

Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development

Minutes of Thirteenth Meeting

Date : 8 October 2013
Time : 2:30 p.m.
Venue : Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices,
333 Java Road, North Point

Present

Mr Vincent Ng Chair

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
Mrs Karen Barretto	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Andy Leung	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Tam Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr Ivan Ho	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Prof Choy Kin-kuen	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour

Individual Members

Ms Lily Chow Individual Member

Official Members

Mr Thomas Chan	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands) 1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Vitus Ng	Chief Assistant Secretary (Works) 3, DEVB
Mr Thomas WK Chan	Senior Manager (Tourism)41, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr Albert Lee	Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department (TD)
Mr LO Kam-yan, Anthony	Head/Kai Tak Office (Ag.), 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

Mr Paul Chan Yuen-king Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape

Dr Paul Ho
Mr Louis Loong
Mr Raj Sital Motwani

Architects
Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Representing Real Estate Developers Association of
Hong Kong
Individual Member

In attendance

Mr Nicholas Brooke
Mrs Winnie Kang
Mr Larry Chu
Mr Stephen Wong
Mr Kelvin Wu

Chair, Harbourfront Commission
Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 1, DEVB
Senior Engineer/SCL(2), RDO, Highways
Development (HyD)
Senior Liaison Engineer/SCL, MTR Corporation
Limited (MTRCL)

For Item 5

Mr LO Kam-yan, Anthony Head/Kai Tak Office (Ag.), CEDD

For Item 6

Mr Janson C S WONG Chief Engineer/Kowloon 2, Kowloon Development
Office, CEDD
Ms Joyce Y Y LAU Senior Engineer/1 (Kowloon), Kowloon
Development Office, CEDD
Mr James PENNY Deputy Project Manger, Hyder-Meinhardt Joint
Venture
Mr James W PIERCE Director, The Oval Partnership Limited
Mr Edmund KWOK Associate Director, MVA Hong Kong Limited

For Item 7

Ms Karen LOH Project Director, Amstar Theme Attractions

Mr Nicholas BROOKE welcomed all to the meeting and thanked Members for volunteering to serve on Harbourfront Commission (HC)'s Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (TFKT). He expressed that the Task Force had an important role to play in overlooking harbourfront matters in Kai Tak Development (KTD).

Mr BROOKE also mentioned that the Symposium on Harbourfront Development on 4 Oct had been a success which received good publicity. The announcement of the launch of public engagement exercise for the proposed establishment of the Harbourfront Authority also attracted wide media coverage. Despite that the public response had been generally positive so far, the Commission should be prepared to address public's concern and explain details of the proposed HA to move ahead. As the HC Chair, **Mr BROOKE** urged for Members' support throughout the Phase 1 public engagement exercise.

Item 1 Election of Chairman

1.1 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE**, as the Chair of the Harbourfront Commission (HC), suggested re-electing **Mr Vincent NG** to chair TFKT for the second term. Members supported and **Mr BROOKE** announced that **Mr Vincent NG** was elected the Chair of TFKT. **Mr NG** took over the chairmanship from **Mr BROOKE**, and thanked Members for their support.

Item 2 Confirmation of Terms of Reference

2.1 **The Chair**¹ invited Members to consider the Terms of Reference (ToR) of TFKT tabled at the meeting, which was the same as the one for the last term of TFKT. There being no other comments or objection from Members, the ToR was confirmed.

Item 3 Confirmation of Minutes of the last Meeting

3.1 The draft minutes of the 12th TFKT meeting were

¹ "The Chair" is thereafter referred to Mr Vincent Ng as the Chair of TFKT.

circulated to Members for comments on 10 September 2013. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated again on 2 October 2013. The draft minutes were confirmed at the meeting without further amendments.

Item 4 Matters Arising
(Paper No. TFKT/11/2013)

Retaining bollards along the waterfront of Kwun Tong Promenade Stage 2
(paragraph 2.5 of the confirmed minutes of the 12th meeting)

4.1 **The Chair** briefed Members that LCSD had taken on board Members' views and retained half of the bollards along the Kwun Tong Promenade Stage 2 after rounds of discussions and negotiations. A plan showing the location of the retained bollards had been circulated to members for information. There being no other comments from Members, **the Chair** asked LCSD to proceed with the project.

