

**11th Meeting of Harbourfront Commission**  
**Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development**  
**5 February 2013 (Tuesday) at 2:15 p.m.**  
**in Conference Room (Room G46) at Upper Ground Floor, Hong Kong Heritage**  
**Discovery Centre, Kowloon Park, Tsim Sha Tsui**  
**Minutes of Meeting**

**Present**

Mr Vincent Ng                      Chairman

**Organization Members**

Mrs Margaret Brooke	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr Lam Kin-lai	Representing the Conservancy Association
Prof Carlos Lo	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Andy Leung	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
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
Ir Dr Chan Fuk-cheung	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour

**Individual Members**

Ms Lily Chow

**Official Members**

Mr Thomas Chan	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands) <sup>1</sup> , Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Liu Chun-san	Principal Assistant Secretary (Works) <sup>2</sup> , DEVB
Mr Albert Lee	Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department
Mrs Sorais Lee	Head (Kai Tak Office), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Miss Margrit Li	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) <sup>1</sup> , Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Mr Stephen Chan	Senior Town Planner/Kowloon 3, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Simon Wong	Manager (Tourism) <sup>42</sup> , Tourism Commission
Miss Venus Tsoi	Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr Leung Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
-------------------	---

Ms Connie Lam  
Ms Vivian Lau  
Mr Sam Farrands  
Mr Nicholas Brooke  
Ms Ann So  
Mr Benjamin Cha

Co-opted Member  
Co-opted Member  
Co-opted Member

**In attendance**

Mrs Winnie Kang  
Mr Raymond Lee

Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB  
Head of Energising Kowloon East Office (EKEO),  
DEVB

Ms Winnie Ho  
Mr Anthony Lo  
Mr Jeff MAN

Deputy Head of EKEO, DEVB  
Chief Engineer/Kowloon 1, CEDD  
Senior Manager (Kowloon)2

**For Item 3**

Mr Raymond Lee  
Ms Winnie Ho

Head of EKEO, DEVB  
Deputy Head of EKEO, DEVB

**For Item 4**

Mr Andy Lam  
Mr David Chak

Assistant Commissioner (Tourism) 4, TC  
Chief Project Manager 201, Architectural Services  
Department (ArchSD)

Mr Jackson Wai  
Ms Jacinta Chow  
Mr James Marshall

Senior Project Manager 236, ArchSD  
Senior Project Manager 239, ArchSD  
Design Director, Dragages Hong Kong

**For Item 5**

Mr Wong Lop-fai  
Mr Raymond Lau  
Mr Harry Tsang  
Mr Andrew Lee

Chief Project Manager/303, ArchSD  
Senior Project Manager/332, ArchSD  
Chief Executive Officer (Planning)1, LCSD  
Director, Andrew Lee King Fun and Associates  
Architects Ltd

Mr Dennis Yeung

Associate, Andrew Lee King Fun and Associates  
Architects Ltd

**Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of Last Meeting**

1.1 The draft minutes of the 10<sup>th</sup> meeting were circulated to Members for comments on 30 January 2013. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated again on 4 February 2013. The draft minutes were confirmed at the meeting without further amendments.

**Item 2 Matters Arising  
(Paper No. TFKT/01/2013)**

*Proposed Water Sports Centre at Kai Tak Development (paragraph 4.14 of the confirmed minutes of the 10<sup>th</sup> meeting)*

2.1 **Mrs Winnie KANG** updated Members on the Proposed Water Sports Centre at Kai Tak Development (KTD) subsequent to the last meeting:

- (i) The Secretariat had conveyed Members' views on promoting water sports at KTD and the associated water quality issues to the relevant policy bureau (i.e. Home Affairs Bureau);
- (ii) as water quality issue was the critical factor in determining whether water sports could be accommodated within Kai Tak, the Secretariat had liaised with relevant bureaux and departments to look into the situation and feasible improvement measures, and the findings had been presented to the Commission meeting on 7 January 2013;
- (iii) in response to Members' suggestion that B/Ds should advise on re-alignment of roads as proposed by the Provisional Water Sports Council, it was premature to advise on the planning details as the proposal presented in the last meeting was only a conceptual idea. If the Provisional Water Sports Council would like to pursue the project as a private sector initiative,

the Council would be responsible for conducting detailed feasibility and engineering studies, as well as traffic impact assessment, before submitting a planning application to the Town Planning Board for consideration.

*Design Layout of Kwun Tong Promenade Stage 2 (paragraph 3.11 of the confirmed minutes of the 10<sup>th</sup> meeting)*

2.2 **The Chair** advised the meeting that in response to **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN**'s enquiry at the last meeting, LCSD had provided the finalised design layout of Kwun Tong Promenade Stage 2, which was circulated on 30 January 2013 together with the draft minutes for Members' information.

