

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

Minutes of Sixteenth Meeting

Date : 26 May 2014
Time : 2:30 pm
Venue : Conference Room , 15/F, North Point Government Offices
333 Java Road, North Point

Present

Prof Becky LOO	Chair
Mr Tom CALLAHAN	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr Ken SO	Representing Conservancy Association
Mr TAM Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr LAU Chun-kong	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
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 Paul CHAN Yuen-king	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr Shuki LEUNG	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Prof Raymond FUNG	
Mr CHOW Ping-tim	
Mr Derek HUNG	
Mr SHUM Siu Hung	
Mrs Winnie KANG	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Edward LEUNG	Senior Manager (Tourism) 2, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr Wilson PANG	Chief Traffic Engineer/ Kowloon, 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,

Ms Amy CHEUNG	Leisure and Cultural Services Department Assistant Director/Territorial, Planning Department (PlanD)
Ms Phyllis LAU	Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Ms Nancy POON Siu-ping	

In Attendance

Mr Tom YIP	District Planning Officer/Kowloon, PlanD
Mr KT NG	Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan, PlanD

Action

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting.

The Chair advised Members that Mr Edward LEUNG, Senior Manager of TC, attended the meeting on behalf of Ms Emily MO; and Ms Joyce LAU, Senior Engineer of CEDD, attended on behalf of Mr Janson WONG.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 14th Meeting

1.1 The draft minutes of the 15th meeting held on 12 February 2014 were circulated to Members on 15 May 2014. The revised draft minutes incorporating Members' comments were circulated to the Task Force on 22 May 2014. There being no further amendment, the revised draft minutes were confirmed at the meeting.

Item 2 Matters Arising

Renovation of the Hong Kong Museum of Art (para. 3.9 of the minutes of the 15th meeting)

2.1 **The Chair** informed the meeting that the Leisure and Cultural

Services Department (LCSD) would brief the Task Force on the master plan for the enhancement of the Hong Kong Cultural Centre Complex in due course. In response to the Chair's enquiry, **Miss Margrit LI** said that LCSD would consult the Public Works Sub-committee of Legislative Council on the renovation of the Hong Kong Museum of Art in June 2014 and the department would brief the Task Force on the master plan separately.

Any Other Business (para. 8.1 of the minutes of the 15th meeting)

2.2 **The Chair** informed the meeting that the site visit to the Tsuen Wan waterfront was held on 21 May 2014. Members also met with the Tsuen Wan District Council (TWDC) members to share views on harbourfront matters in the district. The following suggestions to further enhance the Tsuen Wan waterfront were put forth:

- (a) there was a need to improve the water quality along the Tsuen Wan waterfront;
- (b) apart from the regular events organised by TWDC, opportunities for more vibrant uses at the waterfront promenade should be explored;
- (c) the proposed cycle track should be implemented as soon as practicable; and
- (d) the design and management of the waterfront promenade from Tsuen Wan West Station to Ting Kau Bridge should be improved under a unified theme.

2.3 **The Chair** said that one of the Task Force members, **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN**, also suggested a holistic planning be adopted for the area. In his written comments, he proposed a urban design study to be jointly commissioned by TWDC and the Harbourfront Commission (HC) for the Tsuen Wan harbourfront. The study process could make reference to that for the Kowloon City District Urban Renewal Forum (DURF). The study should aim to formulate an urban design plan with a wish list of enhancement initiatives and potential implementation agents for the Government to follow up.

- 2.4 **The Chair** supplemented that a TWDC member had suggested relocating the nearby Public Cargo Works Area and the dangerous goods vessels berthing area which was causing nuisances to waterfront promenade users and nearby residents. The views expressed had been referred to the relevant departments for follow up as appropriate.
- 2.5 **The Chair** said that among the issues raised, the shared concern was the water quality along the Tsuen Wan waterfront as it had significantly affected public enjoyment and potential for further enhancement of the waterfront promenade. **The Chair** suggested and the meeting agreed that Tsuen Wan Action Area would be the focus of the next meeting and relevant departments would be invited to brief members on the short-term and long-term improvement/mitigation measures to address the water quality issue.

