

# Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development

## Minutes of Twenty-fifth Meeting

Date : 24 February 2017 (Friday)  
Time : 3:00 p.m.  
Venue : Conference Room (Room G46), 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  
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  
Sr Emily LI Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors  
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 CHAN Ka-kui Individual Member  
Mr NGAN Man-yu Individual Member  
Mr Derek SUN Co-opted Member  
Mr YIP Hing-kwok Co-opted Member

### Official Members

Mr Thomas CHAN Deputy Secretary (Planning & Lands)<sup>1</sup>, DEVB  
Ms Irene PANG Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)<sup>2</sup> (Acting), DEVB  
Mr Thomas WK CHAN Senior Manager (Tourism)<sup>41</sup>, Tourism Commission (TC)  
Mr Wilson PANG Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department (TD)  
Mr Peter CHUI Chief Engineer/Kowloon<sup>1</sup>, 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
<i>Absent with Apologies</i>	
Ms Kelly CHAN Yuen-sau	Individual Member
Mr Hans Joachim ISLER	Individual Member
Ms Vivian LEE	Individual Member
Mr Duncan CHIU	Co-opted Member
Mr LO Chiu-kit	Co-opted Member
Ms Melissa Kaye PANG	Co-opted Member
Dr NG Cho-nam	Representing The Conservancy Association
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
Miss Christine AU	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Edmund ZHOU	Assistant Secretary (Harbour)EP, DEVB
Mr Peter MOK	Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Carlos FUNG	Engineer (Harbour), DEVB

*For Item 3*

Mr Peter CHUI	Chief Engineer/Kowloon1, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Ms Lilian CHEUNG	Senior Architect/1(Kowloon), CEDD
Mr Freeman LAU	Consultant
Professor Kurt CHAN	Consultant
Ms Maggie WOO	Consultant

*For Item 4*

*Architectural Services Department (ArchSD)*

Ms Alice YEUNG	Chief Architect/2
Mr Thomas WAN	Senior Architect/25
Mr Raymond LAU	Senior Project Manager 332
Mr Donald LEUNG	Architect/205
Ms Minerva HUI	Architect/203

*Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)*

Mr Michael CHIU	Chief Executive Officer (Planning)1
Mr CHAN Tze-fung	Senior Executive Officer (Planning)6
Ms Brenda YEUNG	District Leisure Manager (Kowloon City)

**The Chair** welcomed all attending the 25<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development.

**The Chair** announced that **Ms Irene PANG**, Principal Assistant Secretary (Works) 2 (Acting) of Development Bureau, attended on behalf of Mr Vincent MAK. **Mr Thomas WK CHAN**, Senior Manager of Tourism Commission, attended on behalf of Mr George TSOI. **Mr Peter CHUI**, Chief Engineer/Kowloon1, of Civil Engineering and Development Department attended on behalf of Ms YING Fun-fong.

**The Chair** informed Members that the draft meeting minutes of the 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> meeting would be confirmed at the 26<sup>th</sup> meeting.

## **Item 1 Matters Arising**

### *Progress Report on Kai Tak Development (KTD) (Paper No. TFKT/04/2017)*

1.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Kai Tak Development Office (KTO) had provided a meeting paper on the progress of KTD (TFKT/04/2017) for Members' information.

1.2 **Mr Peter CHUI** introduced the paper and highlighted the key progress since the last meeting.

1.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** raised the following enquiries and comments:

- (a) he would like the format of the progress report to be refined;
- (b) previous discussions on the development at the head of the Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC) and the urban design study on Kai Tak promenade should be included in the progress report. He urged KTO to provide updates on these matters;
- (c) there should be a progress report on temporary land uses in

Kai Tak Development (KTD) and Members should be provided with updates regarding the existing and planned temporary uses. He opined that the proposed Temporary Government Land Allocation (TGLA) to the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD) as parking spaces for government vehicles, which had been circulated to Members recently, should be discussed at the meeting;

