

3rd Meeting of the Harbourfront Commission
Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development
11 January 2011 (Tuesday) at 2:30 p.m.
at Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices,
333 Java Road, Hong Kong

Minutes of Meeting

Present

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Mr Vincent Ng | Chairman, Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development |
| Mrs Margaret Brooke | Representing Business Environment Council |
| Mr 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 Sujata Govada | Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design |
| Mr Winston Chu | Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour |
| Mr Nicholas Brooke | |
| Ms Ann So | |
| Ms Gracie Foo | Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands) 1, Development Bureau |
| Mr Enoch Lam | Deputy Secretary (Works) 2, Development Bureau |
| Mr Clement Lau | Assistant Commissioner 4, Tourism Commission |
| Mr To Kam-biu | Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department |
| Mr Stephen Tang | Head(Kai Tak Office), Civil Engineering and Development Department |
| Mr Paul Cheung | Assistant Director(Leisure Services)1, Leisure and Cultural Services Department |
| Mr Eric Yue | District Planning Officer/Kowloon, Planning Department |
| Mr Ronald Leung | Secretary |

Absent with Apologies

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Mr Leung Kong-yui | Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong |
| Ir Dr Chan Fuk-cheung | Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers |
| Mr Patrick Lau | Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects |
| Mr Benjamin Cha | |
| Ms Lily Chow | |

In attendance

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Ms Maisie Chan | Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), Development Bureau |
| Mr Peter PC Mok | Senior Engineer/2 (Kowloon), Civil Engineering and Development Department |
| Ms Selina Li | Senior Executive Officer (Planning)6, Leisure and Cultural Services Department |

For Item 4

Architectural Services Department

| | |
|----------------|---------------------------------|
| Mr KT Leung | Chief Project Manager/303 (Ag.) |
| Ms Alice Yeung | Senior Project Manager/332 |
| Mr Simon Chiu | Project Manager/352 |

Hsin Yieh Architects & Associates Ltd.

| | |
|--------------|------------------|
| Mr PL Yiu | Project Director |
| Mr Johnny Ho | Design Director |

EDAW Ltd.

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Mr Andy Lewis | Regional Landscape Architecture Director |
| Ms Stephanie Lai | Assistant Project Manager |

Action

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

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the last meeting

1.1 **The Chairman** informed Members that the Secretariat has

received a letter from Mr Winston Chu on the draft minutes, and said Mr Winston Chu was of the view that the minutes did not fully record some repeated discussions. The Chairman said it was a general principle of conciseness in drafting minutes that repeated discussions were not shown.

1.2 **The Chairman** added that Mr Winston Chu in his letter also proposed a change of paragraph orders, to which he and the Secretariat had no objection. The minutes incorporating such change were then confirmed.

Item 2 Matters Arising

2.1 **The Chairman** informed Members that the following information was provided – a programme chart with location plan of Kai Tak, an “action area” table of Kai Tak, and an inventory list of Kai Tak.

2.2 **The Chairman** welcomed Mr Stephen Tang, Head(Kai Tak Office) of Civil Engineering and Development Department. **Mr Stephen Tang** presented the programme chart with location plan of Kai Tak with the aid of a powerpoint.

2.3 **The Chairman** said the programme chart with location plan had provided an overall picture of Kai Tak Development to facilitate Members’ deliberation.

2.4 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** enquired about the schedule for building construction and land sale for planned estate developments along the Runway Precinct. He expressed concern over the impact of infrastructure works and late construction of Route 6 to accessibility of the cruise terminal.

2.5 **Mr Andy Leung** appreciated the programme chart with location plan provided by CEDD. He opined that the Task Force would play an active part in the “design and tender” stage of various projects in Kai Tak development. He therefore suggested CEDD to indicate the “design and tender” stage for all the tabulated projects to facilitate Members’ timely inputs.

2.6 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** suggested that temporary accessibility to the waterfront should be addressed. He also opined that expectations management was needed in this regard.

2.7 **Dr Sujata Govada** enquired whether the Metro Park could be developed at an earlier date. She suggested that “land-water interface” should be addressed.

