

# Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development

## Minutes of Twenty-first Meeting

Date : 1 June 2016 (Wednesday)  
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

Mrs Margaret BROOKE Representing Business Environment Council  
Mr LEUNG Kong-yui Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and  
Transport in Hong Kong  
Mrs Karen BARRETTO Representing Friends of the Earth  
Mr Freddie HAI Tuen-tai Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects  
Mr Ivan HO Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design  
Prof CHOY Kin-kuen 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 Paul ZIMMERMAN Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour

### Individual Members

Ms Lily CHOW Individual Member  
Mr Duncan CHIU Co-opted Member  
Ms Melissa Kaye PANG Co-opted Member  
Mr Derek SUN Co-opted Member  
Mr YIP Hing-kwok Co-opted Member

### Official Members

Miss Christine AU Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB  
Mr Francis CHAU Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)2, DEVB  
Mr Thomas WK CHAN Senior Manager (Tourism)41, Tourism Commission (TC)  
Mr PANG Wai-shing Chief Traffic Engineer / Kowloon, Transport Department  
(TD)  
Ms 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 CHAN Ka-kui	Individual Member
Mr Hans Joachim ISLER	Individual Member
Ms Vivian LEE	Individual Member
Mr LO Chiu-kit	Co-opted Member
Dr NG Cho-nam	Representing The Conservancy Association
Mr Paul YK CHAN	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr Louis LOONG	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong

In attendance

Mr Nicholas BROOKE	HC Chair
Mr Larry CHU	Assistant Secretary (Harbour)1, DEVB
Miss Emily SOM	Assistant Secretary (Harbour)2 (Des.), DEVB

Matters Arising

Ms Brenda AU	Head, Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO)
Ms Winnie HO	Deputy Head, EKEO

For Item 3

Ms Brenda AU	Head, Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO)
Ms Winnie HO	Deputy Head, EKEO
Miss Tracy WONG	Place Making Manager (Planning)1, EKEO
Ms Carmen CHU	Director/Transport, Ove Arup & Partners HK Ltd.
Mr LEE Wai-lam	Senior Planner, Ove Arup & Partners HK Ltd.

For Item 4

Food and Health Bureau (FHB)

Mr Richard YUEN	Permanent Secretary for Food & Health (Health), FHB
Mr Patrick LEE	Assistant Secretary (Health)4, FHB

Architectural Services Department (ArchSD)

Mr David CHAK	Chief Project Manager 201, ArchSD
Mr Jackson WAI	Senior Project Manager 236, ArchSD
Mr Ben YEUNG	Senior Project Manager 234(Ag.), ArchSD
Ms Jacinta CHOW	Senior Project Manager 239, ArchSD
Mr Jason LEE	LD/PMB2/2, ArchSD

Hospital Authority (HA)

Dr T L LEE	Hospital Chief Executive, Hong Kong Children's Hospital (HKCH)
Dr Lily CHIU	Consultant, Commissioning/HKCH
Mr Donald LI	Chief Manager (Capital Planning), HA
Dr Bill CHAN	Chairman, Coordinating Committee in Paediatrics, HA
Dr Adolphus CHAU	Consultant, Department of Paediatrics Cardiology, Queen Mary Hospital
Dr Niko TSE	Chief of Service, Department of Paediatrics and Adolescent Medicine, Princess Margaret Hospital
Dr LAI Wai-ming	Consultant Paediatrician, Department of Paediatrics and Adolescent Medicine, Princess Margaret Hospital
Prof Godfrey CHAN Chi-fung	Tsao Yen-chow Endowed Professor (Paediatrics & Adolescent Medicine), Head (Department of Paediatrics & Adolescent Medicine), Chief of Service (Paediatrics, Queen Mary Hospital & HKU-Shenzhen Hospital)
Mr Patrick HAU	Senior Manager (Capital Projects) <sup>3</sup> , Hospital Authority
Ms Miscelle KWOK	Chief Hospital Administrator, Commissioning/Hong Kong Children's Hospital

Patient representatives

Mr MAK Hong-yuen	Sunshine Group (patient representative)
Ms FUNG Wei	Children's Kidney Friend Club (patient representative)
Ms CHAN Suk-kwan	Patient's parent from QEH

ArchSD Consultants

Mr Edwin WONG	Director, Simon Kwan & Associates Ltd.
Mr Michael YAM	Director, Simon Kwan & Associates Ltd.
Mr H C BEE	Associate Director, Simon Kwan & Associates Ltd.
Mr Mark NG	Technical Director, ACLA Ltd.
Mr Enzo LAM	Landscape Designer, ACLA Ltd.
Mr Alfred WONG	Design Manager, China State - Shui On Joint Venture
Mr Willy LAM	Design Manager, China State - Shui On Joint Venture

**The Chair** welcomed all attending the meeting. He informed Members that the 21<sup>st</sup> Task Force meeting originally scheduled on 10 May 2016 was called off due to the Red Rainstorm Warning Signal according to the House Rules. He introduced and welcomed the following co-opted Members, **Mr Duncan CHIU**, **Mr Frank LO Chiu-kit** (in absentia), **Mr YIP Hing-kwok** and **Mr Derek SUN** for joining the Task Force.

