

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

Minutes of First Meeting

Date : 4 October 2010
Time : 10:00 am
Venue : Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices
333 Java Road, North Point

Present

Prof Becky Loo	Chairman
Mrs Margaret Brooke	Representing Business Environment Council
Prof Carlos Lo	Representing Friends of the Earth
Ms Pong Yuen-yee	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Dr Peter Cookson Smith	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Peter Wong	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr Nicholas Brooke	
Ms Dilys Chau	
Ms Maisie Chan	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), Development Bureau (DEVB)
Ms Stephanie Lai	Senior Manager (Tourism) 2, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr Lee Wai-bun	Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon, Transport Department
Mr Mak Chi-biu	Chief Engineer/Kowloon 2, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr Paul Cheung	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) 1, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Mr Raymond Wong	Assistant Director/Territorial, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Eric Yue	District Planning Officer/Kowloon, PlanD
Ms Lily Yam	Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Franklin Yu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Leslie Chen	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects

In Attendance**For Agenda Item 3**TC

Mrs Winifred Chung	Assistant Commissioner for Tourism
Ms Anita SW Tsui	Senior Manager (Tourism)

CEDD

Mr Steven Shum	Senior Engineer (Projects)
Mr Ken Pak	Engineer (Projects)

Architectural Services Department

Mr KW Ma	Senior Project Manager
Mr Jacky Chan	Project Manager

Thomas Chow Architect Ltd

Mr Benny Ng	Director
Mr Brian Li	Project Architectural Assistant

Mr Lui Tung-hai	Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC) Member
-----------------	--

For Agenda Item 4West Kowloon Cultural District Authority (WKCDA)

Mr Graham Sheffield	Chief Executive Officer (CEO)
Ms Bonny Wong	Director, CEO's Office
Dr MW Chan	Project Delivery Executive Director

Foster + Partners

Mr Colin Ward	Partner
Mr Alan Macdonald	Director, Urbis Ltd (Sub-consultant)
Mr Eugene Ching	Senior Associate, Ronald Lu & Partners (Sub-consultant)

Rocco Design Architects (Rocco)

Mr Freddie Hui	Senior Associate
Ms Queenie Szeto	Senior Architect

Office for Metropolitan Architecture (OMA)

Mr David Gianotten	General Manager, OMA (Asia)
Mr Ravi Kamisetti	Architect
Ms Betty Ng	Architect

For Agenda Item 5Ever Sun International Holdings Ltd

Mr Eddy Li	Chairman
Mr Alvin Yau	Manager (Property Division)

Headland Developments Ltd

Mr John Gunning Managing Director

Kenneth To & Associates Ltd

Mr Kenneth To Managing Director

Benoy Ltd

Mr Alan Wan Divisional Director

Mr Alvin Lo Associate Director

Scott Wilson Ltd

Mr Jonathan Meigh Director (Maritime)

Ir Tony Ngai Senior Engineer

For Agenda Item 6Mass Transit Railway Corporation Ltd (MTRCL)

Mr Tang Pak-hung Project Liaison Manager

Mr Kenny Kong Construction Manager (Civil)

Mr Richard Chui Senior Liaison Engineer

Mr Eric Lui Liaison Engineer II

Railway Development Office, Highways Department

Mr KS Yeung Chief Engineer/Railway Development 1-3

Action

Mr Nicholas Brooke, Harbourfront Commission (HC) Chairman, welcomed all to the meeting.

Item 1 Election of Chairman

1.1 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** nominated and **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** seconded Prof Becky Loo to be the Chairman of the Task Force. **Dr Peter Cookson Smith**, though proposed by **Mr Paul Zimmerman** to be the Chairman, declined a nomination.

1.2 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** declared **Prof Becky Loo** as the Chairman of the Task Force. **Prof Loo** then took the Chair.

