

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)1520/05-06
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/PLW/1

Panel on Planning, Lands and Works

**Minutes of special meeting
held on Wednesday, 25 January 2006 at 2:30 pm
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building**

Members present : Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, S.B.St.J., JP
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon WONG Yung-kan, JP
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP
Hon LI Kwok-ying, MH
Hon Daniel LAM Wai-keung, BBS, JP
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, SBS, JP

Members attending : Hon CHAN Yuen-han, JP
Hon Howard YOUNG, SBS, JP

Members absent : Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP (Chairman)
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Hon CHOY So-yuk, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon LEE Wing-tat

- Public officers attending** : Mr Robin IP
Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands
(Planning and Lands) 1
- Mr Eddie POON
Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs
(Recreation and Sport)
- Mr Charles CHU
Project Adviser (Recreation and Sport)
Home Affairs Bureau
- Miss Patricia SO
Assistant Commissioner for Tourism (2)
Economic Development and Labour Bureau
- Mr Enoch T S LAM
Deputy Project Manager (Kowloon)
Civil Engineering and Development Department
- Mr Raymond LEE
District Planning Officer/Kowloon
Planning Department
- Attendance by invitation** : City Planning Consultants Ltd.
- Ms Iris TAM
Managing Director
- Designing Hong Kong Harbour District/
The Experience Group, Limited
- Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN
Convenor, Designing Hong Kong Harbour District/
Principal, The Experience Group, Limited
- Hong Kong & Kowloon Motor Boats & Tug Boats
Association Ltd.
- 郭德基先生
理事長

Kowloon City District Council

Ms SIU Yuen-sheung, BBS, JP
Chairman
Housing and Infrastructure Committee
Kowloon City District Council

Community Alliance on Kai Tak Development

Ms Michelle TANG
Representative

楊師意先生
代表

City Planning Concern Group

Mr LAM Chi-keung
Chairman

Ms LI Kwai-fong
Secretary

關注維港避風塘聯席會議

周溢德先生
代表

Hong Kong Cargo-Vessel Traders' Association Ltd.

Mr WONG Yiu-kan
Chairman

Tsuen Wan District Council

Mr TIN Sai-ming
Member
Tsuen Wan District Council

Hong Kong Aviation Club

Mr Alex YAN
President

Ms Yolanda WONG
General Manager

The Save Kai Tak Campaign

Mr CHIN Yiu-cheong
Chairman

Hong Kong Logistics Management Staff Association

Captain FUNG Ka-kwan
Deputy - Academic Officer

Captain PANG Wai-yung, Norman
Commentary Policy Officer

Hong Kong Tourism Board

Mrs Aliana HO
General Manager

Mr Mason HUNG
Senior Manager

The Hong Kong Institute of Architects

Mr Michael CHIANG
Chairman
Planning & Lands Committee

Hong Kong Air Cadet Corps

Mr Len LEUNG
Commanding Officer

Mr Wilson CHAN
Staff Officer

Hong Kong, China Rowing Association

Mr Robert L WILSON
President

Mr Sam WONG Chi-wai
Director of Coaching

Hong Kong Football Association Limited

Sir David AKERS-JONES
Vice-Patron

Mr Martin HONG Po-kui
Chairman

Travel Industry Council of Hong Kong

Mr Ronnie HO
Chairman

Tuen Mun District Council

Mr CHAN Wan-sang
Chairman
Environment, Hygiene and District Development
Committee
Tuen Mun District Council

