

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

Minutes of Twentieth Meeting

Date : 1 September 2015
Time : 2:00 p.m.
Venue : Conference Room (Room G46) at Upper Ground Floor,
Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre, Kowloon Park,
Tsim Sha Tsui

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 Conservancy Association
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Franklin YU	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Sr Lesly LAM	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr TAM Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Prof CHOY Kin-kuen	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Shuki LEUNG	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr Edward LEUNG	Senior Manager (Tourism) 2, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr Wilson PANG	Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon, Transport Department (TD)
Ms Joyce LAU	Senior Engineer/1 (Kowloon) , Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Ms Margrit LI	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) 1, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Mr Lawrence CHAU	District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon, Planning Department (PlanD)
Miss Ingrid TJENDRO	Secretary

In Attendance

Mr Nicholas BROOKE	Chair, Harbourfront Commission
Miss Christine AU	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), Development Bureau (DEVB)
Ms Michelle YUEN	Senior Town Planner/ Yau Tsim Mong, PlanD

Absent with Apologies

Mr Paul CHAN Yuen-king Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Dr Peter Cookson SMITH Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners

For Agenda Item 5

Dr Louis NG Deputy Director of Leisure & Cultural Services (Culture), LCSD
Ms Heidi CHU Chief Manager (Urban/Services), LCSD
Mr David CHAIONG Chief Leisure Manager(Hong Kong West), LCSD
Mr Jeff TUNG Senior Project Director - Project Management, New World Development Company Limited (NWD)
Ms Angel LUKE Senior Project Manager, NWD
Ms Becky CHAN Senior Manager- Integrated Public Relations - Corporate Communication, NWD
Mr Daniel PANG Project Manager, NWD
Mr Sion EDWARDS Director, Urbis Limited
Mr Kenneth CHEUNG Senior Landscape Designer, Urbis Limited
Mr Paul HART Executive Director, Greater China, Knight Frank
Ms Livian HAR Director, Knight Frank
Mr Peter YAM Chin-pang Director, Ronald Lu & Partners (Hong Kong) Ltd.

For Agenda Item 6

Mr Tom YIP District Planning Officer/Kowloon, PlanD

For Agenda Item 7

Mr Ricky YEUNG Senior Property Manager, MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL)
Mr Jerry WONG Property Development Surveyor, MTRCL
Mr Lewis CHU Senior Deputy Project Manager, Jubilee Year Investments Limited
Mr Sam YIU Architect, Jubilee Year Investments Limited
Mr Kelsey CHAN Architect, Hsin Yieh Architects & Engineers Limited
Mr Niki LAI Director, LWK & Partners (HK) Limited
Ms Stephanie LAI Project Executive, LWK & Partners (HK) Limited
Mr YEUNG Chi Yan Deputy District Leisure Manager(Tsuen Wan)2, LCSD
Mr Eddie CHAN Senior Executive Officer (Planning)7, LCSD

For Agenda Item 8

Mr Samson Y.K. LAI Assistant Director (Waste Management Policy), Environmental Protection Department (EPD)
Mr Eddie S.K. LEUNG Senior Engineer (Waste Management Policy Division), EPD
Ms Sonia H.Y. WONG Engineer (Waste Management Policy Division),

EPD

For Agenda Item 9

Mr Steven WONG Hung -lok Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Waste Reduction & Recycling)², EPD
Mr YU Wing-lun Environmental Protection Officer (Waste Reduction & Recycling)²³, EPD

Action

Welcoming Message

Mr Nicholas BROOKE, Chair of the Harbourfront Commission (“HC”), welcomed all to the meeting.

Item 1 Election of Task Force Chair

- 1.1 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** nominated and Members supported **Prof Becky LOO** unanimously to be the Chair of the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing (“the Task Force”).
- 1.2 **Mr BROOKE** announced that **Prof Becky LOO** would be the Chair of the Task Force. **Prof LOO** took over chairmanship from **Mr BROOKE** and thanked Members for their support.
- 1.3 **The Chair**¹ informed Members that Mr Edward LEUNG, Senior Manager (Tourism) 2 of TC attended on behalf of Ms Emily MO; and Ms Joyce LAU, Senior Engineer/1 (Kowloon) of CEDD attended on behalf of Mr Janson WONG. She also welcomed Sr Lesley LAM representing the Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors as a new Member of the Task Force.

Item 2 Confirmation of Terms of Reference (“ToR”) of the Task Force

- 2.1 **The Chair** invited Members to consider the ToR of the Task Force being tabled at the meeting, which was the same as the one for the last term.
- 2.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested including specific reference to the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines in the ToR.

¹ “The Chair” thereafter is referred to Prof Becky LOO as the Task Force Chair.

Action

- 2.3 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** agreed with Mr ZIMMERMAN's suggestion and proposed highlighting the element of public engagement in the ToR.
- 2.4 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** concurred that the terms related to public engagement on harbourfront projects should be clearly stated in the ToR.
- 2.5 **Miss Christine AU** said that as the proposed amendments would have a bearing to the ToR of all four Task Forces, the Secretariat would circulate the revised draft ToR to Members for comments and endorsement at the forthcoming Commission meeting.
- 2.6 **The Chair** said that notwithstanding the above proposed amendments, the rest of the ToR was confirmed at the meeting.

Item 3 Acknowledgement of Minutes of the 19th Meeting

- 3.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the draft minutes of the 19th meeting were circulated to Members on 14 August 2015. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated to Members again on 21 August 2015. Due to changes in membership, Members of the current term were invited to acknowledge the minutes.

