

# Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development

## Minutes of Twenty-second Meeting

Date : 4 October 2016 (Tuesday)  
Time : 3:00 p.m.  
Venue : Conference Room (Room G64) at Upper Ground Floor, Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre, Kowloon Park, Tsim Sha Tsui

### Present

Mr Vincent NG Chairman

### Organization Members

Mrs Margaret BROOKE Representing Business Environment Council  
Dr NG Cho-nam Representing The Conservancy Association  
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  
Ir Raymond CHAN Kin-sek Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers  
Sr Emily LI Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors  
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour

### Individual Members

Mr CHAN Ka-kui Individual Member  
Ms Kelly CHAN Yuen-sau Individual Member  
Mr NGAN Man-yu Individual Member  
Ms Melissa Kaye PANG Co-opted Member  
Mr Derek SUN Co-opted Member  
Mr YIP Hing-kwok Co-opted Member

### Official Members

Mr Francis CHAU Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)2, DEVB  
Miss Christine AU Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB  
Mr Thomas WK CHAN Senior Manager (Tourism)41, Tourism Commission (TC)  
Mr PANG Wai-shing Assistant Commissioner/Urban, 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) <sup>1</sup> , Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Miss Emily SOM	Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Duncan CHIU	Co-opted Member
Mr LO Chiu-kit	Co-opted Member
Mr Hans Joachim ISLER	Individual Member
Ms Vivian LEE	Individual Member
Mr Paul YK CHAN	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Prof TANG Bo-sin	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr Louis LOONG	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong

In attendance

Mr Nicholas BROOKE	HC Chair
Mr Larry CHU	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) <sup>1</sup> , DEVB

For Item 3

Mr WONG Tak-choi, Frank	Deputy Head of Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO)
Mr WONG On-wa, Edward	Senior Place Making Manager(Design), EKEO

For Item 4

Mr WONG Tak Choi, Frank	Deputy Head of Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO)
Mr TSE Mang-hin, Roy	Senior Works Consolidation Manager, EKEO
Mr Ray TANG	Associate, Arup

For Item 5

Mr David LEUNG	Senior Engineer/District Monitoring Group on Housing Sites & Special Duty (Kowloon), KTO, CEDD
Ms Inness CHAN	Engineer/17 (Kowloon), KTO, CEDD
Mr S.M. MA	Chief Engineer/Mainland South, Drainage Services

Mr Kenneth CHAN	Department (DSD) Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Regional E), Environmental Protection Department, (EPD)
Mr Freeman CHEUNG	Senior Vice President, Environment, Greater China, AECOM
Mr Igor HO	Executive Director, AECOM

*For Item 6*

Mr T K YEUNG	Commissioner for Sports, Home Affairs Bureau (HAB)
Ms Linda LAW	Principal Assistant Secretary (Recreation & Sport) <sup>2</sup> , HAB
Mr James BLAKE	Project Reviewer, HAB
Mr Michael MAK	Senior Architect (Recreation & Sport), HAB
Mr Keith MAN	Senior Engineer (Recreation & Sport), HAB
Ms Ivy LEE	Principal Director, Leigh & Orange Ltd (L&O)
Mr Alan LI	Director, L&O
Mr Ignacio Diez AGUIRRE	Associate, L&O
Dr Sujata S. GOVADA	Founding and Managing Director, UDP International
Mr Widemar SPRUIJT	Senior Associate, UDP International
Mr Frank WONG	Senior Associate, UDP International
Mr Sion EDWARDS	Director, Urbis Limited

*For Item 7*

Mr Roy LAM	Senior Engineer 3/Central Kowloon Route, Highways Department (HyD)
Mr Raymond CHUNG	Senior Engineer 4/Central Kowloon Route, HyD
Ms Jacqueline TAI	Engineer 8/Central Kowloon Route, HyD
Ms Karen CHUI	Project Coordinator 3/Central Kowloon Route, HyD
Mr Franki CHIU	Director, Arup - Mott MacDonald Joint Venture (AMMJV)
Mr Alan LOW	Technical Director, AMMJV
Mr Ray TANG	Associate, AMMJV
Mr MAK Lin-fat	Senior Engineer, AMMJV

**The Chair** welcomed all attending the 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development. He introduced and welcomed the following individual members, **Ms Kelly CHAN** and **Mr NGAN Man-yu** for joining the Task Force.

**The Chair** informed Members that **Mr Wilson PANG** had taken over from Mr TANG Wai-leung as Assistant Commissioner/Urban of Transport Department on 25 July 2016. He welcomed Mr PANG and thanked Mr TANG for his invaluable contribution to 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.

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

1.1 The draft minutes of the 21<sup>st</sup> Task Force meeting were circulated to Members for comments on 15 September 2016. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated again on 30 September 2016.

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

### **Item 2 Matters Arising**

*Workshop cum Site Visit to the Southern Part of Kai Tak Runway (paragraph 2.3 of the confirmed minutes of the 21<sup>st</sup> meeting)*

2.1 **The Chair** reported that Kai Tak Office (KTO) of CEDD has

arranged two workshops to brief Members on the design of the landscaped deck above road D3 on 17 May and 31 August 2016. While connectivity was the major concern raised at both workshops, Members had no adverse comments on the design of the noise barrier as well as the open space on the landscaped deck. The project team would take into account the feedback collected from Members in further developing the design before consulting the Task Force early next year.

*The last Progress Report on Kai Tak Development (paragraphs 2.6, 2.7 and 2.20 of the confirmed minutes of the 21<sup>st</sup> meeting)*

2.2 In response to **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN**'s enquiry about the pedestrian walkway and noise barrier underneath the landscaped deck along Road D3 (para. 2.6), KTO provided a written response in the form of post-meeting notes.

2.3 In response to **Mr Nicholas BROOKE**'s enquiry about the public engagement exercise of the Kai Tak Sports Park (para. 2.7), the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) invited Members to join and expressed their views at an informal briefing on 13 July 2016. The project team would formally consult the Task Force on the design development and findings of its Urban Design Study of Kai Tak Sports Park project under Agenda Item 6 of this meeting.

2.4 With regards to Members' comments on the format of the Progress Report (para. 2.20), KTO had taken Member's comments into account and prepared a new format showing more information including responsible departments and tentative programme of various projects etc.

*Preliminary Outline Development Plan for Kowloon Bay Action Area (paragraph 3.7 of the confirmed minutes of the 21<sup>st</sup> meeting)*

2.5 In response to Mr Freddie HAI's concern on the proposed Environmentally Friendly Linkage System (EFLS) within KTD, KTO planned to conduct an interim consultation exercise on the selection of green transport mode(s) as EFLS in late 2016.

*Design of Hong Kong Children's Hospital at Kai Tak (paragraph 4.24 of the confirmed minutes of the 21<sup>st</sup> meeting)*

2.6 In response to Members' concern on the availability of a controlled access at Hong Kong Children's Hospital (HKCH), the project team of HKCH provided a layout plan showing possible pedestrian routes around and through the hospital bringing people from Road D4 to the waterfront promenade. It was circulated to Members for information on 15 September 2016.

2.7 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** expressed his concern over the pedestrian environment as well as the noise and air pollution within the noise barrier of the landscaped deck. He requested for plans and figures to illustrate the quality of pedestrian environment within the noise barrier.