The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers

Ir Dr Greg C Y WONG
President

Ir Dr CHAN Hon-fai
Fellow

Hong Kong Schools Sports Federation

Mr YEUNG Hoi-cheung
Chairman of the Board

Mr Patrick NG Chak-lin
Assistant Secretary General

The Hong Kong Construction Association

Mr Conrad WONG
President

Mr Alex WONG
Assistant Secretary General

Hong Kong Civic Design Association

Dr Peter Cookson SMITH
Representative

S.K.Y. Travel

Ms Winnie CHAN
Senior Manager

Hong Kong Muay Thai Association

Mr LEE Yuk-tim
President

Mr CHAN Man-yee
Chairman

Sports Federation & Olympic Committee of Hong Kong,
China

Mr Ronnie M C WONG
Deputy Honorary Secretary General

The Hong Kong Institute of Planners

Ms PONG Yuen-yee
Vice-President

Mr CHAN Kim-on
Council Member

Hong Kong Rugby Football Union

Mr Allan PAYNE
Executive Director

The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors

Mr CHAN Cheung-kit
General Practice Division Council Member

Mr Andrew FUNG
General Practice Division Council Member

Kwun Tong District Council

Ms KO Po-ling, MH
Member

Clerk in attendance : Ms Anita SIT
Senior Council Secretary (1)9

Staff in attendance : Mr WONG Siu-yee
Senior Council Secretary (1)7

Ms Christina SHIU
Legislative Assistant (1)7

Action

I Kai Tak Planning Review

- (LC Paper No. CB(1)698/05-06(01) -- Submission from The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
- LC Paper No. CB(1)750/05-06(01) -- Submission from Hong Kong Hotels Association
- LC Paper No. CB(1)778/05-06(01) -- Submission from Hong Kong Squash
- LC Paper No. CB(1)525/05-06(05) -- Information paper provided by the Administration
- LC Paper No. CB(1)525/05-06(06) -- Background brief on “Kai Tak Planning Review” prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat)

Presentation by deputations

The Deputy Chairman welcomed representatives of the Administration and deputations to the meeting. He said that the Panel discussed with the Administration the item of “Kai Tak Planning Review – Outline Concept Plans for Stage 2 Public Participation” at the meeting on 20 December 2005, and the purpose of the present special meeting was to listen to the views of interested groups and individuals. Each deputation would be given about four minutes for their presentation. He then invited the deputations to present their views on Kai Tak Planning Review.

Designing Hong Kong Harbour District (DHKHD)/The Experience Group, Limited

(LC Paper Nos. CB(1)567/05-06(01) and CB(1)801/05-06(01))

2. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, Convenor of DHKHD, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in LC Paper No. CB(1)801/05-06(01).

Hong Kong & Kowloon Motor Boats & Tug Boats Association Ltd. (HKKMBTBA)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)801/05-06(02))

3. 郭德基先生, 理事長 of HKKMBTBA, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission.

Kowloon City District Council (KCDC)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)769/05-06(01))

4. Ms SIU Yuen-sheung, Chairman of Housing and Infrastructure Committee of KCDC, said that KCDC had discussed Kai Tak Planning Review on 17 November 2005. The Housing and Infrastructure Committee of KCDC had also discussed the same subject, in particular the Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC), on 15 December 2005. The majority of the members of KCDC agreed to reclaim KTAC to solve the pollution problem once and for all. The Administration should provide a detailed comparison, including financial implications, between reclamation and no-reclamation scenarios so as to facilitate decision-making. KCDC considered that island concept planning was used in the three outline concept plans (OCPs) and there was insufficient connection with neighbouring districts. While supporting the early construction of the cruise terminal, KCDC considered that ancillary transport infrastructure such as a mass transit railway would be required. Emphasis should also be placed on environmental protection in the planning process.

Community Alliance on Kai Tak Development (CAKTD)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)698/05-06(02))

5. Ms Michelle TANG and 楊師意先生, Representatives of CAKTD, delivered their presentations, the details of which were given in the relevant submission.

City Planning Concern Group (CPCG)
(LC Paper Nos. CB(1)591/05-06(01), CB(1)750/05-06(08) and CB(1)769/05-06(02))

6. Ms LI Kwai-fong and Mr LAM Chi-keung, Secretary and Chairman of CPCG respectively, delivered their presentations, the details of which were given in LC Paper Nos. CB(1)750/05-06(08) and CB(1)769/05-06(02).

關注維港避風塘聯席會議 (聯席)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)750/05-06(02))

7. 周溢德先生, Representative of 聯席, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission. He hoped that the Administration would safeguard the livelihood of the indigenous floating population. He emphasized the importance of preserving the existing typhoon

shelters for marine safety, and the public cargo working areas (PCWAs) for environmental protection and logistics businesses. By way of illustration, he pointed out that the Kwun Tong PCWA handled 80% of the distribution of waste paper in Hong Kong while the Cha Kwo Ling PCWA handled 80% of the distribution of waste metal and 60% of the distribution of timber and plank.

Hong Kong Cargo-Vessel Traders' Association Ltd. (HKCVTA)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)750/05-06(03))

8. Mr WONG Yiu-kan, Chairman of HKCVTA, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission. He regretted that the Administration had not consulted the industry in preparing the three OCPs.

