

Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development

Minutes of Twenty-fourth Meeting

Date : 13 January 2017 (Friday)
Time : 11:00 a.m.
Venue : Liquor Licensing Board (LLB) Conference Room (Room 102),
1/F, 258 Queen's Road East, Wanchai, Hong Kong

Present

Mr Vincent NG Chairman

Organization Members

Mrs Margaret BROOKE Representing Business Environment Council
Mr LEUNG Kong-yui Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and
Transport in Hong Kong
Mr Ken SO 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 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 Wilson PANG 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)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 NGAN Man-yu Individual Member
Mr Duncan CHIU Co-opted Member
Mr LO Chiu-kit Co-opted Member
Ms Melissa Kaye PANG Co-opted Member
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
Mr Larry CHU Assistant Secretary (Harbour)¹, DEVB

For Item 3

Mr KAN Hon-shing Chief Engineer/Drainage Projects, Drainage Projects Division, Drainage Services Department (DSD)
Mr CHAN Hak-keung Senior Engineer/Drainage Projects 2, DSD
Mr CHAN Hok-man Engineer/Drainage Projects 21, DSD
Mr Jeffrey CHAN Associate Director, Atkins China Limited

For Item 4

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

For Item 5

Mr YIU Siu-hung, Edmond Estate Surveyor/Kai Tak Airport (District Lands Office,

Kowloon East), Lands Department (LandsD)

The Chair welcomed all attending the 24th meeting of the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development.

The Chair informed Members that **Mr Francis CHAU**, Principal Assistant Secretary (Works) 2 of Development Bureau (DEVB) attended on behalf of Mr Vincent MAK. **Miss Christine AU**, Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour) of DEVB attended on behalf of Mr Thomas CHAN. **Mr Thomas WK CHAN**, Senior Manager of 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 22nd and 23rd Task Force meeting were circulated to Members for comment on 9 January 2017. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated again on 12 January 2017.

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

Item 2 Matters Arising

Progress Report on Kai Tak Development (TFKT/08/2016) (paragraph 2.17 of the confirmed minutes of the 22nd meeting)

2.1 **The Chair** reported that, in response to Members' enquiries on the Review Study of Kai Tak Development, the Planning Department (PlanD) and Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) had arranged an informal briefing with Members on 28 October 2016 prior to the formal consultation with the Task Force at its 23rd meeting on 18 November 2016. The Secretariat provided a written response in the form of post-meeting notes.

Improvement to Hoi Bun Road Park and Adjacent Area (TFKT/09/2016) (paragraph 3.9 of the confirmed minutes of the 22nd meeting)

2.2 In response to Mr ZIMMERMAN's enquiry on waterfront open space projects in KTD, **the Chair** reported that the Secretariat was preparing a list which would be disseminated to Members for information when ready.

(Post-meeting notes: The Harbour Unit gave a presentation on the open space projects in Kai Tak Development and its neighbouring area at the 25th Task Force meeting on 24 February 2017. Members were invited to express their views on any proposed projects that could be funded by the sum of \$500 million as initial dedicated funding for harbourfront enhancement as promulgated in the 2017 Policy Address.)

Feasibility of Further Water Quality Improvement at Kai Tak Approach Channel and Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter for Water Sports Activities (TFKT/11/2016) (Paragraph 5.17 of the confirmed minutes of the 22nd meeting)

2.3 In response to Mr ZIMMERMAN's enquiry about the treatment of polluted discharge collected by dry weather flow interceptors, CEDD supplemented further information in the form of post-meeting notes issued for Members' information on 9 January 2017.

Kai Tak Sports Park Project Design Development and Findings of Urban Design Study (TFKT/12/2016) (paragraph 6.30 of the confirmed minutes of the 22nd meeting)

2.4 At the 22nd meeting, Members requested the project team to supplement information in relation to the impact and costs of the recommended noise mitigation measures for the Kai Tak Sports Park Project, including the proposed acoustic retractable roof at the Main Stadium. Details of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report on "Noise Impact Assessment" (Chapter 5 of the EIA) were disseminated for Members' information on 9 January 2017.

Review Study of Kai Tak Development (TFKT/14/2016) (paragraph 1.31 of the confirmed minutes of the 23rd meeting)

2.5 **The Chair** reported that, after the consultation with Kai Tak Task Force on the Review Study of Kai Tak Development at the 23rd

meeting on 18 November 2016, PlanD and CEDD consulted the Harbourfront Commission (HC) on the refined schemes at its 25th meeting on 13 December 2016. The Secretariat provided a written response in the form of post-meeting notes.

2.6 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** enquired about the latest progress of the refined schemes for Area 4 of the Review Study of Kai Tak Development.

2.7 **Miss Christine AU** updated Members that, subsequent to the 25th HC meeting, PlanD and CEDD were in the process of preparing a 3-dimensional model to illustrate the refined scheme and reassured the Task Force that a workshop would be arranged for Members to view the physical model prior to the Town Planning Board (TPB) meeting scheduled in January 2017.

