

Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development

Minutes of Twenty-eighth Meeting

Date : 8 September 2017 (Friday)
Time : 2:30 p.m.
Venue : Conference Room (Room G46), Upper Ground Floor, Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre, Kowloon Park, Tsim Sha Tsui

Present

Mr Vincent NG Chairman

Organization Members

Mrs Margaret BROOKE Representing Business Environment Council
Mrs Karen BARRETTO Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Freddie HAI Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Ms Connie CHEUNG Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape
Mei-ngor Architect
Prof TANG Bo-sin Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr Ivan HO Man-yiu Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Raymond CHAN Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Kin-sek
Mr Terence LEE Representing Real Estate Developers Association of
Hong Kong
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour

Individual Members

Mr Tony TSE Individual Member
Wai-chuen

Official Members

Ms Doris HO	Deputy Secretary (Planning & Lands) ¹ , DEVB
Mr Victor CHAN	Principal Assistant Secretary (Works) ² , DEVB
Mr Thomas WK CHAN	Senior Manager (Tourism) ⁴¹ , Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr Wilson PANG	Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department (TD)
Ms YING Fun-fong	Head/Kai Tak Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr Tom YIP	District Planning Officer/Kowloon, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mrs Doris FOK	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) ¹ , Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Mr Ian CHENG	Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr CHAN Ka-kui	Individual Member
Ms Kelly CHAN	Individual Member
Mr Hans Joachim ISLER	Individual Member
Ms Vivian LEE	Individual Member
Mr NGAN Man-yu	Individual Member
Mr LEUNG Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Sr Raymond CHAN Yuk-ming	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Dr NG Cho-nam	Representing The Conservancy Association

In attendance

Mr Nicholas BROOKE	HC Chair
Miss Christine AU	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB

Ms Jenny WONG Assistant Secretary (Harbour) Special Duties, DEVB

For Item 5

Ms Joyce LAU Chief Engineer/Special Projects, CEDD
Mr Lewis LEUNG Senior Engineer/10, CEDD
Mr William YEUNG Engineer/22, CEDD
Mr West WU Chief Pilot (Operations), GFS
Mr Victor LAU Senior Pilot (Operations)1, GFS
Mr Samuel YIP Senior Pilot (Operations)3, GFS
Mr Johnny LEE Senior Helicopter Operations Inspector, CAD
Mr Steven PANG Acting Senior Safety Officer (Airport), CAD
Mr Jeffrey LO Associate/Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited
Mr Tony LAM Director/AGC Design Limited
Mr Joe LUI Associate Director/AGC Design Limited

For Item 6

Mr Harry MA Chief Engineer/Kowloon 3, Kai Tak Office, CEDD
Ms Kei PONG Senior Engineer/7, Kai Tak Office, CEDD
Mr Keith CHU Engineer/12, Kai Tak Office, CEDD
Ms LAI Mei-ling Chief Leisure Manager (Kowloon), LCSD
Mr Michael CHIU Chief Executive Officer (Planning)1, LCSD
Mr Jeffrey CHAN Associate Director/Atkins China Limited

For Item 7

Ms Brenda AU Head/EKEO
Mr Frank WONG Deputy Head/EKEO
Ms Margaret CHAN Senior Place Making Manager(Planning)/EKEO
Ms Pearl HUI Consultant/AECOM
Ms Carol HUI Consultant/AECOM
Mr Simon LEE Consultant/AECOM

Mr Nicholas BROOKE, as the Chair of the Harbourfront Commission (HC), welcomed all to the meeting and thanked Members for serving the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development.

Item 1 Election of Chairman

1.1 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** invited nominations from Members for chairmanship of the Task Force.

1.2 **Mr Ivan HO** nominated **Mr Vincent NG** as the Chair of the Task Force. With unanimous support from Members, **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** announced that Mr NG would be the Chair of the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (TFKT). **Mr NG** took over the chairmanship and thanked Members for their support.

1.3 **The Chair** introduced and welcomed new Members to the Task Force. He informed Members that **Ms Doris HO** has taken over from **Mr Thomas CHAN** as the Deputy Secretary (Planning & Lands)1 of the Development Bureau with effect from 3 July 2017. He welcomed **Ms HO** to the meeting and thanked **Mr CHAN** for his contribution to the Task Force.

1.4 **The Chair** announced that **Mr Thomas WK CHAN**, Senior Manager of Tourism Commission, attended on behalf of Mr George TSOI.

Item 2 Confirmation of Terms of Reference

2.1 **The Chair** invited Members to consider the Terms of Reference (ToR) of TFKT being tabled at the meeting, which was the same as the one for the last term.

2.2 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** said that the ToR could be further reviewed at the Commission level first.

2.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that the Task Force should extend their scope of work and cover the adjacent waters of the harbourfront.

2.4 **The Chair** said that he had no objection to defer the discussion on the ToR to the coming Harbourfront Commission (HC) meeting and any necessary amendments to the Task Force ToR could be made afterwards. He noted Mr ZIMMERMAN's comment and clarified that even though the ToR did not include the use of waterbody, such discussion had never been excluded from discussion during the past years.