Update on Planning and Development in Kai Tak Development (KTD)
(paragraphs 2.14 and 2.20 of the confirmed minutes of the 12th meeting)

4.2 **The Chair** said that CEDD's Kai Tak Office (KTO) undertook to brief Members on the conceptual ideas of KTD, particularly on issues concerning pedestrian connectivity and provision of cycle tracks in KTD. KTO would give a presentation on these matters under Agenda Item 5.

Underground carpark beneath the Public Transport Interchange ("PTI") in Ma Tau Kok
(paragraph 3.6 of the confirmed minutes of the 12th meeting)

4.3 **The Chair** invited **Mr Albert LEE** of Transport Department (TD) to respond to **Mr Paul Zimmerman's** enquiry on the cost implications of having an underground carpark beneath the PTI in Ma Tau Kok.

4.4 **Mr Albert LEE** responded that the concerned cost would be subject to the detailed design. TD would report back the

associated costs of constructing and operating the underground carpark to the Task Force in due course.

TD

Re-opening of To Kwa Wan Public Landing

(paragraph 4.13 of the confirmed minutes of the 12th meeting)

4.5 **Mrs Winnie KANG** updated Members that Harbour Unit had been in liaison with LCSD, Marine Department (“MD”), CEDD and TD since the last meeting, and reported that the re-opening of the To Kwa Wan landing would require some refurbishment works. TD, as the management department of public landings, had agreed to re-open the concerned landings. She supplemented that Harbour Unit would continue liaising with the relevant departments to pursue the refurbishment works with a view to tying in the re-opening of the To Kwa Wan Landing with the development of the proposed Hoi Sham Park extension.

Harbour
Unit

(Post-meeting notes: The design work of the proposed Hoi Sham Park extension was in progress. Harbour Unit would report back to the Task Force when there was any update on the re-opening of To Kwa Wan Public Landing.)

Temporary Government Land Allocation (“TGLA”) application of the construction of a new sewage pumping station at To Kwa Wan Road

4.6 **The Chair** briefed Members that the Secretariat had circulated the TGLA application for Members’ comments in September 2013, and CEDD had provided further information in response to Members’ comments. **The Chair** invited **Mr Anthony LO**, Acting Head of KTO, to address Members’ concern on the aesthetic design of the proposed sewage pumping station and its integration with the neighbouring area. **Mr LO** explained the design details of the proposed pumping station with the aid of a PowerPoint.

4.7 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** inquired about the total floor area of the sewage pumping station. He considered that it would be a more efficient use of land if the site could serve multiple purposes, such as opening up the rooftop of the sewage pumping station for public enjoyment.

4.8 **Mr LAM Kin-lai** was concerned that the TFKT was not informed of the proposed pumping station until the circulation of the TGLA application, and asked whether there would be any deodorisation treatment for the sediment processed in the pumping station. He concurred with **Mr ZIMMERMAN** in support of a green-roof design for the pumping station to be coherent with the surrounding environment, and more space should be opened for public use.

4.9 In response to the comments from **Mr ZIMMERMAN** and **Mr LAM, Mr Anthony LO** said that:

- (i) KTO would provide further information about the total floor area of the sewage pumping station after the meeting. Yet referring to the layout plan, **Mr LO** pointed out that the facility was deliberately set back by about 10 metres to allow a wider pedestrian footpath and an unobstructed view along the future To Kwa Wan Road. There would also be 20% of at-grade amenity area around the station;
- (ii) there was a greening ratio of at least 20% for rooftops of all buildings within KTD including the concerned sewage pumping station; and
- (iii) with a view to achieving Hong Kong Building Environmental Assessment Method (“HK-BEAM”) Assessment, solar panels would be installed to enhance sustainability of this facility. With the panels, there would be little room to open up the rooftop for public enjoyment due to operational concerns;

KTO

(Post-meeting notes: The total floor area of the sewage pumping station is about 1,460 m².)

