

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

Minutes of Fifteenth Meeting

Date : 12 February 2014
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
Dr Peter Cookson SMITH	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Ir Prof CHOY Kin-kuen	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Ivan HO	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Mr Franklin YU	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Shuki LEUNG	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Prof Raymond FUNG	
Mr CHOW Ping-tim	
Mr Derek HUNG	
Mr SHUM Siu Hung	
Mr Thomas CHAN	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mrs Winnie KANG	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Edward LEUNG	Senior Manager (Tourism) 2, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr YEUNG Min	Chief Traffic Engineer/ Kowloon (Atg.), Transport Department (TD)
Ms Joyce YY LAU	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

Ms April KUN Chief Town Planner/Studies & Research,
Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Mann MH CHOW Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr LAM Kin-lai
Mr LAU Chun-kong
Mr Paul Chan Yuen-king
Ms Nancy POON Siu-ping

In Attendance

Mr Tom YIP District Planning Officer/ Kowloon, PlanD
Ms Michelle YUEN Senior Town Planner/Yau Tsim
Mong(Atg.), PlanD

Action

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed Professor Raymond FUNG Wing-kee, Adjunct Associate Professor of the Chinese University of Hong Kong, for joining the Task Force to provide advice from art and cultural perspective.

The Chair also welcomed the following co-opted members nominated by the relevant District Councils (DC) for joining the Task Force to provide advice from district perspective:

- Mr CHOW Ping-tim, nominated by Tsuen Wan DC
- Mr Derek HUNG Chiu-wah, nominated by Yau Tsim Mong DC
- Ms Nancy POON Siu-ping, nominated by Kwai Tsing DC
- Mr SHUM Siu-hung, nominated by Sham Shui Po DC

The Chair advised Members that Mr Edward LEUNG, Senior Manager of TC, attended the meeting on behalf of Ms Emily MO; Mr YEUNG Min, Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon (Atg.) of TD attended on behalf of Mr Wilson PANG; and Ms Joyce LAU, Senior Engineer of CEDD attended on behalf of Mr Janson WONG; and Ms April KUN, Chief Town Planner of PlanD attended on behalf of Ms Amy CHEUNG.

The Chair also welcomed Mr Mann MH CHOW as the new Secretary of the Task Force and thanked Mr Edward LEUNG, the ex-Secretary of the Task Force for his valuable support to the Task Force.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 14th Meeting

- 1.1 The draft minutes of the 14th meeting held on 2 December 2013 were circulated to Members on 24 January 2014. As no comments had been received, the meeting confirmed the draft minutes without amendment.

Item 2 Matters Arising

Enhancement of Pedestrian Connectivity in Tsim Sha Tsui (TST) (para. 4.5 of the minutes of the 14th meeting)

- 2.1 **The Chair** informed the meeting that the pedestrian connection arrangement after the closure of Sogo proposed by the New World Development (NWD) was circulated to Members on 20 January 2014. Comments raised by Members had been conveyed to TD and NWD.
- 2.2 **Mr YEUNG** Min informed the meeting that NWD would open up a temporary access from basement to the ground level through an emergency exits if approval could be obtained from the Fire Services Department, for the scenario that Exit J4 of TST MTR Station is closed before the opening of the at-grade pedestrian crossing on Salisbury Road. However, NWD now planned to defer the closure of Exit J4 by about one year. Since the at-grade pedestrian crossing would be operational by then, pedestrian connectivity in the area would not be a concern.
- 2.3 **The Chair** informed Members that the Task Force had asked the Lands Department (LandsD) to look into the legal interpretation of the lease to ascertain if the grantee of the lot had any obligation under the lease to provide and maintain a public access near Exit J4 of TST MTR Station for public use. As NWD's proposal had indicated that a public access near Exit J4 would be provided, no further follow-up action was required in this regard.

Progress Update on the West Kowloon Cultural District (para. 5.15 of the minutes of the 14th meeting)

- 2.4 **The Chair** said that the West Kowloon Cultural District Authority (WKCDA) would consult Members on the application for minor relaxation of development intensity under Agenda Item 5 of this meeting.

Any Other Business (para. 7.2 of the minutes of the 14th meeting)

- 2.5 Concerning the site visit to the Tsuen Wan waterfront, the Task Force Secretariat was liaising with the Secretariat of Tsuen Wan District Council (TWDC) to organise a sharing session cum site visit between members of the Task Force and TWDC. The Secretariat would issue invitation to Members when the date was confirmed.

Item 3 Action Areas - Tsim Sha Tsui East and Tsim Sha Tsui West Action Areas

Renovation of the Hong Kong Museum of Art (Paper No. TFK/01/2014)

- 3.1 **The Chair** invited Members to declare interests and welcomed the following representatives to the meeting:

Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)

Dr Louis NG, Assistant Director (Heritage & Museums)

Ms Eve TAM, Chief Curator (Art)

Mr TANG Hoi-chiu, Chief Curator (Special Projects)

Mr CHAN Ki-hung, Chief Curator (Special Projects) (Des.)