(Post-meeting notes: Subsequent to the 25th HC meeting, PlanD and CEDD organized an informal workshop on 18 January 2017 during which the notional scheme for Area 4 and a 3-dimensional model were presented to Members.)

2.8 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** would like to correct a typo in para. 2.5 of the confirmed minutes of the 23rd meeting, which was a minor spelling mistake with his name. Regarding the Review Study, he enquired whether and when the Government would conduct an urban design study and land use review for the head of the Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC). He believed that this area could be developed into a renowned harbourfront area similar to the Marina Bay in Singapore and the Darling Harbour in Sydney.

2.9 **Ms YING** responded that CEDD would commence a consultancy study with a view to developing a conceptual plan for the 11 km long waterfront promenade at Kai Tak, including the section near the estuary of KTAC. She pointed out that the Kai Tak waterfront promenade stretched across different types of land use and development sites, e.g. commercial, residential, recreational sites as well as hospital clusters. Given that a certain number of infrastructure projects in Kai Tak Development (KTD) had commenced and their details were available, it was a suitable juncture to develop some planning and design guidelines for the 11km long waterfront promenade holistically. She

supplemented that the consultancy study was expected to start in early 2017 and ascertained that Members would be consulted and engaged during the course of the study.

(Post-meeting notes: CEDD arranged a workshop on 23 March 2017 to exchange views with Members on the Study of Design Control and Guidelines for Kai Tak promenade, among other issues.)

2.10 **The Chair** enquired whether the scope of the consultancy study would include the waterbody abutting the promenade.

2.11 To cater for the flexibility for carrying out water sports and recreational activities at “Open Space” (“O”) zone along the waterfront, **Mr YING** said that it was proposed under the Review Study to include ‘water sports/recreation use’ under Column 1 of the “O” zone in the Notes of the Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). She informed Members that following the implementation of various enhancing measures by the Government, the water quality of KTAC and Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter (KTTS) had progressively and significantly improved. She confirmed that the study would examine how the promenade be designed to facilitate water sports activities.

2.12 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** would like to know how the existing bollards and landing steps along the promenade adjoining the Hong Kong Children’s Hospital (HKCH) would be handled. Noting that the consultancy study of the Kai Tak promenade would only commence after the amendment of the Kai Tak OZP, he asked how the findings of the study could be reflected in the OZP. He pointed out that the uses at the ground level of the properties and development would define the level of activity of the adjacent waterfront open spaces. He queried whether the Government would further amend the OZP with reference to the results of the study.

(Post-meeting notes: The staircase near the north end of the promenade adjacent to the Hong Kong Children's Hospital (HKCH) could not reach the sea level and was therefore unable to serve as landing steps to facilitate boarding / deboarding. Its width was sufficient for maintenance staff but not for public use. The purpose of this staircase was to provide a maintenance access to the retaining wall beneath the taxiway bridge of the former Kai Tak Airport (now

part of Shing Fung Road). As reported in the meeting on 18 August 2015, the staircase would be fenced off with planting and excluded from the existing design. As for the seawall, it was also reported in the meeting that the existing seawall would be retained. Having consulted the Task Force and the Kowloon City District Council in 2015, ArchSD had developed the design of the promenade fronting the hospital accordingly. In view of public safety and as there was no landing steps facility at the promenade, there would be railing on top of the seawall. The design of the railing had already taken into account the need for public enjoyment of the waterfront while balancing the need for public safety, aesthetics and maintenance requirement.)

2.13 **Ms YING** recalled that the project team of HKCH had consulted KTF on the design of the project in previous meeting(s). She would relay Mr ZIMMERMAN's enquires to the project team for follow up. The width of the promenade at Kai Tak was not narrow in general, except the section adjoining HKCH. There was sufficient space on both sides of the former runway to support the development of waters sports in KTD and provision of relevant facilities. She expected that, in terms of land use, findings of the consultancy study would not affect the proposed amendments of the Kai Tak OZP.

2.14 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** reiterated his view that the level of activity and characters of open space and waterfront promenade would be directly affected by the nature of its adjacent development. He raised two questions:

- (a) how the review of the promenade could echo with that of the Kai Tak OZP; and
- (b) how the land use interface issues between the open space and the adjoining developments would be addressed.

2.15 **Ms YING** clarified that the land use in KTD was reviewed through the Review Study and proposed amendments to the Kai Tak OZP. As a further step in urban planning, this consultancy study of waterfront would be carried out with a view to developing an overall planning concept and design guidelines for the 11km long waterfront promenade, thereby enhancing consistency among different sections of the promenade before proceeding to the detailed design stage. She said that, except the section along HKCH had a detailed design, the

remaining sections of the Kai Tak promenade would be delivered at different stages by different parties. Thus, the study outcome would provide a framework for different parties to follow.