2.8 **The Chair** suggested that the Secretariat shall relay Mr ZIMMERMAN's comments to the relevant project team for follow-up. He also invited Ms YING to give an initial response on the issues of air quality and noise problem underneath the landscaped deck during the presentation on the Progress Report on Kai Tak Development.

*Progress Report on Kai Tak Development (KTD) (Paper No. TFKT/08/2016)*

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

2.10 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** enquired about the Review Study of Kai Tak Development which had been undertaken by the Government with a view to increasing the housing supply in Kai Tak. He urged the relevant project proponent to brief and engage Members on the Review Study in advance. **The Chair** agreed.

2.11 **Mr Ivan HO** raised the following comments and questions:

- (a) noting that a considerable number of projects such as schools, housing estates and community facilities had been completed in the KTD, whether the progress report could qualitatively report on the progress of infrastructure projects

in KTD. The progress report should assess whether the planning vision of KTD had been realised. He opined that the progress report would be more purposeful if information on development phasing, accessibility and connectivity, community engagement, urban design, place making and management, spaces for shared use as well as waterfront vibrancy etc. is presented respectively;

- (b) with regards to housing supply, the progress report shall illustrate the kind of living environment and experience as well as the sense of community that had been created within KTD to date;
- (c) the consultants shall report to the Task Force on the latest progress of the study on Kai Tak Fantasy;
- (d) regarding the Planning and Urban Design Review for Developments at Kai Tak Runway Tip from 2015 to 2017, whether public engagement exercises were being conducted and whether the project proponent would brief KTF Members on the findings of the feasibility study in due course; and
- (e) when would Members be briefed on the findings arising from the Detailed Feasibility Study (DFS) of the proposed Environmentally Friendly Linkage System (EFLS).

2.12 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that the progress report should better reflect Members' comments made in previous discussions. He raised several follow-up questions and comments:

- (a) whether the design ideas and planning for the head of the Approach Channel would be brought up for discussion at future Task Force meeting;
- (b) what was the latest progress of the Kai Tak Station Square project;
- (c) with regards to the development of hotel sites along the former Kai Tak Runway, whether there had been any updates on how the design and management of the waterfront adjoining the hotel sites would be included in the land lease conditions of the sites;
- (d) regarding the development of a cycle track network in KTD, the Task Force had discussed this matter at past meeting

which involved the Leisure and Cultural Service Department (LCSD), Housing Authority, MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) and relevant departments etc. The concerned departments and organizations should provide updates on the concept of shared use of road space for cycling, the provision of ancillary facilities and the extension of cycle track into housing estates and connection with the promenades in Kai Tak.

2.13 **Sr Emily LI** suggested that the progress report could include a paragraph on the progress against the original programme to facilitate Members' understanding on the status of individual project. The current report included the commencement and completion dates of various projects but Members were not informed whether these projects were ahead of or behind schedule.

2.14 **The Chair** informed Members that KTO had prepared the progress report with reference to Members' comments. He reminded Members that KTD had over 10 years of planning history and a total area of over 320 hectares for a plethora of uses. Members' comments on the format of the progress report were noted but given Members had each accorded different priorities to different aspects of the development in KTD such as environmental quality, transport facilities and building height, it would be impossible to come up with a format that meets the requirements of all Members. He opined that the primary concern of the Harbourfront Commission was pedestrian and cycling connectivity and accessibility of public space along the harbourfront, which were pointed out by Mr HO and Mr ZIMMERMAN in their comments.

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

- (a) the Government had laid down planning vision and major directions at the early planning stage for KTD. For example, about 1/3 of the development sites in Kai Tak were connected by green areas. Greening guidelines were introduced to govern the development of Government, Institution or Community (G/IC) sites and private lots. She shared that the design of many G/IC facilities e.g. Trade and Industry Tower (TI Tower), Kai Tak Nullah desilting



compounds and sewage pumping stations, had been awarded with BEAM Plus Platinum grading. KTO would continue to play an active role in coordinating different projects and endeavoured to implement the planning vision of KTD step-by-step;

- (b) Members' comments on the harbourfront connectivity, accessibility and place making along the 11km long waterfront promenade at Kai Tak were noted. KTO worked in close coordination with different project teams to ensure all projects at Kai Tak would adopt a people-oriented approach and ensure coherence in taking forward the projects;
- (c) the progress report was an overview of the programme rather than a detailed update on any particular project. She assured Members that different project teams would consult the Task Force and relevant stakeholders separately at different stages of their projects. It was believed that project-based meetings or workshops would allow more time for Members and the project team to exchange views and lead to more fruitful outcomes;
- (d) infrastructure projects in KTD were grouped into 3 packages for completion. The first package of KTD, including the development of public housing estates, the first berth of the cruise terminal and associated infrastructure works etc. was completed on time in 2016. A small number of projects, e.g. Road D2, suffered from slight delay due to unexpected weather conditions. The overall progress of the programmes was optimistic;
- (e) in response to Mr ZIMMERMAN's enquiry about the cycle track network in KTD, KTO was actively engaging relevant parties and departments to discuss the implementation, management and safety issues of the proposed cycle track network. The project team planned to brief and consult Members on the preliminary findings of the feasibility study on the cycle track network in early 2017;
- (f) KTO commenced a detailed feasibility study (DFS) of ELFS and the project team would present the findings to Members when appropriate. The interim report would give recommendations on suitable transport modes to be

- implemented in Kowloon East after comparing and analysing the pros and cons of different transport modes;
- (g) the Secretary for Development announced the completion of a review with the aim of increasing housing supply at KTD. The Government would brief and consult the Task Force and stakeholders on the proposal.

2.16 **The Chair** enquired about the number of additional flats to be built in Kai Tak as a result of the Review Study.

2.17 **Miss Christine AU** replied that an additional Task Force meeting would be scheduled to discuss the Review Study of Kai Tak Development before the next Harbourfront Commission meeting. **The Secretariat**

*(Post-meeting notes: The Planning Department and the Civil Engineering Development Department arranged an informal briefing with Members on 28 October 2016. The project team then consulted the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development on the Review Study of Kai Tak Development at its 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting on 18 November 2016.)*

2.18 **The Chair** reminded Members that the development at Kai Tak was dynamic. Members had assessed and monitored the development progress of KTD in accordance with the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines over the years. The Commission was particularly focused on the timely implementation of public open space within the harbourfront areas for public enjoyment as well as the enhancement of connectivity and accessibility of open spaces along the harbourfront.

2.19 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** reiterated that the progress report should reflect Members' discussions at previous meetings. For instance, the discussions on the development of hotel sites along the former Kai Tak Runway, cycle track at KTD and the treatment of the Kai Tak Approach Channel had not been duly included.

2.20 **The Chair** believed that Government officials would provide their responses and necessary information for Members' information.

**Item 3           Improvement to Hoi Bun Road Park and Adjacent Area  
(Paper No. TFKT/09/2016)**

3.1           **The Chair** informed Members that the Energizing Kowloon east Office (EKEO) had provided a discussion paper (Paper No. TFKT/09/2016) to brief Members on “Improvement to Hoi Bun Road Park and Adjacent Area”.

3.2           **The Chair** welcomed **Mr Frank WONG** and **Mr Edward WONG** from EKEO.

3.3           **Mr Frank WONG** and **Mr Edward WONG** presented the improvement project with the aid of a PowerPoint.

