

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)666/06-07
(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 Tuesday, 14 November 2006 at 2:30 pm
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building**

Members present : Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP (Chairman)
Prof 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, SBS, S.B.St.J., JP
Dr Hon LUI Ming-wah, SBS, JP
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon Bernard CHAN, GBS, JP
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Yung-kan, JP
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-yea, GBS, JP
Hon CHOY So-yuk, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon Vincent FANG Kang, JP
Hon LEE Wing-tat
Hon LI Kwok-ying, MH, JP
Hon Daniel LAM Wai-keung, SBS, JP
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, SBS, JP

Members attending : Hon Mrs Selina CHOW LIANG Shuk-yea, GBS, JP
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, JP
Hon TAM Heung-man

Members absent : Hon Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun, SBS, JP
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP

Public officers attending : **Agenda item I**

Mr Michael SUEN, GBS, JP
Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands

Mr Robin IP, JP
Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands
(Planning & Lands)1

Mr Philip YUNG, JP
Deputy Secretary for the Environment, Transport and
Works (Transport) 1

Ms Esther LEUNG
Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs (3)

Miss Polly KWOK
Principle Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs (Culture) 2

Mr LAU Ka-keung, JP
Deputy Commissioner for Transport/
Planning & Technical Services

Miss Ophelia WONG
Deputy Director of Planning/District

Ms Phyllis LI
Chief Town Planner/Special Duties (1)
Planning Department

Dr Louis NG
Assistant Director of Leisure and Cultural Services
(Heritage & Museums)

Agenda item II

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

Mr Philip YUNG, JP
Deputy Secretary for the Environment, Transport and
Works (Transport) 1

Ms Maisie CHENG
Deputy Commissioner for Tourism
Economic Development and Labour Bureau

Mr Francis CHENG
Principal Assistant Secretary for Economic Development
and Labour (Economic Development) A2

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

Mr Charles CHU
Project Adviser (Recreation and Sport)
Home Affairs Bureau

Miss Ophelia WONG
Deputy Director of Planning/District

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

Mr Talis WONG
Chief Engineer/Kowloon
Civil Engineering Development Department

**Attendance by
invitation**

: **Agenda item II**

Designing Hong Kong Harbour District

Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN
Convenor

Sports Federation & Olympic Committee of Hong Kong,
China

Mr A F M CONWAY
Vice President

Kwun Tong District Council

Ms KO Po-ling, MH
Chairman of Housing Committee
Kwun Tong District Council

Hong Kong & Kowloon Motor Boats & Tug Boats
Association Ltd.

Mr Bondy WEN Tsz-kit
Vice-Chairman

Mr Emil PUI Chi-keung
Secretary

Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administration

Mr August C W TIU
Council Member

City Planning Concern Group

Mr LAM Chi-keung
Chairman

Mr Bill TONG
Secretary (Assistant)

Hong Kong Cargo-Vessel Traders' Association Ltd.

Mr WONG Yiu-kan
Chairman of Executive Committee

The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers

Ir Dr Greg C Y WONG
Immediate Past President

Hong Kong Air Cadet Corps

Mr Len LEUNG
Commanding Officer

Mr Wilson CHAN
Chief Staff Officer

Hong Kong, China Rowing Association

Mr Robert WILSON
President

Mr CHEUNG Kwok-fai
Director

Hong Kong Rugby Football Union

Mr Ian BROWNLEE
Director, Facilities

The Hong Kong Construction Association

Mr Conrad WONG
President

Mr Alex WONG
Assistant Secretary General

The Hong Kong Federation of Electrical and Mechanical
Contractors Limited

Mr James CHIU
President

Mr LAU Chun-kay
Council Member

Hong Kong Aviation Club

Mr Alex YAN
President

Ms Yolanda WONG
General Manager

關注維港避風塘聯席會議

Mr NG Siu-yuen
Representative

Hong Kong Schools Sports Federation

Mr Rilas CHIANG Tak-cheung
Secretary-General

Community Alliance on Kai Tak Development

Ms Michelle TANG
Member

Ms Carman LEUNG
Member

The Hong Kong Institute of Architects

Mr Michael CHIANG
Chairman, Planning and Lands Committee

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

Action

- I Planning issues relating to the reprovisioning of the Star Ferry Pier in Central including the proposed preservation of the building structure and clock tower of the existing Star Ferry Pier**
- (LC Paper No. CB(1)2208/05-06(02) -- Information paper on "Reprovisioning of Star Ferry Pier in Central" provided by the Administration
- LC Paper No. CB(1)2240/05-06 -- Terms of the motion passed by the Panel at the special meeting on 20 September 2006
- LC Paper No. CB(1)46/06-07(01) -- Administration's written response to the motion passed at the special meeting on 20 September 2006

