

Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development

Minutes of Twenty-sixth Meeting

Date : 5 April 2017 (Wednesday)
Time : 2:30 p.m.
Venue : 15/F Conference Room, North Point Government Offices, 333
Java Road, North Point

Present

Mr Vincent NG Chairman

Organization Members

Mrs Margaret BROOKE Representing Business Environment Council
Mr LEUNG Kong-yui Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and
Transport in Hong Kong
Mr Ken SO Representing The Conservancy Association
Mrs Karen BARRETTO Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Anthony CHEUNG Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Man-ching
Mr Paul YK CHAN Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Sr Emily LI Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr TAM Po-yiu Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Raymond CHAN Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Kin-sek
Mr Shuki LEUNG Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong
Kong
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour

Individual Members

Mr Hans Joachim ISLER Individual Member
Mr NGAN Man-yu Individual Member
Ms Melissa Kaye PANG Co-opted Member
Mr YIP Hing-kwok 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
Ms Vivian LEE	Individual Member
Mr Duncan CHIU	Co-opted Member
Mr LO Chiu-kit	Co-opted Member
Mr Derek SUN	Co-opted Member
Prof TANG Bo-sin	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners

In attendance

Mr Nicholas BROOKE	HC Chair
Miss Christine AU	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Larry CHU	Assistant Secretary (Harbour)1, DEVB
Mr Edmund ZHOU	Assistant Secretary (Harbour)EP, DEVB

For Item 3

Planning Department (PlanD)

Mr Tom YIP	District Planning Officer/Kowloon
Mr Gary LAM	Town Planner/Kowloon 6

Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)

Mr Peter CHUI	Chief Engineer/Kowloon 1
Mr Edmund CHAN	Senior Engineer/6 (Kowloon)

Vocational Training Council (VTC)

Mr LEUNG Yam-shing	Deputy Executive Director
Mr Colin SOH	Deputy Head, EHSD

Consultants

Mr Joel CHAN	Director, P&T
Ms Sally CHAN	Senior Associate, P&T
Ms Theresa YEUNG	Director of Planning, Arup
Ms Natalie LEUNG	Urban Planning Manager, Arup
Ms Minnie LAW	Assistant Planner, Arup
Mr Alan MACDONALD	Director, Urbis Ltd
Ms Winona IP	Senior Town Planner, Urbis Ltd
Ms Jennifer CHIK	Senior Architect, Leigh and Orange

Representatives of Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbour Concern Group

Mr Fred TSE

Mr Keith LUK

For Item 4

Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)

Mr Peter CHUI Chief Engineer/Kowloon 1

Mr Sunny LO Senior Engineer/2

Ms Lilian CHEUNG Senior Architect/1

Consultants

Mr W. B. KANG Technical Manager, CEC-CCC Joint Venture

Mr Andrew OSBORNE Director, ADI Limited

Mr Kentis BEH Director, A.LEAD Architects Limited

Mr Clive CHENG Chief Resident Engineer, AECOM Asia Co. Limited

Mr Sion EDWARDS Director, Urbis Limited

The Chair welcomed all attending the 26th meeting of the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development.

The Chair announced 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 Tourism Commission, attended on behalf of Mr George TSOI. **Mr Simon LAU**, Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon of Transport Department attended on behalf of Mr Wilson PANG.

Item 1 Confirmation of the Minutes of the last Meeting

1.1 The draft minutes of the 24th and 25th Task Force meeting were circulated to Members for comments on 29 March and 3 April 2017 respectively. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated again on 3 April 2017.

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

Item 2 Matters Arising

Matters Arising (paragraphs 2.2, 2.7, 2.9 and 2.12 of the confirmed minutes of the 24th meeting)

2.1 In response to Mr ZIMMERMAN's enquiry on waterfront open space projects (para. 2.2), **the Chair** informed Members that the Harbour Unit had given a presentation on possible open space projects at Kai Tak harbourfront area at the 25th Task Force meeting held on 24 February 2017.

2.2 Regarding the latest progress of the Review Study of Kai Tak Development (para. 2.7), **the Chair** said that Members would be briefed under agenda items 3 and 4 at the meeting.

2.3 For the planning and design of the 11km long waterfront promenade in Kai Tak Development (KTD) (para. 2.9), **the Chair** reported that the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) had arranged a workshop on the Study of Design Control and Guidelines for Kai Tak promenade on 23 March 2017 and the said study was still ongoing. CEDD had provided a written response in the form of post-meeting notes.

2.4 In response to Mr ZIMMERMAN's enquiry about the provision of bollards and landing steps along the promenade adjoining the Hong Kong Children's Hospital (HKCH) (para. 2.12), **the Chair** advised that the project team had provided a written response in the form of post-meeting notes.

Proposed Short Term Tenancy by Open Tender of Tourism Node Site at Former Kai Tak Runway, Kai Tak, Kowloon (TFKT/03/2017) (paragraphs 5.8 and 5.18 of the confirmed minutes of the 24th meeting)

2.5 At the 24th meeting, Members enquired about the development schedule of the Kai Tak Fantasy project (para. 5.8), **the Chair** reported that the Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO) had provided a written response in the form of post-meeting notes.

2.6 In response to Members' request for a plan indicating the location of sewage, water supply and electricity connections at the Tourism Node site (para. 5.18), the Secretariat had disseminated two watermain record plans prepared by the Water Supplies Department (WSD) for Members' information on 29 March 2017. The Lands Department (LandsD) had also provided a written response on sewage connection and electricity supply in the form of post-meeting notes.

Progress Report on Kai Tak Development (KTD) (TFKT/04/2017) (paragraphs 1.3, 1.17 and 1.18 of the confirmed minutes of the 25th meeting)

2.7 With regards to the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department's (EMSD) proposed Temporary Government Land Allocation (TGLA) for using a piece of land in Area 3 as parking spaces for government vehicles (para. 1.3c), **the Chair** informed Members that a paper was circulated on 17 February 2017 for comments. Two Members responded with comments by 24 February 2017. A written

response by CEDD and EMSD would be issued for Members' information when ready.

(Post-meeting notes: A table summarizing Members' comments and the response prepared by CEDD and EMSD was issued for Members' information on 12 April 2017 and Members have not raised further comments.)

2.8 For the format of the progress report (para. 1.17), **the Chair** informed Members that CEDD sought Members' views at the workshop on 23 March 2017. CEDD would take Members' views into account in preparing the upcoming report to be presented at the next Task Force meeting.

