

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

Minutes of Seventh Meeting

Date : 19 October 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-yee	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
Ir Peter Wong	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Ms Ida Lam	
Ms Gracie Foo	Deputy Secretary (Planning & Lands) ¹ , Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Vincent Fung	Assistant Commission for Tourism ²
Mr Cheung Kai Ying	Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon (Atg), Transport Department
Mr Janson Wong	Chief Engineer/Kowloon ² , Civil Engineering and Development Department
Miss Margrit Li	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) ¹ , Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Mr Raymond Wong	Assistant Director/Territorial, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Edward Leung	Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Nicholas Brooke

Dr Stefan Al

Ms Dilys Chau

In Attendance

Mrs Winnie Kang Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB

Mr Harry Tsang Chief Executive Officer/Planning, LCSD

Mr Eric Yue District Planning Officer/Kowloon, PlanD

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

Action

The Chair welcomed Mrs Winnie Kang and Miss Margrit Li as new Members of the Task Force. Mrs Kang had taken over the post of Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour) from Ms Maisie Chan with effect from 15 August 2011; and Miss Li had taken over the post of Assistant Director (Leisure Services)¹ from Mr Paul KK Cheung upon his retirement in early October.

The Chair also announced that on 4 August 2011, notification of resignation from a co-opted member, Dr. Ho Siu Kee, was received. His resignation was acknowledged. **The Chair** thanked all outgoing Members for their valuable contributions in the Task Force.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 6th meeting

1.1 The draft minutes of the 6th meeting were circulated to Members on 30 September 2011. The revised draft minutes incorporating Members' comments were circulated to the Task Force on 13 October 2011. The meeting confirmed the revised draft minutes without amendments.

Item 2 Matters Arising

Discussion on the Amendments to the Approved South West Kowloon Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K20/24 (para. 2.11 of the minutes of the 6th meeting)

2.1 **The Chair** said the Planning Department (PlanD) had agreed to

attach the minutes of the Task Force meeting to the relevant Town Planning Board (TPB) papers. If the minutes were yet to be confirmed by the time of TPB's consideration of the cases, a short summary would be prepared by the Secretariat and cleared by the Task Force Chair for incorporation.

Action Areas (para. 3.5 of the minutes of the 6th meeting)

- 2.2 **The Chair** said that the Harbour Unit and PlanD were working on a revised format of the "Action Areas" table ("An Overview of Harbourfront Enhancement by Action Areas") for use by all the Task Forces, and the Action Areas table would be updated in due course.

**Harbour
Unit &
PlanD**

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 (para. 3.27 of the minutes of the 6th meeting)

- 2.3 **The Chair** drew Members' attention to the deliberations at the 7th Harbourfront Commission (HC) meeting held on 7 September 2011 that the HC had no objection to Marine Department (MD)'s proposal to put up temporary structures at the site adjacent to the existing Harbour Patrol Section site. MD would provide the design via circulation to Members.

Tsuen Wan Action Area (para. 3.35 of the minutes of the 6th meeting)

- 2.4 **The Chair** said that matters under the Tsuen Wan Action Area would be discussed under Agenda Item 3B of the meeting.

The Way Forward for the "Development of a Piazza in Tsim Sha Tsui" Project (para. 3.58 of the minutes of the 6th meeting)

- 2.5 **The Chair** said that a set of responses from the Tourism Commission (TC) and its team on the views and enquiries raised by Mr Paul Zimmerman on 9 August 2011 regarding the Tsim Sha Tsui (TST) Piazza and public transport interchange (PTI) was circulated to all Members on 30 September 2011. Further comments were then received from Mr Paul Zimmerman. The TC would make further responses when they would revert to the Task Force at a future meeting.
- 2.6 In response to Mr Paul Zimmerman's enquiry on when TC would revert, **Mr Vincent Fung** said that the TC was collecting public views on the latest scheme for the TST PTI under

gazettal, and would revert to the Task Force with the design of the PTI and piazza at a suitable juncture.

2.7 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that he was not satisfied with the latest scheme. He further added that Designing Hong Kong Limited had been studying various design options for the TST PTI and he requested to circulate these options in the form of a PowerPoint to Members for reference. He urged Members to give views to the Government by the deadline of the public representation period of the gazettal process.

2.8 **The Chair** agreed that the PowerPoint mentioned by Mr Paul Zimmerman be circulated to Members. Members could also send their views, if any, to TC, who would formally address the proposals, questions and views when they would revert to the Task Force.

[Post-meeting note: Mr Paul Zimmerman circulated the PowerPoint to all Members on 20 October 2011.]

Task Force on Water-land Interface (para. 4.1 of the minutes of the 6th meeting)

2.9 **The Chair** said that the first meeting of the Task Force on Water-land Interface was being arranged. Members would be informed once details were confirmed.

[Post-meeting note: The first meeting of the Task Force on Water-land Interface was held on 24 November 2011.]

