

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

**Minutes of Fifth Meeting**

Date : 31 May 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
Mr Andy Leung	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Patrick Lau	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
Mr Nicholas Brooke	
Ms Dilys Chau	
Ms Ida Lam	
Mr Chris Fung	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour) (Acting), Development Bureau (DEVB)
Ms Stephanie Lai	Senior Manager (Tourism) 2, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr Lee Wai-bun	Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon, Transport Department
Mr Janson Wong	Chief Engineer/Kowloon 2, Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr Paul Cheung	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) 1, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Mr Raymond Wong	Assistant Director (Territorial)/Planning, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Edward Leung	Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Prof Carlos Lo	Representing Friends of the Earth
----------------	-----------------------------------

Dr Stefan Al  
Dr Ho Siu-kee

**In Attendance**

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

**Action**

**Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting**

1.1 The draft minutes of the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting were circulated to Members on 28 April 2011. The revised draft minutes incorporating Members' comments were circulated on 24 May 2011. **The meeting** confirmed the revised draft minutes without amendments.

**Item 2 Matters Arising**

*Construction of a Two-storey Building for Harbour Patrol Section of Marine Department (para. 2.5 of the minutes of the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting)*

2.1 **The Chair** said that the presentation given by Marine Department (MD) at the last Commission meeting on 17 May 2011 had provided a good background for the Task Force to consider the new Harbour Patrol Section Building at the next meeting. Upon the Chair's invitation, **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** and **Mr Paul Zimmerman** agreed to present the report on their informal meeting with MD at the next meeting. **The meeting** also agreed to invite MD's representatives to join the discussion.

*Lei Yue Mun Waterfront Enhancement Project (para. 2.8 of the minutes of the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting)*

2.2 **The Chair** said that TC would provide responses to the follow-up questions when they reverted to the Task Force on the project.

*Proposed District Revitalisation with Minor Relaxation of Building Height and Plot Ratio Restrictions in the "Comprehensive Development Area" Zoning at Yau Tong Bay (Item 3 of the minutes of the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting)*

**Action**

- 2.3 **The Chair** noted that consideration of the planning application had been deferred by the Town Planning Board (TPB). The relevant part of the confirmed minutes of the Task Force meeting would be forwarded for TPB's reference after this meeting.

[Post-meeting note: The relevant part of the confirmed minutes of the Task Force meeting was forwarded to TPB on 1 June 2011.]

- 2.4 Referring to para. 3.16 of the minutes of the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that while the project proponent would follow the planning brief requirements to provide public planning gains, the planning brief had not made provision for a marina which was considered important by the Task Force. He suggested the Harbour Unit and PlanD look into the matter.

- 2.5 **The Chair** said that para. 3.16 was the view of the project proponent. As for the need for more land/water use interface including the possibility of a marina, the issue should be further considered by the Harbour Unit, PlanD and other relevant bureaux and departments in the long run.

**Harbour  
Unit  
& PlanD**

*Discussion on the Amendments to the Approved South West Kowloon Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K20/24 (Item 4 of the minutes of the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting)*

- 2.6 **The Chair** said that the confirmed minutes of the Task Force meeting would be forwarded to TPB for reference after the meeting. A formal reply summarising the Task Force's views on the subject would also be issued to 海上業界聯席會議.

[Post-meeting note: Relevant part of the confirmed minutes of the Task Force meeting was forwarded to TPB on 1 June 2011. A reply was issued to 海上業界聯席會議 on the same day.]

*Action Areas (Item 5 of the minutes of the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting)*

- 2.7 Referring to paras. 5.18, 5.28 and 5.40 of the minutes, **the Chair** said that the relevant departments would follow up on the Task Force's suggestions in relation to the Hung Hom Waterfront Promenade and the Harbourfront Signage Scheme, and the Task Force would discuss the West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD), Tsuen Wan and Tsim Sha Tsui (TST) Action Areas under Item 3.

Action

2.8 Regarding the Tsuen Wan Action Area, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that TPB had already received the planning application for the property development at the Tsuen Wan West Station from the Mass Transit Railway Corporation Ltd (MTRCL), but the information circulated by the HC Secretariat on 18 May 2011 did not contain sufficient details to facilitate Members to submit comments to TPB.

