

Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development

Minutes of Twentieth Meeting

Date : 1 March 2016
Time : 2:30 p.m.
Venue : 15/F., Conference Room, North Point Government Offices,
333 Java Road, North Point

Present

Mr Vincent NG Chairman

Organization Members

Mr LEUNG Kong-yui Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Mrs Karen BARRETTO Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Franklin YU Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Paul YK CHAN Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr Ivan HO Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour

Individual Members

Ms Lily CHOW Individual Member
Mr CHAN Ka-kui Individual Member
Ms Melissa Kaye PANG Co-opted Member

Official Members

Mr Thomas CHAN Deputy Secretary (Planning & Lands)¹, DEVB
Mr Francis CHAU Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)², DEVB
Mr Thomas WK CHAN Senior Manager (Tourism)⁴¹, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr TANG Wai-leung Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department (TD)
Mr YING Fun-fong Head/Kai Tak Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr Tom YIP District Planning Officer/Kowloon, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mrs Doris FOK Assistant Director (Leisure Services)¹, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Miss Ingrid TJENDRO Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Hans Joachim ISLER	Individual Member
Ms Vivian LEE	Individual Member
Mr Duncan CHIU	Co-opted Member
Mr Derek SUN	Co-opted Member
Mrs Margaret BROOKE	Representing Business Environment Council
Dr NG Cho-nam	Representing The Conservancy Association
Ir Raymond CHAN	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Prof TANG Bo-sin	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Sr Emily LI	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Louis LOONG	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong

In attendance

Mr Nicholas BROOKE	Chair, Harbourfront Commission
Miss Christine AU	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Larry CHU	Assistant Secretary (Harbour)1, DEVB
Mr Peter MOK	Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB

For Item 3

Ms Connie TAM	Project Manager (SIP)2, Education Bureau (EDB)
Mr WONG Chi-leung	Senior Project Manager 125, Architectural Services Department (ArchSD)
Ms Vivian LAW	Senior Associate, P&T Group
Ms Bella YOUNG	Associate, P&T Group
Ms AU YEUNG Wai-yin	Principal, Cognitio College (Kowloon)
Mr TSUI Siu-keung	School Manager, Cognitio College (Kowloon)

For Item 4

Miss Christine AU	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Peter MOK	Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Edwin TSANG	Director, C.L.Tsang & Partners
Mr Julio FIGUEIRAS	Director, Shankland Cox Asia Ltd
Mr Ralph BALTAZAR	Landscape Architect, Shankland Cox Asia Ltd

Welcoming Message

Action

The Chair welcomed all attending the meeting. He introduced and welcomed three co-opted Members on board, **Mr Duncan CHIU** (in absentia), **Ms Melissa Kaye PANG** and **Mr Derek SUN** (in absentia).

The Chair advised Members that **Mr Francis CHAU**, Principal Assistant Secretary (Works) 2 of Development Bureau attended on behalf of Mr CHAN Chi-ming. **Mr Thomas WK CHAN**, Senior Manager of the Tourism Commission attended on behalf of Mr George TSOI.

Item 1 Confirmation of the Minutes of the last Meeting

1.1 The draft minutes of the 19th Task Force meeting were circulated to Members for comments on 17 February 2016. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated again on 25 February 2016.

1.2 There being no further comments received from Members, the draft minutes were confirmed.

Item 2 Matters Arising

Kai Tak Development – Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC) and Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter (KTTS) Improvement Works (paragraph 2.10 of the confirmed minutes of the 19th meeting)

2.1 In response to Members' concern about further water quality improvement works for Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC) and Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter (KTTS)(para. 2.10), Kai Tak Office (KTO) provided further clarification on the environmental performance of the 600m opening and the Interception and Pumping Scheme (IP Scheme), that both schemes would achieve the same effect. CEDD supplemented

that they were conducting another study on water quality improvement at Kai Tak, which would be completed by mid-2016.

The last Progress Report on Kai Tak Development (paragraphs 2.12-2.14 and 2.18-2.19 of the confirmed minutes of the 19th meeting)

2.2 In response to Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN's enquiry about the environmental efficiency of the District Cooling System (DCS) (para. 2.12), KTO had provided a brief description of the energy saving capacity of the DCS in the form of post-meeting notes.

2.3 With regard to the progress of Road D3 cum landscaped deck (para. 2.13), KTO advised that the project is planned for substantial completion in 2019. The tender assessment was conducted according to the procedures and conditions for Design and Build contract.

