

Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development

Minutes of Eighteenth Meeting

Date : 18 August 2015 (Tuesday)
Time : 4:00 p.m.
Venue : 15/F., Conference Room, North Point Government Offices,
333 Java Road, North Point

Present

Mr Vincent NG Chair

Organization Members

Mrs Margaret BROOKE Representing Business Environment Council
Mr LEUNG Kong-yui Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and
Transport in Hong Kong
Dr NG Cho-nam Representing Conservancy Association
Mrs Karen BARRETTO Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Franklin YU Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects

Prof TANG Bo-sin Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Sr Emily LI Chi-man Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr TAM Po-yiu Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Raymond CHAN Kin-sek Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour

Individual Members

Mr CHAN Ka-kui Individual Member
Ms Lily CHOW Individual Member
Ms Vivian LEE Individual Member

Official Members

Miss Christine AU Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Francis CHAU Principal Assistant Secretary (Works) 2, DEVB
Mr Thomas WK CHAN Senior Manager (Tourism) 41, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr TANG Wai-leung Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department
(TD)
Ms YING Fun-fong Head/Kai Tak Office (KTO), Civil Engineering and
Development Department (CEDD)
Mr Tom YIP District Planning Officer/Kowloon, Planning Department
(PlanD)

Ms Margrit LI Assistant Director (Leisure Services) 1, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Miss Ingrid TJENDRO Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Paul YK CHAN Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr Louis LOONG Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Hans Joachim ISLER Individual Member

In attendance

Mr Nicholas Brooke Chair, Harbourfront Commission
Mr Larry CHU Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 1, DEVB
Mr Frederick YU Assistant Secretary (Harbour) Special Duties, DEVB

For Item 5

Mr Harry MA Chief Engineer/Kowloon 3 (Kowloon), KTO, CEDD
Mr Galy IP Senior Engineer/District Monitoring Group on Housing Sites & Special Duty (Kowloon), KTO, CEDD
Mr Keith CHU Engineer/12 (Kowloon), KTO, CEDD
Mr Lawrence TSUI Associate Director, AECOM

For Item 6

Ms Winnie HO Deputy Head, Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO)
Mr Roy TSE Senior Works Consolidation Manager, EKEO
Mr Tommy CHAN ARUP

For Item 7

Mr Michael LAW Senior Engineer/1 (NTE), CEDD
Mr Billy HUI Senior Engineer/6 (NTE), CEDD
Mr Wilfred NGAI Associate, AECOM

For Item 8

Mr Harry TSANG Chief Executive Officer (Planning) 1, LCSD
Ms Jennifer YAM Senior Executive Officer (Planning) 6 (Atg.), LCSD
Mr Eric CHAN Senior Landscape Architect/2, Architectural Services Department (ArchSD)
Mr Simon CHIU Senior Project Manager 330 (Atg.), ArchSD
Miss Isabella TSUI Landscape Architect/1, ArchSD
Miss Ada SUNG Architect/111, ArchSD
Mr Ray LEE Project Manager 372, ArchSD
Mr Ben YEUNG Project Manager 244, ArchSD

Mr Nicholas BROOKE, as the Chair of the Harbourfront Commission (HC), welcomed all to the meeting and thanked Members for serving on the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development. He also introduced and welcomed new Members to the Task Force.

He informed Members that **Miss Christine AU**, Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), attended on behalf of Mr Thomas CHAN. **Mr Francis CHAU**, Principal Assistant Secretary (Works) 2, attended on behalf of Mr CHAN Chi-ming. **Mr Thomas WK CHAN**, Senior Manager of Tourism Commission, attended on behalf of Mr George TSOI.

Item 1 Election of Chairman

1.1 **Mr BROOKE** invited nominations from Members for chairmanship of the Task Force.

1.2 **Mr KY LEUNG** nominated **Mr Vincent NG** as the Chair of the Task Force. With unanimous support from Members, **Mr BROOKE** announced that Mr NG would be the Chair of the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (TFKT). **Mr NG** took over the chairmanship from Mr BROOKE and thanked Members for their support.

Item 2 Confirmation of Terms of Reference

2.1 **The Chair**¹ invited Members to consider the Terms of Reference (ToR) of TFKT being tabled at the meeting, which was the same as the one for the last term. There being no other comments or objection from Members, the ToR was confirmed.

¹ "The Chair" thereafter is referred to Mr Vincent NG as the Chair of TFKT.

