

**Minutes of 895th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held at 11:00 a.m. on 28.9.2007**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)
Mr. Raymond Young

Chairman

Dr. Peter K.K. Wong

Vice-Chairman

Professor Nora F.Y. Tam

Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan

Mr. Leslie H.C. Chen

Mr. Tony C.N. Kan

Mr. Edmund K.H. Leung

Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim

Dr. C.N. Ng

Dr. Daniel B.M. To

Ms. Sylvia S.F. Yau

Mr. B.W. Chan

Mr. Walter K.L. Chan

Ms. Anna S.Y. Kwong

Mr. K.Y. Leung

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection
Dr. Michael Chiu

Director of Lands
Miss Annie Tam

Director of Planning
Mrs. Ava Ng

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Miss Ophelia Y.S. Wong

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr. Michael K.C. Lai

Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong

Ms. Carmen K.M. Chan

Mr. David W.M. Chan

Dr. Lily Chiang

Professor David Dudgeon

Professor Peter R. Hills

Professor N.K. Leung

Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong

Mr. Alfred Donald Yap

Ms. Maggie M.K. Chan

Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan

Mr. Y.K. Cheng

Mr. Felix W. Fong

Professor Paul K.S. Lam

Dr. James C.W. Lau

Ms. Starry W.K. Lee

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport)
Transport and Housing Bureau
Ms. Ava Chiu

Assistant Director (2), Home Affairs Department
Ms. Margaret Hsia

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Mr. S. Lau

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr. C.T. Ling

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese]

1. The Secretary said that there was no matter arising to report.

Agenda Item 2

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

Consideration of Further Representations in Respect of the Draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K22/1 (Open Meeting)

(TPB Paper No. 7915)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese]

2. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests in this item:

Dr. Greg Wong being a Member of Capital Projects Committee of Kowloon-Canton Railway Corporation (KCRC) which submitted Further Representation No. F4

Mr. Felix Fong) being members of the Democratic Alliance for the
Ms. Maggie Chan) Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong (DAB)
Ms. Starry Lee) which submitted Representation No. 1

Ms. Ava Chiu being an alternative member for the Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport) 1, who was an alternative member of the Boards of MTR Corporation Limited (MTRC) and KCRC which submitted Further Representation No. F4.

Members noted that Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong, Ms. Maggie M.K. Chan, Mr. Felix W. Fong,

Ms. Starry W.K. Lee and Ms. Ava Chiu had sent apologies for being unable to attend this meeting.

3. The Chairman said that on 17.8.2007, the Board considered the revised layout of Kai Tak City Centre and decided to propose amendments to the draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) to partially meet Representation No. 1 submitted by DAB. The proposed amendments were mainly to fine-tune the layout of Kai Tak City Centre and to incorporate the planning vision to transform the existing Kai Tak Nullah into a river channel. During the three-week exhibition period, the following six valid further representations were received:

- F1 San Po Kong Residents Association and San Po Kong Owners Association
- F3 Mr. Ho King Ho
- F4 MTRC and KCRC
- F5 Kowloon City Residents' Concern Group on Kai Tak Development
- F6 Hon. Chan Yuen Han, Legislative Councillor and Mr. Yu Lap Kee
- F7 CLP Power Hong Kong Ltd. (CLP)

4. The Chairman said that the further representations would be heard collectively. Representer R1 and all further representers had been invited to attend the meeting. Three further representers (i.e. F5, F6 and F7) had indicated that they would attend the meeting and make a presentation each. Representer 1 and Further Representer F1, F3 and F4 had indicated that they would not attend the meeting. There was no comment on Representation No. 1.

