

Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development

Minutes of Thirtieth Meeting

Date : 29 March 2018 (Thursday)
Time : 2:30 p.m.
Venue : Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices, 333
Java Road, Hong Kong

Present

Mr Vincent NG Chairman

Organization Members

Mrs Margaret BROOKE Representing Business Environment Council
Mrs Karen BARRETTO Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Anthony CHEUNG Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Ms Connie CHEUNG Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape
Mei-ngor Architects
Sr Raymond CHAN Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr TAM Po-yiu Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Raymond CHAN Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Ken SO Kwok-yin Representing the Conservancy Association

Individual Members

Mr Derek SUN Co-opted Member

Official Members

Miss Rosalind CHEUNG Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Victor CHAN Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)2, DEVB
Miss Ellen CHENG Senior Manager (Tourism)41, Tourism Commission (TC)

Mr LEE Chi-shing	Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon, Transport Department (TD)
Mr Anthony LO	Head/Kai Tak Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mrs Doris FOK	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) ¹ , Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Mr Tom YIP	District Planning Officer/Kowloon, Planning Department (PlanD)
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 Tony TSE Wai-chuen	Individual Member
Prof Wallace CHANG	Co-opted Member
Mr HE Hua-han	Co-opted Member
Mr LEUNG Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Prof TANG Bo-sin	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr Terence LEE	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour

For Item 3

Mr TK YEUNG	Commissioner for Sports, HAB
Ms Linda LAW	Principal Assistant Secretary (Recreation & Sports)2, HAB
Mr Victor TAI	Project Director (Sports Park), HAB
Mr Keith MAN	Senior Engineer (Recreation & Sport), HAB
Ms Ivy LEE	Manging Director, Leigh & Orange Limited
Mr Dennis LEE	Senior Associate, WSP

For Item 4

Mr Peter CHUI	Chief Engineer/E3, CEDD
Mr Ronald SIU	Senior Engineer/8, CEDD
Mr Billy TAM	Director, Thomas Chow Architects Ltd
Ms Peggy SETO	Associate, Thomas Chow Architects Ltd
Mr Benson POON	Town Planner (on behalf of Hong Kong Water Sports Council)
Ms Kitty TANG	Project Officer, Designing Hong Kong

For Item 5

Ms Pauline LAM	Director, Kenneth To & Associates Ltd
Ms Kitty WONG	Senior Town Planner, Kenneth To & Associates Ltd
Ms Anita AU	Senior Associate, Ronald Lu and Partners (HK) Ltd
Mr Simon HO	Architect, Ronald Lu and Partners (HK) Ltd
Ms Belinda NG	Director, Peterson Properties Company Ltd

The Chair welcomed all to the 30th meeting of the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (KTTF).

The Chair informed Members that **Mr Anthony LO** has taken over from **Ms YING Fun-fong** as Head of Kai Tak Office (KTO) with effect from 1 December 2017. He welcomed **Mr LO** and thanked **Ms YING** for her contribution to the Task Force. **The Chair** also welcomed **Mr Derek SUN**, the Head, Planning & Development of West Kowloon Cultural District Authority, as the co-opt Member of the Task Force.

The Chair announced that **Ms Rosalind CHEUNG**, Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour) of Development Bureau, attended on behalf of Ms Doris HO. **Mr Victor CHAN**, Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)2 of Development Bureau, attended on behalf of Mr Vincent MAK. **Mr LEE Chi-shing**, Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon of Transport Department (TD), attended on behalf of Mr Peter WONG. **Miss Ellen CHENG**, Senior Manager of Tourism Commission (TC), attended on behalf of Mr George TSOI.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the last Meeting

1.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the draft minutes of both 28th and 29th KTTF meeting were circulated to Members for comments on 15 March 2018 and no comments were received. The finalised minutes were further circulated to Members on 26 March 2018.

1.2 There being no further comments received from Members, the minutes of the 28th and 29th meeting were confirmed.

Item 2 Matters Arising

Terms of Reference (ToR)

2.1 **The Chair** said that the revised Terms of Reference (ToR) were endorsed at the 30th Harbourfront Commission (HC) Meeting on 5 March 2018. Some corresponding amendments were proposed for the ToR of respective Task Forces and he invited **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** for further explanation.

