

Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development

Minutes of Forty-second Meeting

Date : 1 November 2021 (Mon)
Time : 3 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 Limited

Dr Vivian WONG Representing Friends of the Earth (HK) Charity Limited

Mr Benny CHAN Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design

Mr Winston CHU Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour (attended Item 2)

Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour (attended Item 3)

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

Ms Iris HOI 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*

Mr Ivan HO

Ms Angela SO*

Hon Tony TSE

Official Members

Mr Vic YAU

Deputy Secretary (Planning & Lands) 1, Development
Bureau (DEVB)

Mr Johnny CHAN

Principal Assistant Secretary (Works) 2, DEVB

Ms Stephenie HO

Senior Manager (Tourism) 41, Tourism Commission
(TC)

Mr Patrick HO

Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport
Department (TD)

Mr Henry CHU

Head (Kai Tak Office), Civil Engineering and
Development Department (CEDD)

Mr Michael CHIU

Chief Executive Officer (Planning) 1, Leisure and
Cultural Services Department (LCSD)

Mr Chesterfield LEE

Senior Town Planner/Kowloon 3, Planning
Department (PlanD)

Mr Steven LEE

Secretary

In Attendance

Miss Rosalind CHEUNG

Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB

Mr William LEUNG

Assistant Secretary (Harbour) Special Duties, DEVB

Mr William CHAN

Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB

Mr NG Shing-kit

Senior Engineer (Harbour)2, DEVB

Ms Phoebe WU Engineer (Harbour), DEVB
Ms Helen CHU* Landscape Architect (Harbour), DEVB

Absent with Apologies

Ms Kelly CHAN
Mr Frankie NGAN

For Item 2

Mr George MAK Chief Engineer/East 5, East Development Office,
CEDD
Mr Jason WONG Senior Engineer/10(E), East Development Office,
CEDD
Ms Melissa WAYE Engineer/15(E), East Development Office, CEDD
Mr Chesterfield LEE Senior Town Planner/Kowloon 3, PlanD
Ms Joyce LEE Assistant Town Planner/Kowloon 8, PlanD
Mr Oliver LAW General Manager (Planning & Development), Hong
Kong Housing Society (HKHS)
Mr Raymond LIU Senior Manager (Planning & Development), HKHS
Mr FU Yee Ming Senior Manager (Planning & Development), HKHS
Mr Howard YEE Senior Manager (Project Management), HKHS

For Item 3

Mr Kasper NG Principal Assistant Secretary (Further Education),
Education Bureau (EDB)
Miss Jasmine CHIU Assistant Secretary (Further Education) 2, EDB
Miss May LEE Assistant Secretary (Further Education) 2 Des., EDB
Ms Karen CHEK Senior Executive Officer (Further Education)3, EDB
Dr Wilson LAM Architect / Subvented Projects (4), Architectural
Services Department (ArchSD)

Dr Eric LIU	Deputy Executive Director, Vocational Training Council (VTC)
Mr Philip SHUM	Head/Estates, Health and Safety Division, VTC
Ms Ariel CHOW	Project Manager/Estates, Health and Safety Division, VTC
Mr Joel CHAN	Director, P&T Group

*Denoting attendance online.

The Chairman welcomed all to the 42nd meeting of the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (KTTF).

The Chairman informed the meeting that -

- (a) **Mr Johnny CHAN**, Principal Assistant Secretary (Works) 2, DEVB, attended on behalf of Mr Vincent MAK, Deputy Secretary (Works) 2;
- (b) **Mr Henry CHU**, Head (Kai Tak Office) of CEDD, attended on behalf of Mr Michael LEUNG, Project Manager (E);
- (c) **Mr Michael CHIU**, Chief Executive Officer (Planning) 1 of LCSD, attended on behalf of Mr Horman CHAN, Assistant Director (Leisure Services) 1;
- (d) **Ms Stephenie HO**, Senior Manager (Tourism) 41 of TC, attended on behalf of Henry LAI, Assistant Commissioner for Tourism 4; and
- (e) **Mr Chesterfield LEE**, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon 3 of PlanD, attends on behalf of Ms Katy FUNG, District Planning Officer/Kowloon.

Item 1 Matters Arising

1.1 **The Chairman** informed Members that the Task Force resolved in the 41st meeting to request the Energizing Kowloon East Office to propose improvement measures in response to their comments on the pedestrian connectivity and walking experience from Kowloon Bay Action Area to the waterfront. Further details would be provided when available.

