

Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development

Minutes of Thirty-seventh Meeting

Date : 3 September 2020 (Thursday)
Time : 3 p.m.
Venue : Conference Room 4, G/F, Central Government Offices, 2 Tim Mei Avenue, Tamar

Present

Mr Vincent NG Chair

Organization Members

Mr Ivan HO Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design

Mr Ken SO* Representing The Conservancy Association

Mrs Margaret BROOKE Representing Business Environment Council

Mr Terence LEE* Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong

Dr Vivian WONG* Representing Friends of the Earth (HK) Charity Limited

Sr Raymond CHAN Yuk-ming* Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors

Mr Edward LO* Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners

Ms Iris HOI* Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects

Ir Victor CHEUNG* Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers

Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN* Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour

Individual Members

Ms Angela SO*

Mr Mac CHAN*

Mr NGAN Man-yu*

Hon Tony TSE*

Mr Hans Joachim ISLER*

Co-opted Member

Prof Wallace CHANG*

Official Members

Mr Victor CHAN Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)²,
Development Bureau (DEVB)

Mrs Doris FOK Assistant Director (Leisure Services)¹, Leisure and
Cultural Services Department (LCSD)

Ms Johanna CHENG District Planning Officer/Kowloon, Planning
Department (PlanD)

Mr David NGU* Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon, Transport
Department (TD)

Ms Stephenie HO Senior Manager (Tourism)⁴¹, Tourism Commission
(TC)

Mr George MAK Chief Engineer/East 5, Civil Engineering and
Development Department (CEDD)

Mr Steven LEE Secretary

In Attendance

Miss Rosalind CHEUNG Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB

Mr NG Shing Kit Engineer (Harbour), DEVB

Mr William CHAN* Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB

Absent with Apologies

Ms Doris HO	Deputy Secretary (Planning & Lands) ¹ , DEVB
Mr LEUNG Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Mr Raymond CHAN Kin-sek	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Paul CHAN	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr Freddie HAI	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Ms Kelly CHAN	Individual Member
Mr LAI Kwong-wai	Co-opted Member

For Item 4

Ms Brenda AU	Head / Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO)
Mr Edwin WONG	Deputy Head / EKEO
Ms Carol CHEUK	Senior Place Making Manager (Planning), EKEO
Ms Carol HUI	Director, Urban Planning, AECOM Ltd
Ms Yoko CHEUNG	Associate Director, Urban Planning, AECOM Ltd

For Item 5

Mr Patrick HAU	Senior Manager (Capital Projects) ⁵ , Hospital Authority Head Office (HAHO)
Mr Matthew CHENG	Manager (Capital Projects) ⁵¹ , HAHO
Ms Helen LEUNG	Manager (Capital Projects) ⁵³ , HAHO
Ms LI Ka-yi	Manager (Capital Projects) ⁵² , HAHO
Ms LAI Mei-ling	Chief Leisure Manager (Kowloon), LCSD
Mr Michael CHIU	Chief Executive Officer (Planning) ¹ , LCSD
Mr CHAN Tsz-fung	Senior Executive Officer(Planning) ¹² , LCSD
Mr Stephen TSANG*	Chief Project Manager 202, Architectural Services Department (ArchSD)

Mr Jackson WAI*	Senior Project Manager 236, ArchSD
Ms Jackie CHAU*	Project Manager 241, ArchSD
Ms Elise CHAN	Associate Director, Arup
Ms Polly TSANG	Project Manager, Arup
Mr Michael LAM	Director, WT
Ms Christy SZE	Architect, WT

*denoting joining meeting online

Welcoming Message

Action

Mr Vincent NG, Chair of the Harbourfront Commission (HC), welcomed all to the 37th meeting of the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (KTTF).

He announced that -

- (a) **Mr Victor CHAN**, Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)2, Development Bureau, attended on behalf of Mr Vincent MAK, Deputy Secretary (Works) 2;
- (b) **Ms Stephenie HO**, Senior Manager of Tourism Commission, attended on behalf of Ms Wendy CHUNG, Assistant Commissioner for Tourism 4;
- (c) **Mr David NGU**, Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon of Transport Department, attended on behalf of Mr Tony YAU, Assistant Commissioner/Urban; and
- (d) **Mr George MAK**, Chief Engineer/East 5, Civil Engineering and Development Department, attended on behalf of Mr Michael LEUNG, Project Manager (East).