2.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that it would be necessary to review the circulation and communication flow between Members and the Secretariat. He suggested circulating correspondences issued on HC's behalf.

2.6 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** said that the matter could also be deferred for further discussion at the coming HC Meeting.

Item 3 Confirmation of Minutes of the last Meeting

3.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the draft minutes of the 26th TFKT meeting were circulated to Members for comments on 20 June 2017. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated again on 5 September 2017.

3.2 **The Chair** further reported that the draft minutes of the 27th TFKT meeting were circulated to Members for comments on 10 August 2017. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated again on 29 August and 5 September 2017 respectively.

3.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired if the Task Force was asked to acknowledge but not confirm the minutes since there were changes in membership.

3.4 **Miss Christine AU** clarified that due to changes in membership, Members of the current term were invited to note the minutes.

Item 4 Matters Arising

Progress Report on Kai Tak Development (KTD) (Paper No. TFKT/14/2017)

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

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

4.3 **Mr Tony TSE** was concerned about the connectivity between the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal (KTCT) and other infrastructures in Kai Tak. He asked with the completion of a number of infrastructures by the end of 2017, how the connectivity in the area would be improved.

4.4 **Ir Raymond CHAN** said that Hong Kong was hit by two typhoons in August 2017 and many trees were destroyed in the urban area. He opined that Kai Tak area was prone to strong wind and enquired whether there would be careful tree selection in that area.

4.5 **Mr Freddie HAI** requested that when project proponents consult TFKT in the future, they should all submit a checklist showing whether their project had fully complied with the Harbour Planning Principles & Guidelines (HPP&G).

4.6 **The Chair** noted Mr HAI's comments and supplemented that the proponents would always be required to make reference to the HPP&G in their projects.

4.7 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** recalled from the last meeting that the Public Open Space in Private Development (POSPD) model was considered to be a suitable approach for developing the promenade along the former runway. He enquired about the progress of the Study on Design Control and Guidelines for Kai Tak Promenades for incorporating POSPD requirements in the land leases of individual sites in Area 4 of Kai Tak.

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

- (a) he was given to understand that bicycle parking would not be provided within the Hong Kong Children's Hospital (HKCH) due to infection risk concerns. He questioned why, on the same token, the provision of public carpark in HKCH would not have any concern as possibly causing infectious diseases;
- (b) he suggested moving part of Road D3 to the centre of Metro Park so as to provide more space at the waterfront and urged for a discussion on the alignment of Road D3 without further delay;
- (c) given the influx of tourists and the increasing demand of pick-up/drop-off and parking facilities near Ma Tau Kok Pier, he urged the Transport Department (TD) and Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) to revise the current transport plan and study the feasibility of constructing an underground carpark under Hoi Sham Park;
- (d) he urged for a holistic review on cycling routes within Kai Tak;
- (e) he opined that the Study on Design Control & Guidelines for Kai Tak promenades should cover seawalls, promenades, parks, pavements and public open space;
- (f) he asked for the inclusion of Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC), Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter (KTTS) and To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelter (TKWTS), as well as a schedule of temporary land uses in Kai Tak in the regular progress report;
- (g) he echoed with Mr TSE's comment on enhancing the

temporary connectivity between KTCT and the public transport within Kai Tak area. According to the road plan, upon the realignment of Shing Fung Road and completion of other road infrastructure works, it would take longer time for buses travelling from KTCT to the future Sung Wong Toi and Kai Tak MTR station. He suggested shorter bus routes;

- (h) he opined that the original concept of having an Underground Shopping Street (USS) was to bring vibrancy to the underground subway across Prince Edward Road East, which was initially planned as a major link connecting Kai Tak and Kowloon City. With the USS extended to To Kwa Wan Station, he viewed that the proposed scale of commercial elements was too big and would adversely affect the street environment at-grade;
- (i) he pointed out that under Kai Tak Rethink 2.0, a number of commercial sites were proposed to be rezoned as residential sites and the need of having the runway noise barrier and the landscaped deck was lost given the provision of at-grade pedestrian network and an array of attractions along the waterfront. He was concerned that the noise barrier would not absorb but amplify noise. He urged the Government to consider his comments and review the project; and
- (j) he opined that the progress report should include Smart City initiatives.

4.9 **Ms Connie CHEUNG** enquired whether there were any plans to use the waterbody and the area around KTAC to organize some revenue-generating and celebratory events.

