



Confirmed Minutes of 5th Meeting

Time: 2:30 pm
Date: 23 February 2005
Venue: Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices,
333 Java Road, North Point

Present

Dr Chan Wai-kwan	Chairman
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr Joseph Wong	Representing Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour
Mr Andy Leung	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Roger Tang	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr Mason Hung	Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board
Mr Carl K S Chu	Representing Society for Protection of Harbour Limited
Professor Lam Kin-che	
Mr Thomas Tso	Dep Secy for Housing, Planning & Lands (Planning & Lands)1, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Mr Raymond Ho	Prin AS(Transp)7, Environment, Transport and Works Bureau
Mr Anthony Kwan	Asst Dir of Planning/Metro & Urban Renewal, Planning Department
Mr Talis Wong	Ch Engr/Kln, Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr K B To	Ch Engr/Transport Planning, Transport Department
Mr Kevin Yeung	Dist Offr/Kowloon City Dist Off, Home Affairs Department
Mr Kelvin Chan	Secretary

In Attendance

Ms Christine Chow	Prin AS(Planning & Lands)2, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Ms Portia Yiu	AS(Planning)4, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Mr Raymond Lee	Dist Planning Offr/Kln, Planning Department

For Item 3 of Agenda

Ms Ernestina Wong	Prin AS (Transp) 5, Environment, Transport and Works Bureau
Mr Darryl Chan	Prin AS for Economic Dev & Labour (Economic Dev) A2, Economic Development and Labour Bureau
Mr Y K Leung	Dep Dir, Gen Civil Aviation, Civil Aviation Department
Ms Maisie Cheng	Dep Comr for Tourism, Tourism Commission
Ms Patricia So	Asst Comr for Tourism 2, Tourism Commission
Mr Elvis W K Au	Asst Dir(Env Assessment & Noise), Environmental Protection Department
Mr K M Fung	Ch AS (Port, Maritime & Logistics), Economic Development and Labour Bureau
Mr Daniel Sin	AS(Home Affairs)(Recreation & Sport), Home Affairs Bureau

Consultants

Ms Iris Tam]	
Mr Derek Sun]	City Planning – Maunsell Joint Venture
Mr Eric Ma]	

Absent with Apologies

Dr Alvin Kwok	Conservancy Association
Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke	
Ms Lee Wai-king, Starry	
Mr Wu Man-keung, John	

Opening Remarks

The Chairman welcomed representatives from Government bureaux and departments attending the meeting for the first time.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of 4th Meeting

Action

1.1 **The Chairman** said that the draft minutes of the fourth meeting were circulated to Members for comments on 17.2.2005. As there were no further comments, the meeting confirmed the minutes of the fourth meeting.

All to note

Item 2 Matters Arising

2.1 The Secretary reported the following:

Para. 3.49: A working session of the Sub-committee was held on 3.2.2005 to enhance communication among Members and to discuss further public engagement to analyzing the comments/proposals received in the Stage 1 Public Participation and work plan for the Stage 2 Public Participation. The meeting agreed to arrange further public engagement activity before the Study entering into preparation of the Outline Concept Plan (OCP), and the Sub-committee would take the lead in convening this public session. The details of the proposed public session were presented in SEKD Paper No. 2/05 to be discussed under Item 4 of the Agenda.

Item 3 Further Overview of Public Comments - Development Proposals [SEKD Paper No. 1/05]

3.1 **The Chairman** said that in the last meeting, when considering the public comments/proposals received from the Stage 1 Public Participation, Members considered that more background information regarding the need and timetable of the development components raised in the Stage 1 Public Participation should be provided so that they would be more equipped in the Stage 2 discussions. It was also agreed that further information on these ideas/proposals from the public should be made available so that the public could make more “informed” decisions on whether or not to include any of these items in the OCPs for the Stage 2 Public Participation. He said that these were the purposes of this item. In response to **Mr Paul Zimmerman’s** enquiry, **the Chairman** said that proposals from both the Government and the public were included in this item.

3.2 In response to **Mr Joseph Wong’s** concern, **Mr Raymond Lee** said that the discussion on the development components was in response to the request from Members that more background information on the policy context, needs and development programme was required. Concerned bureaux/departments were invited to attend this meeting to provide such information. As to the submissions from the public, an overview of public comments/proposals received was presented to in its last

meeting, and the Sub-committee would continue its consideration on these public comments/proposals in this meeting. All of the public submission had been made available for public viewing at the public enquiry counter of the Planning Department on 17/F, North Point Government Offices.