Ms Pat WONG, Manager (Special Projects)

Architectural Services Department (ArchSD)

Ms Alice YEUNG, Chief Architect

Ms Vivien FUNG, Senior Architect

Mr Job WEI, Senior Project Manager

Ms Lilian CHEUNG, Project Manager

Mr Billy LAW, Architect

Mr Tony LAU, Architect

- 3.2 **Prof Raymond Fung** said that he had worked in ArchSD before retirement. The Chair suggested and Members agreed that it was not considered as a direct conflict of interest and **Prof Raymond Fung** could stay in the meeting and participate in the discussion.
- 3.3 **The Chair** said that the Task Force was briefed on the renovation plan of Hong Kong Museum of Art (HKMA) at the 13th meeting on 16 May 2013, and LCSD would like to update Members on the revised renovation plan.
- 3.4 **Dr Louis NG** and **Ms Eve TAM** of LCSD, and **Ms Vivien FUNG** of ArchSD, presented the paper with the aid of PowerPoint.
- 3.5 **Prof Raymond Fung** appreciated the latest design of HKMA as it had already taken into account comments received in the course of public engagement. The proposed design did not only offer a new outlook, but also resolve the problems of spatial, transparency and façade treatment. The design had addressed the need and respected the trend of modern architecture, which could enable the renovated HKMA to stand out in the Tsim Sha Tsui (TST) waterfront.
- 3.6 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired if any facilities would be provided to support outdoor events along the waterfront and whether the area between the east end of HKMA and the MTRC ventilation shaft would be closed during construction. He also asked the location of the area that would be designated for alfresco dining and whether retail kiosks would be provided during construction. He added that the walkway between the Space Museum and HKMA should be enhanced.
- 3.7 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** expressed that the public area at the ground floor should be redesigned to enhance vibrancy of harbourfront. He added that the upper level should be more transparent; the landscaping proposal should be improved; more space should be allocated for outdoor exhibition; and the restaurant at the ground floor should be enlarged to take full advantage of the harbour view.
- 3.8 **Mr Derek HUNG** said that with the proposal to re-provision the at-grade pedestrian crossing at Salisbury Road, the YTMDC supported the renovation project to provide more quality art and cultural facilities and urged that the project be taken forward as soon as possible.

3.9 **Dr Louis NG and Ms Vivien FUNG** responded as follows:

- (a) the Art Square at Salisbury Garden to be opened on 22 February 2014 would provide a cultural oasis where visitors could enjoy artwork, public open space and the waterfront at the same time. The Salisbury Garden would be integrated with other open space in the area for organising events;
- (b) a larger café would be available on the first floor after renovation. LCSD would review the provision of catering services in the entire Hong Kong Cultural Centre Complex (HKCCC) and TST waterfront area in the overall master plan for HKCCC. When the NWD project and the Phase II Salisbury Garden were completed, there would be several other restaurant outlets in the area. The feasibility of providing catering services in the kiosks at the Art Square of Salisbury Garden during construction would be explored;
- (c) more space would be opened to the public on the ground floor. LCSD would explore the feasibility of allowing public access through the lobby of HKMA and the gallery free of charge outside the opening hour of the museum. The walkway in the Salisbury Garden managed by NWD and pedestrian connection from the car park to HKMA and the Hong Kong Cultural Centre (HKCC) would be reviewed holistically in future;
- (d) the provision of supporting facilities for outdoor events would be considered in the overall master plan. Lighting for the external art display would be provided in the Art Square after the Phase I renovation of the Salisbury Garden;
- (e) whilst the HKMA building would be fenced off during construction, sufficient walkway would be provided to ensure smooth pedestrian flow within HKCCC; and
- (f) no parking space would be provided within HKMA. Visitors might use the car parks of HKCC and the nearby shopping malls. Loading and unloading bays would be provided in HKMA, but there would be stringent control on its usage to minimize nuisances to visitors.

- 3.10 **Ms Michelle YUEN** added that if the proposal involves amendments to the approved scheme classified as Class B or beyond under the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 36A, planning approval from TPB would be required. Further, LCSD as the applicant was reminded to comply with the approval conditions as imposed by TPB regarding landscaping, fire safety and fire service installation.
- 3.11 **Ir Prof CHOY Kin-kuen** opined that a larger green roof should be provided.
- 3.12 **Mr Franklin YU** appreciated the efforts of the project team in enhancing the proposal and commented that the proposed canopy and new entrance at the north-eastern corner of the museum would enhance the pedestrian connectivity to the harbourfront and the glazed entrance would attract visitors to the open area between the Space Museum and HKMA. He enquired whether it would be feasible to redevelop the HKMA building.
- 3.13 **Mr Ivan HO** said that more covered public space at the ground floor should be provided and it was worth exploring to open the roof to the public. LCSD should continue organising events at the nearby open space during construction so as to maintain the vibrancy of the waterfront.
- 3.14 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that the overall master plan for HKCCC should show the temporary and permanent uses including the location that outdoor events could be organised, and the loading/unloading area should be shielded off by hoarding.
- 3.15 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** suggested relocating the storage facilities from the ground level fronting the waterfront to upper levels or basement so that shops, café, restaurants, etc. could be provided at the harbourfront side.
- 3.16 **Mr CHOW Ping-tim** opined that an innovative approach could be adopted to integrate activities with the building such as providing facilities at the waterfront side for public enjoyment.
- 3.17 **Dr Louis NG** responded that:
- (a) the project did not only cover museum renovation, but also

