

**12th Meeting of Harbourfront Commission**  
**Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development**  
**14 May 2013 (Tuesday) at 2:30 p.m.**  
**in Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices,**  
**333 Java Road, North Point**  
**Minutes of Meeting**

**Present**

Mr Vincent Ng                      Chairman

**Organization Members**

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 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
Ir Dr Chan Fuk-cheung	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour

**Individual Members**

Mr Nicholas Brooke	Individual Member
Ms Lily Chow	Individual Member
Mr Sam Farrands	Co-opted Member

**Official Members**

Mrs Winnie Kang	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), Development Bureau (DevB)
Mr CS Liu	Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)2, DevB
Mr Thomas WK Chan	Senior Manager (Tourism)41, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr Albert Lee	Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department (TD)
Mrs Sorais Lee	Head (Kai Tak Office), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Miss Margrit Li	Assistant Director (Leisure Services)1, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Miss Fiona Lung	District Planning Officer/Kowloon, Planning Department (PlanD)
Miss Venus Tsoi	Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Dr Peter Cookson Smith	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Urban Design
Ms Ann So Lai-chun	Individual Member
Mr Benjamin Cha	Individual Member
Ms Vivian Lau Sio-kuan	Co-opted Member
Ms Connie Lam	Co-opted Member

**In attendance**

Mr Sunny Lo	Senior Engineer/2 (Kowloon), CEDD
-------------	-----------------------------------

**For Item 3**

Mr KH Tao	Deputy Project Manager/Major Works(1), Highways Department (HyD)
Mr Roy Lam	Senior Engineer 3/ Central Kowloon Route, HyD
Mr Stephen Ko	Engineer 3 / Central Kowloon Route, HyD
Mr Ken Chan	Associate, Arup-Mott MacDonald Joint Venture

**For Item 4**

Mr KT Chau	Senior Project Manager 333, Architectural Services Department (ArchSD)
Mr Tony Mui	Senior Landscape Architect/2, ArchSD
Ms Angie Au-yeung	Landscape Architect/6, ArchSD
Ms Vivian Ho	Architect/109, ArchSD
Ms Xenia Kwan	Project Manager 349, ArchSD
Ms Selina Li	Senior Executive Officer (Planning)6, LCSD

**For Item 5**

***Study Team***

Mr Albert Lai	Representative, The Professional Commons
Mr Stanley Ng	Representative, The Professional Commons
Mr Chow Sung-ming	Representative, Local Research Community
Ms Camille Lam	Representative, Local Research Community
Ms Erica Chui	Representative, Harmonic HK

***Government Team***

Mr CS Liu	Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)2, DevB
Mr Jonathan McKinley	Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs(2), Home Affairs Bureau (HAB)
Mrs Sorais Lee	Head/KTO, CEDD
Mr Wong Lop-fai	Chief Project Manager 303, ArchSD
Mr Raymond Lau	Senior Project Manager 332, ArchSD
Mr Roy Lam	Senior Engineer 3/CKR, HyD

**The Chair** welcomed all to the meeting and informed Members would adhere to a tight schedule for this meeting. He announced that Harbour Unit had taken over the Secretariat of the Task Force and thanked Mr Sunny LO and Mr Jeff MAN of CEDD for serving the Secretariat in the past eighteen months.

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

1.1 The draft minutes of the 11<sup>th</sup> meeting were circulated to Members for comments on 6 May 2013. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated again on 13 May 2013. The draft minutes were confirmed at the meeting without further amendments.

**Item 2 Matters Arising**  
**(Paper No. TFKT/05/2013 and TFKT/06/2013)**

*Retaining bollards along the waterfront of Kwun Tong Promenade Stage 2*  
*(paragraph 2.13 of the confirmed minutes of the 11<sup>th</sup> meeting)*

2.1 **Miss Margrit LI** reported that LCSD had been in liaison with the concerned departments and proposed that half of the bollards along the waterfront of the Kwun Tong Promenade Stage 2 would be retained in-situ, whilst the other half would be preserved in the new park as featured seating.

2.2 **The Chair** appreciated the concerted efforts by the relevant departments in realising the Task Force's suggestions. He opined that the bollards were important marine features to be retained in remembrance of the marine history of the site.

