

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

**Minutes of Twelfth Meeting**

Date : 22 January 2013  
Time : 2:30 pm  
Venue : Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices  
333 Java Road, North Point

**Present**

Prof Becky Loo	Chair
Mr Franklin Yu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Ms Pong Yuen-yee	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Dr Peter Cookson Smith	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Mr Patrick Lau	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr Tom Callahan	Representing Business Environment Council
Prof Carlos Lo	Representing Friends of the Earth
Ir Peter Wong	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Engineers
Ms Ida Lam	
Ms Dilys Chau	
Mrs Winnie Kang	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), Development Bureau (DEVB)
Miss Margrit Li	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) 1, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Mr Brandon Chau	Senior Manager (Tourism), Tourism Commission (TC)
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)
Mr Raymond Wong	Assistant Director of Planning/Territorial, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Edward Leung	Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr Nicholas Brooke

Dr Stefan Al

**In Attendance**

Miss Fiona Lung                      District Planning Officer/Kowloon, PlanD

Mr Tom Yip                              Senior Town Planner/Yau Tsim Mong, PlanD

**Action****Item 1      Confirmation of Minutes of the 11<sup>th</sup> meeting**

- 1.1      The draft minutes of the 11<sup>th</sup> meeting were circulated to Members on 10 January 2013. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated on 16 January 2013. The meeting confirmed the revised draft minutes without further amendments.

**Item 2      Matters Arising**

- 2.1      **The Chair** referred to the table on Departments' Responses to Follow-up Items for the 11<sup>th</sup> meeting on 20 November 2012, which was circulated to Members on 18 January 2013.

*Renovation of Salisbury Garden (para. 2.4 of the minutes of the 11<sup>th</sup> meeting)*

- 2.2      **The Chair** said that this item would be discussed under Agenda Item 3 of this meeting.

*Tsim Sha Tsui (TST) Pier and Bus Terminus (para. 2.20 of the minutes of the 11<sup>th</sup> meeting)*

- 2.3      **The Chair** said that TD was considering the initial scope of works for renovating the TST pier and simple renovation works were being carried out at the TST Pier Bus Terminus, which included providing tactile guide paths for the disabled, repainting bus and taxi passenger shelters and passenger railings, and repaving unsatisfactory parts of the carriageway. The works were expected to complete in mid-2013. **The Chair** considered that such short term measures were useful but not adequate to meet Members' expectation on TST waterfront.

Walking Tour (para. 2.30 and 4.15 of the minutes of the 11<sup>th</sup> meeting)

- 2.4 **The Chair** said that Harbour Unit had liaised with Transport and Housing Bureau and TD and TD would organise a walking tour to the TST Pier and Bus Terminus to brief Members on the latest developments.

Secretariat  
TD

[Post-meeting note: The walking tour to the TST Pier and Bus Terminus was held on 13 March 2013.]

At-grade Crossing at Salisbury Road (para. 3.23(a) and 3.24 of the minutes of the 11<sup>th</sup> meeting)

- 2.5 **The Chair** said that TD was studying the pros and cons of different options for an at-grade crossing at Salisbury Road to strike a balance between pedestrian and vehicular traffic.

Interdepartmental Working Group on Enhancement of Pedestrian Connectivity in TST (para. 3.25 of the minutes of the 11<sup>th</sup> meeting)

- 2.6 **The Chair** said that an interdepartmental working group on enhancement of pedestrian connectivity in TST had been formed and two meetings were held which aimed to synchronise the routings and signages with a view to producing a walking map for the TST harbourfront.

- 2.7 **Mrs Winnie Kang** supplemented that the working group, with the participation of relevant government departments as well as Mass Transit Railway Corporation Limited and Hong Kong Tourism Board, was set up to holistically review the existing signages and take forward enhancement measures. Its main objectives were:

- (a) review and synchronise, in phases, signages managed by various parties in the area;
- (b) identify and install necessary new signages;
- (c) remove or replace duplicated/misleading signages; and
- (d) produce an interactive walking map for the tourists and the general public.

- 2.8 **Mrs Winnie Kang** added that the working group had explored the most convenient routes from TST MTR stations to the harbourfront destinations such as TST Pier, Hong Kong Museum of Art, Avenue of Stars (AoS), etc. Relevant departments and institutions were now stocktaking the existing signages under their management along the routes so as to identify possible

improvements. Harbour Unit would report progress to the Task Force on a regular basis.

