

Harbourfront Commission
Task Force on Harbourfront Developments
on Hong Kong Island

Minutes of Twenty-ninth Meeting

Date : 23 January 2018
Time : 9:30 a.m.
Venue : Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices,
333 Java Road, Hong Kong

Present

Mr Nicholas BROOKE	Chair, Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island
Mrs Margaret BROOKE	Representing Business Environment Council
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Anthony CHEUNG	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Dr Eunice MAK	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Sr Francis LAM	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Ivan HO	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Victor CHEUNG	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Terence LEE	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr Walter CHAN	
Mr Hans Joachim ISLER	
Mr NGAN Man-yu	
Mr Tony TSE	
Mr Stanley HO	Co-opted Member
Mr YEUNG Hoi-wing	Co-opted Member
Ms Doris HO	Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Edward LEUNG	Senior Manager (Tourism) 21, Tourism Commission (TC)
Ms Maggie MAK	Senior Engineer / Central & Western, Transport Department (TD)
Mr Wilson MA	Chief Engineer/ South 3, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr Michael CHIU	Chief Executive Officer (Planning) 1, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)

Mr Louis KAU District Planning Officer/ Hong Kong, Planning
Department (PlanD)
Mr Larry CHU Secretary

In Attendance

Miss Rosalind CHEUNG Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Ian CHENG Assistant Secretary (Harbour)2, DEVB
Mr Peter MOK Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Carlos FUNG Engineer (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Patrick FUNG Senior Town Planner (Studies and Research)5,
PlanD

Absent with Apologies

Mr LEUNG Kong-yui Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and
Transport in Hong Kong
Mr Evans IU Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape
Architects
Dr NG Cho-nam Representing The Conservancy Association
Mr Karl KWOK
Mr Vincent NG
Ms Jacqueline CHUNG Co-opted Member

For Agenda Item 2

Miss Rosalind CHEUNG Principle Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Peter MOK Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB
Miss Ida TSE Project Coordinator (Harbour), DEVB
Mrs Susanne WONG District Officer (Central and Western), Home
Affairs Department (HAD)
Mr Jiv MOK Senior Executive Officer (District Management),
HAD
Mr Ben MOK Representative of Protect Kennedy Town Alliance
Ms Cherry WONG Representative of Protect Kennedy Town Alliance

For Agenda Item 3

Mr Gary YIU Estate Surveyor / Central & Harbourfront
(District Lands Office, Hong Kong West and
South), Lands Department (LandsD)
Ms Maggie MAK Senior Engineer / Central & Western, TD
Mrs Susanne WONG District Officer (Central & Western), HAD
Mr Jiv MOK Senior Executive Officer (District Management),
HAD
Mr Joe HUI Wing-koon Senior Engineer / Gas Standards A2, Electrical

and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD)

For Agenda Item 4

Mr C K LAM	Chief Engineer / South 4, South Development Office, CEDD
Mr James CHU	Senior Engineer / 10(S), South Development Office, CEDD
Mr Ricky CHUNG	Project Coordinator / 2(S), South Development Office, CEDD
Mr Jeremy WONG	Technical Director, Black & Veatch Hong Kong Limited
Mrs Susanne WONG	District Officer (Central & Western), HAD

Action

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting. He introduced Mr Stanley HO and Mr YEUNG Hoi-wing who are co-opted Members nominated by the Eastern District Council and the Central and Western District Council (C&WDC) respectively.

He informed Members that Mr Edward LEUNG, Senior Manager of Tourism Commission, attended the meeting on behalf of Mr Simpson LO; Ms Maggie MAK, Senior Engineer of Transport Department (TD), attended the meeting on behalf of Mr Eddie LEUNG; and Mr Michael CHIU, Chief Executive Officer of Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD), attended the meeting on behalf of Ms Rebecca LOU, who had taken over the post of Assistant Director of Leisure and Cultural Services from Mr Richard WONG.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 28th Meeting

- 1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 28th meeting on 19 January 2018. No comments were received from members. After amending a typo in spelling raised by Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN at the meeting, the minutes were confirmed by the Task Force.

