

## Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development

### Minutes of Forty-first Meeting

Date : 28 September 2021 (Tue)  
Time : 2:30 p.m.  
Venue : Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices,  
333 Java Road, Hong Kong

#### Present

Mr Vincent NG Chairman

#### Organization Members

|                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| Mrs Margaret BROOKE | Representing Business Environment Council                                    |
| Dr Vivian WONG      | Representing Friends of the Earth (HK) Charity Limited                       |
| Mr Benny CHAN       | Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design                             |
| Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN   | Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour                           |
| Mr Sam CHOW         | Representing The Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong |
| Dr CHUNG Shan-shan  | Representing The Conservancy Association                                     |
| Mr Jacky CHEUNG     | Representing The Hong Kong Institute of Architects                           |
| Mr Paul CHAN        | Representing The Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects                 |
| Mr Edward LO*       | Representing The Hong Kong Institute of Planners                             |
| Sr Francis LAM      | Representing The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors                            |
| Ir Victor CHEUNG    | Representing The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers                          |
| Mr Jeff TUNG        | Representing The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong             |

Individual Members

Mr Mac CHAN\*

Ms Kelly CHAN\*

Mr Ivan HO

Hon Tony TSE\*

Official Members

Miss Rosalind CHEUNG Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour),  
Development Bureau (DEVB)

Mr CHOW Bing-kay Chief Assistant Secretary (Works) 3, DEVB

Ms Stephenie HO Senior Manager (Tourism) 41, Tourism Commission  
(TC)

Mr Patrick HO Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport  
Department (TD)

Mr George MAK Chief Engineer/East 5, Civil Engineering and  
Development Department (CEDD)

Mr Horman CHAN Assistant Director (Leisure Services) 1, Leisure and  
Cultural Services Department (LCSD)

Ms Katy FUNG District Planning Officer/Kowloon (Acting),  
Planning Department (PlanD)

Mr Steven LEE Secretary

In Attendance

Mr William CHAN Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB

Mr NG Shing-kit Senior Engineer (Harbour) 2, DEVB

Ms Helen CHU\* Landscape Architect (Harbour), DEVB

Ms Maggie WOO\* Quantity Surveyor (Harbour), DEVB

Absent with Apologies

Mr Frankie NGAN Individual Member

Ms Angela SO Individual Member

For Item 3

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| Mr Ricky WONG     | Managing Director, Wheelock Properties                                 |
| Ms Phoebe YEE     | General Manager (Commercial), Wheelock Properties                      |
| Mr Charles CHIU   | Assistant General Manager (Project Management),<br>Wheelock Properties |
| Mr Samuel POON    | Senior Manager - Project Design & Marketing,<br>Wheelock Properties    |
| Ms Elaine HO      | Manager - Property Development, Wheelock<br>Properties                 |
| Mr Jason CHONG    | Senior Project Manager, Wheelock Properties                            |
| Ms Gladys LEUNG   | Assistant Property Development Manager, Wheelock<br>Properties         |
| Mr Bobby AU YEUNG | Associate, Ronald Lu & Partners  |
| Ms Betty HO       | Director, PlanArch Consultants Ltd                                     |
| Ms Sara CHONG     | Assistant Town Planner, PlanArch Consultants Ltd                       |

For Item 4

|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| Mr KING Kwok-cheung | Deputy Head, Energizing Kowloon East Office<br>(EKEO) |
| Ms Carol CHEUK      | Senior Place Making Manager (Planning), EKEO          |
| Mr Kelvin CHAN      | Place Making Manager (Planning) 1, EKEO               |
| Ms Katy FUNG        | District Planning Officer/Kowloon (Acting), PlanD     |
| Mr William CHAN     | Senior Town Planner/Kowloon 4, PlanD                  |
| Mr LI Wai-lam       | Urban Planning Manager, Arup                          |

For Item 5

|               |   |
|---------------|---|
| Mr Ken YEUNG  | Chief Engineer, Electrical and Mechanical Services<br>Department (EMSD) |
| Mr Felix LUNG | Senior Engineer, EMSD   |