3.4           **Mr Freddie HAI**, being frequent visitor to Hoi Bun Road, noted that the traffic volume along the road was not very high but it segregated Hoi Bun Road Park and the waterfront promenade. With regards to the proposed provision of new pedestrian crossing facilities, he enquired whether the project team and the Transport Department (TD) would consider adding zebra crossing rather than traffic island as the former would convey a ‘pedestrian first’ message.

3.5           **Mr YIP Hing-kwok** pointed out that the pedestrian connectivity to Hoi Bun Road Park and the waterfront promenade was not satisfactory at present. Noting that EKEO’s proposal aimed at enhancing the connectivity from Nga Tau Kok MTR station to the waterfront, he suggested EKEO to consider including a more direct elevated walkway from Lai Yip Street to the Kwun Tong Promenade in their proposal.

3.6           **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** gave the following comments and enquiries:

- (a)           The priority of this proposal over the other waterfront projects and the reasons behind. He opined that the completion of other waterfront projects, e.g. Hoi Sham Park Extension for Waterfront Promenade and Sai Ying Pun Promenade should be accorded with higher priority. He

- would like to know the programme for Hoi Shum Park waterfront projects;
- (b) whether user demand study survey and research had been conducted by the project team;
  - (c) whether EKEO and the Harbour Unit had received applications or proposals for alternative use of the sites covered in the project; and
  - (d) could the project proponent provide more details on the management of the car parking and coach parking areas.

3.7 In response to the issue of prioritization of waterfront projects, **the Chair** said that the Legislative Council (LegCo) would decide on the priority of funding allocation to different waterfront projects. He invited the Harbour Unit to respond to Mr ZIMMERMAN later.

**Harbour  
Unit**

3.8 **Mr Frank WONG** thanked Members for the comments. He gave the following responses:

- (a) EKEO would further study the traffic flow in the area and follow up with TD on the proposal of adding crossing facilities to ensure better connectivity to the waterfront area;
- (b) Mr YIP's suggestion for an elevated walkway to the waterfront was also raised at EKEO's consultation with the District Council. EKEO would certainly take Member's views into account but given the presence of extensive underground utilities underneath Lai Yip Street and the potential impacts of the columns of the elevated walkway on the pedestrian traffic at ground level, the project team would look into measures to enhance the pedestrian network holistically and balance the pedestrian flow at elevated and ground level;
- (c) EKEO took every opportunity to implement long-term and quick-win projects to improve waterfront connectivity and greening environment within Kowloon East area; and
- (d) Once the works at the vacant site (named "Fly the Flyover 04" or FF04) is completed, the concerned site would be handed over to the Highways Department (HyD) for management. Parking spaces with parking meters for

coaches, private cars and motorcycles will be provided. EKEO would also work closely with the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) and the Hong Kong Police Force to address the problem of illegal parking.

3.9 **Miss Christine AU** said that the Hoi Sham Park Extension project was under the purview of LCSD. In response to Mr ZIMMERMAN's request for a list of waterfront open space projects, the Harbour Unit could assist to prepare a list for Members' information.

**Harbour  
Unit**

*(Post-meeting notes: The Harbour Unit is collating inputs from relevant departments to prepare a list of waterfront open space projects. The list will be issued to HC Members for information when ready.)*

3.10 **Mrs Doris FOK** supplemented that the Hoi Sham Park project was a Capital Works Project (CWP). LCSD would take forward the project for funding approval by LegCo's Finance Committee having regards to the established process and procedures on implementation of CWPs.

3.11 **The Chair** invited Members to share views on EKEO's proposal, in particular, matters related to the enhancement of harbourfront vibrancy, greening and the design of streetscape.

3.12 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** would like a response from EKEO/Harbour Unit on whether the Government had received any application or proposal for alternative use of the site concerned. He also raised a follow-up question in relation to the priority of funding allocation of waterfront enhancement projects led by different Government departments.

3.13 **The Chair** said that Mr ZIMMERMAN had raised a valid point but explained that it would be difficult for Task Force Members to discuss and conclude whether harbourfront enhancement projects at Kai Tak were more important than projects at other locations. In view of this, **the Chair** advised Members to state whether they would support EKEO's project as well as its funding application.

3.14 Regarding the issue on funding, **Miss Christine AU** said

that Government bureaux and departments would accord different priorities to individual projects having regard to their policy objectives and jurisdiction. The funding priority for different projects would be determined internally within the Government before funding proposals are submitted for LegCo for approval. Echoing the Chair's view, she invited Members to comment on individual project on its own merits. On the basis of Members' support, the project proponent could then bid for the necessary resources.

3.15 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** stressed that there were other harbourfront projects, e.g. in Sai Ying Pun, that deserved more attention and had more imminent need for funding than the proposed improvement works to Hoi Bun Road Park. On this basis, he was against the proposal.

3.16 **The Chair** noted Mr ZIMMERMAN's views. He advised that the enhancement projects at Sai Ying Pun shall be raised for discussion at the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island.

3.17 **Mr Derek SUN** observed that the Kwun Tong promenade had become a more popular destination on account of its increasing accessibility. He asked whether the proposal had looked into the provision of dining and catering facilities for visitors, e.g. food trucks or sampan boats that serve food.

3.18 **Mr Freddie HAI** said that EKEO should clearly convey the message of "pedestrians taking precedence". He raised follow-up questions in relation to the provision of outdoor performance venues, whether the project had reserved any area for arts and performing groups currently operating in the adjacent industrial buildings. In addition to that, whether any mitigation measures would be in place to reduce the noise generated.

3.19 **Mr Frank WONG** responded to Members' comments as follows:

- (a) The proposed use of FF04 would be in line with the uses of Sites FF01, FF02 and FF03 underneath the Kwun Tong

Bypass where different events and activities had been held to enhance the vibrancy of the waterfront. LandsD confirmed that there had not been any proposals for alternative use of FF04;

- (b) there would be pilot food trucks to be operated shortly within site FF01. He foresaw that the event organiser of FF02 and FF03 would also propose some thematic facilities. Details would be explored with the event organiser; and
- (c) there was a multi-purpose venue at the Hoi Bun Road Park for different events and activities. Apart from improving connectivity, EKEO aimed at enhancing the vibrancy of the waterfront areas.

3.20 **Ms Kelly CHAN** enquired about the budget estimate of EKEO's quick-win project. She opined that the major objective of the project was to improve connectivity and accessibility so as to benefit residents and working population in Nga Tau Kok and Kwun Tong districts. However, she was uncertain how increasing the number of parking spaces would benefit local community.

3.21 **Mr Frank WONG** noted Ms CHAN's comment and agreed that accessibility to the waterfront promenade should be the focus. He supplemented that the provision of car parking spaces along Hoi Bun Road would provide boarding and alighting locations for elderly and visitors who travelled to the park by private cars or coaches. Regarding the budget estimate the project, he reported that the quick-win project would cost below HKD 30 million and the long-term waterfront improvement works of the Energizing Hoi Bun Road- Green Operation would cost approximately HKD 200 million. A more accurate budget could be provided for Members' information at the funding application stage.

3.22 **The Chair** noted that Members were positive about the project and had no objection in principle. He advised the project team to take into account Members' concern in relation to connectivity to Hoi Bun Road Park from nearby public transport facilities and that the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines should be upheld when taking forward the project. He thanked the project team for the presentation and their responses.