2.2 Upon the Chair's invitation, **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** briefed Members on the proposed amendments to the ToR of the Task Force which had been tabled for Members' reference.

2.3 **The Chair** suggested and Members agreed to confirm the revised ToR of KTTF.

Progress Report on Kai Tak Development (KTD) (Paper No. TFKT/02/2018)

2.4 At the Chair's invitation, **Mr Anthony LO** introduced the paper.

2.5 In response to **the Chair's** enquiry on the progress of KTO in coordinating the use of barging facilities in KTD, **Mr Anthony LO** presented a layout plan showing the location and size of temporary barging facilities in the former runway and Cha Kwo Ling (CKL).

2.6 **The Chair** raised the following comments:

- (a) the shared-use of barging facilities was discussed at the last HC meeting. He stated that vacant harbourfront sites pending long-term development were often occupied as temporary works areas or carparks, which were not in line with the Harbour Planning Principles & Guidelines (HPP&Gs);
- (b) he understood the need for temporary works areas to facilitate the many infrastructure projects in KTD. Nonetheless, KTO should take the initiative to coordinate the shared-use of barging facilities among different project proponents for them to share the barging facilities as far as possible; and
- (c) he opined that the permanent uses could never be realised if the harbourfront sites were occupied as temporary works areas in a prolonged manner.

2.7 **Ir Raymond CHAN** enquired about the progress of the Kwun Tong Transportation Link (KTTL).

2.8 **Ms Connie CHEUNG** raised the following comments:

- (a) overall planning of open spaces was important but the design of KTD open spaces had not been studied in a holistic manner. She asked how KTO would ensure that the open spaces would be developed as a single entity; and
- (b) she asked how pedestrians could walk from the northern promenade along the runway to the southern one.

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

- (a) he concurred with the proposed shared-use of barging facilities; and
- (b) he opined that the impacts brought by different infrastructure projects on the harbourfront were not clearly stated in the progress report. He further asked for elaboration on how the construction of the Central Kowloon Route (CKR) would affect the harbourfront.

2.10 **Mr Ken SO** asked whether there were any standard guidelines to ensure a coherent design of open spaces developed under the approach of Public Open Space in Private Development (POSPD).

2.11 In response to Mr SO, **the Chair** said that KTO would brief Members on the findings of the Study on Kai Tak Promenade Design Control and Guidelines under agenda item 4 of the meeting.

2.12 **Mr Anthony LO** responded to Members' comments as follows:

- (a) the delivery of KTTL would tie in with the proposed Environmentally Friendly Linkage System (EFLS). KTO would update Members when the relevant consultancy study on EFLS was completed later this year;
- (b) in response to Ms CHEUNG's enquiry about the pedestrian linkage in the former runway area, he responded that a three-dimensional pedestrian network with both at-grade and elevated pedestrian facilities would be provided. He added that the proposed 13-km long cycling track would

- further connect all the key attractions within KTD;
- (c) in response to Mr TAM's enquiries, he responded that the construction of CKR involved two phases of reclamation, which mainly took place near the Kowloon City Ferry Pier and To Kwa Wan. He supplemented that at-grade roads would be constructed in the south apron and former runway area before reaching the underwater tunnel between KTD and Ma Tau Kok; and
 - (d) he said that the Design Control and Guidelines for Kai Tak Promenades to be presented later in the meeting would also be incorporated into the land lease.

2.13 **Ms Connie CHEUNG** further raised the following comments:

- (a) she opined that merely incorporating the Kai Tak Public Creatives into the design of different open spaces was not sufficient. She urged for an overall master plan to ensure a coherent design;
- (b) she would like to know the design of the three-dimensional pedestrian network in Kai Tak;
- (c) she asked whether cyclists could make use of the proposed three-dimensional pedestrian network. She further said that if space allow , bicycle parking facilities and intermittent emergency access should be provided along the cycle track; and
- (d) she regarded the proposed music fountains at Kwun Tong Promenade as passive recreational facilities and preferred better utilisation of the existing waterbody.

