

Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development

Minutes of Twenty-third Meeting

Date : 18 November 2016 (Friday)
Time : 2:45 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

Dr NG Cho-nam Representing The Conservancy Association
Mrs Karen BARRETTO Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Freddie HAI Tuen-tai Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Paul YK CHAN Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Prof TANG Bo-sin Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr Ivan HO Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Raymond CHAN Kin-sek Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour

Individual Members

Mr NGAN Man-yu Individual Member
Mr Derek SUN Co-opted Member

Official Members

Mr Thomas CHAN Deputy Secretary (Planning & Lands)¹, DEVB
Mr Francis CHAU Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)², DEVB
Mr Thomas WK CHAN Senior Manager (Tourism)⁴¹, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr Simon LAU 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 Emily SOM Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr CHAN Ka-kui	Individual Member
Ms Kelly CHAN Yuen-sau	Individual Member
Mr Hans Joachim ISLER	Individual Member
Ms Vivian LEE	Individual Member
Mr Duncan CHIU	Co-opted Member
Ms Melissa Kaye PANG	Co-opted Member
Mr LO Chiu-kit	Co-opted Member
Mr YIP Hing-kwok	Co-opted Member
Mrs Margaret BROOKE	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr LEUNG Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Sr Emily LI	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Louis LOONG	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong

In attendance

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

For Item 3

Mr Tom YIP	District Planning Officer/Kowloon, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Peter CHUI	Chief Engineer / Kowloon 1(Kowloon), CEDD

For Item 4

Mr YEUNG Chung-cheung, Tony	Senior Engineer/Consultants Management 5, Drainage Services Department (DSD)
Mr LAU Tsz-yeung	Engineer/ Consultants Management 18, DSD
Mr WONG Ka-ming	Technical Manager/ Consultants Management, DSD
Ms WONG Ying-ying, Regina	Senior Engineer/ Electrical & Mechanical Projects Group 2 (Acting), DSD
Mr MA Sai-cheong, Eddie	Engineer /P2/1(Electrical & Mechanical Project Group 2), DSD
Mr LAM Cheuk-fung	Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Sewerage Infrastructure)4, Environmental Protection Department

(EPD)
Mr LEE Sing-tim, Wallace Environmental Protection Officer (Sewerage
Infrastructure)43, EPD
Ms XIAO Ying Project Manager, Atkins
Ms Gabrelle Colwill Liaison Manager, Atkins
CHAN
Mr Ricky CHEUNG Project Engineer, Atkins
Mr Kentis BEH Project Architect, A.LEAD Architects Ltd.
Mr Larry FLORENTINO Design Architect, A.LEAD Architects Ltd.
Mr Andy KWOK Deputy Project Director, Black & Veatch
Mr Summer CHOW Deputy Project Manager, Black & Veatch
Mr Jarvis LAM Project Engineer, Black & Veatch

The Chair welcomed all attending the meeting. He informed Members that the 23rd Task Force meeting was arranged shortly after the 22nd Task Force meeting in October 2016 for Members to give views on the Review Study of Kai Tak Development that was conducted by the Planning Department (PlanD) and Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD). The 23rd Task Force meeting had two agenda items: (i) Review Study of Kai Tak Development and (ii) Upgrading of Kwun Tong Preliminary Treatment Works & Enhancement Works for Kwun Tong Sewage Pumping Station. The draft meeting minutes of the 22nd and 23rd meeting would be confirmed at the 24th meeting.

The Chair announced that **Mr Vincent MAK** had taken over from Mr CHAN Chi-ming as Deputy Secretary for Development (Works) 2 of Development Bureau from 5 October 2016. He thanked Mr CHAN for his invaluable contributions to the Task Force. He advised Members that **Mr Francis CHAU**, Principal Assistant Secretary (Works) 2 of Development Bureau attended on behalf of Mr Vincent MAK. **Mr Thomas WK CHAN**, Senior Manager of the Tourism Commission (TC) attended on behalf of Mr George TSOI. **Mr Simon LAU**, Chief Traffic Engineer / Kowloon of Transport Department (TD) attended on behalf of Mr Wilson PANG.