Item 3 Acknowledgement of Minutes of the last Meeting

3.1 The draft minutes of the 17th TFKT meeting were circulated to Members for comments on 30 July 2015. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated again on 17 August 2015. Due to changes in membership, Members of the current term were invited to acknowledge the minutes.

Item 4 Matters Arising

Progress Report on Kai Tak Development (KTD) (paragraphs 2.5, 2.10 and 2.13 of the acknowledged minutes of the 17th meeting)

4.1 In response to Mr ZIMMERMAN's enquiries on various projects in Kai Tak Development (KTD) (para 2.5), Kai Tak Office (KTO) provided a written response in the form of post-meeting notes for Members' reference on 30 July 2015.

4.2 With regard to the application submitted by the Hong Kong Water Sports Council (HKWSC) for temporary use of the waterbody in Kai Tak (para 2.10), KTO replied that the consolidated comments from the Government were conveyed to the applicant for follow-up in April 2015.

4.3 With regard to the short term and permanent uses of waterbody at Kai Tak (para 2.13), the Harbour Unit, Planning Department (PlanD) and the Marine Department (MD) briefed Members on the updated plan for harbourfront and harbour planning at the 20th Harbourfront Commission (HC) meeting in June 2015. Kai Tak was suggested as one of the opportunity areas for further exploration, with Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter and Kai Tak Approach Channel as a potential venue for water-related recreational use.

Progress Report on Kai Tak Development (KTD) (Paper No. TFKT/05/2015)

4.4 **Ms YING Fun-fong** introduced the paper and highlighted the key progress since the last meeting for Members' information.

4.5 **Mr Franklin YU** enquired whether the impact of climate change, sea level rise and flooding were taken into account in the planning and design of new infrastructure works in KTD. He suggested that KTO could include climate change as one of the factors of consideration. He also said that the historical value of Kai Tak should be acknowledged and incorporated in the future development of the area. Echoing Mr YU's views, **Mr KY LEUNG** said infrastructure works in KTD, for example the hospitals, would have an expected lifespan until at least the end of the century. Hence, he agreed that climate change should be a crucial factor in guiding future development.

4.6 **Mr CHAN Ka-kui** enquired whether open space and parks in KTD were mainly passive in nature or whether they would feature different characters and themes.

4.7 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** was concerned about the connectivity within KTD. He opined that the proposed environmental friendly linkage system (EFLS) might not be the optimal solution. Despite the expanded scope of the upcoming feasibility study for EFLS, he advised that more creative types of transport with high passenger throughput should be explored for enhancing connection between the runway tip and Kwun Tong.

4.8 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** recalled that the Government intended to use Kowloon East as a pilot area to explore the concept of a "Smart City" as promulgated in the Policy Address. He wondered if the concept would also be experimented in KTD. He noted that the District Cooling System might have adopted a similar concept on a district level. He said that KTO should try to monitor energy consumption and transport movement using elements of a "Smart City".

4.9 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** commented that the report provided an update on the infrastructure projects from an engineering perspective, but the element of urban planning seemed to be missing. He raised the following enquiries and comments:

- (i) whether there was an elevated pedestrian network in KTD and what were the details;
- (ii) in terms of at-grade pedestrian connectivity, whether there

- was a plan showing all pedestrian areas within KTD including footpaths, parks and housing estates;
- (iii) when the detailed design of the Station Square would be available;
 - (iv) whether KTO could update the photograph of Kwun Tong Promenade on slide 18 of the PowerPoint to show the seawall outside the glass balustrade;
 - (v) whether Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) could provide Members with an implementation schedule of public open space projects in KTD, especially for the extension of Hoi Sham Park. He raised that that the Hoi Sham Park extension project was discussed in previous meetings but was still not implemented, and the Transport Department (TD) had used part of the extension area as carpark; and
 - (vi) with regard to the cycle track network in KTD, whether KTO could provide a plan indicating the roads and areas in housing estates where cycling was allowed and the roads with cycling facilities.

4.10 **The Chair** invited Ms YING to give a brief response to Members' comments and advised the Secretariat to follow up.