2.9 Noting that the planning application would be considered by TPB before the next meeting of the Task Force, **the meeting** agreed that PlanD should relay the following questions/concerns to MTRCL for an urgent response, based on which the Task Force could formulate and submit its views to TPB for consideration together with the application in a timely manner:

- (a) whether and how the Harbour Planning Principles had been taken account of in the proposed scheme;
- (b) the interface of the property development at street level including the impact on the waterfront promenade;
- (c) the arrangement on outdoor seating areas for dining; and
- (d) the impact on and interface with the cycle track project to be undertaken by CEDD in Tsuen Wan.

[Post-meeting note: PlanD had conveyed the above questions to MTRCL. The reply from MTRCL was circulated for Members' comment on 9 June 2011. The Task Force's views on the application were conveyed to TPB for reference on 13 June 2011.]

2.10 Since only the cycle track project had been discussed at the last meeting, **the Chair** suggested, and **the meeting** agreed, that the Tsuen Wan Action Area be reviewed at the next meeting.

**Secretariat**

2.11 Regarding para. 5.10 of the minutes of the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** opined that action should be taken by the Administration to reinstate the kiosk and the outdoor seating at the Hung Hom Ferry Pier. **Mr Chris Fung** responded that the Harbour Unit would liaise with the relevant departments and reverted to the Task Force on the matter.

**Harbour  
Unit**

**Item 3 Action Areas**

3.1 **The Chair** drew Members' attention that three sets of reference materials were relevant to this agenda Item:

- (a) "An Overview of Harbourfront Enhancement by Action Areas" prepared by the then HEC (the "Action Areas" table);
- (b) Inventory on Known (Planned and Proposed) Projects at Harbourfront; and
- (c) HC Paper No. HC/04/2011 "Overview of Land Use Framework for the Victoria Harbourfront" and powerpoint presentation at the Commission meeting on 9 February 2011.

**A. West Kowloon Cultural District Action Area**

3.2 Referring to the "Action Areas" table, **the Chair** said that the former HEC had suggested that public uses and waterfront access be provided during the construction of the WKCD site and the key issue was to coordinate the planning and implementation of WKCD with other works occupying the project site. At this meeting, the West Kowloon Cultural District Authority (WKCDA) would brief the Task Force on the temporary use of the WKCD site.

*Temporary Use of the West Kowloon Cultural District Site (Paper No. TFK/09/2011)*

3.3 The following representatives were invited to the meeting:

WKCDA

Ms Bonny Wong (Director, Chief Executive Officer's Office)

Mr Derek Sun (Head, Planning and Development)

Ms Wendy Cheng (Manager, Property Development)

3.4 The following Members declared interest in this item:

Mr Patrick Lau – his company was a sub-consultant of the project consultants of WKCD

Ms Ida Lam – being a member of the

## Consultation Panel of WKCDA

Mr Andy Leung – his company was a sub-consultant of the conceptual plan by Foster + Partners

Dr Peter Cookson Smith – his company was a sub-consultant of the ongoing detailed planning study by Foster + Partners

- 3.5 Noting that the subject paper was specifically about temporary use of the WKCD site, **the Chair** considered that these Members' interests indirect. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the Task Force should review the WKCD Action Area in an overall manner rather than just focusing on this particular paper, but he was also of the view that these Members could participate in the discussion and share their insights and knowledge of the project with other Members. **The meeting** agreed that these Members could stay in the meeting and participate in the discussion of this item.
- 3.6 **Ms Bonny Wong** presented the Paper with the aid of PowerPoint slides.
- 3.7 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** said that the quality of the existing temporary promenade was not good enough and it should be taken over by WKCDA to provide more activities. The Shanghai Expo was an example showing that some good facilities like café and restaurants could be provided on a temporary basis. He supported the proposed entertainment/cultural uses and commercial events, but questioned about the time frame.
- 3.8 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that this was a welcoming and timely initiative. The paper had echoed the objectives of the Harbourfront Commission. He believed that Commission members were ready to share their experiences with the WKCDA team. Given the limited land access to the site, he suggested the team take the opportunity to consider land/water interface and consider providing waterborne transport to WKCD.
- 3.9 **Ms Pong Yuen-ye** welcomed the initiative with the following suggestions:

**Action**

- (a) as the site was meant to be an incubator for nurturing arts and culture, concessionary rates could be charged for budding artists who could not afford high rates; and
- (b) early tree planting in the future park area so as to allow sufficient time for them to grow before the cultural facilities were ready for use. This would also help soften the current environment and make the area more attractive.