*Pedestrian Subway Connecting Sheraton Hotel to Middle Road Subway*  
(para. 3.26 of the minutes of the 11<sup>th</sup> meeting)

- 2.9 **The Chair** said that the Sheraton Hotel once submitted a proposal to construct a pedestrian subway connecting its basement to the existing Middle Road Subway, but the proposal was withdrawn in 2011 according to LandsD's information.

*Proposed Development in Yau Tong Bay Comprehensive Development Area*  
(para. 4.11(c) of the minutes of the 11<sup>th</sup> meeting)

- 2.10 **The Chair** said that the Task Force's views on the planning application were conveyed to the Town Planning Board (TPB) on 7 December 2012. The letter to the TPB was tabled at the meeting. The Metro Planning Committee of the TPB however deferred the application at its meeting on 21 December 2012.

*Study on Improving Yau Tong Waterfront Area* (para. 4.12 and 13 of the minutes of the 11<sup>th</sup> meeting)

- 2.11 **The Chair** remarked that the web link of the 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. Members' comments on the paper were conveyed to the Group on 19 December 2012.

- 2.12 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** made the following comments:

- (a) TC should organise the tour to the TST Pier area and revisit the enhancement project;
- (b) regarding the enhancement of the TST signage system, Harbour Unit could make reference to a project in London which studied how good quality mapping, routing and way finding information could be provided; and
- (c) more information on the proposal of developing a pedestrian subway connecting Sheraton Hotel to Middle Road Subway and the reason of its withdrawal should be provided.

[Post-meeting note: According to LandsD, the proposal was withdrawn in 2011 due to the applicant's commercial decision. The relevant information regarding the proposal was sent to

Members on 14 May 2013.]

2.13 **The Chair** made the following responses:

- (a) the walking tour would be useful for Members to have inputs from various parties involved in the TST Pier area. As the Secretariat was liaising with the concerned parties, it was not necessary to ask TC to take the lead in organising the tour;
- (b) all Members should have received the information on the London mapping project, and Harbour Unit was suggested to make reference to it; and
- (c) as the Task Force was exploring the possibility of having an at-grade crossing at Salisbury Road, the pedestrian subway proposal had become less urgent.

### **Item 3 Action Area**

(a) **Tsim Sha Tsui East and Tsim Sha Tsui West Action Areas**

3.1 **The Chair** welcomed the following representatives to the meeting:

#### **Revitalizing Tsim Sha Tsui Waterfront (Paper No. TFK/03/2013)**

##### New World Development Limited (NWD)

Mr Jeff Tung, Project Director

Ms Maria Cheung, General Manager, Corporate Communication

Mr Kelvin To, Project Manager

Mr Calvin Chan, Project Manager

Mr Daniel Pang, Project Manager

##### Masterplan Limited

Mr Ian Brownlee, Managing Director

##### James Corner Field Operations

Mr James Corner, Principal

Mr Keith O'Connor, Associate Partner

Mr Jayyun Jung, Senior Associate

##### Urbis Limited

Mr Alexander Duggie, Managing Director

Kohn Pedersen Fox Associates

Mr Paul Katz, Managing Principal

Mr Forth Bagley, Director

Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited

Ms Carmen Chu, Associate Director

**Provision of an Art Square at Salisbury Garden, Tsim Sha Tsui  
(Paper No. TFK/04/2013)**Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)

Dr Louis NG, Assistant Director (Heritage &amp; Museums)

Mr Tang Hoi-chiu, Chief Curator (Art/Special Projects)

Ms Tam Mei-yee, Eve, Chief Curator (Art), Hong Kong Museum  
of ArtArchitectural Services Department (ArchSD)

