winston Chu** also suggested that the contour map showing the depth of Victoria Harbour should be made available to the public on sale. He opined that the map would be helpful for academics and researchers.

**Item 3 Residential Development at 1-5 Kai Hing Road, Kai Tak South
(Paper No. TFKT/04/2010)**

3.1 **The Chairman** welcomed Mr Ricky Wong, Mr Charles Chiu, Mr Matthew Chan and Ms Carol Choy of Hong Tai Yuen Ltd, Mr Kelvin Ip and Ms Carmen Cheung of Ronald Lu & Partners (Hong Kong) Ltd, and Ms Betty Ho and Mr Cheng Pui-kan of PlanArch Consultants Ltd.

3.2 **The Chairman** informed Members that the proponent had previously presented to the Harbour Plan Review Subcommittee of the former Harbour-front Enhancement Committee in 2009. He also reminded Members that Harbourfront Commission was a non-statutory advisory body. Views would be reflected to both the proponent and the Town Planning Board (TPB), the latter of which has the statutory power to grant approvals, for their consideration.

3.3 **The Chairman** asked whether any Members needed to declare interests before starting discussion.

3.4 **Mr Andy Leung** notified the meeting that his company was among one of the consultants for the project.

3.5 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** notified the meeting that Ms Betty Ho of the proponent was an ex-president of the Conservancy Association.

3.6 **The Chairman** ruled that Mr Andy Leung, who has a direct interest, should remain in the meeting but not participate in the discussion. Mr Lam Kin-lai should be allowed to participate in the discussion.

3.7 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** suggested that proponents should identify their parent company to facilitate the declaration of interests by Members.

3.8 **Mr Ricky Wong** notified the meeting that the application was under Hong Tai Yuen Limited, a subsidiary of Wharf Holdings Limited.

3.9 **Ms Betty Ho** and **Mr Kelvin Ip** presented the paper with the aid of a Powerpoint.

3.10 **The Chairman** reminded Members that the plans attached to the discussion paper reflected the scheme approved by TPB. Members should comment on the 3 supplementary plans tabled at the meeting which reflected the proponent's latest proposed amendments to the TPB-approved scheme.

3.11 **Mr Paul Cheung** stated that the proponent had not highlighted in full its latest proposed amendments to the TPB-approved scheme. Firstly, a portion of the original landscape garden had been replaced by two Food and Beverage (F&B) sites. There was concern over the interface between such F&B and the waterfront promenade. Secondly, there was uncertainty over whether the proposed planting areas would belong to the future promenade, which would have an impact on the promenade design. Mr Paul Cheung invited the proponent to further discuss the amended scheme with LCSD.

3.12 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** opined that the subject case was a good case study for the Task Force and welcomed the proponent's submission. He also opined that the presence of R&B facilities abutting the waterfront promenade could be beneficial. He enquired about the business model for the future management and maintenance of the

waterfront as well as connectivity and accessibility issues.

3.13 **Mr Patrick Lau** drew the proponent's attention to the concept of public-private partnership. He stated that given the prominence of the subject waterfront, more effort from the proponent on design of the promenade to capture the unique view of the water body in the vicinity would be welcome. He opined that this could be mutually beneficial to both the proponent and the public.

3.14 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** echoed Mr Nicholas Brooke's concern over the issue of accessibility. He also enquired about the opening hours and management responsibility of the waterfront promenade. He opined that the proposed new breezeway arrangement would have an adverse wall effect since the breezeways could only enhance visual permeability at a certain angle.

3.15 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** enquired whether the proponent had explored the prevailing wind directions in different seasons in determining the breezeway arrangement.

3.16 **Dr Sujata Govada** opined that there were more buildings obstructing the site at ground level when compared to the TPB-approved scheme. She echoed Mr Lam Kin-lai's comment on the wall effect arising from the proposed amendment and asked for photomontages which would facilitate better visualization. She also echoed Mr Nicholas Brooke's enquiry on the issue of accessibility.

3.17 **The Chairman** invited the proponent to respond to the first round of comments by Members, particularly the management responsibility of the waterfront promenade.