2.9 Regarding Mr ZIMMERMAN's enquiry on the availability of bicycle parking and ancillary facilities within HKCH (para. 1.18), **the Chair** said that the Hospital Authority (HA) had provided a written response in the form of post-meeting notes. The project team advised that bicycle parking and rental facilities would not be included in HKCH's design from its hospital operation point of view.

AOB (Paragraph 4.8 of the confirmed minutes of the 25th meeting)

2.10 In response to Mr ZIMMERMAN's enquiry regarding the pedestrian and cycling connectivity along Kai Tak River, **the Chair** informed Members that CEDD was reviewing the matter and the Task Force would be briefed in due course.

2.11 With regard to the availability of bicycle parking and ancillary facilities within HKCH, **Mrs Karen BARRETTO** commented that the response provided by HA was not acceptable and urged the bureaux and departments concerned to provide more justifications.

2.12 **The Chair** thanked Members for the comments. In paragraph 1.18 of the 25th meeting confirmed minutes, HA replied that there would be no bicycle parking and rental facilities within HKCH. He noted that Members were not satisfied with the response given.

2.13 **The Chair** informed Members that Kai Tak Office (KTO) would present the Progress Report on Kai Tak Development at the next

Task Force meeting.

**Item 3 Amendments Incorporated in the Draft Kai Tak Outline
Zoning Plan No. S/K22/5 (Paper No. TFKT/07/2017)**

3.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Planning Department (PlanD) and the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) had submitted a paper (TFKT/07/2017) to consult Members on amendments incorporated in the draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K22/5.

3.2 He recalled that Members' views on the recommendations of the Review Study of Kai Tak Development were sought at previous Task Force meeting and workshops. At the 23rd Task Force meeting, Members were briefed and had thorough discussion on the proposals recommended by the Review, in particular the proposed rezoning of hotel sites to residential sites at the former Kai Tak runway. Members were particularly dissatisfied with the proposed building height profile, building block layout and development bulk for the development sites at the runway and did not go through the proposed rezoning of a piece of land along the Cha Kwo Ling (CKL) waterfront for the development of a Vocational Training Council (VTC) campus in any detail.

3.3 **The Chair** reported that a pre-meeting was arranged on 3 April 2017 for PlanD and representatives of the Laguna City Estate Owners' Committee to brief Members on their respective views prior to today's meeting. Upon the request of the representatives of the Owner's Committee, two resident representatives were invited to give a 10-minutes presentation under the agenda item. He suggested dividing the discussion into two sessions. In the first session, Members would hear from PlanD and CEDD on all the amendments incorporated in the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/5. In the second session, PlanD would go through the amendments for the CKL waterfront, followed by a presentation on the subject by resident representatives.

3.4 **The Chair** informed Members that Mr Ivan HO had provided a written submission on behalf of the Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design to express their views on the proposal. Mr HO's

submission and other letters addressed to the Task Force on the subject were tabled for Members' information.

3.5 **The Chair** welcomed **Mr TOM YIP** and **Mr Gary LAM** from PlanD; **Mr Peter CHUI** and **Mr Edmund CHAN** from CEDD; **Mr LEUNG Yam-shing** and **Mr Colin SOH** from VTC; **Mr Joel CHAN**, **Ms Sally CHAN**, **Ms Theresa YEUNG**, **Ms Natalie LEUNG**, **Ms Minnie LAW**, **Mr Alan MACDONALD**, **Ms Winona IP** and **Ms Jennifer CHIK** from the consultant team to the meeting.

3.6 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** declared that he was a resident of Laguna City. He would abstain from commenting on the rezoning proposal for the CKL waterfront.

3.7 **Mr Paul YK CHAN** declared that he was employed by VTC. **The Chair** opined that would constitute conflict of interest and advised Mr CHAN to refrain from participating in the second session of the discussion.

3.8 **The Chair** advised that **Mr TAM** and **Mr CHAN** could participate in the discussion and comment on all other amendments incorporated in the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/5 but they should abstain from commenting on the proposed rezoning at CKL waterfront.

3.9 **Mr Tom YIP** introduced the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

3.10 **The Chair** said that Mr YIP's presentation covered all the amendments incorporated in the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/5. At this stage, he advised Members to focus on other parts of KTD first.

3.11 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** raised the following enquires and comments:

- (a) why the proposed inclusion of hotel development into the Kai Tak Sports Park had not been included in the proposed OZP amendments;
- (b) for amendment items G1 and G2, he noted that the areas near the ring road of the future Central Kowloon Route

(CKR) will be rezoned to “Open Space” (O) while areas near the junction of Road D2 and Road D3 will be rezoned to “Other Specified Uses (Amenity)”. He would like the proponent to explain the rationale behind the proposals. He was doubtful whether the proposals could tie in with and reflect the future development of the head of the Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC), as well as the views of the Task Force on this front;

- (c) he further asked whether the waterfront promenade situated at KTAC would be subject to the recommendations of the ongoing consultancy study for the Kai Tak promenade and whether the Government would propose further changes to the OZP accordingly;
- (d) for amendment item H2, a “Government, Institution or Community” (“GIC”) site abutting Road L10 would be rezoned to “Commercial (1)” (C(1)) zone. He recalled that Members had suggested, in previous meetings the inclusion of GIC uses, retail, and food and beverage facilities to the ground and podium level of the future commercial developments so as to activate the waterfront. To guarantee such provision, he would like to know whether it would be incorporated into the lease conditions as requirements to be fulfilled by the developers;
- (e) for amendment item V2, a portion of land originally reserved for Road D3 would be rezoned to “Open Space (2)” to provide a landscaped deck connecting Metro Park to the waterfront promenade. He would like to know how this proposal could be realised and implemented and enquired about the design and parameters of the proposed landscaped deck;
- (f) noting that Road D4 was a main yet temporary connection between the former South Apron and the former Runway, he enquired whether it would be rebuilt and cause any changes on the draft OZP; and
- (g) what was the greening ratio of the development sites at the former runway as he was wary that high greening ratio would make it impossible for developers to provide set back and outdoor seating areas, as well as pedestrian areas.