- (d) apart from an overview on temporary land uses, he said that Government departments responsible for the development of Kai Tak should put more efforts in planning and providing temporary promenade, pedestrian walkways and cycling routes to enhance public use and enjoyment of the waterfront. He also recalled that a cyclist was killed in a fatal car accident on Shing Fung Road in November 2016. He urged the Government to draw up an overall strategy for the provision of temporary facilities to create a continuous promenade with reference to the example of the Olympic Village in Vancouver;
- (e) for the amendments of Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), he pointed out that the proposal development of a Vocational Training Council (VTC) campus at Cha Kwo Ling waterfront had not been thoroughly discussed at previous meetings and the proposal should be brought to the Task Force again for discussion;
- (f) he had shared with the Marine Department (MD) and the Harbour Unit a proposal for designating the waterbody within the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter (KTTS) for different water uses, including anchorage, berthing, as well as water sports areas etc. He hoped this could be discussed at the Task Force in the future; and
- (g) regarding the development of the Hong Kong Children's Hospital (HKCH) and the adjoining promenade, he would like to obtain a response from the Hospital Authority regarding the availability of bicycle parking facilities within the hospital area as well as the treatment of the existing bollards and landing steps at the promenade adjoining the site.

*(Post-meeting notes: For 1.3(c), a circulation paper in relation to the proposed*

*TGLA to EMSD as parking spaces for government vehicles was circulated for Members comment for a week in February 2017. Member's views were consolidated and reverted to Lands Department and EMSD for consideration and follow-up. The written response would be circulated to Members for information when ready.)*

1.4 **Mr Ivan HO** recalled that he had suggested KTO to consider consolidating information in relation to the completed major Government, Institution or Community (GIC) facilities, as well as recreational and open spaces within Kai Tak in the regular progress report for Members' information. He said that solid information would be useful in helping Members understand the accessibility, connectivity as well as availability of open space for public use in Kai Tak at present and in the near future. It would allow Members to make more meaningful suggestions regarding the development phrasing and interfacing between various infrastructure projects within KTD.

1.5 Noting that a considerable number of infrastructure projects had been completed and disposal of land in KTD was ongoing, **Mr Wilson YIP** enquired about the latest progress and the targeted implementation schedule of the proposed Environmentally Friendly Linkage System (EFLS). He opined the EFLS should tie in with the intake of population and increase in commercial activities in KTD.

1.6 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** said that the progress report should be more robust and focused on reporting on the latest development and major initiatives at KTD.

1.7 **Mr Peter CHUI** thanked Members for their invaluable comments. He gave the following responses:

- (a) the progress report was an overview of the programme rather than a detailed update on any particular project. He said that specific progress updates of individual projects have been reported to the Task Force in the form of discussion papers. Project-based meetings would allow more time for Members to express their views. For instance, KTO submitted a discussion paper with regard to the water quality and the potential use of the waterbody at

- KTTS and KTAC for water sports activities at the 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting on 4 October 2016;
- (b) the location of ongoing as well as completed major infrastructures and projects, their current status and expected completion dates had been shown on the annexes of the progress report;
  - (c) regarding the provision of temporary pedestrian and cycling routes, KTO has been in close liaison with relevant departments in identifying opportunities for early implementation;
  - (d) the Planning Department (PlanD) would respond to Members' comments on the proposed VTC campus at the Cha Kwo Ling waterfront;
  - (e) the Harbour Unit and Marine Department could supplement information in relation to the use of the waterbody in KTTS and KTAC;
  - (f) KTO was conducting a feasibility study on the cycle track network in KTD and had taken into account Members' concern on the provision of bicycle parking and rental facilities. The project team planned to launch a pilot scheme and would brief Members on the preliminary findings of the feasibility study in 2017;
  - (g) KTO would conduct public consultation to seek views from Members of the public on the alignment and transport mode of the proposed EFLS in 2017; and
  - (h) KTD was a huge and highly complex development project. He reiterated that the progress report was intended to serve as an overview of the programme of KTD with location and development status of individual projects indicated. Since most infrastructure projects were ongoing, it was difficult to state the costs of individual projects which were subject to changes.