*Proposed Marina at Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter (paragraph 3.12 of the confirmed minutes of the 10<sup>th</sup> meeting)*

2.3 **The Chair** invited **Mr Raymond LEE** to respond to **Captain CHEUNG Tak-kee**'s query on the plan of a proposed marina in Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter. **Mr LEE** advised that the planning for a marina in the water body was a long-term proposal which would be subject to a number of factors, such as water quality and feasibility of co-locating a marina and a typhoon shelter in the area. As such, there was no concrete plan for the proposed marina at the moment.

*Progress Report on KTD*

2.4 **The Chair** reported that CEDD submitted a paper (Paper No. TFKT/01/2013) on the latest progress of KTD for Members' information and invited **Mrs Sorais LEE** to introduce the paper.

2.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired the different environmentally friendly initiatives in Kai Tak Development (KTD), particularly the on-shore power system in the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal as well as Environmentally Friendly Linkage System (EFLS). **The Chair** advised that Mr Paul Zimmerman might raise issues in relation to the Cruise Terminal when the project team briefed Members on the progress of the Cruise Terminal under

Agenda Item No.4 of the meeting; and he might suggest the environmentally friendly issues in Kai Tak as an agenda item for the forthcoming meetings to the Secretariat.

2.6 In response to **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN**'s enquiry on the bollards and waterfront access in Kwun Tong Promenade Stage 2, **Miss Margrit LI** explained that the design of Promenade Stage 2 would be coherent with that of Stage 1, with a transparent glass railing at the waterfront. While the existing moorings along the seawall would be removed, they would serve as creative park furniture inside the promenade to resemble the collective memory of the site as a former Public Cargo Handling Area (PCWA). **Miss LI** also advised that if landing steps or waterfront access points were required in future, LCSD would reserve areas at either end of the Kwun Tong Promenade.

2.7 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that since Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter (KTTS) was an active typhoon shelter, the bollards were important water-land interfaces that should be retained in-situ to enable more vibrant activities in future. The glass railing could be set back to accommodate this arrangement. He quoted that the new Yau Ma Tei Typhoon Shelter and the Hoi Fan Road Promenade adopted similar practice.

2.8 **Miss Margrit LI** responded that there were proper mooring facilities, including buoys installed by MD at the KTTS; and there were also public landing steps with bollards at the Kwun Tong Public Pier next to the Kwun Tong Promenade Stage 1. Hence there might not be strong demand for additional landing facilities along the Kwun Tong Promenade.

2.9 **The Chair** enquired why all of the bollards could not be retained in-situ. **Miss Margrit LI** responded that if the bollards had to be retained along the seawall, it would inevitably require setting back the glass railing and reducing the area of the Promenade. She also pointed out the safety concern of retaining the bollards in-situ if corresponding openings were to be provided along the railing for marine access purpose and the possibility of inducing improper use of the bollards by the public.

2.10 **The Chair** opined that the Task Force had earlier formulated a view that bollards should be kept in-situ as far as possible to provide flexibility for future uses. It would be undesirable if the bollards were to be removed due to management issues.

2.11 **Mrs Winnie KANG** advised that there were no proper landing facilities in Kwun Tong Promenade Stage II, and the bollards were for mooring of working vessels when the site was formerly a PCWA. She added that LCSD could make provision for further development of any public landing facilities for embarkation and disembarkation if necessary.

2.12 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** considered that the existing bollards could also be used for tying pontoons and landing steps. He added that LCSD also managed waterfront in Shau Kei Wan with landing steps and waterfront access points, and thus considered that a similar arrangement could be made at the Kwun Tong Promenade.

2.13 **The Chair** concluded that harbourfront was a dynamic place with evolving uses over time. He considered it acceptable to set back the glass railing so as to keep those bollards at some sections of the Promenade, perhaps as decorative features along the harbourfront at present, pending any future uses. **Miss Margrit LI** agreed that LCSD would look into the possibility of retaining some of the bollards as suggested.

LCSD

**Item 3 Kai Tak Fantasy  
(Paper No. TFKT/02/2013)**

3.1 **The Chair** welcomed **Mr Raymond LEE** and **Ms Winnie HO** of EKEO, and invited Members to declare potential conflict of interests. **Mr Raymond LEE** and **Ms Winnie HO** presented the proposal with the aid of a PowerPoint.

3.2 In response to **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN**'s enquiry, **Mr Raymond LEE** informed the meeting that EKEO was working on the boundary of the Kai Tak Fantasy, which would include the Tourism Node and the Action Area 2, i.e. Kwun Tong Ferry Pier Waterfront.