Other Matters

- 2.6 As regards the re-provisioning of Yau Ma Tei Police Station, there was a request made by a Member at the previous HC meeting to follow up the suggestion on the provision of a public entrance to the new Yau Ma Tei Police Station at the podium level. The Secretariat had relayed Member's comment to the Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF) and Architectural Services Department (ArchSD). After further consideration, HKPF advised that for security reason, members of the public had to access the police station from the front entrance on the ground floor and providing another connection at the landscaped deck was not feasible.

Site Visit Arrangement

- 2.7 **The Chair** said that organising site visit for Task Force Members involved engaging different parties, including local stakeholders such as DC members, as well as government officials, who would be invited to prepare and brief Members on issues under various aspects. Although site visits could help Members understand the context of harbourfront issues, the Chair considered that it was not the only way to achieve this purpose as some Members might have already visited the waterfront areas on their own. In view of this, **the Chair** suggested and the meeting agreed that, in order to make the site visit fruitful, future site visits would

normally be arranged only when:

- (a) there was a clear purpose of the site visit; and
- (b) half or more than half of the non-official Members had expressed interest to join the site visit.

- 2.8 **Mrs Winnie KANG** suggested that for Member(s) who proposed a site visit which he or she had specific interest in the area might be invited to make a short presentation under Matters Arising (MA) or Any Other Business (AOB), so that other Members could also express their views/comments on the suggestions before organising a site visit for all Members.
- 2.9 In response to **Mr Derek HUNG's** query, the Chair said that arrangement could be made for site visit under a specific theme covering more than one action area. However, such visit might take longer time and would be more difficult to fit into Members' schedule.
- 2.10 **Ir Prof CHOY Kin-kuen** suggested that Members be informed of the site visit arrangement as early as possible so that they could make suitable arrangements amongst their busy schedule. **The Chair** responded that once Members had expressed interest to join the site visit, the Secretariat would work with Members and parties concerned to fix the schedule by fitting the dairies of the interested Members as far as possible.
- 2.11 **The Chair** concluded that any proposed site visit should normally fulfil the above two conditions and could be further deliberated under MA or AOB. If there was strong interest from Members, site visit might then be arranged on specific issue.

Item 3 Action Areas - Tsuen Wan Action Area

Advance Works of Cycle Track between Tsuen Wan and Tuen Mun (Paper No. TFK/06/2014)

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

Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)

Mr Michael FONG, Chief Engineer 1, New Territories North and West Development Office

Mr Henry YIP, Senior Engineer 6, New Territories North and West Development Office

- 3.2 **The Chair** said that the Task Force was briefed on the project at the 4th meeting on 16 March 2011. CEDD would like to update Members on the latest progress of the project.
- 3.3 **Mr Michael FONG** of CEDD presented the paper with the aid of PowerPoint.
- 3.4 **Prof Raymond Fung** enquired whether any part of the cycle track was built over the sea and if the ramp for the footbridge could be removed after the installation of lift with a view to allowing more open area in the congested urban environment. He added that the winning entries of the design competition, in particular the theme of the resting area, should be implemented.
- 3.5 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** considered that amendment items 2 and 3 were better as the cycle track was moved inland so that pedestrians could enjoy the waterfront with various activities. For amendment item 1, he enquired if it would be possible to replant the affected trees along the cycle track and whether the area under Tsing Tsuen Bridge was the starting point or the end point. He opined that more details regarding the ancillary facilities should be provided.
- 3.6 **Mr Franklin YU** commented that two out of the three amendments had curved alignments which might be too sharp. He considered cross section 2 more preferable as the cycle track was situated at a higher level than the pavement and the cyclists could enjoy the sea view. He enquired the possibility of providing facilities for the cyclists to park their bicycles temporarily and whether there were places for operators to hire and return the bicycles.
- 3.7 **Mr Michael FONG** responded as follows:
- (a) advance works for the cycle track would not be built over the sea;

- (b) the ramp of footbridge would be demolished permanently;
- (c) winning entries of the design competition would be taken into account when conducting detailed design;
- (d) for amendment item 1, a balance needed to be struck given the site constraints. There would be a 4m wide cycle track alongside with a 2-3m wide footpath near the waterfront. If the alignment of the cycle track was moved further inland, the existing car parking facilities and trees would be affected. For the advance work, resting areas would be provided at both ends of the cycle track while the entry/exit hub would be in the middle which would include bicycle rental, toilet, refreshment kiosks, resting area, practice area, etc.,
- (e) the cycle track under amendment item 2 was designed in accordance with the prevailing standard which was more desirable from safety point of view;
- (f) the entire cycle track from Tsuen Wan to Tuen Mun was about 20 km long and would link up with Yuen Long, Sheung Shui onto Ma On Shan to form a loop;
- (g) there were objections to the Stage 2 works, and CEDD was resolving the objections, whilst an implementation timetable had yet to be confirmed;
- (h) sufficient space would be reserved along the cycle track for cyclists to stop temporarily; and
- (i) further liaison with LCSD would be made regarding the operation mode of the bicycle rental.