**The Chair** advised Members that **Miss Christine AU**, Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour) of Development Bureau attended on behalf of Mr Thomas CHAN. **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 (TC) attended on behalf of Mr George TSOI. **Mr Wilson PANG**, Chief Traffic Engineer / Kowloon of Transport Department (TD) attended on behalf of Mr TANG Wai-leung.

### **Item 1 Confirmation of the Minutes of the last Meeting**

1.1 The draft minutes of the 20<sup>th</sup> Task Force meeting were circulated to Members for comments on 5 May 2016. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated again on 9 May 2016.

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

### **Item 2 Matters Arising**

2.1 **The Chair** informed Members that there were in total four presentations under Matters Arising, including (a) the regular progress report on Kai Tak Development by Kai Tak Office (KTO); (b) report by the Harbour Unit on the feedback collected from the public discussion session for the public open space adjoining hotel sites; (c) an update by the Transport Department (TD) on kaito service at Kai Tak; and (d) a

briefing by the Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO) on the pilot scheme of "Facilitating Provision of Pedestrian Links by the Private Sector".

*Proposed Development with “Eating Place” and “Shop & Services” for the Promenade fronting Hotel Sites at Kai Tak Runway (paragraph 4.25 of the confirmed minutes of the 20<sup>th</sup> meeting)*

2.2 In response to Members’ comments expressed at the last meeting, the Harbour Unit organised an informal session with the Task Force on 21 April 2016 and a public discussion session for all members of the public on 7 May 2016. **The Chair** said that the Harbour Unit would report the views collected for Members’ information and discussion at the meeting later.

*Workshop cum Site Visit to the Southern Part of Kai Tak Runway*

2.3 **The Chair** reported that, in response to Members’ interest in the latest development and design of the landscaped deck above Road D3 at the southern part of the runway area, the Kai Tak Office (KTO) arranged an informal workshop cum site visit on 17 May 2016. The project team would take into account Members’ views in further developing the design of the landscaped deck and consult the Task Force again when the design matured.

*(Post-meeting notes: A workshop was organized on 31 August 2016 to update Members on the revised design of the landscaped deck after the ACABAS meeting in June 2016. KTO plans to formally consult the Task Force on this subject near end 2016 or early 2017.)*

*Progress Report on Kai Tak Development (KTD) (Paper No. TFKT/04/2016)*

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

2.5 **The Chair** invited Members to comment on the progress report. To allow new members to have better understanding, he said that the Progress Report presented by KTO was an overall report. Members were welcome to express their interests in specific projects for

further discussion in future task force meetings. Certain focus areas including (a) the public open space adjoining hotel sites; (b) kaito service at Kai Tak; and (c) the pilot scheme of "Facilitating Provision of Pedestrian Links by the Private Sector" would be covered and discussed under Matters Arising later at the meeting.

2.6 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** raised the following suggestions and questions:

- (a) the project team could consider presenting the progress report in a clear column-based layout to facilitate Members' tracking on the latest progress and understanding of significant elements of projects in KTD;
- (b) which departments and parties were involved in the development of cycle track network in KTD;
- (c) what was the implementation schedule of the Hoi Sham Park Extension project;
- (d) would there be a separate briefing or an agenda item on the developments around the estuary of Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC);
- (e) in relation to the development of the landscaped deck above Road D3, he questioned whether pedestrians were expected to walk inside or outside the noise barriers;
- (f) when an update on the treatment of the bollards along the promenade outside the Hong Kong Children's Hospital (HKCH) and Kwun Tong promenade would be available;
- (g) regarding the Multi-purpose Sports Complex (MPSC) project, would the proposed retail areas of the promenade be integrated with the development of the stadium;
- (h) whether the Government would report the findings and views collected from the public discussion session and informal meeting in relation to the public open space adjoining hotel sites; and
- (i) what was the progress and status of the Station Square project.

*(Post-meeting notes: For item (e), pedestrians would mainly walk outside the noise barrier. For places where there are pedestrian crossings and bus lay-by, short sections of public footpath would be provided inside the noise barrier for*

*pedestrians.)*

2.7 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** credited KTO for the smooth progress of KTD. He was concerned that infrastructure seemed to be driving the process, which might limit the flexibility for future planning. Noting that there was an ongoing public engagement exercise of the MPSC project, he encouraged Members to participate in the exercise.

