

**5<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Harbourfront Commission**  
**Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development**  
**1 June 2011 (Wednesday) 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	Chair, Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development
Mrs Margaret Brooke	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr Leung Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Mr Andy Leung	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Ir Dr Chan Fuk-cheung	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Patrick Lau	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape 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	
Mr Sam Farrands	Co-opted Member
Ms Vivian Lau	Co-opted Member
Ms Gracie Foo	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands) 1, Development Bureau
Mr Vitus Ng	Chief Assistant Secretary (Works) 3, 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 Lam Kin-lai Representing Conservancy Association  
Prof Carlos Lo Representing Friends of the Earth  
Mr Benjamin Cha  
Ms Lily Chow  
Miss Connie Lam Co-opted Member

**In attendance**

Mr Chris Fung Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour) (Acting),  
Development Bureau  
Mr Anthony Lo Chief Engineer/1 (Kowloon),  
Civil Engineering and Development Department  
Mr Harry Tsang Chief Executive Officer (Planning)1,  
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

**For Item 4**

**Architectural Services Department**

Mr K T Leung Chief Project Manager/303 (Acting)  
Ms Teresa Leung Senior Project Manager/332 (Acting)

**Leisure and Cultural Services Department**

Ms Selina Li Senior Executive Officer (Planning)6

**Hsin Yieh Architects & Associates Ltd**

Mr Joseph Ho Director  
Mr P L Yiu Project Director  
Mr Johnny Ho Design Director  
Mr W S Lee Project Architect

**EDAW Ltd**

Mr Andy Lewis Regional Landscape Architecture Director  
Mr T Y Ko Senior Landscape Architect  
Ms Stephanie Lai Assistant Project Manager

**For Item 5**

Architectural Services Department

Mr K T Leung	Chief Project Manager/303 (Acting)
Ms Teresa Leung	Senior Project Manager/332 (Acting)
Ms Vivian Au	Chief Architect/1
Mr M C Chung	Senior Architect/11
Mr Andrew Nam	Architect/102

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Ms Lee Bo-man	Senior Executive Officer (Planning)5
---------------	--------------------------------------

**For Item 6**

Government Property Agency

Mr Howard Hui	Estate Surveyor (Site Utilisation)22
---------------	--------------------------------------

**For Item 7**

Kerry Properties Limited

Ms Ida Leung	Senior Development Manager
--------------	----------------------------

Ho & Partners Architects Limited

Mr Tony Mui	Associate Director
Mr Zip Lo	Assistant Design Manager

LD Asia

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

**Action**

**Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the last meeting**

1.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Secretariat has circulated the minutes on 23 May 2011. No amendment has been proposed at the meeting and the minutes were confirmed.

**Item 2 Matters Arising  
(Paper No. TFKT/07/2011)**

2.1 **The Chair** reported the following:

- (i) the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) had conducted a Value Management Workshop on Kwun Tong Promenade Stage 2 on 14 April 2011. A summary report had been circulated among Members on 26 May 2011.
- (ii) two informal meetings had been held on 9 May and 26 May 2011 respectively in relation to the First Phase of Runway Park at Kai Tak, Kwun Tong Promenade Stage 2, and Urban Design Enhancement Proposals in Kai Tak.
- (iii) the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) and the Lands Department (LandsD) were preparing a paper on temporary land uses in Kai Tak for Members' reference as a follow-up to agenda item "Voices and Appeals from South Tokwawan Area near Kai Tak" of the last meeting. **CEDD**  
**LandsD**
- (iv) the Food and Health Bureau (FHB) and ArchSD had noted the Task Force's call for consultation on the exterior design of the Centre of Excellence in Paediatrics in Kai Tak, and would consult the Task Force at a suitable juncture. The Secretariat was asked to convey to FHB and ArchSD the Task Force's request for consultation at a later meeting. **Secretariat**
- (v) in response to Members' enquiry at the last meeting, the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) and Civil Aviation Department (CAD) had prepared an information paper on the cross-boundary heliport in Kai Tak, which had been circulated among Members on 26 May 2011.