3.12 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** had the following comments:

- (a) for amendment item D2, he supported the Government's proposal to set aside four housing sites near Kai Tak City Centre for public housing development but viewed that the original planning intention of having a neighbourhood in grid pattern with substantial greening elements and wide pedestrian streets should be maintained to enhance visual and physical permeability. He advised that departments concerned should incorporate appropriate urban design principles and greening elements into the planning brief for the public housing development;
- (b) a site zoned "GIC" at the junction of Concorde and Road L1 was earmarked for an electricity substation. Given the junction would serve as a major gateway to KTD, departments concerned should assess the aesthetic appearance of the electricity substation from a three-dimensional perspective and provide building setback and suitable greening features to beautify its outlook as appropriate;
- (c) he supported the proposed rezoning of GIC sites abutting Road L10 and Kai Fuk Road for commercial uses which would create synergy in support of the transformation of the adjoining Kowloon Bay Business Area. Having regard to the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines, the project team was reminded to carefully examine the built form and mass of the commercial developments and enhance the connectivity from the hinterland of Kowloon Bay to the waterfront promenade; and
- (d) rezoning some commercial sites to residential sites at the former runway might affect the design of the landscaped deck and the semi-enclosed noise barrier. Possible traffic noise and nuisance caused by Road D3 to residents in adjacent developments should be suitably addressed. He added that both sides of the waterfront promenade along the runway should be well connected.

3.13 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** then shared his opinions as follows:

- (a) the original planning intention of having a vibrant waterfront in Area 4 should be maintained in spite of the rezoning of some commercial sites to residential sites. The project team was advised to introduce a mix of commercial, retail and recreational activities at the ground level of the future residential developments along the runway as a means to enhance public enjoyment of the waterfront promenade. Further information in relation to the planning intention and design of the promenade should be provided for Members' consideration;
- (b) noting that the maximum building height for development sites at Area 4 was set at about 120 metres above the Hong Kong Principal Datum (mPD), it might be difficult to achieve the intended Plot Ratio. PlanD should look into this carefully in order to achieve a more interesting skyline and varied building height profile at the runway;
- (c) further to Mr TAM's comments, he was wary that the residential sites abutting Road D3 would be susceptible to the traffic noise generated by Road D3. It would be unfair to leave it to the developers to come up with solutions;
- (d) he agreed with Mr TAM that the intended grid pattern and physical and visual permeability between building blocks at Area 2 should be maintained, even though some of the sites would be allocated for public housing development. He urged the Government to avoid adopting standard public housing design in KTD; and
- (e) the Hong Kong Institute of Architects also supported the proposed rezoning of GIC sites abutting Road L10 and Kai Fuk Road to commercial developments. Considerations should be given to enhancing the use and vibrancy of the waterfront promenade abutting the sites and facilitating the integration among the ground floor uses of the sites, the activities to be held at the waterfront promenade and the recreational activities to be carried out in the adjacent waterbody.

3.14 **Mr Paul YK CHAN** enquired about the estimated population increase in Kai Tak as a result of the intensification of

development density in KTD and asked whether the total provision of open space would increase accordingly. Noting that 98.18 hectares (ha) of KTD would be used for public open space; he would like the Government to come up with an overall strategy for landscape design and incorporate more detailed information with regard to the proposed character, location, function and typology of open space into the Notes and Explanatory Statement of the Kai Tak OZP. Such information could also be incorporated into the planning brief and land lease documents of development sites in KTD.

3.15 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** said that the Commission supported the Government's proposal to increase development and population intensity at KTD in order to meet the demand for housing. However, it would be necessary to have a public transport solution to cater for such increase, as well as to facilitate public enjoyment of the public open space at the former runway area. He urged the Government to urgently look for a public transport solution before further refining the urban design schemes for the former runway.

3.16 **Sr Emily LI** noted that the buildings in the hinterland of KTD and part of the future Kai Tak Sports Park (KTSP) would be visually blocked by the future development sites at the former runway, she was concerned and would like the project team to review the proposed building heights for development sites at the former runway. She enquired about the percentage of land area assigned for residential developments on the draft OZP.

3.17 **Mr Tom YIP** thanked Members for their comments and responded as follows:

- (a) the rezoning of four sites in Area 2 from "Residential (Group B)" (R(B)) to "Residential (Group A)" (R(A)) for public housing development would not cause adverse impacts to the planned pedestrian circulation and connectivity in the area. Three planned 10-metre-wide pedestrian streets between the developments sites would be maintained to enhance air ventilation, as well as visual and physical permeability;
- (b) with regards to the inclusion of hotel development into the

- KTSP and the proposed relaxation of building height restrictions of the main stadium from 55 mPD to 70mPD, the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) had submitted an application for planning permission under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance. The application was approved by The Town Planning Board (TPB) on 17 March 2017;
- (c) in response to Members' concern about the ground-floor land use in the vicinity of the KTAC in Area 3, he said that "Eating Place", "Shop and Services" and "Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture" etc. were permitted uses within commercial sites. The proposed amendments to the OZP had allowed flexibility for different types of activities to take place at the waterfront. The project team would take Members' views into account in further proceedings with the proposals;
 - (d) the land uses of areas near the CKR were revised according to the latest approved CKR alignment. For item G2, he said that part of the land area originally reserved for the CKR's tunnel ventilation shaft and administration building could be released for "Other Specified Uses (Amenity)" use. For item G1, two areas near the ring road of the proposed CKR would be rezoned to "O" to facilitate better integration and design with the adjoining open space;
 - (e) in response to Mr. Tam's enquiry, he clarified that the "G/IC" site at the junction of Concorde Road and Road L1 was an existing electricity substation. It was located to the immediate southeast of amendment item E site;
 - (f) for amendment item E, the site was once earmarked for the development of a government building but such provision was no longer required. Being close to a planned commercial cluster, the site was therefore proposed to be rezoned for commercial use to achieve better integration. Non-building area (NBA) was designated within the boundary of the site to serve multiple purposes including greening, enhancement of air ventilation and air permeability;
 - (g) in response to Members' concern about the vibrancy and diversity of the waterfront promenade after rezoning certain commercial sites to residential sites at the former

runway, he explained that the developers would be required to provide retail shops and eating places at the lowest two floors of the residential sites fronting the waterfront promenade and pedestrian streets. This would enhance vibrancy and diversified activities at the waterfront promenade and provide an interesting pedestrian environment and experience to members of the public;

- (h) with regards to the building height profile at the former runway, he recalled that PlanD and CEDD had presented the refined schemes of the Review Study of Kai Tak Development to Harbourfront Commission (HC) for consideration in December 2016. He said that building heights of the residential sites were adjusted to between 95 mPD and 120 mPD in order to strike a balance between allowing design flexibility and minimizing visual impacts to nearby developments. Under the amended OZP, Area 4 would have a more varied and interesting built form with high and low blocks, as well as an active frontage with retail facilities at the ground level. He supplemented that the tallest band of 120 mPD in Area 4 was generally similar to the height of buildings in the hinterland area, such as Kowloon Bay and To Kwa Wan. The consultant would supplement further information about the urban design scheme for Area 4; and
- (i) it was estimated that the total population in KTD would increase by 28% to about 134,000. About 98 ha of KTD would be used for the provision of open space after the OZP amendments. According to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), the standard for provision of open space was 2 square meters per person; hence KTD should have at least 27 ha of open space. The provision of open space in KTD had indeed far exceeded the requirements stipulated in the HKPSG. He further explained that open space in KTD was composed of local, district and regional open spaces. For instance, the Metro Park and the Station Square would serve the recreational needs of local residents, visitors, tourists and the general public. A continuous pedestrian connection would be

formed by an extensive network of interconnected public open space and the 11 km long waterfront promenade.