2.16 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** stressed that the atmosphere of waterfront promenade would be defined by the land use of the adjacent developments at ground and mezzanine levels, as well as the actual design of the promenade itself.

2.17 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** shared Mr ZIMMERMAN's view and recalled that some detailed design ideas could not be adopted given they had not been incorporated into the OZP, she was worried that this would happen again, leaving little flexibility on the design of the promenade.

2.18 **The Chair** noted Members' views. He agreed that there were interface issues between the urban design study on the waterfront promenade in Kai Tak and the land use as stated in the Kai Tak OZP. There were also interface issues between the promenade and the adjoining waterbody, in terms of planning and design perspectives, as well as the provision of facilities. Members should note that the urban planning process and the construction and management of relevant facilities would involve a high degree of coordination within the Government. From an urban design perspective, he shared Members' views that land uses and planning restrictions stated in the OZP could be refined and amended with sufficient justifications if opportunities arose. Members could raise comments on the OZP during the public inspection period for PlanD's consideration. He opined that Members should welcome CEDD's initiative to take a step forward in carrying out an urban design study for the Kai Tak promenade. Members could offer opinions to help resolve the interface issues between the promenade and the adjoining land uses as well as setting some design criteria on the promenade, with a vision to building a vibrant harbourfront. Instead of having a single Government department being responsible for all the planning issues, it was more practical for CEDD and its consultants to come up with design inputs and ideas to address the interfacing issues between the waterfront and the adjoining land uses.

2.19 In response to Members' concern, **Mr Tom YIP** replied that

there would be frontage areas at the ground level of the proposed developments along the promenade in Area 4 as stated in the OZP. The project team endeavoured to realize and implement the planning concepts in accordance with the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines. He assured Members that CEDD and PlanD would take comments received from previous consultation sessions onboard in taking the scheme forward.

2.20 **Mr Ivan HO** opined that it should be seen as an improvement that the Government would take the initiative in formulating a planning concept for the Kai Tak promenade by means of urban design study prior to land disposal. He understood that Members were concerned whether the OZP would pose constraints on the design of the promenade. In view of this, he suggested CEDD and its consultants to provide regular updates of the study to Members at the interim stage. He would also like to know how the planning and design concepts recommended by the study could eventually be implemented.

2.21 **The Chair** said that Mr HO's question pointed out the importance of ensuring that the study findings would be implementable.

2.22 **Mr Tom YIP** replied that the consultancy study would recommend a set of design guidelines for the promenade. The project team would keep Members informed on the progress during the course of the study. He said that among different mechanism, the simplest and most direct way to implement the planning concept and design guidelines was to include relevant requirements into the land lease of development sites as lease conditions.

2.23 **The Chair** enquired whether the consultant study would be jointly carried out by CEDD and PlanD.

2.24 **Ms YING** said that the study would involve a number of Government departments, including PlanD, CEDD, the Harbour Unit and the Leisure and Cultural Services Department.

2.25 **The Chair** commented that the Government had taken a big step forward in enhancing the urban design in Kai Tak through inter-departmental coordination and efforts. He advised the project

team to report to the Task Force regularly so that Members could express their views and monitor the progress closely.

2.26 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** viewed that the interface issues between the land use review and the promenade study had to be addressed in the early stage and should be stipulated as one of the scopes of the consultancy study.

2.27 **The Chair** thanked Mr BROOKE for his comment. He presumed that the project team agreed with Members' suggestions and they would be incorporated into the study.

2.28 **Ms YING** supplemented that the consultancy study was at its preparation stage and the scope of the study would be suitably adjusted taking into account the constraints of available funding.

2.29 **Miss Christine AU** understood that Members' concern centered on the interfacing issues between the open space and its adjoining land use. She opined that the overall planning of open space, as well as its integration with adjoining developments had been suitably addressed in the OZP. For instance, retail belt and underground shopping streets were planned in Area 4 and Area 2 of the Kai Tak Development respectively. There would also be commercial developments in Area 2. She pointed out that interfacing issues would necessarily be featured in the study given that it would be fundamental to look into the planning of adjoining development before coming up with design ideas for a particular section of open space.

2.30 **The Chair** agreed and stressed that the promenade should not be segregated from the neighbouring land uses. He assumed that the consultants would address the aforesaid interfacing issues in the study.

2.31 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** reminded Members that the presentation on the Review Study of Kai Tak Development did not feature human activities or experience on the ground level of the waterfront area, he opined that these should be included into the study.

2.32 **The Chair** advised the project team to take note of Mr

ZIMMERMAN's and Members' remarks in the consultancy study.

**Item 3 Revitalisation of Tsui Ping River
(Paper No. TFKT/01/2017)**

3.1 **The Chair** recalled that the Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO) and the Drainage Services Department (DSD) had briefed Members on the transformation of Tsui Ping River project at the meeting held in April 2015. DSD had now provided a discussion paper (TFKT/01/2017) to update and seek Members' views on the project.

