

4th Meeting of the Harbourfront Commission
Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development
31 March 2011 (Thursday) at 10:00 a.m.
at Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices,
333 Java Road, Hong Kong

Minutes of Meeting

Present

Mr Vincent Ng	Chair, Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development
Mrs Margaret Brooke	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr Lam Kin-lai	Representing Conservancy Association
Mr Franklin Yu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Ir Dr Chan Fuk-cheung	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Tam Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Dr Sujata Govada	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Mr Nicholas Brooke	
Ms Lily Chow	
Ms Ann So	
Miss Connie Lam	Co-opted Member
Mr Sam Farrands	Co-opted Member
Ms Vivian Lau	Co-opted Member
Ms Gracie Foo	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands) 1, Development Bureau
Mr Andy Yau	Principal Assistant Secretary (Works) 2, Development Bureau
Mr John Kwong	Senior Manager (Tourism)41, 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
Prof Carlos Lo Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Patrick Lau Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr Winston Chu Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr Benjamin Cha

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 3

Architectural Services Department

Mr KT Leung Chief Project Manager/303 (Acting)
Ms Alice Yeung Senior Project Manager/332

Hong Kong Observatory

Mr Tam Kwong-hung Senior Scientific Officer (Weather and Radiation
Observation Networks) (Acting)
Mr Chan Ying-wa Scientific Officer (Weather and Radiation
Observation Networks)

For Item 5

Hong Tai Yuen Limited

Mr Ricky Wong Managing Director
Mr Charles Chiu Project Manager
Mr Patrick Ng Architect
Ms Carol Choy Senior Assistant Manager – Development

Ronald Lu & Partners (Hong Kong) Ltd

Mr Kelvin Ip Director
Ms Carmen Cheung Chief Architect

PlanArch Consultants Ltd

Ms Betty Ho Director
Mr Cheng Pui-kan Assistant Town Planner

For Item 6

Kerry Properties Limited

Ms Hanna Hsu Director of Architecture
Ms Ida Leung Senior Development Manager

Ho & Partners Architects Limited

Ms Cissi Chan Deputy Director
Mr Tony Mui Associate Director

LD Asia

Mr Dickson Hui Director
Ms Winnie Wu Associate
Mr Viko Wan Assistant Town Planner

For Item 7

South Tokwawan Concern Group

Mr Edwin Town Chair

Lands Department

Mr P C Fan Senior Estate Surveyor/ South East Kowloon
Miss Elaine Kwan Estate Surveyor/ Kai Tak

Environmental Protection Department

Mr Warren Wong Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Regional E)5
Mr Wai Chok-pong Environmental Protection Officer (Regional E)52

Action

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting. He informed Members that the meeting should end by 1pm.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the last meeting

1.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Secretariat has circulated the minutes on 7 February 2011. No amendment has been proposed at the meeting and the minutes were confirmed.

Item 2 Matters Arising

2.1 **The Chair** informed Members that an updated programme chart for Kai Tak Development has been circulated among Members on 25 March 2011.

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

2.3 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** suggested that the Task Force be consulted on the Environmentally Friendly Transport System and the heliport at the runway tip at an early stage.

2.4 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** enquired whether the Task Force would be consulted on the exterior design of the Centre of Excellence in Pediatrics. He considered that the Task Force should be consulted at an early stage so that the Task Force could provide timely comments for the design teams' consideration.

2.5 **Dr Sujata Govada** enquired about temporary accessibility to the waterfront by the public.

2.6 **Mr Stephen Tang** informed the meeting that the Environmentally Friendly Transport System would be renamed the Environmentally Friendly Linkage System to better reflect its nature. He added that a consultancy was being engaged to produce 3-dimensional models and video clips to present the relevant technical information and various development options, and the Task Force would be consulted in the near future.

2.7 **Mr Stephen Tang** continued that on the heliport and Centre

of Excellence in Pediatrics, the Task Force's call for consultation would be conveyed to the Transport and Housing Bureau and Food and Health Bureau respectively. On temporary public access, he stated that while there was a general lack of public transport at Kai Tak given the stage of development, various organizations were welcome to submit proposals for holding events or short-term uses for CEDD's consideration.

2.8 **The Chair** suggested a large map showing the whole Kai Tak Development could be provided at the meeting room to facilitate Members' deliberation as and when different projects were discussed.

