

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

Minutes of Twenty-second Meeting

Date : 9 March 2016
Time : 3:00 p.m.
Venue : Conference Room , 15/F, North Point Government Offices,
333 Java Road, Hong Kong

Present

Prof Becky LOO	Chair, Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing
Mrs Margaret BROOKE	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr SO Kwok-yin	Representing the Conservancy Association
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Freddie HAI	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Dr Peter Cookson SMITH	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Sr Lesly LAM	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr TAM Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Prof Raymond FUNG	
Mr Thomas CHAN	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands) ¹ , Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Brandon CHAU	Senior Manager (Tourism) 31, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr CHEUNG Mun-kit	Senior Engineer/ Kowloon District Central, Transport Department (TD)
Mr Janson WONG	Chief Engineer/Kowloon 2, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Miss Sylvia TANG	Chief Leisure Manager (Kowloon), Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Mr Lawrence CHAU	District Planning Officer/ Tsuen Wan & West Kowloon, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Larry CHU	Secretary

In Attendance

Mr Nicholas BROOKE	Chair, Harbourfront Commission (HC)
Miss Christine AU	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Miss Ingrid TJENDRO	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 2, DEVB

Absent with Apologies

Mr Paul CHAN Yuen-king	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape
------------------------	---

Ir Prof CHOY Kin-kuen	Architects
Mr Shuki LEUNG Shu-ki	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
	Representing Real Estate Developers Association
	of Hong Kong (REDA)
Dr Edmund LEE	

For Agenda Item 3

Dr Louis NG	Deputy Director of Leisure & Cultural Services (Culture)
Ms Elaine YEUNG	Assistant Director (Performing Arts), LCSD
Ms Heidi CHU	Chief Manager (Urban/ Cultural Services), LCSD

For Agenda Item 4

Mrs Miranda YIM	Assistant Commissioner for Tourism, TC
Mr Brandon CHAU	Senior Manager (Tourism) 31, TC
Mr Wilson PANG	Chief Traffic Engineer/ Kowloon, TD
Ms Sandy SIN	Senior Estate Surveyor/ Kowloon South, Lands Department

Action

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting. She informed Members that Mr Brandon CHAU, Senior Manager of TC, attended on behalf of Ms Emily MO; Mr CHEUNG Mun-kit, Senior Engineer of TD, attended on behalf of Mr Wilson PANG; and Miss Sylvia TANG, Chief Leisure Manager of LCSD, attended on behalf of Mrs Doris FOK.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 21st Meeting

- 1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 21st meeting on 19 February 2016. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated again on 8 March 2016. There being no further amendment, the revised draft minutes were confirmed at the meeting.

Item 2 Matters Arising

- A. Five "Comprehensive Development Area" Zones at Tung Yuen Street and Yan Yue Wai, Yau Tong (paragraphs 2.6 and 2.9 of the minutes of the 21st meeting)

Action

- 2.1 **The Chair** reported that Members had provided comments on the berthing function of the seawall at the Yau Tong Industrial Area. PlanD had provided a written response which was included as a post-meeting note in the minutes circulated to Members.
- 2.2 In response to the post-meeting note, **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** considered that the windy condition should not be the reason for not providing mooring facilities along the seawall. He opined that provision of mooring facilities should be specified in the planning brief. Otherwise, the future proponent would not take any initiative to add or enhance mooring facilities when taking forward development at the site. He saw merits in enhancing the seawall to facilitate berthing of leisure vessels along the Victoria Harbour. He added that the Government should make active attempts to ensure continuous improvement of water-land interface along the harbourfront.
- 2.3 **The Chair** opined that although it might not be appropriate to include provision of mooring facilities as a mandatory requirement due to technical constraints, a more proactive approach could be adopted in the planning brief to encourage the proponent to take forward the initiative. She invited the Task Force on Water-land Interface (TFWLI) to look into the issue holistically along the entire waterfront, and asked Mr Lawrence CHAU to further elaborate on PlanD's response.
- 2.4 **Mr Lawrence CHAU** said that the technical concerns of the departments had to be resolved and he would relay Members' comments to the Kowloon District Planning Office to further explore with other relevant departments.
- 2.5 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** enquired if the sentence "the planning brief did not preclude the provision of berthing facilities..." in the post-meeting note meant that the planning brief stated the provision of berthing facilities would be allowed or the matter would not be mentioned at all. She opined that the planning brief should require the future proponent to further explore provision of berthing facilities. According to her observation, the waterfront along Kwun Tong to Yau Tong did not have many water-land connections.