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).

A. West Kowloon Cultural District Action Area

West Kowloon Cultural District Stage 3 Public Engagement Exercise (Paper No. TFK/13/2011)

3.2 The Chair drew Members' attention to the following reference materials that were relevant to this item:

- (a) paper No. TFK/03/2011 and minutes of the Task Force meeting on 4 October 2010;
- (b) paper No. TFK/09/2011 and minutes of the Task Force meeting on 31 May 2011;
- (c) position paper submitted by Hong Kong Alternatives to the Task Force on 16 September 2011; and
- (d) overseas example of temporary structures – Beach Club Ries, Noordwijk, The Netherlands referred by Mr Paul Zimmerman.

3.3 The pamphlet "West Kowloon Cultural District – A Place for Everyone – Stage 3 Public Engagement (PE) Exercise (30/9/2011 – 30/10/2011)" was tabled for Members' reference.

3.4 The following representatives were invited to the meeting to participate in the discussion:

West Kowloon Cultural District Authority (WCKDA)

Mr Michael Lynch, Chief Executive Officer

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

Dr. Chan Man-wai, Executive Director, Project Delivery

Mr Louis Yu, Executive Director, Performing Arts

Dr. Lars Nittve, Executive Director, M+

Mr Garmen Chan, Executive Director, Communications and Marketing

Mr Derek Sun, Head, Planning and Development

Foster+Partners

Mr Colin Ward, Partner

Mr Kevin Chan, Associate

Mott MacDonald HK Limited

Mr Stephen Bingham, Associate

LD Asia

Mr Dickson Hui, Director

Hong Kong Polytechnic University – Public Policy Research Institute (PPRI)

Dr. King Chong

3.5 The following Members declared an interest in this item:

- (a) Prof Carlos Lo - being a research associate of PPRI
- (b) Ms Ida Lam - being a member of the Consultation Panel of WKCDA
- (c) Dr. Peter Cookson Smith - his company was a sub-consultant of the project

3.6 **The meeting** agreed that Prof Lo's interest was indirect and should be allowed to stay in the meeting and participate in the discussion on this item. It was agreed that Ms Lam and Dr. Smith's interests were direct. They were allowed to stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion on this item.

3.7 **Mr Colin Ward** of Foster+Partners, **Mr Dickson Hui** of LD Asia and **Dr. Chan Man-wai** of WKCDA presented the "City Park" concept of WKCD, the Proposed Development Plan (DP) to be finalized and submitted to the TPB, and some temporary uses in WKCD with the aid of a PowerPoint.

3.8 **The Chair** drew Members' attention that WKCDA would like to seek Task Force's views specifically on four items, i.e. the 20m wide promenade, two piers, the Central Square and a floating art pontoon.

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

- (a) it was encouraging that the WCKDA had planned for a number of waterfront facilities in the WKCD (i.e. a floating art pontoon, two piers and four landing steps). However, as these facilities fell outside the boundary of the DP, he raised concern on who the implementation agent would be and how these facilities be implemented; and
- (b) while a series of north-south streets were planned, they were zoned as part of the development lots instead of 'Road' on the DP. He sought clarifications if these streets would be part of the development sites for sale and their ownership belong to each future individual property owner. He expressed concern on the management of these

streets when different parties were involved.

- 3.10 **Mr Vincent Fung** said that the waterfront promenade was located next to the open space. He suggested that fewer trees be planted thereat with a view to causing less obstruction of views and allowing more flexibility to hold different activities at the promenade.
- 3.11 **Ms Pong Yuen-yee** said that WKCD was one of the few prominent locations in Hong Kong which had a grand harbour view. While she supported more trees to be planted in the area, she enquired if detailed studies had been conducted to identify the locations for tree planting. She also enquired if the wind tunnel effect had been studied, in particular for the buildings facing the harbour and impact on pedestrians' comfort level.
- 3.12 In response, **Mr Colin Ward** made the following points:
- (a) trees would not be compromised within the WKCD and abundant trees would be planted wherever possible within the area. There would not be any structures beneath the parks and promenade that might limit tree planting and growth; and
 - (b) wind and breeze studies had been conducted for the area so as to provide a cool environment with breeze through the open fabric in the WKCD. Shelter from the sun would be provided by arcades or trees. It aimed to provide a comfortable environment for people to enjoy the street culture as currently it was not popular under the heat.
- 3.13 **Dr. Chan Man-wai** supplemented that the consultants had prepared the Master Landscape Plan. Members' comments would be taken into account in the detailed landscape design.
- 3.14 With regard to the enquiry on the management of the area along the north-south streets, **Mr Dickson Hui** explained that apart from the DP, a number of supplementary plans had been attached to the Explanatory Statement of the DP to illustrate different planning aspects of the future development including urban design, landscaping, open space and pedestrian connections and circulation in more details. Issues related to the maintenance and management of common facilities would be subject to incorporation of these requirements in the lease at the subsequent stage of land disposal by the Government.