Item 1 Election of Chairman

1.1 **Mr Vincent NG**, as the Chair of HC, 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 Vincent NG** was elected as the Chair of the Task Force. He officially took over the chairmanship of the meeting and thanked Members for their support.

Item 2 Confirmation of Minutes of the 36th Meeting

2.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the draft minutes of the 36th KTF meeting were circulated to Members for comments on 16 July 2020. The finalised minutes with Members' comments incorporated were further circulated to Members on 28 August 2020.

2.2 There being no further comments received from Members, the minutes of the 36th meeting were confirmed.

Item 3 Matters Arising

3.1 There was no matter arising from the last meeting.

Item 4 Planning and Urban Design Review for Developments at Kai Tak Runway Tip (TFKT/04/2020)

Briefing by the proponent

4.1 **The Chair** informed Members that Energizing Kowloon East

Office (EKEO) submitted a paper (TFKT/04/2020) on the recommendations of the Planning and Urban Design Review for Developments at Kai Tak Runway Tip (KTRT) – Feasibility Study (the Study).

4.2 **The Chair** informed Members on the background of the item. Having regard to the design merits of the winning and shortlisted schemes of the Kai Tak Fantasy (KTF) International Ideas Competition as well as findings of relevant studies and guidelines, the Study aimed to formulate an attractive and feasible design and a development scheme for the developments at KTRT. The Study covered the area of the runway tip of the former Kai Tak Airport adjoining Kai Tak Cruise Terminal (KTCT) and Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter, including Kai Tak Runway Park (KTRP) and Tourism Node (TN).

4.3 With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, **Ms Carol HUI** from AECOM Ltd briefed Members on the recommendations.

Discussion

Integration with Public Open Spaces in Private Development in former runway

4.4 As they fell within the boundary of its study area, **Mr Ivan HO** suggested including in the Study the design layout of the public open spaces in private development (POSPD) in the Kai Tak former runway, which was supported by Members at the previous KTTF meeting.

4.5 **Ms Brenda AU** responded that EKEO had provided comments on the design of all POSPD in Kai Tak Development Area to ensure that a coordinated and integrated design would be achieved for all these POSPD.

Undulating Shoreline Design

4.6 **Mr Ivan HO** suggested that the key design feature of the winning scheme in the KTF International Ideas Competition of having a naturalistic and undulating water edge treatment should be kept if possible. **Prof Wallace CHANG** concurred and opined that the recommendations should reflect this organic element of the winning scheme.

4.7 **Ms Brenda AU** responded that the Study has critically assessed the feasibility of incorporating the undulating seawall design. However, the modification of seawall would involve substantial construction works and have costs and programme implications. Alternatively, if the shoreline was shifted inwards, it would inevitably reduce the valuable promenade area for public enjoyment and undermine the opportunity to allow more flexibility for holding various events.

Design Language

4.8 **Mr Ivan HO** opined that while he appreciated the distinctive play facilities such as swings to strengthen the aviation theme of KTRP, the proposal of adding a Facility Building resembling the former Air Traffic Control Tower might be slightly old-fashioned. **Mr Edward Lo** suggested that apart from looking into the past developments of Kai Tak, the design could be enriched by adding elements with future visions on aviation development.

4.9 **Ms Brenda AU** explained that the design idea of the Facility Building was emanated from previous consultation with District Council, which suggested retaining remnants of the former Air Traffic Control Tower at the runway of the former airport. In this connection, the Study

recommended that the external design of the Facility Building could pay tribute to the former Air Traffic Control Tower. In addition to the aviation theme, food and beverage facilities were also proposed in the Facility Building to bring more vibrancy.

Disposal Timetable

4.10 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired about the schedule of land disposal and if Members could further provide comments on the design of the TN site.

4.11 **Ms Brenda AU** responded that the TN site had been included in the 2020-21 Land Sale Programme, while the actual disposal date would be subject to the market situation. Members' comments on the design of the TN site would be incorporated in its development brief as far as possible.