2.14 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** raised the following comments:

- (a) he said that the planning and overall vision of KTD was unclear. He shared the successful example of Singapore Marina Bay and advised the Government to take reference from it; and
- (b) he enquired about the positioning of the Metro Park and the Kai Tak Sports Park (KTSP). Knowing that the KTSP was positioned for hosting mega sports events, he suggested upgrading the hardware facilities of the adjacent Metro Park for hosting international events;

2.15 **Mr Anthony LO** further responded to Members' comments as follows:

- (a) the planning concepts and principles for individual open space sites had been set out in the explanatory statement of the Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP);
- (b) EVAs would be provided to connect the cycle tracks on both sides of the former runway to public road or pedestrian streets so that emergency rescue duties could be performed;
- (c) the proposed pilot scheme on shared-use of footway and cycle track in Kwun Tong Promenade would commence in mid-2018., CEDD and LCSD would build on the findings of the pilot project to further explore the feasibility of providing bike rental facilities along the cycle track; and
- (d) in response to Mr CHEUNG's comments on the planning vision of KTD, he clarified that KTO had been liaising with various departments (i.e. PlanD, LCSD and the Architectural Services Department) to ensure that the theme and design of

all open space projects were in line with the planning principles set out in the Kai Tak OZP.

2.16 **Mr Tom YIP** responded to Members' comments as follows:

- (a) the Kai Tak OZP was formulated after three stages of Public Engagement Programme and several rounds of consultation. KTD was proposed to be developed as the "Heritage, Green, Sports and Tourism Hub" of Hong Kong and the series of sub-districts within Kai Tak would be linked up by its definitive open space system;
- (b) the functionality of each open space project was different. For instance, the Metro Park was positioned as a regional park serving the territorial population, while the Station Square would serve as the gateway to the Kai Tak City Centre ; and
- (c) given that KTD covered an area of 320 hectares, the open space projects would be completed in phases. When these projects were being taken forward, PlanD would ensure that the planning principles and urban design considerations set out in the Kai Tak OZP would be followed.

2.17 **Ms Connie CHEUNG** acknowledged the contributions of KTO but further raised the following comments:

- (a) the OZP could only provide general planning guidelines and parameters, but not an overall master design. She further asked KTO whether there would be any integrated planning in KTD in terms of urban design and landscape master planning;

- (b) even if all the planning guidelines were fulfilled, the design of the open spaces might not be necessarily good; and
- (c) “Metropolitan Kai Tak” itself could already serve as a theme and asked once again why individual open spaces in KTD were divided in smaller spaces and themed.

2.18 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** concurred with Ms CHEUNG’s comments. He further raised the following comments:

- (a) the Government should take more proactive action other than merely fulfilling the planning guidelines in the Kai Tak OZP;
- (b) the vision and positioning of the Metro Park and Station Square were still unclear. The two open space projects should not only target at locals, but also overseas tourists; and
- (c) the Task Force should closely monitor the progress and how these open space projects could effectively enhance the vibrancy and public enjoyment of the harbourfront.

2.19 **The Chair** thanked Members for their comments and responded as follows:

- (a) the Station Square project had been discussed at the 25th KTTF held in February 2017 and that the Task Force had been constantly monitoring all the KTD projects since its establishment;
- (b) Members had always upheld the vision and mission of HC, ensuring every project to be complied with the HPP&Gs;

and

- (c) KTD covered an area of over 320 hectares and was a mega-size and highly complex development project. Many projects were under construction, planning or design with ever-changing updates. Members would always be welcomed to raise comments so that in-depth discussion on specific topics could be facilitated afterwards.

2.20 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** advised KTO to include in the progress report the artist impressions of the Government, Institution and Community facilities in Kai Tak for easier understanding.

2.21 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** appreciated the efforts of the Government and raised the following comments:

- (a) it would be necessary to review the existing implementation mechanism to meet the long-term vision of HC as well as the increasing public aspiration for a vibrant harbourfront; and
- (b) due to some latest changes in the land uses within KTD, he opined that the current Kai Tak OZP was outdated.

2.22 **Ms Connie CHEUNG** noted that KTO and various departments had made strenuous effort in planning and developing all the projects in KTD. She further raised the following comments:

- (a) she urged the Government to develop the whole of Kai Tak open space network into an internationally renowned open space, the “Metropolitan Kai Tak”;
- (b) she said that proper implementation of open space projects

would be crucial to making the best out of valuable harbourfront sites; and

- (c) she understood that it took time to review the overall planning in KTD and hoped that workshops could be organised to gauge Members' views as necessary.

