

Harbourfront Commission
Task Force on Harbourfront Developments
in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing

Minutes of Forty-fifth Meeting

Date : 10 October 2023
Time : 2:00 p.m.
Venue : Room 1303, 13/F, Wing On Kowloon Centre, 345 Nathan Road, Kowloon

Present

Prof Becky LOO	Chairlady, Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing (KTF)
Mr Vincent NG	Chairman, Harbourfront Commission
Mr Chiky WONG	Representing Friends of the Earth (HK) Charity Limited
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Prof Ir Sam CHOW	Representing the Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Dr CHUNG Shan-shan	Representing the Conservancy Association
Ir Alice CHOW	Representing the Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Ms Iris HOI	Representing the Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Miss Sam LOK	Representing the Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Sr Vincent HO	Representing the Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Jeff TUNG	Representing the Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Mac CHAN	Individual Member
Ir Janice LAI	Individual Member
Sr Francis LAM	Individual Member
Ms Christina LEE	Individual Member
Mr Wilson OR	Individual Member

Official Members

Ms Leonie LEE	Commissioner for Harbourfront, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Jon MAK	Senior Manager (Tourism) 2, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr Vincent CHOW	Senior Engineer/Kowloon District Central, Transport Department (TD)

Mr Patrick HUI	Senior Engineer/2 (South), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Ms May CHEUNG	Chief Leisure Manager (Kowloon), Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Ms Vivian LAI	District Planning Officer/Kowloon, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Nelson SO	Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Andy LEWIS	Representing Business Environment Council Limited
Mr Dennis HO	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ms Corrin CHAN	Representing the Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Dr Lawrence LI	Individual Member

For Agenda Item 4

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Ms Maggie NG	District Leisure Manager (Tsuen Wan)
Mr Ryan LAM	Deputy District Leisure Manager (Tsuen Wan) 2
Ms Angel WU	Assistant District Leisure Manager (Tsuen Wan) 3

Architectural Services Department

Ms Jackie LEE	Senior Project Manager 330
Mr Gavin LAU	Project Manager 352

One Bite Design Studio Limited

Ms Sarah MUI	Co-Founder & Design Director
--------------	------------------------------

For Agenda Item 5

The Hong Kong Ice & Cold Storage Company Limited

Mr Alex AU YEUNG	General Manager
Ms Erica CHEUNG	Senior Development Officer
Ms Victoria LAW	Property Investment Officer

ALKF+

Mr James LEUNG	Director
----------------	----------

ARUP

Ms Theresa YEUNG	Director
Mr Mark LIM	Urban Planning Manager
Ms Natalie CHAN	Assistant Town Planner

Welcoming Message

Mr Vincent NG, Chairman of the Harbourfront Commission (HC), welcomed all to the meeting, in particular the following new Members who were appointed on 1 July 2023 and attending the Task Force meeting for the first time -

- (a) **Mr Chiky WONG**, representing Friends of the Earth (HK) Charity Limited;
- (b) **Ir Alice CHOW**, representing the Hong Kong Institution of Engineers;
- (c) **Sr Vincent HO**, representing the Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors; and
- (d) **Mr Wilson OR**, Individual Member.

He also informed the meeting that -

- (a) **Ms Leonie LEE**, Commissioner for Harbourfront of Development Bureau, attends on behalf of Mr Gary POON, Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands) 1;
- (b) **Mr Jon MAK**, Senior Manager of the Tourism Commission (TC), attends on behalf of Ms Elsa HUNG, Assistant Commissioner for Tourism 2;
- (c) **Mr Vincent CHOW**, Senior Engineer/ Kowloon District Central of Transport Department (TD), attends on behalf of Mr Gary WONG, Chief Engineer, Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon;
- (d) **Mr Patrick HUI**, Senior Engineer/2 of Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD), attends on behalf of Mr Clarence YEUNG, Chief Engineer/South 1; and
- (e) **Ms May CHEUNG**, Chief Leisure Services Manager (Kowloon) of Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD), attends on behalf of Mr Henry WONG, Assistant Director (Leisure Services) 1.

