

# HEC Sub-committee on South East Kowloon Development Review

## Minutes of 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting

Time: 2:30 pm  
Date: 1 September 2004  
Venue: Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices,  
333 Java Road, North Point

### Present

Dr Chan Wai-kwan	Chairman
Mr Joseph Wong	Representing Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour
Dr Kwok Ngai-kuen, Alvin	Representing Conservancy Association
Mr Vincent Ng	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Kim Chan	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr Mason Hung	Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board
Mr Carl Chu	Representing Society for Protection of Harbour Limited
Professor Lam Kin-che	
Ms Lee Wai-king, Starry	
Mr Wu Man-keung, John	
Mr Thomas Tso	Deputy Secretary (Planning & Lands)1, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Mr Raymond Ho	Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport)7, Environment, Transport & Works Bureau
Mr Anthony Kwan	Assistant Director of Planning/Metro, Planning Department
Mr Talis Wong	Chief Engineer/Kowloon, Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr K B To	Chief Engineer/Transport Planning, Transport Department
Mr Kevin Yeung	District Officer (Kowloon City), Home 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 Raymond K W Lee District Planning Officer/Kowloon

**Consultants**

Ms Iris Tam ]  
Ms Evelyn Lee ]City Planning – Maunsell Joint Venture  
Mr Eric Ma ]

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr Nicholas C Brooke  
Professor Jim Chi-yung

**Opening Remarks**

**The Chairman** welcomed Mr Joseph Wong of Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour, Mr Kim Chan of Hong Kong Institute of Planners, and Mr Carl Chu of the Society for Protection of Harbour Limited, as alternate members of their respective member organization, for attending the meeting for the first time.

**Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of 1st Meeting**

**Action**

- 1.1 **The Chairman** said that the draft minutes of the first meeting were circulated to Members for comment on 2.8.2004, which were subsequently revised and re-circulated on 31.8.2004. As there were no additional comments, the meeting confirmed the minutes of the first meeting.

**Item 2 Matters Arising**

- 2.1 **The Secretary** reported the following:

Para 2.5: Members' comments on the draft House Rules had been conveyed to the HEC Secretariat for submission to HEC for further consideration.

Para 3.17: Information regarding population projection would be provided in the Baseline Review by the Consultants for reporting to the meeting in due course.

Para 3.37: Background planning information was passed to

Members on 18.8.04. Members of the public could obtain the same information through the study website.

Other action items: These would be followed up/examined by the Consultants in the study process.

- 2.2 **The Chairman** said that the Business Environment Council (BEC) had recently submitted a suggestion to the HEC Secretariat to modify the Terms of Reference (ToR) of the three Sub-committees. He considered that it would be more appropriate for the main committee to discuss BEC's submission as it would affect all three Sub-committees. He, however, was open-minded on the proposal.

**Item 3 SEKD Comprehensive Planning and Engineering Review Stage 1 Planning Review – Public Participation Strategy and Roadmap for Stage 1 Public Participation**

- 3.1 **Upon the Chairman's invitation, Mr Raymond Lee** said that the main purpose of the paper was to invite Members to comment on the overall framework/approach of public participation for the planning review, the proposed activities for the Stage 1 Public Participation, as well as on the draft Consultation Digest. **The Chairman** drew Members' attention to the further comments made by Government bureaux/departments on the draft Consultation Digest that had been tabled.
- 3.2 **Ms Iris Tam** said that taking into account the well-established identity of the ex-airport site, the title already adopted on the approved OZPs and the likely reduction in the scale of development (resulted from reduction in reclamation area), a short title - "Kai Tak Planning Review" was proposed to be adopted for the study.
- 3.3 **Ms Iris Tam** said that in order to facilitate continuous public involvement in the study process the public participation activities would be arranged into three stages. This would include:
- Stage 1 to involve the community and stakeholder groups to set the agenda for the study, to identify key

issues, and to establish visions and positioning of Kai Tak;

- Stage 2 to discuss with the community on the development options, particularly on reclamation issues, if any, and to involve the stakeholder groups for focused discussions on sectoral interests regarding housing, sports, recreation, tourism, etc.; and
- Stage 3 to involve the community in fine-tuning detailed land use proposals of the recommended development option, prior to adoption of the plan for the next phase of Engineering Review.