*(Post-meeting notes: A briefing session on the MPSC project was held on 13 July 2016. As part of the public engagement exercise, Members were invited to give views on the Master Layout Plan of the project. Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) would take into account Members' views and consult the Task Force again in the coming Task Force meeting.)*

2.8 **Mr Ivan HO** noticed that there was significant difference between the proposed layout of the MPSC presented to the Task Force at the 19<sup>th</sup> meeting in November 2015 and the one presented in the public engagement exercise. He said that the project team should consult the Task Force in relation to the latest progress and refined layout of the project in due course.

2.9 **Mr Freddie HAI** suggested KTO to brief Members on the progress and preliminary findings of the study on the proposed Environmentally Friendly Linkage System (EFLS).

2.10 **Mr Derek SUN** said that KTO could include quantifiable data to illustrate the varying pace and stage of development progress of different land use zones in KTD.

2.11 **The Chair** summarised the specific items that Members would like to follow up in future meetings as follows:

- (a) the commercial sites surrounding the Kai Tak Approaching Channel ;
- (b) the progress and design of the MPSC project;
- (c) the findings of the study on EFLS; and
- (d) the progress of other major projects in KTD, e.g. Hoi Sham Park, Station Square and Kai Tak Park.

2.12 **Mrs Doris FOK** replied that the Hoi Sham Park project was a capital works project. The Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) needed to take forward the project having regard to the relevant established mechanism including fund bidding process..

2.13 **Ms YING** responded to Members' comments as follows:

- (a) the study team of the feasibility study on the cycle track network composed of representatives from various Government departments including LCSD, HyD, TD, HKPF and Housing Authority. The MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) would also be approached in the process, if necessary. The project team would brief and consult Members on the preliminary findings of the feasibility study in future meetings;
- (b) KTO commenced a detailed feasibility study (DFS) of EFLS in October 2015 and an interim public consultation exercise was planned to conduct later this year. Findings would be presented to the Task Force at appropriate juncture;
- (c) regarding Members' concern on "infrastructure-driven" development in KTD, KTO was actually a multi-professional team with not just engineers, but architects and other professionals. It had been playing an active role in coordinating the many different aspects of work such as design and outlook of various projects in an integrated and holistic manner;
- (d) KTO would take into account Members' comments on the format of the progress report; and
- (e) KTO noted the strategic importance of the estuary of KTAC and strived for an integrated design for the 11km waterfront promenade. KTO would work closely with various project teams and departments in taking forward the design and development of the open space in KTD. The team would implement the Planning and Landscaping Master Plan by phases to bring about a cohesive yet diversified and vibrant KTD.

2.14 **The Chair** thanked Ms YING for the presentation and response.



Development of Public Open Space (POS) Adjoining Hotel Sites at Kai Tak Runway

2.15 **The Chair** invited **Miss Christine AU** to report to Members the views collected from the public discussion forum held on 7 May 2016.

2.16 **Miss Christine AU** informed Members that their views as expressed on the subject at the last Task Force meeting had been incorporated. The design was then revised and presented at an informal briefing and a public discussion session held on 21 April and 7 May 2016 respectively. The latest design and implementation approach having taken into account views collected were presented with the aid of a PowerPoint.

2.17 **The Chair** recalled that the subject was one of the agenda items thoroughly discussed at the last Task Force meeting. He invited Members to express further comments.

2.18 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** raised several follow up questions and comments:

- (a) whether the Government would review and renew the land lease of POS after a certain period of time;
- (b) members were not given sufficient time to comment on the proposal on POS and the Progress Report; and
- (c) would the Government respond to his enquiries about the progress report of KTD in the form of post-meeting notes.

2.19 Regarding the conduct of the meeting, **the Chair** clarified that sufficient time would be given for discussion. Members were encouraged to give concise comments and avoid repeating the comments already expressed by others.

2.20 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** had the following requests and comments:

- (a) KTO to respond to his enquires about the progress report of KTD in the form of post-meeting notes;

- (b) would a template of the Progress Report of KTD be circulated for Members' agreement after the meeting; and
- (c) Harbour Unit's response on the review and renewal of the POS land lease.

*(Post-meeting notes: Mr ZIMMERMAN's comments have been taken onboard and that the progress report would have a new format allowing more information on responsible departments and tentative programme of various projects to be provided.)*

2.21 **Miss Christine AU** responded to Mr ZIMMERMAN's comments in relation to the POS issue as follows:

- (a) it was important to reiterate that ownership of the POS adjoining the hotel sites would remain with the Government, and that the Government could take back the the POS for direct management at its discretion at any time;
- (b) regarding the treatment and retention of bollards along Kwun Tong Promenade, Members might recall that the current arrangements of bollards along Kwun Tong Promenade were thoroughly discussed at the 10<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> Kai Tak Task Force meetings. In consultation with relevant departments and Members, it was agreed that more than half of the bollards along the promenade would be retained in-situ as "decorative features". The Harbour Unit would work with relevant department to explore other alternative arrangements before reporting back to Members; and
- (c) the Harbour Unit was aware of the public engagement exercise of the MPSC project, and would invite the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) to update Members at the next Task Force meeting.

