

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

Minutes of Third Meeting

Date : 12 January 2011
Time : 2:30 pm
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
Ms Pong Yuen-ye	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Dr Peter Cookson Smith	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr Nicholas Brooke	
Ms Dilys Chau	
Ms Ida Lam	
Ms Gracie Foo	Deputy Secretary (Planning & Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Vincent Fung	Assistant Commission for Tourism 2
Mr Lee Wai-bun	Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon, Transport Department
Mr Walter Leung	Senior Engineer/District Monitoring Group on Housing Sites & Special Duties (Kowloon), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr Paul Cheung	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) 1, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Mr Roger Tupper	Director of Marine
Mr Raymond Wong	Assistant Director/Territorial, 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

Ir Peter Wong Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
 Mr Stefan Al
 Dr Ho Siu-kee

In Attendance

Ms Maisie Chan Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
 Mr Harry Tsang Chief Executive Officer (Planning) 1, LCSD
 Mr Eric Yue District Planning Officer/Kowloon, PlanD
 Mr Soh Chun-kok Senior Town Planner/Yau Ma Tei, Tsim Sha Tsui and Mong Kok, PlanD

Agenda Item 3Architectural Services Department (ArchSD)

Mr Andy Suen Senior Project Manager
 Mr Lai Cheuk-man Project Manager

Design 2 (HK) Ltd

Mr Hollain Lau Architect
 Ms Sarah Wu Architectural Assistant

Team 73 HK Ltd

Mr Stanley Ing Director

Agenda Item 4Marine Department (MD)

Mr Chan Cheuk-sang Senior Marine Officer/Harbour Patrol Section (1)
 Mr Ho Chi-ping Marine Officer/Harbour Patrol Section (Administration)

ArchSD

Ms Shih Hsiao-hung Property Services Manager/Project Management 28N
 Mr Lo Yau-keung Property Officer/Project Management 28

WCWP International Ltd

Mr Arthur Tong Senior Architect
 Ms Joyce Mui Architect
 Ms Keria Lam Architectural Executive

Agenda Item 5Tourism Commission (TC)

Miss Rosanna Law Deputy Commissioner for Tourism

Mrs Winifred Chung Assistant Commissioner for Tourism

ArchSD

Mr K.W. Ma Senior Project Manager
Mr Jacky Chan Project Manager

Thomas Chow Architect Ltd

Mr Benny Ng Director
Mr Philip Mak Project Architectural Assistant

CEDD

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

Environmental Protection Department (EPD)

Dr Yeung Hung-yiu Principal Environmental Protection Officer
Mr Gordon Wan Senior Environmental Protection Officer

Agenda Item 6

Ms Jacinta Woo Chief Town Planner/Studies & Research, PlanD

Action

The Chairman extended a welcome and informed Members that the Commission Chairman in consultation with the Task Force Chairmen had invited three distinguished individuals to join the Task Force as co-opted Members. They were Ms Ida Lam (Senior Lecturer of the Community College of the City University; and the Chairperson of the Arts with the Disabled Association, Hong Kong), Mr Stefan Al (Director of the Urban Design Programme and Assistant Professor in the Department of Urban Planning and Design of the University of Hong Kong; and the Director of a design firm, Stefan Al Architects) and Dr Ho Siu-kee (the Associate Professor of the Academy of Visual Arts of the Hong Kong Baptist University).

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 2nd meeting

1.1 The draft minutes of the 2nd meeting were circulated to Members on 17 December 2010. The revised draft minutes incorporating Members' comments were circulated to the Task Force on 6 January 2011. **The meeting** confirmed the revised draft minutes subject to the revision of the word "was" in the first sentence of para. 3.10 (a) to "were".

Item 2 Matters Arising

Inviting presentations from other parties (para. 2.6 of the minutes of the 2nd meeting)

2.1 **The Chairman** said that she had reported the Task Force's suggestion of inviting presentation from other parties at the 3rd HC meeting on 21 December 2010. The Commission generally agreed to try out the following arrangements:

- (a) when an interested party approached the Task Force requesting presentation of its views on a particular agenda item and one-third of Members considered it useful and important to hear such presentation, the Secretariat would invite the party to make a presentation to the Task Force;
- (b) the invitation was not intended to re-open any statutory processes that the relevant planning proposals /development projects had duly undergone or to attempt reversing the decisions of the relevant approving authorities. Such invitation would not be triggered if the project was in the midst of any statutory process. The Secretary for Development advised that the statutory process of the Lei Yue Mun Waterfront Enhancement Project (LYMWEP) had already started and the relevant plans and objections would be submitted to the Chief Executive in Council for consideration. Hence, it did not fulfill the criterion concerning statutory process for inviting presentation from other parties; and
- (c) to ensure that the presentation would be relevant to the subject matter of the agenda item, the party would be requested to provide synopsis of the presentation prior to the meeting.