PlanD

Action

- 2.6 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that it was important for relevant bureaux and departments to recognise that water-land interface would benefit the community as a whole instead of giving comments solely from the perspective of transport needs.
- 2.7 **Mr Thomas CHAN** pointed out that there were landing steps at the adjacent Sam Ka Tsuen Typhoon Shelter to facilitate boarding of vessels. He clarified that after relevant discussions on providing water-land interface facilities in the Yau Tong Bay comprehensive development area, a thorough stock-taking exercise on the distribution of landing steps and public piers was conducted and presented to TFWLI. The issue that the Commission and the Government faced was how the challenges identified, such as the requirements of the Protection of Harbour Ordinance (PHO), could be overcome by government departments and private proponents to further improve water-land interface along the harbourfront.
- 2.8 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** echoed Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN's views on having more mooring facilities. Quoting the example of Yau Tong Bay comprehensive development area, he opined that the developer would not consider including mooring facilities along the waterfront if it was not a requirement in the planning brief. He was disappointed that after repeated discussions, there was limited progress made on overcoming the hurdles like PHO and many opportunities identified along the harbourfront could not be seized due to these constraints. He expressed that the Commission should discuss an overall urban design vision for the harbourfront.
- 2.9 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that providing landing steps would not be sufficient. Seawall should be strengthened for installing bollards and the promenade railing should be set back to facilitate tying of vessels to the bollards. He said that the bollards along the Kwun Tong waterfront could not be used because the glass railings along the promenade were installed too close to the bollards.
- 2.10 **The Chair** concluded that Members aspired to provide more water-land interface facilities along the waterfront. She recognised that TFWLI had been working on identifying gaps. The Commission could take a more proactive role in identifying a pragmatic urban design approach for respective Task Forces to look into specific sites and explore ways to overcome the

Action

hurdles identified. On this particular case, she said that the Task Force would like to see the provision of landing facilities at the site concerned. This initiative could be considered for incorporation into the planning brief as a requirement. She invited Members to identify and report mooring facilities that were not functioning to the Harbour Unit for follow up.

[Post-meeting note: PlanD noted the views of the Task Force in respect of providing more water-land interface facilities along the waterfront and will liaise with the applicant of the concerned sites on the feasibility of providing mooring facilities at the planning application stage.]

B. Refurbishment of the Waterfront Promenade at West Rail Tsuen Wan West Station TW5 Bayside Property Development (paragraph 2.18 of the minutes of the 21st meeting)

2.11 **The Chair** informed Members that an information paper on the provision of food and beverage facilities along the Tsuen Wan waterfront was circulated to Members on 8 March 2016.

C. Advance Works of Cycle Track between Tsuen Wan and Tuen Mun (paragraph 2.26 of the minutes of the 21st meeting)

2.12 **The Chair** noted that CEDD would consult the Task Force on the cycle track design and address the issues raised by Members and requested the timing of consulting the Task Force.

2.13 In response to the Chair's enquiry, **Mr Janson WONG** CEDD responded that he would check and revert after the meeting.

[Post-meeting note: CEDD advised that they would work on the gazettal of the amended cycle track alignment first, and would consult the Task Force when the detailed design of the proposed cycle track was available.]

D. The Tsim Sha Tsui Waterfront Revitalisation Plan (paragraph 3.26 of the minutes of the 21st meeting)

2.14 **The Chair** said that LCSD would update Members on the latest progress under agenda item 3 of the meeting.

E. Marine Access Points in West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD) (paragraph 4.4 of the minutes of the 21st meeting)

Action

2.15 On possible water transport route between WKCD and destinations including Central, Tsim Sha Tsui and Kai Tak, **the Chair** reported that the matter would be followed up by TFWLI.

