



Minutes of 7th Meeting

Time: 2:30 pm
Date: 21 June 2005
Venue: Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices,
333 Java Road, North Point

Present

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

In Attendance

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

Consultants

Ms Iris Tam] City Planning – Maunsell Joint Venture
Mr Derek Sun]
Mr Igor Ho]

Absent with Apologies

Professor JIM Chi-yung
Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke
Ms Lee Wai-king, Starry

Opening Remarks

The Chairman welcomed Mrs Ava Ng, Dep Secy (Planning & Lands)1, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau attending the meeting for the first time.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of 6th Meeting

Action

1.1 **The Chairman** said that the draft minutes of the 6th meeting were circulated to Members for comments on 31.5.2005. As there were no further comments, the meeting confirmed the minutes.

Item 2 Matters Arising

2.1 **The Chairman** noted that most of the matters arising from the 6th meeting had been included in Agenda Items No. 3 and 4 in this meeting.

2.2 Para 3.9: In response to **the Chairman, Mr Talis Wong** said that the suspected oil spillage did not come from the barges of Civil Engineering and Development Department's (CEDD's) contractors. **The Secretary** said that the District Lands Officer/Kowloon East (DLO/KE) had undertaken site

inspections recently but did not record oil spillage in the area. They had reminded the tenants of the Short Term Tenancies on the Government land along the waterfront area to keep the foreshore area clean. Both Marine Department and Environmental Protection Department (EPD) were informed of the issue.

2.3 Para 3.20: **The Chairman** noted that the temporary stockpiling at the runway area would cease operation by the end of 2006. He questioned whether enhancement works could be carried out immediately afterwards. **Mr Talis Wong** said that it was an on-going effort to relocate the stockpiled materials to other sites and the volume of stockpiles had already been reduced. He agreed that concerned departments should get prepared in advance so that upon clearance of the site, the area could be released for other beneficial uses to enable the public to have easy access to the waterfront. In this regard, CEDD would continue to liaise with LandsD to explore future temporary uses for the area and report to the Committee in due course. **The Chairman** said that the subject on temporary uses in Kai Tak should be monitored by the concerned department and reported to this Committee where appropriate.

All to note

2.4 In response to **Mr Paul Zimmerman's** questions on funding and programming arrangements for the enhancement work in the waterfront area, **Mrs Ava Ng** said that the HEC had discussed this issue. They would work with the concerned departments on this matter. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the concerned bureaux/departments should expedite their actions as the issue had been raised in the HEC for some times already. This concern was also applicable to the early action to clean up the Kai Tak Approach Channel.

Briefing to Town Planning Board on Kai Tak Planning Review

2.5 In view of the concerns of Members on the recent reports in the newspapers regarding TPB's comments on the Kai Tak Planning Review, the Chairman proposed and Members agreed to advance the discussion of this issue under Matters Arising.

2.6 **The Chairman** said that as part of the public participation programme of the Kai Tak Planning Review (the Study), Planning Department (PlanD) briefed the statutory and advisory

committees, e.g. the District Councils (DCs) and LegCo Panel, etc. on a regular basis. On 17.6.2005, the Town Planning Board (TPB) was briefed on the progress of the Study. The occasion was widely covered by the mass media as this was the first open meeting of TPB. Since the briefing was related to the Study and open to the public, some Members opined that they should be informed of the event, with the option to participate, where appropriate.

- 2.7 **Mr Raymond Lee** said that apart from the briefings undertaken under the Stage 1 Public Participation, they would brief these bodies and other interested parties if and when necessary to discuss progress of the Study. He said that in view of Members' interest, PlanD would inform Members of these events in the future. PlanD
- 2.8 **Mr Raymond Lee** said that the recent TPB briefing mainly covered the study progress, activities undertaken in the Stage 1 Public Participation and key comments received. The TPB members' main concerns were on the technical issues, public opinions on the proposed uses, population projection and slow progress of the development of Kai Tak site. They urged the Government departments to expedite the study process.
- 2.9 Referring to a newspaper report of 18.6.2005, **Dr Alvin Kwok** said that Mrs Rita Lau, Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (PSPL), as Chairperson of the TPB, was quoted to have said during the briefing session, that "public consultation process could not go on forever" and "hoped that public consensus could be concluded in the future submission to the TPB". **Mr Raymond Lee** said that the TPB members noted the comments received in the Stage 1 Public Participation, some of which might be conflicting and stressed the need to strike a balance. He said that Mrs Lau was concluding the discussions of the meeting and had highlighted the importance of a proper balance between public participation and early development of the Kai Tak site.
- 2.10 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** asked whether Mrs Lau's concluding remarks represented the Chairperson's summary of the views of the TPB members or whether it was an Administration's position. **The Chairman** remarked that this was a question for the TPB and the Administration, it was not one which could be answered in this meeting. However, he considered it a fair

observation to describe that Mrs Lau was summarizing the views of TPB members, as he was also present at the TPB briefing.