Miss Vivien Fung, Senior Architect/24

- 3.2 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** declared that he was the director of the Urbis Limited which was involved in NWD's proposal. **The Chair** considered that he could stay in the meeting but refrain from discussion.
- 3.3 **Mr Patrick Lau** declared that his company had business dealings with NWD but not on this proposal. **The Chair** considered that since his work and relation with NWD on this proposal was not direct, he could provide comments as usual.
- 3.4 **The Chair** informed Members that NWD would present a conceptual proposal for enhancing the TST waterfront with a focus on the waterfront area adjacent to the New World Centre and the Palace Mall sites. LCSD would then present the proposal for renovating the Salisbury Garden.
- 3.5 **Mr Ian Brownlee** and **Mr James Corner** representing NWD; and **Dr Louis NG** and **Ms TAM Mei-yee, Eve** of LCSD and ArchSD presented their respective papers with the aid of PowerPoints.
- 3.6 **The Chair** said that the intention of having the two presentations together was not asking Members to choose between the two proposals but to consider both proposals holistically from the Harbour Planning Principles (HPP) perspective. LCSD's Art Square would commence soon for completion by end 2013, while the New World Centre and Palace Mall renovation was scheduled for completion in the fourth quarter of 2016. NWD

considered that the Art Square proposal was compatible with their overall conceptual proposal.

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

- (a) the programme of all related works of both proposals should be carefully managed and a proponent should be identified;
- (b) since the area was popular for organising major events, sound, lighting, seating and other facilities for holding events should be built in as well as storage spaces for Police's crowd control arrangements so as to minimise set up time, reduce operation cost for the Police and avoid blockage of the area due to the presence of such equipments in normal days;
- (c) the NWD's initiative to develop an at-grade pedestrian crossing at Salisbury Road between Peninsula Hotel and Salisbury Garden was supported;
- (d) as regards LCSD's Art Square, as the entrance of the area, it should be designed on a temporary basis at this stage whilst its final design should be implemented to tie in with other renovation works at the entire Hong Kong Cultural Centre Complex (HKCCC);
- (e) adequate coach drop off and parking spaces for holding coaches should be provided; and
- (f) as a major pick-up/drop-off point for harbour cruise, the area should be designed taking into account the increasing demand for marine traffic.

3.8 **Mr Tom Callahan** raised the following comments:

- (a) The NWD's plan should be supported. Its buzzwords of green, people-oriented, engaging and interconnected were just what the area needed and it provided a much-needed holistic plan for the area as a whole, not just piecemeal plans for individual sites;
- (b) The NWD's plan was good for the areas between the buildings. However, it presently treated the buildings themselves as obstacles to be landscaped around. Rather, the plan needed to work with the buildings, open them up and use these to link the spaces in between;

- (c) the NWD's proposal at the moment was strong on amenity and aesthetic aspects, but could place more focus on the economic and business development angles, namely the provision of more small scale commercial activities and amenities that could draw visitors and therefore bring vibrancy to the site, providing utility to visitors and value added to Hong Kong's economy as a whole;
- (d) achieving vibrancy was not only just about good plans, but also proactive management. In recent years, this had tended to be interpreted as requiring private sector involvement. However, having worked on the plans for implementing Sites 4 and 7 in the New Central Harbourfront, involving the private sector in projects of this scale and sensitivity was challenging - the project needed to be financially viable, or at the very least cover its operating costs. How these areas might be procured and managed was therefore just as important an issue as their design and this needed to be considered upfront;
- (e) a holistic enhancement programme covering the entire area should be developed before implementing quick-win projects. The problem with quick-win projects was that they tended to come before the wider plans were in place and were then treated as untouchable and had to be built around. LCSD's plan for Salisbury Garden could therefore be supported in-principle provided that this project was not considered final which could be reviewed and amended as wider plans for the entire HKCCC area were developed;
- (f) before LCSD's Salisbury Garden plan was endorsed, the issue of the multitude of underground cables crossing the site should be sorted out; and
- (g) the provision of an at-grade pedestrian crossing at Salisbury Road was supported.

**3.9 Ms Pong Yuen-yee made the following comments:**

- (a) the proposals demonstrated a good example of public-private partnership and place making, and the timing for their implementation should be coordinated as appropriate;
- (b) relocation of the underground utilities could be a lengthy process and it would be important to make good use of space above ground;



- (c) the proposed removal of pillar boxes in Salisbury Garden was supported so that more space would be available for public enjoyment;
- (d) the idea of outdoor art performance in the Art Square was appreciated. However, with the development of West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD), the role of HKCCC might need to be repositioned. While the proposed Art Square could be more art-oriented, the eastern part of HKCCC might be more tourism oriented; and
- (e) outdoor café would be welcomed, but food kiosks, which could provide a wider choice of refreshments, should also be made available for the visitors.