Tsuen Wan District Council (TWDC)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)750/05-06(04))

9. Mr TIN Sai-ming, Member of TWDC, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission. He added that he had reservations on the suggestion to relocate all Government offices in Central to South East Kowloon. He suggested that the Hong Kong Stadium could be relocated to other areas on Hong Kong Island, such as the Western waterfront. The site thus vacated could be used for commercial developments which adopted environmental protection concepts so that Causeway Bay and Wan Chai could further enhance their status as a commercial area.

Hong Kong Aviation Club (HKAC)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)759/05-06(01))

10. Mr Alex YAN, President of HKAC, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission. He was disappointed that the three OCPs did not mention that the current headquarters of HKAC would be preserved. He pointed out that even if the Administration allocated another site for HKAC, HKAC would not have the resources for redevelopment of a new headquarters because it was a non-profit-making organization. While acknowledging that the Administration might not be able to provide an airfield at Kai Tak, he hoped that an airfield could be provided elsewhere so that HKAC could continue to promote aviation culture, aviation training, aviation sports and aviation education.

The Save Kai Tak Campaign (TSKTC)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)801/05-06(03))

11. Mr CHIN Yiu-cheong, Chairman of TSKTC, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission.

Hong Kong Logistics Management Staff Association (HKLMSA)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)750/05-06(05))

12. Captain FUNG Ka-kwan, Deputy - Academic Officer, and Captain PANG Wai-yung, Norman, Commentary Policy Officer of HKLMSA, delivered their presentations, the details of which were given in the relevant submission.

Hong Kong Tourism Board (HKTB)

13. Mrs Aliana HO, General Manager of HKTB, said that there was a pressing need to construct a cruise terminal for developing the cruise industry and tourism in Hong Kong. The cruise industry was a fast-growing industry, with a cumulative growth rate of 42% over the past decade. Many cruise operators wanted to extend their business to Asia. Although Hong Kong's attractive location had made it a designated berthing port for the Asia-Pacific shipping industry, there were insufficient cruise terminal facilities in Hong Kong. Some cruises had to berth at container terminals because the existing berths at the Ocean Terminal were not long enough, thus tarnishing Hong Kong's image as an international city. The cruise industry considered that the new cruise terminal should be within the Victoria Harbour so as to allow the tourists to enjoy the harbour view. It should have sufficient capacity to accommodate the new generation mega cruises, good ancillary transport facilities and expansion capability in the future. Hong Kong should strive to secure a leading position in tourism in the region when competing with other cities such as Singapore and Shanghai which were actively developing their port facilities. Otherwise, the leading position would be left to the hands of other competitors. Hong Kong should seize the opportunity to develop at full speed a cruise terminal which could meet the needs and growth of the market, and further develop tourism and related businesses to strengthen Hong Kong's image as an international city.

The Hong Kong Institute of Architects (HKIA)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)801/05-06(04))

14. Mr Michael CHIANG, Chairman of Planning & Lands Committee of HKIA, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission. He emphasized that instead of using two-dimensional planning which was merely a land distribution plan, there should be three-dimensional planning involving cross-bureau/department coordination. The planning should avoid creating an "island effect" with trunk roads partitioning the area into segregated plots. Consideration should be given to using podiums with landscaped gardens and arcades as a means of connection. The size of the plots, the plot ratio and the scale of the roads near Kowloon City should be smaller to facilitate the integration of the new and old districts.

Hong Kong Air Cadet Corps (HKACC)
(LC Paper Nos. CB(1)502/05-06(01), CB(1)750/05-06(07) and
CB(1)801/05-06(05))

15. Mr Len LEUNG, Commanding Officer of HKACC, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in LC Paper No. CB(1)801/05-06(05).

Hong Kong, China Rowing Association (HKCRA)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)769/05-06(03))

16. Mr Robert WILSON, President of HKCRA, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission. He added that HKCRA fully supported the construction of a multi-purpose stadium at Kai Tak so that Hong Kong could compete with other Mainland and Asian cities and would not lag behind. Hong Kong needed a multi-purpose stadium as a core feature of its development and as part of a plan to expand sports and recreation for the promotion of the community's cohesion and the physical and psychological health of its citizens.

Hong Kong Football Association Limited (HKFA)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)750/05-06(06))

17. Mr Martin HONG Po-kui, Chairman of HKFA, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission. He added that in scheduling events in the Hong Kong Stadium, there was an additional constraint to avoid clashes with horse racing days for crowd control purposes in view of the close proximity of the Hong Kong Stadium and the Happy Valley Race Course.

