

Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development

Minutes of Twenty-seventh Meeting

Date : 7 June 2017 (Wednesday)
Time : 3:00 p.m.
Venue : 15/F Conference Room, North Point Government Offices, 333
Java Road, North Point

Present

Mr Vincent NG Chairman

Organization Members

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 Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr TAM Po-yiu Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Prof CHOY Kin-kuen Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour

Individual Members

Ms Kelly CHAN Individual Member
Yuen-sau
Mr NGAN Man-yu Individual Member
Mr Derek SUN Co-opted Member

Official Members

Mr Thomas CHAN Deputy Secretary (Planning & Lands)1, DEVB
Ms Irene PANG Chief Assistant Secretary (Works)3, DEVB
Mr Thomas WK CHAN Senior Manager (Tourism)41, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr David NGU Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon (Acting), 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
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
Mr YIP Hing-kwok	Co-opted Member
Dr NG Cho-nam	Representing The Conservancy Association
Mrs Margaret BROOKE	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr Paul YK CHAN	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Prof TANG Bo-sin	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Sr Emily LI	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Louis LOONG	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong

In attendance

Miss Christine AU	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Larry CHU	Assistant Secretary (Harbour)1, DEVB

For Item 3

Ms YING Fun-fong	Head/Kai Tak Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr Edmund CHAN	Acting Chief Engineer / Kowloon 1, CEDD
Mr Raymond LEE	Chief Engineer / Kowloon 2, CEDD
Mr John LEUNG	Senior Engineer / 4, CEDD
Mr Ronald SIU	Senior Engineer / 15, CEDD
Mr James PENNY	Technical Director, Hyder - Meinhardt Joint Venture
Mr Vincent AU YEUNG	Technical Director, AECOM

For Item 4

Ms YING Fun-fong	Head/Kai Tak Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr Harry MA	Chief Engineer/Kowloon 3, CEDD
Ms Carmen CHU	Director, ARUP
Mr Ray TANG	Associate, ARUP

The Chair welcomed all to the 27th meeting of the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development.

The Chair announced that **Ms Irene PANG**, Chief Assistant Secretary (Works) 3 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 David NGU**, Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon of Transport Department attended on behalf of Mr Wilson PANG.

The Chair informed Members that the draft minutes of the 26th meeting would be confirmed at the 28th meeting.

The Chair said that Mr ZIMMERMAN shared with Members an article on Chicago waterfront, which was tabled at the meeting. He invited Mr ZIMMERMAN to briefly introduce the content of the article and advised that Members could further discuss and give their views under agenda item 4 “Any Other Business”.

Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN said that the article was about waterfront design in Chicago and would be a good example for Hong Kong to follow.

Item 1 Matters Arising

Progress Report on Kai Tak Development (KTD) (Paper No. TFKT/11/2017)

1.1 **The Chair** invited **Ms YING** of the Kai Tak Office (KTO) to introduce the progress report.

1.2 **Ms YING** introduced the paper and highlighted the key progress since the last meeting.

1.3 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** gave the following views:

- (a) he supported the proposed rezoning of “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) sites abutting Road L10

and Kai Fuk Road for commercial uses. He opined that during the detailed planning stage, the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) should seek views from the Harbourfront Commission and professional institutes on the urban design issues, including how to enhance the pedestrian connectivity of the area with the waterfront;

- (b) regarding the change of four residential sites in the North Apron area to public housing development, he expressed concern on the loss of the urban design character and quality of the original street block shapes and sizes and their more human scaled streets as well as better ventilation, compared to the usually massive and standard design of public housing developments. He suggested that suitable design parameters should be added to the development briefs to guide these public housing developments to maintain the aforementioned urban design characteristics;
- (c) he opined that it was necessary to holistically design the future Kai Tak Sports Park (KTSP) and the adjacent Dining Cove near To Kwa Wan; and
- (d) with regards to the temporary usage of waterfront, the Government should deliver a comprehensive plan and timeframe for the long term and temporary usage of Kai Tak promenade for public enjoyment.