involve reorientation of indoor and outdoor space and coordination of artistic and non-artistic elements. The software aspect such as the number and types of exhibitions to be held at the Art Square, interface between indoor and outdoor exhibition space, type of exhibition, etc. could be fine-tuned in future, and waterfront activities such as digital art exhibition could also be explored;

- (b) a large store room would be provided for storing mill barriers and other back of house equipment and tools. Upon completion of the central repository of exhibits/ collections in Tin Shui Wai, the area originally used for storing exhibits in HKMA might be made available for other uses;
- (c) artistic drawing would be used to beautify the hoarding of the site during construction. Some exhibitions would continue in the newly refurbished Salisbury Garden and Art Square to provide an artistic ambience and maintain vibrancy of the area; and
- (d) LCSD would work closely with NWD on Phase II renovation of the Salisbury Garden, AOS and New World Centre. The preliminary overall master plan would be available by end 2014 and the Task Force would be consulted in due course.

3.18 **Ms Vivien FUNG** supplemented that due to site constraint, opening the roof for public access was infeasible but some roof greening could be provided at the Central Block and Annex Block. Adopting a cantilevered design for the building was also not technically feasible. A shutter gate would be proposed to shield off the loading and unloading bay. A good management plan would be prepared to ensure proper use of the loading and unloading area. In response to **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH's** question on the feasibility of having an entrance as the harbourfront side by removing the external wall at the ground floor, **Ms Vivien FUNG** explained that the wall was a supporting structure and demolishing it would affect the structural integrity of the building.

3.19 **The Chair** concluded that the Task Force in general appreciated the departments' efforts in revising the renovation plan with reference to Harbour Planning Principles, and considered that the Art Square adjacent to HKMA would be an important venue for organising outdoor exhibitions and maintaining the functions of

HKMA during its renovation. She asked the project team to take into account Members' comments when finalising the renovation plan, with particular attention to further enhancement of the public area at the ground level for public enjoyment and complying with the approval conditions of the planning application. The Task Force should be engaged when the overall master plan was available.

LCSD

Item 4 Reprovisioning of Food and Environmental Hygiene Department Sai Yee Street Environmental Hygiene Offices-cum-Vehicle Depot at Yen Ming Road, West Kowloon Reclamation Area (Paper No. TFK/02/2014)

4.1 **The Chair** invited members to declare interests, and welcomed the following representatives to the meeting:

Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD)

Mr YK FAN, Assistant Director (Operations)²

Mr David CHOI, Principal Executive Officer

Mr Matthew TANG, Government Transport Manager

Architectural Services Department (ArchSD)

Mr SH SAT, Senior Project Manager

Mr LUK Tong-yiu, Project Manager

P&T Architects and Engineers Ltd

Mr William YUEN, Group Director

Mr Jess YEUNG, Associate

Mr YAU Kin Pui, Matt, Associate Director

URS Hong Kong Ltd

Mr Thomas WONG, Principal Environmental Engineer

Urbis Ltd

Mr TRAN Tuan Huy, Senior Associate Director

4.2 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** declared that he was the director of one of the consultants involved in the project. **The Chair** decided and Members agreed that he could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion.

- 4.3 **Mr YK FAN** of FEHD and **Mr William YUEN** of P&T Architects and Engineers Ltd presented the paper with the aid of PowerPoint.
- 4.4 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired about the zoning and the planned long term use of the site in front of the project site to the waterfront and how the project would comply with the waste management strategy. In view of the changing policy in waste management and increasing demand for recycling, he considered that the capacity of the proposed depot would be inadequate.
- 4.5 **Mr Franklin YU** commented that the building should facilitate pedestrian connectivity from the hinterland to the waterfront. He enquired whether the offices at the upper floors were of any supporting function and any specific measures would be implemented to mitigate potential nuisances arising from vehicle cleaning or maintenance on the ground floor.
- 4.6 **Mr Shuki LEUNG** opined that although the reprovisioning would release the site at Mongkok for other uses, the project team should not merely focus on meeting departmental needs when choosing a suitable site and drawing up design for the facility. He supported the provision of a resource centre for public use and enquired if there were building height and plot ratio restrictions for the site.
- 4.7 **The Chair** supported the idea of providing a resource centre to promote waste management knowledge and enquired about the details of the centre.
- 4.8 **Mr CHOW Ping-tim** queried if the resources centre would be able to attract visitors given its remote location and a boring building design. He suggested better decorating the outlook of the building.
- 4.9 **Mr YK FAN** and **Mr William YUEN** made the following responses:
- (a) the main objective of the project was to provide a functional building to accommodate offices cum depot to maintain provision of efficient environmental hygiene services to the nearby districts while allowing public use of some areas of the building;