5. The following Government representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

- | | |
|-----------------|--|
| Mr. Eric Yue | District Planning Officer/Kowloon, Planning Department (DPO/K, PlanD) |
| Mr. Kelvin Chan | Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), PlanD |
| Mr. Mak Chi Biu | Chief Engineer / Kowloon (Acting), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) |

Mr. Eric Ma Project Director, Maunsell – City Planning Joint Venture

6. The following further representers and their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Further Representation No. F5

- Mr. Tsui Ka Fun) Representatives of Further Representer F5,
Mr. Ko Mun Chun) Kowloon City Residents’ Concern Group
Ms. Chan Mei Sim) on Kai Tak Development
Ms. Wong Siu To)
Mr. Lam Ming Chung)

Further Representation No. F6

Mr. Yu Lap Kee Further Representer F6

Representation No. F7

- Mr. W.K. Chou) Representatives of Further Representer F7,
Mr. K.W. Leung) CLP
Mr. K.K. Leung)
Mr. Wilson Cheng)
Ms. Juliana Lai)

7. The Chairman extended a welcome. Members noted that sufficient notice had been given to Representer R1 and Further Representers F1, F3 and F4 and they had indicated not to attend the meeting. The Board agreed to proceed with the meeting in the absence of the remaining parties. The Chairman then explained the procedures of the hearing.

8. The Secretary said that a letter dated 21.9.2007 was received from Hon. Emily Lau, conveying the view of Further Representer F5, Kowloon City Residents’ Concern Group on Kai Tak Development. Members were invited to note the letter, which was tabled at the meeting.

9. The Chairman then invited Mr. Eric Yue, DPO/K, to brief Members on the background of the further representations.

10. Mr. Eric Yue said that replacement pages to Annex VI of the Paper were tabled at the meeting. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation and two physical models displayed at the meeting, Mr. Yue made the following main points as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the proposed amendments was set out in paragraph 1 of the Paper. On 17.8.2007, the Board considered the revised layout of Kai Tak City Centre and decided to propose amendments to the OZP to partially meet Representation No. 1. The proposed amendments were to fine-tune the layout of Kai Tak City Centre and to incorporate the planning vision to transform the existing Kai Tak Nullah into a river channel. During the three-week exhibition period, six further representations were received;
- (b) the main grounds of the further representations and the planning assessment were summarised in paragraph 2 of the Paper;
- (c) In gist, Further Representer F1 supported the proposed amendments to the Kai Tak City Centre. Further Representer F3 supported the proposed amendments in general but considered that the building height limit for some of the development sites in the City Centre too low. Further Representer F4 considered that higher plot ratio should be allowed for the development sites within walking distance of the SCL Kai Tak Station. Further Representer F5 did not support the enlargement and increase in maximum building height restrictions of "R(B)1" site as it might affect the air ventilation of Kowloon City. Also, they requested that the curvilinear elevated walkway should be extended to Tak Ku Ling Road Rest Garden in Kowloon City. Further Representer F6 commented that the view corridor should be repositioned to orient towards the Lion's Head. Further Representer F7 objected to the reduction in the area of the "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") site reserved for the provision of

an electricity substation near Sung Wong Toi Park; and

- (d) PlanD did not support Further Representations No. F3 to F7 for reasons set out under planning consideration and assessment in paragraph 2 of the Paper. The proposed amendments to the Kai Tak City Centre layout were aimed, inter alia, to open up the vista of the city centre area. Stringent building height restrictions had been imposed to protect the view corridor towards the Lion Rock, which also served as a breezeway to Kowloon City. The increase in building heights proposed by Further Representer F3 was not compatible with the stepped height profile envisaged on the OZP. Further Representer F4 had mainly repeated their earlier concerns raised in their representation when the Kai Tak OZP was first gazetted. To encourage public transport and reduce road-based vehicular travel demand, the development in the vicinity of Kai Tak Station had adopted relatively higher plot ratios and mixed-use development had been introduced. For Further Representer F5, the SCL Kai Tak Station would be connected with Kowloon City by an underground shopping street system. As such, pedestrian facilities had been planned for to assist pedestrian movement between the station and the surrounding developments. To address the concern raised by Further Representer F6, a computer model had been prepared to simulate a walk-through in the view corridor which showed that the view of Lion's Head was not obstructed within the corridor. As regards the provision of electricity substation raised by Further Representer F7, the Transport Department (TD) had raised no objection to the request for two vehicular access points to the subject "G/IC" site. The feasibility of accommodating the substation within a slightly reduced site area would be examined in detail as part of the on-going Kai Tak Development Engineering Study.