2.2 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** disagreed with the Secretary for Development's conclusion that LYMWEP should not be opened for inviting presentations of alternative views. He considered that while the objections should be dealt with under the relevant statutory processes, the Task Force could discuss at any time and hear alternative views on the LYMWEP since it was a harbourfront enhancement project and Lei Yue Mun was one of the 22 Action Areas.

Action

- 2.3 **The Chairman** said that the arrangements above had been deliberated and generally agreed at the HC meeting. Members could raise further comments on this subject when the draft minutes of the HC meeting were circulated.

Reference materials for Lei Yue Mun Waterfront Enhancement Project (paras. 2.10(a)(ii) and (iii) of the minutes of the 2nd meeting)

- 2.4 **The Chairman** said that in addition to the background materials which had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting, some supplementary reference materials were tabled to facilitate Members' further discussion of the subject project under Item 5.

Action Areas Proposals (para. 4.4 of the minutes of the 2nd meeting)

- 2.5 **The Chairman** said that PlanD would present the Action Areas proposals under Item 6.

Inventory on Known (Planned and Proposed) Projects at Harbourfront – Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing

- 2.6 **The Chairman** drew Members' attention that an Inventory list of major projects at the harbourfront in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing was tabled for Members' reference. Members could discuss the Inventory list and the Action Areas proposals under Item 6.

Application for temporary use of the Government land near Hung Hom Ferry Pier for float temporary parking by the Hong Kong Tourism Board (HKTB)

- 2.7 Regarding the proposal for temporary use of the Government land near Hung Hom Ferry Pier for float temporary parking submitted by HKTB after the 2nd meeting, **the Chairman** reported that the Secretariat had already replied to HKTB according to the key points as agreed by Members through emails.

Circulation of meeting documents

- 2.8 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** said that sufficient time should be allowed for Members to digest the relevant materials prior to the meeting and suggested that all meeting documents be

circulated to Members at least one day in advance.

- 2.9 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** noted that a lot of materials were also tabled at the recent meeting of the Kai Tak Task Force. He opined that the Secretariat could consider reviewing the deadline for issuing the meeting agenda and papers, say, 7 and 5 days in advance respectively. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested further that an invitation for agenda items be issued 2 weeks before the meeting.
- 2.10 **Ms Maisie Chan** said that according to the House Rules, the agenda and papers should be issued 4 and 2 clear days before the meeting respectively and the details of any proposed agenda item should reach the secretariats 10 clear days in advance. So far, the Secretariat had followed the House Rules on issuing agenda and papers. If Members had any issues to raise, they should let the Secretariat know well in advance.
- 2.11 **The Chairman** noted that while some reference materials were requested by a Member shortly before the meeting, the background materials of the LYMWEP, which were requested by Members at the last meeting, could have been included in the first batch of document circulation.

Presentation materials (para. 2.10(b) of the minutes of the 2nd meeting)

- 2.12 Noting the post-meeting note to para. 2.10(b) of the minutes of the last meeting, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the concerns of West Kowloon Cultural District Authority (WKCD) and the project proponent of the conversion scheme of Wing Shan Industrial Building on uploading their presentation materials onto the HC's website could be overcome by combining the audio recording with the PowerPoint file. In future, the Secretariat should liaise with the presentation parties in advance to make sure that their presentation materials could be made available on HC's website for public viewing.
- 2.13 **The Chairman** said that while the Secretariat could further liaise with WKCD and the proponent of the conversion scheme on the suggestion of combining their PowerPoint files with the respective audio clips, the Task Force should respect their final decisions because they had not been told in advance that their PowerPoints would be put on the website. As for the future arrangement, it had already been deliberated and agreed

Secretariat

at the last meeting that presenters would be alerted about the arrangement that all PowerPoint files would be made available to the general public through the website.

(Note: Due to other commitments of some presentation teams, Items 4 and 5 were discussed before Item 3 at the meeting.)

Item 4 Construction of a Two-storey Building for Harbour Patrol Section of Marine Department (Paper No. TFK/02/2011)

- 4.1 **The Chairman** said that the former HEC Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review had been briefed on the captioned project in May 2009. The previous paper submitted by MD to the Sub-committee and the relevant minutes of the Sub-committee meeting had been circulated to Members for reference prior to the meeting.
- 4.2 **Mr Chan Cheuk-sang** of MD and **Ms Joyce Mui** of WCWP International Ltd presented the Paper with the aid of PowerPoint slides.
- 4.3 **Ms Pong Yuen-yee** enquired about the status of the adjoining Marine Refuse Collection Point (MRCP) and the progress of the review study of the public cargo working area (PCWA). She considered that the proposed non-building area between the MRCP and the new Harbour Patrol Section (HPS) building not very helpful in providing public access to the harbourfront because of its narrow width (1.6m).
- 4.4 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** said that the fundamental objective of the Task Force was to enhance the harbourfront for public enjoyment and to introduce public space for activities/circulation. He enquired if the shortage of working space was only recently identified by MD. He queried the necessity of constructing a new building at the subject site and was not convinced with the justifications set out in the Paper.
- 4.5 **Mr Franklin Yu** asked whether the waterfront area outside the new HPS building would be opened to the public.
- 4.6 In response, **Mr Chan Cheuk-sang** and **Ms Joyce Mui** made the following main points:

Action

- (a) the adjacent MRCP was one of four such facilities in the territory which served as a transit point for collecting the refuse from the waters and vessels in the western part of Hong Kong for onward disposal to the landfills by trucks. Its relocation might cause hygienic and water pollution problems to the harbour and affect the operation of the remaining three MRCPs, and hence such facility would be a permanent requirement and there was no plan to relocate it;
- (b) there was a strong demand for the New Yau Ma Tei PCWA, which provided 2,800 jobs and handled 3 million tonnes of goods per year. While meeting the needs of the trade, the Government would explore opportunities to provide public access to the harbourfront as far as possible;
- (c) in addition to the 1.6m setback from the MRCP, setbacks from the adjacent water selling kiosk and along Hoi Fai Road were also proposed. The setback from MRCP would provide a possibility for pedestrian access to the harbourfront if the harbourfront would be developed for public use in future;

(Post-meeting note: MD advised that the width of the proposed non-building area between the MRCP and the new HPS building could be widened from 1.6m to 2.0m.)

- (d) in considering the expansion plan for HPS, the Government Property Agency had conducted a thorough survey and worked out that at least 761m² of accommodation space was required to meet the operational need of HPS. However, the existing building, having an accommodation space of only 568m², could not be expanded to meet the shortfall of 193m² due to insufficient structural capacity and site constraints. No suitable government land or government building for co-location with HPS in the vicinity could be identified to support the round the clock operation of the HPS for the enforcement of marine regulations and marine traffic control/management, especially during large-scale marine-related events and typhoon season; and

- (e) the total accommodation space of the new building was about 200m². It would accommodate a new command centre for deploying vessels and providing support to the Marine Police, Fire Services Department, Customs and Excise Department and Immigration Department. Other facilities in the new building included an office for ship inspectors, conference room, interviewing room, equipment room, etc.

- 4.7 **Ms Pong Yuen-yee** suggested MD consider providing pedestrian access to the waterfront through the area to the south of the existing HPS building.

(Post-meeting note: MD advised that there were cargo operation and stacking of containers/cargoes at the cargo operation area at the southern boundary of the existing HPS site common with the New Yau Ma Tei PCWA, the suggestion on providing pedestrian access was not recommended due to safety consideration.)

- 4.8 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** had the following comments:

- (a) given the importance of MD's operation to the harbour, appropriate sites (in terms of size, location, marine and road access, etc.) should be identified for their exclusive use. In doing so, an overview of the existing facilities and future requirements of MD's facilities with marine access should be provided to facilitate the Task Force to consider their appropriate locations. The same request was made when the proposal was discussed by the HEC Sub-committee in May 2009. However, MD had not provided the requested information at this meeting; and
- (b) the Task Force should not ask for a public promenade or public access if the waterfront was required for the crucial operation of MD. A nice interface between MD's facility and the public areas for people to walk around would suffice. He enquired whether the steel fence in front of the existing HPS building would be removed, as illustrated in the PowerPoint presentation.

- 4.9 **The Chairman** raised a question about the traffic impact of the new activities generated at the proposed addition, as Annex 2B of the Paper already showed a car parked on the pedestrian

footpath outside the subject site.

4.10 In response, **Mr Roger Tupper** made the following points:

- (a) the HPS facility was the hub for launching MD's vessels. Its major function was to police the traffic of local vessels and to respond to emergencies. The existing location of HPS was chosen because Yau Ma Tei had the highest concentration of local vessels in the harbour, and it was a convenient location to the owners/operators of such local vessels;
- (b) HPS had suffered from the shortage of working space for a considerable period of time. The expansion project had been held up due to funding constraints since 1997/1998. The expansion project had become very urgent now, and there was a need to set up a proper command centre for the HPS; and
- (c) the shortfall of working space should be met at a location adjacent to the same HPS unit so as to provide support to its fleet.

4.11 Responding to paragraph 4.9, **Mr Chan Cheuk-sang** added that to ensure the safety of both the pedestrians and the staff, any illegal parking that came to HPS's attention would be reported to the Police.

4.12 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** queried whether the proposal was the only option to pursue. He noted that the existing HPS building only covered about 30% of its site. He opined that the possibility of adding 200m² working space and a public waterfront promenade within the existing site should be further investigated.

4.13 **The Chairman** said that the development of a public waterfront promenade might not be realistic for the time being with the presence of the nearby PCWA and the present layout of the area.

4.14 **Mr Roger Tupper** reiterated the urgency of the project in relation to the operation of HPS as a control centre and transit point for crews and launches. The current proposal was to meet the basic working requirement of MD and it was the best

option in terms of location and scale. In view of the need to enhance the harbourfront environment, a number of measures had been proposed to ensure that the facility would blend in with the use of this part of the waterfront for public enjoyment in future.

