



圖例 NOTATION

ZONES	地帶
COMMERCIAL (C)	商業
COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT AREA (CDA)	綜合發展區
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP A) (RA)	住宅(甲類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP B) (RB)	住宅(乙類)
GOVERNMENT, INSTITUTION OR COMMUNITY (GIC)	政府、機構或社區
OPEN SPACE (O)	休憩用地
OTHER SPECIFIED USES (AMENITY AREA) (OU)	其他指定用途(美化休憩地帶)
OTHER SPECIFIED USES (AMENITY AREA) (OUA)	其他指定用途(美化休憩地帶)
COMMUNICATIONS	交通
RAILWAY AND STATION (UNDERGROUND)	鐵路及車站(地下)
RAILWAY AND STATION (ELEVATED)	鐵路及車站(高架)
ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY LINKAGE SYSTEM AND STATION	環保連接系統及車站
MAJOR ROAD AND JUNCTION	主要道路及路口
ELEVATED ROAD	高架道路
PEDESTRIAN PROMENADE / STREET	行人專用區/街道
MISCELLANEOUS	其他
BOUNDARY OF PLANNING SCHEME	規劃範圍界線
BUILDING HEIGHT CONTROL ZONE BOUNDARY	建築物高度管制區界線
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT (RELATIVE TO PRINCIPAL DATUM)	最高建築物高度(在主要基準面上量度)
PETROL FILLING STATION	加油站
AREA DESIGNATED FOR SHOP AND SERVICE AND EATING PLACE USES ONLY (WATERFRONT PROMENADE)	只限於指定為「商店及服務行業」和「食肆」用途的地帶(指定為「海濱廊道」的地帶)
NON-BUILDING AREA	非建築用地

土地用途及面積一覽表 SCHEDULE OF USES AND AREAS

USES	土地用途	面積	百分比	用途
COMMERCIAL	商業	15.22	5.02	商業
COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT AREA	綜合發展區	9.82	2.98	綜合發展區
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP A)	住宅(甲類)	15.25	4.72	住宅(甲類)
RESIDENTIAL (GROUP B)	住宅(乙類)	35.65	8.25	住宅(乙類)
GOVERNMENT, INSTITUTION OR COMMUNITY	政府、機構或社區	17.30	11.45	政府、機構或社區
OPEN SPACE	休憩用地	98.19	30.38	休憩用地
OTHER SPECIFIED USES	其他指定用途	40.82	15.66	其他指定用途
OTHER SPECIFIED USES (AMENITY AREA)	其他指定用途(美化休憩地帶)	3.19	0.99	其他指定用途(美化休憩地帶)
MAJOR ROAD ETC.	主要道路等	65.45	20.55	主要道路等
TOTAL PLANNING SCHEME AREA	規劃範圍總面積	303.20	100.00	規劃範圍總面積

本圖的《註釋》是這份圖則的一部分，現經修訂並按《城市規劃條例》第5條展示。THE ATTACHED NOTES ALSO FORM PART OF THIS PLAN AND HAVE BEEN AMENDED FOR EXHIBITION UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

核准圖號 S/K 22/4 的修訂 AMENDMENTS TO APPROVED PLAN No. S/K22/4

按照《城市規劃條例》第5條展示的修訂

AMENDMENTS EXHIBITED UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

修訂項目 A 1 項 AMENDMENT ITEM A1 修訂項目 A 2 項 AMENDMENT ITEM A2 修訂項目 A 3 項 AMENDMENT ITEM A3 修訂項目 A 4 項 AMENDMENT ITEM A4 修訂項目 B 項 AMENDMENT ITEM B 修訂項目 C 項 AMENDMENT ITEM C 修訂項目 D 1 項 AMENDMENT ITEM D1 修訂項目 D 2 項 AMENDMENT ITEM D2 修訂項目 E 項 AMENDMENT ITEM E 修訂項目 F 項 AMENDMENT ITEM F 修訂項目 G 1 項 AMENDMENT ITEM G1 修訂項目 G 2 項 AMENDMENT ITEM G2 修訂項目 H 1 項 AMENDMENT ITEM H1 修訂項目 H 2 項 AMENDMENT ITEM H2 修訂項目 H 3 項 AMENDMENT ITEM H3 修訂項目 H 4 項 AMENDMENT ITEM H4 修訂項目 I 項 AMENDMENT ITEM I 修訂項目 J 項 AMENDMENT ITEM J 修訂項目 K 項 AMENDMENT ITEM K 修訂項目 L 項 AMENDMENT ITEM L 修訂項目 M 1 項 AMENDMENT ITEM M1 修訂項目 M 2 項 AMENDMENT ITEM M2 修訂項目 M 3 項 AMENDMENT ITEM M3	修訂項目 M 4 項 AMENDMENT ITEM M4 修訂項目 M 5 項 AMENDMENT ITEM M5 修訂項目 N 1 項 AMENDMENT ITEM N1 修訂項目 N 2 項 AMENDMENT ITEM N2 修訂項目 O 項 AMENDMENT ITEM O 修訂項目 P 項 AMENDMENT ITEM P 修訂項目 Q 項 AMENDMENT ITEM Q 修訂項目 R 項 AMENDMENT ITEM R 修訂項目 S 項 AMENDMENT ITEM S 修訂項目 T 項 AMENDMENT ITEM T 修訂項目 U 1 項 AMENDMENT ITEM U1 修訂項目 U 2 項 AMENDMENT ITEM U2 修訂項目 U 3 項 AMENDMENT ITEM U3 修訂項目 V 1 項 AMENDMENT ITEM V1 修訂項目 V 2 項 AMENDMENT ITEM V2 修訂項目 W 1 項 AMENDMENT ITEM W1 修訂項目 W 2 項 AMENDMENT ITEM W2 修訂項目 W 3 項 AMENDMENT ITEM W3 修訂項目 W 4 項 AMENDMENT ITEM W4 修訂項目 W 5 項 AMENDMENT ITEM W5 修訂項目 W 6 項 AMENDMENT ITEM W6 修訂項目 W 7 項 AMENDMENT ITEM W7
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

(參看附表)
(SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)

2017年2月17日 根據《城市規劃條例》第5條展示的
 核准圖號 S/K22/4 的修訂
 AMENDMENTS TO APPROVED PLAN No. S/K22/4 EXHIBITED
 UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE ON
 17 FEBRUARY 2017

Ma Jacinta K. C. Woo
 胡潔貞女士
 SECRETARY
 TOWN PLANNING BOARD

香港城市規劃委員會依據城市規劃條例擬備的啟德(九龍規劃區第22區)分區計劃大綱圖
TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE, HONG KONG TOWN PLANNING BOARD
KOWLOON PLANNING AREA No. 22 - KAI TAK - OUTLINE ZONING PLAN

製圖者遵照城市規劃委員會指示
 PREPARED BY THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT UNDER
 THE DIRECTION OF THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD

圖則編號
 PLAN No. **S/K22/5**

**SCHEDULE OF AMENDMENTS TO THE
APPROVED KAI TAK OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/K22/4
MADE BY THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD
UNDER THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE (Chapter 131)**

I. Amendments to Matters shown on the Plan

Kai Tak City Centre

- Item A1 - Rezoning of an area to the north of the proposed Shatin to Central Link To Kwa Wan Station from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”), “Commercial (3)” (“C(3)”) and areas shown as ‘Road’ and ‘Pedestrian Precinct/Street’ to “Open Space (3)” (“O(3)”).
- Item A2 - Rezoning of a strip of land between Road D1 and Road L16 from “C(3)”, “G/IC” and area shown as ‘Pedestrian Precinct/Street’ to area shown as ‘Road’.
- Item A3 - Rezoning of an area abutting Road D1 from “C(3)” to “G/IC” with stipulation of building height restriction.
- Item A4 - Rezoning of an area at the western end of Road L16 from “O” to area shown as ‘Road’, a strip of land at the western end of Road L16 from “O” and area shown as ‘Road’ to area shown as ‘Pedestrian Precinct/Street’, and an area to the further south-east of the said ‘Pedestrian Precinct/Street’ from area shown as ‘Road’ to “O”.
- Item B - Revision to the stipulated building height restrictions for four sites zoned “C(3)” abutting Road L7 and to the north of Road L16 and rezoning of a site near the western end of Road L16 from “G/IC” and area shown as ‘Pedestrian Precinct/Street’ to “C(3)” with stipulation of building height restriction and designation of non-building area (NBA).
- Item C - Revision to the stipulated building height restrictions for three sites to the north-east and south-east of Road L7 zoned “Comprehensive Development Area (3)” (“CDA(3)”), “CDA(4)” and “CDA(5)” and designation of land along the frontages of the three sites facing the “O(3)” zone as areas for ‘Shop and Services’ and ‘Eating Place’ uses only.
- Item D1 - Rezoning of a site at the southern end of Road L7 from “Residential (Group B)1” (“R(B)1”) to “R(B)6” with stipulation of building height restriction.
- Item D2 - Rezoning of four sites zoned “R(B)1” and a strip of land to the south-east of Road L16 zoned “O” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “Residential (Group A)4” (“R(A)4”) with stipulation of building height restrictions and deletion of the designation of the area for ‘Shop and Services’ and ‘Eating Place’ uses only within these four sites.

- Item E - Rezoning of a site abutting Road L1 and Concorde Road from “G/IC” to “C(8)” with stipulation of building height restriction and designation of NBA.
- Item F - Revision to the stipulated building height restriction for a site zoned “G/IC” at the junction of Road D2 and Road D3.
- Item G1 - Rezoning of two areas near the ring road of the proposed Central Kowloon Route from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Amenity” (“OU(A)”) and areas shown as ‘Road’ to “O”.
- Item G2 - Rezoning of the areas near the junction of Road D2 and Road D3 from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Tunnel Ventilation Shaft and Administration Building” to “OU(A)”.

South Apron

- Item H1 - Rezoning of an area between Kai Fuk Road and the proposed Central Kowloon Route from “G/IC” and areas shown as ‘Road’ to “C(8)” with stipulation of building height restriction.
- Item H2 - Rezoning of an area abutting Road L10 from “G/IC”, “O” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “C(1)” with stipulation of building height restriction and rezoning of a strip of land at the junction of Road L10 and Road L18 from “G/IC” to area shown as ‘Road’.
- Item H3 - Rezoning of areas shown as ‘Road’ and “G/IC” to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Landscaped Elevated Walkway” (“OU(Landscaped Elevated Walkway)”) to reflect the re-alignment of elevated walkways and corresponding deletion of the originally proposed elevated walkway by rezoning the areas zoned “OU(Landscaped Elevated Walkway)” to “C(1)”, “C(8)” and areas shown as ‘Road’.
- Item H4 - Rezoning of an area at the north-western part of the South Apron near the proposed Central Kowloon Route from area shown as ‘Road’ to “O”.
- Item I - Rezoning of two areas adjoining the existing petrol filling stations at Kai Fuk Road from “G/IC” and areas shown as ‘Road’ to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Petrol Filling Station” (“OU(PFS)”) with stipulation of building height restriction and rezoning of two strips of land nearby from “G/IC” to areas shown as ‘Road’.
- Item J - Rezoning of an area between the proposed Central Kowloon Route and a site zoned “G/IC” to the south-west of Kwun Tong Bypass from area shown as ‘Road’ to “G/IC” and revision to the stipulated building height restriction of the enlarged “G/IC” zone.
- Item K - Rezoning of an area to the south of the existing petrol filling stations at Kai Fuk Road from area shown as ‘Road’ to “G/IC” with stipulation of building height restriction.

- Item L - Rezoning of a strip of land between two sites zoned “G/IC” to the south of Kwun Tong Bypass from “OU(Landscaped Elevated Walkway)” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “G/IC” with stipulation of building height restriction and a strip of land across Road L18 from area shown as ‘Road’ to “OU(Landscaped Elevated Walkway)”.
- Item M1 - Rezoning of an area between Kwun Tong Bypass and Trunk Road T2 from “OU(A)”, “OU(Landscaped Elevated Walkway)” and areas shown as ‘Road’ to “G/IC” with stipulation of building height restriction and revision to the stipulated building height restriction of the northern portion of a site zoned “G/IC” .
- Item M2 - Revision to the stipulated building height restriction of a site zoned “G/IC” at the junction of Cheung Yip Street and Shing Cheong Road.
- Item M3 - Rezoning of the southern part of a site near the junction of Road D4 and Shing Cheong Road from “G/IC” to area shown as ‘Road’ and “OU(Landscaped Elevated Walkway)”.
- Item M4 - Revisions to the building height sub-zone boundary and the respective stipulated building height restrictions for a site zoned “G/IC” at the junction of Cheung Yip Street and Shing Cheong Road.
- Item M5 - Rezoning of two strips of land across Shing Cheong Road and Kwun Tong Bypass from areas shown as ‘Road’ to “OU(Landscaped Elevated Walkway)” to reflect the re-alignment of the elevated walkways and corresponding deletion of the originally proposed elevated walkways by rezoning the respective walkways across Shing Cheong Road and Kwun Tong Bypass from “OU(Landscaped Elevated Walkway)” to areas shown as ‘Road’.
- Item N1 - Rezoning of a site at Cheung Yip Street from “C(2)”, “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Gas Pigging Station” and “O” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “R(B)2” with stipulation of building height restrictions and designation of two building height sub-zones.
- Item N2 - Rezoning of two areas from “C(2)” and “O” to areas shown as ‘Road’ and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “O” to reflect the latest alignment of Kai Hing Road.

Runway Area

- Item O - Rezoning of four sites facing Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter from “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”) to “R(B)7”, “R(B)5” and “R(B)4” with stipulation of building height restrictions.
- Item P - Rezoning of a site to the south-east of Road L12C from “R(C)” to “C(4)” with stipulation of building height restriction.

- Item Q - Rezoning of three sites facing To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelter from “C(4)” to “R(B)7”, “R(B)5” and “R(B)4” respectively with stipulation of building height restrictions.
- Item R - Rezoning of two sites abutting Road L13A from “C(4)” to “C(7)” and “C(5)” respectively with stipulation of building height restrictions.
- Item S - Rezoning of a site to the west of Road D4 and its adjoining area from “R(C)” and “O” respectively to “R(B)5” with stipulation of building height restriction and designation of NBAs.
- Item T - Rezoning of a site facing To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelter and its adjoining area from “C(4)” and “O” respectively to “R(B)5” with stipulation of building height restriction and designation of NBAs.
- Item U1 - Rezoning of an area abutting Road D3 from “O” to “R(B)4” with stipulation of building height restriction.
- Item U2 - Rezoning of an area to the further south of Road D3 facing To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelter from “O” to “R(B)4” with stipulation of building height restriction and designation of NBAs.
- Item U3 - Rezoning of a strip of land and an area zoned “O” to the south of Road D3 to areas shown as ‘Pedestrian Precinct/Street’ and area shown as ‘Road’ respectively.
- Item V1 - Rezoning of a site abutting Road D3 from “O” to “G/IC” with stipulation of building height restriction.
- Item V2 - Rezoning of a section of Road D3 from area shown as ‘Road’ to “O(2)” for a proposed landscaped deck atop the relevant section of the road.

