

1st Meeting of the Harbourfront Commission
Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development
7 September 2010 (Tuesday) at 2:30 p.m.
at Room 1201, 12/F Murray Building, Garden Road, Hong Kong

Minutes of Meeting

Present

Mr Vincent Ng	Chairman, Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development
Mr Nicholas Brooke	Chairman, Harbourfront Commission
Mrs Margaret Brooke	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr Leung Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Mr Lam Kin-lai	Representing Conservancy Association
Prof Carlos Lo	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Andy Leung	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Tam Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Dr Peter Cookson Smith	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Mr Winston Chu	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Ms Lily Chow	
Mr Enoch Lam	Deputy Secretary (Works) 2, Development Bureau
Mr Clement Lau	Assistant Commissioner 4, Tourism Commission
Mr Anthony Loo	Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department
Mr Stephen Tang	Head(Kai Tak Office), Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr Paul Cheung	Assistant Director(Leisure Services)1, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr Adam Lai	General Manager/Planning, Development & Port Security, Marine Department
Mr Eric Yue	District Planning Officer/Kowloon, Planning Department
Mr Tony Chan	Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Patrick Lau Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects

Mr Benjamin Cha

Ms Ann So

In attendance

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

Mr Peter YK Mok Project Manager (Harbour),
Development Bureau

Mr Ronald Leung Assistant Secretary (Harbour)² (designate),
Development Bureau

Mr Peter PC Mok Senior Engineer/2 (Kowloon),
Civil Engineering and Development Department
(for agenda items 3 and 4)

Action

Mr Nicholas Brooke welcomed all to the meeting. He noted that some Members had put forward the suggestion of establishing Panels under the Harbourfront Commission to discuss issues such as harbourfront design and management models. He said that the structure of the Commission could be discussed separately and that the Task Forces at present could take charge of working-level issues. **Mr Nicholas Brooke** also pointed out that the Task Forces may generate a heavy workload and welcomed Members to take up membership in up to two Task Forces, allowing the alternate to sit in the remaining one.

Item 1 Election of Chairman

1.1 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** invited Members to elect the Chairman for this Task Force. **Mr Peter Cookson Smith** nominated Mr Vincent Ng to chair the Task Force. **Mr Andy Leung** seconded. There being no other nomination or objection, **Mr Vincent Ng** was elected Chairman of the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development. **The Chairman** thanked Members for their support.

1.2 **The Chairman** informed Members that Mr Ronald Leung

would take over as Secretary to the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development at the next meeting, vice Mr Tony Chan's transfer out of Development Bureau.

Item 2 Terms of Reference
(Paper No. TFKT/01/2010)

2.1 **The Chairman** invited Members to consider the Terms of Reference (ToR) and the area of responsibility as set out in the Paper. He said that the ToR would be the same for each Task Force, save the geographic coverage.

2.2 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** remarked that the ToR had deliberately incorporated a point on marine uses, given that land-water interfacing issues were considered to be of importance by some Members.

2.3 **Mr Winston Chu** highlighted the importance of the Cruise Terminal in the Kai Tak development, and suggested adding the words "including the Cruise Terminal and the land use of Kai Tak Runway" at the end of point (a) in the ToR. **Mr Peter Cookson Smith** agreed that the long term needs of the Cruise Terminal were indeed a matter of concern.

2.4 **Mr Clement Lau** updated the meeting that the Legislative Council Finance Committee had approved the funding for the cruise terminal building in April this year and the relevant works already commenced in May. The project was being taken forward in full swing and the terminal building and the first berth were expected to come into operation in mid-2013. He invited Members to note that the Cruise Terminal project had already reached an advanced stage of implementation and had gone through extensive discussions as well as necessary procedures. He was willing to update members on the further development of the project in future meetings.

2.5 **The Chairman** saw no problem with the addition proposed by Mr Winston Chu. **Mr Nicholas Brooke** agreed. There being no other comment or objection from Members, the meeting endorsed the

ToR with the addition as proposed by Mr Winston Chu.

