

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

**Minutes of Second Meeting**

Date : 29 November 2010  
Time : 9:15 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
Mr Franklin Yu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Tam Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr Nicholas Brooke	
Ms Gracie Foo	Deputy Secretary (Planning & Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Ms Stephanie Lai	Senior Manager (Tourism) 2, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr Lee Wai-bun	Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon, Transport Department
Mr Janson Wong	Chief Engineer/Kowloon 2, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Ms Jacinta Woo	Chief Town Planner/Studies & Research, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Edward Leung	Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Prof Carlos Lo	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Leslie Chen	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Dr Peter Cookson Smith	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Peter Wong	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Ms Dilys Chau	
Mr Paul Cheung	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) 1, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)

**In Attendance**

Ms Maisie Chan	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Harry Tsang	Chief Executive Officer (Planning) 1, LCSD
Mr Philip Chum	Senior Town Planner/Sham Shui Po, PlanD

**Agenda Item 3**Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)

Mr Liu Kwei-kin	Assistant Director (Agriculture)
Ms Wendy Ko	Senior Agricultural Officer (Planning & Livestock Farm Licensing)
Mr Peter Ma	Senior Market Management Officer

Sham Shui Po District Council Members

Mr Aaron Lam  
Mr Jimmy Kwok  
Mr Shum Siu-hung

**Action**

**The Chairman** extended a welcome and informed Members that Mr Edward Leung had taken over from Ms Lily Yam as the Secretary of the Task Force.

**Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting**

- 1.1 The draft minutes were circulated to Members on 22 October 2010. Revised drafts incorporating Members' comments were circulated to the Task Force on 8 and 25 November 2010. **The meeting** confirmed the 2<sup>nd</sup> revised draft minutes subject to the deletion of the word "of" after "goddess statue" from para. 3.6 as proposed by Mr Tam Po-yiu.

**Item 2 Matters Arising**Inviting presentations from other parties

- 2.1 In his email of 6 November 2010, Mr Peter Wong had raised a general issue as to whether the Task Force should hear views from both the proponents and opponents. Noting there were previous occasions that ad hoc arrangements had been made for opponents to present their views to the former Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC), **the Chairman** considered it desirable to work out a more formalised arrangement and some objective criteria for inviting

presentations from parties other than the project proponents. She suggested that:

- (a) upon circulation of the meeting agenda, if one-third of Members considered it useful and important to hear different views for a particular agenda item, the Secretariat would invite the relevant parties (if they could be identified and contacted) to make presentations to the Task Force;
- (b) the purpose of such invitation was not to re-open any statutory processes that the relevant planning proposals /development projects had duly undergone or to review any decisions of approval authorities. It should be made clear to the presenters that they should focus on giving views on the subject proposal of the agenda item; and
- (c) for the sake of efficiency, a separate briefing session for that particular agenda item could be arranged.

2.2 The suggestion was supported by **Mr Paul Zimmerman**, who considered that flexibility should be allowed to accommodate such presentations either at the regular Task Force meetings or in separate briefing sessions.

2.3 **Ms Gracie Foo** said that the suggestion would have read-across implications on the business and operation of the HC and the other Task Forces and it should be discussed at Commission level. She remarked that the suggestion might also have bearings on the workload of the Harbour Unit. Apart from providing secretariat services to HC and two Task Forces, the Harbour Unit was also the policy and executive arm driving many harbourfront enhancement initiatives. In relation to this, the proposal for the HC to set out the major initiatives and key performance indicators that the HC would like to achieve in its term could help focus the Unit's efforts.

2.4 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the work of HC should not be dictated by the current manpower/resources of the Harbour Unit. As a lot of harbourfront enhancement work would need to be done, the Harbour Unit should acquire sufficient manpower/resources to deliver the work of HC.

2.5 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that the Task Force's suggestion should be further discussed at Commission level with a view to

Action

agreeing on a consistent approach for adoption by HC and all Task Forces. Regarding the manpower constraint of the Harbour Unit, he had continuous dialogue with the Secretary of Development with a view to identifying ways to resolve the resource issue. A paper setting out the priorities and deliverables of this term of HC would be submitted for discussion at the next HC meeting.