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

- (a) in response to Mr TSE's enquiry about the connectivity between KTCT and other areas in Kai Tak, she replied that the realignment and widening of Shing Fung Road from a single carriageway to a dual carriageway could help to cope with the increasing traffic flow. She further elaborated that upon the subsequent completion of Road D3 and Central Kowloon Route (CKR) in 2020s, the accessibility of KTCT would be greatly enhanced. She said that the future Kai Tak MTR Station would be surrounded by the green areas of the Station Square. This would echo with the "people-oriented" design theme of Kai Tak and residents could enjoy a better living environment with improved walkability. To tie in with the development progress and the population growth in KTD, TD would introduce franchised bus or green minibus (GMB) routes in the near future;
- (b) in response to Ir CHAN's enquiry about tree selection, she responded that sturdy and durable trees had been planted while only a few were damaged after the typhoons. She reassured that the trees to be planted on the landscaped deck would be carefully selected; and
- (c) she stated that a POSPD approach was still valid for the promenade along the former runway.

4.11 **Miss Christine AU** further added that the POSPD approach would help achieve a win-win situation: the public open space concerned would be completed in time for early public enjoyment together with the adjacent development projects, without having to be left idle upon the

completion of the hotels. Despite the changes in zoning, public open space would still be provided in front of the three hotel sites. She stressed that the Government would take a holistic view on the implementation of POSPD in Kai Tak area and would further update Members after the completion of the Urban Design Review Study for Former Runway commissioned by KTO.

4.12 Ms YING further responded to Mr ZIMMERMAN's comments as follows:

- (a) for the alignment of Road D3, she clarified that due to technical constraints, it would not be feasible to shift Road D3 away from the waterfront and to the middle of the former runway, which would essentially bisect the future Metro Park. She added that about 4,000 sq. m of open space would be created above the sunken underpass section of Road D3, adding up to a total of 2.9 ha of open space in the area, which could provide an array of facilities and activities for public enjoyment;
- (b) she recalled that two workshops had been conducted to seek Members' comments on the urban design for the Former Runway. She reassured that Members' views regarding better connectivity between promenade and development sites, as well as how to bring more vibrancy to the waterfront were duly heard and would be taken into account in the two studies commissioned by KTO. While maintaining vibrant waterbodies, care should also be taken at the same time to avoid nuisance that could be brought by visitors;
- (c) CEDD would continue to work with Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO) and departments concerned in utilising

the waterbodies with the improved water quality. She added that EKEO would further elaborate under Item 7 on the provision of landing steps around KTTS that would facilitate water sports activities;

- (d) a Traffic Noise Assessment was conducted and the predicted noise level of Noise Sensitive Receivers (NSR) was still within an acceptable range even after taking into account the reflection noise. She further supplemented that clauses would be included in the Conditions of Sale of respective development sites to mandate the developer to carry out Noise Impact Assessment (NIA);
- (e) for the Smart City Consultancy Study commissioned by EKEO, she replied that some of the initiatives would be included in the next progress report, i.e. smart water and electricity meters, shared information of parking availability, eco-friendly building facilities, etc; and
- (f) regarding Mr. ZIMMERMAN's request to include temporary land uses as a regular item in the progress report, she stated that land uses would not change frequently and Members had been kept abreast of relevant information in the past. Lands Department (LandsD) would update the list of land uses biannually.

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

- (a) he requested the project team to clarify about the USS project;
- (b) he pointed out that shifting Road D3 to the middle of the former runway would not disrupt the Metro Park. He further urged the Government to refine the alignment of Road D3 so that more spaces along the waterfront could be

- freed up to accommodate water sports activities; and
- (c) he opined that the shortest route between the drop-off point of KTCT and the Kai Tak MTR Station should be clearly indicated on the transport plan. The plan should also include other details, e.g. the space for buses to turn around and the expected number of passengers dropping off at KTCT.

4.14 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** suggested that a briefing session could be held to brief new Members on the background and developments in Kai Tak. **The Chair** agreed.

4.15 **Miss Christine AU** responded that an orientation session was held in early September and new Members were briefed about the operation of Harbourfront Commission (HC) and its Task Forces. She agreed to convene another session and would invite Ms YING to brief Members on the history and the latest development of Kai Tak.

4.16 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested that both existing and new Members should be allowed to join.

4.17 **The Chair** agreed with Mr ZIMMERMAN and reaffirmed that the briefing session would welcome both existing and new Members.

(Posting Meeting Notes: An informal briefing session was held for both incumbent and new Members on 27 October 2017 where Ms YING Fun-fong, Head of Kai Tak Office (KTO), and her team introduced the history and latest development of Kai Tak Development Area. 7 Members participated in the session.)

4.18 **Ms YING** further responded to Mr **ZIMMERMAN**'s comments as follows:

- (a) a Public Transport Interchange (PTI) would be located near the Kai Tak MTR Station and buses would be able to turnaround;
- (b) she further elaborated on the USS and pointed out that the shopping street would also serve as a main connection to link up San Po Kong and Kowloon City. Developers would be requested to provide respective sections of barrier-free pedestrian corridor at the basement level and open it up to the public round the clock. She added that there would be restrictions on lighting, signage and floor tiles to ensure uniform design of the pedestrian corridor.