- 3.15 **The Chair and Ir Peter Wong** enquired on whether the proposed piers and floating pontoon would involve reclamation. In response, **Mr Colin Ward** said that the proposed piers and pontoon would be floating facilities on the water and there would be temporary connecting wires securing these facilities to the seabed. While he anticipated that the proposal should be acceptable under the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO), he suggested taking action to ensure that the proposal would comply with the Ordinance if these facilities were considered desirable for WKCD.
- 3.16 **Mr Franklin Yu** raised the following questions:
- (a) how the promenade would be designed so that there would be a variety of spaces and the views from the inland buildings would not be blocked by trees;
 - (b) how the variety of activities on the western side of WKCD, in particular the Great Park, would be sustained; and
 - (c) how the pedestrian circulation within WKCD could be managed, especially the Mega Performance Venue which was quite isolated but would attract many people. There was also no clear indication regarding the accessibility within the district and to the neighbouring area such as the Kowloon Station.
- 3.17 **Mr Michael Lynch** said that the pedestrian plan as proposed in the DP indicated the connectivity of WKCD with the surrounding areas. Access by the water and the piers were also essential and WKCDA was pursuing with relevant Government departments on these issues.
- 3.18 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** pointed out that according to the WKCDA Ordinance, there was no specific provision in limiting the boundary of the DP. While the DP would dictate the future zoning, management and land sales details, there was no indication under the current plan on the implementation responsibilities including the management of streets, promenade and trees.
- 3.19 **Mr Michael Lynch** clarified that it had always been the Government's responsibility to dispose the land for developments. Nonetheless, WKCDA would be involved in the discussions of these issues in ensuring that the plan would work.

- 3.20 In response to Mr Paul Zimmerman's further enquiry regarding the zoning of the land area for the piers, Mr Dickson Hui said that the piers did not form part of the DP at this stage. However, subject to public views, WKCDA could propose to the TPB in adding the two piers onto the DP in future.
- 3.21 Mr Raymond Wong said that it was premature to finalise the zonings at this stage. While it was legally feasible to incorporate the piers and their related land area under "Other Specified Uses" zoning, PlanD would consider the proposal once the DP had been firmed up.
- 3.22 Mr CK Soh supplemented that different Government departments had already been discussing with the WKCDA on drawing up the DP and its associated technical assessments. Some of the technical issues and proposals raised by WKCDA and Members, including buildings and land matters, had been deliberated within the Government, and between Government and WKCDA. The DP had yet to be finalised and Members' views and ideas were welcomed. WKCDA would consolidate the ideas for further discussion with the Government.
- 3.23 The Chair said the Task Force in general supported more water activities in WKCD and the associated facilities, subject to the compliance with PHO.
- 3.24 Mr Paul Zimmerman further raised the following points:
- (a) noting that piers and floating art pontoon were proposed, there should be clear indication of these water-based facilities on the DP. The connectivity between these facilities and the land should also be studied and specified; and
 - (b) as far as PHO was concerned, all the proposed facilities on the water would have impacts on harbour protection. WKCDA should make use of the Stage 3 PE exercise in bringing the issues up for public discussion and establishing the public need with cogent evidence.
- 3.25 The Chair agreed that a detailed plan showing the locations of the water-based facilities to the public in the PE exercise would be instrumental in soliciting public support for them.
- 3.26 The Chair then drew Members' attention to a position paper

submitted by an organisation called “the Hong Kong Alternatives” advocating that there should be no office/hotel/residential developments for the privileged and wealthy within WKCD. Members noted that while WKCDA had received the position paper, they were not prepared to give feedback in the meeting. **The Chair** asked WKCDA to provide its formal written responses on the position paper for circulation to Members for reference.

[Post-meeting note: Responses from WKCDA on the position paper had been circulated to Members on 9 November 2011. A formal reply had been issued to “the Hong Kong Alternatives” on 17 November 2011.]

- 3.27 With regard to the set of information on temporary structures referred to by Mr Paul Zimmerman, **Mr Michael Lynch** said that the WKCDA would look into a whole range of structures for use over the next couple of years for restaurants, cultural or commercial activities or others which would animate the site and attract people to visit. However, since WKCDA would not have control of the site until the end of the year, the development of WKCD and the use of these physical facilities were still at the planning phase.
- 3.28 **The Chair** pointed out that the Hong Kong Institute of Planners had suggested the “Space Ship of Water” in Nagoya as another example for WKCDA’s reference. The Secretariat was requested to send the relevant materials to WKCDA.

[Post-meeting note: The relevant website links were forwarded to WKCDA on 20 October 2011.]