3.10 **Prof Carlos Lo** expressed the following views:

- (a) NWD and LCSD should engage the Police early on crowd management arrangement for events during the planning stage;
- (b) while some commercial facilities could be provided to attract tourists, such facilities should not be excessive so that the provision of open space for public enjoyment would not be affected;
- (c) NWD and LCSD should consider reserving sufficient parking spaces for coaches and other vehicles; and
- (d) since the area was popular to both tourists and young people, NWD and LCSD might consider opening certain areas round the clock.

3.11 **Ms Ida Lam** supported the idea of displaying local art works at the Art Square. She also remarked that barrier-free facilities should be provided to facilitate the access of disabled and elderly.

3.12 While supporting the proposal of having an Art Square, **Ms Dilys Chau** considered that HKCCC should have its own function and character which were different from WKCD. She also considered that more food and beverage facilities should be provided so as to provide business opportunities for local operators.

3.13 **Ir Peter Wong** said that opportunity should be taken under the projects to re-route underground utilities so as to provide more ground space for planting trees.

3.14 **Mr Ian Brownlee** and **Mr James Corner** made the following responses:

- (a) various issues and suggestions raised by Members would be addressed in the detailed design;
- (b) management issues would need to be re-examined; and
- (c) as regards the access for the disabled and elderly, options such as provision of ramps would be considered.

3.15 **Mr Jeff Tung** supplemented that:

- (a) NWD would not only consider revitalising AoS, but also suggest possibilities in turning the TST harbourfront into a more energetic, holistic and accessible area for public enjoyment for future reference;
- (b) NWD would study the possibility to improve the pedestrian connectivity across Salisbury Road so as to attract more people to AoS while maintaining existing vehicular traffic circulation; and
- (c) a traffic impact study had been conducted which recommended slight adjustment of some drop-off facilities at the New World Centre and Palace Mall to facilitate both pedestrian and vehicular traffic.

3.16 **Dr Louis NG** made the following responses:

- (a) a coordinating team had been formed in LCSD to oversee various tasks related to LCSD's initiative to renovate HKCCC;
- (b) Members' comments would be addressed when taking forward the renovation proposals. LCSD would work with NWD and other departments, and report progress to the Task Force in due course; and
- (c) interim storage areas could be provided either at the Hong Kong Museum of Art or the renovated Salisbury Garden. Permanent storage facilities might be provided in the Hong Kong Culture Centre upon its renovation.

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

- (a) the Government welcomed NWD's creative idea which aimed to enhance the vibrancy and accessibility to the TST harbourfront with a view to making it a world-class waterfront and tourism destination, and NWD was encouraged to continue discussing with relevant government departments, especially LCSD on taking forward its proposal;
- (b) various technical, land, management, and financing issues involved in the conceptual idea should be further examined; and
- (c) the suggestion to widen the promenade and the proposed harbour terrace in the area fronting the New World Centre would encroach onto the water body, and might have implication on the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO). NWD should take this factor into account when considering the initiative.

3.18 **Mr Franklin Yu** made the following comments:

- (a) he welcomed the collaboration between public and private sectors with a view to creating a more vibrant TST waterfront;
- (b) the provision of an at-grade crossing at Salisbury Road with a view to enhancing accessibility to the waterfront was worth considering;
- (c) spontaneous performances in the Art Square should be encouraged; and
- (d) the TST Pier area might be included as part of NWD's proposal.

3.19 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** supported **Mr Franklin Yu's** view and commented further on the proposals as follows:

- (a) the visual corridor from Nathan Road to the waterfront should be preserved and enhanced;
- (b) a traffic study should be undertaken to further explore the proposed at-grade crossing at Salisbury Road;
- (c) a proponent should be identified for the proposed enhancement projects;

- (d) outdoor seating areas along the waterfront should be added; and
- (e) the project proponent to be identified was encouraged to go through the PHO process so as to establish the overriding public need for the proposal if any was needed.