**Item 4 Pedestrian Environment Improvement Scheme for Transformation of Kwun Tong Business Area - Feasibility Study Stage 3 Public Engagement (Paper No. TFKT/10/2016)**

4.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO) had prepared a discussion paper (TFKT/10/2016) to brief Members on the latest progress of Stage 3 Public Engagement exercise of the Pedestrian Environment Improvement Scheme for Transformation of Kwun Tong Business Area (KTBA) Feasibility Study. He welcomed **Mr Frank WONG** and **Mr Roy TSE** from EKEO, and **Mr Ray TANG** from Arup to the meeting.

4.2 **Mr Ray TANG** briefed Members on the findings of the feasibility study with the aid of a PowerPoint.

4.3 **The Chair** opened the floor for discussion and invited Members to give views on the findings of the KTBA feasibility study.

4.4 **Mr Ivan HO** welcomed and supported EKEO's initiatives. The feasibility study had adopted a people-oriented approach to improve the connectivity and accessibility of an old district. He looked forward to seeing similar studies to be conducted in other districts. He had two comments:

- (a) he observed that the problem of double and triple parking in Kwun Tong industrial area was severe on weekdays. On-street loading and unloading activities of trucks caused serious traffic congestion. Apart from planning and analysing the traffic conditions, consideration should be given to stepping up enforcement measures and confining loading and unloading activities within certain hours within a day; and
- (b) in addition to revitalization, a wider range of activities such as dining and retail activities should be introduced at back alleys to attract more visitors. For instance, social enterprises could be invited to organize events and activities.



4.5 **Mr Freddie HAI** shared Mr HO's views and was glad to see a blueprint for the future development of the district. He was aware that eco-friendly buses would be introduced in Hong Kong shortly. This new model of buses would be 3 feet longer than typical double-deckers, therefore occupying more road space and might have to slow down when making turns and changing lanes. He suggested the project proponent to discuss with relevant Government departments and explore whether and how this new kind of bus would have implications on the proposed improvement scheme.

4.6 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired whether TD had agreed to EKEO's proposal. He requested for an overview of the secondary/elevated networks connecting redeveloped buildings within Kwun Tong.

4.7 **Mr Frank WONG** gave the following responses:

- (a) in order to resolve the conflicting use of road space between pedestrians and vehicles, the proposed quick-win proposals would enhance pedestrian crossings and road junctions along the 6 major North-South Corridors and 4 major East-West Corridors. Together with the back alleys project, he believed that the proposal could improve pedestrian traffic and redistribute vehicular traffic within the district;
- (b) EKEO worked with TD and the HKPF to look into measures to tackle illegal parking and frequent loading/unloading activities. Echoing the Smart City initiatives in Kowloon East, EKEO would carry out a proof of concept trial to monitor the usage and availability of kerbside loading/unloading bays;
- (c) EKEO facilitated social enterprise to introduce public art elements at back alleys. He reported that activities and events, e.g. backstreet art and run, helped promote and integrate back alleys into the pedestrian network and generated human activities. EKEO would consider to gradually extend the improvement works of back alleys to increase their attractiveness and vibrancy;
- (d) EKEO would explore the possibility of relocating some of the bus stops from busy streets and further discuss with TD;

- (e) EKEO would work with bus companies to explore introducing passenger information display system at bus stops; and
- (f) EKEO briefed Members on the proposed pilot scheme of pedestrian links by the private sector in Kowloon East at the last Task Force meeting. In future redevelopment projects, private developers who would like to provide a pedestrian link/connection according to the planned pedestrian network could submit application to apply for premium waiver payable for lease modifications.

4.8 **The Chair** enquired whether TD had agreed to EKEO's proposed pedestrian environment improvement scheme.

4.9 **Mr Frank WONG** replied that TD had in principle agreed to EKEO's proposals. EKEO and relevant departments would further seek views from stakeholders at the project implementation stage.

4.10 **Mr Wilson PANG** supplemented that TD fully supported any initiatives that would improve pedestrian environment and connectivity. He pointed out that there was also a need to strike a balance between different users for the use of road space. TD had in principle agreed to EKEO's preliminary proposals and believed that EKEO would further refine the proposals and work out a more detailed design for further discussion.

4.11 **The Chair** summarized that Members supported the people-oriented approach and the principle of precedence for pedestrians of the project which are both crucial in transport and pedestrian planning.

4.12 **Mr Frank WONG** assured Members that EKEO would constantly review the proposed improvement scheme.

4.13 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired whether the project team would consider providing additional seating facilities and shading areas for pedestrians under the improvement scheme.

4.14 **Mr Frank WONG** assured Members that **Mr ZIMMERMAN**'s comment would be taken into consideration in the overall review.

4.15 **The Chair** thanked the project team for the presentation. He concluded that Members gave support to the proposal.

**Item 5 Feasibility of Further Water Quality Improvement at Kai Tak Approach Channel and Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter for Water Sports Activities (Paper No. TFKT/11/2016)**

5.1 **The Chair** informed Members that Kai Tak Office (KTO) would brief Members on the findings on the feasibility of further improving the water quality at Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC) and Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter (KTTS) to enable the hosting of water sports activities. He welcomed **Mr David LEUNG** and **Ms Inness CHAN** from the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD), **Mr S.M. MA** from the Drainage Services Department (DSD), **Mr Kenneth CHAN** from the Environmental Protection Department (EPD), **Mr Freeman CHEUNG** and **Mr Igor HO** from AECOM to the meeting.

5.2 **Ms Inness CHAN** briefed Members on the findings of the study with the aid of a PowerPoint.

5.3 **The Chair** was delighted that the successful collaboration between different Government departments had led to the significant improvement of water quality at KTAC and KTTS, which would facilitate the development of water sports in KTD in the near future.

5.4 With the implementation of the water quality improvement measures, **Mr Derek SUN** asked whether the proposed 600m opening at the former runway was still necessary.

5.5 **Mr CHAN Ka-kui** understood from the presentation that the water quality at the KTTS had significantly improved, enabling water sports e.g. dragon boat races, to take place. However, the water quality at part of KTAC or Kai Tak Nullah was not satisfactory. He asked

whether the Government had identified any suitable locations for the development of rowing centres or storage of boats.

5.6 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired what kind of control and mitigation measures would be in place to guarantee that the water quality would be suitable for water sports activities and how the odour problem at KTAC could be tackled in the future. He provided some suggestions for the project team's consideration.

5.7 **Ms Kelly CHAN** enquired whether the requirement of *E. coli* not exceeding 610 count/100 ml, for water sports activities was an internationally recognized standard, and whether there were other more stringent international standards for water quality control that could be adopted to give public more confidence.

5.8 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** would like to know how far the project team had come in improving the water quality in Kai Tak and how much was left to be done. He asked when the water quality at KTAC would meet the required standard for water sports activities.

5.9 **Mr David LEUNG** responded to Members' comments as follows:

- (a) Members might recall that CEDD had consulted Members on Kai Tak Approach Channel and Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter Improvement Works (Phase 2) and introduced an Interception and Pumping (IP) Scheme at the 18<sup>th</sup> Task Force meeting in August 2015. He said that the proposed IP Scheme was a replacement proposal for the original 600m opening achieving similar environmental performance as a means to tackle the odour problem. The proposed IP Scheme was under design stage and CEDD would submit the proposal for funding application in due course;
- (b) based on the water quality modelling results presented to Members, he supplemented that the water quality at KTAC to the east of the existing Taxiway Bridge and KTTS would be able to meet the requirement of *E. coli* for water sports activities, whilst that at KTAC to the west of Taxiway Bridge with around 800 to 2,000 / 100ml was close to but yet to

- meet the standard required;
- (c) the requirement of *E. coli* for water sports, i.e. annual geometric mean *E.coli* not exceeding 610 count/100 ml was made reference to the Water Pollution Control Ordinance. He was not aware of any other international standards; and
- (d) regarding the proposed IP Scheme, a pumping station would be built near the outlet of Kai Tak Nullah intercept part of its flow and discharges to the west of the former Runway outside the To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelter. The IP scheme would be partly integrated with the Kai Tak District Cooling System (DCS). The DCS intake would be relocated to KTAC to enhance the water circulation of KTAC.