Cha Kwo Ling Waterfront

- Item W1 - Rezoning of a piece of land at Wai Yip Street/Cha Kwo Ling Road from “O”, “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Sewage Treatment Plant with Landscaped Deck Above”, “OU(PFS)”, “OU” annotated “Tunnel Ventilation Shaft and Administration Building” and areas shown as ‘Road’ to “G/IC” with stipulation of building height restrictions and designation of two building height sub-zones.
- Item W2 - Rezoning of a site to the south-east of Kwun Tong Sewage Pumping Station from “OU” annotated “Sewage Treatment Plant with Landscaped Deck Above” to “OU(PFS)” with stipulation of building height restriction.
- Item W3 - Rezoning of a site to the south-east of Kwun Tong Sewage Pumping Station from “OU” annotated “Sewage Treatment Plant with Landscaped Deck Above” to “O”.

- Item W4 - Rezoning of a strip of land connecting Wai Yip Street from “OU” annotated “Sewage Treatment Plant with Landscaped Deck Above” and “O” to area shown as ‘Road’.
- Item W5 - Rezoning of an area to the west of Cha Kwo Ling Road from “OU” annotated “Tunnel Ventilation Shaft and Administration Building” and area shown as ‘Road’ to “O”.
- Item W6 - Rezoning of a strip of land along Cha Kwo Ling Road from “O” and “OU” annotated “Tunnel Ventilation Shaft and Administration Building” to area shown as ‘Road’.
- Item W7 - Rezoning of an area along Cha Kwo Ling Road from area shown as ‘Road’ to “G/IC” with stipulation of building height restriction.

Showing the railway alignment for the Shatin to Central Link authorized under the Railways Ordinance (Chapter 519) on 27 March 2012 and the road alignment for the Central Kowloon Route authorized under the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (Chapter 370) on 5 January 2016 by the Chief Executive in Council respectively on the Plan for information. The authorized railway scheme and road scheme shall be deemed to be approved pursuant to section 13A of the Town Planning Ordinance.

II. Amendments to the Notes of the Plan

- (a) Revision to the Remarks of the Notes for the “C” zone to revise the plot ratio restrictions for the “C(3)” and “C(4)” zones, and to incorporate plot ratio and site coverage restrictions for the new “C(1)”, “C(5)”, “C(7)” and “C(8)” zones and a clause clarifying the plot ratio calculation relating to railway facilities for a “C(3)” site.
- (b) Revision to the Remarks of the Notes for the “CDA” zone to revise the plot ratio restrictions for the “CDA(3)”, “CDA(4)” and “CDA(5)” zones, and to incorporate the requirement of the provision of ‘Shop and Services’ and ‘Eating Place’ uses in buildings not exceeding 2 storeys for the “CDA(3)” and “CDA(4)” zones.
- (c) Revision to the Remarks of the Notes for the “R(A)” zone to stipulate the plot ratio restriction for the new “R(A)4” zone.
- (d) Revision to the Schedule of Uses of the “R(B)” zone to amend the provisions regarding the circumstances where ‘Shop and Services’ and ‘Eating Place’ uses are always permitted.
- (e) Revision to the planning intention of the “R(B)” zone and incorporation of plot ratio and site coverage restrictions for the new “R(B)4”, “R(B)5”, “R(B)6” and “R(B)7” zones in the Remarks of the Notes for the “R(B)” zone.

- (f) Revision to the Remarks of the Notes for the “R(B)” zone to incorporate the requirement of the provision of ‘Shop and Services’ and ‘Eating Place’ uses in buildings not exceeding 2 storeys for the “R(B)6” zone.
- (g) Deletion of the set of Notes for the “R(C)” zone.
- (h) Incorporation of ‘Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Water Sports/Water Recreation only)’ as a Column 1 use in the Schedule of Uses for “O” zone and corresponding amendment to replace ‘Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture’ under Column 2 by ‘Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (not elsewhere specified)’.
- (i) Revision to the planning intention of the “O” zone.

Town Planning Board

17 February 2017

(Extract of Minutes of KTDC meeting held on 2.3.2017)

議項 IV – 《啟德分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/K22/5》所收納的修訂項目
(觀塘區議會文件第 11/2017 號)

15. 主席歡迎規劃署九龍規劃專員葉子季先生和城市規劃師/九龍 6 林達良先生、土木工程拓展署總工程師/九龍 1(九龍)徐仕基先生和高級工程師/6(九龍)陳炳華先生、職業訓練局副執行幹事梁任城先生，以及奧雅納工程顧問公司楊詠珊女士協助討論。

16. 葉專員介紹文件。

17. 主席表示，麗港城業主委員會(第一、二、四期及三期)在會前來信，並一併提交共二萬多個居民的簽名(第一、二、四期：21 077 個；三期：980

個)，反對將茶果嶺海旁一幅「休憩用地」改劃為「政府、機構或社區」地帶，用以興建職業訓練局(下稱「職訓局」)校舍。主席表示來信及簽名已轉交予署方，以把居民意見轉達城市規劃委員會(下稱「城規會」)考慮，並呼籲署方與居民保持溝通和良性互動。

18. 議員提出的查詢及意見如下：

18.1 鄧咏駿議員指出，署方上一次到區議會並未透露具體的校舍設計，亦未有諮詢居民及持份者，故他已向主席提出動議，並獲張順華議員及呂東孩議員和議，反對城規會將一幅位於偉業街/茶果嶺道的「休憩用地」改劃為「政府、機構或社區」地帶，背景及理由如下：

18.1.1 觀塘為全港 18 區人口最稠密的區域，然而特區政府在過去幾年間仍然不斷在觀塘區插建房屋，使觀塘居民能夠享用的綠化休憩用地不斷減少。尤其觀塘海濱的休憩用地與其他區域相比，更是相形見拙，故此觀塘海濱用地及規劃長期受區內居民所關注。

18.1.2 城規會於 2 月 17 日刊憲，公布茶果嶺海旁的「休憩用地」改劃為「政府、機構或社區」地帶，以興建職訓局分校。在公布這項建議之前，政府並未諮詢麗港城及鄰近社區不同持份者的意見，更未有考慮這項建議對鄰近社區的持份者帶來的影響。基於上述的前題及下述之考慮，堅決反對城規會將偉業街/茶果嶺道的「休憩用地」改劃為「政府、機構或社區」地帶：

(a) 周邊配套不足，爭奪鄰近社區資源：現時方案選址鄰近麗港城，而區內只有兩個商場，食肆及商鋪有限，僅足以支持當區居民。倘若有關計劃得以落實，將會對麗港城的社區資源造成無法彌補的傷害；況且麗港城的居民尚在擔心因高嶺土礦場的建屋計劃而遷入的 6 600 位新居民會對他們造成怎樣的影響。

- (b) 計劃中的建築高度必然造成屏風效應：現時選址位於麗港城通風廊上，而建議高度達主水平基準上 70 米，這個高度勢必嚴重影響區內通風，造成屏風效應，絕對不能接受。
- (c) 交通不便，嚴重增加周邊交通負荷：建議位置遠離地鐵站，由藍田站步行需時超過 10 分鐘。目前來往麗港城及藍田港鐵站 D1 出口的人流已呈飽和，道路及出入口已十分擠迫。日後高嶺土礦場規劃完成後必更為加重該段行人通道的負荷。倘若計劃得以落實，職訓局為數近萬學生及教職員加入使用同一通道，而且集中在早晚的繁忙時段，勢必迫滿整段茜發道及邨內通道，引致維修費用增加，屆時必然嚴重影響居民日常生活質素。

- 18.2 張順華議員就文件中 W 項的改變土地用途建議提出反對。他期望觀塘海濱長廊可延伸至麗港城對出海濱，以至油塘及鯉魚門。對於在擬議地段興建職訓局大樓，他有所保留，並質疑是否有此需要。他補充，茜發道擴闊後僅足以配合目前居民的需要，無法應付更多的人流。
- 18.3 呂東孩議員表示，在上一次會議已明確要求署方就改劃建議諮詢茶果嶺及附近受影響的居民，他希望署方在呈交建議予城規會之前能完成有關的諮詢工作。此外，他和議鄧咏駿議員的動議。
- 18.4 畢東尼議員反對按文件中的規劃建議興建職訓局校舍。他詢問署方：(i)K9 橋拆卸後的交通配套為何；以及(ii)啟德發展區毗鄰觀塘的核心商業區，道路網絡能否負荷未來的交通流量。
- 18.5 莫建成議員反對在沿海地段興建職訓局校舍，擔心近八千名師生出入會對鄰近區域的交通及社區設施有負面影響，並進一步加劇觀塘區的交通擠塞情況。

- 18.6 洪錦鉉議員詢問署方：(i)未來九龍城區萬一發生嚴重交通事故，如何解決啟德發展區因沒有其他出入道路而可能引致的交通癱瘓；(ii)為何規劃概念圖中沒有區議會所建議連接觀塘區的天橋；(iii)動物管理中心能否改為獸醫醫院；(iv)單軌鐵路系統現時的進度為何；以及(v)將來職訓局師生若未能使用麗港城通道設施前往校舍，有何解決方法。
- 18.7 柯創盛議員表示，署方自上次到區議會後，未有就議員及居民的關注作出諮詢、回應及跟進。他建議署方考慮：(i)確切回應議員及麗港城居民對社區及交通設施問題的憂慮及關注；(ii)在區議會通過反對動議後作出適當的跟進；以及(iii)匯報啟德發展區以至觀塘區的交通網絡建設有何進展。
- 18.8 譚肇卓議員表示，不認同署方在高嶺土礦場用地發展及麗港城休憩用地改劃事宜上漠視民意的做法。
- 18.9 姚柏良議員指出，擬建職訓局校舍會阻礙吹向麗港城的東南風及其海景景觀。他建議署方考慮另覓地點興建校舍。
- 18.10 張琪騰議員表示，署方文件並沒有回應議員較早時提出的關注。他建議署方：(i)重新考慮職訓局校舍的選址；(ii)正視觀塘區現時交通嚴重擠塞的情況；以及(iii)保留珍貴的休憩用地。
- 18.11 黎樹濠議員明白麗港城居民反對改劃建議的原因。對於署方在未有解決交通問題的情況下不斷在觀塘區進行發展，他表示未能接受。

19. 署方及職訓局的代表就議員的查詢及意見回應如下：

- 19.1 大綱圖諮詢程序：署方表示去年 11 月就《啟德發展檢討研究》發展建議到區議會進行諮詢，其中包括涉及職訓局新校舍的改劃建議。署方會繼續聆聽區議員的意見，優化有關規劃。此外，署方在去年 11 月的會議後也出席

了於麗港城舉行的居民大會，向地區人士解釋有關改劃建議，並把收到的區議會的意見及地區人士的反對意見向城規會反映。城規會在考慮有關意見後，同意大綱圖的修訂，並在大綱圖的《說明書》特別訂明校舍設計須考慮海濱環境，並須確保在視覺上與周圍發展互相協調。此外，發展項目應採納特別的設計考慮因素，包括關設公用通道、把建築物後移，以及與毗連的已規劃海濱長廊互相融合。署方希望藉是次會議提供更多資料予區議會考慮，並承諾會在日後詳細設計階段再次諮詢區議會。至於大綱圖修訂的諮詢剛開始，根據《城市規劃條例》，修訂後的大綱圖須公開展示兩個月，公眾可提出申述。城規會稍後會進行公眾聆訊，已提交申述的公眾人士可出席聆訊，直接表達他們的意見。署方會將主席在會前所轉交的麗港城業主委員會的信件及約二萬個麗港城居民的反對簽名，和區議會的會議記錄一併提交予城規會考慮。

- 19.2 麗港城行人與車輛通道：署方指出茜發道為公共道路，可供公眾使用，而麗港城部分行人通道亦可開放予公眾使用，地契上亦有此規定。職訓局亦會尊重地區人士的意見，並會提出合宜的方案回應其訴求。
- 19.3 啟德發展區交通網絡：土木工程拓展署表示，連接啟德發展區與新蒲崗的行人車道即將開通，屆時橫跨太子道東近采頤花園的 K9 橋將會拆卸，由於兩者位置相若，後者拆卸後不會影響附近一帶交通。此外，日後沙中線、六號幹線及將軍澳-藍田隧道通車後，來往九龍西與九龍東之間的人流及車流將得以大大紓緩，故預期啟德發展區落成後不會對觀塘區交通造成影響。若連接啟德發展區與九龍城區的道路發生事故，除了圍繞啟德區的三條主要道路外(D2路、L1路及D1路)，亦有其他道路可以疏導交通，包括上述快將落成連接新蒲崗的行人車道，而橫跨太子道東近富豪酒店的天橋亦將會重新接駁，至於啟德區內亦會有直接出入口前往未來的中九龍幹線，將前往九龍西的車輛分流，無須途經宋王臺道及太子道東。署方現正就連接前跑道末端與觀塘區的天橋及環保連接系統一併進行可行性研究，預計年內會進行公眾諮詢。

19.4 職訓局擬建校舍：職訓局表示，興建新校舍目的並非為擴大局方規模，而是以較大的校舍整合不同分校，以產生協同效應，並會交出這些位於市區的校舍，包括長沙灣的黃克競分校及曉明街的觀塘分校，故學生人數不會因興建新校舍而大大增加。局方曾多次與麗港城居民溝通，明白居民對未來八千多名師生及員工使用藍田港鐵站、巴士站及麗港城公共設施的關注。局方將聯同顧問就此再作評估，並會繼續研究如何優化校舍景觀及通風廊等設計。若有需要興建教學酒店，局方會向城規會提交申請。

20. 主席報告收到由鄧咏駿議員動議，並獲張順華議員及呂東孩議員和議的臨時動議，內容如下：

「反對城規會就偉業街/茶果嶺道的「休憩用地」改劃為「政府、機構或社區」地帶」

21. 經討論及投票後，動議以 27 票贊成、0 票反對及 2 票棄權(陳國華議員授權柯創盛議員投票)獲得通過。

22. 主席呼籲署方：(i)將已獲通過的動議轉交予城規會；以及(ii)聯同職訓局繼續與麗港城居民溝通。

(符碧珍議員於下午 6 時正離場。)

(Extract of Minutes of WTSDC meeting held on 7.3.2017)

(iii) 《啟德分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/K22/5》所收納的修訂項目
(黃大仙區議會文件第 18/2017 號)

77. 主席歡迎為議題出席會議的規劃署九龍規劃專員葉子季先生、土木工程拓展署總工程師／九龍 1(九龍)徐仕基先生及土木工程拓展署高級工程師／6(九龍)陳炳華先生。

78. 主席邀請規劃署葉子季先生介紹文件。

79. 葉子季先生以簡報輔助介紹文件。

80. 胡志偉議員表示麗港城居民對茶果嶺海旁區域的發展計劃表達關注。由於職業訓練局(職訓局)會對當區交通加重負擔，因此希望規劃署重新審視該選址及發展規模是否合適。另外，胡議員認為研究當中的單軌列車經濟效益成疑，只能將人流疏導至主要鐵路系統，就此查詢規劃署在新增發展項目後，如何將人流帶入及帶出新發展區。

