



Minutes of 6th Meeting

Time: 9:00 am
Date: 26 April 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
Dr Ng Mee-kam	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
Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke	
Mr Wu Man-keung, John	
Ms Christine Chow	Prin AS(Planning & Lands)2, 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 Li Wai	Sr Engr/3, Transport Department
Mr Kelvin Chan	Secretary

In Attendance

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

For Agenda Item 3

Ms Rita Lai	Dist Lands Offr (Kowloon East), Lands Department
Ms Angela Chan	Senior Estate Surveyor (South East Kowloon), Lands Department
Ms Anita Chung	Estate Manger (Kai Tak Area), Lands Department

Consultants

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

Absent with Apologies

Dr Alvin Kwok	Conservancy Association
Professor JIM Chi-yung	
Professor LAM Kin-che	
Ms Lee Wai-king, Starry	
Mr Kevin Yeung	Dist Offr/Kowloon City, Home Affairs Department

Opening Remarks

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

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of 5th Meeting

Action

1.1 **The Chairman** said that the draft minutes of the fourth meeting were circulated to Members for comments on 13.4.2005. As there were no further comments, the meeting confirmed the minutes of the fourth meeting.

All to note

Item 2 Matters Arising

2.1 Para. 3.20: **The Chairman** noted that the Secretariat of the Sub-committee had provided Members a copy of the LegCo Panel Paper submitted by EDLB in 2003 regarding helicopter traffic demand and heliport development in Hong Kong, as well as the Executive Summary of the consultancy study.

2.2 Para. 5.2: **The Chairman** also noted that the temporary uses of Kai Tak had been included as one of the agenda items in this meeting.

- 2.3 Para. 3.12: With respect to the response by Tourism Commission that the Government's earlier studies on SEKD had already covered many aspects of a sustainability study in the context of the current OZP, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the earlier proposal of cruise terminal would differ substantially from the current one, which was based on a "no reclamation" scenario. As such, a new sustainability study should be undertaken. **The Secretary** said that preliminary sustainability assessment would be undertaken on the options of the Outline Concept Plan (OCP), and more dedicated sustainability assessment would be conducted when formulating the Preliminary Outline Development Plan (PODP). **The Chairman** noted that this matter would be further discussed in Item 5 of the Agenda.

Item 3 **Temporary Uses of the Kai Tak Site**
[SEKD SC Paper No. 3/05]

- 3.1 At **the Chairman's** invitation, **Ms Angela Chan** informed Members that since the de-commissioning of the ex-Kai Tak Airport, District Lands Office/Kowloon East (DLO/KE), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) and Government Property Agency had been managing the Kai Tak site, pending permanent land uses and developments.
- 3.2 With the aid of PowerPoint, **Ms Angela Chan** pointed out that there were currently 19 sites (total area: about 45.6 ha) under short term lettings to private sector for uses such as golf centre, non-profit making flying training school, fee-paying public carpark, open storage, bus parking etc. There were also currently 19 sites (total area: 80.8 ha) under temporary Government land allocations (TGLAs) to various government departments for purposes including works area, contractor's depot, storage, electricity sub-stations, etc. In all, more than two-thirds of the 202-ha Kai Tak site had been currently let or allocated for various temporary uses.
- 3.3 **Ms Angela Chan** said that out of the 19 TGLAs, CEDD had been granted with 6 allocations, with a total area of about 73.1 ha for purposes including work sites, works area, storage, contractor's depot, public filling barging points and stockpiling and storage area. Of this, 34.9ha (17% of total Kai Tak area) was for stockpiling purposes for a duration until 2006, and

36.3 ha was for the purposes of the demolition of the ex-Kai Tai Terminal Building, carpark building and associated works.

