

## Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development

### Minutes of Twenty-ninth Meeting

Date : 1 November 2017 (Wednesday)  
Time : 3:00 p.m.  
Venue : Conference Room (Room G46), Upper Ground Floor, Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre, Kowloon Park, Tsim Sha Tsui

#### Present

Mr Vincent NG Chairman

#### Organization Members

Mrs Margaret BROOKE Representing Business Environment Council  
Mr LEUNG Kong-yui Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong  
Mrs Karen BARRETTO Representing Friends of the Earth  
Mr Evans IU Po-lung Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects  
Sr Raymond CHAN Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors  
Mr Ivan HO Man-yiu Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design  
Ir Victor CHEUNG Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers  
Chi-kong  
Ms Elsa MAN Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong  
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour  
Mr Ken SO Kwok-yin Representing the Conservancy Association

Individual Members

Mr Hans Joachim ISLER Individual Member  
Mr Tony TSE Wai-chuen Individual Member

Official Members

Ms Doris HO Deputy Secretary (Planning & Lands)1, DEVB  
Ms Irene PANG Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)2, DEVB  
Miss Ellen CHENG Senior Manager (Tourism)41, Tourism Commission (TC)  
Mr Simon LAU Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon, Transport Department (TD)  
Mr Peter CHUI Chief Engineer (Kowloon)1, 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  
Ms Vivian LEE Individual Member  
Mr NGAN Man-yu Individual Member  
Mr Freddie HAI Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects  
Prof TANG Bo-sin Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners

In attendance

Miss Rosalind CHEUNG Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB  
Mr Larry CHU Assistant Secretary (Harbour)1, DEVB

For Item 2

Mrs Vicky TONG	Chief Leisure Manager (Recreation & Sports)1, HAB
Miss Lynn WONG	Senior Leisure Manager (Recreation & Sports)1, HAB
Mr Melvin BYRES	Operations Director/Mayo & Calder Limited
Ms Rebecca SOWDEN	Commercial Director/Mayo & Calder Limited
Mr TONG Shing	President/Hong Kong Sailing Federation

For Item 3

Ms Linda LAW	Principal Assistant Secretary (Recreation & Sports)2, HAB
Mr James BLAKE	Project Reviewer, HAB
Mr Keith MAN	Senior Engineer (Recreation & Sport), HAB
Ms Ivy LEE	Manging Director, Leigh & Orange Limited
Mr Dennis LEE	Associate, WSP

For Item 4

Mr Kevin LI	Senior Architect/12, ArchSD
Ms Helen WONG	Architect/102, ArchSD
Ms Cecilia SUEN	Project Manager/346, ArchSD
Mr GAO Yan	Design Consultant and Winner of the Design
Mr Michael CHIU	Chief Executive Officer (Planning)1, LCSD
Mr CHAN Tsz-fung	Senior Executive Officer (Planning)6, LCSD
Ms Brenda YEUNG	District Leisure Manager (Kowloon Ciry)m LCSD

For Item 5

Ms Joyce LAU	Chief Engineer/Special Tasks, 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 Johnny LEE	Senior Helicopter Operations Inspector, CAD
Mr Steven PANG	Acting Senior Safety Officer (Airport), CAD
Mr Jeffrey LO	Associate/Over Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited
Mr Tony LAM	Director/AGC Design Ltd

**The Chair** welcomed all to the 29<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development.

**The Chair** introduced and welcomed new Members to the Task Force. He informed Members that **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** has taken over from **Miss Christine AU** as the Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour) of the Development Bureau with effect from 27 October 2017. He welcomed **Miss CHEUNG** to the meeting and thanked **Miss AU** for her contribution to the Task Force.

**The Chair** announced that **Ms Irene PANG**, Chief Assistant Secretary (Works)<sup>3</sup> of Development Bureau, attended on behalf of Mr Victor CHAN. **Mr Simon LAU**, Chief Traffic Engineer of Transport Department (TD), attended on behalf of Mr Wilson PANG. **Mr Peter CHUI**, Chief Engineer of Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD), attended on behalf of Ms YING Fun-fong. **Miss Ellen CHENG**, Senior Manager of Tourism Commission (TC), attended on behalf of Mr George TSOI.

**The Chair** informed Members that the draft minutes of the 28<sup>th</sup> meeting would be confirmed at the 30<sup>th</sup> meeting.

## **Item 1      Matters Arising**

1.1            **The Chair** informed Members that an informal briefing session was held for both long-serving and new Members on 27 October 2017 where Kai Tak Office (KTO) of CEDD introduced the history and

latest developments of Kai Tak Development Area. Eight Members, including the Chair himself and seven non-official Members, attended.