Traffic Access to the Runway Tip

4.12 **Sr Raymond CHAN** opined that given the location of KTRT and there was only one vehicular route connecting to it, more buffer area at the runway tip was needed for boarding and parking in order to ensure smooth traffic access. **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that the existing landing steps at KTRT were neither suitable for water transport nor convenient to passengers arriving from KTCT. He suggested providing landing steps at the northern side of and in the midway between Phase 1 and Phase 2A of the KTRP for the public convenience, as that location would be much closer to the KTCT.

4.13 **Ms Brenda AU** clarified that in addition to the public transport interchange (PTI) in the TN site, there were public transport services, coach

bay and car parks provided at KTCT. She further explained that with the future water taxi services at KTRP Pier, passengers should have more choices for their preferred means of transportation to and from the TN. For the issue on the landing steps, EKEO would provide a written reply after consultation with the relevant Government departments.

[Post-meeting note: Subsequent to the meeting, EKEO provided post-meeting responses on the provision of landing steps via email circulation on 6 November 2020.]

Connectivity within the runway tip

4.14 **Prof Wallace CHANG** enquired about the reason for providing the axial at-grade connection across the TN site and the internal water channel at the 45m setback area, and their effects on the connectivity within the area.

4.15 **Mr Brenda AU** explained that the at-grade connection across TN was intended to provide a visual and physical corridor for the site. She further clarified that the 45m setback requirement was stipulated in the Outline Zoning Plan. The internal water channel was proposed having considered that no structures could be built within the 45m setback area. It was also one of the important features of the winning scheme in the KTF International Ideas Competition.

[Post-meeting note: **Dr Vivian WONG** provided her comments on the connectivity in the runway tip via email during the meeting. She opined that TN should be innovatively merged with the River Channel and enquired about how the designs could be connected with KTCT physically and visually. Subsequent to the meeting, EKEO provided post-meeting

responses via email circulation on 6 November 2020.]

Design of the At-grade PTI

4.16 **Mr Ivan HO** expressed concerns over the actual implementation of the design of the at-grade PTI. From the experience of the North Point Promenade, there were solid walls and louvers built at the perimeter of the PTI which had affected the accessibility to the waterfront and the interface with the promenade. He reminded the project team to properly address similar issues by stipulating clearly the urban design requirements in the development brief of TN site. **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** concurred and suggested providing retail and dining facilities at the G/F along the edges of the PTI with integration with the park for a more active frontage.

4.17 **Ms Brenda AU** noted Members' comments and advised that the project team could strengthen the visual and air permeability design requirements of the PTI in the development brief so as to achieve an easily accessible and active frontage. She further explained that an active frontage at G/F with retail facilities as well as food and beverage services were proposed as illustrated in Plan 5 of the Paper.

Flexibility of Open Space

4.18 **Mr Edward LO** opined that flexible open space should be provided to allow the public to enjoy various kinds of activities in order to create an inclusive and dynamic public realm.

4.19 **Ms Brenda AU** responded that the lawn at the end of the runway tip could provide a flexible open space with various functions

servicing as event spaces, passive landscape garden and inclusive play areas for all to enjoy.

Water-land Interface at the Water Edge

4.20 **The Chair** suggested reducing the provision of fences at the northern water edge and provide a stepped water edge design with a view to enhancing public access to the waterfront and facilitating water-friendly activities.

4.21 **Ms Brenda AU** noted his comments and responded that they would liaise with relevant Government departments to review if the suggested stepped water edge could be incorporated into the design of the open space.

Way Forward

4.22 **The Chair** concluded that Members raised various suggestions regarding the design of developments at KTRT by enhancing the water-land interface at the water edge, the connectivity and versatility of the public open space. Members also expressed concerns over the traffic access to the runway tip and the design of the at-grade PTI. He ended the discussion by inviting the project team to take into account Members' comments in taking forward the developments at KTRT and in formulating the development brief for the TN site.