3.10 **Ir Peter Wong** echoed the views of Mr Brooke and Ms Pong by pointing out the following issues:

- (a) how to access the temporary areas in the western part of the project site would be a concern when construction began to take place at the northern part of the site. A temporary public transport interchange might be needed, while reclamation to facilitate water access would be subject to legal constraints; and
- (b) the western part of the site would be the future park area under Foster + Partners' scheme. If temporary facilities were to be set up there, no space would be available for planting trees.

3.11 In response, **Ms Bonny Wong** said that WKCDA would welcome any assistance and collaboration from the Commission in taking forward the initiative. She made the following points:

- (a) given the Commission's support, WKCDA was willing to consider water access to the site;
- (b) on the timing, the temporary areas in the western part of the project site could be used until 2013 or 2014 because construction of WKCD would not begin until the works for the relevant section of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link was completed;
- (c) despite the temporary facilities, WKCDA would engage consultants to start planting trees and other landscaping works on the project site. However, it might not be possible to plant as many trees as shown in the Foster + Partners' conceptual plan, especially above the Western

Harbour Tunnel area; and

- (d) regarding charges, other than recovery of some security and management costs, the initial thought was not to charge the cultural groups as it was not the intention to make any profits and this was only a piece of open land.
- 3.12 **Mr Derek Sun** added that as most of the available temporary sites were a bit distant from the existing built-up area, WKCDA was negotiating with MTRCL on whether some of the works area closer to Canton Road could be released to WKCDA.
- 3.13 **Ms Ida Lam** asked the project team to elaborate on the point about “a balanced mix” of commercial and cultural activities.
- 3.14 **Mr Andy Leung** noted that the temporary sites were fragmented and expressed concern on the overall management and control. He suggested WKCDA take a holistic approach to enable the transformation from temporary use to the future cultural district by progressive tree planting and establishing permanent facilities.
- 3.15 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** had the following comments:
- (a) he supported the use of the WKCD site for cultural events and urged the project team to take forward the initiative as soon as possible;
  - (b) to facilitate water access across the harbour, marine facilities including mooring and berthing spaces for vessels should be included;
  - (c) as for tree planting, MTRCL had a plant nursery/park in the Southern District. The experience could serve as a reference for WKCDA; and
  - (d) all temporary sites within the project area including the West Kowloon Waterfront Promenade should be consolidated under one management agent. In terms of operation, WKCDA might consider setting up some semi-permanent facilities like public toilets, ticketing booths, etc. before renting the space out.
- 3.16 **Ir Peter Wong** said that on the issue of access, egress arrangement after events was more important as thousands of



people would leave the site within a very short period of time. While supporting early implementation of the proposed temporary use, he also considered it important to start installing permanent facilities.

3.17 In response, **Ms Bonny Wong** elaborated the following:

- (a) the Short Term Tenancy to be taken up by WKCD would include the site now occupied by the DHL Balloon Ride as well as the existing temporary promenade subject to further assessment. The grey areas in the Appendix of the Paper were the areas which could be used for the proposed activities. For the prime waterfront area, WKCD would start the planting works and upgrade the existing promenade for public use and branding events. Water access would also be explored; and
- (b) regarding the mix of activities, cultural events would probably include the Hong Kong Jazz Festival, Symphony under the Stars, arts by the Hong Kong Youth Arts Foundation, "Make a Difference" by the Hong Kong School of Creativity, Chinese and western operas, dance and musical performances, etc. For commercial ones, such events as fun parks or carnivals might have a better chance as the operators might help level the site and bring in such basic facilities as electricity, toilets, water, etc.

3.18 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the Task Force should be further consulted on the design of WKCD before its finalisation. He opined that the designs by the Office for Metropolitan Architecture and Rocco Design Architects had more diversified and interesting waterfronts, and he hoped that elements would be included in Foster + Partners' design to avoid a boring waterfront experience. Planning work for the permanent piers should not be an afterthought and should start as soon as possible because reclamation might be involved.