Item 4 Matters Arising

A. *Proposed Short Term Tenancy (STT) for Fee-paying Public Carparks at Wa Shun Street and Bailey Street (paragraph 2.6 of the minutes of the 19th meeting)*

- 4.1 In response to **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN's** email on 17 August 2015 requesting for a report on the latest progress as well as the development programme of the planned open spaces at the two sites concerned, **the Chair** informed the meeting that relevant departments would update Members under "Any Other Business" of the meeting.

Action

B. Public Open Space Bylaw of West Kowloon Cultural District (paragraph 3.21 of the minutes of the 19th meeting)

4.2 **The Chair** reported that Members' comments raised at the last meeting were summarised and conveyed to the West Kowloon Cultural District Authority on 29 May 2015.

Item 5 Action Areas - Tsim Sha Tsui East and Tsim Sha Tsui West Action Areas - The Avenue of Stars and Salisbury Garden Revitalisation Plan - Progress Update (Paper No. TFK/06/2015)

5.1 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** proposed that the Task Force should have a separate discussion on three aspects of the project before the project proponent was invited to join the meeting, namely design, management and public consultation.

5.2 **The Chair** responded that she would rather open the entire discussion to the project proponent since the Harbourfront Commission ("HC") and its Task Force was a transparent advisory body. She proceeded to welcome representatives from the project team.

5.3 **Mr Shuki LEUNG** informed the meeting that the project proponent was a member of REDA. **The Chair** considered that there was no direct conflict of interest and REDA had no substantive involvement in the project; Mr LEUNG could stay at the meeting and take part in the discussion.

5.4 **Mr Franklin YU** declared that his company had business dealings with the project proponent but not on this particular project. **The Chair** considered that Mr YU's involvement in the project was not direct and he could take part in the discussion.

5.5 **The Chair** then informed the meeting that the proponent consulted the Task Force on the revitalisation proposal twice - on 22 January 2013 and 19 January 2015. In both meetings, Members expressed a strong wish to be kept informed of the development of the project, especially in relation to the development parameters, commercial activities and management approach. The proponent submitted a planning application to the Town Planning Board ("TPB") on 3 July 2015 for approval for uses including eating place, and shop and

Action

services within the project area. The gist of the planning application was circulated to Members on 16 July 2015. The proponent invited Members to attend an informal session held on 17 August 2015 with three days' notice, and regrettably, many Members including herself could not join. The application was then approved with conditions by the Metro Planning Committee of TPB on 21 August 2015. She expressed great disappointment that the proponent submitted their planning application before consulting Members again, and the Task Force was not given the opportunity to indicate its views including support or objection to the proposal. **The Chair** also agreed to table a PowerPoint and an email submitted by **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** and **Prof Raymond FUNG**, a co-opted Member of the Task Force in the last term, respectively for Members' information.

- 5.6 **Mr Jeff TUNG** apologised for not being able to consult the Task Force again before their submission of planning application to TPB, but he reassured Members that the project team would continue to engage the Task Force and report on their progress on different parts of the project. He proceeded to make the presentation with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 5.7 **Dr Louis NG** offered his apologies for not consulting Members earlier. He made the following remarks in relation to the management of the promenade -
- (a) the project team was prepared to engage the public and relevant stakeholders, including the Task Force, to improve the present design of the waterfront;
 - (b) he noted Members' views on the management model including the entrustment to a not-for-profit organisation ("NPO"). LCSD would set up an Advisory Committee to assist in the formulation of the management plan and key performance indicators ("KPIs") for the NPO, as well as to supervise performance of the NPO in the future. A member of the Task Force would be invited to join the Advisory Committee. He added that the management framework currently proposed was still at a preliminary stage and had yet to be finalised. The project team would work closely with the Task Force in refining and finalising the details of the management approach; and

Action

- (c) due to on-going legal proceedings of a case for judicial review relating to the revitalization plan, the Proponent would not comment on the entrustment and tendering procedures at the meeting.

5.8 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** pointed out that the fundamental issue, before tapping into the detailed design and management approach, was that only a limited number of stakeholders but not the broad community were consulted. He said that a good engagement process should involve three steps, including envisioning, concept design and finalisation. He viewed that the Task Force should ensure that the proponent would carry out broad and early public consultation in a well-organised manner.

5.9 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** said that devil was in the details and the project proponent did not provide clear explanation on the management option of the waterfront. It was important for the proponent to strike a good balance among different opinions expressed on the design and management model. For example, it was unknown to the public to whom the future operating organization would be accountable, and who would have the final discretion on the design, operation and activities of the promenade.

5.10 **Mr Franklin YU** agreed with Mr ZIMMERMAN and Mr TAM and added the following comments and enquiries -

- (a) a wide range of activities and food and beverages ("F&B") selection ranging from local snacks to up-scale dining should be accommodated along the waterfront;
- (b) the existing landing steps at the promenade should be retained and enhanced;
- (c) connectivity between the hinterland to the north of Salisbury Road and the waterfront should be improved;
- (d) he sought clarification on the completion time for the renovation works for the Avenue of Stars ("AoS") as stated in paragraph 30 of the paper - whether it would be completed in Q4 2017 or Q4 of 2018;
- (e) on detailed design, he opined that sitting area should be provided along the whole of the waterfront and the

Action

design of the public toilet should be improved. He suggested that the proponent should consult the Architectural Services Department (“ArchSD”) for improving the detailed design; and

- (f) noting that any revenue reaped from the project would be remitted in full to the Government, he considered it difficult to have an effective Public Private Partnership (“PPP”) as the private sector was not given any incentive for higher performance. He questioned if it would be possible for the private entity to make profit from the project if the operator was to be selected through open tender.