F. Planning Brief for Comprehensive Development Sites at Lin Cheung Road, Sham Shui Po (paragraph 6.10 of the minutes of the 21st meeting)

2.16 **The Chair** informed Members that PlanD would consult Members when the draft planning brief was ready. In response to the Chair's enquiry, **Mr Lawrence CHAU** said that the draft planning brief might be ready in mid-2016.

G. Road and Infrastructural Works at Lin Cheung Road Site, Sham Shui Po (paragraph 6.12 of the minutes of the 21st meeting)

2.17 **The Chair** reported that after taking into account Members' comments, CEDD proposed a revised design and it was circulated to Members for further comment on 4 February 2016. There was no further comment received from Members.

Item 3 Tsim Sha Tsui East and Tsim Sha Tsui West Action Areas - Public Engagement Exercise Report and Revision of the Tsim Sha Tsui Waterfront Revitalisation Plan (Paper No. TFK/01/2016)

3.1 **The Chair** welcomed the representatives from LCSD to the meeting and invited Members to declare interest, if any. She informed Members that LCSD launched a Public Engagement (PE) exercise on the Tsim Sha Tsui Waterfront Revitalisation Plan (the Plan) between September and November 2015. LCSD briefed the Task Force on their initial findings.

3.2 **Ms Elaine YEUNG** presented Paper No. TFK/01/2016 by summarising key findings and comments received from the PE exercise. She also reported the decision on revising the Plan.

3.3 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** said that Members commented on the questionnaire in which respondents were only asked to comment on the proposed design but not encouraged to give new ideas. Public views on issues such as enhancing accessibility to Tsim Sha Tsui East and improving water-land interface could be

Action

sought through the questionnaire. Comments raised by Task Force Members during previous meetings were not comprehensively recorded in the PE report. He would also like to see how the proponent would balance the conflicting views received during the PE exercise.

3.4 Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN raised the following comments and questions -

- (a) Members had discussed about enhancing the Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront for years and were eager to see resources be invested to improve the area. He enquired the reason for scaling down the Plan;
- (b) he noted that the food and beverage (F&B) facilities were removed from Salisbury Garden in the revised Plan and asked if F&B would be provided somewhere else;
- (c) he enquired about the proposed use of the existing building where the Starbucks café was located and details of the improvement works at Tsim Sha Tsui East;
- (d) the existing railings were serving as seats for visitors and he asked if the revised design of the railing could still provide such function;
- (e) there was pressing need to improve the seawall in the area to facilitate berthing of vessels. He asked whether the previous proposal of providing a set of landing steps near Hung Hom would still be included in the Plan and whether the design had taken into account the needs of other marine related activities; and
- (f) he asked if Members would be consulted on the new design of the Avenue of Stars (AoS).

3.5 Mr Freddie HAI expressed the following comments -

- (a) the current design of Salisbury Garden would not be able to satisfy the needs of coaches for picking up/dropping off tourists and caused traffic congestion in nearby lay-bys. He suggested taking the opportunity to address such needs in the revised design;
- (b) he opined that F&B facilities at Salisbury Garden might

Action

be retained as some arts and performing groups, e.g. Hong Kong Philharmonic, had expressed that provision of F&B facilities nearby was insufficient;

- (c) there were no underground sewerage facilities provided for toilets and the regular need for desludging vehicles coming to empty sludge would give rise to nuisances. He asked the project team to consider this issue when formulating the revised design by providing proper underground sewerage facilities. Public toilets should also be provided near the coach parking area for the convenience of tourists; and
- (d) some trees could be planted at the edge of the promenade to provide shades.

3.6 **Ms Elaine YEUNG** responded that comments from professional groups were received through the focus group meetings. After balancing public views which were received during the PE exercise, a simpler design was adopted and the renovation of Salisbury Garden, AoS and the Tsim Sha Tsui East promenade would be completed in phases to minimise disruption to public enjoyment. She added that the design of Salisbury Garden, including trees shades, public seating, vertical greening and central lawn, etc., would largely remain unchanged. Subject to further discussion with TD, a picking up/dropping off point would be provided at the area outside the former SOGO store.