1.2 **The Chair** said that the Terms of Reference (ToR) were discussed at the 29<sup>th</sup> Harbourfront Commission (HC) Meeting on 26 October 2017 and the HC Chair suggested further consulting Members on the HC ToR in due course.

1.3 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** supplemented that the Secretariat would circulate the HC ToR with proposed amendments to Members for comments. Once the HC ToR were finalised, the ToR of the respective Task Forces would be reviewed accordingly.

*(Post-meeting notes: With HC Chair's agreement, the suggested amendments to the HC ToR were circulated to Members for comments on 27 December 2017. The HC endorsed on 5 March the revised ToR.)*

1.4 **The Chair** concluded that the ToR for the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (KTTF) ToR could be discussed when the HC ToR were finalised. For the time being, the current ToR was still valid.

1.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that the Task Force should review its operating procedure of circulation and the communication flow between Members and the Secretariat. He suggested circulating correspondences issued on HC's behalf.

1.6 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** responded that for the incoming correspondences addressed to HC or Task Force Chairs, the Secretariat would pass them to respective Chairs or Members for necessary actions.

She reassured that the Secretariat would continue this practice and make sure that all relevant correspondences would be circulated as appropriate.

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

- (a) he recalled from the 28<sup>th</sup> KTTF meeting that the Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO) presented the medium and long-term co-use proposals of waterbody in Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter (KTTS) and that the designated area for the mooring of working vessels was on the western side of KTTS. However, the Marine Department (MD) mentioned at the 29<sup>th</sup> HC meeting that the designated area for working vessels was on the eastern side of KTTS. In this connection, he urged for clarification on the area designated for working vessels;
- (b) he counter-proposed that the working vessels could berth at To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelter where the utilization rate was low;
- (c) he said that a wide variety of water sports activities could be held in KTTS so as to enhance the vibrancy of the Harbour. He reiterated his opposition to any proposals that might exclude PVs from KTTS; and
- (d) he urged the Government to establish new objectives and implementation programs to achieve safe secondary contact of water in KTTS and Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC). Those objectives should be included in the Kai Tak Development (KTD) progress report.

1.8 **Mr Hans Joachim ISLER** opined that the decision on the berthing arrangement at typhoon shelters required coordinated efforts.

He also pointed out that only anchorage but not moorings were provided for PVs in sheltered waters.

1.9 **The Chair** thanked Members for their comments and added that the use of waterbody in the typhoon shelters had been discussed in previous meetings. He asked which department was responsible for managing and planning the use of waterbody in KTTS.

1.10 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** responded that MD was responsible for managing the typhoon shelters in Hong Kong. She assured Members that Harbour Unit would assist and co-ordinate with relevant bureaux and departments as appropriate and added that Members had raised similar comments on the co-use proposals of waterbody in KTTS at the 29<sup>th</sup> HC Meeting. The Secretariat would consolidate Members' views and convey them to MD and relevant departments for follow-up actions.

1.11 **Mr Ivan HO** observed that a number of project proponents did not have clear understanding on the Harbour Planning Principles & Guidelines (HPP&G) and efforts should be made to brief new Members and project proponents on HPP&G.

1.12 **The Chair** responded to Members as follows:

- (a) he said that there had been increasing attention on the use and activation of the waterbodies, such as Kai Tak Approach Channel. He would like to invite the relevant parties to brief the Task Force on the relevant issues in due course;
- (b) he also noted Mr HO's comments and supplemented that a total of eight principles were established by the former



Harbour-front Enhancement Committee in April 2006 and that the proponents would always be required to comply with HPP&G in their projects. He said that the Secretariat would further enhance Members and project proponents' understanding on HPP&G; and

- (c) he opined that a holistic view should be taken in the design and long-term planning of the waterbody in Kai Tak, while the collaboration of different departments was also crucial.

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

- (a) he requested the Transport Department (TD) to provide the expected trip rates for cycling within KTD; and
- (b) he was given to understand that bicycle parking would not be provided within the Hong Kong Children's Hospital (HKCH) and Kai Tak Sports Park (KTSP). He reiterated that a target trip rate is needed for other bureaux and departments to take reference from and provide bicycle facilities accordingly.

1.14 **The Chair** noted Mr ZIMMERMAN's comments and he recalled that Members were generally supportive of the cycle track study presented at the last KTTF Meeting. Though it was not easy to promote cycling culture in such a congested area as Hong Kong, he acknowledged the efforts of the Government in developing a cycle track network in KTD. He said that cycling was one of the transport solutions that required long-term planning and he further invited TD for response.