[Post-meeting note: Subsequent to the meeting, further information on the

pedestrian connectivity and walking experience from hinterland to harbourfront was supplemented by EKEO and was circulated to Members on 31 December 2021 for information and comments. With the Chairman's agreement, the Secretariat made a written submission consolidating Members' views and comments on the proposed development plan and amendment proposal of the Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) to the Town Planning Board (TPB) on 1 March 2022.]

1.2 Since the last KTTF meeting was only held a short while ago, **the Chairman** informed Members that the minutes of the 41st meeting would be confirmed at the next meeting.

Item 2 Further Review of Land Use in Kai Tak Development (TFKT/07/2021)

Briefing by the proponent

2.1 **The Chairman** informed the meeting that a briefing was arranged on 26 October 2021 for PlanD and CEDD to consult Members on the further review of land use in Kai Tak Development (KTD). Subsequently, the team had submitted a paper (TFKT/07/2021) on the latest review proposal.

2.2 Upon **the Chairman's** invitation, **Mr Steven LEE** briefed Members on the background of the item. In view of the latest economic situation and market response, as well as the acute housing demand, the review study was commissioned in 2020 to examine the feasibility of rezoning 5 commercial sites for residential use. Other proposed amendments to the prevailing Kai Tak OZP including, among others, the proposed Dedicated Rehousing Estate (DRE) at Ma Tau Kok, were also focus of the current item.

2.3 **Sr Francis LAM** declared that he was a Member of the Hong Kong Housing Authority. **The Chairman** decided that he could remain in the meeting but should refrain from commenting on the specific site concerned where potential conflict of interest was involved.

2.4 With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, **Mr Chesterfield LEE** from PlanD briefed Members on the latest review proposal.

Discussion

Dining Cove

2.5 **Mr Ivan HO, Mr Jeff TUNG, Ms Iris HOI, Mr Jacky CHEUNG** and **the Chairman** expressed grave concerns over the removal of the Dining Cove and that the proposed remedial measures of implementing the public open space (POS) outside the original Dining Cove lacked vibrancy. **Mr Ivan HO** and **the Chairman** stressed the importance of providing alfresco dining within the POS to be managed by LCSD, and if this was not possible in the near future, it was considered that there should at least be proper seating, tables and shelters on this LCSD site to support the restaurants inside the site to be managed by the HKHS.

2.6 **Mr Chesterfield LEE** explained that the proposed DRE development adjoining the Dining Cove POS was intended to meet the rehousing demands arising from government development and/or urban renewal projects. He added that that site had been reconfigured with a view to facilitating HKHS to accommodate certain at-grade food and beverage as well as alfresco dining provision for public enjoyment following the original planning intention and facilitating the implementation of the intended Dining Cove. **Mr Oliver LAW** supplemented that open air alfresco dining and

commercial facilities fronting the adjoining Dining Cove POS were planned on the lower floors of the proposed development. **Mr Michael CHIU** remarked that while food and beverage facilities were generally not allowed in venues managed by LCSD, they would be willing to explore with HKHS ways to facilitate their dining activities.

2.7 **The Chairman** expressed that with reference to the experience of Central Market, the public should be able to enjoy food and beverage within the POS. **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** remarked that if there would be at least proper seating, tables and shelters on the LCSD site, it would allow members of the public to enjoy their food and beverage purchased from the outlets in HKHS' development. **Mr Jeff TUNG** considered that the proposed arrangement was still inconvenient for public enjoyment. He suggested having more food kiosks in the LCSD site directly so as to have a vibrant harbourfront.

2.8 **Mr Ivan HO** enquired about the types of "Government, Institution or Community" (GIC) and social welfare facilities to be provided in the site, and expressed concerns that some proposed uses might not be compatible with the original planning intention of achieving a vibrant area. **Ms Iris HOI** opined that the overall design of the POS within the DRE site was not conducive to vibrancy but only provided a passive passageway. She suggested rearranging the building disposition for having a more open public space with shelters and seating which could offer multi-functional uses for public enjoyment.

2.9 **Mr Oliver LAW** responded that the GIC and social welfare facilities were planned for elderly care, pre-school rehabilitation services, care services for children with special needs, hostel for physically or mentally handicapped persons, etc. He also explained that the proposed building

disposition was arranged having regard to both technical constraints imposed by the residential developments and the intention to open up the at-grade POS for public enjoyment.

2.10 **Mr Jacky CHEUNG** requested further elaboration regarding the interdepartmental design review panel formed by relevant government representatives in monitoring the design and construction of the POS by HKHS.