81. 葉子季先生回應表示，本年施政報告提及政府將加強對職業教育發展的支持，並提供土地供職訓局興建具規模及現代化的新校舍。經考慮職訓局的選址要求後，即校舍選址須位於市區，用地面積為三至五公頃，及選址有利新校舍盡快落成，規劃署認為茶果嶺海旁用地符合職訓局有關選址要求。署方備悉麗港城居民反對有關建議，就此署方及職訓局將繼續與居民就有關發展保持溝通。而校舍的初步設計將採用階級式建築物高度輪廓，高度訂為主水平基準上六十至七十米，較其東北面住宅發展「麗港城」的高度(即主水平基準上約八十至九十米)為低，而且校舍將提供通風廊，以緩解發展在空氣流通方面帶來的影響。在早前的諮詢過程中，地區人士關注計劃對景觀及交通所造成的影響，職訓局已就有關方面進行技術評估，評估結果顯示計劃並不會在景觀及交通等方面造成不能接受的重大影響，規劃署亦會繼續與居民溝通，並將居民的意見向城規會反映。

82. 徐仕基先生補充，在大綱圖上顯示的環保連接系統走線中，單軌列車只是眾多選項的其中之一，就環保連接系統的模式及走線，土木工程拓展署正進行詳細可行性研究，報告將於今年年底前完成，屆時會就此進行諮詢，收集公眾意見以決定進一步發展。就增加啟德發展密度後人流的帶動，徐先生表示啟德發展區內外的連繫主要有道路及集體運輸系統兩方面。道路方面目前有太子道東、觀塘道及舊機場隧道。現時附近道路的交通擠塞源於有部分工程尚未完工，未來中九龍幹線、T2 主幹道及將軍澳－藍田隧道落成後，所形成的東西走廊將有效改善目前的道路交通情況。而集體運輸系統方面，現時有港鐵觀塘綫，而未來啟用的沙中綫亦能減輕觀塘綫的負擔。至於區內的行人連接，接近一百公頃的綠化及休憩地帶將貫穿整個啟德發展區，作為綠色走廊供市民使用。

83. 施德來議員表示政府、機構或社區用地所興建的醫院大多只有職員飯堂，若要開設普通食肆，則須再向城規會申請，以致市民大多要光顧離醫院較遠的食肆。施議員查詢啟德全科醫院現時的擴展計劃中是否有包括食肆在內，而若要增加食肆，應由規劃署還是醫管局負責跟進。

84. 林文輝議員表示現時環保單軌列車走線由觀塘到啟德站，其他區的市民並未能受惠，建議延伸至舊區如經石鼓壟公園至東頭邨，再經摩士公園到達樂富、黃大仙廟等，並接合黃大仙廟此旅遊景點。樂富、黃大仙下邨及東頭邨的居民亦可使用此路線到達郵輪碼頭，增加使用率。

85. 主席表示在環保單軌列車走線進行概念性諮詢時，黃大仙區議會已建議走線須延至觀塘區、黃大仙區及九龍城區，才能有效地服務市民，否則人流太少只會造成浪費。

86. 胡志偉議員表示對職訓局項目的發展規模及選址有保留，並指出觀塘區議會已一致動議反對茶果嶺職訓局發展項目。胡議員亦希望日後能再就環保連接系統進行詳細討論，望能以更有效的方式服務更多市民。

87. 葉子季先生備悉主席及各位議員的意見，並回應表示現時區內醫院的規劃由醫院管理局負責，啟德急症醫院初步規劃有二千四百個床位、急症室服務、不同專科服務及日間化療和放射治療設施，當中亦會包括附屬飯堂設施。葉先生表示所有前往診症及探病的市民應能享用醫院附屬飯堂的服務，而從規劃角度看，醫院範圍內規模較小及附屬食肆及商鋪，只要不超出合理範圍，無須提出規劃申請。有關醫院現時尚在初步設計階段，對於附屬食肆方面的規劃，須由醫院管理局在詳細設計階段考慮。

(譚香文議員於六時十五分離席。)

《啟德分區計劃大綱草圖編號S/K22/5》所收納的修訂項目
(九龍城房建會文件第09/17)

4. 規劃署九龍規劃專員葉子季先生介紹文件。
5. 何華漢議員感謝規劃署積極回應委員的意見，把修訂項目D2的啟德發展區用地改劃用作公營房屋發展。然而，為了達到公私營房屋供應比例為70:30的要求，他希望署方將項目D1的用地亦劃作興建公營房屋。此外，康樂及文化事務署(下文簡稱「康文署」)曾經表示區內擬建的圖書館及游泳池可能受「政府、機構或社區」用地的限制，故建議署方待康文署與其他相關持分者落實區內各社區配套規模後，才考慮是否推展修訂項目H1至H4中有關將用地改劃為商業用地。他又關注減少郵輪碼頭附近一塊酒店用地後是否能夠應付未來郵輪旅遊發展所增加的遊客量。
6. 楊永杰議員歡迎規劃署把修訂項目D2的用地改劃作公營房屋發展。然而，他希望署方將項目D1的用地亦劃作興建公營房屋，以達至公私營房屋供應的合適比例及完整性。
7. 鄭利明議員查詢規劃署在修訂項目D2未有用盡准許地積比率6.8倍的原因。此外，他指出由於適齡學童人數持續減少，故要求署方確保修訂項目W1至W7擬建職業訓練局校舍的計劃須配合實際需要。他又查詢署方有關校舍是否用作重置職業訓練局的現有校舍，及作重置後原有土地的用途。
8. 邵天虹議員強烈希望有關部門清晰了解居民的訴求，把握區內重建及啟德區發展的機遇，善用宋皇臺道、土瓜灣道及啟德發展區合適的土地，用作安遷及重建樓齡已甚高的馬頭圍邨及真善美村。他又表示舊邨重建不能待完全消除公屋輪候冊上的等候人數才作規劃，建議預留一定數量的新建公營房屋單位安遷受重建影響的舊邨居民。
9. 楊振宇議員表示歡迎規劃署修訂項目D2的用地作公營房屋發展，以增建公營房屋的供應。然而，他認為署方亦須考慮該項目周邊的持分者對增加公營房屋的意見，避免有關計劃未來受到居民的反對。
10. 左滙雄議員表示支持修訂項目B至D1及D2的內容，以提高地積比率及增加公營房屋供應。

11. 陸勁光議員指出由於啟德發展區已規劃大量休憩用地，故對修訂項目G1及G2將環形道路附近兩塊較大型的土地改劃為休憩用地有保留。此外，他查詢是否必須重置分區變電站於修訂項目F的大型用地，區內是否有其他更合適的地點。

12. 勞超傑議員表示歡迎政府落實於區內增建公營房屋，惟認為有關的力度仍然不足，建議署方進一步提高修訂項目D2的地積比率，以協助輪候公屋的基層居民能夠盡快入住。此外，他查詢目前的規劃能否配合協助政府未來可能推出的有關協助首次置業人士置業的計劃。

13. 主席提出以下意見/查詢：(一) 修訂項目W1至W7的職業訓練局新校舍周邊大量「休憩用地」及「污水處理廠附連的上蓋園景平台」，令該地帶的休憩用地過多，故希望署方從善用資源的角度檢視有關項目；(二) 建議項目W3的大型綠化用地改劃作興建資助房屋；(三) 重置職業訓練局現有校舍後，原有土地的用途；(四) 關注改劃跑道區一塊酒店用地為住宅用地後，酒店前的公共空間的管理事宜；(五) 九龍灣及觀塘一帶嚴重缺乏停車場，建議於項目H2的商貿區興建多層停車場；(六) 建議於修訂項目D2增加社區設施，以提高地積比率至6.8倍，進一步增加公營房屋單位數目；以及(七) 希望署方在發展啟德新區時，一併計劃重置馬頭圍邨及真善美村等舊屋邨。

14. 規劃署葉子季先生作出綜合回應，重點如下：

- 根據2017年施政報告，政府已於全港選定25個有潛力作住宅發展的地盤，以提供約60,000個單位，其中八成為公營房屋。而修訂項目D2涵蓋的4幅用地由於鄰近沙中線土瓜灣站，故十分適合用作興建公營房屋，啟德發展區的公私營房屋供應比例約為40:60。此外，項目D1已預留作私人住宅發展，署方在訂定改劃建議時，已平衡及考慮整體土地利用情況及持分者的關注。
- 根據《香港規劃標準與準則》，市區的新發展區最高住用地積比率為6.5倍。有關住宅用地已採用了最高住用地積比率，及另外0.1-0.3倍的非住用地積比率(作商業用途)。在增加地積比率時，須考慮通風、視覺及周邊建築物高度輪廓等因素，整個啟德發展區經過這次修訂後將合共增加約11,000個單位。若需進一步提高修訂項目D2用地的地積比率，需重新評估對交通、基建及環境等的影響。

- 一 署方在區內預留多幅「政府、機構或社區」用地，以提供相關社區設施，包括位於啓德城中心四幅小學用地、兩幅中學用地、圖書館、社會福利設施，室內體育中心及室內游泳池。此外，啓德體育園及周邊的休憩用地亦將為區內居民提供各項體育及休憩設施。署方會繼續與康文署及其他部門商討有關圖書館、游泳池及社會福利設施等的規劃及實施工作，以回應社會的訴求。此外，將第3區內用地改劃作商業用途旨在回應社會對商業用地的需求，及與九龍灣商貿區產生協同效應。
- 一 郵輪碼頭附近原四幅酒店用地雖然將減至三幅，但是仍能維持提供約2,100間酒店房間。此外，因應郵輪碼頭南面將發展為旅遊樞紐，該處會興建另一所酒店，故跑道區會有至少四所酒店，以滿足未來旅遊業的需求。
- 一 由於大綱草圖上的「住宅(甲類)」土地用途地帶並沒有訂明房屋類型，故此可用於發展不同類型的住宅，未來可因應社會需要或政策要求作出合適的發展。
- 一 房屋署會根據房屋政策決定是否優先編配單位予輪候公屋人士或預留作調遷舊屋邨的住戶。署方會向房屋署反映委員有關房屋政策的意見。
- 一 在茶果嶺用地興建具規模及現代化的職業訓練局校舍獲相關的政策支持，以解決訓練局空間不足的問題。擬建的校舍將重置現有黃克競及觀塘(鄰近翠屏邨)的分校，現劃為「政府、機構或社區」的用地，現階段暫未有具體的規劃建議。此外，擬建校舍周邊的休憩用地為未來海濱長廊的一部分，而「污水處理廠附連的上蓋園景平台」用途地帶內的用地則屬現有設施，亦將進行擴建及優化工程。
- 一 署方備悉委員對項目H2的意見，「起動九龍東辦事處」正制定方案回應對九龍灣及觀塘商貿區的泊車位訴求。
- 一 修訂項目F為容量較大的變電站，是次修訂僅放寬了變電站的高度限制以作相關發展。修訂項目G1及G2用地附近為主幹道，因受到較大的噪音及空氣污染而不適合興建住宅，故將改劃為「休憩用地」及作「其他指定用途」註明「美化市容地帶」。此外，修訂項目W3的「休憩用地」將重置區內原有的臨時七人足球場。

(Extract of Minutes of KTTF meeting held on 5.4.2017)

**Item 3 Amendments Incorporated in the Draft Kai Tak Outline
Zoning Plan No. S/K22/5 (Paper No. TFKT/07/2017)**

3.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Planning Department (PlanD) and the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) had submitted a paper (TFKT/07/2017) to consult Members on amendments incorporated in the draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K22/5.

3.2 He recalled that Members' views on the recommendations of the Review Study of Kai Tak Development were sought at previous Task Force meeting and workshops. At the 23rd Task Force meeting, Members were briefed and had thorough discussion on the proposals recommended by the Review, in particular the proposed rezoning of hotel sites to residential sites at the former Kai Tak runway. Members were particularly dissatisfied with the proposed building height profile, building block layout and development bulk for the development sites at the runway and did not go through the proposed rezoning of a piece of land along the Cha Kwo Ling (CKL) waterfront for the development of a Vocational Training Council (VTC) campus in any detail.

3.3 **The Chair** reported that a pre-meeting was arranged on 3 April 2017 for PlanD and representatives of the Laguna City Estate Owners' Committee to brief Members on their respective views prior to today's meeting. Upon the request of the representatives of the Owner's Committee, two resident representatives were invited to give a 10-minutes presentation under the agenda item. He suggested dividing the discussion into two sessions. In the first session, Members would hear from PlanD and CEDD on all the amendments incorporated in the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/5. In the second session, PlanD would go through the amendments for the CKL waterfront, followed by a presentation on the subject by resident representatives.

3.4 **The Chair** informed Members that Mr Ivan HO had provided a written submission on behalf of the Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design to express their views on the proposal. Mr HO's

submission and other letters addressed to the Task Force on the subject were tabled for Members' information.

3.5 The Chair welcomed Mr TOM YIP and Mr Gary LAM from PlanD; Mr Peter CHUI and Mr Edmund CHAN from CEDD; Mr LEUNG Yam-shing and Mr Colin SOH from VTC; Mr Joel CHAN, Ms Sally CHAN, Ms Theresa YEUNG, Ms Natalie LEUNG, Ms Minnie LAW, Mr Alan MACDONALD, Ms Winona IP and Ms Jennifer CHIK from the consultant team to the meeting.

3.6 Mr TAM Po-yiu declared that he was a resident of Laguna City. He would abstain from commenting on the rezoning proposal for the CKL waterfront.

3.7 Mr Paul YK CHAN declared that he was employed by VTC. The Chair opined that would constitute conflict of interest and advised Mr CHAN to refrain from participating in the second session of the discussion.

3.8 The Chair advised that Mr TAM and Mr CHAN could participate in the discussion and comment on all other amendments incorporated in the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/5 but they should abstain from commenting on the proposed rezoning at CKL waterfront.

3.9 Mr Tom YIP introduced the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

3.10 The Chair said that Mr YIP's presentation covered all the amendments incorporated in the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/5. At this stage, he advised Members to focus on other parts of KTD first.

3.11 Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN raised the following enquires and comments:

- (a) why the proposed inclusion of hotel development into the Kai Tak Sports Park had not been included in the proposed OZP amendments;
- (b) for amendment items G1 and G2, he noted that the areas near the ring road of the future Central Kowloon Route

(CKR) will be rezoned to "Open Space" (O) while areas near the junction of Road D2 and Road D3 will be rezoned to "Other Specified Uses (Amenity)". He would like the proponent to explain the rationale behind the proposals. He was doubtful whether the proposals could tie in with and reflect the future development of the head of the Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC), as well as the views of the Task Force on this front;

- (c) he further asked whether the waterfront promenade situated at KTAC would be subject to the recommendations of the ongoing consultancy study for the Kai Tak promenade and whether the Government would propose further changes to the OZP accordingly;
- (d) for amendment item H2, a "Government, Institution or Community" ("GIC") site abutting Road L10 would be rezoned to "Commercial (1)" (C(1)) zone. He recalled that Members had suggested, in previous meetings the inclusion of GIC uses, retail, and food and beverage facilities to the ground and podium level of the future commercial developments so as to activate the waterfront. To guarantee such provision, he would like to know whether it would be incorporated into the lease conditions as requirements to be fulfilled by the developers;
- (e) for amendment item V2, a portion of land originally reserved for Road D3 would be rezoned to "Open Space (2)" to provide a landscaped deck connecting Metro Park to the waterfront promenade. He would like to know how this proposal could be realised and implemented and enquired about the design and parameters of the proposed landscaped deck;
- (f) noting that Road D4 was a main yet temporary connection between the former South Apron and the former Runway, he enquired whether it would be rebuilt and cause any changes on the draft OZP; and
- (g) what was the greening ratio of the development sites at the former runway as he was wary that high greening ratio would make it impossible for developers to provide set back and outdoor seating areas, as well as pedestrian areas.