- 3.20 **Mr Tom Callahan** enquired if the PHO implication would be referred to the Task Force on Water-land Interface for discussion. **The Chair** responded that this Task Force would work with the other Task Forces as necessary.
- 3.21 **Dr Louis NG** said that it would be difficult to demolish part of the existing Hong Kong Museum of Art for the purpose of preserving a visual corridor.
- 3.22 **The Chair** concluded that the Task Force welcomed NWD's initiative and conceptual idea with a view to making the TST a world-class waterfront. NWD's attempt to further examine the feasibility of an at-grade crossing at Salisbury Road was also supported. She advised NWD to take into account Members' comments and continue to engage relevant departments in taking forward the proposal.
- 3.23 **The Chair** also advised LCSD to take into account Members' comments in enhancing the proposal of the Art Square. She considered that the proposal should be supported as it would enhance leisure facilities and bring vibrancy to the harbourfront. She suggested that LCSD to continue liaising with NWD so that a holistic enhancement could be implemented for the TST waterfront.
- 3.24 **The Chair** further said that the Task Force would champion the enhancement of this important part of harbourfront areas. Different parties should coordinate among themselves to come up with a holistic scheme, and update the Task Force in due course.

**Item 4 Proposed Hotel Development at "Comprehensive Development Area (1)" Site at the Junction of Hung Luen Road and Wa Shun Street in Hung Hom (Paper No. TFK/01/2013)**

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

Shangri-La Hotel (Kowloon) Limited

Ms Lillian Tsui, Deputy Design Director - Architecture

Rocco Design Architects Limited

Mr Rocco Yim, Executive Director

Mr William Tam, Director

Mr C M Chan, Director

Mr Freddie Hai, Senior Associate

Townland Consultants Limited

Ms Cindy Tsang, Director

Mr Ben Cheung, Senior Town Planner

Ms Janet Ngai, Assistant Town Planner

Adrian L. Norman Limited

Mr Adrian Norman, Managing Director

Ms Lucy Yip, Project Landscape Designer

Parsons Brinckerhoff

Mr Dicken Wu, Technical Director

- 4.2 **The Chair** said that the website links of the following reference/background materials had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting:
- (a) Paper No. 6/2009 "Draft Planning Briefs for 'Comprehensive Development Area (1)' Site (KIL 11205) and 'Comprehensive Development Area (2)' Site (KIL 11111) on the Draft Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K9/21"; and
  - (b) Extracted minutes of the former HEC Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review meeting on 18 March 2009.
- 4.3 **The Chair** supplemented that the subject site, i.e. KIL 11205, was disposed by tender in December 2011 and was governed by a Planning Brief endorsed by the Metro Planning Committee of the TPB in June 2009. According to the Hung Hom OZP and the Planning Brief, the subject site was intended for hotel, retail and public transport interchange (PTI) uses. The proponent had prepared a conceptual design for an 18-storey hotel with retail facilities and a PTI to seek the Task Force's preliminary views. A section 16 application was just submitted to the TPB.
- 4.4 **Ms Cindy Tsang** and **Mr Rocco Yim** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

- 4.5 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** enquired the following:
- (a) how the subject development would be connected with neighbouring area;
  - (b) visual and illumination intrusion could be dealt with as this could be a concern of nearby residents;
  - (c) whether the developer would design, manage and maintain the proposed park to the east, upgrade the waterfront promenade fronting the hotel development and revitalise the Hung Hom Ferry Pier; and
  - (d) how the PTI would be designed to avoid creating the “wall effect” against the area behind the development.
- 4.6 **Ms Pong Yuen-ye**e asked if there would be any ventilation shafts placed around the site or at the promenade for air ventilation of the PTI and the underground carpark.
- 4.7 **Prof Carlos Lo** said that green facilities should be considered in the early planning stage. He wondered how far the green concept had been adopted in the project.
- 4.8 **Mr Franklin Yu** appreciated the comparison of the notional scheme with the preferred scheme, which showed the likely “wall effect” if the design adhered strictly to the planning parameters of the OZP. He enquired whether the proposed setback area with alfresco dining facilities, which could be a connection between the urban park to the east and the promenade, would be accessible to the public.
- 4.9 **Ms Cindy Tsang, Mr Rocco Yim and Ms Lillian Tsui** made the following responses:
- (a) the scheme had taken into account the pedestrian connections comprehensively with the neighbouring areas. A pedestrian walkway was planned along the western boundary of the site to link Hung Luen Road to the waterfront. Provision was also made for future possible footbridge links to the pier and the urban park to the east;
  - (b) the preferred scheme had a softer building façade as compared with the notional scheme;
  - (c) the PTI would serve as another major entrance to the hotel,

and would be well designed to give visitors a good impression;

- (d) while illumination of the hotel would be subject to detailed design, a subtle approach would be adopted on the side facing the residential area. More lighting would be provided at the ground floor level;
- (e) retail facilities and food and beverage outlets would be provided around the perimeter of the PTI at the ground level, especially along the waterfront and fronting the proposed urban park; and
- (f) the setback area between the waterfront promenade and the urban park would be accessible to the public.