2.11 **Mr Chesterfield LEE** explained that making reference to the practice for the residential sites at Kai Tak former runway, the interdepartmental design review panel would compose of representatives of different departments including CEDD, PlanD, LCSD, ArchSD, Harbour Office and the Green and Landscape Office of DEVB. The project team would also consult the Task Force on the detailed design of the POS to be delivered by HKHS in due course.

Underground Shopping Street (USS) and Underground Carpark

2.12 **Mr Ivan HO** opined that with the segregated ownership along the different USS sections, the business viability for the realigned USS should be considered thoroughly so as to achieve a critical mass. He further enquired which party was responsible for constructing the section of USS which was not to be taken forward by private developers. **Mr Benny CHAN, Mr Jeff TUNG** and **Mr Jacky CHEUNG** concurred. They proposed that the USS could be managed by a single operator for holistic management, which would be conducive to its vibrancy and integration. **Mr Jeff TUNG** suggested having sufficient retail facilities at the podium of the residential buildings above and exploring the possibility of having hotel development nearby so as to create synergy and attract a critical public mass for the USS.

2.13 **Mr George MAK** responded that in the future land sale documents of the sites concerned, developers would be required to integrate the basement retail provision with the USS so as to achieve a critical mass. In response to Members' comments on holistic management of the USS by government, he said that the USS would generally be located within private land and be integrated with other shops at the USS level. The developers concerned would also be required to maintain round-the-clock pedestrian access through the USS. It would therefore be prudent for the developer to manage its own section of USS as a single party.

2.14 **Mr Ivan HO** urged the project team to study the possibility in linking up the basement car parks within the rezoned bundled residential sites in Area 2 so as to provide more parking spaces and flexibility to meet the anticipated traffic flow. **Mr Jeff TUNG** concurred.

2.15 **Mr George MAK** responded that in line with the latest updates to the parking standard under Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, more underground parking spaces would be provided. He remarked that there were also considerable parking provisions in other parts of KTD such as the Tourism Node and Kai Tak Sports Park to meet the parking demand. In response to Members' suggestion on linking up the basement car parks, **Mr Chesterfield LEE** supplemented that the project team would liaise with relevant departments to explore if it would be technically feasible. [Post meeting note: Members' proposal involved the use of the underground space underneath public roads and pedestrian street for parking use. Upon consulting relevant departments, it was considered that the notional schemes under the Review Study with parking spaces confined to the development sites (i.e. without encroaching into the underground areas of public roads) were technically feasible. If the future developers had the intention to provide ancillary car parking spaces of commercial/residential development in area

shown as 'Road' on the OZP, they could submit planning application to the TPB under the provisions of the OZP.]

2.16 **Dr CHUNG Shan-shan** opined that the factor of global climate change should be taken into account in the design of USS and asked if the proposal had considered the possible adverse weather conditions in the years to come.

2.17 **Mr George MAK** explained that necessary architectural and drainage features had been incorporated in the design of USS to avoid flooding brought about by the adverse weather.

Pedestrian-cum-cyclist Bridge across Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter

2.18 While agreeing that a pedestrian connection should be added across Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter, **Mr Winston CHU** expressed concerns over its potential adverse impact on the operation of the Typhoon Shelter due to height restriction, and urged the proponent to consider other possible locations for constructing the bridge, such as at the opening of Kai Tak Approach Channel or along the existing breakwater. With reference to the Greenwich Foot Tunnel in London, he proposed that alternative solutions such as pedestrian tunnel or ferry services should be considered. He also expressed that the views of relevant stakeholders on the conceptual proposal should be fully considered before proceeding to prepare the detailed design of the proposed bridge.

2.19 **Mr Edward LO** supported enhancing cycling connectivity throughout KTD as it could promote cycling for recreation as well as commuting purposes. **Mr Benny CHAN** requested further details showing the latest overall connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists in KTD.

2.20 **Mr George MAK** responded that the latest proposed location of the pedestrian-cum-cyclist bridge had already significantly reduced its impact on the operation of Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter. The project team would also take into consideration Members' comments in refining the proposal as appropriate. In respect of the suggested pedestrian tunnel, he explained that it might not be technically feasible as Trunk Road T2 would also pass through the seabed underneath Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter. He further explained that under the proposed travellers networks, including the 1.3km traveller along Wai Yip Street linking up Kowloon Bay Action Area and Kwun Tong Action Area, together with the proposed pedestrian-cum-cyclist bridge (with traveller) would provide a direct and convenient linkage among Kwun Tong Action Area, Kowloon Bay Action Area and Kai Tak Runway under the "multi-modal" Environmentally Friendly Linkage System. He supplemented that the commencement of detailed design of the proposed bridge was still subject to review with regards to the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance and various technical impact assessments.