3.2 **The Chair** welcomed **Mr KAN Hon-shing**, **Mr CHAN Hak-keung** and **Mr CHAN Hok-man** from DSD, and Mr Jeffrey CHAN from Atkins China Limited to the meeting.

3.3 **Mr KAN** and **Mr CHAN Hak-keung** presented the improvement project with the aid of a PowerPoint.

3.4 **The Chair** commented that the Tsui Ping River project resembled the Cheonggyecheon Stream in South Korea. He recalled that Members supported the Tsui Ping River revitalisation project as presented at the 17th meeting and invited Members to give views on the preliminary design concepts of the project.

3.5 **Mr Wilson YIP** said that the Kwun Tong District Council had given its support to the project in principle. He raised the following enquiries:

- (a) he noted that the project targeted to enhance the flood conveyance function of the existing river channel. He would like to know whether the capacity of Tsui Ping River would be affected by the proposed floating pontoons and in-stream planting and intensify the risk of flooding at Fuk Tong Road and Tsui Ping Road. He enquired whether DSD would deepen the river to increase the capacity of Tsui Ping River;
- (b) the existing carpark at Shing Yip Street would be transformed into Tsui Ping River Garden to be managed by

Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD). He enquired whether these parking facilities would be reprovisioned near the future Tsui Ping River; and

- (c) the project team should also consider aesthetics in developing the design for the proposed walkways and footbridges alongside and across the river so as to create a unique character for the future Tsui Ping River.

3.6 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** was in support of the proposal. He believed that DSD would further refine the design of the project after taking into account Members' comments. He said that the initiative would result in a remarkable transformation of the Kwun Tong district. He had three observations:

- (a) he suggested DSD to extend the public engagement period from two months to three or four months to allow sufficient time for members of the public to express their views;
- (b) in terms of the overall design, he opined that the fundamental goal was to encourage people to go near the river. The current design was sophisticated and suggested that the project team could start with a base case and add on special features step by step; and
- (c) regarding water quality of Tsui Ping River, he was aware that polluted water was discharged into the river and caused odour problem. He wondered if these problems could be tackled through the revitalisation project.

3.7 **Mr Ivan HO** supported the proposal and noted that the local community was enthusiastic about the project. He raised four points to the project team for consideration:

- (a) apart from the proposed water gate near Hung To Road, he suggested to install an additional one at Wai Yip Street in order to maintain a constant flow of water in the river and to control the water level. The project team could make reference to similar cases in Macau and Panama Canal;
- (b) the general public was also concerned that the downstream would be flooded during raining season. He shared that

the Barcelona Government had installed an alarm system which would be triggered when the water level at the upstream of the river reached a certain level, such that people at the downstream would be alerted and evacuated in advance;

- (c) in terms of pedestrian connectivity and accessibility, he supported the idea of demolishing the existing pedestrian ramp above the nullah which would help improve the visual environment. For a similar project in Yuen Long, he noted that a new footbridge would be erected above the nullah instead. It appeared to him there was inconsistency within the Government in handling these similar projects; and
- (d) to enhance walkability and connectivity, he said that space underneath the existing Kwun Tong Bypass flyover should also be planned so as to link up with the nearby Laguna Park and Laguna City. He viewed that DSD and the consultant could suitably review the number of footbridges and walkways.

3.8 **Prof TANG Bo-sin** supported the project. He enquired whether the concept of the proposed engineered wetland in Zone A could also be used in the future Tsui Ping River Garden at King Yip Street.

3.9 **Mr Paul YK CHAN** expressed appreciation for the project as well as the illustration in the PowerPoint presentation. He raised the following comments:

- (a) he pointed out that the site area of the engineered wetland between Kai Lim Road and Kwun Tong Road in Zone A was relatively small. It appeared to him that the wetland mainly served a decorative purpose. He suggested to simplify the architectural design and asked whether it could be replaced with a bioswales and rain garden;
- (b) the Government had launched a public consultation on Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan for Hong Kong in 2016. He asked whether the project team could also provide some biodiversified landscape and create roadside

buffers between the wetland area and the neighbouring community facilities;

- (c) given the waterbody of Tsui Ping River was not large, it might not be necessary to have covered decks along the riverside. He asked whether the floating pontoons and footbridges would serve as open space, thereby encouraging social interaction; and
- (d) in order to help promote a “water-friendly culture” in Hong Kong, the general public should have access to water in certain parts of the river under safe conditions.

3.10 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** would like the project team to provide further information regarding the sources of water running into Tsui Ping River during dry seasons.

3.11 **Ir Raymond CHAN** fully supported the proposal and credited the photomontages and video presented by the project team. He realized that the presentation was based on a dry weather flow situation. Noting that the main function of Tsui Ping River was flood control, he would like to know more about the situation of the river and the condition of the proposed drainage infrastructures in rainy seasons.