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Mr Brian LEUNG    | Chief Resident Engineer, Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. |
| Mr Gabriel LEUNG  | Resident Engineer, Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd        |
| Mr Frank WONG     | General Manager, Paul Y. - Qianhai Joint Venture            |
| Mr Jimmy FUNG     | Senior Manager, Paul Y. - Qianhai Joint Venture             |
| Mr Vincent NGAI   | Technical Director, Binnies Hong Kong Limited               |
| Mr CHAN Ho-chung  | Director, LWK + Partners                                    |
| Mr CHAN Chung-man | Associate, LWK + Partners                                   |

For AOB

|                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| Mr KING Kwok-cheung | Deputy Head, EKEO  |
| Ms Sofia LAU        | Senior Place Making Manager (Design), EKEO   |
| Mr Nathan CHO       | Place Making Manager (Design) 1, EKEO  |
| Mr Joe LAM          | Senior Project Manager 337, Architectural Services Department (ArchSD)                 |
| Mr Lawrence LO      | Project Manager 385, ArchSD  |
| Mr Alan TANG        | Senior Architect, Ho & Partners Architects Engineers & Development Consultants Limited |

\*Denoting attendance online.

**The Chairman** welcomed all to the 41<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (KTTF).

**The Chairman** introduced and welcomed new Members to the meeting, including –

- (a) **Mr Benny CHAN**, representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design;
- (b) **Mr Sam CHOW**, representing The Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong;
- (c) **Mr Jacky CHEUNG**, representing The Hong Kong Institute of Architects;
- (d) **Mr Jeff TUNG**, representing The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong; and
- (e) **Mr Ivan HO**, who had been appointed as individual member since 1 July 2021.

**The Chairman** informed the meeting that –

- (a) **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG**, Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour) of DEVB, attended on behalf of Mr Vic YAU, Deputy Secretary (Planning & Lands) 1;
- (b) **Mr CHOW Bing-kay**, Chief Assistant Secretary (Works) 3 of DEVB, attended on behalf of Mr Vincent MAK, Deputy Secretary (Works) 2;
- (c) **Ms Stephenie HO**, Senior Manager (Tourism) 41 of TC, attended on behalf of Mr Henry LAI, Assistant Commissioner for Tourism 4; and
- (d) **Mr George MAK**, Chief Engineer/East 5 of CEDD, attended on behalf of Mr Michael LEUNG, Project Manager (E).

## **Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 39<sup>th</sup> and 40<sup>th</sup> Meetings**

1.1 **The Chairman** informed Members that the draft minutes of the 39<sup>th</sup> and 40<sup>th</sup> KTTF meetings were circulated to Members on 20 September 2021. The finalised minutes having incorporated Members' comments were circulated to Members on 27 September 2021.

1.2 There being no further comments from Members, the minutes of the 39<sup>th</sup> and 40<sup>th</sup> meetings were confirmed.

## **Item 2 Matters Arising**

2.1 There was no matter arising from the last meeting.

## **Item 3 Residential Development at 1-5 Kai Hing Road, Kai Tak South (TFKT/04/2021)**

### Briefing by the proponent

3.1 **The Chairman** informed Members that the Horizon Moon Limited, the Vision Charm Limited and the Wealthy Bay Limited submitted a paper (TFKT/04/2021) on the Residential Development at 1-5 Kai Hing Road, Kai Tak South.

3.2 **Mr Steven LEE** briefed Members on the background of the item. The Town Planning Board (TPB) recently received an s.16 Planning Application No. A/K22/31 concerning a proposed residential development in the former South Apron. An earlier s.16 Planning Application No. A/K22/11 for the same site was approved by the TPB in June 2011, following consultation with the Task Force in November 2010 and March 2011 respectively. Information of the updated development scheme under the present

application was circulated to Members on 9 August 2021. Initially, it was noted that the landing steps, as well as food and beverage/retail blocks abutting the promenade under the previously approved scheme, which were generally welcomed by Members, had been omitted under the present application. The Secretariat had relayed the concern to PlanD and requested justifications from the applicant on how the latest scheme could maintain a vibrant waterfront for public enjoyment, hence this submission.

3.3 With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, **Ms Betty HO** from PlanArch Consultants Limited briefed Members on the latest proposed development scheme.