2.4 In response to Mr Nicholas BROOKE's enquiry about alternative usage of the Cruise Terminal building during the low season (para. 2.14), the Tourism Commission responded that the design of the Cruise Terminal building had allowed flexibility for hosting events and there had been commercial and community events organised at the site in the past years.

2.5 In response to Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN's enquiry about the key performance indicator (KPI) of greening at Kai Tak (para. 2.18), KTO had provided a written response in relation to the minimum green ratio for different parts of Kai Tak in the post-meeting notes.

2.6 With regards to the suggested provision of landing steps at the promenade adjoining Hong Kong Children's Hospital (HKCH) by the Cruise Terminal operator (para. 2.19), the Secretariat had circulated the letter to Members for information on 20 November 2015. Relevant departments would explore enhancement of the promenade design having regard to the technical feasibility of the proposal.

2.7 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** noted that CEDD undertook a study with a view to reducing the *e. coli* level at KTAC/KTTS to facilitate hosting water sport activities within the area, which was scheduled for completion by mid-2016 (para. 2.1). From the Simultaneous

Interpretation (SI) at the meeting, he was given to understand that original 600m opening and the IP Scheme would achieve the same result on water quality improvement for water sports development at Kai Tak, which did not seem to be the case. He asked for clarification on this front.

2.8 **The Chair** clarified that the post-meeting notes from CEDD explained that the newly proposed IP Scheme would serve the same objective and function, and achieve the same effect in odour mitigation and diluting pollutants with the original 600m opening.

2.9 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that before the completion of CEDD's study on water quality improvement in mid-2016, no decision should be made on whether to abandon the option of creating a 600m opening at the former runway.

2.10 **Ms YING** said that the water quality performance of the proposed IP Scheme would be equivalent to that of the 600m opening. The water quality at KTAC and KTTS had been significantly improved after the implementation of mitigation measures such as localized maintenance dredging and bio-remediation treatments. A comprehensive review conducted by CEDD last year concluded that the IP Scheme would be more cost effective than the original 600m opening. However, neither proposal could achieve the water quality standard required for secondary contact recreational use (i.e. lowering the *e. coli* concentration level to below 610 cfu/100ml). Meanwhile, CEDD had embarked on another study to improve the *e. coli* concentration level at KTAC and KTTS. The project team would report to the Task Force soon in the future meetings. She reaffirmed that enhancing water quality level for this area up to the benchmark suitable for water sports activities was the ultimate goal and KTO was working towards this target.

2.11 **Mr Paul ZIMMEMAN** raised the following enquiries and comments:

- (a) other than the District Cooling System (DCS), could KTO provide other examples that contributed to the building of a "green" and "smart" city at Kai Tak (para. 2.12 of the 19th meeting minutes);

- (b) why was the open space, commercial and other developments around the estuary of KTAC not being highlighted under a separate section in the progress report; and
- (c) the open space at the estuary of KTAC was allocated as a works site until 2023 (para. 2.18 of the 19th meeting minutes). He recalled that Members had discussed the road alignments of this area in previous meetings. He urged the Government to plan ahead for the area and requested an update.

2.12 **Ms YING** gave the following responses:

- (a) the open space area at the estuary of KTAC would continue to be occupied for the construction of Central Kowloon Route (CKR) tentatively until 2023. The project team acknowledged Members' comments and interest in the area and would take them into consideration in its planning and design. Members would be engaged at the preliminary design stage of the open space when ready; and
- (b) in general, the DCS was more applicable and energy efficient for commercial buildings with central air conditioning. She advised that residential properties could also choose to link to the DCS via applications made to the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD).

2.13 **The Chair** thanked Ms YING for the responses.

Progress Report on Kai Tak Development (KTD) (Paper No. TFKT/01/2016)

2.14 **Ms YING** introduced the paper and highlighted the key progress since the last meeting for Members' information.

2.15 **Mr CHAN Ka-kui** commented that the pedestrian street naming competition launched in January 2016 was a good initiative for place-making and promotion of sense of belonging for the Kai Tak community.

2.16 **Ms YING** supplemented that 10 pedestrian streets within

the Grid Neighbourhood were included in the first round of the pedestrian streets naming competition. KTO might conduct next round of the competition to cover remaining pedestrian streets in Kai Tak.

2.17 With regards to the cycle track network in KTD, **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** noted that the current proposal was more leisure and recreational oriented and less for commuting. Understanding that the project team had been liaising with the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) in the planning for cycling along promenades and public open space, he asked whether they would also approach the Housing Authority and the MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) for the provision of ancillary facilities and the extension of cycle track into housing estates and main transport nodes in Kai Tak.