1.4 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** complimented the efforts of KTO in revising the format of the progress report. He raised the following enquires and comments:

- (a) he learnt that bicycle parking would not be provided within the Hong Kong Children's Hospital (HKCH) due to infection risk concerns and questioned why public carpark would not contribute to infectious diseases and was allowed within HKCH;
- (b) he queried the targeted trip rate for cycling for transport within Kai Tak area, such as between the MTR station and the many destinations. He believed that the Government should set out a clear cycling strategy and give directions to departments on the provision of cycling routes and

facilities for their respective projects. He warned that the many tracks and destinations will attract residents and visitors to use bicycles, resulting in illegal parking and safety concerns unless a comprehensive strategy is embraced for the Kai Tak area;

- (c) he observed that marine users had faced challenges in using existing landing facilities as they would have to climb over glass balustrades along Kwun Tong waterfront to enter the promenade and to reach the Ngau Tau Kok MTR station. He opined that the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) should welcome marine users and provide landing facilities along waterfront promenades including the use of the bollards;
- (d) he recalled that LCSD and the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) consulted the Task Force on the design of the promenade adjacent to HKCH in the previous meeting. Members commented that the design of the promenade should accommodate for marine uses and allow active use of the water in the future to respond to the call for a water-friendly culture. Specifically, there is a need for a landing step near the bridge. He looked for a positive response from the project team;
- (e) he recalled that Members generally supported the schematic design of the Station Square project when LCSD and ArchSD consulted the Task Force on the subject at a previous meeting. Noting the project had already progressed into the detailed design stage, he urged the project team to suitably address Members' comments when taking forward the project;
- (f) he enquired about the reopening of the public landing steps near Hoi Sham Park;
- (g) he opined that the progress report should include Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter, To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelter (TKWTS) and Approach Channel as action items. For KTTS, he had submitted proposals on the uses of waterbody and identified a demarcation for various types of marine facilities and activities to the Marine Department (MD) for consideration;
- (h) apart from a schedule of temporary land uses, he enquired

about the provision of temporary pedestrian and cycling connections between To Kwa Wan, Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay and to the waterfront areas;

- (i) he pointed out that the land allocation for the future KTSP displayed on Annex B of the Report excluded the waterfront Dining Cove area by mistake;
- (j) he did not agree that timely delivery of public open space could only be achieved by the development approach of public open space in private development (POSPD); and
- (k) he asked CEDD to shift the section of Road D3 adjacent to Metro Park to the middle of the former runway, in order to free up more space along the waterfront. He added that the western section (the head) of the Kai Tak Approach Channel had the potential to be developed into an attractive and world-class harbourfront area comparable to Sydney's Darling Harbour and Singapore's Marina Bay, and outlines that this requires a strategy for the land uses on the three sides and by shifting the road to make space available.

1.5 **The Chair** said that Members' comments on various projects in KTD were valid and should be taken on board.

1.6 Regarding temporary land uses in Kai Tak, **Mr Derek SUN** suggested bureaux and departments concerned to consider implementing quick-win temporary projects at Kai Tak in the coming 5 years. He said these projects should showcase the character of the future KTD, such as good connectivity and scenic harbour view.

1.7 **Mr Freddie HAI** was concerned about the study of the proposed Environmentally Friendly Linkage System (EFLS). He noticed that the land sale programme was actively in progress. Given that the provision of EFLS was still uncertain, he enquired how the proposed EFLS could possibly be integrated with its adjoining development projects.

1.8 **The Chair** advised that CEDD would brief Members on the findings of Stage 1 of the Detailed Feasibility Study (DFS) for EFLS for Kowloon East under agenda item 3.

1.9 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** urged government departments to resolve management issue arisen from temporary land uses. He noted that a number of infrastructure works in Hong Kong had suffered from delays and temporary land uses could compensate the nuisance brought by these delays. He also encouraged the Government to identify suitable locations for the building of temporary promenades in Kai Tak.

1.10 **The Chair** invited Ms YING and representatives of concerned departments to give consolidated responses to Members' comments.

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

- (a) in response to Mr TAM's enquiry about the possible interfacing issues between Infrastructure Works Stage 5B and public housing development at Area 2B, she replied that the two would be carried out simultaneously; and
- (b) regarding the provision of open spaces, she said that the Government had announced the Five-year Plan for Sports and Recreation Facilities which covered open spaces funded by public funding. She informed Members that CEDD was conducting an Urban Design Review Study for the development at the Former Runway as well as the Study on Design Control and Guidelines for Kai Tak Promenades. Separately, the Government considered that POSPD model was a suitable approach for the development of the promenade abutting development sites, i.e. along the former runway and at the former south apron area, in order to achieve an interactive design between the development and the promenade. It was considered possible to extend the strip of promenade along the former runway to connect some temporary promenades at the north in order to reach the future KTSP upon its completion. CEDD will work with departments concerned on the terms and conditions of land leases for the future residential and hotel sites in Area 4 at the former runway to ensure timely delivery of waterfront promenade for public enjoyment.

