

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

Minutes of Eleventh Meeting

Date : 20 November 2012
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 Franklin Yu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Ms Pong Yuen-ye	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Dr Peter Cookson Smith	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Ms Ida Lam	
Mr Thomas Chan	Deputy Secretary (Planning & Lands) ¹ , Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mrs Miranda Yim	Assistant Commissioner for Tourism
Mr Wilson Pang	Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon, Transport Department (TD)
Mr Joe Yip	Senior Engineer/1, Kowloon Development Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Miss Margrit Li	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) 1, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Ms Amy Cheung	Assistant Director of Planning/Territorial, Planning Department (Acting) (PlanD)
Mr Edward Leung	Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Nicholas Brooke
Dr Stefan Al
Prof Carlos Lo
Ir Peter Wong
Mr Leslie Chen

Ms Dilys Chau

In Attendance

Mrs Winnie Kang Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Tom Yip Senior Town Planner/Yau Tsim Mong, PlanD

Action

Welcoming Message

1.1 **The Chair** welcomed the following new official members of the Task Force:

(a) Mr Thomas Chan, who had taken over the post of Deputy Secretary (Planning & Lands) 1 from Ms Gracie Foo with effect from 6 September 2012;

(b) Mr Raymond Wong, who had taken over the post of Assistant Director of Planning/Territorial from Mr Raymond Lee with effect from 31 October 2012; and

(c) Mr Wilson Pang, who had taken over the post of Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon from Mr Albert Lee with effect from 28 July 2012.

1.2 **The Chair** thanked Ms Gracie Foo, Mr Raymond Lee and Mr Albert Lee for their contribution to the Task Force and welcomed Mr Thomas Chan and Mr Wilson Pang to their first Task Force meeting. **The Chair** also welcomed Ms Amy Cheung who attended this meeting on behalf of Mr Raymond Wong.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 10th meeting

1.3 The draft minutes of the 10th meeting were circulated to Members on 5 September 2012. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated on 14 November 2012. The meeting confirmed the revised draft minutes without further amendments.

Item 2 Matters Arising

2.1 **The Chair** asked Members to refer to the table on Departments' Responses to Follow-up Items for the 10th meeting on 18 July

2012, which was circulated to Members on 16 November 2012.

Enhancement of the Avenue of Star (AoS) (para. 2.2 and 2.3 of the minutes of the 10th meeting)

- 2.2 **The Chair** said that legal advice was being sought by LCSD on releasing the annual audit reports of the AoS. LCSD had also confirmed with New World Development that new seats and shelters would be provided at AoS in the first quarter of 2013. As advised by the Tourism Commission (TC), the visitors' feedback collected by Hong Kong Tourism Board through its departing visitor survey and regular meetings with the tourism sector showed that the AoS was very popular amongst visitors, in particular, tour groups from the Mainland. Visitors were generally satisfied with the AoS as a tourist attraction.

Walking Tour in Tsim Sha Tsui (TST) Waterfront (para. 2.4 of the minutes of the 10th meeting)

- 2.3 **The Chair** thanked the Secretariat for arranging the walking tour on 13 November 2012. Subsequent to the walking tour, TD had prepared a paper summarizing the comments raised by Members on the pedestrian connection in TST waterfront for discussion under Agenda Item 3 of this meeting.
- 2.4 **The Chair** also mentioned that, Members raised other comments during the walking tour relating to the enhancement of LCSD venues along the TST waterfront, for example integration of Salisbury Garden with the adjacent open space of New World Development in design; provision of alfresco dining and more outdoor seating areas; planting of crown trees to provide shading; and improvement of signage to the AoS. As LCSD would consult the Task Force on the renovation of the Salisbury Garden in early 2013 when the detailed design was ready, Members' comments would be addressed in the next Task Force meeting.