2.18 **Ms YING** replied that the primary function of the cycle track in KTD was for recreational and leisure use. A feasibility study was now underway to examine the alignment, safety measures, implementation strategy and mode of operation and management. In response to Members' aspiration for wider coverage of the cycle network in KTD, KTO was exploring the possibility of extending the cycle network for commuting purposes. KTO was also aware of the importance of having innovative design to suit the planning theme and urban design of Kai Tak.

2.19 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that the scope of the feasibility study should have a broader scope instead of focusing on the building cycling track per se. A holistic cycling plan covering all major roads in KTD was required. He suggested KTO briefing Members on the brief of the feasibility study such that Members would give inputs. Regarding the estuary of the KTAC, he urged relevant departments to review the land use of the commercial sites surrounding the open space.

2.20 **The Chair** enquired about the element of public engagement in the feasibility study of cycle track network in KTD.

2.21 **Ms YING** reaffirmed public participation in the feasibility study for cycle track network. Noting the challenges involved in developing a 13km cycle track in a newly developed and densely built area, she reiterated that KTO would maintain an open mind in devising

the implementation approach and possible extension into the housing estates and transportation nodes to facilitate cycling in KTD at a later stage. KTO would communicate with the Housing Authority and the MTRCL for the provision of cycling ancillary facilities and engage the Task Force when there are more concrete details.

2.22 **Mr Franklin YU** concurred with Mr ZIMMERMAN and said that a mix of leisure and commuting functions of the cycle track should be considered in KTD. With regard to the Kai Tak Fantasy (KTF), he suggested KTO to provide Members an interim progress update in mid-2016. He would also like to learn about the Public Creatives design guidelines for street furniture and public facilities in the progress report.

2.23 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** was pleased to see the smooth progress of KTD. However, he was worried if infrastructure works would have already taken place in a more advanced stage, hence pre-empting or restricting the opportunities left for other planning initiatives and innovative design for different development projects in KTD.

2.24 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** agreed with the adoption of an open and welcoming approach towards the function of cycle track network in Kai Tak, although noting that road and cycling safety as an equally important consideration. With regard to the provision of bicycle parking at the Station Square, he said that such provision within premises of the MTRCL might have pecuniary implication. He suggested KTO seeking MTR's involvement early on.

2.25 **Mr Ivan HO** expressed on behalf of the Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design that they had witnessed the efforts made by KTO and the Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO) in the past years on a wide range of key projects, including the revitalization of back lanes in Kwun Tong, the Environmentally Friendly Linkage System (EFLS), the preservation corridor of Lung Tsun Stone Bridge Remnants and cycle track network. However, there might be a lack of integration and cohesiveness of all these projects from a wider urban design perspective for the whole of Kowloon East. He encouraged KTO to incorporate urban design elements, such as public art, place branding and the

concept of liveable environment, to produce a better visual image of the future Kai Tak.

2.26 **Ms YING** thanked Members for the comments. She responded as follows:

- (a) the KTO had been playing an active role in coordinating various projects in KTD and would continue to handle proposals in relation to the cycle track network and open space development in Kai Tak in an integrated and holistic manner;
- (b) the project team acknowledged Mr LEUNG's comments on the provision of bicycle parking within the premises held by MTRCL and KTO would communicate with MTRCL on this front. In parallel, area in the Station Square would also be explored as a possible location for bicycle parking facilities;
- (c) the planning and design of KTD had gone through several stages of public consultation. On the basis of past community engagement, KTO had been playing the role as a coordinator as KTD gradually entered into the implementation stage. KTO would work closely with various project teams and departments in the consideration of the design and development for the 100 hectare open space in KTD; and
- (d) as part of the Public Creatives initiative, a design consultant and advisor was engaged to formulate a set of reference design and guidelines on street furniture and public facilities for KTD. Where applicable, both government departments and private developers would be encouraged to make reference to these designs in the design of their projects.

2.27 **The Chair** concluded that the Task Force had many discussions on KTD from both macro and micro perspectives. He said that infrastructure projects and other development proposals would need to start from a smaller scale with phased completion. With regard to the cycle track network, there was general consensus among Members for a cycle track along the waterfront and possibly the adjoining road network which could serve for both leisure and commuting purposes.

He advised KTO to take into account Members' views when taking forward the feasibility study.