1.12 **Mrs Doris FOK** informed Members that the Kowloon City

District Council and local communities opposed to the reopening of landing steps (KP008) near Hoi Sham Park in To Kwa Wan. They were concerned that the reopening would bring along tourists who would make use of the landing steps as a boarding point for boat tours around Victoria Harbour, and coaches that carry the tourists to the landing steps would further increase the traffic flow in the area. She said that the Hoi Sham Park Extension project was included in the Five-year Plan for Sports and Recreation Facilities as pledged in the 2017 Policy Address. ArchSD had completed the technical feasibility study for the project.

1.13 **Mr David NGU** said that CEDD was conducting a feasibility study on the cycle track network in KTD. The reference trip rate for planning cycling in KTD in the study had made reference to the survey at the Tolo Harbour cycle track, among others. He advised that the width of a typical cycle track was 3.5 to 4 metres (m). Having considered the busy traffic and limited road spaces in urban areas, he said that the Transport Department (TD) did not encourage the use of bicycles as a transport mode in urban areas due to road safety considerations. The feasibility study was centred around the idea that cycle track network in KTD was planned for leisure and recreation purposes. The planned cycle track along the promenade would allow visitors to ride their bicycles to HKCH and within open spaces in KTD.

1.14 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** pointed out that the Tolo Harbour cycle track was for leisure cycling during weekends, and his enquiry was about the trip rate for cycling between the future Mass Transit Railway (MTR) station and other destinations in Kai Tak on a daily basis. He said that bicycles were the best mode of green transport which should be encouraged. He reiterated that the Government should set out a clear cycling strategy to facilitate the daily commuting of residents and visitors in Kai Tak.

1.15 Regarding the landing steps at Hoi Sham Park, he said that the distance between landing steps and other public transport facilities was far and opined that the reopening of landing steps would not cause adverse impacts to the traffic flow in the area. The response provided by LCSD for abandoning a landing step within the park was not convincing. For the marine facilities in KTTS, he commented that LCSD had built glass balustrades along the Kwun Tong promenade and disabled the

mooring function of existing bollards. He opined that LCSD should be taken away of their management role of the promenades if they could not resolve the problem of facilitating marine uses.

1.16 **Mrs Doris FOK** said that it was mentioned in previous Task Force meetings that the remaining bollards along the Kwun Tong promenade would be retained in-situ as "decorative features". She pointed out that there was an existing pier near the promenade to provide proper landing facilities for marine users. LCSD and the Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO) would study the feasibility to open a glass gate along the balustrade of Kwun Tong Promenade occasionally to provide marine access for ad hoc water sports events. LCSD strived to maintain a balance between public safety and the provision of marine accesses at Kwun Tong Promenade.

1.17 **Miss Christine AU** provided clarification on two issues:

- (a) upon detailed deliberation, the Commission reached a consensus in mid-2013 that half of the bollards along the promenade would be retained in-situ as "decorative features", while the other half would be relocated inside the promenade as featured seating. She noted that marine activities had grown in the vicinity in recent years and assured Members that departments concerned were looking into the feasibility to provide marine accesses and re-activate the use of marine facilities along Kwun Tong Promenade in a prudent manner that would accord priority to safety considerations. She stressed that the Government adopted a welcoming approach to this matter and relevant departments would consult the Commission when concrete proposals were ready; and
- (b) in response to Mr ZIMMERMAN's comment on POSPD, she reaffirmed the meeting that the mechanism of POSPD would be adopted in parallel to the use of public funding for the implementation of open spaces at different locations. Members should note that a lot of open space projects in Kai Tak were incorporated in the Government's Five-year Plan for Sports and Recreation Facilities.

1.18 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** thanked Miss AU for the clarification. He said that when the Task Force was consulted on the issue of bollards, Members were given to understand that the half of the bollards along Kwun Tong Promenade could be saved from demolition at the expense of being converted into decorative features and that there would be future deliberations on their use.

1.19 **The Chair** recalled that retaining half of the bollards along Kwun Tong Promenade was the final result in 2013. While recognising Government's efforts in arriving at the current status, he understood that the Task Force had expressed aspiration to one day restoring the marine function of these bollards. Referencing foreign experiences on harbourfront design and management, he shared Members' view that marine activities should be allowed and introduced along Promenades.

