

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

Minutes of Fourth Meeting

Date : 16 March 2011
Time : 2:30 pm
Venue : Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices
333 Java Road, North Point

Present

Prof Becky Loo	Chair
Mrs Margaret Brooke	Representing Business Environment Council
Prof Carlos Lo	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Franklin Yu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Leslie Chen	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Ms Pong Yuen-ye	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
Dr Ho Siu-kee	
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 Janson Wong	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 Adam Lai	General Manager/Planning, Development & Port Security, Marine Department (MD)
Ms Jacinta Woo	Chief Town Planner/Studies & Research, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Edward Leung	Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Nicholas Brooke

Ms Dilys Chau

Dr Stefan Al

In Attendance

Ms Maisie Chan Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB

Mr Eric Yue District Planning Officer/Kowloon, PlanD

Mr CK Soh Senior Town Planner/Yau Tsim Mong, PlanD

Mr Harry Tsang Chief Executive Officer (Planning) 1, LCSD

Agenda Item 3Henderson Land Development Company Ltd

Mr Augustine Wong Executive Director

Ms Iris Cheng Property Development Manager

Ms Virginia Ng Assistant Property Development Manager

Townland Consultants Ltd

Ms Cindy Tsang Associate Director

Ms Janet Ngai Assistant Town Planner

Ms Miranda Chiu Assistant Town Planner

DLN Architects & Engineers (HK) Ltd

Ms Carolin Fong Director

AECOM Asia Company Ltd

Mr Robert Chan Technical Director

Urbis Ltd

Mr Leigh Jones Landscape Designer

Agenda Item 4PlanD

Mr CH Mak Town Planner (3) / Yau Tsim Mong

Agenda Item 5ACEDD

Mr HS Law Chief Engineer/Land Works (Acting)

Mr KH Leung Senior Landscape Architect/Land Works 3

Mr HM Tsang Senior Engineer/3

Agenda Item 5B

DEVB

Mr Ronald Leung Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 2

CEDD

Mr HS Law Chief Engineer/Land Works (Acting)

Agenda Item 5C

CEDD

Mr SK Lam Senior Engineer/7, NT North & West

Ms WH Tsui Engineer/21, NT North & West

Ove Arup & Partners HK Ltd

Mr Lam Chun-cheuk Senior Engineer

Action

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 3rd meeting

- 1.1 The draft minutes of the 3rd meeting were circulated to Members on 14 February 2011. The revised draft minutes incorporating Members' comments were circulated on 9 March 2011. **The Chair** pointed out that the follow-up emails from individual Members on various items had also been circulated to the full Task Force. This was to keep the communications and any significant issues raised by Members between meetings as transparent as possible.
- 1.2 **The meeting** confirmed the revised draft minutes without amendments.

Item 2 Matters Arising

Circulation of meeting documents (paras. 2.8 to 2.11 of the minutes of the 3rd meeting)

- 2.1 **The Chair** reported that the Secretariat would work towards the objective to issue the meeting agenda and papers not less than 7 and 5 clear days respectively before the date of the meeting as compared to 4 and 2 clear days according to the House Rules.

Action

- 2.2 She noted that Mr Paul Zimmerman had submitted a paper for consideration under Item 4 just in the morning before this meeting. She said that Members should avoid tabling information in the last minute. If this was inevitable, the tabled information should be factual and brief. The papers submitted to the Task Force should also have clear authorship and the source of all data should be clearly referenced.

**Members
to note**

Presentation materials (para. 2.13 of the minutes of the 3rd meeting)

- 2.3 **The Chair** reported that the Secretariat had sought the view of the two presentation teams on combining their PowerPoint files with the respective audio clips for uploading onto the HC's website:

- (a) the West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD) Authority had no objection to the suggestion, and their presentation materials had already been uploaded onto the HC's website; and
- (b) the project proponent of the conversion scheme of Wing Shan Industrial Building still had reservation on putting the presentation materials on the website. They considered that it would confuse the general public rather than helping them to understand the scheme. They would share more information with the Task Force and the public after having a more comprehensive study.

She reiterated that the Task Force should respect the latter's view, while the Secretariat would alert the future presenters on the requirement of putting their presentation materials on the HC's website in advance.

Secretariat

Construction of a Two-storey Building for Harbour Patrol Section of Marine Department (para. 4.23 of the minutes of the 3rd meeting)

- 2.4 Referring to the post-meeting note to para. 4.23, **the Chair** tabled her email of 7 February 2011 to Dr Peter Cookson Smith. She said that the site meeting amongst Mr Paul Zimmerman, Dr Peter Cookson Smith and MD on 1 February 2011 was an informal one which was not arranged by the Task Force. The two Members had offered to give a presentation of their report. The report was circulated to the Task Force on 9 March 2011

Action

and the presentation would be arranged when MD reverted to the Task Force.

