

**6<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Harbourfront Commission**  
**Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development**  
**3 Aug 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 Lam Kin-lai	Representing Conservancy Association
Prof Carlos Lo	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Franklin Yu	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
Ms Lily Chow	
Mr Nicholas Brooke	
Miss Connie Lam	Co-opted Member
Mr Sam Farrands	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 Albert Lee	Chief Transport Engineer (Kowloon), 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 Adam Lai	General Manager (Planning, Development & Port Security), Marine Department
Mr Ronald Leung	Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Ms Ann So	
Mr Benjamin Cha	
Ms Vivian Lau	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 Sunny Lo	Senior Engineer/2 (Kowloon), Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr Harry Tsang	Chief Executive Officer (Planning)1, Leisure and Cultural Services Department

**For Item 3**

**Transport and Housing Bureau**

Miss Monica Chen	Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport)9
------------------	--

**Civil Aviation Department**

Mr Johnny Lee	Helicopter Operations Inspector
Ms Bella Luk	Senior Operations Officer (Technical Support)

**For Item 4**

**Presentation Team 1**

Mr Ian Brownlee	Masterplan Limited
Mr Robert Wilson	China Hong Kong Rowing Association
Mr Luk Wai-hung	Hong Kong Canoe Union

Ms Leung Ching-wa            Hong Kong Dragon Boat Association

Presentation Team 2

Mr Paul Zimmerman        CEO, Designing Hong Kong Limited  
Ms Eva Tam                    Project Manager, Designing Hong Kong Limited  
Mr David Robinson         Secretary, Hong Kong Marine Industry  
   Association

**Action**

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

1.1            The draft minutes of the 5<sup>th</sup> meeting were circulated to Members on 27 July 2011. No amendments were proposed at the meeting and the minutes were confirmed.

**Item 2        Matters Arising  
(Paper No. TFKT/13/2011, TFKT/14/2011 and TFKT/15/2011)**

2.1            **The Chair** reported the following:

- (i) following the discussion of agenda item “Voices and Appeals from South Tokwawan Area near Kai Tak” at the Task Force’s meeting in March, the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)’s Kai Tak Office (KTO) and the Lands Department had prepared a paper on “Temporary Land Uses in Kai Tak” for Members’ information. It had been circulated to Members on 29 July together with two other papers on “Updated Programme for Kai Tak Development” and “Public Engagement Exercise on Kai Tak River”;
- (ii) in response to Members’ enquiry at previous meetings, the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) and the Civil Aviation Department (CAD) had provided another paper on the heliport to be discussed under Agenda Item 3 of this meeting; and
- (iii) in response to Members’ enquiries at previous meetings, the Food and Health Bureau had advised that consultation with the

Task Force could take place at the next Task Force meeting in mid-Oct 2011.

**Item 3 Cross-boundary Heliport in the Kai Tak Development Area (Paper No. TFKT/16/2011)**

3.1 **The Chair** welcomed Miss Monica Chen of THB as well as Mr Johnny Lee and Ms Bella Luk of CAD. **Miss Monica Chen** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

3.2 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** considered that the selected location for the heliport was unacceptable as it would occupy an area otherwise available for public enjoyment of the harbour, and more information on flight paths should be provided for assessing its noise impacts. He considered that developing the heliport at the rooftop of a low-rise building with an enclosed viewing gallery for the public would be better than developing it at ground-level together with visually obstructive noise barriers.

3.3 **Dr Sujata Govada** and **Mr Sam Farrands** enquired whether alternative locations outside and within Kai Tak Development (KTD) had been explored for the heliport.

3.4 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** doubted whether the selected location at the runway tip was appropriate for business travellers. She echoed the views that noise barriers would be visually obstructive and thus undesirable.

3.5 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** echoed the views that the selected location was not appropriate unless there would be sufficient demand from future cruise terminal users. He said that twin-engine helicopters would be compatible with the proposal put forward by Mr Lam Kin-lai as they could land at locations above ground, and considered that public enjoyment of the harbour should not be sacrificed to provide flexibility for usage of the heliport by single-engine helicopters.

3.6 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** considered that the information and arguments put forward by the project team's paper on site selection,

demand for helicopter services and mitigation measures were not sufficient to justify its case. **Mr Leung Kong-yui** echoed his views.

3.7 **Mr Winston Chu** considered that in adopting a proportionality principle, three questions would be relevant – whether a harbourfront location was necessary, whether public enjoyment of the harbour would be enriched, and whether value of the harbour would be enhanced. While acknowledging potential advantages of the selected location of the heliport such as the synergy of sharing the immigration facilities with the cruise terminal, he echoed Members’ views that there would be adverse impacts on public enjoyment of the harbour such as noise nuisance and visual obstruction.