The idea competition under Kai Tak Fantasy intended to suggest ways to enhance synergy and connectivity in these areas.

3.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested that the idea competition should include the whole area, together with the water body in Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter. Connectivity and access points between two sides of the area would be another issue to be addressed. He further suggested not having too many restrictions on the design details at the Former Runway.

3.4 **Mr Andy LEUNG** suggested inviting ideas to look at the area in a holistic manner, so as to ensure the proposals were realistic and practical. He also considered that EKEO should nail down the committed uses, such as Cruise Terminal for participants to take into account.

3.5 **Mr Patrick LAU** opined that setting a stringent boundary may limit the creativity and development potential. Instead, he suggested that only essential elements should be highlighted such that the participants could come up with more creative and viable solutions.

3.6 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** concurred with Members' views, and suggested that emphasis should also be placed on the proposed use of water body, water-land interface and connectivity to other areas etc. The participants should also take into account the Harbour Planning Principles when putting forward creative ideas. Also, the ideas should illustrate how Kai Tak Fantasy would make a difference compared to other harbourfront areas.

3.7 **Prof Carlos LO** opined that EKEO should set clear objectives for this idea competition to manage expectation of the participants. In addition to technical feasibility, he considered that financial feasibility should also be taken into account when selecting the winning proposal.

3.8 **Mr Raymond LEE** thanked Members for the valuable comments and suggestions, and made the following response to Members' comments:

- (i) the main design theme of the Kai Tak Fantasy would be related to aviation, maritime and transportation history;
- (ii) he agreed with Members that it would be critical to set out all constraints that are acknowledged in the study area, but EKEO was also mindful to allow flexibility for participants to creative ideas;
- (iii) the awarded design from the idea competition would be subject to further feasibility, planning and engineering assessment;
- (iv) EKEO would engage professional bodies before launching the competition; and
- (v) while the approved Kai Tak OZP would be subject to changes, the Kai Tak Fantasy initiative should not result in a total revamp of the existing planned uses, but adjustments that could enhance the planning and connectivity of the concerned areas.

3.9 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested that pending finalising the permanent uses, temporary uses should be considered, such as making it a green flat land available.

3.10 **The Chair** concluded that Members' welcomed this initiative and looked forward to the success of the idea competition.

3.11 As per **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN's** request, **Mr Raymond LEE** undertook that EKEO would pass a draft idea competition brief to Members for reference when available. **EKEO**

**Item 4 Update on the Development of Kai Tak Cruise Terminal  
(Paper No. TFKT/03/2013)**

4.1 **The Chair** welcomed **Mr Andy LAM, Mr Simon WONG, Mr David CHAK, Mr Jackson WAI, Ms Jacinta CHOW and Mr James MARSHALL** to the meeting, and invited Members to declare their potential conflict of interests. **Mr Andy LAM and Mr James MARSHALL** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.



4.2 In response to the **Chair's** query, **Mr Andy LAM** said the commencement date of the landscaped deck would tie in with that of the Cruise Terminal, subject to the progress of planting work. The opening of Cruise Terminal was tentatively scheduled for mid-2013.

*(Post-meeting note: According to the latest progress, it is expected that the landscaped deck will be open to the public in the third quarter of 2013.)*

4.3 **Mr Andy LEUNG** raised his concern on the interface between Kai Tak Cruise Terminal and its adjoining uses, such as its interface with the heliport, its connectivity to the Runway Park, the Tourism Node and the future EFLS.

4.4 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired about the on-shore power system at the Cruise Terminal, and made following comments:

- (i) cruise passengers alone could hardly be sufficient to support the retail and food and beverage businesses in the Cruise Terminal. It would be sensible for the Cruise Terminal to provide conference venues and facilities to attract business travellers with a view to supporting its retailers and restaurants;
- (ii) the acoustic design and conferencing facilities should be of good quality so that it would be appealing to users; and
- (iii) with respect to the rooftop landscape deck garden of the Cruise Terminal, he commented that active recreational facilities should be incorporated to attract people to visit the landscape deck.

4.5 **Mr Andy LAM** responded to Members' enquiries/comments as follows:

- (i) there was currently no concrete programme for the proposed heliport in place;
- (ii) regarding connectivity to the adjoining developments, the Tourism Node and Runway Park would be served by Road D3 which also led to the Cruise Terminal.

The public could reach these destinations by taking the proposed green minibus route; and

- (iii) the landscaped deck at Cruise Terminal would be mainly managed by LCSD, except the ancillary commercial areas (e.g. dining areas) on the landscape deck, which would be managed by the operator of Cruise Terminal.