LC Paper No. CB(1)245/06-07(01) -- Submission dated 31 October 2006 from Central & Western District Council)

The Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (SHPL) referred to the Administration's written response dated 11 October 2006 to the motion passed at the special meeting of the Panel held on 20 September 2006 and stated that over the past seven years, the Government had consulted the stakeholders concerned, including the "Star" Ferry Company Limited, the Town Planning Board and the Central and Western District Council, on the arrangements for reprovisioning the Star Ferry Pier. The public had also been consulted on the arrangements through gazettal of the relevant amendments to the approved Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan. Besides, the Administration had publicized the reprovisioning arrangements in conjunction with the planning for the new Central reclamation area on various occasions. He further said that the Government understood that there were views in the community that the Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower were an important icon of Hong Kong people's collective memory and thus should be preserved. The Government would consider, from a urban design point of view, how to incorporate some special features of the existing Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower in the new Central harbourfront under the Central Reclamation Urban Design Study, which would commence shortly.

2. Dr KWOK Ka-ki said that many citizens were dissatisfied and disappointed with the Government's decision to demolish the Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower. He opined that the Government's consultation work had not reached the men in the street and the general public might not be aware of the town plans and gazette notices relating to the demolition of the Star Ferry Pier. The Government had been selective in accepting public opinions and in fact, since 2003, Legislative Council Members had been raising objections to the reclamation in Central. Given that all members of the Town Planning Board were appointed by the Government and its secretariat was manned by civil servants, the Board was inclined to be rubber-stamping the proposals from the Government. He said that the Government still had time to change its decision and should respond positively to Panel members' and the public's opinions by not demolishing the pier and the clock tower.

3. SHPL said that the Government had strictly followed the statutory procedures in implementing the Central Reclamation Phase III (CRIII) project and the associated reprovisioning and development plans. There had been three phases of public consultation in the past seven years. During each phase, there had been enthusiastic debates at various forums and wide publicity about the project, and hence all interested parties should be aware of the Government's plan to reprovision the Star Ferry Pier. In this regard, the Government had taken heed of public views and had significantly reduced the reclamation area. As a decision on the reprovisioning of the Star Ferry Pier had been made, it should be implemented without undue delay. The Government would discuss with concerned parties to

identify the best way to incorporate some special features of the existing Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower in the new Central harbourfront.

4. Dr Kwok Ka-ki pointed out that the public had raised objection to the CRIII and the reduction in the reclamation area could not meet the public's aspiration. There was no basis for the claim that the public had agreed to the demolition of the existing Star Ferry Pier. SHPL said that the existing plan had struck a proper balance and had been arrived at after extensive public consultations.

5. Mr Albert CHAN said that Members, including himself, were responsible for not having made a concrete request for preserving the clock tower of the Star Ferry Pier when the CRIII project and the associated plans were considered by the committees of the Legislative Council. He said that as a respectful response to the public's yawning wish to preserve the collective memory associated with the Star Ferry Pier, the Government should preserve the clock tower and incorporate it in the new Central harbourfront. At least the appearance and the chimes of the clock should be preserved.

6. SHPL said that the Government would further examine the feasibility of preserving the clock and the mechanical parts, but pointed out The "Star" Ferry Company, Limited had already indicated in its submission to this Panel that according to expert advice, owing to the cessation of production of new parts and components of the clock in the market, relocation of the clock and subsequent maintenance would not be feasible. Therefore, it had been the Company's plan to display the parts of the clock in the new Star Ferry Pier.

