

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

Minutes of Sixth Meeting

Date : 27 July 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 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
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr Nicholas Brooke	
Ms Ida Lam	
Dr Stefan Al	
Ms Gracie Foo	Deputy Secretary (Planning & Lands) ¹ , Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Vincent Fung	Assistant Commission for Tourism 2
Mr Albert Lee	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)
Ms Jacinta Woo	Chief Town Planner/Studies & Research, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Edward Leung	Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Ir Peter Wong	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
---------------	---

Ms Dilys Chau

Dr Ho Siu-kee

In Attendance

Mr Chris Fung

Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour) (Acting), DEVB

Mr CK Soh

Senior Town Planner/Yau Tsim Mong, PlanD

Action

The Chair led Members to pay a one-minute silence tribute to the people perished in the recent rail collision in the Mainland and the tragedy in Norway.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 5th meeting

- 1.1 The draft minutes of the 5th meeting were circulated to Members on 19 July 2011. Proposed amendments to paras. 3.17(a) and 3.20 of the draft minutes by the West Kowloon Cultural District Authority (WKCD) and para. 3.18 by Mr Paul Zimmerman were received.
- 1.2 **The Chair** said that Mr Paul Zimmerman had also suggested adding an action party to para. 5.6 about inviting presentation from the public. She considered this an issue of the Commission which might not be proper for the Task Force to identify the responsible party. The matter should be relayed to the Commission for consideration.
- 1.3 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that the Commission should listen to the views of the community especially the District Councils, whilst **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** cautioned that it might be difficult for the Commission to reconcile different views after such presentations.
- 1.4 In relation to para. 3.18, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested that WKCD brief the Task Force on the final design of WKCD.
- 1.5 As no further comments were raised by Members, the draft minutes were confirmed subject to the incorporation of the amendments stated in para. 1.1 above.

Item 2 Matters Arising

Construction of a Two-storey Building for Harbour Patrol Section of Marine Department (para. 2.1 of the minutes of the 5th meeting)

- 2.1 **The Chair** said that matters relating to the new Harbour Patrol Section (HPS) building would be discussed under agenda Item 3A.

Proposed District Revitalisation with Minor Relaxation of Building Height and Plot Ratio Restrictions in the "Comprehensive Development Area" Zoning at Yau Tong Bay (para. 2.5 of the minutes of the 5th meeting)

- 2.2 **The Chair** said that issues relating to the proposed marina in Yau Tong Bay could be further deliberated by the new Task Force on Water-land Interface.

Tsuen Wan Action Area (para. 2.10 of the minutes of the 5th meeting)

- 2.3 **The Chair** said that Tsuen Wan Action Area would be discussed under agenda Item 3B.

Kiosk and Outdoor Seating at Hung Hom Ferry Piers (para. 2.11 of the minutes of the 5th meeting)

- 2.4 **The Chair** said that Harbour Unit had consulted the relevant departments regarding the proposed outdoor seating of the restaurants at the Hung Hom Ferry Piers and advised that one of the restaurants had submitted an application for outdoor seating, which was being processed by the departments concerned.

Development of a Piazza in Tsim Sha Tsui (para. 3.41 of the minutes of the 5th meeting)

- 2.5 **The Chair** said that Tourism Commission (TC) would brief Members on the TST piazza project under agenda Item 3C.

Discussion on the Amendments to the Approved South West Kowloon Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K20/24 (para. 2.6 of the minutes of the 5th meeting)

- 2.6 The letter from Task Force Secretary to Town Planning Board (TPB) dated 1 June 2011 regarding the Task Force's views on the subject and an extract of para. 4.3.2 of TPB Paper No. 8844 prepared by PlanD for TPB's hearing of the relevant

representations were tabled at the meeting.

2.7 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** raised concern on para. 4.3.2 of the TPB paper that summarised the Task Force's discussion on 16 March 2011, and considered it a misrepresentation in stating that the Task Force had "no consensus on the rezoning".

2.8 **The Chair** considered that the main considerations of the Task Force had been fairly given in the TPB paper. The statement "there was no consensus on the rezoning" in the TPB paper was correct as the Task Force did not reach consensus on the specific use of the site. On the whole she did not perceive any misrepresentation in the subject case. For similar cases in future, she enquired if it was possible for PlanD to circulate such summary paragraphs for the Task Force's agreement in advance.