3.4 **Ms Iris Tam** said that the public participation activities would be arranged into three groups, i.e.:

- General public – public forums and community workshops would be arranged for public discussion and hand-on experience;
- Statutory and advisory committees, e.g. LegCo Panel, TPB, Planning Sub-committee of Land and Building Advisory Committee, Kowloon City DC, Wong Tai Sin DC and Kwun Tong DC: Their views would be solicited through briefing and discussion sessions; and
- Stakeholder/user groups and professional bodies: Their views would be obtained through focused discussion sessions.

3.5 **Ms Iris Tam** further said that further effort would be made through dissemination of information and collection of views through the study website, Plan D's Outreach Programme, exhibitions as well as the mass media. Materials to be used at various stages would include Consultation Digest, video, website and physical models, where appropriate.

3.6 **Ms Iris Tam** said that in response to Members' comments in the last meeting concerning the duration of the Stage 1 Public Participation, it was now extended to commence in mid-September until around mid-November 2004 to allow more elaborated activities. Apart from the draft Consultation Digest submitted to the Committee for discussion,

preparatory work for the study website, public forums and workshop was in progress. Detailed arrangements for meetings with stakeholder groups would be worked out in due course.

3.7 Members generally agreed to the short title – “Kai Tak Planning Review”. **The Chairman** concluded that this would be reported to the main committee.

Secretary

3.8 **Dr Alvin Kwok** commended the Consultants for presenting a public participation strategy that would encourage involvement of both the general public and the stakeholders. He continued to say that under this framework, the stakeholders could involve as participants in attending the relevant activities or as partners in organizing these functions. He suggested that different groups should be invited to co-organise some of the public participation activities as partners. This would provide the channel for these bodies to share experience and participate in the process.

3.9 **Ms Iris Tam** said that in the early stage of public participation the stakeholders were expected to be partners to discuss their aspirations, vision and general requirements. However, when study proposals were formulated in the later phase of the study, it might not meet the expectation and requirements of some stakeholders. At that stage, the public participation activities would progress into facilitating discussion and aiming to achieve compromises.

3.10 **Mr Raymond Lee** said that under the proposed framework public forums and community workshops would be organized to encourage public participation in the study process. For the Stage 1 Public Participation, three public forums had been planned in the adjacent districts. It was anticipated that district representatives, HEC members, TPB members, and representatives from relevant Government departments, would be invited to attend these activities so that they could hear the views of the general public directly. Relevant stakeholder groups, including HEC member organizations, would be invited to help organize some of the activities and act as facilitators in the workshop.

- 3.11 **Mr Vincent Ng** supported Dr Kwok's view and pointed out that by involving a wider spectrum of organizing bodies it would help in building ownership of the resulting proposals. Member organizations of the HEC Sub-committee should be encouraged to assist in organizing the relevant events.
- 3.12 **The Chairman** said that Government departments and stakeholders should join hands to organize the public participation activities. Since this approach had already been adopted by the Council for Sustainable Development, he considered the same could be pursued under this study.
- 3.13 In response to **Ms Starry Lee's** enquiry about the proposed workshop, **Mr Raymond Lee** said that participants in the workshop would be provided with background information about the study area, e.g. development opportunities, constraints and key components. They would be divided into groups to allow better exchange of ideas and development concepts. These groups would be led by facilitators from supporting organizations to encourage discussion and to share ideas. **Ms Iris Tam** added that there could also be introductory talks by local elderly in sharing local stories and heritage interests to stimulate discussion in the workshops.
- 3.14 **Ms Starry Lee** said that there should also be publicity activities, e.g. briefings to the mass media and exhibitions to arouse public interest to attend these forums and workshops.
- 3.15 **Professor Lam Kin-che** said that the general approach in the public participation strategy was commendable. He asked whether the Stage 1 Public Participation would put forward a number of vision statements to invite the community to comment. Then, during the Stage 2 Public Participation, when discussing the more specific issues, whether there would be the opportunity to revisit the vision agreed at Stage 1.
- 3.16 **Mr Raymond Lee** said that the draft Consultation Digest had included a vision statement, which was intended to be broad enough to embrace different aspirations. Different options of Outline Concept Plan to be prepared in the next

Planning  
Department

phase of the study were expected to have different emphasis to address different visions of the community. The Preliminary Outline Development Plan (PODP) to be prepared in due course would consolidate the community's visions. Throughout the process, there would be the opportunity to fine-tune the vision statement such that it would tally with the PODP.