5.11 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** said that the Task Force had a specific remit with regards to public engagement for the planning and urban design of harbourfront development projects. He viewed that the project proponent should furnish the Task Force with a detailed plan and programme for public engagement as soon as possible.

5.12 **The Chair** made the following comments and enquiries –

- (a) the building height of structures would range from 8.15m to 9m as shown in the presentation but it was not clear whether such an increase would be considered significant;
- (b) whether the proponent had considered omitting the roof canopy of the observation decks in order to minimise visual impact on the Harbour;
- (c) whether the proponent could advise on the operation party for the eateries and commercial activities along the waterfront; and
- (d) on the design of railings, she understood from the presentation that the new design would not be fully transparent. Given that the existing railing along the waterfront was part of the collective memory for people of Hong Kong and its popularity, the proponent should collect public views more extensively on the most suitable railing design.

5.13 **Mr Jeff TUNG** made the following responses –

Action

- (a) visual impact to the harbour view would be minimised in the detailed design stage; and
- (b) the modified design of the railing was suggested so as to improve its visual permeability and protective function. The design could be further revised to balance both technical requirements and public opinion for preserving collective memory.

5.14 With regards to the provision of F&B services on the waterfront, **Dr Louis NG** said that they would select catering operators for the food outlets through open tender. The exact variety and types of eateries provided would depend on the outcome of community engagement and consideration by the Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee would also assist in formulating a management plan.

5.15 **Mr Jeff TUNG** supplemented as follows -

- (a) the project team had all along been collecting views from relevant stakeholders including the locals and tourists, and he assured that they would continue to engage different parties and take into account their comments and aspirations when improving the detailed design;
- (b) he echoed Mr TAM Po-yiu's opinion and responded that the project team would strike a balance between public feedback received and the approval conditions provided by TPB to ensure a waterfront design welcomed by all;
- (c) a set of landing steps would be added along the AoS to enhance water-land interface and marine access along the waterfront; and
- (d) the proposed observation decks would be to serve as additional area for passive activities such as tai-chi, in order to have better dispersion and avoid over-crowding and conflicting uses on the promenade.

5.16 **Dr Louis NG** added that LCSD would advance the establishment of an Advisory Committee to end 2015. Compared with the existing monitoring group led by LCSD, the future Advisory Committee should be able to improve the transparency and accountability of the future NPO for its

management role.

5.17 **Mr Jeff TUNG** continued to respond as follows –

- (a) they believed that the market position of the eateries would not be high-end as the area of each food kiosk and stall was relatively small (around 20 m²). It would most likely be cafeteria serving grab-and-go food, such as hot dogs and local snacks, while more upscale restaurants could be found inside the Museum of Art;
- (b) as regards the connectivity, he said that there were three footbridges connecting to the waterfront, including one from the north of Salisbury Road to the proposed observation deck at Tsim Sha Tsui East promenade, and another one linking up Hung Hom and a proposed podium at the waterfront. For further enhancement, clear signage would be erected to direct people from the transport nodes at Hung Hom and the Hong Kong Coliseum to the extended promenade at Tsim Sha Tsui East;
- (c) in response to Mr Franklin YU's query, he clarified that repair and improvement works of the existing AoS were scheduled for completion in Q4 2018. A three-year period was required for AoS due to its complexity and scale, but the project team would strive to advance the completion time if possible; and
- (d) adequate sitting-out areas would be provided along the waterfront, including the decks atop the food outlets. He also undertook to provide an illustrative plan for temporary seating at the Garden of Stars upon the Chair's request.

**the project
proponent**

[Post-meeting note: the illustrative plan was circulated to Members on 30 October 2015]

5.18 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** considered the response on public engagement strategy from the proponent unacceptable and insisted for a detailed public engagement plan from the project team to Members within ten days.

5.19 **Mr SO Kwok-yin** opined that a questionnaire targeting 500 participants was clearly insufficient and the lack of public

Action

engagement was reflected on the modified design of railings. He would also like to understand why the Task Force was not consulted again before the submission of planning application to TPB.

- 5.20 **Ir Prof CHOY Kin-kuen** opined that the proposed observation decks would impose visual impact on the harbour and there would also be safety concerns especially during special occasions when a large crowd would gather for festive events.
- 5.21 **Mr Shuki LEUNG** pointed out that the Task Force had given its blessings to the proponent in the past few years on the overall objectives and principles of the revitalisation plan, but the project team should draw up a detailed public engagement plan to allow community participation in the process. A bottom-up approach of public engagement appeared to be preferable. He also suggested setting up an information kiosk on-site where the design team would be stationed to distribute brochures and have direct interactions with members of the public to seek their views on the Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront.
- 5.22 **Mrs Karen BARRETTO** said that sustainability should be a key component in the design of the waterfront. The proponent should undertake to, minimise waste generated from the construction, re-use materials and furniture if possible, avoid surface run-off towards the Harbour and using recyclable materials for the shops and services on the waterfront.
- 5.23 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** made the following comments and enquiries –
- (a) LCSD should consult the Task Force again and should not make any decisions on the entrustment, management and design of the waterfront before the public was fully consulted on these three aspects;
 - (b) he enquired why the New World Development (NWD) would like to manage the waterfront site. He suggested for NWD to donate the promenade renovation for public enjoyment so as to ease any perceived conflict of interests and complications in terms of management;
 - (c) NWD should brief the Task Force and the community on the design of the renovated Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront, including the buildings and components to be built;

Action

- (d) the existing railings were well-loved by the public and should not be removed. The current design also served as “Hong Kong’s longest love seat” for couples to enjoy the seaview;
- (e) he questioned whether crowd control was fully taken into account with the designs, and pointed out that the observation decks and proposed seating would likely be closed by the Police for crowd control during events like dragon boat races. He also would like to see a 3D-model of the proposed promenade before providing further comment;
- (f) there were a lot of existing and future marine uses and waterborne transport using the waterfront. The design of the promenade should support and enhance these uses;
- (g) the proponent should justify the three-year closure of the entire waterfront for renovation, and explain why construction works could not be carried out in phases; and
- (h) he asked for the locations and size area of harbourfront land entrusted to NWD and the rationale behind.