**Item 3 Urban Design Framework for Kai Tak Development
(Paper No. TFKT/02/2010)**

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

3.2 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** suggested adding one more consideration into the urban design framework of Kai Tak, which is the connection among various subareas. He opined that the Kai Tak area has a unique shape because the Kai Tak Approach Channel separated the subareas such as the Runway Precinct and the South Apron. He said that he expected some kind of sustainable transport at Kai Tak such as sky rail or tram, as discussed during the site visit on 3 September 2010. He acknowledged that consideration had been given by the Government to the notion but urged the Government to formally incorporate it into the urban design framework, in order to better connect the Tourism and Leisure Hub at the tip of Kai Tak Runway to its neighbourhood.

3.3 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** identified a triangular area near the South Apron and Kai Tai City Centre as a “leftover area”. He urged the Government to better utilize the area for pedestrian connection and to enhance physical and visual accessibilities. He advocated adopting Environmental Friendly Transport System (EFTS) such as light rail, sky rail, and monorail for connection to Kwun Tong and Lei Yue Mun, with a view to revitalizing these areas and creating more destinations for Cruise Terminal visitors. He opined that there would be potential for tourism developments at Lei Yue Mun such as the typhoon shelter and seafood restaurants, while acknowledging that financial viability studies would be needed to determine suitable construction and operation arrangements.

3.4 **Mr Andy Leung** noted that a large portion of South Apron would be occupied by trunk roads and highways. He recalled suggesting taking away the existing elevated Kwun Tong Bypass through incorporation into T2, which was considered infeasible. He

urged the Government to resolve the “road spaghetti” problem through better design and an optimal mix of submerged, at-grade, and elevated roads.

3.5 **Mr Peter Cookson Smith** opined that linkage between the tip of Kai Tak runway and Kwun Tong would be critical for enhancing accessibility and that the potential of marine-land interface had not been fully realized.

3.6 **Mr Winston Chu** opined that priorities for Kai Tak development should be set to form the basis of discussion for the Task Force. He outlined 3 priorities to use the harbourfront - the essential facilities which had to operate at the harbourfront such as piers and drainage, what would be beneficial to HK in the long term as a world-class city, and what would be enjoyable for the community and the residents. He urged the Government to make maximum use of the precious harbourfront areas.

3.7 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** opined that the proposed bridge from the tip of Kai Tak Runway to Kwun Tong would lead to a dead end since the Kwun Tong and Ngau Tau Kok MTR stations were far away from the waterfront. He advocated enhancing convenience for cyclists by allowing space for bicycle operators so that cyclists could hire bicycles at the starting point and hand them over at the destination. He also enquired about the adoption of renewable energy and carbon-zero design in the development of Kai Tak.

3.8 Regarding sustainable transport, **Mr Stephen Tang** outlined the merits of EFTS beyond its commuting function, including tourism and regeneration of old districts. He said that the transport system in Kai Tak would comprise above-ground rail system (i.e. EFTS) under study, Mass Transit Railway and a pedestrian environment with limited vehicular traffic. There would not be many through roads apart from D1, D2, D3 and D4, while remaining roads would be mostly cul-de-sacs. Pedestrian movement would be encouraged through extensive greening corridors. A network of cycle tracks would also be developed to connect all major open space areas including the Station Square. He added that the feasibility study of EFTS was advanced and the Kai Tak

Office would brief Members on the findings in early 2011.

3.9 Regarding connection to the hinterland, **Mr Stephen Tang** explained the practical difficulties to Members. Regarding cycling, there were currently no cycle tracks or related facilities at the neighbouring old districts. Regarding rail-based system, constraints were posed by the width of existing roads which would not allow further penetration of structures given serious traffic congestions during peak hours, as well as private land ownership which would limit scope for construction of rail stations. Financial viability would also be an issue. Nevertheless, different alignment options for the above-ground rail system were being considered, for instance, whether it would be elevated or close to ground level, and whether stations would be constructed near hotels or near residential areas. He added that expanding marine transport such as water taxis and ferries could be another option for creating linkage to Kwun Tong and Lei Yue Mun. There would be merits in terms of townscape since marine transport would not require massive structures with visual impact. However, such development would be subject to further investigation and the views of relevant stakeholders.

3.10 Regarding the 'road spaghetti' blocking connection from Kai Tak River to the waterfront, **Mr Stephen Tang** said that initial solutions in relation to refinement to Road T2 and Central Kowloon Route layout were to be presented to Members for discussion in due course.