4.6 **Mr Jackson WAI** made the following response to Members' comments:

- (i) provisions had been made for connecting footbridges at two locations and at two different levels of the Cruise Terminal Building to the Tourism Node;
- (ii) there had been provision for a EFLS station immediately next to the entrance of the Cruise Terminal Building;
- (iii) for the on-shore power system, ArchSD had reserved space for transformers and switch rooms on the ground floor of the Cruise Terminal Building, but the on-shore power facilities would be procured separately through another project; and
- (iv) given there were other open spaces which would provide active recreational facilities in KTD, the landscaped deck might not be the most suitable location to provide such facilities.

4.7 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that elevated pedestrian connection should be as easily accessible and favourable as the at-grade crossing for public enjoyment. Narrow footbridges should be avoided in KTD. Regarding on-shore power system, he said that all cruise builders had put in facilities to cater for on-shore power supply.

4.8 **The Chair** concluded that the Task Force opposed to narrow and skinny elevated pedestrian connection, such as footbridges, to be built in KTD. In response to **Chair's** request, **Mr Andy LAM** undertook that TC would arrange a site visit to Cruise Terminal for the Task Force when it was close to completion.

TC

**Item 5 Kai Tak Avenue Park Phase I  
(Paper No. TFKT/04/2013)**

5.1 **The Chair** welcomed **Mr WONG Lop-fai**, **Mr Raymond LAU**, **Mr Harry TSANG**, **Mr Andrew LEE** and **Mr Dennis YEUNG** to the meeting, and invited Members to declare their potential conflict of interest. **Mr Andy LEUNG** declared that he was a member of consulting team for flat-for-flat development of Urban Renewal Authority which was adjacent to the proposed park.

5.2 **Mr WONG Lop-fai** and **Mr Dennis YEUNG** presented the proposed design with the aid of a PowerPoint.

5.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** had the following enquiries:

- (i) the connections of cycling routes between the housing estates and along the waterfront;
- (ii) the connectivity between the park and the public roads and public housing estates; and
- (iii) if there were certain restricted routes which dogs were allowed.

**CEDD**

5.4 **Dr Sujata GOVADA** suggested that the park might provide a large lawn to allow more flexible use of the open space.

5.5 **Mr LAM Kin-lai** raised his concern on the provision of toilet facilities in the park and suggested that larger trees should be planted at the park to provide better shading for park users.

5.6 **Mr Andy LEUNG** opined that connections between public open space and individual developments should be addressed. Noting that private developments would normally fence off their development to restrict public access, he pondered if it would be possible to allow more direct connection between the park entrance and the development site. **Mr LEUNG** also added that peripheral planters to segregate the park area should be avoided. His views were concurred by **the Chair**.

5.7 **Mr Patrick LAU** agreed with other Members'

comments on interface issues, and considered that open space should serve to link the surrounding developments. He further suggested that future commercial activities in the adjoining areas, such as alfresco dining, should be taken into account in the park design.

5.8 **Mr Harry TSANG** made the following response to Members' comments:

- (i) as CEDD was conducting a study of cycling track network, it might brief Members on the progress of the study; and
- (ii) with respect to areas catered for pets, LCSD kept an open mind to any proposal to include pet garden in the open space in Kai Tak. As the Avenue Park was surrounded by public housing estates which prohibited pet-keeping, a pet garden was hence not suggested in the design.

5.9 **Mr Raymond LAU** responded to Members' comments as follows:

- (i) in relation to interfacing with surrounding developments, there would not be any fence walls surrounding or enclosing the park. It was designed to be a freely-accessible park round-the-clock;
- (ii) taking into account the diverse views from various stakeholders, the project team had to strike a balance between providing more open space for flexible uses and avoiding a plain design for the design, and finally arrived at the current proposal; and
- (iii) apart from the one in Phase I, there would be another toilet in Phase II of Avenue Park which would be located at the other end of the park.

5.10 **Mr Dennis YEUNG** supplemented that the designer of the park was the same as that of the commercial facilities of housing Site 1A. The project team had also discussed with the housing estates architects to come up with the design which would integrate the park and the adjoining housing estates smoothly.

5.11 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested having a plan showing the routes for cycling and pet-owners, pedestrian accessible space and routes and outdoor seating areas. **The Chair** advised that he would allow more time for discussion on this aspect for projects that are closer to the waterfront.

## **Item 6 Any Other Business**

6.1 **The Chair** informed the meeting that the next meeting was tentatively scheduled for May 2013. The Secretariat would inform Members of the meeting schedule in due course.

6.2 There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 4:00pm.

**Secretariat**

**Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development**

**May 2013**