CEDD

**Item 3 First Phase of Runway Park at Kai Tak
(Paper No. TFKT/03/2011)**

3.1 **The Chair** welcomed Mr Paul Cheung and Ms Selina Li of Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD), Mr KT Leung, Ms Alice Yeung and Mr Simon Chiu of Architectural Services Department (ArchSD), and Mr KH Tam and Mr YW Chan of Hong Kong Observatory (HKO).

3.2 **Mr Paul Cheung** and **Mr KT Leung** presented the paper.

3.3 **Mr KH Tam** informed Members that since the weather station at the tip of the former runway was located at a vantage point near the centre of the Victoria Harbour and free from any obstruction, the wind data collected there was essential for accurately assessing the threat of typhoons to the most densely populated areas of Hong Kong. Furthermore, historical wind records at the station have been used in compiling statistics for reference by HKO in considering the issuance of tropical cyclone signals. It is therefore necessary to retain the weather station at the tip of the runway to maintain HKO's capability in ensuring public safety during the onslaught of a typhoon. HKO would welcome proposals to integrate the weather station with the design of the Runway Park.

3.4 **The Chair** observed that there was a lack of progress in formulating the design and a delay in completion date compared to the

presentation at the last meeting. He added that more information on the design was expected and necessary for a fruitful discussion at the meeting.

3.5 **Mr Lam Kin-Lai** enquired whether the weather station could be relocated to the heliport site also at the tip of the former runway. He suggested that if the station could not be relocated, it should be opened to the public to provide weather data of interest and weather education. On the development programme of the runway park, he stated that the original site area for the first phase should be completed on originally planned dates in developing the expanded lawn.

3.6 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** shared Mr Lam Kin-lai's view that the programme for the original site area for the first phase should not be delayed by the development of the expanded lawn. On the heliport, he opined that its noise impact to the Runway Park should be studied. On the weather station, he noted the operational need for its current location but expressed concern on its potential infringement to the design of the Runway Park.

3.7 **Ms Ann So** echoed Mr Lam Kin-lai and Mr Nicholas Brooke's views given that the original programme for the first phase of Runway Park would tally with the commissioning of the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal in mid-2013. She added that the weather station could be of considerable educational value to secondary students. She suggested art displays at the lawn area of the Runway Park could be considered, citing the example of Kwun Tong Promenade Stage 1.

3.8 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** shared the Chair's view that more information should have been provided to facilitate the discussion at the meeting.

3.9 **Dr Sujata Govada** asked whether temporary access using the breakwaters from Kwun Tong to the former runway would be feasible and whether "open air theatres" could be provided at the Runway Park.

3.10 **Mr Tam Kwong-hung** stated that locations near the heliport were not suitable for wind measurements due to the blockage caused by the Cruise Terminal and the near gale force winds caused by helicopters.

He added that there was flexibility in modifying the exterior design of the station for better integration with the Runway Park. He also welcomed Members' suggestion to open it up to the public for educational purpose.

3.11 **Mr Chan Ying-wa** illustrated the current design of the weather station. He reiterated that HKO would welcome proposals on the design of the weather station for educational uses as long as its operation remained unaffected.

3.12 **Mr KT Leung** explained that the increase in construction period for the lawn area from 12 months to 18 months arose from the substantial expansion of its size, and subsequently the increased amount of essential works comprising installation of subsoil drainage system, soil treatment, and grass establishment, among others. However, the target completion date for the waterfront promenade portion of the Phase 1 Park remained unchanged at mid-2013. He added that more detailed information on the design would be provided to the Task Force at the next meeting.

3.13 **Mr Paul Cheung** said that facilities such as water and electricity supply would be provided to facilitate events such as the "wine and dine" festival which could help make the venue a destination for both locals and tourists.

3.14 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** expressed concern on the potential impact of the nearby heliport on the public enjoyment of the Runway Park.

3.15 **The Chair** asked relevant bureau/departments of the Administration to make appropriate consideration of the heliport issue.

**The
Secretariat**

3.16 **Ms Vivian Lau** opined that the purpose and objective of the project should be outlined to guide the discussion on the design details.

3.17 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** opined that a green and sustainable design should be explored.

