

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

Minutes of Eighteenth Meeting

Date : 19 January 2015
Time : 3:00 pm
Venue : Conference Room , (Room G46) at Upper Ground Floor,
Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre, Kowloon Park,
Tsim Sha Tsui

Present

Prof Becky LOO	Chair
Mr Tom CALLAHAN	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
Dr Sujata S. GOVADA	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Mr Franklin YU	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr LAU Chun-kong	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Shuki LEUNG	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong (REDA)
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Ms Debby CHAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Prof Raymond FUNG	
Mr CHOW Ping-tim	
Mr Derek Hung	
Mr Thomas CHAN	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Edward LEUNG	Senior Manager (Tourism) 2, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr Wilson PANG	Chief Traffic Engineer/ Kowloon, Transport Department (TD)
Mr Janson WONG	Chief Engineer 2/Kowloon Development Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Miss Margrit LI	Assistant Director (Leisure Services)1, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Ms Amy CHEUNG	Assistant Director/Territorial, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Mann CHOW	Secretary

In Attendance

Miss Christine AU	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Larry CHU	Assistant Secretary (Harbour)1, DEVB
Miss Ingrid TJENDRO	Assistant Secretary (Harbour)2, DEVB
Ms Michelle YUEN	Senior Town Planner/Yau Tsim Mong, PlanD

Absent with Apologies

Mr LAM Kin-lai	Representing Conservation Association
Mr Paul CHAN	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr SHUM Siu-hung	
Ms Nancy POON Siu-ping	

For Agenda Item (3)**New World Development (NWD)**

Mr Jeff TUNG	Senior Project Director
Ms Maria CHEUNG	General Manager - Corporate Communication

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Dr Louis NG	Deputy Director (Culture)
-------------	---------------------------

James Corner Field Operations

Mr James CORNER	Principal
Mr Keith O'CONNOR	Associate Partner

Urbis Limited

Mr Alexander DUGGIE	Managing Director
---------------------	-------------------

Ho Wang SPB Limited

Mr Joseph WONG	Executive Director
Dr HC PANG	Consultant

Knight Frank

Mr Paul HART	Executive Director Greater China
--------------	----------------------------------

Ronal Lu & Partners (Hong Kong) Ltd

Mr Peter YAM	Director
--------------	----------

For Agenda Item (4)**PlanD**

Mr Tom YIP	District Planning Officer/Kowloon
------------	-----------------------------------

For Agenda Item (5)Home Affairs Bureau

Ms Juana CHAN Man-ling Senior Architect (West Kowloon Cultural District)

Fire Services Department (FSD)

Mr KEUNG Sai-ming Divisional Officer (Planning Group)2
(Acting)

Mr YIU Men-yeung Assistant Divisional Officer (Planning Group)3

Architectural Services Department

Mr MOK Chung-keung Chief Project Manager 203

Mr HO Tat-hei Senior Project Manager 233

Andrew Lee King Fun & Associates Architects Ltd

Mr Ellis LEUNG Heung-kwan Deputy Director

Mr Marcus CHOI Ching-yu Senior Architect

Action**Welcoming Message**

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting, and informed Members that Mr Edward LEUNG, Senior Manager of TC, was attending the meeting on behalf of Ms Emily MO.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 17th Meeting

- 1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 17th meeting on 9 December 2014. No comments had been received from Members. There being no further amendment, the revised draft minutes were confirmed at the meeting.

Item 2 Matters Arising

- A. *Development Progress of the West Kowloon Cultural District (para. 3.22 of the minutes of the 17th meeting)*

- 2.1 **The Chair** informed the meeting that West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD) Authority would update Members on the progress of WKCD development in the second half of 2015.

2.2 **Ms Debby CHAN** said that Mr Paul Zimmerman would like to include the gist of some major works such as the proposed seawall enhancement works in regular progress report and queried if proposed works on the seawall in West Kowloon would be discussed separately in future. **The Chair** responded that the proposed seawall enhancement works were included in the progress update of WKCD and was discussed at the last meeting held on 10 September 2014.