2.22 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** presumed that the hotel sites would be granted to developers for at least 50 years. He asked for a clarification on the mechanism to safeguard the management among the different POS sections adjoining the hotel sites and the recovery mechanism should the management of the concerned POS fall short on its performance.

2.23 **Miss Christine AU** replied that Members' concern on the POS was noted. The Government would consider in greater details the terms and conditions to be included in the land lease to gate-keep and review the performance of the developers in managing the POS.

2.24 **The Chair** concluded that, at the last meeting, Members had no in-principle objection to the proposed implementation of public open space in private development (POSPD). He believed that Members and the public were more concerned about the monitoring of the performances of the POS. Although the ownership of the POS would rest with the Government, there might be potential enforcement issues. He recommended the Government to consider putting down a fixed leasing period of POS so as to allow the government to review the management performance of the developers after a certain period of time.

*Kaito Service at Kai Tak*

2.25 **The Chair** invited **Mr Wilson PANG** of TD to brief Members on the kaito service at Kai Tak.

2.26 **Mr Wilson PANG** introduced the kaito service between Kwun Tong Ferry Pier and Kai Tak Cruise Terminal with the aid of a PowerPoint.

2.27 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired whether the kaito service could be more flexible in terms of licencing and services agreement in order to allow kaitos to have more boarding locations to better respond to public demand.

2.28 **Mr YIP Hing-kwok** would like to know details about the current operation, for instance, the patronage figures of the kaito service.

2.29 **Mr Wilson PANG** gave the following responses:

- (a) Members might wish to note that the refurbishment works for a disused fireboat pier at the Kai Tak runway facing KTTS was completed, which had provided a boarding and

alighting point for the public. Both TD and the kaito operator would explore other suitable boarding locations in the future; and

- (b) the patronage of the kaito service was correlated with the number and nature of events being held at the Kai Tak runway. The daily patronage ranged from about 200 to 1,000.

2.30 **The Chair** thanked Mr PANG for the responses.

*Facilitating Provision of Pedestrian Links by the Private Sector (Paper No. TFKT/05/2016)*

2.31 **The Chair** informed Members that EKEO would brief Members on the proposed pilot scheme of pedestrian links by the private sector in Kowloon East. He welcomed **Ms Brenda AU**, Head of EKEO and **Ms Winnie HO**, Deputy Head of EKEO to the meeting.

2.32 **Ms Winnie HO** introduced the pilot scheme with the aid of a PowerPoint.

2.33 **Mr Ivan HO** had two comments on the proposed approach for implementation of the pilot scheme:

- (a) noting that private landowners had to apply to the Lands Department (LandsD) for necessary lease modifications, he enquired whether there would be performance pledges on the application timeline and whether other agents, for instance EKEO, would be involved in the process; and
- (b) he pointed out that private developers had to or had already set back their developments for the connection of some elevated pedestrian links from public area to private buildings and wondered if the set-back areas could be excluded from the calculation of gross floor area (GFA) and site coverage.

2.34 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** echoed Mr HO's views and said that elevated pedestrian walkways could help connect Kowloon Bay better, which was currently segregated by major roads. They could also

help relieve the overcrowded situation on at-grade roads in Kwun Tong. He supported the pilot scheme in principle and raised the following questions:

- (a) was there an entire pedestrian plan in the OZP for both elevated footbridges and ground-level pedestrian crossings for the district;
- (b) given the understanding that the pedestrian links of the proposed comprehensive pedestrian network would be incorporated in the relevant Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) and go through the Town Planning Board application procedure, he wondered how flexibility for further changes could be retained ; and
- (c) in terms of design, he asked how to ensure the footbridges would be nice, wide and provided with pleasant landscaping.

2.35 **Mr YIP Hing-kwok** welcomed the proposed pilot scheme as a means to resolve the at-grade congestion in Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay. On the proposed pedestrian links involving multiple ownership and small property owners, he enquired about the proposed mechanism for better management and maintenance of footbridges.

2.36 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** said that LandsD focused on revenue generating projects and might pay less attention to the proposed scheme. He shared Mr HO's concerns and suggested to set specific timeline for LandsD to assess the proposals for minor adjustments.

2.37 **Ms Melissa PANG** expressed support for the initiative. She viewed that dispersed ownership of estates and shopping malls could be an obstacle to the successful implementation of the pilot scheme and assistance and support might be necessary to resolve disputes arising from multiple ownership of property.