Before the meeting, **the Chair** reported that a cyclist was killed and two others were injured in a fatal car accident on Shing Fung Road, near the Cruise Terminal on 2 November 2016. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN forwarded a press cutting to Members for information on 3 November 2016. The Task Force expressed sympathy and condolences to the victims and their families. Noting that Kai Tak Office (KTO) was conducting a feasibility study on the proposed cycle track in Kai Tak Development (KTD), he advised the project team to carefully look into road safety and the shared use of road spaces among different road users in the study. He also invited the project team to report on the findings of the study when ready.

Item 1 Review Study of Kai Tak Development (Paper No. TFKT/14/2016)

1.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Planning Department (PlanD) and Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) had provided a discussion paper (TFKT/14/2016) to brief Members on the findings of the Review Study of Kai Tak Development (the Review) and seek Members' views on the proposals recommended under the Review. Prior to the Task Force meeting, the subject was presented and discussed at an informal consultation session on 28 October 2016. He welcomed **Mr Tom YIP** from PlanD and **Mr Peter CHUI** from CEDD to the meeting.

1.2 **Mr Tom YIP** presented the recommended proposals of the Review with the aid of a PowerPoint.

1.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that the design and planning for KTD started in 2004 and had gone through several stages of public consultation over the years. The Kai Tak Planning Review was completed in 2007 and the development plan for Kai Tak was considered to be well-balanced. He expressed his concern over the current proposal which deviated from the original planning intention. He had the following requests and comments:

- (a) It appeared to him that the Government only wanted to increase revenue by increasing development density and plot ratio of development sites in Kai Tak. The sense of neighbourhood as a core aspect of community building had been forgone in the Review;
- (b) the Review had undermined the development potential of KTD into an attractive and world-class harbourfront area such as Marina Bay and Darling Harbour in Singapore and Sydney respectively. Kai Tak should be treated as the jewel in the crown;
- (c) relevant departments should explore setting back the sections of road adjacent to the Metro Park and commercial sites in Area 3 in order to create more open space along the estuary of the Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC);
- (d) noting that "water sports and recreation use" was proposed

- to be included as a permitted use within the Open Space (O) zone of the Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), he enquired about the facilities to be planned in the “O” zone;
- (e) the proposed increase in plot ratio at the former runway was not in compliance with the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines. The proposed building height profile at the former runway was monotonous and would lead to a massive building bulk. The project team should strike a balance between creating dynamic skyline along the harbourfront and preserving the ridgeline;
 - (f) he enquired whether commercial and Government, Institution or Community (GIC) facilities would be planned at the street level of the residential sites at Area 4 to enhance vibrancy; and
 - (g) he recalled that the Task Force in previous meetings had suggested including some GIC and/or clubs and sports facilities in the commercial space at KTAC. He was disappointed that Members’ past discussions had not been taken into consideration during the course of the Review.

1.4 **The Chair** shared Mr ZIMMERMAN’s views.

1.5 **Mr Freddie HAI** declared that he had taken part in the planning study of Kai Tak City Centre and the Lung Tsun Stone Bridge projects at Area 2 of KTD and would therefore abstain from commenting on these two specific areas. He enquired whether he could comment on other areas in KTD.

1.6 **The Chair** said that KTD was a huge development site and viewed that Mr HAI’s comments on other parts of KTD would not pose a conflict.

1.7 **Mr Freddie HAI** said that the Hong Kong Institute of Architects (HKIA) had conducted an internal consultation with regards to the Review. He summarised HKIA’s views as follows:

- (a) While understanding the increase in plot ratio and development intensity would help increase housing supply in KTD, there should be more deliberations on the

