

Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development

Minutes of Fourteenth Meeting

Date : 14 January 2014
Time : 2:30 p.m.
Venue : Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices,
333 Java Road, North Point

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
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 Peter WONG Yiu-sun Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour

Individual Members

Mr Sam FARRANDS Co-opted Member
Ms Connie LAM Co-opted Member
Ms Lily CHOW Individual Member

Official Members

Mr Thomas CHAN Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands) 1, Development
Bureau (DEVB)
Mr CHAN Chi-ming Deputy 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)
Mr Tom YIP District Planning Officer/Kowloon, Planning Department

Miss Venus TSOI (PlanD)
Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Paul YK CHAN Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Dr Paul HO Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Louis LOONG Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Raj Sital MOTWANI Individual Member

In attendance

Mrs Winnie KANG Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Larry CHU Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 1, DEVB
Mr Stephen CHAN Senior Town Planner/Kowloon 3, PlanD

For Item 2

Ms Angela CHAN District Lands Officer/Kowloon East, Lands Department (LandsD)
Mr Patrick FAN Senior Estate Surveyor/South East Kowloon, LandsD
Miss Carrie CHAN Project Surveyor, LandsD
Mr CHEUNG Mun-kit Senior Engineer/ Strategic Roads 5, TD

For Item 3

Mr Jonathan MCKINLEY Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs(2), Home Affairs Bureau (HAB)
Ms Linda LAW Assistant Secretary (Recreation & Sport) Special Duties, HAB
Mr L.F. WONG Lop-fai Chief Project Manager 303, Architectural Services Department (ArchSD)
Mr Raymond LAU Senior Project Manager 332, ArchSD
Ms Susanna LEE Project Manager 368, ArchSD
Ms Vicky LAM Project Manager 376, ArchSD

For Item 4

Mrs Sorais LEE Head/Kai Tak Office, CEDD
Ms YING Fun-fong Chief Engineer/Kowloon 3, CEDD
Ms Julie O Senior Engineer/7, CEDD
Mr Igo HO Technical Director, AECOM

For Item 5

Mr Anthony LO	Chief Engineers/Kowloon 1, CEDD
Mr John LEUNG	Senior Engineer/4, CEDD
Mr Sion EDWARDS	Director, AECOM
Mr Igo HO	Technical Director, AECOM
Ms Gwendoline BESTAR	Senior Landscape Designer, AECOM

For Item 6

Ms YING Fun-fong	Chief Engineer/Kowloon 3, CEDD
Mr CHOW Wing-kwong	Senior Engineer/9, CEDD
Mr Reeds LO	Engineer/13, CEDD

The Chair welcomed two co-opted Members, Mr Sam FARRANDS and Ms Connie LAM for joining the Task Force again to provide advice from legal as well as arts and cultural perspectives.

He also introduced Mr CHAN Chi-ming, Deputy Secretary for Development (Works) 2 of DEVB who took over the post from Mr Enoch LAM, and Mr Tom YIP, District Planning Officer/Kowloon of PlanD, who took over the post from Miss Fiona LUNG. He also thanked Mr LAM and Miss LUNG for their contribution to the Task Force. The Chair advised Members that Mr Thomas WK CHAN, Senior Manager of TC, attended the meeting on behalf of Mr Eddie LEE.

Item 1 Confirmation of the Minutes of the last Meeting

1.1 The draft minutes of the 13th TFKT meeting were circulated to Members for comments on 30 December 2013. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated again on 10 January 2014. The draft minutes were confirmed at the meeting without further amendments.

Item 2 Matters Arising

Underground carpark beneath the public transport interchange ("PTI") in Ma Tau Kok (paragraph 4.3 and 4.4 of the confirmed minutes of the 13th meeting)

2.1 The Chair advised Members that TD would report to the Task Force the cost of constructing and operating an underground carpark beneath the PTI in Ma Tau Kok once available.

Re-opening and refurbishment works of To Kwa Wan Public Landing (paragraph 4.5 of the confirmed minutes of the 13th meeting)

2.2 The Chair informed Members that Harbour Unit would continue liaising with relevant departments on the matter and update

the Task Force in due course.

Temporary Government Land Allocation ("TGLA") application for the construction of a new sewage pumping station at To Kwa Wan Road (paragraph 4.9, 4.11 and 4.14 of the confirmed minutes of the 13th meeting)

2.3 **The Chair** said that Kai Tak Office (KTO) had responded to Members' enquiries on the total floor area and the optimisation of footprint of the sewage pumping station in the form of post-meeting notes in the minutes.

2.4 **The Chair** invited **Mrs Sorais LEE** to update Members on the progress of the project. **Mrs LEE** said that KTO was liaising with relevant departments to explore the feasibility of opening up the rooftop of the sewage pumping station for public use and enhance its connectivity with the surrounding development. She informed Members that a workshop would be organised in the first quarter of 2014 to further address Members concerns.

KTO

(Post-meeting notes: A workshop on the revised design of the sewage pumping station was organized on 20 February 2014. Members had no objection to the revised design of the sewage pumping station.)

Floor area under Central Kowloon Route (CKR) (paragraph 4.19 of the confirmed minutes of the 13th meeting)

2.5 **The Chair** reported that the Highways Department (HyD) had responded to **Mr ZIMMERMAN**'s enquiry on the maximum floor area underneath CKR in the form of post-meeting notes in the minutes.