5.24 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** pointed out that approval conditions by TPB were usually broad, and the Task Force would be able to contribute towards the detailed design of the project. He said that the proponent should clarify the design language for the entire waterfront. For example, the design should demonstrate interesting and unique elements during both day and night time, and there should also be seasonal variations. With Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront as a popular gathering place during special occasions, the design should cater for different events and enable good utilisation of its facilities.

5.25 **The Chair** asked the team to consider Members’ suggestions on the detailed design and report to the Task Force again. In response to Members’ emphasis on the need for extensive consultation, she requested the project team to submit a detailed and realistic public engagement plan in 14 days, so that Members would know when to be consulted again before the project was to be rolled out.

Action

- 5.26 **Dr Louis NG** undertook to provide the Task Force with the requested public engagement proposal within ten working days. He said that the agreement for entrustment would not be signed within 2015 and there would still be ample time and room for further consultation and refinement to improve the present design of the waterfront.

[Post-meeting note: the Secretariat circulated the paper entitled "Enhanced Public Engagement Exercise for the Tsim Sha Tsui Waterfront Revitalisation Plan" submitted by LCSD to Members on 14 September 2015.]

- 5.27 **Mr Jeff TUNG** promised that the team would take into consideration Members' comments as well as the conditions given by TPB in the design and consult the Task Force again when the revised design was ready. He also responded that sustainability was one of the key underlying elements of the overall design. NWD had registered to the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design ("LEED") and the Sustainable Sites Initiatives ("SITES") for certification of sustainability of the open space design. They would also explore different types of sustainable energy for use and display to show the conscientiousness for green building. For existing street furniture which was still usable, they would liaise with LCSD to see whether it could be re-used or re-featured elsewhere.
- 5.28 **Mr Sion EDWARDS** supplemented there were certain good elements in the present design of the railings, but there were also operational constraints which had restricted the variety of activities permissible on the promenade. He said that the proposed design was still at an infant stage and they would certainly hone the new design further to create a relaxing but lively environment for people to enjoy.
- 5.29 **The Chair** thanked the proponent for their initiative in revitalising the Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront and making it into a more enjoyable place for the community. She invited the project team to share the revised design with technical details with the Task Force when ready.

- Item 6 Draft Planning Brief for the Five "Comprehensive Development Area" Zones at Tung Yuen Street and Yan Yue Wai, Yau Tong (Paper No. TFK/07/2015)**

Action

- 6.1 **The Chair** welcomed **Mr Tom YIP**, District Planning Officer/Kowloon of the Planning Department (PlanD), to the meeting. **Mr Tom YIP** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 6.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** expressed that the edge of the waterfront should be enhanced to include a two to three foot wide seawall with bollards and railings similar to those at New Yau Ma Tei Typhoon Shelter. A 10-metre wide promenade and a three-metre wide outdoor dining area could be provided. He also viewed that a canopy should be built to block noise nuisance generated from patronage in the sitting area.
- 6.3 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** had the following comments and questions -
- (a) the fragmented land ownership of the five Comprehensive Development Area ("CDA") zones would lead to different designs;
 - (b) why there was no request for a separate urban design proposal to be submitted by the developers;
 - (c) special attention should be given to the interface between the periphery of CDA(5) site and the adjoining Sam Ka Tsuen Typhoon Shelter;
 - (d) whether Government, Institution and Community (G/IC) facilities could be re-provisioned within a single site instead of having them distributed on the waterfront or scattered amongst the five sites; and
 - (e) connection of the promenade to Kwun Tong and Kai Tak might not be possible given the presence of a mixed concrete plant and other private entities at the western end leading to Kai Tak.
- 6.4 **Mr Franklin YU** expressed the following views -
- (a) visual impact caused by the proposed residential development might not be regarded as insignificant. Yet given that it would replace the existing industrial use, he considered it as an acceptable trade-offs;
 - (b) he asked if there were any requirements in the Planning

Action

Brief or urban design guidelines which could align the design of the whole of the promenade fronting the five CDA sites;

- (c) the sewerage pumping station in the vicinity of the mixed concrete company mentioned by Mr TAM Po-yiu should eventually be relocated and PlanD might explore whether the owner of the mixed concrete company could open up its seafront land for the construction of a continuous promenade to link up the one at Yau Tong Bay in the future; and
- (d) he suggested including certain requirements on visual permeability in the design of the ground floor of buildings within the five CDA sites so that people strolling along Tung Yuen Street could enjoy a more pleasant environment.

6.5 **Mr SO Kwok-yin** expressed that the location of the proposed promenade was rather remote and suggested including a cycling track to make the place more accessible.

6.6 **Mr Shuki LEUNG** supported the idea of subdividing the currently large CDA zone into five smaller zones to allow richer diversity in terms of design and use. He enquired whether the Planning Brief could allow some flexibility for iconic building design and provision of pedestrian connections between sites. He asked about the rationale of not setting a minimum commercial GFA requirement for the CDA sites except for CDA(5). He also asked if there would be any mitigating measures for noise nuisance.

6.7 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** asked if it was possible to turn the three dead-end streets, namely Shung Wo Path, Yan Yue Wai and Shung Shun Street, into designated pedestrian areas to improve the connectivity to the waterfront as well as the nearby typhoon shelter.