- (b) existing offices in the Sai Yee Street site, including the Mongkok District Hawker Control Team, Kowloon Region Hawker Control Taskforce, Environmental Hygiene Section and the Licensing Office for Hawkers and Markets, had to be reprovisioned in the building. Around 600 officers would work in the proposed building and there was a genuine need to provide office accommodation within the building;
- (c) around 70 vehicles serving Yau Tsim Mong and Shum Shui Po districts currently parked in East Kowloon would be relocated to the proposed depot to enhance efficiency of public services and reduce dead mileage and pollution on the road. The refuse collection vehicles (RCVs) would not be loaded with refuse when leaving or entering the depot and it was expected that the facility would not cause significant nuisance to the nearby residential area; and
- (d) the resource centre would provide information on food safety to the trade and public, and facilitate conducting educational activities for schools.

4.10 **The Chair** asked the project team to provide information after the meeting on details of the resource centre.

(Post-meeting note: FEHD advised that during the local consultation process, nearby secondary schools suggested to include a resource centre in the new building to serve the community. FEHD would organise talks and exhibitions relating to food safety and students and operators in the trade would be visitors of the resource centre. The resource centre would also provide meeting venue for local and overseas visitors. The proposed resource centre was compatible with the existing "Government, Institution or Community" (G/IC) zone to provide community facilities serving the needs of the local residents.)

4.11 In response to the enquiry on the planning restrictions of the site, **Ms Michelle YUEN** informed Members that the site was zoned "G/IC" with no building height or GFA restriction according to the draft South West Kowloon Outline Zoning Plan.

4.12 **Mr Derek HUNG** said that local residents had strongly requested to convert the Sai Yee Street site into a public transport interchange to improve the traffic problem in MongKok area for over 10 years, and he appreciated FEHD's efforts in searching for an alternative site in Yau Tsim Mong district for relocating the

facility. He enquired the possibility of increasing the plot ratio of the site to incorporate more facilities/floor areas for Hong Kong Police Force, Fire Services Department and Marine Department to provide supporting services to enhance marine safety.

- 4.13 **Mr Ivan HO** doubted if the proposed project could help enhance the harbourfront and there was no interface planned between the depot and the neighbouring environment. He commented that the design of the building might not respond to the need of the community in particular the demand for more public space. He suggested that the project team should revise the design at the ground level to incorporate facilities that would help enhance the environment of and pedestrian connectivity to the waterfront.
- 4.14 **Mr Franklin YU** said that since the building would accommodate some offices and the public might also visit the building, there should be measures to segregate those unfavourable uses and improve the greening of the building. He added that the resource centre could be designed in an innovative way so as to attract visitors.
- 4.15 **Mr Shuki LEUNG** expressed that the project should not only beautify and add value to the harbourfront, but could also help achieve a balance between a leisure harbour and a working harbour.
- 4.16 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that the proposed location for depot was acceptable as it offered a reasonable transition between residential development and marine related industry at the harbourfront. He supplemented that the proposed building was too small and it should be enlarged to accommodate more vehicles and cancel temporary on-street RCVs parking areas so as to mitigate odour and as well as other adverse impacts. A canteen should be provided in the proposed depot for its staff.
- 4.17 **Prof Raymond FUNG** echoed **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** and suggested FEHD making full use of the site to provide parking spaces for RCVs and be mindful of the positioning of the project when planning the resource centre.
- 4.18 **Mr Derek HUNG** agreed that the positioning of the project was important and the focus should be put on the functional use of the facility as well as traffic safety.

- 4.19 In conclusion, **the Chair** asked the team to take into account Members' comments when refining the proposal, with particular attention to including more value-added elements to the harbourfront for the public use, facilitating the connectivity to the planned waterfront promenade; and integrating the project with the neighbouring developments.

Item 5 Minor Relaxation of the Development Intensity of the West Kowloon Cultural District Site (Paper No. TFK/03/2014)

- 5.1 **The Chair** invited members to declare interests and welcomed the following representatives to the meeting :

West Kowloon Cultural District Authority (WKCD)

Mr Derek SUN, Head, Planning and Development

Mr Patrick LAM, Senior Traffic and Transport Engineer

Ms LAU Man-sze, Manager, Destination Development

Mr FU Yee-ming, Planner

Ms Wendy LAM, Head, Communication and Public Affair

Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Ltd

Mr Dickson HUI

Ronald Lu & Partners (HK) Ltd

Mr Eugene CHING

- 5.2 **Prof Raymond FUNG** declared that he was a Board Member of WKCD. **Mr Ivan HO** declared that as he was likely to accept the appointment as the professional advisor of a sub-consultant for the WKCD project, it was not appropriate for him to give any comments on the proposal due to perceived conflict of interest. **The Chair** decided and Members agreed that **Prof Raymond FUNG** and **Mr Ivan HO** could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion. **Mr Derek HUNG** declared that he was the chairman of the Waterfront Owners Committee of Kowloon Station, a member of the Consultation Panel of the WKCD, but he would like to give comment on the proposal as he was an elected district councillor of Tsim Sha Tsui West constituency which covered WKCD. **The Chair** agreed that **Mr Derek HUNG** could participate the discussion.