Item 2 Terms of Reference of the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing (Paper No. TFK/01/2010)

- 2.1 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested adding to the proposed terms of reference the mandate of the Task Force to oversee all marine and related uses throughout the Victoria Harbour. **Ms Maisie Chan** advised the meeting that the responsibility of the Task Force to provide comments and monitor marine use located within its geographical jurisdiction had already been included in the proposed terms of reference.
- 2.2 **Mr Nicholas Brooke**, whilst sharing Mr Zimmerman's concern, considered that the water-land interface issue should be dealt with in a holistic manner, and not by this Task Force which was tasked to deal with issues within its geographical jurisdiction. He said that the issue should be brought up to the HC meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The Task Force's suggestion of dealing with marine use and water-land interface by the Commission was reported at the 2nd HC meeting on 25 October 2010. The HC Chairman agreed to take up the task at Commission level.)

- 2.3 The meeting endorsed the proposed terms of reference of the Task Force as set out in the Paper.

Item 3 Lei Yue Mun Waterfront Enhancement Project (Paper No. TFK/02/2010)

- 3.1 Being one of the objectors to the project, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** declared an interest in the item. **The Chairman** considered that Members should be free to give their views on the project and Mr Zimmerman could stay in the meeting and participate in the discussion of this item.
- 3.2 Noting that there were 190 representations received upon gazettal of the relevant outline zoning plan (OZP) under the Town Planning Ordinance and the project under the Foreshore and Sea-bed (Reclamations) Ordinance (FS(R)O), **Mr Paul Zimmerman** enquired the reason for not including objectors to the project in the 'attendants list' of the item. **The Secretary** clarified that the agenda item was included in response to an earlier request of the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review of the former Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC Sub-committee). The attendants included mainly members of

the project proponent.

- 3.3 **Mr Benny Ng** of Thomas Chow Architect Ltd presented the proposal with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 3.4 Before discussion, **the Chairman** pointed out for Members' background information that the HEC Sub-committee was briefed on the project in September 2008, and the Sub-committee had no in-principle objection to enhancing the Lei Yue Mun (LYM) waterfront. In discussing the amendments to the Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong, Lei Yue Mun OZP to facilitate the implementation of the project in November 2009, the Sub-committee agreed to request TC for a briefing when the detailed design of the project was available.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat informed Members of the then HEC Sub-committee's discussion in November 2009 by circulating the relevant minutes of the Sub-committee meeting for Members' information via the Secretariat's email of 25 October 2010. In the same email, Members were also informed that a paper prepared on "Revitalising Lei Yue Mun", together with the Sub-committee's views on the OZP amendments, had been forwarded to TPB for reference in December 2009.)

- 3.5 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** commented that the proposed ocean-themed blue mosaic tiles might initially appear interesting, but it might become dated overtime. **Ms Pong Yuen-ye**e questioned the relevancy of the type of tropical fish used as the design motif.
- 3.6 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** also pointed out that one of the major concerns of the then HEC Sub-committee expressed at a previous site visit was the proposal for a goddess statue at the beach. He asked about the status of the proposal as it would have a major impact on the waterfront.
- 3.7 **Ms Dilys Chau** asked whether the proposal would include any measures to improve water quality and the odour condition, and whether there would be any change to the scale and structure of the existing seafood restaurants.
- 3.8 **Ir Peter Wong** questioned whether it was the proponent's obligation to bring additional improvements beyond the proposed enhancement of the project, such as solving the

general sewage problem in the area, or whether the Task Force's concern should focus on the enhancement measures of the project itself and the effect that it would bring.

3.9 **Mrs Winifred Chung** of TC made the following points in response:

- (a) the proposal for a goddess statue on the LYM waterfront, initiated by the locals, was outside the scope of TC's enhancement project. However, the beach had been zoned "Coastal Protection Area" ("CPA") and whatever was proposed to be placed there would have to be agreed by the Town Planning Board (TPB);
- (b) the existing structures and fish tanks of the seafood restaurants in LYM were a major tourist attraction, and the enhancement project did not intend to change the scale or modernise the outlook of the restaurants; and
- (c) TC's role was to maintain the attractiveness of LYM as a tourist attraction. There were two aspects concerning improvement of water quality in the area, namely the quality of seawater used by seafood restaurants to keep live seafood and the general sewerage system in the area. Concerning the former, the Food Business (Amendment) Regulation 2009 which came into effect on 1 August 2010 had prohibited the extraction of seawater from prescribed areas, including the LYM coastal area, for keeping live seafood. The Food and Environmental Hygiene Department would enforce the regulation through inspecting the water quality from time to time. In addressing the latter concern as raised by TPB, a two-pronged approach was adopted. The Environmental Protection Department and Drainage Services Department (DSD) would commence before end 2010 a consultancy study to explore feasible long-term measures to address the sewerage problem in LYM. As an interim mitigation measure, an underground septic tank would be constructed adjacent to the site of the landing facility planned under the project. She further pointed out that the problem of sewage in LYM was mainly generated from the squatter area and not the seafood restaurants as each restaurant had its own septic system.

Action

- 3.10 **Mr Lui Tung-hai**, KTDC member, supplemented that the provision of a septic system for each seafood restaurant was a licence requirement. Some villagers would use the two high-standard public lavatories in the LYM village, while some villagers also had their own septic tanks. With proper measures taken by the government, the sewage problem in the area could be resolved.
- 3.11 On the issue of the mosaic design, **Mr Benny Ng** of Thomas Chow Architect said that modifications on the design could be made after taking into account Members' views on the specific theme and colour scheme.
- 3.12 **Prof Carlos Lo** commented that the enhancement project might attract more coach traffic in the area. He enquired whether there was any information in this respect or measures to address the problem.
- 3.13 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** said there was a general impression that the area was dark and insanitary. The proposed enhancement project was inadequate. It was doubtful if LYM could become a genuine tourist attraction. The question of how LYM was expected to compete with other successful seafood destinations like Sai Kung should be answered. TC should put forth a more comprehensive improvement scheme covering the entire area of LYM. He suggested that the Task Force should listen to other views e.g. from objectors to the project and supported Mr Paul Zimmerman's suggestion that before the Task Force would form any views, the objections and any alternative proposals should be heard.
- 3.14 **Mrs Winifred Chung** made the following points in further response:
- (a) there was an increase in the number of visitors and coaches going to LYM especially since the introduction of the Individual Visit Scheme. The proposed 30m-landing facility was an important enhancement feature for berthing of yachts and sightseeing ferries, thereby providing an additional transport means for visitors to LYM;
 - (b) LYM had been a popular tourist attraction for over 30 years and the conditions of the area were run down. If

Action

no action was taken to improve the conditions, the restaurants in LYM would suffer from gradual drop of patronage. In response to the request for enhancement of the area initiated by the LYM local community, the Hong Kong Tourism Board (HKTB) had assessed the tourism merit of the proposed project. HKTB considered that the enhancement proposal would increase the number of visitors to LYM from the present 3,000 per month to 8,000 per month; and

- (c) apart from the seafood restaurants, there were in fact other attractions in LYM, which visitors might not have noticed. These included some heritage features like the Tin Hau Temple and the abandoned cannon in the inner part of LYM. It was difficult to access the waterfront as it was dangerous to climb over the rocks. The proposed waterfront promenade was to allow people to walk along the waterfront and enjoy the sea view.

3.15 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** urged the Task Force to consider the views of the HEC Sub-committee and the alternative proposals before supporting the enhancement project. He made the following points and requested that the related information be provided:

- (a) there was no apparent merit to introduce artificial elements, including the carp-shaped viewing platform, into the natural setting of LYM as per the previous discussions of the HEC Sub-committee;
- (b) the location of the dangerous rocks should be clarified. A map showing the Oyster Shell Beach and the boundary of the "CPA" zone should be provided for reference so as to ensure that the beach was indeed protected entirely as claimed;
- (c) the justifications for the proposed pier location, as ever since the first settlements there, piers were built on the western side of the LYM village in view of the rapid current on the southern side of LYM. What were the alternative pier locations and what were the respective hydrographic conditions, extent of reclamation required, holding areas for vessels and risk of accidents for the different options of the pier location;