3.11 Regarding marine activities, **Mr Stephen Tang** said that the Government had been in constant dialogue with the Rowing Association, which would later advise on estimated dimensions of venue for water sports for consideration.

3.12 Regarding land uses, **Mr Stephen Tang** noted the need to prioritise and strike a balance among competing land uses such as public open space against the Cruise Terminal. He suggested that the current Outline Zoning Plan resulting from a 2-year 3-stage public engagement exercise had struck a good balance.

3.13 Regarding the Cruise Terminal, **Mr Stephen Tang** stated

that there would be adequate connections between the Terminal and the rest of Kai Tak as well as potential rail linkage to Kwun Tong under study. He also explained that the Cruise Terminal would be an attractive destination itself as a venue for hosting various conventions, exhibitions and wedding banquets. Visitors could also enjoy excellent view of the Victoria Harbour at the nearby Runway Park.

3.14 Regarding renewable energy, **Mr Stephen Tang** stated that a District Cooling System (DCS) would be built at Kai Tak and government buildings would connect to it. Internal guidelines would also be in place for government buildings to adopt renewable energy where appropriate. Whether these should be made mandatory for private developments would be subject to further deliberation. He stated that the Kai Tak example would have a demonstration effect to other large-scale developments.

3.15 **Mr Eric Yue** supplemented **Mr Stephen Tang** on waterfront land use. He assured Members that the Government was fully aware of the significance of the matter and the planning intention was to materialize a continuous waterfront promenade from Hung Hom to Kwun Tong, bringing the waterfront to the people and vice versa. For instance, a lot of waterfront land at Kai Tak had been zoned 'Open Space'. Moreover, the Cruise Terminal building would have a landscaped roof deck opened to the public with connections to the adjacent open spaces.

3.16 **Mr Eric Yue** also drew Members' attention to the Government's development controls in place. For instance, the Explanatory Statement of the Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan stated that future developments would have to make reference to the Town Planning Board's Vision Statement for the Victoria Harbour as well as the former Harbour-front Enhancement Committee's Harbour Planning Principles. Another example would be the Tourism and Leisure Hub at the tip of the Kai Tak Runway, which had been zoned tourism-related uses to include commercial, hotel and entertainment facilities as well as public observation gallery. The future developer would have to submit a layout plan to the Town Planning Board for approval. The public would also be invited to comment.

3.17 **Mr Carlos Lo** opined that a website providing information on the overall management framework as well as roles and responsibilities of various Government departments would be desirable. He also requested that the Government provide an inventory list of all projects and infrastructure works under way and being planned at Kai Tak to facilitate the Task Force's future deliberations.

3.18 **Mr Anthony Loo** supplemented **Mr Stephen Tang** on provision of marine transport services. He saw a need to manage expectations of Members, highlighting the critical issue of financial viability of such services as exemplified by difficulties faced by the existing ferry operators in general.

3.19 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** enquired about details of the proposed bridge linking Kwun Tong and the tip of Kai Tak Runway. He opined that it would be a huge structure by the standard of Hong Kong. He indicated support to Mr Carlos Lo's latter request.

3.20 **Mr Peter Cookson Smith** cautioned against over-engineering and utilitarian approach. He also opined that merits of cycle tracks at Kai Tak in terms of either transport or recreation would be questionable. For instance, a 100-kilometre-long waterfront cycle track complemented by related facilities was already available at Shatin, which would be easily accessible from Kai Tak when the two Mass Transit Railway stations were open. He opined that the cycle tracks would instead constrain pedestrian movement. He also suggested the Task Force to look into land/marine interface and marine recreation uses in the future.

3.21 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** opined that roles and responsibilities among Government departments could be clarified to materialize their good intentions and visions on EFTS.

3.22 Regarding implementation schedule, **Mr Stephen Tang** gave Members an update on major developments at Kai Tak, which included the Cruise Terminal, a public housing rental estate, infrastructures, Metro Park, Stadium Complex, Shatin-Central Link,

other private residential and commercial developments, as well as Government, Institution and Community developments such as Kai Tak Government Offices and sewage facilities, and local parks. He suggested that the Task Force zoom in to projects requiring prompt decisions and advice with reference to the established urban design framework.