2.3 In response to Chair's invitation, **Mr Janson WONG** explained that the information on the proposed seawall enhancement works included in the WKCD Progress Report and presented at the last meeting was part of the infrastructure works to support WKCD development including reconstruction of three short sections of existing seawall for the proposed drainage outfall. The infrastructure works to be responsible by the Government were highly integrated with the overall WKCD development and some works were entrusted to the WKCD Authority for implementation. Therefore, CEDD made a joint presentation with the WKCD Authority on the proposed seawall enhancement works at the last meeting. **The Chair** said that if Members would like to express their supplementary comments on any specific issues that had been previously discussed, they could write their comments to the Secretariat for further conveying to relevant departments. For the proposed seawall works in WKCD, the Secretariat would relay any further comments to CEDD for consideration.

B. *Proposed Site Visit to Tsing Yi (para. 5.3 of the minutes of the 17th meeting)*

2.4 **The Chair** informed the meeting that the Secretariat had received a request from Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN for organising a site visit to Tsing Yi. In accordance with the practice agreed by the Task Force at its meeting on 26 May 2014, the request would be deliberated under Any Other Business of the meeting.

**Item 3 Action Areas - Tsim Sha Tsui East and Tsim Sha Tsui West
Action Areas - The Avenue of Stars and Salisbury Garden
Revitalisation Plan (Paper No. TFK/01/2015)**

3.1 **Dr Peter Cookson-Smith** declared that he was the director of one of the consultants involved in the project. **The Chair** decided that he could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion.

- 3.2 **Mr Franklin YU** declared that his company had business dealings with the project proponent but not on this particular project. **The Chair** considered that his involvement in the project was not direct, and he could still take part in the discussion.
- 3.3 **Mr Shuki LEUNG** informed the meeting that the project proponent was a member of REDA and he was REDA's representative at the meeting. **The Chair** considered that as REDA had no substantive involvement in the project, he could still take part in the discussion.
- 3.4 **The Chair** informed the meeting that the project proponent had introduced the conceptual idea of revitalising the Tsim Sha Tsui (TST) waterfront at the Task Force meeting on 7 January 2013. The project proponent would brief Members on the concrete proposal at this meeting.
- 3.5 **Messrs. Jeff TUNG, James CORNER and Paul HART** presented the paper with the aid of PowerPoint.
- 3.6 **Mr Tom CALLAHAN** said the following:
- (a) the proposed 2,500m² commercial Gross Floor Area (GFA) did not appear sufficient to cover the management and maintenance expenditure of the project;
 - (b) key performance indicators (KPI) should be introduced in the new management contract to monitor management performances; and
 - (c) which party would be responsible for the capital expenditure and what were the conditions of the management contract.
- 3.7 **Mr Derek HUNG** expressed following comments:
- (a) the proposal was presented to the Yau Tsim Mong District Council (YTMDC) for three times. YTMDC was in general receptive to the phased works programme which aimed to minimise the nuisances caused to the public and visitors;
 - (b) while some YTMDC Members expressed concerns over the large number of trees to be transplanted, the proposal was in general supported as it would increase the overall greening ratio by 5%;
 - (c) the project proponent had addressed YTMDC's earlier comments on traffic impact, coach parking, accessibility and

pedestrian safety; and

- (d) when preparing the management contract, the proponent should strike a balance between control of management cost and public enjoyment.

3.8 **Dr Sujata GOVADA** echoed Mr CALLAHAN's view in respect of the provision of commercial GFA and enquired the sample size of the survey that was mentioned in the presentation. She further commented that the construction period appeared to be too long; the proposed temporary re-provisioning of the key elements of Avenue of Stars (AOS) to TST East Waterfront Podium Garden was not appropriate; and the increase of coach parking spaces along Salisbury Road would attract more traffic to the area.

3.9 **The Chair** asked if the 500 respondents of the survey were visitors or local residents.

3.10 **Mr Jeff TUNG** and **Mr Paul HART** responded as follows:

- (a) NWD was prepared to contribute the construction cost of the project. This is the same as the arrangement of constructing the existing AOS;
- (b) the management model to be adopted would aim to attract people to use the revitalised AOS by bringing in activities with commercial elements. Revenue generated from the commercial GFA would be used to support routine management and maintenance costs. Further corporate contribution might be required to meet with the shortfall. Members would be consulted on the more detailed management arrangement at a later stage;
- (c) 400 out of the 500 respondents to the survey were local residents from other districts and about 90% of them had visited the AOS before; and
- (d) as the construction works involved removal of some existing supporting structures and installing new ones underneath the AOS, the construction period could not be shortened anymore while adjacent sites such as east TST promenade and Salisbury Garden had to be used as access points and ancillary works areas.