### Discussion

#### *Harbourfront Vibrancy*

3.4 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, Mr Ivan HO, Mr Benny CHAN and Mr Edward LO** expressed grave concerns over the removal of the landing steps which would significantly affect harbourfront vibrancy and limit interactions between the waterfront promenade and the water. **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** also indicated his disappointment that such arrangement was not conducive to promoting water sports activities despite the unique and suitable location of the site.

3.5 **Ms Betty HO** responded that the former landing steps in the 2011 development scheme was proposed having regard that there were no landing steps in the area back then, but five landing steps had been added nearby over the past years. The proposed landing steps was removed from the updated development scheme also because there was insufficient space for building the full range of ancillary facilities required for the landing steps, such as disabled

access, holding area, etc.

3.6 **Mr Ivan HO** and **Mr Benny CHAN** raised grave concerns over the lack of retail and commercial elements along the promenade, which was originally committed in the 2011 development scheme. It was considered that the latest proposal would adversely affect the vibrancy of the waterfront.

3.7 **Ms Betty HO** responded that it would be difficult for retail and food and beverage shops to survive and thrive, given the small non-domestic gross floor area of about 600 square metres available, and thus these elements were removed from the updated development. She added that the public could still enjoy the retail and alfresco dining services at the nearby Kwun Tong Promenade.

#### *Connectivity and Permeability*

3.8 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** and **Mr Ivan HO** noted that the promenade was segregated from the residential development by planters and fences, and considered that its connectivity and permeability should be improved from the harbourfront enhancement angle. **Mr Edward LO** also pointed out that the design of the residential development and the adjacent promenade should be better integrated. **Mr Jacky CHEUNG** concurred and added that the frontage arrangement between the residential development and waterfront promenade would be vital in terms of connectivity and accessibility. **The Chairman** enquired whether the public would be able to access to the harbourfront from Kai Hing Road directly in between the proposed development and the adjoining site to its west where the existing Kerry Dangerous Goods Warehouse was located.

3.9 **Ms Betty HO** responded that the public could have a convenient access to the harbourfront from Kai Hing Road through the future open space



to the west of the existing Kerry Dangerous Goods Warehouse site, while the setback area adjoining the proposed development would not be accessible by the public. She added that the disposition of the residential buildings had been designed with the intention in maintaining visual permeability, and that the 1.5m-wide landscape buffer at pedestrian level was proposed along the southern boundary of private residential development as visual mitigation from the harbourfront promenade, with a view to minimising the potential conflicts between residents and harbourfront users.

#### *Landscape and Design of the Promenade*

3.10 **Mr Ivan HO** opined that the overall landscape design of the promenade was not attractive but only provided a passive passageway with greenery. **Mr Jacky CHEUNG** concurred and suggested that better landscape design should be added for a vibrant promenade. **Mr Ivan HO** also pointed out that the rain shelters along the promenade should be enlarged to ensure their shading effectiveness.

3.11 **Mr Ivan HO** and **Mr Benny CHAN** stressed the importance of having an integrated and holistic design for the entire promenade for public enjoyment. They opined that the design of the promenade should be better integrated with that of the adjacent Hong Kong Children's Hospital and the Kwun Tong Promenade.

3.12 **Mr Edward LO** considered that more concrete details should be provided as to how the proposed design ideas, such as inclusive planning, shared use of harbourfront between pedestrian and cyclists, etc., would be realised. **Mr Benny CHAN** opined that with the generic promenade design presented, the proponent should consult the Task Force again in due course when more concrete design proposal was available.

3.13 **Ms Betty HO** responded that the proposed harbourfront promenade would be open round the clock for public enjoyment and be linked up with the adjoining promenades directly for a continuous waterfront. Noting Members' comments, she explained that the 20m width of the promenade also posed difficulty in adding more design elements, in particular with the requirement of having 30% at-grade greening and the GreenWay. The project team would nonetheless stand ready to refine the design of the promenade in consultation with the Harbourfront Commission, including the enlargement of the rain shelters as suggested.