- 4.15 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** considered that the subject site, with limited road access, might not be an ideal location to serve as an efficient transit point which required good access to both marine and land transport. He was of the view that a clear understanding of the entire operation of MD would facilitate a constructive discussion, and that the Task Force should deliberate a long-term plan for this part of the harbourfront with cross reference to MD's requirements.
- 4.16 **The Chairman** opined that the Task Force had no sufficient data to conduct a detailed analysis for MD and to select the best location for the HPS. Since the project team had demonstrated efforts in addressing the concerns of the former HEC Sub-committee, particularly in mitigating the development impacts and enhancing the harbourfront environment, the project could perhaps proceed. On the other hand, the Task Force might need to consider whether a public waterfront promenade could be provided in this part of the harbourfront beyond the subject site.
- 4.17 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** opined that his concern on site selection had not been satisfactorily addressed.
- 4.18 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** suggested that more information should be provided to explain why the existing building could not be expanded, given that the existing site was not subject to any site coverage or building height restriction.

(Post-meeting note: MD advised that according to Clause (23) of the Engineering Conditions of the existing HPS building site, no part of any structure shall exceed a height of 20 metres above Hong Kong Principal Datum.)

- 4.19 In response to **Ms Dilys Chau's** query on decisions about site selection, **the Chairman** clarified that she believed that the Task Force could not make a decision for MD. Rather, the Task Force could form its own opinion on the proposed project, and such opinion would be taken into account by MD in taking

Action

forth the project. Members' concern on site selection would be clearly recorded in the minutes for consideration or follow-up by MD.

- 4.20 **Ms Gracie Foo** said that the need for a strategic view on harbourfront land uses was raised at the last HC meeting. Individual projects should proceed if the project proponent had given due considerations to the Harbour Planning Principles/Guidelines (HPPs/HPGs) and taken into account Members' views. It should be noted that subsequent to the consultation with the HEC Sub-committee, MD had thoroughly considered all options and the HPPs/HPGs. The purpose of this briefing was to seek further comments from the Task Force, which would be duly followed up by MD in taking forth the project.
- 4.21 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** opined that full details on why the subject site was selected by MD should be provided for Members' reference.
- 4.22 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** reiterated the previous request of the HEC Sub-committee for comprehensive information on MD's facilities. In response, **the Chairman** suggested that as the requested information also related to the work of other Task Forces, MD should be invited to give a briefing on their facilities to the HC.
- 4.23 **Mr Roger Tupper** said that the entire operation of MD was quite complicated and covered the waters beyond Victoria Harbour. He suggested that the discussion should focus on the HPS facilities and agreed to give the HC a briefing on an overview of the requirements of the harbour patrol facilities within Victoria Harbour. The detailed justifications for selecting the subject site could also be provided for Members' reference.

MD

(Post-meeting note: On 1 February 2011, an informal site meeting was arranged by MD with Mr Paul Zimmerman and Dr Peter Cookson Smith to exchange further views on this project. ArchSD also provided information about the restrictions of the existing HPS site for reference. On 7 February 2011, the two Members submitted a report with their further views to the Task Force.)

Item 5 Lei Yue Mun Waterfront Enhancement Project (Paper No. TFK/03/2011)

- 5.1 **The Chairman** drew Members' attention to the reference materials which were circulated by email/tabled at the meeting, including (i) the previous discussions of the HEC Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review on the project in September 2008 and November 2009; (ii) a paper on "Revitalising Lei Yue Mun (LYM)" submitted to the Town Planning Board by the HEC Sub-committee; (iii) information relating to the Oyster Shell Beach; and (iv) the replies from relevant departments to the questions raised by the HEC Sub-committee in late 2009 and early 2010.
- 5.2 **Miss Rosanna Law** of TC said that in response to the questions raised by the Task Force at its 1st meeting on 4 October 2010, the subject Paper had been prepared to provide additional information on various aspects of the project for Members' reference. Representatives of the relevant departments would answer any further queries raised by Members at this meeting.
- 5.3 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** raised concerns on the lack of sewerage facilities in the LYM area, direct discharge of effluents into the sea and the water quality of the typhoon shelter.
- 5.4 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said the "Study on Village Improvement and Upgrading of LYM" completed in 2002 (the 2002 Study) had concluded that LYM, being an unsewered area, was unhygienic and incompatible with its being a seafood heaven. He queried the inconsistency between the previous advice of EPD and the information provided in the current Paper regarding the sewerage condition and installation of septic tanks in the village.
- 5.5 In response, **Dr Yeung Hung-yiu** and **Mr Gordon Wan** of EPD made the following main points:
- (a) in many villages in Hong Kong, the villagers discharged effluents into open drain channels or relied on private treatment systems such as septic tanks to treat the wastewater. It was also common for the villagers to cover their septic tanks with concrete or tiles so their exact locations could not be ascertained in many cases. Since the operation of septic tanks was based on the principle of percolation of treated wastewater into the