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

(a) in considering the representations, TPB had given due regard to the views of the Task Force and carefully considered the use of the site. The possibility of relocating the HPS office in order to free up land for an extension of the public cargo working area (PCWA) had been discussed at the TPB meeting. Since MD confirmed that the HPS office would not be relocated, TPB considered that the proposed open space use could better serve the public and provide an opportunity to improve the connectivity of the waterfront promenade; and

(b) given the tight timeframe for preparing TPB papers, it would not be possible to circulate the summary paragraph of the Task Force's discussion for Members' agreement in advance. If necessary, the letter and meeting minutes of the Task Force could be included as an annex to the paper for TPB's reference in future.

2.10 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that as a matter of principle, the views of the Task Force recorded in the meeting minutes should be replicated exactly in the TPB papers to avoid subjective interpretation of the summary.

2.11 **The meeting** agreed to handle similar cases in future as follows:

**PlanD &
Members
to note**

- (a) PlanD should attach the minutes of the Task Force meeting to the relevant TPB papers; and
- (b) if the minutes of the Task Force meeting were yet to be confirmed by the time of TPB's consideration of the case, a summary paragraph cleared by the Task Force Chair could be issued to TPB instead.

Item 3 Action Areas

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

- (a) An Overview of Harbourfront Enhancement by Action Areas (the "Action Areas" table); and
- (b) Inventory on Known (Planned and Proposed) Projects at Harbourfront (the Inventory).

3.2 To facilitate progress tracking of the discussion and achievement of the Task Force, she suggested updating the last column of the Action Area table to include (a) date of discussion by the Task Force; (b) progress achieved; and (c) issues to be addressed.

3.3 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested that the above 2 sets of reference materials, together with the "Overview of Land Use Framework for the Victoria Harbourfront" presented to the Commission meeting on 9 February 2011, be consolidated into one set of materials.

3.4 **Ms Gracie Foo** pointed out that a consistent format should be adopted for materials of all Task Forces.

3.5 **The Chair** said that the major projects which had been completed or were in progress, as well as new initiatives (including issues to be addressed), should be highlighted for Members' easy reference.

**Harbour
Unit
&
PlanD**

A. Yau Ma Tei Action Area

Construction of a Two-storey Building for Harbour Patrol Section – Report by Dr Peter Cookson Smith and Mr Paul Zimmerman on Site Meeting with Marine Department

3.6 **The Chair** said that the following reference materials were

relevant to this item:

- (a) Paper No. 11/2009 and minutes of the former HEC Subcommittee on Harbour Plan Review meeting on 20 May 2009;
- (b) Paper No. TFK/02/2011 and minutes of the Task Force meeting on 12 January 2011; and
- (c) Paper No. HC/06/2011 and minutes of the briefing given by MD to the Commission on the commercial operations and facilities in the harbour on 17 May 2011.

3.7 She also drew Members' attention that apart from the report submitted by Dr Peter Cookson Smith and Mr Paul Zimmerman, supplementary information about the site selection justifications for this project had been provided by MD. The following representatives were invited to the meeting to participate in the discussion:

MD

Mr Chan Cheuk-sang (Senior Marine Officer/HPS(1))

Mr Ho Chi-ping (Marine Officer/HPS(Administration))

Architectural Services Department

Mr KM Poon (Property Services Manager)

WCWP International Ltd

Mr Arthur Tong (Senior Architect)

Mr CM Ding (Associate)

Mr Chris Leung (Associate)

3.8 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** made a presentation with the aid of a Powerpoint.

3.9 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** opined that:

- (a) the Task Force should protect the waterfront from unnecessary development by taking a presumption against new development which was not in line with the Harbour Planning Principles;
- (b) given the importance of MD's operation to the working harbour, a strategic view should be taken to rationalise MD's accommodations in the long term;

- (c) the existing HPS building only occupied about 30% of the site. The rest of the site only consisted of 18 car parking spaces, an emergency generator building and a 5m wide non-building set back from the waterfront. Extending the existing building to the rest of the site should not be very difficult. The concern on building foundation might be overstated; and
- (d) there was no conflict or incompatibility between working harbour and public enjoyment of the harbour. The sites to the north-east of the typhoon shelter could be converted to public open space in the long term, and the nearby ship inspection activities could add visual interest to the enjoyment of the harbour.