2.38 **Ms Brenda AU** gave a consolidated response to Members' comments as follows:

- (a) under the new policy, any land premium arising from necessary lease modifications would be waived, as long as

the pedestrian link concerned was one that had been incorporated into the Outline Development Plan (ODP). Such lease modification applications would be processed by the LandsD. For applications involving proposed pedestrian links that were slightly deviated from the relevant ODP, the deviations could be considered as “minor”. EKEO would provide advice and work closely with LandsD in processing the applications under the new policy;

- (b) there was an existing for considering and approving applications for exemption of set-back areas from gross floor area and/or site coverage calculations, which would continue to be applicable;
- (c) EKEO’s studies for enhancing the pedestrian environment included proposals for footbridges and subways which were both relevant under the new policy. Members might also note from the presentation that the provision and enhancement of ground-level pedestrian links such as the Green Spines and Green Links were also duly considered in the proposed improvements for the northern part of Kowloon Bay. These proposals had in mind the importance to strike a balance between providing a comfortable grade-separated pedestrian network and maintaining vibrancy and activities on the ground level;
- (d) ODP was not a statutory plan. The amendment of ODP would not entail any statutory process;
- (e) the proposed public walkway system was not solely based on forecast pedestrian flow. Other considerations such as enhancing walkability, connectivity and improving the walking environment were accounted for. The project team would include greening elements in the design as far as practicable; and
- (f) small property owners of a building under multiple ownership would need to liaise amongst themselves to come to an agreement, they would be the party taking the initiative to submit an application to LandsD. EKEO would facilitate as deemed useful and appropriate. ; and

2.39 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired if a target height/level

had been set for the pedestrian links and what other potential uses (e.g. sitting, eating and sleeping) or elements would be included in the comprehensive pedestrian network.

2.40 **The Chair** said that the footbridges should be connected to the level of existing buildings.

2.41 **Ms Brenda AU** clarified that the height for the footbridges would largely be the height of the 1<sup>st</sup> floor of buildings. She supplemented that the absolute height of the connection points at individual buildings might vary to some extent and it would be suitable to specify an absolute height. She concurred with Mr ZIMMERMAN's view on multiple uses of open space. The proposed pedestrian links would link up the Green Spine with nearby POS to provide pedestrians with a convenient network.

2.42 **Mr Ivan HO** said that sleeping should not be one of the potential uses of the footbridges under any comprehensive pedestrian network.

2.43 **The Chair** concluded that Members supported EKEO's initiative in general. He reminded the project team to take note of Members' concerns in relation to the efficiency of processing applications, the issue of multiple ownership of property and the integration and coordination of elevated and at-grade pedestrian links.

### **Item 3 Preliminary Outline Development Plan for Kowloon Bay Action Area (Paper No. TFKT/06/2016)**

3.1 **The Chair** informed Members that EKEO had also provided a discussion paper (Paper No. TFKT/06/2016) to brief Members on the Preliminary Outline Development Plan for Kowloon Bay Action Area (KBAA). KBAA was currently occupied by a number of government facilities. The release of the development potential of these government sites was one of the key initiatives in the transformation of Kowloon East to become the second core business district.

3.2 **The Chair** welcomed **Ms Brenda AU, Ms Winnie HO** and

**Miss Tracy WONG** from EKEO, **Ms Carmen CHU** and **Mr LEE Wai-lam** from Ove Arup & Partners HK Ltd.

3.3 **Ms Brenda AU** presented the Preliminary Outline Development Plan (PODP) with the aid of a PowerPoint.

3.4 **The Chair** opened the floor for discussion and invited Members to give views from a harbourfront enhancement perspective.

3.5 **Mr Ivan HO** credited EKEO for conducting a comprehensive study for the development of KBAA. Meanwhile, he also gave the following comments:

- (a) terraced design and height restrictions had been adopted and imposed on future buildings along the waterfront. From an urban design perspective, he opined that such rules would deprive future design of creativity and suggested that some buildings could be granted exceptions in order to create some vista for the city and landmarks within KBAA;
- (b) in view of the recent collapse of a green rooftop at a local institution, he said that roof loading of the proposed urban farming activities would have to be carefully assessed;
- (c) whether there would be more landscaped decks to connect different segments of KBAA to enhance the pedestrian connectivity and walkability;
- (d) whether the food waste treatment facilities could serve local residents and community more directly and in a more integrated manner;
- (e) the provision of more centralised underground car parks and drop off areas would release road space and help create a walkable network connecting nearby places; and
- (f) from an urban design perspective, he opined that the increase in the overall greening ratio to 40% within KBAA would impose more constraints and difficulties in the implementation of the development projects.

3.6 Noting that KBAA would incorporate smart city elements in respect of refuse collection and handling, information dissemination, traffic management, building design and facilities management and



greening, **Mr Duncan CHIU** enquired whether there was an overall plan indicating the applicability of smart city elements within the area in greater detail. With regard to the proposed Small and Medium-sized enterprise (SME) Business Showcase, he advised that it could be run by a professional team and to be used as a support centre rather than just a venue showcasing successful start-ups.