- 2.5 **The Chair** also informed Members that MD would brief the full Commission on its marine operations across the harbour at the next HC meeting. MD would also take the opportunity to respond to the two Members' report at the HC meeting. Subject to the discussion/deliberation at the next HC meeting, the Task Force might further discuss the matters relating to the new Harbour Patrol Section building afterwards. **MD**

Lei Yue Mun Waterfront Enhancement Project (Item 5 of the minutes of the 3rd meeting)

- 2.6 The meeting noted that two follow-up messages on the Lei Yue Mun Waterfront Enhancement Project (LYMWEP) had been received from Dr Peter Cookson Smith and Mr Paul Zimmerman, which were circulated to the Task Force on 9 March 2011.
- 2.7 Regarding Dr Peter Cookson Smith's email dated 21 February 2011 suggesting that a presentation of the paper "Revitalising Lei Yue Mun" by Mr Paul Zimmerman be arranged for the Task Force,
- (a) **the Chair** said that the subject paper had been circulated for Members' reference at the last meeting. Presentation of the paper could be arranged when the Tourism Commission (TC) reported back to the Task Force or when the relevant Action Area was brought up for the Task Force's discussion if the Paper covered issues beyond TC's project.
 - (b) **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** raised concern on the overall procedure as there was no mechanism for the Task Force to deliberate the way forward (say, by casting a vote) for such cases like the LYMWEP that several Members had critical comments while others having no comments at all.
 - (c) **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that he could present the paper at the time when the relevant Action Area was discussed, and the presentation should be arranged before or at the same time when TC reverted to the Task Force.

Action

(d) **Mrs Margaret Brooke** said that the presentation would be useful and it should be arranged as soon as possible.

(e) Regarding the overall procedure, **the Chair** said that she was not aware of voting as a practice in the former Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC) or its sub-committees. Nonetheless, if a Member considered it necessary, he/she could suggest the Task Force to cast a vote for a particular project at the meeting. This could then be considered by Members. As for the presentation, she concluded that it should be made earlier and at one of the two occasions, that was, either when the Task Force discussed the relevant Action Area or when TC reported back to the Task Force.

Secretariat

2.8 Regarding the follow-up questions raised in Mr Paul Zimmerman's email dated 27 February, **the Chair** said that the 37 questions had been forwarded to TC for follow-up, and TC had been advised to provide response to the questions when they reverted to the Task Force in one go.

TC

2.9 Referring to para. 5.17(b) and (c) the minutes of the 3rd meeting, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** raised the following points:

(a) on the aspect of seawall/flood prevention, recent events showed the dangers of storm tides and flooding for residents and visitors. Although sections of the existing footpath surface would be improved under the LYMWEP, it was built on a low and dangerous rubble seawall; and

(b) he doubted whether LYM should be regarded as a "major" tourist attraction. While TC claimed that LYM was amongst the top 10 or 20 favourite places for tourists in Hong Kong, the "Visitor Profile 2009" compiled by the Hong Kong Tourism Board indicated that less than 1% of tourists had visited LYM. According to a paper "Using GPS Data to Compare First-Time and Repeat Visitors to Hong Kong" (written by McKercher, B., Shoal, N., Ng, E., & A Birenboim), the data captured by GPS device showed that no tourists had visited LYM at all.

2.10 **The Chair** said that she recalled that the information was based

Action

on tourist surveys and provided by TC in their responses to questions. She also suggested Mr Zimmerman pass his information to the Secretariat for circulation to Members so that Members could look at the sources and methodologies of different surveys to form an opinion when TC reported back to the Task Force.

(Post-meeting note: The information that the Chair referred to was on page 6 of Paper No. TFK/03/2011 that “Based on surveys conducted by the Hong Kong Tourism Board (HKTB), visitation to LYM has on the whole been stable in the past three years.”)

(Post-meeting note: On 17 March 2011, Mr Paul Zimmerman forwarded the above paper by McKercher, B., Shoval, N., Ng, E., & A Birenboim to the Secretariat. The paper will be circulated for Members’ reference when TC reported back to the Task Force.)

Action Areas (para. 6.8 of the minutes of the 3rd meeting)

- 2.11 **The Chair** said that Mr Paul Zimmerman and Dr Peter Cookson Smith had raised further issues relating to the Action Areas through emails on 15 and 17 January respectively. Given the time constraint, she suggested that the Task Force should discuss at most three Action Areas in each meeting and Members should make a joint decision at the meeting about the next three Action Areas to be discussed at the following meeting.

Item 3 Proposed District Revitalisation with Minor Relaxation of Building Height and Plot Ratio Restrictions in the “Comprehensive Development Area” Zoning at Yau Tong Bay (Paper No. TFK/04/2011)

- 3.1 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** declared an interest in this item as his company was one of the consultants of the subject proposal. **The meeting** agreed that Dr Smith could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion of this item.
- 3.2 **The Chair** said that the subject of this item was a planning application being processed by the Town Planning Board (TPB). The site had a long planning history. As set out in the

Reference Materials, the former HEC and its Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review (HPR Sub-com) had been briefed on two proposals submitted by the project proponent in 2005 and 2007, and the amendments to the Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong, Lei Yue Mun Outline Zoning Plan in 2008 and the draft planning brief for the subject "Comprehensive Development Area" ("CDA") site in 2010 by PlanD. The subject planning application was the first scheme to be considered by TPB after its endorsement of the planning brief in April 2010.

- 3.3 **Ms Cindy Tsang** of Townland Consultants Ltd presented the Paper with the aid of PowerPoint slides.
- 3.4 **The Chair** said that the subject planning application involved a relaxation of the restrictions of plot ratio (PR) and building height (BH) from 4.5 and 120mPD to 5 and 132mPD respectively. She pointed out that the planning brief endorsed by TPB in April 2010 had set out the basic requirements of the future development. Any relaxation of the development parameters should be considered based on the additional planning gains to be provided apart from the basic requirements as stipulated in the planning brief.
- 3.5 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that in its previous discussion in January 2010, the former HPR Sub-com noted that Yau Tong Bay, with its unique configuration being partly sheltered, could be used for a public boat club, private marina or both. The HPR Sub-com considered that the provision of a waterfront promenade was not enough to produce an exciting harbourfront and the appropriate marine use and land-based supporting facilities should be further examined. He believed that the owners of the site were interested in developing a marina/boat club but did not want to delay the development by seeking amendments to the zoning and planning brief. He observed that the proposed scheme basically followed inadequate planning brief requirements and his comments were as follows:
- (a) the only land/water use interface proposed in the scheme was a pair of landing steps which was a poor interface for the entire site;
 - (b) it should be made clear to the developer and TPB that it would be a missed opportunity if only a waterfront promenade was provided around a semi-sheltered water

body which could cost effectively be put for more active marine uses such as leisure boating and water sports;