7. Mr LEE Wing-tat pointed out that the public consultation on CRIII and the associated development and reprovisioning plans were carried out in around 1999 and 2000, while the public's sentiment towards the preservation of historical premises had considerably heightened since 2003 and 2004. He quoted, as an example, that the Housing Authority had spent nearly \$40 million to remove the Murray Building from Central to Stanley and the public supported the move. He opined that the Government should endeavour to restore the clock tower, as in the case of the clock tower of the former railway station in Tsimshatsui. Efforts should also be made to enable the clock to continue operation.

8. Miss CHAN Yuen-han opined that the Government should consult concerned parties and the relevant District Council in deciding how and where to relocate the clock tower, which was a "collective memory" icon for Hong Kong people. She pointed out that in many neighbouring areas such as Macao, a holistic approach was adopted for preservation of historical buildings and monuments. Instead of designating a single building or monument as a historical icon, a whole area was preserved. She urged the Government to review the legislation related to the preservation of historical sites and buildings in Hong Kong.

Admin

9. SHPL replied that a large amenity area had been included in the planning for the new Central harbourfront and it should not be very difficult to find a site therein for the clock tower. The Administration would consult the concerned parties and consider suggestions from the public on the best site for relocating the clock tower. As regards the suggestion of reviewing the legislation for preservation of historical sites and buildings, SHPL said that members' views would be conveyed to the relevant bureau and department for consideration.

10. Prof Patrick LAU asked whether it was because of the building of the Airport Railway Extended Overrun Tunnel (EOT) underneath the clock tower which made it impossible to preserve the clock tower at the original site.

11. The Deputy Commissioner for Transport/Planning and Technical Services (DC/PTS) replied that it was necessary to demolish the Star Ferry Pier and Queen's Pier to build Road P2, the EOT and an extension of a drainage box culvert underneath the existing Star Ferry Pier and Queen's Pier. Road P2 was an extension of Man Cheung Street between the Airport Railway Hong Kong Station and the International Finance Centre II, and for road safety reasons, it was infeasible to shift the alignment of Road P2 to avoid cutting through the existing Star Ferry Pier. For this and other reasons related to EOT and the drainage box culvert, the demolition of the Star Ferry Pier was inevitable.

12. Prof Patrick LAU said that immediate action should be taken to carry out a detailed survey of the architectural and structural features of the clock tower and compile a comprehensive record of these to facilitate the future restoration work. SHPL said that the Government should have in its records the building plans of the existing clock tower. If necessary, the Government would carry out further surveying and recording work for the rebuilding purpose.

13. Mr Alan LEONG remarked that anybody who witnessed the passion expressed by the more than 10 000 citizens towards the imminent demolition of the Star Ferry Pier during the last day of operation of the ferry should be moved by the scenes. He concurred with Mr LEE Wing-tat's view that the public's sentiment towards historical sites and buildings had heightened considerably in recent years and this should not be ignored by the Government. He then enquired about the time schedule for demolition of the Star Ferry Pier and the clock tower, and the anticipated timing for relocation of the clock tower to a new site.

14. The Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning & Lands)1 (DS/PL1) responded that to make way for the public works projects mentioned above, the clock tower would be demolished in December 2006 and the Star Ferry Pier would be removed in early 2007. The Deputy Director of Planning/District (DD of Plan) added that the tendering exercise for the Central Reclamation Urban Design Study was in progress and the consultants for the study were expected to be appointed in early 2007. The public would be consulted on the design of the new Central harbourfront.

15. Noting that the design of the harbourfront area had yet to be worked out when the clock tower was demolished, Mr Alan LEONG expressed concern about the uncertainties as to the extent and the manner in which the clock tower would be preserved.

16. SHPL responded that what the public wanted most was to preserve the clock tower as a "collective memory" icon and its chimes, and not the building itself. The preservation of the clock tower at the existing location would not be feasible, but the Government would attempt to incorporate some special features of the existing Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower at the new Central harbourfront. The Government would ensure that comprehensive and detailed building records on the pier building and the clock tower would be maintained and would work out a viable plan for their reconstruction.