Action

- (d) in terms of sewerage solution, comprehensive analysis and information including the catchment area of the proposed septic tank and whether it was in operation at all times, the amount of sewage generated by the entire area, the discharge locations, which village houses and restaurants had septic tanks, details on the interception by the septic tanks and the extent of the sewage intercepted by the septic tanks should be provided;
- (e) the sewerage problem should be fixed before completion of the enhancement proposals. Cooperation of villagers and restaurant operators with this objective in mind should be a prerequisite for making public investment in such enhancements as construction of piers to bring more visitors;
- (f) the overall programme of the enhancement of LYM, including the sequence and timeframe for the completion of the sewerage system, landing facilities and other enhancements;
- (g) was there any need for improving the seawall in light of rising sea levels? The synergies of improving the seawall, landing facilities and sewerage as one project should be considered;
- (h) LYM appeared to be well served with the new MTR Yau Tong Station and many operators were promoting harbour tours to LYM using existing pier facilities. Despite this increase in transport options, visitation to the area had declined. Information on the existing land and sea transport, current traffic flow, capacity and usage should be provided. Surveys were needed to help identify why people no longer came to LYM and how the new landing facilities could make an impact; and
- (i) given the impression of LYM as unhygienic and expensive, details of the study supporting the visitor projection from 3,000 to 8,000 should be provided so as to facilitate a better understanding of the reasons for the declining visitation.

3.16 Ms Dilys Chau suggested that the budget for the enhancement

project and details of the benefits should be provided in order to assess the project.

- 3.17 **Mr Eric Yue** clarified that of the total 190 representations, 95 representations were received by the TPB while the other 95 were made in relation to the FS(R)O. The amendments to the draft OZP gazetted in 2009 were to facilitate the implementation of the enhancement project and hearing of the representations by TPB was completed in April 2010. TPB decided to propose amendments to the OZP to partially meet some of the representations by including part of the Oyster Shell Beach and the rocky outcrop including the lighthouse at the southern coast of LYM into the planning scheme area and zoning them to "CPA". The draft OZP, together with the amendments made, would need to be approved by the Chief Executive in Council.
- 3.18 **Mrs Winifred Chung** thanked Members for their comments on the project. She said that the project was meant to be a minor beautification proposal to enhance the attractiveness of LYM. Its objective was to maintain the key features of LYM while providing safe access to the waterfront for enjoyment by the locals and visitors alike.
- 3.19 **Mr Lui Tung-hai** supplemented that there were about 1,000 people visiting LYM every day, or 30,000 visitors every month. According to a local survey covering the LYM residents conducted by KTDC, 99% of the respondents supported the proposed enhancement project. KTDC also supported the project and urged for implementation of the project as soon as possible. **Mrs Winifred Chung** clarified that the visitation figures mentioned by Mr Lui were figures during the peak season.
- 3.20 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that since a number of major issues had been raised, TC should address the concerns and report to the Task Force.
- 3.21 **Ir Peter Wong** opined that as different views had already been dealt with by the relevant District Council and deliberated by TPB which were more appropriate venues to address concerns, it might not be appropriate or efficient for the Task Force to hear these views again which might give the representers a wrong expectation. He also suggested that if alternative

Action

designs were to be submitted by other parties, the Task Force should look at the concept rather than detailed design and feasibility.

- 3.22 **The Chairman** concluded that whilst Members expressed support for enhancement to LYM, holistic consideration was required taking into account such aspects as water quality, traffic, design features, visitor projection, costs and benefits, synchronization of the enhancement works with existing infrastructure and how the programme should be worked out in an orderly manner. In these respects, TC should prepare relevant information as requested by Members. The Task Force could also deliberate whether to invite other concerned parties to brief Members on their alternative proposals. TC

(Post-meeting note: To reflect the position of the former HEC Sub-committee regarding LYM, the Secretariat would provide the relevant papers considered by the HEC Sub-committee and the minutes of the Sub-committee meetings for Members' reference when TC reported back to the Task Force.)