- corresponding mitigation measures (e.g. higher green ratio for new residential developments) that would be put in place to minimize the potential impacts brought about by the proposal;
- (b) noting that the recommended proposal would mainly lead to increase in the supply of private housing supply in KTD, he enquired whether more residential units would be set aside for the development of subsidised housing to address public demand;
 - (c) plot ratio of development sites at the former runway would be significantly increased. In this connection, the building height restriction should be further relaxed to allow for flexibility in building design, thereby achieving a more dynamic skyline and cityscape along the harbourfront;
 - (d) he enquired about the measures to be implemented in order to compensate for the loss of green open space in the Metro Park for the formation of two new residential sites (i.e. Sites 4E1 and 4E2);
 - (e) he noted that certain hotel sites along the ex-runway area would be rezoned for residential developments. Given the prominent harbourfront location, these sites were expected to be developed into luxurious residential developments. It would be essential to ensure that the public open space adjacent to these residential sites would not be fenced off from the general public;
 - (f) since the new residential sites at the former runway would be facing public open space including the waterfront promenade and Metro Park, the buildings to be built within these sites would have to be set back in order to comply with the requirement of prescribed windows as stated in the Buildings Ordinance. He enquired whether the site area of these sites would then be significantly reduced and whether the project team had sought views from the Buildings Department in ensuring that this would not pose technical difficulties to future developers of the sites;
 - (g) rezoning three hotel sites (i.e. Sites 4A2, 4C1 and 4C2) to residential sites would make them susceptible to the road traffic noise of Shing Fun Road given the semi-enclosed noise barrier along Shing Fung Road, which would only be

able to mitigate road traffic noise impact on the adjoining residential developments facing the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter;

- (h) a more integrated and vibrant environment should be created through better interface between the Metro Park and the two newly proposed residential sites (i.e. Sites 4E1 and 4E2) at the former runway area. Retail facilities and activities should be planned at the section of Metro Park adjoining the residential sites for public enjoyment ; and
- (i) regarding the proposed Environmentally Friendly Linkage System (EFLS), he would like to know when the Government would be ready to report the results of the feasibility study to the public. The Government should also report whether the proposed EFLS would be able to cope with the proposed increase in population density and traffic demand in KTD.

1.8 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** echoed the views of Mr ZIMMERMAN and Mr HAI and pointed out a bolder approach should be adopted to review the building height variation, configuration and massing of development sites at the former runway area. He opined that the photomontage of future KTD as shown on Slide 16 of the PowerPoint presentation was disappointing. KTD was meant to be an exemplar demonstrating the development potential and possibility of valuable harbourfront areas in Hong Kong and set new standards for other harbourfront cities from design and planning perspectives. He agreed with Mr HAI that community participation and enjoyment should be a key consideration of the Review but these elements had not been featured. He urged the project team to adopt a braver approach and prepare a new masterplan with additional GFA and population to be accommodated elsewhere in KTD.

1.9 **Mr Ivan HO** had no in-principle objection to the proposal of increasing plot ratio of development sites in the hinterland of KTD. He shared Members' views on the recommended proposal in Area 4 and had the following comments:

- (a) KTD was the last piece of land along Victoria Harbour that could be developed through innovative urban planning and

design. Apart from meeting the Government's housing supply targets, he said that creative urban planning concepts should be introduced in KTD so as to create a new and distinctive image of Hong Kong;

- (b) echoing Mr HAI's earlier comments, he supplemented that there was great difference between commercial and residential land use in terms of design, technical, noise as well as environmental considerations. More importantly, the atmosphere and quality of public open space at Area 4 would be directly affected by its adjacent land use. In compliance with the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines, the Review should explain how a vibrant and diversified waterfront promenade at the ground level of these development sites could be achieved and that the waterfront promenade should be opened up for physical access by the public;
- (c) from an architectural perspective, he viewed that the massing of the development sites under the Review was disastrous; and
- (d) echoing Mr BROOKE's view and on behalf on the Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design (HKIUD), he requested the project team to come up with a refined urban design scheme for Area 4 .

1.10 Noting that there would be over 25% increase in the total number of flats, population and commercial floor space in KTD, **Mr Derek SUN** commented that the rezoning proposal was a large-scale one and adopting a fragmented approach to look into rezoning proposals in different areas could not provide a thorough assessment of the resulting impacts to adjoining areas. He opined that the Review should take into account the progress and planning vision of KTD holistically. Without all necessary information, it was premature to assess whether the recommended proposals were acceptable. The project team shall present a whole picture for Members' comment again.