Item 1 Election of Chairperson

- 1.1 **Sr Francis LAM** nominated and **Mr Jeff TUNG** as well as **Prof Ir Sam CHOW** seconded Prof Becky LOO to be the Chairperson of the Task Force. **Prof Becky LOO** accepted the nomination and officially took over the chairmanship of the meeting.

Item 2 Confirmation of Minutes of the 44th Meeting

- 2.1 **The Chairlady** informed Members that the draft minutes of the 44th meeting were circulated on 5 September 2023. No comment had been received from Members. There being no further amendment, the draft minutes were confirmed at the meeting.

Item 3 Matters Arising

- 3.1 No matters arising were raised at the meeting.

Item 4 Transformation of Public Play Space in Tsuen Wan Park (Phase II) (Paper No. TFK/03/2023)

Introduction

- 4.1 **The Chairlady** welcomed representatives of the project proponent to the meeting, and invited Members to declare any conflict of interest.
- 4.2 Upon **the Chairlady's** invitation, **Mr Nelson SO** briefed Members on the background of the project as follows:
- (a) To make the Public Play Space (PPS) more innovative and fun as well as to meet the aspirations of local residents, the Government announced in the 2019 Policy Address the launching of a five-year plan to transform more than 170 PPS under LCSD and the Project at Tsuen Wan Park (Phase II) was one of them; and
 - (b) The Park was about 43m away from the water frontage. The extent of the existing Children Play Area was about 1,100m².

Presentation by the Project Proponent

- 4.3 With the aid of a PowerPoint, **Ms Sarah MUI** presented to Members the outline design of the Project.

Discussion

General Comments

- 4.4 **Miss Sam LOK** supported the proposal and hoped that LCSD would continue engaging the community during the design stage in future projects. She enquired about life expectancy of the Park's design and whether the proposed design allowed for future modifications. She suggested expediting the construction process due to the high popularity of the playground within the community.
- 4.5 In response, **Ms Sarah MUI** explained that during the construction, the team had to follow certain procedures including the transplantation of a few trees, and had to take forward the construction work in two stages to minimize the disturbances to the public. Besides, pedestrian access would have to be maintained for the Park during the construction. All these would inevitably lengthen the project period. That said, the team would closely monitor the progress during construction phase with a view to completing the works as quickly as possible.
- 4.6 **Mr Ryan LAM** added that Tsuen Wan Park consisted of three Phases, each featuring a playground. While the playground at Phase II of the Park was proposed to be closed for two years during construction, children would still have access to other playgrounds at Phase I and Phase III of the Park, as well as the indoor Children's Play Room at the nearby Tsuen Wan Sports Centre (TWSC). The team would also strive to minimise the closure period of the playground.
- 4.7 **Ms Jackie LEE** supplemented that tentatively, the first stage of construction would last for approximately six months, and the second stage around a year and a half. The first stage would primarily involve improvements of the road and the footpath, while the second stage would focus on the construction work of the children's playground. The playground would continue to be operated throughout the initial stage of construction.