- (c) he refrained from commenting on other aspects of the scheme as he believed that others including the District Council would comment on the PR, BH, visual impact of the proposed development, etc.; and
- (d) he cast doubt on the current methodology adopted for traffic impact assessments as they failed to take into account the cumulative impact of permitted developments and trends as was borne out by growing traffic congestion problems throughout Hong Kong.

3.6 **Ms Pong Yuen-ye** had the following comments:

- (a) more efforts should be made to give this unique site more character and to provide more benefits to the public; and
- (b) more illustrations on the stepped height profile should be provided to facilitate Members' consideration of the proposed relaxation of BH.

3.7 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** concurred that more land/water use interface should be provided for the subject site in addition to the proposed landing steps. She was also concerned with the development density in the eastern part of the harbour on Kowloon side as the developments there as a whole, even with gaps between some individual buildings, looked like a huge solid mass.

3.8 **The Chair** raised the following questions:

- (a) whether land had been reserved for the future development of a marina club which required more facilities than just landing steps;
- (b) the number of towers exceeding the BH restriction of 120mPD, and whether podium structures had been proposed in the current scheme; and
- (c) whether the planning brief requirement on building separation (i.e. a minimum of 25m between each residential block) had been complied with.

3.9 In response, **Mr Augustine Wong** of Henderson Land Development Company Ltd, **Ms Cindy Tsang** and **Ms Carolin Fong** of DLN Architects & Engineers (HK) Ltd made the following points:

- (a) it might not be possible to deliver the vision for a marina club or other water uses by the developer itself without the cooperation of various stakeholders including the government. In the Master Layout Plan, the land between T15 and T16, which was currently occupied by the Cha Kwo Ling Salt Water Pumping Station, was reserved for the future provision of marina club facilities. Albeit costly, it was technically feasible to relocate the pumping station to the building proposed for government, institution or community (GIC) facilities on the southern part of the site;
- (b) the BH profile would step down from 132mPD in the eastern side of the site towards 70mPD at the western ends. Four residential towers (T5, T6, T11 and T12) would exceed 120mPD;
- (c) two podia had been proposed in the scheme, with one linking up T9, T10 and T11 at the north-eastern corner of the site and the other linking up T6 and T7 at the south-eastern corner. Apart from accommodating commercial and residential club facilities, these podia would also provide pedestrian linkage (in the form of a footbridge) from the elevated MTR Cha Kwo Ling Station to the waterfront promenade; and
- (d) the average building separation distance was 31.36m. The widest building gap was about 36m, but the narrowest one, which was between T10 and T11, was only 18.21m due to the configuration of the site. Attempts had been made to optimise the separation distances for the rest of the towers to achieve maximum permeability, and positive results had been indicated in the air ventilation assessment (AVA) submitted to TPB.

3.10 **Prof Carlos Lo** enquired about the public benefits to be brought about by the proposed minor relaxation of PR and BH of the development, the details of the opposing views received

and how such views were addressed in the scheme.

3.11 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** had the following further comments and questions:

- (a) relocating the salt water pumping station to make way for the provision of a marina club might not be ideal as there was an underground pipe which might have impact on the location of the breakwater that defined the reserve for moorings. He also enquired about the amount of area reserved for the private marina/public boat club, the locations of slipways, hoists and storage yard for boats and their interface with the waterfront promenade; and

(Post-meeting note: Mr Paul Zimmerman had provided for Members' reference a hyperlink about floating breakwaters which were considered more flexible and possibly less onerous in respect of the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance:

<http://www.fdn-engineering.nl/en-product-development/floating-breakwaters.>)

- (b) noting that no dredging would be carried out to remove the contaminated mud, he queried what the long lasting impact on the environment and water quality was, and how this might constrain water uses.

3.12 **Mr Franklin Yu** asked if the AVA had demonstrated that the proposed development layout was an optimal one.

3.13 In response, **Mr Augustine Wong** made the following points:

- (a) some objections were raised by the owners who had not joined the consortium. Some owners considered that the BH or development intensity on their lots should be higher, while some were unwilling to team up with other owners at this stage. There was also an objection against the proposed building heights;
- (b) extensive dredging would stir up the contaminants on the seabed, in particular the heavy metals, that might eventually enter into the food chain. As such, minimum dredging was proposed;