- 3.4 **Ms Angela Chan** said that another 12.9 ha (6% of the total area) had been proposed to be let by way of short term tenancies to private tenants or allocated to government departments for temporary uses including storage, landscape gardening, sports centre, etc., all of which was under active processing.
- 3.5 **Ms Angela Chan** said that there were currently 11 plots of vacant land (62.3 ha; or 31% of total area), 6 of which (45.9 ha) were sites that had completed decontamination works and would require site leveling before release for other temporary uses, 2 of which (11.6 ha) had frequently been used for public events, e.g. charity fair, variety show and film shooting. The remaining 3 sites (4.8 ha) were subject to traffic / environmental constraints.
- 3.6 **Ms Angela Chan** concluded by saying that over 69% of the total area was currently let / allocated or proposed to be let / allocated for temporary uses. About 6% of the total area was frequently used for public events. She said that Lands Department would continue to explore viable temporary uses pending permanent developments.
- 3.7 **Mr Talis Wong** supplemented that the large quantity of earth being stockpiled by CEDD at Kai Tak was from the excavation works at the Choi Wan Road & Jordan Valley Development. These were valuable fill materials that needed to be stockpiled due to slower intake of the materials by the receptor sites, such as Penny's Bay, Shek O and Tung Sha Chau, but CEDD were working towards their eventual removal by end 2006. By using PowerPoint, **Mr Talis Wong** elaborated on the mitigation measures being undertaken to reduce the environmental implications, including use of conveying belts to transport materials from source, spraying haul roads within Kai Tak, installing temporary drainage and hydroseeding the stockpiles wherever possible.
- 3.8 In referring to an aerial photo of Kai Tak in the PowerPoint slides, **Mr Wu Man-Keung** said that there appeared to be oil spillage at the bay area between the runway and the Kowloon City Ferry Pier. He urged that the earth stockpiling at Kai Tak

should cease and the existing stockpiles be removed as soon as possible, so that the water around Kai Tak would not be subject to pollution from ships transporting the materials.

3.9 **Mr Talis Wong** said that as the barging point for shipping the stockpiling materials was located at the outer part of the runway, he believed the oil spillage in question might not be coming from the barges of CEDD's contract works. He promised to follow up investigation of the case and report to Members in due course. He added that the current transportation system through conveying belt from Choi Wan Road site to Kai Tak and through barges to the receptor sites would avoid pollution and traffic problems arising from conventional road transport. The District Councils had found the current arrangement acceptable.

CEDD

3.10 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the current arrangement for temporary uses of Kai Tak had not given consideration to public accessibility or enjoyment of this valuable waterfront site. The current uses were considered unacceptable as they had deprived public enjoyment of the land. He said that as the site would not be fully developed for a long period of time, there needed to be a positively defined strategy for temporary uses, giving people opportunities to enjoy the site and the harbour, while the site was being planned and developed.

3.11 **Mr Charles Brooke** said that the current approach to temporary uses represented an opportunity missed to turn Kai Tak into a place of public enjoyment when the airport was removed. He said that as Kai Tak would take 10-15 years to develop, he would strongly propose that comprehensive scheme for short and medium uses be prepared to facilitate public access, use and enjoyment of the site.

3.12 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** said that the unsightly activities at such a prominent location of the Harbour Area would affect Hong Kong's good image. She said that the situation should be improved by opening up the area for the public use.

3.13 **The Chairman** noted that the temporary uses at Kai Tak had turned the area into a works yard. Given the stockpiling of fill materials would be ceased by end 2006, this would present an opportunity to open up the runway area for more beneficial uses

to the public.

- 3.14 While agreeing to **the Chairman's** proposals, **Mr Wu Man-keung** said that the relevant District Councils should also be consulted on the temporary uses. **Mr Talis Wong** said that the Wong Tai Sin District Council (WTSDC) had been briefed on the stockpiling at Kai Tak. Whilst the feedback was that it should be removed as soon as possible, there was also a general understanding that there might not be a better arrangement in handling and transporting the material from environmental point of view. He said that the reduction of the planned reclamation projects had interrupted the programme for the removal of the stockpiled materials, but CEDD would endeavour to remove those in Kai Tak by end 2006.
- 3.15 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** reiterated that the Kai Tak site should not be used as a convenient solution to any public or private projects that required extensive land resource. There should be a coherent and positive strategy for temporary uses of the land in the harbour-front area.
- 3.16 **Mr Andy Leung** said that there should be more systematic approach to make available the sites in Kai Tak for temporary uses, e.g. location and duration, and the District Councils could be invited to use these temporary site for community activities.
- 3.17 In response to **Mr Roger Tang's** enquiry, **Ms Rita Lai** said that the mission of Lands Department was to continuously review policies and employ best practices to meet the changing needs of the community in land uses. At present, a large part of the Kai Tak site were used as works sites allocated to CEDD for essential works of site decontamination and removal of existing buildings/structures to prepare the site for future development. Another large part was stockpiling area also allocated to CEDD to receive and barge out the soil evacuated from the site formation works of the Choi Wan Road and Jordan Valley (CWR&JV) Development. CEDD representative had explained the environmental merits in choosing Kai Tak for soil stockpiling/disposal purposes versus using trucks to transport the soil by road.
- 3.18 **Ms Rita Lai** said that these types of uses were not aesthetically appealing, but they were nevertheless locationally tied to Kai Tak, temporary in nature, and they did serve important