4.11 **Ms YING** responded as follows:

- (i) the relevant departments would study the data from the Hong Kong Observatory (HKO) and brief Members on their initial views and responses to climate change as appropriate;
- (ii) in terms of heritage preservation, KTO had taken into account and responded actively to the discovery of historic remnants of Lung Tsun Stone Bridge and the Song dynasty in the development schedule;
- (iii) Members' views on the mode of transport for the EFLS were noted. KTO had expanded the scope of the detailed feasibility study of the EFLS to include other transport means, including water-borne transport, so as to improve the connectivity of KTD and its vicinity;
- (iv) with regard to the concept of "Smart City", EKEO would

spearhead a study in end 2015. KTO would work closely with EKEO throughout the process;

- (v) Mr ZIMMERMAN's enquires on various issues including the cycle track network, pedestrian connectivity and open space had been responded to previously. In terms of walkability, all developments in KTD were connected by the 100-hectare open space areas. Elevated walkways and subways would be built to connect KTD with the adjacent old districts. A plan illustrating cycling connectivity in KTD had been provided for Members' information in past meetings; and
- (vi) the implementation programme of open space projects in KTD would depend on the availability of funding resources.

4.12 **The Chair** thanked Ms YING for her presentation and responses. He advised Members to raise further enquiries in the upcoming discussion items.

Item 5 Kai Tak Development - Kai Tak Approach Channel and Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter Improvement Works (Phase 2) (Paper No. TFKT/06/2015)

5.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) would like to seek Members' views on the proposal on Phase 2 improvement works for Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC) and Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter (KTTS). He invited Members to declare interests. He welcomed **Mr Harry MA**, **Mr Galy IP** and **Mr Keith CHU** of CEDD, and **Mr Lawrence TSUI** of AECOM to the meeting.

5.2 **Mr Keith CHU** presented the proposal with the aid of a PowerPoint.

5.3 **The Chair** asked whether it was CEDD's main intention to seek Members' views on the newly proposed Interception and Pumping Scheme (IP Scheme) as a replacement proposal to the original 600-metre(m) opening at the former runway.

5.4 **Mr Harry MA** replied affirmatively that the project team proposed the IP Scheme to substitute the original suggestion of creating a 600m opening.

5.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that the targeted water quality objectives would affect the cost of the project. He asked for clarification on the standard of water quality objectives that CEDD aimed to achieve at KTAC and KTTS, and the current status. He opined that the water quality at KTAC and KTTS should be improved to reach the standard suitable for water activities in the future.

5.6 **Mr Franklin YU** pointed out that the project team should specify the short-term and long-term objectives of the proposal, particular in respect to the mitigation of odour. He was also concerned about the impact of climate change and sea level rise to the proposed interception facilities.

5.7 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** believed that it was a positive and bold step to abandon the idea of the 600m opening. In terms of contingency planning, he asked whether the project team would adopt a minimal development approach for the original location of the 600m opening, so that in the worst-case scenario, the creation of the 600m opening could still be pursued as a last resort.

5.8 **Sr Emily LI** wished to know whether the proposed IP Scheme had already been endorsed.

5.9 **The Chair** clarified that the project team wished to seek Members' views on the way forward, including whether to replace the initial idea of a 600m opening with the IP Scheme.

5.10 **Sr Emily LI** opined that the project team could provide Members with a clearer comparison between the pros and cons of both proposals in order to facilitate discussion. She also asked about the detailed design and the possible visual impact of the proposed pumping station on the Harbour.

5.11 **Mr Harry MA** responded that according to the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) report for KTD approved in

2009, a three-pronged mitigation approach was recommended to improve the water quality and abate the odour problems at KTAC and KTTS. While two of the three improvement measures had been completed, the creation of a 600m opening at the former runway was the remaining measure as stipulated under the approved EIA report for KTD that was to be reviewed prior to its implementation.

5.12 **Mr Lawrence TSUI** supplemented that odour was one of the key problems identified in the EIA report. Relevant departments had attempted at addressing the issue via rectification and interception of polluted discharges at the hinterland and treatment of sediment at KTAC and KTTS. To complete the remaining works for improving water quality as stipulated under the EIA report, the project team targeted to control the “bottom dissolved oxygen” at KTAC and KTTS to 2 milligram/litre (mg/l) to suppress the formation of odour. According to the odour patrols conducted by CEDD, the odour level could meet the standard set in the EIA report. At present, the *e. coli* content at KTTS was in the range of 10 to 4,500 cfu/100ml. For the next stage, CEDD would further look into the parameters for water quality improvement, including level of *e. coli*, and total inorganic nitrogen (TIN).