6.8 **Mr Tom YIP** responded as below –

- (a) the draft Planning Brief outlined the basic design and development requirements of the sites for individual developers to work upon their detailed design and proposals to be submitted to the Town Planning Board (“TPB”) for approval in the future. Setting detailed

Action

conditions in the Planning Brief at this stage might pre-empt and restrict future design by the private sector. Nonetheless, PlanD would relay Members' views to the TPB and they could be further considered by the developers during the detailed design stage;

- (b) the Planning Brief included the requirements like permeability and separation between buildings. PlanD would try to incorporate constructive comments from Members' as far as practicable, for instance, in aligning the design of five CDA zones and enhancing the visual permeability near Tung Yuen Street;
- (c) both CDA(1) and CDA(3) zones were divided into two portions by Tung Yuen Street. There was flexibility to adjust the GFA on individual portion so long as the total plot ratio of the CDA zone remained at 5;
- (d) there was currently a site zoned R(E) and a sewage treatment plant which blocked the linkage between the promenade at Yau Tong Bay and the proposed promenade within the five CDA sites. The land owner of the "R(E)" site would be encouraged to provide a waterfront promenade when applying to TPB for redevelopment of the site. As the sewerage treatment plant was a government property, PlanD would follow up with the Drainage Services Department to explore feasible options for linking up the two promenades;
- (e) in terms of possible visual impact on the Harbour, the maximum building heights allowed at the five CDA sites were lower than those in the hinterland;
- (f) individual developers were required to submit their urban design proposals as part of the Master Layout Plan submission to TPB and under the established procedure, TPB would invite public comments on the application. The proponent would also be invited to consult Harbourfront Commission or its relevant Task Force(s) on the detailed design;
- (g) on the reprovisioning of G/IC facilities, there were only a salt water pumping station of the Water Supplies Department and a cooked food market of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department ("FEHD") within

Action

the proposed sites and they would be roofed together within CDA(2) zone;

- (h) since the promenade was intended primarily for public use, the specification of commercial elements, such as outdoor dining facilities, in the Planning Brief might not be suitable. However, outdoor seating would be provided along the promenade and future developers could make use of the front edge of their lots adjoining the promenade as outdoor dining area if they so wish;
- (i) the inclusion of cycle track within the promenade might reduce the width of promenade area that pedestrians could enjoy, and cyclists would only be able to cycle for some 400 metres as there would be no cycle track on the proposed promenade at Yau Tong Bay. That said, PlanD would seek advice from LCSD and TD on the possibility for constructing cycle track on the subject promenade; and
- (j) iconic building design was not prohibited in the Planning Brief but the maximum building heights permissible were 80 mPD and 100mPD with room for application to the TPB for minor relaxation.

6.9 **Mr Shuki LEUNG** followed up on his enquire on mitigation for noise nuisance.

6.10 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** asked if the building of bollards and the provision of outdoor dining area could be specified in the Planning Brief. He was also of the view that LCSD would not be the right authority to decide whether a cycle track could be built on the promenade, and requested that shared use should be allowed and it would not be necessary to build a segregated cycle track.

6.11 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** followed up on the possibility of turning the three previously mentioned streets into pedestrian areas and he opined that PlanD might consider allowing an iconic building to be built at CDA(5) zone with a view to diversifying the skyline of the Harbour.

6.12 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** echoed Mr ZIMMERMAN's views on the provision of bollards, outdoor dining areas and allowance of

Action

shared use by cyclists and pedestrians on the promenade.

6.13 **The Chair** said that PlanD could look into the feasibility of including bollards, and pointed out at the same time that guidelines in the Planning Brief should be general in nature and allow flexibility for future development.

6.14 **Mr Tom YIP** further responded as follows -

- (a) the draft Planning Brief did not preclude the possibility of providing bollards along the seawall. PlanD would consult relevant departments and explore the feasibility of specifying such provision;
- (b) since some of the existing facilities like the wholesale fish market might cause nuisance to the nearby residents, requirements would be stipulated in the Planning Brief for the developers to provide mitigating measures on-site and, if considered necessary, off-site;
- (c) the ends of Shung Wo Path, Yan Yue Wai and Shung Shun Street would also form part of the promenade upon full development of the CDA sites but turning the remaining section of the streets into pedestrian areas might not be likely as they served as access roads for vehicles for individual sites; and
- (d) cycling was not prohibited in the Planning Brief. The suggestion of adding cycle track on the promenade was also raised by some Members of TPB. While PlanD would follow-up on this idea with LCSD and TD, he opined that from the planning perspective, the provision of cycle track on the subject promenade might not be recommended as there was no cycle track linking the western section of the waterfront to Yau Tong Bay, rendering the length of the proposed cycle track relatively short.

6.15 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** insisted that the cycle track and bollards should be specified in the Planning Brief at this stage.

6.16 **The Chair** concluded by asking PlanD to consider and consult relevant departments regarding Members' suggestions, including a seawall with bollards and shared use of the

Action

PlanD

promenade by both pedestrians and cyclists. She invited PlanD to suitably inform the Task Force of its final decisions when ready.

