

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(1)2115/05-06  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/PLW/1

**Panel on Planning, Lands and Works**

**Minutes of meeting**  
**held on Tuesday, 27 June 2006 at 2:30 pm**  
**in Conference Room A of the Legislative Council Building**

**Members present** : Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP (Chairman)  
Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP  
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan  
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, S.B.St.J., JP  
Hon James TO Kun-sun  
Hon WONG Yung-kan, JP  
Hon CHOY So-yuk, JP  
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP  
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip  
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 Fred LI Wah-ming, JP  
Hon Mrs Selina CHOW LIANG Shuk-ye, GBS, JP  
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, JP  
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP

**Members absent** : Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP  
Hon LEE Wing-tat

**Public officers attending : Agenda item V**

Mrs Rita LAU, JP  
Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands  
(Planning and Lands)

Miss Ophelia WONG  
Deputy Director of Planning/District

Mr Anthony KWAN  
Assistant Director of Planning/Metro

Mr KWAN Pak-lam, JP  
Project Manager/Kowloon  
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Mr Darryl CHAN  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Economic Development  
and Labour (Economic Development)A2

Mr Henry CHAN  
Principal Assistant Secretary for the Environment,  
Transport and Works (Transport)7

Miss Patricia SO  
Assistant Commissioner for Tourism (2)  
Economic Development and Labour Bureau

Miss Janet WONG  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs  
(Recreation and Sport)

Mr Daniel SIN  
Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs  
(Recreation and Sport)

**Clerk in attendance :** Ms Anita SIT  
Chief Council Secretary (1)4

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

Ms Christina SHIU  
Legislative Assistant (1)7

---

**I Confirmation of minutes**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1615/05-06 -- Minutes of meeting on 25 April 2006)

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 April 2006 were confirmed.

**II Endorsement of the report of the Panel for submission to the Legislative Council**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1834/05-06(01) -- Draft report of the Panel for submission to the Legislative Council)

2. Members endorsed the report of the Panel for submission to the Legislative Council on 12 July 2006 and authorized the Chairman to approve amendments to the report after the meeting so as to incorporate the discussions at this meeting and the meeting on 26 June 2006.

**III Information papers issued since last meeting**

(LC Paper No. IN29/05-06 -- Information note entitled "Incentives for Innovation in the United Kingdom" prepared by Research and Library Services Division

LC Paper No. CB(1)1756/05-06(01) -- Information paper entitled "Ground investigation conducted for the Tamar development project"

LC Paper Nos. CB(1)1831/05-06(01) and (02) -- Issues raised by North District Council members at the meeting with Legislative Council Members on 11 May 2006 on "Development of tourism in North District" and the Administration's response made before the meeting

LC Paper Nos. CB(1)1835/05-06(01), (02) and (03) -- Issues raised by Central & Western District Council members at the meeting with Legislative Council Members on 2 March 2006 on "Planning along the Harbour-front in Central and Western District" and the Administration's response

LC Paper Nos. -- Issues raised by Wong Tai Sin

- CB(1)1836/05-06(01), (02) and (03) District Council members at the meeting with Legislative Council Members on 10 November 2005 on “Removal of unauthorized building works and illegal rooftop structures” and the Administration’s response
- LC Paper Nos. CB(1)1837/05-06(01), (02) and (03) -- A referral dated 12 June 2006 from the Complaints Division relating to the subject of “Request for Revision of the Definition and Development Parameters of the “CDA/CRA” Zones in Outline Zoning Plans”)

3. Members noted the information papers issued since last meeting.

**IV Items for discussion at the next meeting**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1834/05-06(02) -- List of outstanding items for discussion

LC Paper No. CB(1)1834/05-06(03) -- List of follow-up actions)

4. Members agreed that the following items would be discussed at the next meeting scheduled for 25 July 2006 –

- (a) Greening master plans for Kowloon West and Hong Kong Island – development of greening master plans for Mong Kok/Yau Ma Tei and Sheung Wan/Wan Chai/Causeway Bay; and
- (b) Enhancement of continuity of the pedestrian links along the northern shore of the Hong Kong Island and public accessibility to the harbourfront of the Hong Kong Island.

Noting that the Administration would release the revised Concept Plan for Lantau in the second half of 2006, Mr Albert CHAN suggested that the item on Concept Plan for Lantau be discussed at the next meeting if possible. The Chairman said that the Clerk should check with the Administration to confirm whether the item would be ready for discussion.