3.8 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** opined that the synergy of sharing the immigration facilities with the cruise terminal was an important consideration in selecting the site. He also considered that the landscape deck at the top of the cruise terminal building would have already provided the opportunity for public enjoyment of the harbour at the runway region.

3.9 **Mr Patrick Lau** considered that development proposals more compatible with the harbourfront should have been devised for the selected location.

3.10 **Mr Franklin Yu** echoed Mr Leung Kong-yui’s views that a building with its rooftop as a heliport for twin-engine helicopters would be a more balanced way forward. He added that the design of such building should be coherent with that of the cruise terminal building.

3.11 **Prof Carlos Lo** enquired whether the selected location was appropriate given that there could be little room for expansion in meeting increasing demand in the future. He also considered that more information on flight paths, target customers, operation mode, among others, should be provided.

3.12 In response, **Ms Monica Chen** said that:

- (i) having conducted detailed studies, the selected location at Kai

Tak was found most appropriate for the heliport;

- (ii) there was a need for the heliport to be at-grade to allow usage of the heliport by single-engine helicopters;
- (iii) the proposal for noise barriers was preliminary. As long as safety would not be compromised, other means of noise mitigation such as adjustment of flight paths would be explored in the technical feasibility study; and
- (iv) more information would be obtained from the market in due course in coming up with the operation mode and business model of the heliport. Meanwhile, there was a need to commence preparation work in advance, including site selection.

3.13 **Dr Chan Fuk-cheung** considered the selected location appropriate as it was distant from residential areas and its wide angle would allow a large number of flight paths and thus a variety of helicopter services.

3.14 **Mr Eric Yue** informed the meeting that the area reserved for the heliport in the Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan was 0.78 hectares.

3.15 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** reiterated that public enjoyment of the harbour should not be sacrificed to provide flexibility for usage of the heliport by single-engine helicopters.

3.16 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** asked how the Administration would take forward the project after this meeting.

3.17 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** considered that insufficient information had been provided on the demand for the heliport.

3.18 **Miss Monica Chen** said that a technical feasibility study would be conducted in due course and thanked the Task Force for expressing its views for consideration during the study. She said that demand for cross-boundary helicopter services was anticipated as

Mainland China, particularly the Pearl River Delta, continued to develop.

3.19 **The Chair** observed that the majority of Members had expressed reservation over the site selection issue. He said that according to the Harbour Planning Principles, harbourfront areas should be utilized to facilitate public enjoyment of the harbour as far as practicable. If the heliport inevitably had to be developed at the runway tip, he invited the project team to look further into measures that would facilitate public enjoyment of the harbour in addition to mitigation measures, such as the alternative proposal to develop a public viewing gallery with its rooftop as heliport put forward by Members. He concurred with Members' views that the cost of providing flexibility for usage of the heliport by single-engine helicopters was too high in terms of sacrificing public enjoyment of the harbour at a prime harbourfront location. He invited the project team to provide further information in due course.

**THB**  
**CAD**

3.20 **Ms Monica Chen** said that the project team would be happy to provide further information in due course. She also understood that there was considerable usage of single-engine helicopters by the industry, resulting in the need for the heliport to be at-grade.

3.21 **Mr Johnny Lee** said that helicopter services provided a popular option for tourists and business travellers to travel between foreign cities such as New York and New Jersey. He anticipated that the heliport at Kai Tak could contribute to Hong Kong in a similar fashion. He added that single-engine helicopters were comparatively affordable.

3.22 **The Chair** recalled that there had been discussions on site selection of the heliport as well as types of helicopters to be served for years. While respecting the industry's views on the need for single-engine helicopters, he reiterated that the necessitated occupation of the harbourfront was not in line with the Harbour Planning Principles observed by the then Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC) and the Harbourfront Commission (HC) including this Task Force. He considered the proposal put forward by this Task Force a compromise that could result in a win-win situation for the industry and the general

public.

3.23 **Mr Winston Chu** suggested that the project team consider developing the heliport at the rooftop of the future tourism node as the development of the cruise terminal building had already commenced.

3.24 **The Chair** thanked the project team for its presentation. (Note: the project team left the meeting at this juncture.)

3.25 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** considered that the project team should be invited to revert to the Task Force with further information within six to nine months. **The Chair** and the meeting agreed.

3.26 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** reiterated her reservation over the suitability of the selected site in servicing business travellers.

3.27 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** added that there were already quite a few heliports around the harbour, with or without immigration facilities.

3.28 **The Chair** summarized by reiterating that the Task Force had expressed reservation over the site selection. He anticipated that more discussions on the subject would be needed in due course.