3.11 In response to the Chair's further enquiries on the amount of commercial GFA as provided for in the project area, **Mr Jeff**

TUNG supplemented that about 60-70% of the GFA to be available would be used for commercial activities and alfresco dining, while about 30% would be allocated for other public facilities such as movie element, information kiosk and public toilets.

- 3.12 **Prof Raymond FUNG** said that when the existing AOS was planned, there were many complaints and objections from various stakeholders against planting of trees and construction of structures. Against this background, a cap on the amount of commercial GFA was introduced. If it is deemed necessary to lift the restriction on the cap in order to bring in vibrancy to the waterfront, the community would have to be consulted.
- 3.13 **Ms Debby CHAN** had the following comments/enquires:
- (a) the greening ratio should be maintained in the future and the existing trees should be preserved;
 - (b) some existing facilities with good design such as the railings should also be preserved;
 - (c) as the majority of respondents were local residents, the survey might not be comprehensive enough as the AOS was also a tourist attraction. She considered that facilities for tourists would be different in nature from those that were designed for the general public; and
 - (d) local elements such as movie display boards could be added into the future AOS.
- 3.14 **Mr Franklin YU** enquired whether both scheduled and improvised performances could be allowed at the waterfront promenade and if works at the east TST waterfront promenade and Salisbury Garden could be completed in advance of others for earlier release. He further expressed the following comments:
- (a) the intention to enhance the east-west connection and the proposed design of the public open space including that of the railings were appreciated. The project proponent could further consider enhancing the connection between the hinterland and the waterfront;
 - (b) activities in the format of alfresco dining, arts performances, etc. should be brought to the new AOS; and
 - (c) eating places offering food at different price levels should be

provided within the AOS to cater for different visitors.

3.15 **Dr Sujata GOVADA** provided further comments as follows:

- (a) more pedestrian connections such as at-grade crossings and footbridges should be provided to connect the AOS with the hinterland;
- (b) residents of Hung Hom district should be consulted on the revitalisation plan; and
- (c) the connection with the Star Ferry Pier should be further enhanced.

3.16 **Mr Tom CALLAHAN** enquired the type of corporate sponsorship that could be sought to cover any shortfall in capital expenditure, and whether any sponsorship would be secured before the commencement of works. He opined that an increase in the commercial GFA to be provided by the revitalised AOS could make future operation more financially self-sustainable.

3.17 **Mr Derek HUNG** said that the TST East Waterfront Podium Garden could provide space to relocate the sculptures and exhibits of the AOS for temporary display. He urged the project proponent to undertake extensive promotion and promulgate appropriate management rules for tourists and the public.

3.18 **Ir Prof CHOY Kin-kuen** commented that further shortening the construction period might not be easy from an engineering point of view given the current scale of works. He suggested scheduling the construction works in phases so that part of the waterfront could be opened earlier for public enjoyment.

3.19 **The Chair** enquired details on the proposal of having a non-government organisation (NGO) to manage the revitalised AOS.

3.20 **Dr Louis NG** assured Members that the ownership of the revitalized AOS would remain with the Government. LCSD would entrust the management responsibility of the site to a NGO. To oversee the operation and performance of the NGO concerned, a management committee to be chaired by a senior LCSD directorate officer would be set up to make major management decisions while allowing the NGO to take up daily management duties. An advisory committee comprising different experts, representatives from district councils as well as the community would also be set

up to provide advice on management issues. The NGO would submit an annual business plan for endorsement by the management committee. Discussion between LCSD and the project proponent on details of the management contract was still underway.