1.15 **Mr Simon LAU** responded that although the GreenWay was

primarily positioned for leisure and recreational use, as well as connecting the tourist attractions and residential areas within KTD, it could also serve as a transport alternative for short-distance commuting. TD would welcome the provision of bicycle parking facilities along the cycle track network.

1.16 **Mr Peter CHUI** said that under the current Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), part of the harbourfront areas were designated for cycle tracks. He explained that the proposed 13-kilometre cycle track network would be extended to the Metro Park and KTSP. He further added that CEDD had conducted a study on the cycle track network and associated facilities including bicycle parking in Kai Tak and would report to the Task Force if necessary.

1.17 **Mr KY LEUNG** raised the following comments:

- (a) he said that in order to further promote cycling as one of the transportation modes, the Government should increase the number of bicycle parking lots;
- (b) he mentioned that public transportation played an important role in our daily lives in the sense that over 90% of Hong Kong people relied on public transportation for commuting; and
- (c) he enquired whether there were any areas reserved for bicycle parking under the current design plans of HKCH and the New Acute Hospital (NAH).

1.18 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** reiterated that cycle tracks should not only be positioned for leisure use and that the cycling trip rates within Kai Tak should not be underestimated. He urged the Government to

plan thoroughly in realising the “shared-use” concept of footway and cycle path in the KTD.

**Item 2 Volvo Ocean Race - Hong Kong Stopover 2018  
(Paper No. TFKT/18/2017)**

2.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) and the event delivery partner, Mayo & Calder, once briefed Members on the Volvo Ocean Race - Hong Kong Stopover 2018 event at an informal briefing session in August 2017. They had taken into account Members’ comments and submitted a paper (TFKT/18/2017) to report their progress.

2.2 **The Chair** welcomed **Mrs Vicky TONG** and **Miss Lynn WONG** from HAB; **Mr Melvin BYRES** and **Ms Rebecca SOWDEN** from Mayo & Calder and **Mr TONG Shing** from Hong Kong Sailing Federation to the meeting.

2.3 **Mr Hans Joachim ISLER** declared that he was the member of the Board of Directors of Hong Kong Sailing Federation and Hong Kong Water Sports Council. **The Chair** advised that there was no conflict of interest.

2.4 **Mr Melvin BYRES** and **Ms Rebecca SOWDEN** briefed Members on the event with the aid of a PowerPoint.

2.5 **Ms Elsa MAN** declared that the corporate sponsor of one of the boats, Sun Hung Kai Properties, was a member of the Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong (REDA). **The Chair** advised that

there was no conflict of interest.

2.6 **Mr Hans Joachim ISLER** clarified that the corporate sponsor should be Sun Hung Kai Financial, not Sun Hung Kai Properties.

2.7 **Mr Ivan HO** opined that the event demonstrated how vibrancy could be brought to the Harbour while the two items to be discussed up next, namely the proposed establishment of Government Flying Service (GFS) Division at the ex-runway tip and the proposed temporary works areas for KTSP, would be the other way round.

2.8 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** supported the event and raised the following comments:

- (a) he suggested that the organiser should turn the pavilions, stage and other temporary structures to facing the Harbour;
- (b) he advised the organiser to enhance public participation and enjoyment of the race, such as through setting up viewing points along the Harbour; and
- (c) he recommended the organiser to make better use of ferries to ease the traffic during the event days.

2.9 **Mrs Karen BARRETTO** raised the following questions:

- (a) given that all structures for the event would be temporary in nature, she enquired about the expected amount of waste to be generated;
- (b) she asked for the number of cruises berthing at the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal (KTCT) during the event period; and
- (c) she further enquired about the bad weather arrangement,

which might direct all the boats to sail to the Guangzhou pit-stop.

2.10 **Miss Ellen CHENG** welcomed the event. Nevertheless, she reminded that more than 6,000 passengers would disembark if two large-scale cruises were to berth at the KTCT at the same time. She further expressed her concerns over the traffic impacts arisen thereof. She hoped that a comprehensive traffic management plan could be worked out between the organiser, the operator of KTCT and other departments.

2.11 **Mr Hans Joachim ISLER** suggested the organiser to engage young athletes so as to foster water sports development in the long run.