3.10 In response to the Chair's question, **Mr Chan Cheuk-sang** said that MD's intention was to proceed with the construction of a 2-storey building adjacent to the existing building rather than relocating the HPS to another site. The justifications for selecting the subject site for the new building had been set out in the information note submitted by MD.

3.11 In response to **Mr Nicholas Brooke's** enquiry on whether it was feasible to construct additional floor(s) within the existing site, **Mr CM Ding** explained that:

- (a) the foundation of the existing building had not been designed to cater for the addition of 2 storeys. It was a shallow foundation on reclaimed land sitting on soft soil sensitive to settlement. Adding 2 storeys on the building would double the loading of the original design load as well as that of double the original design wind load. It was therefore technically not feasible; and
- (b) neither shallow foundation nor pile foundation was feasible for the provision of extra office space on the rest of the site. Given the short distance between the existing building and the seawall and the low superimposed load on the seaward side of the site, shallow foundation would affect the stability of the existing seawall. As for pile foundation, it would cause vibration which would have adverse effect on the seawall. Setback from the seawall would be required but there was insufficient space for constructing the pile foundation in such a narrow area.

- 3.12 **Prof Carlos Lo** said that public facilities should not be located at the harbourfront unless a genuine need for the harbourfront location was demonstrated. He enquired about the impact of the project on harbourfront accessibility to the public, the urgency of the project and whether the adjacent site was the only feasible site for constructing the new building.
- 3.13 **Ms Gracie Foo** remarked that:
- (a) the Chief Secretary had set out the principles and guidelines on harbourfront enhancement in a General Circular for government bureaux/departments to follow. As a matter of principle, incompatible or environmentally unfriendly public facilities should not be located at the harbourfront. For public facilities which could not be relocated for the time being or those facilities which required water access, the building footprint should be kept to a minimum and mitigation measures (including building setback for public access to the harbourfront and landscape treatment) should be implemented to minimise the development impacts; and
 - (b) in taking forth this project, MD had been adhering to the above principles and guidelines. Members could refer to MD's previous Paper No. TFK/02/2011 for the proposed measures to mitigate the development impacts and enhance the harbourfront environment.
- 3.14 **Ms Pong Yuen-ye**e considered that the need of MD for additional office space had been established. In selecting the site, the whole area from the marine refuse collection point to the existing HPS site should be reviewed.
- 3.15 **The Chair** said it seemed that the adjacent site was not the only site available for constructing the additional office space. MD's team should take a broader view to review its facilities in the area.
- 3.16 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** opined that he understood from MD that its efficiency could be enhanced if the HPS and prosecution section were co-located at the same site.
- 3.17 In response to Members' comments, **Messrs Chan Cheuk-sang and Ho Chi-ping** made the following points:
- (a) HPS had been suffering from the shortage of office space

for many years. The existing office could hardly meet the increasing service requirements. The expansion project was meant to provide better service to the marine community as well as the public, including emergency support during accidents. Members of the Yau Tsim Mong District Council had expressed support and urged MD to expedite delivery of the project;

- (b) the site adjacent to the existing building was selected for the expansion project after careful consideration of potential alternatives. While ArchSD has explained why it was not feasible to construct additional floor(s) at the existing building, the rest of the existing site was reserved for vehicular access, car parks, etc. No other government land could be identified to meet the needs of the HPS which operated round the clock;
- (c) efforts had been made to minimise the building footprint. The new building would be set back on three sides (including the seaward side) to provide visual connection to the harbour and possible pedestrian access in future. Vertical greening would be implemented and external lighting would be installed to improve the visual quality and security of the pedestrian environment; and
- (d) while MD could consider relocating its prosecution section from Shau Kei Wan to the new HPS building, the existing marine licensing office should be retained in Shau Kei Wan to serve the vessels in the eastern harbour.