2.23 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** further raised the following comments:

- (a) other than hardware facilities, he advised the Government to consider the "software" aspect by organising more complimentary events in the Metro Park, such as country music or Chinese music concerts; and
- (b) he opined that the existing implementation mechanism was flawed as some planned facilities could not be delivered. He reiterated that the design control and guidelines could be included into the land lease.

Item 3 Kai Tak Sports Park - Proposed Temporary Works Areas (Paper No. TFKT/03/2018)

3.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) had submitted a paper (TFKT/03/2018) on the subject with more detailed information to address Members' concerns raised at the previous meeting.

3.2 **The Chair** welcomed **Mr TK YEUNG**, **Ms Linda LAW**, **Mr Victor TAI** 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 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** and **Ir Raymond CHAN** declared their interests. **The Chair** decided that their involvements were indirect and both of them could remain in the meeting.

3.4 **Mr TK YEUNG** and **Ms Ivy LEE** introduced the paper with the aid of PowerPoint.

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

- (a) in assessing whether green light should be given to the proposal, the Task Force should weigh between the possible delay in delivering the Dining Cove in case the barging facility is not granted, and the possible impact to the vicinity or compromise in accessibility in case the facility is allowed. He opined that the Task Force should opt for the lesser of the two evils; and
- (b) he said that the CKR alignment seemed to have stood in the way of the KTSP and invited KTO to clarify the coordination between the two projects.

3.6 **Mr Anthony LO** responded that the KTTF had been consulted on the CKR alignment before its gazettal. The CKR alignment and KTSP location had not been changed so far.

3.7 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** said that KTO should be more proactive in addressing the interfacing issues between CKR and KTSP.

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

- (a) at the informal session held on 7 March 2018, the project team presented the revised proposal in which the proposed turf nursery had been given up and agreement had been secured for the shared-use of barging points amongst projects in the vicinity. It was also noted that KTO would further coordinate the use of barging facilities along the former runway; and
- (b) without further comments from Members, he concluded that Members generally had no objection towards the revised proposal.

3.9 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** reiterated his enquiries of the Dining Cove.

3.10 **Mr TK YEUNG** clarified that the delivery timetable for both the Dining Cove and the KTSP would be largely affected without the temporary barging facility.

3.11 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** further asked whether the materials could be carried to the waterfront by overhead conveyors belts on viaducts so that the storage needs not occupy a waterfront site, or dividing the works into phases would be possible ways-out to resolve the interfacing issues of CKR and KTSP.

3.12 **Mr Anthony LO** supplemented that the concerned section of CKR in Kai Tak would be underwater and could not be matched with viaducts.

3.13 **The Chair** further raised the following comments:

- (a) given that there were various barging activities happening in the vicinity, even if the Task Force do not allow the use of the subject site as barging facility, the site could not be made available for public use. Instead, it would be more practical to allow the project proponent to barge at the subject site and expedite the project completion for early public enjoyment of the harbourfront;
- (b) KTO should closely monitor and coordinate the shared-use of barging facilities amongst projects in the vicinity; and
- (c) he concluded again that Members generally had no objection towards the proposed temporary barging facility for the KTSP project.

Item 4 Study of Kai Tak Promenade Design Control and Guidelines - Conceptual Design Scheme for Promenade at Runway Precinct and Promenade adjoining Road D3 (Metro Park Section) (Paper No. TFKT/04/2018)

4.1 **The Chair** informed Members that CEDD had submitted a paper (TFKT/04/2018) to brief Members on the findings of the Study on Kai Tak Promenade Design Control and Guidelines and the conceptual design scheme for two significant promenade sections at runway precinct and adjoining Road D3 respectively. He welcomed **Mr Anthony LO**, **Mr Peter CHUI** and **Mr Ronald SIU** from CEDD; as well as **Mr Billy TAM** and **Ms Peggy SETO** from the consultant team to the meeting.