17. Dr KWOK Ka-ki remarked that what the public really wanted was the preservation of the whole Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower at the existing location. The value of the premises was in its holistic form, and parts and pieces of the building would be valueless. Based on the Government's work schedule, the whole building including the clock tower would be demolished in December 2006, which meant that only the remains or parts of the building would be left for display in a future site and this would fall far short of the public's expectation. He pointed out that the configuration of Road P2 was closely related to the scale and density of developments in CRIII and thus its alignment would not necessarily be in conflict with the main Star Ferry Pier building nor the clock tower. He opined that any real consultation should not involve any pre-conditions, and hence he objected to the pre-condition for the Central Reclamation Urban Design Study that the Study should not result in any major change to the maximum gross floor areas and building heights specified in the relevant Outline Zoning Plans (OZPs). He stated that the Government should accept the public's demands that the commercial developments in CRIII should be replaced by facilities for public enjoyment.

18. SHPL responded that based on the current planning for CRIII, a large portion of the new Central harbourfront would be developed as a greenery area with a continuous promenade. The Star Ferry Pier at its existing location would not tie in with the overall design. The best option would be to incorporate some special features of the existing Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower in the new Central harbourfront under the Central Reclamation Urban Design Study. He gathered at this meeting that most members considered that the Administration's proposal was a viable solution for the issue.

19. Dr Kwok Ka-ki said that SHPL should withdraw his remark that the majority of members of the Panel supported the Administration's proposed option. He considered that members had not expressed their support to the proposal and SHPL should not put words in their mouths. Dr KWOK asked that SHPL's remark should not be recorded in the minutes.

20. SHPL said that his remark should be recorded in the minutes and he was responsible for what he said at the meeting. Members were at liberty to disagree to what he said. He stated that based on the views expressed by members at the meeting, he came to his own conclusion that the majority of the members who had expressed their views considered the Administration's proposed arrangements for preservation of the Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower a viable option.

21. Prof Patrick LAU suggested that in demolishing the clock tower, efforts should be made to preserve the tower as much in its holistic form as possible, including the arms, letters and face of the clock. SHPL said that he agreed to Prof LAU's suggestion.

II Kai Tak Planning Review - Revised Preliminary Outline Development Plan

- | | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| (LC Paper No. CB(1)89/06-07(01) | -- Information paper provided by the Administration |
| LC Paper No. CB(1)89/06-07(04) | -- Background brief on "Kai Tak Planning Review" prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat |
| LC Paper No. CB(1)163/06-07(01) | -- Booklet on "Kai Tak Planning Review -- Revised Preliminary Outline Development Plan" provided by the Administration |
| LC Paper No. CB(1)245/06-07(03) | -- Letter dated 3 November 2006 from The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong |
| LC Paper No. CB(1)245/06-07(04) | -- Submission received from Hong Kong Civic Design Association on 8 November 2006) |

Presentation by deputations

*Designing Hong Kong Harbour District (DHKHD)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)284/06-07(01), tabled and issued to members on 15 November 2006)*

22. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, Convenor of DHKHD, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission.

Sports Federation & Olympic Committee of Hong Kong, China (SF&OC of HK, China)

23. Mr A F M CONWAY, Vice President of SF&OC of HK, China, pointed out that although Hong Kong athletes had participated in many international sports events in the past, Hong Kong lacked modern and efficient facilities for organizing major international sports events and promoting sports. The sports community was very enthusiastic about developing a Multi-purpose Stadium Complex (Stadium Complex) in Kai Tak because it would allow Hong Kong to host major international sports events and provide facilities for organizing sports activities for the community on a regular basis. The Stadium Complex would bring enormous benefits to Hong Kong citizens. The nearby districts would also gain economic benefits from the community's use of the Stadium Complex.

*Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)245/06-07(02))*

24. Ms KO Po-ling, Chairman of Housing Committee, KTDC, delivered her presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission.

*Hong Kong & Kowloon Motor Boats & Tug Boats Association Ltd. (HKKMBTBA)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)252/06-07(01))*

25. Mr Bondy WEN, Vice-Chairman of HKKMBTBA, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission.

Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administration (HKIREA)

26. Mr August TIU, Council Member of HKIREA, supported stitching together the urban fabrics but was concerned about how the neighbouring districts could contribute to and benefit from the Kai Tak development. He would like to see how the proposed land uses and the range of proposed facilities and amenities in the revised Preliminary Outline Development Plan (PODP) could reflect the above intention. He supported the bridge link to Kwun Tong and a light and rapid transport system serving Kai Tak and the neighbouring districts. There should be innovative design approaches for providing environmentally friendly and pedestrian friendly connections with neighbouring districts, and there should be flexibility in integrating different land uses vertically. For instance, some facilities could be planned underneath the Metro Park, open space or highway structures to reduce the intensity of developments above the ground.