Action

soil, no discrete discharge point could be seen once they were covered, making it hard to tell which village houses had septic tanks. For the LYM area, the restaurants were confirmed to have sewerage facilities or septic tanks. There were signs showing that some village houses had septic tanks, but it was hard to tell the exact number;

- (b) there were about a thousand unsewered villages in Hong Kong. While the government had successfully extended sewerage systems to about 140 villages, government sewers had yet to be extended to the LYM area;
- (c) the water samples collected from the Sam Ka Tsuen Typhoon Shelter in 2009 indicated that except for the water quality objective of depth-averaged dissolved oxygen (DO) concentration, the typhoon shelter had complied with the other three water quality objectives (viz. bottom DO concentration, inorganic nitrogen and unionised ammonia nitrogen) of the Victoria Harbour water control zone;
- (d) a consultancy study was commissioned by EPD in November 2010 with a view to exploring the long-term solutions to the sewerage problem in the LYM area. It would identify the appropriate pollution interception system for the collection and proper treatment of the effluents. The consultancy study would be completed in 15 months; and
- (e) despite government's best efforts, from past experience, sewerage improvement works might sometimes meet with strong objections from the villagers and it would take time and efforts to resolve the conflicts.

5.6 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** noted that except for the use of grease traps by the restaurant kitchens, there was no report on the use of sewerage facilities by the restaurants and village houses. He opined that even if a restaurant had a septic tank, it would be located so close to the waterfront that the wastewater in effect percolated directly into the sea. He was of the view that objection from the local community including the restaurant operators would be the greatest obstacle for implementing the sewerage improvement works, it would be better to install the

sewerage system before any enhancement works.

- 5.7 **Miss Rosanna Law** responded that LYMWEP was a tourism project responding to the request of the local villagers and restaurants. The project was supported by the Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC). For the seafood restaurants, experience told that some forms of treatment facilities might already be in place. As part of TC's initiative to ease the sewerage problem in the area, an underground septic tank would be constructed near the landing facility to help improve the water quality of the LYM area in the short term. A holistic solution would be formulated under EPD's consultancy study to bring an overall improvement to the water quality in the long term. **Dr Yeung Hung-yiu** added that EPD would consult and engage the local villagers and restaurant operators in programming the sewerage improvement works so as to minimise the inconvenience or disruption caused to the local community.
- 5.8 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the Task Force should support the enhancement of LYM. The question was how to take this opportunity to turn it into a tourist attraction. The following concerns/questions should be addressed:
- (a) the proposed underground septic tank was misrepresented as it could only handle the sewage of very few village houses and did not materially reduce the direct discharge of sewage into the sea. Also, with the soakaway pit located on the water's edge, the effluents soaking through the subsoil would immediately flow into the sea. The only benefit was cosmetic as it would ensure that sewage would not directly flow over the proposed landing facility;
 - (b) the alternatives were limited since installation of septic tanks might not be feasible because the existing restaurants and houses were located in close proximity to each other. Laying sewerage pipes under the footpaths or along the shore could be more feasible;
 - (c) in making its recommendation on the LYMWEP, the Task Force should bear in mind that it would be more difficult and more costly to request the operators to temporarily close their restaurants for carrying out the

Action

sewerage improvement works after more visitors, and hence more business, were brought to the area by first completing enhancement works;

- (d) referring to the forecasted return periods for extreme sea levels by the Observatory, there was a growing flooding risk for the LYM area. This was also recognised in the 2002 Study and engineering solutions were recommended to address the issues of sewerage, seawall/flood prevention and provision of landing facility in one go (figure 6.1 of the Study);
- (e) the requested information on patronage and traffic data via land and sea to LYM had not been provided. Since the visitation figure was projected based on the potential increase in the patronage of harbour tours to the LYM area, TC should provide the study done by the HKTB including the current and future patronage of harbour tours to the area, and the reasons why not more tours or more tourists were coming to LYM; and
- (f) according to the advice of MD, the proposed location of the landing facility was not safer than the alternative locations and required a breakwater which was not needed for the other locations to cope with the strong currents. The requested information on the additional cost and reclamation required for the breakwater had yet to be provided.

5.9 Regarding the breakwater and landing facility, **Mr Steven Shum** of CEDD said that the safety of the nearby vessels and safe berthing of vessels at the landing facility were the key concerns. The marine traffic near the typhoon shelter would be disturbed if the landing facility was provided at the alternative locations which were closer to the typhoon shelter. The proposed breakwater was required to ensure safe berthing of vessels at the landing facility. The current location of the landing facility was endorsed by KTDC.

5.10 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** was of the view that LYM was an unattractive and unhygienic squatter area with mainly unsightly temporary structures, limited attractions, polluted water, illegal uses and no proper control on the use of private lots and squatter structures. The current project had not addressed these primary concerns. In light of the increasing

competition from other tourist destinations like Lamma Island and Sai Kung, a lot of work would need to be done and concerted efforts from various government departments were required to make LYM more attractive.