*(Post-meeting note: In response to the Clerk’s enquiry, the Administration advised that it might be ready to discuss the item with the Panel by the end of 2006 and would confirm the exact timing nearer the time. On the advice of the Chairman, discussion of the item was deferred to the next legislative session.)*

**V Kai Tak Planning Review**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1834/05-06(04) -- Information paper provided by the Administration

LC Paper No. CB(1)1834/05-06(05) -- Background brief on “Kai Tak Planning Review” prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat)

**Briefing by the Administration**

5. The Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) (PSPL) briefed members on the Kai Tak Planning Review. She said that a new approach involving a high degree of public participation had been adopted for the Kai Tak Planning Review, which started in July 2004. Public input had been solicited since the very beginning of the Kai Tak Planning Review and the views received during the stage I and stage II public participation programmes had been carefully considered and duly responded to by the Administration. The Administration had prepared a draft Preliminary Outline Development Plan (PODP) for further discussion with the community in the next two months. The draft PODP would then be reviewed and finalized, taking into account the public comments. The finalized PODP would provide the basis for making a submission by the end of 2006 to the Town Planning Board for amending the currently approved Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plans.

6. The Deputy Director of Planning/District (DD of Plan) gave a PowerPoint presentation to brief members on the detailed proposals in the draft PODP, highlighting the planning principles, planning concepts, development constraints and different land use proposals at Kai Tak.

*(Post-meeting note: The presentation materials (LC Paper No. CB(1)1881/05-06(01)) were subsequently issued to members on 28 June 2006.)*

7. The Chairman relayed the following concerns raised by some district councils in relation to the Kai Tak Planning Review-

- (a) Kowloon City District Council enquired about the Administration’s stance on its request for demolishing the East Kowloon Way so as to reduce air pollution in Kowloon City;
- (b) Kwun Tong District Council enquired about the timeframe and detailed development plans for decommissioning the Kwun Tong Public Cargo Working Area (PCWA) so as to construct a waterfront promenade to renew the appearance of the commercial area in Kwun Tong; and

- (c) Kwun Tong District Council expressed concern on the connectivity between Kai Tak and Kwun Tong and asked whether there would be connection methods other than a tunnel, which the Administration had confirmed not feasible.

8. PSPL said that the Administration had already taken note of the above concerns during the consultation process. As the East Kowloon Way was a strategic transport link, it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to demolish it without seriously affecting the traffic in the area. Even with the planned Central Kowloon Route in place, the East Kowloon Way was still indispensable for meeting traffic needs. As for the Kwun Tong PCWA, the Administration did not have plan to decommission the facility at present in view of the operational need of the logistics industry. If decommissioning was carried out in the end, the site could be used for constructing a waterfront promenade. As regards connection between Kai Tak and Kwun Tong, the idea of an openable bridge had been explored but was found not feasible because of technical and operational constraints involving vessels using the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter and Kwun Tong PCWA. The Administration would continue to explore alternatives to provide connection between the two districts.

#### Development intensity

9. Noting that there would be an additional 700 000 square metres (gross floor area) of office developments in Kai Tak, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming enquired about the heights of the buildings in the commercial area of Kai Tak and expressed concern that the new and old districts would seem to be separated by high-rise buildings. He was also worried that the buildings would be even taller than those in Kwun Tong.

10. In reply, DD of Plan said that the heights of the commercial buildings would range from 100 mPD to a maximum of 175 mPD (about 40-odd storeys). The maximum height of the buildings at the railway depot would be 110 mPD (about 20-odd storeys). For Government offices, the heights would be lower at about 45 mPD to 80 mPD. The heights of the public rental housing buildings would be about 120 mPD (about 40-odd storeys). In the Kai Tak grid residential neighbourhood, the buildings would be three storeys in the front and 30 storeys at the back. Residential buildings in the Runway Precinct would range from 10 to 20 storeys. As a comparison, she pointed out that according to the relevant outline zoning plan, the buildings in Kwun Tong were subject to height restrictions mainly ranging from 100 mPD to 160 mPD, though some existing/committed buildings were as tall as about 180 mPD.

11. Mr James TO also considered that the buildings in Kai Tak should not be too high and should be subject to appropriate height restrictions.