3.12 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** had the following comments:

- (a) for amendment item D2, he supported the Government's proposal to set aside four housing sites near Kai Tak City Centre for public housing development but viewed that the original planning intention of having a neighbourhood in grid pattern with substantial greening elements and wide pedestrian streets should be maintained to enhance visual and physical permeability. He advised that departments concerned should incorporate appropriate urban design principles and greening elements into the planning brief for the public housing development;
- (b) a site zoned "GIC" at the junction of Concorde and Road L1 was earmarked for an electricity substation. Given the junction would serve as a major gateway to KTD, departments concerned should assess the aesthetic appearance of the electricity substation from a three-dimensional perspective and provide building setback and suitable greening features to beautify its outlook as appropriate;
- (c) he supported the proposed rezoning of GIC sites abutting Road L10 and Kai Fuk Road for commercial uses which would create synergy in support of the transformation of the adjoining Kowloon Bay Business Area. Having regard to the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines, the project team was reminded to carefully examine the built form and mass of the commercial developments and enhance the connectivity from the hinterland of Kowloon Bay to the waterfront promenade; and
- (d) rezoning some commercial sites to residential sites at the former runway might affect the design of the landscaped deck and the semi-enclosed noise barrier. Possible traffic noise and nuisance caused by Road D3 to residents in adjacent developments should be suitably addressed. He added that both sides of the waterfront promenade along the runway should be well connected.

3.13 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** then shared his opinions as follows:

- (a) the original planning intention of having a vibrant waterfront in Area 4 should be maintained in spite of the rezoning of some commercial sites to residential sites. The project team was advised to introduce a mix of commercial, retail and recreational activities at the ground level of the future residential developments along the runway as a means to enhance public enjoyment of the waterfront promenade. Further information in relation to the planning intention and design of the promenade should be provided for Members' consideration;
- (b) noting that the maximum building height for development sites at Area 4 was set at about 120 metres above the Hong Kong Principal Datum (mPD), it might be difficult to achieve the intended Plot Ratio. PlanD should look into this carefully in order to achieve a more interesting skyline and varied building height profile at the runway;
- (c) further to Mr TAM's comments, he was wary that the residential sites abutting Road D3 would be susceptible to the traffic noise generated by Road D3. It would be unfair to leave it to the developers to come up with solutions;
- (d) he agreed with Mr TAM that the intended grid pattern and physical and visual permeability between building blocks at Area 2 should be maintained, even though some of the sites would be allocated for public housing development. He urged the Government to avoid adopting standard public housing design in KTD; and
- (e) the Hong Kong Institute of Architects also supported the proposed rezoning of GIC sites abutting Road L10 and Kai Fuk Road to commercial developments. Considerations should be given to enhancing the use and vibrancy of the waterfront promenade abutting the sites and facilitating the integration among the ground floor uses of the sites, the activities to be held at the waterfront promenade and the recreational activities to be carried out in the adjacent waterbody.

3.14 **Mr Paul YK CHAN** enquired about the estimated population increase in Kai Tak as a result of the intensification of

development density in KTD and asked whether the total provision of open space would increase accordingly. Noting that 98.18 hectares (ha) of KTD would be used for public open space; he would like the Government to come up with an overall strategy for landscape design and incorporate more detailed information with regard to the proposed character, location, function and typology of open space into the Notes and Explanatory Statement of the Kai Tak OZP. Such information could also be incorporated into the planning brief and land lease documents of development sites in KTD.

3.15 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** said that the Commission supported the Government's proposal to increase development and population intensity at KTD in order to meet the demand for housing. However, it would be necessary to have a public transport solution to cater for such increase, as well as to facilitate public enjoyment of the public open space at the former runway area. He urged the Government to urgently look for a public transport solution before further refining the urban design schemes for the former runway.

3.16 **Sr Emily LI** noted that the buildings in the hinterland of KTD and part of the future Kai Tak Sports Park (KTSP) would be visually blocked by the future development sites at the former runway, she was concerned and would like the project team to review the proposed building heights for development sites at the former runway. She enquired about the percentage of land area assigned for residential developments on the draft OZP.

3.17 **Mr Tom YIP** thanked Members for their comments and responded as follows:

- (a) the rezoning of four sites in Area 2 from "Residential (Group B)" (R(B)) to "Residential (Group A)" (R(A)) for public housing development would not cause adverse impacts to the planned pedestrian circulation and connectivity in the area. Three planned 10-metre-wide pedestrian streets between the developments sites would be maintained to enhance air ventilation, as well as visual and physical permeability;
- (b) with regards to the inclusion of hotel development into the

- KTSP and the proposed relaxation of building height restrictions of the main stadium from 55 mPD to 70mPD, the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) had submitted an application for planning permission under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance. The application was approved by The Town Planning Board (TPB) on 17 March 2017;
- (c) in response to Members' concern about the ground-floor land use in the vicinity of the KTAC in Area 3, he said that "Eating Place", "Shop and Services" and "Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture" etc. were permitted uses within commercial sites. The proposed amendments to the OZP had allowed flexibility for different types of activities to take place at the waterfront. The project team would take Members' views into account in further proceedings with the proposals;
 - (d) the land uses of areas near the CKR were revised according to the latest approved CKR alignment. For item G2, he said that part of the land area originally reserved for the CKR's tunnel ventilation shaft and administration building could be released for "Other Specified Uses (Amenity)" use. For item G1, two areas near the ring road of the proposed CKR would be rezoned to "O" to facilitate better integration and design with the adjoining open space;
 - (e) in response to Mr. Tam's enquiry, he clarified that the "G/IC" site at the junction of Concorde Road and Road L1 was an existing electricity substation. It was located to the immediate southeast of amendment item E site;
 - (f) for amendment item E, the site was once earmarked for the development of a government building but such provision was no longer required. Being close to a planned commercial cluster, the site was therefore proposed to be rezoned for commercial use to achieve better integration. Non-building area (NBA) was designated within the boundary of the site to serve multiple purposes including greening, enhancement of air ventilation and air permeability;
 - (g) in response to Members' concern about the vibrancy and diversity of the waterfront promenade after rezoning certain commercial sites to residential sites at the former

runway, he explained that the developers would be required to provide retail shops and eating places at the lowest two floors of the residential sites fronting the waterfront promenade and pedestrian streets. This would enhance vibrancy and diversified activities at the waterfront promenade and provide an interesting pedestrian environment and experience to members of the public;

- (h) with regards to the building height profile at the former runway, he recalled that PlanD and CEDD had presented the refined schemes of the Review Study of Kai Tak Development to Harbourfront Commission (HC) for consideration in December 2016. He said that building heights of the residential sites were adjusted to between 95 mPD and 120 mPD in order to strike a balance between allowing design flexibility and minimizing visual impacts to nearby developments. Under the amended OZP, Area 4 would have a more varied and interesting built form with high and low blocks, as well as an active frontage with retail facilities at the ground level. He supplemented that the tallest band of 120 mPD in Area 4 was generally similar to the height of buildings in the hinterland area, such as Kowloon Bay and To Kwa Wan. The consultant would supplement further information about the urban design scheme for Area 4; and
- (i) it was estimated that the total population in KTD would increase by 28% to about 134,000. About 98 ha of KTD would be used for the provision of open space after the OZP amendments. According to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), the standard for provision of open space was 2 square meters per person; hence KTD should have at least 27 ha of open space. The provision of open space in KTD had indeed far exceeded the requirements stipulated in the HKPSG. He further explained that open space in KTD was composed of local, district and regional open spaces. For instance, the Metro Park and the Station Square would serve the recreational needs of local residents, visitors, tourists and the general public. A continuous pedestrian connection would be

formed by an extensive network of interconnected public open space and the 11 km long waterfront promenade.

3.18 **Mr Peter CHUI** responded to Members' comments as follows:

- (a) in response to Mr ZIMMERMAN's enquiry about the connection between the roundabout on Road D3 and the Metro Park, he pointed out that the rezoned "Open Space (2)" (O(2)) would serve as an inclined surface connecting the northern crescent walkway at the deck level to the at-grade Metro Park. A section of Road D3 abutting Metro Park would be sunken to facilitate the construction of an at-grade landscaped deck so as to enhance the connectivity between the Metro Park and the promenade facing KTAC;
- (b) the taxiway bridge (i.e. Road D4) served as a main access to the southern part of the former runway, its enhancement would be looked into upon the completion of Road D3 and the landscaped deck on top. He shared Members' concern that the location and design of the taxiway bridge would pose headroom limit for carrying out water sports activities;
- (c) CEDD commenced an urban design study for the development sites in Area 4 in December 2016. The study focused on enhancing the connectivity and integration among the residential sites, the landscaped deck and the adjoining waterfront promenade. He informed Members that the consultant would go through the preliminary findings later;
- (d) the noise barrier along Road D3 adopted a semi-enclosed design and it was not feasible to have a fully-enclosed noise barrier given the technical difficulties and safety concerns. The future developers of the residential sites would be required to implement noise mitigation measures, such as the installation of acoustic windows and balconies in order to screen off the traffic noise generated by Road D3. He added that such mitigation measures had been commonly adopted in different types of developments in Hong Kong;

- (e) with regards to water-land interface issues on promenades, CEDD engaged a consultant to carry out a study on design control and guidelines for promenades in KTD. Members were briefed on the initial ideas of the study through the workshop on 23 March 2017. The project team would further engage and seek Members' views again at appropriate junction; and
- (f) regarding Members' concern on the traffic impacts resulting from the increase in development intensity and population, he reassured Members that a detailed traffic impact assessment was conducted and the findings demonstrated that the proposals would not cause unacceptable impacts to the traffic conditions in KTD and surrounding areas. The commissioning of SCL and construction of trunk road projects such as CKR would also help relieve traffic congestion at existing major roads namely Prince Edward Road East and Kwun Tong Bypass. To further improve the traffic condition, relevant Government departments would implement necessary traffic improvement measures.

3.19 **The Chair** asked whether Members had any follow-up questions.

3.20 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** raised the following comments:

- (a) the Task Force had expressed the view that the head of KTAC should be developed into a tourist attraction and sightseeing destination referencing Sydney's Darling Harbour and Singapore's Marina Bay. The provision of a mix of retail shops and eating places and GIC uses at ground and podium levels of the commercial developments should be specified and mandated through lease conditions. Specifically, a certain percentage of ground level space should be assigned to accommodate sports centres and clubs so as to encourage the active use of waterfront;
- (b) he enquired whether the open space of amendment item G1 and land uses in the vicinity of KTAC would be further

reviewed subject to the results of the consultancy study for the Kai Tak promenades; and

- (c) he expressed doubt over the necessity of the roundabout at the northern end of the runway precinct. He asked the Government to clarify whether Road D3 would be set back to release more open space along the waterfront for public enjoyment as a means to make up for the rezoning of part of the Metro Park to residential developments. He further asked whether the Government had a specific plan to replace or remove the existing taxiway bridge.

3.21 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** clarified that his previous question was not centered on traffic mitigation but the imminent need to identify a sustainable public transport solution to serve the runway area and the adjoining developments. Connectivity would be fundamental to the success of the development of the former runway.

3.22 **The Chair** said that the Task Force had been monitoring the planning and development of KTD for over a decade. The proposals put forward by the Government covered a spectrum of land use amendments which would result in a significant increase in the housing supply and population in KTD. Members had expressed their concerns on the recommendations of the review throughout the consultation process. Members' views from harbourfront enhancement and urban design perspectives are summarised as follows:

- (a) while he understood that provision of open space in KTD had exceeded the minimum standard for such as stipulated in HKPSG, the Government should make effort to maximize the availability of open space in harbourfront areas for members of the public;
- (b) the Task Force understood the pressing need to increase the development intensity in KTD so as to accommodate an increased population but it appeared that the proposals put forward by the Government had not brought any improvement or enhancement to the planning of the harbourfront area, the environment and the public transport system;
- (c) for the noise barrier at the former runway, its primary

function was to screen off the noise generated by Road D3. It hence appeared to be ironic that some of the sites along Road D3 would still be susceptible to traffic noise. It was undesirable to shift the responsibility for noise mitigation to property developers. He opined that changes in the planning and development of KTD should have been made in a more gradual and logical manner;

- (d) Members considered that the amendments should enhance the vibrancy and diversity of the harbourfront. Despite the changes in the zoning of some development sites abutting the waterfront, the ground level of these sites should be used for a mix of activities and integrate with the adjoining waterfront promenade;
- (e) the proponent provided a positive response to Members' concern with regards to the visual and physical permeability and connectivity of the future public housing development. The project team should consider adopting creative design and building forms for the housing blocks so as to better reflect the characters of the community; and
- (f) details of individual project such as open space network, design control and guidelines for waterfront promenades and road alignment of CKR project would be better supplemented by relevant project teams.

3.23 **Mr Tom YIP** thanked the Chair for making a summary. He said that the project team would take into account Members' views and comments.

3.24 **The Chair** said that the second part of the discussion would focus on the proposed rezoning of a piece of land in CKL waterfront for the development of a VTC campus on which Members had been briefed by PlanD with some general background.

3.25 **The Chair** informed Members that the Laguna City Estate Owners' Committee had submitted over 40,000 petition signatures to the Task Force before the meeting to express their objection to the Government's proposal. He recalled that Mr TAM Po-yiu and Mr Paul YK CHAN declared interest and they would therefore abstain from participating in the ensuing discussion.

3.26 **The Chair** invited **Mr Fred TSE** and **Mr Keith LUK**, representatives from Laguna City Estate Owners' Committee to the meeting.

3.27 **Mr Fred TSE** and **Mr Keith LUK** shared with Members the views of residents with respect to the proposed rezoning of a piece of land in CKL for the development of a VTC campus.

3.28 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** made the following comments:

- (a) the construction of buildings or developments at harbourfront areas was not prohibited by the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines but it would be essential for any proposals put forward at such locations to comply with the principles and guidelines. Given some public facilities such as hospitals within KTD would be situated at the harbourfront and they are intended to serve members of the public, he had no objection to having an education institute to be located at the harbourfront. However, from a harbourfront enhancement perspective, the reduction in the provision of open space by 1 ha at CKL cannot be supported;
- (b) he suggested the project team to consider reconfiguring and relocating nearby community and public facilities, such as the liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) filling station and the Sewage Treatment Plant in order to release more open space for the development of a CKL harbourfront park. He recalled that the Government had approved a non-in-situ land exchange with the private owner of King Yin Lei in order to preserve the historic building for revitalisation a few years ago. The case could serve as a reference; and
- (c) members of the public should be able to have at-grade access to the harbourfront through the open space within the VTC campus. Part of the campus facilities such as cafeteria and sports ground could be opened for public use.

3.29 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** raised the following comments:

- (a) the proposed VTC campus to be built would be a huge complex. The proponent should provide adequate explanation as to which were the alternative locations they have explored and the reason why they were not considered suitable for the proposed campus;
- (b) VTC and PlanD were invited to comment on the massive red block in the photomontage portrayed by the resident representatives which indicated the building mass of the proposed campus; and
- (c) noting that the construction of the project would last for 10 to 15 years, the proponent was urged to provide further information on the development programme.