LCSD

Walkability Performance Indicators (para. 3.14 of the minutes of the 10th meeting)

- 2.5 **The Chair** said that she had been conducting walkability studies over the past few years and understood that walkability was a complex field. In her research with New York University regarding the walkability in some areas of Hong Kong and New York, it was found that there were many more established walkability performance indicators. She suggested TD to

include more performance indicators such as convenience and comfort in its future planning to suit the local circumstances.

[Post-meeting note : The research paper was circulated to Members for information on 9 January 2013.]

- 2.6 **Mr Wilson Pang** responded that the suggestion would be taken into account when the relevant guidelines were reviewed.

Pedestrian Connectivity (para. 3.19(b) and 3.22 of the minutes of the 10th meeting)

- 2.7 **The Chair** recognized the need to study the pedestrian connectivity issues holistically. Responses from TD, including both short and long-term measures, would be discussed under Agenda Item 3.

Coach Loitering and Provision of Coach Parking Spaces (para. 4.7-4.9 of the minutes of the 10th meeting)

- 2.8 **The meeting** noted that TC and TD had a meeting with the tourism trade on 12 November 2012, urging them to use the coach parking spaces properly. TD had also been liaising with the Police in dealing with the subject issue. Concerning the provision of additional coach parking spaces and car parking spaces in new tourist attractions, the project proponents would have to follow the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines.

- 2.9 Regarding the provision of parking spaces in the future New World Development, it had been clarified that 3 lay-bys for single deck tour buses and 64 loading/unloading (L/UL) bays for tourist buses, trucks or lorry would be provided within the development. In response to **the Chair's** enquiry, **Mr Wilson Pang** said that while there was no specific requirement to open the parking and L/UL facilities for public use, these additional facilities would help alleviate the on-street traffic situation in the vicinity. It was not certain at this stage whether these facilities would be opened for public use.

- 2.10 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** commented that in order to relieve the traffic congestion in TST, the Government should have the management power over the use of the parking and L/UL facilities within the development even though there was no specific requirement in the lease for opening up those facilities

for public use.

- 2.11 **Ms Pong Yuen-ye**e said that whether to open the facilities for public use hinged on management responsibility issue.
- 2.12 **The Chair** remarked that developers might be willing to open parking facilities to public use if a fee could be charged. She suggested that a requirement on provision of coach parking spaces within developments for public use be clearly specified in the lease of developments in TST area in future so as to alleviate the coach loitering and traffic congestion problems along the waterfront.
- 2.13 **Mr Thomas Chan** responded that in general, provision of public car park in a development, if found necessary and justified on the basis of traffic impact assessment, could be considered for inclusion as a requirement through the lease conditions upon land grant or lease modification.
- 2.14 **The meeting** also noted that TD would liaise with the Lands Department (LandsD) and look for suitable replacement sites in case the current Short Term Tenancy (STT) parking sites in the area would need to be replaced by various development reasons.
- Forecast on Future Demand of Coach Parking (para. 4.11 and 4.13 of the minutes of the 10th meeting)*
- 2.15 **The meeting** noted that TD had conducted site surveys including both legal and illegal parking and the result revealed that the demand in parking spaces was estimated to be quite close to the current provision. TD had been liaising with the Police to strengthen enforcement action against it.
- 2.16 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that TD should review the performance indicators; upgrade the quality of pedestrian network; and increase supply of coach parking spaces. Issues such as coaches staying too long in the lay-bys, illegal parking along Salisbury Road and provision of more holding areas in TST should be addressed.
- 2.17 In response, **the Chair** said that as HC was concerned with bringing people to the waterfront, the Task Force had agreed to focus on improving the pedestrian connectivity and walkability along the TST waterfront first. The crux of the issue was the number of coach parking spaces located on the waterfront and

how overall traffic flow and pedestrian experience to the waterfront were affected by the current situation. As regards illegal parking at lay-bys, she suggested TD to liaise with the Police with a view to stepping up enforcement action. **Mr Wilson PANG** said that TD would continue to maintain a close dialogue with the Police in dealing with the issue.