3.7 **Dr Louis NG** responded as follows -

- (a) the decision to revise the Plan was based on the views collected during the PE exercise;
- (b) LCSD would make reference to its experience of managing the art square fronting the Museum of Art when formulating the management model of Salisbury Garden;
- (c) LCSD would review the provision of F&B facilities at the Hong Kong Cultural Centre while additional catering facilities would be provided upon re-opening of the Museum of Art. LCSD and TC were working on the provision of food trucks at Salisbury Garden;
- (d) LCSD was working with relevant stakeholders including

Action

New World Development (NWD) and TC to explore the provision of more water-land interface facilities;

- (e) the project team was aware of the demand for picking up/dropping off points for tourists. A coach parking area near Tsim Sha Tsui East was identified and the team was exploring another suitable area near Hung Hom; and
- (f) Members' views would be sought on the design of AOS.

3.8 **The Chair** asked the project team to take into account Members' comments on the design of Salisbury Garden. The comments on the design of AoS could be addressed at the next Task Force meeting when a detailed design was presented. She suggested arranging a working session to discuss with Members on the design of AoS in detail. She also opined that water-land interface facilities, toilets and coach parking facilities could be dealt with comprehensively when the design of AoS was discussed.

3.9 **Prof Raymond FUNG** said the following -

- (a) public opinions received during the design stage of the existing Tsim Sha Tsui promenade indicated that placing trees and lamp poles at the edge of waterfront was not preferred as they might block the harbour view. There were also safety issues on putting additional loading onto the seawall. Therefore, trees had been planted next to the road instead of at the waterfront;
- (b) lack of F&B facilities was raised by the public many years ago and the former pumping station was reconstructed to provide space for the Starbucks café as well as an additional kiosk near Hub 3. It was considered difficult to build additional structures along the promenade;
- (c) there were public toilet and coach picking up/dropping off point provided near the Starbucks café but the provision was no longer sufficient due to the increase in number of tourists; and
- (d) there was a suggestion to connect the Tsim Sha Tsui East waterfront with the hinterland to improve its accessibility.

- 3.10 **The Chair** considered that Prof FUNG's involvement in the development of the existing promenade useful in helping Members to better understand the rationales behind the design.
- 3.11 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** expressed that it was not evident from the PE exercise that the revised Plan with a simple design was what the majority of the public wanted. He opined that the proponent might consider other options in addition to the Starbucks café and food trucks to add vibrancy to the waterfront.
- 3.12 **Mr SO Kwok-yin** said that Members were informed of the decision to revise the Plan before knowing the detailed findings of the survey conducted during the PE exercise. He noted that the survey indicated that the original Plan was supported by a majority. He enquired the reason of adopting a simpler design.
- 3.13 Referring to paragraph 8 of the paper, **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** sought clarification on the closure period of AoS. He said that paragraph 8 of the paper might give the public an impression that the closure of AoS could be reduced to 1 year.
- 3.14 **The Chair** commented that the methodology adopted for the survey and the design of the questionnaire might not be suitable for collecting views on the detailed design. She said that a different approach should be explored when collecting public views on the revised design of AoS.
- 3.15 **Ms Elaine YEUNG** replied that the space at Salisbury Garden would be used for arts activities such as mini-concert to complement the overall ambience of nearby cultural venues. She added that the original plan was to close AoS, Salisbury Garden and Tsim Sha Tsui East promenade for 3 years. After taking into account views received during the PE, only AoS, which required complicated repair and renovation works, would be closed for 3 years. The closure of other parts would be reduced by adopting a simpler design.
- 3.16 **Dr Louis NG** added that the period for closing AoS would remain at 3 years due to the complexity of the repair and maintenance works. Paragraph 8 of the paper referred to the Tsim Sha Tsui East promenade which would only be closed upon re-opening of AoS with the closure period reduced from 3 to 1 year. He said that the project team planned to present the

Action

revised design of AoS to Members at the next Task Force meeting and would explore if there would be any room for further shortening the renovation period. For the Tsim Sha Tsui East promenade, relevant stakeholders including the Task Force would be consulted later on two options including partial closure of the promenade for a longer period or closing the entire promenade for a shorter period.