3.30 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that little information in relation to the proposed VTC campus had been included in the consultation papers and presentation slides prepared by the Government in previous meetings and the Task Force did not discuss the proposal in detail. He agreed with the views of the residents. With reference to the approved Kai Tak OZP, the CKL waterfront was supposed to be a park not just a promenade. He objected to the rezoning proposal given that it would turn a wide park into a linear and narrow promenade. He urged the Government to retain the originally planned park area and this piece of waterfront should be safeguarded for the enjoyment of Hong Kong people. With regards to the design of the proposed campus, he opined that the building mass of VTC building should be modified and that visual porosity as well as 24-hour public access to the waterfront should be guaranteed.

3.31 **Mr NGAN Man-yu** objected to the rezoning proposal and raised the following enquires and comments:

- (a) why the proposed VTC campus should be located at prominent waterfront area as there should be alternative locations in urban areas;
- (b) having a massive structure at CKL waterfront would not be compatible with the atmosphere of Kwun Tong waterfront; and
- (c) he could not agree with the results of the TIA and was

especially concerned about the potential traffic impacts to be caused by the proposal. He pointed out that there were limited public transport services connecting the area to Yau Tong Mass Transit Railway (MTR) Station and having a massive campus would intensify pedestrian and traffic flows in Lam Tin district.

3.32 **Mr Ken SO** echoed with Mr NGAN's view that there should be alternative locations in urban areas to accommodate the development of the VTC campus. He agreed with the Chair's view that the Commission would not accept the minimum provision of public open space in harbourfront area and project proponents should actively come up with ways to enhance the vibrancy of the harbourfront. He was glad to know that the Kwun Tong promenade was crowded with visitors which indicated the high demand and popularity of public open space in harbourfront areas. He could not support the rezoning proposal as it would not be able to help create a vibrant and active CKL harbourfront. The piece of land concerned should be developed into a waterfront park.

3.33 **The Chair** said that the popularity of Kwun Tong promenade was a recognition of the efforts of the Task Force.

3.34 **Ms Melissa PANG** said that the mission of the Task Force was to enhance the conditions of the limited harbourfront areas in order to meet public expectation. She made the following comments:

- (a) the proposal presented at the meeting could not address and incorporate residents' comments and views;
- (b) it was the community's aspiration that a CKL park would be constructed to serve as a district open space with both active and passive landscape areas. She was disappointed that the CKL waterfront park was proposed to be replaced by a 50m wide and 660m long waterfront promenade;
- (c) she opined that a balance should be struck between meeting the expectation of the community and meeting the development need of VTC;
- (d) she quoted from the consultation paper that "public passageway would be provided within the VTC

development during opening hours of the campus to facilitate public access to the waterfront” but she was aware that VTC campuses were usually closed at around 5 o’clock in the afternoon. She was doubtful whether pedestrians could gain access to the waterfront after school hours;

- (e) according to the photomontages prepared by the residents, the massive building mass of VTC would cause appalling visual impacts to the waterfront; and
- (f) the proponent was advised to refine the design of the campus building to achieve a win-win situation to compensate for the loss of public open space.

3.35 **Mr YIP Hing-kwok** raised the following suggestions for the proponent’s consideration:

- (a) the alignment and layout of different land uses at CKL waterfront should be suitably adjusted to achieve a more connected network of open space; and
- (b) noting that the provision of open space would be significantly reduced, he asked whether the proponent could provide an extended landscaped structure passing through the campus building to the waterfront, similar to the Tamar Park, as a compensatory measure.

3.36 **Mr Fred TSE** clarified that the demand for public open space in Kwun Tong far exceeded the supply; hence the Kwun Tong promenade was overcrowded. He said that it would be necessary to have larger and wider waterfront promenades in the district.

3.37 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** said that, according to the approved Kai Tak OZP, a sizable park would be constructed along the CKL waterfront but not a promenade. She agreed with Mr TSE that the Kwun Tong promenade was overcrowded and there was a need to create another waterfront open space within reasonable vicinity to serve residents in CKL and Yau Tong. She reminded the proponent that that the design of any buildings to be situated at the harbourfront, including building height, density and permeability, should comply with the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines. In this connection, the proposed campus at its present scale should not be

supported and should not be situated at any harbourfront locations. She was dissatisfied that this proposal had not been thoroughly discussed before submission to the TPB.

3.38 **Mr Tom YIP** responded to Members' enquires as follows:

- (a) in the 2016 Policy Address, the Government announced to reserve a site in the urban district to develop a VTC campus building with adequate capacity and state-of-the-art facilities. He clarified that while the development of the VTC campus would require about 3 to 5 ha of land in urban area with immediate availability, waterfront location was not a site selection criterion. After considering the site requirements of VTC, the subject site at CKL waterfront was the only location that could meet the criteria in urban area. Consideration had been given to the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines during the planning process;
- (b) PlanD and the CEDD briefed Members on the proposals that were recommended under the 'Review Study of Kai Tak Development' at the 23rd meeting in November 2016. The proposed rezoning of a piece of land along CKL waterfront to GIC use for the development of a VTC campus was mentioned in the meeting paper (TFKT/14/2016). A layout plan was also incorporated into the paper to illustrate the land uses at CKL before and after rezoning. He recalled that Members' discussion at the 23rd meeting mainly centered on the urban design issues at the former Kai Tak runway, and no specific comment was raised in relation to CKL waterfront. He stressed that the Government had no intention to hide any information from the public;
- (c) PlanD noted the comments from residents of Laguna City on the VTC proposal, which were flagged up in its consultation with the Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC) on the proposed amendments in March 2017;
- (d) he assured Members that comments collected at the meeting would be conveyed to TPB for consideration. The project team would take into account Members' views in

- the refined proposal as far as possible;
- (e) he noted the Task Force's concern on the reduction of public open space but reassured Members that the Government strived to strike a balance between maintaining the original planning intention and responding to new planning circumstances and societal needs. About 98 ha of KTD would be developed as open space in KTD. For the subject CKL waterfront; there would still be a total of about 4.2 ha of planned open space after rezoning including a waterfront promenade of 660m long, 50m wide and about 3.3 ha. The proposed VTC development would provide appropriate greening area, wind corridor between building blocks and setback along Wai Yip Street and waterfront promenade to facilitate visual and air permeability. Part of the campus facilities might also be opened to the local community;
 - (f) he informed Members that the LPG filling station concerned was the only gas station serving CKL district. The Government attempted but could not identify another suitable location for its relocation; and
 - (g) VTC would respond to Members' concern about accessibility to the waterfront through the campus and the consultant would elaborate on the design features and photomontages of the proposed VTC campus.

3.39 **Mr LEUNG Yam-shing** informed Members that VTC was required by the Government to review and provide a comprehensive development plan for its campuses in 2014. Some existing VTC campuses would be redeveloped and new campus would be constructed to facilitate the continued development of their education programmes. He said that harbourfront location was not a site selection criterion but VTC welcomed the allocation of the subject land by the Government. He supplemented further information in respect of the preliminary design ideas for the campus:

- (a) the proposed VTC campus building would adopt a podium free design;
- (b) the height of the campus buildings would be compatible with the building height profile of the adjacent

- developments;
- (c) the design of the buildings was at a preliminary and schematic stage. The project team would take Members' views into account and refine the scheme as appropriate;
 - (d) it was operationally necessary for VTC to acquire a site with sufficient size to accommodate necessary campus facilities;
 - (e) regarding the development programme of the campus, he informed Members that the development of the campus was expected to last for about 10 years. The rezoning application and pre-construction works were expected to be completed in early 2018 and early 2020 respectively.. He understood that the LPG gas station could be relocated in 2021 the earliest therefore the construction works would likely start in mid to late 2021 according to the latest programme. The construction works would take about 5 years and was expected to be completed in 2026 or 2027;
 - (f) after the completion of the new campus at CKL, VTC would surrender the Kwun Tong campus and Haking Wong campus to the Government;
 - (g) the new campus would offer Higher Diploma and Diploma of Foundation Studies programmes;
 - (h) even though the student intakes to Higher Diploma and Diploma of Foundation Studies would decrease from 37,000 to 32,000 in the short term, , however, according to the statistics provided by the Education Bureau, the number of secondary 6 students would increase after 2022, and the number of students enrolled in courses offered by VTC was expected to grow thereafter; and
 - (i) he could not agree that the proposed VTC campus would resemble the photomontage prepared by the resident representatives; he invited the consultant to supplement further information on this front.

3.40 **Ms Theresa YEUNG** said that the VTC campus would consist of three building blocks with BHs ranging from 60 mPD to 70 mPD. The tallest block (i.e. 70 mPD) was not directly fronting the Laguna City and was considerably lower than the residential developments at the back. The proposed VTC building adopted a

stepped height concept and the blocks were arranged in staggered manner. The consultant team would take Members' views into account and suitably refine the design of the buildings.

3.41 In response to Members' concern on traffic impacts to be caused by the development of the VTC campus, Ms YEUNG said that VTC offered programmes with different class hours and duration such that students and staff would not have to arrive at or leave the campus at the same time. There would be contraflow traffic movement to the VTC campus and from Laguna City at peak hours. According to the TIA, the area concerned was currently served by 5 existing bus routes and 5 exiting minibus routes. VTC would liaise with Transport Department (TD) on enhancing public transport services in the vicinity of the development. VTC would also consider providing shuttle bus service plying between the new campus and Yau Tong MTR Station.

3.42 Mr Fred TSE thanked Ms YEUNG for the clarification. He had the following comments:

- (a) he pointed out that the image presented by the consultant was taken from a bird's eye view. He reminded Members that pedestrians and residents would view the buildings horizontally;
- (b) he said that the explanation of reverse traffic direction and other traffic evaluation were not acceptable given road users would share the same road space. He pointed out that the justification provided by the consultant had already been challenged at district council;
- (c) while he noted that over 98 ha of public open space would be provided for the future residents of KTD, the provision of waterfront open space in Kwun Tong and CLK area was far from sufficient in meeting the community's need. The demand for a CKL waterfront park by about 650,000 residents living in Kwun Tong district should be addressed.

3.43 Ms Theresa YEUNG clarified that the consultant team assessed the development height profile of the proposed campus from different vantage points, including Quarry Bay Park (Powerpoint slide

28), as required by the HKPSG. Members would note that the proposed VTC campus would adopt a stepped building height profile.

3.44 **The Chair** asked whether Members had further comments.

3.45 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** would like the proponent to clarify whether the proposed VTC development would adopt a no-fencing design at the waterfront side.

3.46 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** said that the Task Force understood the imminent need of VTC to develop a larger campus but the proposed VTC development was not in compliance with the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines. The proposal would result in a reduction of open space and public enjoyment of the harbourfront, it would also cause visual intrusion to the waterfront, as well as traffic impacts to the area. He advised that from a harbourfront enhancement perspective, the Task Force could not support the rezoning of land at CKL waterfront.

3.47 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** agreed with Mr BROOKE's views. He added that the landscape terraces between the building blocks would affect visual permeability and that the LPG gas station should not be located at the centre of a park. He reiterated that the original planning intention of having a CKL park should be maintained. He said that the proposal for the VTC campus was not acceptable; and that in case the project went ahead against the advice of the committee that the Government should reduce the building footprints and consider increasing the building height.

3.48 **Mrs Karen BARRETTO** did not support the proposed VTC development. She commented that undesirable utilities and buildings should not be concentrated at the waterfront simply because no alternative locations could be identified

3.49 With regards to the connectivity to waterfront, **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** said that the provision of 24-hour public access to the harbourfront should be specified as a mandatory requirement in the Notes of the draft OZP.

3.50 **The Chair** said that Members had a thorough discussion on the amendments incorporated in the draft Kai Tak OZP. Regarding the proposed rezoning at CKL waterfront, he concluded that Members were particularly concerned about the site selection criteria, building design as well as development parameters of the proposed VTC development. While the Task Force had all along recognised the need to have diversity of uses at the harbourfront and also to cater for the different needs of the society, having a large-scale VTC campus with massive building form, bulk and footprints at the subject location may not be the most desirable. The provision of public open space would be reduced from 5.2 ha to 4.2 ha, which was also unacceptable from harbourfront planning perspective. The straightening of the public open space into uniformly shaped rectangle would not be conducive to the Commission's vision of creating an interesting harbourfront. He pointed out that residents of the Kowloon East District, members of the public as well as the Commission were once promised a waterfront park at Cha Kwo Ling, therefore any proposals to be put forward at the CKL waterfront that would have compromised the further development of a park thereon would not be supported.

3.51 He concluded that Members had no objection to the amendments put forward by the project team for other parts of KTD but the Task Force could not support the rezoning proposal put forward for CKL waterfront. The Secretariat would convey Members' views in detail to TPB for consideration.

(Post-meeting notes: With Chair's agreement, the Secretariat provided a written submission consolidating Members' views and comments on the amendments incorporated in the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/5 to the Secretariat of Town Planning Board on 18 April 2017.)



Harbourfront Commission
香港海濱委員會

Our Reference: DEVB(PL-H)51/03/07
Telephone: 3509 8811
Fax: 2110 0841

F A X

17/F West Wing, Central Government Offices
2 Tim Mei Avenue, Tamar, Hong Kong
香港海濱委員會2號政府總部西翼17樓
T 電話: (852) 3509 8811
F 傳真: (852) 2110 0841
E 電郵: enquiry@hfc.org.hk
W 網址: www.hfc.org.hk

18 April 2017

Secretary
Town Planning Board
15/F North Point Government Offices
333 Java Road, North Point
Hong Kong

Dear Sir,

**Amendments Incorporated in the Draft Kai Tak
Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K22/5**

On 5 April 2017, the Planning Department (PlanD) and the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) consulted Harbourfront Commission (HC)'s Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (KTTF) on the amendments incorporated in the draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K22/5. Members' comments expressed at the meeting are summarized as follows –

- (a) While Members supported the Government's proposal to set aside four housing sites near Kai Tak City Center for public housing development, the original planning intention of having a neighbourhood in grid pattern in that area with substantial greening elements and wide pedestrian streets should be maintained to enhance visual and physical permeability, thereby providing a lively living environment for the community. Departments concerned should consider adopting more innovative designs and building forms for the housing developments.
- (b) Rezoning two "G/IC" sites at the South Apron area to commercial sites would help create synergy with the adjoining Kowloon Bay

Business Area. Members considered that the visual and physical permeability to the harbourfront should be enhanced having regard to the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines. Members of the public should be able to gain access to the harbourfront through the commercial developments. A mix of commercial, retail and water sports activities should be introduced to achieve a diversified waterfront promenade fronting the commercial sites.

- (c) Members welcomed the rezoning of two areas near the ring road of the proposed Central Kowloon Route to "O". The open space concerned, along with those in the vicinity of the Kai Tak Approach Channel should be developed holistically. Members considered that the atmosphere and quality of public open space would be directly affected by its adjacent land use. The proponent was advised to activate the ground level of the development sites and adjoining waterfront promenade through an optimal amount of commercial and retail activities.
- (d) In view that a part of the open space within the Metro Park was proposed to be rezoned for residential developments, a Member asked whether the proponent would consider setting back the section of Road D3 adjacent to the Metro Park in order to make available more public open space for the enjoyment of the public.
- (e) Given that there would be a significant increase in the population and development intensity at the former runway area, the proponent was asked to provide details with regard to the proposed public transport solution. Members opined that connectivity would be fundamental to the success of the development of the former runway and the Task Force would like to be informed whether a sustainable mode of public transport would be adopted.
- (f) Some Members were concerned that rezoning of some commercial sites for residential development on the former runway would affect the atmosphere and quality of the public open space at the waterfront promenade adjoining these sites. Noting that the proponent has purposely conducted urban design studies to enhance the vibrancy and diversity of the area concerned, Members would just like to add that it would be essential to ensure that the waterfront promenade would be open to the public round the clock and sufficient seating facilities

would be provided. The Task Force noted the improvements that were made in relation to the connectivity between the landscaped deck above Road D3 and the harbourfront. The project team was reminded to provide sufficient pedestrian facilities and access to the landscaped deck and enhance walkability and connectivity to the harbourfront.