4.19 **The Chair** thanked Members for the comments and Ms **YING**'s positive responses. He reiterated that KTD, covering an area of over 320 hectares, was a mega-size and highly complex development project. Many projects were under construction, planning or design with ever-changing updates. KTO was therefore invited to report the progress in the meetings. Members were welcomed to raise their comments and he will further coordinate with the Secretariat to facilitate in-depth discussion on specific topics afterwards.

**Item 5 Proposed Establishment of Government Flying Service at Kai Tak Division at Ex- Kai Tak Runway Tip
(Paper No. TFKT/16/2017)**

(Note: The Chair excused himself from the discussion to avoid conflict of interest and he passed the chairmanship to Mr Nicholas BROOKE. As to fit in Mr BROOKE's schedule, this item was discussed before the Feasibility Study on Cycle Track Network in KTD.)

5.1 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** informed Members that the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) had submitted a paper (TFKT/16/2017) to brief Members on the preliminary design of the proposed Government Flying Service (GFS) Kai Tak Division at the Ex-Kai Tak Runway Tip (EKTR) under a co-location arrangement with future commercial operator(s) of cross-boundary helicopter services.

5.2 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** welcomed **Ms Joyce LAU, Mr Lewis LEUNG** and **Mr William YEUNG** from CEDD; **Mr West WU, Mr Victor LAU** and **Mr Samuel YIP** from GFS; **Mr Johnny LEE** and **Mr Steven PANG** from Civil Aviation Department (CAD), and **Mr Jeffrey LO, Mr Tony LAM** and **Mr Joe LUI** from the consultant team to the meeting.

5.3 **Ms Joyce LAU, Mr Lewis LEUNG** and **Mr Joe LUI** briefed Members on the project with the aid of a PowerPoint.

5.4 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** noted that the proposed GFS Kai Tak Division was close to the future Tourism Node. He queried the possible impacts on it.

5.5 **Mr Freddie HAI** raised the following comments:

- (a) according to the Architectural Design Concept, the public could not gain easy access to the tip of the former runway due to safety and security concerns. He showed his understanding but questioned if the project team would facilitate public access to the areas subject to no adverse impacts posed on the operations;
- (b) he suggested that the enclosing walls should not be wired so as to create a more welcoming and favourable image; and
- (c) he opined that the existing access road leading to HKCH could not cope with the need for large-scale emergency rescue. He viewed that there was an overriding public need to construct the proposed Kwun Tong Transportation Link (KTTL) as an alternative route to connect the GFS Division and other parts of Kwun Tong including HKCH.

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

- (a) he understood that the site had been zoned “Other Specified Uses (OU)” annotated “Heliport” under the Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), with a view to providing cross-boundary helicopter services. However, he opined that fundamentally, the planning contravened the HPP&G by taking away public rights to enjoy the view of harbourfront;
- (b) he remained unconvinced that the Division should be placed here and said that the Technical Feasibility Study (TFS) was based only on the operational need of GFS, but not from the perspective of HPP&G and the public enjoyment of the Harbour;
- (c) he said that Kai Tak Fantasy (KTF) encompassed a visionary

plan to develop the former runway and the adjoining areas into a world-class tourism, entertainment and leisure hub. Given the proposed Division's proximity to KTF, he questioned how the vision of KTF could be actualised;

- (d) regarding the connectivity of the Division and the neighbouring area, he echoed with Mr HAI that the provision of only one access road to the Division would not be enough for emergency rescue;
- (e) although rooftop greening would be incorporated into the office building and hangar, he opined that it would only serve visual purpose and could not be accessed by public. He added that the green roof is also separated from the green areas of KTCT rooftop and the Runway Park;
- (f) he asked the project team to supplement on sustainability building design; and
- (g) he recalled his unpleasant experience of viewing helicopters taking off and landing and opined that the noise generated was unbearable.

5.7 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** gave the following views:

- (a) she understood the need of establishing the Division, however, with the operation of eight flights per day, she was doubtful whether the tip of former runway could still become a "world-class tourism, entertainment & leisure attraction" as proposed in KTF;
- (b) she opined that preserving the development potentials of North Lantau was not a legitimate reason to establish the Division outside Lantau Island and in the Harbour. She stressed that harbourfront development was more important

than the Lantau development; and

- (c) she queried if additional structures and spaces would be required for providing commercial helicopter services under the co-location arrangement in future.

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

- (a) he recalled that back in 2007, the site was originally planned to be a cross-boundary heliport, co-using the Customs, Immigration and Quarantine (CIQ) facilities of KTCT. The current proposal greatly deviated from the original one and he urged the Planning Department (PlanD) and Development Bureau (DEVB) to explain;
- (b) he acknowledged the need for GFS to provide emergency rescue services but was unconvinced that the former runway tip was the only suitable site. He suggested that a detailed comparison of all possible alternative sites should be included in the consultation paper;
- (c) he opined that assessment on noise contours was missing and he could not come up with a clear stance based on the current information;
- (d) he said that helicopter operations would lead to the closure of some water areas near the runway tip. He added that a map indicating the affected water areas should also be included in the paper;
- (e) as a District Councillor himself, he was doubtful of GFS' claim that the project had "obtained general support from District Councils" and asked the project team to report in detail all comments raised by District Councillors;

- (f) he said that the site should be part of a community facility for public enjoyment. He further suggested installing noise proof glass and designating photo spots on the rooftop of KTCT so that the public could view flight operations there;
- (g) he asked the proponent to clarify whether the site would be co-used with the cross-boundary heliport;
- (h) he queried whether the planned flight operations in Kai Tak were solely for emergency services under poor weather conditions; and
- (i) in response to Mr. HAI's comment, he stated that he would strongly object to any road plan that would induce reclamation in KTTS, such as building KTTL.