3.18 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** opined that the project would not fully address the long-term needs of MD.

3.19 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the Administration should identify proper sites/facilities to meet the long-term operational requirements of MD.

3.20 **Ms Gracie Foo** pointed out that the Administration would give full support to any proposal which was considered by MD as suitable in meeting their operational needs.

3.21 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** said that the Commission should ensure the best use of harbourfront land. He considered the design and access arrangement of the new HPS building not satisfactory.

- 3.22 **Ms Ida Lam** opined that the Meeting should take note of the timetable and urgency of the project.
- 3.23 **The Chair** considered that the construction of the new HPS building as a short-term solution should proceed, and invited MD to come back with a comprehensive review to rationalise the long-term use of its sites and facilities particularly those in the western harbour.
- 3.24 **Mr Chan Cheuk-sang** said that MD had already briefed the full Commission on the department's operation and facilities in May. MD would work closely with the new Task Force on water-land interface if relocation of the new HPS building was required in the long term. **Mr Ho Chi-ping** added that works for the subject project would commence in early 2012 according to the current timetable.
- 3.25 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that a holistic solution in meeting the long-term requirements of MD was needed and this fell within the remit of the new Task Force on Water-land Interface.
- 3.26 **Ms Ida Lam** agreed that some interim measures should be implemented to accommodate the present need while sorting out the long-term issues separately. As for the short-term solution, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that MD should only put to temporary structures for its new office space.
- 3.27 **The Chair** concluded that the Task Force appreciated the services provided by MD to the community and that MD's need for office space should be properly catered for. The Task Force suggested MD to put up temporary structures for accommodating the immediate need for office space as an interim measure, and to work out its long-term operational requirements for consultation with the new Task Force on Water-land Interface in due course.

MD

[Post-meeting note: At the Commission's meeting on 7 September 2011, it was confirmed that HC has no objection to MD's proposal to put up temporary structures at the site GLA-K432 adjacent to the existing HPS site. The project team would provide the design by circulation for Members' information in due course.]

General Issue

- 3.28 Noting that the report was the initiative of only two Task Force

Members, **Mr Nicholas Brooke** raised concern on the general practice for the Task Force to follow up on individual projects. He suggested all future site visits to be coordinated by Harbour Unit or the Secretariat to ensure structured dialogues.

- 3.29 **The Chair** said that the site meeting between the two Members and MD was an informal one which was not arranged by Harbour Unit nor the Secretariat. She was only aware of this meeting upon receipt of the report from the two concerned Members after their meeting. While appreciating the two Members' efforts in finding out more about the project, she reminded that if any Members receive invitation from project proponents for site visits in future, they should inform the Secretariat for extending the invitation to all Task Force Members. **All to note**

Pedestrian Connectivity between Tai Kok Tsui and WKCD

- 3.30 **The Chair** said that at the brainstorming workshop held amongst HC Members on 23 July 2011, it was generally agreed that connectivity between Tai Kok Tsui and WKCD should be enhanced as a medium/long-term measure.
- 3.31 In response, **Mr Albert Lee** pointed out that:
- (a) it was impossible to provide a standard at-grade pedestrian connection along the New YMT typhoon shelter unless the PCWA was set back or relocated. The presence of the YMT Public Cargo Handling Administrative Building was another physical constraint for an at-grade connection. As for elevated connection, it might not be justified due to low pedestrian flow; and
 - (b) while some road improvement schemes were being carried out in the area, they were relatively far away from the waterfront. The current road improvement works had not included any footpath or cycle track because no such facilities were available for connection in the area.
- 3.32 **The Chair** said that instead of just looking at demand and supply, the focus should be medium to long-term enhancement of pedestrian connectivity at different levels (at-grade and elevated). She appreciated that such enhancement might not be realised in a short period of time and hence be categorised as medium to long-term measures.

3.33 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested that TD explore the provision of a trail rather than a standard footpath because the former had more design flexibility.

3.34 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** said that to start with, it was not necessary to confine the pedestrian link to the harbourfront. **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** echoed that opportunities would gradually arise once a pedestrian link was in place.