2.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** requested for a plan of the bollards to be retained such that Members could comment specifically with reference to the plan. He considered that apart from its heritage value, the bollards were infrastructure that could be used for marine uses in the future.

2.4 **Mrs Winnie KANG** responded that the retention of half of the bollards at the Kwun Tong Promenade Stage 2 was an agreement resulted from rounds of discussions and negotiations with the concerned departments, the relevant District Office and some key members of the District Council. The agreement was reached on a very clear understanding that these retained bollards would serve as decorative items and the Government did not have any plans to make use of the bollards as marine facilities at present. She added that if there were other management agents of the promenade in future and saw the need of using these bollards as marine facilities, the use and management of bollards might then be reviewed.

2.5 In response to **Mr ZIMMERMAN**'s request, **the Chair** suggested the Government to provide a drawing on the revised design for Members' reference.

LCSD

*(Post-meeting notes: The plan as requested was issued to Members on 10 September 2013.)*

*Kai Tak Fantasy (paragraph 3.11 of the confirmed minutes of the 11<sup>th</sup> meeting)*

2.6 **The Chair** reported that the Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO) was preparing the draft idea competition brief of Kai Tak Fantasy in consultation with the relevant bureaux and departments, and would send the draft to Members for reference when ready.

EKEO

*(Post-meeting notes: The briefing on the Kai Tak Fantasy International Idea Competition was held on 13 August 2013 and Members' views on the proposal were submitted to EKEO on 26 August 2013.)*

*Site-visit to Kai Tak Cruise Terminal (paragraph 4.8 of the confirmed minutes of the 11<sup>th</sup> meeting)*

2.7 **The Chair** invited **Mr Thomas WK CHAN** to update Members on the arrangement of the site-visit to Kai Tak Cruise Terminal. **Mr CHAN** reported that the cruise terminal operator and the concerned departments were focusing efforts to prepare for

the arrival of the next cruise ship (i.e. Mariner of the Seas) in mid-June. There were also some outstanding works in progress. Therefore a site visit for the Task Force could only be arranged after mid-June, but before the terminal was open to the public in the third quarter of 2013.

2.8 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** suggested that the visit should be arranged as soon as practicable so that Members' comments could be incorporated.

TC

*(Post-meeting notes: The site-visit to Kai Tak Cruise Terminal was arranged on 13 August 2013.)*

Kai Tak Avenue Park Phase 1 (paragraph 5.3 of the confirmed minutes of the 11<sup>th</sup> meeting)

2.9 In response to **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN**'s enquiry on cycling routes between the housing estates at the North Apron and the waterfront at the last meeting, **Mrs Sorais LEE** said that the Preliminary Outline Development Plan for the Kai Tak Development had included a cycle track network of about 6-kilometre long along the waterfront area for leisure purposes. Taking into account the public views for a longer network, Kai Tak Office (KTO) was studying an extension of the cycle track network to cover different attractions in the Kai Tak harbourfront areas. KTO would consult the relevant district councils and the Task Force on the study findings revised in the second half of 2013.

Progress Report on KTD

2.10 **The Chair** reported that CEDD had submitted a paper (Paper No. TFKT/05/2013) on the latest progress of KTD for Members' information. **The Chair** pointed out that most of the items listed in the paper were currently under construction. **Mrs Sorais LEE** introduced the paper and highlighted the key progress since the last meeting.

2.11 With respect to paragraphs 5.3 and 5.11 of the minutes of the last meeting, **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** considered that an overall plan showing the outdoor seating, cycling and pedestrian connection

in KTD should be marked up and presented in the progress report.

2.12 **Mr Patrick LAU** shared **Mr ZIMMERMAN's** views, and suggested that green infrastructure should be accorded priority when considering the connectivity network within KTD.

2.13 In response to **Mr ZIMMERMAN's** and **Mr LAU's** concerns, **Mrs Winnie KANG** said that this Task Force had been involved in the overall development in Kai Tak for a long time, and the progress report prepared by KTO served as a regular update on the latest development. Having regard to the different stages of various infrastructures in KTD, it would be impractical for KTO to include all details of each item in the report. Alternatively, she suggested that KTO might provide more pictures to show the overview of the development as a supplement to the progress report to facilitate Members' understanding.