*City Planning Concern Group (CPCG)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)252/06-07(02))*

27. Mr Bill TONG, Secretary (Assistant) of CPCG, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission.

Hong Kong Cargo-Vessel Traders' Association Ltd. (HKCVTA)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)252/06-07(03))

28. Mr WONG Yiu-kan, Chairman of Executive Committee of HKCVTA, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission.

The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers (HKIE)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)265/06-07(01))

29. Ir Dr Grey WONG, Immediate Past President of HKIE, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission.

Hong Kong Air Cadet Corps (HKACC)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)252/06-07(04); and LC Paper No. CB(1)310/06-07(01),
received after the meeting and issued to members on 17 November 2006)

30. Mr Len LEUNG, Commanding Officer of HKACC, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submissions.

Hong Kong, China Rowing Association (HKCRA)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)252/06-07(05); and LC Paper No. CB(1)284/06-07(02),
tabled and issued to members on 15 November 2006)

31. Mr Robert WILSON, President of HKCRA, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submissions.

Hong Kong Rugby Football Union (HKRFU)

32. Mr Ian BROWNLEE, Director (Facilities) of HKRFU, expressed support for constructing the Stadium Complex because sports facilities of international standard would make Hong Kong a great sports centre for a wide range of events, which would bring status and economic benefits for Hong Kong people. Space for local sports grounds for young people was also under-provided, especially in districts like To Kwa Wan, Kowloon City and Kwun Tong, and therefore more sports facilities would be required in Kai Tak in addition to the Stadium Complex. The space reserved for residential developments on the former runway should be used for sports activities and open space on a temporary basis until the Metro Park above the 600-metre deck was implemented. He supported the bridge link to Kwun Tong because Kwun Tong was extremely under-provided with recreational facilities. The bridge link was also essential for diverting traffic away from the former runway, thus reducing traffic passing through the recreational facilities and the Stadium Complex.

The Hong Kong Construction Association (HKCA)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)265/06-07(02))

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

The Hong Kong Federation of Electrical and Mechanical Contractors Limited (HKFEMC)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)265/06-07(03))

34. Mr James CHIU, President of HKFEMC, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission.

Hong Kong Aviation Club (HKAC)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)252/06-07(06))

35. Mr Alex YAN, President of HKAC, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission.

關注維港避風塘聯席會議 (聯席)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)252/06-07(07))

36. Mr NG Siu-yuen, Representative of 聯席, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission. He added that as one of the four pillars of the Hong Kong economy, the logistics industry could co-exist with the tourism industry and make long-term contributions to Hong Kong. Visual considerations should not be a justification for decommissioning the To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelter and Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter, which were important for sustaining the operation of the logistics industry.

Hong Kong Schools Sports Federation (HKSSF)

37. Mr Rilas CHIANG, Secretary-General of HKSSF, expressed support for the construction of the Stadium Complex as soon as possible because at present, there were insufficient venues for organizing sports events, especially sizable venues for large-scale events. As an illustration, he pointed out that although Hong Kong ranked first in the world in wheelchair fencing, an international wheelchair fencing competition had to be organized in the lobby of a hotel because of the lack of a suitable venue. He considered that early completion of the Stadium Complex would be of great benefit to the development of sports in Hong Kong.

Community Alliance on Kai Tak Development (CAKTD)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)284/06-07(03), tabled and issued to members on 15 November 2006)

38. Ms Michelle TANG and Ms Carman LEUNG, Members of CAKTD, delivered their presentations, the details of which were given in the relevant

submission.