5.10 **The Chair** asked the project team to confirm and advise when water sports activities could be carried out at the waterbody of KTAC.

5.11 **Mr David LEUNG** responded with the following:

- (a) Regarding Mr SUN's enquiry about the 600-metre opening, he confirmed that the creation of a 600-metre opening at the former runway would no longer be necessary as the new IP Scheme would achieve similar performance; and
- (b) on whether water sports activities could be carried out at the waterbody of KTAC, he advised that, at present, the project team was not certain about whether the water quality at the whole KTAC would meet the *E.coli* requirement in the long term. However, the project team would continue with their monitoring work.

5.12 **Mr Freddie HAI** raised the following enquires:

- (a) why was the IP Scheme not included as a possible option when the public consultation on water quality improvement project in KTD was conducted 10 years ago;
- (b) whether the proposed IP Scheme had any shortcomings; and
- (c) other than the proposed pumping station, would the project team consider building a back-up box culvert and/or

underground pipes connecting the KTAC and the Victoria Harbour.

5.13 According to the presentation, **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** noted that there were two existing outlets at the KTAC and one of them would be intercepted. He enquired whether the proposed interceptor would operate only during dry weather or all year round. He urged the project team to report to the Committee on all the necessary measures that should be put in place in order to achieve the requirement of *E. coli* for water sports activities at KTAC.

5.14 **Mr David LEUNG** thanked Members for the comments. He gave the following responses:

- (a) According to the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) report for KTD that was approved in 2009 under the EIA Ordinance, CEDD, DSD and EPD had implemented mitigation measures, such as localized maintenance dredging, interception of pollution discharges from hinterland and bio-remediation treatments. In view of the continuous improvement in water quality and decrease in odour nuisance, the project team considered that the proposed IP Scheme an effective measure to replace the original 600m opening proposal; and
- (b) regarding the project scope, he said that a new pumping station would be built near the outlet of Kai Tak Nullah to intercept flow from Kai Tak Nullah and then discharge outside To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelter which is to the west of the former runway. Secondly, the seawater intake of DCS seawater pump house would extract seawater from KTAC instead of Victoria Harbour to enhance the water circulation of KTAC.

5.15 **The Chair** reminded Members that the reasons for choosing the proposed IP Scheme rather than the proposed creation of 600-meter opening had been thoroughly discussed in previous Task Force meetings.

5.16 **Ms YING** said that she had taken part in the two-year

consultancy study which had examined different improvement options. She provided Members with the following supplementary information:

- (a) regarding the possibility of mixing and diluting polluted discharges to KTAC with clean water in Victoria Harbour, she explained that a substantial quantity of clean water would have to be pumped into the KTAC to dilute water therein as the circulation of water in KTTS was relatively slow and the water quality at To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelter was not significantly better than the KTAC. Considering the amount of investment, environmental constraints and the expected results of such proposal, she opined that pumping clean water from Victoria Harbour would not be a cost-effectiveness measure; and
- (b) KTAC and Jordon Valley Box Culvert had much large catchment areas. It would be a huge project to channel all polluted discharges from Jordon Valley Box Culvert and Kai Tak Nullah directly into Victoria Harbour, passing through KTAC and the former runway. She said that both the project team and Members should seriously weigh the cost and benefits of all suggested measures.

5.17 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that the community was left with no choice but to accept the project team's recommended measures on water quality improvement at KTAC. He doubted why polluted discharges pumped out from dry weather flow interceptors (DWFIs) would enter the Victoria Harbour but not into the sewage system.

*(Post-meeting notes: CEDD clarified that polluted flow collected by DWFI is currently discharged into the existing sewage system for further treatment.)*

5.18 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** shared Mr ZIMMERMAN's views and emphasized that Members' main concern was whether the target of an annual geometric mean *E.coli* at KTAC below 610 count/100 ml could be achieved.

5.19 **Ms YING** supplemented that the *E.coli* level of KTAC has been greatly reduced from a range of about 12,000 to 130,000 count/100ml to now in the range of about 610 to 5,500 count/100ml.

Based on the completed mitigation measures and relevant assessment, the most effective measure was to rectify expedient connections and intercept polluted discharges from the hinterland into KTAC and KTTS. CEDD in coordination with EPD and DSD had identified three major sources of pollution and commenced mitigation measures in the area over the years during the course of study. She assured Members that concerned departments would continue with their efforts to improve the water quality of KTAC further with the aim to achieve the standard level.

5.20 **The Chair** acknowledged the commitment of the Government to improving the water quality at KTD through inter-departmental efforts. He recognised the success of the mitigation measures that had been put in place over the years and repeated that the proposed IP Scheme as a replacement proposal would achieve the same targets of the original 600m opening proposal. However, Members noted and were concerned that neither scheme could help part of the KTAC achieve the target of *E.coli* below 610 count/100 ml at the moment.

5.21 Although a timeframe for achieving the water quality standard for water sports activities at part of KTAC was not yet available, **the Chair** affirmed that the Committee would continue to monitor the progress and outcome of the water quality improvement scheme.

5.22 **Mr Freddie HAI** noted the project team had commenced the bio-remediation treatment of sediments at KTAC and KTTS. He enquired whether the said treatment would continue and go hand-in-hand with the proposed IP Scheme in order to achieve the target. He pointed out that interception and redirection of discharged water flow might not be able to tackle the *E.coli* problem at KTAC.

5.23 **Ms YING** clarified that the objective of the bio-remediation treatment of sediments and the proposed IP Scheme was to tackle the odour problem by improving the water quality, as stated in the EIA report for KTD 2009. She noted that there had been public aspiration and the Government also recognised the opportunities for developing water sports activities at KTAC and KTTS. While the water quality at KTTS and KTAC had significantly improved over the years, she pointed out that the level of human activities would directly correlate to the



water quality at KTAC and KTTS. Behavioural change would be the best way to lead to improvement in water quality. She affirmed that concerned departments would step up measures to improve the water quality of KTAC to the west of Taxiway Bridge.

5.24 **The Chair** concluded that the Task Force had high expectation on the results of the water quality improvement scheme and the expectation had risen from merely tackling the odour problem to enabling water sports activities to take place at KTAC and KTTS over the years. He thanked the project team for the presentation and the responses.

## **Item 6 Kai Tak Sports Park Project Design Development and Findings of Urban Design Study (Paper No. TFKT/12/2016)**

6.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) and its consultants would brief Members on the Design Development and Finding of Urban Design Study for the Kai Tak Sports Park (KTSP) Project. Members might recall that HAB had consulted the Task Force on the subject in previous meetings. He welcomed **Mr T.K. YEUNG, Ms Linda LAW, Mr James BLAKE, Mr Michael MAK and Mr Keith MAN** from HAB; **Ms Ivy LEE, Mr Alan LI and Mr Ignacio Diez AGUIRRE** from Leigh & Orange Ltd.; **Dr Sujata GOVADA, Mr Widemar SPRUIJT and Mr Frank WONG** from UDP International and **Mr Sion EDWARDS** from Urbis Limited to the meeting.