3.7 **Mr Freddie HAI** enquired whether the development density and critical mass for commercial activities could be increased to attract more activities and enrich vibrancy in the area. Regarding the proposed Environmentally Friendly Linkage System (EFLS), he believed that KBAA could be a potential EFLS interchange point to integrate the EFLS with existing MTR station network, although it was not so proposed as part of the alignment. He suggested that EKEO and relevant departments to explore other alternative green transport modes other than EFLS for connection to be made between KBAA and Kowloon Bay MTR Station.

*(Post-meeting notes: KTO plans to conduct an interim consultation exercise on the selection of green transport mode(s) as EFLS later this year.)*

3.8 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** concurred with Mr HAI's views and commented that the master plan and concept of the proposed scheme was driven by the EFLS. He suggested that the project team should design an alternative scheme without the EFLS for Members to consider and compare. He estimated that the office population within KBAA would be about 30,000 people and that it would be imperative to immediately address the issue of public transport rather than hoping for solutions in the future.

3.9 **Mr Derek SUN** noted that there were industries and storage areas along Kai Hing Road to the south of the action area. He asked whether enhancement works would be carried out to upgrade Kai Hing Road and enhance the connectivity between KBAA and the harbourfront.

3.10 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** pointed out that there was serious traffic jam in the vicinity of Kwun Tong Bypass and Kowloon Bay. Noting there would be ever-increasing traffic activities on roads arising from the long term development of KBAA, he would like to know what

were the proposed schemes and solutions to address existing and foreseeable traffic issue. He also raised his concern on the location of the food waste facilities and the actual implementation of food waste separation, collection and transportation proposed by the Environmental Protection Department (EPD).

3.11 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** shared Mr SUN's views and suggested EKEO to conduct further study and develop concrete ideas to enhance the connection between KBAA and the waterfront.

3.12 **The Chair** said that the next agenda item was on the design of the Hong Kong Children's Hospital. He viewed that the future development of the Hospital Cluster was a great opportunity to create good pedestrian access from the KBAA to the harbourfront.

3.13 **Ms Brenda AU** thanked Members for the comments. She gave the following responses:

- (a) the building height restrictions within KBAA would range from 120-150 mPD, with sufficient flexibility for diverse building designs;
- (b) EKEO was exploring with EPD on whether there could be more convenient and direct waste collection (including food waste) in KBAA under the study;
- (c) the basement carparks on Lots 2 and 4 were proposed to be connected so as to reduce the traffic on the ground level;
- (d) similar to development sites in KTD, the overall greening ratio at KBAA was 10% higher than the ratio under the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBD Guidelines), and thus for sites up to two hectares, the overall greening ratio would be 30% of the overall site area;
- (e) regarding the elements of smart city, an Automatic Refuse Collection System (ARCS) and Integrated Waste Handling Facility (IWHF) would be introduced. Besides electric vehicle charging facilities, smart facilities such as smart water meters and real-time parking availability information, as well as other new ideas and proposals coming up from EKEO's on-going study would be considered in the long term development of KBAA;

- (f) the proposed development intensity of about 500,000 square metres of GFA had almost reached the maximum development capacity;
- (g) EKEO would coordinate with KTO to adjust the implementation details of KBAA upon the completion of the DFS of EFLS. A “Without EFLS” scenario for Lot 4 had also been looked into under the study but was not covered in the presentation;
- (h) the Vehicle Examination Centres of Transport Department (TD) at Lot 4 would be relocated and EKEO would further review the design of Lot 4;
- (i) Members’ aspiration for good connectivity between KBAA and the waterfront was noted. EKEO and the project teams responsible for the Hong Kong Children’s Hospital and the New Acute Hospital would work together to further improve harbourfront connectivity; and
- (j) the SME Business Showcase Space and SME Support Centre were proposed with the intention to provide services to SMEs. She supplemented that the Innovation and Technology Bureau (ITB) had intention intend to provide some co-working space for start-ups in KBAA.

3.14 **Ms Carmen CHU** gave the following responses to Members’ concerns about traffic arrangement:

- (a) pedestrians would be connected at multi-levels within the KBAA.
- (b) in view of the traffic congestion in the neighbouring area, a new ingress/egress on Lai Fuk Road flyover to Lot 2 was proposed to cater for the additional traffic load generated by KBAA;
- (c) traffic flow and air pollutants emitted from vehicles at the ground-level would be reduced as the underground vehicle parks of Lots 2 and 4 would be connected to reduce the circulation traffic at-grade; and
- (d) the project team had also considered both ‘with and without EFLS’ scenarios in the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA). A temporary transport interchange would cater for the transport demand in the area prior to the commissioning of

the proposed EFLS.

3.15 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** reiterated his questions on the proposed solution to tackle the exiting traffic issues and the increasing traffic flow. He raised further questions and comments as follows:

- (a) whether the proposed temporary transport interchange was designed for the proposed EFLS;
- (b) how would the ARCS be implemented and whether there would be separate collection systems for different types of waste such as food, glass, wood, metal, paper and plastic etc.;
- (c) how to deal with excessive at-grade truck and coach parking in the area; and
- (d) 3-dimensional graphics or animation should be shown in the presentation to illustrate the proposed multi-layered pedestrian and traffic connections of the project.