Shelving of the "Development of a Piazza in Tsim Sha Tsui" Project (Paper No. TFK/09/2012)

- 2.18 **The Chair** said that Paper No. TFK/09/2012 was an information paper, and the website links to the reference/background materials related to this item had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting.
- 2.19 Referring to para. 7 of the paper, **the Chair** said that the reasons for shelving this project were mainly due to the considerable technical problems and the strong aspirations from relevant District Councils and local residents for maintaining the existing level of bus service, and from conservation groups for preserving TST Pier Bus Terminus. From the Task Force's point of view, it was regrettable that the Government had decided to shelve the project which would otherwise provide an opportunity to revitalize this part of the harbourfront. She enquired if there was any plan and who would be the leading party for improving the area especially in view of the dilapidated state of the TST Pier and the TST Pier Bus Terminus.
- 2.20 **Mrs Miranda Yim** and **Mr Wilson Pang** responded that TD would liaise with Star Ferry Co. Ltd on the feasibility of undertaking some renovation works for the TST Pier. TD was also discussing with the bus company on some minor improvement works to the TST Pier Bus Terminus. TD would update the Task Force when more detailed proposals were available.
- 2.21 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** commented that the Bus Terminus should be relocated closer to the MTR station. In view of a lack of connection points in TST and the undesirable harbourfront environment in that area, the Government should reconsider the piazza project.
- 2.22 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** was of the view that the constraints associated with the structural integrity of the ferry pier could be resolved technically. Given the need to maintain the service level at the Bus Terminus, careful consideration was required

TD

before formulation of an enhancement plan, and a leading party should be identified for the improvement works.

- 2.23 **Mr Franklin Yu** said that for revitalising the TST harbourfront, the project might still be taken forward by addressing the public's concerns, and an innovative piazza design might make the project more acceptable to the public.
- 2.24 **Ms Ida Lam** concurred that some enhancement works should be undertaken for the TST Pier. The Government should address the concerns raised.
- 2.25 **The Chair** opined that the crux of the issue was that the District Councillors concerned had strongly opposed to the re-routing of bus lines serving the area. When considering improvements to the area, views raised by relevant stakeholders should be taken into account.
- 2.26 **Mrs Miranda Yim** supplemented that:
- (a) during the periods of the previous two gazettals of the turnaround road scheme in 2009 and 2010, the Administration received more than 5,000 and 13,000 representations against the proposed road works respectively. On top of these, there were also strong objections from the five District Councils (DCs) in Kowloon, namely the Yau Tsim Mong (YTM) DC, the Kwun Tong DC, the Kowloon City DC, the Sham Shui Po DC and the Wong Tai Sin DC. In particular, almost all the YTM DC members had strongly objected against the relocation of the existing bus routes using the TST Pier Bus Terminus;
 - (b) in order to address the strong aspirations of the public and the DCs, the Administration had re-considered the approach for the project and put forth a revised proposal for further consultation with the Task Force and the public in July last year, in the hope of working out a win-win option by integrating the piazza development with the renovation and expansion of the TST Pier. Nevertheless, it was unfortunate that they still received more than 7,000 representations against the project works during the period of gazettal of the revised turnaround road scheme in 2011, more than 90% of which urged for preservation of the TST Pier. Some set out alternative designs for the public transport interchange;

- (c) in taking forth the piazza project, the Administration had already followed the due process to resolve objections in accordance with the statutory procedures. HyD, in collaboration with TC and TD, had made strenuous efforts in the objection resolution process, viz. replying to each of the individual objectors, by letter or telephone call, to address their particular concern(s) and explain to them the situation, with a view to persuading them to withdraw their objections against the project works. Despite the Administration's efforts, almost none of the objectors was willing to withdraw; and
- (d) given the situation, the Administration had explored and studied different options, hoping to identify a feasible proposal which could allow adequate room for a substantial piazza development with merits, and at the same time, could meet the DC's and the public aspirations. Nevertheless, we were unable to find a good solution for the project at last. Having balanced all considerations, the Administration therefore decided to shelve the piazza project.