B. Tsuen Wan Action Area

3.35 Due to insufficient time, **the meeting** agreed to discuss the Tsuen Wan Action Area at the next meeting.

C. Tsim Sha Tsui East Action Area

The Way Forward for the "Development of a Piazza in Tsim Sha Tsui" Project (Paper No. TFK/12/2011)

3.36 **The Chair** said that TC consulted the former HEC Subcommittee on Harbour Plan Review and the Task Group on Management Model for the Harbourfront (TGMMH) on the TST piazza project in 2008. The following reference materials were relevant to this item:

- (a) Paper No. 4/2008 and minutes of the former HEC Subcommittee on Harbour Plan Review meeting on 23 January 2008; and
- (b) Paper No. M1/2008 and minutes of the TGMMH meeting on 5 February 2008.

3.37 The following representatives were invited to the meeting:

TC

Mrs Miranda Yim (Assistant Commissioner for Tourism)

TD

Mr Albert Su (Principal Transport Officer (Management))

Mr Albert Lee (Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon)

Highways Department

Mr Dennis Lo (District Engineer/Kowloon West (Projects))

3.38 **Mrs Miranda Yim** presented the paper with the aid of

Powerpoint slides.

- 3.39 **The Chair** enquired about the location for exhibiting the decommissioned train compartment and antique bus and the views of TC on the revitalisation proposal presented by the "Star" Ferry Company Ltd. at the Task Force meeting on 31 May 2011.
- 3.40 **Mrs Miranda Yim** replied that the Tourism Commission's (TC) initial idea was to exhibit the decommissioned train compartment and antique bus in the open area of the proposed tourism node. The ferry company's proposal would be used as a starting point for further feasibility study to be undertaken by the relevant works departments.
- 3.41 **Ms Ida Lam** enquired whether outdoor performance space would be provided within the piazza.
- 3.42 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** had the following comments:
- (a) referring to a more detailed drawing on the proposed public transport interchange (PTI) under the new design concept of the tourism node submitted to the Yau Tsim Mong District Council in June 2011, he pointed out that the proposed bus stops outside Star House would reduce the circulation space of the already cramped pavement. The plans failed to reserve space for kiosks for the bus operators, terminus related furniture and queuing areas. The bus stops at Salisbury Road would blight the pavement at the Hong Kong Cultural Centre (HKCC) area. The issue of private car drop off, access to the HKCC, temporary car parking in the existing open space outside HKCC by performance groups/news reporters and storage of event and crowd control related items had not been resolved. Alternative PTI designs addressing these concerns should be devised;
 - (b) as the scale of the piazza had been substantially reduced, massive objects like train compartment/bus should be avoided; and
 - (c) management of the whole area including the piazza and the nearby open space should be carried out under one management agent so that crowd control, storage space for mills barriers and other management issues could be better coordinated.

3.43 In response, **Mr Albert Lee** and **Mrs Miranda Yim** explained that:

- (a) in identifying suitable locations for the proposed bus stops, factors such as bus route schedules, passenger volumes, required circulation space, etc. had been carefully analysed;
- (b) the pavement outside Star House would be wide enough and the bus stops proposed there would not obstruct the pedestrian flows;
- (c) different layout options of the PTI had been considered. The current layout was meant to retain the existing services of all 15 bus routes in response to public views;
- (d) the proposed display of a decommissioned train compartment/ antique bus was one of the possible means to preserve the collective memory of the community over the history of the area as a public transport interchange. This proposal was subject to further consultation and feasibility study. Members' comments, including the provision of outdoor performance venue, would also be taken into account when the detailed design was drawn up; and
- (e) TC would convey Member's concerns over the arrangements for temporary car parking and storage of mills barriers at HKCC to LCSD, the venue management, for follow-up. It was understood that HKCC would strictly control the temporary loading/unloading or car parking by performance groups or media. They would also review long-term storage space for mills barriers.

3.44 **Mr Franklin Yu** said that the proposed layout not only reduced the pedestrian circulation space outside Star House, but also limited the usage of the piazza for such large events as New Year's Eve countdown. The PTI would also obstruct the pedestrian flow from the ferry pier to 1881 Heritage. He asked whether it was necessary to keep all the 15 bus routes in this PTI, which should have been diverted to the PTI at Mody Road as originally planned.

