



7th Meeting

Date : 21 June 2005 (Tuesday)
Time : 2:30 pm.
Venue : Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices,
333 Java Road, North Point, Hong Kong

AGENDA

1. Confirmation of Minutes of 6th Meeting
2. Matters Arising
3. Report on Collaborators Meeting
[SEKD SC Paper No. 5/05]
4. Suggestions for Stage 2 Public Participation
[SEKD SC Paper No. 6/05]
5. Any Other Business

KAI TAK PLANNING REVIEW

Report on Collaborators Meeting

Purpose

This paper aims to report the issues identified in the Collaborators Meeting convened on 4.6.2005 and the additional comments from Members. Members would be invited to consolidate the issues for further action by the Consultants.

Background

2. Taking advice of the Sub-committee, a Collaborators Meeting was held on 4.6.2005 to discuss the approach to prepare the concept plans for Kai Tak Development and the technical issues involved as well as to gather suggestions on how to conduct the Stage 2 Public Participation. Over 30 participants including representatives of academic and professional institutes, green and business groups, local District Councils and relevant Government bureaux/ departments attended this session.

3. A copy of the Consultants' report on the Collaborators Meeting, as a record of the event and a summary of comments discussed, is at **Annex 1**.

4. During this period, the Sub-committee Members have also offered comments on a number of on-going technical issues, regarding the key development components and the land use concepts discussed in the Collaborators Meeting. A summary of these comments and the Consultant's responses are attached at **Annex 2**. In main, these cover:

- (a) justification for location and scale of cruise terminal and stadium projects in Kai Tak, and their environmental and traffic impacts;
- (b) mitigation measures for Kai Tak Approach Channel and their implementation;
- (c) adequacy of the on-going process in preparing the Outline

Concept Plan e.g. lack of difference in the options, lack of waterfront facilities, hindrance of major road interchange, connectivity with hinterlands, etc; and

- (d) the issue of sustainability in the outline concept plans for Kai Tak in view of the likely reduction in the scale of development.

Way Forward

5. The report has proposed, as a way forward, that Consultants and the concerned Government bureaux/ departments should address the comments received at the Collaborators Meeting in the preparation of options of Outline Concept Plan and in undertaking the Stage 2 Public Participation activities. It is proposed that the report, subject to Members' comments, would be uploaded to the HEC and study websites for general reference.

6. The issues as raised by the Sub-committee Members should be further investigated by the Consultants in the study process.

Advice Sought

7. Members are invited to:
- (a) comment to the Report on Collaborators Meeting at **Annex 1**; and
 - (b) advise on a consolidated list of issues for further investigation by the Consultants in the preparation of Outline Concept Plan, having regard to **Annex 2**.

Planning Department
June 2005

DRAFT

Kai Tak Planning Review

Report on Collaborators Meeting

~ Planning with the Community ~

City Planning – Maunsell Joint Venture
June 2005

Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 ISSUES DISCUSSED	2
3 COMMENTS RECEIVED IN THE MEETING	3
4 NEXT STEP	5

Appendix

Appendix 1

Summary of Key Discussion Points

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Stage 1 Public Participation of the Kai Tak Planning Review on ‘Community’s Vision for Kai Tak’ was conducted from September to November 2004. The community response is positive, with over 500 participants in the public forums/workshop and over 250 written comments and proposals.
- 1.2 The Sub-committee on South East Kowloon Development Review under the HEC (the Sub-committee) was briefed on the comments and proposals received in the Stage 1 Public Participation on 13.12.2004 and 23.2.2005. The Sub-committee considered that in order to facilitate the building of community consensus, the public should be given an opportunity to know the comments and proposals received, and provide further views before concluding the public participation report and the generation of options for the Outline Concept Plan for the Stage 2 Public Participation.
- 1.3 The “Kai Tak Forum” was convened by the Sub-committee on 19.3.2005 in Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre. The event was well attended with over 200 participants, including individuals, representatives of local community/organizations, District Councilors, stakeholders groups, professional institutions, consultants of previous Kai Tak studies, etc.
- 1.4 The Sub-committee was briefed on the major findings of the Kai Tak Forum on 26.4.2005. The Sub-committee advised to convene a Collaborators Meeting to discuss the approach in the preparation of the Outline Concept Plan (OCP) for Stage 2 Public Participation. The main purpose of the meeting is to discuss the technical issues involved in preparing the OCPs and to gather suggestions for Stage 2 Public Participation. The meeting was chaired by Mr. Anthony Kwan, Assistant Director/Metro & Urban Renewal, Planning Department and convened by Dr. W.K. Chan, Chairman of the Sub-committees. Over 30 participants have attended the event including the following:

Ms. Betty HO	The Conversancy Association
Mr. Roger TANG	Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr. Andy LEUNG	Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr. Michael CHIANG	-- ditto --
Dr. HUNG Wing-tat	Hong Kong People’s Council for Sustainable Development
Dr. Mee Kam NG	Centre of Urban Planning and Environmental Management, Hong Kong University
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Business Environment Council
Mr Dennis LI	Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited
Mr Charles Nicholas BROOKE	--
Mr. Mason HUNG	Hong Kong Tourism Board

Mr. Richard HO	Hong Kong General Chamber of Commerce
Mr. Paul TANG	-- ditto --
Mr. CHAN Ka Wai	Kowloon City District Council
Mr. LIU Sing Lee	-- ditto --
Mr. WEN Choy Bon	-- ditto --
Ms. KO Po-ling	Kwun Tong District Council
Ms. LAM Man-fai	Wong Tai Sin District Council
Mr. Raymond HO	Environment, Transport and Works Bureau
Mr. Talis WONG	Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr. K. M. LEUNG	-- ditto --
Mr. K.B. TO	Transport Department
Mr. S. M. CHAU	-- ditto --
Mr. Daniel SIN	Home Affairs Bureau
Mr Raymond LEE	Planning Department
Mr. Kelvin CHAN	-- ditto --

- 1.5 The main purpose of this Report is to provide a record of the Collaborators Meeting.