1.11 On account of limited land resources and growing public aspiration for more housing supply, **Ir Raymond CHAN** said that increasing development intensity at KTD was inevitable. He commented that KTD presented an opportunity for a landmark

development project within the Harbour but he was wary that the increase in plot ratio coupled with the existing building height restriction might cause wall effect at the former runway. Consideration should be given to optimising the provision and use of underground space in KTD. At-grade and underground space could be integrated to create a vibrant commercial hub at KTD.

1.12 **Prof TANG Bo-sin** shared the views expressed by Members regarding the visual impacts to be caused by the proposed increase in plot ratio at the former runway. He would like the project team to supplement information on the impacts of the rezoning proposal on microclimate and air ventilation in the area.

1.13 **The Chair** said that the Commission and the former Harbourfront Enhancement Committee had been monitoring and giving views on the planning and development of KTD since 2004 and were aware of the different stages and changing needs of the community over the years. The Harbourfront Commission's mission and primary focus was to realize the vision of developing Kai Tak into "a distinguished, vibrant, attractive and people-oriented area by the Victoria Harbour" while engaging the public. He was disappointed that the Review had not balanced utilization of land at the former runway with the importance to comply with the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines, which had provided guidance on different aspects of development of the harbour and harbourfront areas including urban design and building intensity etc. He stressed that while Members had no objection to the proposed increase in development intensity in order to cater for the rising demand for housing supply, the project team should justify the proposed changes from urban planning and design perspectives. He considered that the monotonous building design resulting from the proposal would create similar building structures like those in Tsim Sha Tsui East which were undesirable and unacceptable from harbourfront enhancement perspective.

1.14 **Mr Tom YIP** thanked Members for the comments. He explained that the Review endeavoured to adhere to the planning concepts and themes formulated under the 2007 Kai Tak Planning Review, which had duly considered the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines. Vision and principles, such as enhancement of vibrancy

and connectivity, as well as physical and visual permeability at harbourfront area had been considered. He elaborated that the project team had struck a careful balance between the needs for meeting changing social aspirations and adhering to the original planning themes. The proposals recommended under the Review would not undermine the original planning intention and urban design concepts for KTD as enshrined in the Kai Tak OZP, which were established after extensive public consultation. The land use layout/pattern, open space network, non-building areas, and visual/air ventilation corridors, and urban design principles could be generally maintained. The proposals would not have adverse impacts on the visual corridor and ridgeline of Lion Rock. He gave a consolidated response to Members' comments as follows:

- (a) Members were wary that the proposed increase in plot ratio in Area 4 would result in massive building bulk and monotonous building height profile. The project team would look into the room of enhancing the urban design for Area 4;
- (b) to enhance vibrancy of the waterfront promenade fronting the future residential sites at Area 4, the developers would be required to provide retail frontage on the lower floors;
- (c) although part of the area of the Metro Park would be freed up for the formation of two new residential sites, the total provision of open space in KTD would be maintained at about 100 hectares (ha) for public enjoyment. After the proposed rezoning, the Metro Park would still have an area of around 20 ha for open space development. Since the new residential sites were situated at the southern edge of the Metro Park, it would not affect the design of the Metro Park;
- (d) the planning intention to create a dynamic skyline and the urban design principle on the gradual decrease of building height profile from hinterland to waterfront could be generally maintained. Besides, the overall building height profile originating from the landmark commercial towers at the Kai Tak City Centre and gradating in two directions could also be maintained. The project team would suitably review the building height profile and design with reference

- to Members' comments;
- (e) regarding Members' questions and concerns on the issue of prescribed windows, "Dedicated Pedestrian Zones" had been designated within the "Open Space" zone fronting the residential sites to serve the purpose of natural lighting, ventilation and means of escape;;
 - (f) regarding the utilisation of underground spaces, all car parks within development sites in KTD would be located at the basement level. Apart from that, an underground shopping street had been planned to link up Kai Tak Station and To Kwa Station of Shatin-Central Link to Kowloon City and San Po Kong areas; and
 - (g) in response to Members' concern about microclimate and air ventilation, he supplemented that the air ventilation corridors for KTD would be generally maintained and the proposal would not have significant air ventilation impacts on the surrounding areas.