**Item 3 A 30-classroom Secondary School at Site 1A-2 at
Kai Tak Development (Paper No. TFKT/02/2016)**

3.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Education Bureau (EDB) and the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) had provided a discussion paper (Paper No. TFKT/02/2016) to brief Members on the design of the proposed 30-classroom secondary school at Site 1A-2 within KTD. The project team would submit the proposal to the Legislative Council for funding approval in June 2016 for commencement of works in the second half of 2016. He said that this project was brought up for discussion due to its location within KTD. He also drew Members' attention to the distance of the project site from the harbourfront was over 1km.

3.2 **The Chair** welcomed **Ms Connie TAM** from EDB, **Mr WONG Chi-leung** from ArchSD and **Ms Vivian LAW** from P&T Group.

3.3 **Ms Connie TAM** highlighted the background of the school project. **Ms Vivian LAW** presented the design of the school with the aid of a PowerPoint.

3.4 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** thanked the project team for their presentation. He viewed that the project site was situated at a relatively distant position from the Kai Tak harbourfront and hence the Task Force might have limited comments in terms of planning and design to offer on the project.

3.5 **The Chair** noted Mr BROOKE's comment. He explained to Members that as formality and usual practice, proponents of projects falling within KTD would be invited to brief and consult Members. He advised Members to bear in mind the distance between the project site and the harbourfront when giving comments.

3.6 **Mr Ivan HO** supported Mr BROOKE's comments.

3.7 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** concurred with Mr BROOKE's views. He recalled that KTD fell into the remit of the former Harbourfront Enhancement Committee (HEC) because of reclamation proposed at the time. He opined that Kai Tak had already entered the stage of implementation and therefore suggested a review of the role and area of interest for the Task Force.

3.8 While recognising its location in the hinterland, **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** considered the design of the school harmonious with its neighbourhood and in line with the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines.

3.9 **The Chair** noted Members' views. He viewed that it might be time consuming and labour intensive for the Commission and the Secretariat to review the role of the Task Force. He also believed it would be preferable for the multi-professional Task Force to adopt a flexible approach in dealing with projects in the inner parts of KTD as he foresaw that other projects in relation to public open space and road networks in the hinterland would require Members' contributions and inputs in the future.

3.10 **Miss Christine AU** responded to Members that as a matter of good practice, the Secretariat encouraged KTO, EKEO and other project departments to brief and inform Members on their proposals in KTD. She believed that the Task Force was a gatekeeper in safeguarding and ensuring the compliance with the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines for various waterfront-related projects. She advised that the existing practice would continue in the future and agreed with the Chair's suggestion for Members to adopt a flexible approach based on the individual merits and particularities of different projects.

3.11 **The Chair** concluded that Members had no objection to the said secondary school project and thanked the project team for their presentation.

Item 4 Proposed Development with "Eating Place" and "Shop &

Services” for the Promenade fronting Hotel Sites at Kai Tak Runway (Paper No. TFKT/03/2016)

4.1 **The Chair** informed Members that that the Harbour Unit of Development Bureau (DEVB) together with their consultant, C.L. Tsang & Partners and Shankland Cox Asia Ltd., had provided a discussion paper (Paper No. TFKT/03/2016) to seek Members’ views on the proposed uses of “Eating Place” and “Shop and Services” in the promenade fronting hotel sites at the Kai Tak runway. The project team would submit a section 16 application to the Town Planning Board (TPB) and Members’ comments expressed at the meeting would be conveyed to TPB for consideration. He welcomed **Miss Christine AU** and **Mr Peter MOK** from the Harbour Unit and their consultants, **Mr Edwin TSANG**, **Mr Julio FIGUEIRAS** and **Mr Ralph BALTAZAR** to the meeting.

4.2 With the aid of a PowerPoint, **Miss Christine AU** introduced and briefed Members’ on the overall objectives and principles of the development proposal and **Mr Julio FIGUEIRAS** supplemented on the conceptual design of the subject waterfront open space.

4.3 **Mr Ivan HO** expressed support for the development approach as public open space in private development (POSPD), considering that it would guarantee seamless and timely completion of the waterfront POS with the adjoining hotel developments. Meanwhile, he also gave the following comments:

- (a) the authority and mechanism to safeguard the coherence of the design among the five POS sections adjoining the hotel sites should be specified. He was mindful that the Harbourfront Commission (HC) was an advisory body with no executive or regulatory power to control the design put forward by future hotel developers. He opined that a mechanism to ensure the consistency and smooth interface of the essential components present in all five POS sections, including the pedestrian pathway, cycle track reserve and other public facilities, should be put in place;
- (b) with regard to the proposed ratio of 20:80 between the enclosed and open-air area within the commercial space, he pointed out that the definition of “enclosed area” provided

in the Building (Planning) Regulations might be different from what the Paper and the conceptual design seemed to suggest. He advised the project team to clarify the meaning of “enclosed area” in the development proposal. They could approach the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) and see if other terms, such as covered or roofed over area, would be more accurate and appropriate;