18. Sir David AKERS-JONES, Vice-Patron of HKFA, emphasized that there was a need for a multi-purpose stadium of international standards and he strongly supported the construction of an all-weather and all-purpose stadium with a retractable roof at Kai Tak for organizing sports events, concerts, religious gatherings and other activities.

Travel Industry Council of HK (TICHK)

19. Mr Ronnie HO, Chairman of TICHK, said that Kai Tak was an ideal location for a cruise terminal because the depth of the water there could meet international standards and the fairway to Kai Tak was smooth. Kai Tak could accommodate up to three berths and there was enough space for setting up luggage handling facilities, car-parks and fuel supply facilities. The transport infrastructure would be able to cater for the traffic generated by the cruise terminal. As Kai Tak was near the town centre, it would be a convenient location for the tourists. The tourism sector wished that a cruise terminal would be constructed at Kai Tak as soon as possible.

Tuen Mun District Council (TMDC)

20. Mr CHAN Wan-sang, Chairman of Environment, Hygiene and District Development Committee of TMDC, said that he supported the proposal of the City Planning Concern Group, and was pleased to note that it was compatible with the proposals put forward by other deputations in that the planning for Kai Tak should bring out the element of "Pearl of the Orient". He urged the Administration and Legislative Council Members to actively and fully make reference to and accept the proposal of the Concern Group.

The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers (HKIE)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)769/05-06(04))

21. Ir Dr Greg WONG, President of HKIE, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission.

Hong Kong Schools Sports Federation (HKSSF)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)769/05-06(05))

22. Mr YEUNG Hoi-cheung, Chairman of the Board of HKSSF, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission.

The Hong Kong Construction Association (HKCA)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)769/05-06(06))

23. Mr Conrad WONG, President of HKCA, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission.

Hong Kong Civic Design Association (HKCDA)
(LC Paper Nos. CB(1)759/05-06(02) and CB(1)801/05-06(06))

24. Dr Peter Cookson SMITH, Representative of HKCDA, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submissions.

S.K.Y. Travel (SKY)

25. Ms Winnie CHAN, Senior Manager of SKY, said that eight out of the 22 cruises represented by her company could not berth at Ocean Terminal at present because they exceeded 100 000 tons. In 2002, a 109 000-ton cruise had to reduce its load before it could visit Hong Kong. In 2005, four 116 000-ton cruises had to berth at the Kwai Chung Container Terminal. Since the Kwai Chung Container Terminal was not designed as a passenger terminal, there were insufficient facilities for receiving and handling passengers. The situation had caused much inconvenience to the passengers and her company. In 2006, the arrangements for four out of the 11 cruises intending to visit Hong Kong had yet to be made because of inadequate berthing facilities. The tourism sector wished to provide the best

possible services and a good impression to the tourists when they visited Hong Kong, and a decent cruise terminal was very much needed for receiving more tourists because a 100 000-ton cruise could carry about 3 000 to 4 000 passengers. There were 14 new cruises in the pipeline, six of which would be over 100 000 tons. Without the necessary cruise terminal facilities, Hong Kong would not be able to receive those international cruises.

Hong Kong Muay Thai Association (HKMTA)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)769/05-06(07))

26. Mr LEE Yuk-tim, President of HKMTA, said that Hong Kong lacked a decent multi-purpose stadium for hosting international sports events. Hong Kong had often been invited to participate in sports events held in other places but had hosted few major international sports events. Although Hong Kong had world renowned athletes who had won prizes in international sports events, Hong Kong did not even have a multi-purpose stadium where various types of sports events could be held. With a multi-purpose stadium, Hong Kong could invite athletes from Asian cities and other places to participate in international sports events to be hosted by Hong Kong. This could also bring benefits to the Hong Kong tourism industry. He strongly emphasized that Hong Kong needed a multi-purpose stadium and HKMTA fully supported the proposed multi-purpose stadium at Kai Tak.

Sports Federation & Olympic Committee of Hong Kong, China (SF&OC)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)801/05-06(07))

27. Mr Ronnie WONG, Deputy Honorary Secretary General of SF&OC, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission.

The Hong Kong Institute of Planners (HKIP)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)769/05-06(08))

28. Ms PONG Yuen-ye, Vice-President of HKIP, delivered her presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission.