[Post meeting note: PlanD has consulted departments concerned including TD, LCSD and CEDD for a consolidated response to Members' suggestions as follows –

- (i) with regard to the provision of bollards for mooring of pleasure boats, since the existing seawall was not designed to cater for berthing of vessels and the location was exposed to south-easterly wind and possible wave action, feasibility of mooring along this section of waterfront would be subject to detailed study. The Planning Brief did not preclude the provision of such facilities by developers taking into account their own design and assessment, and a mandatory requirement on this may not be appropriate;*
- (ii) there was no plan to provide cycle tracks within public road area between Yau Tong and Kai Tak. LCSD advised that no bicycles were allowed to ride at the general area of LCSD's venues. Given that the waterfront promenade was not long with limited width, and there was no similar provision of cycle track in the existing and planned waterfront promenade in Yau Tong Bay and Kwun Tong areas in the north, it was considered not appropriate to stipulate this requirement in the Planning Brief.*

Members' views and departmental comments would be relayed to TPB to facilitate its further consideration of the Planning Brief.]

Item 7 Refurbishment of the Waterfront Promenade at West Rail Tsuen Wan West Station TW5 Bayside Property Development (Paper No. TFK/08/2015)

7.1 **The Chair** welcomed the project team to the meeting. As background, **the Chair** informed the Task Force that according to the lease conditions of West Rail Tsuen Wan West Station TW5 Bayside Property Development, the grantee would need to carry out improvement and refurbishment works for the waterfront promenade in front of the development site near the Tsuen Wan West MTR Station and, upon completion, hand over the refurbished promenade to LCSD for management and maintenance. A site visit to the subject site was organised for Members of last term on 21 May 2014. The project team would like to seek Members' comments on the conceptual design for the refurbishment works. **Mr Niki LAI** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

Action

7.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** made the following comments and enquiries -

- (a) trees with extensive canopy should be selected for better shading. The species at Tsing Yi north and Stanley were good examples;
- (b) whether the project team could show the design of the interface between the promenade and the adjacent West Rail Tsuen Wan West Station TW5 Bayside Property Development and specifically entrances/exits, and where food and beverage would be available together with open areas designated for outdoor seating accommodation;
- (c) what the area shaded grey was between the water space and promenade as indicated on slide 7 of the PowerPoint.

7.3 **Mr SO Kwok-yin** echoed with Mr ZIMMERMAN that none of the proposed tree types could provide good shading and reminded the project team that larger rooting areas would be required for trees with bigger canopy.

7.4 **Mr Franklin YU** had the following comments and questions -

- (a) the proposed alignment of the cycle track was rather awkward;
- (b) with reference to the plan on slide 7 of the PowerPoint, whether the area shaded grey in between the sea and the promenade was publicly accessible and what the white building was; and
- (c) what the design of the ground floor of West Rail Tsuen Wan West Station TW5 Bayside Property Development as well as the exit points to the promenade would be like.

7.5 **Mr Shuki LEUNG** said that there should be enhancement on the functional relationship between the promenade and the Tsuen Wan West station.

7.6 **The Chair** appreciated the contemporary and creative design elements proposed by the project team in the conceptual plan and their consideration from the viewpoint of users of different

Action

ages. She advised the team to take into account the comments received today for further incorporation in the design.

7.7 **Mr Niki LAI** responded as follows –

- (a) the team would explore planting trees with bigger canopy along the promenade to provide better shading. However, there were already a lot of existing trees on the waterfront concerned and the team would hope to retain as many as possible;
- (b) there were four exits from West Rail Tsuen Wan West Station TW5 Bayside Property Development leading to the promenade;
- (c) the strip of grey area in between the water and the waterfront land was a two-metre wide seawall, and the white structure was the existing pumping station. The pumping station could not be relocated but it would not affect the use and safety standard of the cycle track; and
- (d) the alignment of the cycle track was drawn up in such a way because of the need to avoid the Emergency Vehicular Access (“EVA”) reserved thereon.

7.8 **Mr Ricky YEUNG** supplemented that the Tsuen Wan District Council was consulted twice on the design and their comments were well incorporated to their satisfaction.

7.9 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** asked whether the pier-like structure was for embarkation or for loading goods. He suggested covering the pumping station and EVA by some plants to enhance aesthetic appeal of the promenade.

7.10 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** asked why there could not be shared use of the EVA and cycle track. He also opined that the subject waterfront area would become a popular gathering place for different activities instead of an area for people just lingering.

7.11 **Mr Franklin YU** believed that it should be permissible for placing cycle tracks on EVAs and the promenade should be designed for shared use among passers-by, joggers and cyclists. He also suggested utilising the two-metre-wide strip of area that was closest to the sea as a footpath.

Action

- 7.12 **Mr Ricky YEUNG** responded that the strip of area near the sea was rubble-made and was not walkable.
- 7.13 **Mr Kelsey CHAN** supplemented that the width of cycle track and that of EVA did not align. While the width of EVA should be of six metres, a cycle track could not be too wide. He said that the pier-like structure was a water inlet and was not publicly accessible.
- 7.14 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** disagreed with the idea of the cycle track and EVA being mutually exclusive, and opined that the cycle track could cross onto the EVA with demarcation made by paint-marking without having to erect any permanent structures.
- 7.15 **Mr Franklin YU** concurred that part of the cycle track could cross onto the EVA in order to have a smoother alignment.
- 7.16 **The Chair** said that the rationale of separating EVAs and cycle tracks could be further examined and relevant departments such as the Fire Services Department (“FSD”) might be able to provide Members with more insights.
- 7.17 **Mr Ricky YEUNG** explained that co-use of the EVA and cycle track was indeed their original intention. However, it was rejected by FSD and BD in the previous Site Formation Works submission. He added that a two-metre separation between the existing trees and the cycle track was required by CEDD due to safety concerns, and CEDD considered the current layout is preferable from safety perspective under the site constraint.
- 7.18 Upon the Chair’s request, **Ms Joyce LAU** said that she would convey Members’ comments to her colleagues and assist in finding out why cycle track and EVA had to be separated.
- 7.19 In conclusion, **the Chair** said that relevant departments should provide reasonable justifications for the currently proposed cycle track alignment and endeavour to improve and achieve a mutually agreeable design.