4.10 On green facilities, **Mr Rocco Yim** advised that the hotel design, including the performance of electrical equipments, mechanical installations and ventilation, aimed to achieve the gold standard in Hong Kong Building Environment Assessment Method. Good ventilation performance could be achieved by the provision of setback and decks with ample horizontal and vertical planting.

4.11 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** further commented that the PTI would be larger than the current facility and could have a significant impact on the ground level environment. He suggested that the footprint of the PTI should be reviewed. **The Chair** considered that such issue could be considered at the detailed design stage.

4.12 **The Chair** concluded that the Task Force would give an in-principle support to the proposed scheme based on the discussion. The project team was advised to take into account Members' comments in the detailed design of the project. The comments would also be summarised and submitted to the TPB for consideration.

[Post-meeting note: The Task Force's views on the planning application were conveyed to the TPB on 25 February 2012.]

## **Item 5 Conceptual Design of a Dry Weather Flow Interceptor at Cherry Street Box Culvert (Paper No. TFK/02/2013)**

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

Drainage Services Department (DSD)

Mr Gabriel Woo, Chief Engineer  
Mr Raymond Seit, Senior Engineer  
Ms Elaine Wong, Engineer

Black & Veatch Hong Kong Limited

Mr Kelvin Lau, Project Director  
Mr Glenn Chan, Project Manager  
Mr Colin Chan, Senior Engineer

A-Lead Architects Limited

Mr Kentis Beh, Associate

- 5.2 **The Chair** said that DSD proposed to construct a dry weather flow interceptor (DWFI) at Cherry Street Box Culvert (CSBC) in Tai Kok Tsui (TKT) to collect the polluted flow during dry weather in order to improve the water quality and associated odour problem at the New Yau Ma Tei Typhoon Shelter (NYMTTS). A major portion of the site was zoned “Open Space” on the draft South West Kowloon Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K20/27 and a planning application to the TPB would be required for implementing the project. About 75% of the area could still be available for public enjoyment upon completion of the project.
- 5.3 **Mr Gabriel Woo** and **Mr Kelvin Lau** presented the conceptual design of the DWFI paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 5.4 **Ms Pong Yuen-ye**e asked if the requirement for maintenance access would constrain the design of the site for public use. As the proposed pumping station was at a prominent waterfront location, she suggested that the project proponent apply suitable design and provide more greening so as to make it more compatible with the harbour setting.
- 5.5 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** raised the following comments/questions:
- (a) the design of the water edge should be consistent with the adjoining waterfront and TKT Advance Promenade in that the bollards should be provided and railings should be setback for tying boats;
  - (b) to adopt a more creative design with greening and sheltered seatings; and
  - (c) whether the pumping station site would be opened for public access.



5.6 **Mr Franklin Yu** gave the following comments:

- (a) the design of the open space should be compatible with the adjacent TKT Advance Promenade;
- (b) the proposed pumping station should be relocated to the area to the south of the site so as to allow more open space at the northern part of the site. If it was not feasible, a more open design for the pumping station should be adopted to connect and integrate with the TKT Advance Promenade; and
- (c) whether the bollards along the pavement of Hoi Fai Road were necessary.

5.7 **Mr Tom Callahan** enquired the need for having the DWFI at the proposed waterfront location, noting that there were two other possible sites further away from the waterfront.

5.8 **The Chair** raised questions on the potential noise and odour impact arising from the DWFI to the nearby residents and the operation pattern of the DWFI.

