

# **HEC Sub-committee on South East Kowloon Development Review**

## **Minutes of 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting**

Date: 27 July 2004  
Time: 2:00 pm  
Venue: Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices,  
333 Java Road, North Point

### **Present**

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Dr Chan Wai-kwan         | Chairman   |
| Dr Kwok Ngai-kuen, Alvin | Conservancy Association  |
| Mr Vincent Ng            | Hong Kong Institute of Architects  |
| Mr Roger Tang            | Hong Kong Institute of Planners  |
| Mr Mason Hung            | Hong Kong Tourism Board  |
| Mr Hardy Lok             | Society for Protection of Harbour Limited  |
| Professor Jim Chi-yung   |  |
| Professor Lam Kin-che    |  |
| Ms Lee Wai-king, Starry  |  |
| Mr Wu Man-keung, John    |  |
| Mr Thomas Tso            | Deputy Secretary (Planning & Lands)1,<br>Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau          |
| Mr Raymond Ho            | Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport)7,<br>Environment, Transport & Works Bureau |
| Mr Anthony Kwan          | Assistant Director of Planning/Metro,<br>Planning Department                         |
| Mr Talis Wong            | Chief Engineer/Kowloon, Civil Engineering<br>and Development Department              |
| Mr K B To                | Chief Engineer/Transport Planning, Transport<br>Department                           |
| Mr Kevin Yeung           | District Officer (Kowloon City), Home<br>Affairs Department                          |
| Mr Kelvin Chan           | Secretary  |

**In Attendance**

|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| Miss Christine Chow | Principal Assistant Secretary (Planning & Lands)2, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau                     |
| Ms Portia Yiu       | Assistant Secretary (Planning)4, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau                                       |
| Mr Eddie Poon       | Principal Assistant Secretary (Recreation & Sport), Home Affairs Bureau                                   |
| Mr Edmond Ho        | Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Waste Policy & Services), Environmental Protection Department |

**Consultants**

|               |  |
|---------------|--|
| Ms Iris Tam   | City Planning – Maunsell Joint Venture |
| Ms Evelyn Lee | - “ -                                  |
| Mr Eric Ma    | - “ -                                  |
| Mr Tim Cramp  | - “ -                                  |

**Absent with Apologies**

|                      |                               |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Dr Ng Mee-kam        | Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour |
| Mr Nicholas C BROOKE |                               |

**Item 1 Election of Chairman, Membership and Terms of Reference**

**Action**

**A. Election of Chairman**

- 1.1 **The Secretary** welcomed all Members, representatives from bureaux/departments and the Consultants to attend the first meeting of the Sub-committee on South East Kowloon Development Review (the Sub-committee) of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC).
- 1.2 As the meeting was open to members of the public, Members agreed that the election of chairman would be conducted in open session. **Mr Vincent Ng** nominated **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** to be the Chairman of the Sub-committee, and **Mr Mason Hung, Mr Roger Tang** and **Mr Hardy Lok**

seconded the nomination. As there was no other nomination, **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** was elected Chairman of the Sub-committee ipso facto.

- 1.3 **The Chairman** thanked Members' support. He said that the Kai Tak site was probably the last piece of virgin land in the harbour-front area. Given the opportunity to revisit the development scheme, he appealed to Members to work together to replan the area professionally in order to meet the aspiration of the community.

## **B. Membership List and Terms of Reference**

- 1.4 **The Chairman** pointed out that Terms of Reference and Membership list were discussed at the HEC meeting held on 8.7.2004. Since there was no further comment, the meeting confirmed the Membership and Terms of Reference for the Sub-committee (A copy at **Annex A**).

## **Item 2 House Rules for Sub-committees**

- 2.1 **The Chairman** said that the HEC Secretariat had circulated the draft House Rules for the Sub-committees to Members for comments. Subject to Members' comments, these would be submitted to HEC for endorsement.
- 2.2 **The Secretary** briefly introduced the draft House Rules, which covered the chairmanship, alternate member for non-official member organization, co-opted membership in sub-committees, quorum requirement, voting power, request for submission, declaration of interests as well as mode of meetings. **The Chairman** invited Members to give their views on each part of the House Rules.
- 2.3 **Mr John Wu** said that co-opted membership could be open to individuals as well as members of organizations. Such members could be appointed from or nominated by the relevant District Councils (DCs). **The Chairman** said that from the comments received through recent emails there were different views on co-opted membership. He said that views of Members should be submitted to HEC for

resolution.