Design and Facilities

- 4.8 **Dr CHUNG Shan-shan** appreciated the team for their efforts on community engagement and also for considering children's input in the design. She suggested allowing young children to climb up the structure with an octopus at the top. Besides, she enquired about the length of the jogging trail and suggested providing additional water fountains and information on the calories burned during jogging to encourage more people to use the trail.
- 4.9 **Ms Sarah MUI** responded that the octopus, while being an eye-catching icon to attract visitors, was not meant to be climbed as its primary purpose was to provide shelter for the drinking fountain. Regarding the jogging trail, she appreciated the suggestion of enhancing the signage by incorporating necessary information for visitors. **Mr Ryan LAM** supplemented that the existing drinking fountain at the playground at Phase II of the Park would be reprovisioned upon completion of the construction works. The proposed new drinking fountain would be equipped with both bubbler and bottle filling features. Moreover, a number of drinking fountains were available nearby, including those near the pet garden, near the tennis court, and within the TWSC. As for the jogging trail, its length was approximately 150m.
- 4.10 **Prof Ir Sam CHOW** supported the proposal and enquired about the nighttime lighting and whether any decorative elements would be incorporated. He noted the uneven ground levels and expressed concern about the potential risk this might bring to visitors. He also enquired about the materials to be used at the Park. In respect of the matting materials, **Mr Chiky WONG** expressed concern on the safety issue and the potential odour that might have caused to the users. He sought information on the criteria used for selecting these materials.
- 4.11 **Ms Jackie LEE** responded that LED lights would be installed, including on the chairs and door frames, for serving the dual purposes of meeting the lighting requirements and creating attractive decorative effects. More importantly, these lighting arrangements would be implemented in a manner that would not disturb the nearby residents. Concerning the issue of step height, a safety consultant had been engaged and would inspect the children's playground before opening the site to the public, so as to ensure the safety of the playground in overall terms, and that of individual items including the play equipment and materials used.
- 4.12 **Mr Chiky WONG** suggested increasing the overall number of

facilities in the Park in view of its popularity among children. **Ms Sarah MUI** responded that there would be more new swings, along with the addition of several trampolines. Moreover, both the merry-go-round and the balancing wheel could each accommodate up to eight children at any one time. The playground would feature a variety of play equipment, catering to individual play as well as group activities.

- 4.13 **Sr Francis LAM** opined that there seemed to be a number of good features to be located inside a small space of the site. He enquired about the possibility of expanding the site. **The Chairlady** concurred.
- 4.14 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested providing an outdoor dining area or seating area with tables and kiosks for visitors coming to enjoy the view of the harbour. **Mr Jeff TUNG** shared his views.
- 4.15 **The Chairlady** suggested that a road and an exit leading towards the waterfront be constructed to enhance the accessibility of the site. **Ms Jackie LEE** responded that further discussions with LCSD would be held to explore options for improving accessibility. They would also take into account the presence of nearby LCSD facilities and the need to preserve the trees within the site areas.
- 4.16 **Sr Vincent HO** suggested relocating the “Forest of Mystery” area to a suitable lawn area within the park given the limited space of the site. Also, he opined that the “Forest of Mystery” area, which should embody a forest atmosphere with grass and trees, did not appear to be aligned with the current site context.

[Post-meeting note: Subsequent to the meeting, Mr Freddie HAI, who represented The Hong Kong Institute of Architects, made the following comments by email dated 15 October 2023. He suggested providing more shading and trees to provide shelter from the sun. The proponent responded that additional tree and more sitting area with shelters or tree shading would be provided in the proposed project.]

Greening and Sustainability

- 4.17 **Dr CHUNG Shan-shan** suggested implementing solar panels to generate energy for powering the lights and adopting renewable energy. She also suggested the use of recyclable materials, like rubber tiles, in the playground design to

promote recycling practices. **Ms Sarah MUI** responded that recyclable materials such as recycled rubber would be used. On the other hand, it was assessed that solar panels might not be cost-effective. Hence, energy-saving lamps would be selected as an energy-conserving alternative. **Dr CHUNG Shan-shan** sought further clarification on the proportion of recycled materials. Besides, she suggested incorporating timber sourced from Y PARK into the project.

- 4.18 **Prof Ir Sam CHOW** enquired about the species of trees intended for planting and the party responsible for the maintenance and management of these trees. **Mr Chiky WONG** suggested choosing suitable trees for better shading. **Ms Sarah MUI** responded that *Liquidambar formosana* was picked as trees of this species were known for their larger crown canopy. They could not only provide ample shade but could also add aesthetic value to the surroundings.