Hong Kong Rugby Football Union (HKRFU)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)801/05-06(08))

29. Mr Allan PAYNE, Executive Director of HKRFU, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission.

The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors (HKIS)

30. Mr CHAN Cheung-kit, General Practice Division Council Member of HKIS, said that a multi-purpose stadium was proposed in all the three OCPs. He was concerned whether too much space had been earmarked for sports facilities in

the “Sports by the Harbour” OCP. Issues such as funding and management of the facilities should be considered. He had reservations on the “Kai Tak Glamour” OCP, which was commercially oriented, because nearby districts such as Kowloon Bay, San Po Kong and Kwun Tong were evolving into commercial districts from industrial districts. If Kai Tak was planned mainly for commercial use, there might be an over supply of office premises, leading to low investment returns; or the evolution of the above three districts would be deterred because Kai Tak might have an competitive edge over those old districts. He considered that the “City in the Park” OCP, a residentially oriented plan with a safer theme, was more appropriate. Some commercial elements could be introduced to the waterfront promenade to add vibrancy to the area. If the distinction between Kai Tak and the neighbouring old districts, especially San Po Kong and Ngau Chi Wan, was insufficient, the value of land at Kai Tak might be affected. A plot ratio of four to five was still too high and consideration should be given to lower it further. He was worried that Residential (Group A) zones would provide too many shopping arcades at Kai Tak. Public rental housing might not be compatible with the image of Kai Tak as a newly developed district. Attention should be given to the planning for the cruise terminal because transport problems might arise.

Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC)

31. Ms KO Po-ling, Member of KTDC, said that the planning for Kai Tak was important not only for Hong Kong in general, but also for Kwun Tong in particular. KTDC members basically supported the “Sports by the Harbour” OCP because of a lower population density and comprehensive development in terms of environmental protection, sports and tourism. The planning for Kai Tak should be considered together with adjoining old districts. Pointing out that connectivity was not enough according to the present planning, she suggested that there should be railways connecting neighbouring districts and an exit from Trunk Road T2 to provide connection with Kwun Tong and Ngau Tau Kok. A holistic approach to planning should be adopted and issues relating to sustainable development should be considered. As regards KTAC, while agreeing to the “no reclamation” approach in principle, KTDC considered that minimal reclamation should not be ruled out if the pollution problem could not be solved. The public should be given the opportunity to compare the pros and cons of reclamation against those of no reclamation. The typhoon shelter and the PCWA in Kwun Tong should be relocated to other appropriate locations so as to tie in with the evolution of Kwun Tong from an industrial district into a commercial district, reduce vessel traffic in the harbour, ease traffic congestion in Kwun Tong and render the waterfront enjoyable by the public. In addition to protecting the harbour, the waterfront should also be protected. Another location should be identified for the proposed refuse transfer station so that nuisances to residents could be reduced, a continuous waterfront promenade could be provided and water-based activities could be held.

Discussion

32. Miss CHAN Yuen-han sought clarification from the Administration on whether the public could only choose one out of the three OCPs because she was worried that the public might be misled into believing that it was the case. She also sought clarification on the allegation that the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) had indicated that “Sports by the Harbour” was the chosen plan. She opined that any sports facilities built at Kai Tak must be made available for use by the public, and that there should be water-based sports facilities. Commenting that the current planning was merely a juggling of facilities, she considered that the planning for Kai Tak should be considered together with the neighbouring old districts so as to add vibrancy to the economy of those districts. The historical heritage sites in Kowloon City could become tourist attractions. She agreed to the view that the size of the Metro Park should be doubled that of the Victoria Park and emphasized that Kai Tak was the only location where the ridgelines on both Hong Kong side and Kowloon side could be seen. On the suggestion to relocate the typhoon shelters and PCWAs in the Kai Tak area, she said that suitable locations should be identified if relocation was really necessary so that related small businesses would not be sacrificed, and pointed out that small businesses handling waste materials had been contributing towards environmental protection.

33. The Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) 1 (DS/P&L)1 clarified that the three OCPs were not development options to choose from. All three OCPs adopted a “no reclamation” scenario as a starting point and they were prepared with different land use emphasis. They served to facilitate public comments, which would provide inputs to the preparation of a Preliminary Outline Development Plan (PODP). As stated in the Public Consultation Digest (2) of the Kai Tak Planning Review, the public was welcome to offer comments on individual concepts shown in different plans instead of selecting one plan from the three.