2.4 In response to **the Chairman's** enquiry on the requests for submissions to the Sub-committees, **the Secretary** clarified that the draft Rules aimed to prevent the Sub-committees from becoming a forum to solicit support for private/commercial projects as well as to avoid delay to committed projects.

2.5 As there were no further comments from Members, **the Chairman** concluded that the draft House Rules appeared reasonable and members' comments would be submitted to the HEC for further consideration.

Secretary

### **Item 3 Introduction of South East Kowloon Development Planning Review**

#### **A. Background**

3.1 Upon the Chairman's invitation, **Mr Anthony Kwan** said that the planning of South East Kowloon commenced in the early 1990s. The Feasibility Study for South East Kowloon Development (SEKD) completed in 1997 had recommended a development area of over 600 ha, with a reclamation area of about 300 ha, for an overall population of 320,000. The development scheme was incorporated in the statutory Outline Zoning Plans (OZPs) in September 1998. Over 800 valid objections were received, which were mainly related to the extent of reclamation. In order to address the concerns of the objectors, the development scheme was subsequently revised after going through extensive public consultation and comprehensive technical investigations. As a result, the proposed development area and reclamation area were reduced to 460 ha and 133 ha respectively. The revised development scheme was published in August 2001, and the number of objections received had reduced to 40, with concerns mainly related to ways to further improve the development scheme. After completion of the objection procedure, the statutory OZPs were approved by Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) in June 2002.

3.2 **Mr Anthony Kwan** continued to explain that according to the Judgment of the Court of Final Appeal (CFA) handed

down on 9.1.2004, the presumption against reclamation enshrined in the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO) could only be rebutted by establishing an overriding public need for reclamation, i.e., “the overriding public need test”. Since the proposed reclamation projects in SEKD covered about one-third of the total development area and the whole development scheme had been planned in an integrated manner, it would be impractical merely to exclude the proposed reclamation areas from the comprehensive development scheme. An overall review of the SEKD, rather than a piecemeal approach, was therefore necessary. He said that for complying with the CFA Judgment, the Planning Review would begin with a “no reclamation” scenario to formulate conceptual development options. If the planning proposal would involve reclamation, it had to be fully justified according to the overriding public need test. The consultants were commissioned on 20.7.2004 to carry out the Planning Review.

## **B. Consultants’ Presentation**

- 3.3 **Ms Iris Tam** thanked Members for the opportunity to present and discuss various issues of the SEKD at the very outset of the study. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, she highlighted that the study would formulate a new development concept for the Kai Tak site starting from a “no reclamation” scenario, and it would encourage public participation throughout the study process. The main objective was to bring people to the Harbour and the Harbour to the people, to enhance connectivity of the Harbour to its hinterland, and to create a coherent community supported by a variety of educational, social and recreational facilities. The Study would pursue an environmentally friendly design, where practicable.
- 3.4 **Ms Iris Tam** continued to say that the Comprehensive Review of SEKD included three stages of work, namely, Stage 1 Planning Review, Stage 2 Engineering Review and Stage 3 Statutory Planning Process. The consultancy pertained to the Planning Review, which was expected to complete in November 2005. Their key tasks would include a review of the current proposals for SEKD to establish the essential development and infrastructure

components, the engagement of the public in the study process, the formulation of alternative Outline Concept Plans as options for public consultation, the preparation of a draft Preliminary Outline Development Plan setting out detailed land use proposals, and the undertaking of preliminary technical assessments to confirm broad feasibility.

- 3.5 **Ms Iris Tam** pointed out that there were a number of inherent development constraints in the SEKD that needed to be tackled, including the heavily trafficked circumferential roads - Prince Edward Road East and Kwun Tong Bypass, the polluted Kai Tak Approach Channel, the existing marine activities in the Kwun Tong and Cha Kwo Ling Public Cargo Working Areas and Kwun Tong and To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelters. She also noted the key development components that had been identified for incorporation in the SEKD through previous studies, including a multi-purpose stadium, a cruise terminal, a heliport, the Shatin to Central Link depot and stations, Route 6 (part) - Central Kowloon Route and Trunk Road T2, as well as road/pedestrian connections between SEKD and adjacent areas.
- 3.6 **Ms Iris Tam** informed members that the study process included a three-stage public participation programme to discuss the community's vision of the study area, development options as presented in Outline Concept Plans and detailed land use proposals set out in a Preliminary Outline Development Plan.