4.10 **Mr Andy LEUNG** opined that it would be more desirable to let Members have better understanding of the development of the adjoining areas before commenting on the design and use of the sewage pumping station. Since the sewage

pumping station was a relatively undesirable facility at the harbourfront, it would be more preferable if the above-ground structure of the facility could be minimised. He suggested KTO to consider adjusting the design of the pumping station with a view to freeing up more area for public enjoyment and blending in the facility with its adjacent open space, instead of merely fencing off the facility and making its rooftop green.

4.11 Noting the time constraint in discussing this item, **the Chair** advised that KTO should take into account Members' views when revising the design of the sewage pumping station.

KTO

4.12 Sharing other Members' views, **Mr TAM Po-yiu** queried the lack of a landscape master plan or urban design plan to synchronise the design of the sewage pumping station and its adjacent site which was intended to be developed as a Dining Cove in the existing Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). Without knowledge of the intended development of the adjacent sites, it would be difficult for the Task Force to advise the preferred design of the pumping station. He also reiterated that an overall programme of KTD was crucial to illustrate the interface between various smaller projects within KTD.

4.13 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** considered that the Task Force should have an overview of KTD again and look into the details of interfacing between projects. He suggested that the rooftop of the pumping station should be multi-purposed, and there should be provision in permitted loading to facilitate public enjoyment at the rooftop. He deemed that infrastructural facilities of considerable size located at the harbourfront, which did not allow public activities, could hardly be acceptable.

4.14 With reference to the DSD project in the Central and Western (C&W) district several years ago, **the Chair** said Members should recognise that the provision of some unwelcome facilities, was sometimes unavoidable due to operational reasons. The crux should, however, be the efforts in planning and design to integrate these facilities into the surrounding environment, instead of making them isolated. The general urban design principles for these infrastructural works, such as minimising the aboveground

footprint, opening up the facilities for public enjoyment, producing designs compatible with the neighbourhood etc. have long been established. He was aware that Members were more concerned about the compatibility of the developments from a more holistic angle rather than only the façade of an individual facility. **The Chair** asked KTO to review whether the existing design had been optimised with reference to the aforementioned urban design principles and report back to the Task Force in future meetings.

KTO

(Post-meeting notes: The sewage pumping station is located within a G/IC site reserved in the Kai Tak OZP. The sewage pumping station is an unmanned pumping station housing electrical and mechanical equipment only. The footprint of the sewage pumping station has been minimized in terms of aboveground building height and floor plan.)

4.15 **Mr Anthony LO** agreed that some infrastructural facilities were undesirable but indispensable. Noting Members' concern over the fencing-off effect and the suggestion to open up the rooftop for public enjoyment, he undertook to explore with the Drainage Services Department (DSD) how the design could be enhanced to address Members' comments. In addition, **Mr LO** reiterated that pending a more concrete development of the adjacent site of the sewage pumping station, the possible improvements by DSD and KTO could only be confined to making provision to allow more flexibility for future development.

4.16 **The Chair** emphasised that given the massive scope of KTD with over 300 hectares of land and a wide range of infrastructure projects, Members must recognise the need to look at the developments at varying degrees of details according to the circumstances. Thus he appreciated and recognised the importance of KTO, as a dedicated office, to play a critical role in planning, coordinating and implementing various projects in Kai Tak to ensure that Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines were safeguarded and vision towards a vibrant harbourfront was not compromised.

4.17 **Mr LAM Kin-lai** opined that the DSD project in C&W district had demonstrated a well-planned integration between a utility facilities and public open space.

4.18 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** suggested that the unwelcome infrastructural facilities could be beautified, say with designated exhibition areas, to reflect their history and importance to enhance public's awareness. He added that a minimalistic design could be adopted to the sewage pumping station to allow easier integration with its adjoining developments in future.

4.19 Regarding paragraph 3.6 of the confirmed minutes of the last meeting, **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired about the maximum floor area and volume allowable underneath the proposed Central Kowloon Route (CKR) structures based on the proposed technical configurations. **The Chair** advised that it would be provided after the meeting.