Item 2 Matters Arising

- A. Confirmation of Terms of Reference of the Task Force (paragraph 2.2 of the minutes of the 28th meeting)
- 2.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat was collecting feedbacks from Members on the revised terms of reference (ToR) for further discussion at the next Commission meeting. Upon confirmation of the ToR of the Commission, the ToR of the Task Force would be revised and confirmed at the Task Force meeting that follows.
- B. Proposed Short-term Use at the Three Berths Released from Western District Public Cargo Working Area (WDPCWA) (paragraph 3.18 of the minutes of the 25th meeting) (Paper No. TFHK/01/2018)
- 2.2 **The Chair** welcomed representatives from the Harbour Unit, the Central and Western District Office (C&WDO) and the Protect Kennedy Town Alliance (the Alliance) to the meeting. As background, he informed Members that the Central and Western District Council (C&WDC) put forward a temporary use proposal for the three berths released from WDPCWA in end 2016 and the Harbour Unit consulted the Task Force on the proposal in January 2017.
- 2.3 Upon the Chair's invitation, **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** presented the latest proposal with the aid of a PowerPoint, followed by **Mr Ben MOK** from the Alliance expressing their views with the aid of a PowerPoint (**Annex**).
- 2.4 **Mrs Susanne WONG** informed Members of the community views collected on the proposed short-term use as follows -
- (a) the proposed temporary use for the subject site had been thoroughly discussed at the C&WDC for over one year. Taking into account the concerns raised by the community groups, the Government had come up with two proposals to ensure that people could access the majority area of the three released berths;

- (b) the site had not yet been open for public use. Relevant works departments advised that safety measures had to be put in place before opening the site;
- (c) it was proposed to let out the site to a Non-Government Organisation or social enterprise (collectively referred as NGO thereafter) for allowing greater flexibility in terms of design and management;
- (d) the selected NGO, whoever it would be, was expected to collaborate with other NGOs in providing diversified activities at the site for different sectors of the community, including those currently not going to the site as the site was not open for public access. For the latest proposal, only 20% of the site would be used for leisure farming while the remaining area would be large enough for many other uses; and
- (e) this met the demand from local stakeholders providing space to serve a wider range of activities and more community groups and members of the public.

2.5 **Mr Ben MOK** remarked that to collect opinions from the community, the Alliance had interviewed different groups of people at Kennedy Town and also on-site including both frequent and occasional users. He gathered that most of the people did not see the need to have a leisure farm at the site.

2.6 **The Chair** raised the following questions-

- (a) how long it would take for implementing safety measures to the site so that it could be opened for public access safely; and
- (b) whether it would be a compromising option for the Alliance and the community if there would already be 5,500m² open space for public enjoyment under both proposals.

2.7 **Mr Ivan HO** declared that he was the Chairman of the Biennale Foundation being accused as one of the scandals by

the Alliance. He consulted and **the Chair** decided that he could remain in the meeting and speak on the matter.

2.8 **Dr Eunice MAK** made the following comments-

- (a) the fundamental concern on the proposal was whether the selected NGO could manage the site properly given its huge area; and whether the site could continue to be used by the residents freely if it was managed by LCSD according to requirements applicable to other open space; and
- (b) whoever to manage the site, the Government should address the public aspiration for maintaining free access to the site by the public at any time .

2.9 **Mr Francis LAM** was concerned about the issue of legal liability for any accidents at the site. He supported the Government to take over the site for management for the time being. He was particularly concerned that NGOs might lack the experience and financial resources to manage such a large piece of land. In terms of railing design, it could be further discussed at the design stage.

2.10 **Mr Ivan HO** made the following remarks-

- (a) the lack of open space in Kennedy Town was the reason for people coming to the site for leisure and enjoyment despite it had not been opened for public access;
- (b) the crux of the proposal was proper management of the site for meeting public expectation;
- (c) he supported the proposed short-term use and regarded it as a pilot scheme. He urged for its early implementation so that the experience gained could provide useful references for other sites; and
- (d) he suggested allowing a longer period for the short-term tenancy (STT) with an initial fixed term of three years, while allowing extension subject to performance to

provide greater incentive to the NGO to invest into the site.