### C. **Study Approach**

#### **Reclamation**

- 3.7 **Mr Roger Tang** enquired whether the “overriding public need” test for the key development components had been established. **Ms Iris Tam** said that they would undertake a baseline review on the key development components. One issue that would need to be examined was whether these components could be accommodated in a “no reclamation” scenario. **Mr Roger Tang** commented that there should be a development scenario without reclamation so as to comply with the legal requirement.

- 3.8 **The Secretary** clarified that among the key development components, only the proposed Central Kowloon Route/Road T2 and the cruise terminal would involve reclamation. The Planning Review would produce alternative Outline Concept Plans (at least three) to incorporate the developments and infrastructures projects identified in the study process. The process would help to identify whether reclamation was necessary to accommodate these projects.
- 3.9 **Mr Vincent Ng** enquired how the “overriding public need” test was to be undertaken and who would determine whether there was an overriding public need for reclamation. **Mr Thomas Tso** said that taking experience from the Central Reclamation Phase III project, any proposal involving reclamation would be subject to the CFA Judgment stipulating the requirement of “overriding public need” in terms of economic, environmental and social needs of the community. The factors in support of reclamation would have to be cogent and convincing, and in the process, legal advice would be sought.

#### Urban Design and Open Space

- 3.10 **Professor Jim Chi-yung** said that good urban design and landscaping should be one of the goals to be achieved for the study area, which was highlighted in the previous studies. **Mr Roger Tang** agreed and suggested that this be incorporated in the study visions and objectives. **Mr Anthony Kwan** agreed.
- 3.11 **The Chairman** pointed out that the previous development schemes had included a metropolitan park as a key feature and asked whether this would be examined as a key development component in the current study. **Ms Iris Tam** said that provision of open space would be an important aspect of the study. Without reclamation the study area would be open to an extensive harbour area. The future open space could also take the form of a promenade along the waterfront area. **The Chairman** remarked that some of the good planning concepts in previous development

Consultants

Consultants

schemes should be applied to the current study.

- 3.12 **Professor Jim Chi-yung** said that without the reclamation a series of linear park, as experienced in overseas cities, could also be very attractive features and enhance the accessibility to the general public. **Mr Vincent Ng** added that the water bodies along the waterfront area, e.g. the typhoon shelters, could be developed for recreational uses and contributed to the provision of open space in the study area. Consultants
- 3.13 **Mr Vincent Ng** said that the Kwun Tong Bypass currently separating Kwun Tong from the waterfront area was an unsightly structure in the area. He suggested the study to explore improvement measures to address this issue. Consultants
- 3.14 **Professor Lam Kin-che** said that the environmentally friendly initiatives, e.g. environmentally friendly transport system, water-cooling system, etc. mooted in the previous studies should be examined further in this study. Consultants
- 3.15 **Professor Jim Che-yung** said that the current title of the study area, “SEKD”, should be changed as it did not convey clearly to the public the location, identify and character of the area. He considered names like “Kai Tak” would be more proper. **The Chairman** agreed and considered that this could be pursued in forthcoming public participation exercises. Consultants

#### Population

- 3.16 **Professor Lam Kin-che** asked whether there was a target population in the Planning Review as compared to the approach adopted in the previous studies. **Mr Anthony Kwan** said that relevant strategic plans and housing policy had recommended population target for investigation in the previous studies. As currently there was no set population target for the Kai Tak site, the Planning Review would start with the development concept, taking into account the community’s aspiration to formulate proposals for housing development through bottom-up approach.
- 3.17 **The Chairman** said that the target population for the study area should be considered in the context of the current population projection and strategic planning framework.



The projected population level had reduced over the years. These data would help appreciation of the planning context of the current exercise. These data should be taken into account in the planning of the strategic transport and infrastructure networks. **Mr Anthony Kwan** said that the information would be provided in the study process.