2.2 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that the Task Force should be fully briefed on the design, layout and details of the heliport, as well as any mitigation measures proposed to reduce the adverse impact on nearby facilities and attractions such as the Runway Park. He considered that THB and CAD should brief the Task Force at the next meeting.

2.3 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** said that the paper only set out the reasons why the heliport was needed. While tending to accept the provision of a heliport in Kai Tak, he considered that information on the detailed design and visual impact on the surroundings should also be provided.

2.4 **Ms Vivian Lau** considered that the information provided was not sufficient for substantiating the level of demand that justified the provision of a heliport at Kai Tak.

2.5 **Mr Sam Farrands** observed that the potential impact of heliport operations on the Cruise Terminal was not mentioned in the recent tender invitation for the tenancy of operating it. He asked if the customs facilities at the Cruise Terminal would also support the heliport. He considered that it would be aesthetically better to locate the proposed heliport elsewhere such as Tsim Sha Tsui and Sheung Wan.

2.6 In concluding the discussion, **the Chair** considered that the Task Force should be provided with more information on the Project and asked the Secretariat to put forward the Project as an agenda item for the next meeting. **Secretariat**

### **Item 3 Urban Design Enhancements Proposals at Kai Tak (Paper No. TFKT/08/2011)**

3.1 **The Chair** welcomed Mr Stephen Tang and Mr Anthony Lo of CEDD. **Mr Anthony Lo** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

3.2 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** welcomed the proposals. He asked if the proposals would implicate on the delivery dates of projects set out in the Kai Tak Development's Master Programme. He asked CEDD to consider advancing the date of public access to the Lung Tsun Stone Bridge (Bridge) remnants.

3.3 **Mr Winston Chu** opined that the proposed bridge connecting the runway tip and Kwun Tong might have implication on

harbour reclamation. He considered that a pedestrian bridge might be more acceptable.

3.4 **Mr Andy Leung** asked if sufficient space would be reserved for Emergency Vehicular Access (EVA) at the Kai Tak waterfront promenade and its adjoining developments, and if the proposed preservation corridor for the LTSB was an independent government project.

3.5 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** asked if the relocated roads would be made underground or at least lowered for improving waterfront accessibility, and if the gas stations at the tip of the proposed “Government, Institution or Community” (G/IC) site could be relocated to reduce the limitation on the future use of that site.

3.6 In response, **Mr Stephen Tang** said:

- (i) on the Centre of Excellence in Paediatrics and the cross-boundary heliport in Kai Tak, CEDD would liaise with relevant bureaux/departments for further information for incorporation into the master programme; **CEDD**
- (ii) on the Bridge, the preservation corridor would be affected by the implementation of the Shatin-to-Central Link. The Government would explore various means to meet public aspiration for an early view of the remnants. On the three adjoining private development sites, the Government was proposing to incorporate conditions in the land leases to ensure that the design would be compatible with the ambience of the Bridge and would separately consider different implementation options for the preservation corridor;
- (iii) on the waterfront EVA, the Government was considering integrating it with other compatible uses including cycling in the overall landscaped design;
- (iv) on the proposed bridge connecting the runway tip and Kwun Tong, CEDD was well aware of its implications on landscape,

use of waters, and the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance. Once technical difficulties were resolved, CEDD would consult the public including the Task Force on both the proposed Environmentally Friendly Linkage System and the bridge in one go; and

- (v) on the pedestrian linkage between the Kai Tak waterfront and the hinterland, the detailed design was being prepared. Regarding the new "G/IC" zone, the adjoining gas station would remain in its original site due to its necessity to drivers. CEDD would carefully consider the appropriate use of the "G/IC" site.

3.7 **Dr Sujata Govada** said that the current approach to reduce road footprints and enhance waterfront connectivity would make Kai Tak more pedestrian-friendly. She asked if other events such as dragon boat racing could be held.

3.8 **Mr Patrick Lau** commented that CEDD should consider some advance planting and landscaping works to improve the surrounding environment.