Item 4 West Kowloon Cultural District - Stage 2 Public Engagement Exercise (Paper No. TFK/03/2010)

- 4.1 Being a member of one of the conceptual plans consultants, **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** (*Foster + Partners*), **Mrs Margaret Brooke** (*Rocco*) and **Mr Nicholas Brooke** (*Rocco*) declared an interest on this item. Being a member of the technical advisory panel of the WKCD, **Ir Peter Wong** also declared an interest on this item. **The Chairman** proposed and **Members** agreed that they could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion of the item.
- 4.2 Copies of the Consultation Digest of the Stage 2 public engagement (PE) exercise for the WKCD were tabled for Members' reference.
- 4.3 **Dr MW Chan** of WKCD thanked the former HEC for being a collaborator in the PE exercise for the preparation of the Development Plan for WKCD. He informed Members that after completing all the PE exercises, the Development Plan would be submitted to TPB for consideration.
- 4.4 **Mr Colin Ward** of Foster + Partners, **Mr Freddie Hui** of Rocco and **Mr David Gianotten** of OMA respectively presented their

conceptual plans for the WKCD, with the aid of PowerPoint.

- 4.5 **The Chairman** then invited comments on the three conceptual plans.
- 4.6 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** enquired as to how the 3 conceptual plans would relate to the Harbour Planning Principles/ Harbour Planning Guidelines. To the Foster + Partner team, he asked how an animated and activated waterfront could be perceived through the 'Central Park' concept. To the Rocco team, he asked whether the proposed various level changes would cater for the aging population; and whether the pontoons along the waterfront was justified as an overriding public need in relation to the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO). To the OMA team, he questioned if the two proposed water inlets were technically feasible.
- 4.7 **Mr Colin Ward** of Foster + Partners responded that the design scheme with a wide varieties of cultural, commercial facilities including bar and café with its close relationship to the proposed park in the further west of the WKCD offered ample opportunities for a host of cultural and social activities that would animate the area. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested that the schedule of accommodation of various uses should be provided.
- 4.8 **Mr Freddie Hui** of Rocco said that since most people would come to WKCD by railway which would lead them to the elevated level of the development, the scheme allowed for a gradual and effortless descending from the elevated levels to the waterfront through gentle slopes and ramps. For accessibility of others including the elderly, mobility impaired and those arriving by vehicles at ground level, there would be provision of escalators and elevators. On the issue relating to PHO, he explained that the proposed pontoons were a series of floatation systems that would be anchored to the seabed but could easily be tolled away, so in principle they would not contravene PHO. It was in response to the public aspiration of having access from the seaside that these pontoons, which would add value to the vitality and activity to the waterfront, were proposed.
- 4.9 **Mr David Gianotten** of OMA said that the construction of the inlets and loop bridge had been confirmed feasible by detailed engineering studies.

Action

- 4.10 **Prof Carlos Lo** commented that the three design schemes were quite attractive, but would like to know the theoretical assumptions underpinning their design, in terms of whether a broadening perspective or a deepening perspective had been adopted in the interpretation of culture. He also asked for details on the amount of open space provision, the target group and the variety of activities and categories, capacity of the area as to how many people could be accommodated, traffic system, and quantifiable information regarding sustainability issues.
- 4.11 **The Chairman** asked how the concept of carbon-neutrality would be implemented, and whether it would be through building design or separation of traffic. She also asked about WKCDA's plan forward after the Stage 2 PE exercise and said that the Task Force would be willing to continue contributing in shaping up the plan for WKCD.
- 4.12 **Dr MW Chan** informed the meeting that the Stage 2 PE exercise would end on 20 November 2010, while the initial plan was to commence the Stage 3 exercise in mid 2011.
- 4.13 To facilitate the 3 teams to address the questions raised, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** asked whether WKCDA could list out a set of criteria and indicators and present the relevant information in the form of a comparison table, which would facilitate side-by-side comparison of the schemes. **The Chairman** suggested that if Members had further questions, they could send them to the Secretariat within a week. WKCDA would respond to Members' questions altogether.