Planning and Design of the Kai Tak Development (KTD) (paragraph 5.10, 5.11 and 5.16 of the confirmed minutes of the 13th meeting)

2.6 **The Chair** said that KTO would give a presentation on cycle track in Kai Tak Development under Agenda Item 6, and KTO would arrange a presentation with the aid of a physical model to facilitate Members' discussion on the interfacing issue between various developments in KTD at the next Task Force meeting.

KTO

(Post-meeting notes: For members' better understand of the overall planning

of KTD, KTO would give a briefing in the third quarter of 2014 subject to completion of the new KTD physical model.)

2.7 **The Chair** briefed Members that having regard to Members' earlier comments, KTO had revised the format of the progress report to incorporate plans showing the scope and progress of key projects.

Trunk Road T2 – Preliminary Design (paragraph 6.18 of the confirmed minutes of the 13th meeting)

2.8 **The Chair** said that CEDD would take into account Members' views and comments when considering the preliminary design of the project, and a workshop would be arranged to address Members' concern in the first or second quarter of 2014.

CEDD

(Post-meeting notes: At the working session held on 16 June 2014, CEDD explained that the footprint of the western ventilation building of the proposed Trunk Road T2 had been optimised and the area for the ventilation building would not be suitable for open to public access. CEDD would follow up with relevant parties to finalise the pedestrian connections at South Apron and implementation of the pedestrian connections would tie in with the developments in the vicinity. Members had no further comment.)

2.9 **Mr PY TAM** requested that his comments in relation to the fragmented land pieces at the promenade near Kai Fuk Road (paragraph 6.6 of the confirmed minutes of the 13th meeting) should be conveyed to PlanD to respond.

PlanD

(Post-meeting notes: According to the Policy Address of 2014, in order to tie in with the transformation of Kowloon East, the Government has reviewed the planning for the Kai Tak Development and is now carrying out technical studies. The "G/IC" sites at Kai Fuk Road near the existing petrol filling stations have formed part of the sites under the subject review. If any change in the zoning for the area is proposed under the review, appropriate amendments to the OZP will be published for public consultation in accordance with the Town Planning Ordinance.)

Progress Report of KTD (Paper No. TFKT/01/2014)

2.10 **Mrs Sorais LEE** introduced the paper and highlighted the key progress since the last meeting for Members' information.

2.11 In response to **the Chair's** request, **Mrs Sorais LEE** said that presentation materials would be available at the Harbourfront Commission's website shortly after the meeting.

2.12 **Mr PY Tam** had raised the following issues / enquiries:

- (i) Noting that the Trade and Industry Tower (TI Tower) would be completed in April 2015 but the District Cooling System (DCS) would only be in operation in mid-2017, whether the TI Tower would be served with chilled water supply between 2015 to 2017; and
- (ii) Regarding the diversion of the submarine gas mains, he would like to know the design of the gas pigging stations at both sides of the harbour, and if there would be any structures erected at the harbourfront areas in relation to the diversion.

2.13 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** gave the following comments:

- (i) he suggested that the issues being raised under the Matters Arising to be incorporated into the KTD progress report;
- (ii) apart from the floor area, he asked for the volume underneath the highways of CKR at the estuary area of Kai Tak Approach Channel; and
- (iii) he opined that it would be preferable if KTO could use a three-dimensional (3D) model to illustrate the overall planning of KTD in the presentation scheduled in the second quarter of 2014.

HyD

KTO

(Post-meeting notes: Regarding Mr Zimmerman's enquiry on (ii), the Secretariat had provided information in consultation with the relevant departments on 21 March 2014. For members' better understand of the overall planning of KTD, KTO would give a briefing in the third quarter of 2014 subject to completion of the new KTD physical model.)

2.14 **The Chair** opined that the revised format of the progress report could facilitate Members' understanding on the overall progress and the interfaces between various projects in KTD. He suggested that for projects consulting the Task Force in future, their scope should be illustrated on the Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). He also agreed with **Mr ZIMMERMAN** that the issues raised under matters arising could be better integrated in the progress report.

2.15 **Mrs Sorais LEE** made the following responses to Members' comments:

- (i) the entire DCS would be completed in 2017, but the project would be completed in phases such that it could tie in with the commencement of TI Tower; and
- (ii) KTO would incorporate issues raised under matters arising into the progress report for Members' information.

KTO

2.16 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested that it would be more efficient to include other infrastructure items at the sewage pumping station workshop for discussion.

2.17 In response to **Mr Ivan HO's** enquiry, **Mrs Sorais LEE** replied that the design of the diversion of submarine gas mains and the gas pigging stations had been finalized and KTO would provide Members with supplementary information after the meeting.

KTO

(Post-meeting notes: According to the past record, the Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited consulted Harbourfront Enhancement Committee's Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review on the proposed relocation of the gas pigging station at To Kwa Wan in May 2008. The discussion paper and the extract of the minutes were circulated to Members for information on 18 July 2014.)

2.18 **Mr KY LEUNG** concurred that more information on the diversion of submarine gas mains was required as Members might need to examine if the design of the gas pigging stations had any

undesirable impact on the harbourfront areas.