2.11 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** commented as follows-

(a) public engagement on the proposal including the management model was important;

(b) letting the entire site to NGO would be a possible option provided that there would be a monitoring mechanism on NGO's performance; and

(c) while suitable warnings and safety signages were needed in the site, members of the public should also be educated to take care of their own safety.

2.12 **Mr Walter CHAN** shared Members' views on implementing public safety measures before opening the site for public access. He preferred having a NGO to manage the entire site provided that the selected NGO would have sufficient resources to install basic infrastructure works for ensuring public safety.

2.13 **Mr NGAN Man-yu** enquired whether the Government had any long-term planning for the site and if further public consultation would be carried out. He commented that public safety should be accorded top priority. Both Proposal 1 and Proposal 2 could meet the public needs of round-the-clock free access with diversified activities.

2.14 **Mr YEUNG Hoi-wing** said that the subject site should be opened for public use the soonest possible after implementing safety measures in view of the lack of open space for the residents of Central and Western (C&W) district. On a survey conducted by himself on the use of the site, out of the 750 questionnaires received, about 70% indicated the wish for early opening of the site and about 60% asked for basic infrastructure.

2.15 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** concurred that C&W district lacked open space so the site should be opened for public enjoyment

as soon as possible after installing adequate warning signs. He shared Members' concern about legal liability and asked about the details of public consultation that the Government had conducted.

- 2.16 **Ir Victor CHEUNG** shared other members' view that the site should be opened as soon as possible after imposing safety measures. He opined that 20% of the site area for leisure farming was reasonable, while leaving sufficient space for other uses.
- 2.17 **Mr Tony TSE** supported allowing shared uses at the site but had reservation for a NGO to manage the site having regard that it might not have sufficient resources. He suggested the Government install basic facilities with user-friendly design.
- 2.18 In terms of the demand for leisure farming, **Mr Michael CHIU** informed that LCSD had provided 55 plots for leisure farming at Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park and received over 1,500 applications last year for joining the program. In Yau Tsim Mok District, the demand for leisure farming was also high with 90 plots but over 1,200 applications received last year.
- 2.19 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** made the following comments and enquiries-
- (a) while acknowledging that people had entered the site without permission, he considered people enjoyed the unique flat open space and the waterfront was long enough for current diversified uses of the site including cycling, dog walking, jogging, drone flying and sunset gazing etc. The Government should recognise these current uses as an experiment/ showcase for harbourfront design;
 - (b) he enquired about the budget for conducting public consultation activities by the C&WDO and the Harbour Unit. He remarked that adequate community engagement and place making activities should be carried out to understand public expectation;

- (c) basic infrastructure and safety measures should be provided by the Government ,as NGOs might not have enough resources, with an implementation timetable for Members' reference;
- (d) given the site had no railings along the waterfront, he trusted that people were fully aware of the potential dangers and considered that they should be responsible for their own safety. The Government could open the site with simple warning signage. He requested the accident report of the site;
- (e) there should be no rush in opening the site. He noted that the government had done nothing to prepare for opening the area for public use since 2014, but was rushing to open the site as against public opinion. There was ample time for the current term of Government to complete the project; Thorough public consultation was needed; and
- (f) he enquired about the long-term development of the site.

2.20 **Mrs Karen BARRETTO** asked for the accident report for the site for reference. She opined that the site was not suitable for leisure farming. It should be opened for public use after providing necessary ancillary facilities and warning signages.

2.21 **The Chair** asked the Government to ensure public safety prior to opening the site for public use.

2.22 **Mrs Susanne WONG** made the following responses-

- (a) it was the responsibility for the Government or the management agent to ensure public safety before opening any sites for public access;
- (b) there was a suspected case of a man falling into the sea related to trespassing the site. The Police were also worried about opening the site without sufficient safety measures and had asked for safety measures; and
- (c) the site has been handed to C&WDO for temporary

management. There was a warning signage at the entrance of WDPCWA asking people not to enter the site without authorisation.