HyD

(Post-meeting notes: The maximum floor area underneath CKR mainline at the west bank of Kai Tak River is 1812 m².)

4.20 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** raised the following enquiries and comments regarding KTD:

- (i) an integrated plan showing the pedestrian and cycling routes irrespective of land ownership/maintenance responsibility in KTD should be provided;
- (ii) as a follow-up to the visit to the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal (KTCT) in August, he opined that instead of asking for additional new sites in the vicinity to provide carparks, the KTCT operator should make use of the quay deck for carparking since the deck would not be in use during event days; and
- (iii) he suggested that the KTCT operator could provide a local boarding area for local ferry services as a marine access point to optimise use of the quay areas.

4.21 **The Chair** advised that **Mr ZIMMERMAN's** comments were noted and could be raised again for discussion under Agenda Item 5.

Progress Report on KTD

4.22 **The Chair** reported that CEDD's KTO had submitted a paper (Paper No. TFKT/11/2013) on the latest progress of KTD for Members' information. **Mr Anthony LO** introduced the paper and highlighted the key progress since the last meeting.

4.23 **The Chair** concluded that after listening to the progress report of individual KTD projects under Agenda Item 5, Members would be given a presentation on the overall planning of KTD from a wider perspective. Members would be invited to give views after the presentation.

Item 5 An Update on the Planning and Design of the Kai Tak Development (Paper No. TFKT/12/2013)

5.1 **The Chair** reported that KTO had provided an information paper (Paper No. TFKT/12/2013) to brief Members on the latest progress of the KTD. He invited **Mr Anthony LO**, Acting Head of KTO, to give a presentation. **Mr LO** made the presentation with the aid of a PowerPoint.

5.2 Before discussion, **the Chair** welcomed **Mr Stephen WONG** of HyD and **Mr Kelvin WU** of MTRCL to the meeting to brief Members on the above-ground structures under the Shatin to Central Link ("SCL"). **Mr WU** made the presentation with the aid of a PowerPoint.

5.3 **Mr LAM Kin-lai** asked about the progress of development of schools in KTD.

5.4 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** made the following enquiries and comments:

- (i) why CEDD, instead of the planners, took the lead in planning KTD projects to cater for the citizens' activities and movements in the area under the existing institutional arrangement;

- (ii) a plan showing the pedestrian and cycling routes irrespective of land ownership/maintenance responsibility, the marine uses of waterbody around KTD as well as the locations of future vibrant areas / nodes along Kai Tak waterfront was not covered or shown in the presentation;
- (iii) how the promenade adjacent to the Centre for Excellence in Paediatrics (CEP) was proceeded to address Members' comments made in the Task Force in early 2012 regarding the interactive features between the CEP and its waterfront.

5.5 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** opined that to provide a more comprehensive picture for TFKT's reference, KTO should also provide information on projects which had been deferred, for example the Metro Park, the Multi-Purpose Sports Complex and the hospital development. He expressed that vacant sites identified should be made known to the Task Force for early discussion.

5.6 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** suggested that there should be graphs showing the timeline and progress of works at different stages. Also, he concurred with **Mr LEUNG** that TFKT should be briefed on the development programme of the residential and hotel sites along the Runway Precinct, such that TFKT might consider any alternative short-term uses of these vacant sites.

5.7 **The Chair** remarked that it would be impracticable to cover all details of KTD from both the macro and micro perspectives in three-hour Task Force meeting in every two months. Hence, the Task Force counted heavily on KTO's overall coordination. **The Chair** also explained that KTO under CEDD was a multi-disciplinary office composed of planners, urban designers, engineers and other expertise.