3.16 **Mr Ivan HO** emphasised that the project team should carefully consider enhancing pedestrian links connecting KBAA to the waterfront and public transport facilities. He enquired about the actual implementation of connecting the basements of privately owned buildings.

3.17 **The Chair** reminded Members to give comments in relation to waterfront connectivity. He asked the project team to provide the details of the public consultation exercise and how Members could express further views on the project.

3.18 **Mr Derek SUN** opined that the project team should consider the future redevelopment of old industrial buildings along Kai Hing Road in the scheme.

3.19 **Ms Brenda AU** responded to Members' comments as follows:

- (a) the project team shared Members' concern about connectivity to the harbourfront. The project team would take into account views collected from stakeholders through

- public consultation and further study and refine the preliminary ODP of KBAA;
- (b) the proposed food waste treatment plant mainly cater for the commercial, business and “Government, Institution or Community” (GIC) facilities in Kowloon East. As for the ARCS within KBAA, different waste materials would be collected at different periods during the day; and
  - (c) goods vehicle and coach parking spaces would be provided generally in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). To address the issue of lorry parking, EKEO and TD would explore the feasibility of allowing parking at loading and unloading bays within the developments at KBAA during night time.

3.20 **The Chair** thanked the project team for the presentation and their responses.

#### **Item 4 Design of Hong Kong Children’s Hospital at Kai Tak (Paper No. TFKT/07/2016)**

4.1 **The Chair** recounted that the Food and Health Bureau (FHB), the Hospital Authority (HA) and ArchSD had briefed Members on the proposed development of the Hong Kong Children’s Hospital (HKCH) at the 8<sup>th</sup> meeting in January 2012. The project team had provided a discussion paper (TFKT/07/2016) to update Members on the detailed design and latest progress of the project. He welcomed **Mr Richard YUEN** and **Mr Patrick LEE** from FHB; **Mr David CHAK** and **Mr Jackson WAI** from ArchSD; **Dr T.L. LEE**, **Dr Lily CHIU** and **Mr Donald LI** from HA; **Mr Michael YAM** from Simon Kwan & Associates Ltd. to the meeting. He also welcomed representatives from stakeholder groups. He drew Members’ attention to two letters from patient representatives expressing their views on the project.

4.2 **Mr Richard YUEN** and **Mr Michael YAM** updated Members on the detailed design and the latest progress of HKCH with the aid of a PowerPoint.

4.3 **The Chair** thanked the project team for the presentation.

He invited Members to comment from the aspects of waterfront connectivity and the interface between HKCH and the waterfront.

4.4 **Mr Freddie HAI** asked the project team to clarify the delineation and division of private area and POS on the ground floor and whether the public would be allowed to enter and use the facilities in the Rehab Garden and therefore mix with the patients. He thought that a visually permeable hospital environment might not be desirable from the public's point of view as he noted the hospital would be specialised in treating patients with severe sickness. The sight of sickly patients might be visually daunting for the public to bear. He suggested the project team to strike a balance between public enjoyment of waterfront open spaces and protection of patients' privacy through reviewing the open space design.

4.5 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** raised concern on the connectivity between HKCH and the waterfront, especially as patients might have to return to the hospital even after recovery.

4.6 **Mr Ivan HO** asked the project team to clarify on the following:

- (a) whether HKCH would be totally fenced off by fences or screen walls ;
- (b) whether the Rehab Garden was intended to be a POS with 24-hour public access; and
- (c) whether the project team only gave Members a general update of the project or aimed to seek Members' views on certain aspects of the project noting that it had already entered the final design stage.

4.7 **The Chair** reminded Members that the focus of the discussion was the relationship and connectivity between the HKCH and the waterfront.

4.8 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** shared the Chair's views and said that the role of the Committee was to examine waterfront projects in the context of the Harbour Planning Principles (HPP). He expressed disappointment that the HPP had not been mentioned in the presentation and asked the project team whether the scheme had taken

into account HPP.

4.9 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** commented that the level of access to hospital premises and its open spaces depended on the risk of infection. Certain degree of design flexibility should be allowed. He credited the visual and physical permeability of the design. Meanwhile, he also gave the following comments:

- (a) he asked whether HA would welcome the provision of landing steps and mooring facilities along the waterfront promenade fronting HKCH;
- (b) sufficient parking facilities within HKCH should be provided for hospital staff, patients and the general public;
- (c) cycling between Kai Tak Station and HKCH should be promoted, and appropriate parking and bike rental facilities shall be included in the design of the HKCH; and
- (d) whether the dining and cafeteria facilities within HKCH would be opened to the general public when the infection risk level was low.