- 3.3 **Mr Raymond Lee** continued to say that the working session held in early February had discussed the further public engagement activities prior to completion of the first phase of the Study. According to the updated study programme, the Stage 1 Public Participation Report, as well as the draft OCPs, would be prepared in March/April and the Study would prepare for Stage 2 Public Participation in May/June.

Development Components Proposed in Current OZP

Multi-purpose Stadium

- 3.4 At the Chairman's invitation, **Mr Derek Sun** said that the Stage 1 Public Participation had revealed that the majority of the public supported the proposed multi-purpose stadium in Kai Tak. To take this forward, the stadium would be included in each option of the OCP for further discussion with the community in the Stage 2 Public Participation. **Mr Daniel Sin** added that the proposed stadium was intended to provide a venue for international sports events and a platform for the sports sector to engage business partners in organizing them. It could also provide training facilities for local athletes and also serve as venues for entertainment events, concerts, conferences, product shows, etc.
- 3.5 In replying to **Mr Roger Tang**, **Ms Iris Tam** said that most of the outline concepts produced in the Community Workshop included a stadium and there was little opposition to this land use component. **Mr Raymond Lee** supplemented that public's feedback on the stadium mainly related to the size of the site that it would occupy.
- 3.6 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** asked what responses had been received from the sports community on the proposed stadium, whether development model allowing private participation and mixed uses (such as hotel) would be considered, and whether

alternative sites other than Kai Tak had been considered for the proposed stadium. He also remarked that in the Stage 1 Public Participation, by presenting the stadium as a major development component in the Consultation Digest, gave the public the impression that supporting a stadium would also mean supporting it being located in Kai Tak.

- 3.7 **Mr Daniel Sin** said that public consultation on the stadium development would be undertaken this year, and he expected that the stadium proposal would be welcomed by the sports community as represented in the Community Sports Committee, Elite Sports Committee and Major Sports Events Committee. Details such as development model, private participation, mixed uses and land area requirement were included in their study. In replying to **Mr Joseph Wong**, he said that while their consultancy study had concluded on the need for a multi-purpose stadium with retractable roof, the facilities to be developed as part of the project were all subject to further investigation.

Cruise Terminal

- 3.8 **Mr Derek Sun** said that the proposed international cruise terminal also received majority support as revealed in the Stage 1 Public Participation. According to Commissioner for Tourism's advice, the projected berth requirements would be 1 berth in the medium term and another 1-2 berths in the longer term. These berthing requirements would take about one-third of the runway length. For OCP preparation, it was intended to explore different berthing options to highlight the land use implications.
- 3.9 **Ms Maisie Cheng** said that according to their latest study, which had taken into account different growth scenarios, Hong Kong was likely to require an additional berth in the medium term (2009-2015) and one to two additional berths in the longer term (beyond 2015), to sustain its development as a regional cruise hub. As revealed in the studies on cruise terminal development in Hong Kong, international cruise liners were already considering increasing their operations in the Asia market and the demand for berthing facilities in the region would increase. Top international operators viewed Hong Kong, with its world-class infrastructure and tourism facilities, to be in a good position to become a regional cruise hub. However, the

existing berthing facilities were found inadequate to meet market demand and some of the new mega cruise ships were too big to be berthed at the Ocean Terminal. Kai Tak was considered a suitable location to develop a cruise terminal.

- 3.10 **Ms Maisie Cheng** said that Kai Tak was the only site within the Harbour Area, which could allow for future expansion of berthing facilities, and though berthing requirement beyond 2015 was subject to further calibration, it was necessary to plan for future expansion. Since the public was supportive of incorporating a cruise terminal in the future development of Kai Tak, she appealed to Members for their support.
- 3.11 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that according to his understanding from the cruise industry, Hong Kong would be a popular cruise destination with or without additional port facilities. The current arrangement of mooring and using container terminal facilities would be sufficient for cruise line operators to continue including Hong Kong in their tour itinerary. The operators seemed to prefer locations like Ocean Terminal or the tip of West Kowloon. He said that from the sustainability point of view, in terms of need for reclamation, impact on land use, availability of transport infrastructure and surrounding entertainment and business facilities, the Kai Tak location might not be better than Ocean Terminal or West Kowloon. He said that cruise terminal development at Kai Tak should be subject to sustainability study.
- 3.12 **Ms Maisie Cheng** said that Hong Kong itself was the main draw for visitors to come here, but they would not be impressed if they had to land on barges or container terminals. Cruise tourists were mostly older in age with higher spending power that adequate terminal facilities were required to cater for this market. As for Ocean Terminal, it was a private enterprise. According to Government's consultant, the Ocean Terminal had undertaken a study on future expansion but it had not been made available to the Government. For West Kowloon, as advised by the technical departments, it had technical constraints for future expansion. With respect to entertainment/commercial facilities, she said that it was important for these facilities to be established in the surrounding area of the cruise terminal. The previous studies for Kai Tak had proposed these facilities to be developed along with the cruise terminal development. **Ms Maisie Cheng** said