- (c) questions relating to the marina could only be answered after a detailed study, bearing in mind that there was little room to accommodate all marina supporting facilities within the site while the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance had also posed constraints on the use of the harbour. The developer would consult the relevant stakeholders on how to make good use of the water if a marina was decided to be provided in future; and
 - (d) the proposed relaxation of BH was to add visual contrast to make the stepped height profile more interesting. Although it was possible to transfer the gross floor area of the four tallest towers to the rest of the site by building an additional block or increasing the height of the other towers, the former would reduce the building separation distance and the latter might not result in a clear stepped height profile.
- 3.14 **Ms Pong Yuen-ye**e asked whether the relaxation of BH was to accommodate the additional PR (from 4.5 to 5) proposed by the developer.
- 3.15 Following Prof Carlos Lo's question on public benefits, **the Chair** enquired about the time frame for implementing Phases 2 and 3 of the waterfront promenade. She also requested the project team to explain the provision of soft landscaped area in the current scheme as it appeared to be much less than the planning brief requirement (i.e. 85% of the public open space should be soft landscape).
- 3.16 **Mr Leigh Jones** of Urbis Ltd, **Ms Cindy Tsang** and **Mr Augustine Wong** responded as follows:
- (a) it was impossible to achieve the 85% soft landscape requirement without affecting the usability of the public open space. In the current scheme, about 32% of the public open space would be in the form of soft landscape, of which the vast majority would be large trees;
 - (b) the public planning gains should be considered in a comprehensive manner. The minor relaxation of PR and

Action

BH sought by the developer was an incentive offered in the planning brief for a comprehensive and integrated redevelopment. The developer had assembled over 80% of private land within the “CDA” zone and had fulfilled the 10 pre-set criteria for seeking the minor relaxation of PR as stated in the Planning Brief, including implementing the waterfront promenade at the initial phase of the development for public enjoyment, providing recreational facilities along the waterfront, providing landing steps to facilitate berthing of pleasure boats, etc. The developer was therefore considered to be eligible to apply to TPB for a minor relaxation of the maximum PR. Nevertheless, the relaxation of PR being sought was minor in nature and the total PR did not exceed the maximum PR of 5 as stipulated in the OZP; and

- (c) assuming that the relevant planning approval could be obtained within this year, Phases 1 and 2 of the waterfront promenade, which were under the control of the consortium, could be completed by 2017. As for Phase 3, the implementation time frame would depend on the intention of the dissenting owners. Nonetheless, transitional pedestrian connection had been proposed to facilitate public access to the waterfront before completion of the Phase 3 development.

3.17 **Prof Carlos Lo** opined that the public gains so claimed by the project team were indeed planning brief requirements that the developer should follow.

3.18 **Ir Peter Wong** had reservation on the project team’s suggestion to opt for minimum dredging. He pointed out that costs, risks and benefits were key considerations that the project team should look into beyond minimum efforts.

3.19 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** raised the following further comments:

- (a) the retail, food and beverage facilities should be provided at the waterfront and not just within the podia. To avoid future complaints by the residents against the outdoor dining facilities, it should be made clear to the potential property buyers at an early stage that these facilities were an integral part of the development; and

Action

- (b) while the issue of breakwater could be considered later, the current proposed layout would make the future development of a marina or public boat club impossible because the waterfront promenade would hinder the boats from getting in and out of the water and marina supporting facilities had not been catered for. A master plan on the land/water use interface showing the design integration of marina supporting facilities (e.g. hoists, slipways, club facilities, storage space, etc.) should be prepared so as to ensure that such facilities could be provided in future and it should be submitted for the Task Force's consideration.
- 3.20 **Ms Pong Yuen-ye** opined that the landscaped areas were just leftovers of the site, and there were insufficient public benefits to justify the requested minor relaxation of PR and BH.
- 3.21 **Mr Leslie Chen** considered that 85% of public open space on soft landscape was not an easily achievable target for this site. If a lower percentage was to be accepted, it would be desirable to make these landscaped areas accessible to the public as much as possible. To compensate for the non-compliance with the soft landscape requirement, he suggested making good use of the areas within the drip line of the canopy trees for public enjoyment.
- 3.22 **Ms Carolin Fong** and **Ms Cindy Tsang** responded further as follows:
- (a) apart from the two podia, there would be shops facing the waterfront promenade on the ground floor of the towers so as to optimise the commercial potential and to facilitate public enjoyment of the waterfront;
- (b) the layout of the towers had been adjusted to enhance air ventilation based on the AVA findings to achieve the current optimal layout. The result of the AVA process should be a more important consideration than a prescriptive figure on building separation under the planning brief; and
- (c) on the aspect of public planning gains, in addition to the relocation of the Cha Kwo Ling Salt Water Pumping Station and those mentioned in para. 3.16(b) above, the

Action

developer would provide a number of GIC facilities, including an integrated vocational rehabilitation services centre, a hostel for moderately mentally handicapped persons and an integrated children and youth centre, to serve the local population.

- 3.23 **The Chair** concluded that, based on the deliberation, the Task Force would not be able to give in-principle support to the application. Members had raised concerns on various aspects. The Task Force's views would be submitted to TPB for reference in considering the subject application, and the Secretariat would seek her clearance before submission. **Secretariat**

Item 4 Discussion on the Amendments to the Approved South West Kowloon Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K20/24 (Paper No. TFK/05/2011)

- 4.1 **The Chair** drew Members' attention to the following letter and paper, which were tabled at the meeting:

- (a) a letter dated 15 March 2011 from 海上業界聯席會議 expressing objection to Amendment Item A to the approved South West Kowloon Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K20/24; and
- (b) a paper "Changing use of the waterfront of Victoria Harbour" submitted by Mr Paul Zimmerman.

- 4.2 **Mr CK Soh** presented Paper No. TFK/05/2011 with the aid of powerpoint slides.