3.21 **Mr Jeff TUNG and Mr Paul HART** made the following responses:

- (a) the proposed implementation programme aimed to minimise inconvenience caused to the public, ensure public safety during construction works, and reopen the project area as soon as practicable. Barges would be used to support the works including demolition and repair of the existing supporting structure of the AOS. The east TST waterfront promenade, Salisbury Garden and the New World Centre construction site would be used as access points and ancillary works areas for the renovation works. The project team considered that the renovation works of Salisbury Garden and the east TST waterfront promenade could be completed and re-opened earlier;
- (b) the project proponent would explore any additional pedestrian connections to the AOS. Visitors could make use of Hung Hom MTR Station of the Shatin-to-Central Link to gain access to the revitalised AOS in future;
- (c) as regards the movie component to be featured within the renovated AOS, the project proponent would continue to collaborate with the Hong Kong Film Awards Association and the trade to obtain their advice;
- (d) while existing trees would be retained as far as possible, new trees would be planted at suitable locations with a view to meeting the greening requirement. Other quality greenery features such as vertical greening and lawn would also be considered;
- (e) the survey as well as previous engagement with stakeholders indicated that bringing in commercial activities to the renovated AOS would be important in adding vibrancy to the area;
- (f) the proposed works aimed to bring local residents to the waterfront, and at the same time, create a new landmark for tourists;

- (g) a mixture of eating outlets of different price levels would be provided along the renovated AOS. With the provision of outdoor seating, people could enjoy the space by bringing in their own food; and
- (h) a balance would be achieved between allocating GFA for commercial uses and other facilities. Any shortfall of operating expenditure would be met by corporate sponsorship.

3.22 **The Chair** said that the Task Force supported the general direction of the project especially in creating a vibrant harbourfront, which was in line with the harbour planning principles. Members noted the details provided by the project proponent on the proposal. She asked the project proponent to take into account Members' comments when taking forward the project and consult the Task Force again on the commercial activities and management approach within the renovated AOS.

**The project
proponent**

[Post-meeting note: The Secretariat received further written comments from Ms Debby CHAN, which was copied to Members on 4 February 2015. It was relayed to the project proponent for information.]

Item 4 Amendments to the Approved Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong, Lei Yue Mun Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K15/21 (Paper No. TFK/02/2015)

- 4.1 **The Chair** informed Members that PlanD had previously briefed the Task Force on the preliminary land use proposals of the Planning Review on Development of Ex-Cha Kwo Ling Kaolin Mine Site (the Planning Review) at its 12th meeting on 22 January 2013. PlanD would like to seek Members' views on the amendments to the approved Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong, Lei Yue Mun Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K15/21. Part of the amendments was to implement the finalised land use proposals for the ex-Kaolin Mine Site recommended by the Planning Review. Other amendments were mainly related to dividing the Yau Tong Industrial Area "Comprehensive Development Area" (CDA) into sub-zones and developing new social welfare facilities at Lei Yue Mun Path.
- 4.2 **Mr Tom YIP** presented the paper with the aid of PowerPoint.
- 4.3 **Mr Franklin YU** said as the Task Force was consulted on Amendment Items B and C in the past, he enquired if the

comments raised by Members had been addressed in the current amendments.

4.4 **Mr Tom YIP** responded as follows:

- (a) the previous land use proposals for the ex-Kaolin Mine Site were in general supported by the Task Force. Members earlier requested for an improved urban design in which the building height could better tie in with the waterfront setting. This had been taken into account when finalizing the corresponding Amendment Item; and
- (b) it was PlanD's intention to maintain the existing condition of the Cha Kwo Ling Tsuen when the previous land use proposals were presented to the Task Force in January 2013. After subsequent discussions with stakeholders, the villagers had requested redevelopment of the Cha Kwo Ling Tsuen. PlanD considered that it was prudent to conduct a separate study to ascertain future land use of the Cha Kwo Ling Tsuen, and the site was rezoned to "Undetermined" for the time being pending the results of the study; and
- (c) the Task Force was not consulted on the proposed subdivision of the Yau Tong Industrial Area (YTIA) CDA, i.e. Amendment Item A, in the past. However, one of the developers of the CDA zone had consulted the Task Force on its proposed redevelopment scheme within YTIA in May 2014. Through the deliberation, PlanD noted Members' comments in respect of providing an accessible waterfront promenade for public enjoyment. Under Amendment Item A, a 15m-wide waterfront promenade of about 400m long was designated along the waterfront within all CDA sub-zones.

4.5 **The Chair** said that when discussing the redevelopment plan proposed by the private developer within YTIA, Members were concerned that only residents or users of the CDA sub-zones could have access to the waterfront promenade. She enquired if the current OZP amendments could address such concern and ensure that the general public would be allowed to gain access to the waterfront promenade.