- 2.6 **The Chairman** concluded that the Task Force would submit its recommendation of inviting presentations from other parties to HC for consideration. Pending endorsement by HC, only the project proponents would be invited to present at the Task Force meetings. **Task Force**

Items 3 to 6 of the minutes of the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting

- 2.7 **The Chairman** pointed out that the Secretariat would continue to follow up on the items as discussed in the last meeting. Some project teams would report back to the Task Force in due course. **Secretariat**

Site visit to Cheung Sha Wan Wholesale Food Market

- 2.8 **The Chairman** said that a joint site visit would be made after the meeting. Prior to that, representatives of AFCD would give a briefing on the wholesale market under Item 3. Some members of the Sham Shui Po District Council (SSPDC) would also join the discussion.

Others

- 2.9 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** raised the following comments:
- (a) the minutes should be an accurate record of the essence of discussion and proceeding which should not be manipulated to rectify any incorrect information provided at the meeting. Corrections, if any, should be provided in the form of a post-meeting note;
  - (b) while para. 3.17 of the minutes specified that “part of” the Oyster Shell Beach was zoned “Coastal Protection Area” (“CPA”), he noted that the “CPA” zone actually covered only a very tiny portion of the beach, which should not be regarded as entirely protected. A large portion of the beach was zoned “Open Space”. He had

**Action**

marked up the beach on a map provided by the Secretariat, which should be distributed to Members for reference; and

- (c) regarding para. 7.5 of the minutes, as a matter of principle, the materials presented to the Task Force's open meetings should be available for public browsing at the HC's website. The West Kowloon Cultural District Authority (WKCDA) and the project proponent of the conversion scheme of Wing Shan Industrial Building (Wing Shan conversion scheme) should provide reasons for refusing to give consent for uploading their presentation materials on line.

2.10 In response, **the Chairman** made the following points:

- (a) regarding the meeting minutes,

(i) Members were always welcomed to propose amendments to the draft minutes to accurately reflect the views they expressed at the meetings;

(ii) substantial background materials which might be useful for the Task Force's discussion should be provided in the form of a background paper on the agenda item, rather than just incorporated into the minutes in a retrospective manner because the discussion of the meeting had not been made in light of these background materials. For the Lei Yue Mun Waterfront Enhancement Project (LYMWEP), background information would be provided for Members' reference when the project team reverted to the Task Force;

**Secretariat**

(iii) para. 3.17 of the minutes truly reflected the point made by PlanD's representative at the last meeting. Relevant plans of the "CPA" zone and the Oyster Shell Beach could be provided for Members' reference. PlanD's representative could also be invited to further explain this issue when the Task Force discussed the LYMWEP in the future meeting; and

**Secretariat**

- (b) WKCDA and the proponent of the Wing Shan conversion scheme had been asked to give an

**Action**

explanation for declining the Task Force's request for uploading their presentation materials onto the HC's website, which could be provided for Members' reference. In future, the Secretariat would liaise with concerned parties in advance to make sure that the materials presented at the Task Force's meetings could be made available on the website.

[Post-meeting note: For the conceptual plans of WKCD, WKCDA considered that without explanatory narrative, the PowerPoint slides could be difficult to understand and might lead to misinterpretation. On this account, WKCDA further advised that the general public should be encouraged to access the comprehensive set of consultation documents currently posted on WKCDA's website. For the Wing Shan conversion scheme, the project proponent preferred not releasing the presentation materials on line at this stage because the PowerPoint itself, without verbal explanation, did not contain sufficient explanation on status of the proposal which could be confusing to the public. The project proponent would be happy to release information to the public when a more comprehensive proposal was ready.]