Way Forward

- 4.19 **The Chairlady** appreciated the project team's efforts in engaging the public, specifically in incorporating children's input into the design. She suggested expediting the construction process and providing clear signage for visitors to easily locate other available playgrounds. Moreover, she invited the project team to consider Members' comments in order to enhance the accessibility and design of the park.

Item 5 Proposed Residential Development at Yau Tong Marine Lot (YTML) 71 in Yau Tong Bay (Paper No. TFK/04/2023)

Introduction

- 5.1 **The Chairlady** welcomed the project proponent to the meeting and invited Members to declare any conflict of interest.
- 5.2 **Sr Vincent HO** declared that he was a member of the Town Planning Board (TPB). **The Chairlady** considered that he could remain in the meeting and join the discussion.
- 5.3 **Prof Ir Sam CHOW** and **Ir Alice CHOW** declared that their company was involved in the project. **Ms Sam LOK** declared that her company was one of the developers of the Consortium. **The Chairlady** considered that they could stay at the meeting but should refrain from giving comments on the project.

- 5.4 Upon **the Chairlady's** invitation, **Mr Nelson SO** briefed Members on the background of the project as follows:
- (a) The subject site, Yau Tong Marine Lot 71 (YTML 71), was currently occupied by the Yau Tong Ice Plant with a site area of about 3,000m²;
 - (b) At the 38th KTF Meeting held in September 2020, the project proponents, including the proponent of this item, presented their scheme to rezone the subject site (which formed part of a larger application site) from "Comprehensive Development Area" ("CDA") to "Commercial (1)" ("C(1)"). Also, the proponents proposed to provide a connected public waterfront promenade (PWP) of not less than 15m wide with 24-hour access. They would also take up the management and maintenance responsibility of the PWP in front of their land lots;
 - (c) However, the then KTF considered it premature to render support to the proposal at that stage as Members cast doubt on the execution and details of the proposed scheme, and invited the proponents to refine it with due consideration to Members' concerns;
 - (d) In July 2023, the proponent submitted a s.16 planning application (No. A/K15/130) to TPB for a proposed 34-storey (including 2-storey basement carpark) residential tower with minor relaxation of plot ratio restriction from 4.5 to 5. The proposed building height was 115mPD. According to the application, a PWP of not less than 15m wide with an area of about 895m² in size would be provided; and
 - (e) The rezoning proposal for the nearby site to facilitate the redevelopment of Wing Shan Industrial Building to a commercial/office building at YTMLs 73 and 74, was discussed at the last (44th) KTF meeting on 29 June 2023.

Briefing by the Planning Department

- 5.5 With the aid of a PowerPoint, **Ms Vivian LAI** briefed Members on the background and history of the case as follows -
- (a) The subject site was previously zoned as "Industrial" on the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) and was subsequently rezoned as part of the Yau Tong Bay "CDA" zone in 2002;
 - (b) The Yau Tong Bay "CDA" zone was subject to a maximum

plot ratio of 4.5 and a maximum building height of 120mPD. Based on the individual merits of a development or redevelopment proposal, minor relaxation of the plot ratio/building height restrictions may be considered by the TPB on application. Under no circumstances shall the total plot ratio exceed 5.0;

- (c) Despite the application covering the whole Yau Tong Bay "CDA" zone, the proposal was essentially to redevelop the Yau Tong Ice Plant at YTML 71 into a 34-storey residential tower with a maximum PR of 5 and building height of 115mPD. A PWP of not less than 15m wide and not less than 895m² in size was proposed in the notional scheme;
- (d) The latest s.16 application covering the whole of Yau Tong Bay (No. A/K15/112) for proposed comprehensive development (including residential, commercial, hotel and pier (landing steps)) and minor relaxation of plot ratio restriction from 4.5 to 5 was approved in 2015. The application was submitted by a Consortium owning the majority of the land at Yau Tong Bay (but excluding the subject site and some other private lots / government land in the "CDA" zone). Under the approved Master Layout Plan (MLP), the building height would ascend gradually from 60.5mPD and 72mPD at the two western ends to a maximum of 120mPD near the two eastern corners of the "CDA" zone; and
- (e) A separate s.12A application (No. Y/K15/6) for rezoning YTMLs 73 & 74 (i.e. Wing Shan Industrial Building) from "CDA" to "C(1)" with a maximum plot ratio of 11 and building height of 130mPD was partially agreed by the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the TPB. The proposal also included amendments to the Notes of the OZP for the "C" zone, i.e. incorporation of 'Marine Related Facilities' and 'Marina' as Column 1 and 2 uses respectively for the "C(1)" zone, and proposed provision for a PWP of not less than 20m wide and a size of not less than 1,205m².