6.2 **Mr T.K. YEUNG** briefly recapped that the team had conducted an urban design study for the project, which had been conducted in response to Members' requests at the 19<sup>th</sup> Task Force meeting in November 2015. **Dr GOVADA and Ms Ivy LEE** presented the findings of the study and elaborated on the project design development with the aid of a PowerPoint.

6.3 **Mr Ivan HO** expressed his dissatisfaction with the format of the meeting paper. He raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (a) the statement in the paper, i.e. "At its meeting in November 2015, while the Task Force generally had no objection to the

proposed increase in building height and the proposed hotel development, ..." (para. 4 of the Paper) did not align with his recollection of the conclusion made at the 19<sup>th</sup> Task Force meeting and a clarification from the project team or the Secretariat would be necessary;

- (b) whether the proposed acoustic retractable roof at the main stadium (para. 13) was financially viable, effective in mitigating the noise generated by activities to be held within the stadium and would lead to unforeseen environmental issues to the surrounding residential areas; and
- (c) he required the project team to highlight all updates in the proposal, e.g. the 300-bedrom 3-star hotel was upgraded to 4-star hotel (para. 15).

6.4 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** raised the following enquiries:

- (a) which Government department was responsible for the development of the Metro Park and the adjoining Dining Cove and whether their design would blend in with that of the main stadium;
- (b) what was the proposed design underneath the landscaped deck;
- (c) what was the percentage of the total outdoor areas of KTSP that would have shading provided by trees or fixed canopies;
- (d) what was the function of the event village and whether it would be equipped with electricity supply and other facilities;
- (e) where would the food and beverage outlets be located;
- (f) what were the functions of the walled spaces on top and underneath the landscaped deck and around the stadium; and
- (g) although there would be cycle track around the KTSP, it seemed that there would be not be any tracks enabling cyclists to enter or go across the KTSP area. He would like to know how cyclists could get onto the landscaped deck or through the deck and whether there would be any ancillary facilities. He was dissatisfied with the proposal on the basis that the cycle track provision would not be located

near the points of access, meaning that visitors would be discouraged from riding their bikes to get to the KTSP.

6.5 **Mr CHAN Ka-kui** asked whether the project team had engaged any business management consultants to oversee and manage the sports and commercial activities at the KTSP to ensure year-round vibrancy. Regarding water sports activities, he asked whether the proposal had catered for the potential development of a sailing centre at To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelter.

6.6 Regarding visual permeability, **Mr Derek SUN** queried whether the future main stadium would block the ridge line of the Lion Rock.

6.7 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** noted that the KTSP would be extended to accommodate entertainment and commercial activities rather than serving as a venue for sports only. He would like to know the impact of the proposed change on KTSP. Secondly, apart from Shing Kai Road underneath the landscaped deck of the sports park, there were many major roads running adjacent to the KTSP site. He expressed concern over the possible traffic and environmental implications.

6.8 **Mr Freddie HAI** opined that the preliminary design of the appearance of the main stadium appeared to be very dense. He would like the project team to provide the maximum building height of the main stadium. He shared that a more fluid building height could allow flexibility in the design of the main stadium in the future. He asked the project team to clarify whether the proposed acoustic retractable roof had been included in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) report as a prerequisite to meet the relevant noise control standard. He also advised the project team to study the noise level and impact to the adjacent neighbourhood when the acoustic retractable roof was not closed.

6.9 **The Chair** recalled that the Task Force had reservation on HAB's application for a relaxation in the building height from +55 to +75 meters above principal datum (mPD) of the stadium at its last consultation due to the lack of a detailed design and the project team was

urged to further examine the urban design aspects of the project and report to the Task Force.

6.10 **Mr Freddie HAI** clarified that he had no objection to the proposed increase in height limit of the main stadium but would like to remind the project team that the proposed retractable roof might limit the creativity and flexibility of the design.

6.11 Regarding the EIA report of the KTSP (para. 39(b)), **Mr HO** requested the project team to provide further details in relation to the impacts and costs of the recommended mitigation measures.

6.12 **Dr GOVADA** briefly went through the PowerPoint slides on the proposal to enhance year-round vibrancy of the KTSP and the proposed planning application. She also highlighted the changes and difference between the planning application and the original proposal for Members' information.

6.13 In response to Members' enquires, **Mr T.K. YEUNG** clarified that (a) the project team had appointed an operations consultant to review the business plan for the project in order to ensure year-round vibrancy at the KTSP, and (b) the Dining Cove would be developed in conjunction with the KTSP.

6.14 **Ms Linda LAW** responded to Members' comments as follows:

- (a) in the EIA report, the proposed retractable roof was an important noise mitigation measure to allow the hosting of a variety of sports and entertainment events at the main stadium. The technical study conducted by the EIA consultant illustrated that the retractable roof could keep the noise level to an acceptable level. With the retractable roof closed, events in the main stadium could continue beyond 11 p.m.;
- (b) the project would provide a generous amount of greenery coverage, allowing the achievement of an overall greening ratio of 30%. There would be sufficient green covers and shading in the open areas; and

- (c) similar to the Central Harbourfront Event Space, the event village would allow flexible use of space for a large variety of activities. It would be equipped with appropriate utility and drainage service.

6.15 Regarding the view corridor to the Lion Rock, **Dr GOVADA** confirmed that the future main stadium and the adjacent grid neighbourhood would not block the ridgeline of the Lion Rock.

6.16 In response to Mr ZIMMERMAN's comments on cycling connectivity, **Ms Linda LAW** replied that a North-South cycling track had been planned along the eastern edge of the project site passing through the neighbouring park. The exact entrance points of the cycle track into KTSP were subject to detailed design and interfacing with neighbouring projects, some of which were also under planning.

6.17 **Mr Sion EDWARDS** supplemented that the cycle track would start at the Station Square, run along the edge of the neighbourhood park, rise up to the landscaped deck level and descend through the Metro Park to the waterfront.

6.18 To provide a better pedestrian environment, **Ms LAW** supplemented that covered walkways and shaded areas would be provided around the main stadium.

6.19 Noting that there were regular ferry services at the Kowloon City Public Ferry Pier, **Ms Linda LAW** said that the To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelter was busy with marine traffic. She said that the other side of the runway, i.e. at the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter, might be a more appropriate location for water sports and HAB was studying the feasibility of a water sports centre.

6.20 Regarding the design under the landscaped deck, **Ms Ivy LEE** replied that Shing Kai Road underneath the deck separated the KTSP into northern and southern sections. Under the indoor sports centre would be carparking and retail spaces. The pitch of the main stadium would sit on 5+ mPD, next to the proposed office and hotel. Amenity facilities, e.g. hotel food and beverage facilities, would provide a continuous strip of commercial facilities along the harbourfront

promenade. She added that there would be no public transport interchange (PTI) under the deck.