- 2.11 In response to **Dr Alvin Kwok's** question on whether the role of HEC was explained to the TPB members, **Mr Raymond Lee** said that HEC was an important advisor to the Government on harbour front issues and also a valuable partner in fostering public involvement in the planning process for the Kai Tak area. The TPB was aware of the role of HEC and their contribution.
- 2.12 In response to **Mr Paul Zimmerman's** concern on a quote in the newspaper that "the site had a role to play in the long-term development of the city and housing should not be ignored". **Mr Raymond Lee** recalled from the discussions in the TPB meeting that Members had pointed out that Kai Tak was a very large site and that housing development should not be ruled out. Also, according to the comments received from the Stage 1 Public Participation, many people wished to see quality housing to be constructed. The actual volume of housing development would depend on the final conceptual plan.
- 2.13 **Mr Andy Leung** remarked that Members had been discussing newspaper reports and reflected their concerns on how the Administration perceived the on-going public participation initiatives for the Kai Tak Planning Review. He said that the minutes of the TPB briefing should be distributed to Members, as a reference of the official stance on the relevant issues.
- 2.14 In response to **Mr Kim Chan's** questions on what sort of consultation timetable would be considered reasonable by the TPB members, **Mr Raymond Lee** said that the TPB was briefed on the progress of the Kai Tak Planning Review periodically. The importance of public engagement was one of the main issues that was emphasised to the TPB members. TPB members were fully aware of the need to strengthen the public engagement activities to enhance public consensus on different issues.
- 2.15 **Dr Alvin Kwok** said if these recent newspaper reports were not properly addressed and clarified, it would cast doubt on the validity of the on-going public participation initiatives by the HEC and the concerned bureaux/departments should review

PlanD

their consultation exercise, where appropriate.

- 2.16 **Mrs Ava Ng** said that the HPLB fully supported the work of the HEC and their advice on the public engagement activities to help building public consensus on various planning and development issues. She pointed out that the main purpose to set up the HEC was to strengthen the communication with the community and general public. **Mrs Ava Ng** urged Members not to perceive negatively to the reports published in newspapers recently. She continued that the HPLB treasured the efforts of the HEC in strengthening the public engagement activities and opined that TPB members' concern was on whether Government departments could expedite their work process to enable early development in the Kai Tak area.
- 2.17 **Mr Anthony Kwan** said that PlanD also fully supported public participation in the planning process. He explained that the TPB's main concern was on the work of the Government departments. He said that continual public participation could focus discussion on key issues at the early stage and avoid abortive work later in the implementation phase.
- 2.18 **Mr Andy Leung** said that PlanD should address this concern of TPB and highlight the programming implications to the HEC members, where necessary, in future discussions.
- 2.19 **Dr Alvin Kwok** opined that Mrs Lau, as Chairperson of the TPB, member of the HEC and also PSPL, should be in a good position to bridge the interests of the three bodies and enhance liaison with the TPB. However, the newspaper reports gave the impression that the public participation process was affecting the development process of Kai Tak.
- 2.20 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** expressed regret that the PSPL had not taken the opportunity to define the relationship between the HEC and TPB and questioned whether Members' efforts had been spent for the right reasons. He said that the HEC, in their earlier discussions had established public participation in the planning process as an on-going process. In light of the recent concern to speed up the planning process, it warranted discussion on the perceived obstacles which delayed the process and actions required to expedite it.

2.21 In response, **Mrs Ava Ng** said that the TPB, as a statutory body, would also take into account public comments in their work. HEC's initiative on the public participation process would contribute to TPB's deliberation on the OZPs for the Kai Tak area. Since planning was an on-going exercise that it would require continuous effort to gather public feedback to the relevant proposals, the HEC was invited to advise and assist in this process. In response to **the Chairman's** question, **Mrs Ava Ng** confirmed that HPLB did not perceive public participation as a waste of time and there was no question that the HPLB would want to terminate the on-going consultation exercise.

2.22 **The Chairman** suggested that the HEC should communicate more with the TPB vis-à-vis the concept of public participation. He said that Members expected Mrs Lau, as the Chairperson of TPB, PSPL and member of the HEC, to defend the public participation process, as and when necessary. In concluding, **the Chairman** said that given the impression that the TPB cast doubt on the on-going public participation process, he reminded Members to study the minutes of the TPB meeting and to pursue this issue further, if necessary. As raised in the TPB briefing session, the HEC Sub-committee would invite the TPB members to participate in future public engagement activities to enhance communication.