Presentation by the Project Proponent

- 5.6 With the aid of a PowerPoint, **Ms Theresa YEUNG** presented to Members the design of the project.

Discussion

General Comments

- 5.7 **The Chairlady** enquired about the need for a section 16 application if the proposed plan could comply with the requirements stipulated in the Notes and the OZP. **Ms Theresa YEUNG** clarified that all uses within the “CDA” zone required permission from the TPB. This requirement aimed to control and monitor the phased development within the “CDA” zone through a MLP. To ensure integrated development, the PWP of each development site should align with the PWP of adjacent land parcels.
- 5.8 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that the development of the site should take a high priority, mentioning that the proposed building height would not negatively impact any stakeholders since the area behind the application site comprised only hillslopes and roads. He enquired about the party responsible for the maintenance of the PWP after its completion. **Mr Chiky WONG** enquired whether the proponent would be committed to the maintenance of the lawn and grass areas of the promenade. **Ms Theresa YEUNG** responded that the proponent would assume the maintenance responsibility for the PWP until the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) assumed ownership.
- 5.9 **Sr Vincent HO** enquired about the need to allocate 895m² for the PWP. **Ms Vivian LAI** confirmed that it was necessary as this figure represented the minimum requirement stipulated in the Notes of the OZP. According to the Notes of the OZP, the total site area of the PWP should not be less than 24,700m² for the whole “CDA” zone, which was measured at a width of 20m along the entire stretch of the waterfront. Hence, on a pro-rata basis, the subject site should provide a PWP of not less than 895m² in size.
- 5.10 **Mr Vincent NG** supported the proposal and recognised the efforts made to improve accessibility and connectivity, especially considering the constraints of the narrow site. He opined that the most effective approach of developing the PWP would be to facilitate its early opening.
- 5.11 **Mr Jeff TUNG** suggested preserving specific buildings as heritage sites. **The Chairlady** mentioned that the subject building did not hold any heritage grading, and the proponent was allowed to proceed with the sites’ development.

- 5.12 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested providing landing steps to enhance the vibrancy of the area. **Mr Chiky WONG** echoed his view and highlighted the potential of landing steps in attracting more visitors to the site, and also enquired about the strategies to draw people to the waterfront. **Ms Theresa YEUNG** responded that the proponent of the nearby sites, YTMLs 73 & 74, which were two lots away, had already committed to providing landing steps. There would be a total of three landing steps within the Yau Tong Bay CDA along Ko Fai Road if landing steps were to be provided in the subject site as well. Moreover, considering that the subject site was proposed for residential development, there might be challenges on the maintenance responsibility of the landing steps among future residents.
- 5.13 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** responded that the landing steps adjacent to YTMLs 73 & 74 were situated some 110m away from the subject site. He also mentioned that the maintenance costs for these landing steps would be minimal due to their concrete composition. **Ms Theresa YEUNG** explained that the 110m distance was considered an acceptable walking distance, and YTMLs 73 & 74 were planned for commercial development which was expected to offer a wide range of activities and provide better synergy with the landing steps.
- 5.14 **Ms Iris HOI** suggested providing facilities, such as shelters and benches, to enhance public enjoyment.
- 5.15 **Mr Jeff TUNG** considered that some PWP lacked a wide range of amenities as they mainly contained trees and walkways only. He suggested providing some food and beverage (F&B) facilities at the subject site. **Ms Theresa YEUNG** responded that the proposed development of the nearby lots, YTML 73 & 74, aimed to provide about 2,000m² of retail services, including F&B facilities. Besides, in the vicinity of the Yau Tong MTR station, specifically T5 and T6 under the Consortium, there was a plan of developing an 8,000m² shopping mall that would incorporate F&B facilities. Altogether, the Yau Tong Bay "CDA" zone would span approximately 10,000m² of retail space.