community/works purposes. Arising from the current review of the Kai Tak development scheme, the programme of some works on Kai Tak had been put back. This coupled with the lack of receptor sites for the soil from CWR&JV development resulted in such temporary land uses. The nature of these uses constrained temporary land uses on other parts of Kai Tak.

3.19 **Ms Rita Lai** said that the temporary land uses at Kai Tak had continuously been reviewed having regard to the existing uses, works programme, land availability and changing circumstances. She anticipated a good part of the site could be used as works site by 2008/09 for the Shatin-to-Central Link project. Roads and drains projects would follow after completion of the current review of the Kai Tak development ahead of any permanent land uses and developments. With these works in progress temporary land uses on Kai Tak would still be constrained. Nonetheless, the District Lands Office would continue to make use of the available land. She welcomed any views or proposals regarding temporary uses of Kai Tak.

3.20 **The Chairman** said that it was the view of the Sub-committee that the current temporary uses at Kai Tak could be enhanced. Given the HEC was tasked to advise the Government on the need for enhancement at the harbour-front area, relevant Government departments should take into account the Sub-committee's advice when arranging for temporary uses at Kai Tak.

DLO/KE
PM/K

Item 4 Report on Kai Tak Forum
[SEKD SC Paper No. 4/05]

4.1 The Chairman said that the Kai Tak Forum was well received as an initiative of the Sub-committee in advocating the objective of planning with the community. In this regard, the effort of the Members and the Secretariat should be commended.

4.2 **Mr Anthony Kwan** said that the Forum was intended to discuss with the community the comments and proposals received in the Stage 1 Public Participation and to gauge their further views. The event was successfully held, with over 200 people attending and about 30 participants raised questions and expressed their views at the Forum. The importance of the event was that it helped strengthening the partnership between

the HEC, Government and the community.

4.3 Through a PowerPoint presentation, **Ms Iris Tam** said that the Kai Tak Forum had helped to conclude the Stage 1 Public Participation and embark the process for preparation of the Outline Concept Plan (OCP) for the Stage 2 Public Participation. She said that the participants at the Forum reiterated the points that the future Kai Tak should not involve reclamation, be people-oriented, adhere to sustainable development principles, be an enhanced living environment, have environmentally friendly transport network and create employment opportunities.

4.4 **Ms Iris Tam** said that the participants had raised the following key issues for discussion:

(a) Kai Tak Approach Channel

There should be proper mitigation measures so that the water body could be utilized for beneficial uses and the mitigation works should be commenced as soon as possible.

(b) Aviation Facilities

The aviation groups reiterated the request for a 3,500-foot civil runway and the representative of the Civil Aviation Department (CAD) explained the need to introduce obstacle limitation surface requirement to ensure the safe operation of the runway. Whilst the local residents attending the forum did not support the proposal for civil airfield on environmental and safety ground, the aviation group considered that the cruise terminal proposal would deprive the opportunity for aviation development including aviation education, training, culture and national defence. There were also suggestion for the development of a heliport and a permanent Hong Kong Aviation Centre at the existing Sung Wong Toi Road site if the runway was found infeasible.

(c) Cruise Terminal

The tourism group presented at the forum pointed out that the proposal for cruise terminal development in Kai

Tak was supported by the public. Dedicated berthing facility for cruise ships were required within the Victoria Harbour to capitalize on the growth of the cruise industry, which should also have the potential for future expansion. In response to the comments on alternative locations, the representative of Tourism Commission had reiterated at the Forum that Kai Tak was chosen as the location for cruise terminal development since it had potential for future expansion.

(d) Transport Facilities

There was call for integrated and coherent planning of road and pedestrian network such that more public space should be set aside for pedestrian activity. There were also comments for more sunken roads, no-vehicle zone and environmental friendly transport for Kai Tak.