- 3.29 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the proposed swimming pool afloat or some designated swimming area in the harbour was an idea much welcomed. **Ir. Peter Wong** echoed the view but pointed out that the technical committee on the consultations had raised queries on the technical feasibility of these floating swimming pools and platforms in terms of operation, design and safety, in particular considering the short distance from piers serving hydrofoils running in this part of the harbour.
- 3.30 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** made further enquires as follows:
- (a) whether funding would be allocated for seawall improvement as the existing seawall was of standard design and was unsightly;

- (b) how the development of the WKCD would interface with the breakwater at the former Yau Ma Tei Typhoon Shelter; and
- (c) how the proposed water-based facilities including the piers and floating pontoons would be funded as they did not form part of the DP.

- 3.31 In response, **Mr Michael Lynch** agreed that the existing seawall appeared unpleasant and WKCDA would investigate the interface issue with the seawall as part of its plan. WKCDA was currently in discussion with Government on funding for infrastructure, including the water-land interface matters. The Task Force would be informed of the progress.
- 3.32 **The Chair** said that the Task Force was concerned about the broad issues instead of specific details. WKCDA should ensure that there would be sufficient funding to sustain the development of WKCD.
- 3.33 **The Chair** concluded that the Task Force appreciated the work done by WKCDA. They were requested to take into account Members' views and suggestions in taking the project forward.

B. Tsuen Wan Action Area

Planning application by MTRCL for the property development at Tsuen Wan West Station

- 3.34 **The Chair** said that the discussion on Tsuen Wan Action Area was postponed from the last meeting on 27 July 2011 due to insufficient time for discussion. She said that a planning application by the Mass Transit Railway Company Limited (MTRCL) for property development at Tsuen Wan West Station was discussed earlier by the Task Force. The Task Force's questions on the proposal and MTRCL's responses were conveyed to the TPB on 13 June 2011. The application was approved with conditions on 17 June 2011.
- 3.35 At the invitation of the Chair, **Mr CK Soh** informed the meeting that the views of the Task Force had been fully conveyed to the TPB for consideration. In the approval letter, the applicant was advised to note the comments from the Task Force. Approval conditions were also incorporated on the design and

implementation of the podium and waterfront promenade to the satisfaction of the PlanD and Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) respectively.

3.36 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** made the following points:

(a) noting outdoor seating for food & beverage facilities was under the authority of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department instead of LCSD, there was concern on how LCSD would evaluate MTRCL's plan for the waterfront promenade. It was requested that LCSD should seek the Task Force's views when the plans were submitted; and

LCSD

(b) promenades were essentially pavements with trees. However, if the promenades were managed as parks by LCSD under the Pleasure Grounds Regulation, it would become extremely restrictive on the kind of activities allowed. Activities like dog-walking, fishing and cycling which were permitted on walkways would be prohibited in parks and on promenades. There should be a discussion on the desirable management approach, rule and guidelines on promenades with LCSD.

3.37 **The Chair** requested that LCSD should seek views from the Task Force upon receiving plans from MTRCL. Regarding the discussion on the general management of promenades, **the Chair** considered this issue to be strategic and relevant to all geographical Task Forces. She suggested this issue to be discussed at the HC level.

LCSD

Harbour
Unit

Cycle track project

3.38 **The Chair** said that the Task Force was briefed on the cycle track project between Tsuen Wan and Tuen Mun by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) in March 2011 and gave its strong support for the project.

Activation of the waterfront by designating public areas for outdoor seating and other uses

3.39 At the invitation of the Chair, **Miss Margrit Li** made the following points on the activation of the waterfront in the Tsuen Wan Action Area by designating public areas for outdoor seating and other uses:

- (a) outdoor seating had been provided to the patrons of the refreshment kiosk in the Tsuen Wan Park. LCSD would seek the opportunity to upgrade the existing refreshment kiosk so that some outdoor dining could be included; and
- (b) LCSD had liaised with the District Council (DC) and other organisations to run more programmes including a wall painting activity and a long distance race both held by Tsuen Wan DC and were successful.

3.40 The meeting acknowledged the progress made in adding LCSD to note vibrancy to Tsuen Wan Park and Tsuen Wan Riviera Park. LCSD was requested to continue their effort in activating the parks and open space in this area.

Item 4 Proposed District Revitalisation with Minor Relaxation of Building Height and Plot Ratio Restrictions in the "Comprehensive Development Area" Zone at Yau Tong Bay (Paper No. TFK/14/2011)

4.1 The Chair said that the main paper for discussion of this item (Paper No. TFK/14/2011) contained six appendices and the following reference materials were relevant to this item:

- (a) proposal submitted by the project proponent in 2005 and minutes of the former HEC briefing on 6 April 2005;
- (b) proposal submitted by the project proponent in 2007 and minutes of the former HEC Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review meeting on 18 April 2007;
- (c) paper No. 13/2008 and minutes of the former HEC meeting on 10 June 2008;
- (d) paper No. 2/2010 and minutes of the former HEC Sub-Committee meeting on Harbour Plan Review meeting on 20 January 2010; and
- (e) paper No. TFK/04/2011 and minutes of the Task Force meeting on 16 March 2011.