Item 2 Kai Tak Development - Infrastructure Works at the former Runway and South Apron (Paper No. TFKT/12/2017)

2.1 **The Chair** informed Members that KTO of the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) had submitted a paper (TFKT/12/2017) to seek Members' views on the infrastructure works at the former Runway and South Apron in Kai Tak Development (KTD). He welcomed **Ms YING Fun-fong, Mr Edmund CHAN, Mr Raymond LEE, Mr John LEUNG** and **Mr Ronald SIU** from CEDD; **Mr James PENNY** and **Mr Vincent AU YEUNG** from the consultant team to the meeting.

2.2 **Ms YING, Mr Vincent AU YEUNG** and **Mr James PENNY** introduced the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

2.3 **The Chair** enquired whether the scope of the proposed infrastructure works comprised the adjacent promenade fronting the Kai Tak Approach Channel.

2.4 **Mr Edmund CHAN** replied that the purposes of the projects were to enhance road facilities and connectivity at the former South Apron area and the former Runway so it did not cover the adjacent promenade.

2.5 **The Chair** viewed that it would be a more integrated development to combine road works and promenade project into the same package.

2.6 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** raised the following comments and enquires:

- (a) Annex A of the paper indicated that the Road D3 (Metro Park Section) infrastructure works contained different levels of roads (elevated, at-grade and depressed). He enquired which departments were responsible for the design, construction, management and maintenance of different sections of the project;
- (b) the project team was advised to provide further information on the height and width of the elevated road and the adjacent pedestrian walkway. He was also concerned about the greening, safety and noise issues of the proposed elevated road and the pedestrian environment underneath; and
- (c) Annex C of the paper showed that pavement renovation works would be conducted at Kai Hing Road. He said paving blocks alone would not be enough, and enquired about the width of the footpath along Kai Hing Road and whether the road was mainly for industrial use. He would also like to know how Kai Hing Road would be connected with the waterfront promenade.

2.7 Regarding the provision of bus stops next to the Tourism Node, **Mr Freddie HAI** enquired about the capacity of the new bus stops and whether the ground transportation area in the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal (KTCT) could absorb the additional traffic.

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

- (a) why the landscaped deck at the depressed road section of Road D3 did not have shaded shelters or tree shading referencing Footbridge FB02 at the former south apron area;

- (b) how would the depressed section of Road D3 (Metro Park Section) connect to the landscaped deck along the runway precinct and eventually to the Road D3A carriageway;
- (c) what was the function of the proposed Road L12d and the roundabout as it appeared that the land taken up is disproportionate to the traffic demand;
- (d) whether Road D3 could be further setback along the waterfront to provide more space for marine and recreational related facilities; and
- (e) what was the project implementation plan and when would the projects be gazetted.

2.9 **The Chair** had the following observations:

- (a) he complemented the efforts of KTO to enhance walkability and strengthen the connectivity between the waterfront promenade and the future Metro Park by proposing an underpass and a depressed road design;
- (b) Members were concerned about the walkability and pedestrian environment of the at-grade crossing underneath the elevated road section. He viewed that sheltered activities underneath the elevated road could increase the vibrancy at the head of the Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC) and attract more patronage to the waterfront; and
- (c) from a public interest point of view, he urged that the scope of the proposed infrastructure works should include the construction of the adjacent promenade, such that the waterfront promenade along KTAC could be delivered soon.

2.10 **Mr Edmund CHAN** thanked Members for their comments and responded as follows:

- (a) the graphs and images showed in the PowerPoint were indicative plans. Actual parameters, dimensions and greening elements of the road infrastructures would be worked out at the detailed design stage;
- (b) the landscape deck at the depressed road section of Road D3 was an extension of the landscape deck above Road D3A, forming a green connector linking up the future Metro Park.

He informed Members that the landscape design of both landscape decks echoed with each another and reflected the overall development theme of Kai Tak. He reaffirmed the meeting that shading shelters would be provided on both landscaped decks;

- (c) CEDD considered that further setback of Road D3 towards the centre of the former runway would reduce the size of the future Metro Park. He added that CEDD had taken the relevant standards and guideline into full consideration when designing the alignment and gradient of Road D3 so as to maximize the area of landscape deck at the depressed road section; and
- (d) KTO coordinated with the Transport Department (TD) on the provision of new bus bays next to the Tourism Node. He understood that TD proposed to introduce more bus routes to better serve the adjacent commercial sites at the former Runway in the future.