5.13 **Mr Harry MA** assured Members that CEDD was conducting another study in parallel to explore further improvement measures in terms of the water quality at KTAC and KTTS for potential water sports activities, and would brief Members on the outcomes at the appropriate juncture. He highlighted that the proposed IP Scheme would serve as a replacement proposal to the original 600m opening at the former runway for meeting the requirements as stipulated under the approved EIA report for KTD, as it was found to be more preferable in terms of its project scale and environmental performance. Regarding odour mitigation, he said that most of the monitoring results of the odour patrols in 2014 could not detect any significant odour intensity at KTD and its vicinity, except at the estuary of Kai Tak River (KTR). It was deduced that the identifiable odour still slightly detected there might be a result of the ongoing construction works at the KTR.

5.14 Noting that effluents from the Tai Po and Sha Tin Sewage Treatment Works were pumped through a tunnel to KTR, **Ir Raymond CHAN** enquired whether the government had any plans of opening up

KTR for swimming.

5.15 On top of Ir CHAN's comment, **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that odour elimination alone should not stand as a convincing justification to secure Members' support for the proposed IP Scheme. He reiterated that the Task Force should set the target usage for KTAC and KTTS.

5.16 **Mr Franklin YU** suggested that CEDD should tabulate the following information for Members' comparison: (i) water quality standards required for different kinds of water sports, e.g. sailing, canoeing, and swimming; (ii) a realistic estimation of the timeframe needed to achieve the respective water quality standards; and (iii) estimated corresponding costs.

5.17 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** suggested that visual illustration or computer simulation of the predicted water quality arising from both proposals could facilitate Members' understanding. He noticed that the discharge point of the pumping station for the IP Scheme was quite close to To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelter (TKWTS), and though he noted that the impacts on TKWTS would be significantly reduced when compared with the originally scheme with a 600 m opening, he was still concerned about the possible impact of tidal flows and water circulation on TKWTS. He agreed with CEDD that the odour was significantly improved; however, the water at KTAC and KTTS was still not suitable for swimming at present.

5.18 **Mr KY LEUNG** pointed out that there might be discrepancies between CEDD's intent and Members' expectation. He recalled that the main objective of the original 600m opening proposed 10 years ago was to improve water quality and tackle the problem of odour at Kai Tak. However, it was clearly not the target of the EIA report in 2009 to achieve water quality good enough for swimming. That said, he agreed that the aspiration of allowing water sports activities at KTAC and KTTS was not unreasonable, but this subject could be discussed separately at future meetings. On the understanding that the 600m opening could potentially be replaced, he welcomed the newly proposed IP Scheme as an alternative so that more flexibility could be allowed for land use planning at the former runway.

5.19 **Ms Vivian LEE** said that the sporting community and the general public had high expectation for developing Kai Tak as a sports hub. As a former athlete, she reflected that Hong Kong had always looked for opportunities to organize mega sports events, and the largest water sports event hosted was the Cross Harbour Swim around Quarry Bay. There was great demand for water areas with water quality suitable for different types of water-related uses. In view of the variety of sports and running events held at Kai Tak in the past two years, she expressed that the Government should treat odour mitigation and the provision of ancillary facilities as long-term objectives to support sports development in Hong Kong.

5.20 **Dr NG Cho-nam** shared his experience in participating in the EIA committee for KTD in 2009. He reiterated that the chief objectives of the proposed 600m opening were to tackle odour and improve water quality, but swimming at Kai Tak was not one of the purposes of the EIA at the time. He said that even if the option of the 600m opening was implemented, swimming at Kai Tak would still be quite impossible due to direct water circulation with TKWTS on the other side of the runway. Dr NG expressed that if CEDD could convince the Task Force and the public that the IP Scheme was an equally effective alternative in lieu of the 600m opening for achieving its initial objectives but with much saving in cost, the IP Scheme would be worth considering. However, if the Task Force had in mind a different goal from the EIA report, a completely new measure would be necessary.

5.21 **Ir Raymond CHAN** said that based on the information given by CEDD, the proposed IP Scheme could be accepted as an alternative to the 600m opening at the former runway to achieve the requirements as stated in the EIA. He viewed that the request for further improvement of water quality standard at KTAC and KTTS could be discussed at the next stage.