1.15 **Mr Peter CHUI** gave the following responses:

- (a) In response to Mr Zimmerman's suggestion of shifting the section of Road D3 adjacent to Metro Park to the middle of the former runway in order to free up more space along the waterfront, he informed Members that the suggestion might not be feasible given it would affect the design of the Metro Park. He assured Members that the project team would coordinate with neighbouring works projects and explore the feasibility of adopting alternative construction method for Road D3 to enhance connectivity between the Metro Park and the waterfront;
- (b) a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Infrastructure Impact Assessment had been conducted to assess the impacts of the proposed increase in development density and population. The results suggested that certain infrastructure projects should be enhanced to cope with the increasing population in KTD. Mr CHUI assured Members that the proposals would not cause any significant traffic and air ventilation problems. The relevant reports would be made available when the

Review was submitted to the Town Planning Board for discussion; and

- (c) the noise barrier along Road D3 adopted a semi-enclosure design and Members were wary that the residential sites to be rezoned from commercial use might be more susceptible to the traffic noise of Road D3. However, it might not be feasible to have a fully-enclosed noise barrier given the technical difficulties and safety concerns. The project team would suggest the future developers of the residential sites to install acoustic windows to screen off the traffic noise generated by Road D3.

1.16 **The Chair** commented that the intensification and rezoning proposals put forward at the former runway would impose extra requirements e.g. acoustic window to address the noise issue and difficulties in designing residential developments. Over the years, the Task Force had stressed the importance of compliance with Harbour Planning Principles and Harbour Planning Guidelines in the planning and development of the harbour and harbourfront areas. He quoted the following from the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines for Victoria Harbour and its Harbourfront Areas:

“Development Density

- (a) Development fronting directly onto Victoria Harbour should adopt a lower development density to provide a human scale environment, which is commensurate with the harbour-front setting.

Building Height

- (b) Developments within and around the harbour-front areas should generally adopt a gradation of height profile with building height descending towards the Harbour to avoid dominating the Harbour and to increase permeability to the water body.
- (c) Diversity in building mass and varying building heights along the harbour-front area is encouraged to promote visual interest and create an interesting harbour image.”

1.17 **The Chair** recalled that PlanD had been involved in the drafting and formulation of the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines, and they should have been duly considered during the course of the Review. He would like the project team to go through the said principles and guidelines again to ensure the project's compliance with such.

1.18 **Mr Ivan HO** said that the technical issues concerning acoustic windows were yet to be resolved. The technical circulars and practice notes on the subject published by different Government departments were not consistent. He also doubted the effectiveness of acoustic window as a noise mitigation measure.

1.19 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** commented that the Review had failed to create a people-oriented neighbourhood and could not respond to Members' comments that were expressed in previous meetings. He opined that a detailed design layout would be necessary to help Members conceptualize the planning intention and goals of KTD. The Review should be discussed at a higher level involving senior officials of the Development Bureau.

1.20 Regarding the proposal for Road D3, **Mr ZIMMERMAN** was disappointed that the formation of two new residential sites at the Metro Park would reduce the provision of open space but this was not highlighted in the presentation. He questioned the lack of Government response to the suggestion of shifting Road D3 to the middle of the Metro Park, which was raised at past Task Force meetings. He felt that past discussions at the Task Force had not been taken into account. He urged the project team to conduct the Review in accordance to the winning schemes of urban design competitions including Kai Tak Fantasy; to provide an exciting building profile; to encourage more retail and GIC facilities on the ground level of the residential sites; to elaborate on the proposed waters sports and recreation land use; and to highlight possible changes on infrastructural facilities, e.g. the Kwun Tong Bypass. He said that the Task Force should not give support to the proposals at this stage.