11. The Chairman then invited the further representers to make their presentations.

Further Representation No. F5

12. Mr. Tsui Ka Fun, representative of the Kowloon City Residents' Concern Group on Kai Tak Development (the Concern Group), made the following main points:

- (a) their request for amendments to the Kai Tak OZP was presented to the Board on 4.5.2007, but not accepted. The Concern Group was an organization of the local residents. Various consultation forums were held to collect the local views. The views presented to the Board truly reflected the view of the local residents of Kowloon City, and should be duly taken care of by the Board;
- (b) the Concern Group requested the Kai Tak Station be located closer to Kowloon City. Knowing that such a request was not accepted, the Concern Group then lowered its requirement and requested an additional station entrance be provided in Kowloon City. This request was again being turned down. The proposed pedestrian connection between Kai Tak Station and Kowloon City through an underground shopping street system had failed to take into account the long distance involved in getting to the station, which was particularly onerous for elderly residents;
- (c) the Concern Group now requested to extend the proposed curvilinear landscaped elevated walkway to Tak Ku Ling Road Rest Garden in Kowloon City. The current proposed landing point of the curvilinear elevated walkway was at Tung Lei Road, which was east of the Shek Ku Lung Road Playground and was in Wong Tai Sin District, but away from Kowloon City;
- (d) elevated walkway and underground shopping street were two different systems. The provision of underground shopping street could not replace the need for extending the elevated walkway system to Kowloon City. The local residents in Kowloon City should not be deprived of the right to enjoy using the elevated walkway system; and
- (e) the curvilinear elevated walkway should serve the local residents. If

the landing points were wrongly chosen, it would affect the utilization rate of the walkway. Members should go for a site visit to better appreciate the local context in the planning of the elevated walkway.

13. Mr. Ko Mun Chun, another representative of the Concern Group, made the following main points:

- (a) the provision of an underground shopping street could not replace the need for extending the curvilinear elevated walkway to Kowloon City;
- (b) it was deceiving to say in the Paper that the curvilinear elevated walkway was to link Kai Tak with Kowloon City and San Po Kong. In actual fact, the elevated walkway could not achieve the purpose. The Concern Group requested the extension of the elevated walkway to Tak Ku Ling Road Rest Garden such that the local residents in Kowloon City could have direct access to the Kai Tak Station through the elevated walkway; and
- (c) the proposed increase in building heights in areas around Road L8 was not supported and the “G/IC” zone at the end of Road L16 should be retained.

[Ms. Anna S.Y. Kwong arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

14. In response to a Member’s queries on the distance between Kowloon City to the Kai Tak Station and the location of the entrance point of the proposed underground shopping street nearest to Kowloon City, Mr. Eric Yue said that the estimated distance from Kowloon City to the Kai Tak Station through the underground shopping street was about 870m, and the proposed entrance point was at Tak Ku Ling Road Rest Garden, the previous subway to the old Kai Tak Airport.

15. Another Member asked whether there was any other more convenient access to the Kai Tak Station from Kowloon City. Mr. Eric Yue replied that the location of the Kai Tak Station was discussed at length at the Board’s meeting on 4.5.2007. The exact location of the Kai Tak Station and its connection with Kowloon City would be subject to

further review at the detailed planning stage.

16. A Member asked whether there was any direct link from the elevated walkway to the Kai Tak Station and to the underground shopping street. Mr. Eric Yue responded that the elevated walkway would be connected to the Station Square via the “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” development while the underground shopping street would connect Tak Ku Ling Road Rest Garden with Kai Tak Station. In other words, the Kai Tak Station was connected to both the eastern (San Po Kong) and western (Kowloon City) sides.

17. Members had no further questions on Further Representation No. F5.

18. As Hon. Chan Yuen Han had not yet arrived, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of Further Representation No. F7 first.