5.8 **Mr Anthony LO** responded that:

- (i) two sites were designated for primary schools at shown in Annex A of the paper. These primary

schools would be put up for tender and completed in next few years. They would be taken up by school operators relocated from neighbouring districts;

(ii) TPB agreed in the explanatory statement that subject to resolving further technical and operation issues in particular the water quality issues, there would be an opportunity to accommodate water-sports / recreational uses in Kai Tak in the longer run;

(iii) CEDD had line up LCSD and Architectural Services Department (“ArchSD”) to explain to Members the land use plan around the south apron area before the consultation on the CEP was conducted at the 8th TFKT meeting. Members preferred having a direct pedestrian access from the hospital to the harbourfront. According to CEDD’s understanding, it was LCSD and ArchSD’s plan to synchronise the development programme of CEP and the promenade with a view to opening them around the same time and they would ensure that the promenade design could blend well with the CEP as far as possible. The relevant departments would report back to the Task Force in future meeting when the preliminary design of the promenade became available;

**LCSD /
ArchSD**

(iv) three sites at the north apron area were reserved for the development of hospitals as shown on the master plan of the Kai Tak OZP. The Hospital Authority, the Food and Health Bureau and the relevant departments would kick start the planning and design process of the hospitals as and when appropriate; and

(v) KTO would further discuss with the Secretariat with a view to improving the presentation of the progress for Members’ easy understanding.

**KTO / the
Secretariat**

5.9 **The Chair** reckoned that Members had concern over the development of the massive Kai Tak area, and recognised that

the Task Force had devoted much time and effort in overseeing the development programme and keep monitoring the progress.

5.10 In response to **Mr ZIMMERMAN**'s enquiry, **Mr Anthony LO** replied that KTO would prepare a separate paper on cycling in KTD and consult the Task Force in due course. **KTO**

(Post-meeting notes: KTO will consult TFKT on the extension of cycle track network at KTD at the upcoming meeting in 14 January 2014.)

5.11 **The Chair** said that the development of KTD had evolved from the early planning and design stage to the construction phase, with a growing number of sites being developed. He was of the view that the role of KTO would become increasingly important with more intensive inter-department coordination. Task Force Members also played an important role in ensuring the initial urban design concepts and objectives remained consistent throughout the whole development. Given that Members' major concern was on accessibility and vibrancy along the waterfront in KTD, **the Chair** suggested that KTO should give a more focused presentation in future meetings to demonstrate the interfacing between the ground areas along the harbourfront, the adjoining development and surrounding waterbody. If needed, **the Chair** would welcome discussion with KTO to consider how the presentation could be made such that Members could focus their attention and efforts on enhancing the public space near the waterfront. **KTO**

(Post-meeting notes: KTO will arrange a presentation for Members with the aid of an updated physical model to introduce the overall planning and the accessibility provision of KTD, which are in accordance with Kai Tak OZP, in the second quarter of 2014.)

5.12 **Mr Andy LEUNG** opined that the Task Force should spare its key effort in considering the interface, particularly the public open space, between the major developments. Task Force's views should be sought as early as possible, preferably before the detailed design of individual projects had come in place. In addition, he suggested KTO to present the whole plan of KTD as several precincts such that Member could look at the larger area and have regard to the nearby urban fabric rather than micromanaging

the detailed design of each individual project.

5.13 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** echoed **Mr Andy LEUNG's** views, and said that emphasis should be placed on the entire public realm of Kai Tak, especially for locations surrounding the waterfront with a view to activating suitable activity nodes, with due regard to the possible water activities in Kai Tak. He added that the development programme of KTD as well as the temporary land use and land allocation plans could facilitate discussion of the Task Force.

5.14 **Mr Ivan HO** concurred with **Mr Andy LEUNG** and said that the delivery of the projects could have impact on the connectivity and accessibility of public open space in KTD. Thus the Task Force should also oversee the delivery of the projects to ensure they are completed in a timely and orderly manner.

5.15 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** suggested that KTO might use alternative presentation tools to present more clearly the work progress at different stages. Members could then review the progress and development according to the Harbour Planning Principles.

5.16 Noting **Mr TAM's** comments, **the Chair** asked KTO to take into account Members' comments in preparing the next progress update.

KTO

(Post-meeting notes: KTO will include location plans of key projects in the progress report.)

5.17 **The Chair** thanked **Mr Anthony LO, Mr Stephen WONG** and **Mr Kelvin WU** for the presentations.