3.23 Regarding the bridge between Kwun Tong and the tip of Kai Tak Runway, **Mr Stephen Tang** suggested that the architectural structure would be very large and tall if no reclamation were allowed. The Government would consult the Task Force further after conducting feasibility studies and exploring other options in detail.

3.24 Regarding EFTS, **Mr Stephen Tang** drew Members' attention to the technical and financial difficulties. For instance, it would be very difficult to find an operator without providing subsidies.

3.25 **Mr Andy Leung** indicated support to Mr Carlos Lo's earlier request for an inventory list of projects and infrastructure works under way and being planned at Kai Tak. He opined that the list would assist the Task Force in identifying areas to provide timely advice. **The Chairman** indicated support and opined that the list would facilitate identification of potential contributions by the Task Force and a systematic overall view on the Kai Tak development.

Item 4 Enhancements of Accessibility to Kai Tak Waterfront (Paper No. TFKT/03/2010)

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

4.2 **Mr Winston Chu** enquired about the possibility of constructing a tunnel instead of the proposed bridge for linkage between Kwun Tong and the tip of Kai Tak Runway. He also reminded Members' to take into account the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance.

4.3 **Mr Stephen Tang** told members that the height of the

proposed bridge would be some 40 metres above water, necessitating a spiral ramp of over 10 storeys high at Kwun Tong. There would also be safety concerns at nighttime for the pedestrian lift. Regarding Mr Winston Chu's comment, he reminded Members that there would already be a T2 tunnel connecting Kai Tak to Lam Tin to the east and Central Kowloon Route to the west. He suggested that a vehicular connection between Kwun Tong and the tip of Kai Tak Runway would not be necessary.

4.4 **Mr Andy Leung** enquired whether decommissioning the Kwun Tong Public Cargo Handling Area (PCWA) in the future would solve the headroom issue of the proposed bridge. He also opined that the technical requirements for either a tunnel or a bridge should be explored as the first step in choosing between the two options.

4.5 **Mr Adam Lai** explained to Members that the water area under question was designated as a typhoon shelter, the primary function of the shelter was for barges and other local vessels to take refuge thereat during severe weather conditions.

4.6 **Mr Peter Cookson Smith** was confident that alternatives would be found to get around the constraints being discussed in light of overseas examples. He opined that 'good' reclamation could be considered.

4.7 **Mr Winston Chu** drew Members' attention to the legal aspect of reclamation. He explained that reclamation and the associated public expenditure had to be justified by public need. He enquired about the merits of the proposed bridge given that vehicular connection had been stated unnecessary.

4.8 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** did not see a need for vehicular access between Kwun Tong and the tip of Kai Tak Runway since the travelling time using existing or planned roads would already be short for mechanised transport. However, he opined that an underground tunnel for pedestrians would be convenient and could enhance vibrancy of the waterfronts at both sides.

4.9 **Mr Stephen Tang** told Members that the Government had been working on technical solutions with its consultant, which included exploring options such as building an openable bridge linking the breakwaters of the typhoon shelter without reclamation or touching the water surface. He suggested that the bridge could provide a scenic walk for pedestrians.

4.10 **Mr Andy Leung** drew Members' attention to the Kwun Tong residents' preference towards the proposed bridge. He also quoted the example of the Millennium Bridge in London, which enhanced vibrancy at both sides of River Thames. He opined that the proposed bridge would complete the pedestrian loop and provide an integrated experience for visitors when marine activities and tourism facilities were developed at the area in the future.

4.11 **Mr Winston Chu** informed Members that he had been drafting a legal paper on a concept called proportionality, by which reclamation might be justified in light of an overriding public need. He suggested that the pedestrian bridge being discussed could potentially fulfill the criteria.

4.12 **Mr Peter Cookson Smith** indicated support to Mr Andy Leung's views that a pedestrian bridge could enhance vibrancy at both sides of the bridge.

4.13 **The Chairman** enquired about the necessity of covering the vehicular road running through the centre of the Runway Precinct with noise barriers.