- 4.3 Referring to his Paper, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** made the following points:

- (a) sheltered waterfront was important for the safe operation of marine uses and water-dependent and logistics industries, but there was a mismatch in the provision of sheltered waterfront for these uses. According to a study currently undertaken by the Harbour Business Forum (HBF), out of the total 76km long harbourfront, only 16km was sheltered waterfront. In the western harbour where there was a high concentration of water-dependent and water-related

Action

uses, only 9% of the waterfront was sheltered, as compared to 36% in the eastern harbour where such uses were to be phased out. The proportion of sheltered waterfront which could be used by marine uses and water-dependent and logistics industries would continue to decrease in the coming years as the public cargo working areas (PCWAs) in the eastern harbour had been / would be removed. Only three PCWAs would remain in the western harbour by 2015 and they were the Rambler Channel, Western District and New Yau Ma Tei PCWAs. It was therefore important to prioritise the use of the waterfront of the New Yau Ma Tei Typhoon Shelter for marine supporting uses;

- (b) as a case in point, the paper recycling industry was losing their berths in the eastern harbour. The result was increased competition for the remaining berths in the western harbour, with more existing operators than berths available;
- (c) the question was whether the “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) site fronting sheltered water in Yau Ma Tei should be reserved for a dog park or the uses and industries which required water access;
- (d) he had met with the operators of the 海上業界聯席會議 who considered that the Yau Ma Tei waterfront should be used for marine uses and industries; and
- (e) to make good use of the Yau Ma Tei waterfront, a suggestion was to revert the “G/IC” zoning of Amendment Item A, which was situated next to the ex-Tai Kok Tsui Bus Terminus and earmarked for a park, to consolidate MD’s ship inspection and typhoon mooring with new facilities together with a replacement for the dilapidated and inadequate facilities at MD’s existing site at Hoi Fai Road. Facilities for sewage and oil disposal could be added to keep the harbour clean. MD’s existing site at Hoi Fai Road could be released for use as an extension of the PCWA.

4.4 **The Chair** enquired if it had been decided that the site in question would be converted into a dog park.

4.5 **Ir Peter Wong** enquired about the pedestrian access to the site.

- 4.6 **Prof Carlos Lo** enquired about the alternative use of the site if the “G/IC” zoning was to be reverted.
- 4.7 In response, **Mr CK Soh** made the following points:
- (a) pet garden was one of the possible uses under the subject “Open Space” (“O”) site. There was a strong urge from the local community for a pet garden in the vicinity and this site was one of the candidates. LCSD and the works agent would need to present the open space proposal to the District Council for consideration before determining the facilities to be provided at the site;
 - (b) the public could gain access to the site via an at-grade crossing from the “Commercial (2)” zone which was connected with the MTR Olympic Station by a footbridge. There was also a footpath connecting the subject site with the “O” zone to its west; and
 - (c) while “open space” was a permitted use in all land use zones, an “O” zoning would serve as a strong justification in securing funding for implementing the open space. If the “G/IC” zoning was reverted, the site would likely remain as a government land reserve and might be put for temporary uses such as car park.
- 4.8 **Prof Carlos Lo** considered it more sensible to use the site for public enjoyment rather than a car park or leaving it idle.
- 4.9 **The Chair** commented that a huge population in the West Kowloon were yet to be provided with sufficient open space or promenade at a level comparable to the population living in the other parts of the city. One could see from the figures provided that the percentage of harbourfront with promenade in the eastern harbour would increase from 22% in 2000 to 52% in 2015 according to HBF’s study. Yet, the respective figures for the western harbour were only 9% in 2000 and 23% in 2015.
- 4.10 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** had the following comments:
- (a) there were ample open space at the ex-Tai Kok Tsui Bus Terminus and open space facilities in the neighbouring residential properties. There was also an adequate pavement to provide continuous connectivity along the

waterfront. He queried the value of building another promenade or dog park at the subject site;

- (b) there was a pressing demand from the marine industries for sheltered water in the western harbour as the government had taken away their sites and berths in eastern harbour. With sheltered water, the Yau Ma Tei waterfront was an ideal location to meet the demand because there was already an agglomeration of water-dependent and water-related uses and it was closed to the port and mid-stream sites and served by highway and MTR; and
- (c) the harbourfront should not be used entirely for promenade at the expense of the marine and cargo handling industries. He urged the Harbourfront Commission to develop clear criteria as to where different uses should be located, and how the use of specific waterfronts could be optimised.

4.11 In response, **Mr CK Soh** made the following points:

- (a) as numerous complaints were already received from the nearby residents against the adverse impacts (light, noise, nuisances, etc.) caused by the existing cargo handling activities, it might not be appropriate to extend the PCWA to the subject site, which was closer to the existing residential developments;
- (b) when compared with the existing PCWA (with a width of about 40m), the configuration of the subject site (with a width of 8m to 26m) might be too narrow for cargo handling operation; and
- (c) 2 representations on the rezoning of the site had been received so far. One of them was from a member of the public who supported the "O" zoning, while the other was submitted by the operators with different view. These representations would be submitted to TPB for consideration. The views of the District Council, which strongly supported the rezoning, would also be a relevant consideration.

4.12 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the subject site could be used to

consolidate MD's facilities, while the existing MD's site next to the PCWA could be integrated to provide valuable water frontage for additional berthing space for the PCWA users. In so doing, it might also be possible to negotiate with the PCWA operators to set back their operation to provide pedestrian connection from WKCD to Cherry Street as the net site area for cargo handling would not be reduced.