2 ISSUES DISCUSSED

- 2.1 The following technical issues were covered in the meeting:

Topical Discussion

- (i) Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC)
 - Result of water quality model test
 - Possible break along Kai Tak Runway
 - Implication on typhoon shelter
- (ii) Central Kowloon Route (CKR) and Road T2
 - Strategic function of CKR & Road T2
 - Alignment gradient and reclamation issue
 - Possible additional local connection
- (iii) Cruise Terminal
 - Finger pier and alongside berth
 - Marine impact
 - Land use impact
- (iv) Multi-purpose Stadium
 - Study requirements
 - Location considerations
 - Design considerations

Preparation of Outline Concept Plan

- (i) Developing Outline Concept Plan
 - Land Use Components
 - Land Use Themes
 - Outline Land Use Concepts

- (ii) Urban Design Concepts
 - Ridgeline protection, visual corridor and landmark disposition
 - Open Space Network
 - Various design concepts

- (iii) Road Pattern and Circulation
 - Major connection points and interchange
 - Ring road and through road system
 - Connectivity with surrounding areas

3 COMMENTS RECEIVED IN THE MEETING

3.1 The participants have actively participated in the floor discussion. A record of the session is attached in **Appendix 1**. The major views raised are summarized as follows:

3.2. Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC)

- Local residents of Kowloon City had proposed to reclaim the KTAC to resolve the pollution problem therein and requested the Government to implement mitigation measures as early as possible.
- There were also suggestions to construct submarine discharge pipes/channels to divert the polluted water from Kai Tak Nullah and other discharge to KTAC to the outer sea area.
- The options of mitigation measures for KTAC and the details of their technical assessments (e.g. effectiveness, broad cost estimate and timing) should be promulgated for public's consideration.

3.3 Central Kowloon Route (CKR) and Road T2

- In planning the road network of Kai Tak, consideration should be given to the followings:
 - Interfaces issue between the two at-grade interchanges including CKR/Road T2 at Kowloon Bay and Road T2/Western Coast Road at Cha Kwo Ling and the adjacent land.
 - Major highways should not block pedestrian connectivity between the hinterland and Kai Tak. There were suggestions to construct

landscaped deck or shopping mall on top of major roads so as to enhance the connectivity between the old and new areas.

- Necessity of extensive road network should be carefully considered. Sunken roads and alternative means of transportation modes could be considered to reduce the possible environmental and visual impacts. A comprehensive transport plan would be required.
- 3-dimensional model to illustrate the road network concept in Kai Tak would be required.

3.4 Cruise Terminal

- Since locating the cruise terminal at the runway would involve substantial transportation for both passengers and goods/services supply, adequate traffic data would be required prior to determining the exact location of the cruise terminal.
- Some Collaborators pointed out that local residents had raised their concern on the possible nuisance associated with cruise terminal in Kai Tak in terms of traffic, environment and visual impacts.
- The possible traffic and environmental impacts generated by the cruise terminal at Kai Tak should be carefully addressed.
- Proper transportation linkages should be planned to link up the cruise terminal at the runway tip with other tourist locations in the city centre.

3.5 Multi-purpose Stadium

- Justifications for the required land take and location of the proposed 24-ha stadium should be substantiated.
- With no reclamation, the proposed 24-ha stadium may displace other land uses e.g. metro park.
- Some Collaborators supported the development of the stadium in Kai Tak due to the lack of world standard sports facilities in Hong Kong.
- In view of the competing demand of other land uses, the stadium, if implemented, should be catered for public enjoyment.
- The sports community was not properly consulted regarding the proposed stadium. It was suggested that this stakeholder group should be included in the consultation process. Also, the overall sports policy in Hong Kong should be reviewed to ascertain the actual need of the proposed 24-ha stadium in Kai Tak.

3.6 Developing Preliminary Land Use Concept Plans

-
- Goals and objectives of the land use plans and the location of key development components (e.g. cruise terminal, stadium etc.) should be provided.
 - Connectivity between major land uses should be carefully planned.
 - Interface with the surrounding areas e.g. San Po Kong , Kowloon Bay and Kwun Tong should also be taken into account in planning Kai Tak.
 - Sustainable assessment for all options of the OCP should be conducted. Economic, environmental and social sustainability are important considerations.
 - The Approach Channel should be cleaned up for more beneficial uses.

3.7 Suggestions for Stage 2 Public Participation

- To supplement the Stage 2 Public Participation, the Collaborators suggested the following activities:
 - To collaborate with District Councils to organize publicity activities so as to solicit views from local residents e.g. display of development concepts of options of the OCP at major shopping malls or public venues within each district;
 - To arrange outreaching programme to display development concepts and to collect students' views; and
 - To encourage and facilitate individual and organizations to arrange their own public participation activities.

4 NEXT STEP

- 4.1 The comments collected in the Collaborators Meeting will provide input to the Consultants for the preparation of the options of Outline Concept Plan and the arrangement of public activities for Stage 2 Public Participation.

~ End ~

KAI TAK PLANNING REVIEW

Collaborators Meeting

~ Planning with the Community ~

Summary of Key Discussion Points

Date: 4 June 2005 (Saturday)
Time: 9:30 am to 12:30 pm
Venue: Room 338-9, 3/F, Civil Services Training & Development Institute, North Point
Government Offices, 333 Java Road, Hong Kong

This summary covers the followings:

- I. Opening remarks by Mr. Anthony KWAN (Assistant Director/Metro & Urban Renewal, Planning Department) and Dr. W.K. CHAN (Chairman of HEC Sub-committee on SEKD Review)
- II. Comments of participants in the floor discussion
- III. Closing remarks by Mr. Anthony KWAN

I. Opening Remarks by Mr. Anthony KWAN and Dr. W.K. CHAN

Mr. Anthony KWAN

- The Stage 1 Public Participation of the Kai Tak Planning Review (the Study) regarding “Community’s Vision for Kai Tak” was conducted between September and November 2004. The community response is positive, with over 500 participants in the public forums/workshop and over 250 written comments and proposals. The Sub-committee on South East Kowloon Development Review under the HEC (the Sub-committee) was briefed on the comments and proposal received in the Stage 1 Public Participation in December 2004 and February 2005. Subsequently, the Sub-committee convened the “Kai Tak Forum” on 19 March 2005 in order to provide an opportunity to know the comments and proposals received and to provide further views before concluding the public participation report and the generation of options for the Outline Concept Plan for the Stage 2 Public Participation.
- The major findings of the Kai Tak Forum were reported to the Sub-Committee in April 2005. The Sub-committee advised to convene a Collaborators Meeting to discuss the way forward for Stage 2 Public Participation of the Study. The meeting would discuss the approach in the preparation of the Outline Concepts Plans and the technical issues involved.