The Hong Kong Institute of Architects (HKIA)

39. Mr Michael CHIANG, Chairman of Planning and Lands Committee of HKIA, commended the three-stage public engagement approach which allowed the assimilation of various views of the community. He suggested that there should be centralized conduits for underground public utilities and three-dimensional town planning. As regards connection with nearby districts, noting that Kai Tak would be connected with Kowloon City by an underground walkway, he suggested that underground walkways and elevated walkways with shopping facilities should also be provided to connect Kai Tak with other nearby districts. For the Heliport, he did not object to its proposed location at the tip of the former runway, but suggested that the location be adjusted so as to leave some space for the public to enjoy the view of the Victoria Harbour. As for facilities such as the Cruise Terminal and Stadium Complex, he urged the Administration to place emphasis on technology transfer during the implementation of the projects so that Hong Kong could build up its own pool of professionals in these types of projects and be better equipped to compete with other regions in future after completion of those projects.

The Administration's response

40. The Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) (PSPL) said that the Administration had adopted a planning approach with emphasis on community participation with three rounds of public engagement in planning for Kai Tak. All comments received had been given due consideration. The planning process had reached an advanced stage and should proceed to the statutory plan-making process. TPB discussed the relevant draft OZP on 10 November 2006 and the public could submit their views or representations to TPB in the two months following the gazettal of the draft OZPs.

41. DD of Plan said that the draft OZP was scheduled for gazettal on 24 November 2006. The public at large were supportive of the various major proposals in the revised PODP, such as the Cruise Terminal, environmentally friendly transport system (EFTS) and bridge link to Kwun Tong. While the Kwun Tong and To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelters would be retained, the Administration would address the re-provision issues arising from the closure of the Kwun Tong Public Cargo Working Area in the implementation stage. As regards the bridge link to Kwun Tong, a preliminary study showed that a bridge with a vertical clearance of 20m would probably be able to accommodate the EFTS, vehicular and pedestrian traffic. It would also be more acceptable from the visual impact perspective. There would be further public consultation after completion of more detailed investigations on this proposal. As for the Cruise Terminal, she pointed out that after detailed investigation, Kai Tak was identified as the preferred location in the Victoria Harbour taking into account relevant factors including expansion capability, the depth of water and the availability of infrastructure and

ancillary facilities. There were both supporting views on and concerns about the proposed location of the Heliport. The Administration considered that the proposed location was the most suitable one given the flight path requirement. The Administration had examined the proposals to retain the headquarters of the Hong Kong Air Cadet Corps. Apart from the existing facility, the Corps could also consider alternative site within Kai Tak. As regards the Tourism Node, she said that TPB had agreed that the maximum building height for the developments in the Tourism Node should be 100 mPD and the height restriction could be relaxed to 200 mPD for a landmark building that provided a public observation gallery. The master layout plan for the Tourism Node development with a site area of six hectares and a maximum plot ratio of about three, would have to be approved by TPB.

42. As regards the Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC), PSPL said that on-site pilot tests and model assessments had been conducted during the past year. Although the Administration had adopted a "zero reclamation" approach as a starting point, the water quality at KTAC and up-stream pollution would still have to be treated. The Administration hoped that KTAC could be used for recreational activities, such as rowing, in the long run after the water quality had reached the required standard. The Administration would soon submit a funding proposal for a detailed engineering feasibility study to the Public Works Subcommittee. She assured members that the planned developments in 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).

43. DD of Plan said that the planning for Kai Tak had been three-dimensional rather than two-dimensional. There would be enhanced pedestrian facilities, including landscaped walkways to connect the Stadium Complex with the Metro Park and underground shopping streets to improve the accessibility and integration with the surrounding districts. Building height and site coverage restrictions would be introduced to maintain an overall urban design framework for the Kai Tak Development. The revised PODP had allowed for possible future provision of underground utility corridors. While the general public had responded positively to the current proposals for connectivity between Kai Tak and nearby districts, the Administration would endeavour to examine further scope for enhancement could be identified for connecting Kai Tak with Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay.

Discussion

General comments, connectivity with neighbouring districts and transport infrastructure

44. Mr CHAN Kam-lam welcomed the proposals in the revised PODP. However, he expressed concern on whether there would be sufficient transport facilities in Kai Tak to meet the transport need of the residential population, working population and tourists. He considered that the Shatin to Central Link

alone might be inadequate in meeting the inter-district transport need of Kai Tak and urged the Administration to plan transport matters well in advance. He further asked whether transport infrastructure would be completed in time to serve the Cruise Terminal when it started to operate.