2.11 Regarding the pavement renovation works at Kai Hing Road, **Mr Raymond LEE** said that the existing footpaths of Kai Hing Road were bounded by the commercial and industrial buildings on both sides. Widening of the said footpaths for provision of roadside plantings was not possible. Thus, CEDD proposed to repave the footpaths to enhance the overall street environment. He added that CEDD was carrying out road widening works at Cheung Yip Street where more roadside plantings would be provided.

2.12 **Ms YING** supplemented the following in response to Members' comments:

- (a) for the proposed roundabout at the mid-section of Road D3, it could provide a more direct traffic flow from the former south apron area to the residential sites near KTAC given that Road D3 was a dual carriageway;
- (b) the amount of land area taken up by the roundabout was akin to that to be taken up by a signal junction;
- (c) for the at-grade access to the head of KTAC underneath the elevated road section, she said the dimension of the sheltered pathway was about 90m wide and 2.5 to 5m in height.

CEDD and the consultant would incorporate interesting design to the column structures in a view to attracting public events;

- (d) as regards to the alignment of Road D3, she clarified that the footpath would be either elevated or at-grade to provide more open spaces at the waterfront promenade. Having regard to the traffic safety issues at the roundabout and technical constraints at the interfaces between Road D3, Road D3A and the Central Kowloon Route (CKR), CEDD would study the feasibility to further setback Road D3 slightly away from the promenade. The project team noted Members' views and strived to refine the design and alignment of Road D3 at the detailed design stage; and
- (e) CEDD could study the feasibility to include the waterfront promenade in the scope of the proposed infrastructure works at the former runway. Nevertheless, she affirmed that it would not be possible for CEDD to also take up the infrastructure works of Metro Park due to the project scale.

2.13 **The Chair** welcomed Ms YING's positive response to consider including the waterfront promenade project in the scope of the proposed infrastructure works as far as possible.

2.14 From urban planning and design perspective, **Mr Freddie HAI** viewed that CEDD and TD should adopt a more integrated and holistic approach to plan for the long-term development of public transport facilities at the former runway tip. He said that there might be spare capacity at the bus terminus lay-bys inside KTCT.

2.15 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** said that the CKR involved a spaghetti of roads and pedestrian spaces beneath CKR near KTAC were fragmented. He suggested that CEDD should provide Members with animations and/or physical models to better illustrate the actual spatial arrangements of roads and pedestrian networks of the area. Apart from engineering considerations, he opined that architectural and landscape inputs were essential to enhance the walkability and aesthetics of the at-grade access connecting the head of KTAC. He observed that the widths of the pedestrian walkways on both sides of the elevated road were different.

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

- (a) the proposed road works took up enormous amount of space on the former runway. He view that the demand for road transport induced by KTCT, the future Tourism Node, and the future commercial sites at the tip of the former runway was not justified and asked if the design for Road D3 could be simplified; and
- (b) he was pleased to learn that the underpass section of Road D3 could release more open space for the promenade. He questioned the reasons behind putting Road D3 next to the waterfront and urged the Government to refine the alignment of Road D3 and the landscape design of the promenade to create an interesting and exciting KTAC.

2.17 **The Chair** noted that Mr ZIMMERMAN was not satisfied with the existing alignment of Road D3. He said that Road D3 was a planning and transport issue. The Task Force agreed that KTAC had the potential to become a vibrant harbourfront area comparable to Sydney's Darling Harbour and Singapore's Marina Bay. He opined that technical studies of infrastructure works should take into account factors in creating a vibrant harbourfront at KTAC and accommodate the aspiration and need of the community for a wider promenade.

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

- (a) CEDD worked closely with TD and the Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO) on the provision of bus stops along the former runway. She said that the distance between another proposed bus stop on Road D3 and the one inside KTCT was more than 1 kilometre (km). The proposed bus stops were close to the ex-fireboat pier, the Tourism Node and the proposed commercial development hotel sites at Areas 4B and 4C. Adding that the Hong Kong Water Sports Council had applied for a short-term tenancy to set up a Water Sports Centre adjacent to the ex-fireboat pier, she said the newly proposed bus stops would become essential in bringing more people to the said area; and

- (b) In response to what Mr Tam Po-yiu said, Road D3 would be the only infrastructure flying over the CKR near the head of KTAC and the CKR administration building would be at the north of Road D3. She said that pedestrian walkways were provided on both sides of the elevated road section of Road D3. The narrower walkway was close to the future Kai Tak Sports Park (KTSP) and was designed for maintenance purpose and access to places other than the park. On the other hand, visitors of KTSP would access through its main plaza.