DRAFT

Dr. W.K. CHAN

- Dr. Chan welcomed representatives from the Collaborators to attend this discussion meeting. He explained that Kai Tak Planning Review consisted of three stages of public participation. The Study has already finished the Stage 1 Public Participation regarding Community's Visions for Kai Tak and would start the preparation of the OCP for the Stage 2 Public Participation.
- He stressed that the Collaborators Meeting would neither decide what Kai Tak should be, nor prepare any OCP. The main purposes of the meeting were to conduct focus discussion on the technical issues involved, to discuss the approach in the preparation of the OCP as well as to give some suggestions for Stage 2 Public Participation.

II. Comments of participants in topical discussion

- According to the study programme, the consultant team had already started the preparation of the OCP after analyzing the public comments/proposals received in the Stage 1 Public Participation. Based on the public aspirations for Kai Tak received in the Stage 1 Public Participation, some preliminary land use concepts have been formulated. This meeting would focus on the discussion on technical issues and to solicit the views from the Collaborators on the preliminary land use concepts. Details of the discussion at the meeting are as follows:

Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC)

- **Mr. LAM Man-fai** asked whether water quality models for other scenarios of breaking the runway had been conducted or not. He did not support dredging of contaminated mud at the KTAC as it would further accelerate the pollution problem. He requested a full picture of the water quality model results of different mitigation measures.
- **Dr. HUNG Wing-tat** asked if further improvement works could be done at the Tai Po Treatment Plant so that the pollutants at sources could be further reduced. He asked whether the mitigation measures adopted for the KTAC would help to improve the water quality of the Victoria Harbour.
- **Mr. Michael CHIANG** suggested to construct submarine pipes to divert pollutants from the Kai Tak nullah and other discharge at KTAC to the outer sea. If the sea depth at the KTAC was too shallow, the pipes could be put under the existing bridges across the Channel. He also queried about the methods of treatment of the contaminated mud in the KTAC.
- **Mr. Paul ZIMMERMAN** queried about the cost implications of zero discharge. He suggested that large box culverts could be built in the runway to divert the pollutants to deep water.
- **Mr. CHAN Ka-wai** stated that the Kowloon City District Council had proposed to reclaim the KTAC as the long term mitigation measure to improve the water quality therein. He pointed out that local residents had requested the Government to implement mitigation measures for the KTAC as early as possible.

DRAFT

- **Dr. Mee-kam NG** requested that consultant team to provide the details of various options of mitigation measures (e.g. cost and timing) for public consideration. She suggested that treatment of the contaminated mud at the KTAC should be done as soon as possible.
- Responses by the Consultants:
 - **Mr. Eric MA** responded that the improvement of the water quality of the Victoria Harbour would depend on the Harbour Area Treatment Scheme (HATS). CEDD added that the Ecoli level of the discharge had already been significantly reduced after secondary treatment at the existing Tai Po and Shatin Sewage Treatment Works. Further improvement of the water quality would be difficult to achieve.
 - The water quality models for other scenarios of breaking the runway were still under investigation.
 - He further explained that discharge box culverts were designed within the reclamation area in the previous scheme. If no reclamation would be pursued in Kai Tak, constructing an extensive discharge box culvert within the KTAC would be required. However, the accumulation of culvert underneath the shallow water of the KTAC might not be technical viable and the hydraulic loss resulted could be substantial.
 - In response to the suggestion to reclaim the KTAC, he explained that water quality problem could only be partially resolved. Expedient connections and treatment of the contaminated mud should also be tackled at the same time.
 - All suggestions made by the Collaborators would be further investigated taking into account their technical feasibility and cost-effectiveness.

Central Kowloon Route (CKR) and Road T2

- **Mr. Michael CHIANG** suggested that planning and design flexibility should be allowed in designing the road network. He was concerned about whether the interchange for CKR/Road T2 at Kowloon Bay would block the connectivity of the neighbouring districts and Kai Tak. Landscaped deck or shopping mall could be designed with adequate pedestrian linkage facilities on top of major highways to enhance the connectivity between the old and new areas. He also requested 3-dimensional model to illustrate the proposed road network in Kai Tak.
- **Ms. KO Po-ling** raised her concern about the environmental impacts on the local residents due to the large-scale at-grade interchanges arising from construction of Road T2.
- **Mr. Paul ZIMMERMAN** queried about the necessity of an extensive road network within Kai Tak. He suggested the consultant team to explore alternative means of transportation modes to reduce the amount of surface road and a comprehensive transportation plan would be required.
- **Mr. HUNG Wing-tak** opined that the two interchanges at Kowloon Bay and Cha Kwo Ling arising from the proposed CKR and Road T2 would become the landmark of Kai

DRAFT

Tak waterfront. He suggested the interface issue between the transport interchanges and surrounding land use should be considered. Also depressed roads could be an alternative for connection.

- **Mr. Andy LEUNG** asked if Road T2 could replace part of the existing Kwun Tong Bypass along the waterfront. He also opined that the interface between the proposed interchanges and the adjacent land uses should properly planned. Transport-led planning should be avoided.
- Responses by the Consultants:
 - **Mr. Eric MA** responded that the two interchanges at Kowloon Bay and Cha Kwo Ling would be essential to provide the connection between the CKR and Road T2 as well as between Road T2 and Western Coast Road. In planning the strategic road, consideration would be given to minimize the amount of at-grade interchanges, however adequate linkages with the surrounding areas should also be planned. The suggestion to incorporate landscaped deck over major highways would be further investigated.

Cruise Terminal

- **Mr. Paul ZIMMERMAN** asked if there was any traffic calculation generated by the cruise terminal at the runway tip and the road network required to support the facility. The traffic volume arising from passengers and goods/services supply at cruise terminal would be substantial. The traffic data would be essential to determine the exact location of the cruise terminal in Kai Tak.
- **Dr. HUNG Wing-tat** asked if the heliport would not be required for the alongside berth options.
- **Mr. CHAN Ka Wai** pointed out that local residents were quite concerned about the environmental impacts arising from the cruise terminal in particular, the late evening. The location of the cruise terminal would also create visual impacts to the waterfront.
- **Ms. Betty HO** opined that many cruise terminals in foreign countries are located outside city centre. The possible environmental impacts generated by the cruise terminal at Kai Tak, in the city centre, should be carefully tackled.
- **Dr. Mee-kam NG** pointed out that many public proposals suggested proper transportation connection e.g. monorail to link up the cruise terminal and the city centre. In designing the cruise terminal, proper transportation linkages should be provided.
- Responses by the Consultants:
 - **Mr. Eric MA** responded that the transportation connection between the cruise terminal and the city centre was still under investigation. As the traffic generated by the cruise terminal would be different from other typical land uses, further discussion with the cruise operators would be required. More detailed traffic data would be available in the later stage of the Study.
 - Regarding the heliport question, it would be accommodated within both alongside and finger piers options.