- (c) following from point (b) above, supposed that the “enclosed area” referred to covered areas such as kitchens, washrooms and indoor dining areas, the project team might need to review the 20:80 ratio currently suggested. From past experience in comparable projects, a larger proportion for covered space might be needed to support the outdoor dining area and to sustain the commercial viability of the eateries, especially with regard to the weather in Hong Kong. He would suggest having at least one-third of the eating place to be housed indoor in order to provide an all-weather dining location all year round and hence strengthen financial sustainability for the food & beverages (F&B) services at the POS;
- (d) the boundary of each POS section adjoining the hotel sites was not marked in the paper or the conceptual design plan clearly enough. The design, management and maintenance arrangement at these interfacing junctions should also be clarified; and
- (e) he agreed for the ownership of the POS to be remained with the Government. In this connection, it would be important for the utilities provided on the waterfront open space, such as electrical and mechanical (E&M), water, electricity and drainage, to be independent from those of the hotel developments and be self-contained.

4.4 **Mr Franklin YU** supported the idea of implementing the waterfront area concerned as POSPD, which would allow the introduction of a certain level of commercial activities to enhance vibrancy of the Kai Tak harbourfront. He commented on the design and management on three points below:

- (a) he shared Mr HO’s concerns regarding the interface of

- management across the five sections;
- (b) in terms of design, he suggested relaxing the rather rigid and chiselled division of the boardwalk, cycle track reserve and the landscaped area as shown in the schematic plan in order to enable fusing of the different elements along the waterfront;
 - (c) whether there would be any vetting mechanism for the Government to review and approve the design submitted by the private developers before they were to be taken forward.

4.5 **Mr Paul YK CHAN** agreed that the POSPD model could encourage more integrated use and was a feasible avenue to realise the aspiration of a vibrant harbourfront at Kai Tak. Regarding the construction and management of the five respective sites, he had the following comments:

- (a) the consistency in terms of design of these five open spaces was the one of the key concerns among Members. He was worried that the potentially dissimilar completion time of the POS sections might result in truncated development of the promenade as a whole;
- (b) whether opening hours of the POS would be regulated and whether public access to the area would be affected if any part of dining area had to be closed; and
- (c) the conceptual design demonstrated a good attempt to incorporate alfresco dining in the waterfront with landscaped area in the surrounding. He suggested including some landscaping principles and strategy for future developers to follow so as to create a more coherent design of the public area and pedestrian pathway.

4.6 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** commented on the POSPD model and the master plan as follows:

- (a) under the currently proposed POSPD approach, the eateries run and operated by the hotel developers would most likely be priced at a high level which might not be affordable to the general public. This might limit the group of public who could truly enjoy and be benefitted from a waterfront open

- space developed as POSPD;
- (b) he opposed the POSPD model as it would only serve to provide the Government with administrative expedience of not having to go through the funding process in the Legislative Council for open space development and maintenance. However, the public would lose control and the public gain from the proposal was questionable;
 - (c) whether pets were allowed on the subject open space;
 - (d) how to ensure that the Government would take back the promenade at its discretion if necessary. He shared that private developers in Singapore handed back the promenade near their property after they completed the construction. Next they obtained short term licenses for the management and operation. The renewal of the licenses provided an option for the government to respond to changing circumstances and public aspirations. He enquired whether this approach would be more appropriate for Kai Tak;
 - (e) the location of Emergency Vehicular Access (EVA) might impose limitations on the food preparation area for the eating place and could be reviewed;
 - (f) further consideration should be given to the marine facilities along the promenade, such as piers, for turning them into activity nodes with proper shelter, seating and lighting;;
 - (g) the provision of shading would be important for the subject 3.1ha open space; and
 - (h) how to ensure consistency in terms of management rules of the five POS sections.

4.7 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** shared many of the concerns raised by Members. He opined that the biggest challenge was to ensure coherence across the five different sections along the waterfront concerned. The positioning of the open space should be clarified: whether it was meant to be a public open space under private control, or whether it would be a private open space; whether LCSD regulations or private management rules would apply. In terms of design, he shared Mr YU's views and said that there could be better integration of the boardwalk with the landscape area at the back. A weaving pattern of the boardwalk would perhaps offer a more interesting design and

improve the quality of the waterfront open space.