3.19 In response to Members' comments, **Mr Paul Cheung** shared LCSD's experience in respect of the West Kowloon Waterfront Promenade as follows:

- (a) only temporary landscaping was considered when the

**Action**

promenade was constructed over four years ago because LCSD was expected to manage the site for only two years at that time. LCSD could hand over the site to WKCDA at any time;

- (b) it was not an easily accessible site. Although LCSD had put up a lot of directional signs to guide the public to the area, only a few people would visit the promenade during weekdays and the metered car park was not too heavily used on weekdays;
- (c) while attempts had been made to invite Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and commercial operators to do business there, the kiosk was eventually closed due to no tender response. Only vending machines were provided at the site now; and
- (d) drawing on the successful experiences of the Hong Kong Wine and Dine Festival and Classic Cars Exhibition, a lot of promotion work for the venue and improvement to the access would be needed for future events to be successful.

3.20 In conclusion, **the Chair** said that the proposed temporary use was supported by the Task Force as it was in line with the Harbour Planning Principle of making the project site available for early public enjoyment. WKCDA would pursue the option of water access including the possibility of a pier. More coordinated efforts with government departments in such aspects as landscaping, access, etc. were also needed. HC would particularly like to work closely with WKCDA in making such co-ordinated efforts. **Ms Bonny Wong** welcomed the suggestion of closer co-ordination with HC and agreed to provide feedback on various issues at the next Task Force meeting.

**WKCDA**

[Post-meeting note: WKCDA advised on 18 July 2011 that they are now actively working on various initiatives on temporary uses in WKCD and could likely get some material progress in the coming months. Instead of reverting to the Task Force at the next meeting in July, they suggest coming back at the meeting after the next one.]

**B. Tsim Sha Tsui East Action Area**

*The Tsim Sha Tsui Star Ferry Pier: Restoration and Revitalisation*  
(Paper No. TFK/11/2011)

3.21 The following representatives were invited to the meeting:

Masterplan Ltd

Mr Ian Brownlee (Director)

Ms Kira Brownlee (Town Planner)

3.22 **Mr Ian Brownlee** of Masterplan Ltd, the consultant of The “Star” Ferry Company Ltd (“Star” Ferry), presented the proposal with the aid of PowerPoint.

3.23 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** supported the proposal as it would make the pier more public friendly and provide dining opportunity on the waterfront. He raised the following comments/questions:

- (a) whether the existing newspaper stalls would be reprovisioned;
- (b) the existing public toilet adjacent to the pier building should also be upgraded by the project proponent;
- (c) whether the sightline of the users in the Star House and other visual receivers in the vicinity would be affected by the proposed increase in building height;
- (d) the nearby bus terminus would be revamped under the TST piazza project to be undertaken by TC and this should be taken into account in the subject proposal; and
- (e) no advertising sign on the roof of the pier building or its external wall should be allowed in future.

3.24 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** had the following comments:

- (a) as the existing pier building was in a poor condition, he did not object to its upgrading, the minor increase in building height or the new commercial accommodation including the rooftop café;
- (b) the proposal should complement the design context as

set out by the TST piazza project; and

- (c) ferry service should be regarded as a public service rather than a commercial activity.

3.25 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** considered it important to ensure that the public access to the new deck would be practical and welcoming to the public. He pointed out that the restaurant layout at one of the Central Piers was unfriendly to the public and even deterred them from accessing the public viewing platform.

3.26 In response, **Mr Ian Brownlee** made the following points:

- (a) the newspaper stalls would be kept;
- (b) the public toilet would be retained for the convenience of the general public;
- (c) the comment of no advertising signage on the pier building was noted;
- (d) ferry service alone would hardly be commercially viable without some forms of subsidy. The subject revitalising proposal might be more acceptable than other forms of direct subsidy as it would turn the pier into a tourist attraction, and hence achieving double benefits;
- (e) the layout of the pier building had been carefully considered. The public could access the outer portion of the roof area directly from the lifts without the need to route through the restaurant area. Additional public access would also be provided along the roof edge facing inland. In terms of practicability, the only technical concern would be the fire services including Means of Escape requirements; and
- (f) as illustrated in the PowerPoint slides, the sightline from Harbour City, which was the closest building to the ferry pier, would not be obstructed by the proposal. The photomontage showing the building façade from the Clock Tower also illustrated that the visual impact on ground level users was relatively insignificant.