- 2.27 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** commented that the strong objection was caused by the perception that traffic implication arising from the relocation of the Bus Terminus would be significant and the undesirable design of the piazza. He considered that TC should consider an enhancement plan for the TST Pier area.
- 2.28 **The Chair** said that due to strong objection from the public, it seemed that there was no scope to re-route the bus routes serving the TST Pier area and the Bus Terminus had to maintain its present function. If the scheme was no longer a tourist project, it was logical that TD might take up the improvement works and the Task Force could work closely with and provide inputs to TD at an early stage with a view to formulating an enhancement plan for the area.
- 2.29 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** commented that TD might not be the suitable party to take forward enhancement for an area solely for tourism purpose. **Ms Pong Yuen-yee** shared his view and considered that TC should play an important role. **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** opined that TC should re-consider the piazza project.
- 2.30 **Mr Thomas Chan** responded that public support was essential to realise the piazza project. He said that the original intention

of the piazza project was to enhance the harbourfront and improve tourist attraction, which should also be the guiding objectives for enhancing the TST harbourfront area. As the TST Pier and the TST Pier Bus Terminus would remain for the time being, enhancement proposal for these transport facilities would bring vibrancy to the area, and Harbour Unit would discuss with the Transport and Housing Bureau and TC on any scope for further enhancement of the TST Pier area having regard to the constraints.

**Harbour
Unit**

- 2.31 **The meeting** agreed that the Administration should report further at the forthcoming Task Force meeting.

Item 3 Action Areas

Action Areas Table

- 3.1 **The Chair** said that the Revised Action Areas Table (as at October 2012) had been updated and circulated to Members on 16 November 2012. This meeting would focus on Yau Ma Tei Action Area as well as TST East and West Action Areas as agreed in the last meeting.

(a) Yau Ma Tei Action Area

Tai Kok Tsui Advance Promenade (Paper No. TFK/10/2012)

- 3.2 **The Chair** welcomed the following representatives to the meeting:

CEDD

Mr Chui Si Kay Peter, Chief Engineer/Kowloon 1 (Acting)
Mr Yue Hon-man, Albert, Senior Architect

LCSD

Mr Harry Tsang, Chief Executive Officer (Planning)¹

Architectural Services Department (ArchSD)

Mr Mui Tung-king, Tony, Senior Landscape Architect/2
Ms Wong Wing-yee, Landscape Architect/4
Miss Ho Wai-yan, Vivian, Architect/109

- 3.3 **Mr Chui Si Kay, Peter, Ms Wong Wing-ye** and **Miss Ho Wai-yan, Vivian** presented the paper with the aid of PowerPoint.
- 3.4 **The Chair** said that while the proposed promenade was relatively small in scale, the Task Force welcomed such development which would be in line with the Harbour Planning Principles (HPPs).
- 3.5 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** enquired the following:
- (a) whether the design of the promenade was consistent with the open space at ex-Tai Kok Tsui Bus Terminus and the interface between the open space at ex-Tai Kok Tsui Bus Terminus and the proposed promenade;
 - (b) whether the facilities would affect the active marine use in the New Yau Ma Tei Typhoon Shelter;
 - (c) the reasons for not including the adjacent public landing steps in the design and allowing pets in the design;
 - (d) the possibility of provide a L/UL area adjacent to the public landing steps for public use; and
 - (e) the measures to improve pedestrian connectivity between the proposed promenade and the MTR station.
- 3.6 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** enquired if the promenade would link directly to the open space in the private developments to the west. The simple tuck shop design under the “Garden” themes was considered better than that of the modern glass and concrete design under the “Museum” theme. He concurred the importance to enhance the connectivity with the MTR station especially for disabled persons. More comfortable seatings should also be provided for visitors.
- 3.7 **Ms Ida Lam** considered that seats with shelter or under tree shading should be provided for people to enjoy the harbourfront.
- 3.8 **Ms Pong Yuen-ye** concurred that more seats with shelter or shading should be provided. She preferred the “Garden” theme as more open space could be provided the site. She was concerned about the potential odour problem in the area.
- 3.9 **Mr Franklin Yu** agreed that shaded seatings and an additional