2.14 **Mrs Sorais LEE** considered that the format of the progress report should be maintained to clearly reflect the progress of different infrastructures in KTD. Noting Members' concerns on the overall development of Kai Tak, she undertook that KTO could give a presentation to illustrate the conceptual ideas on issues of Members' concern, such as cycle tracks and pedestrian connection in KTD at the coming meeting.

**KTO**

2.15 **The Chair** recognised the challenge faced by the Task Force in overseeing the progress of individual works while maintaining a macro-view of the overall planning of KTD. He considered that planning for harbourfront was a complicated issue and had to be viewed from different perspectives. He agreed with **Mrs KANG** and **Mrs LEE's** suggestions that the presentation should be useful to give an overview of KTD and refresh Members memory.

2.16 **Mr Andy LEUNG** pointed out that the progress report might not be able to show district-wide issues such as urban design, open space, street furniture and strategic greening plan. He opined that Members should also be updated and be given the opportunity to discuss these macro-level issues.

2.17 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** considered that the works programme

presented to the Task Force was overly simplified. He suggested that in future reporting, it should be elaborated more by showing the more important sub-tasks and critical-paths among various tasks in order to ensure proper coordination and that timely decisions were made, since a great number of large-scale projects and infrastructures were being handled.

2.18 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that sufficient context and supporting information were essential for Members to comment on both the overall plan and the individual projects in KTD.

2.19 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** concurred with **Mr ZIMMERMAN** and considered that a comprehensive approach was preferred to a piece-meal one in contemplating the development of Kai Tak. He also raised that the Task Force should be briefed on the Environmental Friendly Linkage System (EFLS) and an update on the Multi-purpose Sports Complex (MPSC).

2.20 **The Chair** noted Members' concern for a comprehensive overview of the development. He concluded that KTO, in consultation with Harbour Unit and the Chair, would work to see how the multiple layers of information requested in relation to KTD could be presented in a clear manner for Members' easy understanding.

**KTO**

*Information Paper on Update on the Progress of Trunk Road T2*

2.21 **The Chair** reported that CEDD provided an information paper (Paper No. TFKT/06/2013) to brief Members on the latest progress of the Trunk Road T2. He added that the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) application of the project was recently submitted to the Environmental Protection Department, and the project team would formally consult the Task Force in around the third quarter of 2013, after the EIA procedures.

2.22 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that Members should look at the detailed design of the infrastructure and the impacts of adjoining road connections on the street and landscape with a detailed plan.

*(Post-meeting note: CEDD will consult the Task Force on the Trunk Road T2 project at the next meeting.)*

**Item 3 Central Kowloon Route – Kai Tak and Ma Tau Kok  
(Paper No. TFKT/07/2013)**

3.1 **The Chair** welcomed **Mr KH TAO**, **Mr Roy LAM**, **Mr Stephen KO** of HyD and **Mr Ken CHAN** of Arup-Mott MacDonald Joint Venture to the meeting, and invited Members to declare interest. **Mr Ken CHAN** presented the proposal with the aid of a PowerPoint.

3.2 **Mr Andy LEUNG** suggested the following enhancements to the detailed design of the CKR project:

- (i) apart from lifting the vertical alignment of the flyovers at the Kai Tak Interchange, the project team should consider setting further apart the viaducts to allow more sunlight penetration onto the portion of the Kai Tak River Walk underneath the flyovers;
- (ii) the deck across the estuary area of Kai Tak River could be placed further away from the viaducts for making it a symbolic feature in Kai Tak, which would require coordination between the CKR project and the design of Kai Tak River, as well as subject to any possible implications on the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance; and
- (iii) as regards the Kowloon City Ferry Pier Public Transport Interchange (the PTI) at Ma Tau Kok, the project team should explore the feasibility of moving the coach parking area underground, with a view to releasing more ground area for better integration between the landscaped deck above the PTI and the adjoining promenade.

3.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested that PlanD should look into the road plan of the Ma Tau Kok area, and consider how this strip of waterfront could become an exciting environment for public enjoyment.



3.4 **Mr Sam FARRANDS** agreed with **Mr ZIMMERMAN**'s comments and opined that the present proposal was infrastructure-driven, and it could not facilitate the creation of an enjoyable destination for the public.