1.8 Regarding the proposed VTC campus at Cha Kwo Ling waterfront, **Mr Tom YIP** responded to Members' comments as follows:

- (a) PlanD and the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) briefed Members on the proposals recommended under the 'Review Study of Kai Tak

Development' at the 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting in November 2016. The proposed rezoning of a piece of land along Cha Kwo Ling waterfront to GIC use for the development of a VTC campus was mentioned in the meeting paper (TFKT/14/2016). He recalled that Members' discussion was centered on the former Kai Tak runway from urban design perspective, and no comment was raised on that site; and

- (b) PlanD noted the comments from residents of Laguna City on the VTC proposal. In response to residents' concerns such as site selection, visual impact and pedestrian accessibility, he said that consideration had been given to the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines during the planning process. A piece of land with a width of 50 metres and a length of 660m had been reserved for the development of waterfront promenade for public enjoyment. The proposed VTC campus would adopt a stepped building height profile, which were lower than the adjacent residential development by about 20 to 30 metres. Furthermore, ventilation and visual corridors would be provided within the site to facilitate visual and air permeability. The draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/5, which included the rezoning amendment for VTC proposal, had been exhibited for public inspection under the Town Planning Ordinance (TPO) since 17 February 2017 for a period of two months up to 18 April 2017. PlanD would provide a discussion paper on the amended Kai Tak OZP covering the amendments related to VTC proposal and consult the Task Force at the next meeting in April 2017.

1.9 **The Chair** informed Members that Chairman of the Harbourfront Commission had received a letter from the Estate Owners' Committee of Laguna City summarizing their concern on the proposed VTC campus at Cha Kwo Ling waterfront and it was forwarded to him for information. Given the subject site fell under the purview of KTTF and in response to the views received, he considered that consultation with KTTF would be necessary.

1.10 **Mr Ivan HO** said that the format and information of the current KTD progress report had yet to fulfil Members' expectations.

He suggested arranging a working session to allow Members and officers concerned to exchange views on this matter.

1.11 **The Chair** fully understood Members' views and concerns. Having participated in the work of KTTF for a considerable period of time, he was fully aware that Members' key concern lied on accessibility to the waterfront and connectivity between public open spaces in KTD. While he recognised the efforts of KTO in trying to provide updates of major projects in KTD, Members were specifically more concerned with the progress of public facilities and public space. He also opined that such information would be essential in helping Members make purposeful comments and informed decisions in relation to temporary land uses in Kai Tak. For instance, Members were recently consulted by EMSD on the TGLA for parking spaces for government vehicles through paper circulation. While understanding the need of the applicant, Members were uncertain whether the proposed temporary use would affect the long-term development of public open space or delay the completion time of certain facilities. He supported Mr HO's suggestion of arranging a separate working session to go through the format of the progress report in detail.

1.12 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** commented that the progress report would be more reader-friendly if some notes, linkages and indications to different infrastructure projects were provided. At present, Members had to refer back-and-forth between the meeting paper, annexes and other relevant materials on the website.

1.13 **Mr Derek SUN** said that different parties had different areas of focus, thus different approaches of reporting progress. Noting that Members were interested in the spatial aspects of KTD, he recommended KTO to consider dividing KTD into certain sub-areas and highlight the progress of each of them in the report. Members' attention and discussion would then be centered on more important initiatives in each of the sub-areas.

1.14 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that the Task Force should reach an agreement with the Government on the format of the progress report. The project team should consider presenting the progress report in a clear column-based layout to facilitate Members' tracking on the



latest progress of projects in KTD.

1.15 **The Chair** noted Mr ZIMMERMAN's request and recalled that the format of the report had been repeatedly discussed in every meeting and KTO had refined the report format every time. He viewed that a separate working session on the format of progress report between KTO and Members would be a more pragmatic solution in achieving an agreement.

1.16 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** enquired whether virtual reality technology could be adopted in the presentation of the progress report.

1.17 **Mr Peter CHUI** agreed to arrange a working session to discuss the format of the progress report after the meeting.

*(Post-meeting notes: A working session on the format of Kai Tak Development Progress Report was arranged on 23 March 2017.)*

1.18 **Miss Christine AU** responded to Members' comments as follows:

- (a) the Secretariat in coordination with KTO would arrange a working session to discuss the format of the progress report after the meeting;
- (b) given that the water quality at part of the KTAC and KTTS had substantially improved, the Harbour Unit, Home Affairs Bureau (HAB), Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO) and Marine Department (MD) were identifying suitable locations for the development of water sports to promote a water-friendly culture. She informed Members that the Volvo Ocean Race, with the Kai Tak runway tip as a land base for activities and spectating, was expected to take place in 2018. The Secretariat would invite HAB to brief the Task Force in due course. The Hong Kong Water Sports Council (HKWSC) was also looking for suitable office and event sites in the area. She supplemented that the refurbishment works for a disused fireboat pier at Kai Tak runway facing KTTS were completed and the pier had been opened for public use. There were also regular ferry