2.12 **Mr Melvin BYRES** responded to Members' comments as follows:

- (a) he thanked Mr ISLER's clarification and reaffirmed that the corporate sponsor should be Sun Hung Kai Financial;
- (b) in response to Mr ZIMMERMAN's enquiry about the facing direction of the structures, he explained that the Sailors' Terrace and the pavilions are both inward-facing so that public could face the Harbour and enjoy the prominent view;
- (c) for enhancing public participation and enjoyment, he responded that a big screen would be placed in the race village so that the public could watch the race on live. Moreover, some other viewing points would be set up along the Harbour;
- (d) he stated that the organisers had been conducting Traffic

Impact Assessments to formulate a better traffic and transportation plan. He agreed that ferries would be the best transportation mode with less disturbance to the neighbouring area and could lessen the burden on road traffic;

- (e) in response to Mrs BARRETTO's enquiries, he clarified that all temporary structures would be reused in the ten pit-stops around the world and the amount of waste generated would be kept to a minimum. He responded that the racing yachts would travel to Guangzhou using their motor engines but not sailing, whilst other equipment would travel to Guangzhou in containers by road and/or barge;
- (f) he explained that typhoons were not anticipated during the event period, but there might be chances of heavy rain. He said that the race would continue unless the weather condition was too adverse; and
- (g) he said that regular meetings were held with the operator of KTCT and that the organiser was familiar with the cruise schedule during the event period.

2.13 **Ms Rebecca SOWDEN** further responded to Members' comments as follows:

- (a) a countdown ceremony was held on 22 October to increase public participation in the event. She also encouraged the public to come to Kai Tak Runway Park and view all the boats departing from Hong Kong to Auckland on 7<sup>th</sup> February 2018; and
- (b) she replied that over 8,000 students had enrolled in related activities, such as the behind-the-scenes tour and the

drawing competition. The organiser had been working with several organisations, such as the Hong Kong Sailing Federation and the Hong Kong Water Sports Council, to engage more people.

*(Post-meeting notes: Over 12,500 students registered to attend the Volvo Ocean Race. The organiser also worked with Hong Kong Sailing Federation and the Hong Kong Water Sports Council to establish a "Hong Kong Sailing Plaza" at the Kai Tak Runway Park from 17 to 31 January 2018. The Plaza featured various sailing-related clubs and organisations across Hong Kong and included information displays along with small boats for visitors to experience.)*

2.14 **The Chair** thanked Members' comments and the positive response from the organiser. He concluded that Members welcomed and supported the event to be held in the Harbour.

2.15 **Mrs Vicky TONG** thanked Members' for their support and encouraged Members to pay a visit to the race village.

2.16 **Mr TONG Shing** appreciated the contributions from the Government and the organiser. He hoped that the event would further promote sailing in Hong Kong.

### **Item 3 Kai Tak Sports Park - Progress Updates & Proposed Temporary Works Areas (Paper No. TFKT/19/2017)**

3.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) had submitted a paper (TFKT/19/2017) to update Members on the

progress of KTSP and seek Members' views on the three proposed works areas with a total area of 3.8 ha.

3.2 **The Chair** welcomed **Ms Linda LAW**, **Mr James BLAKE** and **Mr Keith MAN** from HAB; as well as **Ms Ivy LEE** and **Mr Dennis LEE** from the consultant team to the meeting.

3.3 **Ms Linda LAW** and **Ms Ivy LEE** introduced the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

3.4 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** requested KTO of CEDD to update the list of temporary land use in KTD.

3.5 **Mr KY LEUNG** raised the following comments:

- (a) while he supported the KTSP project itself, he had reservations on the proposed temporary works areas along the former runway;
- (b) he stated that much of the valuable and limited harbourfront land had been occupied as temporary works areas for various infrastructure projects, such as the Central Kowloon Route (CKR) and the Shatin-to-Central Link (SCL). He was disappointed that the project proponents were reluctant to shared-use the barging facilities; and
- (c) he was doubtful of the necessity to set up a turf nursery along the harbourfront and requested the project team to explain further.

3.6 **Mr Tony TSE** concurred with **Mr LEUNG's** comments and further suggested to relocate the works areas to within the site boundary



of KTSP. Without further information and explanation, he saw no reasons for him to support the temporary land application.

3.7 **Mr Ivan HO** also showed his support to the KTSP project but raised the following comments:

- (a) he said that contractual implications should not be a reason for project proponents to refuse sharing the barging facilities. He further suggested that the Government should consider mandating the contractor to share the works areas when granting any Temporary Government Land Allocation (TGLA) applications in the future;
- (b) he echoed with Mr TSE's comments and questioned whether the existing works within the site boundary of KTSP could be reorganised to accommodate the turf nursery or the stockpiling area;
- (c) he opined that fencing off the turf nursery would adversely affect the vibrancy and public enjoyment of the harbourfront; and
- (d) he was unconvinced that the Task Force should support the application.