3.5 **Mr KH TAO** responded to Members' comments/enquiries as follows:

- (i) in response to **Mr PY TAM**'s enquiry, the artist impression depicted the view from north to south along the Kai Tak River Walk, and the head room of the lower level slip road was around 5 metres. The photomontages showed that sunlight penetration was made possible under the current scheme. Given that the proposed viaducts were already 70-metre wide, if they were set further apart, it would result in more land-intake of the road works and was not desirable;
- (ii) the project team would further liaise with TD regarding the proposed underground parking beneath the PTI. Nonetheless, due regard should be given to the technical factors of the proposal, including the required space for vehicular access ramps, and the substantial maintenance and operation cost required;
- (iii) HyD had taken into account Members' comments expressed in previous meetings and accordingly elevated the vertical alignment of the trunk roads. This had remarkably improved the environment of the Kai Tak River Walk underneath in the revised design; and
- (iv) while the current presentation was rather conceptual, HyD would coordinate and liaise with concerned departments to proceed with detailed design for the CKR and other facilities. Pending further detailed design, more specific information would be proposed for consultation with the Task Force in future.

**HyD**

3.6 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired about the Gross **PlanD, HyD** Floor Area (GFA) to be allowed underneath the proposed trunk **and KTO** roads at Kai Tak Interchange and at Ma Tau Kok. He opined that

TD should advise on the cost implications of having an underground carpark beneath the PTI in Ma Tau Kok when available.

TD

*(Post-meeting notes: There is currently no provision of GFA for area beneath the viaducts of CKR. The development of the concerned area (including any proposed provision of GFA) will be subject to the development of Kai Tak River Walk, which will be reviewed in due course.)*

3.7 **The Chair** noted **Mr ZIMMERMAN**'s concerns, and encouraged Members to provide comments as far as possible since this Task Force served to give suggestions to the project teams. The comments expressed would be taken into account for the proponent to enhance the scheme.

3.8 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** opined that an integrated plan showing the attractions and facilities along the waterfront was important for Members to make comments. She added that the project team should not be bounded by engineering constraints.

3.9 With respect to **Mr KH TAO**'s reply on the underground parking in Ma Tau Kok, **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** opined that an underground solution was possible with reference to the experience of the Central-Wanchai Bypass project.

3.10 **Mr Patrick LAU** opined that HyD and its consultant should give more regard to the landscape planning and urban design. He held that both engineering and urban/landscaping design should have equal weight in the whole project.

3.11 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** shared **Mr LAU**'s views and elaborated that a master landscape and urban design concept should have been well thought out first, integrating the waterfront with the landscape in the hinterland, especially that of the revitalized Kai Tak River which would have good ecological and heritage value. Such themes and potential could be usefully extended to this waterfront and make the waterfront a landmark as well, if the pedestrian access were also well thought out as discussed above, and thus they together would comply with the principle of bringing the people to the waterfront, which would otherwise be perceived as rather

remote.

3.12 **The Chair** thanked Members for their suggestions and comments, and made the following summary:

- (i) this multi-disciplinary Task Force comprised Members of different professions and thus could give views which were of great breadth and depth;
- (ii) on the other hand, KTD was a huge infrastructural project which required considerations from various perspectives to work out a multi-disciplinary solution for the development;
- (iii) he appreciated the project team for taking into account Members' views expressed at the previous meetings and devoting much effort in enhancing the proposal; and
- (iv) in response to Members' recommendations, he opined the project team to should comprise professionals from different expertise to put forward solutions which balanced views from various perspectives.

3.13 **Mrs Sorais LEE** concurred with **the Chair** and complimented HyD for placing strenuous efforts in reducing the footprint of the ventilation and administration building for releasing more open space for public enjoyment. She undertook that KTO would coordinate with various departments, including HyD, LCSD, CEDD and PlanD, to work on the urban design in KTD. In addition, she reported that KTO would launch a design idea competition on the Kai Tak River in 2014/15. KTO would consult Members when more details were ready.

3.14 **Mr Patrick LAU** expressed concern about the interfacing between CKR and other exciting concepts and ideas along Kai Tak River.