4.2 **Mr Peter CHUI** and **Ms Peggy SETO** introduced the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

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

- (a) he appreciated that the proposed promenade design could further promote the water-friendly culture. For the promenade adjoining Road D3 (Metro Park Section), he suggested that its landscape design should be compatible with that of Kai Tak Nullah;
- (b) he asked for more details regarding the “Floating Theatre”;
- (c) he hoped that more Smart City Initiatives could be incorporated into the design of promenade;
- (d) he suggested the Government to increase the greening and education elements in the promenade design;
- (e) he supported the proposed commercial development along the South Apron. In order to enhance visitor flow and attract more business, he advised the Government to improve the connectivity between KTD and Kowloon East, such as providing more franchised Green Minibus (GMB) routes; and
- (f) regarding the POSPD, he said that the design control and guidelines should be incorporated into the lease conditions to ensure that the proposals could be realised.

4.4 **Mr Derek SUN** raised the following comments:

- (a) he was pleased to see that the Government would conduct modification works on the slanted seawall facing the Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC);
- (b) he understood that the wave conditions in the Victoria Harbour were unfavourable for large-scale seawall modification but enquired if the seawall near the proposed

nodal points could be slightly modified to create more spaces for development;

- (c) he enquired whether the proposed “Floating Theatre” would be built on water or on the seawall;
- (d) he said that the proposed community base camp would be an important nodal point and would contribute to the branding of KTD; and
- (e) he is concerned about the ability to attract and retain patronage in the retail outlets along the promenade and advised the Government to draw reference from the Tseung Kwan O promenade.

4.5 **Mr Ken SO** raised the following comments:

- (a) regarding POSPD, he asked whether flexibility in designing the promenade would be allowed under the suggested design control and guidelines; and
- (b) given that a large number of structural trees would be planted along the promenade, he reminded the Government to provide sufficient underground space for the roots so that the trees could survive.

4.6 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** raised the following comments:

- (a) he suggested allowing the public to touch the water so as to promote water-friendly culture;
- (b) other than the kiosks fronting the two hotel sites in the southern promenade, he hoped that the Government could keep the original plan of allowing retail activities on the ground level of residential sites as well;

- (c) he suggested including more indoor and outdoor amenity facilities along the promenade for public use, such as wedding chapel or community hall;
- (d) he appreciated the provision of viewing steps and further suggested incorporating the stepped-height design into the promenade so that the pedestrian flow would not be obstructed when hosting large-scale events;
- (e) he said that larger nodal spaces should be provided to host more international events and enhance the vibrancy of the harbourfront;
- (f) food and beverage (F&B) facilities were insufficient at the head of KTAC and suggested more provision;
- (g) given its prime location, he expected to see more impressive design along the promenade and he welcomed the meandering alignment of the Greenway; and
- (h) he enquired if the proposed design control and guidelines would be incorporated in the future land leases. He further advised the Government to manage the transitional areas between the nodes by displaying interactive information boards and providing photo spots.

4.7 **Sr Raymond CHAN** raised the following comments:

- (a) he asked whether the private developers would be required to maintain and manage the public open spaces;
- (b) he acknowledged that Kai Tak would be a future focal point of Hong Kong and that its design and facilities should be distinctive. A proper balance should be struck between attracting more visitors and protecting the interests of the future residents;

- (c) he enquired whether any all-water pedestrian walkways would be constructed; and
- (d) he worried that the private developers would prohibit non-residents to have direct access to enjoy the public open spaces.

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

- (a) he asked for further elaboration on the approval mechanism of the POS design and how it would be translated into land lease conditions; and
- (b) he was worried that if the HC was excluded from the approval mechanism, then the developer might not give due consideration to HPP&Gs. He was also worried that some developers might be reluctant to consult the HC on the POS design.

4.9 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** responded that while the private developers would be required to design and construct the part of promenade, the management and maintenance responsibilities of the POS would rest with the Government. The private developers would be required to submit a landscape master plan for the approval by Government departments and be invited to consult the HC and the District Council.