#### *Management and Maintenance*

3.14 **Mr Ivan HO** enquired about which party would be responsible for managing the harbourfront promenade in future. **Mr Jacky CHEUNG** requested further elaboration as to the future management implementation in facilitating different types of activities to be held on the promenade. In view of the possible conflicting expectations of residents and harbourfront users, **Mr Benny CHAN, Mr Sam CHOW** and **Sr Francis LAM** suggested exploring if the promenade should be handed over to the government for better management and maintenance upon completion by the private developer.

3.15 **Ms Betty HO** responded that the promenade would be handed over to the Government upon completion for management and maintenance. Miss Rosalind CHEUNG also shared the successful experiences of promenade management in the Public Open Space in Private Development (POSPD) at the Kai Tak former runway and the VESSEL at Kwun Tong Promenade, which had brought in a lot of innovative and diverse ideas to the harbourfront.

3.16 As regards the management and maintenance of landing steps, **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** supplemented that according to the planning approval obtained in 2011, the developer had made commitment to design,

construct, manage and maintain the proposed landing steps for public enjoyment, and that such costs would not be transferred to the residents.

### *Way Forward*

3.17 **The Chairman** concluded that Members raised grave concerns over the lack of vibrancy offered under the proposed development scheme. Among others, Members were specifically concerned about the omission of the landing steps as well as the retail and commercial elements as proposed in the approved scheme in 2011. This was contradicting the developer's commitment to design, construct, manage and maintain the landing steps, and that such costs would not be transferred to the residents. This was the basis of the support given by the Task Force in 2011. The project team was invited to refine the development scheme based on Members' comments raised at the meeting and put back the landing steps as well as retail and commercial elements, without which the proposed planning application would not be supported.

[Post-meeting note: Subsequent to the meeting, the project team conducted a follow-up briefing on the revised development scheme on 10 January 2022. In response to the further comments from Members, further refinements to the development proposal were made, including revising the orientation of the retail block for an elongated frontage along the promenade and the arrangement for the proponent to undertake the management and maintenance responsibilities of the public landing steps until it was taken up by government departments. As concluded at the briefing session, in view of the relatively generic design of the harbourfront promenade presented, the proponent was invited to consult the Task Force on its detailed design so that further comments from Members could be incorporated in a timely manner.]

#### **Item 4 Recommended Outline Development Plan on Kowloon Bay Action Area and Proposed Amendments to the Approved Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay Outline Zoning Plan (TFKT/05/2021)**

##### Briefing by the proponent

4.1 **The Chairman** informed Members that EKEO and PlanD submitted a paper (TFKT/05/2021) on the Recommended Outline Development Plan (RODP) on Kowloon Bay Action Area (KBAA) and Proposed Amendments to the Approved Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP).

4.2 **Mr Steven LEE** briefed Members on the background of the item. With a view to transforming a cluster of government land into a new commercial and office hub, EKEO commissioned the Planning and Engineering Study for the Development at KBAA in 2014 and consulted the Task Force on its Preliminary Outline Development Plan in June 2016. While Members were generally supportive of the proposal, they also raised concerns mainly in relation to the connectivity of KBAA to the harbourfront and the traffic issues in the area. Taking into account the feedback received during the previous round of public consultation, the RODP for the study had been formulated. Hence, EKEO and PlanD would brief KTTF Members on the RODP and its implementation arrangements, as well as the associated OZP amendment proposal.

4.3 **Mr Sam CHOW** declared that his company was a party to the project team of the study. **The Chairman** decided that he could remain in the meeting as an observer but should refrain from commenting on this item.

4.4 With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, **Mr KING Kwok-cheung** from EKEO, **Mr William CHAN** from PlanD and **Mr LI Wai-lam** from Arup briefed Members on the proposed development plan and OZP amendment proposal.

## Discussion

### *Pedestrian Connectivity and Walking Experience*

4.5 **Mr Paul CHAN** enquired if there would be any 24-hour pedestrian walkway connecting the nearby MTR stations through footbridges to the harbourfront. He opined that the existing walking environment and streetscape in KBAA should be improved to promote walkability. **Sr Francis LAM**, **Mr Jeff TUNG**, **Mr Ivan HO** and **Mr Jacky CHEUNG** concurred. **Sr Francis LAM** considered that the KBAA development should strive to improve the pedestrian linkage to the harbourfront as well as the hospital cluster in Kai Tak by connecting different segments in the vicinity.