**Item 6 Trunk Road T2 - Preliminary Design
(Paper No. TFKT/13/2013)**

6.1 **The Chair** welcomed **Mr Janson WONG** and **Ms Joyce LAU** of CEDD, **Mr James PENNY** of Hyder-Meinhardt Joint Venture, **Mr James W PIERCE** of the Oval Partnership Limited and

Mr Edmund KWOK of MVA Hong Kong Limited to the meeting; and invite Members to declare interests. **Mr Janson WONG** and the consultants jointly presented the preliminary design of Trunk Road T2 with an aid of PowerPoint.

6.2 In response to **the Chair's** enquiry, **Mr Janson WONG** advised that the temporary works areas would be required, tentatively starting from late 2015 for about 5 years subject to funding approval and gazettal procedures.

6.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** questioned if it was possible to reduce the permanent footprint of the Trunk Road and the ancillary facilities such as ventilation shaft. Also, noting that a large portion of the south apron area has been occupied by the planned road works, including the Trunk Road T2 and the CKR, he was doubtful of the adequacy of the proposed footbridges to connect people to the harbourfront. He opined that the project team should provide more details to analyse different ways of pedestrian connectivity.

CEDD

6.4 **Mr Andy LEUNG** was aware that the extensive road network in the south apron area near Kowloon Bay had divided up the "Government/Institution or Community" (G/IC) sites into patches. He also made the following comments:

- (i) whether the project team could provide more information on the design of the exposed section of Trunk Road T2;
- (ii) if there was any coordination between project teams of the Trunk Road T2 and CKR regarding the design of connections of the two projects;
- (iii) if the project team could provide more details of greening areas on top of the ventilation buildings and its neighbouring amenity areas as hatched green in the plan;
- (iv) whether the green areas shown in the presentation would be accessible by the public; and
- (v) the interface between Trunk Road T2 and CEP upon the commencement of CEP in 2018.

6.5 **Mr Ivan HO** expressed the following views on the preliminary design of Trunk Road T2:

- (i) while the design of the west ventilation building was sensible, the project team should consider public accessibility to the ventilation building and its surrounding areas at the detailed design stage, preferably an integrated design to transform the ventilation building into public open space;
- (ii) the project team should pay more effort in producing street furniture and street elements with a view to creating a vibrant and unique district brand in Kai Tak;
- (iii) public enjoyment at the harbourfront should be facilitated when the works areas were in use; and
- (iv) the carriageways of CKR and Trunk Road T2 had taken up around one-third of the south apron area. The project team should explore the feasibility of releasing more at-grade road spaces for public use by sinking the roads.

6.6 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** raised concern over the fragmented sites at Kai Fuk Road near the existing petrol station. He considered that the G/IC sites adjacent to Trunk Road T2 would have strong commercial potential and the land use should be reviewed.

6.7 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** echoed the views of **Mr Andy LEUNG** and **Mr HO**, adding that the project team could provide a plan showing the vertical profile at the connection of CKR and Trunk Road T2 and explain how the road space could be released. In addition, he held that CKR and Trunk Road T2 should be treated as single road system in Kai Tak from the planning perspective.

**HyD/
CEDD**

6.8 **The Chair** said that for every proposed infrastructure project, Members were concerned about how to minimize the footprint to release more land for public enjoyment and optimise land uses at the waterfront, as well as how the harbourfront could be better connected to the hinterland, in particular facilitating at-grade accessibility. On the understanding that the Trunk Road T2

project was at the preliminary design phase and the project team would consult TFKT again on its detailed design, **the Chair** invited the project team to give preliminary responses to Members' comments at the meeting, and take on board Members' suggestions when carrying out the detailed design.