(Post-meeting Note: No further questions from Members had been received by the Secretariat. WKCDA subsequently provided a comparison table for the Task Force' reference, which was circulated to Members via the Secretariat's email of 24 November 2010.)

- 4.14 In closing, **Mr Nicholas Brooke** suggested that the Task Force might have a role as an advisor to WKCDA in championing the waterfront and helping to create a waterfront of world class. **Mr Graham Sheffield** expressed WKCDA's willingness to work with the Task Force. He clarified WKCDA's stance in terms of its interpretation of culture in that they had taken a broad definition of cultural activities. After all, it was the people who would make and animate the WKCD, and the

authority was to enable that to happen.

Item 5 Proposed Conversion of an Existing Industrial Building to Hotel and Shop and Services Uses, 428 Cha Kwo Ling Road, Yau Tong, Kowloon (Paper No. TFK/04/2010)

- 5.1 **Mr Alan Wan** of Benoy Ltd presented the proposal with the aid of a PowerPoint. It was followed by a presentation by Mr Jonathan Meigh of Scott Wilson Ltd on the proponent's vision to turn the whole Yau Tong Bay into a marina.
- 5.2 **Mr Jonathan Meigh** pointed out that Yau Tong Bay was more or less disused from the marine side, which offered an opportunity for the site to become an exciting marina. In view of the enhancement of yachting and coastal development in places such as Guangdong and Hainan in the Mainland, there would be an increase in visiting yachts and regatta in future and the demand for berthing in Hong Kong might even be greater. He also quoted Harbour Business Forum's document 'Designing Victoria Harbour: Integrating, Improving, and Facilitating Marine Activities' that consideration be given to the development of land surrounding sheltered water for marine users.
- 5.3 **Mr John Gunning** of Headland Development Ltd further pointed out that with a huge shortage of berthing spaces, the proposed marina at Yau Tong could free up space in other marinas for small boats and create jobs and associated business opportunities. The proposed marina would integrate potentially well with the LYM seafood attraction, the proposed Kai Tak cruise terminal and help in the revitalization of Yau Tong Bay. In line with the principle of a public-private partnership approach, the proponent was willing to pay for the development of the marina. He asked how the Task Force might help to put this idea into fruition.
- 5.4 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** shared the view that Yau Tong Bay might have good opportunity for a marina. However, the proponent's initiation should be put into context for the consideration of the Task Force. Once the proponent had a more concrete proposal with relevant justifications and option evaluation, etc., they could make a submission for the Task Force's consideration.
- 5.5 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** opined that the whole of Yau Tong

Action

Bay development should be subject to a comprehensive master plan. Although the proposed conversion of the industrial building was in line with Government's planning intention for the area, he asked why the site did not form part of the consortium for the future redevelopment of the adjacent land. In terms of cost and technicality, he also questioned why conversion was opted instead of redevelopment. While he was of the view that Yau Tong Bay should be used proactively, the marina concept, if taken forward, should involve a wider area and form part of the submission to the Government.

- 5.6 **Mr Paul Cheung** pointed out that the promenade was an open space which fell within the ambit of LCSD. The proposed marina and the associated breakwater however fell outside its ambit. The proponent should submit a complete package with more details for concerned departments to consider.
- 5.7 **Ms Stephanie Lai** enquired into the timing of the completion of the project, its integration with the adjoining areas given that the adjacent areas were unlikely to be redeveloped in the near future, and the group that would benefit from the promenade.
- 5.8 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** asked as to how the subject proposal could be implemented in the middle of a construction site and in such isolation.
- 5.9 **The Chairman** said that the marina concept should be treated as reference information from the proponent and the Task Force should focus on the current scheme of converting an existing industrial building into a hotel with shop and services uses and a 20m waterfront promenade. As a related issue, she noted from paragraph 7 of the Paper that the proponent intended to make use of the existing sea access right to provide landing steps in front of the site, and asked how the proposed landing steps would fit into the current proposal and whether it would be opened for public use.
- 5.10 In response, **Mr Kenneth To** of Kenneth To & Associates made the following points:
- (a) planning approval had been given to the proposed conversion scheme, while the marina concept was an added-on idea, though the two were closely related;
 - (b) on the issue on consortium, the subject site originally