- 5.3 **The Chair** said that WKCDA had reported at the 14th meeting of the Task Force that it would apply for minor relaxation of the maximum gross floor area (GFA) and building height restrictions under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance in order to optimise the development potential of WKCD. WKCDA now sought Members' comments on the detailed proposal at this meeting.
- 5.4 **Mr Derek SUN** of WKCDA and **Mr Dickson HUI** of Llewelyn-Davies Hong Kong Ltd presented the paper with the aid of PowerPoint.
- 5.5 **The Chair** enquired whether the Harbour Planning Principles (HPP) had been taken into account in formulating the revised planning proposal.
- 5.6 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that the current plot ratio of 1.81 for WKCD was a result of a comprehensive public engagement exercise, and WKCDA should avoid deviating from the consensus of the community unless there were strong justifications. Optimising development potential and providing flexibility for future development of the site were not justifiable reasons and hence he could not support the proposal.
- 5.7 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** concurred that the proposal could not be supported as it was not fully justified without a comprehensive consultation. He enquired the reasons that the GFA for retail and dining facilities, which would be important to support art and cultural facilities, was increased less than residential development in terms of percentage.
- 5.8 **Mr Derek HUNG** said that a three-stage public engagement exercise was conducted and the final report was submitted by the Hong Kong Polytechnic University in December 2011. The Development Plan was then finalised and submitted to TPB in December 2012. It was not convincing to increase the plot ratio on the ground of optimising development potential and the proposed relaxation was not minor. The proposal was submitted to the Community Building Committee of Yau Tsim Mong DC on 17 October 2013 and the Committee requested for additional information to justify the proposed increase in building height and the actual building height after minor relaxation was approved. He added that the 2014 Policy Address had mentioned that the Government would conduct a pilot study on developing

more urban underground space at TST West and suggested that WKCDA should consider making use of the underground space to accommodate some of the proposed increase in GFA.

5.9 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** considered the scheme unacceptable as the proposed increase of 15% in total GFA was not minor and would set an undesirable precedent for the harbourfront areas.

5.10 **Mr Derek SUN** and **Mr Dickson HUI** responded as follows:

- (a) the proposal was derived with reference to the HPP and the Development Plan;
- (b) Members' comments on the proposed increase in building height were noted. However, there were also views from the community that WKCD was not fully utilised since the plot ratio was low as compared with other developed areas around Victoria Harbour. Some considered that there was potential to increase the plot ratio even up to 3 with a view to addressing the pressing demand for hotel, office and other arts and cultural facilities;
- (c) the presence of an extensive underground utility network and railway structures would pose restriction to the underground development in WKCD and once the infrastructure such as the integrated basement was constructed, the development density of WKCD could not be further revised. Hence, WKCDA considered this was the last opportunity to enhance the development parameters in order to address various demands; and
- (d) WKCDA would attach high importance to arts and cultural facilities and the proposed hotel, office and residential developments would generate visitor flow. WKCDA considered that the proposed minor relaxation of development intensity should be able to maintain a balanced mix of land uses within WKCD. Various technical assessments being undertaken by WKCDA would ensure that the proposal with a balanced development mix was technically feasible.

5.11 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** was concerned that residential development might become the dominant use in WKCD after relaxing the plot ratio. She added that the development intensity

relaxation without an extensive public consultation should not be supported.

- 5.12 **Mr Franklin YU** questioned that the amount of public open space was not increased proportionally with the total GFA and asked whether the “City Park” concept could still be retained. He commented that the increase in GFA might not give rise to increase in building height and WKCD could consider utilising the underground space to accommodate the proposed increase in GFA. The Development Plan would be significantly affected if the current proposal was pursued and an urban design study taking into account the planned iconic buildings in WKCD should be undertaken.
- 5.13 **Mr Derek HUNG** considered that the proposed increase in the plot ratio and building height should not be supported if GFA in the Development Plan had been fully utilised. He opined that the Development Plan of WKCD had already undergone extensive public consultation and the proposed relaxation was not convincing.
- 5.14 **Mr Derek SUN** responded that the primary objective of the planning proposal was to optimise the development potential of the WKCD site. The proposal was to make use of the flexibility already allowed in the Development Plan. The GFA mix as set out in the Explanatory Statement of the approved Development Plan would still be maintained. Members’ views would be taken into account in revising the proposal, including utilising the underground space to accommodate the proposed increase in GFA and the increased GFA would only be allocated to certain areas within WKCD.
- 5.15 **The Chair** thanked the project team for the presentation. She said that the proposal might fall short to meet the HPPs. She advised the project team to take into account Members’ comments when revising the proposal, and the discussion of the Task Force would be summarised for TPB’s reference.