- (g) Members were concerned about the possible traffic noise and nuisance to be caused by Road D3 to residents in adjacent developments. If the semi-enclosed noise barrier at the former runway could not be extended to form a fully-enclosed one, alternative noise mitigation measures would have to be put in place. Some members of the Task Force had reservations on the proposal of having acoustic windows and balconies as a noise mitigation measure.
- (h) Members would like for the Government to come up with an overall strategy for landscape design to help with their integration among adjoining developments in KTD.
- (i) Members raised extensive comments with regard to the proposed rezoning of land in Cha Kwo Ling (CKL) waterfront for the development of a Vocational Training Council (VTC) campus. Members pointed out that compliance with the established Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines was of utmost importance. While the Task Force had all along recognized the need to have diversity of uses at the harbourfront and also to cater for the different needs of the society, having a large-scale VTC campus with massive building form, bulk and footprints at the harbourfront may not be the most desirable.
- (j) Following from the above, Members commented that a reduction in the provision of open space by 1 hectare at the CKL waterfront would not be supported from a harbourfront enhancement perspective. Members further commented that any proposals to be put forward at the CKL waterfront that would have compromised the further development of a park thereon will not be supported.
- (k) Some Members suggested the proponent to consider adjusting the development parameters of the VTC campus, such as changing the building form and height profile so as to increase visual permeability and air ventilation.

- (l) Members further opined that the straightening of the public open space into a uniformly shaped rectangle might not be conducive to the vision of creating an interesting harbourfront. Considerations should be given to reconfiguring the land at CKL waterfront so that the proposed campus and nearby community facilities could be grouped together, hence releasing more open space for the development of a harbourfront park.
- (m) The Task Force considered that members of the public should be allowed at-grade access to the harbourfront through the open space within the campus and such access should be made available to the public preferably round the clock. The proponent should also consider opening part of the campus facilities to the public.
- (n) Some Members were concerned about the potential traffic impacts to be caused by the development of the VTC campus at the subject location.

The meeting concluded that while Members had no objection to the proposed amendments put forward by the project team for other parts of KTD, the Task Force could not support the rezoning proposal for the development of a VTC campus at CKL waterfront at this stage.

Copies of the discussion paper (Annex A) and PowerPoint presentation (Annex B) submitted by the proponent at the 26th KTTF meeting on 3 April 2017 are enclosed for your reference. The minutes of the meeting will be uploaded onto HC's website after confirmation at the meeting, which is tentatively scheduled for the second quarter in 2017.

I should be grateful if you would convey the above to the Town Planning Board for reference when considering the OZP amendments.

Yours faithfully,



(Miss Emily SOM)

Secretary

Task Force on Kai Tak
Harbourfront Development
Harbourfront Commission

**Provision of Open Space and Major GIC Facilities in
Kai Tak Planning Area**

<u>Type of Facilities</u>	<u>Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)</u>	<u>HKPSG Requirement Based on Planned Population (i)</u>	<u>Provision</u>		<u>Surplus / Shortfall (Against Provision) (ii)-(i)</u>
			<u>Existing</u>	<u>Existing plus Planned (ii)</u>	
Local open space	10 ha per 100,000 persons	13.4ha	0.05ha	6.89ha	-6.51ha
District open space	10 ha per 100,000 persons	13.4ha	6.36ha	50.75ha	+37.35ha
Secondary school	1 whole day classroom for 40 persons aged 12-17	155 classrooms	0 classroom	60 classrooms	-95 classrooms (see footnote 3)
Primary school	1 whole day classroom for 25.5 persons aged 6-11	223 classrooms	109 classrooms	169 classrooms	-54 classrooms (see footnote 3)
Kindergarten/nursery	26 classrooms for 1,000 persons aged 3 to under 6	65 classrooms	14 classrooms	14 classrooms	-51 classrooms (see footnote 3)
District police station	1 per 200,000 to 500,000 persons	0	0	1	+1
Divisional police station	1 per 100,000 to 200,000 persons	0	0	1	+1
Clinic/health centre	1 per 100,000 persons	1	0	1 (see footnote 4)	0
Magistracy	1 per 660,000 persons	0	0	0	0
Integrated children and youth services centre	1 for 12,000 persons aged 6-24	1	1	1	0
Integrated family services centre	1 for 100,000 to 150,000 persons	0	0	1	+1

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	HKPSG Requirement Based on Planned Population (i)	Provision		Surplus / Shortfall (Against Provision) (ii)-(i)
			Existing	Existing plus Planned (ii)	
Library	1 district library for 200,000 persons	0	0	1	+1
Sports centre	1 per 50,000 to 65,000 persons	2	0	2	0
Sports ground/sport complex	1 per 200,000 to 250,000 persons	0	0	1	+1
Swimming pool – standard	1 complex per 287,000 persons	0	0	0	0

Notes:

1. The planned population of the planning area is about 134,000.
2. Some facilities do not have set requirement under HKPSG, e.g. elderly facilities, community hall, study room, etc. They are not included in this table.
3. Some facilities are assessed on a wider district basis, instead of the OZP area, by the relevant departments, e.g. secondary and primary schools. They are subject to the assessment of concerned departments. There is a surplus provision of secondary school (+726 classrooms), primary school (+577 classrooms) and kindergarten/nursery (+356 classrooms) in Kowloon City District to meet the deficit in Kai Tak Planning Area. For planned open space, the deficit in the provision of local open space can be compensated by the surplus of district open space and the provision of regional open space in Kai Tak.
4. A community health centre is proposed to be provided at the planned Kai Tak Acute Hospital.

**Provision of Open Space and Major GIC Facilities in
Kowloon City District Council District**

<u>Type of Facilities</u>	<u>Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)</u>	<u>HKPSG Requirement Based on Planned Population (i)</u>	<u>Provision</u>		<u>Surplus / Shortfall (Against Provision) (ii)-(i)</u>
			<u>Existing</u>	<u>Existing plus Planned (ii)</u>	
Local open space	10 ha per 100,000 persons	50.56ha	40.55ha	54.03ha	+3.47ha
District open space	10 ha per 100,000 persons	50.56ha	54.45ha	102.57ha	+52.01ha
Secondary school	1 whole day classroom for 40 persons aged 12-17	566 classrooms	1,196 classroom	1,292 classrooms	+726 classrooms
Primary school	1 whole day classroom for 25.5 persons aged 6-11	816 classrooms	1,279 classrooms	1,393 classrooms	+577 classrooms
Kindergarten/ nursery	26 classrooms for 1,000 persons aged 3 to under 6	238 classrooms	594 classrooms	594 classrooms	+356 classrooms
District police station	1 per 200,000 to 500,000 persons	1	2	3	+2
Divisional police station	1 per 100,000 to 200,000 persons	2	2	3	+1
Clinic/health centre	1 per 100,000 persons	5	7	8 (see footnote 2)	+3
Magistracy	1 per 660,000 persons	0	1	1	+1
Integrated children and youth services centre	1 for 12,000 persons aged 6-24	6	6	6	0
Integrated family services centre	1 for 100,000 to 150,000 persons	3	3	5	+2

<u>Type of Facilities</u>	<u>Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)</u>	<u>HKPSG Requirement Based on Planned Population</u> (i)	<u>Provision</u>		<u>Surplus / Shortfall (Against Provision)</u> (ii)-(i)
			<u>Existing</u>	<u>Existing plus Planned</u> (ii)	
Library	1 district library for 200,000 persons	2	4	5	+3
Sports centre	1 per 50,000 to 65,000 persons	7	5	7	0
Sports ground/sport complex	1 per 200,000 to 250,000 persons	2	2	3	+1
Swimming pool – standard	1 complex per 287,000 persons	1	2	2	+1

Notes:

1. The planned population of the planning area is about 505,645.
2. A community health centre is proposed to be provided at the planned Kai Tak Acute Hospital.

Summary of Representations and Responses

- (1) The grounds of **R3 to R270, R433, R12084 to R12151 and R12153 to R12158** in **Group 1** as well as the responses of government departments are summarized below:

Grounds of Representations	Responses of Government Departments
Supportive Representation	
A. Water Sports Development	
A1. Rezoning areas from amenity area and ‘Road’ to “Open Space” (“O”) and incorporation of ‘water sports/water recreation’ use as Column 1 use under “O” zone would facilitate the development of waterfront for water-based recreation and sports.	Noted.
Adverse Representations	
B. Land Use	
<i>General</i>	
B1. Oppose the rezoning of a number of “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) sites to residential and commercial uses which leads to a reduction in the provision of community facilities despite the increased population. This is not in line with the vision of the Hong Kong 2030+ Study on increasing the provision of community facilities and open space for Hong Kong.	See Para. 6.3.5 of the TPB Paper.
B2. Land in the harbourfront area should be preserved and planned for uses with higher value and put for sale to increase the Government’s revenue.	The Harbour Planning Principle and Guideline (HPPG) has been taken into consideration for the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) amendments. See Para. 6.3.29 of the TPB Paper.
Item D2 in Kai Tak City Centre	
B3. The proposed public housing development on the sites under Item D2 will induce adverse impacts on vehicular and pedestrian traffic. The resulting additional traffic together with the flow of people after the commencement of operation of Kai Tak Sports Park with 50,000 spectators will overload the district, causing chaos in traffic and crowd management. There are inadequate traffic infrastructures and pedestrian crossing	See Para. 6.3.41 of the TPB Paper. The sites are well served with existing public transport services and are close to the future Shatin-to-Central Link (SCL) To Kwa Wan

Grounds of Representations	Responses of Government Departments
facilities to cater for the demand arising from increased population. The existing Ma Tau Chung Road and Sung Wong Toi Road, which are already congested, will be paralyzed, inducing traffic safety issue at the roads including the Olympic Avenue.	Station.
B4. The proposed high-rise public housing development will induce adverse visual and air ventilation impacts on the living environment and create wall effect, especially on those areas occupied by low-rise buildings in Kowloon City, violating the Government's planning principle. Stricter BH restriction should be imposed and buffer spaces should be reserved.	See Paras. 6.3.32 and 6.3.37 of the TPB Paper.
B5. The provision of shops and markets, recreational facilities, various public and civic services, emergency and public order services in the areas of Kai Tak, To Kwa Wan and Kowloon City may not be able to cater for the increased population arising from the public housing development.	See Paras. 6.3.9 and 6.3.10 of the TPB Paper.
B6. The sites can be used for the construction of an exhibition hall for technology and culture to promote Hong Kong's technology and innovation.	See Para. 6.3.11 of the TPB Paper.
<i>Item E in Kai Tak City Centre</i>	
B7. There is already adequate supply of sites for commercial development. There is no site designated for religious institution in Kai Tak, which is essential. The "G/IC" zoning of the site under Item E should be retained and the site should be designated for religious use.	See Para. 6.3.12 of the TPB Paper.
<i>Item H1 in the South Apron</i>	
B8. Oppose the rezoning of the site under Item H1 from "G/IC" to "Commercial (8)" ("C(8)") as there is traffic congestion in the area, in particular at the junction of Sheung Yee Road and Wang Chiu Road as well as from Kwun Tong Bypass (towards Mong Kok) to Wang Chiu Road. Without railway infrastructure at the new commercial area in Kowloon Bay, the congestions on the roads and footbridges would be serious, particularly during the morning and evening peak hours.	See Paras. 6.3.13 and 6.3.42 of the TPB Paper.

Grounds of Representations	Responses of Government Departments
<i>Item H2 in the South Apron</i>	
<p>B9. The north-western end of Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC) is suitable for the development of water sports and there are no other better alternative locations in Hong Kong. Only this location could provide a site of sufficient size to accommodate a substantial building of at least 2 storeys required for the facilities to support water sports. The rezoning proposal under Item H2 will remove the possibility of developing an International Water Sports Centre (IWSC).</p>	<p>See Paras. 6.3.14 to 6.3.17 of the TPB Paper.</p> <p>For the construction of infrastructure works at and adjacent to Area 3, the concerned sites in Area 3B would not be made available until 2026/27. Portion of sites may be vacated early subject to the progress of infrastructure works.</p>
<p>B10. In addition to water sports, there is possibility of creating a ‘Water Arena’ at KTAC for events such as ‘floating concerts’ and other displays.</p>	
<p>B11. There is no need to establish a commercial node in this waterfront location under Item H2.</p>	
<p>B12. In 2011/12, the Government considered that the “G/IC” sites (Sites 3B1 and 3B2) will not be available for development until early 2021. Therefore, it is premature to rezone the sites to “C(1)” under Item H2.</p>	
<i>Item N1 in South Apron</i>	
<p>B13. Despite planning approvals granted in 2011 and 2012, the redevelopments of the adjacent Kerry D.G. Warehouse (Kowloon Bay) and Kowloon Godown for residential use has not been commenced. A residential cluster may not be formed at this location eventually.</p>	<p>See Paras. 6.3.18 to 6.3.20 of the TPB Paper.</p>
<p>B14. The southern portion of the site under Item N1 should be rezoned from “Residential (Group B) 2” (“R(B)2”) to “O” so that it could form a more proper open space with the adjoining “O” zone to act as an activity node at the corner of South Apron connecting the Kwun Tong and Kai Tak waterfront promenades. The arrangement could allow greater flexibility for integration and interface between the open space network and the future Environmentally Friendly Linkage System (EFLS) to be run along the concerned promenade. The reduced domestic gross floor area (GFA) of the site could be</p>	

Grounds of Representations	Responses of Government Departments
<p>re-distributed to the undeveloped residential and “CDA” sites at Kai Tak City Centre for reinforcing the strong neighbourhood concept at the city centre and making better use of the existing infrastructure readily available at the hinterland, and/or to the site under Item P in the Runway Area.</p>	
<i>Items O, P, Q, R, S and T in the Runway Area</i>	
<p>B15. The planning vision, principles and key development components of Kai Tak are the result of various rounds of public engagement. Kai Tak Development (KTD) should have a balanced mix of housing, commercial, community, tourism and infrastructural uses, instead of focusing the Runway Area for residential use.</p>	<p>See Paras. 6.3.21 and 6.3.22 of the TPB Paper.</p>
<p>B16. Low-density development instead of high-density residential developments would help reduce environmental, traffic and visual impact on surroundings. The excessive development intensity would make KTD losing its planning features and identity as an iconic development.</p>	<p>With regard to the provision of tourism-related facilities, Commissioner for Tourism opines that other than the planned Tourism Node (TN) which is intended for the provision of tourism-related use to include commercial, hotel and entertainment facilities, there are also commercial sites located in the Runway Area which are intended for hotel and other commercial uses so as to support the TN and Cruise Terminal development.</p>
<p>B17. The sites should be reserved for commercial and tourism-related uses, including hotel, shopping mall, other entertainment facilities and public facilities given that the Cruise Terminal in the Runway Area is the first arrival point for tourists, which will give them the first impression of Hong Kong.</p>	<p>The development of new cruise berth could be subject to further study when future needs arise.</p>
<p>B18. The original hotel belt along the waterfront of the former runway was planned to face the harbour to give flexibility for the possible third cruise berth, while residential developments were planned to face KTAC to give a more leisure lifestyle. Breaking the “hotel belt” into various residential zones is not in line with the original planning concept and it would cause an imbalance mix of residential and commercial use, making Kai Tak no difference from other new towns with imbalance mix of uses.</p>	
<i>Items S, T, U1, U2, V1 and V2 in the Runway Area</i>	
<p>B19. Oppose the rezoning of the sites under Items S, T, U1, U2, U3 and V1 from “O” to residential, commercial, government, institution or community (GIC) and road uses as</p>	<p>See Para. 6.3.24 of the TPB Paper.</p>