4.2 The following representatives were invited to the meeting:

Henderson Land Development Company Limited
Mr Augustine Wong, Executive Director

Ms Iris Cheng, Property Development Manager
 Ms Virginia Ng, Assistant Property Development Manager

Townland Consultants Limited

Ms Cindy Tsang, Associate Director
 Ms Janet Ngai, Assistant Town Planner

AECOM Asia Company Limited

Mr Robert Chan, Technical Director
 Ms Cathleen Chan, Project Engineer

DLN Architects & Engineers (HK) Limited

Ms Carolin Fong, Director
 Ms Candy Chan, Senior Architect

Urbis Limited

Mr Craig Doubleday, Director

Wheelock Properties (Hong Kong) Limited

Mr Ricky Wong, Managing Director
 Ms Mabel Lam, Property Development Manager

- 4.3 **Dr. Peter Cookson Smith** declared an interest in this item as his company was one of the consultants of the subject proposal. **Mr Franklin Yu** also declared an interest in this item as his company had business dealings with the project proponent. **The meeting** agreed that Dr. Smith and Mr Yu could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion in this item.
- 4.4 **Ms Cindy Tsang** of Townland Consultants Limited presented the paper with the aid of PowerPoint slides.
- 4.5 **The Chair** drew Members' attention that the site had a long planning history as reflected in the reference materials. The current discussion however should focus on the proponent's latest scheme. She referred Members to the development parameters of the latest scheme set out in Table 1 of the paper. Compared with the requirements in the Planning Brief (PB), the current scheme had four major deviations: (i) the maximum plot ratio (PR) with an increase from PR 4.5 in the PB to PR5; (ii) the maximum building height with an increase from 120mPD in the PB to 128.9mPD; (iii) the ratio of soft landscape within the waterfront promenade with a reduction from 85% in the PB to 60%; and (iv) avoidance of podium structures specified in the PB while development structures were found on podia on the

eastern part of the site in the current scheme. Members might wish to consider if such deviations could be outweighed by the gains.

4.6 At the invitation of the Chair, Mr Eric Yue provided some supplementary information as follows :

- (a) the subject site was zoned "Comprehensive Development Area" ("CDA") under the outline zoning plan (OZP) and approval for development from the TPB was required;
- (b) the PB set out the major development parameters and other technical requirements and was a guideline for the project proponent to prepare the Master Layout Plan (MLP) for submission to the TPB;
- (c) the project proponent had submitted the MLP including various technical assessments for the current scheme and comments from relevant Government departments were being sought;
- (d) the maximum PR of 4.5 was a statutory restriction stipulated on the OZP. However, there was a provision for minor relaxation of restriction to a maximum PR of 5.0 as stipulated in the Notes of the OZP subject to the decision of the TPB based on departmental comments and that all criteria as stipulated in the PB had been fulfilled; and
- (e) the MLP submission was scheduled for consideration by the TPB in early December 2011.

4.7 **The Chair** said that in the last Task Force meeting in March 2011 when the previous scheme was discussed, various concerns including water-land interface, landscaping, building height and plot ratio, building separation and air ventilation, and dredging were raised. Members were invited to give views, if any, along these lines.

4.8 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** enquired whether the additional financial gain resulting from the PR relaxation would be used to finance the proposed yacht centre, the improvement and beautification of the seawall design and other waterfront improvements etc. in the area.

4.9 In response, **Mr Augustine Wong** of Henderson Land

Development Company Limited said that the project proponent was not proposing the yacht centre as a trade-off to relax the PR. The PR relaxation was sought strictly following the ten pre-set criteria in the PB and as provided under the OZP. Technically, the planning application would not involve the water area and the yacht centre did not form part of the application. Nonetheless, the Task Force's concerns on the use of the water, though falling outside the "CDA" zone, would be taken into consideration.

- 4.10 **Ms Pong Yuen-ye** said that a site at the western end of the "CDA" zone was currently occupied by CEDD. According to the current proposal, this CEDD site seemed to make up a substantial portion of the public open space. The existing government use, if not relocated, would affect the total amount of public open space to be provided under the scheme.
- 4.11 **Mr Augustine Wong** responded that the CEDD site was considered appropriate as open space under the comprehensive plan of the "CDA" zone since it was closely located to the future road network and the Eastern Harbour Crossing and would be highly accessible to the general public. There had been preliminary discussions with the concerned Government departments on its future use. Its implementation would be dealt with in the land grant upon approval of the MLP by the TPB.
- 4.12 At the request of the Chair for details, **Mr Janson Wong** said that he would provide further information on the latest development of the CEDD site to the Task Force after the meeting.

[Post-meeting note: On 25 October 2011, Mr Janson Wong provided further information via email that the subject CEDD site was currently occupied by the Port Works Division of CEDD as a maintenance depot. As it was proposed as public open space under the "CDA" scheme, land search for the relocation of the maintenance depot was being conducted by the Lands Department.]