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

- (a) in response to Mr ZIMMERMAN's enquiry about the connection between the roundabout on Road D3 and the Metro Park, he pointed out that the rezoned "Open Space (2)" (O(2)) would serve as an inclined surface connecting the northern crescent walkway at the deck level to the at-grade Metro Park. A section of Road D3 abutting Metro Park would be sunken to facilitate the construction of an at-grade landscaped deck so as to enhance the connectivity between the Metro Park and the promenade facing KTAC;
- (b) the taxiway bridge (i.e. Road D4) served as a main access to the southern part of the former runway, its enhancement would be looked into upon the completion of Road D3 and the landscaped deck on top. He shared Members' concern that the location and design of the taxiway bridge would pose headroom limit for carrying out water sports activities;
- (c) CEDD commenced an urban design study for the development sites in Area 4 in December 2016. The study focused on enhancing the connectivity and integration among the residential sites, the landscaped deck and the adjoining waterfront promenade. He informed Members that the consultant would go through the preliminary findings later;
- (d) the noise barrier along Road D3 adopted a semi-enclosed design and it was not feasible to have a fully-enclosed noise barrier given the technical difficulties and safety concerns. The future developers of the residential sites would be required to implement noise mitigation measures, such as the installation of acoustic windows and balconies in order to screen off the traffic noise generated by Road D3. He added that such mitigation measures had been commonly adopted in different types of developments in Hong Kong;

- (e) with regards to water-land interface issues on promenades, CEDD engaged a consultant to carry out a study on design control and guidelines for promenades in KTD. Members were briefed on the initial ideas of the study through the workshop on 23 March 2017. The project team would further engage and seek Members' views again at appropriate junction; and
- (f) regarding Members' concern on the traffic impacts resulting from the increase in development intensity and population, he reassured Members that a detailed traffic impact assessment was conducted and the findings demonstrated that the proposals would not cause unacceptable impacts to the traffic conditions in KTD and surrounding areas. The commissioning of SCL and construction of trunk road projects such as CKR would also help relieve traffic congestion at existing major roads namely Prince Edward Road East and Kwun Tong Bypass. To further improve the traffic condition, relevant Government departments would implement necessary traffic improvement measures.

3.19 **The Chair** asked whether Members had any follow-up questions.

3.20 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** raised the following comments:

- (a) the Task Force had expressed the view that the head of KTAC should be developed into a tourist attraction and sightseeing destination referencing Sydney's Darling Harbour and Singapore's Marina Bay. The provision of a mix of retail shops and eating places and GIC uses at ground and podium levels of the commercial developments should be specified and mandated through lease conditions. Specifically, a certain percentage of ground level space should be assigned to accommodate sports centres and clubs so as to encourage the active use of waterfront;
- (b) he enquired whether the open space of amendment item G1 and land uses in the vicinity of KTAC would be further

reviewed subject to the results of the consultancy study for the Kai Tak promenades; and

- (c) he expressed doubt over the necessity of the roundabout at the northern end of the runway precinct. He asked the Government to clarify whether Road D3 would be set back to release more open space along the waterfront for public enjoyment as a means to make up for the rezoning of part of the Metro Park to residential developments. He further asked whether the Government had a specific plan to replace or remove the existing taxiway bridge.

3.21 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** clarified that his previous question was not centered on traffic mitigation but the imminent need to identify a sustainable public transport solution to serve the runway area and the adjoining developments. Connectivity would be fundamental to the success of the development of the former runway.

3.22 **The Chair** said that the Task Force had been monitoring the planning and development of KTD for over a decade. The proposals put forward by the Government covered a spectrum of land use amendments which would result in a significant increase in the housing supply and population in KTD. Members had expressed their concerns on the recommendations of the review throughout the consultation process. Members' views from harbourfront enhancement and urban design perspectives are summarised as follows:

- (a) while he understood that provision of open space in KTD had exceeded the minimum standard for such as stipulated in HKPSG, the Government should make effort to maximize the availability of open space in harbourfront areas for members of the public;
- (b) the Task Force understood the pressing need to increase the development intensity in KTD so as to accommodate an increased population but it appeared that the proposals put forward by the Government had not brought any improvement or enhancement to the planning of the harbourfront area, the environment and the public transport system;
- (c) for the noise barrier at the former runway, its primary

function was to screen off the noise generated by Road D3. It hence appeared to be ironic that some of the sites along Road D3 would still be susceptible to traffic noise. It was undesirable to shift the responsibility for noise mitigation to property developers. He opined that changes in the planning and development of KTD should have been made in a more gradual and logical manner;

- (d) Members considered that the amendments should enhance the vibrancy and diversity of the harbourfront. Despite the changes in the zoning of some development sites abutting the waterfront, the ground level of these sites should be used for a mix of activities and integrate with the adjoining waterfront promenade;
- (e) the proponent provided a positive response to Members' concern with regards to the visual and physical permeability and connectivity of the future public housing development. The project team should consider adopting creative design and building forms for the housing blocks so as to better reflect the characters of the community; and
- (f) details of individual project such as open space network, design control and guidelines for waterfront promenades and road alignment of CKR project would be better supplemented by relevant project teams.

3.23 **Mr Tom YIP** thanked the Chair for making a summary. He said that the project team would take into account Members' views and comments.

3.24 **The Chair** said that the second part of the discussion would focus on the proposed rezoning of a piece of land in CKL waterfront for the development of a VTC campus on which Members had been briefed by PlanD with some general background.

3.25 **The Chair** informed Members that the Laguna City Estate Owners' Committee had submitted over 40,000 petition signatures to the Task Force before the meeting to express their objection to the Government's proposal. He recalled that Mr TAM Po-yiu and Mr Paul YK CHAN declared interest and they would therefore abstain from participating in the ensuing discussion.