12. Mrs Selina CHOW also expressed concern that the intensity of the

developments at Kai Tak City Centre might be too high. The high-rise buildings therein might segregate Kai Tak from the nearby old districts. She also commented that there was sharp contrast between the high development intensity at Kai Tak City Centre and the low development intensity near the Metro Park and the Multi-purpose Stadium Complex, and expressed reservation on the desirability of such uneven distribution of developments. While expressing support for the proposed Multi-purpose Stadium Complex, she was concerned about the level of economic benefits that could be generated in the areas planned for the Multi-purpose Stadium Complex and the Metro Park.

13. Dr KWOK Ka-ki supported the Administration in adopting a “zero reclamation” approach in the planning for Kai Tak. He pointed out that while there was a reduction in the intensity of residential developments, there was an increase in commercial office developments. The increase in supply of office premises at Kai Tak would relieve the pressure on the increasing demand for office premises. However, those commercial office developments might be discordant with the idea of developing Kai Tak to bring vibrancy and to benefit residents of nearby districts. He was worried that there would not be sufficient vibrancy because the commercial area would become sterile at night after office hours and the Multi-purpose Stadium Complex would not bring much vibrancy either in view of its infrequent usage.

#### Transport infrastructure

14. Noting that there would only be roads in the periphery of Kai Tak and one major road passing through the area, Mr CHAN Kam-lam expressed concern on whether the transport network would be able to cope with the traffic arising from the additional population and workforce in the area. He enquired about the measures to be taken to meet the traffic demand in addition to the Shatin to Central Link and the number and locations of the transport interchanges for connecting the nearby districts.

15. PSPL pointed out that more transport networks would have significant impact on the environment. Trunk Road T2 would be submerged at Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC) to reduce its impact on the environment of Kai Tak. Inter-district transport would mainly be serviced by the mass transit railway system while environmentally-friendly transport mode would be considered for intra-district transport. According to the information from the Environment, Transport and Works Bureau, appropriate specifications for providing the latest available vehicle mode would be included in the procurement contract for such environmentally-friendly transport mode. As regards transport interchanges, DD of Plan said that there were two existing transport interchanges, one located near Kowloon City Ferry Pier in To Kwa Wan and the other near Kwun Tong Ferry Pier. Another two transport interchanges were planned to be provided near the commercial area next to the Kai Tak Station and the tourism node next to the Cruise Terminal respectively.

16. In relation to intra-district transport, Mr Fred LI asked whether monorail running on viaduct would be a feasible option. In reply, PSPL said that apart from aerial monorail, at-grade environmentally-friendly transport mode would also be suitable to serve intra-district transport. DD of Plan added that the Administration considered that intra-district transport facilities would be important for providing good linkage within the area. However, taking into consideration the planned population, it might not be cost-effective to provide a monorail system. The Administration was inviting suggestions from the community on more cost-effective alternatives.

17. Mrs Selina CHOW was worried that intra-district transportation facilities might be inadequate. She did not support too much separation between vehicles and pedestrians because too much separation would reduce pedestrian flow and user-friendliness of the environment.

18. Similarly, Mr WONG Yung-kan considered that the facilities at Kai Tak should be easily accessible to all Hong Kong citizens. In this connection, he asked whether consideration would be given to providing water transport between Hong Kong Island and Kai Tak. He added that water transport would also be conducive to crowd dispersal.

19. PSPL said that members' concerns on the provision of adequate transport facilities and Mr WONG's suggestion of providing water transport to connect Kai Tak with Hong Kong Island would be duly considered in the future planning. DD of Plan added that several public landing steps/piers had been planned along the runway and water transport to connect various areas within and near Kai Tak could be considered in the future.

20. Mr James TO was quite satisfied with the overall planning for Kai Tak in relation to practicability, aesthetics, land use, landscape and planning concept. He commented that bridges would create a dynamic feel and those bridges in the area could be beautified to make them more appealing aesthetically. More bridges could be built for providing better connection if feasible. Trunk Road T2 could also be beautified to reduce its impact on landscape. In response, PSPL thanked Mr TO for his comments and added that as a major part of Trunk Road T2 would be built in the form of a tunnel, its impact on landscape would be minimal.