3.18 **Mr Paul Cheung** explained that the latest design of Phase 1 development has taken into account Members' comment that a simplistic design should be adopted to leave greater flexibility for Phase 2 development and reduce abortive works. For Phase 2 development, an aviation theme would be adopted. He added that LCSD would explore with ArchSD on advancing the programme of Phase 1 development as far as practicable.

3.19 **The Chair** reiterated the Task Force's concern on the programme of Phase 1 development.

3.20 **Mr Chan Fuk-cheung** considered that the extended construction period resulting from the expansion of the lawn reasonable given the necessary engineering works involved.

3.21 **Mr KT Leung** supplemented that there would be considerable amount of underground works for the expanded lawn such as installation of subsoil drainage system and formation works. He added that phased completion would be considered and a more detailed design would be presented to the Task Force at the next meeting.

ArchSD

**Item 4 Stage 2 Public Engagement on the Preservation of Lung Tsun Stone Bridge Remnants
(Paper No. TFKT/04/2011)**

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

4.2 **Mr Franklin Yu** supported the conversion of the footbridge at Prince Edward Road to an underground tunnel. He enquired about the at-grade connection of the curvilinear footbridge and suggested that part of the Lung Tsun Stone Bridge Remnants could be revitalized to facilitate its functional use and appreciation by the public at a closer distance.

4.3 **Dr Sujata Govada** suggested that the alignment of the curvilinear footbridge be refined to enhance the view of the bridge

remnants from the footbridge. She also drew reference to the recent exhibition of the animated version of “Riverside Scene at Qingming Festival” and suggested similar measures to facilitate the visualization of the area around the bridge remnants in the past.

4.4 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** expressed concern on the safety and ventilation issues of the tunnel.

4.5 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** echoed Mr Franklin Yu’s comment that the public should be allowed to appreciate the bridge remnants at a close distance. On the other hand, he opined that the size of the potential audience in practice should be considered in reviewing the cost effectiveness of the whole initiative.

4.6 **Mr Stephen Tang** stated that different design details for the curvilinear bridge to provide different functions were being deliberated, for instance, developing a landscaped deck at which exhibitions and arts performances could be conducted. Regarding the tunnel, he stated that the safety and ventilation issues would be addressed through the design.

4.7 The Meeting noted the progress of the public engagement and **the Chair** thanked CEDD’s presentation.

**Item 5 Residential Development at 1-5 Kai Hing Road, Kai Tak South
(Paper No. TFKT/05/2011)**

5.1 **The Chair** welcomed Mr Ricky Wong, Mr Charles Chiu, Mr Patrick Ng and Ms Carol Choy of Hong Tai Yuen Ltd, Mr Kelvin Ip and Ms Carmen Cheung of Ronald Lu & Partners (Hong Kong) Ltd, and Ms Betty Ho and Mr Cheng Pui-kan of PlanArch Consultants Ltd.

5.2 **Ms Betty Ho** presented the paper with the aid of a powerpoint.

5.3 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** appreciated the proponent’s initiative to return to the Task Force to present a further revised design, and

opined that there were improvements to ventilation and permeability. He expressed support to the latest design.

5.4 **Mr Franklin Yu** enquired whether the Buildings Department's latest environmental guidelines had been adopted for the latest design and the result of the Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) outlined in the paper.

5.5 **Dr Sujata Govada** echoed Mr Nicholas Brooke's view that there were improvements in the latest design. She enquired whether the 9-metre-wide passageway to the west of the subject site was accessible by the public. She also opined that a stepped height profile should be adopted.

5.6 **Mr Kelvin Ip** stated that the Buildings Department's guidelines had been fulfilled although the proponent did not have such obligation. He added that the AVA indicated improvement. While the 9-metre-wide passageway concerned would not be accessible to the public, greening would be provided thereat.

5.7 **Ms Betty Ho** stated that consideration has previously been given to a stepping height profile, which was eventually not accepted on planning ground. She supplemented that the 9-metre-wide passageway concerned was a private open space. Nevertheless, accessibility to the subject site's waterfront by the public would be adequately provided by alternative routes.

5.8 **Mr Eric Yue** explained that there was a provision under the Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan for application to the Town Planning Board for minor relaxation of building height restriction based on the individual merits of a development. That said, given its harbourfront location, a more prudent approach over the height limit for the subject development would be adopted. Moreover, the building height restriction for the subject site had taken into account the building height profile in a wider context extending from the waterfront to the hinterland at Kowloon Bay.