4.6 **Mr KING Kwok-cheung** responded that a comprehensive multi-level pedestrian network with 24-hour public access was proposed for KBAA to connect the proposed commercial development, the Green Transport Hub and the activity nodes, including the nearby MTR stations, the hospital cluster, open space and harbourfront promenade.

4.7 **Mr Jeff TUNG** opined that in uplifting the existing elevated pedestrian network, wider connections in form of landscape decks instead of narrow footbridges should be considered. **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** and **Mr Jacky CHEUNG** concurred. **Mr Jeff TUNG** also suggested providing retail and food and beverage facilities along the street-facing edges of the Green Transport Hub for a more active frontage.

4.8 **Mr Benny CHAN** suggested the project team to consider further enhancing the north-south connectivity across the 24-hour pedestrianised area along Cheung Yip Street. He requested further elaboration regarding the way to access the hospital cluster in Kai Tak via the amenity area from the Green Transport Hub, and enquired if a new footbridge would be built above the Kai Fuk Road Flyover.

4.9 **Mr KING Kwok-cheung** responded that a vertical connection would be provided to connect the Green Transport Hub to the deck level of Lot 2, where a footbridge would lead to the amenity area. A new elevated walkway would also be constructed to link up the amenity area with the hospital cluster and the promenade. He reiterated that a footbridge was proposed above the Kai Fuk Road Flyover to connect the Lots 2 and 4. He remarked that the provision of vertical linkages in the open spaces would form a three-dimensional network to facilitate pedestrian movement between different levels so as to enhance pedestrian connectivity.

4.10 **Mr Benny CHAN** further enquired if the proposed setback areas on the ground level of Lots 2 and 4 would be open round-the-clock for public enjoyment without any fence wall, and whether such requirement would be stipulated under the lease.

4.11 **Mr KING Kwok-cheung** responded that a set of development control mechanisms would be adopted to ensure that there would not be any fence wall within the non-building areas of the concerned lots blocking the access to the open spaces.

#### *Open Space Provision*

4.12 **Mr Benny CHAN** noted that the open space located underneath the Kai Fuk Road Flyover might not be effective for public enjoyment. He

suggested exploring the possibility of relocating the proposed Organic Resources Recovery Centre (ORRC) to underneath the Flyover so that more open spaces could be released. **Mr Jeff TUNG** suggested the project team to consider lowering the level of the Flyover with a wide deck to be built atop for providing more quality open spaces.

4.13 **Mr KING Kwok-cheung** responded that there would be multi-level open spaces amounting to 21,400 m<sup>2</sup> in KBAA. The open space located underneath the Kai Fuk Road Flyover was proposed to provide space for arts, cultural and creative uses. **Mr LI Wai-lam** supplemented that the proposed ORRC was strategically located for recycling and upcycling operations on the one hand, while facilitating environmental and community education on the other. As such, its proposed location could create synergy with Zero Carbon Park and other green buildings and public facilities nearby to form an eco-economic hub.

#### *Integrated Basement Carparks and Smart Parking System*

4.14 **Sr Francis LAM** suggested integrating the basement carparks of various lots in KBAA for providing more parking spaces and flexibility to meet the anticipated traffic flow and to allow drivers to have a more convenient access to different lots. **Ir Victor CHEUNG, Mr Jeff TUNG, Mr Ivan HO** and **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** concurred. **Mr Ivan HO** asked if the proposed connection between basement carparks would be required under lease. **Mr Ivan HO** and **Ir Victor CHEUNG** opined that the smart parking system should be designed and implemented in KBAA with a view to promoting user-friendliness.

4.15 **Mr KING Kwok-cheung** noted Members' comments and responded that the basement carparks on Lots 2 and 4 were proposed to be connected so as to reduce the traffic on the ground level. As regards the

smart parking system, **Mr KING Kwok-cheung** remarked that the future developers would be encouraged to incorporate it as appropriate.

4.16 **Mr Ivan HO** reiterated that relevant requirements should be specified in the OZP or lease documents to ensure proper delivery of the proposed connections between underground car parks.