[Post-meeting Notes: Extract of Confirmed TPB minutes of meeting of 17.6.2005 is at Annex I]

Item 3 Report on Collaborators Meeting
[SEKD SC Paper No. 5/05]

3.1 At **the Chairman's** invitation, **Mr Anthony Kwan** said that at the last Sub-committee meeting, Members decided to convene a Collaborators Meeting (CM) to discuss the approach in the preparation of the Outline Concept Plan (OCP) for Stage 2 Public Participation. The main purpose of the CM was to discuss the technical issues involved in preparing the options of OCP and to gather suggestions for Stage 2 Public Participation. The meeting was held on 4.6.2005 and had covered technical issues like Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC), Central

Kowloon Route (CKR) and Road T2, Cruise Terminal, Multi-purpose Stadium, also integration between Kai Tak and nearby areas in the preparation of OCP.

- 3.2 In presenting the draft report on the CM, **Ms Iris Tam** said that a number of District Councillors had also attended the CM to discuss the local concerns on the future development of the areas near their own districts. She said that the comments raised in the CM would be considered further and the OCPs would be prepared as soon as possible, which would be supported by justifications and preliminary technical assessments. She then highlighted the following key issues that were identified in the CM:
- (a) Identification of beneficial uses for KTAC, accessibility issues, mitigation measures, cost evaluation of options and time table of implementation if there would be no reclamation, and the various cleaning options for KTAC.
 - (b) Transportation - call for innovative approach to the design of interchanges for CKR/Road T2/WCR at Kowloon Bay and Cha Kwo Ling to avoid segregation; also called for integrated land use, transport and environment approach to avoid the proposed road system pre-empting the people-oriented living environment.
 - (c) Locating cruise terminal and multi-purpose stadium in Kai Tak were still areas of concern. Tourism Commission and Home Affairs Bureau should address these on-going concerns.
 - (d) Cruise Terminal - general concern on the land use, transport and environmental impacts of this facility at the prominent waterfront of Kai Tak.
 - (e) Multi-purpose Stadium - whether the proposed sports facilities were well justified, in terms of their scale, utilisation and financial viability. Also general concern on land-take, sports policy, environmental and traffic impact of the facility were raised.
 - (f) OCPs - there were insufficient points of difference in the 3 preliminary options. As presented, the public would not be given a relevant choice. The constraints imposed by the Shatin to Central Link Depot needed to be addressed. Lack of waterfront activities and thus future recreation activities in the adjacent water bodies would be hindered. Whether

the proposals/ideas received previously had been incorporated/filtered out; and

- (g) Sustainability - whether the proposed OCPs could be sustained from the economic, social and environmental perspectives, in view of the high cost for provision of extensive sub-merged CKR/Road T2, the mitigation measures for KTAC, etc.

- 3.3 **Ms Iris Tam** added that the initial concepts presented in the CM were being revised to take into account the findings of the preliminary technical assessments, in particular, the water quality assessment.
- 3.4 **The Chairman** said that Annex 2 of the Report on CM had included responses to queries raised by Members after the CM. He reminded Members that it was the job of PlanD and the consultants to prepare the OCP and the purpose of the meeting was therefore not to come up with the best development option but bring out the major issues thus allowing the public to have clearer information on the development options that would be made available in Stage 2 Public Participation.
- 3.5 In response to **Dr Alvin Kwok's** question on the discussion of housing provision at the CM, **Ms Iris Tam** said that among the 3 preliminary concepts presented at the meeting, one concept had a slightly greater housing component and the CM had stressed the need to balance social, environmental and economic considerations.
- 3.6 In response to **Professor K C Lam's** question on the expectations for a park in Kai Tak, **Ms Iris Tam** said that among the comments raised some people felt that there should be a central park, others felt that it could be provided as a network of parks. She said that the objective was to achieve at least 10-20 hectares of park area even though it might not be in the form of a single major Metro Park.
- 3.7 In response to another question of **Professor KC Lam, Mr Raymond Lee** said that during the Stage 1 Public Participation, there were a lot of discussions on the KTAC, including the idea to use the water body for water recreation uses. Since pollution was the main problem of the KTAC, relevant technical assessments had been advanced, so that there would be technical information to assist the discussion on utilizing the water body for appropriate uses. The Consultants were

working with the concerned departments to identify feasible method to enhance the water quality of the KTAC. **Ms Iris Tam** supplemented that the results of the assessments indicated that it would be difficult to have contact or secondary contact water-based activities in KTAC.