Proposed Short Term Tenancy (“STT”) for Public Fee-paying Carparks at North Apron in Kai Tak Development

2.19 **The Chair** reminded Members that LandsD had consulted Members on the proposal by way of circulation in November 2013. Taking into account Members’ comments, LandsD had prepared a paper (Paper No. TFKT/02/2014) to seek Members’ views on the revised STT carpark proposal. **The Chair** welcomed **Ms Angela CHAN**, **Mr Patrick FAN** and **Miss Carrie CHAN** of LandsD, and **Mr CHEUNG Mun-kit** of TD to the meeting. **Ms Angela CHAN** presented the proposal with the aid of a PowerPoint.

2.20 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** did not support the STT proposal and considered that KTO and relevant departments should explore other short-term development opportunities to better utilise the vacant land, quoting the successful case of turning the STT carpark at Tamar into the popular Winter Carnival few years ago. He also opined that the paper did not present a strategic long-term plan of carpark facilities in KTD to support the parking demand in KTD and its adjoining areas.

2.21 In view of the significant drop in the number of STT carparks available when the permanent development in KTD proceeded, **Mr PY TAM** concurred with **Mr ZIMMERMAN** that there should be a long-term solution to cater for the demand for carparking facilities. While having no objection to the proposed STT carparks as they were in the proximity to the urban area of Kowloon City, **Mr TAM** reminded the relevant departments to resolve the possible traffic congestion in the district.

2.22 **Mr Ivan HO** opined that from the urban design perspective, the provision of STT carparks should not be justified on the grounds of “good accessibility and pedestrian connectivity with the neighboring built-up area”. He stressed that the expectation for and provision of more STT carparks should be discouraged in KTD as these sites would have better alternative uses to cater the community needs than temporary carparks.

2.23 **Mr KY LEUNG** had the following comments:

- (i) as the existing STT carparks would be resumed for development, the proposed STT carparks would be a reluctant but acceptable temporary measure to resolve the illegal street-parking problem in the neighbouring districts;
- (ii) LandsD should review and formulate medium- or long-term land use plans to address the shortage in carparking space around KTD. It was necessary to justify the need for temporary parking space with robust evidence; and
- (iii) while noting that KTTF was an advisory body on harbourfront rather than carparking issues, similar discussions would be raised repeatedly if there was no long-term strategic plan for carparking facilities in KTD.

2.24 As KTD was a huge area with many sites at a distance from the harbourfront, **the Chair** advised that KTTF should focus its discussion on the long-term harbourfront planning. He said that Members' concerns and views were consistent with the Harbour Planning Principles (HPPs) and Harbour Planning Guidelines which stipulated that any available temporary sites at the harbourfront should be used for public enjoyment but not carparks and billboards. However, since the proposed sites were far away from the waterfront, **the Chair** suggested that Members might re-consider the proposal having regard to the circumstances.

2.25 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** opined that Members should not agree to the proposed STT carparks unless there was a medium- and long-term strategic plan to address the carparking problem around KTD and its neighbouring districts.

2.26 **Mrs Winnie KANG** said that Members' views and concerns about temporary land uses, in particular STT carparks were duly noted. Accordingly, Harbour Unit had been in liaison with the relevant departments that any temporary carpark proposals at South Apron and Runway area, which were closer to the waterfront, would not be supported. On the other hand, as the sites in question were distant from the waterfront and surrounded by works areas, there

was little potential for alternative community uses at these sites. Thus it was deemed reasonable for the concerned sites to serve as STT carparks with a tenancy period of one year to meet the acute and increasing demand for carparking space in KTD.

2.27 **The Chair** concurred with **Mrs KANG** that Members should strike a balance between upholding HPPs and fulfilling community's needs, and urged Members to take into account the location of the sites, tenancy period and long-term impact on the harbourfront when considering the proposal.

2.28 **Mr Andy LEUNG** agreed that the proposed STT carparks was an acceptable measure to maximize temporary uses of the sites. Nevertheless, he opined that TD needed to review and assess the district demand for carparking space. He was worried that the temporary carparks with lower fees would attract lorries and shuttle buses from other districts which would aggravate the carparking problem around Kai Tak.

2.29 **The Chair** summarized that Members had divergent views on the STT carpark proposal, and were most concerned about the district demand for carparking facilities and how it would affect the urban planning of Kai Tak. He also shared Members' views that a long-term planning for carparking facilities was required, and noted that the demand for carparks might eventually intrude into other waterfront areas.

2.30 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** noted that Members clearly object to the proposal, and the relevant departments should come up with a long-term plan for parking facilities for the different type of vehicles before consulting the Task Force again.

2.31 **Mr Thomas CHAN** noted that Members were more concerned about whether the long-term carparking need would creep into the long-term lease that encroached onto KTD. He opined that TD should respond to Task Force's concern in future Task Force meetings.

TD

(Post-meeting notes: TD will liaise with LandsD and PlanD on whether long-term land leases could incorporate provisions requiring developers to

provide car parking spaces within the developments for public use.)

2.32 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** noticed that the tenancy period was “up to February 2015 and renewed thereafter quarterly”. She proposed that the tenancy period should be limited to a fixed term of one year, and the applicant should consult the Task Force with a long-term plan when the tenancy period expired. **The Chair** agreed.

2.33 **Mrs Winnie KANG** advised TD to consult the Task Force with the strategy and long-term plan for carparking facilities in KTD in future meetings. She also enquired whether it would be agreeable by Members to allow LandsD to proceed with the proposed STT carparks for better utilization of vacant land and limit the tenancy period to one year without the renewal clause.