entrance to enhance accessibility from the sea side to the promenade should be provided. Due to the gentle sloping of the site towards the sea, lawn areas could be provided for people to lie down and rest on when enjoying the harbour view. He preferred the "Museum" theme as it might be more interesting for people to enjoy the sea view through the picture frames and these frames could also be used as seating benches. He considered that one tuck shop would be sufficient to serve both the open space at ex-Tai Kok Tsui Bus Terminus site and the proposed promenade.

3.10 **Mr. Chui Si Kay, Peter** made the following responses:

- (a) the proposed promenade would not affect the existing marine facilities;
- (b) Members' comments would be taken into account in refining the promenade design; and
- (c) CEDD would liaise with TD on the possibility of improving pedestrian connectivity between the MTR station and the promenade.

3.11 **Mr Mui Tung-king, Tony** and **Ms Wong Wing-ye**e supplemented as follows:

- (a) there was a level difference between the existing pedestrian walkway and the seawall at the western entrance. The structure of the existing seawall might be affected if a direct link from the proposed promenade to the open space at ex-Tai Kok Tsui Bus Terminus was provided. The seawall was just at the side of the pavement, which made widening of Ho Fai Road to facilitate the provision of a direct link between the two open spaces infeasible; and
- (b) the existing public landing steps could be incorporated in the promenade design after completion of the project by the Drainage Services Department (DSD) nearby. The landing steps would not be affected in the current promenade design and plantings would be used to separate the promenade from the DSD site during construction period.

3.12 **The Chair** suggested that the project proponent should take into account Members' comments raised, such as provision of an additional entrance near the landing steps, improvement of pedestrian connectivity between the MTR station and the

proposed promenade, in refining the scheme.

- 3.13 **Mrs Winnie Kang** added that the proposal served as a quick-win in enhancing the harbourfront. She suggested that the Task Force to indicate their preference between the two design themes so that the project proponent could proceed with detailed design.
- 3.14 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** indicated his preference to the “Museum” theme. Since the neighbouring residential developments had already provided with garden style open space, he considered that the picture frame concept could make the promenade different from others and attractive to visitors. He reiterated his requests for incorporating the existing public landing steps in the promenade design, fixing the bollards and enhancing the seawall.
- 3.15 Taking into account Members’ comments, **the Chair** concluded that the project proponent was advised to develop the promenade design based on the concept of “Museum” design with incorporation of garden features such as more trees and shading areas and the project team should be cautious of not putting too much furniture in the promenade.

(b) Tsim Sha Tsui East and Tsim Sha Tsui West Action Areas

Improving Pedestrian Connectivity in Tsim Sha Tsui Waterfront (Paper No. TFK/11/2012)

- 3.16 **The Chair** welcomed the following representatives to the meeting:

TD

Mr Wilson Pang, Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon

Mr M. Yeung, Senior Engineer/Kowloon District Central

- 3.17 **The Chair** said that the subject issue was discussed at the previous Task Force meetings on 18 January 2012 and 18 July 2012 respectively and relevant website links to the reference/background materials had been circulated to Members.
- 3.18 **Mr M Yeung** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 3.19 **Mr Franklin Yu** suggested that a subway under Nathan Road to connect Kowloon Hotel with Peninsula Hotel be built, and the

at-grade crossing at Salisbury Road from Peninsula Hotel to Hong Kong Cultural Centre be resumed to improve pedestrian connectivity in the TST waterfront.

3.20 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** raised the following comments:

- (a) simple annotations to show the direction to the harbourfront would be useful;
- (b) landscape features to the south side of Salisbury Road and along the waterfront should be improved; and
- (c) an at-grade crossing at Salisbury Road from Peninsula Hotel to Hong Kong Cultural Centre should be further examined since the existing subway network would involve level changes and the nearest at-grade crossing was at Canton Road.