6.9 **Mr Janson WONG** responded to Members' comments / enquires as follows:

- (i) the project team had considered all relevant factors when designing Trunk Road T2. He stated that the road space shown on the existing OZP was not only included Trunk Road T2, but also included some other necessary local roads serving the neighbouring developments and linking up the CKR with the south apron area. Furthermore, the Jordon Valley Box Culvert had imposed a significant site constraint to the vertical alignment of the Trunk Road T2. Thus from the traffic engineering point of view, Trunk Road T2 had adopted an optimal design;
- (ii) as regards the footprint of the western ventilation building, he advised that a semi-sunken layout had been adopted in the existing design taking into account the operational and maintenance requirements including the height and location of ventilation exhaust point and the associated essential mechanical rooms; and
- (iii) for the western ventilation building, the project team had proposed to provide vertical greening and landscaping such that the facility could blend in with the nearby areas.

6.10 While understanding that the project team might not be able to address all concerns at this meeting, **the Chair** commented that the presentation should demonstrate the pedestrian connectivity between Kowloon Bay and the waterfront upon completion of the project and opined that it would be most undesirable for an overall and holistic development of KTD and to ensure that the vision of the

Task Force would not be violated if the CKR and Trunk Road T2 could be treated in a coordinated manner.

6.11 With respect to **the Chair's** concern, **Mr Anthony LO** said that KTO had been playing a major role in coordinating various projects in KTD and tackling the interfacing issues. He supplemented that Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO) was conducting a consultancy study on enhancing the at-grade pedestrian connectivity around Kowloon Bay. KTO worked closely with EKEO on the following enhancement works:

- (i) for the proposed footbridge near the International Trade and Exhibition Centre to be constructed under the CKR project, KTO had been in liaison with EKEO and HyD to enhance pedestrian walking environment and explore possibility of reducing the number of flyovers with a design to connect people directly and naturally from the Kowloon Bay MTR station to the waterfront; and
- (ii) KTO and EKEO were exploring to develop a more direct connection from Kowloon Bay to waterfront at Wang Chiu Street (close to the Billion Centre); as well as a convenient link near the Kai Tak taxiway bridge that enable connectivity to the Kai Tak waterfront through green space along the route.

6.12 To facilitate discussion, **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested the project team to present the design with relevant drawings as well as a three-dimensional model. Separately, he asked why the ventilation building and the refuse collection point were placed at such prominent locations.

CEDD

6.13 **Mr Janson WONG** replied that the concerned refuse collection point was to serve the south apron area as shown in the current OZP which is outside the scope of Trunk Rod T2 project and the project team would liaise with the departments concerned.

CEDD

(Post-meeting notes: Members' concern on the location of the proposed

refuse collection point has been relayed to the departments concerned for consideration.)

6.14 In response to **the Chair's** enquiry, **Mr Janson Wong** confirmed that the project manager of Trunk Road T2 project had been in coordination with KTO and EKEO.

6.15 **The Chair** reminded Members that it was impracticable for the Task Force to micro-manage the details of all projects in KTD in the meeting. The objective of TFKT was to put in place an effective mechanism to oversee the development and allow Members to provide suggestions to the projects. The Task Force must count on KTO and EKEO to effectively implement.

6.16 **Ms Joyce LAU** advised that the green area around the western ventilation building was amenity open space, and EKEO would examine comprehensively how these green areas could be better connected to the surrounding open space. If possible, the project team would incorporate EKEO's design into the detailed design of Trunk Road T2 project. Even if the programme did not fit, temporary greening would be carried out under the Trunk Road T2 project to enable the site to be opened for public use at the earliest.

6.17 **The Chair** said that Members could express views and comments on the preliminary plan as presented at the meeting. The project team would report back to the Task Force with revised drawings in future.

6.18 **Mr Andy LEUNG** appreciated that KTO and the project team were fully aware of the impacts of road networks on the neighbouring areas. He considered that the existing depot site, the area underneath the Kwun Tong Bypass together with the Mega Box would form an important activity node with good potential. He suggested that the discussion on detailed design should be conducted in some working sessions rather than at Task Force meetings. The project team of Trunk Road T2 and KTO could organise working sessions to engage Members who were interested in the matter to provide constructive suggestions in a more casual setting.

**KTO/
CEDD**

(Post-meeting notes: A working session on the Trunk Road T2 project will be arranged in the first or second quarter of 2014 to address Members' concerns and enquiries.)