that Government's earlier studies on SEKD in the context of approving the current OZP had already covered many aspects of a sustainability study.

- 3.13 **Mr Mason Hung** added that landing on barges or container terminals would incur risks to the visitors and substantial inconvenience in luggage handling and custom clearing. He said that whilst major international cruise line operators had indicated their preference to include Hong Kong in their tour itinerary, the existing berthing facilities at Ocean Terminal were considered inadequate to meet market demand.
- 3.14 **Mr Joseph Wong** noted that the conclusion of majority public support on the stadium and cruise terminal seemed to be based on the lack of public objection received. He asked whether the public had commented on these development components, and if so, what were their opinions.
- 3.15 **Mr. Anthony Kwan** said that among the development concepts put forward by the public at the Community Workshop held on 6.11.2004, most had in fact incorporated a cruise terminal. It reflected that the majority of the public participating in the workshop was in support of a cruise terminal development in Kai Tak. The facilities related to cruise terminal development would be planned for as part of the tourism project.
- 3.16 **Mr Andy Leung** said that the public was requested to consider the development components such as stadium and cruise terminals at Kai Tak, without the benefit of knowing why they needed to be located at Kai Tak and not elsewhere in Hong Kong. If there had been studies in this regard, the information should be shared with the public.

Heliport

- 3.17 **Mr Derek Sun** said that according to the Economic Development and Labour Bureau (EDLB), a cross-boundary heliport was required to meet the long-term demand. Kai Tak was considered a preferred location for the heliport as it could share the CIQ (Customs-Immigration-Quarantine) facilities with the proposed cruise terminal. He said that there were also comments expressing concern on the environmental impact of a heliport, which would need to be further examined in the study

process when incorporating the heliport in the OCP for Stage 2 Public Participation.

- 3.18 **Mr Darryl Chan** said that in view of the anticipated growth of cross-boundary passenger trips up to 2020, there was a need to identify suitable sites for the development of a second heliport to cater for the demand beyond 2015. Kai Tak with the planned cruise terminal and CIQ support, would provide a good location.
- 3.19 In response to **Professor Lam Kin-che's** question, **Mr Darryl Chan** said that the facility was expected to cater for cross-boundary travelers in the Pearl River Delta (PRD) area. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** asked why this heliport was not in Chek Lap Kok Airport instead. Given the potential noise and environmental impact of a heliport, he said that the facility should be subject to a sustainability study. **Mr Darryl Chan** said that the Hong Kong International Airport (HKIA) already had the facility to support connecting helicopter services for passengers travelling between the PRD and other overseas destinations via HKIA. The proposed cross-boundary heliport at Kai Tak would mainly serve passengers travelling between Hong Kong and the PRD for business or leisure activities.
- 3.20 In response to **Mr Andy Leung, Mr Joseph Wong and Professor Lam Kin-che's** questions, **Mr Darryl Chan** said that –
- (a) a comprehensive study was undertaken in 2001/02 to review the demand for helicopter services and to examine the location for new heliport. The proposed heliport at Kai Tak was a recommendation of that study;
 - (b) the proposal was mainly due to the CIQ facilities at the proposed cruise terminal. If a cruise terminal was not located in Kai Tak, the location of this heliport would need to be reviewed; and
 - (c) the 2001/02 study on heliport facilities was presented to the LegCo in 2003, which could be made available to Members. Further information could be provided, if necessary.