3.8 **Mrs Karen BARRETTO** asked why the proposed turf nursery (Site C) was distant from the KTSP and enquired about the future land use of the site.

3.9 **The Chair** said that a more holistic picture is needed in deliberating the temporary land use in Kai Tak and asked if KTO had coordinated the matter.

3.10 **Mr Peter CHUI** responded that KTO had the role to oversee the implementation of KTD, including the temporary land use in KTD, and that the Office had been liaising with the Lands Department (LandsD) and project proponents in processing TGLA applications. He further explained that it was their target to maximise the use of harbourfront land and release the land for public enjoyment as early as possible. He quoted the example of the ex-fire boat pier and said it was revamped and opened for public use.

3.11 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that the current information was not sufficient for the matter to be discussed. Specifically, he urged KTO to provide a map, a timeline and clear strategies of making harbourfront land available for public enjoyment as early as possible.

3.12 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** concurred with Members' comments and enquired about the impact on the harbourfront if the proposed sites were granted as temporary works areas. She opined that the proposed work areas adversely affected the connectivity of the harbourfront and that events similar to the Volvo Ocean Race might not be held during the construction.

3.13 **Ms Linda LAW** responded to Members' comments as follows:

- (a) she said that KTSP was the largest sports infrastructure project in Hong Kong, with the aim of further promoting sports development. According to the latest timetable, the Sports Park was expected to complete by 2022 to 2023 so as to respond to the call from community for more sports and recreational facilities. The temporary works areas were

necessary in order to facilitate and speed up the construction to meet the ambitious timetable;

- (b) she explained that the Kowloon City District Council had expressed grave concern over transportation of large amount of construction and demolition materials through the local road network. Setting up barging facilities to provide marine transport for these materials would effectively ease the pressure on road traffic and reduce nuisances to local residents;
- (c) she supplemented that Site A was currently used by MTRC as the barging facility for the construction of SCL until 2020;
- (d) she explained that apart from three main buildings, a large podium deck of the main stadium would be constructed at the southern part of the Sports Park, occupying much of the site. As such, there was limited space within project site for temporary works area;
- (e) she explained that it was technically infeasible to set up barging facility within the KTSP site, given that the water in To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelter near the site was too shallow and that there were ongoing works of the Central Kowloon Route; and
- (f) she said that the Site C was currently a fenced-off area with restricted public access. The proposed turf nursery would be a green area with improved management and would not affect any planned water-related events and activities.

3.14 **Ms Ivy LEE** further responded to Members' comments as follows:

- (a) she said that the KTSP was a complex project and explained

- that part of the KTSP site area was reserved for carpark and future hotel and office development. The space for temporary works areas was insufficient given that the site would interface with other infrastructure projects, such as the Environmentally-Friendly Linkage System (ELFS); and
- (b) she mentioned that it was challenging for the contractors to meet the tight construction schedule. If the proposed sites were granted as temporary works areas then the park could be completed in time and with lower construction cost to the public.

3.15 **Mr Dennis LEE** further responded that although the site area of KTSP was around 28 hectares, the existing structures and the ongoing infrastructure works, such as the area above the Kai Tak Tunnel and the proposed Neighbourhood Park, would limit the feasibility of setting up stockpiling and nursery facilities. He said that the proposed off-site works areas would not require dredging or any seawall modification, causing minimal impact on the existing seawall.

3.16 **Ms Linda LAW** supplemented that the Neighbourhood Park could not be used as temporary works areas as there would be plantation of shrubs and trees.

3.17 **Sr Raymond CHAN** said that Hong Kong people had waited 20 years for KTD to realise. He questioned why the contractor was asked to complete the KTSP project in a tight schedule of 56 months. He was of the view that tourists arriving from the KTCT would have a bad first impression on Hong Kong owing to the nuisance brought by works areas on the former runway.

3.18 **Mr Ivan HO** said that he fully understood the complexity of this project and echoed with Sr CHAN's comments on the tight construction schedule. He would not support this TGLA application if the only reason was to meet the target completion date of 2022-23.

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

- (a) he fully agreed that the barging facility was operationally necessary to the construction of KTSP;
- (b) he asked whether there were any alternative sites for the turf nursery and how it could integrate with the community;
- (c) he reiterated that KTO should review all the temporary land use in KTD to give Members a full picture. He could not support a separate TGLA application with mere piecemeal information; and
- (d) he suggested KTO to take lead in managing all the barging facilities in KTD and then subcontract to different project proponents to avoid conflicts.