5.9 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** asked the project team to give an initial reply and invited them to address Members' specific concerns in the next meeting.

5.10 **Ms Joyce LAU** responded to Members' comments as follows:

- (a) she clarified that the site had been zoned "OU" annotated "Heliport" under the Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/2 since 2007 and was primarily intended for a cross-boundary heliport. The current co-location proposal was to maximise the use of limited land resources along the harbourfront and to preserve synergy among KTCT and the commercial helicopter services, etc.;
- (b) she responded that one of the key considerations of site selection was to provide safe flight paths for helicopter approach and departure. Other factors included compatibility of land use, impact of the GFS operations on the

neighbourhood and site availability as the relocation of the GFS operations was on the critical path of the housing development at Tung Chung New Town Extension (TCNTE). Taking all these factors into account, relocating the Division at the proposed site was considered the most suitable.

5.11 **Mr Tom YIP** supplemented that the site was selected for providing a cross-boundary commercial heliport back in 2007 and the Town Planning Board (TPB) received a number of representations regarding the proposal when the draft OZP was gazetted back then. After due consideration, TPB considered that the site was suitable for providing helicopter services and decided to uphold the zoning for the site. He further added that the proposal could achieve synergy by co-using the CIQ facilities in KTCT, and reiterated that the proposal was compatible with the intended use. According to the OZP, the proposed GFS Division was permitted and in line with the planning intentions.

5.12 **Mr West WU** responded to Mr ZIMMERMAN's comments as follows:

- (a) he reassured that the intention of establishing a Division in Kai Tak was solely for emergency response and only two helicopters would be stationed at the hangar at any time;
- (b) he stated that the North Lantau Expressway Flight Path would be dysfunctional upon the development at North Lantau including TCNTE. He acknowledged the aspirations for public enjoyment of the Harbour but he also stressed that it was GFS' commitment to save citizens' lives and there was an operational need to ensure GFS' response to emergency calls would not be compromised;

- (c) he said that other sites had been considered for the proposed Division and Kai Tak was eventually selected due to a host of considerations including its central location which could provide effective emergency responses;
- (d) he responded that GFS would co-operate with the commercial operator if the cross-boundary heliport is set up in future; and
- (e) he viewed that the noise generated by helicopters would be transient and kept to a minimum with the emergency operation of only eight call-outs per day. He further added that GFS would continue to coordinate with the CAD and Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) for the procedural operations of the Division.

5.13 **Mr Lewis LEUNG** responded to Mr ZIMMERMAN's enquiry on site selection. He said that a total of 19 sites, including Hung Hom, Kwun Tong, Cha Kwo Ling, Wan Chai etc., were longlisted as candidate sites for TFS. However, after considering the relevant technical parameters such as location, GFS' operation needs, aviation safety, environment impact, accessibility, planned land use and land availability, Kai Tak was considered to be the most suitable location among all. He added that CEDD would be pleased to provide the study details at the next meeting.

5.14 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** advised CEDD to report the details of the TFS and the comparison of alternative site options at the next meeting. To ease Members' concerns, the project team had to explain the impact of this project on KTF.

5.15 **Ms Joyce LAU** supplemented that the interfacing with other KTD projects had been taken into account in the preliminary design stage

and there were no interfacing issues so far. Moving into the detailed design stage, CEDD would continue to closely liaise with other project proponents to ensure that there would be no impact on KTF.

5.16 **Mr Lewis LEUNG** added that the calculated helicopter noise levels due to KTD operation in neighbouring residential areas, including Laguna City, Cha Kwo Ling Village and Kai Tak Development sites along the former runway could comply with the relevant requirements

5.17 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** doubted that under the NIA, the former runway was wrongly assumed as a deserted area with no development. Specifically, he enquired whether there would be any noise impacts on KTF.

5.18 **Mr Lewis LEUNG** explained that the noise standard for helicopter operation applied to uses which rely on openable windows for ventilation. Other uses that did not rely on openable windows for ventilation, such as hotels and offices, were excluded in the NIA.

5.19 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** said that it would be hard for the Task Force to render support without the full picture.

5.20 **Mr Ivan HO** urged the project team to provide a comprehensive plan, detailing the noise impact and the mitigation measures on all areas along the former runway. He pointed out that the noise criteria were misleading and queried whether road traffic noise had been taken into account. He said that it was undesirable to shove the noise problem to developers, otherwise residents in Kai Tak might risk living in an enclosed area without any openable windows.