4.8 **Miss Christine AU** responded that the subject development proposal put forward for Members' discussion was in fact an attempt to realise many of the aspiration over vibrancy and attractiveness of the harbourfront that Members had expressed over the past few years and Members had voiced their hopes for alfresco dining and more outdoor activities to take place along some of the harbourfront locations. With the unique opportunity presented at the waterfront area abutting the hotel sites at Kai Tak runway, there was potential to make better use of the area to actualise the wishes made by Members all along. She clarified that under the POSPD policy, the future hotel developers could also initiate and apply for approval to provide eateries and small-scale shops on their respective POS sections after land sale if they wished. However, the current recommendation for the Government to submit a section 16 application to TPB before land sale was really to encourage and incentivise the provision of such commercial elements by the future developers and to overcome one of the hurdles towards achieving a vibrant and interesting harbourfront at Kai Tak. In this regard, the subject proposal for the land fronting hotel sites at Kai Tak could be seen as a trial to inject vibrancy for the harbourfront via an approach different from conventional open space development. The project team was aware of the considerations related to the consistency of design and management across the POS sections as pointed out by Members, and in this relation, Miss AU responded as follows:

- (a) the conceptual design scheme attempted to strike a balance between diversity and consistency, flexibility and control over the particular stretch of POS. For design consistency, the design concept promulgated under the Public Creatives for KTD would be serve as a set of basic guideline for the future developers to comply with as part of the requirement under land lease. At the same time, certain degree of variety and diversity at some 100m to 200m interval promenade might not be as undesirable as having a monotonous waterfront throughout;
- (b) the future developers could draw up their set of house rules for managing the POS adjoining their hotel sites. However, there were also requirements under the POSPD

Design and Management Guidelines that they would need to observe and adhere to. For instance, the hotel developers would need to open the POS 24 hours a day for the public access. She reassured Members that sufficient controls would be specified under the land lease while hotel developers would be given some freedom in devising management rules for their POS;

- (c) in terms of connection, the future developers would be required to provide an unobstructed passageway for patrons and visitors to walk through along the whole waterfront POS;
- (d) the proposed split for enclosed and open-air area was to demonstrate the intention to open up as much space in the POS as possible for public enjoyment. The project team would review the suggested ratio having regards to Members' views;
- (e) it was hoped that the F&B services provided at the POS would be affordable to be general public. It was not the intention of the proposal to introduce high-end dining experience on the POS. Hence, the current proposal had included more open-air space for alfresco dining area where the public could buy light refreshments and finger food from the kiosks nearby and enjoy eating them on the waterfront. She also emphasised that the waterfront area concerned would remain as a public open space, despite it being privately managed. All members of the public, whether they would like to make use of the eateries and small-scale shops, could access and enjoy the POS all the same; and
- (f) regarding Members' concerns on the overly straight alignment of the boardwalk and cycle track reserve, the project team would review its layout accordingly while keeping the overall continuity and accessibility of the waterfront.

4.9 **Mr Julio FIGUEIRAS** noted Members' comments on the proposed ratio for enclosed and open-air area and said that the project team would further refine the conceptual design scheme.

4.10 **Miss Christine AU** supplemented that there were two flights of public landing steps at the open space fronting Site 4C1 which were recently refurbished and managed by the Transport Department (TD). Hotel developers were welcomed to initiate new uses for these landing steps. Also, there was an existing deserted pier at the POS adjoining Sites 4C2 and 4C3. However, the status of the pier was not satisfactory and it would be necessary to check its structural condition before assessing how it would be re-opened for public use.

4.11 Regarding Members' concerns about the design and management consistency of different segments of the promenade, **the Chair** suggested that a dedicated group or committee could be set up to review and monitor the eventual delivery of the POS by private developers in order to ensure that some of the more innovative elements in the design could materialise. It might be more preferable and effective than having only the Lands Department vetting the submission by the future developers based on the land sale conditions. He invited Members to give another round of comments.

4.12 **Mr Ivan HO** clarified that he supported the development proposal and looked forward to its fruition. Hence, he would like to focus his comments on the implementation of the proposal:

- (a) the development approach proposed for the Kai Tak runway was completely different from that of the Avenue of Stars in Tsim Sha Tsui. The five hotel sites would be open to the market for tender and hence there should be no question of collusion. The implementation mode with certain commercial elements and participation from the private sector was considered a crucial attempt for harbourfront development;
- (b) with the alfresco dining area proposed, the hotel operators could choose to serve meals outdoor under good weather. It could be a valuable opportunity to promote the tourism image of Hong Kong. At the same time, to offer a wider assortment of food affordable to all, food trucks could be introduced. He cited the successful examples from overseas where POS were managed by private parties with food trucks and kiosks serving the public;

- (c) the current design lacked local character and identity. For example, he viewed that this waterfront POS was a suitable site for hosting Sunday markets; and
- (d) the project team should come up with a backup plan for managing the POS in case any one of the hotel operators chose to cease its management responsibility.