3.15 **Mr Sam FARRANDS** agreed with **Mr BROOKE's** comments and opined that the project team should consider the cost implications of placing the bus terminal underground at the PTI.

3.16 **Mr KH TAO** recognised the huge scope of the KTD

which was of significant breadth and depth. He reiterated that HyD had paid due regard to Members' comments, uplifted the vertical alignment of the trunk road at Kai Tak Interchange to make rooms for pedestrian walk underneath the trunk road, and reduced the area of the administrative building and ventilation building for more open space for public enjoyment. He added that HyD would continue to liaise with relevant government departments on the detailed design to ensure it would blend in well with the facilities in the vicinity.

3.17 **The Chair** thanked the project team for the presentation and asked HyD to take into account Members' comments in taking forward the project.

**Item 4 Hoi Sham Park Extension for Waterfront Promenade and Reprovisioning of Tennis Courts from Ko Shan Road Park  
(Paper No. TFKT/08/2013)**

4.1 **The Chair** welcomed **Mr KT CHAU, Mr Tony MUI, Ms Angie Au-yeung, Ms Vivian HO, Ms Xenia KWAN** of ArchSD, and **Ms Selina LI** of LCSD, and invited Members to declare interest. **Ms Angie AU-YEUNG and Ms Vivian HO** presented the proposed design with the aid of a PowerPoint.

4.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired if there could be seating and refreshment areas adjacent to the harbourfront and the level of services available at the Light Refreshment Area.

4.3 **Mr Patrick LAU** considered that tree-shading along the waterfront was inadequate. He further suggested that ArchSD to consider the feasibility of having ecological seawall at the waterfront.

4.4 **Ms Selina LI** responded to the comments as follows:

- (i) there was currently no landing steps inside the Hoi Sham Park;
- (ii) as regards the disused landing steps near Chi Kiang

Street, it was now being fenced off as concerned department currently has no plan to re-open the steps for public use. CEDD advised that improvement works would be required before the steps could be re-opened for public use. Hence in the meanwhile, ArchSD would improve the design of railings to safeguard safety of park users; and

- (iii) since the Light Refreshment Outlet was mainly serving the locals, simple refreshment and drinks would be most suitable.

4.5 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** proposed having more greenery in the park. She also pointed out that the Master Layout Plan did not show any access between the existing Fish Tail Rock and the proposed promenade.

4.6 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested re-opening the disused landing steps for public use, and setting up restaurants closer to the waterfront at the Waterfront Plaza to enjoy the panoramic view.

4.7 **Mr Andy LEUNG** was aware that the fitness station was adjacent to the proposed school nearby, and due consideration should be given to the interface issues between the park and the school.

4.8 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** opined that on top of the other five entrances identified in the plan, the main entrance of the park should be at Lok Shan Road and Chi Kiang Street, given its relatively more prominent location in the general area. He thus also suggested more greening be provided at the Lok Shan Road entrance.

4.9 **Ms Angie AU-YEUNG** made the following responses to Members' comments / concerns:

- (i) as the theme of Hoi Sham Park was rock feature, rock benches, arbours and seating areas were proposed along the promenade and around the Light Refreshment Area;

- (ii) sufficient sheltered seating would be scattered in the Waterfront Plaza. There would be trees and shrubs along the promenade and ArchSD could strengthen the greening element in the detailed design;
- (iii) ArchSD and CEDD would study the design of seawall to match with the theme of the park;
- (iv) a sizable Amenity Lawn Area would be located at the central of the park, whilst, lawns of different sizes and gradients would be identified along the promenade;
- (v) having regard to the seawall condition and the possible reclamation implications, access between the Waterfront Plaza and the Fish Tail Rock would take the existing walkway in the park; and
- (vi) main entrances of the park would be widened and ArchSD would liaise with HyD to make use of the adjoining pavement to create a larger entrance piazza with more greening and sculptures in future; and
- (vii) the design of the landing steps would be similar to those in the vicinity of the existing Hoi Sham Park. ArchSD noted that the landing steps did not fulfil the safety requirements, thus reinforcement of the landing steps by CEDD would be investigated. Furthermore, ArchSD would liaise with the concerned departments on the feasibility of using landing steps for marine access in future.