- 4.13 **Mr Eric Yue** said that more than 24,700m² of public open space would be provided under the scheme. There was suggestion that more active recreational use instead of passive open space use should be designated for the CEDD site. It was also noted that no gross floor area (GFA) had been reserved for the development of this site, which might pose difficulties for any

proposed erection of building structures on the site to support future recreational use. The proponent was requested to consider reserving some GFA for this site.

- 4.14 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** asked if any GFA had been allocated to the proposed yacht centre. In response, **Mr Eric Yue** said that under the proponent's scheme, GFA equivalent to a PR of 1.5 had been reserved for the proposed yacht centre site currently occupied by a salt water pumping station (SWPS) site. He further suggested that the proponent could consider combining the SWPS and CEDD sites for developing the yacht centre.
- 4.15 **Prof Carlos Lo** said that it was not desirable to have a reduction in soft landscaping from 85% as required by the PB to 60% as currently proposed, particularly when such a large area was involved. While 60% appeared to be arbitrary, there was no clear indication whether it was an optimal provision or there was any rationale behind the reduction. He enquired how the quantitative loss would be compensated with qualitative improvements.
- 4.16 **Mr Craig Doubleday** of Urbis Limited said that the required ratio of soft landscaping applied to the area of the public promenade only. Greening outside the promenade was not included in this requirement. Given an example of a 10m wide promenade, the area for walking would be reduced to a 1.5m wide footpath after 85% of the space was taken up by soft landscaping. This would not be a high quality promenade space by any standard. The proposed 60% of greening was believed to be the optimum proportion. Any increase would mean a reduction in quality and quantity of the promenade.
- 4.17 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** had the following further comments:
- (a) while it was desirable that some GFA was assigned for the yacht centre, it would be difficult for the Task Force to judge whether the provision was sufficient;
 - (b) as a breakwater would be required for the yacht centre, the proponent should ensure that the drainage system of the whole "CDA" area would be capable to flush the foul water out of the bay;
 - (c) more landing steps should be provided to facilitate accessibility; and

- (d) there should be some alfresco dining areas on the waterfront. However, the future residents should be made aware of the possible impacts, e.g. noise nuisance, from these facilities well in advance to avoid future complaints.

4.18 In response, **Mr Robert Chan** of AECOM Asia Co. Limited and **Ms Carolin Fong** of DLN Architects & Engineers (HK) Limited explained that:

- (a) although the yacht centre did not form part of the application, various breakwater options had been studied. It was considered that instead of using the traditional rock-core type breakwater, the pile type breakwater would be suitable for the Yau Tong Bay area which would allow water to flow underneath in facilitating water circulation within the bay. The existing storm water box culvert serving the site and its upper catchment ran across the site from Cha Kwo Ling Road. It would be maintained and might also help to create some flushing effect; and
- (b) in the current design, alfresco dining could be provided either at the ground floor of the commercial buildings abutting the waterfront or spill onto the promenade. It was envisaged that the external walls of these buildings could be fully opened to allow for such flexibility and to give the waterfront its vibrant character in a free relaxed arrangement.

4.19 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that alfresco dining was not a use permitted as-of-right on public open space in Hong Kong. In order to facilitate their implementation, the proponent should clearly identify and mark these areas on the plan before it was considered by the TPB. This would avoid unnecessary future debates with the local community or the DC concerned.

4.20 With regard to possible complaints on the alfresco dining from future residents, **the Chair** said that the project proponent should ensure that the future residents were aware of such facilities.

4.21 **The Chair** summed up that Members had noted about the issues of building height, plot ratio, building separation and air ventilation. Members had no new further comments regarding the Task Force's previous concerns. Moreover, Members had expressed additional concerns on: (i) the status of the CEDD site and lack of GFA reserved for it; and (ii) whether the GFA

reserved for the yacht centre was sufficient for its activities.

- 4.22 In response to point (ii) above, **Ms Cindy Tsang** said that reference was made to other yacht clubs in Hong Kong in proposing the current yacht centre. The Club Marina Cove in Sai Kung and the Royal Hong Kong Yacht Club at Kellet Island had GFA of about 2,000m² and 2,249m² respectively accommodating uses such as restaurants and bars, gymnasiums, sports courts, function rooms, offices, storage space, caretakers' quarters etc. In the current proposal, a total GFA of 3,750m² was set aside for the landside facilities of the yacht centre, which should be sufficient to serve the purpose.
- 4.23 **Mr Augustine Wong** supplemented that it was up to the future implementation agent of the yacht centre to distribute the GFA. There was also flexibility to spread the GFA onto the CEDD and SWPS sites.
- 4.24 **The Chair** said that the additional information provided good references for comparison and addressed the Task Force's concern on the GFA reserved for the yacht centre. She was of the view that the proposed yacht centre could be a potential item for the new Task Force on Water-land Interface.

