

立法會
Legislative Council

Ref : CB2/DC/KC/06

**Extract from Minutes of Meeting between Legislative Council Members
and Kowloon City District Council Members
on Thursday, 9 November 2006, at 10:45 am
in Conference Room A of the Legislative Council Building**

Members present : Hon LI Fung-ying, BBS, JP (Convenor)
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon Jasper TSANG Yok-sing, GBS, JP
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-ye, GBS, JP
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, JP
Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, SBS, JP

By Invitation : **Kowloon City District Council**

Ir WONG Kwok-keung, JP (Chairman)
Mr CHAN Ka-wai (Vice Chairman)
Mr CHAN King-wong
Mr Ringo CHIANG Sai-cheong, MH
Mr HO Hin-ming
Mr IP Che-kin, MH
Mr LEE Kin-kan
Ms LI Lin
Mr Bruce LIU Sing-lee
Ms Rosanda MOK Ka-han
Mr NG Ching-man
Ms SIU Yuen-sheung, BBS, JP
Mr WEN Choy-bon, MH
Dr WONG Yee-him

In attendance : Mr Alba AU Kam-wing
Clerk to Kowloon City District Council

Staff in Attendance : Miss Flora TAI
Chief Council Secretary (2)2

Ms Rebecca LEE
Council Secretary (Social Functions)

Action

X X X X X X X

V. Cruise Terminal

46. Mr CHAN King-wong told the meeting that cruise vacation was an emerging tourism industry in Hong Kong as well as the rest of the world. Although the Government planned to build a cruise terminal in Kai Tak, the progress was slow. On the other hand, our competitor, Singapore, had taken the lead and confirmed that a new world-class cruise terminal would be completed by 2010. He expressed concern over a number of issues such as whether the building of a cruise terminal could be proceeded on schedule, the scale of the project, the funding arrangement, the implications on the surrounding areas and the ancillary support facilities. Mr CHAN also doubted whether LegCo Members had made their best efforts to urge the Government to step up the work in this regard.

47. The Convenor responded that according to the information paper provided to LegCo by the Government, a site in the Preliminary Outline Development Plan for the Kai Tak Development had been earmarked for the development of a cruise terminal. As regards the details, the Government advised that it would further consult the public to gauge their views. Consultants would be engaged to work out the costs required for the entire development.

48. Mr Jasper TSANG pointed out that in fact, the paper provided to LegCo by the Government had announced that at this stage, it would invite tender for the new cruise terminal so that the first berth could be completed in 2012. The Government advised that the cruise terminal in Kai Tak would provide up to three berths and some of them could accommodate large cruise vessels. As regards the reasons for taking six years to give the green light to build a cruise terminal in Kai Tak, the Government

explained that it had to wait for the outcome of the Environmental Impact Assessment study to resolve the problem arising from the KTAC. He further advised that several years ago, the Government decided to develop the cruise terminal at the southern end of the former runway at the Kai Tak Airport. However, building a cruise terminal would constitute reclamation for the purposes of the Protection of Harbour Ordinance (PHO). Such reclamation should only proceed if the overriding public need test, pursuant to the judgment of the Court of Final Appeal on the application of the PHO, was satisfied. The Government therefore solicited public views again to gauge market feedback on whether there were feasible locations for a cruise terminal other than Kai Tak. Nevertheless, none of the suggestions received were considered feasible.

49. Mr CHAN King-wong hoped that the Government would look at the whole picture when making any plans in future. Moreover, it should take a proactive and forward-looking approach instead of having the entire development of certain projects being delayed by other issues. In this connection, he was worried about whether the new cruise terminal could be ready for commissioning in 2010.

50. Ms SIU Yuen-sheung hoped that LegCo could play a monitoring role to ensure that the Government would take forward the construction of the cruise terminal expeditiously, in particular, the design work which she considered important. She hoped that the Government would take into account the environmental development of the neighbouring community when designing the cruise terminal. However, should the Government have any environmental considerations which overrode community interest regarding the design, she would render her support.

51. Mr Frederick FUNG pointed out that LegCo and KCDC shared similar view on this issue. He said that while LegCo had various concerns, KCDC was mainly concerned about district issues. Therefore, he called upon members of KCDC to put in their efforts to galvanize the work of the Government. Citing his experience as a member of the Sham Shui Po (SSP) DC as an example, he pointed out that SSPDC had exerted its influence on certain district issues. For instance, the tender exercise for the works of the West Rail Nam Cheong Station had to be suspended due to SSPDC's pressure.

52. Mr LEE Kin-kan pointed out that according to the existing plan, the first berth would be very close to the edge of the runway and situated next to a heliport. As such, the harbour view available for public enjoyment was limited. Although he

reckoned that it would be more beneficial to the economy to provide more berths in the new cruise terminal, the harbour view which could be enjoyed by the general public or those who were not cruise passengers might be more limited as a result. Therefore, he hoped that the Government would take this point into consideration.

LegCo Secretariat 53. In response, the Convenor pointed out that the LegCo Panel on Economic Services (ES Panel) would discuss the construction of the cruise terminal. She suggested that the concerns and views of KCDC on this issue be conveyed to the ES Panel for reference. Members agreed. She also suggested that KCDC might consider submitting its written views to the ES Panel.

LegCo Secretariat 54. Mr Frederick FUNG suggested that the Secretariat should inform KCDC after the ES Panel had decided on the date of the meeting in which the said discussion would be held, so that members of KCDC could consider whether they would observe the meeting for the discussion.

X X X X X X X