- 5.11 **Ms Gracie Foo** considered that LYM was a popular spot and an interesting place for both locals and tourists. As a tourism project, the LYMWEP would bring in investments to revitalise and enhance the area.
- 5.12 **Miss Rosanna Law** elaborated further that according to the interviews conducted by HKTB, LYM was amongst the top 10 or 20 favourite places in Hong Kong for tourists. Being an international city, Hong Kong should provide a mix of attractions for tourists. Since the traditional way of living in Hong Kong was one of the appeals for tourists, the traditional elements in LYM would be retained. The project would also improve the access to the Tin Hau Temple and the rocky beach so as to make the LYM area more accessible to the tourists and the public. The government would undertake short-term measures in the form of a septic tank to address the water quality issue, and had planned further measures to improve the situation in the longer term.
- 5.13 In response to the questions raised by **Ms Dilys Chau** on the budget, revenue, payback period/cost-benefits and visitation projection, **Miss Rosanna Law** said that the budget of \$195M covered the construction and recurrent cost of the LYMWEP, but excluded the cost of the long-term sewerage improvement measures now being studied by EPD. Like some public projects, the benefits of the LYMWEP had not been determined in a commercial way. As an indication, the tourist arrivals in 2010 had increased by 20% from 30 million in 2009 to 36 million. As a similar growth rate was envisaged for the coming years, there was a need to enhance the tourist facilities/attractions in Hong Kong, and LYMWEP was part of TC's efforts in this regard. However, revenue figure and payback period had not been calculated.
- 5.14 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** wondered why efforts were being made to maintain a squatter area and considered that a holistic approach should be adopted to enhance the LYM area. Rehousing of the squatter community to regenerate the area should be considered. The squatter area could be properly rebuilt with traditional elements and interesting developments

Action

(e.g. low-rise terraced housing).

5.15 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that we were trapped lacking a comprehensive plan and questioned whether the LYMWEP could be implemented as the first phase of an overall upgrading plan for the area. In the meantime, relevant government departments could work out the different components of the plan, including the long-term sewerage solution being studied by EPD, for the Task Force's consideration.

5.16 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** noted that the LYM Action Area included the existing pier and the typhoon shelter. On the works sequence for upgrading LYM, he pointed out that the villagers and operators should welcome the investment in sewerage and seawall/flood prevention measures as this would enhance their property value and that the investment in tourism enhancement could be used as a carrot. However, if the tourism enhancement took place first, the villagers would object to closing down for infrastructure improvements as it would impact their business.

5.17 **The Chairman** summarised the discussion and made the following observations:

- (a) while the underground septic tank proposed by TC would not be able to fully address the sewerage problem, the restaurants had already been equipped with sewerage facilities or septic tanks and EPD was trying to solve the sewerage problem in consultation with the locals and KTDC. However, it would be a concern if the enhancement works would only be carried out after the sewerage improvement works, which took 6 years to complete, had finished;
- (b) information relating to the seawall and flood prevention had been provided in the Paper; and
- (c) visitation to LYM was stable in the past 3 years and LYM was still a major tourist attraction in Hong Kong.

EPD

On the way forward, **the Chairman** suggested that the Task Force should consider whether the project was compatible with and in pursuance of HC's objective of enhancing the harbourfront for enjoyment of the locals and tourists. She

TC

Action

considered that the LYMWEP was compatible and could possibly form a catalyst for further environmental improvements in the area. She also considered it more advisable for EPD to brief the Task Force on the sewerage improvement measures for the entire LYM area as a separate project independent from the LYMWEP in due course. Regarding the transport issue, she suggested that more information should be provided for the Task Force's reference. On the suggestion of adopting a holistic approach to enhance the entire LYM area, she suggested that this could be considered under the HC's Action Areas proposals in which different enhancement initiatives could be integrated together. As the Task Force was so far only briefed on the conceptual plan of the LYMWEP, she advised that more project details should be provided for Members' consideration in due course.

- 5.18 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that whether the LYMWEP was compatible with the harbourfront enhancement objective and minimised reclamation could only be determined when an overall programme for upgrading the entire LYM area, including flood prevention and sewerage, was available. He was also concerned about the long timeline for implementing the sewerage improvement works. He considered that the improvement works could be completed in a shorter period of time if cooperation of the locals was secured in the first place.
- 5.19 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** also considered it necessary to obtain the commitment from the locals on sewerage and infrastructure works before making public investment on the enhancement project.
- 5.20 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** reiterated that there should first be a comprehensive plan before proceeding with this project.
- 5.21 **Ms Dilys Chau** considered the need for a study on the villagers' response and willingness to cooperate with the provision of sewerage systems.
- 5.22 **The Chairman** remarked that the Task Force would rely on EPD to work out a realistic programme for implementing the sewerage improvement measures. TC and the relevant departments should explain how the outstanding issues such as pier location, flooding, traffic and engagement of the local community were to be addressed when they further briefed the Task Force on the project details.