- services plying between Kwun Tong Ferry Pier and North Point Ferry Pier via the subject pier;
- (c) the consultancy study of the Kai Tak promenade would also include consideration of the waterbody abutting the promenade. In other words, the interface issues between the open space and adjacent land or water uses, especially along the former runway and Kwun Tong Promenade, would be looked into. The study could also help identify and explore the best possible use of landing facilities in the area; and
  - (d) the Secretariat would follow up with the Hospital Authority with regard to the availability or provision of bicycle parking facilities within the future HKCH.

*(Post-meeting notes: The project team of HKCH advised that bicycle parking and bike rental facilities would not be included in HKCH's design from hospital operation point of view. This was to take into account the need to maintain in HKCH the highest level in patient safety and privacy, infection control, providing a tranquil environment for recovery and therapy as well as maintaining the hospital security.)*

## **Item 2      Update on Implementation of Public Creatives in Kai Tak Development (Paper No. TFKT/05/2017)**

2.1            **The Chair** informed Members that the Kai Tak Office (KTO) and its consultants would provide updates to Members on the Implementation of Public Creatives in Kai Tak Development (KTD). He welcomed **Mr Peter CHUI** and **Ms Lilian CHEUNG** from KTO, **Mr Freeman LAU**, **Professor Kurt CHAN** and **Ms Maggie WOO** from the consultant team to the meeting.

2.2            **Ms Lilian CHEUNG** and **Ms Maggie WOO** presented the initiative with the aid of a PowerPoint.

2.3            **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** raised the following enquiries and comments:

- (a)            regarding the design of street furniture for traffic uses, he

- asked whether the project team and relevant departments had explored reducing the number of unnecessary sign posts by clipping different signs onto one single pole;
- (b) in terms of streetscape, he said that concrete profile barrier on roads would result in unpleasant walking experience. He would like to see more planters and granite tile design along the roads in KTD; and
  - (c) the design and aesthetics of amenity railings should also be looked into.

2.4 In response to Mr ZIMMEMAN's concerns, **Ms Lilian CHEUNG** gave the following responses:

- (a) regarding the design of railings, she said that it was the vision of KTO to create a railing-free environment in KTD. There was only one type of railing in the Kai Tak Brand Identity Manual and Public Creatives Guideline (the Guideline) for installation around pedestrian safety islands;
- (b) KTO worked in partnership with the Highways Department (HyD) in using specific graphics to modify and beautify the concrete pavements;
- (c) to facilitate the implementation of Public Creatives in KTD, comments from relevant departments have been resolved and incorporated when drawing up the Guideline; and
- (d) the idea of multi-purpose traffic sign pole was not covered in the Guideline. However, there were specific designs for street light and street name plate poles which she believed would help create a specific identity for KTD.

2.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** had three follow-up comments:

- (a) HyD and the Transport Department (TD) should commit to implementing the design options suggested by the Guideline to create a coherent traffic and pedestrian environment in KTD;
- (b) KTO should actively consider reducing the number of traffic poles on the streets; and
- (c) edged planters, instead of concretised profile barriers should be installed on roads to improve the overall

streetscape in KTD.

2.6 **Mr Peter CHUI** said that the use of concrete profile barriers would be avoided in Kai Tak, as far as practicable. On the other hand, instead of having planters in concrete blocks, trees and plants in KTD are directly planted into the ground. These measures should be able to address Mr ZIMMERMAN's concern regarding the excessive use of concrete streetscape on roads.

2.7 **Miss Christine AU** invited the artists and KTO to share with Members the interaction between KTO and project teams in implementing and incorporating the elements of Public Creatives into the design of their own development projects.

2.8 **Ms Lilian CHEUNG** replied that the Guideline had been adopted by CEDD's infrastructure projects in KTD by phases. Relevant government departments responsible for GIC and school projects within Kai Tak have worked closely with KTO in applying the design elements and graphics in their architectural design. Various project teams were invited to exchange views on the implementation of the Guideline.

2.9 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** asked to what extent the concepts of Public Creatives could be realized in KTD. He invited the consultants to share their experience with Members.