Item 5 New Acute Hospital at Kai Tak Development Area (Paper No. TFKT/05/2020)

5.1 **The Chair** briefed Members that the Hospital Authority (HA) and the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) submitted a paper (TFKT/05/2020) on the detailed design of New Acute Hospital (NAH) at Kai Tak Development Area. A briefing was arranged on 7 July 2020 for the project team to brief Members on the design. The project team had further refined the design taking into account Members' comments.

5.2 With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, **Ms Elise CHAN** of Arup and **Mr Michael Lam** of WT briefed Members on the design.

Discussion

Pedestrian Accessibility

5.3 **Mr Ivan HO** opined that the crossing at Shing Fung Road connecting the promenades fronting NAH and the Hong Kong Children's Hospital (HKCH) should be relocated southward as far as possible to provide a more direct physical connection.

5.4 **Mr Patrick HAU** added that CEDD had raised concerns over road safety for the proposed relocation. Alternatively, HA has also considered relocating the crossing to the covered area under the bridge connecting NAH and HKCH. HA would further explore possible refinements in consultation with CEDD.

5.5 **The Chair** enquired about how the current design and the

management of the public open space (POS) could enhance the pedestrian accessibility between the hinterland and the waterfront promenade.

5.6 **Mr Michael LAM** responded that a 24-hour covered public passageway, lifts and staircases at strategic locations, and various at-grade pedestrian routes would be provided to enhance the connectivity and accessibility between the hinterland and the promenade.

Location and Design of Service Block

5.7 **Mr Ivan HO** remarked that the service block located at the western end of the promenade is distant away from that provided at the promenade fronting HKCH, which was located at its eastern end. The service block also largely blocked the western entrance of the promenade. As regards its design, since a separate barrier-free toilet would already be provided, he asked if it was still necessary to provide barrier free toilets inside both the female and male service blocks. He also enquired if it was necessary for the electrical and mechanical facilities to occupy more than 30% of its G/F space. He opined that the natural lighting, ventilation, and layout of the service block had to be further improved.

5.8 **Mr Michael LAM** responded that in view of the locational constraints and to avoid potential impacts on the promenade landscape design, it would be difficult to relocate the service block. As regards the design of the service block, he explained that the built-in barrier free toilets inside the female and male service blocks were intended also for the elderly. He also explained that since the service block only had one floor, it had to use a relatively large area for placing all the necessary electrical and mechanical facilities. In light of Members' comments, the project team would further refine the design into a less bulky form.

An Integrated and Holistic POS with HKCH

5.9 **Mr Ivan HO** opined that the design of NAH was not complementary to that of the adjacent HKCH. He stressed the importance of having an integrated and holistic design for the entire promenade for public enjoyment. **Dr Vivian WONG** concurred and opined that the design of both children playgrounds in the promenade adjacent to NAH and HKCH should be better integrated.

5.10 **Mr Michael LAM** responded that the project team had referred to the design concept of the HKCH promenade in drawing up the design of the NAH promenade. He attributed the design difference to the different target users of the promenade adjacent to NAH and that adjacent to HKCH.

5.11 **Mr Ivan HO** clarified that instead of the hospital users, the promenade fronting NAH and HKCH was POS which serve the general public.

5.12 **Mr Michael LAM** noted the comments and responded that the project team would further refine the design of the promenade and make it complementary to that of the adjacent HKCH.

Shading, Sitting and Greening

5.13 **Mr Ivan HO** opined that shading for the pavilions should be further enhanced. There was also a lack of sufficient sitting, shading and greening along the promenade.

5.14 **Mr Michael LAM** responded that the project team would take

into account Members' comments in adjusting the design of the pavilions and enhancing shading. As regards tree planting, he explained that different low maintenance tree types were proposed in different zones of the promenade to demonstrate their various landscape concepts.

Way Forward

5.15 **The Chair** invited the project team to take into account Members' comments in further improving the overall design of promenade and consult Members on the revised proposal again. **Mr Patrick HAU** responded that they would factor in Members' comments and refine the design of the promenade to provide an integrated and quality open space for public enjoyment.

Item 6 Any Other Business

6.1 There being no other comments, the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 pm.

Secretariat

Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development

November 2020