5.22 **The Chair** enquired whether the projected water quality improvement attained by the originally proposed 600m opening and the newly proposed IP Scheme would be equivalent. Members might find it difficult to indicate their preference if CEDD could not provide factual clarification on this front.

5.23 **Mr CHAN Ka-kui** said that Members' expectation on water quality at Kai Tak had substantially leaped in the past 10 years. He opined that proposals for water quality improvement should also take into account the growing public aspiration for water sports.

5.24 Concerning the alternative proposal, **Ms YING** reaffirmed that the outcome and environmental performance of the proposed IP Scheme would be equivalent to that of the 600m opening. The outcome of the review was submitted to the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) and it was ascertained that the proposed IP Scheme would also achieve the requirements as laid down in the EIA report for KTD. She supplemented that the IP Scheme would achieve saving in both capital and operational cost as compared with the 600 m opening option. Expectations expressed by Members and the wider community of using the water body at Kai Tak for water sports were recognised. She reported again that the *e. coli* concentration level at KTTS was about 610cfu/100ml, which should be suitable for secondary contact recreational use. However, the *e. coli* level at KTAC as revealed in some sampling occasions was close to 40,000cfu/100ml, which was a level still far from being suitable for secondary contact recreational use. She clarified for Members that CEDD was actively and continuously conducting studies to further improve the water quality at KTAC and KTTS. Enhancing water quality level for KTAC and KTTS up to the benchmark suitable for secondary contact recreational use was regarded as an intermediate target, and swimming could perhaps be a potential goal in the longer run.

5.25 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** enquired whether there would be a water sports centre at Kai Tak in the future. She opined that it should be the responsibility of the Government to ensure safe water quality for the general public.

5.26 With reference to slide 10 of the PowerPoint presentation, **Miss Christine AU** drew Members' attention to the locations of the three different waterbodies concerned - (i) KTAC; (ii) KTTS; and (iii) TKWTS - and the expected uses at these areas respectively. In past discussions, it was suggested that water sports activities and elements of the "water-friendly culture" could start with KTTS, and if possible, KTAC

when the water quality thereat had reached the satisfactory threshold for secondary contact recreational use. Miss Au reassured the Task Force once again of the Government's recognition of the community aspiration to develop more venues for water-related events within Victoria Harbour. For the purpose of the meeting, however, she hoped Members could focus their discussion on the technical aspects and merits of the IP Scheme as an alternative to the 600m opening; while further deliberation on water sports development could be dealt with separately in subsequent meetings.

5.27 **The Chair** concurred with Miss AU. He repeated that CEDD should clarify for Members the purpose and intent of the IP Scheme, whether it was a substitute for the 600m opening and whether it could achieve the same results. If CEDD could confirm that neither the 600m opening nor the new IP Scheme could help achieve water quality standard for water sports activities, and if the original 600m opening could not demonstrate superior performance, he believed the IP Scheme would be worth pursuing as an intermediate measure. He stressed once again that CEDD would need to convince the Task Force of the merits of the IP Scheme to facilitate Members' consideration.

5.28 From a technical perspective, **Mr Lawrence TSUI** advised that both the 600m opening and the IP Scheme would be equally effective in diluting pollutants. He explained that dilution alone had limited effect for lowering *e. coli* content of the water body. Therefore other measures, such as interception of polluted discharges from the hinterland and rectification of expedient connections, had to be carried out simultaneously to lower the *e. coli* level. He reiterated that the current IP Scheme was aimed to improve water flow and dilute pollutants, and CEDD would study other possible measures to further reduce concentration level of *e. coli*.

5.29 With regard to land use planning, **Prof TANG Bo-sin** enquired the differences between the two alternatives and their implications on the use of land along the runway.

5.30 **The Chair** invited CEDD to respond to the question on planning as much as they could. He recalled that the proposed 600m opening would impose certain constraints on the planning and design of

the Metro Park.

5.31 **Prof TANG Bo-sin** added a question on the implication of the pumping station to the adjacent land use.

5.32 **Ms YING** supplemented that CEDD would try to combine the pumping station required for the IP Scheme with the desilting compound of KTR in order to minimise the footprint. Failing that, a semi-sunken structure would be built adjacent to the compound to minimise the impact on the surrounding land use.

5.33 **The Chair** suggested CEDD to consult the Task Force on the detailed design of the proposed pumping station in future meetings.