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

- (a) how to maintain constant water flow in the river and tackle the problem of odour in dry weather. Despite all the efforts by the Government, he said that expedient connections could not be practically eliminated;
- (b) would DSD improve the hydraulics of the river for wet weather seasons;
- (c) whether DSD would prepare a coordinated scheme that covered the Tsui Ping River revitalisation project, the upgrading of Kwun Tong preliminary treatment works and enhancement works for Kwun Tong sewage pumping station which had been separately presented to the Task Force;
- (d) whether it was feasible to move the proposed cantilevered footpath along Wai Fat Road to King Yip Street. Given the proposed footpath along Wai Fat Road was at a close

proximity to the highways where vehicles were going up Kwun Tong Bypass, he was concerned that it would result in an unpleasant pedestrian environment;

- (e) whether the pavement works in the vicinity would also be taken up by the project team to enhance the streetscape, and whether the Transport Department (TD) was involved for the pedestrian crossing enhancement works in the area; and
- (f) he shared Mr YIP's concern regarding the availability of carparking facilities and it appeared to be more sensible to retain the existing carpark to allow visitors to park their cars and visit the Tsui Ping River. He said that TD should update Members with an overall car parking and congestion relief plan for Kwun Tong. He also raised the interfacing issue between the future commercial site at King Yip Lane and the river; and
- (g) he expressed support for the project and would like the project team to highlight the major changes of the project between the current presentation and the last presentation which was discussed at the 17th meeting in April 2015.

3.13 **Mr Freddie HAI** fully supported the project and recognised and praised DSD's efforts in carrying out the upgrading and improvement works. Assuming that the future Tsui Ping River would become a very popular destination with wide biological diversity, it would be important for the project team to work closely with the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department to tackle the potential waste materials produced within the site in the near future. For instance, visitors should be encouraged to observe the 'leave-no-trace' principle. He also supported Mr ZIMMERMAN's suggestion that there should be a pedestrian link bridge at the river's mouth to improve connectivity along the promenade. He cited example in Canary Wharf, London, that such kind of link bridge could be a local landmark and would not need to be over-engineered or over designed.

3.14 **Mrs Karen BARRETTO** supported the project and raised two questions:

- (a) whether the current ecological function of the waterway had been assessed; and

- (b) what would be the impacts of the upgrading works and the installation of water gate to the ecological function of the waterway.

3.15 **Mr Ken SO** noticed that the Tsui Ping River project emphasised the need for enhancing and preserving biodiversity. He echoed Mrs BARRETTO's views and encouraged the project team to conduct a detailed assessment on biodiversity at the current King Yip Street Nullah, and on this basis devise educational messages to the general public through the project in the future. He noted that the project team had responded to public concern on the preservation of trees at the concerned location and he supported the project.

3.16 **The Chair** summarised that Members supported the project in principle. He said that the Secretariat would record Members' views and comments in detail and that it should be incorporated as part of the views gauged during its public engagement exercise. He invited the project team to provide an initial response to Members' comments.

3.17 **Mr KAN** thanked Members for their invaluable views. He gave the following responses:

- (a) in terms of flood prevention, he supplemented that Tsui Ping River was located at the downstream of the catchment area in central Kwun Tong. DSD had recently completed the Review of Drainage Master Plan in East Kowloon - Feasibility Study. The Tsui Ping River project in coordination with other flood prevention measures at the upstream would enhance the protection capacity of the entire catchment;
- (b) the aesthetical design of footbridges would be considered and handled at the next stage;
- (c) an interdepartmental steering committee including TD as a member would monitor the progress of the project. DSD would work closely with relevant departments in addressing the carparking issue;
- (d) water quality was the key to the success of the Tsui Ping River project. DSD and the Environmental Protection

Department (EPD) had identified some expedient connections at the upstream and carried out rectification measures. The Government would continue the work on this front;

- (e) to realise the “water-friendly culture” as promulgated in the Policy Address, it was proposed to feature floating pontoons in the project. He assured Members that safety measures and alarm or alert system would be suitably introduced; and
- (f) the existing King Yip Street Nullah was lined with concrete and biodiversity value was relatively low. The Revitalisation of Tsui Ping River would introduce aquatic planting and diversify habitat which would help enhance its biodiversity.

3.18 **The Chair** repeated Mr BROOKE’s question and asked whether the consultation period of the Public Engagement exercise of the project could be extended.

3.19 **Mr KAN** replied that the Stage 1 Public Engagement exercise would last for 2 months but there would be a further public engagement exercise during the detailed design stage. Within the 2-month public engagement period, DSD would organize roving exhibitions at different locations in Kwun Tong and a community workshop to collect views from the general public. **The Chair** noted.

3.20 On the issue of carparking, **Mr Tom YIP** supplemented that public carparking spaces would be provided within a commercial site at the north of the future Tsing Ping River Garden.

3.21 In response to Mr ZIMMERMAN’s concern on road crossings and facilities, **Mr Wilson PANG** said that TD would provide inputs from the traffic and transport perspective as member of the interdepartmental steering committee.