2.19 **Mr Freddie HAI** advised that the proposed new bus stops have occupied a very precious piece of open area at the runway tip. Once the traffic user pattern was established it would be very difficult to relocate such open air bus stops. He opined that the newly proposed bus stops would reduce the flexibility in the future development of open space in the area concerned. It should therefore be merged into the adjacent commercial site development to form an integrated passenger transport interchange and be hidden from sight. The Integrated passenger transport interchange could also offer shelter from the elements and also provide synergies with other retail activities.

2.20 **The Chair** concurred with Mr HAI and added that relevant authorities should consider integrating the proposed bus stops into the development of the Tourism Node.

2.21 **Mr Thomas CHAN** assured Members that the Government adopted an approach of planning public transport interchanges and adjacent developments in an integrated manner so as to reduce the need for additional infrastructures. The Government noted Members' concerns and would coordinate with relevant departments to study the possibility for a more integrated development at the former runway.

2.22 **The Chair** thanked Mr CHAN for his positive response. He also thanked the project team for the presentation and responses. He also reiterated the importance for KTO to include the implementation of the waterfront promenade within the scope of the proposed infrastructure works.

**Item 3 Stage 1 of Detailed Feasibility Study for Environmentally Friendly Linkage System for Kowloon East
(Paper No. TFKT/13/2017)**

3.1 **The Chair** informed Members that KTO had provided a paper (TFKT/13/2017) to brief Members on the findings of Stage 1 of the Detailed Feasibility Study (DFS) for Environmentally Friendly Linkage System (EFLS) for Kowloon East. As background, the DFS on EFLS commenced in October 2015 with a view to enhancing the connectivity in Kowloon East for its transformation into a new Core Business District. The DFS was being conducted in two stages. The interim consultation exercise for the first stage of the DFS was launched on 2 May 2017 for a period of two months. The Public Consultation Digest was forwarded to Members for information on 11 May 2017.

3.2 He welcomed **Ms YING Fun-fong** and **Mr Harry MA** from CEDD; **Ms Carman CHU** and **Mr Ray TANG** from Arup to the meeting.

3.3 **Mr Ray TANG** and **Mr Harry MA** introduced the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

3.4 **The Chair** said that the proposed EFLS had been discussed in the community for over ten years. He invited Members to give views on the findings.

3.5 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** said that the public consultation exercise and materials presented at the meeting were more objective than that which were presented at the previous consultation with the Task Force in 2014. The paper looked into the pros and cons of different at-grade and elevated transport modes, rather than simply advertising the proposed monorail system as the optimal solution to address the traffic problem in Kai Tak. Given the limited road space in Kowloon East, he agreed that there was a need to strengthen the transport network and alleviate traffic congestion in the area. He believed that elevated transport modes could release more spaces for activities on the surface. It was his understanding that the Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong (CILTHK) did not support the proposed elevated monorail system due to its low Economic Internal Rate of Return

(EIRR) and high construction cost. He advised the project team to provide further information on EIRR of different transport modes to facilitate Members' consideration.

3.6 **Mr Freddie HAI** gave the following views:

- (a) the project team should carefully calculate the cost-effectiveness of the proposed system and take into account all economic factors including travel time, construction cost and EIRR etc.;
- (b) he pointed out that except for slight differences in mechanics, the operation and alignment of Automated People Mover (APM) and Monorail was similar and should be classified into the same category;
- (c) the development of Kai Tak was dynamic and the originally planned commercial sites along the former runway had been rezoned for residential developments. He enquired whether the amendments in land uses and pedestrian circulation had been considered in the DFS. He viewed that the proposed EFLS would mainly service the residential population at the runway area, but would be unable to take tens of thousands of visitors coming to and from the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal (KTCT) and the future Kai Tak Sports Park (KTSP);
- (d) Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay districts were highly congested, in particular around the Mass Transit Railway (MTR) stations. He pointed out that the proposed EFLS appeared to be able to serve as a feeder service between Kai Tak and the adjacent districts and enquired why a "loop" alignment of EFLS was needed;
- (e) He pointed out that the traveller should not be ruled out at this early stage. The traveller could be a good connector with a shuttle system.
- (f) he noted that fire safety was a great concern to an elevated transport system. The installation of fire extinction equipment and the provision of emergency vehicular access (EVA) would take up a lot of built area. The project team was advised to explain further on possible implications on land to be taken up by fire safety facilities; and