2.8 **Mr Winston Chu** opined that provision for expansion of the cruise terminal beyond two berths was important to obviate the need for future reclamation. He quoted Mr Nicholas Brooke’s comment that “the Tourism Commission could further report on the cruise terminal in due course” from the minutes of last meeting, and suggested a separate agenda item named “need for future expansion of cruise terminal” for discussion.

2.9 **Mr Carlos Lo** enquired whether the bioremediation of Kai Tak Approach Channel was one-off or continuous, and how the water quality could be maintained in the long term. He also enquired about the transportation arrangement and public safety issues regarding the Runway Park.

2.10 In response, **Mr Stephen Tang** informed Members that public housing developments would be available by 2013 and serviced by existing transport network. Regarding the cruise terminal, a temporary road at the northern waterfront of the Runway Precinct was being developed to service it by the time it would be commissioned in 2013. A road running through the centre of the Runway Precinct would tentatively be completed by 2016 to replace the temporary road, releasing the area for development of waterfront promenade. Public transport would also be in place by 2013 to serve the terminal as well as Runway Park Phase 1. Works near the Metro Park would not affect access to the terminal. The southern part of the Runway Precinct facing the harbour was currently planned for commercial and hotel uses. The road layout and urban design of the Runway Precinct were being formulated.

2.11 **The Chairman** pointed out that Members were concerned

whether access roads to different parts of Kai Tak Development would be ready and complemented by pleasant surrounding environment. He recalled that this issue had been repeatedly raised by various members, and suggested that it should be given due consideration. He also asked whether Mr Andy Leung's suggestion to include an item on "design and tender" stage at the programme chart for various projects could be adopted.

2.12 **Mr Stephen Tang** said the "design and tender" stage would be incorporated into the chart. He added that on accessibility to the waterfront, Lands Department had been seeking comments from departments whether the current temporary uses were needed. Leisure and Cultural Services Department had also sounded out interest in waterfront-compatible temporary uses or activities, but response was lukewarm. Regarding access roads to different areas of Kai Tak Development, they would be beautified as far as practicable. However, Members should appreciate that construction works in the vicinity of early developments would not be completed in the near future. Turning to the Metro Park, **Mr Stephen Tang** said that it would not be cost effective to develop it earlier since it was distant from other early developments and surrounded by works areas. He advised that the bioremediation process would be one-off subject to water quality review in the future. He also welcomed more proposals on land-water interface.

(Post-meeting note: District Lands Office/Kowloon East supplemented that it had sought advice of various departments on the demand for two current temporary uses in the context of reviewing environmental issues, and their short-term tenancies were permitted to continue on a quarterly basis upon the review.)

2.13 **Mr Lam Kin-Lai** enquired about the sale schedule of private land.

2.14 **Mr Winston Chu** opined that it would be desirable to provide reserve for cruise terminal by making use of the future waterfront promenade along the southern waterfront of Runway Precinct. He enquired about the width and length of the concerned

promenade. He opined that six berths would be required for the cruise terminal to reach a critical mass as a home port according to some research.

2.15 **Dr Sujata Govada** enquired about the link between Kwun Tong and the tip of the Runway.

2.16 **Mr Stephen Tang** said that there was not yet a detailed schedule for private land disposal. He added that the next stage of infrastructure works would commence as soon as possible to facilitate development. He clarified that he had not suggested that the entire waterfront along the Runway Precinct could be reserved for cruise terminal expansion and emphasized that the current planned land uses were formulated upon due public consultation and reflected balanced planning. He added that waterfront promenade at the southern waterfront of the Runway Precinct would be 25 to 35 metres wide. Regarding the link between Kwun Tong and the tip of the Runway, he said that further evaluation of the merits of a bridge for vehicles and pedestrians would take place.

Item 3 Enhancement of waterfront accessibility in South Apron (Paper No. TFKT/07/2010)

3.1 **The Chairman** reminded Members that the subject item was deferred from the last meeting.

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

3.3 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** enquired about the linkage between access roads in Kai Tak Development and Trunk Road T2. He also enquired whether the realigned portion of the Central Kowloon Route (CKR) would be depressed to further release land for open space development and enjoyment of the prominent views of Lei Yue Mun.