2.10 **Mr Freeman LAU** said that Public Creatives was more than just a strategy for place branding or making, it also encouraged public involvement throughout the process. Having designs and graphics on community facilities would help connect the community and foster public's conception of public spaces. The scope of Public Creatives in Kai Tak included public design, public art and public event.

2.11 **Professor Kurt CHAN** supplemented that the core value of Public Creatives was public engagement. A bottom-up approach was adopted to encourage the community to voice their opinions for improving the living environment through public art. During the interactive process, professionals, for instance, architects and designers would be engaged to modify and give technical advice to help the community achieve their ideas.

2.12 **Mr Ivan HO** would like to know whether the ideas of Public Creatives could be incorporated into private development projects as well as the public open space to be constructed and managed by private developers.

2.13 **Mr CHAN Ka-kui** enquired whether landscape designs have been or would be incorporated in Public Creatives.

2.14 **Mr Peter CHUI** responded to Members' comments as follows:

- (a) private developers were welcome to make reference to or incorporate Public Creatives design concepts into the design of their respective developments. KTO had promoted the design concepts through interaction with developers as well as dissemination of relevant information on KTO's website. He assured Members that Public Creatives would not obliterate the design flexibility from an architectural and urban design perspective as private developers could freely adopt the concepts in consideration of achieving better synergy with their intended designs; and
- (b) The Design Guideline of Public Creatives mainly applied to street furniture. With regard to landscaping design, he was aware that relevant departments such as the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) would assess the architectural and landscape elements of their own projects and make reference to the Guideline as appropriate.

2.15 **The Chair** advised that the next agenda item on Station Square would verify whether the ideas of Public Creatives could be implemented in other projects in Kai Tak.

2.16 **Mr CHAN Ka-kui** commented that private developers might be reluctant to adopt the Guideline if it was on a voluntary basis. He said that KTO should explore incorporating the Guideline in the Conditions of Sale as requirements to help create an identity for KTD.

2.17 **The Chair** thanked the project team for the presentation and

Members for their comments.

**Item 3 Station Square at Kai Tak (Paper No. TFKT/06/2017)**

3.1 **The Chair** informed Members that a value management workshop on the Station Square project was held on 26 January 2016 and Members of the Task Force were invited to attend. The Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) and Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) had submitted a paper (TFKT/06/2017) to consult Members on the design of the Station Square.

3.2 **The Chair** welcomed **Ms Alice YEUNG, Mr Thomas WAN, Mr Raymond LAU, Mr Donald LEUNG** and **Ms Minerva HUI** from ArchSD, and **Mr Michael CHIU, Mr CHAN Tsz-fung** and **Ms Brenda YEUNG** from LCSD to the meeting.

3.3 **Mr Freddie HAI** declared that he had been involved in preparing the development control guideline for an area adjacent to the Station Square back in 2010. **The Chair** advised that there was no conflict of interest.

3.4 **Mr Michael CHIU** and **Mr Thomas WAN** presented the project with the aid of a PowerPoint.

3.5 **The Chair** commented that Station Square was slightly distanced from the waterfront and advised Members to focus their comments on the connectivity and accessibility to the waterfront. He believed that the project team would also welcome comments from other perspectives.

3.6 **Mr Ivan HO** raised the following comments:

- (a) the project team through the presentation slides had addressed Members' concern by clearly illustrating the connectivity and layout of the project, as well as its relationship with the waterfront. Other project proponents should try to follow similar format of presentation;
- (b) he was delighted that the number of built structures would

be minimized so as to create passive open space in the Station Square. He said the types of human activities to be carried out would impact on the character of a place. Regarding design features, he supported the idea of “Canopy of Trees” and water features;

- (c) he opined that the future management model of the Station Square would be fundamental to the realisation of the design concepts as presented in the slides. He asked LCSD to advise whether railings would be installed to facilitate its management yet at the expense of fencing off and segregating the open spaces from public use;
- (d) he was disappointed that the proposed cycle track would run around the Station Square rather than integrating with the open space; and
- (e) the relationship and interaction between the Station Square and the adjacent commercial developments would affect the vibrancy and variety of activities at the open space concerned. He hoped that LCSD as the management party of the Station Square would help achieve the vision of the project.