5.21 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** further raised the following comments:

- (a) to his original understanding, the proposed Division would be an alternate site for GFS providing emergency services under poor weather conditions. However, he now learnt that the site would be permanent and co-located with cross-boundary commercial heliport, where part of the service provided in the current base at Chek Lap Kok would be relocated to Kai Tak. He urged the project team to clarify the purpose of establishing the Division and the ancillary facilities required for both emergency and commercial services;
- (b) he suggested that the area at the end of Wan Po Road, Tseung Kwan O had development potentials for the proposed Division; and
- (c) he opined that it was unsustainable to relocate the GFS base from Chek Lap Kok to Kai Tak.

5.22 **Ms Joyce LAU** responded that the project team would provide more details at the next meeting and clarified that the Kai Tak Division would not replace the current headquarters in Chek Lap Kok. Under the preliminary layout plan of the proposed Division, sufficient space would be reserved for future commercial heliport, including a designated parking pad, refuelling facilities, etc.

5.23 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** asked whether the potential operators of the commercial heliport were consulted on the preliminary layout plan.

5.24 **Mr Steven PANG** responded that CAD had reached out to the potential operators and the proposed design of the GFS Division. has

taken into account the operational need of the future commercial operator(s) .

5.25 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** thanked Members for their comments and the responses from project team. He reminded the project team to provide the required information in the coming meeting.

Item 6 Feasibility Study on Cycle Track Network in Kai Tak Development (Paper No. TFKT/15/2017)

6.1 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** passed the chairmanship back to Mr. Vincent NG.

6.2 **The Chair** informed Members that the CEDD and LCSD had submitted a paper (TFKT/15/2017) to brief Members on the recommendations of the feasibility study on the cycle track network in KTD. He welcomed **Mr Harry MA**, **Ms Kei PONG** and **Mr Keith CHU** from KTO; Mr Michael CHIU and Ms LAI Mei-ling from LCSD as well as **Mr Jeffrey CHAN** from the consultant to the meeting.

6.3 **Ms Kei PONG** introduced the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

6.4 **Mr Ivan HO** showed his support to the project and further raised the following comments:

- (a) he appreciated the promotion of a sharing culture in open space through this project;
- (b) he enquired whether trees would be planted along the “GreenWay” to provide more sheltered areas;

- (c) he asked the project team to elaborate on how the cycle track would be connected at both sides of KTTS; and
- (d) he said that innovative ways could be considered to carry the bicycles across the KTTS, such as the use of sanpans.

6.5 **Mr Tony TSE** said that sharing and fully-utilising the limited land resources was worthy of support and he agreed that the pilot scheme should be implemented with a step-by-step approach. Given that “shared-use” was a new concept in Hong Kong, he advised the project team to make reference to various overseas examples and anticipate possible problems. He was also concerned about the safety of both pedestrians and cyclists and opined that public education would be required.

6.6 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** also supported the project and further raised the following comments:

- (a) he enquired about the number of bicycle parking lots provided for cyclists living in KTD;
- (b) literally, “GreenWay” should refer to a wide track surrounded by green areas where pedestrians and cyclists could both share. He said that the proposed “GreenWay” in KTD would indeed give pedestrians priority over cyclists and suggested that this term should not be used. He further advised the project team to make reference to the parks in London, where the incorporation of cycle tracks into pedestrian walkways was well-planned;
- (c) given the increasing number of cyclists in KTD, he urged the project team to adopt a more holistic approach in planning the cycling routes, origins and destinations, parking and other ancillary facilities within KTD; and

- (d) he opined that allowing cycling through parks would further enhance the connectivity within KTD.

6.7 **Prof TANG Bo-sin** said that he supported the extension of cycle track network. Other than serving for leisure and recreational purpose, he opined that the cycle tracks could also allow short-distance commuting for residents in KTD. He mentioned that the cycling network was scattered and advised CEDD to utilise the unused space in residential area to create a more connected network.

6.8 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** concurred with Prof TANG and commented that the intended use of the cycle tracks should not be just for leisure and recreation, but also short-distance commuting within KTD.

6.9 **The Chair** thanked Members' comments and invited the project team to provide initial response. He said that this topic had been discussed for many times, especially on whether cycling was one of the transport solutions. He supported the proposed pilot scheme in Kwun Tong Promenade and concurred with Mr TSE's comments on making reference to overseas examples. He further opined that Hong Kong people should be open-minded and be more tolerant to shared-use of public space.

6.10 **Mr Harry MA** clarified that the cycle track network was positioned for leisure and recreational uses, connecting major scenic spots and most development sites within KTD, and the proposed cycle tracks would not induce great impacts on the surrounding open space. He understood that some residents might utilise the future cycle tracks for short-distance journeys in KTD. Speaking of the shared-use of footway and cycle path under the pilot scheme, he mentioned that only necessary

restrictions would be laid down and that the scheme could be fine-tuned according to public response.