4.10 **Mr Peter CHUI** responded to Members as follows:

- (a) in response to Mr TAM's enquiries, he said that educational elements and Smart City Initiatives would be considered

- along the implementation process;
- (b) he reiterated that the developer would be required by lease conditions to submit a landscape master plan for approval;
 - (c) due to wind and wave conditions, he said that there were no plans to modify the seawall fronting the Victoria Harbour;
 - (d) he noted Mr SUN's suggestion of attracting more visitors and said that KTO would take reference from the Tseung Kwan O promenade;
 - (e) in response to Mr SO's enquiry, he said that the width of the promenade would range from 10 to 50 meters and there would be sufficient space for plant growth;
 - (f) he said that three-dimensional design would be incorporated by providing cascade seating to create level difference in the proposed Floating Theatre;
 - (g) several non-building areas (NBAs) would be reserved in the residential sites along the southern promenade for creating nodal points;
 - (h) he said that more F&B facilities and mobile food trucks could be provided at the head of KTAC; and
 - (i) in response to Sr CHAN's comments, he responded that consultants were engaged for designing the iconic 11-km long promenade and Public Creatives had been duly incorporated into the design.

4.11 **The Chair** further raised the following comments:

- (a) he noted that the Kai Tak promenade was much wider than other promenades in Hong Kong. As such, he suggested including more interactive facilities and organize different activities so as to enhance its vibrancy; and

- (b) he expected that al-fresco dining and F&B could bring much vibrancy to the harbourfront and asked if the subject area, being under the future management of LCSD, would be able to provide such.

4.12 **Mrs Doris FOK** quoted an example of the Urban Council Centenary Garden and said that the existing policy had already allowed the private sector to apply for providing F&B facilities in adjacent open spaces.

4.13 **Ms Connie CHEUNG** further raised the following comments:

- (a) the proposed design of promenade was soulless;
- (b) it was not necessary to theme different sections of the promenade; and
- (c) she asked how design compatibility could be ensured between different sections of promenade to be delivered by private developers. She further raised her concerns over the interfacing between the private development sites and the public open spaces.

4.14 **The Chair** concurred with Ms CHEUNG's comments and expressed his concerns over the interface issue.

4.15 **Mr Anthony LO** further responded to Members as follows:

- (a) he said that KTO had been closely working with KTTF to include creative design features within the KTD and would continue such efforts;

- (b) in response to Ms CHEUNG's concerns over the interfacing of sites, he explained that clear requirements regarding the position of common passage and finished ground level would be included in the land lease to mandate the developer; and
- (c) though the private developers had to follow design control and guidelines, certain degree of flexibility would be allowed to cater for design expertise and creativity.

4.16 **The Chair** said that Members had given useful advice on the design of the promenade and would like to see more efforts on design to bring up the vibrancy of the harbourfront. He further asked if HC could have a say on the conditions to be written on the future land lease.

4.17 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** expressed the difficulty to allow HC Members to scrutinize the land lease conditions. Nonetheless, the developer would be mandated to submit a landscape master plan for approval and be invited to consult the HC on it.

4.18 **Mr Anthony LO** reiterated that the promenade adjoining Road D3 was planned for implementation under a design and build contract. The contractor would be required to consult KTTF on the design of the promenade as well.

4.19 **The Chair** was not worried about the design of the promenade adjoining Road D3 since its implementation agent would be the contractor of the Government. To his understanding, however, private developers would only deliver the minimum requirements stated in the lease condition and be reluctant to provide anything further.

4.20 **Mr Peter CHUI** quoted the meeting paper that the future developers would be required to develop the promenade in accordance with a wide array of mandatory controls in the key design elements but at the same time be allowed certain degree of design flexibility and creativity. He further reaffirmed that the developers would be invited to consult KTF on its detail design.

4.21 **The Chair** said that it would be impracticable to include a clear message for all the key design elements into the lease condition and asked whether there was a separate list of design guidelines for easy reference.

4.22 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** reiterated that the Government should formulate the design guidelines clearly and include into the lease condition.

4.23 **Mr Peter CHUI** further responded that KTD would be responsible for formulating the necessary design controls and guidelines to ensure design compatibility of adjacent sections of the promenade. He supplemented that technical schedules and engineering drawings would also be attached to the lease document.

4.24 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** reassured Members that the objective of the consultancy is to formulate a set of design control and guidelines to be included in the future land lease. The required landscape master plan would also be subject to approval.

4.25 **The Chair** informed Members that Designing Hong Kong (DHK) would like to make a presentation regarding its proposal on Road D3 (Metro Park Section) and the letter from DHK was tabled for

Members' information. **The Chair** welcomed **Mr Benson POON** and **Ms Kitty TANG** from DHK to the meeting.