3.45 **Ms Pong Yuen-yee** said there might not be sufficient holding area at Salisbury Road for returning buses, which might result

in traffic congestion and affect the environment for public enjoyment. The size of the piazza had also been reduced and there would not be much space for introducing different uses/activities. She suggested integrating this piazza with the open space around HKCC by a coherent theme. Provision of water taxi from TST to WKCD should also be considered.

- 3.46 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that the TC's new design concept which worked towards an integrated solution should be endorsed, but there were insufficient details for the Task Force to consider the gazettal of the PTI scheduled for September 2011. For the future facilities/activities in the piazza, the views collected at the workshop organised by TC in 2007 should be considered.
- 3.47 **Prof Carlos Lo** enquired whether private cars would be allowed to enter the PTI area.
- 3.48 In response to Members' comments, **Mr Albert Lee** and **Mrs Miranda Yim** stated the following:
- (a) in the original design, only 4 bus routes would terminate at the PTI at Mody Road while 11 bus routes would still call at the ferry pier area;
 - (b) it would be unlikely that the design of the PTI would result in traffic congestion. The minimum width (about 10.5m) of the carriageway at the PTI entrance near HKCC was sufficient for the stopping of a bus with two more buses passing through in parallel. Several unloading bays would be provided near the PTI entrance and they could serve as additional waiting space for buses pending entry to the PTI. The bus stops for more frequent bus routes or routes with large passenger volume would be located at wider sections of the road with adequate circulation space. The number and duration of buses staying in the PTI would be reduced as non-traffic related activities, like drivers' lunch breaks, would be relocated elsewhere;
 - (c) private cars would not be allowed to enter the PTI area;
 - (d) the present proposal to expand the planned turnaround to become a PTI was meant to address public views received during previous rounds of gazettal of the turnaround scheme under the Roads (Works, Use and

Compensation) Ordinance (RO). Under the statutory procedures, the road works amendment scheme for construction of the PTI should be gazetted before the expiry of the statutory time limit by September 2011. The public could offer further comments during the gazettal period and the road scheme was subject to further consideration by the Chief Executive-in-Council ; and

- (e) the workshop in 2007 was launched on the basis of the original piazza design. Since the size of the piazza had been reduced, the facilities/activities suggested at the previous workshop might need to be re-examined in the light of the changes in circumstances, and TC would seek further public views before drawing up the design of the tourism node.

3.49 **Mr Patrick Lau** said that the uses of the piazza and the ferry pier should be carefully integrated to provide more opportunities for public enjoyment of the harbour. The ferry company's proposal to construct a new floor on the pier building would affect the visual access to the harbour. To compensate for this, a suggestion was to extend the existing elevated landscape deck towards Star House to provide additional activity space for framing the harbour view while overlooking the piazza.

3.50 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** said that the piazza should also integrate with the open space on the other side of the area. She enquired about the area breakdown between the PTI and the piazza.

3.51 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** opined that the current PTI design would only address the traffic issue. He was concerned with possible pollution caused by the bus traffic to this tourism node, noting that many cities were extending pedestrianisation schemes to provide a traffic-free environment for public spaces.

3.52 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested that:

- (a) TD come up with alternative PTI designs that reflect the importance of the location and would take into account the need for drop-off area for private cars, and explore whether the PTI entrance could be moved farther away from HKCC. Details such as the location of toilets and waiting areas for bus drivers, operators' control booth, etc. should also be incorporated;

- (b) for the piazza, TC should exhibit the design ideas received under the piazza design competition for consideration by the public. TC should also work out different layout designs illustrating the arrangements with and without mega-events in the piazza; and
- (c) the revitalisation proposal for the ferry pier should be implemented as soon as practicable.

3.53 In response, **Mrs Miranda Yim** made the following points:

- (a) the area of the piazza had been reduced from about 8,500m² to about 5,000m². After taking into account the revitalisation proposal for the ferry pier, the overall area of the tourism node project would be comparable to that of the original piazza;
- (b) a prize presentation ceremony for the piazza design competition would be arranged and TC would explain the changing circumstances leading to the revised approach of the project to the winning teams; and
- (c) Members' comments would be taken into consideration when drawing up the design brief for the project. The Task Force would be consulted at major stages of the design process.