DRAFT

- The possible environmental impacts generated by the cruise terminal would be further investigated. It is understood that the large cruise vessels need to comply with the certain environmental standards.

Multi-purpose Stadium

- **Dr. W.K. CHAN** queried about the size of the stadium as it would take up substantial land area in Kai Tak. The size of 24 ha would be much larger than the area designated for cultural development in West Kowloon. Justifications for the size and location of the stadium should be provided.
- **Mr. Andy LEUNG** agreed with Dr. Chan's concern. In view of the competing demand of various land uses in the urban area, consideration should also be given whether the proposed stadium could be utilized by the surrounding neighbourhood.
- **Mr. Richard HO** opined that the stadium would take up the land for the next decade. The 24-ha stadium would deprive the opportunity to develop Kai Tak as a potential business centre for finance, logistics and commercial sectors.
- **Mr. Michael CHIANG** opined that a large metro park and a stadium had been included in the previous planning scheme. The 24-ha stadium, if implemented, would displace other land uses e.g. metro park under the "no reclamation" development scenario.
- **Mr. LAM Man-fai** and **Ms. KO Po-ling** supported the stadium proposal due to the lack of high standard sports facilities in Hong Kong.
- **Mr. Paul ZIMMERMAN** commented that the sports community was not properly consulted in the Stage 1 Public Participation. He queried the need to cluster three types of sports facilities including main, secondary stadium and aquatic centre within the stadium site. He also requested to review the overall sports policy in Hong Kong so as to achieve proper planning of sports facilities in the territory.
- **Dr. Mee-kam NG** suggested that the stadium should be open to the public for enjoyment.
- Responses by the Consultants:
 - **Ms. Iris TAM** responded that the stadium was taken as given in the Study Brief as one of the key development components in Kai Tak. The Government had conducted a consultancy study and concluded that a stadium would be required for the long-term sports development of Hong Kong. The 24-ha stadium had included the main, a secondary stadium and other supporting facilities proposed in the current OZP. HAB's further advice on the justifications on the location and the size of the stadium would be sought in the light of the "no reclamation" development scenario.
 - It was intended to integrate the metro park with the stadium in the OCP so that more public could enjoy the facilities.

DRAFT

Preliminary Outline Land Use Concept Plan

- **Mr. Paul ZIMMERMAN** did not support the allocation of land uses without considering why the key elements should be located in Kai Tak (e.g. cruise terminal, stadium, etc). The connectivity between the major land uses should be carefully planned.
- **Mr. LAM Man-fai** supported that the Kai Tak timeline concept and more interesting elements should be incorporated to enrich the concept.
- **Mr. Michael CHIANG** opined that the adjacent areas e.g. San Po Kong, Kowloon Bay and Kwun Tong were undergoing transformation. Interface with these areas should be taken into account in planning Kai Tak.
- **Dr. Mee-kam NG** commented that the goals and objectives of the OCPs were missing. The development ideas proposed should be supported by sustainable development principles. Sustainability assessment for all options of the OCP would be required. Also more pedestrianization concept should be applied so that the future development in Kai Tak would be easily accessible for public enjoyment.
- **Mr. Nicholas BROOKE** opined that with an estimated land asset of value in excess of HK\$100 billion, consideration on economic as well as social and environmental sustainability cannot be ignored.
- **Ms. KO Po-ling** pointed out that the Kwun Tong District Council had expressed concern on the future road network of Kai Tak and its impacts on the surrounding areas. The Kwun Tong waterfront should not be sterilized by the Public Cargo Working Area.
- **Mr. LIU Sing-lee** commented that the KTAC and the surrounding water body should be properly cleaned up for other beneficial uses. Proper transport linkages between the runway tip and the hinterland should be provided. Also adequate public space should be provided for public enjoyment.

- **Ms. Iris TAM** responded that the suggestions made by the Collaborators would be considered in refining the options of the OCP.

Suggestion for Stage 2 Public Participation

- **Dr. W.K. CHAN** stated that the Study would proceed to Stage 2 Public Participation after refining of the options of the OCP and completion of the preliminary technical studies. It was anticipated that options of OCP with technical findings would be presented to the public in the coming months. Whilst a series of public activities would be arranged in the Stage 2 Public Participation, Dr. Chan invited the collaborators to suggest other public engagement activities that could supplement the Stage 2 Public Participation.
- **Mr. LAM Man-fai and Ms. KO Po-ling** suggested to collaborate with the District Councils to organize publicity events e.g. display of the options of the OCP at major shopping mall/public venues within each district.
- **Dr. Mee-kam NG** suggested to arrange outreaching programme at schools, e.g. display the materials and collect students' views.

DRAFT

- **Mr. Michael CHIANG** would report the issue to HKIA and the Institute would provide advice, when necessary.
- **Ms. Betty HO** suggested that the collaborators could be encouraged to organize their own public participation activities, with assistance from Government.

Concluding Remarks by Mr. Anthony Kwan

- The suggestions provided by the collaborators at the meeting would be taken into consideration in the study process.

~End~

Kai Tak Planning Review

Collaborators Meeting ~ Planning with the Community ~

Summary of Comments and Responses

Submission Date	Name/Organization	Comments	Responses
8.5.2005	Mr. Paul Zimmerman, Business Environment Council	<p>1. Analyzing views and aspirations should not be limited to Stage 1 of this Kai Tak review but should include previous submissions the Government has received - and we have asked for a list of these submissions for verification with our members.</p> <p>2. What will be taken into account for development visions and planning principles? It was pointed out during the SubCom that the list was incomplete.</p>	<p>1. The analysis on views/aspirations is not limited to those received in the Stage 1 Public Participation, but including also those received in the recent years.</p> <p>A list of the previous submissions is incorporated as part of the Study Brief for Kai Tak Planning Review, which was submitted to the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC) for discussion on 6.5.2004 [available in the HEC website]. The Consultants are required to examine the pros and cons of these previous submissions and their applicability to the Kai Tak Development. The submissions received in the Stage 1 Public Participation are also available in Planning Department's Public Enquiry Counters for general inspection.</p> <p>2. In the analysis of development visions and planning principles for Kai Tak, the Consultants will take into account Town Planning Board's Vision Statement on Victoria Harbour, HEC's Harbour Planning</p>