Action

did not form part of a Comprehensive Development Area (CDA), but became part of it only after a sizeable proposed reclamation area of the Yau Tong Bay had been included within the relevant OZP boundary. The coverage of the CDA was subsequently reduced with the abolition of the reclamation proposal. As various owners of sites within the CDA had different agenda, it might not be easy to reach a consensus on the time frame of development. In this regard, the owner of Wing Shan Industrial Building decided to move ahead of the proposal. The conversion project, though costly, was viable;

- (c) there was general consensus from the consortium regarding the provision of the future promenade;
- (d) upon completion of the lease modification and the building plan approval processes within a year's time from now, building works of the project could commence;
- (e) the existing industrial lease of buildings along Yau Tong Bay had a berthing right along the sea frontage. As the proposed conversion scheme had a hotel element, the proponent considered that the berthing right could be made use of in connection to the hotel, which triggered the idea of the marina; and
- (f) as to the possibility of opening up the proposed landing steps for public use, there were issues of liability and insurance to be worked out. Moreover, a separate planning application for the proposed landing steps would need to be submitted to TPB for consideration.

5.11 Mr Paul Zimmerman made the following points:

- (a) the current OZP and the planning brief for the CDA had not made provision for a marina although the HEC Subcommittee had submitted relevant comments to TPB. The requirement of the current OZP and planning brief for a 25m public promenade made it impossible to operate a marina in Yau Tong Bay and that a few landing steps could not make a marina. To include a marina, a master plan would be required first to

Action

facilitate owners to plan for their property development. It was hence important for the Task Force to take lead in this respect by bringing in concerned Government departments and parties to work out the master plan for marine use;

- (b) whether information could be obtained from the Lands Department (LandsD) on the status of the berthing right of the relevant industrial leases; and

(Post-meeting note: The relevant information provided by LandsD was circulated for Members' reference via the Secretariat's email of 24 November 2010.)

- (c) the project proponent's concept for the marina development seemed to cater for luxury boats only. Both public marina and private berthing requirements should be addressed.

- 5.12 **Mr Eric Yue** informed the meeting that the consortium for the redevelopment of the CDA site had submitted in March 2010 a master layout plan (MLP) application to TPB. The consideration of the application was deferred by the Metro Planning Committee of the TPB at the request of the applicant. The consortium was currently preparing further information in support of the proposal. A planning brief for the CDA site had also been prepared by PlanD to guide future development at the site.
- 5.13 **Mr Raymond Wong** said that the meeting seemed to be moving its focus from a specific proposal to the more general issue on the planning of marine use. He suggested that the planning of marine use could be discussed by the HC as a separate issue.
- 5.14 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** remarked that the fundamental issue was the need of an overall plan in terms of the public realm, and overall co-ordination was required instead of relying on the individual applicant or proponent. He suggested that the planning brief guiding the preparation of MLP should be examined to see whether there were any constraints to the provision of a marina if Yau Tong Bay was considered a suitable location for the use.

Action

- 5.15 **The Chairman** concluded that the proposed conversion scheme and the marina were of different issues. While the meeting was in general supportive of the scheme, it was of the view that use of water body as a marina should be considered by the HC as a general issue.

(Post-meeting note: The Task Force's suggestion of dealing with marine use and water-land interface by the Commission was reported at the 2nd HC meeting on 25 October 2010. The HC Chairman agreed to take up the task at Commission level.)