5.9 **Mr Kelvin Lau** made the following responses:

- (a) the DWFI was planned to operate in both dry season and non-rainy days of the wet season to intercept polluted flow collected at the CSBC. An deodorizer would be installed to minimize the odour impact to the neighbouring areas;
- (b) to optimize the interception efficiency, the DWFI had to be located directly above the downstream section near the outfall of the existing CSBC. Three potential sites were identified. The other two alternative sites (open square outside Central Park near Olympic City and Cherry Street Park) were currently used for leisure and event purposes, and would unlikely be supported by local residents. It would also be less effective to have the facility in the upstream and construction and future operation and maintenance would cause disturbance to the residential area. In view of the above considerations, the current site was proposed; and
- (c) CSBC was an existing 8-cell drainage box culvert and the penstocks should be built according to the box culvert's fixed alignment. In addition, an emergency bypass box culvert

had to be built at the south part of the site to allow normal stormwater flow during installation of the facility. A paved vehicular access would also be required for maintenance vehicles. While shrub planting could be considered at the periphery of the site, the operational and maintenance requirements would render tree planting in large quantity not feasible. Erection of a roof on top of penstocks might affect the underground structure of interceptors and might have undesirable visual impact. Nevertheless, seating benches with some shrub planting would be provided in the area facing the NYMTTS for public use, whilst as a whole, the open space would be designed to tie in with TKT Advance Promenade.

5.10 **Mr Gabriel Woo** supplemented as follows:

- (a) there was a genuine need that the DWFI should be installed at this waterfront site to maximise its effectiveness while most part of the site could still be opened for public use; and
- (b) in view of the limited width between Hoi Fai Road and the seafront, the footprint of the proposed pumping station had been minimized to allow the provision of a 3.5m wide (on average) waterfront promenade to connect with the TKT Advance Promenade. A pedestrian walkway would also be provided to link up the waterfront promenade with Hoi Fai Road.

5.11 In response to **the Chair's** enquiry and **Mr Franklin Yu's** suggestion to relocate the proposed pumping station, **Mr Gabriel Woo** advised that the existing Hoi Fai Road Pumping Station site together with the area proposed for the emergency bypass culvert was not large enough to accommodate the proposed new pumping station.

5.12 **Mr Kelvin Lau** supplemented that DSD had studied the option of placing the pumping station at the south part of the site but considered it not feasible due to insufficient space available. The pumping station had been designed to minimize its above-ground structures.

5.13 **Mrs Winnie Kang** said that the project was important for improving the water quality and associated odour problem at the NYMTTS. Harbour Unit would continue to liaise with DSD on improving the design with a view to tying in with the TKT Advance Promenade as well as making more open space

available for public use. DSD would revise the design after taking into account Members' comments and circulate to Members for further comments.

5.14 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** made further comments as follows:

- (a) an additional access point between the pumping station and the penstocks was suggested to enhance the pedestrian access to the promenade;
- (b) shading with a roof which would not affect the sightline should be incorporated in the design;
- (c) details such as frequency of maintenance works should be provided; and
- (d) the pedestrian access to the existing landing steps nearby should be covered either in this project or in the TKT Advance Promenade project.

5.15 **Mr Tom Callahan** noted the DSD's comment that the DWFI would capture 70% of pollution and asked for clarification as to whether this 70% referred to 70% of all pollution from that source or 70% of all pollution into the typhoon shelter. **The Chair** asked DSD to respond on this at the next meeting.

**DSD**

5.16 **The Chair** concluded that the Task Force recognised the need for the proposed DWFI which could make TKT waterfront more pleasant and attractive for public enjoyment. The project team should take into account Members' comments, explore opportunities to improve the design of the DWFI and submit a revised design for Task Force's consideration in due course.

## **Item 6 Planning Review on Development of Ex-Cha Kwo Ling Kaolin Mine Site (Paper No. TFK/05/2013)**

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

### Planning Department

Mr Eric Yue, Chief Town Planner/Housing & Office Land Supply  
Miss Paulina Kwan, Senior Town Planner/Housing & Office Land Supply 1

6.2 **The Chair** said that the subject planning review was commissioned by PlanD in July 2011 with a view to releasing the

upper part of the Kaolin Mine site early for housing development. The preferred option proposed a private housing development of 15 residential blocks ranging from 16-22 storeys which would provide around 2 200 flats for accommodating a population of about 6 000. The Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC) was consulted on the preferred option on 8 January 2013. After completion of the planning review, an engineering feasibility study would be conducted by CEDD.