Further Representation No. F7

19. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Mr. W.K. Chou, representative of CLP, made the following main points:

- (a) in the proposed amendments to the Kai Tak OZP, Road L16 was realigned and part of the “G/IC” site was changed to ‘Road’. As a result, the length of the “G/IC” site was reduced from 105m to 92m and the site area from 6,800m² to 6,000m², amounting to a 13% reduction;
- (b) under the current technology, the standard design of a 400kV substation was an optimum design that would require site dimensions of 65m x 105m and clear height of 34m. As the site was already subject to a height restriction of 30mPD, ‘flat substation design’ had to be adopted for those bulky and non-compressible equipment and a larger site (about 21% larger) was required;
- (c) if the site area was subject to further constraint, essential equipment could not be provided within the site. This might either affect the secure supply of electricity to the area, or an additional 400kV

substation might have to be established; and

- (d) given the technological constraints, the implementation of substation at the revised “G/IC” site would only be feasible if the height limit was relaxed to a minimum of 40mPD and two vehicular access points were provided at Roads L16 and L9, or the original dimensions of the “G/IC” site (65m x 105m) be maintained and height relaxation be allowed in future.

[The representatives of Further Representer 5 left the meeting at this point.]

20. The questions raised by individual Members were summarized as follows:

- (a) noting that the proposed reduction in site area was just 800m , whether there was any information to substantiate the need for an increase in building height to 40mPD;
- (b) as shown in the conceptual layout, the floor ceiling was as high as 18m and the driveway was as wide as 13m to 19m, whether such a layout was acceptable to concerned Government departments such as Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD) and TD, and whether similar layout was adopted in providing substations in other districts with similar population;
- (c) with the reduction in site area to 6,000m², whether it was still viable to build the 400kV substation in the “G/IC” site, and if not, whether the substation could operate at a reduced scale;
- (d) to what extent the clear height requirement of 34m could be reduced;
- (e) whether it was possible to go underground in order to reduce the visual impact of the proposed 400kV substation;
- (f) whether there was any scope to relocating the ‘oil receptor under’ and the ‘loading bay’ at a width of 6m and 10m respectively so as to reduce

the site area requirement;

- (g) with the reduction in planned population in the Kai Tak Development, whether there remained a need for the 400kV substation; and
- (h) whether planning permission was required for the proposed 400kV substation.

21. In response, Messrs. W.K. Chou and K.K. Leung made the following main points:

- (a) in view of the equipment for 400kV substation available in the market, there was limited scope to reduce the bulk of the equipment in the near future. Similar design and layout were adopted in 400kV substations in other districts, such as Yau Ma Tei;
- (b) the eleven 400kV substations of CLP all followed standard design. If the essential equipment could not be accommodated within the “G/IC” site as a result of a reduced site area, the reliability of electricity supply might be affected;
- (c) information on station design and layout in support of the required site dimensions had been presented to the Board at its meeting on 4.5.2007;
- (d) referring to the conceptual layout attached to the Paper, the technical requirements in the design and layout of the essential equipment in the substation were explained. Relocating individual equipment might not help reduce the site area requirement as there were other limiting factors affecting the layout;
- (e) a clear height of 34m was required for a 400kV substation. As the ground level of the proposed “G/IC” site was at 5mPD, relaxation of building height limit to 40mPD was thus proposed. If the technological constraints could be overcome, a lower building height would be considered;

- (f) as shown in the conceptual layout, cable would be placed at the basement level. Putting more equipment at the basement level would give rise to fire safety concern and might not satisfy the requirements of the Fire Services Department; and
- (g) the 6m wide corridor marked with 'oil receptor under' would also be used as emergency access, whereas the 10m wide 'loading bay' was for loading and unloading of the heavy equipment. While there might be scope to reduce the 10m wide 'loading bay', the overall width was determined by the layout of equipment on the other side of the corridor.