3.20 **Mr Peter CHUI** supplemented that currently there were no public road connecting the subject temporary works areas. He added that Road D3 (Metro Park Section) was gazetted in September 2017 and its completion would tie in with projects nearby.

3.21 **The Chair** asked the project team whether the construction of KTSP would be put on hold if Members did not support the TGLA application at this meeting.

3.22 **Ms Linda LAW** responded that the timetable of KTSP would

definitely be delayed if the current application could not obtain Members' support. She further stated that the local residents and the Kowloon City District Councillors would be very disappointed if they were informed that a large amount of construction and demolition materials need to be transported by local road network because the KTTF did not support the setting up of the proposed barging facilities.

3.23 **The Chair** thanked Members' comments and the responses from project team. He raised the following comments:

- (a) he concluded that Members were all supportive of the KTSP project, but did not expect the proposed areas to be off-site and of such a large scale;
- (b) he said that Members' concerns and comments were in line with the HPP&G. Without sufficient information, Members could not evaluate the impact on the construction schedule if the application for temporary works areas was not supported;
- (c) specifically, he asked whether there were any alternative sites for the turf nursery;
- (d) he said that if the turf nursery was set up and fenced-off for 5 years, it would greatly affect the vibrancy and public enjoyment of the harbourfront; and
- (e) he advised KTO to review the temporary land use in KTD in the long run and consider the shared-use of barging facilities among the project proponents. He further advised the project team to brief Members on the revised proposal at a future meeting.

**Item 4 Lung Tsun Stone Bridge Preservation Corridor at Kai Tak  
(Paper No. TFKT/20/2017)**

4.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) had submitted a paper (TFKT/20/2017) to seek Members' views on the design of Lung Tsun Stone Bridge Preservation Corridor. He welcomed **Mr Kevin LI, Ms Helen WONG, Ms Cecilia SUEN** from ArchSD; **Mr Michael CHIU, Mr CHAN Tsz-fung** and **Ms Brenda YEUNG** from LCSD as well as **Mr GAO Yan** from the consultant to the meeting.

4.2 **Ms Helen WONG** introduced the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

4.3 **The Chair** said that undoubtedly all developments within the KTD should consult KTTF. Noting that the Lung Tsun Stone Bridge Preservation Corridor (LTSBPC) was distant from the harbourfront, he assumed that Members would not strongly oppose to the project and invited Members to comment.

4.4 **Mr Ivan HO** said that he was delighted about the ongoing progress of LTSBPC and further enquired about the project timetable.

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

- (a) without a three-dimensional model, he could not comment on the design and overall layout of the project;
- (b) he opined that the in-situ preservation of bridge remnants and the display of archaeological work could only attract tourists, but not the locals. He advised the project team to consider organising more events to integrate this attraction

into part of the community; and

- (c) he asked who would manage the LTSBPC and whether it would be opened all day.

4.6 **Mr Ivan HO** said that the current design has made reference to the winning entry of the “Design Ideas Competition for Preservation Corridor for Lung Tsun Stone Bridge Remnants” held in 2013 and the details of design had already been fully discussed by the jury panel of the competition. He opined that Members should focus on whether the project complied with the HPP&G.

4.7 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** clarified that he had no problem with the current design of LTSBPC but considered that more could be done to integrate this attraction into the local lives and the neighbourhood.

4.8 **Ms Helen WONG** responded to Mr HO’s enquiry about the project timetable that it was under review. Moreover, consultants would be engaged to assess and minimize the impact of construction on the bridge remnants.

4.9 **Ms Brenda YEUNG** responded that the main access roads at LTSBPC would be opened 24-hours. Besides, similar to other park facilities, LTSBPC would be managed by LCSD, like the existing arrangement of s the Kowloon Walled City Park.

4.10 **The Chair** thanked Members for the comments and advised the project team to take Members’ suggestions into consideration.



**Item 5 Proposed Establishment of Government Flying Service Kai Tak Division at Ex-Kai Tak Runway Tip**  
**(Paper No. TFKT/20/2017)**

*(Note: The Chair excused himself from the discussion to avoid conflict of interest. According to the established HC House Rules, Members present shall elect among themselves a Member to preside at the meeting. The Task Force agreed for Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN to take over the chairmanship for this item.)*

5.1 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** informed Members that the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) had submitted a paper (TFKT/21/2017) with more detailed information to address Members' concerns raised at the previous consultation. Prior to this meeting, an informal workshop cum site visit to the Government Flying Service (GFS) Headquarters was held on 23 October 2017. Ten non-official Members, including HC Chair, attended the workshop. He also informed Members that Sr Francis LAM Ka-fai, the alternate Member representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors, had written to the Commission to indicate his support to the project.