Consultants

### Kai Tak Approach Channel

- 3.18 **Professor Lam Kin-che** enquired about the progress of the decontamination work at the former Kai Tak Airport site and the pollution situation of the Kai Tak Approach Channel. **Mr Talis Wong** said that the decontamination work at the then accessible portion of the north apron area of the ex-airport site had been completed and a soil quality report on the affected area was submitted to the Advisory Council on the Environment in mid-2003. In the demolition works on the ex-passenger terminal building commenced in April 2004, there would be further ground investigation to ensure the remaining portion in the north apron area was cleared from contamination problem. **Mr Eric Ma** said that there was polluted organic sediment in the Approach Channel that gave rise to odour and water quality problems. The study would examine how the organic pollutants could be dealt with if there was no reclamation.
- 3.19 **Mr Thomas Tso** pointed that it had been suggested before to deal with the pollution problem of the Kai Tak Approach Channel by reclaiming the channel. However, this might conflict with the intention of “no reclamation” in the area. He invited Members’ initial views on the option of reclaiming the channel to tackle the environmental problem so as to help the Consultants to take the subject forward.
- 3.20 **Professor Lam Kin-che** said that the then Territory Development Department (now Civil Engineering and Development Department) had presented a proposal to treat the polluted sediments ex-situ and so there was a technical solution to the problem, even though the proposal involved very high cost. Besides, to maintain the water quality in the long channel could be problematic.
- 3.21 **Mr Talis Wong** said that the previous proposal was

undertaken under a reclamation scenario of the Approach Channel. If there were no reclamation, the polluted effluent from illegal discharge upstream would still enter the channel, and a continuous decontamination process would be required to maintain the water quality to an acceptable level.

3.22 **Mr John Wu** said that the Approach Channel was now an enclosed body of “dead” water. He suggested to cut open the runway to introduce water flow to the area in order to improve the water quality.

3.23 **Mr Vincent Ng** said that the Approach Channel was like a “hole” in a cloth and for good urban planning purpose, it needed to be mended. Provided that it would result in a good development scheme, he considered reclaiming the channel acceptable. However, to facilitate the community to make the choice, relevant information should be provided.

3.24 **Professor Jim Chi-yung** noted that if the Approach Channel remained as it was, the long and linear strip of the ex-runway would be difficult for devising a comprehensive development scheme. He said that for better urban planning, he would agree to reclaiming the channel.

3.25 **Ms Starry Lee** said that the local community had mixed views on the Approach Channel. She opined that the channel could be cleaned up and developed into an attractive cultural/recreational area, such as to accommodate a maritime museum of junks. She said that development cost would be an important factor for consideration and that the information should be provided in the study process.

Consultants

3.26 **The Chairman** noted that these were only initial views of Members and the Sub-committee had not reached a consensus on the issue of Approach Channel. In upholding the principle of protecting the harbour, any reclamation proposal for the area would need to go through the “overriding public need” test.

#### **D. Public Participation**

3.27 **The Chairman** pointed out that the Planning Department was one of the Government departments that had a lot of

experience in public consultation. The challenge ahead was to further raise the quality of these exercises. He noted that in the Consultants' presentation, the term "public consultation" had been replaced by "public participation" to encourage more public involvement in this study.

- 3.28 **Dr Alvin Kwok** enquired what the arrangement of public participation was currently conceived for the Planning Review. **Mr Anthony Kwan** said the study team was expected to consult the relevant district councils, to hold community-wide public forum and to solicit views from professional groups.
- 3.29 **Dr Alvin Kwok** said that this was the conventional approach that might not be conducive to an effective public participation process. There should be more out-reaching to the community by discussions with the local residents and with the future end-users and operators of facilities, etc.
- 3.30 In terms of timeframe, he said that the public participation was planned to run on a very tight schedule, with the three-stage process starting in August/September 2004 and ending in May 2005. **Ms Iris Tam** agreed that the timeframe was very tight, and the Consultants would strive to obtain views throughout the study process.
- 3.31 **Mr Mason Hung** said that the public participation should be undertaken in two phases. To encourage participation, the public's awareness of the study should be enhanced. This could be achieved through promulgation of the relevant background data, e.g. a short documentary on SEKD in the first phase, followed by relevant study proposals to gauge public feedback. This might facilitate a more effective public participation process.
- 3.32 **Professor Lam Kin-che** said that for public participation to succeed the support of the community was very important. He suggested that three aspects should be included : (i) determining how to deal with critical issues such as the Approach Channel and key development components such as stadium and cruise terminal; (ii) preparing options and discussing with key stakeholders on the options; and (iii) community-wide public participation process. He said that

the timeframe as outlined was indeed very tight and he stressed that there should not be room for error on this as this was probably the last chance to achieve good planning for SEKD.