5.34 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** suggested regarding the issue as a two-phase exercise: the “first phase” of the improvement works would aim at odour mitigation, and the “second phase” to be implemented would be on further water quality improvement at Kai Tak. He recommended the Task Force to give conditional support to CEDD’s proposed IP Scheme to resolve the problem of odour, with a caveat that CEDD would embark on the “second phase” at the next stage.

(Post-meeting notes: CEDD has already embarked upon another study to identify further feasible measures to improve the water quality at KTAC/KTTS for other possible beneficial uses. Members would be briefed on the recommendations of the study, which would be taken forward under a separate public works project, when available.)

5.35 **The Chair** agreed with Mr Brooke’s suggestion. He recapped CEDD’s confirmation that the newly proposed IP Scheme would serve the same objective and function and achieve the same effect with the original 600m opening. It was understood from CEDD’s presentation and response that neither the 600m opening nor the IP Scheme was the solution to realise the aspiration of the Commission for more water sports activities at Kai Tak. However, compared with the 600m opening, the IP Scheme might be able to avoid the constraints in terms of land use planning for the Metro Park and the runway. He concluded that CEDD could proceed with the proposed IP Scheme in lieu of the 600m opening for alleviating odour as an intermediate

measure. However, it was the firm conviction of the Harbourfront Commission to introduce more water sports and marine recreational activities at Kai Tak and within the Harbour, and continuous efforts would have to be made to realise this vision. He thanked CEDD for their presentation.

Item 6 Pedestrian Environment Improvement Scheme for Transformation of Kwun Tong Business Area - Feasibility Study Stage 2 Public Engagement (Paper No. TFKT/07/2015)

6.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO) had commenced the Pedestrian Environment Improvement Scheme for Transformation of Kwun Tong Business Area - Feasibility Study Stage 2 Public Engagement (PE) and would like to brief Members on the latest progress. He invited Members to declare interests. He welcomed **Ms Winnie HO** and **Mr Roy TSE** of EKEO, and **Mr Tommy CHAN** of ARUP to the meeting.

6.2 **Ms Winnie HO** presented the details of the Stage 2 PE with the aid of a PowerPoint.

6.3 **The Chair** noted the various innovative initiatives in the presentation. He believed EKEO would continue to coordinate and liaise with relevant departments in implementing the pedestrian improvement scheme.

6.4 **Mr Franklin YU** commented that the project team had looked into the details and a comprehensive range of aspects of the project. He was delighted to learn that through innovation, back alleys in Kwun Tong were gradually transformed and infused with local character and artistic elements. To take forward the improvement scheme, he suggested that EKEO could consider having consistent design for the street furniture in Kwun Tong.

6.5 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** appreciated EKEO's work and efforts. It was observed that loading and unloading activities were very common along the narrow roads throughout Kwun Tong. He enquired about

EKEO's coordination with the Transport Department (TD) and Lands Department (LandsD) as regards the property owners' rights of access and restrictions under the lease conditions if certain lanes and streets were to be pedestrianised in the transport management improvement proposals. For better local branding, he recommended that landscaping and the design of street furniture should display some characteristics of the industrial heritage of Kwun Tong.

6.6 **Ms Winnie HO** thanked Members for their support and encouragement. She responded to Members' comments as follows:

- (i) for street furniture, she said EKEO would look into the possibilities including pocket green spaces in Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay to come up with a more consistent set of design language for the districts. EKEO was in close liaison with bureaux / departments to ensure the design of projects along the promenade and other face-lifting works in Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay would be carried out in a harmonious fashion;
- (ii) Hoi Bun Road was taken as the interface between the new development in Kai Tak and the older inner district in Kowloon East. The new design and graphics of the "Current of Vitality" in the Public Creatives for KTD had been/would be adopted in projects along Hoi Bun Road, while the inner older district should follow its own character generated from its industrial heritage;
- (iii) the industrial heritage of Kwun Tong was incorporated and reflected in the design theme of Tsun Yip Street playground, naming of back alleys and the design of other projects such as Tsui Ping River;
- (iv) EKEO understood the challenges imposed by loading/unloading activities by the lorries on the general traffic condition in Kwun Tong. The project team would discuss with TD and stakeholders to explore possible solutions, such as providing a platform for information sharing. She supplemented that, through the transformation of Kowloon East into an additional CBD with more commercial activities, traffic congestion, illegal parking and loading/unloading problem caused by lorries

- could gradually be improved; and
- (v) the project team would brief Members on new proposals for smart mobility under the new “Smart City” initiative at an appropriate juncture.