(Post-meeting note: The summary of discussion on this item was conveyed to TPB on 22 April 2014.)

Item 6 Amendments to the Approved South West Kowloon Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K20/28 (Paper No. TFK/04/2014)

- 6.1 The **Chair** invited members to declare interests welcomed the following representatives to the meeting:

Planning Department (PlanD)

Miss Elsa CHEUK, Chief Town Planner/ Special Duties

Ms Polly YIP, Senior Town Planner/ Special Duties 2

Mr Phillip CHUM, Senior Town Planner/ Shum Shui Po

- 6.2 **Mr Ivan HO** declared that he was the architect responsible for the additional works of the two schools adjacent to Amendment Item A. **The Chair** decided and Members agreed that he could stay in the meeting and provide comments on Amendment Items B to J, but should refrain from discussion on Amendment Item A.
- 6.3 **Ms Polly YIP** of PlanD presented the paper with the aid of PowerPoint.
- 6.4 **Mr Ivan HO** said that for Amendment Item H, suitable landscaping should be incorporated in the pedestrian walkway at the eastern end of the site which would serve as an important pedestrian connection between the MTR Nam Cheong Station and the waterfront. For Amendment Items B to J, a single CDA zone for the whole site should be considered instead of using different zones for different land uses with a view to providing a seamless integration between the proposed private residential and hotel development. Master layout plan, landscaping plan and urban design plan should be prepared holistically for the whole area.
- 6.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired the amount of the harbourfront areas planned in the past 10 years that were used for water-dependent uses, and if any study PlanD had conducted for the potential demand and land requirement for water-dependent uses within Victoria Harbour, especially for commercial, industrial and logistical uses. Separately, he opined that the site concerned should be zoned for commercial, industrial and logistical water dependent uses, such as shipyards as the location of the site was close to the existing industrial and commercial uses at the waterfront. The proposed amendments did not fully comply with HPPs as the proposal if implemented would diminish the value of the harbour by reducing the land that were suitable for water-

dependent uses and resulting in an unbalanced use of the harbour. Turning industrial use to mainly residential use might give rise to potential conflict between the future residents and existing tenants or operators of industrial and commercial sites.

- 6.6 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** noted that the amendments were to provide residential development in response to the increasing housing demand and a waterfront promenade to meet the community's aspiration. He commented that the Harbourfront Commission had to protect the overall urban design by allowing more water-dependent and recreational uses. The scale of development which consisted 14 towers of 40 storeys in the site was somewhat excessive for a waterfront setting.
- 6.7 **Mr SHUM Siu-hung** said that the proposal had been discussed at the Shum Shui Po DC. He enquired about the management agent of the proposed waterfront promenade. To facilitate public enjoyment, the footbridge connection from the hinterland towards the western end of the site concerned should be further improved.
- 6.8 **Miss Elsa CHEUK** made the following responses:
- (a) concerning the Amendment Item H, there was a pedestrian walkway linking with Exit B of MTR Nam Cheong Station at present and the amendment item was proposed to connect this walkway with the waterfront promenade with enhanced landscaping;
 - (b) it would be a statutory requirement that no less than 3 800 sq.m and 3 600 sq.m of public open space should be provided respectively in the public housing site to the north (Amendment Item D) and the CDA site to the south (Amendment Item B). To enhance connectivity to the waterfront, the public open space would be connected to the 350m long waterfront promenade;
 - (c) the future project proponent would design the public open space in the proposed CDA site and the waterfront promenade to ensure an integrated design. The Housing Authority would be responsible for designing the public open space in the northern portion of the site (Amendment Item D). The waterfront promenade and the public open space would be handed over to LCSD for management;

- (d) a review was conducted for the site zoned "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Cargo Working Area, Wholesale Market and Industrial Office" and found that it was no longer be required for the wholesale market expansion. The finding also revealed that the area north to the subject site had been zoned mainly for residential and G/IC purposes. A waterfront promenade was long requested by nearby residents;
- (e) the amendments were made in response to calls from DC and other stakeholders to provide more Home Ownership Scheme flats and private residential housing in the area, and the proposal could meet local community's aspiration for open space and waterfront promenade;
- (f) the interface between the proposed development and the existing uses in the vicinity had been considered. Three proposed breezeways (about 45m, 22m and 30m in width from west to east respectively) were proposed to ensure sufficient air ventilation and visual permeability. The proposed social welfare facilities, primary school would serve as noise buffer in addition to the Lin Cheung Road;
- (g) according to the preliminary environmental impact assessment (EIA) conducted by the Housing Authority, no insurmountable environmental problems would be envisaged when developing the public housing estate at the north. Nevertheless, a more in-depth EIA would be conducted later and the public housing estate would adopt a single orientation design. For the CDA site to the south, EIA, traffic impact assessment, ventilation impact assessment and other technical assessments would be conducted by the project proponent; and
- (h) the Stonecutters Island Sewerage Treatment Works and the West Kowloon Refuse Transfer Station were more than 600m and 700m away from the proposed site respectively. Upon the completion of the Harbour Area Treatment Scheme Stage 2A works by end 2014, odour problem arising from the adjacent water body would be alleviated. Funding had also been reserved for improving and renovating the West Kowloon Refuse Transfer Station. These measures would help mitigate the adverse impacts to the future developments which were expected to be

completed in 2018/2019.