3.26 **The Chair** invited **Mr Fred TSE** and **Mr Keith LUK**, representatives from Laguna City Estate Owners' Committee to the meeting.

3.27 **Mr Fred TSE** and **Mr Keith LUK** shared with Members the views of residents with respect to the proposed rezoning of a piece of land in CKL for the development of a VTC campus.

3.28 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** made the following comments:

- (a) the construction of buildings or developments at harbourfront areas was not prohibited by the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines but it would be essential for any proposals put forward at such locations to comply with the principles and guidelines. Given some public facilities such as hospitals within KTD would be situated at the harbourfront and they are intended to serve members of the public, he had no objection to having an education institute to be located at the harbourfront. However, from a harbourfront enhancement perspective, the reduction in the provision of open space by 1 ha at CKL cannot be supported;
- (b) he suggested the project team to consider reconfiguring and relocating nearby community and public facilities, such as the liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) filling station and the Sewage Treatment Plant in order to release more open space for the development of a CKL harbourfront park. He recalled that the Government had approved a non-in-situ land exchange with the private owner of King Yin Lei in order to preserve the historic building for revitalisation a few years ago. The case could serve as a reference; and
- (c) members of the public should be able to have at-grade access to the harbourfront through the open space within the VTC campus. Part of the campus facilities such as cafeteria and sports ground could be opened for public use.

3.29 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** raised the following comments:

- (a) the proposed VTC campus to be built would be a huge complex. The proponent should provide adequate explanation as to which were the alternative locations they have explored and the reason why they were not considered suitable for the proposed campus;
- (b) VTC and PlanD were invited to comment on the massive red block in the photomontage portrayed by the resident representatives which indicated the building mass of the proposed campus; and
- (c) noting that the construction of the project would last for 10 to 15 years, the proponent was urged to provide further information on the development programme.

3.30 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that little information in relation to the proposed VTC campus had been included in the consultation papers and presentation slides prepared by the Government in previous meetings and the Task Force did not discuss the proposal in detail. He agreed with the views of the residents. With reference to the approved Kai Tak OZP, the CKL waterfront was supposed to be a park not just a promenade. He objected to the rezoning proposal given that it would turn a wide park into a linear and narrow promenade. He urged the Government to retain the originally planned park area and this piece of waterfront should be safeguarded for the enjoyment of Hong Kong people. With regards to the design of the proposed campus, he opined that the building mass of VTC building should be modified and that visual porosity as well as 24-hour public access to the waterfront should be guaranteed.

3.31 **Mr NGAN Man-yu** objected to the rezoning proposal and raised the following enquires and comments:

- (a) why the proposed VTC campus should be located at prominent waterfront area as there should be alternative locations in urban areas;
- (b) having a massive structure at CKL waterfront would not be compatible with the atmosphere of Kwun Tong waterfront; and
- (c) he could not agree with the results of the TIA and was

especially concerned about the potential traffic impacts to be caused by the proposal. He pointed out that there were limited public transport services connecting the area to Yau Tong Mass Transit Railway (MTR) Station and having a massive campus would intensify pedestrian and traffic flows in Lam Tin district.

3.32 **Mr Ken SO** echoed with Mr NGAN's view that there should be alternative locations in urban areas to accommodate the development of the VTC campus. He agreed with the Chair's view that the Commission would not accept the minimum provision of public open space in harbourfront area and project proponents should actively come up with ways to enhance the vibrancy of the harbourfront. He was glad to know that the Kwun Tong promenade was crowded with visitors which indicated the high demand and popularity of public open space in harbourfront areas. He could not support the rezoning proposal as it would not be able to help create a vibrant and active CKL harbourfront. The piece of land concerned should be developed into a waterfront park.

3.33 **The Chair** said that the popularity of Kwun Tong promenade was a recognition of the efforts of the Task Force.

3.34 **Ms Melissa PANG** said that the mission of the Task Force was to enhance the conditions of the limited harbourfront areas in order to meet public expectation. She made the following comments:

- (a) the proposal presented at the meeting could not address and incorporate residents' comments and views;
- (b) it was the community's aspiration that a CKL park would be constructed to serve as a district open space with both active and passive landscape areas. She was disappointed that the CKL waterfront park was proposed to be replaced by a 50m wide and 660m long waterfront promenade;
- (c) she opined that a balance should be struck between meeting the expectation of the community and meeting the development need of VTC;
- (d) she quoted from the consultation paper that "public passageway would be provided within the VTC

development during opening hours of the campus to facilitate public access to the waterfront” but she was aware that VTC campuses were usually closed at around 5 o’clock in the afternoon. She was doubtful whether pedestrians could gain access to the waterfront after school hours;

- (e) according to the photomontages prepared by the residents, the massive building mass of VTC would cause appalling visual impacts to the waterfront; and
- (f) the proponent was advised to refine the design of the campus building to achieve a win-win situation to compensate for the loss of public open space.

3.35 **Mr YIP Hing-kwok** raised the following suggestions for the proponent’s consideration:

- (a) the alignment and layout of different land uses at CKL waterfront should be suitably adjusted to achieve a more connected network of open space; and
- (b) noting that the provision of open space would be significantly reduced, he asked whether the proponent could provide an extended landscaped structure passing through the campus building to the waterfront, similar to the Tamar Park, as a compensatory measure.

3.36 **Mr Fred TSE** clarified that the demand for public open space in Kwun Tong far exceeded the supply; hence the Kwun Tong promenade was overcrowded. He said that it would be necessary to have larger and wider waterfront promenades in the district.

3.37 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** said that, according to the approved Kai Tak OZP, a sizable park would be constructed along the CKL waterfront but not a promenade. She agreed with Mr TSE that the Kwun Tong promenade was overcrowded and there was a need to create another waterfront open space within reasonable vicinity to serve residents in CKL and Yau Tong. She reminded the proponent that that the design of any buildings to be situated at the harbourfront, including building height, density and permeability, should comply with the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines. In this connection, the proposed campus at its present scale should not be

supported and should not be situated at any harbourfront locations. She was dissatisfied that this proposal had not been thoroughly discussed before submission to the TPB.