- 3.17 **Professor Lam Kin-che** said that the Stage 1 Public Participation exercise should be able to gauge views of the population at large on their vision of Kai Tak as it was a prime site in the Victoria Harbour. The local community should also be encouraged to say how Kai Tak could meet their need. The views collected would provide input to the second stage of investigation in developing the relevant land use components.
- 3.18 **Mr Raymond Lee** said that the public forums and workshops would be organized in the districts adjacent to the ex-airport site to help the participants to appreciate the current setting. Different stakeholder groups would be invited to the events to ensure the interests of different sectors had been catered for.
- 3.19 **Mr Vincent Ng** praised the study team for starting the public participation activities at the beginning the study as this would enable the community to get involved throughout the study process rather than the conventional approach of consulting the community on study results.
- 3.20 **Mr Joseph Wong** noted that in the Stage 1 Public Participation the community would be involved to deliberate the vision for the study area, whilst in Stage 2 various development options would be put forward for their discussion. He considered that there should be another step in between the two stages to involve the community in the generation of development options, otherwise some of the good ideas gathered in Stage 1 might get filtered out in the process.
- 3.21 **Ms Iris Tam** said that the visions and ideas gathered in the Stage 1 exercise could be very conceptual. They would take into account the strategic context, planning and

engineering considerations to develop these visions/ideas further into components for presenting in the Outline Concept Plans. The workshop proposed in Stage 1 was intended to share the development constraints with the community in developing their visions/ideas for the study area.

- 3.22 **Mr Kim Chan** said that among the study objectives, the Consultants should also examine the interface issue between the Kai Tak site with the surrounding built-up areas. The relevant interface issues should include the provision of Government, institution or community facilities, transport network, pedestrian linkages, visual corridors, etc. Also, the Consultation Digest should provide more information regarding the development constraints and opportunities of the Kai Tak site as this would help the public to discuss the relevant issues and develop their vision for the site.
- 3.23 **The Chairman** said that there were also interface issues on the waterfront developments at Kai Tak with other parts of Victoria Harbour, e.g. location of the proposed cruise terminal. These interface issues should be addressed through comprehensive planning of the harbour area. **Mr Vincent Ng** said that in the envisioning exercise for Kai Tak, apart from the matters within the site and the interface with the adjacent districts, there should be a wider planning perspective regarding its positioning in the harbour area.
- 3.24 **Mr Thomas Tso** agreed that the whole community, instead of limiting to the residents of the adjoining district, should be encouraged to take part in the public participation activities. He continued to say that it would be more appropriate for the HEC Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review to examine the overall planning framework for Victoria Harbour, as the Consultants' scope of work had been defined under the Study Brief. As for the location of cruise terminal, previous studies had recommended Kai Tak as the preferred location to develop a cruise terminal in the long term. It had therefore been included in the study as a key component.
- 3.25 In response to **the Chairman's** enquiry on the vision statement of the draft Consultation Digest, **Ms Iris Tam** said that the draft Vision Statement was intended to introduce a



new way of urban living in the Kai Tak site, where the community could participate in the planning and development process in shaping the future new developments, which would be supported by strong urban design and landscape elements to enhance the quality of the environment. Subject to the views gathered in the Stage 1 Public Participation, this statement could be modified in the study process.

- 3.26 **The Chairman** said that the Town Planning Board had already adopted a vision statement for the harbour area, i.e., “to make Victoria Harbour attractive, vibrant, accessible and symbolic of Hong Kong - a harbour for the people and a harbour of life”. This could also be the starting point to consult the public on their vision for Kai Tak.
- 3.27 **Dr Alvin Kwok** said that the current Vision Statement could serve as a starting point for discussion in the community. The suggestion by the Consultants of inviting local seniors to talk about the heritage and cultural elements of the area was worth pursuing as this would help bridge local history with the vision for the future. This would help define and preserve the identity of the area, which would be in line with sustainable development principle.
- 3.28 **Professor Lam Kin-che** said that there should be extensive discussion in the community in Stage 1 of the exercise so that different development visions for the site could be identified and brought forward to the next stage for investigation. **Ms Iris Tam** advised that whilst this was the intention of the overall Public Participation Strategy, the Government had envisaged a number of major development components for the site, e.g. cruise terminal and multi-purpose stadium. Yet, the community’s visions could be pursued in the remaining area, which was quite extensive.
- 3.29 **Mr Joseph Wong** said that his concern on the public participation model was also reflected in the Consultation Digest, e.g. the study objective “to create a coherent community supported by a variety of commercial, social and recreational facilities”. Through the envisioning process there might be contradicting views for developing a metropolitan park instead of housing development. He

reiterated that the public should be given the opportunity to develop options for Outline Concept Plan by including another stage of public participation after Stage 1.