6.11 **The Chair** commended the Government for taking a step forward in promoting the shared-use of footway and cycle path. He concluded that Members supported the proposed pilot scheme which could enhance the vibrancy of Harbour. Concerning the safety of both pedestrians and cyclists, he said that sufficient amount of notice boards and signage had to be put up.

Item 7 Planning and Engineering Study on Kwun Tong Action Area - Preliminary Outline Development Plan (Paper No. TFKT/17/2017)

7.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO) had submitted a paper (TFKT/17/2017) to seek Members' views on the Preliminary Outline Development Plan (PODP) for the Kwun Tong Action Area (KTAA) and the water body co-use proposals formulated under the study. He welcomed **Ms Brenda AU**, **Mr Frank WONG** and **Ms Margaret CHAN** from EKEO; and **Ms Pearl HUI**, **Mr Carol HUI** and **Mr Simon LEE** from the consultant to the meeting.

7.2 **Ms Margaret CHAN** introduced the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

7.3 **Mr Freddie HAI** raised the following comments:

- (a) apart from the proposed use of the Cooked Food Market (CFM), he could not see any other differences between the

two conceptual options. He requested the project team to elaborate on the differences with regard to the concept, town planning principles and site improvement;

- (b) he observed that a number of pedestrian footbridges were proposed to be provided in KTAA. He enquired whether the number of footbridges could be reduced so that a more extensive at-grade pedestrian network could be developed to promote walkability;
- (c) he asked whether the project team had liaised with the Transport Department (TD) on reducing the size of Kwun Tong Ferry Pier Public Transport Interchange (PTI), given that it was close to MTR Kwun Tong station; and
- (d) he suggested the project team to consider constructing a footbridge across Tsui Ping River to connect Kwun Tong and Cha Kwo Ling waterfront.

7.4 **Prof TANG Bo-sin** observed that podium parks would be provided under both options. He opined that podium development might not be welcomed and Option 2 would be more desirable with the provision of at-grade food and beverage (F&B) facilities that could serve the public..

7.5 **Mr Tony TSE** said that KTAA should also cover the existing piers and asked the project team to elaborate on how the rooftops of the piers could be made use of. He further enquired how to ensure that the private commercial projects would be delivered on time.

7.6 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that the study showed a great progress and made the following comments:

- (a) he opined that it was necessary to provide at-grade F&B facilities given that the PTI and the existing piers were situated at ground level;
- (b) he suggested that the police moorings in KTTS should be moved from the proposed recreational water area near the runway to the demarcated area in KTTS for mooring of non-pleasure vessels (non-PVs);
- (c) he understood that there was a need to make allowance for working vessels to serve the godowns fronting KTTS , however, he objected to the exclusion of PVs in the designated area in KTTS;
- (d) he considered that more vessels could be moored in KTTS if they were more densely packed; and
- (e) he further suggested that part of the passageway in KTTS could also be used for water sports events to allow more flexibility.

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

- (a) he complimented that the study showed a marked improvement, with the adoption of urban design approach and other planning principles;
- (b) he opined that the planning proposals could better reflect the planning concept of shared-use;
- (c) he advised the project team to clearly position the intended cultural and creative industries (CCI) uses in the proposal;
- (d) he commented that the connectivity of the site to the

adjoining areas was unsatisfactory and urged for further improvement ;

- (e) he suggested that the PODP should be planned strategically, such as considering the connectivity between the green areas and POSs in KTAA with those in the adjoining areas; and
- (f) he opined that it was illogical to provide parking spaces only according to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. He observed that parking spaces in the area were not enough and illegal parking was a problem. He urged for comprehensive planning of parking space provision to meet the increasing demand.

7.8 **The Chair** said that the proposed location of PTI would adversely affect public enjoyment of the harbourfront. He commented that from an architectural perspective, the configuration of the two building towers under Option 2 would be more desirable since there would be less view obstruction and a more efficient use of space.

7.9 **Ms Brenda AU** responded to Members' comments as follows:

- (a) the purpose of the study was to formulate a PODP for KTAA, and the two conceptual options were merely for illustrating different possible spatial layouts. The consultants would further elaborate on the differences between the two options with regard to the arrangement of the dangerous goods vehicle (DGV) queueing area, CFM and CCI;
- (b) other than at-grade pedestrian walkways, elevated footbridges would also be provided to connect the KTAA with Wai Yip Street and Hoi Yuen Road;