3.22 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired whether the public consultation of the Tsui Ping River project, the upgrading of Kwun Tong preliminary treatment works and enhancement works for Kwun Tong sewage pumping station would be carried out separately. He said that

TD should take the opportunity to improve the pedestrian and vehicular connections in the vicinity.

3.23 **The Chair** concluded that the Secretariat would record and convey Members' views to DSD for incorporation into the public engagement report. He thanked the project team for the presentation.

Item 4 Central Kowloon Route - Proposed Temporary Government Land Allocation for Works Area at Kai Tak (Paper No. TFKT/02/2017)

4.1 **The Chair** recalled that the Highways Department (HyD) briefed Members on the temporary land requirements for the Central Kowloon Route (CKR) project along the Kai Tak waterfront at the 22nd Task Force meeting on 4 October 2016. While Members had no objection to the need of having temporary works area and barging points to facilitate the construction works of the project, it was agreed that HyD should (i) minimize the site area and occupation duration of the proposed TGLAs, (ii) introduce harbourfront enhancement measures and (iii) coordinate with the Kai Tak Office (KTO) on other temporary land use within the Kai Tak Development (KTD). The project team was reminded to take into account Members' views in refining their Temporary Government Land Allocation (TGLA) proposals. HyD had now provided a discussion paper (TFKT/02/2017) to seek Members' views on the revised TGLA for the CKR project. He welcomed **Mr Roy LAM** and **Ms Karen CHUI** from HyD; **Mr Franki CHIU**, **Mr Ray TANG** and **Mr MAK Lin-fat** from Arup-Mott MacDonald Joint Venture (AMMJV) to the meeting.

4.2 **Mr Roy LAM** briefed Members on the revised TGLA for the CKR project with the aid of a PowerPoint.

4.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** asked whether there would be a strategy for the temporary use of vacant land as well as the provision of temporary footpaths and roads in KTD. He urged KTO to coordinate with relevant departments and applicants who would apply for land for temporary uses in order to come up with a strategy and provide a timeframe for the provision of temporary cycle tracks, roads and

footpaths.

4.4 **Mr Derek SUN** shared Mr ZIMMERMAN's view and said that the discussion should centre on the proposed temporary pedestrian path along the waterfront. The project proponent should commit to building a temporary pedestrian path to enhance connectivity along the waterfront, with landscape elements and other supporting facilities incorporated in the design. He believed that it would not cause any significant financial implications on the CKR project.

4.5 From a public enjoyment perspective, **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** supported the construction of a temporary pedestrian path along the waterfront. He enquired whether the allocation of these TGLA sites would cause any traffic impact.

4.6 **The Chair** invited HyD to provide an initial response to Members' comments.

4.7 **Mr Roy LAM** gave the following responses:

- (a) HyD would closely liaise with the bureau and departments concerned on the provision of the pedestrian path along the waterfront. He said that the waterfront portion of the TGLA sites could be released for the construction of temporary pedestrian path by end 2020. The project team would also pay attention to landscape and design elements when planning for the temporary footpath; and
- (b) the barging facility was proposed to be set up at the former Kai Tak runway in order to facilitate the construction of the CKR project. The works area at Kowloon City Ferry Pier was connected to the barging facility through To Kwa Wan Road and Road D2 (i.e. Shing Kai Road). The traffic impact should hence be minimal.

4.8 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** recalled that Members of the Harbourfront Commission visited the waterfront of the Olympic Village in Vancouver in 2009. Members learnt that the management agent of the Olympic Village was responsible for the provision and maintenance of temporary cycle tracks, pedestrian walkways, street furniture and

others supporting facilities within the entire site. He stressed that the Government should introduce a similar strategy in Kai Tak with a view to enhancing connectivity and promoting public enjoyment of the waterfront in the interim.

4.9 **The Chair** noted Members' views but pointed out that the location and occupation duration of TGLA works area should not be the centre of discussion in the Task Force. For temporary occupation of waterfront area, he said that the uses should comply with the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines and that the site area and occupation duration for any undesirable uses should be minimised as far as practicable. Members should note that the project team had suitably refined their TGLA applications with reference to Members' comments as expressed at HyD's last consultation with the Task Force at the 22nd meeting in October 2016. In this regard, he opined that the Task Force should give HyD the green light to proceed with its land application. Meanwhile, he requested the project team together with relevant departments to brief Members on the design of the proposed temporary pedestrian path along the waterfront in a few months' time.

4.10 **Mr Roy LAM** thanked the Chair and Members for their support to HyD's TGLA applications. He reiterated that the temporary works sites for the CKR project were targeted for release by end 2020 and there should be sufficient time to carry out the design work for the temporary pedestrian path afterwards. The project team in consultation with relevant departments would report to the Task Force once the design was ready.