4.14 **Mr Stephen Tang** explained that mitigation measures or arrangements were necessary since the future noise level would not meet prevailing environmental requirements. While depressing the road was a form of noise mitigation, this option would necessitate a relocation of the planned underground plant room and pumping station of the district cooling system there. The issue of ventilation of the road would also have to be addressed.

4.15 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** enquired about the factors leading to

the anticipated heavy traffic conditions at the road.

4.16 **Mr Stephen Tang** explained that heavy traffic would be expected since the road would provide vehicular access to the Tourism and Leisure Hub at the tip of Kai Tak Runway including the Cruise Terminal. He added that a public transport interchange would also be constructed there to provide good accessibility to the area. He also reminded Members that the road would be accommodating the combined traffic of the two originally proposed roads at the two sides of the waterfront along the runway.

4.17 **Mr Andy Leung** suggested that multiple measures could be taken in parallel. These included slightly submerging the road, setting back buildings away from the road, and constructing landscape berms at both sides of the road. However, he opined that driving to the Cruise Terminal or Runway Park through such a submerged road without feeling the environment along the runway would be an anti-climax.

4.18 **Mr Peter Cookson Smith** enquired whether the road would be the main vehicular access to the residential and commercial developments along the Runway Precinct.

4.19 **Mr Stephen Tang** confirmed that the road would be the only vehicular access and thus the heavy traffic anticipated. He also explained that the façade of buildings at both sides were bound to be exposed to the resulting noise regardless of layout. He informed Members that the Kai Tak Office would work on possible improvements to the aesthetics, such as developing a partly transparent landscape deck above the road with edge treatments and allowing puncture through the deck.

4.20 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** agreed with Mr Stephen Tang that heavy traffic and substantial noise would be expected at the road.

4.21 **Mr Peter Cookson Smith** enquired whether double glazing could be adopted to the buildings at both sides of the road as an alternative solution.

4.22 **Mr Stephen Tang** explained that double glazing would not be environmentally friendly. The Government would in any case encourage all developments to use natural ventilation as much as possible.

4.23 **The Chairman** concluded that Members' major concern was the aesthetic issues regarding noise mitigation measures. He suggested and Members agreed that the Task Force leave Kai Tak Office to figure out the solutions and report to Task Force in due course.

4.24 **The Chairman** enquired about the constraints to connection between the Kai Tak River and the waterfront.

4.25 **Mr Stephen Tang** informed Members that the Kai Tak Tunnel and the proposed Central Kowloon Route would cut across the direct passageway between the River and the waterfront. The Kai Tak Office would report to the Task Force on proposed measures to enhance waterfront accessibility in due course.

4.26 **Mr Stephen Tang** demonstrated to Members a computer program which allowed 3-dimensional visualisation of Kai Tak in the future. He stated that concerned parties could input the development parameters of their proposal and review the appearance. The Government would also be able to assess more thoroughly the architectural merits of different proposals put forward.

4.27 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** suggested and **the Chairman** agreed that the computer program should be utilised to facilitate the Task Force's future deliberations of Kai Tak development.

4.28 **Mr Peter Cookson Smith** suggested that the Government consider developing a boardwalk along the river banks towards the end of the Kai Tak River.

4.29 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** suggested the Government consider constructing viewing towers at the pockets of unused land within the "road spaghetti".

Item 5 Any Other Business

5.1 **The Chairman** sought members' views on the fields/sectors where the Task Force need co-option of members to supply additional expertise. **Mr Nicholas Brooke** supplemented that the number of co-opted members shall not exceed one-third of the Task Force membership.

5.2 **Mr Winston Chu** stated that the Government had spent HKD2billion to develop 2 berths at the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal. He suggested that 6 berths would be needed in the long run. He requested the Government to provide a list of materials including studies and reports relied on for proposing the present location, scale and design of the cruise terminal. **Mr Clement Lau** undertook to provide the relevant information as appropriate. Mr Chu also requested a contour map showing the depth of water of the Victoria Harbour from the Marine Department. **Mr Adam Lai** said a formal request to Marine Department would not be necessary. The contour map would be provided. **The Chairman** asked the Secretariat to follow up with the collection of the information. TC, MD

5.3 **The Chairman** announced that the Task Force meeting would be held bi-monthly. The next meeting would be held in November.

**Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development Secretariat
November 2010**