Submission Date	Name/Organization	Comments	Responses
		<p>3. When analyzing the impact of development proposals for Kai Tak, the list appears incomplete. Will the list be expanded? In addition to development proposal (land uses?), what are the land/water interfaces to be considered? Will the impact of (transport) infrastructure proposals be considered? If so, how?</p> <p>4. As noted in the meeting, surely reclamation is not the only aspect to 'force' further examination of development and other proposals? What are the other aspects to be considered? For example, should the amount of harbour-front land required for incompatible uses as set out in the harbour planning principles not be a consideration?</p> <p>5. What are the territorial requirements for the harbour and harbour-front, and what are the sitting parameters for each of these</p>	<p>Principles, Urban Design Guidelines and the comments/proposals received in the Stage 1 Public Participation. The proposed development visions and planning principles will be promulgated for further discussion with the community in the Stage 2 Public Participation.</p> <p>3. The study requirements for preparation of Outline Concept Plan are detailed in the Study Brief and the Inception Report for Kai Tak Planning Review, which could be found in the study website. Land and water interfaces and traffic and transports impacts are subjects that the Consultants will examine in the study process.</p> <p>4. The need to comply with the legal requirement of the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance is the main reason to revisit the planning scheme for South East Kowloon Development. Since planning is an on-going process issues like incompatible land uses, if any, in the previously adopted scheme, could be addressed and fine-tuned at the implementation stage. Given the opportunity to re-plan the ex-airport site, all prevailing guidelines and principles, including the Harbour Planning Principles of HEC will be taken into account in the study process.</p> <p>5. The Baseline Review report prepared under the Kai Tak Planning Review has examined the requirements of different land uses that could be developed in Kai</p>

Submission Date	Name/Organization	Comments	Responses
		<p>developments? Which developments should be considered for Kai Tak? Which marine uses should be considered? Which ones should not be considered? How will the trade-off be evaluated? What parameters will be considered?</p> <p>[During the meeting the Consultant identified that the Cruise Terminal cum Tourism Node will require transport infrastructure which in turn will require reclamation. Is that reclamation more or less acceptable than the reclamation for the lengthen of the existing piers at Ocean Terminal? Or the dredging at West Kowloon?]</p> <p>6. Should the TR2 not be split into two - whereby all the work required prior to developing and presenting the Outline Concept Plans is then considered 'The Design and Planning Brief for Kai Tak' which requires consent and agreement</p>	<p>Tak, including their development parameters. The report is mounted on the study website for general reference.</p> <p>The preparation of the Outline Concept Plan is the process where the possible land use components are incorporated and set out in the format of a town plan. The Consultants will prepare not less than three options of the Outline Concept Plan to highlight the attributes of different land use themes. The options of Outline Concept Plan will be promulgated for discussion with the community in the Stage 2 Public Participation.</p> <p>[The Kai Tak Planning Review has taken “no reclamation” as the starting point of the study. Any proposal for reclamation will need to satisfy the “over-riding public need” test handed down by the Court of Final Appeal in January 2004. The comments by the Consultants in the Sub-committee meeting convened on 26.4.2005 was intended to emphasize the need for road connection between the runway area and the Kwun Tong area, but this is subject to meeting the reclamation test.]</p> <p>6. The Study Brief setting out the methodology and study requirements of the Kai Tak Planning Review was discussed by the HEC in May 2004 before it was finalized for commissioning consultants to undertake the assignment. The subject collaborators meeting</p>

Submission Date	Name/Organization	Comments	Responses
		<p>by the HEC first before proceeding to stage 2, the creation and presentation of the outline concept plans. Specifically also because this Design and Planning Brief for Kai Tak requires strategic input based on the territorial requirements for the harbour and harbour-front as a whole.</p> <p>7. Would it not be wise for part 2 of TR2, the preparation of Outline Concept Plans, to be done by several firms of consultants to ensure a healthy competition of ideas? This would then address the current conflict of interest inherent whereby the 'designer' is writing their own 'design brief'.</p>	<p>has been arranged to strengthen the preparation of the Outline Concept Plan and to gauge further expertise input to ensure the study process has covered all relevant aspects.</p> <p>7. The study has systematically collected ideas for redevelopment of Kai Tak as inputs to the Consultants in preparing the options of Outline Concept Plan. The Consultants are required to take into account the comments and proposals received in the Stage 1 Public Participation, the development concepts received in the past years, the ideas emerged in the community workshop, etc. in preparing the Outline Concept Plan.</p>
30.5.2005	Ms Mee Kam Ng, CUPEM, HKU	<p>1. Can the Review guarantee that concerns of revitalization of the districts surrounding Kai Tak will also be taken care of? In New York, the reconstruction of the WTC site concerns the mission of revitalizing Lower Manhattan!</p>	<p>1. The redevelopment of the ex-airport site will provide a catalyst to stimulate revitalization of the surrounding districts, the process of which is gradually emerging. The study is expected to address the interface issues between the new and existing districts, e.g. urban design, connectivity, etc., to address shortfall in open space/GIC facilities and not to impose traffic/transport problems to the surrounding districts. The housing sites identified in Kai Tak could also help in the decanting of the redevelopment sites in the existing districts.</p>

Submission Date	Name/organization	Comments	Responses
6.6.2005	Mr. Paul Zimmerman, Business Environment Council	<p>1. The 'why, why not in Kai Tak' has not been answered for the suggested developments. The current 'district' based planning for Kai Tak, West Kowloon, Wanchai and Central Ferries without an evaluation of the location of facilities around the harbour-front of the protected harbour as a whole, may well result in sub-optimization of Hong Kong's urban plan around the harbour.</p>	<p>1. The Kai Tak Planning Review, as a district planning study, would take account of the findings and recommendations from the various preceding studies, including those being undertaken for respective development components and strategic planning studies such as the Planning Study on the Harbour and its Waterfront Area and its review, Hong Kong 2030, Sustainability Development Study, as well as the Harbour Planning Principles formulated by HEC. The findings of these studies and the planning principles, which would shed light on the question of locating the respective projects in Kai Tak, would be closely observed in the study process.</p>
		<p>2. The Outline Concepts presented on Saturday do not provide the public with a relevant choice. With the SCL depot, Cruise Home Port, Sports Complex, and Metro Park pre-determined - the variations appear limited to:</p> <p>a) The residential and commercial development density and intensity.</p> <p>b) Whether or not to cut through the runway to flush the nullah (at least one, if not two, appear the only cost effective way to address the water quality issues? and at least one cut through on the western end on a temporary</p>	<p>2. Options of OCP on the basis of broad feasibility will be prepared and promulgated to the public in the Stage 2 Public Participation to allow a more focused discussion in the community. Some proposed development concepts not to be pursued in the study process will also be presented to demonstrate the pros and cons of development proposals and technical difficulties involved.</p>