5.9 **Dr Sujata Govada** opined that the control over height limit

of developments could be relaxed in the future.

5.10 **The Chair** concluded that there was no objection from the Task Force to the latest design.

Item 6 Residential Development at 7 Kai Hing Road, Kai Tak South
(Paper No. TFKT/06/2011)

6.1 **The Chair** welcomed Ms Hanna Hsu and Ms Ida Leung of Kerry Properties Limited, Ms Cissi Chan and Mr Tony Mui of Ho & Partners Architects Limited, and Mr Dickson Hui, Ms Winnie Wu and Mr Viko Wan of LD Asia.

6.2 **The Chair** declared conflict of interest in the subject agenda item and temporarily handed over the chairmanship to Mr Nicholas Brooke, while remaining at the meeting as an observer.

(Note: As Mr Nicholas Brooke had taken over the chairmanship throughout the discussion of Item 6, “the Chair” to which the remaining paragraphs in Item 6 referred should be understood as Mr Nicholas Brooke rather than Mr Vincent Ng.)

6.3 **Mr Dickson Hui** presented the paper with the aid of a powerpoint.

6.4 **The Chair** enquired whether the proponent had been in dialogue with the proponent for the adjacent residential development at 1-5 Kai Hing Road, Kai Tak South.

6.5 **Mr Sam Farrands** enquired whether the orientation of Block T2 could be changed to enhance permeability.

6.6 **Ms Vivian Lau** enquired whether Blocks T2 and T3 could be separated to allow access in between the two.

6.7 **Dr Sujata Govada** also enquired whether the orientation of

Block T2 could be changed. She echoed the Chair's comment that there were merits for a dialogue between the proponents for the subject and adjacent developments.

6.8 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** observed that Block T1 appeared to encroach into the pavement to the north of the subject site. He enquired whether pedestrian movement thereat would be affected.

6.9 **Mr Dickson Hui** stated that there had been no formal dialogue between the two proponents. On Block T2, he stated that the existing orientation would provide two breezeways at the subject site. On the pavement to the north, he explained that the subject site boundary would not encroach into the pavement and a continuous pavement thereat towards the adjacent site has been maintained.

6.10 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** suggested that Block T3 be moved to the east to make available a 6-metre-wide breezeway between Blocks T2 and T3.

6.11 **Mr Eric Yue** welcomed the suggested breezeway between Blocks T2 and T3, but considered that the provision of that breezeway should not at the expense of the reduction of the 15m wide separation with building in the adjoining development at the Kowloon Godown site.

6.12 **Dr Sujata Govada** opined that the wall effect should be avoided as far as practicable.

6.13 **The Chair** observed that Members were concerned with building disposition, visual permeability and air ventilation. He considered that the Task Force would not be able to give in-principle support to the application at the meeting.

6.14 **Mr Dickson Hui** noted that Members were aware of the development constraints of the subject site, including the relatively small site area and narrow site frontage. He stated that various design options had been deliberated and the design presented to the Task Force was formulated upon balancing various considerations.

6.15 **The Chair** stated that Members were reviewing the design in the context of harbour planning principles, and considered that the current disposition of Blocks T2 and T3 had created a wall effect. He invited the proponent to refine the design in the light of Members' comments.

6.16 **Ms Vivian Lau** considered that the wall effect was greater at the adjacent development. Nevertheless, there was room for improvement for the design of the subject development.

Item 7 Voices and Appeals from South Tokwawan Area near Kai Tak

7.1 **The Chair** welcomed Mr Edwin Town of South Tokwawan Concern Group, Mr P C Fan and Ms Elaine Kwan of Lands Department (LandsD), and Mr Warren Wong and Mr CP Wai of Environmental Protection Department (EPD).

7.2 **Mr Edwin Town** presented his views with the aid of a powerpoint.

7.3 **The Chair** invited Mr Edwin Town to advise the key points for Members to focus on for discussion at the meeting.

7.4 **Mr Edwin Town** expressed concern on the air pollution caused by a concrete batching plant and a sand depot, which were operating on short-term tenancies, as well as a dumping ground.