- 6.3 **Mr Eric Yue** and **Miss Paulina Kwan** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 6.4 **The Chair** commented that the presentation seemed to have addressed some of the HPPs.
- 6.5 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** raised the following comments:
- (a) the planning review should attempt to make the proposed development different from other parts of Kowloon East which was characterized by homogeneous buildings. Efforts should be made to change the monotonous appearance of the building and improve the visual appearance of the area; and
  - (b) the future alignment of the new road to connect with Trunk Road T2 should be shown in the presentation.
- 6.6 **Prof Carlos Lo** asked if KTDC was advised during the consultation that the project needed to meet the HPPs. He also enquired if other stakeholders such as green groups would be consulted, and if so, whether it would be in a formal or informal manner.
- 6.7 **Mr Eric Yue** made the following responses:
- (a) as the proposed site was situated within harbourfront areas, the HPPs had been taken into account in formulating the development parameters including the development scale and building height, which were accepted by KTDC. KTDC did not raise any comments that were contravened to the HPPs. Their main concern was on the traffic issues in Kwun Tong;
  - (b) opportunities and constraints of the site had been identified in the baseline review as a basis for formulating development options. The proposal had taken into account

the surrounding characteristics including the building height, terrain, topography, etc. and minimized the extent of site formation. Only medium density development was put forth to ensure that the proposed development would be compatible with the surrounding area;

- (c) various sustainable planning guidelines including stepped building height had been considered. The proposed development would blend in well with the surrounding existing developments such as Laguna City and Sceneway Garden;
- (d) as Trunk Road T2 would be built underground, it was not shown in the photomontage. The ex-quarry access road off Sin Fat Road would be upgraded to serve as the main access to the proposed development and no other access was proposed;
- (e) effort would be made to preserve the green area and the knoll, improve the pedestrian walkway, and reserve two 20-metres wide view corridors and breezeways. Building disposition would also meet the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines; and
- (f) the public consultation was open and transparent. Both formal and informal consultations had been undertaken. The formal one included consultation with KTDC. Green Sense had also expressed their opinions in their written submission. Informal ones included site visit with the concerned local parties and District Councilors, and meetings with the residents of Laguna City and Cha Kwo Ling Village were being arranged.

6.8 **Mr Franklin Yu** commented that the buildings were still quite congested despite two view corridors and breezeways were proposed. He suggested removing one or two building and increasing the building height slightly for the remaining blocks while keeping the floor area intact in order to improve the visual effect of the proposed development.

6.9 **The Chair** concluded that PlanD should take into account Members' comments in finalizing the planning review for the site. She added that despite the statement made on proactive harbour enhancement, both the paper and presentation had not demonstrated the required urban design quality and environmental enhancement works in fulfilling the HPPs. PlanD

might need to elaborate more on how the proposal could fulfil the HPPs when finalising the review.

## **Item 7 Any Other Business**

### Action Areas for Next Meeting

- 7.1 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested arranging a walking tour to Tsuen Wan area. **The Chair** considered that the visit could be arranged when there was substantial progress to be discussed. As some progress and update were expected from the interdepartmental working group on enhancement of pedestrian connectivity in TST and the enhancement of the TST Pier area, **the Chair** suggested and the meeting agreed that the next meeting should continue to focus on the TST East and West Action Areas.

**Secretariat**

### Lei Yue Mun Car Parking Sites under Short Term Tenancies (STTs)

- 7.2 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that it was difficult to ensure the standard of the landscaping work in the temporary car parking sites in Lei Yue Mun. He was of the view that specifications of the perimeter design should be incorporated in the future renewal of tenancy agreement. Regarding the rezoning proposal of STT No. KX 2564, he would offer input should the opportunity arise.

### Zoning Amendment to the Middle Road Car Park Building

- 7.3 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that he was concerned that no new coach parking or coach holding area was incorporated in the zoning amendment to the Middle Road Car Park site in TST. **Mrs Winne Kang** responded that the site was outside the harbourfront areas and the purview of the Task Force, and hence it would not be discussed at the Task Force meeting.

- 7.4 **The Chair** suggested that the issues regarding Lei Yue Mun STT sites and coach parking in TST could be considered as follow-up actions by departments, if required.

**Secretariat**

### Next Task Force Meeting

- 7.5 **The Chair** said that the next meeting was tentatively scheduled for May 2013. Members would be informed of the exact meeting date in due course.
- 7.6 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at

6:35pm.

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