Design

- 5.16 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested removing the plants outside the lobby to ensure an unobstructed view of the harbour; and making the lobby area more interactive and connected to the waterfront. **Ms Theresa YEUNG** responded

that review would be carried out to enhance its design.

- 5.17 **Dr CHUNG Shan-shan** enquired about the measures taken to address potential flooding during severe weather conditions. **Ms Theresa YEUNG** responded that they shared concerns about potential flooding in the parking spaces located at basement levels. They had provided the Drainage Services Department with the information on the site formation level and would consider the installation of a floodgate. **Mr James LEUNG** added that during the detailed design stage, efforts would be made to raise the entrance level in order to mitigate the potential flooding risks.
- 5.18 **Dr CHUNG Shan-shan** further suggested that storm surge barrier could be considered. This barrier would close automatically when the area encountered the risk of flooding; and it would solely be operated on water pressure without electricity.

[Post-meeting notes:

- (a) *Subsequent to the meeting, Mr Freddie HAI made the following comments via his email dated 15 October 2023. He emphasized that the proponent should take into account the bay area's three-sided waterfront, which made it very ideal for water-based performances or drone events during night time. He expressed concern that the current landscape design lacked spatial considerations to promote event for festivity or in the water. He suggested that the proponent re-consider the landscape design to allow for crowd congregation and allow for retail elements to activate the waterfront areas.*
- (b) *In response, the proponent explained that the subject site (i.e. YTML 71) would provide a PWP with an area of about 895m². The landscape design of the PWP was carefully planned, taking into account various considerations. The lawn area within the subject site provided flexibility for organizing events and facilitated crowd congregation. Also, the PWP at the subject site offered a vibrant soft-landscape area accessible to the public. Apart from the 3m-wide at-grade public access at the western edge of the subject site, the pedestrian walkway within the PWP ensured comfortable circulation for daily activities and events. Furthermore, the proposed landscape design of the subject site seamlessly connected with the adjacent PWP area, creating a continuous leisure circulation and effectively managing crowd congregation.*
- (c) *In addition, the proponent responded that adopting the Approved Planning Application No. A/K15/112 as a basis, the Yau Tong Bay "CDA" zone had retail uses at Towers 1, 5, 6 and 8 with a gross floor*

area (GFA) of about 12,304.71m². Moreover, according to the Planning Application No. Y/K15/6, which was partially agreed by the TPB, about 2,560m² retail GFA would be provided upon redevelopment of YTML 73 & 74. Therefore, a total of about 14,864.71 m² retail GFA would be provided across the whole "CDA" zone to serve the community and activate the waterfront areas.]