EDLB

Marine Facilities

- 3.21 **Mr Derek Sun** said that there were polarized views between

marine facilities operators and the general public regarding whether to retain or decommission/reprovision the existing marine facilities at Kai Tak. There was general concern that the existing public cargo working areas (PCWAs) would not be compatible with the tourism development and public promenade envisaged in Kai Tak. According to EDLB, the Master Plan 2020 for Hong Kong Port proposed to phase out three of the eight existing PCWAs. However, there was no programme to close any PCWAs at the moment and any future closure would need to take into account the economic situation, employment, impacts on the community and political sensitivity. For other facilities, the naphtha jetty would remain in-situ as the Ma Tau Kok Gas Works was still operative; some mooring spaces might be affected; the ASDE Radar would need to be reprovisioned to continue the service in the Harbour Area; and the typhoon shelters, according to some public views, could be enhanced into a tourist attraction.

- 3.22 In response to **Mr Paul Zimmerman's** question, **Mr Thomas Tso** said that as a breakwater was a form of land, he would expect that constructing a breakwater would constitute reclamation and as such it should be subject to the "overriding public need" test. **Mr K M Fung** said that typhoon shelter was an important port facility for protecting life and property at sea, the Government was open-minded to the ideas of accommodating boating or leisure activities in the typhoon shelter provided that its function was not jeopardized. **Mr Eric Ma** said that as there was no storage facility at the naphtha jetty, there was no exclusion zone around the jetty.
- 3.23 **Mr Roger Tang** said that the Kai Tak development would take many years, during which some of the marine facilities might be phased out for economic reasons. They could be retained in-situ and be phased out according to Kai Tak's development programme.
- 3.24 **Mr Raymond Lee** said that the existing marine facilities would have different land use implications that they should be examined as part of the Study.

Refuse Transfer Station

- 3.25 **Mr Derek Sun** said that the local community had indicated

strong concern on the refuse transfer station (RTS) site at Kwun Tong waterfront. The Study had identified the ex-Kaolin Mine site as a potential site for RTS as there was no other suitable site in the Kai Tak area. In response to **Professor Lam Kin-che's** enquiry, **Mr Elvis Au** explained that a review on the RTS network completed last year indicated that there was still a need for RTSs in the urban area and each RTS had a strategic function to serve. The proposed RTS would serve East Kowloon, Tseung Kwan O and Sai Kung areas. He said that for site selection, various alternative sites had been thoroughly considered and the ex-Kaolin Mine site, with sea frontage, was better than the site proposed at Kwun Tong waterfront as it would not require reclamation. The future feasibility study would examine issues such as land use compatibility and environmental impact, and the public would be consulted. The EIA would also be submitted to the Advisory Council on the Environment for consideration.

Transport Facilities

3.26 **Mr Derek Sun** said that the public expressed their support for an environmentally friendly transport system and a comprehensive pedestrian system in Kai Tak. They preferred more sunken roads and did not prefer elevated highways along the waterfront. There were also concerns as whether the proposed T2 trunk road would be protruded into the Kwun Tong waterfront and thus constraining public accessibility and visual quality. There was also a proposal to replace the Kwun Tong Bypass by a less intrusive structure. **Mr Derek Sun** said that for the next steps in the Study, if the preferred alignments of Central Kowloon Route and Road T2 would involve reclamation, relevant bureaux/departments would need to address the "over-riding public need" test. In terms of an environmentally friendly transport, suitable provision would be allowed in the preparation of OCP to enable flexibility in the future planning.

Discussion

3.27 **The Chairman** said that the one common question raised by Members on various development components such as cruise terminal, multi-purpose stadium and heliport was the rationale for locating them in Kai Tak ("Why Kai Tak"). **Mr Raymond Lee** said that the Kai Tak Planning Review, which was a district

level planning study, had to take account of findings and recommendations from the various preceding studies, including those being undertaken for respective development components and other strategic planning studies such as the Harbour Plan Study. It was noted that the review of the Harbour Plan had just commenced. These studies would shed light on the question of why locating the respective projects in Kai Tak. **Mr Anthony Kwan** emphasized that the proposed development components were to address certain public needs, such as transport, sports/leisure and tourism development.

3.28 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** raised concerns that the discussions on the proposed development components, e.g., RTS, had not make reference to the Harbour Planning Principles, or to demonstrate that the principles had been considered or adhered to. **Professor Lam Kin-che** said that the Harbour Planning Principles needed to be adhered to in planning for the various development components. He remarked that while RTS might not be welcomed by local residents, they were nevertheless essential municipal facility servicing the community. Efforts should be made to mitigate possible nuisance through good design.

3.29 **Mr Joseph Wong** asked whether amongst the development components some were inherently linked for example, between the heliport and cruise terminal, or some could be inherently incompatible. **Mr Raymond Lee** said that these interface issues would be explored in the next stage of the Study, when the ideas/proposals were being put together into coherent concept plan and technical assessments would be undertaken. He said that the Harbour Planning Principles would be closely observed in the process.