4.10 **Ms Selina LI** added that the design of railing for fencing off the landing steps would be similar to those in the vicinity of the existing Hoi Sham Park.

4.11 **Prof Carlos LO** enquired about the opening hours and the constraints of the park for serving a densely populated area. He suggested enhancing the park's utilization by opening round-the-clock.

4.12 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** complimented LCSD for their continuous improvement in park design. He stressed that government departments should make efforts in preserving public landing steps and making them a feature of the park, and also consider accommodating restaurants next to the waterfront.

4.13 As per **Mr ZIMMERMAN**'s suggestion, **Mrs Winnie KANG** undertook that Harbour Unit would liaise with LCSD and other relevant departments to see how the disused landing steps could be upgraded and be reopened to public.

*(Post-meeting notes: CEDD and MD advised that there were no insurmountable technical problems in relation to the re-opening of the steps. TD is assessing the local demand in determining whether the landing steps could be reopened and would advice for Members' information in due course.)*

4.14 **The Chair** thanked the project team for the presentation and briefly summarized that Members welcomed more greening and shelters at the park.

**Item 5 Proposed Kai Tak Alternative Plan: "Kai Tak for the People" - A Citizen's Alternative Plan 2.0  
(Paper No. TFKT/09/2013 and TFKT/10/2013)**

5.1 **The Chair** welcomed **Mr Albert LAI** and **Mr Stanley NG** of Professional Commons, **Mr CHOW Sung-ming** and **Ms Camille LAM** of Local Research Community and **Ms Erica CHUI** of Harmonic HK (the Study Team) to the meeting. **The Chair** also welcomed the Government Team comprising **Mr CS LIU** of Development Bureau, **Mr Jonathan MCKINLEY** of the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB), **Mrs Sorais LEE** of CEDD, **Mr WONG Lap-fai** and **Mr Raymond LAU** of ArchSD and **Mr Roy LAM** of HyD. **The Chair** invited Members to declare interest.

5.2 **Ms Camille LAM** presented the proposal from the Study Team (the Alternative Plan) with the aid of a PowerPoint, and **Mr CS LIU**, **Mr Jonathan McKinley** and **Mrs Sorais LEE** briefed Members on the information paper provided by the Government Team.

5.3 On top of the information paper, **Mr Jonathan MCKINLEY** added that HAB had strong reservation on the Alternative Plan, and cautioned that the sports community would

likely to object to the Plan as well. He also considered that there had to be strong and convincing merits to justify adopting the Alternative Plan, having regard to its impact on the delivery time and cost of the projects in Kai Tak.

5.4 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** had no objections to the Alternative Plan from harbourfront planning perspective. He opined that both the Study and the Government Teams should illustrate more on matters related to harbourfront planning in the Alternative Plan, as that would be the main focus of the Task Force.

5.5 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** opined that the Task Force was not in a position to determine the social merits of the Alternative Plan, but suggested that the Study Team could demonstrate how the plan could enhance the enjoyment of the waterfront.

5.6 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** did not support the Alternative Plan and made the following comments:

- (i) the Alternative Plan involved substantial structural changes rather than slight modifications as the Study Team suggested, which would lead to delay in delivery and increase in capital cost of the planned infrastructure as highlighted in the information paper;
- (ii) the Alternative Plan should be viewed from a three-dimensional angle. The current “cut-and-paste” presentation only viewed the issue in a two-dimensional perspective and under-estimated the technical issues such as access road, ventilation, lack of supporting infrastructure and light and noise pollution;
- (iii) the proposed relocation of the MPSC would encroach into the open space in harbourfront areas, which had to be compensated by eliminating the originally planned hotel development. Furthermore, the elevated Metro Park Extension might incur significant cost;
- (iv) to convert the multi-storey hotels into an elevated podium with commercial space underneath would allow less people to enjoy the scenery of the Victoria Harbour, and had no merits from ventilation and energy-saving perspective;



- (v) a mega podium of such immense size would be less flexible in land disposal and implementation;
- (vi) instead of adopting this scheme, it might be an easier approach to increase housing supply by converting R(B) zone to R(A) zone or by slightly relaxing the plot ratios.

5.7 **Mr Andy LEUNG** considered that the most critical issue was whether it was worthwhile to restart the planning of KTD with a view to increasing housing supply at this stage, which he considered was not to be decided by the Task Force.