6.21 In response to Mr HO's concern about the minutes of the 19<sup>th</sup> Task Force meeting, **Miss Christine AU** read out the conclusion as stated in the finalised minutes "The Chair ... concluded that although the Task Force did not object to the proposed increase in the building height or hotel development, however, without a detailed design, Members opined that it was premature to submit any planning applications to TPB at this stage." (para. 3.18). She informed Members that, at the 19<sup>th</sup> Task Force meeting, the Chair urged the project team to further examine the urban design aspects of the project, including its connectivity, the use of its surrounding open space, interface with the cycle track and pedestrian walkways, access to the harbourfront and alternative use of the stadium during normal days.

6.22 **Mr CHAN Ka-kui** said that the proposed water sports centre at Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter was different from the sailing centre he mentioned earlier. He opined that it would be a good opportunity to introduce sailing activities and make better use of the waterbody at To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelter under the KTSP project.

6.23 **The Chair** advised that Harbour Unit would convey Members' views to relevant Government departments for follow-up actions.

6.24 **Miss Christine AU** said that the Policy Address already advocated for a "water-friendly culture" and a lot of it could be realized at KTD. The Government had received proposals from various organizations for the development of different water sports facilities in KTD in recent years. Having regard to the water quality and the provision of water-land interface facilities at the proposed location, a holistic consideration would be necessary.

6.25 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** repeated his two questions:

- (a) what was the projected usage of the main stadium for the main stadium; and
- (b) what were the noise and environmental impacts of Shing

Kai Road on the KTSP project and what were the solutions.

6.26 **Mr Ivan HO** thanked the Secretariat for the clarification of the meeting minutes. He raised the following follow-up questions and comments:

- (a) regarding the EIA report, the project team should provide Members with the findings and data of the noise assessment report after the meeting. He was concerned about the noise generated by the departure of about 50,000 member of the audience after sports and entertainment events in late evenings beyond 11:00 p.m.;
- (b) apart from positioning itself as a mega project, the project team shall create a more distinctive identity for the KTSP;
- (c) apart from enhancing the connectivity within the KTSP through the provision of covered walkways, the project proponent should look further to achieve 'walkability', that is to enhance the walking experience of visitors, thereby enhancing the vibrancy of urban space;
- (d) noting that there would not be any physical boundary between the event village and the Metro Park, the project proponent was encouraged to pursue a fenceless environment within the entire KTSP; and
- (e) it was premature to conclude that the KTSP project had already fulfilled and complied with the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines at this stage.

6.27 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** raised the following comments and questions:

- (a) water sports activities at Kwun Tong were limited by the glasses balusters installed along the Kwun Tong promenade. He suggested HAB to give the Task Force a comprehensive response, assume a leadership role and provide policy support on development of water sports in KTD;
- (b) good design elements should be incorporated in the back of house and parking facilities underneath the deck;
- (c) the walled spaces on top and underneath the landscaped

- deck and around the stadium should be interactive;
- (d) the project team should consider increasing the overall greening ratio; and
  - (e) proper infrastructure, instead of temporary facilities such as toilets, electricity supply, lighting facilities and control points should be designed and installed to facilitate the organizing of events at the event village.

6.28 **Mr Freddie HAI** clarified that he would like to know what events could be held within the KTSP without the retractable roof while still complying with relevant noise control guidelines. The project team was urged to consider including a base case scenario in the EIA with a simplified design for the main stadium. The project team should ensure that the KTSP project could still be pursued without the retractable roof. He enquired about the technical performance of the proposed retractable roof.

6.29 **Mr T.K. YEUNG** replied that the retractable roof was a requirement in the project. On noise impact assessment data, he reported that details were included in the EIA report, which was exhibited for public inspection in accordance with the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance in September 2016. The project team could supplement further details of the EIA for Members' information after the meeting.

6.30 **Ms Linda LAW** gave the following responses:

- (a) the EIA report was available on the project website and the project team would provide the relevant extracts for Members' reference. She explained that in accordance with the EIA report, the proposed retractable roof was a mandatory feature to allow the sports, leisure and other events to be held in the evening;
- (b) by making reference to stadiums with similar scale around the world, it was estimated that there would be about 20-30 event days at the Main Stadium every year. Each event would require about 2.5 days for preparation and wrapping up. The ratio of sports to entertainment events was about 1:1 and that a wide range of other events such as



- community, religious, youth corporate, etc. could also be held in the main stadium;
- (c) the EIA report included a detailed analysis on the environmental impacts of Shing Kai Road to the surrounding environment and sports facilities. The project team would supplement such information after the meeting; and
  - (d) the project team endeavoured to create a walkable environment and provide visitors with well-connected open spaces between major facilities within the KTSP. It was also the objective to provide a boundary free space within the KTSP and create an interactive environment with the surrounding areas.

*(Post-meeting notes: Details of the EIA were disseminated for Members' information on 9 January 2017.)*

6.31 **The Chair** thanked Members for their invaluable views to the project. He concluded that Members had no objection to the proposed facilities and overall layout of the KTSP project. He reminded the project team to ensure year-round vibrancy of the public open space within the KTSP for public enjoyment, on both event and non-event days. Members expressed their concern on some technical issues including the technical performance of the acoustic retractable roof of the main stadium as well as its noise impacts, the proposed cycle track network interfacing issues within the KTSP, between KTSP and its surrounding as well as the walking experiences along various pedestrian corridors. He trusted that Harbour Unit and relevant Government departments would explore the opportunity to develop water sports centres in KTD. **The Chair** thanked the project team for the presentation and their responses.

6.32 **Ms Linda LAW** noted Members' comments on the following four items included in the planning application to the Town Planning Board and would proceed with the application:

- (a) relaxation of height limit for main stadium from +55 mPD to +70 mPD;
- (b) inclusion of hotel development;

- (c) revised disposition of deck connection over the future Shing Kai Road; and
- (d) inclusion of an eating place in the neighbourhood park.

**Item 7 Central Kowloon Route - Proposed Temporary Government Land Allocation for Works Area and Temporary Barging Facility at Kai Tak (Paper No. TFKT/13/2016)**

7.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Central Kowloon Route (CKR) project was discussed at the 12th HC meeting, 12th TFKT meeting and 13th TFK meeting during Q1 in 2013. On 31 August 2016, the Highways Department (HyD) briefed Members on the temporary land requirements for the CKR project in Kai Tak at a pre-meeting briefing session. While Members had no objection to the need of having temporary works area and barging facilities for the construction works of the project, it was agreed that HyD should (i) minimize the site area and occupation duration of the proposed temporary government land allocations (TGLAs), (ii) introduce harbourfront enhancement measures and (iii) coordinate with KTO on other temporary land use within KTD. The project team was reminded to take into account Members' views and refine their discussion papers before formally consulting the Task Force today.

7.2 **The Chair** welcomed **Mr Roy LAM**, **Mr Raymond CHUNG**, **Ms Jacqueline TAI** and **Ms Karen CHUI** from HyD, **Mr Franki CHIU**, **Mr Alan LOW**, **Mr Ray TANG** and **Mr MAK Lin-fat** from Mott Macdonald Join Venture (AMMJV) to the meeting.

7.3 **Mr Roy LAM** presented the refined proposal with the aid of a PowerPoint.

7.4 In view of the large amount of temporary works and storage areas, site offices and barging points situated along the waterfront areas at KTD, **Mr Ivan HO** viewed that further planning and development of KTD could not proceed before all these temporary sites were returned to the Government. He enquired about the purpose and significance of the proposed roof greening. He opined that "no existing pedestrian

connectivity between the hinterland areas and the harbourfront in the vicinity of the proposed site” as stated in the paper (para. 8) was not a convincing reason to occupy temporary works area along the waterfront.