**LCSD and
CEDD**

[Post-meeting note: CEDD advised that the feasibility of co-using cycle track and the EVA had been explored among relevant departments

during the planning stage of the project. It was not considered suitable as there would be street features and furniture, such as roadside kerbs and frangible bollards, to be provided in the middle of the cycle track at key locations as traffic management measure for the safety of the road users. In view of this, it might not be suitable to have the cycle track overlapped with the EVA. LCSD also advised that outdoor seating would be provided along the waterfront promenade, and eating and drinking would be allowed. A plan showing the proposed outdoor seating was circulated to Members on 30 October 2015.]

Item 8 Development of Community Green Stations in Kwai Tsing, Tsuen Wan, Kowloon City and Yau Tsim Mong Districts (Paper No. TFK/09/2015)

- 8.1 **The Chair** informed the Task Force that the Government proposed to develop community green stations (CGSs) to enable wider public participation in green efforts and to provide support for green living at the community level. The Environmental Protection Department (EPD) would like to seek Members' comments on the proposed development for the four CGSs within the harbourfront areas in Kowloon. **Mr Samson LAI** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 8.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that although he had reservations on the rationale of CGSs for promoting green education and waste management, he had no strong views on the allocation of harbourfront sites for such purposes.
- 8.3 **The Chair** enquired about the policy on monitoring the non-profit-making bodies operating the CGSs and she would like EPD to share with the Task Force the design of the proposed CGSs when the locations had been confirmed.
- 8.4 **Mr Samson LAI** replied that the Government would sign a three-year contract with the selected non-profit-making organisations in order to supervise their performance, and the allocation of sites would be reviewed upon the expiry of a fixed term of five years. As regards the design, ArchSD would deploy its internal resources for the project while the progress would very much depend on the availability of sites.
- 8.5 **Mr Franklin YU** expressed that the design of the CGSs should adhere to the Harbour Planning Principle and Guidelines and

the team might consider making these CGSs accessible by environmentally friendly means, i.e. by walking or cycling. He also asked whether there would be exhibition or display areas at the CGSs.

8.6 **Mr Samson LAI** responded that –

- (a) the proposed locations for CGSs could all be reached by public transport and there would not be parking space for visitors provided thereat;
- (b) there would be multi-purpose areas as well as areas for the operation of simple recycling activities in the CGSs. Drawing from the experiences of the CGSs in Sha Tin and the Eastern district, Mr LAI shared that information on recycling and products made from recycled materials would be exhibited at the multi-purpose areas for public education purpose; and
- (c) environmental or other community activities could be conducted at CGSs for raising community awareness for the importance of recycling.

8.7 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** expressed in-principle support of the proposal and opined that operation of these CGSs was not as detestable as usually perceived by the public. More education and promotion should be done to change conventional understanding of the recycling industry.

8.8 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** pointed out that there were more than 3 000 recyclable collection points (“RCP”) and bin sites in Hong Kong and some of them were close to the harbourfront.

8.9 **Mr Samson LAI** responded that in conjunction with FEHD, they were following up with the recommendations of the Sustainable Development Council, including exploring the use of RCP to provide stronger recycling support in the community. He also highlighted that the CGSs would not involve on-site treatment of recyclables but would only provide logistics support. EPD would provide continuous education to the community and monitor the operators to ensure that the environment of CGSs was clean and pleasant.

Action

8.10 **The Chair** concluded that Members expressed in-principle support for the allocation of the four harbourfront sites for CGSs. She asked the project team to take into account the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines when drawing up the design of CGSs.

Item 9 Proposed Short Term Tenancy No.3874 Kwai Tsing for Recycling Uses at Wing Shun Street Kwai Chung, New Territories (Paper No. TFK/10/2015)

9.1 By way of background, **the Chair** informed Members that the Government strived to identify suitable sites for further promoting the development of the recycling industry in Hong Kong. A site near Rambler Channel Public Cargo Working Area was proposed to be allocated for recyclers by way of short-term tenancy ("STT") for a fixed term of five years. On the advice of the Chair of the Commission, the proposal was brought to the Task Force for discussion. **Mr Steven WONG** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

9.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** supported the proposed location as the Rambler Channel Public Cargo Working Area had all along been used for exporting of local recyclable materials. Meanwhile, he pointed out that there might be potential visual impact for the residents living on the opposite side of the road. He proposed adding a roof on the structure at a height below 5.10 metre, which was the same as the vehicle height restriction on highways for trucks to go in and out. He also acknowledged the difficulty in site search for accommodating recycling centres and recommended EPD to consider a site at Lin Cheung Road, which was originally used for cargo handling with a sewerage treatment plant nearby but was recently rezoned for residential development.

9.3 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** opined that the operation of the recycling business was not necessarily polluting or environmentally unpleasant. Notwithstanding the proximity to the abattoir and cemetery of the site, recycling facilities would not need to be located near such unfavourable uses all the time. He also advised that the project team should be mindful of the traffic situation in the area especially during Ching Ming and Chung Yeung Festivals.