4.6 **Mr Tom YIP** replied that the current proposal could address Members' concern as the general public would be able to gain access to the waterfront promenade. Although the development programmes of different sub-zones might be different, the sections of waterfront promenades within CDA sub-zones could be

accessed through the existing public roads, i.e. Shung Shun Street, Yan Yue Wai and Shung Wo Path.

- 4.7 **The Chair** said that the OZP amendments including setting back at the waterfront would ensure an accessible waterfront and were in line with the harbour planning principles. She informed the meeting that Members' comments would be summarised and conveyed to the Town Planning Board for reference.

[Post-meeting note: Members' comments were summarised and conveyed to the Town Planning Board on 4 February 2015.]

Item 5 Relocation of Supporting Operational Facilities of Tsim Sha Tsui Fire Station Complex (Paper No. TFK/03/2015)

- 5.1 **Mr Franklin YU** declared that his company was the consultant to the project team. **The Chair** decided that he could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion.
- 5.2 **Prof Raymond FUNG** declared that he was a Board Member of West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD) Authority. **The Chair** considered that the item concerned focused more on details of the reprovisioning site. **Prof FUNG's** board membership should not constitute a direct conflict of interest, and he could still participate in the discussion.
- 5.3 **The Chair** informed Members that to facilitate development of WKCD, part of the Tsim Sha Tsui Fire Station Complex would be demolished and relocated to a site at To Wah Road in West Kowloon Reclamation. The project team would brief Members on the relocation proposal and the preliminary design of the new building.
- 5.4 **Mr HO Tat-hei** and **Mr Marcus CHOI** presented the paper with the aid of PowerPoint.
- 5.5 **Prof Raymond FUNG** considered that the design could be more harmonious with the surrounding environment. For instance, the colour of the fence wall might not be red.
- 5.6 **Prof CHOY Kin-kuen** enquired the level that the building aimed to achieve under the Building Environment Assessment Method (BEAM) Plus scheme.
- 5.7 **Mr Tom CALLAHAN** considered the location was ideal for

reprovisioning FSD facility and urged for early implementation of the project.

- 5.8 **Mr Derek HUNG** enquired whether the proposed new facility at To Wah Road site would include any fire training facilities. He considered that the use of the adjacent site (which was currently used as a bus terminus) should be planned holistically with this project.
- 5.9 **The Chair** enquired if it would be possible to replace the new building by a number of smaller buildings in order to minimise visual impact from the hinterland.
- 5.10 **Mr HO Tat-hei** replied as follows:
- (a) the design including the colour of fence wall could be further reviewed in the detailed design stage;
 - (b) the new building aimed to achieve the “Gold” rating under the BEAM Plus scheme;
 - (c) YTMDC and the Legislative Council would be consulted on the proposal in February 2015 and Q2 2015 respectively. It was the Government’s intention to implement the project as soon as possible;
 - (d) if the reprovisioning project could be completed in 2018, the site at Canton Road could be handed over to the WKCD Authority in 2019; and
 - (e) the site was subject to various site constraints including a non-building area covering more than 40% of the site. The available space for development was triangular in shape which limited design flexibility.
- 5.11 **Mr KEUNG Sai-ming** supplemented that the rescue training centre in the vicinity was a stand-alone facility and different from the supporting facilities to be reprovisioned.
- 5.12 **Mr CHOW Ping-tim** said that the proposed new building would affect the visual corridor of the buildings behind. He also enquired if some space could be allocated for organising educational events.
- 5.13 **Mr Derek HUNG** enquired whether the site could provide more GFA to meet future demand of fire services.