4.13 In response, **Mr Adam Lai** made the following points:

- (a) he agreed with Mr Paul Zimmerman's view that the need to use the coastal land for different economic activities should be fully recognised;
- (b) the subject site was earmarked for ship inspection and typhoon mooring use many years ago. With changing circumstances and mode of operation, MD now considered it no longer necessary to keep the site for such purpose;
- (c) given its configuration, the subject site was considered not suitable to be used as a standalone site for PCWA purpose;
- (d) the proposal to consolidate MD's facilities including the Harbour Patrol Section office and marine refuse collection point at the subject site would need to be studied in greater detail;
- (e) a study to update the overall requirement for port facilities would soon commence. The need for additional cargo handling area for the territory as a whole should be examined in that context. As for enlarging the PCWA in Yau Ma Tei, the associated traffic impact would need to be considered. With the existing level of cargo handling activities, there were already complaints on road traffic in the area being seriously affected; and
- (f) setting back of the PCWA would not be feasible as narrowing the site would affect the cargo handling operation, even though the net site area was to remain the same.

4.14 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** considered that the residents'

complaints were unjustified because the cargo handling use had been in existence long before they moved in the area. The need for back-up facilities (such as refuse collection facility) should also be recognised. Instead of reviewing the use of individual sites in isolation, a broader view should be taken to improve the overall environment by rationalising the existing uses and facilities and improving the visual amenities of the typhoon shelter as a whole. As for the subject site, he did not support using it for a dog park.

- 4.15 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** shared Dr Peter Cookson Smith's view by pointing out the importance of striking a balance between the public aspiration for open space for enjoyment and the need to accommodate economic activities. She commented that there was no real interface between the use of the water and the use of the land in the past. It was necessary to take a strategic view to consider the land and water uses in an integrated way from now onwards.
- 4.16 **Ir Peter Wong** considered it better to use the subject site to support marine activities, and it should avoid designating a use which might jeopardise economic activities in future.
- 4.17 **Prof Carlos Lo** had reservation on putting the site for industrial use as the area had already been developed into a residential neighbourhood. He considered that dog park might not be a suitable use, and suggested using the site for social activities which would be compatible with the residential setting and in line with public interest. He also noted that Mr Paul Zimmerman had previously supported turning waterfront areas into spaces for public enjoyment, though Mr Zimmerman had a different view now.
- 4.18 **The Chair** agreed that the Task Force should not consider individual proposals/projects in a piecemeal manner. As MD would give a briefing on the marine facilities in the harbour at the next HC meeting, Members could then have a better idea on the whole planning of the harbour and how to strike a strategic balance between the different needs of a working harbour and a harbour for public enjoyment.
- 4.19 As for the subject site being rezoned, **the Chair** concluded the Task Force's views as follows:

Action

- (a) the subject site was a precious piece of land at the harbourfront. The use of the site should be looked into more carefully;
- (b) the Task Force did not consider that the subject site was best suitable for pet garden use. The site was also not considered suitable to be used as a PCWA on its standalone basis; and
- (c) the demand for public cargo handling facilities should be reviewed at a strategic level.

The Task Force's views would be submitted to TPB for consideration, and the Secretariat would seek her clearance prior to submission. **The meeting** agreed that the Task Force's views would be conveyed to TPB administratively rather than in the form of a formal representation.

Secretariat

Item 5 Action Areas

5.1 **The Chair** recapped that the Task Force had agreed to invite the relevant departments to give progress updates for the projects in the Hung Hom East, Tsim Sha Tsui East and Tsuen Wan Action Areas. She referred Members to Enclosure 1 of the Reference Materials for an overview of these Action Areas.

A. Hung Hom East Action Area

Initial Development of Hung Hom Waterfront Promenade (Paper No. TFK/06/2011)

5.2 **The Chair** said that this was a quick-win project identified by the former HPR Sub-com to improve the waterfront for early public enjoyment pending full-scale development of the open space sites in the area by LCSD. The previous papers submitted by CEDD to the HEC and HPR Sub-com and the comments given by HEC Members were at Enclosures 2 to 5 of the Reference Materials.

5.3 **Messrs HS Law and HM Tsang** of CEDD presented the Paper with the aid of PowerPoint slides.

5.4 **The Chair** said that the walking map was useful in helping visitors to access the promenade.

- 5.5 **Mr Franklin Yu** enquired whether the section of waterfront to the south of the Hong Kong Coliseum would be accessible by the public. He suggested that a sculpture similar to the vertical landmark at the Kwun Tong Promenade could be placed at the subject promenade to add visual interest and attract visitors.
- 5.6 **Ms Pong Yuen-ye**e suggested that instead of using concrete for the jogging trail, some specially designed materials could be used to make it more comfortable for joggers.
- 5.7 In response, **Mr KH Leung** of CEDD made the following points:
- (a) the waterfront area to the south of the Hong Kong Coliseum was still occupied by the MTRC Freight Yard, but there was an elevated walkway linking up the promenades in Tsim Sha Tsui and Hung Hom;
 - (b) given that this was a quick-win project implemented with limited capital funding, the suggestion of adding a landmark sculpture could be considered in the future long-term open space development by LCSD; and
 - (c) for the area along the waterfront, recycled concrete paving materials would be used. For the jogging trail, as the key consideration was to provide a smooth and flat surface to ensure jogging safety, concrete would be used. Synthetic painting, which was an organic material widely used for sports grounds, would be applied to provide visual unity with the concrete paving.
- 5.8 **Ms Gracie Foo** added that while the promenade was funded as a minor works item with CEDD as our agent, DEVB would coordinate the departmental efforts in organising activities (e.g. exhibitions and art display) to sustain the vibrancy of the promenade. These activities could be funded by other bodies (e.g. District Councils).
- 5.9 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** had the following comments:
- (a) an at-grade pedestrian link between Tsim Sha Tsui and Hung Hom should be provided in the long term;

- (b) the current design was not impressive as it comprised mainly lawn area without sitting-out area. The rain shelters and benches were uninteresting. A suggestion was to provide a continuous tree cover along the promenade, which could serve as a shelter for sun and rain;
- (c) instead of a lawn area, consideration should be given to the provision of a better interface with the future commercial developments by putting some cafés and sitting-out areas at the edge; and
- (d) the promenade should be used by everybody. In selecting the paving materials, jogging activity should not be a priority consideration.