3.8 **Mr Ivan HO** enquired the objective of the cycle track and whether any comprehensive urban design study had been undertaken to holistically review the interface between the cycle track and the adjacent land uses and overall environment of the area, in particular having regard to the nearby high density residential developments which would be completed soon. He considered that more information on the interface between waterfront promenade and the proposed cycle track such as the design of the

intersection should be provided. As regular events were organised by TWDC for the local residents at the site, synergy should be created between cyclists and other users of the waterfront promenade whilst minimising any potential conflict. He further opined that resting stations were important hubs from the urban design point of view, and CEDD should integrate these hubs with the neighbourhood.

CEDD

(Post-meeting note: CEDD confirmed that the resting station would be designed to integrate with the neighbourhood.)

3.9 **Mr Paul CHAN** enquired how CEDD would handle the objections from the residents in So Kwun Wat; what would be the design of the resting stations; and how to integrate the cycle track with the character of the local community along the entire alignment of the cycle track.

3.10 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** proposed in his written submission that more food and beverage facilities with outdoor seating should be provided at the entry/exit hub. As it was immediately adjacent to the Tsuen Wan West Station, opportunity could be taken to turn the hub into a local community piazza.

3.11 **Mr Michael FONG** made the following response:

(a) the cycle track was for leisure purpose and its design would tie in with its surrounding. CEDD had closely liaised with TWDC and other stakeholders in the course of project planning. The proposed amendments to the alignment were made in response to the comments received;

(b) the number of crossings from the hinterland to the waterfront would be kept to the minimum and the design would be subject to approval by relevant departments. CEDD would provide further details on crossing and area of the promenade taken up by the cycle track after the meeting. The information on the resting area and entry/exit hubs would be provided when available;

CEDD

(Post-meeting note: Details of the pedestrian crossing and area of the promenade taken up by the cycle track, resting area and entry/exit hubs was conveyed to Members on 7 August 2014.)

- (c) CEDD would revisit the alignment of the cycle track to address the comments from residents of So Kwun Wat as far as possible.

3.12 **Mr Ivan HO** noted that CEDD had not undertaken an urban design study for this project which could help formulate those key planning parameters such as information on the proportion of waterfront promenade taken up by the proposed cycle track. Such information/parameters should have been established at the early planning stage to guide the project, rather than relying solely on the engineering considerations. Amendment item 1 was not considered to be a balanced approach as the cycle track would not be straight as proposed. Regarding the design and number of crossings, local residents should also be consulted.

3.13 **Mr Ken SO** commented that accessibility was an important factor and users might need to walk some distance with their bicycles before reaching the starting point. Whilst it might not be necessary to retain all trees, large trees with good shade along the waterfront should be preserved.

3.14 **Mr CHOW Ping-tim** made the following comments:

- (a) TWDC had offered suggestions relating to the design and provisions of facilities for the cycle track, such as connectivity and types of ancillary facilities. He opined that the Task Force should continue monitoring the project to ensure a user-friendly design to meet the local needs and enhance the harbourfront would be drawn up;
- (b) Amendment 1 was proposed as the original alignment of the cycle track would affect some trees in front of Riviera Gardens. As a site under Tsing Tsuen Bridge which was occupied by the Tsuen Wan Dragon Boat Club had now been returned to the Government for the cycle track project, there would be possibility to straighten the alignment of the cycle track to minimise the impact on the existing trees;
- (c) the original alignment at the site of the amendment item 2 was along the waterfront. In view of local objections, it might need to shift the alignment inland but this might encroach upon Tsuen Wan 5 which was currently under

construction. The works programme of the cycle track might then be affected;

- (d) TWDC had offered suggestions on the provision of ancillary facilities but was concerned that further deliberation might delay the implementation of the project. The proposed cycle track should be implemented as early as possible after taking into account Members' views; and
- (e) although the part of cycle track near Riviera Gardens was at the waterfront, a footpath would also run alongside the cycle track to segregate pedestrians and cyclists for safety purpose.