3.27 **Mr Patrick Lau** supported the proposal of opening up the pier

**Action**

roof for public access and the provision of an outdoor café. He pointed out that the spatial definition of the entire area would be changed substantially when the existing bus terminus was converted to a piazza and the centre of activities. As the pier building would form a prominent backdrop of the whole piazza, the design details of the pier building should be carefully considered from different angles (e.g. Cultural Centre, Clock Tower area, the bus terminus) to ensure the overall visual quality of the area.

- 3.28 **Ms Dilys Chau** anticipated that many visitors would go up to the pier roof to enjoy the sea view. Consideration could be given to blending of the new pier with the entire area including the piazza and the five poles as one big attraction.
- 3.29 **Mr Andy Leung** said that the idea of bringing people closer to the water could be achieved in this location. The project proponent should not just aim at creating a new floor with food and beverage use, but to improve the value of the whole pier area. He considered that comprehensive planning would bring synergies to both the pier and piazza projects and encouraged the project proponent to further explore the improvement opportunities in other parts of the pier area.
- 3.30 **Ms Pong Yuen-yee** said that the covered walkway leading to Ocean Terminal and the railing on the water's edge, though managed by different departments, should be improved altogether.
- 3.31 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** expressed support to the project and pointed out the importance of keeping the ferry pier. She considered that subsidies were needed to help operators maintain the ferry services in the harbour.
- 3.32 **The Chair** enquired if sufficient electricity and sewerage support would be provided for the proposed food and beverage outlets.
- 3.33 In response, **Mr Ian Brownlee** made the following points:
- (a) the "Star" Ferry was only promoting the proposal as an operator and user of the pier. The proposal was subject to TPB's approval. As the pier was owned by the government, it would be for the government to implement the proposal and other improvements in the

**Action**

surrounding waterfront area in accordance with the government's priorities;

- (b) the change in spatial definition as a result of the piazza project was noted. In the subject proposal, the basic approach was to respect the character of the existing pier building by replicating the architectural qualities of the existing building façade in the new façade to be rebuilt. The existing 8m wide pedestrian walkway under the canopy would be kept, and an open walkway would be provided on the upper level for people to look back at the piazza area;
- (c) tourism was a key consideration for the whole area. The pier/ferry service was now a tourist attraction, and the "Star" Ferry would be willing to take account of any specific design theme proposed for the whole area;
- (d) the current conditions of the pier had reflected that the maintenance priorities given to the building were insufficient for its proper upkeep;
- (e) one of the purposes of the new extension was to bring in modern services such as lifts and centralised air-conditioning and to upgrade the existing utility services without adversely affecting the existing structure; and
- (f) he noted that the proposal was generally supported by Members. He would convey Members' comments to the "Star" Ferry in taking forward the proposal.

3.34 **The Chair** concluded the discussion as follows:

- (a) the proposal had a lot of merits which were in line with the Harbour Planning Principles of promoting a vibrant and accessible harbour for public enjoyment. The initiative was supported in-principle by the Task Force;
- (b) the project proponent ought to consider Members' comments in ensuring that the general public especially the non-restaurant patrons could access the roof level to enjoy the sea view. The proposed layout with the general public having to go through or pass the seating area of the restaurant would be unfriendly to non-restaurant patrons. The arrangements at the Hong Kong side of the "Star" Ferry

**Action**

Star Ferry pier made non-restaurant patrons feel unwelcomed;

[Post-meeting note: A member of the public wrote to the Task Force on 31 May and 1 June 2011 on the need to ensure easy and unobstructed public access to the proposed extension area. His comments were conveyed to the project proponent for reference on 3 June 2011.]

- (c) the integration with the piazza project and the surrounding area, though outside the purview of the project proponent, was a concern that the Task Force would continue to discuss.

Activating promenade and providing dining facilities with outdoor seating facing the harbour in the cultural facilities and enhancement of LCSD sites

3.35 **The Chair** said that LCSD would brief the Task Force on the renovation plan of the Museum of Arts at a later meeting. The relevant information provided by LCSD was tabled for Members' reference.