**Item 3 Cheung Sha Wan Wholesale Food Market (Paper No. TFK/06/2010)**

- 3.1 **Ms Wendy Ko** of AFCD presented the Paper by referring to an aerial photo (Annex 2 of the Paper) shown at the meeting.
- 3.2 **Mr Aaron Lam**, Member of SSPDC and Chairman of the Environment and Hygiene Committee of SSPDC, made the following main points:
- (a) with a population of 380,000, the Sham Shui Po district had been deprived of a publicly accessible waterfront since the closure of the Sham Shui Po Ferry Pier some 30 years ago. While acknowledging the important wholesale function of the Cheung Sha Wan Wholesale Food Market (CSWWFM), SSPDC considered that enhancement measures should be explored to improve public accessibility to the waterfront;
  - (b) for CSWWFM 1, consideration could be given to the provision of an elevated walkway along the waterfront;

**Action**

- (c) the CSWWFM 2 site had been occupied by temporary uses (mainly car park) for many years. If properly planned and designed, the site could provide a waterfront accessible to the public;
- (d) another suggestion was to provide a landscaped podium in the future property development at Nam Cheong Station, with possible footbridges linking up Fu Cheong Estate. The landscaped podium would enable the public to enjoy the harbour view towards the Stonecutters Island Naval Base while maintaining the segregation of the wholesale market. With improvement in public transport like green minibus services, the area could have potential to become a tourist attraction; and
- (e) in meeting the aspiration of the local community for an accessible waterfront, SSPDC hoped to obtain support from relevant parties including the Task Force.

3.3 **Mr Jimmy Kwok**, Member of SSPDC and Chairman of the District Facilities Committee of SSPDC, said that the harbour view previously enjoyed by the Sham Shui Po residents was no longer available. Enhancement of this part of the harbourfront had not been accorded high priority in the past work of the former HEC. Pending the development of a continuous waterfront promenade, short-term measures to improve waterfront accessibility should be explored. In this regard, he queried the need for AFCD to prohibit public access to the CSWWFM round the clock, and whether there was scope to improve harbourfront connectivity by, say, constructing a podium to enable safe access to the waterfront. For the longer term, a review of harbourfront connectivity from the New Yau Ma Tei Typhoon Shelter to the Sham Shui Po area should be carried out. SSPDC could assist in providing resources at District Council level to facilitate the implementation of enhancement proposals.

3.4 **Mr Shum Siu-hung**, Member of SSPDC, urged AFCD to proactively consider relocating the wholesale market from the main urban area to, say, the North West New Territories where the wholesale market might create employment opportunities. If expansion of the wholesale market to the CSWWFM 2 site was finally confirmed, information on its site planning should

**Action**

be provided and the possibility of integrating a public waterfront promenade in the design should be explored.

3.5 In response, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** had the following comments:

- (a) there was a need to set aside certain parts of the harbourfront for water-dependent and water-related uses/industries, such as logistics, which were important to Hong Kong's economy. It was unrealistic to assume that a continuous waterfront promenade would be provided throughout the entire harbourfront;
- (b) with good access to roads and to sheltered water, the Sham Shui Po and adjoining waterfront areas were ideal for consolidating water-dependent and water-related uses/industries with the existing agglomeration of users here. It was unfortunate that some sites had been rezoned for residential use, resulting in some conflicts. He urged that the remaining sites be retained for water-dependent and water-related industries and logistics. It should also be made clear to the local residents that the existing users/operators along these waterfront areas would unlikely be relocated in the near future; and
- (c) AFCD should proactively resolve the obstacles preventing co-location of retail and industrial uses of the wholesale and fish market, which appeared to be a general issue for many such markets throughout Hong Kong.

3.6 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** had the following views:

- (a) the need of water frontage for certain industrial and economic activities should be respected. Emphasis should be placed on connectivity to and along the harbourfront rather than the provision of a continuous waterfront promenade; and
- (b) the CSWWFM 2 site offered a good opportunity for harbourfront enhancement. Information on its future use and design should be provided for reference.