TD

(Post-meeting notes: TD is monitoring the parking situation in the vicinity of KTD and will implement measures to enable sufficient parking facilities are provided in KTD and in the vicinity.)

2.34 **Mrs Sorais LEE** advised that the concerned sites would be resumed for the implementation of the Stage 5 Infrastructure Works at North Apron area in 2015, and thus the tenancy period for the proposed carparks could only be one year at most.

2.35 **The Chair** concluded that LandsD could proceed with the proposed STT carparks for one year. He advised LandsD to take into account Members’ concerns on the long-term implications of the STT carparks. He added that as KTTF had been involved in the discussion on temporary land uses at harbourfront areas for years, it was understandable that the multi-professional Task Force requested for more solid justifications for temporary uses.

Item 3 Multi-purpose Sports Complex (MPSC) at Kai Tak (Paper No. TFKT/03/2014)

3.1 **The Chair** welcomed **Mr Jonathan MCKINLEY** and **Ms Linda LAW** of Home Affairs Bureau (HAB); **Mr LF WONG**, **Mr Raymond LAU**, **Ms Susanna LEE** and **Ms Vicky LAM** of Architectural Services Department (ArchSD).

3.2 **Mr Jonathan MCKINLEY** briefed Members on the vision for the MPSC, namely to create a lively and accessible sports park in Hong Kong with a wide range of sports facilities and amenities for regular community use, as well as venues for hosting high-level international sports and entertainment events. He said that HAB had been developing the proposal in consultation with the sports community and the District Councils to ensure the project would facilitate sports development in Hong Kong. **Mr Raymond LAU** then presented the planning of the sports complex with the aid of a PowerPoint.

3.3 **Mr PY TAM** said that Members might have difficulty in understanding the layout of MPSC and suggested that the project team should show the complex from different angles and perspectives, or illustrate with a 3D model. From an urban design perspective, he opined that the project team should pay attention to the interface between MPSC and the adjacent areas, and that the departments should coordinate well to avoid hard boundaries between the projects.

3.4 **Ms Connie LAM** commented that the design of MPSC should demonstrate the holistic relationship and linkage between MPSC and the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal (KTCT) which lied on two ends of the Runway. She added that many public projects failed to create a vibrant environment due to the lack of public furniture, and enquired whether the provision of public facilities and furniture would be covered in the MPSC project.

3.5 **Mr Ivan HO** considered that MPSC would become a focal point and had significant impact on the KTD as a whole. He doubted the need for a sports ground for an audience of 50,000 and worried that MPSC would eventually become a concert venue. In addition, he had reservation about the management of pedestrian flow and the capacity of the landscaped deck outside the main stadium to accommodate 50,000 visitors in times of mega events. He also opined that the waterfront areas should be made available for public enjoyment.

3.6 Since the Kai Tak OZP had been agreed by the

community for long, **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that Task Force should give full support to the project team to take forward the project as soon as possible, and he had no objection to the proposed increase in height restriction of MPSC. He remarked that MPSC was a fantastic opportunity and the transportation hub under the landscaped deck of the main stadium would allow people to get easy access to the waterfront in Kai Tak. He suggested that HAB should conduct a place-making exercise before finalizing the specifications of the design brief, such that the public could participate in the place-making of MPSC and in particular discuss the following issues:

- (i) activities and other facilities to be made available;
- (ii) connectivity between facilities and different zones in and around MPSC;
- (iii) pedestrian and cycling connectivity at every level; and
- (iv) interfacing with neighbouring areas.

3.7 **Ir Peter WONG** was concerned about the detailed design of MPSC and the visual impact on the harbourfront.

3.8 **Mr Andy LEUNG** said that as MPSC would occupy around 20 to 30 hectares at a strategic location in KTD, its design was imperative to the connectivity and continuity between the Runway and the North Apron. He suggested that HAB and relevant departments should formulate an integrated design for MPSC and its adjoining areas.

3.9 Concurring with **Mr LEUNG**, **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** opined that the interface between MPSC and its neighbouring areas should be permeable.

3.10 **Mr Jonathan MCKINLEY** noted Members' concerns and explained that whilst the presentation focused primarily on the infrastructure of the MPSC, HAB was fully aware that the success of MPSC depended greatly on its operation. He agreed with **Mr ZIMMERMAN** that the development of the MPSC was an opportunity to create a venue with an exciting atmosphere that would be attractive for local residents. Apart from providing the three major sports venues, HAB was well aware of the need for good connectivity and accessibility within MPSC and with other open

HAB

spaces in Kai Tak. **Mr MCKINLEY** said that HAB would consult the Task Force with more detailed specifications in due course.

(Post-meeting notes: Subject to LegCo's funding approval, HAB will consult the Task Force with more detailed specifications prior to the formal tendering of the MPSC "Design, Build and Operate" contract.)

3.11 **Mr Raymond LAU** made the following responses to Members' comments:

- (i) public furniture such as outdoor seatings would be incorporated into the design of MPSC to ensure that the public could enjoy free access to the landscaped deck for leisure and recreational purposes;
- (ii) sharing Members' concern on the pedestrian flow of MPSC, the project team had conducted a consultancy study to assess the crowd dispersal pattern for 50,000 spectators. The study indicated that the majority of the spectators could exit the landscaped deck near the main stadium within 20 minutes by using MTR as the major mode of transport; and
- (iii) ArchSD was also responsible for the design of open spaces surrounding MPSC, and the department would ensure the continuity and connectivity between MPSC and various open spaces in Kai Tak.