3.38 **Mr Tom YIP** responded to Members' enquires as follows:

- (a) in the 2016 Policy Address, the Government announced to reserve a site in the urban district to develop a VTC campus building with adequate capacity and state-of-the-art facilities. He clarified that while the development of the VTC campus would require about 3 to 5 ha of land in urban area with immediate availability, waterfront location was not a site selection criterion. After considering the site requirements of VTC, the subject site at CKL waterfront was the only location that could meet the criteria in urban area. Consideration had been given to the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines during the planning process;
- (b) PlanD and the CEDD briefed Members on the proposals that were recommended under the 'Review Study of Kai Tak Development' at the 23rd meeting in November 2016. The proposed rezoning of a piece of land along CKL waterfront to GIC use for the development of a VTC campus was mentioned in the meeting paper (TFKT/14/2016). A layout plan was also incorporated into the paper to illustrate the land uses at CKL before and after rezoning. He recalled that Members' discussion at the 23rd meeting mainly centered on the urban design issues at the former Kai Tak runway, and no specific comment was raised in relation to CKL waterfront. He stressed that the Government had no intention to hide any information from the public;
- (c) PlanD noted the comments from residents of Laguna City on the VTC proposal, which were flagged up in its consultation with the Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC) on the proposed amendments in March 2017;
- (d) he assured Members that comments collected at the meeting would be conveyed to TPB for consideration. The project team would take into account Members' views in

- the refined proposal as far as possible;
- (e) he noted the Task Force's concern on the reduction of public open space but reassured Members that the Government strived to strike a balance between maintaining the original planning intention and responding to new planning circumstances and societal needs. About 98 ha of KTD would be developed as open space in KTD. For the subject CKL waterfront; there would still be a total of about 4.2 ha of planned open space after rezoning including a waterfront promenade of 660m long, 50m wide and about 3.3 ha. The proposed VTC development would provide appropriate greening area, wind corridor between building blocks and setback along Wai Yip Street and waterfront promenade to facilitate visual and air permeability. Part of the campus facilities might also be opened to the local community;
 - (f) he informed Members that the LPG filling station concerned was the only gas station serving CKL district. The Government attempted but could not identify another suitable location for its relocation; and
 - (g) VTC would respond to Members' concern about accessibility to the waterfront through the campus and the consultant would elaborate on the design features and photomontages of the proposed VTC campus.

3.39 **Mr LEUNG Yam-shing** informed Members that VTC was required by the Government to review and provide a comprehensive development plan for its campuses in 2014. Some existing VTC campuses would be redeveloped and new campus would be constructed to facilitate the continued development of their education programmes. He said that harbourfront location was not a site selection criterion but VTC welcomed the allocation of the subject land by the Government. He supplemented further information in respect of the preliminary design ideas for the campus:

- (a) the proposed VTC campus building would adopt a podium free design;
- (b) the height of the campus buildings would be compatible with the building height profile of the adjacent

- developments;
- (c) the design of the buildings was at a preliminary and schematic stage. The project team would take Members' views into account and refine the scheme as appropriate;
 - (d) it was operationally necessary for VTC to acquire a site with sufficient size to accommodate necessary campus facilities;
 - (e) regarding the development programme of the campus, he informed Members that the development of the campus was expected to last for about 10 years. The rezoning application and pre-construction works were expected to be completed in early 2018 and early 2020 respectively.. He understood that the LPG gas station could be relocated in 2021 the earliest therefore the construction works would likely start in mid to late 2021 according to the latest programme. The construction works would take about 5 years and was expected to be completed in 2026 or 2027;
 - (f) after the completion of the new campus at CKL, VTC would surrender the Kwun Tong campus and Haking Wong campus to the Government;
 - (g) the new campus would offer Higher Diploma and Diploma of Foundation Studies programmes;
 - (h) even though the student intakes to Higher Diploma and Diploma of Foundation Studies would decrease from 37,000 to 32,000 in the short term, , however, according to the statistics provided by the Education Bureau, the number of secondary 6 students would increase after 2022, and the number of students enrolled in courses offered by VTC was expected to grow thereafter; and
 - (i) he could not agree that the proposed VTC campus would resemble the photomontage prepared by the resident representatives; he invited the consultant to supplement further information on this front.

3.40 **Ms Theresa YEUNG** said that the VTC campus would consist of three building blocks with BHs ranging from 60 mPD to 70 mPD. The tallest block (i.e. 70 mPD) was not directly fronting the Laguna City and was considerably lower than the residential developments at the back. The proposed VTC building adopted a

stepped height concept and the blocks were arranged in staggered manner. The consultant team would take Members' views into account and suitably refine the design of the buildings.

3.41 In response to Members' concern on traffic impacts to be caused by the development of the VTC campus, **Ms YEUNG** said that VTC offered programmes with different class hours and duration such that students and staff would not have to arrive at or leave the campus at the same time. There would be contraflow traffic movement to the VTC campus and from Laguna City at peak hours. According to the TIA, the area concerned was currently served by 5 existing bus routes and 5 exiting minibus routes. VTC would liaise with Transport Department (TD) on enhancing public transport services in the vicinity of the development. VTC would also consider providing shuttle bus service plying between the new campus and Yau Tong MTR Station.

3.42 **Mr Fred TSE** thanked Ms YEUNG for the clarification. He had the following comments:

- (a) he pointed out that the image presented by the consultant was taken from a bird's eye view. He reminded Members that pedestrians and residents would view the buildings horizontally;
- (b) he said that the explanation of reverse traffic direction and other traffic evaluation were not acceptable given road users would share the same road space. He pointed out that the justification provided by the consultant had already been challenged at district council;
- (c) while he noted that over 98 ha of public open space would be provided for the future residents of KTD, the provision of waterfront open space in Kwun Tong and CLK area was far from sufficient in meeting the community's need. The demand for a CKL waterfront park by about 650,000 residents living in Kwun Tong district should be addressed.

3.43 **Ms Theresa YEUNG** clarified that the consultant team assessed the development height profile of the proposed campus from different vantage points, including Quarry Bay Park (Powerpoint slide

28), as required by the HKPSG. Members would note that the proposed VTC campus would adopt a stepped building height profile.

3.44 **The Chair** asked whether Members had further comments.

3.45 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** would like the proponent to clarify whether the proposed VTC development would adopt a no-fencing design at the waterfront side.

3.46 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** said that the Task Force understood the imminent need of VTC to develop a larger campus but the proposed VTC development was not in compliance with the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines. The proposal would result in a reduction of open space and public enjoyment of the harbourfront, it would also cause visual intrusion to the waterfront, as well as traffic impacts to the area. He advised that from a harbourfront enhancement perspective, the Task Force could not support the rezoning of land at CKL waterfront.

3.47 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** agreed with Mr BROOKE's views. He added that the landscape terraces between the building blocks would affect visual permeability and that the LPG gas station should not be located at the centre of a park. He reiterated that the original planning intention of having a CKL park should be maintained. He said that the proposal for the VTC campus was not acceptable; and that in case the project went ahead against the advice of the committee that the Government should reduce the building footprints and consider increasing the building height.