- 2.23 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** supplemented that the Government considered that safety measures should be put in place before opening the site for public access. There was one fatal case of a man falling into the water and other cases about dogs fallen into the water. Police had advised to step up safety measures.
- 2.24 **The Chair** enquired about the time and cost implication for the proposal.
- 2.25 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** responded that Proposal 1 was to let the entire site to a NGO for management and Proposal 2 was a hybrid model with the Government managing 5,500m² of the land and letting out the remaining to a selected NGO for management. Assuming that the tender exercise and other preparatory work can commence immediately after the HC meeting, if Proposal 2 were to be taken forward under a phased implementation approach, the major part of the site could be opened in around end 2018/early 2019, after installing safety measures.
- 2.26 **Mr Ben MOK** reiterated the importance of allowing diversified and shared uses of the site and disagreed with the leisure farm proposal. From the result of the survey carried out by community groups, the majority of people would like to have a leisure farm located closer to the community. The site should be retained "as is" with basic facilities. In terms of railing, a creative design which could preserve the site scenery was preferred.
- 2.27 **The Chair** asked Mr Ben MOK if they would accept a community-managed initiative.
- 2.28 **Mr Ben MOK** responded that if the design of the site was minimal and the Government could provide basic infrastructure, there was no need to let out the site to NGOs or any other parties for management. He added that the

Government proposal presented at the meeting was a new one and he was not aware of any public consultation on it.

- 2.29 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** responded that the proposed use of the site had been discussed at the 25th Task Force meeting held on 12 January 2017. Having incorporated views and suggestions received during HC and C&WDC meetings, as well as from local residents at these meetings and also through written submissions, the C&WDC had been consulted on the two proposals presented at the current HC meeting. Local residents and members of different concern groups had also attended that C&WDC meeting to express their views on the two proposals and other related issues.
- 2.30 **Mr Ben MOK** commented that the community had not been consulted on the latest proposal and some of the C&WDC members reflected that they had not been given enough time to digest the proposals which were submitted late to the meeting.
- 2.31 **Mrs Susanne WONG** supplemented that the idea of leisure farming at the site has been discussed since 2016. In the proposal put forward for C&WDC's views in 2017, there was a leisure farm while proposing the remaining large area for other use. She believed that DC members would consult residents in their constituencies as appropriate and noted some did.
- 2.32 **The Chair** enquired if the management and cost implication of the latest proposal has been explained to the community.
- 2.33 **Mrs Susanne WONG** said that the proposal which would keep the majority of the open space for public enjoyment had met public aspiration. She gathered from the local community that many of them would welcome the opening of the site as soon as possible after implementing safety measures. There were still ample opportunities for discussion on the possible activities to be organised at the site, with the spirit of supporting using the site by as many people as possible.

Whoever took up the site management, the majority of the open space would be made available for public use and just a small area of space would be operated as a leisure farm. She said that she was open-minded in terms of the design of the railing so long as the safety need was addressed.

2.34 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** further supplemented the following-

(a) the proposal to develop a leisure farm, the use of STT and engagement of NGO were discussed at the C&WDC meeting in early 2017. It was considered that there was adequate consultation on the proposal;

(b) during the said C&WDC meeting, the Harbour Unit had remarked that apart from the running of a leisure farm, a waterfront promenade would be developed for free public access. The meeting also concluded that the site should be retained as an open space for multiple uses together with leisure farming;

(c) if the entire site was to be let out to a NGO, the Government might consider installing basic facilities before handing over the site to the selected NGO so as to make the project more financially affordable. The Government could also request the selected NGO to allow shared use of the site.

2.35 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested the Government provide basic facilities before handing over the site to a NGO. A thorough public consultation should be carried out for place making. The HC had not spent any money on design development through place-making with the community for this waterfront. The Commission had promised to engage the community in waterfront decisions. Workshops participated by the community, the Government, the HC, professionals and concern groups should be organised to discuss the desired uses and design for the site. There should be no rush in opening the site.

2.36 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** concurred that it was the

responsibility of the Government to install basic facilities at the site.