**CEDD**

3.9 In response, **Mr Stephen Tang** said:

- (i) referring to further comment from **Mr Tam Po-yiu** on connectivity with the South Apron, an elevated landscaped walkway concept would be pursued when designing the footbridges connecting to Kowloon Bay and Kowloon Tong. Subways might not be appropriate due to safety and ventilation concerns;
- (ii) CEDD had liaised with Hong Kong China Rowing Association and Marine Industry Association for identifying the likely requirements for water-related activities; and
- (iii) CEDD was considering the possibility of a temporary plant nursery within the Kai Tak area taking into account the Kai Tak master programme.

3.10 **The Chair** summarised that some recurring issues such as master programme, landscaping and land-water interface remained the Task Force's key concerns about major projects in Kai Tak.

3.11 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that the financial community was looking forward to more dedicated commercial space outside Central. Given the good connectivity and public transport service, he asked if the site originally reserved for Kai Tak Stadium could be released for commercial use.

3.12 **Mr Winston Chu** opined that the Kai Tak Apron was the only suitable area for a needed secondary financial centre in the urban area of Hong Kong, given that the site was of suitable size and had the necessary critical mass drawn from the neighbouring districts.

3.13 **Mr Stephen Tang** said that the Home Affairs Bureau was considering how to pursue the stadium project further. **The Chair** said that the business community was giving further thought to the possibility to turn the proposed stadium site into a secondary financial centre, and could present its proposal to the Task Force or the Harbourfront Commission later.

3.14 **The Chair** concluded that the Task Force supported the urban design enhancements proposed by CEDD for the onward amendment in the Kai Tak OZP.

#### **Item 4 First Phase of Runway Park at Kai Tak (Paper No. TFKT/09/2011)**

4.1 **The Chair** welcomed Mr Paul Cheung and Ms Selina Li of Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD), Mr K T Leung and Ms Teresa Leung of Architectural Services Department (ArchSD), Messrs Joseph Ho, P L Yiu, Johnny Ho and W S Lee of Hsin Yieh Architects & Associates Ltd, and Mr Andy Lewis, Mr T Y Ko and Ms Stephanie Lai of EDAW Ltd. **Mr Johnny Ho** and **Mr Andy Lewis** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.



4.2 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** expressed concerns about access to the Runway Park, given his the understanding that the distance from the nearest building in Kai Tak to the Runway Park was about 1.5 km. He asked if there would be sufficient car parking spaces at the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal Building. Given that the Park was always subject to strong wind, he suggested the provision of shelters.

4.3 **Mr Winston Chu** suggested the provision of a running track surrounding the Runway Park, which he considered would be popular without destroying the beautiful design proposed for the Park. **Ms Vivian Lau** echoed Mr Winston Chu's comment.

4.4 **Dr Sujata Govada** opined that the runway heritage should be preserved. She suggested that there should be sufficient water access to the Park.

4.5 In response to Members' comments, **Mr Joseph Ho** said that large arbours would be provided in the Park. He added that people could jog on the pavement proposed in the current design. **Mr Andy Lewis** said that the heritage and geometry of the former runway had been kept in the designs of the Park. The proposed facilities would not be tall and thus the integrity of the original runway alignment could be still viewed in a comfortable setting.

4.6 **Mr K T Leung** stated that there would be more than 100 car parking spaces in the cruise terminal for visitors. ArchSD was also coordinating with LCSD and other government departments on provision of public transport.

4.7 **The Chair** asked CEDD to monitor the overall planning and strategic issues on water access in Kai Tak. **Mr Stephen Tang** said that CEDD welcomed approach from any parties interested in running water taxi service along the Kai Tak waterfront.

**CEDD**

4.8 **The Chair** concluded that the Task Force supported the revised proposal, in which many enhancements were seen.

**Item 5 Kwun Tong Promenade Stage 2 Development  
(Paper No. TFKT/10/2011)**

5.1 **The Chair** welcomed Mr K T Leung, Ms Teresa Leung, Ms Vivian Au, Mr M C Chung and Mr Andrew Nam of ArchSD, and Ms B M Lee of LCSD to the meeting. **Mr Andrew Nam** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

5.2 **The Chair** drew Members' attention to the paper tabled by Mr Paul Zimmerman on his observations of waterfront accessibility in Hong Kong.