3.7 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** shared his opinions as follows:

- (a) regarding green connections, he said that most people would walk along Kai Tak River to gain access to the waterfront. He enquired why the linkage between the Station Square and waterfront through Kai Tak River was not indicated on the plan;
- (b) dog walking routes should also be indicated on the plan for reference;
- (c) he urged the relevant departments to allow members of the public to cycle through the Station Square to have access to the future Mass Transit Railway Station. Cycling routes within the Station Square should be shown on the plan as well;
- (d) he suggested the project team to consider reducing impediments and structures within the park to bring about a large green public space for public enjoyment. Parks and public facilities should be designed and adjusted pursuant

to community's needs and preference. He hoped that the project team could add more features only after the park was put to use;

- (e) in terms of design, he found the porosity of the Kai Tak Station superstructure building and the water feature interesting. He viewed that the public should be able to thoroughly enjoy the openness of the park; and
- (f) he enquired why the covered walkway would be adjourned at the Kai Tak Sports Park to the south of the site and whether it would be connected to the residential estates to the north of the park.

3.8 **Mr Freddie HAI** had three concerns:

- (a) the proposed covered walkway would be extensive in coverage, he was concerned that it would segregate the urban space within the Station Square. The project team could consider having alternatives such as tree crowns and canopies which could serve a similar function;
- (b) he requested the Government to give an update on the proposed Environmentally Friendly Linkage System (EFLS) given the layout design of Station Square would hinge on its implementation, location of stations and alignment etc.; and
- (c) in terms of public enjoyment of the open space, he enquired why an extensive amount of space within the park was assigned for lawn bowling.

3.9 **Ms Alice YEUNG** said that LCSD would respond to the enquiries about lawn bowling and recreational facilities, and ArchSD would later give a consolidated reply to the design issues.

3.10 **Mr Michael CHIU** responded to Members' comments as follows:

- (a) there was no lawn bowling facility provided by LCSD in Kowloon. The provision of lawn bowling facility was suggested and agreed at the Value Management workshop attended by various stakeholders; and
- (b) Kai Tak Office (KTO) was conducting a feasibility study of



the cycle track network in the Kai Tak Development (KTD). LCSD's major concern was the safety of the park users.

3.11 **Ms Brenda YEUNG** noted the concern raised by Members with regard to the future management of public open space. While Task Force Members opined that the open space should be open and the number of railings should be minimised, she recalled that District councillors had expressed concerns about crowd control, noise and safety issues arising from an aggregation of people over weekends. She confirmed that LCSD would make the best use of available resources to guarantee a safe and secure park for public enjoyment.

3.12 From the Harbourfront Commission's standpoint, **the Chair** stressed that public open space at harbourfront areas should be shared by all irrespective of nationality, ethnicity and gender etc.

3.13 **Mr Thomas WAN** gave the following responses to Members' enquires:

- (a) apart from the Kai Tak Station superstructure building, minimal structures would be constructed to serve as public toilets, changing rooms, plant rooms and LCSD offices. The rest of the site, which was about 12 hectares in size, would be accessible and walkable; and
- (b) the proposed covered walkway would ensure a sheltered and easy access for crowd dispersal when events are held at the Kai Tak Sports Park. The covered walkway would hence be in the form of a 3-dimensional lawn underneath the tilted lawn. The walkway would be integrated with the adjoining leisure facilities.

3.14 In responses to Mr ZIMMERMAN's concern about access to the waterfront through the Kai Tak River, **Mr Raymond LAU** noted that some technical issues with regard to the piece of land near and underneath the future Central Kowloon Route along the Kai Tak River were yet to be resolved by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) and Highways Department (HyD). He believed that the departments concerned would give Members an update at a suitable juncture.

3.15 **The Chair** advised KTO to take note of the issue of pedestrian connectivity along Kai Tak River and report to the Task Force when ready.

3.16 **Mr Peter CHUI** supplemented that the feasibility study of cycle track network in KTD would look into the possibility of extending the cycle track into the Station Square. KTO would continue to work closely with the departments concerned. Regarding the connectivity and walkability of Kai Tak River to the waterfront, he said that the Kai Tak River would be developed into a park with walkways on both sides of the river banks. KTO was drawing up measures to enhance the connectivity along Kai Tak River.

3.17 **The Chair** recalled enhancement of accessibility as well as the condition of open space underneath the CKR highway structure had been discussed at various Task Force meetings. It remained his view that it would be essential to enhance the connectivity along Kai Tak River. Noting that this issue fell beyond the project scope of the Station Square project, KTO was tasked to take follow-up actions.