- 3.8 In response to **Mr Kim Chan's** concern on how the harbour planning principles would be applied in the Study, **Ms Iris Tam** said that they were taken into account in formulating the planning principles for Kai Tak and the options of OCP. Some of the principles, including sustainability and public involvement, would be adopted throughout the study process.
- 3.9 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the Consultants should address the provision of land-water interface facilities both on and off the water to support the evolving harbour uses. In response, **Ms Iris Tam** said that the water quality in KTAC and Kowloon Bay was very problematic. Technical assessments were being undertaken to assess whether the relevant water bodies would be suitable for water-based activities. Corresponding land uses and facilities could then be planned for on the landside. Even siting of the typhoon shelter might be affected by the water circulation in the area.
- 3.10 On this point, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** asked whether the assessment of water quality would be a sequential activity in determining an appropriate land use and whether the existing runway could be cut through as soon as possible to start flushing the nullah. In response, **Ms Iris Tam** said that under normal circumstances, beneficial land uses could be identified as basis to assess the requirements on water quality improvement. However, in this case, it was different as the water quality problem was serious and more time was needed to undertake the relevant technical assessments. **Mr Raymond Lee** said that the Kai Tak Approach Channel now posed major environmental problems. Without the reclamation, it would require in-depth investigations to identify sustainable mitigation measures. The concerned departments and the Consultants were working closely on this issue.
- 3.11 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** puzzled on why marine use was possible on one side of the harbour but not on the Kai Tak side. Without a comprehensive harbour plan as requested by the Business Environment Council (BEC), there was a lack of an

overall planning context to consider allocation of key developments in Kai Tak. This issue needed to be addressed to secure general support to the study proposals.

- 3.12 **The Chairman** pointed out a case in point was that in Stage 1 Public Participation, the proposed civil airfield was not accepted as one of the land uses for Kai Tak. The proponent was, however, not deterred and submitted a modified scheme to seek support to the proposal. **The Chairman** said that the current mode of public participation was to encourage the public to advance the level of their views, ideas and justifications to support their proposal as the study was making progress. The BEC should submit more information, better proposal and more justifications to advance their arguments.
- 3.13 **Mr Joseph Wong** commented that the CM was aimed to discuss concerns shared by the public. However the suggestions raised in the Stage 1 Public Participation such as water sports/recreational uses were not raised, whereas the issue of cruise terminal and multi-purpose stadium were discussed many times. He pointed out that it warranted a proper mechanism to collate and analyse public comments. **Mr Raymond Lee** said that the CM was aimed to share with participants the study findings up to that day. There were in-depth discussions on the environmental studies on KTAC, traffic and transport issues (e.g. the strategic trunk roads CKR & Road T2), and issues arising from zero reclamation scenario.
- 3.14 **Mr Raymond Lee** went on to say that the Consultants had also shared their findings on the technical issues involved in locating a cruise terminal and multi-purpose stadium in Kai Tak, e.g. the constraints imposed by various infrastructure corridors in the north apron area and the “alongside berth” and “finger pier” configuration of cruise terminal. The information would help the collaborators to appreciate the inherent opportunities and constraints in formulating the OCPs.
- 3.15 **Mr Joseph Wong** noted that many people might support the idea of developing a cruise terminal and a multi-purpose stadium in Kai Tak. However, there were still many other development options which had aroused interest in the community. He questioned whether there were studies to support the provision and location of these facilities in Kai Tak to address the on-going concerns of Members, in particular

when other proposals were rejected for consideration under the OCP.

- 3.16 In response, **Mr Raymond Lee** said that although relevant bureaux had previously provided the justifications for these facilities in Kai Tak, they would continue be invited to provide further justifications for these facilities to address Members' concern. The Consultants were, however, focusing their investigation on the technical aspects as how to plan for them in the OCP, to address issues like "no reclamation" and impact on the surrounding traffic and environment.
- 3.17 Referring to the water sports centre option, **Mr Raymond Lee** said that this idea had not been excluded as they were not considered incompatible with the other land use themes. However, the investigation on the water quality of the adjacent water body would have a strong bearing on the provision of water sports facilities. Public comments received in the Stage 1 Public Participation would be set out in the Stage 1 Public Participation report together with responses of why some ideas/proposals were acceptable or otherwise.
- 3.18 **The Chairman** believed that the people of Hong Kong were reasonable and would not expect all their proposals to be accepted. However, it was important to acknowledge their ideas and to highlight the pros and cons of the proposals. In this way the community could be convinced of the reasons for rejecting particular ideas. The proponents would rally more support in the next stage of Public Participation, possibly with more professional input and technical studies.
- 3.19 In response to **Mr Paul Zimmerman** queried on the type of marine uses envisaged in the study area, **Ms Iris Tam** said that there was a session on marine facilities at the CM. At this stage of the study, the OCP would examine different options in the provision of marine facilities, for harbour operation and leisure purpose. The investigation on water circulation/quality might, however, affect the existing To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelter, as their breakwater constrained water circulation in the area. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** pointed out that it was agreed in the Harbour Plan Review Sub-committee that the marine uses should be examined in plan preparation process. The Consultants should elaborate their findings in the relevant

technical reports.

- 3.20 **Mr Igor Ho** supplemented that the Kai Tak Development would be subject to the scrutiny under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO) and that the whole development would need to meet relevant environmental standards before proceeding to implementation.
- 3.21 In conclusion, **the Meeting** noted the report on the Collaborators Meeting as submitted by the Consultants.