**EPD, TC &
relevant
departments**

[Post-meeting note: On 21 February 2011, Dr Peter Cookson Smith proposed via email that a presentation of the “Revitalising LYM” paper be arranged for the Task Force. On 27 February 2011, Mr Paul Zimmerman raised a number of follow up questions on this item through email, which had been forwarded for TC’s follow-up.]

Item 3 Open Space at ex-Tai Kok Tsui Bus Terminus, Hoi Fai Road, Tai Kok Tsui (Paper No. TFK/01/2011)

- 3.1 **Mr Hollian Lau** of Design 2 (HK) Ltd, the Architectural Consultant of ArchSD, and **Mr Stanley Ing** of Team 73 Ltd, the Landscape Consultant of ArchSD, presented the design of the subject open space with the aid of PowerPoint slides.
- 3.2 **Mr Franklin Yu** commented that the subject harbourfront site was suitable for placing a low lying landmark. Given the Olympism- and sports-related theme, play equipment for all ages should be provided. Active use or activities should also be introduced to the lawn areas.
- 3.3 **Ms Ida Lam** enquired about the target users and if universal design would be adopted to facilitate the use of the park facilities by people on wheelchairs.
- 3.4 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** considered the theme and design of the open space exciting. Referring to Annex 8 of the Paper, he opined that the scale of the supporting structures of the exhibition area should be reduced to make it less visually intrusive and to enhance permeability.
- 3.5 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that numerous open space/recreational facilities had been provided within the adjacent residential developments. He queried the need to build another open space for these residents, while opining that other people would unlikely be attracted to this open space because it was segregated by roads and no retail facilities would be provided there. To attract more users, he suggested developing the site into a dog garden as no such facility was available in the vicinity. He also considered that there could be other more suitable uses such as marina/boat club since the site was adjacent to sheltered water.

- 3.6 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** commented that the proposed hedges would inhibit the connection between the subject open space and the adjoining public waterfront promenade. As the Olympic Torch-like scroll already served as an identity feature, it should avoid further overplaying the Olympism-related theme. He queried the need for the elevated structure as it was rather empty with very little furniture. He opined that the grouping of benches and seating arrangements should be improved to facilitate social interaction. With a public waterfront promenade right next to the site, he suggested that the jogging trail seemed to be unnecessary.
- 3.7 **The Chairman** pointed out the need to avoid “privatisation” of the subject open space by the adjacent residents. Specific plans to improve public transport should be in place at an early stage so that more people from other areas could enjoy the open space.
- 3.8 In response, **Mr Paul Cheung** made the following points:
- (a) the design of the open space, such as the columns within the exhibition area, could be further improved;
 - (b) the lawn areas were not just for visual amenity. They were multi-purpose, functional lawns where tolerant grass species would be selected to encourage different kinds of activities and events;
 - (c) for the park equipment/facilities, safety standards would be followed and barrier-free design would be adopted;
 - (d) the proposed hedges were to delineate the boundary of the site in response to the security concern as raised by the residents of One SilverSea. In view of Members’ comments, LCSD would further negotiate with the residents on this issue;
 - (e) no dogs would be allowed at the subject site, but there was plan to provide a dog garden at a neighbouring site; and
 - (f) the challenge and mission of this project was to attract not only the local residents in Tai Kok Tsui, but also other people in Hong Kong, and to ensure that it would

LCSD

Action

blend in with the open space/waterfront promenade in the vicinity. The open space provision in the area, including the proposed dog park in the adjacent site, would be presented for Members to consider the case in a holistic manner.

- 3.9 **Ms Maisie Chan** supplemented that DEVB, CEDD and LCSD were exploring the feasibility of developing a pet garden at the adjoining waterfront site to the east. The Task Force would be consulted at an appropriate juncture. **DEVB, CEDD & LCSD**
- 3.10 **Ms Dilys Chau** declared an interest in this item as she was a resident of One SilverSea. **The meeting** considered that there was no conflict of interest and allowed Ms Chau to participate in the discussion of this item and share with Members her local knowledge of the area.
- 3.11 **Ms Dilys Chau** said that noise nuisance from the visitors was a major concern to the residents of One SilverSea. Since the waterfront area was quite spacious, people usually drove there to meet friends and enjoy, which always led to noise complaints. When there were fireworks, a big crowd of people would gather at the waterfront, with vehicles queuing up to the PCWA. The security of One SilverSea was very good. There was no need to set up hedges for security reason. Regarding public transport provision, there was a bus terminus near the Olympic Station.
- 3.12 **Ms Pong Yuen-yee** said that some tall and big canopy trees should be considered to address the visual impact of the hard podium edge of One SilverSea. As a general suggestion for LCSD's parks, certain area could be set aside within the parks for composting the organic wastes like leaves and branches.
- 3.13 **Mr Paul Cheung** responded that LCSD had composts at other places. As the composts should be completely sealed off to avoid any smell nuisance, it might not be suitable for parks like the one at the subject site.
- 3.14 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the Task Force should take a broader view in considering the use of the typhoon shelter waterfront. He opined that the land immediately adjacent to sheltered water, which was rare in Hong Kong, should cater for water-dependent and water-related uses. As a considerable part

Action

of the Yau Ma Tei Typhoon Shelter waterfront was occupied by PCWA and MD's facilities, he had reservation on using the remaining strip of the typhoon shelter waterfront, including the subject site and the proposed dog park, for open space development without any marine supporting uses.