#### **Item 4 Proposed Water Sports Centre at Kai Tak (Paper No. TFKT/17/2011)**

##### Presentation #1

4.1 **The Chair** welcomed Mr Ian Brownlee of Masterplan Limited, Mr Robert Wilson of China Hong Kong Rowing Association, Mr Luk Wai-hung of Hong Kong Canoe Union, and Ms Leung Ching-wa of Hong Kong Dragon Boat Association. **Mr Ian Brownlee** presented the proponent's paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

4.2 **The Chair** invited official members of the Task Force to offer initial comments on the proposal first.



4.3 **Mr Stephen Tang** said that there had been comprehensive deliberations between CEDD's KTO and the proponent on the merits, technical feasibility and necessary supporting facilities of the proposed water sports centre at KTD. For instance, consensus had been reached on the configuration of the race course. Outstanding issues included water quality, management agent, consultation with relevant district councils and operational matters regarding the proposed co-use of the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter (KTTS) with existing users. While interdepartmental efforts were in place to improve water quality of the water body concerned, the Environmental Protection Department had advised that it was currently not suitable for secondary contact sports given the level of E Coli.

4.4 **Mr Adam Lai** said that a variety of water activities such as boat races were allowed under the existing marine legislations enforced by the Marine Department (MD). Organizers of such activities were required to apply for permits from the Director of Marine, who could stipulate certain requirements with a view to protecting the safety of vessels and the people on board. Since the primary function of typhoon shelters was to provide shelters for local vessels during typhoons, MD saw a need to further discuss with the proponent and existing KTTS users various operational details for the proposed co-use of KTTS, such as the timing for ceasing water sports activities in anticipation of incoming typhoons. He advised that further consultation and discussion with the relevant stakeholders including the local working vessel community should be conducted at an early stage to allow the ironing out of any teething problems between the habitual and new users. Issues such as the existing statutory speed limits and the proposed barrier gate should also be further deliberated in due course.

4.5 **Mr Paul Cheung** said that the proposed water sports centre could be managed in a similar fashion as the one at Shing Mun River in Shatin, which was operated by a National Sports Association.

4.6 **Mr Eric Yue** said that the proposal was generally in line with the planning theme of KTD as a sports hub. The proponent could submit applications in accordance with the relevant provisions in the Town Planning Ordinance for development of necessary supporting

facilities for the Town Planning Board's consideration.

4.7 **The Chair** thanked official members for offering their views and invited other members to provide their comments.

4.8 **Mr Winston Chu** saw merits in the proposal in terms of sports promotion, education value and health benefits, among others. Nevertheless, he cautioned against the potential privatization of the concerned part of the harbour, which was by law a special public asset and natural heritage owned by all citizens of Hong Kong. His views were echoed by **Mr Franklin Yu, Mr Tam Po-yiu, Mr Sam Farrands, Mr Leung Kong-yui** and **Prof Carlos Lo**.

4.9 **Dr Sujata Govada** said that there should be a balance between water sports and other water activities. She expressed her preference for the necessary supporting facilities to be developed at the sites currently zoned "Government, Institution or Community" (G/IC) instead of the planned open spaces. Her views were echoed by **Mr Leung Kong-yui**.

4.10 **Mr Franklin Yu** considered the proposal an interesting initiative that utilized the water body uncommonly enclosed by land on three sides. He enquired about the scale and quantity of land-side supporting facilities required. He suggested that there should be other facilities or activities at the area for members of the public less interested in water sports. His views were echoed by **Prof Carlos Lo** and **Dr Sujata Govada**.

4.11 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** enquired whether there could be a suitable management mode for the water sports centre such as that of Happy Valley, which involved a certain level of government oversight.

4.12 **Mr Patrick Lau** considered that water quality remained a considerable challenge to the feasibility of the proposal and its resolution would thus be a priority. He considered that the proposal should involve the wider planning of KTD as the adequacy of spectator stands as well as the backdrop against which water sports events were viewed would all be relevant to the quality of the water sports centre.

4.13 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** welcomed the proposal as it would promote water activities in the harbour. He considered that the water quality of the water body concerned should be improved to facilitate both the proposal and public enjoyment of the harbour at the vicinity. His views were echoed by **Mr Nicholas Brooke** and **Miss Connie Lam**.

4.14 In response, **Mr Robert Wilson** said that:

- (i) there were local and overseas examples where water quality could be improved to facilitate water activities such as Shing Mun River in Shatin and Singapore respectively;
- (ii) the water sports associations represented at this meeting had all along been working to encourage more public participation. Developing a water sports centre at KTD would help arouse interest in these sports;
- (iii) the International Rowing Association had confirmed that the proposed water sports centre could well reach international standards, where world championships could be held; and
- (iv) apart from temporary facilities, a modest grandstand for 2000 spectators should be provided near the finishing end of the race course.

4.15 **Mr Ian Brownlee** supplemented that KTD was the only venue in Hong Kong where an international water sports centre could be developed, and invited the Administration to take the proposal into account when making various engineering decisions for KTD in the near future.