Item 4 Suggestions for Stage 2 Public Participation
[SEKD SC Paper No. 6/05]

- 4.1 In presenting the discussion paper, **Mr Derek Sun** said that taking experience of the Stage 1 Public Participation and the need to facilitate understanding of the development concepts, it was proposed to adjust the direction and format of public participation, for example, to pursue more interactive approach, more visually enhanced presentation materials and encourage the involvement of youth groups.
- 4.2 With the aid of PowerPoint slides, **Mr Derek Sun** said that apart from the major activities undertaken under the Stage 1 Public Participation programme, it was proposed for Stage 2 Public Participation to focus on areas including preparation of consultation digest, arrangement of open discussion forums, promulgation of reference materials and public events through websites. Multi-media presentations including PowerPoint, video clips of 3-D computer models and interactive computer models would also be provided to facilitate the public participation activities and enable easy understanding of the outline concepts of the proposed Kai Tak Development.
- 4.3 **Mr Derek Sun** further said that subject to availability of additional resources, materials such as public participation toolkit, summary of technical issues and relevant analysis could be prepared to enhance the public engagement activities, more collaborators meetings/launching event/public forums and exhibition/youth participation, and on-line interactive opinion collection form would be designed and posted in the Study website to provide a window for gauging the public feedbacks on the options of OCPs, and physical

models showing the proposed outline concepts in broad scale could also be prepared to enhance public appreciation of the outline concept plans.

- 4.4 **The Chairman** remarked that in devising the strategy for the next phase of public participation, the study team should pay attention of the effectiveness of the proposed tools and whether it would allow the public a meaningful participation process. He hoped that the proposed tools would assist members of the public to come up with an option that would embrace the good points included the different OCPs. He commented that public could even revive some of the proposals that were abandoned in Stage 1 if sufficient information and justifications were provided.
- 4.5 **Mr Andy Leung** said that emphasis should be placed on the communication with the public rather than the approaches and medium for public participation. The OCPs would be the core subject for public comment and in the process. The Consultants, when presenting the OCPs, should explain why particular ideas were not adopted and how such ideas could be dealt with/accommodate elsewhere. **Mr Andy Leung** continued to say that the process should assist Members of the public to understand the OCPs before they could participate in the exercise.
- 4.6 **Dr Alvin Kwok** said that more people should be encouraged to take part in the Stage 2 exercise. Apart from the proposed territory-wide public forum, he suggested to organize public forums in the housing estates, sports grounds/playgrounds, etc. so that views of the local community could be sought. He expressed his concern as whether adequate funding was made available for public participation as this would affect the scope of the public engagement actions. He agreed that more young people should be mobilised to organize these activities and the involvement of the housewives could also strengthen the consultation network.
- 4.7 Referring to the major components of the Stage 2 Public Participation programme, **Mr Joseph Wong's** said that the experience in handling public participation in other countries could shed some light to the Study in handling the public comments and the preparation of the concept plans. It would be prudent for the Consultants to examine the pros and cons

of the different public participation models in other countries before concluding on an approach for the Stage 2 Public Participation. **Mr Raymond Lee** said that the Consultants had made reference to the overseas experience in drawing their proposal for the Kai Tak Study. He believed experience drawn from Stage 1 could also help to strengthen the Stage 2 exercise.

- 4.8 In response to **Mr Joseph Wong's** question as to how the public views were translated to the OCPs, **Mr Raymond Lee** cited the example of the public request for water sports activities at the KTAC that was received at Stage 1. He explained that it was necessary to ascertain this use was suitable, feasible and environmentally acceptable at KTAC. In this respect, some technical investigations were being undertaken, taken into account guidance from EPD. If the findings of these investigations were positive, site reservation would be made and the type of suitable water sports activities would then be identified. He said that other public views would also be processed in a similar manner. Quoting the proposed civil airfield as another example, he further explained that the Consultants together with the Civil Aviation Department would examine the proposals submitted by the aviation group. The Stage 1 Public Participation Report would set out as to what concepts/proposals could or could not be pursued further at this stage.
- 4.9 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** registered his concern that the Administration had been selective in taking Members' advice, that the OCPs reflected mainly Government's preference. As regards communication with public, he suggested more advertisement should be undertaken and interests of individual sectors of the community e.g. the Chambers of Commerce could be addressed specifically.
- 4.10 **The Chairman** said that since the HEC Members came from different sectors of the community, he invited Members to co-ordinate the consultation activities within their respective sector to discuss specific subject e.g. the Hong Kong Tourism Board on the topic of cruise terminal, Conservancy Association on the KTAC, etc. He believed that thematic discussions on sectoral interest would be equally useful as holding public forums to cover wider spectrum of issues on the OCPs. **Mr Joseph Wong** agreed that thematic forums

would be more effective but he had concern on how they could be fitted in with overall public participation process.