3.4 **Dr Sujata Govada** appreciated the removal and realignment of roads to reduce road footprint at the area. She enquired whether there was vehicular access to the piece of land referred as “strip free from

yovers”, and if so, whether some G/IC uses currently planned at the waterfront nearby could be relocated to it to release the waterfront for open space or mixed uses development.

3.5 **Mr Andy Leung** enquired whether Route 6 could be further set back from the waterfront and realigned towards the Kwun Tong Bypass.

3.6 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** enquired about the connectivity across Kai Fuk Road to the neighboring old districts. He opined that provision of more pedestrian access points and junctions would improve user-friendliness and usage rate of the nearby waterfront.

3.7 **Mr Andy Leung** enquired whether it would be feasible to depress Route 6 to reduce its environmental impacts.

3.8 **Mr Stephen Tang** said that while existing transport infrastructure posed certain constraints to design of road transport system at the area, improvement works would be conducted at junctions forecast to be congested by traffic impact assessment. He added that the CKR and T2 was an important infrastructure for routing traffic between Kowloon East and Kowloon West. They had already been set back as far as practicable. It was also not feasible to depress all roads due to various reasons. In addition to roads, there was a system of pedestrian links such as a bridge across the Kai Tak Approach Channel.

3.9 **Mr Stephen Tang** continued that the feasibility and merits for relocating the G/IC uses from the waterfront to the “strip free from flyovers” would be further explored along with Planning Department and Transport Department. He reminded Members that the requirement by those G/IC uses for vehicular access would be considered.

3.10 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** opined that prominent views of Lei Yue Mun were available at the waterfront area released by setting back CKR and more creative use of it would be welcome.

3.11 **Mr Carlos Lo** enquired whether pedestrian accessibility

between South Apron and Runway Precinct could be further enhanced. He also enquired whether there were negative impacts upon the latest road realignments.

3.12 **Dr Sujata Govada** enquired whether more pedestrian footbridges between South Apron and Runway Precinct could be provided.

3.13 **Mr Stephen Tang** reminded Members that three bridges would be available for pedestrian movement between South Apron and Runway Precinct, in addition to the pedestrian link between Kwun Tong and tip of Runway under consideration. He added that water transport could also provide alternative means of linkage.

Item 4 First Phase of Runway Park at Kai Tak (Paper No. TFKT/01/2011)

4.1 **The Chairman** welcomed Mr Paul Cheung and Ms Selina Li of Leisure and Cultural Services Department, Mr KT Leung, Ms Alice Yeung and Mr Simon Chiu of Architectural Services Department, Mr PL Yiu and Mr Johnny Ho of Hsin Yieh Architects & Associates Ltd, and Mr Andy Lewis and Ms Stephanie Lai of EDAW Ltd.

4.2 **Mr Paul Cheung** reminded Members that the phased development approach of the Runway Park had been introduced to Members at the last meeting. He added that Phase 1 would tentatively be completed in 2013 to tie in with the commissioning of the cruise terminal. With regard to implementation of Phase 2, reference would be made to the development programme of other related facilities and infrastructure in the vicinity, which might be completed as early as 2016.

4.3 **Mr Johnny Ho** and **Mr Andy Lewis** presented the paper with the aid of a Powerpoint.

4.4 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** opined that the size and scale of the Phase 1 development should be expanded and active uses be allowed to generate the “pull factor” for visiting the park. He also opined that the weather station at the site should be relocated so that it would not

dominate the design layout of the park.

4.5 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** enquired whether sports facilities would be available, whether there would be provision for holding events such as electricity supply and toilets, whether plant species had been chosen with due consideration to the windy weather and seafront location, whether there would be an overall theme for trees and flowers in Kai Tak Development to increase visual appeal, whether renewable energy had been adopted, and whether fishing and landing of fishing boats would be allowed.

4.6 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** enquired whether the design had taken into consideration the potential issue of noise pollution due to proximity to the nearby helipad. He opined that the current layout of Phase 1 development was not visually appealing when viewed from the sea.

4.7 **Mr Winston Chu** opined that the subject site provided prominent views of the harbour. He enquired how such advantage had been maximized in the design. He opined that while the current design was aesthetic from the architect's viewpoint, it should also be people friendly. He enquired how the design would cater for the rainy and windy weather conditions in Hong Kong.