#### *Refuse Collection System*

4.17 **Dr Vivian WONG** requested the project team to give further elaborations on the future waste-handling plan in KBAA. **Dr. CHUNG Shan-shan** enquired if the proposed automatic refuse collection system would serve the local residents directly, and whether the ORRC would handle the food waste produced by the dining facilities nearby. **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** considered that more efforts should be made to facilitate recycling in addition to refuse collection.

4.18 **Mr LI Wai-lam** responded that the ORRC was primarily targeting resources and food waste collected from commercial facilities and government buildings in the district for recycling and upcycling. Meanwhile, the future developers would be encouraged to implement the automatic refuse collection system in their respective lots.

4.19 **Dr CHUNG Shan-shan** supplemented that the implementation of the proposed automatic refuse collection system in the new facilities should be formulated in conjunction with the waste and related policy in future.

#### *Other Comments*

4.20 **Ir Victor CHEUNG** enquired if the District Cooling System at Kai Tak Development would serve the KBAA in view of its anticipated high air-



conditioning demand.

4.21 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** reminded that the project team should make suitable arrangements to avoid excessive exhaust emissions on the ground level which would severely affect visitors' experience in the area.

4.22 **Mr KING Kwok-cheung** clarified that KBAA is beyond the service area of the District Cooling System at Kai Tak Development. As regards exhaust emissions, he responded that as the commercial and office developments in KBAA would mainly adopt the centralised air-conditioning system, excessive exhaust emissions on the ground level were not expected. **Mr KING Kwok-cheung** added that while the proposed OZP amendments would be processed, the vacant site could be considered for temporary uses including public car park to make good use of the land.

#### *Way Forward*

4.23 **The Chairman** concluded that while the Task Force did not object to the proposed comprehensive redevelopment, Members were in particular concerned about the pedestrian connectivity and walking experience from KBAA to the waterfront. In light of Members' concerns, EKEO was invited to propose improvement measures in relation to the issues raised and consult the Task Force again on the pedestrian connectivity, before making submission to TPB on the proposed OZP amendments.

[Post-meeting note: Subsequent to the meeting, further information on the pedestrian connectivity and walking experience from KBAA to harbourfront was supplemented by EKEO and was circulated to Members on 31 December 2021 for comment. With Chairman's agreement, the Secretariat made a written submission consolidating Members' views and comments on the RODP and proposed OZP amendments to the TPB on 1 March 2022.]

## **Item 5      Additional District Cooling System at the Kai Tak Development**

### Briefing by the proponent

5.1            **The Chairman** informed Members that the EMSD submitted a paper (TFKT/06/2021) on the additional District Cooling System (DCS) at the Kai Tak development.

5.2            **The Chairman** declared that his company was a party to the project team and Members agreed to have **Mr Ivan HO** to preside at the meeting for this item.

5.3            **Mr Steven LEE** briefed Members on the background of the item. EMSD consulted the Task Force on the provision of the additional DCS in January 2019. At the meeting, while Members generally acknowledged the operational need and environmental merits of the DCS, concerns regarding the building mass of the proposed DCS were raised and the project team was invited to consult the Task Force again on its revised design when available, hence the current submission.

5.4            **Mr Sam CHOW** declared that his company was a party to the project team. **Mr Ivan HO** decided that he could remain in the meeting as an observer but should refrain from commenting on this item.

5.5            With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, **Mr Ken YEUNG** from EMSD and **Mr CHAN Ho-chung** from LWK + Partners briefed Members on the revised design of the additional DCS at the Kai Tak development.

## Discussion

### *Landscape and Design*

5.6 **Mr Paul CHAN** and **Mr Benny CHAN** appreciated that the building bulk of the additional DCS had been reduced as compared to the previous proposal. **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** proposed to adopt a fence-free design around the plant as far as possible in order to enhance permeability and pedestrian walkability. **Mr Benny CHAN** concurred. **Mr Ivan HO** remarked that the fences might be needed for security purpose.

5.7 **Mr CHAN Ho-chung** responded that in addition to security considerations, the provision of fences with vertical greening would help fulfil the minimum greening requirement at pedestrian level for the site.