4.10 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** asked for a clarification on the access to the waterfront. As indicated on the slides, HKCH would be encircled by boundary screens and fence walls.

4.11 **The Chair** reminded Members that harbourfront promenade was not a private property of HKCH. It was a legitimate request for the hospital to provide both a visual and physical access point within its site leading to harbourfront, which was a public area. Members should note that there were differences between 'using' and 'passing through' the ground level of the HKCH, the latter of which should be the focus of the discussion.

4.12 **Mr Richard YUEN** emphasised that HKCH was planned for vulnerable children patients who suffered from serious illnesses, and HA was committed to protecting the privacy of patients and their families. He informed the meeting that access to the Rehab Garden would be restricted to patients and their families.

4.13 **Dr LEE** gave the following responses:

- (a) HA had the responsibility to guarantee the provision of a safe environment for weak and immunity-compromised patients. The Rehab Garden provided patients with an open space environment for relieving stress. Thus, it was important to restrict public entry to the Rehab Garden as it helped to prevent the transmission of virus and bacteria through contacts with the outer environment; and
- (b) alternative access routes leading to the harbourfront were provided around the two sides of the hospital and it would not involve excessive walking. Thus, it was not HKCH's intention to allow general passage through the Rehab Garden in consideration of the possibility of infection and privacy of children patients.

4.14 From a hospital management perspective, **Mr Richard YUEN** supplemented that non-hospital users should not be encouraged to have free access to hospital premises.

4.15 **The Chair** noted HA's intention to fence off the public open space of the HKCH for exclusive use of the patients and their families. While noting their concerns, he recalled the planning history of the site - prominent harbourfront sites were agreed to be allocated for hospital use only after due consideration of HPP and the promise that suitable arrangements would be put in place in ensuring public accessibility to the harbourfront. Restricting public access to the hospital cluster would in effect hinder the public from enjoying the harbourfront, which is an open space for the general public. This is objectionable from the perspective of the HC. He encouraged Members to comment on the design of HKCH in the context of HPP. A balance between the need of a protective environment and the community's aspiration for a more accessible waterfront must be struck.

4.16 **Mr Ivan HO** echoed the views of **the Chair**. If HKCH decided to close itself off entirely from the public in view of the potential infection risk, the promenade fronting the site might have to be closed off as well. The Committee might need to reconsider the location of the Kai Tak Hospital Cluster.



4.17 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that HA should provide a controlled access to the public, as was the norm with existing hospital grounds.

4.18 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** would like the project team to clarify which of the routes alongside the garden connecting to the waterfront were proposed for public use.

4.19 **Mr Freddie HAI** commented that there was a conflict between the use of public open space and need for safety and disease control from the perspective of HKCH. He suggested HA to consider setting different hierarchy of open spaces for different levels of disease control, with the Rehab Garden as a low infection risk area so that the public is safe to mingle with the patients while the gardens at upper floor decks of the hospitals to be reserved for higher infection risk taking advantage of their inherent spatial segregation.

4.20 **Dr LEE** responded as follows:

- (a) the waterfront promenade would not pose any infection risk to HKCH so its closing would be unnecessary; and
- (b) access control through the gates would allow flexibility for public access. HA would consider releasing the open space at ground floor for public use in the evening and during night-time.

4.21 **The Chair** reiterated that while members agreed that disturbance to patients should be minimised, the design of HKCH must comply with HPP and guidelines which emphasized both visual and physical permeability. In this connection, fencing off the public open space at the ground level would be unacceptable. He would hope the project proponent to commit allowing visitors to pass through the Rehab Garden freely for direct access to the harbourfront. It would be undesirable if any security officers at the gates fronting the hospital would stop and question visitors or direct them to use alternative routes if they intend to visit the harbourfront. He asked HA to confirm if a controlled access route could be provided within the Rehab Garden allowing public access to the harbourfront promenade from Road D4.

4.22 **Dr LEE** confirmed the provision of a controlled access route.

4.23 **Mr Richard YUEN** thanked Members for their comments on the design of HKCH. He said that HKCH was a development milestone that would bring enormous benefits to children patients.

4.24 **The Chair** thanked the project team for the presentations and looked forward to receiving the exact access route within the premises for public access.

*(Post-meeting notes: A layout plan showing all proposed pedestrian routes around or through the hospital which connect Road D4 prepared by the project team was circulated for Members' information on 15 September 2016. HA proposed to install CCTV and lockable metal gates (1.2m high) at appropriate locations in the Rehab Garden as control measures on public access through the HKCH to the harbourfront promenade.)*

## **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 dates in due course.

5.2 **The Chair** announced to Members that **Miss Emily SOM** would take over from Miss Ingrid TJENDRO as Secretary of the Task Force with effect from 6 June 2016. He thanked Miss TJENDRO for her contributions to the work of the Task Force.

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

### **Secretariat**

**Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development  
June 2016**