3.12 **Mr Ivan HO** opined that the project team should consult the Task Force on the project implementation and procurement method in future.

3.13 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** considered that the crowd control issue should be carefully handled to avoid massive empty spaces and over-engineering of the associated facilities.

3.14 **The Chair** concluded that the Task Force recognised MPSC as an important and iconic project in KTD, and its success or failure would substantially affect the vibrancy, sustainability and connectivity of the open spaces and waterfront in Kai Tak. **The Chair** also suggested that the project team could conduct a place-making exercise with reference to the Energizing Kowloon East

HAB

Office (EKEO)'s experience.

(Post-meeting notes: HAB will take account of the above suggestion when preparing the public engagement strategy for the delivery of the MPSC.)

**Item 4 Connecting Kowloon East – Environmentally Friendly Linkage System Stage 2 Public Consultation
(Paper No. TFKT/04/2014)**

4.1 **The Chair** welcomed **Mrs Sorais LEE**, **Ms YING Fung-fong** and **Ms Julie O** of KTO; **Mr Igo HO** of AECOM to the meeting. **Ms Julie O** presented the Paper with an aid of PowerPoint.

4.2 As the at-grade road space was insufficient, **Mr KY LEUNG** considered that EFLS would be necessary to address the traffic problem in Kai Tak by connecting the area with the MTR system in Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay. Nonetheless, since the proposed monorail system would cause visual and noise impacts on the surrounding environment, the project team should carefully consider it. He also raised concerns that a monorail system was likely financially unsustainable, by referring to the closure of the monorail in Sydney due to the high operating cost and low patronage.

4.3 Echoing **Mr LEUNG's** views, **Mr Sam FARRANDS** opined that no operator would be willing to operate the proposed system at a loss.

4.4 **Mr PY TAM** did not object to EFLS with a view to improving the connectivity of Kai Tak with its neighbouring districts, but had the following comments:

- (i) the project team should assess the visual impact of the proposed elevated system;
- (ii) EFLS should be able to facilitate the territorial connectivity of Kai Tak with West Kowloon and Central;
- (iii) the initiative to revitalise Kwun Tong should have taken into account EFLS and reserved space for its implementation; and

- (iv) with regard to the alignment and coverage of EFLS, he preferred the taxiway bridge option which could promote commercial opportunities at Kai Fuk Road.

4.5 **Mr Andy LEUNG** expressed the following views:

- (i) he opined that the success of EFLS could hinge on whether the interchanges / stations could make travel more convenient. He was particularly concerned that the interchange at Kwun Tong MTR station, if located at King Yip Street, might require a long walk that discouraged people from using EFLS;
- (ii) noting that the height of the proposed Kwun Tong Transportation Link (KTTL) was approximately 21m, he doubted if people were willing to walk onto the bridge. He also enquired whether a drawbridge could be an alternative to KTTL; and
- (iii) he anticipated that residents in the nearby districts might object to the project due to the noise problem brought about by EFLS.

4.6 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that the objective of the project was to create an environmentally friendly linkage transport system rather than a monorail. He considered that the monorail system lacked convenience in accessing the station, flexibility in location of stations and integration with other elevated footbridges. Moreover, he opined that the KTTL alignment with 21m height would severely restrict the existing and potential uses of the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter (KTTS). He also asked for information on the breakdown of the demand of trips for each section.

4.7 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** objected to the proposal and enquired why electric buses and trams, which were more flexible means of transport, were not considered as alternative options.

4.8 **Mr Ivan HO** considered that noise from the monorail was a critical issue to be addressed as it would run between the hotel and residential developments along the Runway and the rail station (including the platforms on both side, staircases and lifts) would take up a lot of space, and people would have to climb long stairways to

travel by EFLS. He was of the view that monorail should be used as a leisure transportation mode rather than mass transportation.

4.9 **Mr KL LAM** had reservation about the proposed EFLS, and doubted about whether EFLS could handle and divert the massive pedestrian traffic from KTCT within a short time when a cruise ship arrived. He also said that the elderly might be reluctant to use the elevated rail system, in particular, at 21m height along the KTTL, due to fear of height.

4.10 **Ms Connie LAM** said that she had ridden on monorail in different cities, and realised that monorail was not popular among the locals and failed to serve as a means of mass transportation due to its inconvenience. She also considered that an elevated EFLS might be an eyesore at the harbourfront in future.

4.11 **Ir Peter WONG** said that all underground construction conflicts could be resolved from the engineering perspective, but a change for an elevated railway system after 20-30 years of operation would be impossible and might involve tremendous social cost.