7.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** requested for a plan from Kai Tak Development Office on which temporary pedestrian and cycle routes through KTD would be shown. To improve the connectivity between KTD and its surrounding districts such as To Kwa Wan, Kwun Tong and Kowloon City, **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said temporary pedestrian routes should be provided by the tenants of temporary works areas before the sites are made available for development. He would like to know when the pedestrian and cycling routes within KTD would be delivered. In addition, he questioned about the necessity of having temporary stockpile areas and suggested that the waste management plan of the current proposal should be presented to the Task Force for comments prior to submission to Environmental Protection Department for approval.

7.6 **Ir Raymond CHAN** enquired about the status of a proposed temporary reclamation area at To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelter and asked whether that area could be used for stockpiling purpose.

7.7 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** was concerned about the extensive temporary land intake of the project and the lack of independent reviews of the land requirement of the proposal. Echoing **Mr ZIMMERMAN**'s views, he said an overall plan on pedestrian and cycle routes should be prepared in order to show how temporary land uses could fit into the development of the former runway in short and medium term.

7.8 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** agreed that temporary pedestrian routes or cycle tracks should be provided to allow access from the former runway to the northern part of the project area as soon as possible.

7.9 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** said that the project team had responded to comments expressed by Members at the informal briefing session held in August 2016. He noted the proposed sites to be occupied by HyD would be set back so as to allow flexibility for the provision of a public footpath along the waterfront. He agreed with **Mr BROOKE** that the project team should further review and reduce the site

area as far as possible. He was disappointed that the barging point currently occupied by the Mass Transit Railway Corporation Limited (MTRCL) could not be shared with HyD for CKR project. Noting that the construction of Shatin to Central Link in this area was near completion, he opined that the Commission should be given information as to why the concerned barging facility had to be occupied by MTRCL until December 2020.

7.10 From the harbourfront enhancement point of view, **the Chair** said that temporary occupation of waterfront areas for works sites and storage areas hindered the development of open spaces and public facilities for public enjoyment. The Committee therefore would require the applicant to minimize the proposed site area and duration of the proposed temporary government land allocations (TGLAs) as well as introducing harbourfront enhancement measures during the occupation of the waterfront areas concerned.

7.11 Noting that HyD had the imminent need to commence the CKR project, **the Chair** put forward a suggestion for Members' consideration and discussion. He suggested HyD to consider shortening the occupation duration of the subject sites from 3 years (i.e. 2017 to 2020) to 2 years (i.e. 2017 to 2018) to allow flexibility to cater for and tie in with the development programme of other parts of KTD. Also, the project team should consult the Task Force for further extension of the TGLA after 2018. By that time, the harbourfront enhancement measures implemented and coordination plan with KTO to improve harbourfront facilities and connectivity should be presented to the Task Force for consideration.

7.12 **Mr Ivan HO** supported the Chair's proposal in principle. He said that the project team should compensate the general public for taking up valuable waterfront areas to facilitate the CKR project. He agreed with Mr BROOKE that a third party assessment should be provided to justify the land requirements of the project.

7.13 **Mr Roy LAM** thanked Members for the comments. He gave the following responses:

- (a) HyD was liaising with the Development Bureau, KTO and

- relevant departments to explore and implement possible harbourfront enhancement measures. He assured Members that the project team would consult the Task Force on the proposed enhancement works to be implemented within and around the works area in future meetings; and
- (b) the proposed stockpile area at the former Kai Tak runway would minimize the traffic and environmental impacts to be caused by the transportation of excavated materials through the already congested road network to disposal sites in Tuen Mun.

7.14 In responses to Mr ZIMMERMAN's enquiry about waste management plan, **Mr Franki CHIU** said that Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) report included a chapter detailing the waste disposal methods. He supplemented that HyD would submit a detailed waste management plan to the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) for approval prior to the commencement of the construction works.

7.15 **Mr Roy LAM** said that it could be problematic from a contract management perspective if temporary works site could only be guaranteed for two years. Having said that, HyD would consider the Chair's proposal and apply for an extension of TGLA subject to adjacent developments and availability of land nearer the time.

7.16 **The Chair** said that the Harbourfront Commission would certainly review and assess whether suitable harbourfront enhancement measures had been put in place when HyD applied for an extension of occupation duration in two years' time. In the meantime, he concluded that the Task Force could only agree with HyD's TGLA application for a period of 2 years, up to 2018.

7.17 In addition to the two-year occupation duration, **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** added that the project team should endeavour to minimize the site area and brief Members on the waste management plan for the project before submitting it to EPD for approval. He invited KTO to formulate a plan and programme showing the temporary and permanent use of the concerned sites.

7.18 **Ir Raymond CHAN** would like the project proponent to

answer his earlier enquiry on the possibility of using the temporary reclaimed area at To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelter for stockpile area.

7.19 **Mr Roy LAM** replied that the temporary reclamation works of the project would be divided into two stages and Stage 1 would be carried out at the former Kai Tak runway. Excavated materials to be stored at stockpile area would be used for temporary reclamation to facilitate the construction of a tunnel. The temporary reclamation area would then be removed upon the completion of the tunnel and the seabed would be restored to the original condition. Since the project would involve temporary reclamation, the project team had taken into account the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance and had prepared cogent and convincing materials to demonstrate the overriding public need for temporary reclamation to facilitate the CKR project. The proposed extent of temporary reclamation would have to be kept at the minimum.

7.20 Since there was an urgent need to commence the construction of CKR, **the Chair** suggested the project team to consider accepting the 2-year TGLA suggestion, then work closely with the Harbour Unit and KTO before reporting to the Task Force with harbourfront enhancement measures in 2 years' time

7.21 From the perspective of project management, **Mr Francis CHAU** reiterated that a 2-year occupation period would pose significant risks to the cost. He suggested the project team to further refine the proposal and seek support from the Task Force for a longer TGLA occupation duration, e.g. 4 years, in future meetings.

7.22 **The Chair** asked whether the project team would accept the suggested 2-year occupation period or to consult the Task Force for a longer TGLA duration along with harbourfront enhancement proposals in future meetings.

7.23 **Miss Christine AU** recalled that at the 24<sup>th</sup> Task Force on Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing, Members also expressed some reservations over the request for temporary works site areas by the project proponent. Since the upcoming Harbourfront Commission meeting was tentatively scheduled

in mid-November, she invited the project team to brief and consult Task Force Chairs and HC Members again on their refined TGLAs at Kwai Chung and Kai Tak for the CKR project.

7.24 **Miss Christine AU** pointed out that she noted that some TGLA sites further away from the harbourfront would be returned to the Government by the end of 2016 and asked whether the project team would consider taking up these sites as works area instead. She suggested HyD to consider taking up works area further away from the waterfront, which could be guaranteed for a longer period of time.

7.25 HyD agreed with the proposal to consult HC again in future meetings. **The Chair** concluded that HyD should consult the Commission/Task Force with a refined proposal with harbourfront enhancement measures in future meetings.

## **Item 8 Any Other Business**

8.1 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that HAB should include the provision for marine activities in the detailed design of the Kai Tak Sports Park and highlight the provision of water-land interface facilities for the section of waterfront on which KTSP would be situated.

8.2 **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.

8.3 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:40 pm.

## **Secretariat**

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