7.5 **Mr P C Fan** stated that the concerned short-term tenancies, after a review in 2009, were allowed to continue given various considerations including the environment as well as the facilities' contributions to Kai Tak Development.

7.6 **Mr Stephen Tang** explained that there were operational needs for the concerned concrete batching plant. By serving ongoing developments at Kai Tak such as the cruise terminal and public residential housing, fewer concrete transport vehicles had to travel from

urban areas such as Kowloon City and To Kwa Wan to Kai Tak, which would otherwise generate traffic congestion and air pollution at these areas.

7.7 **Mr Stephen Tang** continued that monitoring stations had been set up at the perimeter of Kai Tak to monitor air pollution by means and standards adopted by EPD and agreed by relevant District Councils. No exceedance of air pollution objectives had been recorded thus far. As such, there was no immediate need to terminate the tenancies of the concerned concrete batching plant and sand depot. However, consideration could be given to their termination or relocation upon the commencement of the construction works for the Shatin-Central Link in the future.

7.8 **Mr Stephen Tang** further explained that the alleged dumping ground was indeed a barging point to facilitate the transport of materials arising from construction works by sea. The whole process of transporting the materials to transport ships was conducted in an enclosed environment, without causing pollution. He added that CEDD proactively conducted regular meetings with contractors operating at Kai Tak to review air pollution issues and take action as appropriate.

7.9 **Mr Warren Wong** stated that EPD paid close attention to the pollution issues associated with the land uses supporting the developments at Kai Tak. Regular site inspections were conducted and immediate action would be taken in the event of non-compliance with environmental standards. Mitigation measures including water-spraying, coverage with impervious sheet such as taupalin, and erection of vertical walls, were also in place.

7.10 **Ms Ann So** considered that a regular dialogue between relevant government departments and the Kowloon City District Council was important for fostering mutual understanding.

7.11 **Dr Sujata Govada** opined that the decision tree diagram on locating uses at the waterfront outlined in a study by the Harbour Business Forum would provide useful reference on the matter.

7.12 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** opined that the existing land use management mechanism should be reviewed. He also suggested that monitoring of pollution should be conducted on fronts such as the delivery routes in addition to construction sites, and more extensive mitigation measures such as landscaping should be considered.

7.13 **The Chair** reminded Members that the Task Force should deliberate the matter with reference to the harbour planning principles. He pointed out that the two facilities concerned were not harbourfront-compatible, and enquired whether there were operational needs for the concrete batching plant and sand depot concerned to be located at the waterfront.

7.14 **Mr P C Fan** explained that the two facilities would have more efficient operation if sea access was available.

7.15 **Miss Elaine Kwan** supplemented that sea access for the two facilities could alleviate the air pollution, traffic congestion and safety issues otherwise brought about by the alternative means of land transport. She added that LandsD had requested the tenants of the two facilities to implement the mitigation measures as aforementioned by EPD and conducted inspections to monitor their implementation.

7.16 **Ms Gracie Foo** stated that the Administration would follow up on the issue by subsequently submitting to the Task Force a note on land uses at Kai Tak with regard to the harbour planning principles.

**LandsD
CEDD**

7.17 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** opined that the two subject facilities, among other construction-related facilities, were eyesores. He considered that prompt action should be taken to beautify the construction sites at Kai Tak for the benefit of future cruise terminal visitors and residents of public residential housing.

7.18 **The Chair** thanked the South Tokwawan Concern Group for expressing its views to the Task Force. He stated that the Task Force would continue to monitor the relevant land use issues.

7.19 **Mr Edwin Town** reiterated his Group's concerns over the

pollution issues brought about by developments at Kai Tak, and thanked the Task Force for providing his Group with the opportunity to express them at the meeting.

Item 8 Any Other Business

8.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) was organizing a Value Management Workshop for Kwun Tong Promenade Stage 2 to be tentatively held on 14 or 15 April 2011. The Secretariat would inform Members of the confirmed date, time and venue in due course. **The Secretariat**

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat issued an email to Members on 1 April 2011 to provide Members with more information on the purpose of the Workshop and invite Members to indicate their availabilities. The Workshop was then held on 15 April 2011. A summary report of the discussion being prepared by ArchSD would be circulated among Members in due course.)

8.2 There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 1:30pm.

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