4.12 **Mrs Sorais LEE** responded to Members comments as follows:

- (i) the project team had received similar views and concerns during the Stage 2 public consultation exercise, and hence it was considered necessary to conduct a detailed feasibility study (DFS) to look into the design of the stations, estimate the construction and operating costs of EFLS and suggest measures to improve financial efficacy of the project. Members' concerns, such as the alignment network and the height of the KTTL would also be further reviewed in the DFS. However, it should be noted that there was no precedent case of using drawbridge in a monorail system;
- (ii) with respect to the noise issue, the project team had consulted some monorail suppliers and understood that noise level of the monorail was usually not a concern. Having said that, the environmental implications including noise and visual impacts would be further

- assessed in the DFS;
- (iii) the success of a monorail system was determined by various factors such as service coverage, connection with other public transport systems, patronage, fare level, etc. It is not appropriate to reject the proposed EFLS only because of the closure of Sydney monorail ;
 - (iv) Kai Tak, formerly being an airport area, was surrounded by major roads and had restricted access points. Only at-grade road transport could hardly fulfil the connectivity requirements for KTD as a part of CBD in future, thus the need for an elevated EFLS was justified. The project team recognised that a well-designed interchange with other public transport systems would be a significant factor for the success of EFLS;
 - (v) the project team did place emphasis on the development of an integrated multi-modal linkage system to serve different transport needs of Kowloon East. Besides monorail, this integrated system also featured improved pedestrian facilities, green road-based transport such as electric buses and the MTR;
 - (vi) the DFS would explore the possibility of integrating the EFLS station with the nearby developments, such as the hotel and residential developments at Runway Precinct; and
 - (vii) as both Kowloon Bay and Kwun Tong MTR stations were elevated, the project team considered that an elevated EFLS could provide same level connections between the EFLS and MTR stations to enable a convenient transfer to the MTR system.

4.13 **The Chair** clarified with **Mrs LEE** that the presentation intended to seek Members' agreement on the DFS rather than proceeding to the construction of EFLS. Noting that EFLS was scheduled for completion in 2023, he asked how the traffic need and connectivity demand in Kai Tak would be addressed alongside with the on-going projects in KTD before EFLS came into place.

4.14 **Mr Ivan HO** opined that the DFS should also conduct a parallel study on other road-based transport options, for instance electric buses, elevated pedestrian walkways and mechanical

pedestrian movement systems, so as to provide fall-back options if the monorail proposal was eventually not preferred after the DFS.

4.15 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** pointed out the there was no integration between the proposed monorail and the landscaped deck of Road D3 which would be discussed under Agenda Item 5. Hence, he considered it unconvincing that either EFLS or the landscaped deck could create a new level of pedestrian connectivity.

4.16 **Mrs Sorais LEE** said that the DFS would explore the possible pedestrian linkage between the elevated EFLS station and the nearby landscaped deck.

4.17 **Mr KY LEUNG** opined that it was critical to gauge public views throughout the planning of the project.

4.18 **The Chair** noted that Members had reservation about the proposed EFLS. He understood that the project team would conduct the DFS to resolve and address Members' concerns. He advised that the project team should consider other possible modes of transport in the study so as to derive a better solution to the traffic problem and enhance connectivity of KTD.

KTO

4.19 **Mrs Sorais LEE** said that the current study had confirmed the preliminary feasibility of the EFLS. She reiterated that the project team was fully aware of the importance of an integrated multi-modal linkage system for Kowloon East, and accordingly there would be a topical study in the DFS to investigate the connectivity demand and identify different measures to enhance the connectivity of Kowloon East, including Kai Tak area, at different stages of CBD development before the commencement of EFLS. She reassured Members that there would be public participation throughout the DFS.

4.20 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that Members should consider the criteria to evaluate the different solutions, for instance connectivity, convenience, impact on at-grade traffic etc. in a separate workshop.

4.21 **Mrs Sorais LEE** responded that the preliminary feasibility study had worked out feasible EFLS alignment. At the current stage, the project team aimed to carry out an in-depth study to ascertain its financial viability, environmental acceptability, as well as technical considerations of the proposed EFLS and enhance the integrated multi-modal linkage system for Kowloon East. She said that Members' concerns would be addressed in the DFS.

4.22 **Mr KL LAM** opined that the project team should consult the Task Force on the alignment of EFLS in future.

4.23 **The Chair** concluded that the project team should carry out the detailed feasibility study to address public concerns, in particular assessing alternative modes of transportation apart from EFLS as Members suggested. He advised the project team to keep Members informed of the study progress.

KTO

(Post-meeting notes: The above comments were taken into account in preparing the scope of the DFS. A topical study has been incorporated in the DFS to review uses of other possible green transport modes.)

Item 5 Kai Tak Development - Stage 2 Infrastructure Works for Developments at the Southern Part of the Former Runway (Paper No. TFKT/05/2014)

5.1 **The Chair** briefed Members that KTO had arranged a working session to seek Members' initial views on the conceptual design of the landscaped deck at the Runway Precinct on 2 January 2014. He invited **Mr Anthony LO** and **Mr John LEUNG** of KTO; **Mr Sion EDWARDS**, **Mr Igo HO** and **Ms Gwendoline BESTAR** of AECOM. **Mr LO** made the presentation with the aid of a PowerPoint.

5.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** noted that the examples of possible activities as quoted in the presentation were not active recreation, and thus suggested that there should be activity nodes or kiosks to make the landscaped deck above Road D3 more active. He also raised the following enquiries:

- (i) whether the alignment of the beams along Road D3 could be adjusted and avoiding the use of heavy concrete beams to increase light penetration;
- (ii) the reason for providing noise mitigation for the residential developments but not the commercial sites. He was concerned that the noise level on the commercial side would discourage street activities; and
- (iii) the reason for not integrating the proposed EFLS or other transport modes into the design of the landscaped deck.

5.3 **Mr PY TAM** suggested that the project team should illustrate the project and its connectivity with the surrounding environment at both elevated and ground levels with 3D plans. He added that it would be crucial to ensure visual permeability and good connectivity between the elevated landscaped deck and the promenades at the two sides of the Runway Precinct. **Mr TAM** also considered that the relevant departments should explore the possibility of incorporating terms requiring the property developers to connect the elevated platform and waterfront in the land lease in future.