5.3 **Ms Ann So** supported the proposal. Since the community had such need for a sensory garden and especially for the visual impaired, she welcomed such kind of facility to be provided in the Stage 2 development.

5.4 **Dr Sujata Govada** suggested that landing steps and some floating features on the waters fronting the promenade be provided to improve water-land interface. She asked if remnants of the former Kwun Tong Public Cargo Works Area (PCWA) could be retained in the promenade to preserve collective memory.

5.5 **Mr Sam Farrands** opined that there were many follies yet insufficient area for grass. **Ms Vivian Lau** suggested one of the proposed follies could be made of recycled papers. She further recommended that the promenade should be turned into a temporary flea market on a recurring basis where teenagers and social enterprises could start up their business. On the design, she also asked if a section of the promenade could be designated as an area without any lights.

5.6 **Mr Andy Leung** considered that while both Stage 1 and Stage 2 of the promenade were attractive to teenagers, the demand from children and the elderly should also be considered. He asked if further possibilities could be explored to better utilise the vacant area underneath the Kwun Tong Bypass (KTB) such as the provision of car parking spaces. **Mr Tam Po-yiu** had a similar view.

5.7 **Mr To Kam-biu** stated that TD had no objection to the provision of car parking spaces for the promenade.

5.8 **Mr Winston Chu** opined that the special advantage of the harbourfront was not fully utilised in the proposal as there was neither planning for water access nor hardware dedicated for water-related activities. He suggested that landing steps be provided.

5.9 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** asked if dogs and bikes would be allowed in the future promenade.

5.10 To strengthen the collective memory of the former Kwun Tong PCWA site, **Mr Tam Po-yiu** suggested placing a cargo ship with an inverted "A" frame at the waters fronting the promenade. He also suggested providing boat service and landing steps.

5.11 **Mr Paul Cheung** wished to draw Members' attention that there was currently an existing public pier adjacent to the Kwun Tong promenade for public use. A landing step was also being proposed at a redevelopment site northwest to Kwun Tong Promenade. LCSD would have no objection to the provision of landing steps along the promenade or in its vicinity if the public supported it. He said that the vacant area under the KTB could be considered for car parking and other uses to complement the design of the promenade. He agreed that the site would be of great attraction if there was provision of water taxi and dining facilities.

5.12 In response to Members' comments, **Mr Andrew Nam** said:

- (i) ArchSD would add tactile, sensory, audio and visual aids along the promenade to accommodate the needs of the disabled;
- (ii) ArchSD would carefully consider Members' suggestion of using recycled materials for constructing follies and displaying a cargo vessel in the vicinity;
- (iii) indirect lighting and LEDs were used in Stage 1 promenade to

ensure a relatively dim background in the evening. To add in more interesting features, lightings might be applied to the follies to tie in with the rhythm of background music within restricted hours;

- (iv) nearly 65% of the promenade was covered by grass and wood. While it was necessary to provide some hard-paved areas for EVA and wheelchair access, ArchSD would try to extend the greenery area as far as possible;
- (v) if a cycle track was proposed along the entire promenade, the presence of speedy bikes might cause danger to promenade users, especially children and the elderly. It was more desirable for riders to park their bikes near the promenade entrance at Hoi Bun Road, so as to allow for a promenade exclusively used by pedestrians; and
- (vi) most of the vacant lots under KTB were unallocated area of LandsD.

5.13 **Mr Paul Cheung** stated that LCSD remained open-minded regarding the provision of a pet garden within the waterfront promenade, subject to the Kwun Tong District Council and local residents' views.

5.14 **Ms Ann So** supplemented that a pet garden next to the Kwun Tong Ferry Pier and Stage 1 of the promenade had been opened for public use two weeks ago. She suggested the government improve the outlook and attractiveness of the vacant lots underneath the KTB.