21. Miss CHAN Yuen-han commented that consideration could be given to demolishing the Kai Tak Tunnel so that there would be higher flexibility in the planning for Kai Tak. Noting that a road would circumscribe the area and pass right through the middle of the site for the Multi-purpose Stadium Complex, she enquired whether the road would be re-designed. She expressed concern on public access to the Metro Park from Kowloon City, Kowloon Bay and Nga Tau Kok in view of the many flyover and road systems. For intra-district traffic, she reiterated that consideration should be given to using unmanned rail or monorail to connect Kai Tak Station with other areas. She considered that using boats to connect Kai Tak and Kwun Tong would not be able to cope with the high pedestrian flow. She



had consulted some architects and was given to understand that construction of an arch bridge connecting Kai Tak and Kwun Tong could be possible with some reclamation for the bridge pier. PSPL noted Miss CHAN's comments and said that the design of the road network would be further studied together with the Transport Department.

22. Miss CHOY So-yuk shared Miss CHAN's views, especially on the need for improving the road network. She considered that roads should not be on the top of the priority list in planning and suggested that roads in Hong Kong should be planned in the form of boulevards with at-grade pedestrian crossings rather than highways so as to enhance vibrancy.

#### Integration with surrounding districts

23. Miss CHAN Yuen-han said that the Administration had been responding to the views of the community on issues such as maintaining the runway and treating environmental pollution at KTAC. She considered that Kai Tak should provide a variety of activities and facilities for nearby residents to make up for the under-provision of communal facilities for those residents since the early years. Kai Tak should be a place for those residents and the development of Kai Tak should help revitalize the neighbouring old districts. She suggested that instead of developing a small scale underground shopping street, a large scale sustainable underground city should be developed in Kowloon City and San Po Kong. She also emphasized the importance of easy access to Kai Tak from densely populated districts like Kowloon Bay, Ngau Tau Kok and Kwun Tong. An underground city would provide easy access between Kai Tak and the neighbouring districts and be able to cope with a high pedestrian flow. Easy pedestrian access would bring about higher economic benefits to nearby districts. She pointed out that how to revitalize economic activities of the surrounding districts of a newly developed district was an important issue in town planning.

24. Mrs Selina CHOW commented that the current planning would separate the old districts from Kai Tak and she was worried that there would be insufficient integration between Kai Tak and the surrounding districts.

25. Mr James TO shared the view that the scale of the underground streets should be expanded to cover as large an area as possible to facilitate smooth pedestrian flow, which in turn would promote spending and bring economic benefits to the districts concerned.

26. PSPL noted members' views and said that Hong Kong residents and tourists alike, especially residents of the nearby districts, would be able to enjoy the facilities at Kai Tak. She shared the view that revitalization of the neighbouring districts was important and the Administration was mindful of the need to provide good linkage. Underground shopping streets would be one type of the proposed pedestrian connections. The Administration would continue to listen to the views of the community in this regard and would make every effort to

improve the connectivity between Kai Tak and adjoining areas.

#### Kai Tak Approach Channel

27. Noting that the Metro Park would be located next to KTAC, Mr CHAN Kam-lam enquired about the progress and time needed for completing the treatment works to remove the odour of KTAC. In reply, PSPL said that the data collected from the treatment tests carried out in the laboratory and on site during different seasons would be available for analysis by the end of 2006. The Administration planned to create a 600-metre opening at the northern end of the runway to improve water circulation and to reduce sedimentation, thus improving the water quality at KTAC. The existing sediments which caused the odour would also have to be treated. The Administration was estimating the time needed in solving the environmental problems. She assured members that the planned developments at Kai Tak would proceed only if it could be confirmed that the environmental problems relating to the odour and water quality of KTAC could be effectively mitigated to meet the stringent requirements under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (Cap. 499).

28. Mr Fred LI and Mr WONG Yung-kan expressed concern on whether the 600-metre opening would be effective in improving the water circulation and water quality of KTAC.

29. The Project Manager/Kowloon of the Civil Engineering and Development Department (Proj Mgr/CEDD) explained that a width of 600 metres for the opening was proposed as an initial estimate based on computer simulations. Water flow and water quality data collected during the dry and wet seasons were recorded and simulations were carried out using various widths for the opening to investigate the effects of tide on water flow and water quality. Recent results of the simulations showed that a minimum opening width of 600 metres would be required under the worst case scenario. With the opening in place, the discharged water would flow into KTAC and out to the To Kwa Wan side. The existing sediments in the KTAC would have to be treated before creating the said opening. The sediments, insufficient tidal flush and up-stream pollution were contributing factors for the present environmental problems at KTAC. While the effluent from Diamond Hill was not much of a problem, the effluent from Kowloon City and Jordan Valley was heavily polluted. These pollution sources would have to be controlled in order to solve the environmental problems at KTAC.