5.8 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** asked if it would be possible to adopt transparent glass walls for the plant so that the public could view the interesting engineering structures inside. **Mr Benny CHAN** concurred and proposed to add architectural features in allowing natural lighting and air ventilation, which could further enhance its sustainability and break down the solid façade of the plant.

5.9 **Mr Ken YEUNG** responded that the project team would explore to enhance the architectural features of the additional DCS in improving its transparency, natural lighting and air ventilation, having regard to potential noise implications. **Mr CHAN Ho-chung** supplemented that the project team would consider having more seasonal plants to enhance the variety at the landscape garden.

### *Visitor Centre and Public Education*

5.10 **Mr Paul CHAN** enquired about the opening hours and details of the landscape garden above the visitor centre, and whether it could be accessed after the visitor centre was closed. He also suggested providing bicycle parking facilities around the plant to facilitate bicycle users to visit the visitor centre. **Mr Benny CHAN** suggested the project team to incorporate educational elements in the visitor centre and the DCS for raising public awareness on sustainable development, and provide food and beverage facilities to be run by social enterprises in the landscape garden.

5.11 **Mr Ken YEUNG** responded that due to security reasons in ensuring effective operation of the plant, the visitor centre and landscape garden was planned to be opened to the public by appointment only, and no bicycle parking facilities would be provided within the site. That said, the project team would further explore the feasibility of opening up relevant facilities and adding bicycle parking as suggested by Members.

#### *Other Comments*

5.12 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired about the usage and operation of the additional DCS in providing central cooling and if it was expected to improve the existing situation where a lot of air-conditioners were installed outside the building units in Kai Tak. He further enquired if the water discharge from the additional DCS could improve the water quality at Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC).

5.13 **Mr Ken YEUNG** explained that the additional DCS at the Kai Tak development would mainly serve buildings with central cooling systems, rather than individual residential units. He added that the seawater intake and discharge were expected to increase the water circulation at KTAC and hence improve its water quality.

5.14 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** requested further elaboration on the intake and outflow direction of the chilled water so as to review the effectiveness in increasing the water circulation within KTAC.

5.15 **Mr Felix LUNG** responded that the desilted seawater would be drawn from the adjacent Desilting Compound and the chilled water would be discharged to the To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelter after processing in the plant.

#### *Way Forward*

5.16 In conclusion, **Mr Ivan HO** invited the project team to take into account Members' comments in taking forward the development.

#### **Item 6 Any Other Business**

6.1 **The Chairman** informed Members that EKEO would like to update Members of their quick-win project for a waterfront site adjacent to the Hoi Bun Industrial Building in the Kwun Tong Action Area (KTAA). The quick-win project had previously been presented to the Task Force under the RODP for KTAA in May 2019.

6.2 **Mr Paul CHAN** declared that his company was a party to the project team. **The Chairman** decided that he could remain in the meeting as an observer but should refrain from commenting on this item.

6.3 With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, **Mr KING Kwok-cheung** from EKEO and **Mr Alan TANG** from Ho & Partners Architects Engineers & Development Consultants Limited briefed Members on the updates of the quick-win project.

6.4 **The Chairman** enquired about the development programme of the project and urged the project team to expedite the process by adopting the “incremental approach” for early public enjoyment. **Mr Ivan HO** concurred. **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** reminded the project team that the design should facilitate cyclists to travel along the promenade smoothly.

6.5 **Mr Joe LAM** responded that the construction works would start in early 2022 and complete in around one year, and it would be difficult in expediting the development progress in view of the complicated works involved in demolishing the existing pier canopy. **Mr KING Kwok-cheung** supplemented that they would explore advancing the development programme in order to turn the vacant land into open space for early public enjoyment.

6.6 Understanding that the detailed design of the site was still under preparation, **the Chairman** invited the project team to consult Members on the detailed development programme and design proposal before they would be confirmed.

6.7 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** proposed to discuss matters related to the proposed amendments to the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO). **The Chairman** responded that as the focus of the Task Force was on the regional development of Kai Tak, the issue should be examined at a future meeting of the Harbourfront Commission in due course.

6.8 There being no other comments, the meeting was adjourned at 6:30 pm.

Secretariat

Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development

April 2022