5.15 **Mr Andy Leung** opined that some landing steps should be built along the waterfront promenade to facilitate point-by-point water access in the future. He suggested the provision of a cycle track along the entire waterfront promenade as long as safety concerns had been properly addressed. **Ms Vivian Lau** concurred that water access should be provided at several points.

5.16 **The Chair** noted the general concerns of Members regarding

the strategic planning of waterfront promenades in Kai Tak, such as water access, cycling, parking and F&B facilities. He hoped that CEDD would take these into account in future planning. He also concluded that the Task Force had no objection in principle to the proposal of Kwun Tong Promenade Stage 2 development.

**Item 6 Proposed Uses of Two Areas at Kwun Tong Ferry Pier, Kwun Tong, Kowloon (Paper No. TFKT/11/2011)**

6.1 **The Chair** welcomed Mr Howard Hui of the Government Property Agency (GPA) to the meeting. **Mr Howard Hui** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

6.2 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** opined that other creative and innovative options should be explored with the private sector instead of leasing the pier decks to ancillary use. He suggested that some areas of the pier be allocated for F&B facilities. The advertisement signs proposed by GPA on the pier rooftop should be set aside for the moment.

6.3 **Mr Andy Leung** held no objection to the better utilisation of the vacant pier as long as there are provisions in the tender to ensure compliance with the Harbour Planning Principles (HPP). On advertising signs, he opined that the Task Force should first establish general principles before considering individual applications.

6.4 **Mr Sam Farrands** opined that a short lease period was not attractive to the private sector as it might put their capital at risk. The lease period should be at least 5 years, or preferably 10 years. Revenue from the advertising signage on the pier rooftop would also be required by the private sector to generate revenue.

6.5 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** said that proposed advertisement signs on government properties along the harbourfront should be carefully considered in light of the HPP, and that the vacant floor areas and rooftop of the pier should be better utilised. He suggested incorporating tender terms to ensure the pier use would be compatible

with the adjoining waterfront.

6.6 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** said that the pier uses proposed appeared inconsistent with the recreational nature of the adjacent Kwun Tong promenade. He opined that there should be fewer limitations in the proposed tender so as to tap in creativity from the private sector. He proposed the provision of one-stop marriage services at the pier to promote vibrancy of the waterfront.

6.7 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** opined that the Task Force would need a specific checklist of standards to review applications of advertisement signs facing on to the Harbour. She suggested that the pier could be integrated with the adjacent promenade as a single project, for instance, by providing more F&B facilities for the promenade.

6.8 **Ms Vivian Lau** opined that a holistic approach should be adopted to review how individual proposals would be integrated. **Dr Sujata Govada** had a similar view. **Ms Lau** also expressed concern on the issue of light pollution for advertisements proposed on top of government buildings.

6.9 **Ms Gracie Foo** said that DEVB had communicated with GPA before the meeting regarding applications to place advertisement signs on government properties, and recommended GPA to holistically study how government resources could be better utilised. She asked if any existing facilities inside the pier, such as stalls and café, were currently used by ferry commuters.

6.10 **Mr Howard Hui** said that the commercial area inside the pier was now vacant. Current commuters would therefore not be affected by postponing the tender.

6.11 **Ms Gracie Foo** agreed that there should be an overall strategy where individual projects would be pursued and presented to the Commission and the Task Forces. Amid rising aspirations, DEVB would continue to take on board Members' views and ensure that the projects would meet the needs of present days. After taking on board Members' views for years, the planning and design for Kai Tak has now

reached an advanced stage. The Kwun Tong Promenade Stage 1 development, for instance, was a success. Various projects were also being taken forward at other harbourfront areas, such as the Hoi Yu Street Temporary Promenade and Hung Hom Promenade Initial Development.

6.12 **Mr Howard Hui** said that the proposed 5-year lease period was already longer than other similar leases of government properties. GPA and relevant departments would consider the feasibility of the suggested 10-year lease for this pier. While GPA had been approached by prospective tenants for leasing the pier for purposes other than ancillary pier uses, the prospective tenant would need to lodge a planning application for changing the land use of the pier with the Planning Department (PlanD) directly. He also suggested that the feasibility to take up the pier as part of the Kwun Tong Promenade project be explored.