1.21 **The Chair** agreed with Mr. Zimmerman that the Task Force

could not provide in-principle support to the Review.

1.22 On behalf of HKIA, **Mr Freddie HAI** objected to the requirement of acoustic windows at the residential sites. He viewed that excessive traffic noise was a planning issue and it would be unfair to have it dealt with through the installation of acoustic windows, which would pose difficulties to the professionals e.g. architects in designing building blocks. He invited officials from PlanD to attend the seminar organized by HKIA to discuss the technical issues of acoustic windows to be held on the following day.

1.23 In view of the large-scale amendments proposed in the Review, **Mr Derek SUN** opined that the planning objectives and ongoing developments in KTD should be re-examined. He would like to know whether there had been communications between the parties responsible for EFLS development and the Review. He also reminded project team that the provision of ancillary facilities should be well-planned to cope with the increase in housing units, population and traffic demand in the area.

1.24 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** said that the Review should be revisited and discussed at the Commission level at its next meeting. It was clear that the Task Force was unimpressed by the proposals put forward at the meeting.

1.25 **The Chair** noted that Members had expressed their concern and dissatisfaction with the proposed amendments, in particular the proposed building height profile, layout and massing in Area 4. He said that it had always been the vision of the Commission and the Task Force to create a lively, vibrant and diversified harbourfront. Area 4 was a strategic harbourfront area but the proposals ran against the established Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines. He concluded that the Review was merely focused on increasing development intensity of KTD without due care and attention to the requirements and concern of the Task Force from harbourfront enhancement perspective. Based on the above considerations, the Task Force could not support the proposals as presented at the meeting.

1.26 **Mr Freddie HAI** would like the Chair to clarify if the

proposed amendments in Area 2 and 3 were accepted by the Task Force.

1.27 **The Chair** responded that Members in general had far fewer comments and concerns on the proposed amendments in Area 2 and 3.

1.28 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that while Members were more concerned about Area 4, an urban design review should be conducted for the entire KTD prior to OZP amendments.

1.29 **The Chair** said that the Task Force could not support the recommended proposals of the Review as a whole and Members were particularly concerned about the proposed amendments to the OZP in Area 4.

1.30 **Mr Tom YIP** said that Members' views and concern were noted. PlanD would discuss with relevant Government bureaux and departments to address Members' concerns.

1.31 In view of the acute shortage of land for housing and commercial facilities in the territory, **Mr Thomas CHAN** said that one of the objectives of the Review was to review land uses and increase development density of development sites in the pipeline in order to make the best use of available land within urban areas. He informed Members that comments received from on-going consultation session with stakeholders would be consolidated and taken into account in a thorough manner to refine the proposals. In response to Mr BROOKE's suggestion of bringing the Review for discussion at the Commission level, he assured Members that the project team would prepare alternative urban design schemes for Area 4 for detailed discussions at the upcoming HC meeting.

(Post-meeting notes: To address the concerns raised by the Task Force, PlanD and CEDD had prepared three refined schemes for Area 4 for HC's consideration at the 26th meeting on 13 December 2016. The refined schemes have proposed varied and more interesting building height profile and better visual permeability as compared to the original scheme. HC considered that the refined schemes represented improvement in urban design.)

1.32 **The Chair** thanked the project team for the presentation and response.

Item 2 Upgrading of Kwun Tong Preliminary Treatment Works & Enhancement Works for Kwun Tong Sewage Pumping Station (Paper No. TFKT/15/2016)

2.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) and Drainage Services Department (DSD) had provided a discussion paper (TFKT/15/2016) to consult Members on the proposed architectural and landscaping design of the Kwun Tong Preliminary Treatment Works and Kwun Tong Sewage Pumping Station prior to their consultation with Legislative Council in early 2017. He welcomed **Mr Tony YEUNG** and **Ms Regina WONG** from DSD, **Mr LAM Cheuk-fung** from EPD and **Mr Kentis BEH** from A.LEAD Architects Ltds to the meeting.

2.2 **Mr LAM Cheuk-fung** presented the projects with the aid of a PowerPoint.