6.19 **The Chair** concluded that the Task Force could not be too ambitious to cover all KTD projects within a two-hour meeting, and it would have to rely on the dedicated offices as gatekeepers. Subject to Members' views, he suggested that the Task Force could consider organizing design workshops with KTO for the discussion of critical issues.

6.20 **The Chair** thanked the project team for the presentation, and asked them to take into account Members' views, in particular interface issues, to enhance the proposed preliminary design as appropriate and consult the Task Force again in future.

CEDD

**Item 7 An Iconic Vertical Entertainment Observation Tower –
As a tourism beacon on Hong Kong harbourfront
(Paper No. TFKT/14/2013)**

7.1 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** queried why the Iconic Tower proposal was being discussed separately from other proposals under the Kai Tak Fantasy International Ideas Competition (the KTF Competition).

7.2 By way of background, **the Chair** briefed Members that the proposed site for the Iconic Tower was at the tip of Kai Tak Runway Park Phase I, and the Government would kick start the KTF Competition covering the concerned location. While noting **Mr ZIMMERMAN's** concern, he considered that the Task Force would not refrain from listening to any proposals from the civic society related to waterfront in KTD.

7.3 On the understanding that the HC should be open to these proposals, **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** considered that Members should be notified about the proposals received by the Secretariat and be given the choice to determine whether or not to listen to the

proposals in the future.

7.4 **The Chair** shared **Mr ZIMMERMAN**'s concern, and said that before being elected as Chair of TFKT, he had approached the Secretariat and enquired if there would be conflict of interest for this Agenda Item. Nonetheless, he held that the Task Force should welcome proposals from the community, and Members should be rational, professional and experienced to make sound judgement.

7.5 **Mrs Winnie KANG** advised that there were similar conceptual proposals from different groups discussed at other Task Force meetings previously. The HC Chair and Chairs of the Task Forces had then deliberated the approach in handling such conceptual proposals. It was concluded that HC or its predecessor, the former Harbourfront Enhancement Committee (HEC), would not stop any civic representatives or organisations submitting their conceptual ideas or proposals to HC or HEC, and it was then suggested that Members might indicate whether they "like" the conceptual ideas put forth or not, but HC or its Task Forces would not express support or objection to the proposal.

7.6 **Mr LAM Kin-lai** opined that the presentation should be regarded as purely informational, and Members should not offer comments, even "like" or "dislike" to such idea.

7.7 **The Chair** said that while the Task Force Chair could not impose constraints on Members' freedom of speech, but he had the responsibility to manage the discussion, including giving background information and making conclusion of the meeting. He thus suggested that subject to Members' agreement, the discussion on this Agenda Item could be conducted in a closed-door setting.

7.8 **Mr LAM Kin-lai** suggested that the proponent should be excused after the presentation, and Members could then have a close-door discussion on the matter. **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** echoed his views.

7.9 **Mr Ivan HO** declared that he was the professional advisor of the KTF Competition. He was concerned that the Iconic

Tower proposal would, to an extent, jeopardised the Competition, and he supported **Mr LAM**'s suggestion.

7.10 Noting **Mr HO**'s concern, **the Chair** responded that only the final conclusion would be recorded in the meeting minutes. He opined that Members, with the years of experience and expertise in handling various proposals since the establishment of HEC in 2004, should not be over-worried.

7.11 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** agreed that the Task Force had been always open to suggestions and proposals. She believed that Members would be happy to listen to the proposal, nonetheless, not to discuss in public.

7.12 **The Chair** concluded that the Task Force would adopt a listening mode to the presentation and Members would not indicate preference to the proposal at the end of the meeting. It was agreed that the proponent would be excused after the presentation, and Members would then have a close-door discussion and only the final conclusion would be recorded.

7.13 **The Chair** welcomed **Ms Karen LOH** of Amstar Theme Attraction to give a presentation. **Ms LOH** presented the proposal with an aid of PowerPoint.

7.14 **The Chair** thanked **Ms Karen LOH** for the presentation and the proposal was noted.

Item 8 Any Other Business

8.1 There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 5:30pm.

Secretariat

**Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development
December 2013**