Development Concept Received in Stage 1 Public Participation

3.30 **The Chairman** observed that some of the ideas and concepts put forward by the public did take into consideration a wider harbour context. In presenting the various development concepts, **Ms Iris Tam** said that these were ideas broader than specific development proposals.

Aviation Hub

- 3.31 **Ms Iris Tam** said that the Aviation and Tourism Hub concept included a 3,500 ft airfield and associated aviation facilities. For the rest of Kai Tak, it proposed reclaiming the Kai Tak Approach Channel and developing continuous waterfront promenade. However, it was not clear how the promenade could integrate with the airfield operation. A cruise terminal was proposed outside Kai Tak, at the Hung Hom waterfront. There would also be cultural, sports, recreation, amusement facilities (e.g. stadium, sports complex, go-cart, F3 racing course, amusement game centre, marina/yacht club at To Kwa Wan waterfront, open-air theatre at Cha Kwo Ling etc.), as well as residential developments in the northeastern part of Kai Tak. For transport, a monorail was proposed to connect Kai Tak with Tsim Sha Tsui.
- 3.32 **Ms Iris Tam** said that according to the Civil Aviation Department's advice, the operation of the proposed airfield would necessitate imposition of obstacle limitation requirements, thus limiting the heights of buildings and structures within prescribed areas. She said that such restrictions would constrain development potential in the affected areas, and would rule out a cruise terminal at Kai Tak.
- 3.33 **Mr Andy Leung** asked whether there were already buildings approved within the affected area exceeding the height restrictions, and whether the affected area could in fact extend beyond the "approach surface" as indicated on the slide of the PowerPoint. **Mr Raymond Lee** said that the location of the airfield and the extent of the obstacle limitation requirement would require detailed investigation. From the approved building plans provided by Buildings Department, there did not seem to be any approved buildings having exceeded the prescribed heights in the Kai Tak area. **Mr Y K Leung** said that the affected area did not extend beyond the "approach surface" as there would also be flight path controls. In responding to **Mr Paul Zimmerman's** query, **Mr Y K Leung** said that the west "approach surface" of the airfield could be done away with if more conditions were imposed on the use of the airfield, such as closing it for use during unfavourable wind directions.

- 3.34 **Mr Elvis Au** said that to reinstall an airfield at Kai Tak could bring back the noise problems associated with the previous Kai Tak Airport, which were some of the reasons leading to its relocation. He said that noise was, however, also an aspect that would need to be studied in the heliport proposal.

International Cruise Centre

- 3.35 **Ms Iris Tam** said that the concept of International Cruise Centre had proposed 6-12 berths located on either side of the ex-runway. Some low-rise tourism related uses were proposed in the areas between the two rows of berths. **Ms Iris Tam** said that extensive dredging and insufficient room for maneuvering for the inner berths were some of the problems in this proposal.

Kai Tak Archipelago

- 3.36 **Ms Iris Tam** said that in the Kai Tak Archipelago concept, the Kai Tak runway would be broken up to form several islands linked by bridges. The Kai Tak Nullah would be rejuvenated into “Kai Tak Stream” with extensive parkland, and the Kai Tak Approach Channel would be turned into a recreational boating cove. There would be quality waterfront with low to medium rise residential developments on the islands, with building heights rising towards the inner land so as to help protecting the view of the ridgelines. At the tip of the runway, a Kai Tak Point with aerospace museum was proposed. Within Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter, marina and yacht facilities were proposed. The proposal also included a long and continuous promenade along the waterfront, and realignment of Road T2 and Central Kowloon Route with some submerged sections.

Kai Tak Environmentally Friendly City

- 3.37 **Ms Iris Tam** said the Kai Tak Environmentally Friendly City concept had proposed to break up the runway to enhance water circulation and creation of a Kai Tak water ecological park. There would be an environmentally-themed museum exhibiting the mitigation measures adopted for the Kai Tak Approach Channel, preservation of the ex-air traffic control tower, a water recreation centre at To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelter and waterfront promenade with pedestrian and cycling zones. Other

proposals included a cruise terminal and an aviation museum at the runway tip, a bridge connecting Kwun Tong area and for areas outside Kai Tak, a heritage trail/cluster at Kowloon City, a business area at San Po Kong and a “Tung Fong” Film City at ex-Tai Hom Village.