3.15 **Mr Derek HUNG** opined that the alignment should depend on the topography of the area. In addition to footbridge, subway might be an option for crossing the cycle track.

3.16 **Prof Raymond FUNG** commented that the railing along the waterfront should not be taller than ordinary height of people. An optimal crossing would allow free access to the harbourfront with minimum obstacles. To minimise visual impact, subway might be more preferable than footbridge.

3.17 **Mr Ivan HO** suggested that a cycle track with tree shading would be more attractive. Also, the level difference of the site could be made use to solve the crossing issue so as to enable different uses of the harbourfront at the same time.

3.18 **Mr Franklin YU** suggested that the entry/exit hub might be provided between the cycle track and the pavement by the level difference. He also enquired whether the cycle track would be managed by the Government.

3.19 **Mr Michael FONG** and **Mr Henry YIP** responded as follows:

- (a) the pedestrian footpath would be close to the waterfront while the cycle track would be located relatively inland. To address the potential conflict at pedestrian crossings across the cycle track, suitable signage/facilities would be put in place to alert cyclists to disembark or slow down. Relevant stakeholders would be consulted on the detailed design in

due course;

- (b) the cycle track alignment would aim to minimise the impact on the existing trees as far as possible;
- (c) no footbridge would be proposed under the project except a lift to replace the ramp of the existing footbridge near Belvedere Garden;
- (d) the option for subway crossing would be explored despite the various constraints such as technical limitations and higher cost;
- (e) Members' views on the design of railing would be taken into account in the project; and
- (f) reference would be made to overseas experiences on utilising level difference when refining the design of the cycle track.

3.20 **The Chair** concluded that the Task Force in general appreciated the departments' efforts in taking forward the advance works of the cycle track. She hoped that the design of the cycle track would adopt a people-based approach and integrate with pedestrian network to serve the local community. She asked the project team to take into account Members' comments when finalising the alignment and design, and implement the project as soon as possible.

Item 4 Proposed Comprehensive Residential Development at Tung Yuen Street and Shung Yiu Street, Yau Tong, Kowloon (YTML No. 69 & YTIL No. 4RP) (Paper No. TFK/07/2014)

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

PDI Consultants Ltd

Dr Andrew CHAN

LWK & Partners (HK) Ltd

Mr Michael THOMAS

Westwood Hong & Associates Ltd

Dr Westwood HONG

Korn Reach Investment Limited and Glass Bead Limited

Mr Eric HO

Ms Karen CHAN

Mr Matthew CHAN

Ms LO Shuk-yi

- 4.2 **Mr Shuki LEUNG** declared that the project proponent was a member of REDA. **The Chair** considered that Mr LEUNG could stay as an observer but should refrain from participating in the discussion. **Mr Paul CHAN** declared that Mr Michael Thomas was a part-time lecturer of the Technological and Higher Education Institute, in which he was also a teaching staff. **The Chair** considered that Mr CHAN had no direct conflict of interest on this particular item and could take part in the discussion.
- 4.3 **The Chair** informed Members that the owner of the lot at Tung Yuen Street and Shung Yiu Street, Yau Tong, which was part of the area zoned “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) at Yau Tong Industrial Area, submitted a planning application to the Town Planning Board (TPB) on its residential scheme. The proponent would like to brief Members on the details of the application.
- 4.4 **Dr Andrew CHAN** presented the paper with the aid of PowerPoint.
- 4.5 **Mr Paul CHAN** enquired how the public could access to the proposed waterfront open space. On landscaping, he noted that stepped planters were proposed to soften the visual impact of the buildings, but the photomontages presented only showed some hard landscapes around the buildings. He enquired whether the planting area under the transfer plate was an open space and whether it could be integrated with the outdoor open space. He added that sunken planters should be provided in the open space so as to allow flexibility for design.
- 4.6 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** commented that although housing was an important Government policy, other types of economic use and