5.10 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** had the following comments:

- (a) the existing kiosk near the Hung Hom Ferry Pier had brought vibrancy to the waterfront and provided a low-cost food outlet for the local community. The operator should be allowed to continue his business and retain the outdoor seating area;
- (b) reference should be made to the railing design at the New Yau Ma Tei Typhoon Shelter waterfront which enabled marine uses and people to do fishing while minimising the conflicts with pedestrians/joggers; and

(Post-meeting note: On 27 March 2011, Mr Paul Zimmerman provided some photographs showing the railing design at the New Yau Ma Tei Typhoon Shelter waterfront for CEDD's reference via the Secretariat.)

- (c) consideration should be given to the provision of canopy trees along the waterfront promenade for people to sit and enjoy underneath.

5.11 **Prof Carlos Lo** opined that different activities/street performances should be allowed to create vibrancy and attractiveness of the promenade.

5.12 **Mr Franklin Yu** said that tolerant grass species should be selected to allow activities on the lawn area.

Action

- 5.13 **Ir Peter Wong** enquired whether Chinese Opera performance would be allowed.
- 5.14 In response to Members' comments, **Mr Eric Yue** said that according to the endorsed planning brief for the adjacent "Comprehensive Development Area" ("CDA"), the future commercial development should be set back to provide more open space to integrate with the waterfront promenade and alfresco dining facilities abutting the promenade should be considered to enhance vibrancy. As the future developer was required to submit a Master Layout Plan (MLP) for TPB's approval, details of the future development including the provision of open space and alfresco dining would be scrutinised during the MLP submission stage.
- 5.15 **Ms Maisie Chan** explained further that the large undulating lawn in this quick-win project was purposely designed with a view to offering another kind of dining experience by providing a green area for people to sit, walk or enjoy their lunch adjacent to the alfresco dining venues proposed at the "CDA" site.
- 5.16 **Mr Harry Tsang** added that the existing kiosk might still operate there. Visitors could always enjoy their food within the promenade including the lawn area. Leisure activities in the promenade, including fishing, would be allowed as long as they did not create nuisance to other people. LCSD always facilitated various activities in its venues to enhance vibrancy, and the subject promenade would not be an exception.
- 5.17 **Ms Ida Lam** suggested that the NGOs, elderly homes, children centres, etc. in the area be included in the promotion of the opening of the waterfront promenade.
- 5.18 **The Chair** remarked that:
- (a) the quick-win project should allow room for better integration of the future CDA development. Further consideration should be given to the constructive use of canopy trees and improving the design of the rain shelters and benches; and
 - (b) regarding promotion, she suggested Ms Lam provide a list of the community organisations in the area to the project team for publicising the opening of the

CEDD

promenade.

(Post-meeting note: Ms Ida Lam advised that information about the community organisations in the area might be available at the District Office and the Social Welfare Department. CEDD had been advised to approach them directly for such information.)

B. Tsim Sha Tsui East Action Area

5.19 **The Chair** said that the former HEC had identified the following enhancement opportunities for this Action Area:

- (a) activating promenade and providing dining facilities with outdoor seating facing the harbour in the cultural facilities and enhancement of LCSD sites; and
- (b) improving the directional signage from Nathan Road and Salisbury Road to the harbourfront at Tsim Sha Tsui.

For the former, LCSD had advised that they were now considering some proposals, and it was expected that consultation with stakeholders including the Task Force would be kicked off in late 2011 at the earliest. For the latter, DEVB and CEDD had submitted an information paper (No. TFK/07/2011) to the Task Force.

Improving Directional Signage from Nathan Road and Salisbury Road to the Harbourfront at Tsim Sha Tsui (Paper No. TFK/07/2011)

5.20 **The Chair** said that Tsim Sha Tsui was one of the pilot areas of the Harbourfront Signage Scheme (HSS). The progress of the scheme was presented to the full Commission in December 2010, and the relevant HC paper and meeting minutes were included in Enclosures 6 and 7 of the Reference Materials.

5.21 **Mr Ronald Leung** of DEVB briefly introduced the Paper.

5.22 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** enquired whether the HSS would make use of the existing signage systems in the area. He noted that in the subways, there were 6 signage systems designed by different parties (including private organisations, MTRC,

Highways Department (HyD), TC, etc.) using different names for subway exits and maps of different orientations, which were considered confusing and could be improved.

5.23 **Mr Ronald Leung** responded that:

- (a) the intention was to attach the harbourfront signage to the existing Visitor Signage Improvement Scheme (VSIS) as far as possible since there were a number of advantages in doing so. Nevertheless, there were similarities and differences between the two systems. While both were directional signage systems, VSIS was an up and running system leading tourists to destinations with tourism merits, whereas HSS was a new system providing directions for any interested person to harbourfront destinations, some of which might not yet possess tourism merits. It was important to recognise these in addition to the technicalities such as loading capacities in addressing the interface issues of the two systems. In this connection, CEDD and TC were having an ongoing discussion and would continue to work together in formulating the appropriate way forward; and
- (b) the primary objective of the HSS was to provide information on the clear, direct and convenient routes from the hinterland to the harbourfront. In terms of scope and priority of the scheme, the focus would therefore be on providing directions via at-grade directional signage.