4.8 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** echoed Members' comments that the site enjoyed a unique advantage of prominent harbourfront views and the design should not be dominated by the weather station.

4.9 **Dr Sujata Govada** echoed Members' comment that the size and scale of the development should be expanded. She opined that the helipad nearby should be relocated.

4.10 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** opined that the "to see and be seen" relationship of the development with Lei Yue Mun to the east was important.

4.11 **Mr Paul Cheung** explained that since various infrastructure works in the vicinity of Runway Park would still be ongoing in 2013, the size and scale of Phase 1 development was intended to allow at-grade

linkage with the cruise terminal when it would be commissioned in 2013 for providing an avenue for visiting the harbourfront of the former Runway tip. Phase 2 development, of which the completion was targeted to tie in with infrastructure works in the vicinity, was intended to be a unique-themed park to become a destination for all. He added that additional facilities and features involving structures of larger scale would be provided in Phase 2 development, LCSD could consider enlarging the lawn area in Phase 1 if considered appropriate.

4.12 **Mr Johnny Ho** said the design had taken into account the prominent views of Lei Yue Mun. For instance, the area had been left relatively open with little structures potentially blocking such views. Regarding the weather station, he informed Members that the Hong Kong Observatory emphasized that it had to stay in order to continue providing important weather information. Against this background, beautification to the station had been incorporated into the design.

4.13 **Mr Andy Lewis** said that full reference would be drawn to the guidelines provided by a planning, landscape and urban design study for Kai Tak, including recommendations on appropriate types of plant materials and appropriate thematic approach in different zones. He added that the landscaping team was aware of the challenge posed by the climatic conditions and seafront location of the site and would conduct further research as appropriate. The resulting lawn would be available for regular use by the public.

4.14 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** opined that Phase 1 Development had to be a landmark from the community aspirations perspective, and the size and scale of development should be adjusted accordingly. He also opined that Phase 1 Development should serve the public at large in addition to cruise terminal visitors. He suggested alternative locations on the runway should be explored for the weather station. He also suggested that the public-private collaboration (PPC) approach could be explored.

4.15 **Mr Winston Chu** opined that it would facilitate Members' deliberation if more design concepts could be provided, similar to the West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD) and New Central Harbourfront

cases.

4.16 **Dr Sujata Govada** echoed Mr Nicholas Brooke's comment that Phase 1 development should be a landmark.

4.17 **Mr Carlos Lo** opined that there would be better feedback from the public if more design concepts could be provided.

4.18 **Mr Paul Cheung** informed Members that the phased development approach was worked out having regard to the comments of some members of the former Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC). There had been practical considerations on factors such as accessibility and infrastructure works in the vicinity in determining the current size and scale of Phase 1 development. Nevertheless, weekend activities would be promoted in a way similar to WKCD to enhance vibrancy and provisions had been made in the design accordingly. He also agreed that more design options should be provided by the consultant to facilitate better deliberation of the Task Force.

4.19 **The Chairman** summarized that Members generally agreed that the subject site was at a unique location with prominent harbourfront views, necessitating quality planning and maximum utilization. Members expressed concerns over a wide range of issues regarding the partial development with passive uses proposed by the project team, including its appeal, size and scale, management mode, variety in design concepts, among all.

4.20 **The Chairman** observed that with many planning and design issues in the vicinity yet to be finalized, the uncertainties posed considerable constraints on Phase 1 development which was an advance development. He considered it difficult given these uncertainties for the size and scale of the advance development to be increased, a variety of design concepts to be provided, or the PPC approach to be deliberated. He asked Members whether they would support the current 'quick-win' approach to facilitate early public enjoyment of the harbour and invite the project team to revise the design having received Members' comments.

4.21 **Ms Gracie Foo** echoed the Chairman's comment and informed Members that the "quick-win" concept had emerged during the tenure of the former HEC in drawing up the "22 Action Areas" approach. While these quick-win projects did not seek optimal development upfront given certain inevitable constraints, the rationale was to open up the harbourfront for early enjoyment by the public. She gave the examples of Kwun Tong temporary promenade and WKCD temporary promenade, and when the waterfront was opened up, such as the former, it then provided an avenue for exhibition of local artists' work. She pointed out that Phase 1 development of Runway Park should be considered separately from long-term issues for Phase 2.