45. In response, PSPL assured members that there would be sufficient transport facilities to support the cruise terminal operation and a public transport interchange had already been planned in the area. The Administration would coordinate various projects to ensure their timely implementation. Temporary roads would be built if necessary as an additional complementary measure.

46. Miss CHAN Yuen-han was concerned that there would be many at-grade roads in Kai Tak. In particular, she pointed out that Road T2 should be built underground as far as possible.

47. Expressing a similar concern, Dr KWOK Ka-ki suggested that all roads on the former runway should be underground so that the public could freely enjoy the place.

48. In reply, the Project Manager/Kowloon of the Civil Engineering and Development Department said that Road T2 would mainly be built in the form of a tunnel. While he agreed that roads in Kai Tak should be underground or depressed as far as possible, it would be very difficult to design all the roads in Kai Tak underground because many existing roads, flyovers and interchanges already built at high levels required to be connected with the Central Kowloon Route. However, it was also the Administration's intention to eliminate as far as possible these high level roads and flyovers. The Administration would continue to try to solve the technical difficulties. As for the roads on the former runway, constructing all of them as underground roads would be very expensive, additional facilities such as ventilation systems and fire services systems would be required and maintenance costs would be very high. One option being explored was to build semi-sunken roads which would enable pedestrians to access the Kai Tak waterfront easily. PSPL added that there would be separation of pedestrians and vehicles along the former runway and at the transport interchange. Pedestrian access to the Runway Park and the waterfront promenade at the tip of the former runway would not be hampered by vehicles. Roads in Kai Tak would be built in a way to minimize noise and air pollution.

49. Miss CHOY So-yuk said that it was a very good phenomenon that the Administration was willing to listen and respond to the views of the public in the planning for Kai Tak. However, in relation to transport infrastructure, she asked whether the Administration would consider planning a mass transit railway system to serve Kai Tak.

50. In response, PSPL said that there would be an environmental friendly transport system in Kai Tak and the Shatin to Central Link would be connected with the Mass Transit Railway network so as to utilize resources to the fullest extent in meeting the transport needs of Kai Tak. The monorail system, if implemented, would be above ground level so that it could also serve a tourism purpose in addition to meeting transport needs.

Heliport

51. While appreciating that the Administration had adopted some of the suggestions from the public, such as preserving the former runway, and had to a certain extent achieved the objective of planning with the public planning, Miss CHAN Yuen-han considered that the proposed location of the Heliport at the tip of the former runway, the prime site in Kai Tak, was not the most desirable option. She also queried the justification for not constructing a roof-top Heliport simply for the sake of accommodating single-engine helicopters.

52. Dr KWOK Ka-ki also queried why the Heliport should occupy the prime site in Kai Tak. He considered that the site should be reserved for public enjoyment and constructing the Heliport at that location would deprive the public of the opportunity to use the site. In addition, the proposed location could not solve problems, such as noise pollution, arising from the operation of the Heliport. He enquired whether placing the Heliport at a location along the coastline to the north of KTAC would be a possible alternative.

53. In reply, the Principal Assistant Secretary for Economic Development and Labour (Economic Development) A2 explained that there were diverse views on the proposed location of the Heliport, and the Administration had been searching for the most appropriate site over the past years before arriving at the current proposal. He said overseas experience had demonstrated that single-engine helicopters were very important to heliport development because, when compared with dual-engine helicopters, they were less expensive, more fuel-saving, generated less noise and had a more flexible mode of operation. Constructing the Heliport at-grade and by the coastline would accommodate both single- and dual-engine helicopters, and the services offered would be more flexible and cost-effective. PSPL emphasized that a detailed study on the location of the Heliport had been conducted and the Administration would reserve a major portion of the tip of the former runway for public use.