4.13 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** shared other Members' worries about the affordability of F&B services along the POS. He concurred with Mr HO's view about introducing food trucks on POS to strike a balance between high-end and more popularised dining experiences. If so, he said that the location and allocation of space of the food trucks could be included in the conceptual plan.

4.14 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that the response from the Government was not convincing and raised several follow up questions and comments:

- (a) whether a management committee between relevant Government departments and hotel operators would be set up to oversee the management of the entire promenade as a whole;
- (b) the initiative of establishing the Harbourfront Authority was to oversee harbourfront development in a new form and should take on the Kai Tak waterfront. There had not been a discussion that waterfront POS on government land should be placed under the management of adjacent private property owners; and
- (c) improvement of the marine access facilities along the POS should be included in the conceptual plan and the construction included in the agreement for implementation by hotel developers, if any.

4.15 **Mr Thomas CHAN** responded to Members' concerns as follows:

- (a) in terms of policy, POSPD was not a new attempt and there had been many precedents. Some Members might recall that controversy and public contention on the subject of

POSPD which led to a major policy review by the Government and subsequent promulgation of the POSPD Design and Management Guidelines to regulate how such POSPDs should be pursued, designed and managed and to specify the obligations by the private developers in handling their POSPDs. In this relation, the development proposal for the open space at Kai Tak runway would not operate in a vacuum. It was put forward in accordance with the relevant POSPD policy considerations to foster better integration and synergy with the adjoining hotel developments, advance its timeframe for implementation and enhance vibrancy of the waterfront;

- (b) it should be clarified that while the POS would be delegated to the future hotel operators to design and manage, the ownership of the waterfront land concerned would remain with the Government. He also emphasised that the five hotel sites would be put up for land sale through open tender as usual and the bidding process of these sites would be open and fair. Aside from the obligation for management and maintenance resting with the future hotel operators, the Government would not give away any part of the land to the private developers and it remained at the discretion of the Government to resume management of the POS if considered necessary or opportune; and
- (c) Members' primary concerns appeared to be the balance between consistency and diversity over the five POS sections at the waterfront. If uniformity was considered more important, the two possible approaches would be to either await the eventual establishment of the Harbourfront Authority to take over the piece of land, or for LCSD to successfully bid for resources and implement it as a public works project. However, it was not likely for either of these approaches to synchronise with the development of the adjoining hotel sites or the wider parts of the runway area, and it would not be desirable to have a vacant piece of land left idling upon completion of the adjacent developments. In view of this, the POSPD proposal put forward was an endeavour to strike a good balance between uniformity and variety. There would be design and

management requirements specified by the Government to ensure a reasonable degree of consistency in the design, while retaining sufficient flexibility for the future developers to design their respective POS to synergise with the neighbouring hotel sites and bring greater vibrancy to the waterfront as a whole.

4.16 **Miss Christine AU** supplemented on the control measures for ensuring the cohesiveness of the design of the five sections. She elaborated that the proposed conceptual design, if approved by the TPB, would be enclosed under the land lease together with a control drawing and a set of technical schedule prescribing all the dimensions, levelling, requirement for landscaping, provision of public facilities, etc. for implementation by the future developers. In addition to the Public Creatives concept for KTD mentioned earlier, other applicable guidelines, such as the POSPD Design and Management Guidelines, Urban Design Guidelines and Manual for Kai Tak Development, would also be set out in the lease for compliance. Future developers would then need to submit their design and management plans to the Government for review and relevant District Councils and the Harbourfront Commission would be consulted on their submission. She reassured Members that a review and approval process would be in place to ensure cohesiveness and public benefits in the development of the POS.

4.17 **The Chair** understood that various requirements could be stipulated under lease conditions, but the key question would be the authority to gate-keep, review and approve the design proposed by the developers, especially when the recommended implementation approach was relatively new in the field of harbourfront development. He believed that Members did not oppose to the general principle of developing the waterfront open space at Kai Tak as POSPD. However, to ease Members' concerns, it would be necessary to have clear rules and regulations set out to control the design and management by the future developers, as well as a mechanism established to monitor the continuous management of the POS by private operators.