4.22 **Mr Stephen Tang** informed Members that the cruise terminal and Phase 1 development would be supported by public transport in 2013.

4.23 **The Chairman** suggested that the size of the lawn could be increased subject to cost implication.

4.24 **Mr Carlos Lo** enquired whether the design for Phase 2 development was available, and whether Phase 1 development was part of the permanent development.

4.25 **Mr Paul Cheung** said that Phase 1 development was part of the permanent development and abortive works should be avoided as far as practicable.

4.26 **Mr PL Yiu** supplemented that provisions had been made in the design of Phase 1 development for incorporation into Phase 2 in the future. For instance, simple and easily removable segregation measures at the interface between the two phases had been adopted.

4.27 **The Chairman** observed that some Members were deliberating from the perspective of optimizing outcome in the eventuality. He further reminded Members that the "quick-win" approach of harbourfront sites had been discussed in the former HEC. He emphasized that while advance development by such approach might not be optimal, leaving all development opportunities until

thorough discussion had taken place and all uncertainties were resolved would cause indefinite delay to public enjoyment of the harbourfront. He urged Members to support Phase 1 development and separately consider long-term issues in the future.

4.28 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** opined that a better arrangement would have been for the project team to provide various design concepts for Members' deliberation several days in advance of the meeting. She did not support the current design as it was.

4.29 **The Chairman** clarified that he was not asking Members to support the current design as it was, but instead, the phased development approach with a view to facilitating early public enjoyment of the harbourfront.

4.30 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** opined that the subject site was a unique site requiring a unique solution. While he expressed support to the phased development approach, he enquired whether there was room for increasing the size and scale of Phase 1 development. Other possibilities like the PPC approach should be left for Phase 2. He also welcomed alternative designs for Phase 1.

4.31 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** opined that if the phased development approach was to be adopted, Phase 1 development should be simplified into an open green area accessible to the public to minimize abortive work for Phase 2 and save costs.

4.32 **Mr Winston Chu** echoed Mr Lam Kin-lai's comment. He opined that the current design would not meet the objective of development.

4.33 **Dr Sujata Govada** opined that the lawn area for Phase 1 development could be expanded.

4.34 **The Chairman** summarized that while Members supported the phased development approach, they were inclined towards simple development at low cost and with little abortive work for Phase 1. He also pointed out that Members would welcome more design concepts for

their deliberation.

4.35 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** suggested the lawn area should be expanded to the extent that cruise terminal visitors could walk straight from the cruise terminal exit to the waterfront facing Kwun Tong through the enlarged lawn.

4.36 **Mr Paul Cheung** said LCSD welcomed Members' suggestion of reducing abortive works and to adopt a simplified design in Phase 1 in order to have greater flexibility in designing Phase 2 in the future. LCSD, ArchSD and its consultant would revise the design of Phase 1 in the light of Members' comments and get back to the Task Force in due course.

**LCSD
ArchSD**

Item 5 Any other business

5.1 **The Chairman** invited Mr Eric Yue, District Planning Officer/Kowloon of Planning Department, to present the inventory list of Kai Tak tabled during **Item 2 - Matters Arising**.

5.2 **Mr Eric Yue** said the inventory list showed all waterfront items at Kai Tak, including private ones. Members were welcome to suggest further discussion of individual items.

5.3 **The Chairman** informed Members that they could send their comments on the "action area" table of Kai Tak, also tabled during **Item 2 - Matters Arising**, to the Secretariat for its follow-up. He also informed Members that the inventory list of Kai Tak would be updated when necessary.

5.4 **The Chairman** informed Members that CEDD had an item on beautification of perimeter fencing of Kai Tak Development. Mr Stephen Tang presented the item with the aid of a powerpoint.

5.5 **The Chairman** opined that regular renewals of banners would maintain the level of interest and facilitate a dynamic communication process with residents. **Mr Nicholas Brooke** suggested a different backdrop colour could be adopted for the banners. **Dr**

Sujata Govada suggested that residents could be invited to draw on the banners as part of the public engagement process.

7.2 **The Chairman** informed Members that the next meeting would be held on 31 March 2011.

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

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