3.48 **Mrs Karen BARRETTO** did not support the proposed VTC development. She commented that undesirable utilities and buildings should not be concentrated at the waterfront simply because no alternative locations could be identified

3.49 With regards to the connectivity to waterfront, **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** said that the provision of 24-hour public access to the harbourfront should be specified as a mandatory requirement in the Notes of the draft OZP.

3.50 **The Chair** said that Members had a thorough discussion on the amendments incorporated in the draft Kai Tak OZP. Regarding the proposed rezoning at CKL waterfront, he concluded that Members were particularly concerned about the site selection criteria, building design as well as development parameters of the proposed VTC development. While the Task Force had all along recognised the need to have diversity of uses at the harbourfront and also to cater for the different needs of the society, having a large-scale VTC campus with massive building form, bulk and footprints at the subject location may not be the most desirable. The provision of public open space would be reduced from 5.2 ha to 4.2 ha, which was also unacceptable from harbourfront planning perspective. The straightening of the public open space into uniformly shaped rectangle would not be conducive to the Commission's vision of creating an interesting harbourfront. He pointed out that residents of the Kowloon East District, members of the public as well as the Commission were once promised a waterfront park at Cha Kwo Ling, therefore any proposals to be put forward at the CKL waterfront that would have compromised the further development of a park thereon would not be supported.

3.51 He concluded that Members had no objection to the amendments put forward by the project team for other parts of KTD but the Task Force could not support the rezoning proposal put forward for CKL waterfront. The Secretariat would convey Members' views in detail to TPB for consideration.

(Post-meeting notes: With Chair's agreement, the Secretariat provided a written submission consolidating Members' views and comments on the amendments incorporated in the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/5 to the Secretariat of Town Planning Board on 18 April 2017.)

3.52 Due to time constraint, **the Chair** announced that Members' views on agenda item 5 and 6 namely "Avenue Park at Kai Tak" (TFKT/09/2017) and "Kowloon East Regional Headquarters and Operational Base cum Ngau Tau Kok Divisional Police Station" (TFKT/10/2017) would be sought by means of paper circulation.

(Post-meeting notes: Meeting papers on "Avenue Park at Kai Tak" (TFKT/09/2017) and "Kowloon East Regional Headquarters and Operational

Base cum Ngau Tau Kok Divisional Police Station" (TFKT/10/2017) were circulated for Members' comment from 6 April to 19 April 2017. Members did not raise any comments.)

Item 4 Kai Tak Development - Stage 2 Infrastructure Works for Developments at Southern Part of Former Runway - Landscape Design of Associated Open Spaces (Paper No. TFKT/08/2017)

4.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Kai Tak Office (KTO) provided a discussion paper (TFKT/08/2017) to update Members on the landscape design of open spaces of the Stage 2 Infrastructure Works for Development at the Southern part of Former Runway.

4.2 He recalled that KTO consulted Members on the subject in January 2014. In response to Members' concern on pedestrian connectivity, design of the noise barrier and open spaces on the landscaped deck, two workshops were held in May and August 2016.

4.3 **The Chair** welcomed **Mr Peter CHUI, Mr Sunny LO and Ms Lilian CHEUNG** from CEDD; **Mr W.B. KANG, Mr Andrew OSBORNE, Mr Kentis BEH, Mr Clive CHENG and Mr Sion EDWARDS** from the consultant team to the meeting.

4.4 **Mr Sunny LO and Mr Andrew OSBORNE** gave Members an update on the landscape design of the landscaped deck with the aid of a PowerPoint.

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

- (a) what was the design of the rezoned "Open Space (2)" (O(2)) which would constitute a part of the landscaped deck and connect to the future Metro Park;
- (b) when it came to shading provision for the landscaped deck, he enquired whether there would be adequate space to accommodate both the trees and their roots.

- (c) the project team was advised to provide necessary ancillary facilities such as drinking water fountains and seating, as well as food kiosks and beverage stalls to turn the landscaped deck into an attractive destination for visitors;
- (d) what was the function of the dry fountain at Urban Room C;
- (e) shading should be provided along the staircases at the multi-functional play area and southern crescent walkway area. It also appeared to him that lift and escalator would not be available at this part of the landscaped deck;
- (f) with regards to the pedestrian connections linking the landscaped deck to the adjoining residential and commercial developments, the connectivity of the area should be reviewed and refined subject to the design of the adjoining residential developments at a later stage;
- (g) whether the Leisure and Cultural Service Department (LCSD) would be responsible for managing the landscaped deck; he would like to hear from LCSD regarding the future treatment and management of the landscaped deck; and
- (h) he knew that the design and build works contract of the project had been awarded and commenced, the project team was asked to present the actual design drawings prepared by the contractor.

4.6 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** raised the following comments:

- (a) with regards to the night view of the northern lookout gallery, he said that there should not be any trees on both sides of the deck if the project team intended for the area to resemble the atmosphere of the old Kai Tak runway. There were metal structures with climber plants on one side of the deck to provide shading, he enquired whether these structures would be built on both sides of the deck; ;
- (b) he advised that the design and provision of street future should be integrated and embedded with smart city elements so as to provide a pleasant open space for the community;
- (c) he agreed with Mr ZIMMERMAN that the provision of

kiosks and food stalls could activate and increase patronage to the deck; and

- (d) the proponent shall supplement information about the design of the proposed pedestrian connections linking the landscaped deck to the adjoining development sites.

4.7 With regards to the design and functions of the landscaped deck, **Mr Paul YK CHAN** gave the following views:

- (a) a wider range of activities such as commercial and retail activities should take place on the landscaped deck to enhance vibrancy;
- (b) in terms of landscaping, the design of outdoor street furniture should reflect the place branding concept of “current of vitality” to strengthen the character of the deck;
- (c) the project team should look into the percentage of canopy coverage on the deck, he reminded the team that low level planting would not be able to provide enough shading for visitors;
- (d) the provision of pedestrian facilities between the landscaped deck and the southern promenade had been enhanced but such facilities should be easily accessible at-grade;
- (e) which government department(s) would serve as the management and maintenance agenda of the deck as well as the associated facilities and amenities;
- (f) the project team was advised to provide more images to illustrate the night view of the landscape deck from different viewpoints;
- (g) apart from passive seating areas, whether outdoor performance areas would be provided at the urban rooms on the landscaped deck. The design of street furniture should constitute a community friendly environment that encouraged social interactions; and
- (h) the project team was advised to provide a typical section drawing to illustrate the profile of the landscaped deck.