3.21 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** raised the following comments:

- (a) the Civic Exchange's report on pedestrian network planning should be taken into account in improving the pedestrian connectivity in TST;
- (b) the idea of reconsidering an at-grade crossing at Salisbury Road was supported;
- (c) there was no direct connection between Nathan Road, MTR station and the waterfront. One possible option might be to provide a subway crossing between Middle Road and Sheraton Hotel;
- (d) the pedestrian network in TST with its different levels should be examined holistically;
- (e) quality signage should be installed; and
- (f) all maps should be oriented in one way.

3.22 **Ms Ida Lam** considered that a walking map for tourists could be done quickly. Views and feedbacks from tourists on the existing pedestrian network in TST could be sought.

3.23 **The Chair** made the following points:

- (a) the proposal on resuming the at-grade crossing at Salisbury

TD

Road should be followed up by TD. A response on whether or not the at-grade crossing was feasible and the rationale behind should then be reported to the Task Force; and

- (b) a comprehensive walking map would be useful to the tourists. The paper maps were standardized with the northern direction pointing upwards. However, for wall-mounted maps or direction guides at MTR stations, it would be more sensible if they were oriented to show the way ahead.

3.24 **Mr Wilson Pang** responded that TD was ready to work with other departments to address Members' comments. Regarding the at-grade crossing at Salisbury Road, TD had examined the issue before and concluded that it was not a desirable option. In view of Members' comments, TD would review the situation. However, Members may wish to note that vehicular traffic flow would inevitably be affected if emphasis was given to at-grade pedestrian traffic. **TD**

3.25 **Mrs Winnie Kang** made the following points:

- (a) suggested the Task Force to focus on the enhancement of subway walking environment and signage system first. Harbour Unit would work closely with TD and other relevant departments; and **Harbour Unit**
- (b) the walking map might be pursued in the short run. However, discussions with concerned private developers and MTRC would be required to synchronise the signages before a comprehensive walking map could be produced.

3.26 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** reiterated his request for reconsideration of the subway connection at the Sheraton Hotel. **The Chair** suggested that more information in relation to this issue should be gathered first. **TD**

Item 4 Any Other Business

Proposed Development in Yau Tong Bay Comprehensive Development Area

4.1 **The Chair** welcomed the following representatives:

PlanD

Mr Michael Chan, Assistant Director of Planning/Metro (Acting)
Ms Karen Wong, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon 5 (Acting)

CEDD

Mr Gordon Pei, Senior Engineer/District

Henderson Land Development Co. Ltd.

Mr Augustine Wong, Executive Director
Ms Iris Cheng, Property Development Manager

- 4.2 **Mr Franklin Yu** declared that the project proponent would be his potential client. In response, **the Chair** said that it was not a direct conflict of interest so he could be allowed to stay and make comments on the project.
- 4.3 **The Chair** said that a background note and the website links for reference/background materials for the subject development had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting. She supplemented that:
- (a) when the Task Force last discussed the proposed development on 19 October 2011, a yacht centre was put forth under the proposal, although the project proponent had advised that the yacht centre did not form part of the scheme under application to the TPB; and
 - (b) on 9 November 2012, the project proponent submitted further information to the TPB to support the planning application and a gist of the further information submitted by the project proponent was circulated to Members prior to this meeting.
- 4.4 **Mr Michael Chan** and **Mr Augustine Wong** briefed Members on the latest scheme, including replacement of the originally proposed yacht centre by hotel development with the aid of Powerpoint.
- 4.5 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** made the following comments:
- (a) The Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO) was to safeguard the harbour both in terms of its physical shape and uses, and should not be interpreted as forbidding development such as a yacht centre. There was a public need for mooring vessels and the yacht centre proposal at Yau Tong Bay should undergo the PHO process to establish

the overriding public need; and

- (b) both floating breakwater and rubble mound breakwater would affect part of the water body. However, rubble mound breakwater would provide adequate wave attenuation. The proposal might comply with relevant section in the CEDD's Port Works Design Manual if the location of the outfall in the area would be reconsidered and adequate wave attenuation could be provided with breakwater, and hence, make Yau Tong Bay a suitable location for a yacht centre.