4.11 **Mr Ivan HO** would like the project team to specify when HyD would be ready to consult the Task Force on this follow-up matter.

4.12 **Mr Roy LAM** responded that HyD would brief Members on the proposal of the temporary pedestrian path in this area with KTD within 2017.

4.13 **The Chair** concluded that HyD should in consultation with relevant departments brief the Task Force within a reasonable period and suggested that HyD should report to the Task Force by July 2017. He thanked the project team for the presentation and responses.

4.14 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired whether KTO and the Harbour Unit would prepare a strategy or plan on temporary land uses in KTD for Members' information.

4.15 **Ms YING** replied that KTO and the Harbour Unit would work together in trying to address Mr ZIMMERMAN's concern.

4.16 **The Chair** advised that Mr ZIMMERMAN's enquiry would be relevant to the discussion on Agenda Item 5.

Item 5 Proposed Short Term Tenancy by Open Tender of Tourism Node Site at Former Kai Tak Runway, Kai Tak, Kowloon (Paper No. TFKT/03/2017)

5.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Lands Department (LandsD) had provided a discussion paper (TFKT/03/2017) to seek Members' views on the proposed tendering of the Government land at the former Kai Tak Runway by way of short term tenancy (STT) for the purposes of "organizing and managing events and activities". Members might note that as part of Kai Tak Fantasy, the Tourism Node was planned primarily for the provision of tourism-related use with commercial, hotel and entertainment facilities. At the 19th meeting in November 2015, the Energizing Kowloon East office (EKEO) briefed Members on the "Development of Tourism Node at Kai Tak - Initiation for Expression of Interest".

5.2 He welcomed **Mr Edmond YIU Siu-hung** from LandsD to the meeting.

5.3 **Mr Edmond YIU** briefed Members on the proposed STT with the aid of a PowerPoint.

5.4 **The Chair** paraphrased that the proposed site at the former Kai Tak runway tip was designated for tourism related use in the long term and was currently vacant. With the purpose of allowing early public enjoyment of waterfront, LandsD proposed to lease the site in the form of STT for organizing events and activities.

5.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** supported the proposal and said that positive use of vacant sites to enhance the vibrancy of Kai Tak waterfront should be encouraged. He raised three enquiries:

- (a) whether the current proposal had made reference to the experience of the Central Harbourfront Event Space;
- (b) what was the percentage of maximum and minimum amount of space to be dedicated for carparking within the STT site; and
- (c) whether the Government would provide sewage discharge connections, water and electricity supply and other ancillary facilities in the STT site to facilitate the organization of events.

5.6 **Mr Ivan HO** concurred with Mr ZIMMERMAN's views and said that the Government as the landlord should bear the responsibility of providing basic facilities and utility connection points to help tenants shorten the preparation time needed for setting up events and activities.

5.7 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** opined that a one-year certain tenancy period gave little incentives to tenants to rent and invest on the subject site. He assumed that tenants would organise one-off events and activities due to the nature of the tenancy and doubted whether the proposal would be attractive to potential tenderers.

5.8 **The Chair** pointed out that the subject site was intended for the development of Tourism Node in the long run instead of serving as a temporary event space. He reminded Members that Kai Tak Fantasy International Design Competition on Urban Planning and Design had been carried out to look for creative ideas for reference and future implementation. Members may recall that the "Development of Tourism Node at Kai Tak - Invitation for Expression of Interest" was discussed at the 19th meeting in November 2015. He requested relevant departments to report on the latest progress and the development schedule of the Kai Tak Fantasy project. He also enquired whether the proposed STT site would be renewed after expiry of the one-year tenancy agreement and when the long term planning vision of the site would be realised.

(Post-meeting notes: The Tourism Commission of the Commerce and Economic Development Bureau is working with relevant policy bureaux and departments on the tender arrangement for the Tourism Node development and will announce the details within this year. Besides, the Energizing Kowloon East Office of the Development Bureau is going to consult the public on the design plan of the adjoining Runway Park, as well as the preliminary outline development plan of the Kwun Tong Action Area within this year.)

5.9 **Mr Edmond YIU** responded to Members' comments as follows:

- (a) LandsD had made reference to the case of Central Harbourfront Event Space. He understood that the Central Harbourfront Event Space was granted to the tenant with a 3-year tenancy period, however, the proposed STT site at Kai Tak could only be tendered out for a one-year fixed-term tenancy. He said that there had been market demand for using the subject site for entertainment or leisure purpose and that the proposed STT could better utilize available land resources at Kai Tak in the interim. Similar to the Central Harbourfront Event Space, the tenant of the subject site would be allowed to sublet part of the site to subtenants;
- (b) when it came to parking space, there was restriction in the tenancy document to prevent the tenant from turning the entire site into a fee-paying car park. He supplemented that only carparks serving the event/activity would be allowed. The tenant would be required to submit a traffic and transport plan to illustrate the number and layout of car parking space to the Transport Department (TD) and the Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF) for prior approval; and
- (c) with reference to previous experiences, e.g. Tung Wah Charity Carnival, tenants were capable of handling and arranging necessary basic utilities and facilities for their events and activities.