- 3.30 **Mr Vincent Ng** remarked that the Consultants' proposals had demonstrated a transition from the conventional approach of public consultation to a more open public participation process. Whilst a more structured approach could help get better results, an open-minded attitude was also very important in undertaking public participation.
- 3.31 **Dr Alvin Kwok** said that while the format of the Consultation Digest could help the public to focus on relevant issues, some points might need more careful handling, e.g. the study objectives, reclamation at Approach Channel.

#### **E. Conclusions**

- 3.32 Upon **the Chairman's** invitation, **Plan D** and **the Consultants** made the following responses.
- 3.33 **Mr Raymond Lee** said that the Kai Tak Planning Review was conducted under the guidance of current strategic plans, e.g. HK 2030 and Harbour Plan Review. The interface with the strategic plans would be undertaken through continuous dialogues among the study teams. However, in the Stage 1 Public Participation, the community could also discuss their expectation of this major waterfront site in the Victoria Harbour. Regarding the draft Consultation Digest, there was always a fine balance between putting in too many details in the consultation document and keeping the document concise so as to enhance general reading. To facilitate deliberation by the public, more substantial background information, including the strategic planning context would be promulgated during the Stage 1 Public Participation, e.g. in the public forums, workshop and website.
- 3.34 **Ms Iris Tam** said that –
- where possible, relevant non-Government organizations would be invited to co-organize some of the public

Consultants

participation events;

- information from other studies, as well as those pertaining to the Kai Tak site, e.g. the Approach Channel, would be disseminated to the public;
- interface issues with adjacent areas and other parts of the harbour would be examined in the study process; and
- the proposal of adding one more stage between Stage 1 and Stage 2 in generating options for Outline Concept Plan would be discussed with Planning Department.

Consultants

3.35 **The Chairman** said that it would be difficult to make a perfect consultation document. At some point, the public should be trusted to be able to understand and make their own judgment on the points raised in it. In response to **the Chairman's** enquiry, **Mr Raymond Lee** said that the launch of the Stage 1 Public Participation was expected to take place in mid-September and the Consultation Digest should be ready for distribution by then. To meet printing deadline, Members were invited to provide further detailed comment, if any, within a reasonable timeframe.

All to note

#### **Item 4    Any Other Business**

4.1 **The Chairman** said that there was a long planning history on the Kai Tak site and prior commitments for different major projects. He proposed that for Members' benefit, there should be a briefing session on the Comprehensive Feasibility Study for the Revised Scheme of SEKD, which was completed in 2001, as it would serve as good reference for the Sub-committee's work ahead. **The Chairman** also proposed that a site visit be arranged to enable Members to familiarize with the current condition of the site.

4.2 **Mr Anthony Kwan** said that a paper on the planning history of the area could be prepared for information in the forthcoming meeting. As for the proposed site visit, Plan D would liaise with concerned departments to work out the necessary arrangement as early as possible.

Planning  
Department

- 4.3 **The Chairman** said that public participation was the main subject of discussion at this meeting. To be consistent with the objective of public involvement, the HEC might consider to allow members of the public attending the meeting to provide feedback on the deliberation at the meeting.
- 4.4 **The Secretary** reported that the HEC Secretariat had received a conceptual proposal for building a “Dragon Ball” City in Kai Tak. Whilst the proposal had been passed to the Consultants for consideration, it could also be made available to Members for information, upon request.
- 4.5 **Dr Alvin Kwok** said that for proposals in Kai Tak, where appropriate, the proponents could be invited to present his/her ideas in the sub-committee meeting. **The Chairman** said that this would be dealt with according to the House Rules.
- 4.6 **The Secretary** said that a revised schedule of meetings had been tabled (**Annex A**). The revision had taken into account the updated Study Programme and schedule of public participation activities.
- 4.7 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:15 pm. The next meeting would be held in the afternoon of 20.10.2004.

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

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

**Revised Meeting Schedule**

[As at 31.8.2004]

<b><u>Meeting</u></b>	<b><u>Date</u></b>
1 <sup>st</sup>	27.7.04 (Tue) pm [held]
2 <sup>nd</sup>	1.9.04 (Wed) pm [held]
3 <sup>rd</sup>	20.10.04 (Wed) pm
4 <sup>th</sup>	13.12.04 (Mon) pm
5 <sup>th</sup>	1.2.05 (Tue) pm
6 <sup>th</sup>	18.4.05 (Mon) pm
7 <sup>th</sup>	23.5.05 (Mon) pm