3.18 Regarding design features, **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested replacing the proposed water feature above the Kai Tak River at the exit of the MTR station with an open plaza.

3.19 **The Chair** thanked Members for their invaluable views. He summarized that Members supported the design idea of “Canopy of Trees” and the project team was suggested to reduce the number of impediments and built structures within the park. Members also expressed their concern with regard to the openness of the public open space. In taking forward the project, the project team should take onboard Members’ comments.

3.20 **Mr Michael CHIU** informed Members that the project would proceed subject to funding approval from the Legislative Council.

3.21 On behalf of the Hong Kong Institute of Architects, **Mr Freddie HAI** expressed objection to the proposed lawn bowling grounds at the western portion of the Station Square project given they would

obstruct the accessibility within the site.

3.22 **The Chair** noted Mr. Hai's comments. He thanked the project team for the presentation.

#### **Item 4 Any Other Business**

##### *Open Space Projects at Kai Tak Harbourfront Area*

4.1 **The Chair** informed Members that in the 2017 Policy Address, the Government had decided to first partner with the Harbourfront Commission and implement harbourfront enhancement initiatives through a dedicated team with dedicated funding. The aim was to further extend the waterfront promenade along both sides of the Victoria Harbour, beautify areas in the vicinity and improve accessibility of the waterfront. The Government had earmarked \$500 million as initial dedicated funding for harbourfront enhancement. He invited **Miss Christine AU** to brief Members on the open space projects in Kai Tak Development and its neighbouring area that are to be funded.

4.2 **Miss Christine AU** briefed Members with the aid of a PowerPoint.

4.3 **The Chair** noted the recommendations of the Secretariat and advised that the vision of the Harbourfront Commission (HC) and the Task Force was to enhance the development of Victoria Harbour as a whole. There should not be any competitions for funding resources among geographical Task Forces. Members' views were welcome and they could be further discussed at HC meeting.

4.4 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** noted that the \$500 million initial funding had not been mentioned in the Budget and asked whether the Harbour Unit had already secured the funding.

4.5 **Miss Christine AU** replied that the Government had earmarked \$500 million as initial dedicated funding for harbourfront enhancement, as stated in the 2017 Policy Address. Subject to the recommendations to be made by the Harbourfront Commission and its

Task Forces with regard to how the funding should be allocated, the Government could make use of the dedicated funding to commence the implementation of proposed projects in due course.

4.6 **Mr Derek SUN** enquired whether the dedicated funding was also applicable to temporary improvement works.

4.7 **Miss Christine AU** confirmed that subject to the deliberation results of HC, the dedicated funding could also apply to temporary improvement projects.

Other businesses

4.8 Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN raised two questions:

- (a) whether the Government would brief Members on the proposed rezoning of a piece of land along Cha Kwo Ling waterfront for the development of a VTC campus before the end of the public inspection period for the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/5; and
- (b) whether the Government could provide a full report on the cost implications of safeguarding the pedestrian and cycling connectivity along Kai Tak River.

*(Post-meeting notes: For 4.8(b), a feasibility study on the cycle track network in the Kai Tak Development (KTD) was being conducted by CEDD. The study would review the alignment of the proposed 13km-long cycle track network and its ancillary facilities as well as the implementation strategies. Members would be briefed on its findings in due course.)*

4.9 **Mr Tom YIP** replied that PlanD would consult Members on the Draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/5 incorporating the proposed amendments related to VTC proposal at the next Task Force meeting tentatively scheduled for early April 2017, prior to the end of the public inspection period on 18 April 2017. He assured Members that their views in respect of the amendments would be relayed to the Town Planning Board for consideration. He advised that Members, local residents and any other person could also make written representation to the Secretary of the Board on or before 18 April 2017.

4.10 In response to Mr ZIMMERMAN's concern on the connectivity along Kai Tak River, **Miss Christine AU** said that KTO, HyD and the Harbour Unit were identifying possible solutions and Members would be briefed in due course.

*Date of next meeting*

4.11 **The Chair** informed Members that the next meeting was tentatively scheduled for early April 2017. The Secretariat would inform Members of the meeting date in due course.

4.12 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:10 pm.

**Secretariat**

**Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development**

**March 2017**