22. Mr. Eric Yue, DPO/K, made the following main points:

- (a) the EMSD had no comment on the further representation, but would advise and comment on the requirements of electricity substation at the detailed design stage;
- (b) the TD had confirmed that two vehicular access points could be provided for the "G/IC" site;
- (c) as the "G/IC" site was very close to the Sung Wong Toi Park, it was necessary to impose more stringent building height control to avoid creating adverse visual impact on the park. The Notes of the "G/IC" zone had made provision for minor relaxation of building height restriction, which might be considered by the Board through the planning permission system; and
- (d) as the reserved site was zoned "G/IC", no planning permission would be required for the proposed 400kV substation, unless the proposed building height exceed the stipulated maximum building height of 30mPD on the OZP.

23. As Members had no further questions on Further Representation No. 7, the representatives of Further Representer 7 left the meeting at this point.

Further Representation No. 6

24. Members noted that Hon. Chan Yuen Han had not yet arrived and decided to proceed with the hearing of Further Representation No.6 in her absence. Mr. Yu Lap Kee, Further Representer 6, played the sound tracks of Hon. Chan Yuen Han, who raised concern on the proposed view corridor. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Mr. Yu made the following main points:

- (a) the view corridor proposed in the OZP provided an unobstructed view to the summit of the Lion Rock, but not directly towards the Lion's Head. The view corridor was narrow and the building heights on both sides were too high. The most important and well-known feature was the 'Lion's Head' and the view corridor should orient towards it. It would be a planning mistake not to rectify the orientation of the view corridor towards the Lion's Head;
- (b) 'Lion Rock' was so named because the ridgeline resembled a lion. The 'sculpture' of the lion, including both its head and tail, should form the central axis in the view corridor. Tilting the central axis towards the summit of Lion Rock was not acceptable;
- (c) to rectify the orientation of the view corridor while minimizing the changes to the OZP, a new view corridor starting from the Metro Park in the runway area was proposed. A new visual axis (marked in yellow) orienting towards the Lion's Head was proposed to replace the meaningless visual axis in the original plan (marked in red). The proposed building heights on both sides of the new view corridor should be lowered to open up the vista and provide a 'view fan' towards the Lion's Head;
- (d) the proposed reduction in building height restrictions in the Kai Tak City Centre was marked in blue in the layout plan shown in the powerpoint; and

- (e) his name 'Yu Lap Kay' as shown in the Paper should read 'Yu Lap Kee'.

[Miss Annie Tam and Ms. Sylvia S.F. Yau left the meeting at this point.]

25. Questions raised by Members were summarized as follows:

- (a) as PlanD had prepared a computer walk-through model which demonstrated that the Lion's Head could be seen throughout the view corridor, the further representer was requested to consider whether further adjustment of the view corridor was really necessary;
- (b) in preserving the view corridor towards Kowloon Ridgeline, the established practice was to take the vantage points from the other side of the harbour. In designing the view corridor for Kai Tak Development, a more stringent and higher standard had already been adopted by the Board in that the vantage points were taken from within the site in the Metro Park. The further representer should advise whether he agreed that a higher standard had already been adopted in the OZP; and

[Mr. Walter K.L. Chan left the meeting at this point.]

- (c) as shown in the computer model, the Lion's Head could be seen all along the view corridor, though it might sway from one side to another when moving down the view corridor from the Metro Park. The further representer was asked to consider whether the dynamic view of the Lion's Head was acceptable or whether it was necessary for the Lion's Head to constantly occupy the central axis.

26. In response, Mr. Yu Lap Kee made the following main points:

- (a) it would be important to keep the Lion's Head as the central axis in the view corridor. While the Lion's Head could be seen in the computer simulation, the orientation was tilted towards the summit in the right.

If the view corridor was not properly oriented, it could not give the right 'feel' of a lion in its proper configuration and would adversely affect the visual impression of the Lion's Head;

- (b) any view corridor with the Lion's Head off-axis was not acceptable;
and
- (c) the proposed reduction in building heights in the Kai Tak City Centre involved minimum changes to the layout of the City Centre and was already a compromise that could complement the view corridor towards the Lion's Head.

[Dr. Michael Chiu left the meeting at this point.]