3.17 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** raised the following comments and questions -

- (a) he noticed that new railings would be used at Salisbury Garden and asked if the same design would also be adopted for the entire Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront;
- (b) the cost of repair and renovation works of AoS and whether the management agreement of AoS would be further extended;
- (c) a detailed review on marine accessibility and facilities for organising events should be conducted; and
- (d) the Commission should engage relevant stakeholders such as LCSD, NWD, TD and the general public to enhance the harbourfront areas from the Tsim Sha Tsui ferry pier to Hung Hom promenade including the former International Mail Centre.

3.18 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** opined that focus group discussions could be a more informative and effective way in gauging views from different sectors of the community.

3.19 **Dr Louis NG** responded as follows -

- (a) the repair/renovation works of AoS was conducted in accordance with the management agreement signed between the AoS Management Limited and LCSD in 2004. The AoS Management Limited would bear the cost of repairing the bridge during the term of the agreement;
- (b) the project team planned to present the revised design of AoS at the next Task Force meeting and the design of railings could be discussed at that juncture; and
- (c) LCSD was committed to engage the Task Force and the

Action

public continuously on harbourfront related initiatives.

- 3.20 In conclusion, **the Chair** said that it was undesirable to halt the efforts to enhance the Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront now. The direction of the project was to adopt a balanced approach and a simplified design. Efforts could be made to focus on proceeding the renovation for Salisbury Garden while organising a working session with the Members to discuss the revised design of AoS before the next Task Force meeting. The enhancement of the Tsim Sha Tsui East promenade could be followed up by the Task Force in the future. As regards the suggestion to conduct public engagement by the Commission to envision the enhancement of the entire harbourfront from Tsim Sha Tsui to Hung Hom, the Chair suggested that the matter be discussed under Any Other Business.

LCSD

Item 4 Proposed Short Term Tenancy (STT) for Fee-paying Public Carpark Government Lands at (i) Wa Shun Street, Hung Hom, Kowloon (to be known as KX2971), and (ii) Junction of Bailey Street and Sung Ping Street, Hung Hom, Kowloon (to be known as KX2962) (Paper No. TFK/02/2016)

- 4.1 **The Chair** welcomed the team to the meeting and invited Members to declare interest, if any. She informed the Task Force that the following written correspondences were tabled for Members' reference –
- (a) a letter dated 7 March 2016 jointly submitted by Hon Starry LEE who was a member of the Legislative Council and the Kowloon City District Council (KCDC); Mr PUN Kwok-wah, Chairman of KCDC; and four other KCDC Members; and
 - (b) an email dated 8 March 2016 from Mr Shuki LEUNG, representing REDA, who could not attend the meeting.
- 4.2 **Mr Freddie HAI** declared that he was involved in a project near Wa Shun Street and land use of the site concerned might affect the interest of his client. **The Chair** decided that he could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion in relation to the site at Wa Shun Street but he could still give comment on the proposal at the junction of Bailey Street and Sung Ping Street.

- 4.3 **Mrs Miranda YIM** presented the Paper No. TFK/02/2016.
- 4.4 **The Chair** reported the written comments made by Mr Shuki LEUNG in support of the proposal.
- 4.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** expressed his objection to the proposal and made the following comments –
- (a) there was no clear long-term solution to address the shortage of coach parking. Analysis should be conducted in examining the genuine reasons of the shortage and formulate corresponding measures to address the issue;
 - (b) there was no indication that the proposal was temporary in nature as parking demand could be created once the temporary parking spaces were provided;
 - (c) the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) should be reviewed to require private developers to include coach parking spaces for public use in new developments; and
 - (d) LCSD should advise the programme to develop open space at the sites concerned.
- 4.6 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** said that letting out vacant harbourfront areas for temporary use would be necessary to better utilise land resources. The Task Force should consider STT car park proposals on a case-by-case basis instead of simply neglecting local demand and objecting to all such proposals.
- 4.7 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** said that the Commission should request TD to formulate a long-term solution to address the issue. He opined that granting the site for temporary car parking purpose under a one-year term could be a balanced option.
- 4.8 **Mr Freddie HAI** echoed Mr ZIMMERMAN's concern that it would be difficult to phase out public car parking spaces once they were provided. Nevertheless, he did not see the proposed temporary coach parking area at Bailey Street would affect the implementation of long-term development of the site. He suggested including a mandatory clause to phase out the coach

Action

parking area when the site was required for long-term development.