- (g) he enquired how the design and construction programme of the proposed EFLS could tie in with the land sale programme of adjoining residential and commercial developments. He opined that an independent elevated structure without any integration with any development would be a sad compromise from urban design point of view.

3.7 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** said that Members of the Hong Kong Institute of Urban Designs (HKIUD) would discuss the findings of the DFS and separately submit their comments in writing to CEDD for consideration. He shared his opinions as follows:

- (a) he said that people lived and worked in Kowloon East relied heavily on the existing MTR system. He commented that the Task Force would not be able to make any informed decisions or comments on the proposed EFLS in the absence of a specific alignment and station locations. Such information should be made available in due course to facilitate Members' consideration.
- (b) he was concerned about physical impacts on areas which the proposed EFLS would be built on;
- (c) noting that there were increasing residential developments uphill near Sau Mau Ping, he enquired whether the proposed EFLS could be aligned to help relieve pedestrian traffic between hillside and business districts;
- (d) he commented that the proposed EFLS could not resolve the traffic congestion problem in Kwun Tong Business Area and Kowloon Bay Business Area unless there are also changes like restrictions to the number of parking spaces; smarter traffic management and more vigorous enforcement on unauthorised parking, loading/unloading in the streets;
- (e) for the improvement of the overall pedestrian connectivity in Kowloon East, he asked how the proposed EFLS would echo and interact with the Pedestrian Environment Improvement Scheme in Kwun Tong Business Area;
- (f) he questioned the target passenger group of the proposed EFLS. He said that while few monorail systems in various countries are viable, some systems are designed for tourism

purpose, and if this was the case for Hong Kong, the route of the proposed EFLS should be extended to Yau Tong, Sam Ka Tsuen and Lei Yue Mun to promote tourism.

3.8 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that the presentation was a piece of marketing material, which failed to provide new information and address Members' previous concerns. He agreed with Mr TAM that the project team had yet to identify the target passenger group of the proposed EFLS. He viewed that the impacts on visual and public space brought about by the proposed EFLS would be massive and urged the project team to carefully examine and come up with measures to address them. The Government was also advised to provide diversified green transport modes to resolve the traffic problem in Kowloon East. He saw that little adjustment could be made to the current proposal of the monorail system. He further opined that the Task Force could not give support to the proposal elevated transport system.

3.9 Commenting on at-grade modes of transport, **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** supplemented that unlike Modern Tramway (MT), BRT ran in the middle of the road and required larger road surface, but had little impact on underground utilities as most of these public utilities underground were beneath pedestrian walkways.

3.10 **Mr Derek SUN** said that the proposed EFLS was part of the planning essentials in Kai Tak Development Area. Its value could not be judged merely by its economic cost and benefit to the society, but should be assessed holistically from urban planning perspective. He commented that the proposed intra-district transport system fell behind the progressive development of Kai Tak. He was pessimistic about the implementation and performance of the proposed EFLS.

3.11 **The Chair** agreed with Members' views that Kai Tak went through 10 years of development, and had experienced lots of changes in land use and development intensity. More infrastructure works and public facilities would be completed in the foreseeable future. He said that Members with professional urban planning and landscape design background were concerned about the interface between the proposed EFLS and adjacent development lots and infrastructures. The

information available from the public consultation document was considered too superficial for the Task Force to provide meaningful comments on. He said elevated modes of transport would also have implications on at-grade structures and connections, such as pillars and EVAs. The project team was reminded to provide technical details of the proposed EFLS in relation to foundation works, construction, emergency evacuation etc. to facilities Members' future discussions.