4.16 **The Chair** supported Mr Ian Brownlee's suggestion, and summarized that the majority of Members supported the proposal while recognizing a number of technical issues such as water quality. He thanked the representatives of the proponent for their presentation, and welcomed further dialogues on the proposal in the future.

Presentation #2

4.17 **The Chair** then welcomed the second proponent who would make a presentation under the same agenda item. The team comprised Mr Paul Zimmerman and Ms Eva Tam of Designing Hong Kong Limited as well as Mr David Robinson of Hong Kong Marine Industry Association.

4.18 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** presented his team's proposal for developing public marina facilities at KTD with the aid of a PowerPoint.

4.19 **The Chair** observed that part of the presentation involved territory-wide issues of the harbour. **Mr Nicholas Brooke** considered that it served to provide context for the discussion.

4.20 **Mr Stephen Tang** did not see any major technical problems with the proposal. That said, he considered that the proponent and existing KTTS users would need to further discuss various operational details for the proposed co-use of KTTS. He also anticipated competing land uses at the Kwun Tong waterfront.

4.21 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** enquired whether the proposed moorings could realistically co-exist with the existing operations at KTTS as well as the proposed water sports activities.

4.22 **Mr Winston Chu** cautioned against the potential privatization of the concerned part of the harbour by a small number of people who could afford pleasure vessels and remarked that it might not meet the overriding public need criterion if reclamation was necessary for developing a private marina. **Mr Sam Farrands** and **Prof Carlos Lo** shared his concern and enquired about how this issue could be resolved.

4.23 **Mr Sam Farrands** considered that while the marina could be operated privately, it had to be made available to the general public.

4.24 **Mr Adam Lai** said that according to the assessment conducted by MD in 2009, the supply of typhoon shelters would be just sufficient until 2025. While the proponent held a different view that

there would be a surplus in supply, he pointed out that the period for which the proponent compiled its statistics was too short and thus not indicative of the actual circumstances in the long run. He raised the example that various typhoon shelters around the harbour had been fully occupied when typhoon signals No. 9 and 10 were hoisted a few years back.

4.25 **Dr Sujata Govada** suggested expanding the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter (CWTS) by replacing the existing breakwaters with new ones further away from the waterfront.

4.26 In response, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that:

- (i) there could be potential conflicts between water sports activities and the proposed marina only if movement of pleasure vessels in and out of KTTS were to be restricted by barrier gates for extended periods. In that case, the proposed marina could be developed at the To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelter instead;
- (ii) there was a certain degree of integration at harbours around the world. Promenades and water-land interfaces for pleasure vessels can co-exist alongside water sports vessels and container ships;
- (iii) non-exclusive access along the promenade can be maintained as well as unlimited entry to pontoons by the general public. All storage and repair facilities for vessels including for the popular small sampans would be made available to the general public and can be included in public areas as traffic across the promenade would be limited; and
- (iv) in addition to the use of the water itself public marinas require supporting facilities on the land, and waterfront in Kai Tak should be reserved accordingly for these uses.

4.27 **Mr David Robinson** reiterated that the proposed marina should be considered as a municipal facility.

4.28 **Mr Winston Chu** reiterated also that the proposed marina had to be a public facility.

4.29 **The Chair** thanked the representatives of the proponent for their presentation, and the Administration and HC might give it further consideration in due course.

## **Item 5 Any Other Business**

5.1 **The Chair** informed the meeting that the Victoria Harbour Icon Design Competition had been conducted successfully. The prize giving ceremony was held on 4 July 2011, during which the winning harbour icon and logo for HC were announced.

5.2 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** expressed his observation that while stakeholders and the market might have more first-hand information, the Administration could be more proactive in pursuing policy visions and addressing relevant challenges. **Mr Leung Kong-yui** echoed his views.

5.3 **Ms Gracie Foo** said that departments such as CEDD's KTO and the Leisure and Cultural Services Department had indeed been diligently taking forward various harbourfront enhancement projects in KTD such as the Runway Park and Kwun Tong Promenade, as discussed at past meetings of the then HEC and this Task Force. Meanwhile, the Development Bureau's Harbour Unit had been playing an overall coordinating role for harbourfront enhancement projects within and outside KTD. For proposals put forward by external parties, advance provision of relevant information would facilitate more fruitful discussions between the proponent and Members of the Task Force including government representatives, as exemplified by the discussion of the proposal for developing an international water sports centre at KTD at the previous agenda item.

5.4 **Mr Winston Chu** expressed his appreciation towards Members for their active participation in harbourfront affairs since the establishment of the Task Force a year ago.

5.5           **The Chair** thanked Members for their sharing, and announced that the next meeting had been scheduled for 18 October 2011 (Tuesday) afternoon.

5.6           There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 5:45pm.

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