Grounds of Representations	Responses of Government Departments
<p>the reduction in area of the “O” zone would reduce the area available for development of the Metro Park for serving the whole of Kowloon and the scope for accommodating a wide range of open space and sporting facilities. Due to the increase in population arising from the OZP amendments, the area of open space in Kai Tak should be increased or retained the same.</p>	
<p>B20. Rezoning for housing is not required as significant areas have been zoned for residential use in KTD and the residential capacity of KTD has been increased by the rezoning of “C” sites to residential use and the increased plot ratio (PR) for the residential sites.</p>	
<p>B21. Oppose the alignment of Road D3 as it would constrain the future design and use of the Metro Park, e.g. prevent the location of public spectator and supporting facilities as part of the IWSC.</p>	<p>See Para. 6.3.26 of the TPB Paper.</p>
<p>B22. The landscape deck above Road D3 should be extended further to the northwest and allow for the construction of sports pitches. The design details of the landscaped deck should be provided to the Town Planning Board (the Board), the public and relevant stakeholders.</p>	
<p>C. Development Intensity and Building Height (BH) Profile</p>	
<p><i>Planning Principles</i></p>	
<p>C1. KTD is intended for low-rise, low-density development. The proposed increase of BH and development intensity at the Runway Area deviates from and jeopardizes the original planning intention and urban design concept for KTD. The development intensity of the former runway should remain as low as possible. The technical study conducted by the Government in 2013 only recommended the increase of BH of 10 sites in the Runway Area by 10m to 20m.</p>	<p>See Paras. 6.3.28 to 6.3.30 of the TPB Paper.</p>
<p>C2. The higher PRs for the residential sites on the runway, when compared with inland sites (e.g. in Areas 1H, 1I, 1K and 1L), deviate from the HPPG and the Hong Kong Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) that lower development density should be adopted for</p>	

Grounds of Representations	Responses of Government Departments
<p>developments fronting directly onto the Victoria Harbour. Developments in the Runway Area should be kept low-rise and low-density to be compatible with the harbourfront setting. Houses not exceeding 3 levels should be considered. Excessive BH at Runway Area is unacceptable from urban design point of view.</p>	
<p>C3. The proposed BHs in the Runway Area fail to adopt the stepped BH profile, which is not in line with HPPG. The BH profile along the Runway Area should be adjusted downwards such that the urban design framework with development intensities descending downwards from the hinterland to the waterfront/Runway Area could be maintained. Adopting lower BHs for the sites, especially Sites 4E2, 4A2, 4C1, 4C2, 4C3, 4C4, and 4C5 which face the harbour, can increase visual permeability to the harbour and improve air circulation to the inland area. The deviation from the stepped BH concept of the HPPG should be justified.</p>	
<p>C4. The photomontage of Area 4 viewed from Quarry Bay Park (Plan 15e of TPB Paper No. 10236) clearly shows a monotonous building mass along the promenade in the Final Refined Scheme, which deviates from the HPPG. Although PlanD had tried to achieve the diversity of building mass concept by varying the BH profile along the direction of southeast to northwest, the proposed increase of BH has undermined the effectiveness of variation of BH profile of these sites.</p>	
<p>C5. KTD is a symbolic development which gives the first impression of Hong Kong to tourists arriving from the Cruise Terminal. The BH in the Runway Area should be compatible with the Cruise Terminal. Balanced development intensity and capacity is one of the principles of the HPPG. Further increase of BH near the Cruise Terminal area is not acceptable. The excessively tall buildings in the Runway Area will result in a monotonous harbour image.</p>	

Grounds of Representations	Responses of Government Departments
<p>C6. The BH restriction at Runway Area is excessive and incompatible with the surroundings, such as the sites along the Kwun Tong harbourfront which have BHs of 60mPD to 80mPD. The BHs of the proposed residential developments on the runway should make reference to the commercial buildings recently commenced nearby. The residential sites in the Runway Area should be rearranged with greater building separation and variation in BH, taking into account the BHs of 60mPD for the Hong Kong Children’s Hospital and 100mPD for the Kai Tak Acute Hospital, and those of the approved residential developments along Kai Hing Road.</p>	
<p>C7. The development intensity of the sites in the Runway Area should not be increased because of the need to increase housing supply. The Government should rezone other sites (e.g. government land or brownfield sites) instead of those in Kai Tak to meet housing supply target.</p>	
<p>C8. Relaxation of BH will significantly affect the ridgeline of Lion Rock, which should be respected.</p>	
<p>C9. The OZP amendments would block the seaview of private properties and the view of developments along Hoi Bun Road in the Kwun Tong waterfront, and affect property price. The uses of several pieces of land at the south of NKIL 6525 (Site 111) (Plan H-2) have been changed from “G/IC” and commercial to commercial and residential. The amendments will have adverse impact on development potential and reduce the value of the development on Site 111 as the harbour view will be blocked.</p>	<p>See Para. 6.3.33 of the TPB Paper.</p>
<p><i>Technical Assessments and Development Impacts</i></p>	
<p><i>Visual</i></p>	
<p>C10. Only 2 out of the 10 selected viewpoints (VP) towards the former runway (i.e. Kwun Tong Promenade and Quarry Bay Park) were presented in TPB Paper No. 10236. The other 8 VPs should be disclosed to the public and the Board to demonstrate that the view of ridgelines would not be obstructed.</p>	<p>See Paras. 6.3.31, 6.3.32, 6.3.34 and 6.3.35 of the TPB paper.</p>

Grounds of Representations	Responses of Government Departments
<p>C11. The views from the new vantage points in different parts of the metropolitan area which have been completed or will be completed in coming few years should be considered. Kai Tak Cruise Terminal Park, Kai Tak Runway Park, Anderson Road Quarry's viewing deck, the promenades along Wan Chai, Causeway Bay, Tin Hau and North Point after completion of Wan Chai Development Phase II and Central - Wan Chai Bypass, the Boardwalk under Island Eastern Corridor and the ex-North Point Estate redevelopment offer various view points towards Area 2, 3 and 4 of KTD. Photomontages from the above new vantage points should be produced for the public and the Board's comments.</p>	
<p>C12. Among the 8 strategic VPs stipulated in the HKPSG for the Victoria Harbour, only two (i.e. VP4 – Quarry Bay Park and VP5 – Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre) have been used to produce the photomontages for the whole OZP. Photomontages from these strategic VPs should be produced to demonstrate if the increased density and BH would have any adverse visual impact on the Kowloon Peak and major Kowloon ridgelines or any intrusion into the 20% building free zone.</p>	
<p>C13. The increase in BHs of the sites under Items H1, H2 and J in the South Apron (i.e. Sites 3A1, 3A6, 3B1, 3B2, 3B3 and 3B4) and Items O, P, Q, R, S and T in the Runway Area would block the view of the ridgelines of Fei Ngo Shan/Lion Rock, which deviates from the 20% building free zone for preservation of ridgelines and the planning concept of the OZP.</p>	
<p>C14. For the photomontage with view from Prince Edward Road East (Plan 9e of TPB Paper No. 10236), the baseline development on Site 2A4 is a single block development while the recommended proposal shows a two-block development with one standing at the back to diminish/alleviate the visual impact. The photomontage for the recommended proposal should be reproduced by adopting the one block design to make a reasonable and fair comparison with the baseline development.</p>	<p>The proposed scheme as shown under the recommended proposal is in fact a single block development. The building layout is indicated on Figure 3 of the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP. With a proposed increase in BH from 60mPD to 80mPD, there is a flexibility for the the proposed building design for the recommended proposal to incorporate a massing with better articulation to avoid a</p>

Grounds of Representations	Responses of Government Departments
	continuous wall effect.
<p>C15. The photomontage with view from Olympic Avenue (Plan 15 of TPB No. 10192 and Plan 9f of TPB Paper No. 10236) was taken from a hazy day that the mountain backdrop of Lion Rock is barely seen. This photomontage should be reproduced since the ridgeline is not visible for both baseline development and recommended proposals. It is impossible to determine whether the recommended proposal respects the 20% building free zone as defined in the HKPSG to preserve the ridgelines of Lion Rock.</p>	<p>According to the HKPSG, the 20% building free zone applies to selected strategic VPs only. The subject VP is not one of the eight strategic VPs promulgated under the HKPSG. Besides, while the Lion Rock is not within the view fan of this selected VP, in comparing the baseline scheme and the recommended proposal, the visual obstruction towards the mountain backdrop is less due to the proposed establishment of the Heritage Park causing a setback of the group of buildings fronting Prince Edward Road East.</p>
<u>Air Ventilation and Environment</u>	
<p>C16. The increase in development intensity and BH at the Runway Area will induce wall effect, urban heat island effect and create adverse air ventilation, environmental and natural lighting impacts on the surrounding areas. Sufficient building separation should be required to maintain air circulation.</p>	<p>See Paras. 6.3.37 to 6.3.40 of TPB paper.</p>
<p>C17. There are a large amount of commercial buildings completed in Kwun Tong recently, causing congestion to the business areas and the adjoining residential areas. The environmental quality is already decaying. With increased development intensity at the Runway Area, the environment of Kwun Tong will further deteriorate.</p>	
<p>C18. The increase in population and the mix of uses including commercial and hotel will increase the number of people commuting in the area. This will deepen the residents' concern on the public order of the area.</p>	<p>The Commissioner of Police has no adverse comment on this aspect.</p>

Grounds of Representations	Responses of Government Departments
<i>Traffic</i>	
<p>C19. The OZP amendments and relaxation of BH at the Runway Area will induce adverse traffic impact. The traffic infrastructure, car parking spaces and public transport services are inadequate to accommodate the increased commuting demand arising from additional population. The existing traffic capacity in the nearby districts has already reached its maximum. The further increase in development intensity and hence population would aggravate the traffic problems in the area and induce significant adverse traffic impact to surrounding neighbourhood. More traffic infrastructures should be provided to cater for the increased population.</p>	<p>See Paras. 6.3.41 and 6.3.43 of the TPB Paper.</p>
<p>C20. The important basic information of the traffic impact assessment (TIA) conducted by the Government to justify the increase in PR, including the locations of the junction capacity tests, findings of the quantitative tests and the proposed mitigation measures on junction improvement, are not disclosed to the public. It is unclear if the implementation of the EFLS has been taken into account in the TIA and how the conclusion of the TIA is arrived at. If the EFLS is not implemented eventually, it is uncertain whether the capacity of the two planned vehicular accesses serving the Runway Area would be sufficient to cater for the increased resident and working populations. More information should be disclosed to the public to demonstrate that the conditions would not be worsened as compared with the baseline scheme.</p>	
<i>Provision of GIC Facilities and Open Space</i>	
<p>C21. The increase in development intensity will make KTD become another overdeveloped district or new town, such as the Mid-Levels, Tung Chung and Tseung Kwan O, with insufficient supporting infrastructure, open space, community facilities and transport facilities. The high population density would create burden on the provision of public facilities. More public facilities should be provided to cater for the increased population, and the vision of the Hong Kong 2030+ Study in increasing the provision of GIC facilities and open space should be taken into account.</p>	<p>See Paras. 6.3.44 and 6.3.45 of the TPB paper.</p>

Grounds of Representations	Responses of Government Departments
<i>Housing Mix and Home Ownership</i>	
<p>C22. With regard to current land price level and the public-private housing ratio in KTD, the increase in development intensity for private residential development will only encourage speculation and further push up housing price. This is not conducive to the general home ownership of Hong Kong people or young people. The Government should maintain a balanced mix of public and private housing in the urban area, e.g. designating the sites under Items O, S and U1 in the Runway Area (facing KTAC) for public housing and the sites under Items Q, T and U2 (facing the Victoria Harbour) for private housing (R9 and R10), and impose sale and re-sale restrictions on residential flats under the land sale conditions to discourage speculation.</p>	<p>See Paras. 6.3.7 and 6.3.23 of the TPB paper.</p>
Representations Providing Views	
<p>D1. The site under Item D1 in Area 2 of Kai Tak City Centre should be designated for subsidized housing to alleviate the difficulty of Hong Kong people in owning homes.</p>	<p>See Para. 6.3.7 of the TPB paper.</p>
<p>D2. More GIC facilities (e.g. basketball courts, parks and library) and/or open space (e.g. waterfront promenade) should be provided.</p>	<p>See Paras. 6.3.44 and 6.3.45 of the TPB paper.</p>
<p>D3. The Government should protect the vista of the harbourfront along the two sides of the Victoria Harbour and promote tourism.</p>	<p>See Paras. 6.3.29 of the TPB paper.</p> <p>With regard to the provision of tourism-related facilities, the Commissioner for Tourism opines that other than the planned TN which is intended for the provision of tourism-related use to include commercial, hotel and entertainment facilities, there are also commercial sites located in the Runway Area which are intended for hotel and other commercial uses so as to support the TN and Cruise Terminal development.</p>

Grounds of Representations	Responses of Government Departments
D4. The transportation should be convenient.	Noted.
D5. The improvement in water quality has led to the demand for more water based activities and this in turn has created stronger demand for adequate waterfront space to serve not only the residents of the districts but also thousands of visitors who will be attracted to the area by various annual and ad hoc water sports related events.	Noted.

- (2) The proposals of **R3 to R270, R433, R12084 to R12151 and R12153 to R12158** in **Group 1** as well as the responses of government departments are summarized below:

Proposals	Responses of Government Departments
<i>Kai Tak City Centre</i>	
E1. To retain the “G/IC” zoning of the site under Item E and designate it for religious use.	See Para. 6.3.12 of the TPB paper.
<i>South Apron</i>	
E2. To rezone Site 3B1 under Item H2: (i) back to “G/IC” for development of water sports facilities, (ii) to “O” for development of water sports facilities, or (iii) to “C(9)” (a new “C” sub-zone) requiring the developer of the future commercial development to provide the ground and first floors for a water sports centre; and make amendments to relevant paragraphs of the ES of the OZP in respect of water sports development.	See Paras. 6.3.14 to 6.3.17 of the TPB paper.
E3. To rezone the southern portion of Item N1 to “O”.	See Paras. 6.3.18 and 6.3.19 of the TPB paper.
E4. To defer the rezoning of the site under Item N1 to “R(B)2” until the commencement of redevelopments of the Kerry D.G. Warehouse (Kowloon Bay) and Kowloon Godown sites; or to rezone the site to “C” with provision of flexibility for residential use upon application to the Board.	See Paras. 6.3.18 and 6.3.19 of the TPB paper.

