

**Minutes of the 1158th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 6.12.2017, 7.12.2017, 11.12.2017,
14.12.2017, 3.1.2018, 4.1.2018, 10.1.2018, and 11.1.2018**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr H.W. Cheung

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Ms Christina M. Lee

Mr H.F. Leung

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport) 3

Transport and Housing Bureau

Mr Andy S.H. Lam (10.1.2018 p.m.)

Assistant Commissioner/Urban

Transport Department

Mr Wilson W.S. Pang (14.12.2017)

Mr Peter P.C. Wong (10.1.2018 a.m.)

Chief Traffic Engineer (Kowloon)

Transport Department

Mr David C. V. Ngu (6.12.2017, 11.12.2017, 3.1.2018 and 11.1.2018)

Chief Traffic Engineer (Hong Kong)

Transport Department

Mr Eddie S. K. Leung (7.12.2017 and 4.1.2018)

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)

Mr Elvis W.K. Au (7.12.2017 p.m., 3.1.2018, 10.1.2018 p.m. and 11.1.2018 p.m.)

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment)

Environmental Protection Department

Mr Tony W.H. Cheung (6.12.2017, 4.1.2018 and 10.1.2018 a.m.)

Mr Richard W.Y. Wong (7.12.2017 a.m. 11.12.2017, 14.12.2017 and 11.1.2018 a.m.)

Deputy Director of Lands/General

Ms Karen P.Y. Chan (6.12.2017 a.m., 7.12.2017, 11.12.2017,
14.12.2017, 3.1.2018, 4.1.2018, 10.1.2018 a.m. and 11.1.2018)

Assistant Director (Regional 1)

Lands Department

Mr Simon S.W. Wang (6.12.2017 p.m. and 10.1.2018 p.m.)

Director of Planning

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Deputy Director of Planning/District

Secretary

Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo (3.1.2018, 4.1.2018, 10.1.2018, and 11.1.2018)

Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung (6.12.2017, 7.12.2017, 11.12.2017 and 14.12.2017)

Absent with Apologies

Professor K.C. Chau

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Ms Janice W.M Lai

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung (3.1.2018, 4.1.2018, 10.1.2018 and 11.1.2018)

Chief Town Planners/Town Planning Board

Ms Doris S.Y. Ting (6.12.2017 a.m., 7.12.2017 p.m., 11.12.2017 a.m. and 14.12.2017 p.m.)

Ms April K. Y. Kan (3.1.2018 p.m., 10.1.2018 p.m. and 11. 1.2018 a.m.)

Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen (6.12.2017 p.m., 7.12.2017 a.m., 11.12.2017 p.m., 14.12.2017 a.m.,
4.1.2018, 10.1.2018 a.m. and 11. 1.2018 p.m.)

Mr Kevin C.P. Ng (3.1.2018 a.m.)

Senior Town Planners/Town Planning Board

Miss Anissa W.Y. Lai (6.12.2017 a.m. and 10.1.2018 p.m.)

Mr T.C. Cheng (6.12.2017 p.m. and 3.1.2018 a.m.)

Mr Raymond H.F. Au (7.12.2017 a.m. and 3.1.2018 p.m.)

Mr Stephen K.S. Lee (7.12.2017 p.m. and 4.1.2018)

Mr Jeff K.C. Ho (11.12.2017 a.m.)

Ms W.H. Ho (11.12.2017 p.m. and 11.1.2018 a.m.)

Mr Alex C.Y. Kiu (14.12.2017 a.m. and 11.1.2018 p.m.)

Ms Christine C.M. Cheung (14.12.2017 p.m.)

Mr Eric C.Y. Chiu (10.1.2018 a.m.)

1. The following Members and the Secretary were present in the morning session on 6.12.2017:

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Ms Christina M. Lee

Mr H.F. Leung

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Chief Traffic Engineer (Kowloon)
Transport Department
Mr David C. V. Ngu

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department
Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Tony W.H. Cheung

Deputy Director of Lands/General
Ms Karen P.Y. Chan

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K22/5

(TPB Papers No. 10364 and 10365)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

Group 1

(TPB Paper No. 10364)

(R3 to R270, R433, R12084 to R12151, R12153 to R12158, C1 to C262, C1427 and C1428)

1. The Secretary reported that the draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K22/5 involved rezoning of sites for proposed public housing developments by the Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The consultants of the Review Study of Kai Tak Development (the Review) included AECOM Asia Co. Limited (AECOM), Urbis Limited (Urbis) and Leigh & Orange Limited (L&O). The following Members had declared interests on the item for being acquainted/having affiliations/business dealings with HKHA, the consultants of the Review, the representers and commenters or their representatives including Kerry Group (Kerry), the parent company of Kerry DG Warehouse (Kowloon Bay) Limited (R11) and its representative, Llewelyn Davis Hong Kong Limited (LD); CK Hutchison Holdings Limited (CKH), the parent company of Goodwell-Fortune Property Services Limited (C309); Sandy Bay Rugby Football Club of the University of Hong Kong (HKU) (C152); Mr Paul Zimmerman of Designing Hong Kong Limited (C258); Ms Mary Mulvihill (C260); Masterplan Limited, representatives of Hong Kong Water Sports Council (R3) and Hong Kong Rugby Union (R13):

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee - being a member of the Strategic Planning
(*as Director of Planning*) Committee (SPC) and Building Committee of
HKHA

- Mr Martin W.C. Kwan
*(as Chief Engineer (Works),
Home Affairs Department)* - being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of SPC and the Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA
- Mr H.F. Leung - being a member of the Tender Committee of HKHA and an employee of HKU
- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having current business dealings with CKH, AECOM, Urbis and Masterplan Limited and past business dealings with HKHA
- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with CKH, HKHA, AECOM and LD
- Dr C.H. Hau - having current business dealings with HKHA and AECOM, and being an employee of HKU
- Ms Janice W.M. Lai - having current business dealings with HKHA, AECOM and Urbis
- Mr K.K. Cheung] their firm having current business dealings with
Mr Alex T.H. Lai] CKH, Kerry, HKHA, AECOM, Urbis and HKU,
] and hiring Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from
] time to time
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with HKHA and past business dealings with AECOM; and his company having current business dealings with Urbis and personally knowing Mr Paul Zimmerman
- Professor S.C. Wong
(Vice-chairperson) - having current business dealings with AECOM and being an employee of HKU

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| Mr Stephen L.H. Liu | - | having past business dealings with HKHA and LD |
| Mr Franklin Yu | - | having past business dealings with HKHA, AECOM and Urbis |
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam | - | having past business dealings with L&O |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon | - | his spouse being an employee of HD but not involved in planning work and ex-employee of Kerry |
| Dr Wilton W.T. Fok | - | being an employee of HKU |
| Mr Wilson Y. W. Fung | - | being the Chairman of the Accounting Advisory Board of School of Business, HKU |

2. Members noted that as the proposed public housing developments in the draft OZP were related to the housing sites in general rather than housing projects proposed by HKHA, a direct conflict of interest did not arise. The meeting agreed that the above Members who had declared having interests associated with HKHA could stay in the meeting. Members noted Messrs Ivan C.S. Fu, Patrick H.T. Lau, Dominic K.K. Lam, K.K. Cheung and Thomas O.S. Ho, Ms Janice W.M. Lai, and Dr Wilton W.T. Fok had tendered apologies for being unable to attend this session of the meeting. Members agreed that Professor S.C. Wong, Messrs Stephen L.H. Liu, Alex T.H. Lai, Franklin Yu and Wilson Y. W. Fung, and Dr C.H. Hau could stay in this session of the meeting as they had no direct involvement in the projects.

3. The Chairperson said that reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenters inviting them to attend the hearing, but other than those who were present or had indicated that they would attend the hearing, the rest had either indicated not to attend or made no reply. As reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenters, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations and comments in their absence.

Presentation and Question Sessions

4. The following government representatives and consultants, as well as representers, commenters and their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

Mr Tom C.K. Yip	District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K)
Mr K.K. Lee	Senior Town Planner/K (STP/K)

Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) and its consultants

Mr Peter S.K. Chui	Chief Engineer/East (CE/E3)
--------------------	-----------------------------

AECOM

Mr Vincent Au Yeung	Technical Director
Mr Steven Wong	Associate Director
Mr Simon Lee	Senior Engineer
Mr Karl An	Project Environmental Consultant

Urbis

Ms Winona Ip	Senior Planner
Ms Sandy Ling	Senior Landscape Architect

Transport Department (TD)

Miss Connie K.Y. Yiu	Engineer/ Housing & Planning (E/H&P2)
----------------------	---------------------------------------

Representers/Commenters and/or their Representatives

R3 - Hong Kong Water Sports Council (HKWSC)

C2 - Hong Kong China Rowing Association

C4 - Christopher J. Perry

C9 - Judy Chan

C15 - Louis Brands Savage

C68 - Philip Crinion

Masterplan Limited -] Representer's and Commenters'

Mr Ian Brownlee] representatives
Mr Benson Poon]
Canoe Union -]
Mr Luk Wai Hung]
Hong Kong China Dragon Boat]
Association -]
Ms Connie Yau]
HKWSC -]
Mr Mike Arnold]

R11 - Kerry DG Warehouse (Kowloon Bay) Ltd.

Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Ltd –] Representer's representatives
Mr Hui Chak Hung, Dickson]
Ms Lau Sin Yee]

R13 - Hong Kong Rugby Union

C153 - James Wood

C155 - Barry M. Hill

C178 - Siddhartha Jane Saunders

C204 - Jasper Donat

C210 - D. Renwick

C217 - Angela McGillivray

C219 - Steve Bryant

C225 - Tom Gerigk

C239 - Alison Quinlivan

C248 - Kristian Murfitt

C254 - John Berry

C255 - Thomas P. Connolly

Hong Kong Rugby Union -] Representer's/Commenters' representatives
Mr Ian Brownlee]
Mr Chiu Kwok Kwong]

R40 - Albert Au

R63 - Manulife (International) Limited

R65 - Ada Lee Wing Shan

R215 - Wayne Fong

R217 - Lee Lee Sing Edward

R218 - Lai Pak Yan Brian

R238 - Cheng Chan Wah Roy

R245 - Or Wing Sing

R260 - Kenneth Ko Kar Yui

R263 - Hui Kau Ho Ryohei

R267 - Lai Ka Lok

R270 - Max Lau Kai Hing

Manulife (International) Limited -] Representers' representatives

Mr Casey So]

Mr Kenneth Tong]

Mr Albert Au]

Mr Gilbert Ng]

Mr Kenneth To]

Ms Kitty Wong]

R138 - Lee Ming Sha

R148 - Charles Lim

R157 - Kenneth Tong

R228 - Helen Yuen

Mr Kenneth Tong -] Representer and Representers' representatives

R254 - Towereed Properties Development Ltd

R255 - Howford Investment Ltd

R256 - Dragon Genius Enterprises Ltd

R257 - Tamson Ltd

R258 - Max Capital International Ltd

R259 - Grand Power Holdings Ltd

Mr Lau Kai Yin] Representers' representatives

Ms Liu Chung Yee]

Mr Chan Ting Hin Derek]

R12084 - 傲雲峰業主委員會

Ms Ho Siu Fong - Representers' representative

R12143 - C. K. Mak

C259 - Green Sense

Green Sense - Representers' and commenters'
Mr C. K. Mak representative

C1 - Hon. Ma Fung Kwok, Legislative Councillor

Mr So Siu Long - Commenters' representative

C3 - John Woo

Mr John Woo - Commenter

C6 - Annie Lam Fung Ching

Ms Annie Lam Fung Ching - Commenter

C16 - Robert L. Wilson MH

C96 - Tristan Strobl

Mr Robert L. Wilson - Commenter and Commenters' representative

C20 - Irene Or

Ms Irene Or - Commenter

C94 - Ng Kong Wan

Mr Ng Kong Wan - Commenter

C258 - Designing Hong Kong Ltd

Mr Paul Zimmerman] Commenters' representative

Ms Kitty Tang]

C260 - Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Commenter

5. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that PlanD's representative would be invited to brief Members on the representations and comments. The representers, commenters or their representatives would then be invited to make oral submissions in turn according to their representation and comment number. To ensure the efficient operation of the meeting, each representer, commenter or their representative would be allotted 10 minutes for making oral submission. There was a timer device to alert the representers, commenters or their representatives two minutes before the allotted time was to expire, and when the allotted time limit was up. A question and answer (Q&A) session would be held after all attending representers, commenters or their representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to government's representatives, representers, commenters or their representatives. After the Q&A session, the representers, commenters or their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. The Town Planning Board (the Board) would deliberate on all the representations and comments in a closed meeting after hearing all the oral submissions and would inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

6. The Chairperson then invited PlanD's representative to brief Members on the representations and comments.

7. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Tom C.K. YIP, DPO/K, briefed Members on the representations and comments, including the background of the amendments, the grounds/views/proposals of the representers and commenters, planning assessments and PlanD's responses on the representations and comments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10364 (the Paper).

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng arrived to join this session of the meeting during DPO/K's presentation.]

8. The Chairperson then invited the representers, commenters and their representative to elaborate on their representations and comments.

R3 - Hong Kong Water Sports Council (HKWSC)

C2 - Hong Kong China Rowing Association

C4 - Christopher J. Perry

C9 - Judy Chan

C15 - Louis Brands Savage

C68 - Philip Crinion

9. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ian Brownlee made the following main points:

- (a) members of the HKWSC included a group of National Sports Associations on water sport activities such as dragon boat, rowing, sailing, canoe, water ski, life saving and triathlon in Hong Kong. Some representatives of the groups had sent apologies for being not able to attend the meeting due to other engagements;
- (b) the representatives of the groups were respected internationally for their administrative and technical knowledge of water sports, and involvement in the organisation of local and international events. They considered the Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC) was an incredible opportunity for achieving a world class standard venue in Hong Kong. However, there was inadequate expertise and understanding in the Government to put forward the proposal of a water sports venue of international standard;
- (c) KTAC was a uniquely sheltered water channel with land on three sides which was suitable for development of water sports. However, inadequate land was reserved on the OZP for facilities to support the events and activities. It was an area which could provide a site of sufficient size to accommodate a building required for the supporting facilities and there were no other better alternative locations in Hong Kong. Locating next to the proposed multi-purpose sports complex, a 'Water Arena' could also be created at the northern part of KTAC including an international water sports centre as well as for other events such as 'floating concerts' and other displays;
- (d) the Sha Tin Rowing Centre with an outdoor area for boat preparation and a three-storey headquarter building at Shing Mun River located next to the Hong Kong Sports Institute (HKSI) was the existing facility. Along the

opposite side of the river bank at Shek Mun, there were the Sha Tin Sports Association, Hong Kong Canoe Union Training Centre, Hong Kong Dragon Boat Association Training Centre, Hong Kong China Rowing Association Training Centre. In the absence of proper planning, the existing facilities were not able to meet the requirements for normal training, nor to host rowing events of international standard; and

- (e) the total area of the existing individual water sports facilities along Shing Mun River was about 6,662 m², and HKWSC was looking for an area of similar size in Kai Tak to develop a water sports centre.

10. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and an information pamphlet, Ms Connie Yau made the following main points on dragon boating:

- (a) she represented the HKWSC as well as the Hong Kong China Dragon Boat Association (HKCDBA). HKCDBA had participated in the organisation of the Hong Kong International Dragon Boat Championships at Tsim Sha Tsui together with the then Hong Kong Tourist Association since 1976. The event was to promote Hong Kong and was recognised by dragon boaters worldwide. However, the event venue at Tsim Sha Tsui was not up to international standards for rowing races. Reclamation had made the harbour condition even worse. The width from seawall to road was only 20 m, and hence there was inadequate land space for spectators, grandstands and support facilities including public convenience, safe movement of spectators and competitors. There was also no space to accommodate the facilities for event management;
- (b) the International Dragon Boat Championships was more than just a dragon boat event as there was a series of related activities promoting Hong Kong. The number of participants and spectators was increasing each year, more spaces were thus required;
- (c) besides, they had concern about the storage of dragon boats which was some 15m long in average. The dragon boat storage area currently at Shek Mun was outdoor. To keep the dragon boats more durable, covered

storage area was preferred but it was not available in Hong Kong. As dragon boats were long and heavy, access ramp from the storage area to the water was also important;

- (d) HKCDBA had successfully out-bid many competitors for the 2012 International Dragon Boat Federation Club Crew World Championship held in Hong Kong which was a well-known world dragon boat championship event. The 2017 Policy Address had proposed that Hong Kong should be hosting more world-class sports events, and the dragon boat events organising experience since 1976 was supporting such policy target. The previous Policy Address had also committed to energize Kowloon East, facilitate hosting of more mega events and activities, and provide basic facilities that meet the requirements of a water-friendly culture. The Conceptual Master Plan 5.0 of Energizing Kowloon East showcased a dragon boat as a symbol of a vibrant waterfront of Kai Tak; and
- (e) the development of para dragon boating in Hong Kong had become more vital and Hong Kong was the first city to organise an international para dragon boating race. However, due to the substandard venue, the arrangement of boarding the physical disabled paddlers into the boats via floating pontoons was required. Dragon boating was not just a sport, it could also help the disabled to enhance their mental and social life, as well as achieving social harmony. The limitations in the event venue would hinder the further development of para dragon boating.

11. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ian Brownlee made the following main points:

- (a) the number of participants in water sports was growing every year. Kai Tak would repeat the case of Tsim Sha Tsui in providing a substandard venue if there were inadequate areas reserved in the current OZP to provide space for spectators, grandstands and support facilities. The realignment of Road D3 would provide space for development of supporting facilities for water sports activities in Kai Tai;

Canoe

- (b) consideration should be given to incorporating a water sports venue into the design of the proposed Metro Park. Reference could be made to the Penrith Whitewater Stadium in Sydney, the venue for the canoe slalom events during the Sydney Olympic Games in 2000 which comprised an artificial water course as a training ground, venue for races as well as local/public recreation area. Moreover, canoe races required adequate space for boat storage and other activities as well as spectator facilities;
- (c) currently, there were inadequate storage areas for canoes at the Shek Mun canoe training centre and temporary structures were used for boat protection, storage and offices;

Rowing

- (d) the Shing Mun Rowing Centre had a 2-storey building for boat storage, administration, gymnastic and supporting facilities, an outdoor space in the front for boat preparation, and long pontoons and ramps to provide access to water. In recent years, more and more young people loved rowing. The Hong Kong Youth Rowing Championships 2017 held at Shing Mun River was very successful;
- (e) a video from the Hong Kong Sports Institute was played to show the training activities and boat storage situation along Shing Mun River;

International reference

- (f) race venues in Amsterdam, Toda and Karapiro were presented to demonstrate the basic facilities such as the grandstand, spectator banks, boat houses, start and finish areas, event centre and administration buildings which were required for an international standard rowing course. Those facilities could also be used for local and regional events. In addition, sufficient space for accessing water and prize presentation, as well as space nearby for boat storage and other events were essential;

Kai Tak Water Sports Park

- (g) Kai Tak was at a suitable location for a water sports venue. According to a study conducted by the Rowing Association, it was feasible to develop the proposed Kai Tak Water Sports Park comprising a 8-lane wide and 1,000 m and 2,000 m long racing courses with boat houses and pontoons on one side, and grandstands and temporary tents on the opposite side;
- (h) according to the report of the World Rowing Federation (FISA) in 2011, the channel, around 200 m wide and 2,400 m long, running down the previous runway provided an opportunity to create an international regatta course and areas for multi-function sport and public space. Should the proposed road be shifted to the middle of the runway, the impact would be minimized and the area could be retained as one big park to accommodate a Water Sports Centre providing necessary and supporting facilities for international sports events;
- (i) HKWSC had successfully staged a trial event at Kai Tak in 2014 with 500 participants for canoeing, dragon boating and rowing activities which showed the Kai Tak was capable of being a world-class water sports venue;
- (j) the Environmental Protection Department had no objection to the use of KTAC for water sports provided that precautionary measures were adopted such as provision of adequate shower facilities and that the users would not swim and would guard against swallowing the water. The water sports activities were not submerged in the water and the participants were not subject to high level of pollution;

The representation

- (k) HKWSC supported Items G1 and H4 which increased the area of open space and reduced the area of road. They objected to Item H2 which was rezoned from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to commercial use, Items S, T, U1, U2, U3 and V1 which would reduce the area available for the Metro Park, and Item V2 relating to the alignment of

Road D3;