4.18 **Mr Thomas CHAN** elaborated on the three main phases in the delivery of the whole POSPD approach:

- (a) first, basic requirements and parameters of the design and management rules of the POS concerned, including the scheme approved by TPB under the section 16 planning application, would be specified under land lease for implementation by future developers;
- (b) secondly, after disposal of the hotel sites through open tender, successful purchasers of the sites would be required to submit their design and management plans in accordance with the land lease, both of which would be subject to review by relevant Government departments and consultation with the District Council(s) and the Harbourfront Commission. Through the reviewing process, the Government would be able to ensure that the eventual design of the POS could meet the requirements by the Government and expectations of the local community and Commission members; and
- (c) lastly, as the ownership of the POS remained with the Government, the Government would have the right to resume management responsibility over the subject POS if deemed necessary. For instance, if the management of the future hotel operators was not as satisfactory, or upon gradual completion of the waterfront areas in Kai Tak in the long run, the Government would also have the option of taking back the subject POS for management by LCSD or the proposed Harbourfront Authority.

4.19 Nonetheless, **Mr Thomas CHAN** reassured Members that the proposed POSPD approach would be the most likely means to achieve seamless completion of the POS and adjoining hotel development for early public enjoyment.

4.20 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** raised that leasing the POS to the hotel developers through short-term tenancies (STTs) might be a more effective alternative for the Government to monitor and control the management performance of the developers. It would not raise false expectations on the part of the developers and the Government, in consultation with the Harbourfront Commission, could decide whether they would renew the STTs or not on a regular basis.

4.21 **Mr Paul YK CHAN** expressed that he had yet to be convinced by the control mechanism of the proposal and that it would be crucial for the project team to beef up both the design and operation guidelines of the proposed scheme in order to achieve a better balance in terms of consistency and flexibility. In relation to Mr ZIMMERMAN's suggestion of leasing the POS via STT, he doubted that the allocation of an open space on a temporary basis would give sufficient incentive for the hotel developers to upkeep the POS in good condition. It would be much important to guarantee the quality of management for the POS than administrative convenience.

4.22 **Mr Thomas CHAN** acknowledged Members' comments and the project team would work on the details of the design and operation guidelines of the proposal and brief Members again. He shared Mr Paul CHAN's views and said that an STT would not be the best method to develop the subject POS. The crux of the present POSPD proposal was to oblige hotel operators to design and manage the respective POS fronting their hotel sites so that they would be incentivised to design in such a way to maximise synergy with their sites, attaining a win-win situation. It would hence be vital for the development of the waterfront to be tacked at the same time as the disposal of the adjacent hotel sites. Once the POS was detached from the hotel sites, it would be very likely for the hotel developers to deliver only the minimum of what was required and the opportunity for developing a vibrant waterfront would be lost.

4.23 **The Chair** said that as a model of harbourfront development, the Harbourfront Commission appreciated the merits of collaboration with the private sector and the presence of a reasonable degree of commercial elements to enliven the harbourfront area. The Commission also cherished the integration of passive and more active activities on the harbourfront. With this understanding, he concluded that the Task Force had no in-principle objection to the proposed POSPD approach or the allowance of certain commercial activities within 10% of the subject POS area, but it would be important for the project team to provide more information on the design and management requirements, including the architectural and technical considerations and the interface among the five POS sections, for further deliberation by the Task Force.

Without such information, it would not be advisable for the scheme to be submitted to TPB.

4.24 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** stressed again that the POS should be leased out via STT instead of the proposed POSPD model to ensure the Government could safeguard the public interest and monitor the management by the hotel developers.

4.25 **The Chair** reinstated that the land ownership of POS would continue to rest with the Government and would not be given away to the private sector. Based on the materials available at the meeting, he believed that Members already had a thorough discussion. He thanked the project team for their presentation and advised the team to follow up on the comments given by Members on the design and monitoring mechanism of POS and report to the Task Force again.

(Post-meeting note: Having considered Members' comments expressed at the meeting, the Harbour Unit organised an informal session with the Task Force on 21 April 2016 and updated Members on the refined design of the POS concerned. In order to hear public views, a public discussion session was hosted on 7 May 2016 and all members of the public were welcomed to join. The Harbour Unit would consolidate the feedback collected therein and report to the Task Force at its next meeting.)

Item 5 Any Other Business

5.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the next meeting would be scheduled in co-ordination with meetings of the Harbourfront Commission and other Task Forces. The Secretariat would inform Members of the meeting date in due course.

5.2 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Secretariat

Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development

May 2016