5.4 **Mr Andy LEUNG** echoed **Mr TAM's** view that the success of the landscaped deck relied on its connectivity with the adjoining private developments and the promenades along the Runway Precinct, and thus the planning of the private developments and the deck should be integrated with a view to achieving direct connections at an elevated level.

5.5 **Mr Ivan HO** opined that a holistic approach should be adopted to realise the integration and connectivity of the deck with its surrounding land uses including residential and commercial developments at both ground and elevated levels.

5.6 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** enquired about the distance between the track of the proposed EFLS and the landscaped deck.

5.7 **The Chair** summarised that Members were concerned about the connectivity and integration of the landscaped deck with its adjoining developments, including the promenades, the proposed

EFLS and other land uses, in different directions and at both ground and elevated levels. He added that Members requested for an overview of the developments around the Runway area instead of a standalone elevated landscaped walkway. He appreciated KTO's idea of an all-in-one landscaped deck which served as a pedestrian movement system, a noise barrier and a public open space. Being the first of its kind, **the Chair** recognised the difficulty in identifying a single government department to take up the management responsibility for this landscaped deck, and advised the project team to coordinate with relevant departments on interfacing issues of the project.

5.8 **Mr Anthony LO** responded to Members' comments as follows:

- (i) the project team had some preliminary ideas on the linkage between the landscaped deck, the Metro Park, the Runway Park and KTCT and more linkages would be proposed at the intermittent connection nodes;
- (ii) there would be lifts or stairways to link up the ground and the deck at strategic locations. The project team would continue liaising with the relevant departments for the management and operation of these linkage facilities. He also assured that there would be sufficient flexibility in the design to accommodate the connection facilities;
- (iii) it would be feasible for the landscaped deck to integrate with the neighbouring developments through footbridges provided by future developers. The team would liaise with LandsD on the proposal of including the provision of footbridges and relevant design requirements into the land lease;
- (iv) the relative position of EFLS and the deck as shown in the presentation was for indicative purpose only. The project team would further investigate the impacts of EFLS on the landscaped deck after the completion of EFLS Stage 2 public consultation exercise and the subsequent detailed feasibility study; and
- (v) the project team would reflect Members' concerns on connectivity in the contract document and consult the

KTO

Task Force on the detailed design again in future meetings.

5.9 Noting that the project would be taken forward under a “Design and Build” (D&B) approach, **the Chair** reminded the project team that it would be crucial to have clear specifications set out in the Employer’s Requirements, such that Members’ aspiration for the landscaped deck could be realised. He advised the project team to incorporate Members’ comments on connectivity issues into the design brief.

5.10 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that Members should object to the design of the deck until there was a decision on the proposed EFLS and an integration plan between EFLS and the deck.

5.11 **Mr Ivan HO** had reservation about the D&B approach proposed by KTO to take forward the implementation of the landscaped deck as the contractors for D&B projects would only be concerned about maximising profit but not optimising urban development.

5.12 **Mr Anthony LO** responded to Members’ comments as –

- (i) the potential bidders under the D&B approach would be required to submit conceptual design under the pre-qualification assessment. He assured that Members’ views would be reflected in the requirements of the pre-qualification assessment and the tender design requirements;
- (ii) as for the design of the landscaped deck, he noted that most Members supported the “Skywalk” approach with a curvilinear noise barrier;
- (iii) regarding Mr ZIMMERMAN’s comments on objecting the project until there was a decision on EFLS, such proposal would delay the completion of necessary infrastructure for the delivery of developments sites along the former Runway area. He was also concerned that the existing Shing Fung Road might not be able to cope with the increasing vehicular traffic after the full operation of KTCT in future.

5.13 **Mr PY TAM** did not object to the project, but considered that the project team should formulate a base case before tendering under a D&B approach.

5.14 In response to **the Chair's** enquiry, **Mr Anthony LO** advised that the pre-qualification assessment was scheduled to start in April 2014, and followed by the tendering process in end 2014.

5.15 **The Chair** concluded that the presentation was not convincing enough and Members had reservation about the D&B approach. He requested the project team to consult the Task Force at a separate meeting to address Members' comments on the project before gazettal. He was concerned that KTTF would no longer be in a position to advice on the design of the landscaped deck once the contract was awarded.

5.16 In response to **Mr LAM's** suggestion of integrating the supporting structure of EFLS into the landscaped deck, **Mr Anthony LO** said that such proposal would result in higher construction cost and significant visual impacts. He explained that as the progress of the two projects was different, it was premature for the Government to commit the design of EFLS at this stage when the latter was still undergoing consultation.

5.17 **The Chair** explained that Members were suggesting integration of EFLS and the landscaped deck in terms of spatial arrangement and visual design. He said that the project team should also indicate the parameters of EFLS such as its height in the plan of the landscaped deck.

5.18 **Mr Sion EDWARDS** made the following clarifications:

- (i) "urban rooms" along the landscaped deck were areas which required a wider coverage for noise mitigation for residential development;
- (ii) the remaining areas between the "urban rooms" would have more delicate structures to allow better illumination of the road underneath to enhance

- ground-level pedestrian areas; and
- (iii) the urban rooms were largely for passive recreational uses. Nonetheless, there were more focused activity areas such as the connection to the future EFLS.