Submission Date	Name/organization	Comments	Responses
		<p>basis should be done immediately to start flushing the nullah?)</p> <p>c) The addition of a light rail bridge (why was did not a circular line continuing through Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay back into the sports city?). The other minor differences (a triathlon: cycle-run-swim? track, a marina) can easily be accommodated under all three. Little of the substantive alternatives identified during the consultations appear as options. If the purpose of the Inception Report was to filter these out, then we disagree and urge for the wider public to be given the choice. Although there was little time to study the plans in detail after some good quality discussions on engineering issues, I noted in all three drawings roads featured on both the left and right of the runway separating developments from the harbour, rather than placing developments immediately adjacent to a public water front (and any public facilities thereon).</p>	

Submission Date	Name/organization	Comments	Responses
		<p>3. The traffic impact and transport requirements for the tourism node including a 3-berth Cruise Terminal Home Port, shopping facilities, hotel and heliport (which was marked as 'on top of' which is not possible for single engine helis), were absent. Verbally the Consultant noted that cruise passengers will want to go to TST. As a homeport, international cruise passengers and crew will arrive or depart via Chep Lap Kok. It appears that locating the cruise terminal at the end of Kai Tak is as far away (in the harbour) as possible from these locations. This will add traffic for a significant distance to a road network with already the highest car density per km in the world. Besides people movement, supplies, servicing and cleaning are a major industrial operation for the proposed complex and requires substantial transport infrastructure over the narrow runway itself through what was planned as a new quality environment.</p>	<p>3. Traffic and transport is an important aspect that the Study needs to address. The Consultants are in the process to obtain more concrete data on various technical matters to refine the options of OCP. The technical data and estimations would be presented together with these options in the Stage 2 Public Participation.</p>

Submission Date	Name/organization	Comments	Responses
		<p>4. The evaluation of different sites around the harbour should be available prior to producing outline concept plans for Kai Tak, and such evaluation will need to include the cost (money and land use) of additional transport infrastructure, traffic impact on existing infrastructure, marine safety, reclamation, among other financial, social and environmental factors?</p>	<p>4. The Consultants will take account of the available studies and relevant information in the preparation of OCP. The preliminary technical assessments including traffic, utilities, implementation etc, will also be undertaken to ensure the broad feasibility of development proposals in Kai Tak.</p>
		<p>5. The placement of the Architectural Services Department’s concept for a Sports City in the heart of Kai Tak creates a large ‘empty hole’. Similarly to the gap identified between arts and culture development policy and the WKCD proposal, there appears to be a significant gap in local sports development, the current management of sports facilities, resulting in questionable usage patterns and viability of the proposed ‘tip of the sports pyramid’ facilities planned for an Asian Games event. Irrespective of the demand and usage issues, the proposed form of integration of the facilities into Hong Kong’s urban plan is questionable (or just solely driven by some predetermined form of financing or development model?) Why clusters the facilities? Outside irregular Asian Games type</p>	<p>5. Further advice from HAB/ArchSD on the size and detailed requirements of proposed stadium will be sought. Issues related to the “Sports Park” will be further investigated and incorporated in outline concepts for Kai Tak development, where appropriate.</p>

Submission Date	Name/organization	Comments	Responses
		<p>events, regular users of each facility are quite different? Why run the roads outside and not through the ‘sports park’? Why not place the main stadium above a station? And/or above the SCL depots? Why, if the sports city is designed as a park, have another metro park? The Study Brief for the Kai Tak Planning Brief does not list previous submissions made to the Government for sports facilities (in Kai Tak). Will they be reviewed? How can these facilities be better integrated in Hong Kong’s urban plan?</p>	
		<p>6. We did not discuss nor were we provided with any relevant information on the SCL depot.</p> <p>7. The urban connectivity between the surrounding districts and new Kai Tak is non-existing in the plans. The street and lot sizes indicated are entirely different. One side is Puxi, the other side is Pudong. Or closer to home, one side is South Wanchai, the other side North Wanchai. The difference is a living, vibrant, street level environment versus a near dead zone (except for</p>	<p>6. The Study has taken this scenario as a working assumption as the SCL project is pending the on-going investigation on the Merger Proposal of the railway operators. The Study would investigate different options of OCP for “with” and “without” SCL depot.</p> <p>7. The connectivity between the hinterland and Kai Tak is one of the key concerns in planning Kai Tak. The Consultants will, through the design of the land use layout and traffic network as well as pedestrian facilities, enhance the connectivity between old and new districts, which will be presented in the PODP/ layout plan stage. The other concerns and suggestions regarding the interface issues, layout design, etc, would be further investigated and</p>

Submission Date	Name/organization	Comments	Responses
		<p>the cars) and some huge and monumental projects. What makes for a sensible interface? What style of developments do the proposed concepts pre-determine? Tseung Kwan O, Ma On Shan, IFC/Exchange Square, and Convention Plaza style complexes but with a bit more parkland and a promenade around the water? Or are we determined to find a way to bring back Hong Kong's culture as embedded in the street life of the older parts of town and the villages? Or do we add a new style of living because of a unique opportunity, if so – what do the outline concepts really express and result in?</p>	<p>incorporated in outline concepts for Kai Tak development, where appropriate.</p>
		<p>8. It was encouraging to hear the meeting on Saturday call for an integrated and holistic review of the existing and new transport infrastructure and all modes of transport services for Kai Tak and surrounding areas, rather than accepting the limited technical outline of just the CKR and T2 alignment. It appears that such should take place before presenting Outline Concepts.</p>	<p>8. As mentioned above, the Consultants are in the process to obtain more concrete data on various technical matters and an integrated transport network connecting the adjacent areas and Kai Tak would be considered in the preparation of the options of OCP.</p>
		<p>9. Other than the cruise terminal, a tourist ferry from the cruise hotel to Kwun Tong, and one verbal</p>	<p>9. Suggestions will be further investigated in the outline concepts for Kai Tak development. Only broad concepts, where appropriate, would be</p>