2.3 **Mr Freddie HAI** enquired about the usage of the Government, Institution or Community (GIC) site to the south of the Kwun Tong Sewage Pumping Station.

2.4 **Mr LAM Cheuk-fung** replied that the GIC site would be assigned to the Vocational Training Council (VTC) for the development of a VTC campus and a soccer pitch.

2.5 Given DSD was in charge of three projects including the upgrading of Kwun Tong Preliminary Treatment Works, enhancement works for the Kwun Tong Sewage Pumping Station and the revitalization of the Tsui Ping River, **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired whether DSD would include in their projects the provision of a footbridge connecting the three project sites and the adjoining public footways and roads to enhance walkability and connectivity in the area. **Mr ZIMMERMAN** had no objection to the proposal in general but suggested that some waterfront enhancement measures should be

implemented in conjunction with DSD's projects.

2.6 **Mr Paul CHAN** enquired whether inputs from landscape architects had been sought when formulating the proposal. He pointed out that some areas underneath the Kwun Tong Bypass were not favorable for planting given that they could not get much sunlight. Setback planting with soil would be a better option than the proposed vertical greening covering the fence walls of the Kwun Tong Preliminary Treatment Works. Regarding the connectivity and integration of projects along the waterfront, he advised DSD that it would be essential for the future viewing deck on top of the Kwun Tong Sewage Pumping Station to be physically connected to the adjoining waterfront promenade. With regards to the height of the viewing deck, he asked if the Kwun Tong Bypass would cause any visual disturbance to the users of the viewing deck.

2.7 **Mr Freddie HAI** credited DSD and EPD for enhancing the appearance and design of sewage facilities which were commonly regarded as undesirable land use, as well as improving the environment. Meanwhile, he also gave the following comments:

- (a) Echoing Mr ZIMMERMAN's suggestion on the provision of a footbridge, he elaborated that the project team could make reference to the pedestrian footbridges over canals in London Docklands and Camden Town. These footbridges enhanced connectivity and became iconic features in the area;
- (b) the project team's response to his earlier question on the GIC site confirmed that there would not be any new residential developments near the Sewage Pumping Station. He commented that the extensive amount of greening and planting on the proposed roof garden could serve as an odour mitigation measure;
- (c) whether the project team would include vertical greening on the wall of the Preliminary Treatment Works facing Wing Yip Street; and
- (d) whether there would be any an at-grade crossing at Wai Yip Street to facilitate and encourage pedestrian movement between the future green roof and the adjacent Laguna

Park.

2.8 **Mr Ivan HO** supported the proposal. On the issue of odour, he shared that a similar greening project was carried out on the roof of a wastewater treatment plant in Barcelona. Despite the ongoing odour problem, the public open space at the roof level has turned into a popular venue for public events, demonstrating the success of greening project to increase public acceptance of undesirable public facilities. While recognizing the efforts of the DSD to enhance the harbourfront areas, he suggested the project team to seek technical advice from professionals to facilitate the implementation of the projects.

2.9 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** agreed with the views expressed by other Members and encouraged DSD to acquire professional advice and assistances to resolve technical issues of the project. He supported Mr ZIMMERMAN's suggestion of pedestrian footbridge over Tsui Ping River. He opined that the project had set a precedent for other sewage pumping stations along both sides of Victoria Harbour.

2.10 **The Chair** recalled that DSD's Sheung Wan Stormwater Pumping Station project had received general accolades with its integrated design with the adjacent open space. He concluded that Members appreciated the efforts made by the project team in face-lifting the sewage treatment facilities and integrating greening features in the design of the projects. Members welcomed the opening of the landscaped deck at the roof of the plant house for public enjoyment. He reminded the project team to take into account Members' suggestions regarding the provision of footbridge and the technical issues of the greening measures.

2.11 **Mr LAM Cheuk-fung** thanked Members for the support and their views would be considered when taking forward the project.

2.12 **The Chair** thanked the project team for the presentation and response.

Item 3 Any Other Business

3.1 **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.

3.2 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:45 pm.

Secretariat

Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development

December 2016