accommodation such as service apartments and hotels should be considered to maximise the development potential around the harbour. Although he noted that the MPC agreed that the very large "CDA" zone was to be sub-divided into smaller sites to facilitate redevelopment, he suggested that such redevelopments should still be "comprehensive" and adjacent sites should be integrated with each other, and this case should be integrated with the adjoining wholesale fish market site to make good use of its potential, and he would like to know from the Government departments how they would facilitate or enhance such possible integrated redevelopments. He agreed with Mr Paul Zimmerman that public landing steps should be provided at the subject waterfront, and that to be in line with the Harbour Planning Principle of bringing people to the harbourfront the proponent should consider options of providing a footbridge system all the way from the upper platforms at Shung Yiu Street area through the site leading to the waterfront. As the development was for private residential use, he thought that the redevelopment at the waterfront was not very compatible with the harbour planning principle of letting the public make use of the waterfront. He also thought that the stepped height planning principle of having lower developments at the waterfront could be better achieved if car parking facilities and some floors were put at the basement level. He would like Government departments to advise what was the implementation programme, if any, of the waterfront connections from this area to the tourist attraction at Lei Yue Mun Sam Ka Tsuen.

4.7 **Mr Ivan HO** commented that the scheme seemed to be a residential development, and more details, including the future management agent of the waterfront open space should be provided. Without the overall picture, it was difficult to consider whether the scheme offered a convincing design to enhance vibrancy of the harbourfront. As the proposed development was surrounded by the existing facilities, pedestrian subway should be considered to enable access to the waterfront.

4.8 **The Project Team** made the following responses:

- (a) the future waterfront open space would be managed by the project proponent until it was surrendered to the Government;

- (b) the design would be flexible enough to integrate with the future waterfront development but the existing seawall would pose some technical constraints;
- (c) whilst landing steps might be considered, it would be difficult to implement from engineering viewpoint in order not to involve any reclamation;
- (d) the area underneath the transfer plate to the west was an loading/unloading area which was transparent in design. The proposed 600m² waterfront open space is uncovered;
- (e) while serving its original purpose, the emergency vehicular access could also be integrated into overall landscape and promenade design;
- (f) the proponent had considered providing sunken planter at the waterfront open space; and
- (g) except loading/unloading area of the western portion, all car parking facilities would be provided at the underground level.

4.9 **Mrs Winnie KANG** enquired whether the proposed waterfront open space would be opened to the public before surrendering to the Government. She said that there were examples of public open space within private property developments in Hong Kong which were constructed, managed and maintained by developers, would be opened to the public before handing over to the Government.

4.10 **Mr Tom YIP** said that the Kwun Tong Wholesale Fish Market to the west of the proposed development was still under operation. Since the CDA site was large and under multiple ownerships, implementation of the entire CDA would take time to complete. PlanD was exploring options to divide the zone into smaller sites to facilitate early redevelopment.

4.11 **The Chair** further enquired why the site was more suitable for residential use and how the proposed development was related to the entire CDA.

4.12 **The Project Team** made the following responses:

- (a) residential use was proposed to address private housing demand;
- (b) the proposed development formed part of the CDA zone, whilst PlanD was considering to divide the whole CDA into smaller sites to facilitate early redevelopment of the area;
- (c) as regards the accessibility to the waterfront, since there was no indication on the current OZP for any waterfront promenade, the project proponent could only design the part of waterfront area within its site boundary; and
- (d) whether the waterfront open space was now suitable to be opened to the public would be subject to detailed design. As the area of open space was only 600m², it would be too small to be opened for public enjoyment at this stage. Future residents of the development might have different views on allowing the public to use the open space due to security and management concerns. However, once other lots in the CDA zone were ready for redevelopment and there was a plan to implement a continuous waterfront promenade within the CDA zone, the project proponent would be willing to surrender the area concerned to the Government.

4.13 **Mr Ivan HO** commented the information presented by the proponent at the meeting might not be consistent with the paper submitted. He could foresee that the waterfront open space would be used exclusively by residents of the development. Whilst it should be for the TPB to decide whether a pure residential development would be appropriate for this site, he opined that other suitable land use options in the 'CDA' zone might bring more vibrancy to this part of harbourfront.

4.14 **Mr Derek HUNG** believed that the project proponent had considered various factors before opting for a residential development, and the TPB should be allowed to decide on the land use. However, he queried whether the proposed maximum building height of 99.925mPD was excessive from harbour planning point of view and commented that the breezeway of

16.5m wide appeared to be too narrow. He opined that the developer should provide clear information in the sales brochure to potential buyers if the waterfront open space would be managed and maintained by the developer but would be opened to the public. He said that it would be important to integrate the proposed development with the adjacent sites to ensure a sustainable development and the feasibility of incorporating the adjacent wholesale fish market into the residential development could be further explored.