- 6.9 **Mr Franklin YU** said that more resources would be required to mitigate the adverse impacts from nearby industrial uses before the proposed residential development could be implemented, and considered that the sites might better be retained for water-dependent uses if land available for such purpose territory wide was inadequate. A podium design within the CDA site, which would segregate the promenade from the residential area, was not recommended. He added that the 20m width of the proposed waterfront promenade might not be sufficient to support vibrant uses.
- 6.10 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** supplemented that the problems could only partially addressed by mitigation measures and the potential land use conflict could not be entirely avoided. There would be no other suitable sites than this one for relocating commercial, logistical or industrial water-dependent uses and therefore, the site should not be used for residential purposes.
- 6.11 **Miss Elsa CHEUK** responded that other possible land use options had been considered when drawing up the proposal. One of the key considerations was the compatibility of the site with its neighbouring environment and different land use demand in the area. As there had been continuous provision of new residential developments with ancillary community facilities in the vicinity, PlanD considered that a mixed residential and community development was the most appropriate for the site.
- 6.12 In conclusion, **the Chair** thanked PlanD for the presentation and informed Members that the discussion would be summarised for TPB's reference.

(Post-meeting note: The summary of discussion on this item was conveyed to TPB on 27 February 2014.)

Item 7 Proposed Minor Revisions to the Approved Scheme (Planning Application No. A/K15/96) for the Yau Tong Bay Comprehensive Development Area, Yau Tong, Kowloon

- 7.1 **The Chair** invited members to declare interests and welcomed the following representatives to the meeting:

Main Wealth Development Limited

Mr Augustine WONG, Executive Director

Mr YU Wai-way, General Manager

Mr Gregory CHAN, Assistant General Manager

Mr Henry CHANG, Property Development Manager

Ms Amy CHAN, Assistant Project Manager

Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited

Ms Theresa YEUNG, Director of Planning

Ms Natalie LEUNG, Town Planner

Mr York IP, Assistant Town Planner

- 7.2 **Mr Shuki LEUNG** declared that his company was a member of the Consortium that proposed the subject planning application. **The Chair** decided and Members agreed that Mr LEUNG could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion. **Mr Franklin YU** also declared that his company had current business dealings with the proponent. **The Chair** decided and Members agreed that as **Mr Franklin YU** had no direct involvement in the subject planning application and he could stay in the meeting and participate the discussion.
- 7.3 **The Chair** said that the Task Force was briefed on the development schemes at the Yau Tong Bay comprehensive development area on 16 March 2011, 19 October 2011 and 20 November 2012. TPB approved the latest scheme with conditions on 8 February 2013. The proponent would like to seek Members' views on its latest planning application under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance on minor relaxation of plot ratio.
- 7.4 **Ms Theresa YEUNG** of Ove Arup & Partners Limited presented the paper with the aid of PowerPoint.
- 7.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired whether outdoor sitting and dining area would be provided to enhance vibrancy; whether bollards would be provided to enable visiting vessels to tie their boats; whether the project proponent would reconsider including a breakwater to enable yacht centre development which its overriding public need could be left to the public to decide; whether water sports facilities would be provided to promote active use of the harbour; and whether pets would be allowed to access the waterfront promenade.

- 7.6 **Mr Derek HUNG** enquired the kind of ancillary facilities that would be provided for boat mooring; whether any arrangement had been agreed with the Marine Department for boat mooring; whether the boat movements in and out of Yau Tong Bay would affect overall marine safety in Victoria Harbour; and measures to be undertaken to ensure marine safety within the bay.
- 7.7 **The Chair** suggested that more at-grade access points should be opened to the public around the clock to facilitate public enjoyment of the promenade.
- 7.8 **Ms Theresa YEUNG** responded as follows:
- (a) multi-functional activities and sitting out areas would be provided along the waterfront promenade for public enjoyment;
 - (b) retail facilities would be provided at the access point between Towers 5 and 6 to enhance harbourfront vibrancy;
 - (c) further liaison with LCSD would be arranged on the provision of bollards at the waterfront promenade for boat mooring;
 - (d) three flights of landings steps would be provided for the public to board or disembark from boats. Based on the experience of managing other landing steps/public piers, such berthing time would usually be short and management would not be an issue;
 - (e) at the Task Force meeting held on 20 November 2012, Members were briefed that the provision of a marina in Yau Tong Bay was technically infeasible as the maximum wave height of 0.15m as stipulated in CEDD's Port Works Designs Manual could not be complied with; and
 - (f) whether pets could be allowed to access the waterfront promenade would be determined by LCSD.
- 7.9 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** commented that the unique shape of Yau Tong Bay made it capable for active waterfront activities similar to Darling Harbour of Sydney or Marina Bay of Singapore. The current design of the waterfront promenade

might not be conducive to enhancing harbourfront vibrancy and a more innovative design with appropriate spread of active and passive uses should be adopted. He added that it was likely that both LCSD and the Marine Department would not agree with installation of bollards along the waterfront at a later stage. To guide future implementation, the idea of installing bollards should be included at the planning stage.