- (c) she concurred with the Chair's comment on the PTI. She added that the existing PTI was sub-standard and the size of the proposed PTI would be about 20% larger to cater for longer bus bays. EKEO would continue to liaise with TD to explore the feasibility of detouring some bus routes and reduce the size of the proposed PTI;
- (d) footbridge across Tsui Ping River was planned, and no reclamation would be involved;
- (e) part of the POS would be reserved for providing at-grade F&B and retail facilities, and EKEO would look into the details at the next stage;
- (f) in response to Mr ZIMMERMAN's comments on the use of the water body, she pointed out that other than the proposed designated water area along Kwun Tong Promenade, the water area near the Runway Park was also proposed for water recreational and sports activities under the medium to long-term water body co-use proposals;
- (g) the conflicting use of KTTS between PVs and non-PVs was only serious during typhoon days, given that there would be a drastic increase in shelter-seeking non-PVs in KTTS. A specific area at the inner part of KTTS had thus been suggested for exclusive mooring of non-PVs. However, with the lower mooring demand of non-PVs during non-typhoon days, the reserved area could be shared with other water recreational activities. She added that the Kerry Godown and Kowloon Godown at Kai Hing Road were expected to undergo redevelopment and the developers would be required to provide a waterfront promenade;
- (h) she agreed with Mr HO's comments on connecting the green areas and POSs in KTAA to adjoining areas and reaffirmed

that a holistic view had always been taken at the planning stage; and

- (i) regarding Mr HO's question on the provision of parking space, she explained that there would be an addition of 100-130 public parking spaces for private cars , 65 for goods vehicles and 10 for coaches in KTAA. The loading and unloading areas could also be opened for public parking during night time. The provision of even more parking spaces might further increase the traffic load of the area. A Traffic Impact Assessment would be conducted for the proposed development at a later stage of the study.

7.10 **Ms Connie CHEUNG** asked whether swimming was feasible in KTTS and KTAC.

7.11 **Mr Freddie HAI** thanked Ms AU for her responses but expressed his frustration regarding the size of the proposed PTI. He observed that the usage of the existing PTI was low and it was unreasonable to further increase the size of PTI. He questioned why TD approved the increase in the length of new buses which took up more road area. He urged for giving better consideration to the water-land interface issue.

7.12 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** further made the following comments:

- (a) he opined that the facilities and the environment of the existing PTI were unacceptably poor and urged for enhancement in the proposed PTI;
- (b) he opined that the upgrading of the three existing piers and the construction of footbridge across Tsui Ping River should

tie in with this project;

- (c) he asked whether the reserved area for F&B facilities could be rezoned as “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”). Otherwise, only food kiosks would be provided by LCSD in the POS. Having restaurants on the harbourfront would promote public enjoyment; and
- (d) he commented that it was unfair to ban PVs from mooring in KTTS, given that the number of PVs had been increasing, in contrast to the decreasing number of non-PVs.

7.13 **Mr Tony TSE** requested the project team to follow-up on his question about the development of the rooftop of three piers.

7.14 **Mr Wilson PANG** responded to Members’ comments as follows:

- (a) he mentioned that the Government attached much importance to public transportation as around 30% to 40 % of Hong Kong people commuted by buses every day;
- (b) he clarified that the longer buses were safer, more environmentally-friendly and could accommodate more passengers. He said that the introduction of longer buses showed the continuous improvement of public transport; and
- (c) he explained that the public had to walk at least 500 m from MTR Kwun Tong Station to reach the waterfront area. It was necessary to keep the existing PTI to take care of the needs of passengers not travelling on MTR. He said that different modes of transport should be adopted to serve the

public and further elaborated on the positive relationship between transport and development.

7.15 **Ms Brenda AU** further responded to Members' comments as follows:

- (a) she shared Mr PANG's view about the need of bus services;
- (b) regarding the facilities provided in the existing PTI, she said that the project team would further liaise with TD on improving the PTI layout and the ancillary facilities without compromising public transport needs;
- (c) in response to Ms CHEUNG's question, she said that there had been progressive improvement of the water quality in KTTS which achieved an acceptable level for secondary contact, such as rowing and dragon boat racing. Swimming in KTTS was still not recommended;
- (d) in response to Mr ZIMMERMAN's suggestion on the "OU" zoning for at-grade F&B facilities, she said that his suggestion would be duly considered;
- (e) in response to Mr ZIMMERMAN's comment on mooring, she clarified that for temporary events in KTTS, coordination with the vessels would be carried out by the Marine Department for them to move away to cater for the events; and
- (f) she elaborated on the development plans of the three piers, namely Kwun Tong Public Pier, Kwun Tong Vehicular Ferry Pier and Kwun Tong Ferry Pier. There was plan to refurbish the first one while the Kwun Tong Vehicular Ferry Pier would need to maintain its operation. Part of the

Kwun Tong Ferry Pier was proposed for CCI uses under one of the options.

7.16 **The Chair** thanked Ms AU's for her positive responses and said that the KTAA would help taking forward the Harbour vision. He reiterated that the impact would be irreversible if the edge of the waterfront was hampered by the proposed enlarged PTI. He mentioned that it was important to balance the needs of different stakeholders on one hand and maintain the vibrancy of waterfront on the other. He concluded that the study displayed some good initiatives and Members raised comments on the design layout, at-grade facilities, connectivity of POSs and green spaces, etc. He advised the project team to take the comments into further consideration.

Item 8 Any other business

Date of next meeting

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

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

Secretariat

Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development

March 2018