2.21 **Mr Chesterfield LEE** explained that a holistic pedestrian and cycling connection network had been planned throughout KTD in particular in connecting the various open spaces and Kai Tak Sports Park. Pedestrian connections in form of footbridges and subways had also been provided to connect to other areas in the vicinity of KTD including San Po Kong and Kowloon City.

Other Comments

2.22 **Hon Tony TSE** enquired if the increase in maximum building heights (BHs) for the residential sites at the former north apron area would visually block the surrounding buildings, and if minor relaxation of BHs would

be allowed for other sites in the vicinity. **Mr Edward LO** concurred and considered that the visual impact assessment should fully consider the potential effects on the ridgeline and harbour view.

2.23 **Mr Chesterfield LEE** responded that the maximum BHs for the rezoning sites were increased with a view to achieving the planned domestic plot ratio along with the reduced footprint. The increased BHs were also in line with the surrounding building profile, and a stepped height profile of the locality would be maintained.

2.24 **Hon Tony TSE** requested further elaboration in terms of traffic flow and the potential impact of the proposed rezoning of the commercial sites for residential use on the overall KTD.

2.25 **Mr George MAK** responded that the overall traffic flow in the area was expected to be slightly reduced upon the proposed rezoning of the commercial sites according to the traffic impact assessment.

2.26 **Hon Tony TSE** added that the traffic impact assessment should also include traffic flow information at different time periods brought about by the rezoning.

Way Forward

2.27 In conclusion, notwithstanding that the Task Force had no in-principle objection to the proposed rezoning for residential uses, Members expressed grave concerns over the lack of vibrancy at the original Dining Cove area. Members also provided other comments with less harbourfront angle including the implementation of the USS and the possibility in linking up the basement car parks within the rezoned bundled residential sites in Area 2.

The Chairman invited the project team to take into account Members' comments in taking forward the rezoning proposal for consideration by the TPB, and to consult the Task Force on the detailed design of the POS to be delivered by HKHS as soon as possible.

Item 3 Pre-construction Works for Proposed Development of New Campus of Vocational Training Council at Kowloon East (Cha Kwo Ling) (TFKT/08/2021)

Briefing by the proponent

3.1 **The Chairman** informed Members that EDB submitted a paper (TFKT/08/2021) on the pre-construction works for the proposed development of new campus of VTC at Kowloon East (Cha Kwo Ling). Further to the briefing session arranged on 26 October 2021, the project team had further refined the proposal taking into account Members' comments.

3.2 Upon the **Chairman's** invitation, **Mr Steven LEE** briefed Members on the background of the item. PlanD and CEDD consulted the Task Force on the amendments incorporated in the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/5, including the proposed rezoning for the proposed VTC campus development, in 2017. While the Task Force recognised the need to cater for the different needs of society, Members expressed concerns over the building bulk of the proposed campus, integration between the campus and the promenade, and connectivity to the waterfront, etc. Subsequently, the TPB considered that the project's purpose of nurturing young people in Hong Kong is compatible with the objective of enhancing the vibrancy and diversity of the waterfront area, and considered that a more responsive building design and configuration of the VTC campus should be explored at the implementation stage to achieve better integration of the campus with the waterfront. To take

forward the project, EDB and VTC were invited to brief the Task Force on the project scope and development programme of the proposed development, which also included the adjoining Cha Kwo Ling Promenade.

3.3 **Mr Joel CHAN**, the consultant to the project team, declared that he was representative of the Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design at the Harbourfront Commission and Alternate Member to the Task Force.

3.4 With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, **Mr Joel CHAN** from P&T Group briefed Members on the pre-construction works for the proposed development of new campus of VTC at Kowloon East (Cha Kwo Ling), including the enhancements to the design of the new campus as well as the adjacent public open space in the light of the feedbacks received.

Discussion

Development Programme

3.5 **Mr Ivan HO** urged that the proposed programme timetable, in which Phase 1 of the waterfront promenade and the whole promenade would be completed in Q4 2027 and Q3 2030 respectively, should be expedited for early public enjoyment. **Sr Francis LAM**, **Mr Benny CHAN** and **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** considered that the promenade should be opened by phases in accordance with the “incremental approach”.

3.6 **Mr Kasper NG** responded that in addition to the campus site, VTC had agreed to take over the coordination of the construction of public open space, harbourfront promenade, etc., for creating better synergy and expediting the development programme. He added that the section of promenade abutting the Kwun Tong Sewage Pumping Station would be

reinstated by the Drainage Services Department, which were expected for completion and opening in 2023 tentatively for early public enjoyment. VTC would continue to work closely with the relevant bureaux and departments to further explore advancing the opening of the site by phases.