4.6 In response to **Ms Pong Yuen-yee's** enquiry, **Mr Michael Chan** said that the further information submitted by the project proponent had been published for public comment. The application would be considered by the TPB in due course.

4.7 **The Chair** said that the Task Force in October 2011 welcomed the idea of a yacht centre and considered it in line with the HPPs. It was not desirable that the yacht centre had been excluded in the current scheme. She enquired if (i) it was the project proponent's decision not to proceed with the yacht centre because of the difficulties encountered; or (ii) the project proponent still wished to proceed with the yacht centre but was hindered by some obstacles.

4.8 **Mr Augustine Wong** made the following responses:

- (a) although the developer had endeavoured to incorporate a yacht centre at Yau Tong Bay, the yacht centre and all the government land involved did not form part of the private residential development project. The developer just proposed such use for the Government to consider in future; and
- (b) the yacht centre proposal was not pursued due to the following reasons:
 - (i) even if the wave condition issue could be overcome by adopting other standards acceptable to the Government, the concerned process might take a long time; and
 - (ii) under the existing PHO, a declaration from the court claiming that the project would comply with the PHO should be obtained. At present, it would be difficult

for the proposal to satisfy the overriding public need test.

4.9 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** commented further that:

- (a) the project proponent should clarify if any department advised that there was no mechanism under the PHO to establish the overriding public need of the yacht centre and that a declaration from the court in this regard was required; and
- (b) the opportunity to make good use of Yau Tong Bay should be maximized by taking forward the yacht centre proposal.

4.10 In response, **Mr Augustine Wong** said that they had sought legal advice in this regard. He added that any individual who was not satisfied with the project proponent's conclusion for the overriding public need test could seek review from the court.

4.11 **The Chair** concluded that:

- (a) issues such as breakwater, the use of Yau Tong Bay in adding vibrancy for public enjoyment, etc. were wider in scope than that of this particular project;
- (b) while noting the obstacles encountered, the Task Force generally considered it undesirable to exclude the yacht centre which would help enliven the Yau Tong Bay harbourfront areas and fulfil the HPPs; and
- (c) Members' views would be summarised and submitted to the TPB for consideration, and the Secretariat would seek her clearance before submission. **Secretariat**

[Post-meeting note: The Task Force's views on the application were conveyed to the TPB on 7 December 2012.]

The Yau Tong – Lei Yue Mun Harbourfront Area

4.12 **The Chair** informed Members that a paper from Yau Tong – Lei Yue Mun Stakeholder Group in respect of a private initiative to conduct a study on improving Yau Tong waterfront area had been circulated to Members before the meeting under confidential cover as requested by the Group. Members could submit their comments to the Secretariat and Members' comments would be consolidated and forwarded to the Group. **Secretariat**

The Group would then be invited to share the findings with the Task Force when ready.

- 4.13 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the web link as stated in para. 7 of the paper was not working. **The Chair** asked the Secretariat to follow up. **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** also considered that the Members should be engaged in the study process. **Secretariat**

[Post-meeting Note: The web link, which was provided from the Group, was sent to Members on 22 November 2012 and Members' comments were consolidated and passed to the project proponent on 19 December 2012].

Action Areas for Next Meeting

- 4.14 Based on the discussions at this meeting, **the Chair** suggested and **the meeting** agreed that the next meeting should continue to focus on the TST East and West Action Areas.

- 4.15 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested arranging another walking tour to areas around the TST Pier and Bus Terminus later and **the Chair** agreed. **Secretariat**

Next Task Force Meeting

- 4.16 **The Chair** said that the next meeting was tentatively scheduled for January/February 2013. Members would be informed of the exact meeting date in due course.
- 4.17 There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 5:45pm.

Secretariat
Task Force on Harbourfront Developments
in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing
January 2013