2.37 **Ir Victor CHEUNG** shared the view that the responsibility of installing basic facilities at the site should not be shifted to the NGO by the Government.

2.38 **Mr Ben MOK** reiterated that there was no rush and asked the meeting to support further community engagement.

2.39 **The Chair** asked the Harbour Unit and the C&WDO to provide the Task Force with supplementary information on the consultation activities conducted so far, as well as the basic facilities (including railings) that would be added to the site if it was to be let out in totality to a NGO, the budget and time implications. Pending provision of such information, the Commission would defer a decision on the matter.

DEVB
C&WDO

Item 3 Proposed Short Term Tenancy for Fee-paying Public Carpark Government Land at Fung Mat Road, Sai Ying Pun, Hong Kong (Paper No. TFHK/02/2018)

3.1 **The Chair** welcomed LandsD, TD, EMSD and C&WDO to attend the meeting.

3.2 **Mr Gary YIU** and **Ms Maggie MAK** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint. **Mrs Susanne WONG** said that there was an imminent need for some trades to use the subject public car park for parking goods vehicles especially light petroleum gas cylinder wagons. To meet the need, TD had strived to identify alternative parking spaces in the Central and Western district but that took time. In the meantime, joint departmental efforts were made to reduce the size of the nearby car park to release some harbourfront area for public use. She appealed to Members' support for the proposal. The Government would continue to explore a better alternative location for reprovisioning the carpark with a view to releasing the site for public enjoyment.

- 3.3 **The Chair** considered that the term of the STT should be one year only.
- 3.4 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** concurred with the Chair's view. He opined that TD should provide a plan on how to tackle the car parking problem in the district. .
- 3.5 **The Chair** invited TD to give an update on their exploration of a territory-wide solution to address car parking problem and the phasing out of short-term car parks within the harbourfront areas at the next Commission meeting. He also invited and the proponent departments agreed to report the latest progress of the arrangement of STT car parks at Fung Mat Road and Eastern Street North in appropriate time in 2018. TD
LandsD
EMSD
C&WDO
- 3.6 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired about the timetable for completing the advance enhancement works along this portion of the waterfront.
- 3.7 In response, **Mrs Susanne WONG** said that an allocation of \$100 million was earmarked for each district to carry out a signature project (SPS). The proposed waterfront promenade at the Western Wholesale Food Market (WWFM) under C&WDC's "Harbourfront Enhancement and Revitalisation at the Western Wholesale Food Market" project would be open in around March / April 2018. The enhancement works at the previous works site at Fung Mat Road were scheduled for completion in Q2 2018. The release of part of the existing temporary car park at Eastern Street North were scheduled for completion by end of 2018 or Q1 2019. She concluded that the connection between the SPS project and the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park was scheduled to open by Q1 2019.
- 3.8 **Mr Gary YIU** said that it was LandsD's established practice to tender a STT carpark with one year fixed term and thereafter half-yearly. The STT could be terminated by either party serving a notice of not less than six calendar months. He solicited support from Members on maintaining the practice.

The relevant departments would consult the Task Force on any extension before the expiry of the first-year fixed term.

- 3.9 With a view to releasing the subject harbourfront site early for public enjoyment, **the Chair** opined that the STT should be one year fixed term only.

Item 4 Proposed Pedestrian Facilities for Public Housing Development in Kennedy Town (Paper No. TFHK/03/2018)

- 4.1 **The Chair** welcomed CEDD and its consultants to attend the meeting. He informed Members that the Housing Department (HD) would implement the public housing development at the site south of Victoria Road in the western part of Kennedy Town in phases and CEDD would like to consult the Task Force on the proposed works on site formation and associated pedestrian footbridge prior to the construction of public housing.
- 4.2 Upon the Chair's invitation, **Mr James CHU** presented the proposal with the aid of a Powerpoint. He supplemented that HD and CEDD had consulted C&WDC about the proposed public housing development and the associated site formation and infrastructure works in the meeting held in October 2017, C&WDC members did not raise objection to the project. He further said that CEDD had been consulting other departments about the proposed road works including the footbridge and planned to gazette the road scheme in March 2018 under Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (Cap. 370).
- 4.3 **Mr Ivan HO** said that the proposal was piecemeal including only one footbridge. CEDD had not incorporated Members' comments made in the past on the design of the pedestrian footbridge. In gist, Members had requested a pedestrian linkage connecting people in the district to the harbourfront. A more holistic plan and a comprehensive design should be proposed to the Task Force for discussion.