4.26 **Mr Benson POON** presented their views with the aid of a PowerPoint.

4.27 **The Chair** said that the Task Force always welcomed public opinions, but the alignment of Road D3 had been displayed in the Kai Tak OZP for some time. If there were any changes to the alignment, it would not only affect gazetted road itself, but also the proposed Metro Park. He understood that DHK's suggestion would compel further town planning procedures.

4.28 **Ms Connie CHEUNG** asked whether it was impossible to re-align Road D3.

4.29 **Mr Ken SO** showed his support for any proposals that could enhance the vibrancy of the harbourfront. He was however unfamiliar with the background and asked whether the Government had taken into consideration the needs of water sports in devising the current draft Kai Tak OZP.

4.30 **The Chair** reiterated that the alignment of Road D3 had been set out in the Kai Tak OZP and discussed in previous KTF meetings, where Members accepted the efforts of KTO in taking on board their comments and sunken part of Road D3, with a view to enhancing the connectivity between Metro Park and the waterfront.

4.31 **Ms Margaret BROOKE** stated that at several occasions in

the past proposals related to water sports development in Kai Tak had already been raised and supported in the Task Force. She was disappointed that these proposals had still yet to come into reality and reiterated that they could hardly be realised without the provision of relevant facilities.

4.32 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** asked about the zoning of Area 3B in Kai Tak and whether it was feasible to relocate the facilities there.

4.33 **Mr Tom YIP** responded as follows:

- (a) the Government had been promoting water sports development, however, the water quality in KTAC and Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter (KTTS) still need improvement, particularly the former;
- (b) water sports uses and activities were always permitted in the areas zoned "Open Space" under the current Kai Tak OZP. This would facilitate the provision of such activities in Kai Tak;
- (c) the Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO) would further study the feasibility of providing water sports facilities in KTTS; and
- (d) the current alignment of Road D3 had already been included in the previous approved Kai Tak OZP and the latest amendments to the OZP were only to reflect the provision of a landscape deck over sunken part of Road D3 as per Members' comments; and
- (e) as for the area Mr TAM enquired, he said it was zoned "Commercial" under the current Kai Tak OZP and a waterfront promenade would also be available in front.

4.34 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** raised the following comments:

- (a) given the emerging aspiration for water sports development, he said that the Government should look for suitable locations for water sports activities; and
- (b) he shared an example of Sydney Darling Harbour that the consultants had planned for future activities before the design stage. He suggested the Government to learn from it.

4.35 **Mr Derek SUN** appreciated that the water quality improvement in Kwun Tong was faster than expected. He concurred that more consideration should be given to providing water sports in the KTTS in response to increasing public aspirations.

4.36 **Mr Benson POON** raised the following comments:

- (a) he said that his team had conveyed their proposal to CEDD but it had not been taken into further consideration;
- (b) although the alignment of Road D3 had been set out in the Kai Tak OZP, the town planning procedures were still under way and the Town Planning Board (TPB) could decide to uphold the representations or comments;
- (c) he said that the Planning Department had rezoned the "GIC" site at the eastern part of KTAC into commercial land use. He understood the need for both commercial and water sports development. In order to achieve a win-win situation, he proposed that the lower two levels of the future commercial development be used to accommodate water sports facilities; and

- (d) he said that the water quality in KTTS had improved a lot and would be suitable for water sports activities in the future.

4.37 **The Chair** further raised the following comments:

- (a) he recapped from previous meetings that the Government was keen to identify suitable locations for water sports activities in KTAC and KTTS;
- (b) the waters in KTTS were shelters and suitable for water sports activities. He further asked whether there were enough ancillary facilities to support water sports development;
- (c) the conflicted use between non-Pleasure Vessels (non-PVs) and the Pleasure Vessels (PVs) in KTTS remained to be unresolved;
- (d) the proposal to shift Road D3 to the middle had been discussed in KTTF previously. He was of the view that the proposal put forward by DHK could not be recommended as it would overturn the agreement made at previous meetings; and
- (e) he supported Mr POON's suggestion of including water sports facilities in the lower levels of future commercial development.

4.38 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** also showed his support to the integrated use of the commercial and water sports activities.

4.39 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** raised no objection to the proposal of having water sports development at the lower levels of future

commercial development at Area 3B and said that a consensus on balancing water sports and commercial development should have been reached for a long time.