- (l) the same representation urging for designation of appropriate zoning for the setting up of a water sports centre at the north-western end of KTAC was made during the last round of Kai Tak OZP amendments in 2011/2012. As CEDD had previously proposed a 600 m wide underground opening at the northern section of the Runway to improve the water quality, Road D3 could not run underground at that time. As the opening would no longer be required, there was no reason why Road D3 could not be moved. During the previous hearing, PlanD had responded that as water sports centre use was always permitted in the “G/IC” zone, and not until the type, land requirements and technical feasibility of the water sports uses in Kai Tak had been assessed and ascertained, it was premature to amend the OZP;
- (m) the proposal of developing a water sports centre was supported by the Harbourfront Commission and others in 2011. Policy support was given by the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) in 2012 to develop water sports activities at the subject “G/IC” site (Item H2) for the proposed water sports centre in Kai Tak given the convenient location and the presence of other sports facilities such as the Multi-purpose Sports Complex. However, as the concerned “G/IC” site was required as works area for construction of Trunk Road T2 until 2021, HKWSC then applied for the ex-Kai Tak Fire Station site near the Kai Tak Runway Park pier for setting up a temporary water sports centre as an interim measure;
- (n) the rezoning of the site for commercial use was not justified as (i) the site had water access and was suitable for water related activities; (ii) lower rise GIC building was more compatible in the urban context; (iii) there were many other sites in Kai Tai, Kowloon Bay and Kwun Tong available for commercial development; (iv) there was no need for commercial development to be located adjacent to the waters of KTAC; (v) it was premature to rezone the site to “C” then as there was no implementation programme for the site yet; and (vi) the site could accommodate boat

storage facilities, training and support facilities and event facilities in a 2 to 3-storey building; and

- (o) it was proposed to rezone site 3B1 which was 9,600 m² in area back to “G/IC” or “O” for development of water sports facilities, or to a special “C” sub-zone requiring the developer to provide two lower floors to accommodate boat storage, event facilities, athlete support facilities with commercial/office development above for efficient use of space. Whilst noting PlanD’s response that there were various “O” sites along the two sides of KTAC and it was not necessary to make specific provision on those “O” sites for water sports use, there was actually no site along the KTAC that was having adequate size and relation to the water to accommodate such facilities. As enormous land had been reserved for commercial development throughout Kwun Tong District and Kai Tak, the response that it was appropriate to rezone the site to “C” to sustain the development of Kowloon East into a second Central Business District was not justified.

12. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Benson Poon made the following main points:

Alignment of Road D3

- (a) the alignment of Road D3 should be shifted to a more central location in the Runway Area to allow adequate space along KTAC for water sports facilities. Additional space should be provided for events at the end of KTAC which was a sports venue. The design of Road D3 and its landscaped deck should be integrated with the design of the Metro Park with water frontage on both sides of the park. The location was so unique and the Government should make good use of both sides;
- (b) the amendment of sites 4E1 and 4E2 from open space to residential uses would reduce the area of Metro Park, it was thus proposed to rezone them back to “O” for the development of Metro Park for the reasons that (i) it

was a significant regional park for the whole of Kowloon; (ii) the other amendments had already provided adequate additional housing with an increase in population by 29,000; (iii) rezoning them back to “O” would only reduce a small population of 4,000; and (iv) the comprehensive design of Metro Park and provision of water sports and other facilities would be compromised;

Metro Park

- (c) the design of Road D3 and its landscaped deck could be integrated with the design of the Metro Park for a more comprehensive layout. Locating Road D3 in the centre of the runway would allow more design flexibility than locating it along the edge;
- (d) as seen in the comprehensive design of Tamar Park, Quarry Bay Park, and Sun-Yat Sen Park, there was sufficient space along the waterfront, in particular the landscape deck at Tamar Park with significant landscape connectivity to the waterfront;
- (e) PlanD’s response of not supporting the realignment of Road D3 and rezoning of the pumping stations as set out in paragraphs 6.3.26 of the Paper was unsound. The alternative alignment of Road D3 would not affect the landscape deck which was determined by the access to the residential development. If the access was relocated, the section for the landscape deck could be extended. Although water sports was always permitted in the “O” zone, the “O” zones along the road was only 20 m wide which was insufficient to meet the required width of at least 50 m for developing the water sports facilities; and
- (f) to sum up, the amendments would reduce public and community spaces excessively and would reduce the livability of Kai Tak. The rare opportunity to develop KTAC as a major public recreation and sports facility was unnecessarily compromised by such rezoning. The current alignment of Road D3 would unnecessarily prevent the development of a Metro Park of international standard with a unique character and a high

component of water related sports activities.

13. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ian Brownlee made the following main points:

- (a) the Board was requested to rezone the “C(1)” site to “G/IC”, “O” or “C(9)”, to shift the alignment of Road D3 to a central location, to rezone the “G/IC” and “R(B)” sites to “O” and to make corresponding amendments to the Explanatory Statement; and
- (b) HKWSC sincerely hoped that the Board would agree that the KTAC was a very suitable location for development of the Kai Tak Water Sports Centre.

R11 - Kerry DG Warehouse (Kowloon Bay) Ltd.

14. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Hui Chak Hung, Dickson of Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Limited made the following main points:

- (a) they objected to further increase the plot ratio (PR) and building height (BH) in the Runway Area (Items O, P, Q, R, S, T, U1, and U2) and reduction in “Open Space” in South Apron (Item N1);

Runway Area

- (b) the Runway Area of Kai Tak was unique, abutting two sides of the Victoria Harbour and with a large area. The Runway Area was at the centre of Kai Tak with prime harbour view. Although the proposed BHs at the Runway Area did not breach the ridgelines of Lion Rock and Kowloon Peak, it would still need to respect the character of neighbourhood and building design in the inland area. A gradation of BH profile should be created with BH declining towards the harbour. The BHs of the sites in the Runway Area should not exceed those in the surrounding areas resulting in blockage of views;
- (c) the drastic increases in PR were not acceptable. The increase in PRs from

3 - 4 to 5.5 - 7.5 (an increase of 38% to 133%) would result in an additional gross floor area (GFA) of 466,080 m² which was equivalent to the development bulk of seven North Point Government Offices or three times as large as the Wings I and PopCorn 1 development in Tseung Kwan O. The revised PRs at the Runway Area were even higher than those at the inland area. For example, PR of “R(B)” zones in the inland area were 4.2 to 6 while those from the waterfront area were 5.5 and 7.0. Moreover, harbourfront sites in general had a PR of about 4 to 5. As such, the revised PRs at the Runway Area deviated from the Harbour Planning Guidelines for Victoria Harbour and its harbour-front areas which advocated a lower development density along the waterfront;

- (d) the BH had also increased substantially from 45 - 80 mPD to 95 - 120 mPD (an increase between 46% to 167%). The proposed increase in BH had deviated from urban design principles and would defeat the gradation of BH profile with BH gradually descending towards the Harbour. The revised BHs at the Runway Area were even higher than those at the inland area. As shown on the photomontages viewing from Hoi Sham Park provided by PlanD in the Paper, high-rise developments along runway had blocked the view of the ridgeline at certain view points and created very compact, out-of-scale urban form, as well as walled developments;
- (e) the proposed increase in development intensity would attract and generate significant increase in traffic flow (by about 50%) which would overstrain the capacity of the road links, junction and public transport services. As there was no concrete implementation programme of the proposed Environmentally Friendly Linkage System (EFLS) nor other major traffic improvements measures, the capacity of roads and public transport services might not sustain the proposed increase in development intensity;

South Apron

- (f) they objected to the reduction in “O” zone and loss of a low-rise zone (Item N1). The tip of South Apron area was an important focal point where the Kai Tak waterfront promenade merged with the Kwun Tung waterfront

promenade. Rezoning part of the “O” zone to “R(B)2” would reduce a sizable activity node of about 5,000 m² (equivalent to the size of 19 tennis courts) and would lead to a permanent loss of open space at the waterfront area. The concerned site, which was located in the vicinity of the proposed Kai Tak Acute Hospital and Hong Kong Children’s Hospital should be retained as a larger open space;

- (g) similar to other overseas hospitals, such as Ronald McDonald Houses of Connecticut and Greater Hudson Valley in the United States, Children’s Hospital at Colorado and Evelina London Children’s Hospital, different supporting facilities and open spaces should be provided in the vicinity of hospitals to better serve the needs of patients and their families. The Government should make better use of the un-used gas pigging station site for provision of such facilities;

Alternative proposals

- (h) the development parameters of Runway Area should be reverted back to those of previous OZP or those approved with planning permissions. The southern portion of the “R(B)” zone at the South Apron should be rezoned back for low-rise development; and
- (i) to redistribute the GFA at the Runway Area by rezoning some “Commercial” (“C”) zones would not lead to any loss in residential GFA but would achieve a reduction in overall development density. Upon the redistribution, the stepped BH profile could be achieved and both the visual impacts and traffic circulation could be enhanced. It was proposed to rezone the “C” zones at the southern end of the runway next to the cruise terminal to residential zones, sites 4B5 and 4C4 could be rezoned from “C(7)” and “C(4)” to “R(C)” with the “C(5)” zoning of site 4C5 remained unchanged due to its proximity to the cruise terminal. Using sites 4B5 and 4C4 as solution space and slightly adjusting the PR to 4, the number of flats provided would be about 1,700 flats. The reduction of PR and BH of the waterfront residential zones to 4 - 6 and

55 - 95 mPD respectively would be more compatible with those in the inland area.