3.54 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that the conceptual design and detailed design were key milestones that should be submitted for the Task Force's consideration before finalisation of the design brief.

3.55 **Mr Franklin Yu** said that the demarcation line between the PTI and the piazza was important and should be revised to ensure proper functioning of both the PTI and piazza. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** also considered that the PTI design should be dealt with first.

3.56 **The Chair** said that the general direction of catering for multiple functions in this tourism node project was supported by the Task Force. On the transport aspect, she saw a need to provide a PTI which would better integrate the land and sea transport in this area. For the piazza, the integration with its surroundings including the ferry pier, Star House and the open space area around HKCC should be emphasised. All these integrated elements should be incorporated into a holistic

TC

design brief and properly followed through. TC was invited to revert to the Task Force with a design brief at a later stage.

- 3.57 **Mr Franklin Yu** raised concern on the proposed gazettal of the PTI in September 2011. **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** expressed his worry that it would be difficult to change the scheme after gazettal. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** agreed and he did not support the proposed gazettal.
- 3.58 **Mr Albert Lee** clarified that the government had to follow up with the comments, objections and advice received during the gazettal period of the turnaround road scheme under RO including modifying the design of the gazetted alignment or scheme to suit such public comments, objections and advice as necessary. In fact, the subject scheme had been gazetted twice. The purpose was to solicit public views on the revised scheme.
- 3.59 **The Chair** concluded that the Task Force was in support of the gazettal of the revised turnaround road scheme in September 2011 as scheduled, on the understanding that the scheme could be further amended to take into account the public views received during the gazettal period.

[Post-meeting note: On 9 August 2011, Mr Paul Zimmerman circulated to all Members through email a comparison of the current situation at the TST pier area, the 2009 gazetted plan and the revised scheme of the proposed PTI for gazettal in September 2011 with enquiries, which had been forwarded to TC for its follow-up. A set of responses from the TC and its team was circulated to all Members on 30 September 2011.]

Item 4 Any Other Business

Task Force on Water-land Interface

- 4.1 **Ms Gracie Foo** reported that the Commission had discussed the setting up of a new Task Force on Water-land Interface and the proposed terms of reference at the HC meeting on 18 July 2011. On the issue of its possible overlapping purview with the 3 geographical task forces, the general consensus was for this new Task Force to deal with strategic water-land interface issues, while individual projects would continue to be submitted to the respective geographical task forces.

- 4.2 **Ms Gracie Foo** added that in anticipation of the increased workload of the Commission and other Task Forces, the new Task Force would not meet as frequently as other Task Forces did.

Victoria Harbour Icon Design

- 4.3 With the aid of a Powerpoint, **Mr Ronald Leung** updated Members on the outcome of the design competition, the winning Harbour Icon, the selected HC logo and their applications.

Personnel Change in the Secretariat

- 4.4 **The Chair** announced that Ms Irene Lai, who had been serving the Commission and the former Harbour-front Enhancement Committee for many years, would be posted out of the Secretariat to another position within the PlanD soon. On behalf of the Task Force, **The Chair** thanked Ms Lai for her dedicated service throughout these years.

Next Task Force meeting

- 4.5 **The Chair** informed Members that the next two meetings originally scheduled for 14 September and 16 November 2011 would be rescheduled to take account of the updated meeting schedule of the Commission. The Secretariat would inform Members of the meeting date in due course.

Secretariat

[Post-meeting note: The next meeting was re-scheduled for 19 October 2011.]

Proposed Short Term Tenancy No. KX 2830 and KX 2840

- 4.6 The subject STT proposals were circulated to Members on 20 July 2011 for comments by 25 July 2011. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that he would submit his comment after the meeting.

[Post-meeting note: Mr Paul Zimmerman submitted his comments to the Secretariat on 29 July 2011.]

- 4.7 **The Chair** reminded Members to observe the deadline set by the Secretariat for commenting on proposals by circulation in future.

**Members
to note**

4.8 There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 6:15 pm.

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