3.18 **Ms Betty Ho** informed Members that the waterfront promenade would be handed over to the Government at a suitable juncture in the future at its request. Prior to such handover, the proponent would be responsible for designing, building and managing the promenade. As advised by TPB, the proponent would consult LCSD on the design and work on integrating the design with the surrounding environment, which included provision of more greening

and sitting-out areas. She added that F&B facilities were included in the TPB-approved scheme. In response to Members' views in the former HEC meeting, the facilities were placed next to the waterfront promenade to facilitate better integration and promote vibrancy.

3.19 **Ms Betty Ho** continued that on connectivity and accessibility, she stated her understanding that the Administration has planned to close down the Kwun Tong Public Cargo Working Area (PCWA). She also reiterated that the proponent as the private developer would be responsible for management and maintenance of the waterfront promenade prior to handover to the Government. On breezeway arrangement, she stated that the proposed amendment was to enhance visual permeability from the waterfront at the Kwun Tong PCWA. While the Gross Floor Area for commercial use had remained unchanged, an amendment was also proposed on lowering the height of the clubhouse.

3.20 **Mr Kelvin Ip** supplemented that the height of R&B facilities had effectively not been changed with a roof garden at the top. The proposed amendment was to scatter the facilities to provide more breathing space, which would further enhance the ventilation effect. He also added that the effect of building frontage on the waterfront promenade had not been adversely affected.

3.21 **Mr Kelvin Ip** continued that the new orientation of the breezeways under the proposed amendment would better align with direction of prevailing winds in the summer. He reiterated that the breezeways upon amendment would enhance visual permeability for users of the future promenade at Kwun Tong PCWA.

3.22 **Ms Betty Ho** informed Members that the waterfront promenade would be open at all time while under management of the proponent.

3.23 **The Chairman** enquired whether the 9-metre-wide landscape garden could provide accessibility to the waterfront from Kai Hing Road for the public.

3.24 **Ms Betty Ho** informed Members that while the landscape garden was a private open space area, accessibility to the waterfront by the public was already provided via a public open space area nearby.

3.25 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** enquired whether handover of the waterfront promenade was stated in the lease condition and whether a handover date has been specified with mutual understanding. He also opined that the orientation of breezeways should facilitate residents' viewing of Victoria Harbour from buildings at the hinterland.

3.26 **Ms Gracie Foo** drew Members' attention to the ongoing community discussion on open space in private developments after the Time Square incident. She informed Members that a consultant had been commissioned to conduct a study along with public consultation in this regard, which would soon be completed.

3.27 **Ms Gracie Foo** continued that the overall planning concept for waterfront promenades at the Kai Tak area would be realized upon the relocation of the Kwun Tong PCWA, and upon private sector development. Upon completion of the promenade, LCSD should take over management as soon as possible. Development Bureau, LCSD, Planning Department, Lands Department and other relevant departments would continue to refine the relevant arrangements with dedicated efforts, taking into account experiences accumulated in delivering a more attractive waterfront promenade. Upon handover to LCSD, the promenades would be open to the public at all time. Lastly, she reminded Members that TPB had already approved the proponent's previous scheme and Members were welcome to comment on its proposed amendments.

3.28 **Mr Eric Yue** reminded Members that a 20-metre-wide waterfront promenade for the subject site had been stipulated in the Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan. As such, it was a statutory requirement for the proponent to provide such promenade upon redevelopment of the site. He added that the proponent's scheme was approved with conditions by TPB. The planning conditions, among all, required the design, provision and management of the waterfront promenade to the satisfaction of LCSD, as well as the proponent's agreement to hand over

the promenade to the Government upon future request. A number of advisory clauses were also in place. Members' concerns were therefore addressed by the planning conditions/ advisory clauses set out in the letter from the Secretary of TPB.

3.29 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** considered the breezeway arrangement upon amendment inappropriate given its wall effect.

3.30 **Dr Sujata Govada** opined that access from the hinterland to the waterfront was important.

3.31 **Ms Betty Ho** stated that buildings at the hinterland were mainly of commercial or industrial office uses. She reminded Members that the plot ratio of buildings to be developed at the subject site (Plot Ratio 5) would be approximately half the maximum plot ratio that is allowable for commercial building (Plot Ratio 9.5) at the site. Also, an air ventilation assessment would be conducted to ensure that breezeways would be arranged to the satisfaction of Environmental Protection Department and Planning Department. A sky garden had also been provided and aligned with the podium level of buildings at the hinterland to allow prevailing winds to reach the hinterland.