6.7 **The Chair** concluded that the Task Force had in-principle support for the initiative and work led by EKEO. He highlighted that the improvement of pedestrian environment and connectivity to harbourfront was one of the most important harbour planning principles. He appreciated the inter-departmental coordination undertaken by EKEO all along and trusted that they would continue to take into account local culture and character in enhancing the urban design for Kowloon East. **The Chair** thanked the project team for their presentation.

**Item 7 Tseung Kwan O - Lam Tin Tunnel Project
(Paper No. TFKT/08/2015)**

7.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) had provided a paper on the latest position of the Tseung Kwan O - Lam Tin Tunnel (TKO-LTT) project. He said that the project was at the detailed design stage and construction was expected to start from early 2016 to end 2020. He invited Members to declare interests. He welcomed **Mr Michael LAW** and **Mr Billy HUI** of CEDD, and **Mr Wilfred NGAI** of AECOM to the meeting.

7.2 **Mr Michael LAW** presented the progress of the TKO-LTT project with the aid of a PowerPoint.

7.3 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** enquired about the visual impact of the project from different vantage points during and after construction. With regard to the proposed landscape deck in the Lam Tin Interchange, he asked whether it would be publicly accessible and who the management agent would be.

7.4 **Dr NG Cho-nam** asked about the treatment of the quarry slope of Cha Kwo Ling knoll. With reference to slide 11 of the PowerPoint, he suggested that the slope and baring rocks could be

covered by climbing plants with a view to improving the landscape and visual appeal of the project site.

7.5 **Ir Raymond CHAN** pointed out that Sai Tso Wan Landfill was located at the top of the project site. He enquired whether the TKO-LTT project would affect the landfill.

7.6 **Mr Michael LAW** gave the following responses to Members' enquires and comments:

- (i) the project would not impose any significant visual impact on the ridge line. The Lam Tin Interchange could not be seen from Victoria Harbour, except from a very narrow angle in the eastern part. The project team would take the opportunity to improve the landscape of the existing baring slope at the back of the knoll;
- (ii) having considered the location of the landscape deck, which would be atop of the future busy trunk road of TKO-LTT, the project team advised that the landscape deck would not be opened to the public;
- (iii) the project team would take into account Members' suggestion about having more greening for the rocky slope. However, given the dryness and the relatively thin layer of soil of the slope, planting might be difficult; and
- (iv) a series of measures would be introduced to prevent leakage of gas and leachates from Sai Tso Wan Landfill. CEDD would also closely monitor the construction works of TKO-LTT.

7.7 **Mr Franklin YU** wondered whether the slope would be under the management by CEDD. He advised that wire mesh could be fixed on the surface of the slope to prevent rocks from falling and to facilitate the growth of climbing plants. With reference to slide 11 of the PowerPoint, he enquired whether the tennis courts were under the management of LCSD and if the rocky slope could be developed into a wall for sport climbing.

7.8 **The Chair** advised Members to focus their discussion on issues related to the harbourfront.

7.9 **Mr Michael LAW** replied that CEDD was responsible for the construction of the TKO-LTT project and other departments, such as the Highways Department, would manage and maintain the slopes. In relation to Members' concern on the safety of the slope, he reassured Members that the Geotechnical Engineering Office of CEDD would vet the design and tender documents to ensure compliance with geotechnical safety requirements. As for the proposal for community facilities, he explained that the traffic at the Lam Tin Interchange was busy and there would not be sufficient area for other community facilities.

7.10 **Miss Margrit LI** said that the tennis courts at Sai Tso Wan were under the management of LCSD but the slope was not.

7.11 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** referred to slide 13 of the PowerPoint and pointed out that the temporary works areas for the project would be located at prominent waterfront sites. He reminded the project team to minimise any undesirable impact it might cause to nearby users.

7.12 **The Chair** thanked CEDD for their presentation. Notwithstanding the minimal visual impact of the project on the harbourfront, he reminded the project team to take the opportunity for improving landscaping and minimising environmental impact to the waterfront during the construction phase.