Submission Date	Name/organization	Comments	Responses
		<p>suggestion to move the To Kwa Wan breakwaters as a technical measure to help flush the nullah, there was an absolute absence of any notion of land/water interfaces to provide people with access to the harbour itself with water taxis, sailing yachts or other vessels, nor to facilitate the 'working' vessels - the current 'permanent' users of the typhoon shelters. During various discussions related to the living harbour review, it was agreed that marine uses and land/water interfaces would be included when planning each 'district'. The outline concepts do not reflect this for Kai Tak and surroundings (incl. the harbour). Kai Tak is the longest coast line we will ever get to develop in the harbour in one go - should we not plan starting from the harbour?</p>	<p>presented at this stage, which would be further fine-tuned with details throughout the process from stages of concept plan to development plan and to layout plan.</p>
		<p>10. The Kai Tak Planning Review methodology was presented and finalized at the first meeting of the HEC in May 2004. There was little discussion or understanding how the work would unfold. With the 'why, why not' questions unanswered, substantive alternative developments for Kai Tak proposed during the last year excluded, and now a lack of true choice among the outline concepts, they appear to express a lack of 'independence'</p>	<p>10. As mentioned in responses to item 1, the findings of these relevant territorial studies would be closely observed in the study process.</p> <p>The main purpose of the Collaborators Meeting is to strengthen the preparation of the OCP and to gauge further expertise input to ensure the study process has covered all relevant aspects. The technical studies and the preliminary land use concept plans would be further refined in the study process taking into account the comments received. The findings of</p>

Submission Date	Name/organization	Comments	Responses
		<p>from a predetermined course. The outcome of the collaborators meeting on Saturday identified various shortcomings and failed to provide endorsement or support. The poverty of alternatives within the outline concepts and not a spark of an understanding of marine uses of a key harbour site is potentially an embarrassment. How do we proceed? and avoid a WD2 kit response? The call for an evaluation of the placement of key developments and facilities around the harbour to ensure an optimization of Hong Kong's urban plan around the harbour stands. And the Kai Tak Planning process should be amended to ensure a healthier competition of ideas.</p>	<p>the technical studies and explanation on the options of the OCP would be incorporated into a user-friendly consultation documents for the Stage 2 Public Participation.</p>
		<p>11. Side bar suggestion: When going public, all 'Enhancements Requiring Reclamation' should be presented in one separate option. For example the finger piers, the small rounding of the corner in To Kwa Wan, the light rail bridge, moving the break water, any additional land/water interfaces requiring reclamation, together with identification of land returned to the harbour such as the cut troughs.</p>	<p>11. The suggestions will be taken into account in preparing public consultation documents in Stage 2 Public Participation.</p>

Submission Date	Name/organization	Comments	Responses
6.6.2005	Mr. Nicholas Brooke	<p>1. Firstly we seem, tacitly at least, to be accepting that certain components, in particular the cruise terminal and the sports stadium complex have to be sited at Kai Tak without being provided with a comprehensive review of other options and locations. Both impact materially not only in terms of land take but also in regard to infrastructure provision and they impinge on the use that can be made of adjoining areas; so that I think the case has not just to be strong but rather overwhelming.</p>	<p>1. Noted. Further input from the respective project proponents are required.</p>
		<p>2. Secondly I also did not find sufficient points of difference in the 3 options tabled towards the end of the session and I think this is something that needs further thought as some of the interesting ideas that emerged during the envisioning stage appear to have been put to one side already.</p>	<p>2. Detailed response to the public comments/proposals collected during the envisioning stage of the study will be prepared and promulgated together with the options of OCP in the Stage 2 Public Participation. Some proposed development concepts not to be pursued in the study process will also be presented to demonstrate the pros and cons of development proposals and technical difficulties involved.</p>
		<p>3. Finally and more importantly is the issue of sustainability which was not raised at all until I reminded the meeting of its importance. As I said on Saturday, it is important to strike the appropriate balance between romance and reality</p>	<p>3. Broad sustainability assessment will be conducted for the options of OCP. Full sustainability assessment will be carried out at the later Preliminary Outline Development Plan stage. These assessments would provide the indication on the</p>

Submission Date	Name/organization	Comments	Responses
		<p>and with a land asset of value in excess of HK\$100 billion economic as well as social and environmental sustainability cannot be ignored. Without wishing to restrict the creative juices of the community we cannot duck this issue and I think the Sub Committee should discuss how it proposes to introduce this aspect into the Phase 2 exercise.</p>	<p>performance of the relevant proposals and where necessary, should lead to modification.</p>
6.6.2005	Mr. Roger Tang, The Hong Kong Institute of Planners	<p>1. I am unconvinced of reserving a 24ha site for a white elephant without some kind of preliminary study by the government at least on the demand side. At least the cruise terminal did have one conducted by the Tourism Commission recently and have consulted the operators on their requirements. I don't think any government department will dare to take up the capital and operating costs of this sports complex and it will again end up like the WKCD to be tendered out as a PPP and end up as a commercial property development project. How can we support this as a development component in the options. Instead I will go for the aviation museum as one of the alternative in the conceptual options.</p>	<p>1. Further advice from HAB/ArchSD on the size and detailed requirements of the proposed stadium will be sought.</p>

~End~

KAI TAK PLANNING REVIEW

Suggestions for Stage 2 Public Participation

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to invite Members to discuss the approach for the Stage 2 Public Participation on Outline Concept Plan.

Background

2. The Kai Tak Planning Review started with an envisioning process to engage the community to discuss vision for Kai Tak (Stage 1 Public Participation). This exercise was mainly organized by Planning Department with enthusiastic support from the HEC Sub-committee and the collaborators advising on the public engagement activities. These mainly included public discussion forums, community workshop, briefing sessions to stakeholders/ advisory bodies, press conference, exhibition and website, etc.

3. The Sub-committee has also taken the initiative to organize the Kai Tak Forum for the public to examine the comments and proposals received, and participate in the generation of options for the Outline Concept Plan for the Stage 2 Public Participation. In general, all the activities have been able to encourage the local community and stakeholders to be involved in the planning process.

4. In the Stage 2 Public Participation, different options of Outline Concept Plan will be put forward for discussion in the community. Taking into account the experience gained in the last exercise, the Consultants have proposed to approach the Stage 2 Public Participation in focusing on the following areas: preparation of consultation digest, arrangement of open public discussion forums, promulgation of the reference materials and public events through websites. To enable a wider public engagement in the process,

the programme will be further strengthened in the involvement of independent organizations and local youth groups. More visually enhanced presentation materials such as video animations, interactive 3-D computer models, and physical models will also be prepared, subject to availability of resources, to facilitate a better understanding and appreciation of the proposed options of Outline Concept Plan.