3.32 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** opined that the discussion had revealed issues such as future management arrangement and handover date of the waterfront promenade for the Task Force to keep in view.

3.33 **The Chairman** asked the Secretariat to summarize Members' comments for passing on to TPB.

3.34 **Mr Paul Cheung** reiterated that LCSD stood ready to take over the management of the waterfront promenade. He also stated that while LCSD saw vibrancy and variety of activities as added benefits, there was concern over the potential impact on breezeways given the positioning of the newly proposed F&B facilities as well as the interface. He welcomed further discussion with the proponent in this regard. Lastly, he stated that connectivity and accessibility issues should be well addressed to enhance utilization of the waterfront promenade.

3.35 **The Chairman** further enquired about the handover arrangements of the waterfront promenade.

3.36 **Mr Paul Cheung** informed Members that a finalized design of the promenade would be required to facilitate LCSD's submission of funding application on recurrent costs. It would be desirable for the promenade to be handed over to LCSD upon completion to reduce uncertainty to residents and the wider public.

3.37 **Mr Kelvin Ip** reiterated that the proponent stood ready to manage the promenade in the interim prior to its handover to the Government, and would ensure that the promenade would be open to the public at all time. He also informed Members that discussion with relevant government departments such as Lands Department on lease modification was in progress. There would also be further discussions over design and management matters to work towards a handover of the promenade to LCSD upon its completion.

3.38 **The Chairman** reminded Members that the discussion at the Task Force was of a non-statutory and advisory nature. He summarized that (i) Members were concerned with the management issue and handover arrangements of the waterfront promenade, particularly whether they would be clearly reflected in lease conditions or other relevant documents to reduce uncertainty to the public; (ii) Members generally welcomed F&B facilities abutting the promenade; (iii) Members were concerned with connectivity and accessibility; and (iv) Members were concerned with impact of newly proposed breezeway arrangement on visual permeability for buildings at the hinterland. The Chairman reminded the Secretariat to pass a summary of Members' views to TPB for its consideration. **Secretariat**

**Item 4 "Building our Kai Tak River" public engagement
(Paper No. TFKT/05/2010)**

4.1 **The Chairman** welcomed Mr Stephen Tang, Head(Kai Tak Office) of Civil Engineering and Development Department. **Mr Stephen Tang** presented the paper with the aid of a Powerpoint.

4.2 **The Chairman** confirmed with Mr Stephen Tang that two community envisioning workshops would be conducted on 11th and 18th December 2010 respectively, and Members were welcome to attend.

4.3 **Mr Andy Leung** asked for more information on the environment surrounding the Kai Tak River to facilitate Members' deliberation.

4.4 **Mr Stephen Tang** informed Members that the characteristics of the river body (such as width, depth, water source, and drainage layout) differed among the upstream, midstream and downstream sections. It was CEDD's plan to give an introduction to the public at the upcoming public engagement activities.

4.5 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** opined that constraints to development could be flagged up during public engagement to guide the public towards feasible development options.

4.6 **Dr Sujata Govada** welcomed CEDD's initiative to engage the public. She enquired about the uses of land adjoining the Kai Tak River.

4.7 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** opined that expectations management would be important in conducting public engagement.

4.8 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** enquired whether public engagement could be conducted through channels such as Facebook in addition to the two afternoon workshops.

4.9 **Mr Stephen Tang** informed Members that current conditions, potential constraints as well as overseas examples would be presented to the public for reference. He drew Members' attention to the example of the SuZhou Creek at Shanghai, where some cultural organizations made a living. It could be worth exploring the potential to facilitate similar cultural activities at the future Kai Tak River. Another possibility to explore would be to educate students and the wider public on sewage treatment processes.

4.10 **Mr Andy Leung** opined that there would be a need to guide the public on the relevant issues to consider and the perspectives to be adopted in such consideration.

4.11 **The Chairman** echoed Mr Andy Leung's views and suggested framing issues to provide better focus and enhance understanding in consulting professionals from various sectors.