Kai Tak Landing

3.38 **Ms Iris Tam** said that the Kai Tak Landing concept consisted of a cruise terminal, landmark office/hotel buildings, and a viewing deck at the tip of runway comprising; Canal Quays at the Kowloon Bay waterfront with residential/service apartment, pedestrian bridge connections; and a Marina Centre at Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter with a water sports centre, a marina, and a vehicular pier/ferry pier. Also, there would be a linear aviation esplanade accommodating an aviation museum, an open-air theatre, and a waterfront boardwalk, a shoreline village consisting of 2-storey boat house/floating village, breakwater boardwalks and pedestrian linkage to To Kwa Wan. At the North Apron area, there would be the Kai Tak Stadium and Sports Centre and mixed uses for residential developments, premium offices and retails, with linkage to mass transit system.

Leisure/Indigenous Culture Conservation District

3.39 **Ms Iris Tam** said that the Leisure/Indigenous Culture Conservation District concept had prepared a 40 ha. open space for ceremonial and leisure events, as well as green park and aviation museum on the runway area. Other proposals included an Olympic village for sports training, water sports and aquatic leisure activities at the Kai Tak Approach Channel, the Kowloon City culinary and indigenous culture area, a cruise terminal at Kwun Tong waterfront and a commercial district at northeast Kai Tak, as well as waterfront and marina at Hoi Sham area.

Leisure Island

3.40 **Ms Iris Tam** said that the Leisure Island concept called for breaking up of the runway and realignment of the coastline to create a “Leisure Island” for water recreation centres, flying school, aviation museum, cruise terminal, etc. The Kai Tak

Approach Channel would be for public enjoyment and a 20-km continuous waterfront promenade from Kai Tak to Lei Yue Mun would be created. There would be an automated people mover system linking up Kai Tak with MTR stations.

Leisure & Recreation Node

- 3.41 **Ms Iris Tam** said that the Leisure and Recreation Node concept included stadium, cruise terminal, water recreation centre, aviation museum, Ferris wheel and some commercial elements at the runway tip, and residential development (Plot Ratio 3-5) at the proposed reclamation area of the Kai Tak Approach Channel. There would be a continuous waterfront promenade, a metro park and G/IC uses. There would be an automated people mover linking up Kai Tak with Ngau Tau Kok MTR station.

World Exposition

- 3.42 **Ms Iris Tam** said that in the World Exposition concept, most of the runway and the waterfront of Kowloon Bay would be used for “World Exposition”, and would be converted to residential use afterwards. Proposed permanent uses included: small and medium enterprise hub, residential development, stadium or theatre in North Kai Tak. There would be light rail/monorail connecting Kowloon Bay, via Kai Tak to To Kwa Wan and Hung Hom, a restaurant and entertainment centre at runway tip, and a navy display area near Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter.

Outline Concepts by Community Workshop

- 3.43 The meeting noted the nine outline concepts generated in the Community Workshop held on 6.11.2004, which were displayed at the venue of this meeting.

Discussion

- 3.44 **Mr Andy Leung** asked whether any of the proposals from the public, e.g., airfield or cutting up of runway, would be ruled out before going into Stage 2 Public Participation. **Mr Raymond Lee** said that many of the development concepts submitted

were consistent with those proposed in the previous Kai Tak studies, e.g., access to the waterfront, gradation of building height, enhancement of air circulation, etc., and the development components recommended in previous studies such as cruise terminal and aviation museum were included by the public in most of their concepts. He said that amongst all the proposals, the “airfield” proposal seemed to be especially difficult because it would impose stringent height restrictions to the area and cause environmental problems. As such, the “airfield” concept might not be taken forward to the next stage of the Study. The proposal of cutting up the runway would worth further investigation as it might be required to enhance water circulation in the area. Further information regarding these proposals would be incorporated into OCPs for presentation to the public.

- 3.45 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that whilst office was not a prominent component in the public’s development concepts, information on the amount of land that would be set aside for private development, e.g., office, housing, etc. should be provided. **Mr Raymond Lee** said that a bottom-up approach was adopted for the Kai Tak Planning Review, including public participation, and the land use budget would be prepared in formulating the OCPs. For current reference, a plot ratio of not more than 5.0 for residential development was assumed.
- 3.46 **Professor Lam Kin-che** said that Kai Tak related strongly to its aviation heritage. However, he doubted whether it was necessary to re-instate an airfield to continue this legacy, and whether an airfield itself could satisfy EIAO requirements. With respect to the Kai Tak Approach Channel, he said that a solution to the water quality problem was essential in allowing for any water-based recreational activities.
- 3.47 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the proponents for an airfield development should be provided with the explanation as why Kai Tak was not suitable and that the aviation community should be assisted in finding another location to meet their needs.