5.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** welcomed **Ms Joyce LAU**, **Mr Lewis LEUNG** and **Mr William YEUNG** from CEDD; **Mr West WU** and **Mr Victor LAU** from GFS; **Mr Johnny LEE** and **Mr Steven PANG** from CAD as well as **Mr Jeffrey LO** and **Mr Tony LAM** from the consultant to the meeting.

5.3 **Mr Lewis LEUNG**, **Mr West WU** and **Mr William YEUNG** briefed Members with the aid of a Powerpoint.

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

- (a) he acknowledged the contribution of GFS to society as well as the need to provide emergency rescue services. He had no problem with the proposed location, but the proposed Division should integrate with the community;
- (b) with the vision to enhance the vibrancy, accessibility and public enjoyment of the harbourfront in mind, he said that the current proposal did not fully comply with the HPP&G;
- (c) he opined that though the site was zoned "Other Uses" annotated "Heliport" and subject to height restrictions, he counter-proposed that the heliport could be located on the rooftop of the one-storey hangar so as to free up the space for ground level development; and
- (d) he stated that the latest Policy Address had pledged to use government land efficiently. He urged the Government to implement the model of "single site with multiple uses" and to achieve a win-win situation for GFS and the public.

5.5 **Mr Tom YIP** responded that the zoning control had been imposed since 2006, and that the planning intention was primarily for an at-grade cross-boundary heliport. He reiterated that there were operational, technical and safety considerations or constraints which needed to be taken into account by the proponent in the design but agreed that the proponent could further discuss with the Task Force on how public enjoyment could be enhanced.

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

- (a) he asked whether the proponent had discussed with any commercial operator on the co-location arrangement;

- (b) he questioned the commercial viability of operating a small-scale cross-boundary heliport at Kai Tak;
- (c) he asked the proponent to supplement on the arrangement of no-mooring zone and its impact on marine traffic; and
- (d) he said that a number of alternative sites were previously suggested by him and he was pleased to have received feedback from the proponent. He advised the proponent to share the information with Members.

5.7 **Mr Johnny LEE** quoted several overseas examples and said that it was a norm for heliports to be at-grade, while the ones at-height were usually for private use. He explained that landing on ground level would be a safer option in case of engine failure. He reiterated that the proposed site was operationally necessary and had fully met all the safety criteria. He was of the view that the site coverage of the concerned harbourfront area was small and that it would be a single-storey development; the Harbour view would not be blocked.

5.8 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** asked Mr LEE to clarify the definition of “at-grade”.

5.9 **Mr Johnny LEE** responded that “at-grade” referred to ground level.

5.10 **Mr West WU** stated that the proposed GFS Division was to support emergency rescue services and life-saving was always a top priority. The service provided by GFS was much different from the commercial ones, such as the Shun Tak cross-boundary heliport. If the heliport were to be placed at a higher level, it would be difficult for the crew to carry bulky life-saving equipment from the hangar onto the

helicopters and would thus undermine operational effectiveness.

5.11 **Mr Ivan HO** opined that should the helipad be elevated, ramps could be provided to facilitate vehicles in transferring patients or equipment.

5.12 **Mr West WU** further responded that it would be time-consuming to transfer the patients from the elevated helipad to the ambulances. Having the proposed heliport at-grade would minimize the operational difficulties so that the patients can receive emergency medical treatment promptly. He said that it would give rise to safety concerns and intrusive visual impact if the heliport site was elevated.

5.13 **Mr Lewis LEUNG** further supplemented that the rooftop of the hangar and office building was designed at +13.0mPD which observed the building height restriction stipulated in the Kai Tak OZP. If the heliport had to be elevated, the building height would have to be increased to some +18.0mPD which would block the view from the first floor of KTCT. He stated that an elevated heliport would inevitably be visually intrusive, given that a higher downwash wall would have to be built at the site boundary.

5.14 **Mr Steven PANG** responded that they had approached potential commercial operators and that they provided their feedbacks and requested for refuelling and passenger handling facilities. He explained that such facilities would be included in the co-located site as far as practicable.

5.15 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** further enquired about the number of helipads and the number of flights that would be operating in the proposed Division.

5.16 **Ir Victor CHEUNG** supported the site selection and raised the following comments:

- (a) he opined that constructing an at-grade heliport would be more cost-effective than an elevated one;
- (b) he asked, under the future co-location arrangement between GFS and commercial helicopters, to whom would priority be accorded to for taking-off and landings;
- (c) he advised the proponent to plan and reserve enough space for the future commercial operator; and
- (d) he expressed his concerns over safety as the refuelling facilities were close to KTCT and advised the proponent to tackle any safety issues.