- 4.9 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** supported granting the site for coach parking purpose for one year only and emphasised that a territory-wide and long-term policy would be essential to resolving the coach parking problem.
- 4.10 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** agreed that demand for coach parking should be analysed in order to formulate corresponding measures. He recognised that coaches would need to park near tourist attractions but provision of road-side parking spaces would no longer be able to cope with the increasing demand. He believed that a long-term solution might not be devised within a year's time.
- 4.11 **Mr SO Kwok-yin** supported that the sites concerned should be used for harbourfront enhancement in the long run. He had no objection to the proposal to reduce traffic congestion in the districts and better utilise the vacant land. He pointed out that the tourism industry was flourishing when the issue was first discussed at the Commission in 2012. He enquired the latest assessment of tourism activities in Hung Hom and To Kwa Wan. He considered that the situation might be improved by coordinating arrival of the tours so as to prevent coaches from entering the area at the same time.
- 4.12 On tourism activities, **Mrs Miranda YIM** said that despite the number of mainland Chinese visitors having dropped by 3% in 2015 and the number of mainland group tours having dropped by 23% as compared with those in 2014, there were still around 120 000 mainland group tours visiting Hong Kong in 2015. The Hung Hom/To Kwa Wan areas were key destinations to provide shops, restaurants and sunset harbour cruises for mainland group tours.
- 4.13 **Mr Wilson PANG** responded that the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) and TD briefed the Commission in March 2015 on the overview of coach and goods vehicle parking at the harbourfront and they would report the progress to the Commission again as committed. At district level, TD was searching suitable parking and loading/unloading sites for coaches and three new loading and unloading spaces along Salisbury Road westbound were just installed in end 2015.

Action

- 4.14 **Ms Sandy SIN** said that the STT was proposed for a fixed term of one year certain and thereafter quarterly and the tenancy could be terminated by serving a three-month notice when the site is required for long-term development.
- 4.15 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** asked about the schedule of reporting back to the Commission on coach and goods vehicle parking at harbourfront.
- 4.16 **Mr Wilson PANG** responded that THB and TD committed to report back to the Commission in one year's time, viz. first half of 2016. **Miss Christine AU** added that an invitation was issued to THB and TD for reporting back to the Commission, timing of which would subject to their confirmation.
- 4.17 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** enquired whether coach drivers would have the incentive to park in the proposed STT sites instead of using on-street parking facilities or parking illegally within the districts.
- 4.18 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** reiterated that using harbourfront areas for coach parking purpose was not conducive to harbourfront enhancement. There was no effort made in reviewing the HKPSG in increasing provision of public coach parking spaces in commercial premises and it would be difficult to phase out any temporary public carparks once operated. The programme for implementing long-term development at the sites concerned should be indicated.
- 4.19 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** reiterated that he would support the proposal for one year only without any scope of extension.
- 4.20 **Mrs Miranda YIM** responded that the proposed STTs were short-term mitigating measures supported by the tourism industry, relevant district council and representatives of tourism and transport constituencies in the Legislative Council. To ensure effective use of the proposed carparks, TC would coordinate with the Travel Industry Council of Hong Kong in issuing circular to the operators of group tours to remind their coach drivers to make good use of the facilities. Where necessary, the Police would also strengthen enforcement action against illegal parking.