Development ideas/proposals

- 3.48 **Ms Iris Tam** said that development ideas/proposals received in

the Stage 1 Public Participation included an Aviation Development Centre (at the existing Hong Kong Aviation Club site), “Dragon Ball City” (“龍珠城”) with a “Dragon Ball” tower (“龍珠塔”), entertainment centre (e.g. Las-Vegas type development with casinos, 6-star hotels, “Red Light” district, Soho-type entertainment centre), Formula 1 or 3 racecourse, golf course, museums with various themes e.g. aviation, military, Chinese history and local heritage, preservation of air traffic control tower, sailing facilities, theme/amusement parks, triathlon training and venue, underground shopping streets, and large-scale shopping centre, waterfront alfresco dining, apart from other generic proposals, e.g., quality housing, office, office centre, hotel/mixed uses, etc. She said that there were also specific proposals for provision of a Government Village, the reprovisioning of Kwun Tong Bypass and major cargo and port facilities at Kai Tak.

- 3.49 Regarding the Government Village proposal, **Ms Iris Tam** said that the Director of Administration advised that when the Government announced the deferral of the Tamar project in Nov 2003, it was explained that the longer term plan was to develop the Tamar site as the new Central Government Complex together with a new LegCo building and other compatible community facilities. The Government’s position remained unchanged.
- 3.50 On the proposed replacement of Kwun Tong Bypass by tunnel/depressed road, **Ms Iris Tam** said that the proposal would require resumption of private properties and there would be adverse traffic disruption during construction. Also, reclamation might be required for the new road tunnel. As to the proposal of consolidating container port back-up storage and cargo working facilities at Kai Tak, she said that the Economic Development and Labour Bureau had advised that port back-up land should be provided in the vicinity of the port wherever possible to enhance productivity of container terminal. New back-up land at Kai Tak was not necessary. From port operation point of view, there was no plan to relocate the cargo working area elsewhere.
- 3.51 **Ms Iris Tam** said that most of the development concepts and proposals received in the Stage 1 Public Participation would be further investigated taking into account their feasibility and

suitability, with the development visions/themes in preparation of the OCP.

Item 4 Public Session to Discuss Comments/Proposals Received in Stage 1 Public Participation and Development Theme for OCP [SEKD Paper No. 2/05]

- 4.1 At **the Chairman's** invitation, **Mr Raymond Lee** said that this submission was to seek Members' advice on the arrangements of a public session to be organized by the Sub-committee to engage the public to discuss the public comments/proposals received and to seek inputs to the preparation of the OCP.
- 4.2 **Ms Iris Tam** said that the target participants were the general public, in particular collaborators and participants of the Stage 1 Public Participation. The public session would be chaired by Chairman of HEC Sub-committee with other HEC members as panel members, and would be a half-day event to be held on Saturday in mid-March subject to availability of suitable venue. It would be supported by a panel of expert consultants and representatives from relevant Government bureaux/departments. There would be two consecutive sessions: (i) to discuss public comments/ proposals received with analysis on these comments/ proposals by the Consultants; and (ii) to develop possible themes for different options of OCP.
- 4.3 In response to **Mr Roger Tang's** suggestion regarding the interface of the public session with the original study programme, **Mr Raymond Lee** said that whilst the original programme was to formulate options of OCP after the Stage 1 Public Participation for further public comments, the Sub-committee considered there was the need to further engage the public to discuss comments/proposals received in Stage 1 and to seek inputs to the preparation of the OCP. Where necessary, more information could be assembled to facilitate the discussion in this public session.
- 4.4 **Mr Roger Tang** said that the public session should provide the forum for members of the public who had made comments/proposals in Stage 1 to discuss with Government officials on how their comments/proposals were being followed up.