Item 8 Promenade adjacent to Hong Kong Children's Hospital at Kai Tak (Paper No. TFKT/09/2015)

8.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) and Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) would like to seek Members' views on the preliminary design of the promenade adjoining the Hong Kong Children's Hospital (HKCH). He invited Members to declare interests. He welcomed **Mr Harry TSANG** and **Ms Jennifer YAM** of LCSD; **Mr Eric CHAN**, **Mr Simon CHIU**, **Miss Isabella TSUI**, **Miss Ada SUNG** and **Mr Ray LEE** of ArchSD to the meeting.

8.2 **Mr Harry TSANG** and **Miss Isabella TSUI** presented the

background and the design of the subject promenade with the aid of a PowerPoint.

8.3 **Sr Emily LI** sought clarification on the objective and main target users of the promenade. She observed that connectivity and access to the promenade was not convenient. For instance, continuity and integration with the Kwun Tong Promenade in the east was not considered in the project scope.

8.4 **The Chair** raised the following enquiries:

- (i) the implementation schedule and estimated completion date of the project;
- (ii) echoing Sr Emily LI's views, how the promenade adjacent to HKCH would be connected to the existing Kwun Tong Promenade;
- (iii) in terms of pedestrian connectivity, whether there would be footpaths linking up different promenade sections to allow people to jog and stroll from Kwun Tong to the runway area with ease;
- (iv) how the existing seawalls and landing steps within the project site would be handled; and
- (v) integration and interface between the central garden at the HKCH and the subject promenade.

8.5 **Mr Harry TSANG** replied that the project was tentatively targeted for completion in 2018 to match with the commissioning of HKCH. He said that the main target users of the 300m promenade with a children's play area included the patients, members of staff and visitors of the HKCH at the initial stage. In terms of land use planning, he informed Members that the open space at eastern side of HKCH and the waterfront outside the existing Kowloon Godown would be developed into promenade at a later stage, and by then, the promenade fronting HKCH could be linked up with the existing Kwun Tong Promenade. He supplemented that open spaces along both sides of Kai Tak River were reserved for promenade development in the future. Similar promenade projects would also take place to the north of Shing Fung Road adjacent to the future New Acute Hospital.

8.6 **Miss Isabella TSUI** replied that the existing seawall would be retained and seating would be provided at the wooden deck and timber boardwalk along the promenade. She said that ArchSD had already sought advice from CEDD about the loading capacity of the seawall. For the linkage between the central garden at HKCH and the promenade, she said there would be slight level difference between the central garden and the promenade, and two access points would be provided connecting the two areas.

8.7 **The Chair** opined that the central garden of HKCH would be a visual corridor and physical linkage between the inland and the waterfront, and the central garden and the promenade should form a significant integrated open space together. He enquired whether the project team had taken into account the design of the HKCH central garden in their design of the promenade.

8.8 **Mr Eric CHAN** replied that the project team of the promenade had been working closely with the team responsible for the design of HKCH. He said that the central garden of HKCH would not be fenced off from the waterfront promenade. For security reasons, low metal gates would be installed within the central garden of HKCH across the entrances / footpaths connecting the two spaces. There would be a level difference between the two open space areas, but barrier free access would be provided at the two entrances. With reference to slide 8 of the PowerPoint, he said that the landing steps as shown from "View D" would be retained for maintenance purpose for the bridge underneath Shing Fung Road. These landing steps would be fenced off with planting and excluded from the existing design.

8.9 **The Chair** enquired how folded aeroplanes as shown on slide 16 of the PowerPoint would be hung up at the children's play area.

8.10 **Mr Eric CHAN** replied that the aeroplanes were only artistic impression for illustrative purpose.

8.11 In terms of the design of railing along the promenade, **Mr Franklin YU** enquired whether the glass balustrade could be substituted by other materials for better ventilation and penetration.

8.12 **Mr Eric CHAN** thanked Members for their suggestions and advice. He said that the project team would consider adopting the design of the glass balustrade at Kwun Tong Promenade with slight modifications to allow more ventilation and sea breeze. Members' comments on the design of railing would be taken on board.

8.13 **The Chair** thanked the project team for their presentation. He advised the project team to proceed with the project and take into account Members' views in finalising the design.

Item 9 Any Other Business

9.1 The Chair informed Members that the next meeting was being scheduled in co-ordination with meetings of the Harbourfront Commission and other Task Forces. The Secretariat would inform Members of the meeting date in due course.

9.2 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:15 pm.

Secretariat

Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development

October 2015