- 5.14 **Mr Tom CALLAHAN** enquired the possibility to relocate other facilities to the site at To Wah Road in order to maximise its site utilisation.
- 5.15 **Dr Sujata GOVADA** asked if the building height restriction of the site could be relaxed to provide more space to accommodate other facilities.
- 5.16 **Mr KEUNG Sai-ming** replied as follows:
- (a) the existing Tsim Sha Tsui Fire Station was strategically located in order for firemen to arrive at the fire scene within the arrival time as prescribed under the performance pledge. The site at To Wah Road was not able to meet with such locational requirement. Therefore, the operational units of the Tsim Sha Tsui Fire Station would not be relocated to the To Wah Road site;
 - (b) the supporting facilities to be reprovisioned including offices, workshops, fitness training facilities, etc. Except for the fire protection regional offices, these facilities would not be open to the public. However, FSD would continue to organise regular events, such as open days at other fire stations to raise fire protection awareness among the public;
 - (c) since it is a reprovisioning project, the usable GFA will be provided on like-to-like basis. However, other facilities such as transformer room and lift shaft will be provided in accordance with up-to-date regulations/requirements and
 - (d) FSD was liaising with relevant government departments to explore ways to achieve better site utilisation. The Task Force would be updated if there was any new proposal in the future.
- 5.17 **The Chair** asked the project team to take into account Members' comments when taking forward the project.

Item 6 Any Other Business

Action Area

- 6.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Action Areas Table as at January 2015 was circulated to Members on 13 January 2015.
- 6.2 **The Chair** invited Member's suggestion on the particular action

area(s) to be discussed at upcoming meetings. **Mr Franklin YU** said that the cycle track between Tsuen Wan and Tuen Mun had potential to become one of the quick win projects. As its programme was being reviewed and detailed design was being prepared, it might be an agenda item for discussion at the next meeting. **The Chair** said that a site visit for the cycle track project was held in May 2014. She enquired if there was any update on the implementation of the project which might be worth for discussion at a future meeting.

CEDD

Site Visit Request

- 6.3 **The Chair** informed Members that Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN had made a request to the Secretariat to organise a site visit to the Tsing Yi waterfront. **The Chair** said that the Task Force at its meeting held on 26 May 2014 agreed that future site visits would only be arranged when (i) there was a clear purpose of the site visit; and (ii) at least half of the non-official Members was interested to join the site visit.
- 6.4 **Miss Debby CHAN** briefed Members on the objective and issues identified through a recent site visit by Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN and herself with the aid of PowerPoint.
- 6.5 **The Chair** appreciated the efforts made by Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN and Ms Debby CHAN in identifying issues related to the Tsing Yi waterfront. She supplemented that the presentation was already comprehensive enough for Members to understand the current situation and issues for further discussion. She recalled that the Task Force had visited the Tsing Yi waterfront in September 2010 whilst some Members might have visited the areas on their own before. Another site visit to the Tsing Yi waterfront might not be necessary. As a major portion of the promenade was managed by LCSD, **the Chair** invited LCSD to coordinate with other concerned departments/parties to address the issues as identified at the next meeting.
- 6.6 **Mr Franklin YU** and **Mr Derek HUNG** concurred that another site visit to the Tsing Yi waterfront might not be necessary. They considered that inter-departmental efforts would be required to address the issues as identified.
- 6.7 The meeting agreed that LCSD and relevant departments/parties responsible for the waterfront promenades along the Tsing Yi waterfront should be invited to respond to the issues as identified at the next meeting.

LCSD and
relevant
departments/
parties

- 6.8 **Dr Sujata GOVADA** suggested another site visit to the Hung Hom and east TST waterfront in view of the possible closure of the promenade for three years.
- 6.9 **The Chair** appreciated her comments, but queried whether a visit to the site while it was closed would be helpful. She invited Dr GOVADA to consider details of the proposed visit and brief Members at a future meeting if she wished to pursue further.

Value Management Workshop for the "Open Space Development at Hung Hom Waterfront"

- 6.10 **Mr Tom CALLAHAN** requested for more information regarding the Value Management Workshop for the "Open Space Development at Hung Hom Waterfront" to be organised by LCSD and Architectural Services Department on 30 January 2015.
- 6.11 **Miss Margrit LI** replied that the purpose of the workshop was to gather views from both Task Force and DC members on the future design and uses of the proposed public open space at the Hom Hung waterfront. She said that supplementary information would be provided for Members' reference after the meeting.

[Post-meeting note: The Secretariat circulated the supplementary information on the Value Management Workshop to Members on 21 January 2015.]

- 6.12 The Chair informed Members that the next meeting was tentatively scheduled for May 2015.
- 6.13 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:30pm.

**Secretariat
Task Force on Harbourfront Developments
in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing
May 2015**