4.11 **Mr Joseph Wong** said that despite all the public engagement activities, the OCPs still ended up with uses such as cruise terminal and multi-purpose stadium. He maintained his concern as how the public views were channelled and translated into the OCPs. He questioned when the information on the studies for the respective projects, including the cruise terminal, multi-purpose stadium would be made available. **The Chairman** requested that the Consultants should examine the public participation frameworks in the overseas and report to Members in due course.

Consultants

4.12 **Professor Lam Kin-che** noted that the HEC and the Study were undergoing a process of continual exploration and learning. In order to achieve the best result, Members would need to move beyond any public perception that the Government's involvement would override the public views. It was important that the whole planning and public consultation/participation process be transparent. The public should be informed as to what the community stand to lose if certain ideas were abandoned. He agreed with **the Chairman** that the public should be informed that the abandoned idea could also be revisited if there was very strong justification to do so. It was also important for the public to understand the cost and benefit in overcoming constraints.

4.13 In concurrent with **Professor Lam Kin-che's** comment, **Mr Mason Hung** said the reasons for certain ideas that were selected or otherwise should be well documented in the consultation report. He also suggested that prior to the public discussion forum, there could be on-site open days or guided tours to Kai Tak and its surrounding areas which would arouse public's interest and achieve effective results.

4.14 **Mr Kim Chan** said that apart from the 3 District Councils surrounding the Kai Tak sites, more District Councils should be consulted on the OCPs. He considered the KTAC a long-term project and the constraints were technical in nature that could be resolved given the determination and availability of resources. He also considered it necessary to have a

physical model to demonstrate the development concepts.

- 4.15 **Dr Alvin Kwok** suggested that the OCPs, when presented to the public, should be accompanied by preliminary sustainability studies and assessment against the Harbour Planning Principles.
- 4.16 **The Chairman** said that the launching of Stage 2 Public Participation was expected to be held in the 3rd quarter of the year. In the interim, effort should be made to fine-tune the process. The Committee would also need to secure funding from the Administration to support more elaborate public participation programme. He asked the PlanD and Consultants to collate Members' views and report to the Sub-committee in due course with a more comprehensive programme of the Stage 2 Public Participation.

PlanD,
Consultants

Item 5 Any Other Business

- 5.1 In showing his experience in the TPB briefing held in mid-June, **Mr Talis Wong** said that both the TPB and HEC members were concerned about the short-term uses of the runway area in Kai Tak. As for expediting the study process, the TPB member also stressed the need to find ways to ensure that public participation was meaningful. He was also impressed by the sincerity of the public in providing their views, and support provided by the HEC Sub-committee in devoting their time and efforts. He concluded that this was something that should be advocated and promoted.
- 5.2 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:10pm. The next meeting was scheduled to be held on 23.8.2005.

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

Extract of Confirmed TPB minutes of meeting of 17.6.2005

Agenda Item 3

Progress Report on Kai Tak Planning Review

(TPB Paper No. 7334)

[Open Meeting (whole agenda item)]

8. The following representatives were invited to the meeting:

Dr. W.K. Chan	-	Sub-committee on South East Kowloon Development Review of Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
Mr. Talis Wong	-	Civil Engineering and Development Department
Ms. Iris Tam)	City Planning - Maunsell Joint Venture
Ms. Evelyn Lee)	
Mr. Raymond Lee]]	Planning Department
Mr. Kelvin Chan]]	

Presentation Session

9. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Dr. W.K. Chan, Mr. Raymond Lee, and Ms. Iris Tam covered the following major aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background of the Kai Tak (KT) Planning Review (the Study), including its broad study programme and progress;
- (b) the role of the Sub-committee on South East Kowloon Development Review of Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC-SEKD Sub-committee) in the Study, particularly in fostering public involvement in the planning process for the KT area. Emphasis was placed on “Planning with the Community” and on establishing good planning principles at the beginning of the planning process;
- (c) major activities undertaken under the Stage 1 Public Participation programme and key comments received; and
- (d) way forward, notably the formulation of options of Outline Concept Plan (OCP) for further discussion with the community under the Stage 2 Public Participation programme.

Discussion Session

[Ms. Ava Chiu, and Messrs. Tony C.N. Kan and Daniel B.M. To left the meeting temporarily during the discussion session.]

10. Major questions and comments raised by Members were as follows:

General

- (a) whether the Study would take into consideration the opinions of the environmentalists/academics on the KT development as noted from the press;
- (b) noting that the public had proposed various development elements/facilities

in the KT area, some of which might be conflicting to each other, how a balance would be struck;

- (c) the initiative of “Planning with the Community” was supported. Noting that different views had been expressed by various stakeholders on a number of proposed developments/facilities, the Study Team should provide feedback and inform the public on how proposals would be evaluated and chosen. The Board should also be apprised of the community views and advised on the formulation of options;