30. Mr James TIEN enquired about the feasibility and estimated cost of demolishing part of the runway and reclaiming KTAC with an equal area to form a complete stretch of land. He said that this might be a preferable idea from the perspective of long term and sustainable planning, as the environmental problems of KTAC could be completely solved and the land around KTAC could then be better utilized after reclamation. He considered that environmental protection concern groups might not necessarily object to the idea and asked whether the suggestion would be in compliance with the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance

(Cap. 531) (PHO). He further asked whether the Administration would consider amending PHO to allow reclamation to be carried out by compensating an equal area of water surface, if PHO did not have provisions in this regard at present. Amending the PHO could be explored if the community supported the idea.

31. PSPL said that Mr TIEN's suggestion was a new idea which the Administration had not ever considered, and as such, there was no cost estimate for implementing such a plan. In order to rebut the presumption against reclamation under the PHO, the Administration had to satisfy the stringent "overriding public need test". The need should be compelling, present and no reasonable alternatives should be available. The extent of reclamation should also be minimal. The Administration had to abide by the PHO and its stance on protecting the Victoria Harbour had been clearly stated. At this stage, the Administration could not rule out that an alternative to reclamation might exist and thus had no plan to pursue any reclamation. Apart from that, there were calls for retaining the runway as it served to maintain Hong Kong people's collective memory of the ex-airport as Hong Kong's heritage. Moreover, even if KTAC was to be reclaimed, treatment works would still be necessary to handle the sediments, odour and water quality. As regards the idea of amending the PHO to cater for reclamation that was compensated for by providing an equal water surface elsewhere in the harbour, she expressed serious doubt on the prospect that the community would arrive at a consensus on the idea.

32. Mr Patrick LAU said that it would be possible to implement Mr TIEN's suggestion in Vancouver. As the cost for creating the 600-metre opening would be substantial and the effectiveness of the measure had yet to be seen, he asked if it would be possible to convert KTAC into a lagoon after treating the sediments and decontaminating the effluent from the up-stream culverts.

33. Proj Mgr/CEDD explained that creating a lagoon was one of the initial options considered. However, there were many culverts discharging rain water into KTAC. If KTAC was sealed off, there was a danger it could not cope with the discharge from the potential flooding occurring once every 200 years. Furthermore, it would be better to make use of the tidal effect to clean KTAC rather than sealing it off. The option was thus not further pursued. Similarly, if KTAC was reclaimed, 18 cells of 2-metre by 2-metre box culverts would be needed for the discharge of rain water collected through the north apron area alone and additional ones for the other catchment areas.

34. Mr James TO said that he did not support the suggestion of removing part of the runway because of its historical significance. Retaining the runway would also provide a longer waterfront for public enjoyment. He commented that the idea of converting KTAC into a lagoon could be further considered in the future.

#### Metro Park

35. Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming expressed reservation on the location of the

Metro Park because the public would have to pass through the commercial area, Multi-purpose Stadium Complex and roads before they could reach the Metro Park. It might not be an ideal location for easy access by residents of the neighbouring districts. Sharing a similar view, Mr CHAN Kam-lam considered that although there would be footbridges and walkways for connection, the public would find it hard to reach the Metro Park because it was too distant.

36. Mr Fred LI also pointed out that it would be difficult to access the Metro Park from districts such as Kowloon Bay and Ngau Tau Kok. Similarly, while Kwun Tong was extremely under-provided with open space, it would be unreasonable if Kwun Tong residents could not easily access the Metro Park.

37. Dr KWOK Ka-ki also urged the Administration to ensure that the public would have easy access to the Metro Park.

38. In response, PSPL said that the Metro Park would be well connected with the Kai Tak Station with direct pedestrian connections. Footbridges and decks would be available over the major roads for easy access to the Metro Park. Bridges across KTAC would also be provided for connecting the Metro Park with other districts.

39. Mr Albert CHAN was disappointed that the Metro Park would be located at the deck above the opening of the runway because there might be odour problems. He considered that trees should be the main theme of the Metro Park. As the Metro Park would be surrounded by water, the number of water features in the Metro Park should be reduced.

40. Mr Patrick LAU also expressed concern that the deck above the opening might not be a good location for the Metro Park because the concrete base would not provide a sufficient amount of soil for the healthy growth of trees.