4.40 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** showed his support as well, as he had once proposed the integrated use of commercial and water sports activities.

4.41 **The Chair** thanked CEDD and DHK for their presentation and advised CEDD to take Members' comments into consideration.

Item 5 Proposed Rezoning of the Site "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Tunnel Ventilation Shaft" and "Government, Institution or Community" to "Commercial (9)" Zone at Nos 3-5 San Ma Tau Street (Paper No. TFKT/05/2018)

5.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Kenneth TO & Associates Limited had submitted a paper (TFKT/05/2018) to brief Members on the proposed rezoning of the site at 3-5 San Ma Tau Street. He welcomed **Ms Pauline LAM, Ms Kitty WONG, Ms Anita AU, Mr Simon HO** and **Ms Belinda NG** from the consultant to the meeting.

5.2 **Ms Pauline LAM** and **Ms Anita AU** introduced the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

5.3 **The Chair** said that this proposal was under the discussion of TPB meetings and Members should focus on whether the proposed rezoning of the site could comply with the HPP&Gs. He further asked why a private site was zoned for tunnel ventilation shaft use.

5.4 In response to Chair's enquiry, **Mr Tom YIP** said that the subject site was previously reserved for developing a ventilation building for CKR and this was reflected in the zoning on the OZP. Such a need had later been reviewed and it was considered that the site is no longer required.

5.5 **Mr Anthony LO** supplemented that there had been public comments that the building footprint of the proposed administration and ventilation buildings for CKR should be minimised. The Government had accepted such comments and combined the two buildings into one, rendering the subject site no longer required.

5.6 In response to the Chair's enquiry, **Ms Pauline LAM** and **Mr Tom YIP** responded that the site was a private one.

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

- (a) he wondered why the site was proposed to be rezoned into "Commercial (9)";
- (b) the proposed development seemed bulkier than the nearby residential site;
- (c) whether barrier-free access could be maintained from the proposed footbridge to the future landscape deck above the Public Transport Interchange (PTI);
- (d) he raised his concerns over at-grade connection to the harbourfront and advised the proponent to explore the opportunity to reserve openings so that footbridge from the redevelopment at the adjoining site could be connected to; and
- (e) noting that insufficient parking spaces had long been a

problem in the area, he asked the Transport Department (TD) whether more coach parking spaces could be provided .

5.8 **Mr Ken SO** concurred and enquired if more coach parking spaces could be provided at the proposed development so as to avoid occupying harbourfront sites for temporary car parking.

5.9 **The Chair** viewed that more space was available at the nearby PTI and enquired whether coach parking facilities could be provided there instead.

5.10 **Mr Tom YIP** responded that under the CKR project, a landscape deck would be provided above the reprovisioned PTI for public enjoyment. There should be room for more parking spaces to be provided within the PTI.

5.11 **The Chair** noted Mr TAM's comments and considered that in terms of building height and mass, the development parameters set out in the application were generally in line with HPP&Gs

5.12 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** stated that as a matter of principle, he had no objection to enhancing the connectivity to the harbourfront but he was unsure whether the proposed footbridge could improve pedestrian connectivity.

5.13 **The Chair** concurred with Mr TAM's comments and opined that the proposed footbridge might not best serve its purpose of improving connectivity to the harbourfront since it would be unlikely that pedestrians at-grade would take the effort and travel up to the footbridge,

then reach the harbourfront.

5.14 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** opined that the existing informal pedestrian access between Lucky Building and the LCSD planter was undesirable and advised the proponent to explore with relevant Government departments on improving the interface.

5.15 **The Chair** concluded that the proposed rezoning of the site was generally in line with the HPP&Gs and the Task Force had no strong views towards the proposal. The proponent was also advised to take into account Members views regarding pedestrian connectivity and suitably update Members in future.

Item 6 New Acute Hospital at Kai Tak Development Area (Paper No. TFKT/06/2018)

6.1 **The Chair** informed Members that, in view of the time constraint, agenda item 6 (New Acute Hospital at Kai Tak Development Area) would be deferred for discussion to the next meeting.

Item 7 Any Other Business

Date of next meeting

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

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

Secretariat

Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development

May 2018