Accessibility and Connectivity

- 5.19 **Sr Vincent HO** stressed the importance of ensuring the continuity of the PWP. **Ms Iris HOI** concurred and opined that if both sides of the PWP could not be connected with the promenade sections of the adjacent land lots, a 3m-wide public access connecting the hinterland and the waterfront might only make PWP a cul-de-sac. She enquired about the height of the building adjacent to the 3m-wide public access and whether people would have an unobstructed view of the waterfront access from this access.
- 5.20 **Mr James LEUNG** responded that a podium-free approach had been adopted to allow for better sea breeze circulation. There was a substantial open area above the lobby. Efforts had been made to improve ventilation by incorporating plantings around the lobby area. Although the 3m-wide public access might seem to be in close proximity to the building, the lobby was positioned at an elevated level which created a spacious environment. **Dr CHUNG Shan-shan** enquired about the current prevailing wind direction.
- 5.21 **Mr Jeff TUNG** opined that the development of the entire PWP lacked a holistic approach, with one section being completed ahead of the others. He enquired about the expected timeframe for the opening of the remaining sections of the PWP.
- 5.22 **Sr Francis LAM** enquired about the possibility of the Government assuming responsibility for completing the remaining sections of the PWP in the event that no parties were available to undertake the task. He also enquired whether it would be feasible to request the proponents to develop the PWP adjacent to their own sites, thus ensuring a seamless connection PWP.
- 5.23 **The Chairlady** suggested connecting the PWP with sites T16 and T18 located to the east and west of the project site respectively. If relocating the "Government, Institution or Community" (GIC) facilities of T16 and T18 was not possible,

she suggested exploring the option of setting them back to allow for space along the waterfront to ensure a seamless PWP.

- 5.24 **Ms Leonie LEE** responded that the Harbour Office attached importance to facilitating the development of the promenade in the area by, among others, actively engaging with relevant government departments to explore possibilities of opening up the waterfront sections where possible for promenade development. Certain facilities, such as pumping stations, understandably had to be situated near the harbourfront for operational reasons. Nonetheless, she mentioned that, for example, discussions were underway with Water Supplies Department (WSD), to set back their facilities located at T16. WSD had expressed an in-principle agreement to release the harbourfront portion to enable the development of a continuous PWP. The government's overall objective and vision was to create a connected and continuous promenade; and the Harbour Office would continue to work towards this objective.
- 5.25 **Ms Theresa YEUNG** responded that the proponent welcomed the Government's involvement in the development of the remaining sections of the PWP situated at T16 and T18. She elaborated that the wider access on both sides would be implemented to comply with the requirements specified in the previous planning application.
- 5.26 **The Chairlady** enquired about the accessibility to the waterfront from Cha Kwo Ling Road and suggested providing clear visual access or signage to direct people towards the waterfront. **Ms Theresa YEUNG** responded that the proponent had been in contact with the site owner of YTMLs 73 & 74 and the Consortium, and the proponent would assume the responsibility of preparing the signage for the access.

Way Forward

- 5.27 **The Chairlady** concluded that the proposal had received general support from Members. She looked forward to the seamless connection of the PWP in Yau Tong Bay and acknowledged the ongoing efforts of the Harbour Office to facilitate the desired connection. As for the project site, she hoped that the podium-free design would genuinely enhance the vibrancy of the site for public enjoyment, and invited the proponent to take into account Members' comments in order to improve the overall design and accessibility of the site.

Item 6 Any Other Business

- 6.1 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** raised the following suggestions:
- (a) providing progress updates on the harbourfront development in Kowloon for new Members;
 - (b) taking a proactive approach to improve the Tsim Sha Tsui ferry pier for the benefit of the public and visitors; and
 - (c) maintaining the option for online meetings due to better attendance and participation.
- 6.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired about anticipated timeline for connecting the Canton Road and West Kowloon Cultural District.
- 6.3 In response to Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN's suggestions and enquiries, **the Chairlady** mentioned that face-to-face discussions were strongly encouraged. If there was any exceptional circumstance that rendered Members impossible to attend the meeting in person, an online option could be made available upon request. Besides, she suggested that the Secretariat look into the suggestion of providing progress updates as appropriate.
- 6.4 **Mr Jeff TUNG** enquired whether consultation with the KTF was mandatory for all projects in the harbourfront areas. He cited that construction of a kiosk in the Tsim Sha Tsui promenade had been carried out recently; but it seemed that this construction was done without consultation with KTF. **The Chairlady** explained that the KTF primarily discussed significant projects within its purview. Members might wish to suggest items for discussion to the Secretariat for further consideration and follow-up.
- 6.5 **The Chairlady** said that the Secretariat would inform Members of the date of the next meeting in due course.
- 6.6 There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.