(e) Refuse Transfer Station (RTS)

The local residents considered that the RTS should be located outside Kai Tak as they would affect the development of the area. The locations suggested included the fringe of Kwun Tong and Sai Kung districts. The representative of EPD responded that Kaolin Mine site at Cha Kwo Ling was recommended for the RTS due to its locational advantage. It was also pointed out that the facility would be subject to detailed feasibility study. The facility should be designed to address the environmental and land use compatibility issues.

(f) Other Issues

Some participants in the Forum did not support the removal of the existing public cargo handling facilities and considered that the facilities should be enhanced to make them more compatible with future Kai Tak development. There should be gradation of building heights to preserve ridgelines and views towards harbour. There were other issues covering the provision of adequate open space, proper pedestrian connection, waterfront promenade, public housing, redevelopment and revitalization of surrounding districts, and the needs of the minority groups.

4.5 **Ms Iris Tam** went on to present the responses by representatives of Government bureaux/departments conveyed at the forum:

- (a) Environmental Protection Department: The existing Kowloon Bay Transfer Station would reach its serviceable life in 2010 and with its limited capacity. It would not be able to handle the future waste generation in the East Kowloon region. Transfer of waste by sea was a cost-effective and more environmentally friendly mode of long distance transportation than road haul and thus the proposal for a new RTS at the Cha Kwo Ling site.
- (b) Planning Department: The development components in the approved Kai Tak OZPs were carried forward in the review to update on the community's responses to these proposals. The views collected from the Stage 1 Public Participation had indicated no conflict with these components. Further discussion of these components would be undertaken in the Stage 2 Public Participation, where these proposals were set out in the context of OCP.
- (c) Transport Department: Route 6 (including Central Kowloon Route, Road T2 and Western Coast Road) formed part of the strategic road network proposed to alleviate the existing traffic congestion as well as environmental problems in Central Kowloon. Tunnel option for the section of CKR in Kai Tak, which was considered more environmentally friendly, was being studied. Without Road T2, the congestion problem within East Kowloon area would be worsened. Government was also considering submerged road option for Road T2. The need for Route 6 had already been discussed at the LegCo and Members urged for its early implementation.

4.6 As for the group discussions, **Ms Iris Tam** said that tourism and sports/recreation were the development themes identified by most groups for Kai Tak development. Other land use themes such as cultural heritage, quality housing, entertainment, education and environmental/greening were selected by some groups. An integrated theme for Kai Tak Development with

emphasis on tourism, leisure and heritage was also advocated.

- 4.7 **Ms Iris Tam** said that there were diverse views on the type of land uses to be included in the preparation of OCP. In general, most groups had selected cruise terminal, preservation of Kai Tak heritage and tourism node as the essential land use components to be developed in Kai Tak. Some groups had preferences for a landmark building at the runway tip, an integrated sports complex, an environmentally friendly transport, hotels, museums, heritage cluster, waterfront alfresco dining, rowing and sailing, housing, heliport, aviation centre, mixed commercial uses and water recreation use as key land use components. A group proposed to include an aviation centre with a civil runway, marina/ yacht club, cultural village, separated islands and entertainment centre in the Kai Tak Development.
- 4.8 **Ms Iris Tam** said Members of the Sub-committee had also offered their feedback to this public event. In general, Members were encouraged by the enthusiastic outcome of the forum and considered this as a new milestone in the planning process. Some Members had offered suggestions to enhance future public engagement activities including the need to provide more information to the participants and to substantiate input/responses on technical constraints and other macro planning issues and background. Members also noted that it was difficult for individual group to set aside their own interests for the sake of the large public good.
- 4.9 **Ms Iris Tam** said that as for the way forward, the views collected at the Kai Tak Forum would be considered among Government bureaux/departments in concluding the responses in the Stage 1 Public Participation Report. Views on development themes and a wish list for the development components for Kai Tak would provide input to them for preparation of the options of the OCP for Stage 2 Public Participation. The Report on Kai Tak Forum would be uploaded to the HEC and study websites for general viewing.
- 4.10 **Mr Roger Tang** noted that the public's sentiment for an aviation theme was quite strong, and said that this needed to be properly addressed by the Government. **Mr Raymond Lee** said the issue of the compatibility between operating a runway and a cruise terminal at Kai Tak had been highlighted in the

Working Session held on 5.3.2005. Whilst it was acknowledged that the aviation heritage would need to be reflected in Kai Tak development, re-instating and operating a runway at Kai Tak would impose substantial constraints to pursue other development projects for Kai Tak, such as a cruise terminal. This issue was also raised in the Kai Tak Forum, though whilst there was support for the runway, there were also objections from some participants. **Mr Raymond Lee** continued to say that when preparing the options of the OCP, the pros and cons for provision of a runway should be presented to the public for their consideration.