3.7 In response, **Mr Liu Kwei-kin** made the following points:



**Action**

- (a) on the possibility of opening up the CSWWFM at certain time slots, it should be noted that there were different activities within the wholesale market during the day. The peak hours were in the early morning when the majority of the wholesale and delivery activities took place. Arrivals of produce at the market would spread out throughout the day due to different land transport and shipment schedules;
- (b) as no fence had been constructed along the seawall, public safety would be a main concern. Heavy machinery including cranes was used for off-loading of the agricultural/fishery produce. The off-loading and labour intensive activities would make the area untidy/slippery. All these might pose risks to visitors;
- (c) for the elevated walkway and landscaped podium as suggested by SSPDC Members, AFCD was open-minded on these suggestions although engineering, planning and safety issues would need to be resolved; and
- (d) the CSWWFM 2 site was reserved for the relocation of the Yau Ma Tei Wholesale Fruit Market. Discussions with the fruit market operators had started, but implementation details including timetable and relocation arrangements had yet to be worked out. Meanwhile, the site had been let out for temporary uses.

**3.8 Mr Paul Zimmerman** had the following further comments:

- (a) in light of the rising public aspiration for combining retail activities and wholesale market use, AFCD should commission a consultancy study to identify ways to overcome the operational constraints and the associated costs for all its facilities on waterfronts; and
- (b) given the “locational” advantage of the CSWWFM 2 site fronting a sheltered water body, which was rare in Hong Kong, priority should be given to developing the site for water-dependent uses or marine supporting facilities if the site was ultimately not required by AFCD.

**3.9 Mr Jimmy Kwok** echoed that instead of emphasising the

**Action**

potential risks of opening up the wholesale market, AFCD should explore the feasibility of allowing public access in a safe manner.

3.10 **The Chairman** concluded the discussion as follows:

- (a) the harbourfront served multiple purposes and the important functions of the CSWWFM in relation to the local food supply were fully acknowledged by the Task Force. The information provided by AFCD was useful for the Task Force in understanding the operation and constraints of the wholesale market. As suggested by Members, AFCD should look into the feasibility of integrating uses for public enjoyment with the wholesale market function; and
- (b) in the context of Sham Shui Po and Western Kowloon in general, any measure to give the public access to the harbourfront for enjoyment should be explored and carefully looked into. The Task Force fully supported such initiatives in principle. Further views could be exchanged during the joint site visit, and the Task Force would continue to follow up on the matter.

[Post-meeting note: The joint site visit to the CSWWFM with SSPDC members was conducted after the Task Force meeting on 29 November 2010. Suggestions raised during the site visit included the opening up of part of the car park area above the wholesale fish market for public viewing of the harbour and adding retail and other active uses to the CSWWFM to enhance vibrancy. AFCD agreed to consider the suggestions and would revert to the Task Force.]

**AFCD**

#### **Item 4 Any Other Business**

##### Action Areas Proposals

- 4.1 An "Overview of Harbourfront Enhancement by Action Areas" prepared by the former HEC was tabled at the meeting.
- 4.2 **The Chairman** reported that an email request had been received from Mr Paul Zimmerman for a progress report on the Action Areas proposals for the Task Force. She suggested that this request should be favourably considered by the Task Force and the HC because the work of the Task Force and the HC in

**Action**

general actually built upon the work of HEC. She then alerted Members that 13 of the 22 Action Areas would fall within the Task Force. Should the proposal be accepted, Members should be mindful of the following:

- (a) it was unlikely that there would be new progress updates of the Action Areas proposals for every Task Force meeting;
- (b) relevant government departments would consult the Task Force on various projects/enhancement initiatives which might overlap with some Action Areas proposals; and
- (c) new quick-wins proposals could be added to the list for subsequent follow-up by the Task Force.

4.3 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested that a briefing on the Action Areas proposals should first be given to facilitate the Task Force in understanding the harbourfront issues in each Action Area. Progress updates could then follow in subsequent meetings. **Mr Nicholas Brooke** concurred with the suggestion.

4.4 **The Chairman** agreed that an overview introduction of the Action Areas proposals relating to the Task Force would be supported by this Task Force. Members could then identify certain priority proposals for further updates.

**PlanD**

*Tentative schedule of Task Force meetings in 2011*

4.5 **The Chairman** invited Members to note the tentative schedule of the Task Force meetings in 2011, which was tabled at the meeting.

**Members  
to note**

4.6 There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 10:15am.

**Secretariat  
Task Force on Harbourfront Developments  
in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing  
January 2011**