27. In response to a question raised by a Member, Mr. Kelvin Chan, STP/K, said that the computer model had simulated a person walking along the central axis of the 50m wide view corridor. Moving off the central axis to either side would allow a slightly different orientation towards the Lion Rock. A conservative approach had been adopted in the computer model in that the buildings on both sides of the corridor were assumed to have built up to the edge with wall-like structures. In real life, the buildings and the stadium facilities would be set back from the site boundaries which would further open up the vista towards the Lion Rock.

28. As all further representers had finished their presentation and Members had no further questions, the Chairman said that the hearing procedures had been completed and the Board would deliberate on the further representations in their absence and would inform them of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairman thanked Further Representer 6 and the Government's representatives for attending the hearing. They all left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation

Further Representation No. F5

29. A Member said that as the estimated distance from Kowloon City to Kai Tak

Station was about 870m, it would take about 20 minutes' walk, which was rather demanding on the elderly residents. Another Member pointed out that the catchment area of a MTR station was 1 km and thus the Kowloon City was within the catchment area. A Member was however of the view that 500m would be a more reasonable walking distance for the elderly residents to get to the Kai Tak Station.

30. A Member was of the view that extending the curvilinear elevated landscaped walkway towards Kowloon City might not be a very practical connection for Kowloon City residents to Kai Tak Station. Another Member pointed out the elevated walkway would mainly connect Kai Tak with San Po Kong and to a lesser extent with Kowloon City. The accessibility from Kowloon City to Kai Tak Station should be improved.

31. Members were generally sympathetic to the concern raised by Further Representer 5, and agreed that consideration should be given to improving the pedestrian connection in the future design of the Kai Tak Station and the underground shopping street system, such as the provision of travelator.

Further Representation No. F6

32. A Member said that the view corridor proposed in the OZP had already allowed a clear view of the Lion's Head, with stringent building height restrictions imposed on the developments on both sides of the view corridor. The new view corridor and building height restrictions proposed by the further representer were excessive and not justified. The view was generally shared by other Members.

Further Representation No. F7

33. In view of the close proximity of the "G/IC" site to the Sung Wong Toi Park, a Member had reservation on relaxing the building height restriction for the "G/IC" site as requested by the further representer. Another Member pointed out that as the "G/IC" site was designated for both the electricity substation and sewage pumping station (SPS), the site area requirements of these facilities could be examined during the detailed design stage. Both Members did not support relaxing the building height control at this stage in consideration that the Notes of the "G/IC" zone had made provision for minor

relaxation of the building height restriction, and planning application could be submitted to the Board for consideration.

34. A Member said that the design of the electricity substation should be integrated with the surrounding environment and its impact on the adjoining Sung Wong Toi Park should be carefully considered. It would be desirable if planning application was required for the proposed electricity substation.

35. A Member noted that standard design of the 400kV substation was adopted in other districts and considered that it might not be appropriate for the Board to query the adoption of standard design. Another Member recognized the need for an electricity substation, but was concerned about the adverse visual impact of relaxing the building height of the “G/IC” site. Both Members suggested that views of EMSD should be sought on the technical requirements of the 400kV substation, and a site visit might also be arranged.

36. The Secretary clarified that relevant Government departments, including the EMSD, had been consulted on the further representation, and had no comment on the proposed amendments to the OZP, i.e., to slightly reduce the site area of the “G/IC” zone in order to simplify the street pattern. The issue at hand was whether the proposed amendments relating to the boundary of the “G/IC” zone and the height restriction were acceptable, and the technical feasibility could be further examined in the detailed designs of the substation and the SPS project. Members generally supported the proposed amendments to the “G/IC” zone and considered the height restriction appropriate.

[Post-meeting notes: The list of bureaux and departments consulted on the further representations was attached at **Annex**.]

Other Further Representations

37. Members noted that Further Representation No. F1 was in support of the proposed amendments to the Kai Tak OZP. For Further Representation No. F3, Members considered that the currently proposed height restrictions on the OZP appropriate and the proposed increase in building height would not be compatible with the overall design concept for Kai Tak. For Further Representation No. F4, Members

noted that the arguments put forward by the further representer had already been considered by the Board on 4.5.2007 at the representation hearing stage and there was no new or further substantiation put forth by the further representer to support their argument. To encourage public transport and reduce road-based vehicular travel demand, the development in the vicinity of Kai Tak Station had adopted relatively higher plot ratios, and mixed-use development had been introduced.