5.17 **Sr Raymond CHAN** said that he understood the difficulty in site selection. He opined that the proposed heliport might not necessarily affect the vibrancy of the harbourfront as some people are interested to watch helicopters landing and taking-off. Under the current layout plan, he observed that the GFS facilities had already occupied a large part of the site area. He was worried that the prescribed land use under the OZP could not be fulfilled should land be insufficient for the future commercial heliport. He thus urged the proponent to reserve adequate space for the future developer.

5.18 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** agreed that the proposed GFS Division was essential to support the emergency rescue services. Given

that there were no better alternative sites, she would support GFS to take up the small site area wholly, rather than sharing it with commercial operators.

5.19 **Mr Ivan HO** further raised the following comments:

- (a) with reference to the Wan Chai North Heliport, he opined that only tourists would be excited about the landing and take-off of helicopters, but not the locals;
- (b) he reiterated that he did not object to the location and the proposed use of the site. He further urged the Government to integrate this facility into the community; and
- (c) he was disappointed by the response made by CEDD regarding elevating the heliport, while he complimented the Planning Department (PlanD) for their open and positive responses.

5.20 **Mrs Karen BARRETTO** said that Members were obliged to allow GFS to establish a division at the former runway tip in accordance with the approved OZP. She concurred with the comments made by Mr Francis LAM's that a public education centre would be a value-added facility which could bring interesting experiences to the visitors.

5.21 **Mr Evans IU** asked whether the proposed hangar would be compatible with the surrounding facilities, such as the KTCT.

5.22 **Ms Elsa MAN** supported the site location and further enquired about the feasibility of slightly setting back the site area from the seashore so as to prevent the waterfront promenade from discontinuing.

5.23 **Mr Ken SO** complimented that the proponent had presented a detailed site selection process and criteria to Members and that he agreed with the proposed site selection at the former runway tip. He also concurred with other Members that the establishment of the GFS Division was in conflict with the vibrancy of the Harbour and further advised the proponent to consider allowing public access to a certain extent. He also requested the proponent to further elaborate on the noise impact on the users of the Runway Park.

5.24 **Mr West WU** responded to Members' comments as follows:

- (a) he explained that with only one helipad in the site, there could only be one helicopter taking off or landing at one time;
- (b) he further said that GFS would coordinate all the ground movements, while air traffic control would control all air movements in and out of the heliport so as to maintain flight safety;
- (c) he added that GFS had discussed with the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) and CAD on the flight schedule and priority would be given to GFS's emergency flights but expected that any delay to commercial helicopter under the circumstances would be short;
- (d) he said that an office area had been reserved at the KTCT for future commercial helicopter operation ;
- (e) he elaborated that since the proposed heliport site was about 700m from the nearest Eastern Fairway, helicopters could achieve higher air draft and steer away from the vessels after taking-off; and
- (f) he said that if cruises were berthed at KTCT, the helicopters would choose a different approach or departure sector so as to

avoid over-flying cruise ships, or be diverted to other heliports, such as the Wan Chai Heliport or the Eastern Hospital heliport.

5.25 **Ms Joyce LAU** responded to Mr HO's comments that CEDD had considered the proposal of allowing public access to the future Division. However, the proposal was not taken forward due to safety and operational concerns. She said that the construction of ramps for an elevated heliport would occupy even more site area, taking up precious and limited harbourfront areas. She also stressed that there was an urgency to establish the Division in order to tie in with the first population intake target in Tung Chung New Town Extension in 2023.

5.26 **Mr West WU** further supplemented that the site area was too small to set up an education centre. Provided that there would be available resources and GFS's emergency services would not be affected, He suggested ongoing guided visits for relevant stakeholders akin to those at the GFS Headquarters in Chek Lap Kok so as to enhance public understanding on the operation and service delivery of GFS.

5.27 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** thanked Members for the comments and the response from the proponent. He concluded that Members supported the project in general as the site at the runway tip was the only suitable location. Nevertheless, he reminded the proponent to further deliberate on the co-location arrangement with the cross-boundary commercial heliport and consider measures to enhance public participation elements.



**Item 6      Any Other Business**

*Date of next meeting*

6.1            **The Chair** informed Members that the next meeting was tentatively scheduled for January 2018. The Secretariat would inform Members of the meeting date in due course.

6.2            There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6: 50pm.

**Secretariat**

**Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development**

**March 2018**