5.24 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** pointed out that the only and nearest at-grade crossing to the Tsim Sha Tsui harbourfront was at Canton Road. He therefore considered it necessary to integrate the HSS with the signage systems of the existing subways or the elevated walkways.

5.25 **Ms Pong Yuen-ye** said that it was common to find numerous signages on narrow footpaths, especially in Tsim Sha Tsui. There was a need for collaboration among government departments to make good use of the limited footpath space in providing directional signage while avoiding obstruction to pedestrian circulation.

5.26 In response, **Mr Ronald Leung** explained further as follows:

- (a) there was on-going discussion with TC to explore the extent of integrating HSS into the existing VSIS system, such as adding panels to existing VSIS poles;
- (b) at-grade routes were accorded priority given the objective of the scheme to provide direct and convenient harbourfront access for pedestrians, but in cases where no at-grade pedestrian connections to the harbourfront were available, a 3-dimensional approach to add the harbourfront signage in the subways or footbridges would be considered; and
- (c) the HSS was taken forward by DEVB and CEDD, which commissioned the consultancy on the design and construction of the harbourfront signage. A working group comprising representatives from relevant departments including TC, TD, HyD, etc. had been formed to collect departmental inputs and discuss interface issues.

5.27 **Mr Vincent Fung** added that TC and the HKTB had continuous dialogues with the project team. He noted that the existing signage systems had been designed with different purposes for different users (e.g. drivers, pedestrians, tourists). The crux of the issue was to use a correct terminology with consistent terms/names to direct users to their destinations.

5.28 **The Chair** remarked that there was good progress of the project. Consideration could be given to developing a harbourfront signage system for pedestrian walkways in 3-dimensional manner because the MTR stations had provided underground pedestrian networks; and flyovers were also important in Hong Kong. Simply looking at at-grade walkways would not be sufficient.

**DEVB
& CEDD**

C. Tsuen Wan Action Area

Cycle Track between Tsuen Wan and Tuen Mun (Paper No. TFK/08/2011)

5.29 **The Chair** said that this project had been discussed by the HPR Sub-com in March 2009. The previous paper and meeting minutes of the HPR Sub-com were at Enclosures 8 and 9 of the

Reference Materials.

5.30 **Mr SK Lam** of CEDD presented the Paper with the aid of PowerPoint slides.

5.31 **The Chair** said that the project would promote a sustainable mode of transport, which was also common in many international cities. She suggested the project team make reference to a recent report completed by the Portland State University on the "Evaluation of Innovative Bicycle Facilities" in designing the cycling facilities.

(Post-meeting note: The Chair forwarded a copy of the above report for CEDD's reference via the Secretariat on 17 March 2011.)

5.32 **Ms Gracie Foo** said that as construction of the first phase of the cycle track was tentatively scheduled to commence in 2013 subject to availability of funding and resources, the Task Force's support would help CEDD to take the proposal forward.

5.33 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** expressed support to the project and **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** noted that the project was part of the cycle track to be developed around the New Territories. They enquired whether a continuous footpath would be provided alongside the entire cycle track.

5.34 **Mr Franklin Yu** enquired whether a rental system would be in place to facilitate cyclists to pick up bicycles at one place and return them at another.

5.35 **Prof Carlos Lo** said that a demand study should be conducted to ensure that the proposed cycle track would have sufficient capacity to avoid future management problems.

5.36 In response, **Mr SK Lam** made the following points:

- (a) pedestrian footpath would be provided all the way alongside the cycle track; and
- (b) an automated bicycle rental system was being studied by TD. Also, several entry/exit hubs had been planned to enable the operators to provide bicycle renting and

returning services at different places.

- 5.37 **The Chair** remarked that the Task Force supported the implementation of the project.

Others

- 5.38 **The Chair** invited Members' suggestion on the Action Areas to be discussed at the next meeting. She opined that the WKCD Action Area was important as it was a green field site with plenty of room for comprehensive planning. She also noted that Mr Paul Zimmerman had requested for a briefing on the recently approved building plans for a 4-storey extension building for immigration, customs and quarantine facilities, retail shops and food and beverage use at the western end of Ocean Terminal, which fell within the Tsim Sha Tsui West Action Area.

- 5.39 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that for the Tsim Sha Tsui East Action Area, apart from harbourfront signage, progress updates on the provision of outdoor seating and food and beverage facilities in the cultural facilities, the Tsim Sha Tsui Piazza project and the refurbishment of Star Ferry Pier should also be given. For the Hung Hom East Action Area, there should be an update on the use of the ferry pier after cancellation of ferry routes.

- 5.40 **The Chair** suggested, and **the meeting** agreed, that the Task Force would discuss/continue to discuss the WKCD, Tsim Sha Tsui West and Tsim Sha Tsui East Action Areas at the next meeting.

Secretariat

Item 6 Any Other Business

Cheung Sha Wan Wholesale Food Market

- 6.1 **The Chair** reported that subsequent to the joint site visit to the Market with the Sham Shui Po District Council (SSPDC) Members on 29 November 2010, the suggestion of opening up part of it to the public was discussed at the SSPDC meeting on 17 February 2011. While welcoming the suggestion, SSPDC considered that detailed planning was required to resolve the practical problems before proceeding further with the suggestion. Relevant departments would be invited to revert to

Action

the Task Force by then.

- 6.2 There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 5:35 pm.

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