[Post-meeting note: The Task Force's views on the application were conveyed to the TPB in a letter dated 21 November 2011. The application had been re-scheduled for TPB's consideration on 10 February 2012.]

Item 5 Proposed Commercial (Office/Shops) Development at Kowloon Inland Lot No. 11111, Hung Luen Road, Hung Hom (Paper No. TFK/15/2011)

- 5.1 **The Chair** drew Members' attention to the background material for this item - the Planning Brief (PB) for the "Comprehensive Development Area(2)" Site at the Junction of Hung Luen Road and Kin Wan Street, Hung Hom (KIL 11111) prepared in 2009.
- 5.2 The following representatives were invited to the meeting:

Wheelock Properties (Hong Kong) Limited

Mr Ricky Wong, Managing Director

Mr Matthew Chan, Manager - Project Design

Mr Charles Chiu, Project Manager

Ms Carol Choy, Senior Assistant Manager - Development

Ronald Lu & Partners (Hong Kong) Limited

Mr Kelvin Ip, Director

Mr Kenneth Ip, Chief Architect

Urbis Limited

Mr Alan Macdonald, Director – Planning and Urban Design

Ms Winona Ip, Planner/Urban Designer

PlanArch Consultants Limited

Ms Betty Ho, Director

Ms Wing Ng, Town Planner

- 5.3 **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 in this item.
- 5.4 **Ms Betty Ho** of PlanArch Consultant Limited, **Mr Alan Macdonald** of Urbis Limited and **Mr Kelvin Ip** of Ronald Lu & Partners (Hong Kong) Limited presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 5.5 In response to the Chair's enquiry on whether the current scheme had met the requirements stipulated in the PB, **Ms Betty Ho** clarified that all the requirements in the PB, OZP and lease conditions had been met. The current scheme had even incorporated an additional 5m building gap between the two building blocks to further enhance the environment of the area.
- 5.6 **Mr Eric Yue** noticed that the current scheme deviated from the PB in terms of the GFA distribution between office and retail uses. In response, **Ms Betty Ho** said that for the subject site, it was estimated that the demand for retail and food & beverage (F&B) facilities would be lower than that suggested in the PB as such facilities would already be provided in the two future hotels nearby. **Mr Eric Yue** suggested that the proponent should justify any deviation with supporting materials.
- 5.7 **The Chair** pointed out that the maximum GFAs in the PB for office and retail uses should be 41,091m² and 13,697m² respectively. However, in the current scheme, the GFA for office use was 47,961m² – 49,331m² and that for retail use was 5,481m² – 6,851m².

- 5.8 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that from the harbourfront enhancement perspective, more at-grade retail and F&B facilities would be instrumental in supporting the vitality of the waterfront.
- 5.9 **Ms Betty Ho** explained that the requirements for GFA distribution on the PB were based on the Hung Hom District Study completed a few years ago. Circumstances and local environment had changed since then:
- (a) under the PB, a development with podium was envisioned for this site providing a larger floor plate for retail uses. Under the current scheme, however, smaller building blocks were proposed without the podium structure. Instead of a typical arcade type development, the proponent aimed for a unique design for this significant site where people would find it friendly and accessible. With smaller blocks, it was more difficult to provide the same amount of retail GFA as that of multi-storey shops; and
 - (b) this area was an extension of TST and was the mid-point from Kowloon East. There would be higher demand for office space than the typical retail uses.
- 5.10 **Mr Franklin Yu** enquired on how the proposed shops and F&B facilities be connected with the promenade and where the connection points would be. In response, **Ms Betty Ho** said that all the non-building areas could be connected to the promenade. However, the existing promenade had been landscaped by CEDD with trees which blocked the direct connections from the hinterland to the promenade to a certain extent.
- 5.11 **Mr Franklin Yu** urged the proponent to liaise with CEDD and LCSD on the matter. The waterfront should be vibrant, allowing the occurrence of different types of activities. Opportunity should also be taken to study the integration of the promenade with the proposed development.
- 5.12 **Mr Janson Wong** pointed out that there was a level difference between the promenade and the subject site. Some technical studies should be done to examine how the existing promenade would be affected.
- 5.13 **Mr Harry Tsang** said that the promenade had been handed

over to LCSD for management. LCSD would be pleased to discuss with the proponent on making minor modifications to improve waterfront connectivity.

5.14 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** made the following points:

(a) he suggested the proponent to adopt a more aggressive approach in coming up with plans for the streetscape, waterfront design and a number of options on the connection between the proposed development and the promenade. The share of cost and management responsibilities should also be indicated; and

(b) the current scheme had been designed to activate the ground level activities which was also the character of the Hung Hom district. However, it was noted that a footbridge connection was used across Hung Luen Road. He enquired if there was a transport demand for the footbridge as it was not part of a comprehensive elevated pedestrian network. He preferred that either at-grade approach would be adopted or footbridge network would be incorporated to provide connection all the way to the waterfront.