5.19 **Mr Anthony LO** supplemented that paragraphs 10 to 12 of the paper had indicated and explained the intention and the preliminary widths of the urban rooms and the deck.

5.20 In response to **the Chair's** request, **Mrs Winnie KANG** said that the Secretariat would work with KTO to organise a workshop for further discussing the case and the representatives from LCSD and TD would be invited to join the discussion. **the Secretariat & KTO**

(Post-meeting notes: Taking into account Members' comments, KTO formulated and presented the enhancements to the design of the landscaped deck to the Task Force at a workshop on 20 February 2014. Members had no objection to the revised design, which addressed comments including the connectivity issue raised by Task Force Members.)

5.21 **The Chair** recognised the challenge to handle various inter-departmental issues of the project, but Members were reluctant to agree to the project due to the unresolved interfacing and connectivity issues.

5.22 **Mr Anthony LO** said that the project team would need to proceed according to the project schedule and would liaise with the Secretariat to arrange the workshop as advised by the Chair.

Item 6 Extension of Cycle Track Network at Kai Tak Development (Paper No. TFKT/06/2014)

6.1 **The Chair** welcomed **Ms YING Fun-fong**, **Mr CHOW Wing-kwong** and **Mr Reeds LO** of KTO. **Mr Reeds LO** gave the presentation with the aid of a PowerPoint.

6.2 **Mr Reeds LO** explained that the proposed extension of the cycle track network would link up MPSC, Hoi Sham Park, Sung Wong Toi Park, Lung Tsun Stone Bridge Remnants, Station Square,

Kai Tak Fantasy area and Kwun Tong Promenade at the waterfront of KTD.

6.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** welcomed the proposed extension of cycle track in KTD, and expressed the following views:

- (i) he reckoned that the plan had catered for the need of weekend cyclists. Nonetheless, since the cycle track would be in proximity to transport nodes; leisure, sports and recreational facilities; and commercial and residential developments in KTD, the regular and daily use of the cycle track should also be addressed; and
- (ii) he suggested that the project team should provide an integrated plan of cycling routes connecting all addresses including dedicated tracks as well as shared roads and promenades. The plan should clearly indicate the locations of bicycle parking facilities. He added that the parking areas should be in close proximity to the destinations and where people live to prevent illegal parking of bicycles in KTD.

6.4 In response to **the Chair's** enquiry, **Ms YING Fun-fong** said that the study for the extension of cycle track in KTD had been completed.

6.5 **Mr KY LEUNG** expressed concern about the possibility for cyclists to get onto the proposed KTTL cantilevered above the KTTS with a vertical clearance of 21m. **The Chair** agreed that it would be impossible to cycle onto the KTTL and the cyclists might need to take a lift instead.

6.6 **Mr Ivan HO** considered that a dedicated cycling track would segregate public open spaces, and thus shared use of open spaces to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists should be encouraged. In addition, he enquired about the solution for the level differences at KTTL and MPSC.

6.7 **Mr KL LAM** commented that a dedicated cycle track along harbourfront might result in segregation of open spaces which would discourage other activities and hamper the vibrancy of

harbourfront. He also asked about the management issue of the cycle track.

6.8 **Ms YING Fun-fong** made the following responses to Members' comments:

- (i) the design of cycle track was at a preliminary stage and the detailed design had not been carried out;
- (ii) Members should note that the proposed cycle track would stretch across a number of infrastructure projects and open space projects. The project team had completed the conceptual design of the cycle track network of about 13km and identified areas which would require close collaboration among various departments in different projects;
- (iii) it was imperative for the community and the relevant departments to reach a consensus on the reservation/provision of space for implementation of the cycle track in future;
- (iv) noting that a large part of the cycle track would be developed within public open spaces, CEDD would liaise with the concerned departments to ensure proper management of the cycle track; and
- (v) CEDD had initially proposed the provision of lifts for cyclists to get on and off the KTTL.

6.9 **The Chair** noted that Members had many enquiries and concerns over the proposed cycle track at the preliminary design stage, but in general Members should recognise and agree on the vision for a cycle track along the Kai Tak harbourfront. He shared with Members that the community had high aspiration for a cycle track at the harbourfront, and there had been repeated call from the public during the public engagement for the proposed establishment of a Harbourfront Authority. As a newly developed area, Kai Tak had the potential to provide better cycling facilities and this should be realised through the long-term strategic planning. He concluded that Members were in support of the proposed extension of cycle track that addressed public aspiration, and believed that the project would not be suspended despite complications in resolving its management issues.

6.10 As regards the issue of shared use of open spaces, **the Chair** echoed **Mr HO's** view that shared use of promenade was common in many renowned harbourfront cities. He considered that Members might have further discussion on this matter in a more general context.

6.11 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested that the project team should prepare a plan of all cycling routes including the roads shared by cyclists and those prohibited cycling so as to facilitate Members' discussion in future.

KTO

(Post-meeting notes: The existing roads in KTD, i.e. Shing Kai Road, Muk Hung Street, Muk Chui Street, Muk On Street, Shing Cheong Road and Shing Fung Road, allow cyclist to ride on.)

6.12 **The Chair** concluded that the project team should proceed with the planning of cycle track in KTD and respond to Members' enquiries and concerns at the next stage.

Item 7 Any Other Business

7.1 There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 6:15 pm.

Secretariat

Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development

July 2014