Tourism node

54. As regards the proposed integrated tourism-related development of about 200 mPD high housing an observation gallery, Miss CHAN Yuen-han considered that the development was too high. Expressing a similar concern, Dr KWOK Ka-ki considered that what was needed would be just a small observation tower, not a 200-metre high-rise hotel with an observation galley. On this matter, Miss CHOY So-yuk pointed out that an observation gallery and a high-rise hotel

housing an observation gallery were two separate matters. If a landmark was indeed required, she suggested that it should be a thin observation tower, not a high-rise and massive hotel with an observation gallery. If an observation gallery was to be housed inside a hotel, the hotel building should be low-rise. Mr Albert CHAN considered that the best observation gallery in Hong Kong was at the Peak and there was no need to construct an observation gallery in Kai Tak, be it a thin or massive one. He strongly objected to the proposed integrated tourism-related development because it would further ruin the overall design outlook of Kai Tak.

55. In response, PSPL pointed out there would be a height restriction for the integrated tourism-related development and the detailed plan of the development would have to be approved by TPB. The planning process would be very transparent because the public could give views to TPB during the process and TPB would consider those views before making its decision.

Other planning issues

56. Mr Albert CHAN expressed disappointment at the planning for Kai Tak and considered it an end product of political deals. The current planning failed to meet public aspirations as the prime sites were designated for the Multi-purpose Stadium and Cruise Terminal, rather than for facilities to be used by the general public. He called on the public to voice out their objections to TPB. Pointing out that Kai Tak was an important opportunity for facilitating urban renewal, he considered that the Administration had failed to honour its pledge made in the 1990s of reserving land in Kai Tak to facilitate urban renewal for old and densely populated districts like Kwun Tong, Wong Tai Sin and Hung Hom. This would still be possible under the current planning for Kai Tak if the Administration made an effort to coordinate land development and administrative matters. Failing to capture the opportunity would be the Administration's biggest fault in land use and urban planning over the past 10-odd years.

57. In response, PSPL said that the whole planning process was transparent. Anyone could raise one's views on the planning for Kai Tak and the Administration would respect those views.

58. Mr Alan LEONG commented that the planning process for Kai Tak was the best among the major development projects that he had ever seen up to the present and the Government's interaction with the community had achieved its results. He understood that in order to proceed with the tendering and construction of the much-awaited Cruise Terminal, the Government had to first confirm the overall planning for Kai Tak. He asked whether there would still be room for further interaction with the public in the statutory planning process ahead.

59. In response, PSPL said that the Government had benefited from the interactive process. Under the statutory planning process, the interactive process would continue and as the whole development process would span over a decade,

TPB would review and consider amendments to the future approved OZP on Kai Tak to meet changing circumstances.

60. In relation to the tendering for the Cruise Terminal, Mr Alan LEONG requested the Administration to examine whether the proposed 50-year land grant for the Cruise Terminal, which would probably extend beyond 30 June 2047 was in conformity with the Basic Law and to provide information on whether there were any existing land grants extending beyond 30 June 2047.

61. In response, the Deputy Commissioner for Tourism said that the land grant for the Cruise Terminal would be processed in accordance with the existing land policy and the grantee would have a right of land development. Before tendering, the Administration would consult the relevant sectors, after which the detailed requirements would be decided. PSPL undertook to coordinate a reply to the questions raised by Mr Alan LEONG.

(Post-meeting note: The Administration's written reply (LC Paper No. CB(1)503/06-07(01)) was issued to members on 13 December 2006.)

III Any other business

Matters arising from the meeting on 20 September 2006

62. In relation to the subject on "Land administration issues arising from the case involving a site under short-term tenancy in Kwun Yam Shan, Sha Tin" discussed at the special meeting on 20 September 2006, Mr LEE Wing-tat noted that not all parties were willing to accept the Panel's invitation to attend a meeting to further discuss the subject and asked whether those who had declined the Panel's invitation should be invited again because he considered that they were involved in the matter. Dr KWOK Ka-ki considered that they should be invited again because more information would then be available for a better understanding of the matter. Mr Albert CHAN pointed out that in the past, even senior officials would be willing to attend meetings of panels of the Legislative Council after their retirement. He also supported the suggestion to invite again those who had declined the Panel's invitation and pointed out that the need or otherwise for their attendance was not a matter for them to decide.

63. The Chairman agreed that those who had declined the Panel's previous invitation should be invited again to attend a meeting if possible.

III Any other business

64. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 5:35 pm.