5.15 **The Chair** said that considering the development scale, the proposed footbridge might not be sufficient to support the full integration of the development with the surrounding environment.

5.16 **Mr Cheung Kai-ying** said that footbridge connection might be preferred in terms of road safety, but it had to be justified with a genuine demand in pedestrian traffic.

5.17 **Mr Eric Yue** pointed out that the footbridge across Hung Luen Road would be part of an elevated walkway system in the Hung Hom reclamation area. It would connect the subject development with the residential blocks to its north and all the way to the Royal Peninsula. It was the planning intention to provide grade-separated pedestrian connection to this part of the waterfront and the subject footbridge should be maintained.

5.18 In response to the Chair's further enquiry, **Mr Eric Yue** said that Transport Department (TD) would need to confirm whether there was a genuine demand for additional and wider footbridges. The need for the subject footbridge had been ascertained.

TD

- 5.19 With the clarifications, **the Chair** said that given that the footbridge would form part of the comprehensive pedestrian network in Hung Hom, it would not be appropriate for the Task Force to suggest deletion of the subject footbridge based only on a plan presented at the meeting.
- 5.20 **Mr Ricky Wong** of Wheelock Properties (Hong Kong) Limited said that the subject footbridge was provided in accordance with the requirement as stipulated in the land grant. The proponent would ensure a well-connected and well-designed footbridge in bringing people to the waterfront promenade.
- 5.21 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested that the proponent could incorporate an elevated footbridge system within its own site as well as pedestrian connections at grade, both connected to the waterfront.
- 5.22 **Mr Eric Yue** suggested that the scheme should adopt a more diversified built form with terrace-type development. In response, **Mr Alan Macdonald** said that the current scheme was a preliminary design. The final scheme would be further developed.
- 5.23 **The Chair** concluded that the proposal compiled with most of the requirements in the PB. However, the proponent was requested to consider improving pedestrian circulation amongst the development blocks as well as connectivity between the hinterland and the waterfront promenade.

[Post-meeting note: The project proponent submitted an application to the TPB on 9 December 2011. The Task Force's views on the proposal were conveyed to the TPB in a letter dated 5 January 2012. The application has been scheduled for consideration on 20 January 2012.]

Item 6 Any Other Business

Comments on Minutes

- 6.1 **The Chair** reminded all Members who had declared interests in any item to refrain from commenting on the minutes of that particular item. **Members to note**

Circulation of Meeting Documents

- 6.2 In view of the bulk size of the meeting documents sent to Members via email, **the Chair** suggested that other delivery alternatives could be explored. In response, **Mrs Winnie Kang** said that the Harbour Unit would work with the secretaries of all the task forces to address Members' concerns. Members were ensured that they would have a more convenient way in receiving documents in future.

Harbour
Unit

Action Areas for Next Meeting

- 6.3 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** raised concerns on when the TC would revert to the Task Force on the design of the TST piazza and PTI. He expressed his disappointment that the original design of the piazza had been removed from Architectural Services Department's official website. He suggested TC should maintain all the designs online until the completion of the project.
- 6.4 **Dr. Peter Cookson Smith** concurred with Mr Paul Zimmerman's view and said that the current transport scheme was of poor design quality. It would impose adverse impacts on the waterfront and should not have been gazetted until all alternatives had been explored.
- 6.5 **The Chair** noted the concerns from Mr Zimmerman and Dr Smith. She also noted from the last meeting on 27 July 2011 that TC had made an effort in balancing the Task Force's views and different public comments.
- 6.6 **Mr Vincent Fung** reiterated that at this juncture, the TC was collecting public views under the gazettal of the current scheme which would last till 8 November 2011. The TC would consider views from all stakeholders concerned including the Task Force. Technical issues would also need to be resolved with the Transport and Housing Bureau and TD. He would confirm with his colleagues on the schedule for coming up with a detailed design and reverting to the Task Force. Nevertheless, it was unlikely that the material would be ready by the next Task Force meeting.
- 6.7 **The Chair** said that the TC should revert to the Task Force as soon as practicable. The Task Force hoped that TC and TD would work towards a better integration of the TST piazza with its surrounding areas in a holistic manner.

TC

- 6.8 **The Chair** also said that since Members had no other specific views on the Action Areas, she would work with the Secretariat in coming up with a maximum of two Action Areas with solid materials for a fruitful discussion in the next meeting. **Secretariat**

Next Task Force Meeting

- 6.9 **The Chair** said that this would be the last meeting in 2011. The next meeting was tentatively scheduled for mid January 2012. Members would be informed in due course.

[Post-meeting note: The next meeting was scheduled for 18 January 2012. Members were informed on 14 November 2011.]

- 6.10 There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 5:40pm

Secretariat
Task Force on Harbourfront Developments
in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing
January 2012