34. The Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs (Recreation and Sport) (PAS for HA (R&S)) clarified that HAB had never indicated that “Sports by the Harbour” was the chosen plan and that individual sports organizations were free to express their own preference. HAB had been maintaining an open attitude towards the three OCPs because all of them included a proposed multi-purpose stadium. The main facilities to be provided at the multi-purpose stadium had been delineated in Public Consultation Digest (2) as that members were fully aware of the proposed components of the stadium complex. The Administration had communicated with District Councils that the provision of a multi-purpose stadium would bring immediate economic benefits to nearby districts. Overseas experience clearly revealed that the presence of major sports facilities would add economic vibrancy by increasing pedestrian flow and providing job opportunities. There was a direct relationship between the presence of sports facilities and the level of economic activities. The Administration could provide District Councils with quantitative data on economic benefits to be generated by the construction of the proposed multi-purpose stadium when such data became available.

35. As for the cruise terminal, the Assistant Commissioner for Tourism (2) of the Tourism Commission (AC for Tourism (2)) pointed out that becoming a regional cruise hub would be highly beneficial for the economy of Hong Kong. According to the latest consultancy study, it was estimated that the tourism expenditure could reach as much as \$2.9 billion and \$4.6 billion by 2010 and 2020 respectively. It would also bring about some 6 200 and 10 900 employment opportunities per annum in 2010 and 2020 respectively. Apart from Kai Tak, the surrounding districts would also benefit economically through a chain effect. Appropriate transport planning would be in place to cater for the traffic demand generated from the cruise terminal.

36. The District Planning Officer/Kowloon of the Planning Department (DPO/PlanD) advised that discussions were being held to explore a suitable arrangement regarding the future of the headquarters of the Hong Kong Aviation Club and the Hong Kong Air Cadet Corps. As for the suggestion of providing an airfield, he pointed out that stringent height restrictions required for an airfield would limit the flexibility in the future development of Kai Tak, and the presence of an airfield at the Kai Tak waterfront might affect the public's access to and enjoyment of the waterfront. Instead of locating it at Kai Tak, the Administration would consider identifying suitable sites territory-wide, if that was required, for the provision of an airfield. As for the typhoon shelters, there were no proposals to remove them in all the three OCPs. Although there was a suggestion of using part of the To Kwa Wan typhoon shelter area for marina use in order to introduce more water-based activities, some parties had expressed reservation on the suggestion because the typhoon shelter area was mainly used by barges at present and providing a yacht anchorage thereat might not be appropriate in terms of compatibility and safety. The administration would continue to explore various possibilities in this regard. As for the relocation or otherwise of the facilities at the Kwun Tong and Cha Kwo Ling PCWAs, the views from the public were diverse. Some supported closing those facilities while others pointed out that related businesses would be affected as a result and appropriate relocation measures had to be in place in the case of closure of those facilities. The Administration did not have any immediate plans to close those facilities. The issue would have to be considered in the wider perspectives of Hong Kong's port operation strategy and possible effects on the economy. In the long run, if those facilities were eventually closed, the sites thus vacated could be used for constructing a waterfront promenade.

37. Ms Iris TAM, Managing Director of City Planning Consultants Ltd., said that the Metro Park would be connected with the Runway Park and the waterfront promenade. The width of the waterfront promenade would be up to 50 metres in some sections. The total area of the Metro Park, the Runway Park and the waterfront promenade taken together ranged from some 40 to 50 hectares (ha) in different OCPs. The planning for Kai Tak would take into consideration the need for connectivity with nearby districts and retention of cultural heritage sites. In order to provide a street environment similar to that found in old districts, the area

of the plots would normally be in the range of 1 to 1.5 ha and no larger than 2 ha. Smaller streets would stretch out from main streets into small community areas to create a quiescent residential environment. For other areas, especially those along the old runway, some commercial elements would be introduced into the residential zones to add vibrancy to those areas.

38. Mr James TO suggested that the planning for Kai Tak should complement the urban renewal programme. The Administration should pay particular attention to the need to reserve land in Kai Tak for resettlement of affected residents in urban renewal projects. For the PODP, Miss CHAN Yuen-han considered that there should be further consultation before promulgation of the PODP. DPO/PlanD said that there would be on-going discussions with various parties to share the Administration's thinking on the planning for Kai Tak and it was hoped that the PODP could be formulated by mid-2006.

II Any other business

39. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 5:30 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
22 May 2006