Action

- 4.21 **Mr Wilson PANG** responded that TD would continue to explore adding road-side parking spaces and loading/unloading areas. They would suitably ask for additional public coach parking spaces in new developments to address the needs in the districts.
- 4.22 **Miss Sylvia TANG** said that the site at Wa Shun Street was one of the potential sites recommended by the Commission to be vested to the proposed Harbourfront Authority for development. For the site at Bailey Street, around 2,000 m² of the site would form part of the Hoi Sham Park extension project while the remaining would be used for school development. Once funding approval for the extension project was obtained, LCSD would work with LandsD to acquire the site.
- 4.23 **The Chair** asked if the school development at Bailey Street would be implemented within a year.
- 4.24 **Ms Sandy SIN** replied that according to the Education Bureau, the site for school development would not be required before September 2017. Letting out the site for temporary use for a term of one year would be suitable.
- 4.25 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** commented that parking spaces could be provided either by the Government or the private sector in future developments, but the demand could change from time to time. He opined that the coach parking problem could not be simply resolved by the two STT carparks and a more pragmatic solution should be identified.
- 4.26 **The Chair** concluded that the Task Force recognised the need to alleviate illegal parking problem faced by local residents, and considered it acceptable to implement the proposal as an interim solution for a year without extension. The proponent departments were asked to monitor the effectiveness of the proposal and identify a solution for phasing out the proposed car parking areas upon expiry. In addition, the Task Force requested long-term land uses of the sites concerned to be implemented as soon as practicable.
- 4.27 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** said that he agreed with the conclusion made by the Chair. He queried if transport

Action

infrastructure used to support tourism would become an essential component for enhancing vibrancy of the harbourfront. **The Chair** said that the issue could be addressed by THB and TD when reporting back to the Commission. Relevant stakeholders including the tourism industry could be invited to express their views.

- 4.28 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that he would not object to the conclusion. He anticipated that the number of tourists would grow in the long run and targeted measures should be identified to address the issue.

Item 5 Any Other Business

A. *Action Area*

- 5.1 **The Chair** reported that the updated Action Area Table as at February 2016 was circulated to Members on 3 March 2016. She invited the Secretariat to identify suitable action area for discussion, if any, at the next meeting.

B. *Date of Next Meeting*

- 5.2 **The Chair** said that the next Task Force meeting would be tentatively scheduled for May/June 2016.

C. *Public Engagement*

- 5.3 **The Chair** invited Mr Nicholas BROOKE, in his capacity of the Commission Chair, to give views on the PE for enhancing the Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront and the Commission's role in this regard.

- 5.4 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** said that the Commission engaged the public on various key harbourfront developments including the Kai Tak development, the Central-Wan Chai Bypass and the new Central harbourfront. The Commission could partner with relevant bureaux and departments in embarking on future PE exercises as joint initiatives.

- 5.5 On the Chair's invitation, **Miss Christine AU** said that the

Action

Commission was closely involved in the PE exercise of the Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas, overseeing implementation of the long-term development of the new Central harbourfront and examining various enhancement projects along the harbourfront. She agreed that the Commission could work in partnership with the proponents in taking forward the PE under joint efforts. However, the role of individual project proponents could not be diminished.

5.6 **Miss Sylvia TANG** said that she would convey Members' views to the project team.

5.7 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that the scope of the PE should cover the harbourfront areas from the Tsim Sha Tsui ferry pier to the former International Mail Centre. The PE should cover a three-stage process including envisioning, planning and implementation. He pointed out that relevant stakeholders should be closely engaged in taking forward the PE.

5.8 **The Chair** said that the Tsim Sha Tsui ferry pier and the former International Mail Centre could be integrated with AoS and Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront promenade in the informal workshop to be organised in the near future.

5.9 **Miss Christine AU** said that the Task Force's priority could be put on AoS and Salisbury Garden. She supplemented that TD's agreement to participate in such public engagement plans would be important as the Tsim Sha Tsui ferry pier and the bus terminal were currently under TD's management. The former International Mail Centre was included in the Hung Hom District Study in 2008 and the long-term development of the area could be revisited holistically later.

5.10 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** suggested that PHO could be one of the items to be further discussed by the Commission. Members should have a better understanding on the requirements of the "overriding public need" test as it had created barriers for implementing various harbourfront related projects. **The Chair** said that this topic would be dealt with at the Commission level.

**The
Secretariat**

5.11 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Action

**Secretariat
Task Force on Harbourfront Developments
in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing
May 2016**