- 4.15 **Mr CHOW Ping-tim** said that he did not support residential development at the site as it was not compatible with the environment which nuisances could arise from the wholesale fish market, cooked food market, typhoon shelter and sewage pumping facilities in the surrounding. The planning of the area should not adopt a piecemeal approach without a long-term vision for the entire 'CDA' zone and opportunities should be seized to revamp the wholesale fish market into a tourist attraction.
- 4.16 **Mr Ken SO** said that the development did not blend well with other adjacent uses. With an unknown implementation programme to open the waterfront open space to the public, he would not support the proposal. He was also concerned that the ridgeline might possibly be blocked by the development.
- 4.17 **Mr Franklin YU** concurred with other Members that the proposed development was undesirable from public enjoyment perspective. The waterfront promenade within the site was only indicative and the waterfront open space could only become usable and accessible by the public after the relocation of the wholesale fish market or the sewage pumping facilities. He enquired if PlanD could advise whether there was any planning intention to provide for a waterfront promenade and connect it with the future Yau Tong Bay waterfront promenade.
- 4.18 In response to Chair's enquiry, **Mr Tom YIP** said that a wide range of uses might be permitted in the concerned CDA zone subject to planning approval by the TPB, such as restaurants, hotels, shops and services, eating places, etc. Mixed residential and commercial development could also be initiated by the project proponent. There was no requirement for developing a

waterfront promenade within the CDA zone in the current OZP. However, PlanD would take on board the views expressed and include the planning intention of providing a waterfront promenade in the next round of OZP amendments where appropriate. Whilst PlanD endeavoured to proceed with the OZP amendment to subdivide the CDA zone into smaller sites as soon as possible, a firm programme could not be provided at this stage given the complicated process involved.

4.19 **Professor CHOY Kin-Kuen** enquired if there would be any land ownership complication if the project proponent surrendered the waterfront open space to the Government which was directly above the privately owned basement car park.

4.20 **The Project Team** responded to the following points:

- (a) according to the Notes and Explanatory Statement of the OZP, the subject area was actually intended for residential and ancillary uses;
- (b) according to government leases, there were situations in which different layers of land were reserved by the Government for future public purposes; and
- (c) the proposed development would be lower than the ridgeline according to the Visual Impact Assessment of the planning application.

4.21 **The Chair** concluded that other possibilities in the CDA should be considered at this stage as any change would be difficult, once the development was implemented. The meeting also considered that the proposed development could not very well fulfil the Harbour Planning Principles in terms of enhancing vibrancy and public enjoyment at the harbourfront. She thanked the project team for the presentation and informed Members that the discussion would be summarised for the TPB's reference.

(Post-meeting note: The summary of discussion on this item was conveyed to the TPB on 20 June 2014.)

Item 5 Any Other Business

- 5.1 **The Chair** said that the updates of harbourfront enhancement initiatives in the Action Areas in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing were circulated to Members on 22 May 2014 and substantial progress had been made for a number of projects as highlighted in the Action Areas Table. She thanked the team of government officials for the substantial efforts.
- 5.2 Although Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN suggested focusing on Tsing Yi Action Area at the next Task Force meeting in his written comment, **the Chair** suggested and Members agreed that Tsuen Wan Action Area would be discussed at the next Task Force meeting, with the focus on the water quality in the action area.
- 5.3 **Mr Derek HUNG** informed Members that after discussing the proposed minor relaxation of the development intensity of the West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD) at the last Task Force meeting, Yau Tsim Mong (YTM) DC discussed and concluded that the building height of WKCD should not exceed 100mPD. YTMDC also received some objections to the proposal due to traffic and environmental concerns. **The Chair** responded that the summary of discussion on the WKCD site including Members' concern on the building height had been conveyed to TPB.
- 5.4 **Mrs Winnie KANG** informed Members that she would be posted out of Development Bureau shortly and thanked Members' support in the past three years. **The Chair** also thanked her for the valuable contribution and support to the Task Force, especially her efforts in coordinating different departments to take forward various harbourfront enhancement initiatives in the past few years.
- 5.5 **The Chair** informed Members that the next meeting was tentatively scheduled for 10 September 2014.
- 5.6 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:35pm.

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