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

- (a) during the funding application for the DFS in mid-2015, some Legislative Council Members questioned the financial viability of the proposed monorail system. The scope of the DFS was thus expanded and the DFS was carried out in 2 stages. Stage 1 of the DFS was to assess various green transport modes and identify the most suitable mode of EFLS. Task Force Members' views and comments on the alignment of the proposed EFLS would be incorporated and addressed in the second stage of the DFS;
- (b) the consultant team had conducted a preliminary study on the fire safety aspects of the proposed EFLS;
- (c) the consultant team would carry out an alignment study to refine the originally proposed alignment of the EFLS to tie in with the latest development of KTD, Kowloon Bay and Kwun Tong;
- (d) she explained that part of the developments in Kai Tak had been under way and there was limited land space to build an at-grade transport system in KTD. It was considered that at-grade transport mode would bring negative impacts to the overall development in Kai Tak. In order to improve the traffic condition in Kowloon East, an elevated EFLS would be a suitable option;
- (e) the project team noted that the EFLS would have considerable visual impacts on adjacent development sites and they would address the problem of potential noise nuisance and privacy intrusion to residents adjacent to the proposed EFLS under the stage 2 of DFS;
- (f) she said that the decision on whether to implement the EFLS would only be made after the completion of the DFS.

However, there had been a rapid transformation in Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay in the past 5 years, and population and pedestrian traffic had substantially increased. It was expected that the demand for public transport in Kowloon East would double that of the current rate by Year 2036. An additional transportation network was needed in Kowloon East, but the building of it would attract a lot of critics. Noting that the EFLS might not be easily accepted by the public, CEDD needed to conduct a more in-depth study in the second phase of the DFS. CEDD would explore how the EFLS stations could be best used, such as their possibility to enhance walkability by acting as footbridges;

- (g) she agreed that EIRR was an important consideration in calculating the cost-effectiveness of infrastructure works. The stage 1 of DFS has conducted such assessment for the potential at-grade and elevated transport modes and concluded that only fully elevated modes could achieve a positive EIRR. ;
- (h) the DFS suggested that the proposed EFLS would tie in with the future development of MTR and road transport system to improve the traffic condition in Kowloon East and Kai Tak. The Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO) had also proposed an elevated walkway system in Kowloon Bay. The Government has proposed various pedestrian and traffic improvement schemes to cope with the increasing pedestrian and vehicular flow in the area; and
- (i) the proposed EFLS system could facilitate inter-district and intra-district travel for Kowloon East . At the inter-district travel, it would act as a feeder service connecting key development nodes with the MTR network.

3.13 **Mr Freddie HAI** said that development projects at KTD would impose constraints to the proposed EFLS as a feeder system and traveller should be retained as an option of green transport mode in Kai Tak.

3.14 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** agreed with Mr HAI's point, and supplemented that the construction cost of at-grade travellers was lower and the construction works could be implemented in phases.

From an economic perspective, he said that population increase in Kowloon East could lower the marginal cost of providing required infrastructure and increase efficiency. The project team was reminded to provide a cost efficiency analysis of the EFLS for Members' consideration.

3.15 **The Chair** said that the EFLS was essential for the improvement of the traffic condition in Kowloon East. The project team was reminded to put more emphasis on urban planning when taking forward the DFS as it was foreseeable that more public comments would arise after increased population intake in KTD. It came to his notice that some new residents in KTD had expressed their views on the EFLS by writing to the Harbourfront Commission.

3.16 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** reiterated his objection towards an elevated monorail transport system at Kai Tak. He urged the Government to pursue other green transportation modes, such as cycling and walking, and the potential development of new transportation routes in the DFS for public consideration.

3.17 **The Chair** clarified that the Task Force agreed that a linkage system was necessary for Kowloon East. Given the information and content available in the consultation document, he concluded that it was too early for the Task Force to give support to any particular modes of green public transport.

3.18 **Mr Harry MA** thanked Members for their comments. He supplemented that travellator was considered as a supplement to pedestrian facility for enhancing walking experience for short-distance travel. He assured Members that travellator would be considered in the DFS. At Stage 2 of the DFS, the project team would conduct more in-depth economic and financial analysis of the EFLS.

3.19 **The Chair** thanked the project team for the presentation and responses. CEDD was reminded to take into account Members' views and comments in taking the public consultation exercise forward.

Item 4 Any Other Business

4.1 **The Chair** informed Members that this meeting would be the last Task Force meeting for the third term of HC and the Secretariat would inform Members of the date for the first Task Force meeting of the new term in due course. He thanked Members for their dedicated service to the Task Force in the last 2 years

4.2 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** thanked the Chair for his chairmanship and Members echoed.

4.3 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:00 pm.

Secretariat

Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development

July 2017