3.36 **Mr Paul Cheung** said that the Architectural Services Department had been requested to look into the proposed scope of work and assess the technical feasibility. The proposal would be presented to the Task Force for comments, probably in late 2011, before finalisation.

**LCSD**

3.37 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** strongly supported the proposal to relocate the café to the ground floor of the museum. He urged the government to expedite the project without further waiting until late 2011 for the assessment of fire services and other technical issues. **The Chair** considered that fire services matters were very important, and hoped that the process could speed up.

Development of a Piazza in Tsim Sha Tsui

3.38 The information provided by TC on the project was tabled at the meeting for Members' reference.

3.39 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** expressed disappointment with the lack of project progress. Apart from refining the proposed turnaround, TC should expedite the work on the piazza design

**Action**

at the same time. In response to the public concern of removing the bus stops, TC should present the benefits of the project including the enhancement opportunities and the piazza design (e.g. the results of the design competition) to the public for consideration.

3.40 **Ms Stephanie Lai** said that TC was now following up with the statutory procedures in handling the views received during the gazettal period of the proposed turnaround. The issues relating to the turnaround would need to be sorted out first. TC would consult the Task Force as soon as they had worked out a time table.

3.41 **The Chair** said that the piazza project was a major concern of the public which was also related to the revitalisation proposal of the TST Star Ferry Pier. Hence, the Task Force would like TC to take the comments back and give a target date, like late 2011 for the renovation project of LCSD above, on reverting to the Task Force on the project.

TC

### C. Tsim Sha Tsui West Action Area

3.42 In response to a Member's suggestion (para. 5.38 of the minutes of the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting), the Harbour City Estates Ltd had been invited to brief the Task Force on the approved building plans for an extension building at Ocean Terminal, but the company had declined the invitation as the plans were only a preliminary design for development cost estimation and the project was still subject to further design and feasibility study for implementation. The company's reply was tabled at the meeting.

3.43 **The Chair** remarked that the "Action Areas" table suggested that this Action Area was to be mainly driven by private initiative. Unless there was a change, the Task Force would keep in view the development progress to be submitted by the company.

3.44 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said he noted that the company had started setting up some restaurants on the ground level near the corner of Ocean Terminal and providing some connections to the service road along the waterfront. The company should be advised to take a further step to improve the whole waterfront area including existing service road for public use



**Action**

and access. **The Chair** said that the information about the “Action Areas” table could be updated and the suggestion should be conveyed to the company for consideration.

[Post-meeting note: The suggestion had been conveyed to Harbour City Estates Ltd for consideration on 5 July 2011.]

**Item 4 Refurbishment and Modification of the West Kowloon Transfer Station at Ngong Shung Road, Kowloon (Paper No. TFK/10/2011)**

4.1 The following representatives were invited to the meeting:

Environmental Protection Department (EPD)

Mr Chen Che-kong (Officer-in-charge (RTS Development))

Mr Michael Tsing (Senior Environmental Protection Officer,  
(RTS Development))

AECOM Asia Company Ltd

Mr Matthew Ko (Regional Director)

4.2 **Mr Chen Che-kong** presented the Paper with the aid of PowerPoint slides.

4.3 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** considered that the reliance on landfills for disposal of solid waste was not a sustainable model. A long-term plan for waste reduction and treatment was needed. An education centre should also be set up in one of the refuse transfer stations (RTS) to educate people, especially the youngsters, of the challenges ahead.

4.4 **Ms Pong Yuen-ye** said that educating people to reduce, recycle and reuse (3R) was an imminent task of Hong Kong as a recent report completed by the World Wide Fund Hong Kong had revealed that Hong Kong had produced a relatively large carbon footprint and ranked only 47<sup>th</sup> in the world.

4.5 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** considered the subject RTS being amidst industrial and maritime uses was a suitable location. He enquired whether the waste sorting and recovery process would be carried out in the RTS. He suggested using a light colour for the repainting works to reduce the temperature inside the facility, and supported the provision of educational facility for children.

4.6 **Mr Patrick Lau** said that the RTS was an important infrastructure for waste management. Given the waterfront location of the RTS, he suggested to improve its industrial outlook by greening the whole building with natural plants.