- 4.5 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** opined that information on possible alternative locations for the development components would be required to support the discussion in this public event. Consideration should also be given to involve independent experts in the discussion of various proposals.
- 4.6 **Professor Lam Kin-che** said that most of the proposals from the public were very general in nature and not supported by any detailed assessments that it was doubtful whether engagement with other consultants/academics would shed more lights on the proposals. He said that before the public session, the Government bureaux/departments and the Study Consultants should substantiate their responses to the comments/proposals and made them available before the public session. This could facilitate a more effective discussion at the public session. **Mr Andy Leung** and **Mr Mason Hung** concurred this view.
- 4.7 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the consultants who had long worked in Hong Kong could be invited to participate in the discussion.
- 4.8 **Mr Andy Leung** said that to develop a “zero” reclamation development scenario for Kai Tak, it would be necessary to have a good understanding of what constitute reclamation, and whether projects like constructing piers or underwater structure/tunnels would have PHO implications.
- 4.9 **Miss Christine Chow** said that the study team had taken “no reclamation” as the starting point of the Study and it would form the basis of one of OCP options. As for a session with the professionals/academics before engaging the public, she said that it would be difficult to say for sure which party should be approached on which ideas/proposals from the public. On the question of “Why Kai Tak”, she said that relevant bureaux/departments should be requested to provide that kind of information.
- 4.10 **Mr Anthony Kwan** said that the responses to the public’s comments/proposals and further information regarding the major development component would be promulgated before the public session. As for involvement of other consultants, he said that the public forums were open to all and they were welcome to participate at any public participation events.

Also, a separate session with outside consultants might give the impression of unfair treatment to these consultants that this should be avoided.

- 4.11 In conclusion, **the Chairman** noted that: firstly, whilst the Sub-committee considered the need to further engage the public in the discussion of public comments and inputs to the OCP, it would still require the professional consultants to prepare the options of OCP for discussion. Secondly, the Study was still at an early stage and key decisions would only be made later in the process and even at the later stages, changes could still be made as planning was an on-going process. Thirdly, the public rightly had an expectation on the Sub-committee that it would be appropriate for the Sub-committee to host the public session to discuss the public community. Fourthly, more information could be disseminated before the public session, so that the participants could be prepared before attending the public event.
- 4.12 **Mr Raymond Lee** said that more information would be gathered from the Government bureaux/departments for promulgation before the public session and the Secretariat would arrange for the public session. He proposed that a working session amongst Members be held to go over the detailed arrangements.
- 4.13 As HEC members might be approached to be panel members, **Miss Christine Chow** said that the HEC members should be briefed about this event in the HEC meeting to be held on 3.3.2005. **Mr Raymond Lee** said that this could be covered by the Sub-committee's progress report to the HEC.
- 4.14 **Mr Andy Leung** said that the role of the Sub-committee in hosting this public session should be clearly spelled out. **The Chairman** said the Study was undertaken by the Government and the public session to be held by the Sub-committee was to facilitate it to perform as an advisory body. **Miss Christine Chow** said that the public engagement activities would help enhance the role of HEC and would mark a new initiative in the planning process.

Item 5 Any Other Business

- 5.1 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** remarked that the stockpile of fill materials at Kai Tak was quite unsightly and asked when they would be removed. He enquired about the administration of temporary land uses in Kai Tak. **Mr Talis Wong** said the materials were originated from the Choi Wan and Jordan Valley Development site. The runway area was used as a transition point before the material was shipped to its permanent disposal locations. The stockpile was expected to be cleared by 2006/07. **Mr Raymond Lee** said that the issue regarding temporary uses in Kai Tak had been raised at an earlier HEC meeting, and Lands Department had been invited to make submission to this Sub-committee for discussion.
- 5.2 **Mr Andy Leung** said that given the long lead-time before full development of Kai Tak, it would be necessary to examine suitable temporary uses in Kai Tak. **The Chairman** said that this should be a discussion item for future meetings.
- 5.3 **The Secretary** said that an updated meeting schedule from April to December 2005 had been tabled for Members to mark their diary.
- 5.4 There being no other business, the meeting closed at 6:30pm. The next meeting was scheduled to be held in the afternoon of 18.4.2005 (Monday).
- [Post Meeting Notes: Date of next meeting has been scheduled to 26.4.2005 (Tuesday). Updated meeting schedule is attached at annex.]

**HEC Sub-committee on
South East Kowloon Development Review
April 2005**

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

Meeting Schedule

[As at 4.4.2005]

<u>Meeting</u>	<u>Date</u>
6 th	26.4.2005 (Tue) am
7 th	23.5.2005 (Mon) pm
8 th	21.6.2005 (Tue) pm
9 th	23.8.2005 (Tue) pm
10 th	25.10.2005 (Tue) pm
11 th	20.12.2005 (Tue) pm