5.10 **Mr Freddie HAI** was concerned that each application for the supply of water, electricity and other utilities would take a

considerable amount of time encroaching well into the STT period thus limiting the effective use of the site. He agreed with the Chair's suggestion and urged LandsD to look into the interfacing between the proposed temporary use and the permanent development at the site. It would be important to have a definite period for temporary uses.

5.11 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that the site as part of the Kai Tak Fantasy project fell under the purview of EKEO, while KTO served as the coordinator of projects in KTD. He viewed that both departments shouldered the responsibility of ensuring that basic and necessary facilities would be available at the site. He suggested LandsD to supplement some information in relation to the location and availability of connection points for sewage, water and electricity supply. He noted that Members were in support of the proposal in principle but reiterated that the Government should formulate an active temporary land strategy or plan for the Task Force's consideration.

5.12 **Mr Ken SO** commented that the occupation period of each the proposed events and activities as stated at Appendix 2 of the discussion paper was very short. He raised two enquires:

- (a) whether applicants of individual events were required to arrange and apply necessary basic facilities and utilities by themselves; and
- (b) how these one-off events and activities would enhance public enjoyment of the waterfront and benefit the Kwun Tong community.

5.13 **Mr Edmond YIU** supplemented that organizers of events previously held at the subject site were responsible for arranging electricity supply and temporary toilets. Similarly, future event organisers would be expected to do the same. He said that the list of proposed events and activities would be subject to approval.

5.14 Regarding the Kai Tak Fantasy project, **Miss Christine AU** responded on behalf of EKEO. In the 2013 Policy Address, the Chief Executive announced that the former runway tip in KTD had excellent potential to be developed into a tourism and entertainment hub and landmark. The 90-hectare planning area of Kai Tak Fantasy comprised

the Tourism Node (about 5.93 hectares), the former runway tip, the Kwun Tong Action Area and the waterbody in between. Members might recall that the Kai Tak Fantasy – International Ideas Competition was held from 2013 to 2014. She informed Members that two detailed planning and engineering studies namely “Planning and Urban Design Review for Developments at Kai Tak Runway Tip – Feasibility Study” and the “Planning and Engineering Study on Kwun Tong Action Area – Feasibility Study” were being undertaken by the Government to further look into the Kai Tak Fantasy project. The aforementioned studies had been introduced at previous Task Force meetings.

5.15 In consideration of the time gap prior to the implementation of the Kai Tak Fantasy project and the market demand for event sites along the waterfront, LandsD put forward the proposal for Members’ consideration and comment. In response to Members’ concern about the provision of basic utilities, **Miss AU** advised that LandsD could supplement a plan showing the location and availability of basic utilities and connections at the proposed STT site after the meeting.

5.16 **Miss AU** further explained that the nature and the tendering procedure of the Central Harbourfront Event Space and this particular proposal were different. The former adopted a two-envelope tendering procedure, whilst the Tourism Node site was proposed to be granted by cash tender. For the list of proposed events and activities, she said that some organizers had registered its interest in applying for use of the site with EKEO or other parties. The future tenant could further liaise with these potential organizers on making detailed arrangements.

5.17 For the time being, she suggested LandsD to liaise with relevant Government departments in preparation of a plan to illustrate the provision of basic utilities and connections at the site constraints for Members’ information. The Secretariat would also invite EKEO to update Members on the latest progress of the Kai Tak Fantasy project in due course.

5.18 **The Chair** concluded that Members had no strong views on the proposed STT by open tender of Tourism Node site for organizing temporary events and activities. Echoing Miss AU’s recommendations,

he requested LandsD to provide supplementary information to Members after the meeting. Regarding Mr ZIMMERMAN's concern on the overall strategy of temporary and permanent land uses at KTD, he enquired whether KTO and the Harbour Unit could give Members a presentation on the topic at the next Task Force meeting.

(Post-meeting notes: Watermain record plans showing water mains of fresh and salt water connection for this site prepared by the Waters Supplies Department was issued for Members' information on 29 March 2017. The Drainage Services Department confirmed that no sewerage connection was available for the site at this moment. As for electricity connection, the organizers were required to arrange electricity supply for their events and activities with power companies.)

5.19 **Ms YING** said that the 25th meeting would be held by the end of February 2017. Given the short duration between the 24th and 25th Task Force meetings, she proposed to give a presentation on the topic at future meeting. **The Chair** agreed.

5.20 **The Chair** thanked Mr YIU for the presentation.

5.21 **Mr Edmond YIU** supplemented that the occupation period of the proposed events and activities as stated at Appendix 2 had already included the setting up and dismantling days needed for the events.

Item 6 Any Other Business

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

6.2 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:15 pm.

Secretariat

**Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development
March 2017**