Action

- 9.4 **Mr Franklin YU** asked if the recycled materials would be exported by sea and whether there would be operational necessity for the recycling centre be located at the harbourfront. Otherwise, the project team might consider selecting other sites farther away from the harbour. The grant of a five-year STT for recycling business should be carefully considered or else other undesirable facilities in the surrounding, such as the abattoir, could never been phased out from the harbourfront.
- 9.5 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** agreed with Mr ZIMMERMAN's suggestion of building a roof as mitigation for the possible visual impact. She viewed that there should be more recycling support facilities in Hong Kong in general. She understood that most of the recyclable materials would be exported by sea and given that most of the surrounding areas were port-related use, the proposed location at Rambler Channel was considered acceptable.
- 9.6 **Mrs Karen BARETTO** enquired if the recyclable materials would be transported by trolley or truck.
- 9.7 **The Chair** asked the team to elaborate their public engagement plan.
- 9.8 **Mr Steven WONG** made the following responses –
- (a) the STT proposal under this agenda item involved treatment and processing of collected recyclables such as sorting shredding, baling, etc., while the CGS initiative presented to Members in the previous agenda item did not. The former should be preferably away from residential premises and the latter could be built closer to residential areas;
 - (b) trucks would generally be used to carry recyclable materials to the site concerned, which would be processed and then exported to Mainland China and other neighbouring countries for recycling. In Hong Kong, around 90% of waste papers would be exported through marine transport. So, the proposed site was located at a desirable location as it was close to the Rambler Channel Public Cargo Working Area which was one of the major export facilities for local recyclable materials ; and

Action

- (c) public engagement would be conducted through the Lands Department. Relevant departments as well as land owners in the surrounding areas were currently being consulted.

9.9 **The Chair** thanked the project team for their presentation and concluded that most Members supported the proposal and considered the proposed site suitable for the proposed use.

Item 10 Any Other Business

A. Proposed Short-term Tenancy ("STT") for Carparking Use

10.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the proposal was circulated to Members on 8 October 2014 and a copy of the paper circulated was also tabled for Members' reference. She invited the Tourism Commission (TC) to update Members on the status of the two proposed STT car parks at (i) Wa Shun Street in Hung Hom; and (ii) the junction of Bailey Street and Sung Ping Street in To Kwa Wan, at the earlier request from Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN.

10.2 In response to the Chair's invitation, **Mr Edward LEUNG** reported that they had received further comments and views from Members of the Kowloon City District Council ("KCDC") and the local community regarding the future traffic arrangement of the proposed fee-paying car park at the junction of Bailey Street and Sung Ping Street. TC, in conjunction with the Transport Department (TD), Lands Department (LandsD) and the Kowloon City District Office, were consolidating responses to address the local concerns. TC would update the Task Force again if there was any progress on the issue in due course.

10.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired about the progress of the extension of Hoi Sham Park.

10.4 **Ms Margrit LI** responded that the design and public consultation of the park extension had been completed. Implementation of the project would be subject to funding availability.

Action

- 10.5 **The Chair** asked if the project of Hoi Sham Park extension would be completed within one year or two, in which case it might not be meaningful for tendering the proposed STTs.
- 10.6 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** supplemented that with the completion of the extension of Hoi Sham Park, the STT car parks at Bailey Street would cease operation. Hence, the Task Force should urge LCSD to implement the project of Hoi Sham Park extension as soon as possible. He also enquired about the progress of the park at the public transport interchange (“PTI”) near the STT car park at Wa Shun Street.
- 10.7 **The Chair** sought clarification on whether both of the proposed STTs were going to be converted into parks to be managed by LCSD.
- 10.8 By way of background, **Miss Christine AU** explained that the proposals of the two STT fee-paying car parks, one at Wa Shun Street and the other one at the junction of Bailey Street and Sung Ping Street, were circulated to Members back in 2014, but were not followed through. Once the construction works for Hoi Sham Park extension commenced, the possibility of using the site as a STT car park would no longer exist. For the site at Wa Shun Street, it was understood that the permanent development would tie in with the adjacent PTI after it was relocated to the hotel development at Hung Luen Road. The construction of the hotel was in progress and was expected to be completed in 2018.
- 10.9 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** expressed his disappointment that government departments continued to propose short-term car-parking use within harbourfront areas despite the objection from HC and the Harbour Planning Principles set in place.
- 10.10 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** requested for a long-term proposal on the overall parking issue at harbourfront areas.
- 10.11 **Mr Franklin YU** agreed that a long-term recommendation for parking space should be formulated.
- 10.12 **Miss Christine AU** said that the Transport and Housing Bureau (“THB”) and TD were invited to the HC meeting in March 2015 to brief Members of the last term on the situation of short-term car-parking sites at harbourfront areas and its long-term

Action

solution. The Chair of the Commission concluded at the meeting that STT carparks should only be a stopgap measure and should be phased out from the harbourfront areas as soon as possible. He also invited THB and TD to update HC in a year's time. She advised that relevant departments had throughout the years, taken onboard Members' comments in a serious manner and were fully aware of Members' preference and concern.

- 10.13 **Mr Wilson PANG** confirmed that the proposed STT carparks were only stopgap measures and TD would look into the matter and devise both short-term and long-term solutions in relieving the traffic and parking problems particularly at tourist hotspots.
- 10.14 In conclusion, **the Chair** remarked that the issue of car-parking within the harbourfront would be discussed holistically at the Commission level and reminded relevant departments, including TC, that STT carparks should be discouraged.

B. *Action Areas Table*

- 10.15 **The Chair** said that the updated Action Areas Table was circulated to Members on 26 August 2015 and was also tabled for Members' information. If Members had any comments or new agenda items that would like to propose, they could pass them to the Secretariat.
- 10.16 **Mr Franklin YU** said that he would like to have an update or further discussion on the cycle track between Tsuen Wan and Tuen Mun at the next meeting. **The Chair** agreed.

CEDD

C. *Date of Next Meeting*

- 10.17 **The Chair** said that the next Task Force meeting would be scheduled for November/ December 2015.
- 10.18 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

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