5.8 Concurring with **Mr BROOKE** and **Mr ZIMMERMAN**, **the Chair** stated that the locus of the discussion should be the impact to Kai Tak waterfront under the Alternative Plan. He opined that there were multiple layers of KTD, and some would fall outside the purview of this Task Force.

5.9 **Mr Stanley NG** responded to Members' comments as follows:

- (i) the Metro Park Extension proposed in the Alternative Plan echoed KTD's original theme as a Tourism and Leisure Hub which could enhance harbourfront development;
- (ii) the increase in population resulting from the Alternative Plan might enhance the financial sustainability of the proposed EFLS;
- (iii) according to the Transport and Housing Bureau's position on the shortage of residential land use, the objective of increasing housing supply as proposed in the Alternative Plan was justified; and
- (iv) the Alternative Plan was a section 12A application which was conceptual in nature. It could be refined to address the technicality in the detailed design.

5.10 In response to **Mr ZIMMERMAN**'s and **Mr BROOKE**'s queries, **Mr Albert LAI** said the Alternative Plan could result in a more sustainable development at the harbourfront, for example -

- (i) rezoning the original hotel adjacent to the Cruise Terminal into the Metro Park Extension could allow more efficient use of the waterfront;
- (ii) there was no urgency for hotel development at the ex-runway of KTD, whilst the supply of hotels could be provided in other districts to accommodate tourists needs; and
- (iii) the housing supply could be increased without sacrificing the district density while the main features of the Sport City could be reserved in the Alternative Plan. Thus the plan could bring social and environmental merits to the harbourfront.

5.11 **Mr CS LIU** pointed out that the proposed relocation of the Secondary Stadium to the northern end of Metro Park was rather visually intrusive at harbourfront development.

5.12 **Mrs Sorais LEE** raised the following issues for Members' consideration:

- (i) in the original plan, visitors and locals could go directly from the hotel ground floor to the waterfront, which created better connectivity between pedestrian and waterfront as compared to the proposed elevated landscaped deck;
- (ii) the provision of open space was being relocated from the Secondary Stadium of the MPSC to Metro Park Extension without an overall increase in the provision of green space as claimed;
- (iii) the design issues of the proposed elongated Metro Park Extension was worth discussion;
- (iv) the proposed relocation of the Secondary Stadium of the MPSC would narrow the width of the adjacent promenade and create a sense of oppression for the park users; and
- (v) the visual corridor to and from the Harbour maintained in the original planning might be blocked by the proposed residential estate under the Alternative Plan.

5.13 From a management perspective, **Prof Carlos LO**

considered that there were substantial changes in the Alternative Plan and its impacts on harbourfront should be reassessed. He held that whether to provide more housing supply at KTD was a political issue which was not under the mandate of the Task Force. While there would be numerous options and approaches to increase the land supply in KTD, he was concerned that the reassessment and re-planning procedure could be time consuming with substantial cost implications.

5.14 **The Chair** summarised that Members understood and appreciated the good intention behind the Alternative Plan to address the imminent social needs, and complimented the efforts of the Study Team in preparing the proposal. As an advisory body, the role of the Task Force was mainly to discuss the planning and development of harbourfront matters, and he considered that the proposal put forth by the Study Team and the corresponding Government response did not present much detail in this regard. **The Chair** therefore concluded that the Task Force would not support or object to the Alternative Proposal from the harbourfront perspective.

5.15 **Mr Stanley NG** reiterated that the Alternative Plan had strong merits of enhancing waterfront activities by offering public a huge patch of green area along the Metro Park Extension.

5.16 **The Chair** thanked the Study Team for the presentation and the Government Team's comments and clarification, and advised that all comments expressed at the meeting would be passed to the Town Planning Board for consideration.

## **Item 6 Any Other Business**

6.1 **The Chair** announced that it was the last Task Force meeting in the first term of the Harbourfront Commission. He thanked Members for their dedicated service to the Task Force over the last three years. The Secretariat would inform Members of the meeting schedule for the next term in due course.

6.2 There being no other business, the meeting adjourned

at 5:30pm.

**Secretariat**

**Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development**

**October 2013**