4.12 **Mr Stephen Tang** informed Members that the public engagement programme would be conducted in two phases. In the first phase, it was considered desirable to encourage creative views from different members of the community. In the second phase, technical issues associated with identified development options would be discussed in depth with professional institutes and organizations including the Harbourfront Commission.

4.13 **Mr Eric Yue** supplemented that the project would be presented to TPB on 17 December 2010.

Item 5 Enhancement of waterfront accessibility at Former Runway (Paper No. TFKT/06/2010)

5.1 **Mr Stephen Tang** presented the paper with the aid of a Powerpoint.

5.2 **Mr Stephen Tang** invited **Mr Paul Cheung**, Assistant Director(Leisure Services)1 of LCSD, to supplement on Runway Park Phase 1 development aided with another Powerpoint.

5.3 **Mr Nicolas Brooke** enquired about the provision for cycling at Kai Tak.

5.4 **Mr Patrick Lau** supported CEDD's proposal on realigning the plantings near the seafront railings. He added that the realignment could take into account the organic forms of different plant species in consultation with landscape architects.

5.5 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** enquired about the provisions for

pet-related activities as well as other large-scale activities with a view to enhancing vibrancy at the open area of the Runway Park.

5.6 **Dr Sujata Govada** welcomed the relocation of roads from the waterfront. She enquired about ground level activities and uses at the buildings at the Runway Precincts. She echoed Mr Nicholas Brooke's concern regarding provision for cycling.

5.7 **Mr To Kam-biu** commented the relative merits of adopting vertical infilling and horizontal infilling for railings. He stated that the design for the railings should strike a balance between visual permeability and road safety.

5.8 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** opined that more information could be provided to facilitate Members' deliberation.

5.9 **Mr Andy Leung** opined that more activities and facilities such as cycling and simple retail stores could be provided at the Runway Park to promote vibrancy and various functional uses at the area. He opined that public expectations would be high given the large size and prominent location of the Runway Park.

5.10 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** drew Members' attention to Paragraph 10 of the paper. She expressed concern over visual impacts of the proposed noise barriers and enclosures.

5.11 **The Chairman** reminded Members that the same issue was raised at the last meeting of the Task Force.

5.12 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** opined that the needs and concerns of different members of the society should be addressed. For instance, walking distance could differ considerably across age and gender.

5.13 **The Chairman** enquired about timeframe for enhancing the urban design solution at Kai Tak.

5.14 **Mr Stephen Tang** clarified to Members that the proposed measures were of temporary nature. Concerning the permanent road

D3 at the centre of the Runway Precinct, a proposal would be tabled in due course. Photomontages would also be provided to facilitate better visualization. Concerning provision for cycling, he stated that the proposal to date was to provide cycling paths at open space and landscaped areas such as waterfront promenades and Station Square.

5.15 **Mr Paul Cheung** stated that the Runway Park should provide areas to facilitate a diversity of activities such as “Wine and Dine Festival” and make it becoming a destination for visitors. He informed Members that while the District Council was against cycling when LCSD first consulted them on the proposed scope of development with the provision of a cycling track, it would not be difficult in practice to set aside a designated area for such purpose given the large size of the park. The design to date had incorporated both a pedestrian footpath and a cycling track. Further consultation with District Council would take place in this regard.

5.16 **Mr Stephen Tang** stated that Members would be further consulted on the permanent waterfront developments at the Runway Precinct.

5.17 **Dr Sujata Govada** enquired about the balance between traffic needs and environmental concerns.

5.18 **Mr Stephen Tang** informed Members that emergency vehicular access would be provided at the waterfronts and integrated with the waterfront promenades.

**Item 6 Enhancement of waterfront accessibility in South Apron
(Paper No. TFKT/07/2010)**

6.1 Due to insufficient time, **the Chairman** suggested and Members agreed to defer discussion of the item to the next meeting.

Item 7 Any other business

7.1 **The Chairman** informed the meeting that the Secretariat

had circulated a short term tenancy proposal for hosting a carnival at Kai Tak, to which **Dr Peter Cookson-Smith** had indicated full support. No comments had been received from other Members.

7.2 **The Chairman** informed Members that the next meeting would be held on 11 January 2011.

7.3 There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 5:00pm.

**Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development Secretariat
January 2011**