- 7.10 **Ms Margrit LI** responded that LCSD would consult the Kwun Tong DC on whether pets would be allowed to access the waterfront promenade after the department took up the management role of the promenade, and the department was open to the provision of refreshment outlet as a supporting facility at the waterfront promenade and installation of bollards along the waterfront. LCSD would be willing to take part in the discussion with relevant departments / parties if required.
- 7.11 **Mr Ivan HO** enquired whether the Task Force would be consulted again on the detailed design of the waterfront promenade. He opined that the design of the waterfront could be more innovative and colourful; the landing steps could be better designed to enhance its visual integration with the waterfront promenade; and the proposed revision showed no improvement to the approved scheme because the skyline and level of permeability of the approved scheme was more appealing. He suggested that the proponent might use a 3D model to better illustrate the visual impact.
- 7.12 **Prof Raymond FUNG** opined that the proposed waterfront promenade was merely designed as a passive open space, and more vibrant uses could be incorporated for better public enjoyment.
- 7.13 **Mr Franklin YU** said that the proposed amendments were generally acceptable in term of HPPs. While he had no objection to the proposed building height revision since there was no change to the maximum building height compared with the approved scheme, he enquired the reason for adjusting the building height of Towers 7 to 9 but not the others. He added that a waterfront promenade purely for passive uses was not preferable. Reference could be made to the waterfront promenade at Stanley where the promenade was more lively integrated with iconic buildings and food & beverages facilities. A more evenly spread of commercial GFA along the U-shape waterfront promenade could be explored and retail uses should

be allowed in areas managed by LCSD but not areas within the private developments in order to allow better public enjoyment.

7.14 **Ms Theresa YEUNG and Mr YU Wai-wai** responded as follows:

- (a) given the greening ratio requirement stipulated in the Planning Brief for the Yau Tong Bay CDA, the configuration of the waterfront promenade, and the need to provide pedestrian walkway as well as other recreational facilities, it would be difficult to introduce additional active uses along the waterfront promenade;
- (b) the adjustment of the building height of Towers 7 to 9 was a positive response to the public comments and one of the approval conditions in the approved planning application which demanded for a more compatible building height for these three towers; and
- (c) a comfortable atmosphere was vital to build up a unique harbourfront ambience. Clustering the commercial uses at key nodes instead of dispersing them along the waterfront might be a more appropriate approach for bringing in vibrancy. Commercial uses such as kiosks and outdoor restaurant could be incorporated at the waterfront as long as it would not exceed 10% of the area of the promenade. Further liaison with LCSD would be conducted during the detailed design stage.

7.15 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested a minor relaxation of the greening ratio to allow for more vibrant uses such as alfresco dining at the promenade and water sports activities in Yau Tong Bay.

7.16 **Mr Ivan HO** concurred with **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** on the relaxation of greening ratio. He opined that an innovative design and appropriate combination of active/passive uses could be explored.

7.17 **Mr YU Wai-Wai and Mr Augustine WONG** responded as follows:

- (a) formulation of any development proposal was an art of compromise as different and conflicting demands had to be

accommodated, for instance, the greening ratio requirement under the Planning Brief and the future residents' expectation for a tranquil living environment had to be balanced with harbourfront vibrancy;

- (b) the adjustment of Towers 7 to 9 was to address demands from various parties; and
- (c) as the proposed scheme had made effort to avoid a bulky podium structure, noise from commercial activities on the ground level could not be shielded off entirely. There might be possible complaints from the future residents. Therefore, it was vital to strike a balance between different needs and the project proponent had made great effort in this regard.

7.18 In conclusion, **the Chair** thanked the project proponent for the presentation and informed Members that the discussion would be summarised for TPB's reference.

(Post-meeting note: The summary of discussion on this item was conveyed to TPB on 26 February 2014.)

Item 8 Any Other Business

- 8.1 **The Chair** suggested and Members agreed that Tsuen Wan Action Area would be discussed at the next Task Force meeting subject to the arrangement of the site visit.
- 8.2 **The Chair** informed Members that the tentative dates of upcoming meetings in 2014 were scheduled for 26 May, 10 September and 1 December respectively.
- 8.3 **Mr Shuki LEUNG** said that Task Force Members were committed to help the Hong Kong community to deliver a vibrant and lively harbourfront. He opined that the members of the development industry, which were also members of the general public, were also committed to deliver development proposals in a win-win situation with the community. **The Chair** concurred that all Task Force Members had a common vision for the harbourfront, and proposals would be discussed on the basis of their compliance with HPPs.

8.4 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:35pm.

Secretariat

**Task Force on Harbourfront Developments
in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing
May 2014**