- 4.11 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that the discussion on the optimal location for a cruise terminal was still on-going, and options like West Kowloon and the existing Ocean Terminal might still be options. He noted, however, that the proposed cruise terminal was starting to impact on the deliberations of other proposals for Kai Tak. **Mr Andy Leung** remarked that there were a number of land use components proposed for Kai Tak and the community had also provided their feedback to these proposals. These should be set out in a town plan to enable the community to discuss the compatibility and the suitability in the Kai Tak Development. **Mr Raymond Ho** added that the land use components in Kai Tak, including a civil runway, would be subject to assessment under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance to ascertain overall environmental acceptability.
- 4.12 **The Chairman** said that it was evident in the Kai Tak Forum that the idea of developing a cruise terminal at Kai Tak had a fair amount of public support. Nevertheless, the question of why developing it at Kai Tak and not elsewhere (“Why Kai Tak”) still remained as a question. On the other hand, however, a cruise terminal at Kai Tak could be viewed as a fair proposal, and as such, one could also ask the question another way, i.e., “Why not Kai Tak”. **Mr Mason Hung** said that the Tourism Commission had already pointed in the last meeting that Kai Tak was the only site within the harbour area that could accommodate a cruise terminal, while having the capacity for future expansion of berthing facilities.
- 4.13 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the response of the participants regarding cruise terminal development might, however, be affected by the adequacy of information about the land and sea

requirements available at the forum. The participants would only react positively to general concepts such as tourism and cruise ships. For the same reason, each group's selection of 10 most essential components, from a list of the Consolidated Group Land Use List, might be affected by the adequacy of information. There should, therefore, be further engagement with the professionals to identify the constraints and opportunities, assess the implications, and consider the territorial context and alternative locations for the proposals before proceeding to Stage 2 Public Participation.

- 4.14 **Ms Ng Mei-kam** said that she was impressed by the Kai Tak Forum, which provided the public the opportunities to have further discussion on the views collected previously in the participation process. She said that taking the experience of New York City in re-planning the ex-World Trade Centre site, the public's views gauged in a series of "Listening to the City" public forums on visions, missions, planning principles, main land uses, key infrastructural framework, and interface with the neighbouring areas were all documented. Subsequent to the promulgation of that document, six concept plans were produced for public's further discussion. She said that this process could shed some light to the Kai Tak Planning Review in handling the public comments and the preparation of the concept plans.
- 4.15 In replying to **the Chairman, Mr Raymond Lee** said that the Consultants' report on Kai Tak Forum served as a record of the event, as well as a document highlighting the further feedbacks collected from the community. The report had proposed, as way forward, that these comments would serve as input to finalizing the Stage 1 Public Participation Report. The views on the development themes and the wish list for the development components for Kai Tak would provide input to the Consultants for preparation of the options of OCP for the next stage of public engagement.
- 4.16 **The Chairman** said that according to the study programme, the Consultants would be preparing the options of OCP at present. These OCP options, together with the Stage 1 Public Participation Report, would be put out for the public's discussion in forums and workshops in the Stage 2 Public Participation. If there was to be another public event before Stage 2 Public Participation, he doubted whether there would be

a clear purpose and subject matter to be brought to the public. In response to **the Chairman's** question whether members of the public could have access to the relevant materials and documents from Stage 1 Public Participation if they would want to work out a concept plan, **Mr Raymond Lee** said that all materials had been made available at the planning enquiry counters in North Point and Shatin Government Offices.

Item 5 Preparation of Outline Concept Plan

- 5.1 At **the Chairman's** invitation, **Ms Iris Tam** presented the broad approach to prepare the OCP with the aid of PowerPoint. She said that they would first analyze the public views and proposals gathered from the Stage 1 Public Participation, as well as the proposals received previously, as input to prepare the OCP. They would consolidate and recommend the development visions and planning principles to guide Kai Tak Development, taking into account public comments/proposals received, Town Planning Board Vision Statement for Victoria Harbour, HEC Harbour Planning Principles, Urban Design Guidelines and Sustainability Principles.