Relationship with Other Major Developments

- (d) the KT area was one of the few remaining large and valuable development sites in the urban area and good utilization of it should be made. The KT development should be considered in tandem with the long-term territorial development currently being studied under the HK 2030 Study;
- (e) consideration should be given to tallying the KT development with other major developments, notably the development in the West Kowloon Reclamation area and other waterfront developments along the Harbour;
- (f) whether there would be any cultural facilities planned in the KT area, bearing in mind that West Kowloon would be developed into a cultural and arts district;
- (g) the visual impact of the building height profile in KT should be carefully considered;
- (h) consideration should be given to the interface issues (especially the provision of transport links and connections such as underpass) between KT and its adjoining areas (e.g. Hung Hom and Kowloon Bay). Planning for KT should also benefit the older neighbouring areas which were in need of revitalization;
- (i) support facilities for KT development should be self-sufficient, and its refuse transfer station should not be located in Kwun Tong;

Population and Housing Development

- (j) there should not be too much housing development in the KT area as its surrounding areas like Kowloon City were already very densely populated;
- (k) wished to know the target population for the KT area, as this would impact on the planning of infrastructures;
- (l) given its history and symbolic significance as the “lifeline” of Hong Kong, development along the Runway should be low in density. Noting that some high-density public housing development had already been committed with piling works undertaken, whether the design along the Runway would be constrained;

Marine Facilities

- (m) given the polarized views between the marine facility operators and the general public on the retention of the existing marine facilities, how the diverse opinions would be dealt with;

Other Proposals

- (n) noting that an aviation museum had previously been proposed and the community’s general wish to preserve Hong Kong’s aviation history, whether and how the aviation-related proposals would be taken forward;
- (o) the vision for transforming KT into a hub of sports and recreational development was supported, especially in view of the forthcoming East Asian Games;

Interim Development

- (p) as shown in the study programme at Annex 1 of the Paper, approval of the draft Outline Zoning Plans (OZPs) incorporating the proposed amendments to the plans for the KT area was scheduled for August 2008. In the interim period, who would control the land uses and development in the KT

area;

- (q) what would be the temporary uses in the KT area pending the implementation of permanent development and whether a large temporary park could be provided in the interim period;
- (r) whether future land uses in the KT area would be compromised by the current temporary uses;
- (s) when the fill material piled along the KT Runway would be removed;

Sustainable Development

- (t) whether there were any plans or interim measures to ensure that the KT development would become a model of sustainable development;

Development Programme

- (u) little progress on the development of KT had been made despite the decommissioning of the Airport for years. While planning with the community was to be commended and encouraged, early development was also important and a balance had to be struck. The process of public engagement took time and finding a consensus appeared difficult at present. Instead of waiting for consensus on all the development options to be reached and having a full approved plan in place, consideration should be given to formulating a short- to medium-term development plan to facilitate early utilization of the land resources. Consideration should be given to expediting some of the projects, particularly in relation to the improvement of the water quality in the Approach Channel;

Environmental Concerns

- (v) consideration could be given to providing marine ducts underneath the Approach Channel to address the silting problem;
- (w) the relationship between air ventilation and building development should be taken into account, particularly in the light of the recommendations of

the recently completed Feasibility Study for Establishment of Air Ventilation Assessment System (AVAS Study);

Public Participation and Consultation

- (x) the public should be informed of the development constraints and the pros and cons of different development scenarios so as to avoid creating false expectations, for example:
 - (i) whether the environmental problems of the Approach Channel could be overcome and whether the water body was suitable for beneficial use;
 - (ii) whether the Approach Channel should be decked and if so, what the implications would be on cost and timing of the KT development;
 - (iii) how the transport issues would be addressed and what traffic impacts would be created for the surrounding areas;
- (y) given its territorial significance, public consultation and engagement should not be confined to Kwun Tong and the nearby districts; and
- (z) information on the timetable for Stage 2 of Public Participation.

11. In response, Dr. W.K. Chan, Messrs. Raymond Lee and Talis Wong, and Ms. Iris Tam made the following points:

General

- (a) the Study Team would take into account public views as well as Members' views on the KT development;
- (b) whilst the current planning approach had started a new planning process for the KT area, it was not starting from zero. The two approved OZPs for the KT area had built in some good planning principles which were worth keeping;

- (c) the public participation process was interactive. The participants learned more about the pros and cons of various proposals and changes in views during the process were noted. A case in point was the debate on the preservation of the Runway for aviation-related uses. The process had provided a platform for the public to voice their concerns and for the advocates to address and review the environmental and safety problems associated with their proposals. Similar dialogues were encouraged in respect of other areas such as housing and other community facilities;
- (d) it was premature to give answers to the questions raised by Members, especially those relating to how various views were to be balanced and whether certain facilities/projects would be undertaken. The Study had yet to conclude the provision of specific facilities/projects except that there were general consensus on the proposals of cruise terminal, multi-purpose stadium and Metro Park. The public participation process conducted so far had aimed to unveil the principles behind the views expressed by participants as well as to facilitate the public in understanding some of the constraints of the development concepts. Nonetheless, the Study Team would take note of these questions;