R13 - Hong Kong Rugby Union (HKRU)

C153 - James Wood

C155 - Barry M. Hill

C178 - Siddhartha Jane Saunders

C204 - Jasper Donat

C210 - D. Renwick

C217 - Angela McGillivray

C219 - Steve Bryant

C225 - Tom Gerigk

C239 - Alison Quinlivan

C248 - Kristian Murfitt

C254 - John Berry

C255 - Thomas P. Connolly

15. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ian Brownlee made the following main points:

- (a) they objected to the rezoning of a portion of Metro Park to residential and GIC uses leading to a reduction of open space. The Government should retain a balance among uses for provision of recreation facilities and urban design reasons. There was a lack of suitable sites for pitches for rugby and other sports in East Kowloon and other parts of the Territory. The Government should take the opportunity created in Kai Tai to make up some of the deficits. The reduction of the Metro Park by 4 ha would severely restrict the options for the provision of active and passive recreation facilities in the area and the scope for accommodating a wide range of open space and sporting facilities. There was no justification to rezone areas of Metro Park to residential use. The rezoning leading to a reduction in the open space provision was not in line with the vision of the Hong Kong 2030+ Study on increasing the provision of open space per capita;

[Mr David Y.T. Lui arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (b) one of the priorities of HKRU was to promote health and fitness of local youth through encouragement of outdoor sports/activities. They also gave high priority to community building through developing and providing public recreational pitches. With their efforts, there was a visible increase in the participation of rugby activities and the demand for rugby games was increasing. To accommodate such increase in demand, nine additional full-time rugby pitches would be required. The proposed Metro Park would hopefully be providing one to two more pitches. The growth of sport in Hong Kong was being hindered by a lack of space. There were only two pitches in the Kowloon Bay Sports Ground and Kowloon Bay Park for training. Any new pitches provided at Kai Tak would be fully utilized not just during school days, but also in evenings, Saturdays and Sundays;
- (c) as mentioned in the Explanatory Statement of the OZP, one of the planning themes of Kai Tak was sports-oriented. The proposed “Sports Park” was the anchor, complemented by a network of open spaces including Metro Park. Water sports and land based facilities would further strengthen the role of Kai Tak as a hub for sports and leisure facilities. The design aimed to create a hierarchical landscape network of parks, gardens, civic squares and waterfront. Through the ‘Stadium in the Park’ concept, the Metro Park would be integrated with open spaces around the Sports Park and Station Square. As a regional open space, Metro Park would serve the needs of tourists, visitors and local residents as well as the territory and should be designed to provide a variety of facilities to form a comprehensive green hub to achieve the ‘Stadium in the Park’ concept;
- (d) the reduction of 4 ha was equivalent to removing four pitches from the future development of the Metro Park and would severely restrict the options for the provision of active and passive recreation facilities. Rezoning of “O” sites to residential use would prevent a longer portion of Road D3 to run underground;

- (e) rezoning open space for private housing was not required as there were significant areas zoned for housing elsewhere in Kai Tak. The rezoning of the “C” zone to residential use and increasing PR of other residential sites would provide significant increase in housing land supply. With the increased population, open space should be increased/retained to meet local sporting and recreational needs;
- (f) the Metro Park would require a comprehensive design, adopting an underpass design for Road D3 in a central location would allow more flexibility in designing the park. The landscaped deck of Road D3 should be extended further to increase the open space area. The length of underpass section of Road D3 was now constrained by the accesses to residential developments. Realignment of Road D3 would relocate the accesses and allow more flexibility;
- (g) rezoning of sites 4E1 and 4E2, parts of sites 4A1 and 4A2 to the “O” zone would affect only 6,800 of the planned population which was insignificant in the context of the whole Kai Tak Development but would provide more flexibility in the park design, in particular sites 4E1 and 4E2. By realigning Road D3 to a more central location, it would be better integrated with the design of the Metro Park. Besides, the further extension of the covered area of Road D3 would provide a larger open space;
- (h) according to paragraphs 6.3.24 of the Paper, PlanD did not support rezoning of the sites back to “O”. In response, he considered that the loss of open space would have material impact on the design of the waterfront promenade as it would remove the options for providing more water sports facilities. Though there were still open space sites in Kai Tak, there were mostly small and could not form a contiguous large park creating a legacy;
- (i) to sum up, the actual need for sports pitches should be properly assessed. The Government was promoting sports development on the one hand, but rezoning of open space to other uses thus taking away the opportunity to meet growing community expectations on the other hand. There was a

need for a comprehensive 'Sports Plan' for Kai Tak so that the design and provision of facilities in various parts could be rationalized. There was insufficient provision of open space for active sports in East Kowloon and an imminent need for additional sports pitches; and

- (j) the "GIC" site for the proposed pumping stations should be rezoned to "O" such that those facilities would require planning application to ensure that they would be compatible with the Metro Park design.

[The meeting was adjourned for a 5-minute break.]

[Dr F.C. Chan left this session of the meeting at this point.]

R40 - Albert Au

R63 - Manulife (International) Limited

R65 - Ada Lee Wing Shan

R215 - Wayne Fong

R217 - Lee Lee Sing Edward

R218 - Lai Pak Yan Brian

R238 - Cheng Chan Wah Roy

R245 - Or Wing Sing

R260 - Kenneth Ko Kar Yui

R263 - Hui Kau Ho Ryohei

R267 - Lai Ka Lok

R270 - Max Lau Kai Hing

16. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Kenneth To made the following main points:

Objection Items

- (a) he represented a group of people working in one of the office towers in the Kwun Tong Business Area (KTBA), which was directly facing the Kai Tak Runway, to object to Items O, P, Q, R, S and T which involved relaxation

of BHR of the sites in the Runway Area. The research conducted by the representers had indicated that the proposed PR of the developments in Runway Area could be achieved without any relaxation of the BH. Besides, it was noted that the percentage increases in the BHs had exceeded those in the PRs in most sites covered by the current zoning amendments;

- (b) according to PlanD's presentation just then, the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) showed that the revised BHs for some sites in the Runway Area would not breach the ridgelines from the vantage point at the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre. However, other relevant planning considerations should also be taken into account. The existing conditions of the Runway Area viewing from the Kwun Tong Promenade were fantastic. The promenade had become a very popular spot for local residents due to the effort of the energizing Kowloon East projects;

Original Design Intention

- (c) the previous PR and BHs in the Runway Area were formulated under the Kai Tak Planning Review commenced in 2004 in which Kai Tak was to be developed with vision, well-defined planning principle, and a distinguished planning and urban design framework. As shown on the Preliminary Outline Development Plan in 2006 and the first draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/1 exhibited on 24.11.2006, a stepped height profile ranging from 45 to 65mPD as recommended under the Kai Tak Planning Review were stipulated for the Runway Area;
- (d) not just for the Kai Tak area, BHs of the KTBA was also reviewed. Four major height bands, viz 100 mPD, 130 mPD, 160 mPD and 200 mPD were adopted to achieve a stepped BH profile for visual permeability, reduce the solidness of KTBA, and maintain a more intertwined relationship with the Victoria Harbour edge. The proposed BHR for the KTBA had undergone various rounds of public consultation in 2004 and representations had been heard by the Board. As such, many efforts and time had been spent on the stipulation of BH and achieving the stepped BH profile for the area;

- (e) One Bay East at 83 Hoi Bun Road, the office building in which the representers were working, was used as an example to demonstrate the stepped BH profile of the KTBA. The subject site was sold in 2011 and the buildings were completed in 2015. The site was zoned “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” subject to a maximum PR of 12 and a BHR of 100 mPD. The site coverage (SC) was about 64%, the floor-to-floor height was about 4.3 to 5 m with the lobby floor of 6 m. Tremendous efforts were spent in achieving the PR and conforming such BHR as well as incorporating sustainable design elements in response to the urban design considerations including building separations, building setback, sky garden and greenery provisions;

Hypothetical Schemes

- (f) they had worked out hypothetical schemes for sites in the Runway Area (i.e. sites 4C5, 4B5, 4C4, 4B4, 4C3, 4B3, 4B2, 4C2, 4B1, 4C1, 4A1 and 4A2) to show that the BHs currently proposed by PlanD were excessive. While keeping the same PR restrictions as allowed in the OZP with some variations in the SC, the BHs of the sites could be much lowered than those proposed by PlanD. Hypothetical schemes for hotel and office development were prepared for the commercial sites, while alternative hypothetical schemes based on a non-domestic SC of 40% and a varied domestic SC of 25% and 30% were prepared for the residential sites. A comparison of PlanD’s proposals and the findings of their hypothetical schemes were presented as follows:

Commercial Sites

	OZP Restrictions			OZP Scheme		Representers' Scheme	
	PR	SC (%)	BH (mPD)	SC (%)	BH (mPD)	SC (%)	BH (mPD)
Site 4C5							
Hotel	6	80	95	27	95	50	60
Office				33.3	95	60	60
Site 4B5							
Hotel	6.5	80	108	28	108	50	64
Office				31	108	60	65
Site 4C4							
Hotel	7.5	80	95	34	95	50	71
Office				42	95	60	73

Residential Sites

	OZP Restrictions			OZP Scheme		Representers' Scheme	
	PR	SC (%)	BH (mPD)	SC (%)	BH (mPD)	SC (%)	BH (mPD)
Sites 4B4, 4C3 and 4B3							
Scheme 1	5.5	40	95	20	95	25	80
Scheme 2				20	95	30	69
Sites 4B2 and 4C2							
Scheme 1	6.1	40	110	19	110	25	87
Scheme 2				19	110	30	75
Sites 4B1 and 4C1							
Scheme 1	7.0	40	120	20	120	25	99
Scheme 2				20	120	30	87
Sites 4A1 and 4A2							
Scheme 1	6.1	40	110	19	110	25	87
Scheme 2				19	110	30	77

- (g) according to Plan 7 of TPB Paper No. 10236 regarding the Review Study of Kai Tak Development, PlanD considered that increasing the BHs of the sites at the Runway Area would result in better building separations, an undulating and a more varied BH profile. However, the future developers would probably adopt a disposition of building to maximize seaview at the waterfront, with minimal building separations within individual site. As a

result, the buildings would become taller only but without achieving wider building separations. According to Plan H-13b of the Paper, the Kai Tak Development would not breach the ridgelines when viewing from the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre, however, it would block the developments in the KTBA and destroy the stepped BH profile previously proposed by Government and achieved by developers with tremendous efforts. Comparing the schemes proposed by PlanD and the representers as shown in the photomontages, adopting the hypothetical schemes proposed by the representers would maintain the stepped BH profile and the buildings behind the runway would not be blocked. As both schemes could achieve the same PR, the flat production of the sites would not be affected; and

- (h) their proposal would achieve a win-win situation, enhance land use proposals of Kai Tak Development, maintain the stepped BH profile of the East Kowloon Area, and achieve variation in BH profile, dynamic skyline and distinctive character for Kai Tak development, Their proposal was considered to be better in terms of the urban design considerations.