- 3.15 **The Chairman** acknowledged the need for different uses at the harbourfront. Regarding the use of typhoon shelters, it would continue to be considered at the Commission level. For the subject proposal, she concluded that Members generally appreciated the design of the open space and the facilities there. The whole park should be opened to the public. Public transport/signage to the site should be improved so as to ensure that the open space would be enjoyed by people of a wider area. **LCSD**

Item 6 Action Areas Proposals

- 6.1 **The Chairman** said that the purpose of this agenda item was to prioritise and identify one to two Action Area proposals to expedite implementation and materialisation, which was in line with the action-oriented approach of the HC in this term. This provided an opportunity for the Task Force to take a more proactive approach in its business.
- 6.2 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** said that when prioritising the projects, Members should bear in mind that an integrated master plan for the harbourfront was yet to be available.
- 6.3 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** commented that instead of "Action Areas", "opportunity areas" seemed to be a more appropriate term.
- 6.4 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the Action Area proposals were indeed opportunity areas identified by the former HEC. In delineating the Action Areas, the HEC had reviewed the uses and on-going developments along the harbourfront. The sites were grouped into different Action Areas according to the respective characteristics and in such a way to facilitate the formulation of strategies for these Action Areas.
- 6.5 **Ms Gracie Foo** pointed out that the Government had been working on several enhancement initiatives of the Action Areas. In this round of Task Forces meetings, PlanD would **PlanD**

Action

give a general briefing on the Action Area proposals. The updated Inventory list could be discussed later as it would take time for Members to digest the details.

6.6 **Ms Jacinta Woo** presented the Action Area proposals with the aid of PowerPoint slides.

6.7 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the strategies for some of the Action Areas might need to be reviewed at a later stage, including:

- (a) Tsing Yi North Action Area - whether the shipyard area should continue to be reserved for recreation and tourism related uses, or be used permanently by the shipyards. Granting a permanent term to the shipyards might facilitate the proper upgrading of the area;
- (b) Tsuen Wan Action Area -
 - (i) whether the proposed cycle track could be extended to pass through the Riviera Park up to Tsing Tsuen Bridge;
 - (ii) LCSD should consider activating the spacious waterfront promenade by setting up pavilions for different activities or provision of food and beverage facilities;
- (c) Yau Mei Tei Action Area - the waterfront along the typhoon shelter should be properly recognised and managed for marine supporting uses and land should be permanently set aside for PCWA and marine supporting facilities;
- (d) WKCD Action Area - while the suggestion was to provide temporary public space during construction, WKCDA should set aside a budget for such temporary uses;
- (e) Tsim Sha Tsui East Action Area - an update should be given by LCSD on the suggestion of activating the promenade and providing dining facilities with outdoor seating in the cultural facilities;
- (f) Hung Hom East Action Area - an update should be

Action

given by CEDD on both the design of the initial promenade and works progress; and

- (g) Yau Tong Bay Action Area – to facilitate the possible use of Yau Tong Bay for marina in future, the requirement of the provision of marine supporting facilities in the Yau Tong Bay “Comprehensive Development Area” zone should be specified as a condition of the development.

- 6.8 **The Chairman** considered that the long-term strategies for some Action Areas, including the long-term planning for the PCWA in Yau Ma Tei and shipyards in Tsing Yi North, required further studies perhaps at the Commission level. She suggested and the meeting agreed that, in the interim, relevant departments could be invited to give a progress update for projects in Tsuen Wan, Tsim Sha Tsui East and Hung Hom East Action Areas at the next meeting. **Secretariat**

(Post-meeting note: Mr Paul Zimmerman and Dr Peter Cookson Smith raised further comments on the Action Area proposals through emails on 15 and 17 January 2011 respectively.)

- 6.9 **Mr Franklin Yu** requested that soft copies of the Action Area proposals be provided for Members’ reference. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** asked the Secretariat to explore whether a Members-Only corner could be set up in the HC’s webpage for Members to log in and retrieve information such as the Action Area proposals and Inventory list. While **the Chairman** had no adverse comment to Mr Zimmerman’s suggestion, she suggested that all the materials which were tabled at the meetings be circulated to Members in electronic format. **Secretariat**

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat circulated the tabled materials to Members by email on 13 January 2011.)

Item 7 Any Other Business

- 7.1 There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 6:45 pm.

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