41. In response, PSPL pointed out that the concept plan for the Metro Park was only a preliminary idea and the final design might be very different. She assured members that there would be sufficient greening with a lot of trees in the Metro Park. DD of Plan added that constructing buildings over the deck would be very expensive, hence the deck would be a suitable location for the Metro Park.

#### Multi-purpose Stadium Complex

42. Dr KWOK Ka-ki expressed concern that the 45 000-seat main stadium would become a “white elephant” because large scale sports events would not be frequently held and large scale cultural activities could be better accommodated by the cultural facilities in the West Kowloon Cultural District Development. He further commented that the sumptuous stadium project was in contrast to the Administration’s lack of enthusiasm in nurturing local athletes and promoting sports for students and the community at large; and hardware was not sufficient for promoting a good sports culture.

43. The Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs (Recreation and Sport) (PAS/HA(R&S)) explained that Hong Kong lacked sufficient sports facilities to support the promotion of sports activities in the community and the activities to be held at the Multi-purpose Stadium Complex would not be limited to major events. The Multi-purpose Stadium Complex could make up for the deficiencies of the Hong Kong Stadium as the latter did not have a retractable roof and a secondary stadium. The Multi-purpose Stadium Complex would introduce into Kai Tak a new element of sports in the city. Apart from sports events, the main stadium could be used for other activities such as exhibitions because it had a retractable roof. There had been requests for holding exhibitions at the Hong Kong Stadium but it was found not feasible due to physical constraints. Besides, the secondary stadium and the ancillary facilities of the Multi-purpose Stadium Complex could be used by residents in neighbouring districts and the community at large. As such, it was envisaged that the Multi-purpose Stadium Complex would be a vibrant sports hub and its overall utilization rate would be high.

44. Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming considered that the proposed location of the Multi-purpose Stadium Complex was appropriate.

45. Mr Albert CHAN however considered that the proposed location of the Multi-purpose Stadium Complex, which was near the Metro Park and the residential area, was discordant with the surrounding areas from the town planning and land use perspectives. The presence of the Multi-purpose Stadium Complex would affect the leisure and residential atmosphere in the nearby areas.

46. Mr Patrick LAU suggested moving the Multi-purpose Stadium Complex to a site near the Kai Tak Station so as to leave the waterfront for uses that could benefit from the waterfront location. As activities would be held inside the Multi-purpose Stadium Complex, he did not see the need for it to have a sea view. He was also not satisfied with the location of the proposed Kai Tak Station of the Shatin to Central Line because it was located right in the middle of Kai Tak City Centre.

47. In response, DD of Plan explained that the Administration had a planning vision to maximize opportunities for public enjoyment of the view of the Victoria Harbour. The proposed location of the Multi-purpose Stadium Complex would allow it to become a conspicuous landmark in the Victoria Harbour and serve as a gateway to Kai Tak. It could be seen from different locations. The Multi-purpose Stadium Complex would be located between two proposed railway stations, Kai Tak and Ma Tau Kok. Nearby districts such as To Kwa Wan would enjoy the economic benefits to be generated by the patrons of the Multi-purpose Stadium Complex when they passed through those districts. If the Multi-purpose Stadium Complex was moved to a location near the Kai Tak Station, there would not be enough space for crowd dispersal. There were also constraints on planning imposed by the Shatin to Central Link and the Kai Tak Tunnel.

48. Mr Timothy FOK declared interest as President of the Sports Federation and Olympic Committee of Hong Kong, China, and President of the Hong Kong Football Association. He expressed appreciation to the Administration for enlisting public participation in the planning for Kai Tak. He would be glad to see the materialization of the Multi-purpose Stadium Complex and did not consider that the main stadium would become a “white elephant” because activities that could be held would not be limited to sports and cultural events. The Multi-purpose Stadium Complex would also become a landmark for Hong Kong. The provision of more sports facilities would be conducive to improving the health and physique of the public. He wholly supported the project and would continue to relay to the Administration the views of the sector, and a major view was that there should be sufficient ancillary facilities near the Multi-purpose Stadium Complex and adequate transport facilities. PSPL thanked Mr FOK for his comments and support.

49. In reply to an enquiry from Mr Fred LI, PSPL said that the retractable roof would be able to prevent excessive noise from the main stadium when large scale events were held and most other facilities of the Multi-purpose Stadium Complex would be air-conditioned.