Item 6 Kwun Tong Line Extension - Temporary Barging Facility at Hung Hom Freight Pier (Paper No. TFK/05/2010)

- 6.1 **Mr Tang Pak-hung** of MTRCL presented the proposal with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 6.2 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** opined that the proposed barging point on a short term basis could be accepted provided that MTRCL would demonstrate its contribution to the community by turning the site into beneficial public use as soon as possible. He suggested MTRCL to come up with a long term plan in this respect.
- 6.3 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** asked whether the proposed barging point at the northern part could be located elsewhere to avoid causing visual, air or noise impact to the adjacent hotel.
- 6.4 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** pointed out that the site was part of the subject of the Hung Hom District Study for harbourfront enhancement. He asked when the site would be made available to fit into the overall waterfront development framework.
- 6.5 In response, **Mr Tang Pak-hung** expressed the willingness of MTRCL to work with the Task Force to facilitate waterfront enhancement at the site. He also made the following points:
- (a) MTRCL was aware of the recommendations put forth in the Hung Hom District Study;
 - (b) in general, reinstatement of the site was required once the temporary use had been terminated. For the subject site, MTRCL was willing to be the works agent for any future enhancement work as part of the reinstatement.

Action

However, it might be more appropriate for the relevant authority to carry out the overall design of the works to accord with recommendations under the Study;

- (c) the Kwun Tong Line Extension project, including the proposed barging point, had already been gazetted and no objection had been received from the hotel owner/operator; and
- (d) there was no other suitable site within Hung Hom and East Kowloon that could be identified for the proposed use. The Traffic Impact Assessment conducted for the use demonstrated that traffic capacity in the area would be able to cope with any additional traffic generated by the barging activities.

6.6 **Mr Eric Yue** informed Members that in accordance with the Hung Hom District Study, the subject site was proposed for waterfront kiosks, harbour cruise departure point, and retail and dining outlets.

6.7 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested that advice from LandsD on the land title of the site should be sought to facilitate MTRCL's involvement in the public-private collaboration for waterfront enhancement.

(Post-meeting note: LandsD advised that the proposed works area for the barging facility at Hung Hom Freight Pier (as shown in Annex 3 of Paper No. TFK/05/2010) comprised 3 lots (namely East Rail Vested Land, KPP91 and the Freight Extension of KIL 11077) and some Government land. The Kowloon Canton Railway Corporation was the owner of the aforesaid lots.)

6.8 **Mr Tang Pak-hung** pointed out that the site might also be required as a temporary work site after 2013 till 2019 for the construction of the cross harbour section of the Shatin to Central Link.

6.9 **The Chairman** concluded that the Task Force generally supported the proposal up to end of 2013, and agreed that the subject site should be released for uses benefiting the public in the long term.

Action**Item 7 Any Other Business***Co-option of members*

- 7.1 The Chairman invited Members to give suggestions on co-option of members to the Task Force for her consideration. **Members**

Site visit to Cheung Sha Wan Wholesale Market

- 7.2 The Chairman informed the meeting that the Shum Shui Po District Council had extended an invitation to the Task Force for a joint site visit to the Cheung Sha Wan Wholesale Market, with a view to exploring enhancement measures at the site. Members accepted the invitation and the Chairman advised that Members would be informed of the date for the visit once it was fixed. **Secretariat**

- 7.3 Mr Paul Zimmerman said that it would help facilitate Members' knowledge of the site if some briefing materials could be prepared in advance. The Secretary responded that the Secretariat would follow up with the appropriate parties for the preparation of the necessary materials. **Secretariat**

Date of next meeting

- 7.4 The next Task Force meeting would be held in mid/late November. The Secretariat would inform Members of the exact date in due course. **Secretariat**

Others

- 7.5 Mr Paul Zimmerman suggested that the proponents' PowerPoint presentations be uploaded onto the website. The Secretariat would follow up the matter with the proponent.

(Post-meeting Note: Upon obtaining permission from the Tourism Commission and MTRCL, their respective PowerPoint presentations had been uploaded onto the website. Permission from WKCDA and the proponent of conversion of Wing Shan Industrial Building had not been given.)

- 7.6 There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 1:20 pm.

**Secretariat
Task Force on Harbourfront Developments
in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing
November 2010**