R138 - Lee Ming Sha

R148 - Charles Lim

R157 - Kenneth Tong

R228 - Helen Yuen

17. Mr Kenneth Tong made the following main points:

- (a) the representers were staff of Citi Group and Manulife (International) Limited working in the offices of One Bay East in Kwun Tong. They had serious concerns on the OZP amendments which would bring additional work trips. Currently, there were about ten thousands people working in the two office towers and the nearest MTR Ngau Tau Kok station had already reached its full capacity and was very crowded during peak hours. To address the problem, shuttle bus services to different MTR stations in the vicinity were provided but the services were often out of schedule due

to the traffic jam in the area. Further increase in the PR of the development sites would result in an increase of population, office workers, as well as members of public in the area. However, there were not many measures on traffic improvement, nor an implementation programme for the proposed traffic improvement measures;

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (b) they also had concerns on the adverse impacts on air quality and air ventilation. The One Bay East development had applied for the silver certificate of the building with good air and water conditions. According the air quality tests conducted by the organiser, the air and water quality within the office buildings had met all requirements for human occupation, however, the air quality at the open space between the two office towers was having a high pollution index. As shown in the interim test report, a lot of pollutants were detected probably because of the busy road traffic condition in front of the development. The developments at the runway would exacerbate the air pollution problem and the high development intensity and BH would further block air ventilation. Developers of the future developments in the Runway Area would probably try to maximize the SC forming wall buildings along the waterfront which would worsen the air quality problem and bring serious visual impacts on them; and
- (c) the final report of the tests conducted would be issued by about the end of December 2017 and they would be willing to share the findings with Members, if required.

R12143 – C. K. Mak

C259 - Green Sense

18. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr C. K. Mak made the following main points:

- (a) he spoke on behalf of the Green Sense as well as Mr Tam Hoi Pong, their

Chief Executive (Voluntary);

- (b) the OZP amendments further raised the residential density of Kai Tak area. The dramatic increase in development intensity would lead to decline in the quality of environment and life. Reasonable and strong justifications for such increase were required;
- (c) in 2013, the Government had already increased the PR of four housing sites (including one for the Home Ownership Scheme (HOS) and three for private housing) at the Apron Area from between 4.5 and 5 to between 5.5 and 6 to meet acute housing demand. However, flat prices of the sites were not affordable even to the middle class. Under such a laissez-faire private housing policy, the housing sites had failed to provide affordable housing for the people of Hong Kong;
- (d) the Government had failed to learn from previous mistakes and proposed further amendments to increase development intensity with no regard to the fundamental problem of property speculation. The increase in number of flats would only benefit the developers and speculators. The latest selling price of residential development in Kai Tak had reached HK\$18,000 per square foot in May 2017, far exceeding the average monthly income of \$15,000 to 16,000 per person. The Government's measure to increase flat supply by raising development intensity and grabbing land blindly wherever available were not effective as property prices remained high. The Government should tighten its housing policy;
- (e) they suggested to impose conditions as a pre-requisite for the increase of development intensity, such as increasing HOS sites, or stipulating in land leases requiring developers to only provide 'Hong Kong first-time home buyers' units for self-occupation;
- (f) according to an opinion survey on housing issues conducted by the Public Opinion Programme of the University of Hong Kong in September 2017, the public opined that the major reasons for Hong Kong's housing problem,

were purchase of property by many Mainlanders, failure of housing policies, as well as accumulation and speculation of land by the developers; and

- (g) the Board should not blindly follow the Government's proposal and should respond to the real need of the community. In the absence of any further government measures restricting the selling of flats to Hong Kong first-time home buyers, the OZP amendments should be withdrawn as affordable housing for the community could hardly be secured.

[Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung left this session of the meeting at this point.]

C1 – Hon. Ma Fung Kwok, Legislative Councillor

19. Mr So Siu Long made the following main points:

- (a) he represented the Hon Ma Fung Kwok, Legislative Councillor, who was engaged in the Legislative Council meeting on that day. Hon Ma supported R3 on provision of an international water sports centre and also raised concerns on the waterfront development at Kai Tak. There was a severe shortage of water sports venue which limited its development in Hong Kong. The site under Item H2 was suitable for the development of an international water sports centre to provide a specialized venue for training, events and races on water sports. It would be the training base for elite athletes, as well as a venue promoting water sports for all people;
- (b) the Kai Tak site was the most suitable area within the Victoria Harbour for water sports activities as the area was sheltered and the water was calm and thus safe for activities. There were spaces along both sides of KTAC for provision of supporting facilities. It was located in the centre of urban area with adequate transport facilities. The water sports centre would complement with the adjacent Sports Park to provide a variety of facilities to serve the needs of tourists, visitors and people of Hong Kong, strengthen the role of Kai Tak as a hub for sports as well as fostering economic

development;

[Mr Franklin Yu left this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (c) to cope with water sports development, continued improvement in the quality of marine water was necessary. Although the water quality in KTAC was not yet suitable for swimming, according to the Annual River Water Quality Report published by the Water Quality Resource Centre in 2016, there were noticeable improvements in water quality of Kai Tak River over the years. The overall water quality of Kai Tak River had reached a 79% compliance rate and the water quality index at the other two monitoring stations near the end of runway had reached a fair level. Whilst CEDD had proposed underground interception and pumping improvement works near entrance of the KTAC to improve the water quality, it was considered that the underground channel making use of tidal mechanism would be more environmental acceptable and cost effective; and
- (d) rezoning the subject waterfront site from “G/IC” to “C” would affect the development of the International Water Sports Centre and provision of ancillary facilities for water sports activities. The Board should give due consideration in the zoning of the site to enhance sports development. Even if rezoning the site to “C” was inevitable, it was recommended that the Government should stipulate under the lease conditions of the site to require the developer to provide space in the lower levels of commercial development for boat storage, as well as support facilities for water sports and related events.

C6 – Annie Lam Fung Ching

20. Ms Annie Lam Fung Ching made the following main points:

- (a) she was the Executive Director of the Hong Kong China Rowing Association (HKCRA) which had been established in Hong Kong for about 40 years and was the governing body for the sports of rowing in Hong

Kong. They objected to the rezoning of the “G/IC” site to commercial use;

- (b) the HKCRA had been operating two rowing centres in Shing Mun River of Shatin for over 35 years. To support Government’s promotion of ‘Sport for All’, more and more water sports activities were organised in Shing Mun River. With an increasing number of training courses, events and races in rowing, the participants had reached 5,500 in the year of 2016/17. There would be at least 52 races in 2018 and the capacity of Shing Mum River as well as the two rowing centres were full. There were almost 350 rowing boats in the two centres and no extra storage space would be available to cope with the growing number of races and participation. That would limit the development of rowing sports in Hong Kong as Shing Mum River was the only available venue for rowing races currently. International races would not be held as there was insufficient space along the river side for spectators and prize presentation uses. Hence, there was a need for an international water sports centre; and
- (c) HKWSC had successfully held the first Kwun Tong Water Sports Festival in 2016 at the Kwun Tong Promenade and was well supported by various water sports associations, District Councils and the Energising Kowloon East Office. The activity had demonstrated that water sports would bring benefits to the local community.

C16 - Robert L. Wilson MH

C96 - Tristan Strobl

21. Mr Robert L. Wilson made the following main points:

- (a) he supported the HKWSC’s proposal to build a water sports centre and objected to the OZP amendments that would make such a project impossible. The proposed water sports centre would provide rowing, canoeing and dragon boating facilities for daily community use and host world championship events as well as other events. There were many

similar facilities internationally providing substantial opportunities for community sports participation and accommodating extensive programmes of various events. The Government had put forward the development of water sports in the harbour as a policy objective;

- (b) he was in Hong Kong for more than 50 years and had been involved in sports promotion. He was a founder of the Rowing Association and had served the Council for Recreation and Sport, Hong Kong Sports Development Board, and the Hong Kong Sports Institute (HKSI). The Rowing Association had assisted in organising the International Dragon Boat Races in Hong Kong and races were now held all over the world. The International Dragon Boat Federation (IDBF) was then founded and became the first international sports federation with headquarters in Hong Kong. He also joined the Royal Hong Kong Yacht Club (RHKYC), Far Eastern Amateur Rowing Association and initiated the founding of HKWSC;
- (c) the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) was responsible for sports with objectives to provide sports facilities, promote sport and international sports events, and raise the standard of international athletes. The Government had no plans for achieving these objectives resulting in a lack of sports facilities, under-developed community sports, lack of capacity to hold major international events, and under-performance at the international level. Though the Board was not a body to determine management of sports facilities, it should be responsible for reserving land for the provision of sports facilities and overall scheme of sports development;
- (d) Denmark, having 75% of Hong Kong's population and a similar level of Gross Domestic Product was much superior than Hong Kong in international sports performance mainly due to differences in government policies. While the Danish Government determined that their role was to provide sport facilities, leaving the organisation of sports activities to the community, the Hong Kong Government organised most activities rendering community sport under-developed. Organising sport by sports

clubs was globally recognised as being the most effective way to promote sport. However, the Government tried to prevent the emergence of sports clubs and wanted the public to use public sport facilities. Hong Kong people were interested in sports, e.g. 74,000 people had turned up for the marathons, but the Government failed to adapt to the community needs. The under-development of community sport had resulted in difficulties to find suitable people to represent Hong Kong at the international level; and

- (e) the lack of a water sports centre meant that world championships of important water sports could not be held. The Board aimed to promote the health, safety, convenience and general welfare of the community. The provision of sports facilities was for the welfare of the community and the Board might set up a committee for identification of required sports facilities during the planning process. The International Rowing Federation could provide full support and assistance in the design of international water sports centres. The Board should direct PlanD to reserve land for sports facilities in Kai Tak and to make provision for the water sports centre to serve as a major world championships sports facility accommodating daily use for recreation, training and race, and a venue for other events. The opportunity to create the Kai Tak Water Sports Centre should not be missed.

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai and Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang left this session of the meeting at this point.]

C20 – Irene Or

22. Ms Irene Or made the following main points:

- (a) she was a water sports lover and an amateur athlete in rowing and supported the development of water sports facilities in Hong Kong; and
- (b) there was a need for land for development of supporting facilities for water sports and a location close to the waterfront was an important factor. She hoped the Board could support their request.

C94 – Ng Kong Wan

23. Mr Ng Kong Wan made the following main points:

- (a) he was a lover in rowing and the Director of the Board of the Hong Kong China Rowing Association. He had participated in organising many international rowing events/races and the first Water Sports Festival at the Kwun Tong Promenade. He supported the proposal of R3 as the participation of Hong Kong in international races was increasing. A waterfront location was just one of requirements for water sports activities; the provision of supporting facilities was also an essential consideration;
- (b) the rezoning of Site 3B1 from “G/IC” to “C” was not supported since it was difficult to find a 2,000 m racing course in the urban area. Although there was a 2,000 m racing course in Shing Mun River, there was not sufficient space for prize presentation and other activities. The RHKYC had just held in November this year the ‘Around the Island Race’, which had attracted many overseas teams. The race was so successful mainly because the RHKYC had its own venue for holding races; and
- (c) many well-known international races/events on water sports would be held in Hong Kong if there was a permanent location for international races. Sports development was an essential element for life. As mentioned by the representative of R3, the venue in Toda, Japan was capable to provide sufficient spaces allowing the accommodation of some 30 rowing clubs and facilities which helped the development of water sports in Japan. To facilitate water sports development, apart from a water sports centre building, land should be available along the whole racing course for supporting facilities. As proposed by R3, a shift in the alignment of Road D3 would help to achieve the proposals. It was opportune to include the proposed water sports facilities in the planning of Kai Tai Development.