Physical and Visual Permeability

3.7 **Dr CHUNG Shan-shan** opined that the direct at-grade access to the harbourfront through the VTC campus should be provided for better connectivity taking into account relevant security considerations. **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** considered that the ground floor of the campus should be designed as a community space with provision of food and beverage and community facilities for public enjoyment. **Mr Benny CHAN** and **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that the building mass of the proposed campus developments was relatively bulky and should be further reduced.

3.8 **Mr Kasper NG** responded that VTC had no plan to open the campus for public access, which was different in terms of scale and facilities as compared with the campuses of most local universities. That said, VTC had already set aside an area of about 1 ha within the campus site for use as public open space, which would be handed over to LCSD for public enjoyment upon completion. **Mr Philip SHUM** added that while the campus was not intended to be opened to the public due to campus management, health monitoring and security reasons, the adjacent 1 hectare open space was expected to provide a convenient access to the harbourfront.

3.9 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** reiterated that VTC should consider opening the ground floor of the campus for the public, while allowing exclusive access by its students and staff to upper floors of the campus

building. **Dr Vivian WONG** and **Mr Benny CHAN** concurred.

3.10 **Mr Philip SHUM** explained that the campus and its facilities were intended for use by students and staff and were not intended to be opened to the public due to campus management, health monitoring and security reasons.

Interfacing between VTC campus and promenade

3.11 **Mr Benny CHAN** opined that the interfacing arrangements between the VTC campus and the adjoining promenade should be studied further in the upcoming consultancy for achieving better integration and vibrancy. **Mr Ivan HO** expressed concerns over the concerned interface with the physical segregation between the VTC campus and the waterfront promenade, which was not in line with the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines.

3.12 **Mr Philip SHUM** noted Members' comments and would take into account Members' comments in formulating the design of the campus including the interfacing arrangements.

Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG) Filling Station

3.13 **Mr Ivan HO** expressed concerns over the proposed location of LPG filling station which was right next to the harbourfront promenade, the uses of which might not be compatible with each other. He considered that the project team should explore switching the position of the LPG filling station with that of the playground abutting Wai Yip Street. **Mr Benny CHAN** concurred. **Dr Vivian WONG** and **Mr Sam CHOW** enquired about the necessity of having a LPG filling station as fossil-fuel powered vehicles were

expected to be phased out in future.

3.14 **Mr Kasper NG** responded that the currently proposed location of the LPG filling station was proposed upon assessment by VTC and relevant departments. **Mr Joel CHAN** supplemented that the alternative location near Wai Yip Street was close to the Laguna City which might pose safety concerns to the residents. He supplemented that more greening elements would be added to enhance the proposed LPG filling station visually. **Mr Patrick HO** advised that TD would continue to liaise with the Environment Bureau in evaluating the necessity of the LPG filling station.

3.15 **Mr Ivan HO** reiterated that he would not support the proposed location of the LPG filling station, which was not compatible with the promenade and would lead to safety concerns to the harbourfront users.

Other Comments

3.16 **Dr CHUNG Shan-shan** and **Dr Vivian WONG** enquired if green and energy-efficient building elements would be added to the proposed development of the VTC campus.

3.17 **Mr Kasper NG** responded that in line with the vision of EDB, various elements on green technology would be incorporated in the campus design, and they would facilitate VTC to further enhance their design in this regard. **Dr Eric LIU** supplemented that they would strive to build a green campus aligning with VTC's strategic initiative on smart and green campus development.

3.18 **Mr Ivan HO** asked if the project team had consulted the local community, in particular the nearby residents, on the latest proposal before consultation with the Task Force.

3.19 **Mr Kasper NG** responded that VTC had taken into account the views of different stakeholders, including the nearby residents, in drawing up the design of the campus with a view to enhancing the proposed development. Upon consultation with the Task Force, they would further consult local stakeholders including the relevant committee of the Kwun Tong District Council before seeking funding approval from the Legislative Council.

Way Forward

3.20 Noting that there was little room to relocate the proposed campus to another location at this stage, **the Chairman** concluded that the project team should take into account Members' comments in taking forward the project, in particular in enhancing harbourfront vibrancy, physical permeability and the interfacing arrangements with the promenade.

Item 4 Any Other Business

4.1 There being no other comments, the meeting was adjourned at 5:45 pm.

Secretariat

Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development

April 2022