4.7 In response, **Mr Chen Che-kong** made the following points:

- (a) as the current practice of relying on landfills alone in treating waste was not sustainable, a 3-pronged approach would be taken to tackle the waste problem in the long term;
- (b) on the aspect of reducing and recycling waste, the government had recently announced a plan to raise the waste recovery target from 50% to 55% by 2015 through a series of measures, thus reducing the amount of waste disposal at landfills;
- (c) EPD was also planning to build the first waste incineration/integrated waste treatment facility, but the waste would still need to be containerised at the RTS for onward transfer to the future incineration facility or landfills by sea. The proposed upgrading works was to cater for long-term operational need of the RTS;
- (d) on educational aspect, EPD was looking for an appropriate location to set up a purpose-built visitor centre on waste management and sustainable practices. The initial view was not to set up education centres at each RTS to avoid duplication. In fact, all the existing waste treatment facilities including RTS and landfills were now open to visitors from schools and community organisations;
- (e) on waste sorting, the strategy was to enhance sorting at source through education and provision of supporting facilities in residential buildings, shopping centres, etc. Since the subject RTS received a lot of wooden pallets from the container terminals, a separate process for sorting wooden waste for onward transfer to wood recyclers would be implemented as part of the follow-on contract to improve the efficiency of the RTS; and
- (f) Members' suggestion on the repainting colour would be

**Action**

taken into consideration in the final design.

4.8 **The Chair** concluded that:

- (a) the proposed refurbishment and modification works was supported in-principle by the Task Force; and
- (b) in the long term, the 3R approach to reduce solid wastes should be strengthened. Further thought should be given to setting up an educational centre inside the RTS as being able to observe the actual operation of the facility would be a different kind of learning experience especially to the young generation.

**EPD**

## **Item 5 Any Other Business**

### Action Areas

- 5.1 Apart from revisiting the Tsuen Wan and WKCD Action Areas, **the Chair** invited Members' views on another Action Area to be discussed at the next meeting.
- 5.2 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the Task Force should look into the issue of improving connectivity between WKCD and Yau Ma Tei. He noted that road works were being undertaken in the area, but it appeared that footpath connections had not been improved.
- 5.3 **The Chair** noted that one of the quick-win proposals of the Yau Ma Tei Action Area was to enhance the pedestrian connectivity along the typhoon shelter linking the Tai Kok Tsui waterfront with WKCD. She suggested, and **the meeting** agreed, to discuss the Yau Ma Tei Action Area at the next meeting.

**Secretariat**

### Student's presentation on Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront project

- 5.4 Tabling her email correspondence dated 19 April 2011 with Dr Peter Cookson Smith, **the Chair** said that Dr Cookson Smith had suggested to invite a student to present her project on the TST waterfront to the Task Force. **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** explained that the project was well thought out and the student's presentation could diversify and enliven the Task Force agenda.

**Action**

- 5.5 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that engaging the wider community was a big issue. To open up the dialogue with the community, the Commission could organise an informal session to invite presentations of harbourfront enhancement suggestions, design solutions, etc. The student could be invited to present her project on that occasion. On this account, **the Chair** said that the matter could be relayed to the Commission for further discussion.
- 5.6 While the suggestion was supported by Members, **Ms Ida Lam** said that certain mechanisms had to be worked out to solicit views and select entries for the session. **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** said that the entries submitted by the general public should be separated from those of the District Councils and the presentation time of each team should be strictly controlled.

*Waterfront conferences in New York*

- 5.7 **The Chair** informed Members that the Waterfront Centre in New York would organise a conference in October 2011. The nearby Brooklyn Waterfront Research Centre had invited the HC members to join another half-day conference at the Brooklyn waterfront. **Mr Chris Fung** said that information about the two conferences would be circulated by the HC Secretariat after the meeting.

[Post-meeting note: Information about the conferences was circulated by the HC Secretariat on 31 May 2011.]

*Survey on pedestrian network and signages in Tsim Sha Tsui*

- 5.8 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that a survey on the pedestrian network in TST had been completed recently. The findings and recommendations in respect of the subway and signage systems could be presented for Members' reference.
- 5.9 **The Chair** said that since LCSD would report the progress of the renovation plan for the Museum of Arts in late 2011, the Task Force could revisit the TST East Action Area and be briefed on the survey at the same time.
- 5.10 There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 5:20 pm.

**Secretariat**

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