### Cruise Terminal

50. Mrs Selina CHOW expressed concern that the provision of two berths at the Cruise Terminal would not be sufficient to meet the future demand of the cruise industry. Pointing out that the size of cruise ships had been ever increasing, she asked whether the length of the berths would be sufficient to accommodate mega cruise ships in the long term. She also commented that the site planned for the Runway Park might be put to better and more compatible use by using it for facilities related to the Cruise Terminal.

51. In reply, the Assistant Commissioner for Tourism (2) of the Economic Development and Labour Bureau explained that there was a need for the provision of one additional berth in the medium term and another one to two additional berths in the long term. The Administration had considered the feasibility of

providing three berths at Kai Tak. However, as no reclamation would be proposed under the “zero reclamation” approach, only two berths were now proposed at Kai Tak. Nevertheless, the apron of the new Cruise Terminal would be about 800 metres long, which would be able to accommodate two mega cruise ships or three ordinary cruise ships. The apron length of the new Cruise Terminal should be able to cope with the industry trend of building mega cruise ships.

### Heliport

52. As for the heliport, Mr Fred LI pointed out that there were concerns from residents, especially those living in Laguna City, about noise pollution caused by large cross-boundary helicopters with high frequency. He urged the Administration to ensure that measures would be taken to prevent residents from being affected by noise pollution.

53. The Principal Assistant Secretary for Economic Development and Labour (Economic Development)A2 (PAS/EDL(ED)A2) said that the proposed heliport would be located at the corner of the runway tip. As helicopters would fly over water for landing and take-off, there should not be significant noise implication on the surrounding areas in Kai Tak. When designing the future flight path for the proposed heliport, the Government would also endeavour to avoid helicopters overflying densely populated areas. In addition, development of the heliport was a long term plan and there was not yet any definite timetable for its construction. It was expected that future models of helicopters would generate less noise than current models. He assured members that the noise impact of the heliport would be given careful consideration during the design stage.

### Kwun Tong Public Cargo Working Area

54. Mr WONG Yung-kan enquired whether suitable locations in Tuen Mun or other districts would be reserved for reprovisioning the the Kwun Tong PCWA in case it had to be decommissioned in the future. He also asked if the PCWA was decommissioned, how the Administration would use the site for providing leisure facilities.

55. PSPL said that the Administration had no plan to decommission the Kwun Tong PCWA at present. Its decommissioning or otherwise would depend on the future development and need of the logistics industry. The Economic Development and Labour Bureau would monitor the situation closely. If a suitable site could be identified for reprovisioning the PCWA without causing the operators too much inconvenience, the existing site of the PCWA would be used for waterfront enhancement facilities, such as a waterfront promenade. PAS/EDL(ED)A2 added that there would be discussion among relevant bureaux and departments on the possibility of reprovisioning the Kwun Tong PCWA in the long run and the views of the industry would be taken into account.

56. Miss CHAN Yuen-han disagreed to the view of Kwun Tong District

Council on decommissioning the Kwun Tong PCWA because it had been serving environmental protection and logistics industries. She commented that enhancement works to the PCWA could be carried out and the PCWA and leisure areas could co-exist.

#### Urban renewal

57. Mr Albert CHAN said that he welcomed the reduction in planned population to 86 500 for Kai Tak. However, he had been urging the Administration for eight years to capitalize on the opportunity of developing Kai Tak to facilitate urban renewal of districts such as Wong Tai Sin and Kwun Tong, through methods like land exchange and re-provisioning of public rental housing estates. He was disappointed that the Administration had not adopted any corresponding strategy in this regard and the failure of the Administration to do so was unfair to those residents in East Kowloon who were living in areas requiring urban renewal.

58. In response, PSPL clarified that the Administration had an overall urban renewal strategy and urban renewal had been carried out in an orderly way. The development of Kai Tak was a long term project. There was no plan to link the Kai Tak development with urban renewal strategy and urban renewal plan.

#### Work plan

59. In reply to the Chairman's enquiry on the work plan of the Kai Tak Planning Review, PSPL said that the current consultation exercise would last for two months and the Administration would be able to report its work to the Panel in the next session.

60. Miss CHAN Yuen-han noted that the Administration would consult professional organizations and other parties to solicit their input on the draft PODP. She enquired whether the Panel would consider holding a meeting to invite deputations to present views. The Chairman advised that members would be consulted on the issue at the next regular Panel meeting.

#### **VI Any other business**

61. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 4:55 pm.