38. Summing up, the Chairman said that after giving consideration to the further representations, Members were not in support of Further Representations No. F3 to F7.

39. After deliberation, the Board decided to amend the Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) by the proposed amendments as detailed at Annex V of the Paper. These amendments should form part of the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/1.

Further Representation No. F1

40. The Board noted that Further Representation No. F1 was in support of the proposed amendments to the Kai Tak OZP to partially meet Representation No. 1.

Further Representation No. F3

41. After deliberation, the Board noted that part of Further Representation No. F3 was in support of the proposed amendments to the Kai Tak OZP and decided not to meet the remaining part of Further Representation No. F3 and the reasons were:

- (a) the height restriction of 45mPD for the “Residential (Group B)1” site was to complement the view corridor towards the Lion Rock, which was zoned “Open Space” on the Kai Tak OZP;
- (b) the proposed amendments to the Kai Tak City Centre layout aimed, inter alia, to open up the vista of the city centre area so as to strengthen the visual integration of Kai Tak Development with the built-up hinterland. The proposed increase in building height to 220mPD was not compatible with the stepped height profile envisaged in the urban design framework for Kai Tak Development; and
- (c) the “Commercial (6)” zone in the Station Square was to form part of the commercial/office belt to the north of the city centre flanking Prince Edward Road East. It was proposed for the development of two iconic commercial buildings, which served as anchors to the vista of the Station Square. The proposed “Residential (Group A)” zoning could not meet this planning intention. The proposed increase in building height to 300mPD was considered not compatible with the stepped height profile envisaged in the urban design framework for the city centre.

Further Representation No. F4

42. After deliberation, the Board decided not to meet Further Representation No. F4 and the reasons were:

- (a) to encourage public transport and reduce road-based vehicular travel demand, the development in the vicinity of Kai Tak Station had adopted relatively higher plot ratios, and mixed-use development had been introduced;

- (b) the proposed mixed-use development above the Kai Tak Station was not commensurate with the planning concept for the Station Square which was to create a pleasant and welcoming atmosphere for passengers entering Kai Tak from the station and at the same time, plan the commercial and residential development in the Kai Tak City Centre around the park with easy access to the Kai Tak Station. The Station Square also provided a leisure environment and retail facilities for the visitors travelling to the multi-purpose stadium complex. The open space planned around Shatin to Central Link (SCL) Kai Tak Station should therefore be maintained as a unique design feature of Kai Tak Development; and

- (c) an underground shopping street was proposed to connect the SCL Kai Tak Station with Nga Tsin Wai Road in Kowloon City and ex-San Po Kong Flatted Factory site. With a large open space network provided round the SCL Kai Tak Station, pedestrian circulation between the SCL Station and the surrounding developments should not be a problem.

Further Representation No. F5

43. After deliberation, the Board decided not to meet Further Representation No. F5 and the reasons were:

- (a) the subject “Residential (Group B)1” (“R(B)1”) site was located on one side of the view corridor to Lion Rock. Building height restriction of 45mPD for the eastern portion of the “R(B)1” site was required to preserve the view corridor towards Lion Rock;

- (b) the rezoning to “Commercial (5)” and “Comprehensive Development Area (2)” (“CDA(2)”) was part of the effort to simplify the street pattern in the western part of the city centre. The maximum building height restrictions of the “CDA(2)” site were to protect the view corridor towards the Lion Rock, which also served as a breezeway to Kowloon City;

- (c) as compared with the original proposals on the Kai Tak OZP, the

proposed amendment to the city centre layout would not adversely affect the air ventilation to the surrounding area; and

- (d) footbridge connection to Tak Ku Ling Road Rest Garden was not necessary as an underground shopping street had already been planned for the area. Measures to facilitate pedestrian connection between Kowloon City and the future Kai Tak Station would be further investigated in the on-going Kai Tak Development Engineering Study.