6.13 **The Chair** summarised that Members generally seemed not to support the proposal. **Mr Leung Kong-yui** clarified that he supported it as long as the pier would be leased for appropriate use.

6.14 **The Chair** also considered that a holistic overview of the strategic issues for the Kai Tak waterfront was necessary. With these strategic issues on mind, there would be a better framework to handle individual cases in the future.

**Item 7 Residential Development at 7 Kai Hing Road, Kai Tak South  
(Paper No. TFKT/12/2011)**

7.1 **The Chair** welcomed Ms Ida Leung of Kerry Properties Limited, Messrs Tong Mui and Zip Lo of Ho & Partners Architects Limited, and Mr Dickson Hui, Ms Winnie Wu and Mr Viko Wan of LD Asia.

7.2 **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 7, “the Chair” to which the remaining paragraphs in Item 7 referred should be understood as Mr Nicholas Brooke rather than Mr Vincent Ng.)

7.3 **Mr Dickson Hui** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

7.4 **Dr Sujata Govada** asked if the 6-metre-wide building gap on the side which adjoined the other private development was a planning requirement. She recalled Members’ suggestion made in the last meeting that the towers should be re-oriented to allow gaps in between. Despite the site constraints, she opined that improvement to permeability could be made by relocating the 6-metre-wide gap to in between Towers 2 and 3.

7.5 **Mr Dickson Hui** explained that the 6-metre-wide gap retained in the revised scheme was an air ventilation requirement suggested by PlanD’s Urban Design Section. Together with the 9-metre-wide gap already approved at the adjoining private development, a 15-metre-wide gap would be created to facilitate air ventilation in this area.

7.6 **Mr Eric Yue** explained the gap recommended for air ventilation was only an advisory comment, rather than a statutory requirement. The primary concern of PlanD was that all three buildings were linked up without any gaps. PlanD would strongly recommend the proponent to reserve a building gap between Towers 2 and 3.

7.7 **Mr Dickson Hui** stated that separating Towers 2 and 3 with a gap on the eastern edge at the same time remained difficult due to the narrow frontage of the subject site.

7.8 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** considered that there was no difference between a single 15-metre gap and the combination of a 6-metre gap and a 9-metre gap from the air ventilation perspective.



7.9 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** expressed concern about the adverse visual impact on the south-western corner of the site as arising from the revised scheme. **Ms Vivian Lau** and **Mr Sam Farrands** shared similar views.

7.10 **Mr Dickson Hui** explained that the provision of a single 15-metre-wide gap on the eastern edge together with the adjacent site would facilitate better ventilation than two separate 6-metre-wide and 9-metre-wide gaps, as proven in most air ventilation assessments that a 15-metre-wide gap was more effective.

7.11 **The Chair** said that the key issue was for the Task Force to consider the two options of air ventilation gaps. He reiterated that a balance had to be struck when reviewing these options.

7.12 **Mr Dickson Hui** said that a balance had been struck between air ventilation and visual impact in the revised scheme, as well as the severe site constraints encountered by the proponent. He stated that the subject site was small and narrow, only equivalent to 28% of the total area of the adjacent private development.

7.13 In response to the Chair's enquiry, **Mr Dickson Hui** replied that the proponent would design and construct the 20-metre-wide promenade before handing it over to the government, the arrangement of which was similar to the adjacent private development. The design proposal of the promenade would be submitted to the Task Force for comments at an appropriate juncture.

7.14 **The Chair** considered that the revised scheme was marginally better while the Task Force was looking forward to a 6-metre gap in between Towers 2 and 3 for a better visual impact. **Mr Dickson Hui** responded that the proponent would explore such possibility, after further discussing with PlanD's Urban Design Section and District Planning Officer to see whether the 6-metre-wide gap on the eastern edge would be mandatory.

**Item 8 Any Other Business**

8.1 **The Chair** announced that the next meeting had been tentatively scheduled for 3 August 2011 (Wednesday) afternoon.

8.2 There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 6:05pm.

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