Relationship with Other Major Developments

- (e) KT was not studied in isolation. Integrated harbour planning principles were very much at play as illustrated by the use of a physical model to show the existing and proposed harbour developments to facilitate public discussion;
- (f) culture and heritage development had emerged as a significant concept and some considered that “Kai Tak spirit” had a significant role to play in the cultural heritage of the city;
- (g) consideration would be given to linking and blending the KT development with the surrounding older districts with a view to bringing life to these older areas;

- (h) the existing refuse transfer station was designed to serve the entire East Kowloon region, not just the KT area;

Population and Housing Development

- (i) the Study had adopted a bottom-up approach in planning for housing development in the KT area in that the proposed number of flats would depend on factors such as the size of the housing sites, design constraints, and planning guidelines. There was no pre-determined target population for the KT area, and the community aspiration for no more reclamation within the Harbour would be taken as a starting point. It was envisaged that the total number of flats and population to be accommodated in the KT area would accord with the public expectation for better quality housing development;
- (j) the estimated population in the KT area was still under review. A drop in population (from the formerly planned 260,000) was expected;
- (k) as shown on a plan displayed at the meeting, the committed public housing sites with piling works completed were located in the north-eastern part of the North Apron Area of the former airport near Prince Edward Road East;

Marine Facilities

- (l) the Economic Development and Labour Bureau was reviewing the long-term need of the existing marine facilities (e.g. public cargo working areas) in the KT area. If the facilities had to be retained in the area, suitable design solutions would be identified;

Other Proposals

- (m) while noting the public views on various proposals, the questions relating to the implementation of specific facilities/projects could not yet be answered at the present stage;

Interim Development

- (n) the Lands Department was responsible for monitoring the short-term/temporary uses in the KT area. The HEC-SEKD Sub-committee was studying the temporary uses for the KT area and was in discussion with relevant government departments to address the issue;
- (o) the Runway was currently used as a temporary stockpiling area for the excavated materials from the Jordan Valley/Choi Wan project, and this operation would cease by the end of 2006. Environmental mitigation measures (e.g. hydro-seeding) had been undertaken and would be closely monitored;

Sustainable Development

- (p) sustainable development was identified as one of the major planning principles for the future KT development, and its realization would depend on the implementation of the actual facilities/projects which were yet to be firmed up;

Development Programme

- (q) the need for early implementation of the KT development would be balanced against the time required for public participation for the better planning of the KT area. Consideration had been given to expediting some of the projects by advancing the associated technical/engineering studies. Some of the findings had been reported to participants and other findings would be done similarly when available;
- (r) while it was difficult to undertake detailed technical assessments without first formulating concrete plans, the Study Team had started preliminary engineering evaluation based on the grouping of different development themes with various emphases (e.g. on sports, recreation, quality housing, or office development) with a view to providing more supporting information to facilitate the public participation process;

Environmental Concerns

- (s) options for improving the water quality of the KT Approach Channel would be examined for early implementation;
- (t) the planning consultant of the Study had also been involved in the AVAS Study, and the findings of the AVAS Study would be taken into account in preparing the development layouts for the KT area;

Public Participation and Consultation

- (u) development constraints and other technical information had been provided to the public as far as possible to facilitate the public participation process;
- (v) although the venues for the public participation activities were mainly located in Kowloon, the participants actually came from various sectors of the community;
- (w) the iterative public participation process could enhance the integrity and fairness of the planning process and was of paramount importance in the entire plan-making process. Continual public participation could enable more focused discussion and avoid abortive work as issues discussed at the early stage should not emerge again at a later stage. The public was in full support of the public participation process and would learn and build up their confidence in the process;
- (x) non-viable options would be screened out at the second stage; and
- (y) consultation on the options of the OCP for KT was scheduled for September 2005.

12. In summing up the discussion, the Chairperson stressed the importance of striking an appropriate balance between the need for due process in public participation and the objective of achieving early development of the KT area. In the public participation process, the participants should be provided with adequate information to facilitate informed discussions. Having obtained public feedbacks on various development ideas, it was important to work out the implementation aspects and let the public know the way forward.

As the KT development might take a long time to be fully realized, a long-term view of the development should be considered.

13. The Chairperson also pointed out that the present discussion was not to seek the Board's decision on any of the concepts/proposals. Instead, it had provided an opportunity for Members to express their views on the KT development, which would form part of the HEC-SEKD Sub-committee's process of seeking stakeholders' views. While acknowledging that it might not be possible for the Study Team to provide an answer to every question raised by Members at this stage, the Chairperson requested the Study Team to take into account the views expressed by Members and to brief Members on the progress of the Study in due course. She thanked the representatives of the Study Team for attending the meeting and they then left the meeting.

[Messrs. Erwin A. Hardy, Patrick Li, C.K. Wong, and Keith G. McKinnell left the meeting temporarily at this point.]