4.8 **Mr Shuki LEUNG** pointed out that the original intention of the noise barrier was to screen off the noise and nuisance to be caused

by Road D3 to residents in adjacent developments. Noting that the commercial sites facing the harbour would be converted into residential developments, he was wary that the semi-enclosed noise barrier could not serve its intended function.

4.9 **Mr Ken SO** enquired whether the biological conditions of the deck could support the growing of trees up to their mature size with strong root anchorage.

4.10 **Mr YIP Hing-kwok** complemented the efforts of the project team and suggested that more seating facilities and kiosks should be provided for visitors along the landscaped deck given it was of considerable length. Shading should be provided at the multi-functional play space at the southern end of the runway, enabling outdoor performances and activities to be held all year round.

4.11 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** urged the project team to clarify whether noise barriers would be constructed on both side of the runway precinct and supplement information about the noise mitigation measures to be implemented.

4.12 **Mr Peter CHUI** responded to Members' enquires as follows:

- (a) he recalled that CEDD consulted the Task Force twice on the preliminary design of the landscape deck and the noise barrier in 2014. The design and build works contract of the project was then awarded in 2015. Subsequently, CEDD arranged two more workshops with the Task Force to seek views from Members on the refined provision of pedestrian facilities, design details of the noise barriers and the design theme of the open space on the deck in mid-2016. The Advisory Committee on the Appearance of Bridges and Associated Structures (ACABAS) had given in-principle approval on the design of the highway structure of the deck in November 2016;
- (b) he assured Members that the images shown in the presentation slides were extracted from the actual design drawings provided by the contractor and such design

- concepts would be realised; and
- (c) the design and construction works of the proposed landscape deck and walkway above the roundabout which stood at 13 mPD would be incorporated in the northern crescent walkway project.

4.13 In response to Members' concerns about tree planting, **Mr Andrew OSBORNE** provided supplementary information for Members' consideration:

- (a) with reference to the typical cross-section of the landscaped deck, there was a straight and continuous approximate 3 meter wide walkway at the centre. Planting patches and planters with different soil depth would be provided on both sides of the walkway;
- (b) the project team has been working closely with LCSD to examine and carefully select the most suitable species of tree to be grown on the deck. He clarified that the trees shown in the images were at their mature size; and
- (c) tree species to be grown at the ground level would be the same as those along the promenade facing KTAC.

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

- (a) the noise barrier along Road D3 adopted a semi-enclosed design and it was not feasible to have a fully-enclosed noise barrier given the technical difficulties and safety concerns. Future developers were advised to install acoustic windows and balconies to screen off the traffic noise generated by Road D3;
- (b) the deck was designed for passive use and activity areas would be concentrated at urban rooms;
- (c) the provision of retail facilities and eating places would be available at the lowest two floors of the residential developments abutting the waterfront promenade; and
- (d) the landscaped deck would be operated and managed by LCSD after completion.

4.15 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** had the following follow-up

comments and questions:

- (a) regarding tree planting on the deck, the project team should be cautioned about the falling of trees and branches during severe weather condition;
- (b) a higher diversity of tree species should be provided at the ground level and along the promenade;
- (c) would dogs and cycling be permitted on the landscaped deck;
- (d) whether drinking water fountains would be provided on the deck;
- (e) the proponent should supplement further information on the proposed pedestrian connections; and
- (f) he commented that the landscaped deck and noise-barrier were no longer necessary given the latter would no longer serve its intended function. If the development sites at the southern part of the runway were to be equipped with acoustic windows to screen off the noise generated by Road D3, the same arrangement could be extended to the development sites to the north.

4.16 **Mr Ken SO** understood that trees with smaller crowns would be more wind resistant. He pointed out that the planting patches and planters might not be able to provide strong anchorage for trees, especially along the edges of the deck, the project team was advised to choose the most adaptable tree species.

4.17 **Mr Sion EDWARDS** responded to Members' enquiries and comments as follows:

- (a) the dry water fountain features would provide playful water displays. When they were switched off, water would drain away, leaving a dry paved area for events and activities; and
- (b) he assured Members that there would be a variety of trees and adequate shading along the deck. The alignment of trees would follow along the deck structure. He said that most of the soil pockets were linear park planters that allowed natural root growth and provided strong

anchorage.

4.18 **The Chair** concluded that the Task Force would like to see a higher level of diversity in the overall design of the landscaped deck and that a wider range of activities should take place to enhance vibrancy and attract patronage. Members were particularly concerned with tree planting and shading and raised comments in relation to the provision of ancillary facilities and street furniture from urban design perspectives. Concern about the selection of tree species as well as the connectivity between the deck and the adjacent development was raised. These comments should be taken into consideration in taking forward the project.

4.19 **The Chair** recalled that various design and technical studies had been conducted to come up with the current design of the landscape deck. However, in view of the recent rezoning proposal, the noise barrier could not serve as a noise mitigation measure to the residential sites to the south. He agreed with Members' observation that if the development sites at the southern part of the runway were to be equipped with acoustic windows, the same arrangement could also be extended to the development sites to the north. To avoid similar incidents from happening again in the near future, he hoped that the Government could revisit the planning history and original planning intention of infrastructures before making any major planning and land use changes.

4.20 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** pointed out that the project was awarded in the form of a design and build contract and enquired whether Members' comments and suggestions would be implemented.

4.21 **The Chair** said that Members' views should be incorporated and the design concepts presented at the meeting should be realised.

Item 5 Any Other Business

5.1 **The Chair** informed Members once again that, in view of time constraint, agenda items 5 and 6 would be circulated to Members

for comments after the meeting.

5.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired whether cycling tracks and facilities would be provided within the Avenue Park and the adjoining housing estates.

5.3 **The Chair** advised Mr Zimmerman's question would be conveyed to the proponent of Avenue Park for follow-up and response.

(Post-meeting notes: LCSD and ArchSD supplemented that, having a narrow and irregular shape site configuration, the Avenue Park was surrounded by various developments. It was predominately designed with walking paths to facilitate the connection of nearby residents/workers with adjacent developments in the neighborhood. Various features and landscaping to meet a 50% greening ratio will be provided to enhance the walking experience of public. Against this background and with the narrow width of the Avenue Park, there was not sufficient space to provide a safe environment to cater for both cyclists and pedestrians. Therefore, there was currently no plan to provide cycle track in the Avenue Park project.)

Date of next meeting

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

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:25 pm.

Secretariat

Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development

April 2017