- 4.4 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** echoed with Mr Ivan HO. He opined that CEDD should consult Members again with more background information and a long-term development plan.
- 4.5 **Dr Eunice MAK** declared that she used to work at the Housing Department. She agreed with other members that the proposal was piecemeal and that a more comprehensive plan should be proposed.
- 4.6 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** expressed his views as follows-
- (a) the proposed alignment which pedestrians would have to experience level changes along the route travelling to the harbourfront was not user-friendly; and
 - (b) in terms of holistic planning, the proposal should include connections to hiking trails in Mount Davis.
- 4.7 **Mr YEUNG Hoi-wing** informed members that when the proposal was previously presented to the C&WDC, Members commented that the issue of whether residents of the Sai Wan Estate could be relocated to the new public housing had not been fully addressed. There were concerns if the proposed footbridge could cope with the projected population growth. Some members suggested constructing more footbridges to connect the new public housing development to the nearby MTR Station.
- 4.8 **Mr C K LAM** said that the current pedestrian footbridge proposal connecting Ka Wai Man Road to the waterfront had tied in with the planning intention of the proposed amendments to the related Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) which were presented to the Commission in the past. To further improve the pedestrian connectivity and accessibility from the public housing development to the waterfront, HD would construct lift facilities at the northeast corner of Phase 2 public housing development.
- 4.9 **Mr James CHU** supplemented that part of the existing hiking trail connecting Victoria Road to Mount Davis at the western

end of the public housing development would be reprovisioned along the footpath of the proposed vehicular access. He added that a temporary hiking trail would be maintained during the construction stage of the project.

- 4.10 **The Chair** asked and **CEDD** agreed to report back with a supplementary paper on the updated circulation routes with existing and future developments to demonstrate how the proposed pedestrian facilities for the public housing development would tally with the planning intention of the previous land use review. CEDD
- 4.11 In view of the tight implementation programme, **the Chair** agreed that the supplementary paper could be submitted to Members by means of circulation.

Item 5: Any Other Business

A. Proposed Boardwalk Underneath the Island Eastern Corridor(IEC)

- 5.1 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** reported that at the Eastern District Council (EDC) meeting in October 2017, Members of the EDC stated their support towards the 10m-wide boardwalk scheme as set out under the Stage 2 Community Engagement exercise (CE2) on the grounds that the scheme had attained general support by the community, and that a boardwalk scheme of 7.5m might not provide a safe environment for cyclists and pedestrians. Currently, CEDD was revising the scheme, with a view to attaining the broadest public support of a scheme that would bring about public accessibility and connection to the related part of the harbourfront. CEDD would come back to the Task Force once a revised scheme was devised.

B. Private Industrial Development at Hoi Yu Street in Quarry Bay

- 5.2 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** reported that the issue was reported at the last Task Force meeting in October 2017. In gist, the lot

owner of a site at Hoi Yu Street in Quarry Bay was implementing foundation works of an industrial building which the building plans were first approved in 2001. The site was subsequently rezoned to "Open Space" and "Other Specified Uses", with an annotation "Cultural and /or Commercial, Leisure and Tourism Related Uses (1)" in 2003. The industrial building was not compatible with the existing zoning on the OZP. That said, legally speaking, the lot owner could proceed with the proposed industrial development in accordance with the approved building plans.

- 5.3 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** added that having regard to Members' aspirations expressed at the last meeting and some other public views received, the Government was liaising with the lot owner with a view to exploring a solution that would be able to deliver a development that was more compatible with the existing OZP. The negotiation was ongoing. It was considered not appropriate to disclose any further details at this stage given the commercial sensitivity of the matter.

C. Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas

- 5.4 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** reported that the study team's responses to Members' comments raised at the last meeting were set out in the overall summary tabled at the meeting. The study team was working with relevant departments to look into various interfacing and implementation issues including funding arrangement, site availability schedule, works sequence before proposing a more detailed implementation plan for further discussion at the Working Group under the Task Force. During the process, the study team had to take into account the ongoing as well as planned development projects including the proposed convention facilities above the Exhibition Centre and the proposed North Island Line railway project. The reporting of the refined Harbourfront Enhancement Proposals as well as the consultation on the implementationP plan would be made in Q3 2018.

D. Proposed Initiatives on Hong Kong Island to be Funded by the \$500

million Dedicated Funding

- 5.5 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** informed the meeting that the Commission had agreed to fund two projects on Hong Kong Island under the \$500 million dedicated funding, namely the open space at Eastern Street North in Sai Ying Pun and the advance promenade from the new Central harbourfront (i.e. Tamar Park) to Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre. The Harbour Unit was working on the scope and preliminary requirements for the works of the two projects. A preliminary study on the technical feasibility would be carried out as soon as possible. Consultation with the Task Force and relevant stakeholders would also be conducted when ready.

E. Future Development of Site 3

- 5.6 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** reported that the Government was aware of some Members' views on devising an enhanced site disposal mechanism for Site 3. The Government would take into account these views when considering the disposal arrangement in due course.
- 5.7 There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 12:45 pm.

Secretariat

Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island

Harbourfront Commission

March 2018

**Summary of presentation made by the Protect Kennedy Town Alliance
at the 29th meeting of Harbourfront Commission's Task Force on Harbourfront
Developments on Hong Kong Island on 23 January 2018
(provided by the Alliance)**

Item 2 – Matters Arising

(b) Proposed Short-term Use at the Three Berths Released from Western District Public Cargo Working Area (WDPCWA)

- The Protect Kennedy Town Alliance (Alliance) collected over 4,000 residents' objections against a leisure farm (i.e community garden) at Sai Wan Pier berths 1-3. The respondents proposed to have such facility at a more appropriate location in the neighborhood as a win-win solution (p.16 & 17 of the presentation submitted by the Alliance). The Alliance set out reasons why Sai Wan Pier is not suitable for a Leisure farm (p.13), including strong winds, high salinity of air, strong sunlight and high evapotranspiration and strong sea waves could potentially damaging the plants.
- The public was not consulted prior to the proposal by DevB being passed at the Central and Western District Council and HC in 2017.
- The Alliance set out a range of issues/concerns related to the proposals made by DevB since (p.7), including :
 - i) the two proposals are still fall short of residents' expectations. Outsourced management is still proposed.
 - ii) it is unclear how the changes in the nature of the community garden in the DevB's original proposal (expected to be similar to the LCSO managed community garden) vs. the new ones that they just proposed (claiming to make reference to the operation model by a NGO commissioned by the Energizing Kowloon East Office), will affect the users of the "community garden"
 - iii) although the remaining open space seems to be larger than the original proposal now, it is unclear what restrictions will be placed to change the ways current users use the site
 - iv) So far, no public consultation has been done on DevB's newly proposed options - why not consider alternative option from community?
- The Alliance provided a summary of recommendations collected during community engagement events it organised (p.19 – 21), including:
 - i) The government needs to admit and respect that residents of Western District and other visitors have been using Sai Wan Pier as a vibrant public space for the past 10 years or so, it is not an "idle" place and is already vibrant.
 - ii) Given the minimal design and infrastructure changes required based on public consultation, outsourced management is not required. The government should be able to manage it and needs to adopt more innovative practices in managing public open space so that it does not sacrifice the spatial quality and characteristics of open space at Sai Wan Pier and preserve current popular activities at the site.
 - iii) To keep the unique character and the open edge of the working pier, we recommend putting up a clear warning line and wordings near the edge and the entrance gates to alert the public, rather than putting up railings.
 - iv) Engage the public in the design and use of Sai Wan Pier instead of just doing misleading questionnaires and residents' meeting.