[Mr Stephen H.B. Yau and Mr Philip S.L. Kan left this session of the meeting at this point.]

C258 – Designing Hong Kong Limited

24. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Paul Zimmerman made the following main points:

- (a) he was closely involved in the planning of Kai Tak as he had been a member of the then Harbour-front Enhancement Committee since 2004, submitting a lot of representations and holding numerous discussions relating to the Kai Tak Development. The northern corner of the KTAC had potential competing with Marina Bay of Singapore or Darling Harbour of Sydney;

[Ms Karen P.Y. Chan left this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (b) making reference to the waterfront development at both Singapore and Sydney, a common design for waterfront promenade was that there was a wide area adjoining a development related zone for outdoor dining and water related zone for leisure and activities. The current proposal of the Kai Tak promenade was that proposed road was located right next to a building without any space in between for activities, and the proposed promenade was rather narrow with no space for dining facilities. That would result in a long and empty promenade not for public enjoyment; and
- (c) Road D3 should be realigned to the centre of the Metro Park to free up more space for supporting facilities to the proposed international Water Sports Centre and other activities. The Government's excuse that further realignment would delay the implementation of the road project was not acceptable. Comparing Darling Harbour with Kai Tak, there were numerous similarities such as dimension and location. There were sufficient capacity and opportunity to develop Kai Tak into a place that would be active, vibrant and used by the community at all times.

C3 - John Woo

25. Mr John Woo made the following main points:

- (a) he was the Vice Commodore of the RHKYC and had been making effort in the promotion of training of sailing, rowing and other paddling sports in Hong Kong. During the consideration the representation and comments on the OZP amendments in 2012, it was concluded that water sports was in line with the planning intention of the Kai Tak Development. Since then the Water Sports Council was formed to represent various water sports associations in order to take forward the proposal of the Water Sports Centre. He supported R3 who objected to the OZP amendment that affected the development of water sports facilities and supported the use of KTAC for water sports. There was a lack of space for holding water sport events in Hong Kong. The waterfront of Kai Tak should be used as an open space with proper access to KTAC to facilitate the participation in water-based recreational sports. Areas for water sports supporting facilities in low-rise developments essential for an international Water Sports Centre should also be provided;

- (b) to enhance urban design and city lives, the waterfront area would normally adopt a low-rise design and used for sports activities. The Marina Bay of Singapore was a successful showcase where the waterfront area was not just a business district but also an area for hosting regular water activities, a focal point for major events and exciting leisure spots. Nam Van Lake in Macau was used for open space and various water sports activities with convertible area for spectators. It was also a training ground for water sports athletes and a venue for cultural and recreational activities, and carnivals;

- (c) items H1 and H2 involving rezoning sites 3B1 and 3B2 from “G/IC” to “C” were not supported. The harbourfront area should be reserved and planned for water sports facilities. The site was suitable for the development of an international Water Sports Centre. The location of a water sports centre in front of a commercial development would enhance property value. Commercial sites did not require water access and locating them at the waterfront was a waste of land resources;

- (d) they also opposed the rezoning of the sites under items T, U and V from “O” to other uses which would reduce the area for development of the Metro Park and affect the alignment and treatment of the waterfront along KTAC, compromising the scope for accommodating open space and sporting facilities, and the development of a ‘Water Arena’ and the international Water Sports Centre; and
- (e) the Kai Tak Development with a large portion of protected water was the last frontier to be protected in the city and within the Victoria Harbour. Land use planning should not be just commercial oriented. The recommendations of the HKWSC should be taken heed of.

C260 – Mary Mulvihill

26. Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

- (a) when the Stage 3 public participation of the Kai Tak Planning Review (the Review) was launched in 2006, there was ‘general support’ to leisure-oriented lower density development of the Kai Tak area. However, consultation on the current proposed amendments which included significant changes was restricted to District Councils and the Harbourfront Commission and did not involve the public;
- (b) instead of creating a well-designed, well ventilated and attractive district as set out in the vision and planning principles of the Review, the area ended up with rows of identical and monotonous high-rise housing estates. The so-called ‘undulating’ BH profile was creating wall effect. The lure of land premiums had affected good planning giving due regard to the community needs for leisure. Instead of a typical low-rise GIC building with open space and roof garden where children and patients of the two proposed hospitals could play, the future development nearby might become a high rise curtain wall. The road in the middle would be in line with the runway experience and enable more efficient land use. The potential of connectivity between the new stadium and water sports events

should be considered;

- (c) the Board should properly inquire into the matters, consider all the factors, and question how the community had been misled. The public had reasonable expectation that they could enjoy a certain level of public services and recreational facilities. The Government's excuse to provide more land for housing and commercial uses should not deprive and downgrade the quality of life. The Board should ensure that each district had sufficient GIC sites to meeting the requirements of the community as pledged in the prevailing Policy Address. Rezoning of the GIC sites would make the implementation of the policy measures improbable. Consideration should also be given to the changes in employment opportunities. Although office jobs might be lost, employment in leisure field would increase; and

- (d) the Board should listen to the views of the local residents who had to live with the increasing congestion and air pollution. It was heard that the MTR was considering blocking some exits on the Kwun Tong Line at peak hours before the operation of new line. The increase in development intensity would bring additional volume of traffic and pedestrians into the area. Thus the Board should demand the relevant departments to provide solid facts and data to substantiate the amendments to the OZP before they were agreed by the Board.

[The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 1:10 p.m.]

27. The meeting was resumed at 2:30 p.m. on 6.12.2017.

28. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting:

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-Chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr H.F. Leung

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Dr C.H. Hau

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Tony W.H. Cheung

Chief Traffic Engineer (Kowloon)
Transport Department
Mr David C.V. Ngu

Assistant Director (Regional 1),
Lands Department
Mr Simon S.W. Wang

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Presentation and Question Sessions (Continued)

[Open Meeting]

29. The following Government representatives, their consultants, the representers and their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

Mr Tom C.K. Yip - District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K)

Mr K.K. Lee - Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K)

Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)

Mr Peter S.K. Chui - Chief Engineer/East 3 (CE/E3)

Transport Department (TD)

Miss Connie K.Y. Yiu - Engineer/Housing & Planning 2 (E/H&P2)

Government's Consultants

Mr Vincent Au Yeung - Technical Director, AECOM

Mr Steven Wong - Associate Director, AECOM

Mr Simon Lee - Senior Engineer, AECOM

Mr Karl An - Project Environmental Consultant, AECOM

Ms Winona Ip - Senior Planner, Urbis Limited

Ms Sandy Ling - Senior Landscape Architect, Urbis Limited

Representers/Commenters and their Representatives

R3 – Hong Kong Water Sports Council (HKWSC)

C2 – Hong Kong China Rowing Association

C4 – Christopher J. Perry

C9 – Judy Chan

C15 – Louis Brands Savage

C68 – Philip Crinion

Masterplan Limited –] Representers' and Commenters'

Mr Ian Brownlee] representatives

Canoe Union –]

Mr Luk Wai Hung]

HKWSC –]

Mr Mike Arnold]

R13 – Hong Kong Rugby Union

C153 – James Wood

C155 – Barry M. Hill

C178 – Siddhartha Jane Saunders

C204 – Jasper Donat

C210 – D. Renwick

C217 – Angela McGillivray

C219 – Steve Bryant

C225 – Tom Gerigk

C239 – Alison Quinlivan

C248 – Kristian Murfitt

C254 – John Berry

C255 – Thomas P. Connolly

Hong Kong Rugby Union -] Representers' and Commenters'

Mr Ian Brownlee] representatives

Mr Chiu Kwok Kwong]

R40 – Albert Au

R63 – Manulife (International) Limited

R65 - Ada Lee Wing Shan

R215 – Miss Wong

R217 - Lee Lee Sing Edward

R218 – Lai Pak Yan Brian

R238 – Cheng Chan Wah Roy

R245 – Or Wing Sing

R260 – Kenneth Ko Kar Yui

R263 – Hui Kau Ho Ryohei

R267 – Lai Ka Lok

R270 – Max Lau Kai Hing

Manulife (International) Limited –] Representers' representatives

Mr Gilbert Ng]

Mr Kenneth To]

Ms Kitty Wong]

R138 – Lee Ming Sha

R148 – Charles Lim

R157 – Kenneth Tong

R228 – Helen Yuen

Mr Kenneth Tong - Representer and Representers' representative

C6 – Annie Lam Fung Ching

Ms Annie Lam Fung Ching - Commenter

C16 – Robert L. Wilson MH

C96 – Tristan Strobl

Mr Robert L. Wilson MH - Commenter and Commenter's representative

C20 – Irene Or

Ms Irene Or - Commenter

C94 – Ng Kong Wan

Mr Ng Kong Wan - Commenter

C258 – Designing Hong Kong Ltd

Mr Paul Zimmerman - Commenter's representative

C260 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Commenter

30. The Chairperson extended a welcome to the Government representatives, consultants, representers, commenters and their representatives. She said that the oral presentation of Group 1 was completed in the morning session and this session of the meeting was a question-and-answer (Q&A) session for Group 1. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

Water Quality at Kai Tak Approach Channel

31. The Vice-chairperson and some Members had the following questions :

- (a) whether the water quality at Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC) near the Metro Park would be improved, the anticipated time and resources required to improve the water quality to a level suitable for water sports, and whether policy support had been obtained for water sports development at KTAC;
- (b) whether the water quality problem at KTAC was mainly caused by the drainage discharge from the hinterland and whether the water quality could be improved drastically if the discharge was diverted somewhere else; and
- (c) whether there was any guarantee that the water quality of KTAC could meet the requirement for secondary contact recreational use after the implementation of mitigation measures such as Interception Pumping (IP) Scheme.

[Mr H.W. Cheung arrived to join this session of the meeting.]

32. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K made the following main points :

- (a) the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) welcomed water sports at KTAC/Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter (KTTS) in-principle. However, the exact location for water sports would be subject to resolution of technical and operational issues. Hong Kong Water Sports Council (HKWSC) (R3) had applied for a short-term tenancy (STT) to use a 3,500 m² site near the ex-Fire Boat Pier for a temporary water sports centre. The feasibility of using any particular site for the provision of supporting facilities for water sports use would need to be further explored.

33. Mr Peter S.K. Chui, CE/E3, CEDD made the following main points :

- (a) the water quality at KTAC was mainly affected by the water from Kai Tak River, the drainage discharge near Southern Apron and the accumulation of polluted material on the seabed. The various sources of pollution had been tackled and the water quality at KTAC and KTTS had improved through the implementation of drainage/sewerage projects in the hinterland. Funding would be obtained for the implementation of the proposed IP Scheme. Further improvement in the water quality in KTAC and KTTS was expected by 2027 when sites would be available for development ; and
- (b) there had been progressive improvement in the water quality in KTTS which would probably allow secondary contact recreational use such as canoeing and dragon boat racing, but not primary contact recreational use like swimming as the water quality at KTAC had yet to reach such a standard. CEDD proposed an IP Scheme to improve the water quality of KTAC by intercepting and pumping stormwater from the upstream of KTAC to the Victoria Harbour side of the Runway. Relevant District Council and the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (the Task Force) had been consulted on the IP Scheme. Upon completion of the detailed design, CEDD would apply for funding for its implementation. It was expected that works would not commence within a short period of time.

34. Regarding water quality, Mr Ian Brownlee, representative of R3's group, said that while the water quality at KTAC near the Metro Park was not yet suitable for water sports, the water quality was gradually improving. As the sites at this end of KTAC would not be available until 2027 for water sports or any other development, there would be time available to further improve the water quality in KTAC. Mr Robert L. Wilson (C16) supplemented that the situation in KTAC was similar to that in Shing Mun River when rowing first started there in 1982 with water quality not up to the standard for secondary contact recreational use. Yet, there was no health problem for the rowing boat members. The water quality of KTAC was progressively getting better since the relocation of Kai Tak Airport. With the work of the relevant departments, the water quality would be improved to the level required when the water sports centre was in place in 7 to 10 years' time.

35. Mr Paul Zimmerman, representative of C258, said that it was technically and financially feasible to improve the water quality of KTAC to meet the water quality objective for secondary contact recreational use, subject to the amount of resources the Government was willing to spend. If the Board agreed to designate KTAC for water sports use, the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) would then set the water quality objectives accordingly and CEDD would implement the measures that would be required to meet those objectives.

Provision of Water Sports Facilities

36. The Chairperson, Vice-chairperson and some Members had the following questions:

- (a) the types of sports facilities to be provided at Kai Tak Sports Park and the Metro Park;
- (b) whether any site had been reserved for boat storage, ramp for launching and retrieving canoes and boats, and whether those facilities were always permitted uses on the OZP;

- (c) apart from those areas near the Metro Park that had sea frontage to KTAC, whether there were other sites suitable for the provision of on-shore supporting facilities for water sports, e.g. the “Open Space” (“O”) zone at the South Apron Corner, and whether there was any development programme for that “O” site;
- (d) whether it was necessary to provide on-shore facilities at the northwestern end of KTAC to facilitate the use of KTAC for water sports competitions, whether these facilities could be accommodated within the podium of future developments at the “Commercial” (“C”) zone and that such a requirement be incorporated in the land sale document of those sites;
- (e) whether it was technically feasible to provide a spectators’ stand on top of the at-grade deck over the underpass section of Road D3 and whether the design of the deck had taken into account the possibility of providing a spectators’ stand for viewing water sports competitions in future;
- (f) given the constraints posed by Road D4, which ran across KTAC in the form of a bridge, whether water sports would be appropriate along KTAC and whether a suitable site for water sports should be designated first so that suitable design could be incorporated in providing the necessary infrastructure by relevant government departments; and
- (g) pending the achievement of the long-term goal of improving the water quality, whether water sports was an immediate choice for KTAC.

[Mr David Y.T. Lui returned to join this session of the meeting.]

37. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K made the following main points :

- (a) funding for the construction of the Main Stadium, Public Sports Ground and Indoor Sports Centre Building had been obtained and those facilities were under construction. The Main Stadium, equipped with an openable roof

and could accommodate 50,000 spectators, would be used for major/international sports events such as football and rugby matches. There were grassed pitches in the Public Sports Ground with a seating capacity of 5,000 to serve local schools/sports organisations for sports training and matches. The Indoor Sports Centre Building would provide indoor ball courts for badminton, basketball, volleyball, as well as venue for indoor games. Those facilities could generally meet the demand for sports facilities in Kai Tak area and the community as a whole;

- (b) with the OZP amendments, water sports and water recreation were always permitted within the “O” zone. While it was the intention of the OZP to accommodate a variety of water sports/activities in KTAC and KTTS, suitable location for the provision of on-shore supporting facilities was yet to be identified. The Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO) was carrying out studies to identify suitable location within KTTS for water sports/activities and the provision of supporting facilities such as landing ramps for such use. A number of locations along the Kwun Tong waterfront promenade had been identified as potential sites for providing landing ramps for canoes and boats. Those supporting facilities for water sports/water recreation could generally be considered as ancillary development to those permitted uses if their scale was not excessive. EKEO would further liaise with relevant government departments in identifying suitable location in KTTS for water sports, and would consult stakeholders including HKWSC (R3);
- (c) assuming the water quality of KTTS was suitable for secondary contact recreational use, on-shore supporting facilities for water sports would be permitted in sites zoned “O” along the waterfront, including the site at the South Apron Corner. However, it would be premature at this stage to designate a particular site for such a purpose as the suitability of any particular site would need to be assessed on the basis of the types of recreational use proposed and permissible under the water quality prevailing

at the material time, the operational arrangement and the compatibility with the adjacent area;

- (d) according to the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD), there was no development programme for the “O” site at the South Apron Corner. However, the site might be used as a temporary works area for the construction of Trunk Road T2; and
- (e) although Road D4 running across KTAC posed constraints on the water sports activities at KTAC, the possibility of having water sports along KTAC would not be ruled out. Consideration should be given to the water quality, the availability of sites for on-shore supporting facilities, and the constraints on land and water in the future planning of water sports facilities.

38. Mr Peter S.K. Chui, CE/E3, CEDD made the following main points :

- (a) it was technically feasible to provide a spectators’ stand on top of the at-grade deck above the underpass section of Road D3, taking into account the width of the road and the 20 m wide frontage between the road and KTAC. The spectators’ stand would need to take into account the seawall of KTAC. While permanent structures would not be permitted on the at-grade deck as it would affect the maintenance of the underpass, temporary spectators’ stand might be accommodated;
- (b) it was noted that HKWSC (R3) would need a 50 m wide area at the waterfront for boat towing and preparation. The current 20 m wide waterfront promenade in addition to the 30 m wide at-grade deck above the underpass section of Road D3 could meet their requirement if the supporting facilities could be built within the Metro Park; and
- (c) in carrying out works for the provision of infrastructure, e.g. Road D3, the provision of suitable land/water interface facilities such as bollards and

anchorage would be considered at appropriate location at the detailed design stage. The waterfront promenade would be constructed together with Road D3. While the provision of land/water interface facilities might not meet the specific requirement for various types of activities, modification works could be carried out at the designated location at a later stage.

39. Mr Ian Brownlee, representative of R3's group, made the following main points :

- (a) KTTS was not suitable for water sports as boat racing activities would interfere with the mooring area and the fairways of the typhoon shelter. If facilities supporting boat racing were provided near KTTS, there would be potential conflict with marine traffic in KTTS. The potentially dangerous situation and the additional marine traffic in KTTS would not be welcomed by the Marine Department. The site near the ex-Fire Boat Pier offered to them under STT was not adequate in size. Besides, that STT site was only for temporary use;
- (b) putting aside water quality consideration, KTAC was more suitable for water sports and boat competition. KTAC could accommodate the 1000 m course where most of the racing would take place and would not interfere with KTTS. The finishing line would be placed at the northwestern end of KTAC, and spectators' stand and related facilities should also be provided there to enhance the vibrancy of the area. Although water sports/water recreation and its supporting facilities were permitted within the "O" zone on the OZP, specific sites at suitable locations should be made available to them;
- (c) proposals were submitted by HKWSC (R3) to rezone sites near the Metro Park to "O", "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") or "C(6)" for the provision of on-shore supporting facilities for water sports. The "G/IC" and "C(6)" zones could also accommodate both GIC and commercial developments, if necessary. Although such facilities were always permitted in the "C" zone, the "C(6)" zone could specify the amount

of GFA for such GIC facilities. In the event that water sports could not take place in KTAC due to water quality issue, these sites could be rezoned later for other uses;

- (d) as advised by LCSD, the boat storing/launching facilities and spectators' stand building proposed by HKWSC (R3) was quite substantial and should be constructed within "G/IC" zone instead of "O" zone. Although the "O" site at the South Apron Corner could be used for such purpose, the site was not ideal in terms of location, size and zoning;
- (e) regarding the identification of suitable sites for water sports and the supporting facilities, they had yet to be approached by EKEO; and
- (f) although there was a 20 m wide strip of land between Road D3 and KTAC, any permanent structure would need to be set back from the seawall structure as well as the underpass structure of Road D3 by 10 m and 5m respectively. As a result, only a 5m strip would remain, which would not be adequate for building anything. Permanent structure would not be allowed on top of the at-grade deck due to road maintenance requirement.

40. Mr Luk Wai Hung, Chairman of the Canoe Union and representative of R3's group, added that a marine traffic impact assessment had been submitted to demonstrate that the boat competitions would not have any adverse impact on KTTS.

Road D3

41. The Chairperson and some Members had the following questions :

- (a) whether Road D3 had been moved to the current location near the waterfront, and whether there would be any constraint in realigning the road southwards towards the Metro Park and decking over the underpass section for open space development, as proposed by some representers;

- (b) whether the current alignment of Road D3 was gazetted under the Road (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance;
- (c) what LCSD's comment was on the alternative road re-alignment as proposed by the representers from park development perspective, and whether the amendments to the OZP involved any re-alignment of Road D3; and
- (d) how the landscaped deck above Road D3 would be connected to the landscaped decks in the residential development and whether the connectivity problem of the dissected Metro Park could be resolved if the re-aligned Road D3 was in the form of a tunnel through the park, and whether the 180 m decked-over area could be extended.