Further Representation No. F6

44. After deliberation, the Board decided not to meet Further Representation No. F6 and the reasons were:

- (a) to protect the view to the Lion Rock, stringent building height restrictions had been imposed on the developments on both sides of the view corridor; and
- (b) given the size of the Metro Park and its distance away from the development sites, visitors in most part of the park were expected to have a clear view of the Lion Rock, except in the location in close proximity to the main stadium.

Further Representation No. F7

45. After deliberation, the Board decided not to meet Further Representation No. F7 and the reasons were:

- (a) the site area of the subject “Government, Institution or Community (“G/IC”) zone had been reduced slightly in order to straighten Road L16. As part of the on-going Kai Tak Development Engineering Study, the provision of the utility infrastructure, including the electricity and sewerage facilities, would be examined in detail. The minor reduction in site area would be examined in the detailed designs of the respective facilities planned in the “G/IC” zone, including the need to provide additional access point for the electricity substation.

Since vehicular access points were always permitted under “G/IC” zone, further amendment to the Kai Tak OZP was not necessary; and

- (b) the Notes of the “G/IC” zone had made provision for minor relaxation of the building height restriction, which might be considered by the Board through the planning permission system. Each application for minor relaxation of building height restriction would be considered on its own merits.

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting]

Draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan Confirmation of Proposed Amendments and Submission of Draft Plan to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval (Open Meeting)

(TPB Paper No. 7916)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese]

- 46. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper.
- 47. After deliberation, the Board:
 - (a) agreed that the draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K22/1 should be amended by the proposed amendments as shown at Annex I of the Paper under section 6F(8) of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance);
 - (b) agreed that the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/1A and its Notes at Annexes II and III of the Paper respectively were suitable for submission under section 8 of the Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval;
 - (c) endorsed the updated Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/1A at Annex IV of the Paper as an expression of the planning intention and objectives of the Board for the various land-use

zonings on the draft OZP and issued under the name of the Board; and

- (d) agreed that the updated ES was suitable for submission to the CE in C together with the draft OZP.

Agenda Item 4

Any Other Business

- 48. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 1:20 p.m.

(CHAIRMAN)
TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K22/1

Consideration of Further Representations No. TPB/R/S/K22/1-F1, F3 to F7

(TPB Paper No. 7915)

List of Bureaux and Departments Consulted

- (a) Secretary for Commercial and Economic Development
- (b) Secretary for the Environment
- (c) Secretary for Transport and Housing
- (d) Secretary for Home Affairs
- (e) Secretary for Development
- (f) Commissioner for Tourism
- (g) Director of Architectural Services
- (h) Director General of Civil Aviation
- (i) Director of Environmental Protection
- (j) Director of Housing
- (k) Director of Marine
- (l) Director of Leisure and Cultural Services
- (m) Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene
- (n) Director of Social Welfare
- (o) Director of Electrical & Mechanical Services
- (p) Director of Health
- (q) Commissioner of Police
- (r) Director of Fire Services
- (s) Project Manager/Kowloon, Civil Engineering Development Department
- (t) District Lands Officer/Kowloon East
- (u) District Lands Officer/Kowloon West
- (v) District Officer/Kwun Tong
- (w) District Officer/Kowloon City
- (x) District Officer/Wong Tai Sin
- (y) Government Property Administrator
- (z) Chief Highway Engineer/Kowloon, Highways Department
- (aa) Chief Engineer/Major Works 1-3, Highways Department
- (bb) Chief Engineer/Railway Planning (2), Highways Department
- (cc) Assistant Commissioner for Transport/Urban, Transport Department
- (dd) Chief Engineer/Port Works, Civil Engineering Development Department
- (ee) Chief Engineer/Priority Railway 2, Transport Department
- (ff) Chief Building Surveyor/Building Development, Buildings Department
- (gg) Chief Estate Surveyor/Acquisition, Lands Department
- (hh) Chief Engineer/Development (2), Water Supplies Department
- (ii) Chief Town Planner/Strategic Planning, Planning Department
- (jj) Chief Town Planner/Urban Design & Landscape, Planning Department