- 3.33 **Ms Starry Lee** agreed and said that critical issues such as the Approach Channel should be discussed at the beginning of the study process so that the community could offer more meaningful comments through out the study process.
- 3.34 **Mr Vincent Ng** said that in “public participation”, he would expect the public to be given opportunity to work hand-in-hand with the government and the consultants in such tasks as the inception of the study. Workshops and public hearings should be arranged.
- 3.35 **Mr Anthony Kwan** agreed with Members’ views and said that for success in the public participation process, support from Members of the Sub-committee would be crucial. The study team would be prepared to participate in workshops in the community to discuss the issues and proposals of SEKD.
- 3.36 **The Secretary** said that the approach of public participation would be one of the key topics for discussion in the next meeting, including the proposals for the Stage 1 Public Participation.

Consultants

**E. Conclusion**

- 3.37 In concluding the discussion, **the Chairman** said that given the background of SEKD, the Sub-committee should aim at getting the revised development scheme right and the relevant issues should be tackled professionally. The relevant background information of SEKD should be passed onto Members for their reference.
- 3.38 To help shaping the new plan for the Kai Tak site, **the Chairman** continued to invite Members to think about what dreams they would have for the SEKD, as the community would be asked the same question.
- 3.39 **Mr Thomas Tso** added that Members might also wish to think about determining the positioning of SEK, e.g., as an

Planning  
Department

extension of the existing urban area, a tourism/recreational area, a new town or a city within a city, etc.

**Item 4 Any Other Business**

- 4.1 The Secretary said that the meeting schedule would be revised to avoid clashing with major and regular commitments of some of the Members and the schedule would be circulated to Members in due course.
- 4.2 There being no other business, the meeting closed at 3:45 pm. The next meeting would be held in the afternoon of 1.9.2004.

**HEC Sub-committee on  
South East Kowloon Development Review  
September 2004**

## HEC Sub-committee on South East Kowloon Development Review

### Terms of reference

To assist HEC in monitoring and giving advice on the Planning and Engineering Review of South East Kowloon Development (the Review).

Specifically, the Sub-committee will –

- (a) Provide comments on and monitor the planning, design and development issues including land use, transport and infrastructure, landscaping and other matters relating to the implementation proposals under the Review;
- (b) Advise on the public involvement strategy at various stages of the Review; and
- (c) Report to HEC on its findings and recommendations on a regular basis.

### Membership

- |                                |  |
|--------------------------------|--|
| 1. Dr Ng Mee-kam               | Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour                        |
| 2. Dr Alvin Kwok/Ms Betty Ho   | Conservancy Association                              |
| 3. Mr Vincent Ng               | Hong Kong Institute of Architects                    |
| 4. Mr Roger Tang               | Hong Kong Institute of Planners                      |
| 5. Mrs Aliana Ho               | Hong Kong Tourism Board                              |
| 6. Mr Hardy Lok                | Society for Protection of Harbour Limited            |
| 7. Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke  |  |
| 8. Dr W K Chan                 |  |
| 9. Professor Jim Chi-yung      |  |
| 10. Professor Lam Kin-che      |  |
| 11. Ms Starry Lee              |  |
| 12. Mr John Wu                 |  |
| 13. Representative from HPLB:  | Mr Thomas Tso, DS(PL)1/Miss Christine Chow, PAS(PL)2 |
| 14. Representative from ETWB:  | Mr. Thomas Chow, DS(T)1/ PAS(T)                      |
| 15. Representative from PlanD: | Mr Anthony Kwan, AD(Metro)/Mr Raymond Lee, DPO(K)    |
| 16. Representative from CEDD:  | Mr Talis Wong, CE(K)                                 |
| 17. Representative from TD:    | Mr K B To/CE(TP)/SE(TP)                              |
| 18. Representative from HAD:   | Mr. Kevin Yeung, DO(KC)/Mr. Damian Chan, ADO(KC)     |

### Secretary :

Mr Kelvin Chan, Senior Town Planner, PlanD