42. In response, Mr Peter S.K. Chui, CE/E3, CEDD and Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K made the following main points :

- (a) Road D3 first appeared on the OZP in 2006 and the alignment of its northern section abutting the Metro Park had not been changed. Part of Road D3 near the roundabout on the eastern end adopted an underpass design with an at-grade deck to facilitate pedestrian connection between the Metro Park and the waterfront along KTAC. Vehicular access to the Metro Park would be provided near the roundabout to the east and the road bend in the middle section. If Road D3 was re-aligned to traverse the Metro Park, it would impose constraints on the design of the park, especially if football fields were to be provided within the park. Moreover, the deck above the underpass section would then only be about 70 m wide, which was narrower than the 180 m wide deck in the current design and would be less desirable in facilitating pedestrian movement. On the other hand, any variation in the design to further widen the decked-over portion to exceed 180 m would need to be further examined as the vehicular access near the roundabout might be affected, leaving only one vehicular access to the west, which was not desirable. Road D3 was gazetted in July 2017 under the

Road (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance for a period of two months. CEDD was currently processing objections to the road gazette;

- (b) LCSD did not support the road re-alignment proposed by the representers. The current OZP amendments were not related to the alignment of Road D3, though one of the amendment items was to rezone a section of the road to “O(2)” to facilitate the provision of a landscaped deck above the underpass section for pedestrian connection between the Metro Park, waterfront promenade and the elevated landscaped deck leading to the developments within the Runway Precinct; and
- (c) the underpass section of Road D3 would be covered by a 180 m long at-grade deck to facilitate pedestrian access from the Metro Park to the waterfront area. The underpass section would then rise gradually towards the roundabout. A landscaped deck of similar height to a typical pedestrian footbridge would be provided along that section of Road D3 to facilitate pedestrian connection from the Metro Park to the residential developments to the southeast. Further extending the 180 m at-grade decking or adding another landscaped deck would delay the road construction programme as the project might need to be examined again under Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance.

43. Mr Paul Zimmerman said that Designing Hong Kong Limited (C258) had also raised objection to Road D3 under the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance. He said that there was no programme for the Metro Park and there would be scope to re-align Road D3. As no structure could be built on top of the decked-over portion of Road D3, the current road alignment would only provide a narrow strip of land at the KTAC waterfront, which was inadequate for providing a spectators’ stand for viewing water sports events. The decked-over portion of the re-aligned Road D3 through the Metro Park could be used as open space, which would not require the construction of any structure. That would enable a wider KTAC waterfront for the construction of spectators’ stand and for public enjoyment. CEDD could consider rearranging the accesses to the buildings along Road D3 to provide a wider decked-over area.

Traffic Issue

44. Some Members had the following questions :

- (a) whether consideration had been given on the traffic arrangement in the area in view that water sports facilities might be provided at sites near the Kai Tak Sports Park (KTSP) where football matches/sports events would be held;
- (b) where the mass transit system would be provided; and
- (c) whether Kai Tak Development (KTD) would be developed as a vehicle-free district and the provision of an Environmentally Friendly Linkage System (EFLS) cum ferry services would be adequate to serve the future population in KTD.

45. In response, Mr Peter S.K. Chui, CE/E3, CEDD and Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K made the following main points :

- (a) the Transport Department and the Police would have temporary crowd control and traffic arrangements in controlling pedestrian and vehicular traffic in the KTSP during major sports events. As the site for water sports facilities had yet to be identified, specific traffic arrangement had not been worked out to address traffic issues arising from simultaneous land and water sports events;
- (b) public engagement on the routing of EFLS and the mode of operation had been carried out in early 2017. It was likely that the EFLS would be elevated and separated from pedestrian and vehicular traffic; and
- (c) ferry services between North Point and Kwun Tong were being provided at the ex-Fire Boat Pier. EKEO would comprehensively review the need for strengthening the ferry service. The EFLS and ferry services together

would not solve the traffic problem as there was also demand for road transportation generated from tourists and goods transportation to and from the Cruise Terminal. Restricting vehicular traffic in KTD might not be practical. In any case, a traffic impact assessment (TIA) had been carried out for KTD, which demonstrated that the traffic infrastructure would be able to cope with the planned development.

46. Mr Ian Brownlee, representative of R3's group, said that the local water sports events held would not normally attract a large crowd and they could be accommodated by public transport.

Development Restrictions at the Runway Precinct

47. The Vice-chairperson and some Members had the following questions :

- (a) whether a lower building height restriction (BHR) at the Runway Precinct could accommodate the permissible development intensity;
- (b) whether the building height (BH) profile was in line with the stepped BH principle of having lower buildings near the sea front and taller buildings towards inland, and whether the permissible BH of developments in the Runway Precinct was higher than that in the hinterland;
- (c) whether developers would adopt an elongated building design along the waterfront to maximize the seaview of their future development, which would defeat the original intention of relaxing the BHR for encouraging wider building gaps; and
- (d) considering that some representers opposed the increase in development intensity of developments in the Runway Precinct, whether there was any information to compare the development intensity of the area with the surrounding areas.

48. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K made the following main points :

- (a) BHRs of 60 mPD to 95mPD were originally proposed for the Runway Precinct in KTD. The said BHRs could accommodate the development intensity permitted under the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). A lower BHR would generally result in bigger building footprint and narrower building gaps, which might adversely affect visual penetration and air ventilation. Upon consultation with the Harbourfront Commission and its Task Force, a revised scheme with higher BHRs was proposed. The revised BHRs proposed on the OZP would enable flexibility in building design with a lower site coverage, larger building gaps and a greater variation in BH profile. In comparison, both BHR schemes would not encroach upon the 20% building-free zone of the ridgeline of Lion Rock. However, a lower BHR would likely result in buildings with bigger footprint, thus creating wall effect. In general, a lower BHR with a larger site coverage would also have less design flexibility in building layout;
- (b) in general, the BHRs of developments in Hung Hom and Kowloon City/Wong Tai Sin were mostly 100 mPD to 120 mPD while that of Kowloon Bay and Kwun Tong Business Areas involving mainly commercial developments were 120 mPD to 170 mPD and 100 mPD to 160 mPD respectively. The BHRs of 95mPD to 120 mPD for the Runway Precinct was not incompatible with those in the surrounding areas;
- (c) the BHRs for developments at the Runway Precinct were to achieve a variation in BH profile for a dynamic and interesting skyline. There was also requirement for low-rise buildings near the waterfront promenade to minimise the visual impact at pedestrian level and provide a quality pedestrian environment. The building design concept of putting lower buildings near the waterfront could be stated in the Explanatory Statement of the OZP as well as incorporated in the lease to ensure that the above urban design concept would be achieved; and

- (d) according to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), the maximum plot ratio (PR) for new development areas in the urban area was 6.5. However, the permitted PR for residential developments in the Runway Precinct was about 6 on average. For developments within the “Residential (Group A)” zone on OZPs in Kowloon, a maximum domestic PR of 7.5 or a total PR of 9 was permitted. For commercial developments within “C” zone or “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) zones, the maximum PR was 12. Residential developments in Hung Hom generally had a PR of 7.5 to 9 while the commercial developments in San Po Kong, Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay had in general a PR of 12. In comparison, the development intensity of developments in the Runway Precinct was not higher than those in the surrounding areas.

49. Mr Kenneth To, representative of R40’s group, said that a higher BHR with correspondingly reduced site coverage would not necessarily facilitate the provision of building gaps if buildings were not aligned properly. It was likely that developers would maximise the building frontage to enjoy the sea view, thus the variation in BH as indicated in PlanD’s presentation might not be achieved. Only with designation of building gap requirements on the OZP could a more permeable layout be achieved while maintaining the permissible development intensity and a lower BHR. Any special building design requirements could also be incorporated in the lease at land disposal stage.

Other Issues

50. Some Members had the following questions :

- (a) whether there was any site reserved for the future expansion of the Hong Kong Children Hospital at the South Apron Corner;
- (b) whether consideration had been given to the provision of an underground refuse treatment system for KTD;

- (c) whether there was any information on the headroom of the existing Road D4, and whether the headroom and supporting columns of the road bridge across KTAC would pose constraints on the water sports and boat competitions underneath;
- (d) whether there was a reduction of “O” zone by 4 ha as claimed by some representers after the amendments to the OZP; and
- (e) whether KTTS would be phased out and/or relocated elsewhere noting that the land uses surrounding KTTS had been changed and in anticipation of the water sports development in KTD.

51. In response, Mr Peter S.K. Chui, CE/E3, CEDD and Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K made the following main points :

- (a) the Hong Kong Children Hospital would be completed by end 2017. The OZP had already accommodated its long-term requirement and no site was reserved for its future expansion. Should there be any need for its expansion in the future, review could be conducted taking into account the land use condition of the area at the time;
- (b) the infrastructure for KTD had largely been completed, and there would not be any central refuse treatment system to be provided underground in KTD;
- (c) Road D4 was an existing road across KTAC which had a clearance of 2-3 m above water. While canoes and small boats could pass underneath the road, the clearance level might impose constraints for larger boats;
- (d) the amendments to the OZP would result in a slight reduction in the total area zoned “O” from 99.38 ha to 98.18 ha, i.e. a reduction of 1.2 ha. However, the figure had not taken into account open space falling within other zones (e.g. the park on top of cruise terminal). The reduction in the total area of open space was not significant; and

- (e) KTTS was a gazetted typhoon shelter currently in use. A study on the utilization of KTTS, carried out by EKEO, revealed that the utilization rate of KTTS was not high during non-typhoon seasons. EKEO was also studying whether KTTS could maintain its typhoon shelter function while a portion could be used for water sports, on a co-existing basis.

52. Mr Ian Brownlee, representative of R3's group, supplemented that small boats and canoes could pass underneath Road D4. While the headroom of the road was lower on the two landward sides, boat competition could still use the middle section. Although there was no programme for the redevelopment of Road D4, the headroom could be raised and the bridge span could be increased to accommodate water sports at KTAC eventually. In this regard, Mr Peter S.K. Chui, CE/E3, CEDD confirmed that there was no redevelopment programme for Road D4.

53. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedures for Group 1 had been completed. The Board would deliberate on the representations and comments in a closed meeting after the hearing procedures for Group 2 were completed and would inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representers, commenters, their representatives, and the government representatives/consultants for attending the hearing. They all left the meeting at this point.

54. This session of the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.