Proposals	Responses of Government Departments
<i>Runway Area</i>	
E5. To realign Road D3 (a section of which is under Item V2) to a more central position on the former runway and extend the landscaped deck on top of the realigned Road D3.	See Para. 6.3.26 of the TPB paper.
E6. To rezone the areas rezoned for residential development (i.e. “R(B)4” and “R(B)5” zones under Items S, T, U1 and U2) and road (i.e. Item U3) back to “O”.	See Para. 6.3.24 of the TPB paper.
E7. To rezone the “G/IC” site for the proposed salt water pumping station and sewage pumping station under Item V1 back to “O” and provide such utility facilities underground. Planning permission should be required from the Board for the development of such pumping stations in the “O” zone.	See Para. 6.3.25 of the TPB paper.
E8. To retain the site under Item P for residential use. The PR and BH restrictions for the sites under Items P and R should be reduced and the commercial GFA of these sites should be re-distributed to the undeveloped commercial sites at Kai Tak City Centre.	See Para. 6.3.22 of the TPB paper.
E9. To retain the original BH restrictions of the approved Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/4 or to allow a BH not exceeding 80mPD for the sites under Items O, P, Q, R, S and T for maintaining a stepped BH profile or a low-density environment.	See Paras. 6.3.29 and 6.3.30 of the TPB paper.

(2) Major Grounds and Proposals of Respective Representations

Representers	Major Representations Grounds/Proposals
R3	A1, B9, B10, B11, B12, B19, B20, B21, E3, E5, E6, E7
R4	B8, B19, C19
R5	C2, C4, C10, C11, C12, C13, C14, C15, C20
R6	B3, B4
R7	B3, B4, B5, B6
R8	C9
R9	C22
R10	C22
R11	B14, C2, C3, C6, E3, E8
R12	B7, B13, C2, E1, E4
R13	B19, B20, B22, E5, E6, E7
R14	C1
R15	B15, C5
R16	C1
R17	C16
R18	C16
R19	C16
R20	C16
R21	B17
R22	C1
R23	C1, C8
R24	C16
R25	B15
R26	B18, C1, C16
R27	C2, C3, C16, E9
R28	B15, C8
R29	C5
R30	C21
R31	C1
R32	C1, C16
R33	C16
R34	C1, C6
R35	B16
R36	C1, C2

Representers	Major Representations Grounds/Proposals
R37	C3, C16
R38	B15, C16
R39	C17
R40	C16, C19
R41	C1, C16, C19
R42	C16, C19
R43, R44	B15, B17, C1, C2, C3, C16, C19
R45	C16, C19
R46	C3, C8, C9
R47, R48	C1, C16
R49	C1, C9, C16
R50 to R52	C1, C16
R53	C1, C16
R54	C16
R55	C7, C16
R56	C16
R57	C16, C19
R58	C16, C19
R59	C16, C19
R60	C16, C19
R61	C16, C19
R62	C16, C17, C19
R63	C8, C9, C16, C19
R64	C19
R65	C9
R66	C16
R67	C6, C9
R68	C16
R69	C3, C8, C9
R70	C9, C16
R71	C9
R72	C9, C16
R73	C9
R74	C9
R75	C3, C8, C9
R76	C16

Representers	Major Representations Grounds/Proposals
R77	C16
R78	C16
R79	C16
R80 to R84	C9, C16
R85	C9, C16
R86	C9
R87	C16
R88	C9, C16
R89	C16
R90	C9
R91	C9, C16
R92	C16
R93	C16
R94	C16, C17
R95	C16, C17
R96	C1
R97	C1
R98	C6
R99	C5
R100	C5
R101	C5
R102	C1
R103	C1
R104	C1
R105	C1
R106	B16
R107	C1
R108	C1
R109	C1
R110	C3
R111	C1
R112	C3
R113	C3
R114	C7
R115	B18
R116	B18

Representers	Major Representations Grounds/Proposals
R117	B1, C19
R118	B15, B16, B18, C1, C2, C3, C5, C8, C9, C16, C19
R119	B18, C5, C9, C16, C19
R120	B16, C2, C5, C9, C16, C19
R121	B16, C2, C5, C9, C16, C19
R122	B16, C2, C5, C9, C16, C19
R123	B16, C2, C5, C9, C16, C19
R124 to R201	B15, B16, B18, C1, C2, C3, C5, C8, C9, C16, C19
R202	B15, B16, B18, C1, C2, C3, C5, C8, C9, C16, C19
R203	B15, B16, B18, C1, C2, C3, C5, C8, C9, C16, C19
R204	B15, B16, B18, C1, C2, C3, C5, C8, C9, C16, C19
R205	B15, B16, B18, C1, C2, C3, C5, C8, C9, C16, C19
R206 to R215	B15, B16, B18, C1, C2, C3, C5, C8, C9, C16, C19
R216	B15, B16, B18, C1, C2, C3, C5, C8, C9, C16, C19
R217	B15, B16, B18, C1, C2, C3, C5, C8, C9, C16, C19
R218	B18, C1, C3, C5, C8, C9, C16
R219	B16, B18, C1, C16
R220	B16, C1, C3, C5, C8, C9, C16
R221	B16, C1, C9, C16
R222 to R228	C1, C5, C9
R229	B16, C1, C5, C9
R230	C1, C16
R231	C1, C16
R232	B16, C1, C3, C5, C9, C16
R233	C1, C16
R234	C1, C3, C8, C9, C16
R235	B16, C1, C5, C9
R236	C1, C16
R237	C1, C3, C8, C9, C16
R238	B16, C1, C5, C9
R239	C1, C16
R240	B15, B17, C2, C16, C19
R241	B15, B17, C2, C16, C19
R242	C2
R243	C1
R244	C1

Representers	Major Representations Grounds/Proposals
R245	C6, C16, C17, C18
R246	C1, C3, C5, C9
R247	B16, C1
R248	B16, C1
R249	B16, C1
R250	B16, C1
R251	C2
R252	C2
R253 to R259	C1, C2, C6, C9, C16, E9
R260	B16
R261	B16
R262	B16
R263	C16, C19, E9
R264	C19
R265	B17, C6
R266	B15, C1, C6, C16
R267	B15, C1, C6, C16
R268	C16
R269	C16
R270	C2, C9, C16, C19
R433	B1, C16, C21, D5
R12084	B3, B4, B5, C17, C18
R12085 to R12137	Oppose the changes of land use in general without relating to specific items.
R12138	C19
R12139	C9
R12140	C5, C16
R12141	C3, C5
R12142	B2
R12143	C22
R12144	D1
R12145	D3
R12146	D2, D3
R12147	B4, C19
R12148	D3
R12149	D3, D4

Representers	Major Representations Grounds/Proposals
R12150	D2, D3
R12151	D2, D3
R12153	D2
R12154 to R12158	Have not provided any specific grounds.

Summary of Comments and Responses

(1) The grounds of **C1 to C262, C1427 and C1428** in **Group 1** as well as the responses of government departments are summarized below:

Grounds of Comments	Responses of Government Departments
A. Support R3 / Provision of Water Sports Facilities	
A1. Support the rezoning proposals by R3 and object the rezoning of Sites 3B1 and 3B2 from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “Commercial (1)” (“C(1)”) which removes the possibility of developing an International Water Sports Centre (IWSC) for Hong Kong. The IWSC is complimentary to Kai Tak Sports Park (KTSP) and matches with the sport-oriented theme of Kai Tak Development (KTD).	See Paras. 6.3.14 to 6.3.17 of the TPB Paper.
A2. The location of Sites 3B1 and 3B2 is convenient and the adjoining water is steady. There is no other better alternative location for an IWSC along the Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC) or elsewhere in Hong Kong, while there are alternative locations for commercial and office use.	
A3. KTAC is a unique area of protected water in the centre of the city. The proposed IWSC would allow the community to use this water area and host water sports events, such as regular training camps for overseas teams.	
A4. The ground floor to podium of the site under Amendment Item H2 facing KTAC should be made available for government, institution or community (GIC) and retail uses.	
A5. A ‘Water Arena’ can be created to provide space and facilities for events on the water such as competitions, ‘floating concerts’ and other displays. The area of the planned Metro Park should not be reduced as it could provide potential space along KTAC for the ‘Water Arena’.	
A6. This body of water is unique and new uses of the harbour will add distinction to the city. This would bring greater, lasting and overall public and economic benefit	

Grounds of Comments	Responses of Government Departments
<p>compared to purely commercial use of land. The proposed IWSC would allow the holding of more international events which can benefit not only the sports sector, but also generate economic benefit from the spending of tourists or sales of event tickets. It also provides more opportunities for Hong Kong people to participate in competitions of high level.</p>	
<p>A7. Hong Kong needs more recreational area, rather than only focusing on commercial development along the harbourfront. It is important to bring various facilities along the harbour and retain a recreation space for citizen in sharing the beauty of the harbour.</p>	
<p>B. Support R13 / Provision of Open Space for Active and Passive Recreation</p>	
<p>B1. Support the rezoning proposals of R13 to rezone the areas rezoned for residential development (under Items S, T, U1 and U2) and road (under Item U3) back to “O”.</p>	<p>See Paras. 6.3.24 to 6.3.26, 6.3.44 and 6.3.45 of the TPB Paper.</p>
<p>B2. There is a shortage of open space and space for active sports in Hong Kong. The reduction in the area of the Metro Park by more than 4 ha will severely restrict the options for the provision of active and passive recreation in the area and the scope for accommodating a wide range of open space and sporting facilities. The Metro Park is a major public open space for KTD and for the whole of Kowloon.</p>	
<p>B3. Hong Kong is significantly short of outdoor activity space and town planning should not only weight on commercial area. More land should be designated to sport and recreation whenever possible. Open areas are important for the health of the city as they provide spaces for citizens to participate in outdoor sports. While New York has Central Park, London has the Royal Park of London and Paris has an abundance of parks, Hong Kong is missing a large park that all great cities across the world have.</p>	
<p>B4. Rezoning for housing is not necessary as significant areas have been zoned for housing in KTD and the residential capacity of KTD has been increased by the rezoning of “C” sites to residential use and increased plot ratio (PR) for the residential</p>	

Grounds of Comments	Responses of Government Departments
sites.	
B5. Support in principle the extension of the landscaped deck under Item V2.	
B6. Road D3 should be aligned to centre of the Metro Park to free up more space for supporting facilities of IWSC and other activities as it is no longer necessary to cut through the runway to facilitate water circulation. (C258)	
B7. The shape of the head of the Kai Tak Approach Channel and the absence of residential uses provide an opportunity for it to become Hong Kong's Marina Bay or Darling Harbour. (C258)	
C. Comments of C259	
C1. Share the views of those representations expressing concerns on and opposing the increased BH restriction and development intensity in KTD.	See Paras. 6.3.7 and 6.3.23 of the TPB Paper.
C2. The rising housing price is caused by 'hot money' and rezoning for residential sites cannot help suppress the housing price. Increasing housing supply would only further push up the housing price.	
C3. Appropriate sale and re-sale restrictions should be stipulated in the land lease so as to help Hong Kong people buy their first properties and suppress speculation.	
C4. The Government should designate the majority of land for public housing development.	
D. Comments of C260	
D1. Support Item A as it improves heritage conservation and development.	Noted.
D2. The combined effect of Items B and C would induce significant visual and air ventilation impacts on the surrounding areas and turn the Lung Tsun Stone Bridge	Items B and C are related to the increase of the PR restrictions of the commercial and residential sites

Grounds of Comments	Responses of Government Departments
(LTSB) Preservation Corridor into a wall effect walkway between reflecting curtain wall blocks.	under “C” and “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) zonings in Area 2 for optimization of their development potential, with corresponding relaxation of BH restrictions. For the three “CDA” sites abutting the LTSB Preservation Corridor, the planning intention is to ensure that the disposition and design of the developments on these sites are in harmony with the Preservation Corridor through the approval of master layout plan by the Town Planning Board. Retail belts are designated along the frontage of the Preservation Corridor to help foster a lively atmosphere.
D3. Object Item D as the development would result in rows of buildings of the same BH and size.	See Para. 6.3.32 of the TPB Paper.
D4. Object Item E as the most pressing need for GIC facilities in coming years is the provision of Ageing-in-Place support facilities, especially in Kowloon City.	See Para. 6.3.44 of the TPB Paper.
D5. The development under Item E should be designed in such a way that the planning intention as a breathing space for “G/IC” site will not be undermined. Low-rise building under Item E would provide some visual relief along Prince Edward Road East.	See Para. 6.3.32 of the TPB Paper.
D6. Object Item H and query if consideration has been given to building the Vocational Training Council (VTC) facility at the site under Item H instead of on the waterfront.	See Para. 6.3.44 of the TPB Paper. For the rationale of developing the VTC campus at the Cha Kwo Ling waterfront area, see TPB Paper No. 10365 for Group 2.

Grounds of Comments	Responses of Government Departments
<p>D7. Object Item I as much GIC space has been given to road. The current government policy is to curb the growth in the number of vehicles but the increase in road coverage continues, which impacts the environment, walkability and quality of life.</p>	<p>Arising from the gazetted Central Kowloon Route alignment, the access road to the three existing petrol filling stations along Kai Fuk Road would be widened and re-aligned. The site configuration of the “OU(Petrol Filling Station)” zone and the site boundaries of the two adjoining “G/IC” sites (i.e. Sites 3A1 and 3A6) would therefore be revised correspondingly.</p>
<p>D8. Object Item J and query the rationale of having an animal facility in the middle of a congested urban area.</p>	<p>Site 3A1 is earmarked for the reprovisioning of the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)’s existing Animal Management Centre at Mok Cheong Street, which has to be relocated to facilitate redevelopment of the site for residential use. The new site is far away from the major development area and the relocation proposal has been incorporated in the approved Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/2 gazetted in 2007. The current amendment is to update the site layout to tally with the latest road alignment and relax the BH restriction to meet the AFCD’s latest operational needs to incorporate additional animal management/welfare services.</p>
<p>D9. Object Item M as it is impossible to ensure safe evacuation from high-rise buildings in emergency.</p>	<p>The future hospital development on the site has to comply with the relevant building regulations including fire safety requirements.</p>
<p>D10. Object the monotonous layout and wall effect at the Runway Area. There has been no master plan with a diversity of buildings.</p>	<p>See Para. 6.3.29 of the TPB Paper.</p>

(2) Major Comments on the Representations

Commenters	Major Comments on the Representations
C1	A1, A2, A3
C2, C3	A1, A2, A5
C4	A1, A2, A3, A5
C5 to C51	A1, A2, A5
C52	A1, A2, A5, A7
C53 to C87	A1, A2, A5
C88	A1, A2, A5, A6
C89 to C95	A1, A2, A5
C96	A1, A2, A5, A7
C97 to C148	A1, A2, A5
C149	A6
C150	A1
C151 to C219	B1, B2, B4
C220	B1, B2, B3, B4
C221 to C240	B1, B2, B4
C241	B1, B2, B3, B4
C242 to C253	B1, B2, B4
C254	B1, B2, B3, B4
C255	B1
C256	B3
C257	B3
C258	A1, A2, A4, A5, B1, B2, B4, B5, B6, B7
C259	C1, C2, C3, C4
C260	D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, D9, D10
C261	C1, D5
C262	Support Representations 9 and 40 to 270 without specifying further comments.
C1427 to C1428	No View