- 5.2 **Ms Iris Tam** said that they would then analyze the development proposals which might require reclamation, including Kai Tak Approach Channel, Central Kowloon Route and Road T2, cruise terminal, bridge connections and road linkages, and public promenade for To Kwa Wan, Kwun Tong and Cha Kwo Ling. Three OCPs would then be prepared, serving as a tool to explore different land use emphases and urban design themes, test the broad technical feasibility involved and facilitate more focused public comments and discussion in the community.

- 5.3 **Ms Iris Tam** said that each OCP would have distinct land use emphasis, development intensity and layout design. For Option 1 [i.e. Business and Living Park], the emphasis was in the creation of an elegant business and living district in a park-like environment; for Option 2 [i.e. Recreational Harbourfront], it was on the promotion of Kai Tak as a sports and recreation hub in integration with the harbourfront; and for Option 3 [i.e. Tourism Time Line], the emphasis was for promoting Kai Tak as a tourism and entertainment hub with particular emphasis on our collective memory of the Kai Tak runway. The options would be presented with some exaggeration in their emphasis,

so as to expose their merits and demerits to facilitate discussion in the community.

5.4 **Ms Iris Tam** said that there would be preliminary investigations on various transportation, infrastructure, environment, marine and socioeconomic implications on these options, which should address comments made by Members in earlier discussions. A preliminary sustainability assessment of the three OCPs would also be carried out.

5.5 As for the study programme, **Ms Iris Tam** said that they hoped to complete the Technical Report No. 2 on OCPs in May/June 2005, and undertake the Stage 2 Public Participation in July-September 2005. Afterwards, they would consolidate a preferred option based on the analysis and preliminary sustainability assessment of the three OCPs and comments received from Stage 2 Public Participation programme. Lastly, the Preliminary Outline Development Plan, which would include a more in-depth sustainability study, would be prepared in late 2005 to early 2006.

5.6 In response to the **Chairman's** question in consolidating the visions, themes and major land use components for discussion with the community in Stage 2 Public Participation, **Ms Iris Tam** said that the public's comments/proposals received in the Stage 1 Public Participation would be taken into account in the process. **The Chairman** further asked whether the "no reclamation" option would constitute one of the OCPs, or there would be a "no reclamation" case for each of the OCPs. **Ms Iris Tam** said that their starting point was no reclamation for all OCP options. However, there might be the need to provide bridges connecting the end part of the runway with the Kwun Tong area. This, however, would be subject to legal advice on the reclamation issue. Also, the section of Central Kowloon Route in Kai Tak and Road T2 would likely be submerged tunnels, but due to the top cover of the tunnels, they might be higher than the seabed. However, whether this would constitute reclamation was subject to legal advice.

5.7 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** pointed out that the investigation should also cover the territorial requirements for housing or offices and reports produced by Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour and by Designing Hong Kong Harbour District. The Consultants should also explore projects that might enhance land-water

interfaces, such as new piers and breakwaters, which, however, might involve reclamation. Also, as reclamation would need to go through the “overriding public need” test, distinctions should be made among projects that would create new incompatible land uses (such as roads), projects for creation of new land and projects for harbourfront enhancement. As such, it would be better for these matters to be sorted out before entering into Stage 2, and outside professionals should be engaged for advice.

- 5.8 **The Chairman** said that **Mr Paul Zimmerman’s** comments had highlighted the need for in-depth technical deliberations on various issues such as what would constitute reclamation, the territorial contexts for proposals such as cruise terminal, airfield, etc. After some discussions, the meeting agreed that the technical report should include both the views/proposals received from the public, as well as the issues and questions raised in the meeting. The meeting also agreed that the collaborators in the Stage 1 Public Participation would be approached for their expert advice on the technical issues that would need to be tackled in preparing the OCPs, the findings on these technical deliberations would be incorporated in the Technical Report No. 2 on the preparation of OCPs, and that to enhance communication with the public, a user-friendly consultation digest on the OCPs should be prepared for the Stage 2 Public Participation.
- Consultants
- Consultants

Item 6 Any Other Business

- 6.1 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:45am. The next meeting was scheduled to be held in the morning of 23.5.2005 (Monday).

[Post-meeting Notes: The date of the next meeting is postponed to 21.6.2005]