5. The Consultants have proposed the approaches to undertake the Stage 2 Public Participation, as attached at **Annex**.

Advice Sought

6. Members are invited to advise on:

(a) the approaches for the Stage 2 Public Participation proposed by the Consultants, as attached at **Annex**; and

(b) any other suggestions to enhance the Stage 2 Public Participation.

Planning Department
June 2005

Kai Tak Planning Review

Suggestions for the Stage 2 Public Participation

Background

1. In view of the public concern on reclamation in the Victoria Harbour and waterfront developments as well as the general demand for public participation in the planning process, a more pro-active approach is adopted to consult and engage the general public and the concerned groups in the course of Kai Tak Planning Review. According to the Study Brief, public participation activities have been structured into 3 different stages for “Community’s Vision for Kai Tak”, “Outline Concept Plan” and “Preliminary Outline Development Plan” respectively.

2. Stage 1 Public Participation regarding “Community’s Vision for Kai Tak” was undertaken during September and November 2004. From the experience gained in the Stage 1 Public Participation programme, it is noted that provision of more interactive and visually enhanced materials can better facilitate the participants from different sectors. Effort should be paid to encourage more participation of the younger generations to build up their consensus on Kai Tak Development as they will be the major users when development proposals in Kai Tak are fully implemented.

3. In the Stage 2 Public Participation, different options of Outline Concept Plan will be put forward for discussion in the community. Since the exercise is to gauge feedback from the public on these options and encourage innovative ideas/proposals, as input to the Consultants to prepare a Preliminary Outline Concept Plan for Kai Tak, it is proposed to adopt a multi-channel and multi-media approach for the Stage 2 Public Participation. This would involve, in main, the following. A list comparing the Stage 1 Public Participation activities and those proposed for Stage 2 is at **Appendix 1**.

Background and Discussion Materials

4. Discussion materials will be prepared and provided for the public to enable better understanding of the options of Outline Concept Plan. They include:

- Public Consultation Digest – to be released to the public upon launching of the

Stage 2 Public Participation programme, which would outline the latest findings of the study.

- Poster and flyers – to be distributed together with the digest as part of the publicity programme. Flyers in electronic format can be produced in parallel to enable a wider promulgation and more timely circulation.
- Public Participation Report – to summarize the findings of the public participation programme and how the input from the public will be carried forward in the study process.
- Relevant publicity and consultant materials will be displayed in Hong Kong Planning and Infrastructure Exhibition Gallery for local and overseas visitors and PlanD 's Mobile Exhibition Centre for viewing by local communities.

5. Subject to availability of adequate resource, the following additional discussion materials will be prepared in an attempt to further enhance the depth and width of the public engagement:

- Public Participation Toolkit – to include a package of relevant public participation materials (e.g. digest, poster, exhibits, plans, photos, animation) and guideline, which would form a handy toolkit for independent organizations to arrange their own public participation events.
- Summary of the technical issues and relevant analysis e.g. water quality, traffic impact etc.- to enable the public to formulate their comments on the OCP.

Public Involvement

6. Public discussion forums, consultation and focus group meetings will be arranged to encourage public involvement in the exercise. Details are as follows:

- 1 Public Forum – to encourage public participation. Floor presentation and more in-dept group discussion/ workshop will be included.
- Various Public Consultation Meetings – to arrange briefing sessions for District Councils, Town Planning Board, and other public bodies concerned.
- Various Focus Group Meetings – to build consensus among groups of special interests on particular planning issues.

7. Subject to availability of adequate resource, the following activities will be arranged to strengthen the public participation:

- Collaborators Meeting – to focus on the technical issues.

- Launching Event – a press conference to be held to introduce the Stage 2 Public Participation programme.
- Public Forums & Exhibitions – One forum will be arranged at the territory-wide scale with central location and the public from all places are welcomed to the forum. More forums will be organized in the neighboring areas around Kai Tak. Floor presentation and more in-depth group discussion would be included. Exhibition would be arranged in the districts prior to each forum to attract more participants.
- Youth Programme – to encourage youth groups to organize discussion on the OCP at local level.

Website

8. All relevant materials in digital format including the digest, options of Outline Concept Plan, background materials, technical information, video clips and photos of public events will be posted in the study website to enable wider promulgation of the information to the public. The website will also provide a strong media for updated information on the study.

9. Subject to availability of adequate resource, an on-line interactive opinion collection form will be designed and posted in the study website to provide a window for gauging the public feedbacks on the options of OCP.

Multi-media

10. Powerpoint presentation for better communication in the public events will be prepared and the following multi-media materials will also be provided to facilitate the public participation activities and more importantly, to enable easy understanding of the outline concepts for Kai Tak:

- Video animations – overview and fly-through of the 3-D computer models for the proposed outline concepts with highlights on key land uses and urban design features.
- Interactive Computer Models – 360-degree overview of the 3-D computer models for the proposed outline concepts to allow interactive panning and zooming control of views.

11. Subject to availability of adequate resource, physical models showing the proposed outline concepts in broad scale can also be prepared to enhance

appreciation of the various options of OCP.

Mass Media

12. Briefing for the mass media will be arranged at the beginning of the Stage 2 Public Participation programme. Spokesman will be arranged to maintain consistency in the press line. The Information Services Department will be consulted on the relevant activities to ensure public relation angle is well managed.

**City Planning – Maunsell Joint Venture
June 2005**

A List of Major Components for Stage 1 and 2 Public Participation Programmes

	Stage 1 Public Participation	Stage 2 Public Participation
Background & Discussion	Poster & Flyer	Poster & Flyer
Materials	Public Consultation Digest (1) Public Participation Report (2)	Public Consultation Digest (2) Public Participation Report (2)
Public Involvement	1 Public Forum Various Public Consultation Meetings HEC Subcom Site Visit 2 Additional Public Forums 1 Community Workshop Kai Tak Forum	1 Public Forum Various Public Consultation Meetings Various Focus Group Meetings Collaborators Meeting # Launching Event# 3 Additional Forums & Exhibition# Youth Programme#
Website	Public Consultation Digest Public Participation Strategy Baseline Review Promulgation of Public Events Video Clips of Public Events	Public Consultation Digest Outline Concept Plans Promulgation of Public Events Video Clips of Public Events On-line Interactive Opinion Collection Form#
Multi-media	Powerpoint Presentation	Powerpoint Presentation Video Presentation on Outline Concepts Interactive 3-D Computer Model for Outline Concepts Physical Model for Outline Concepts in Broad Scale#
Mass Media	Press Briefing	Press Briefing

Subject to availability of adequate resources