

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

**Minutes of Twenty-first Meeting**

Date : 9 November 2015  
Time : 2:30 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 Franklin YU	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Dr Peter Cookson SMITH	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr TAM Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr Thomas CHAN	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Edward LEUNG	Senior Manager (Tourism) 2, 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)
Mrs Doris FOK	Assistant Director (Leisure Services)1, 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
Mr Frederick YU	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) Special Duties, DEVB
Miss Ingrid TJENDRO	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 2, DEVB
Mr Dennis LO	Senior Engineer/ 6 (New Territories West), CEDD

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr Paul CHAN Yuen-king	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Sr Lesly LAM	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Ir Prof CHOY Kin-kuen	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Shuki LEUNG Shu-ki	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong

**For Agenda Item 3**

Dr Louis NG	Deputy Director of Leisure & Cultural Services (Culture)
Ms Elaine YEUNG	Assistant Director (Performing Arts), LCSD

**For Agenda Item 4**

Mr Derek SUN	Head, Planning & Development, West Kowloon Cultural District Authority (WKCDA)
Ms LAU Man Sze	Manager, Destination Development, WKCDA
Mr Patrick LAM	Senior Traffic and Transport Engineer, WKCDA
Mr Eric NG	Senior Civil Engineer, WKCDA
Ms Stella WONG	Manager, Community Relations and External Affairs, WKCDA
Mr Matthew POTTER	Associate Director, Wilkinson Eyre
Mr Gordon NG	Divisional Director (Hong Kong), Mott MacDonald

**For Agenda Item 5**

Ms Winnie CHU	Deputy Executive Director, Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (HK) (SPCA)
Dr Fiona M WOODHOUSE	Deputy Director (Welfare), SPCA
Mr Wilfred DIANTO	Authorised Person (List 1), SPCA
Mr CHAN Tat-choi	Managing Director, Toco Planning Consultants Ltd.
Mr Daniel WEI	Project Planner, Toco Planning Consultants Ltd.
Ms Angie PEI	Director of Architecture, Barrie Ho Architecture Interiors Ltd.
Mr Ted LAM	Director, Landes Ltd.

**For Agenda Item 6**

Mr WAN Man-leung	Principal Project Coordinator, CEDD
Mr CHAN Chuen-lung	Senior Engineer, CEDD

**Action**

## Welcoming Message

**The Chair** welcomed all to the meeting. She informed Members that Mr Edward LEUNG, Senior Manager of TC, attended the meeting on behalf of Ms Emily MO; and Mr CHEUNG Mun-kit, Senior Engineer of TD attended on behalf of Mr Wilson PANG.

## Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 20<sup>th</sup> Meeting

- 1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 20<sup>th</sup> meeting on 30 October 2015. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated again on 5 November 2015. **The Chair** suggested adding the date of circulating the gist of planning application in paragraph 5.5 of the revised minutes.
- 1.2 After incorporating the proposed amendment from the Chair, the further revised draft minutes were confirmed at the meeting.

## Item 2 Matters Arising

- A. *The Avenue of Stars and Salisbury Garden Revitalisation Plan – Progress Update (paragraph 5.17(d) of the minutes of the 20<sup>th</sup> meeting)*
  - 2.1 **The Chair** informed Members that an illustrative plan provided by LCSD showing the locations of the sitting-out areas was circulated to Members on 30 October 2015.
- B. *Draft Planning Brief for the Five “Comprehensive Development Area” Zones at Tung Yuen Street and Yan Yue Wai, Yau Tong (paragraph 6.16 of the minutes of the 20<sup>th</sup> meeting)*
  - 2.2 **The Chair** reported that in response to Members' comments that PlanD should consider including in the planning brief requirements to provide bollards along the seawall and develop a shared waterfront promenade for both pedestrians and cyclists, a written response was provided by PlanD and included in the minutes as a post-meeting note.
  - 2.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that he was disappointed that the provision of bollards along the seawall would not be included

**Action**

as a mandatory requirement in the planning brief. He requested the berthing function of the seawall be maintained and the future developer be mandatorily required to provide bollards along the seawall for mooring of leisure boats.

2.4 **Mr Lawrence CHAU** responded that there was no study to substantiate the technical feasibility of providing mooring facilities along the seawall. Nevertheless, he said that PlanD would relay Members' comments to the Town Planning Board (TPB) for reference when considering the planning brief.

2.5 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** asked whether the current seawall would be reconstructed by the future developer.

2.6 **Mr Lawrence CHAU** replied that PlanD would provide Members with the requested information after the meeting. **PlanD**

2.7 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** opined that it was not necessary to conduct any study to substantiate the technical feasibility of providing mooring facilities if the seawall was currently providing berthing function.

2.8 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** pointed out that according to the minutes of the 20<sup>th</sup> meeting, the existing seawall was not designed for berthing leisure vessels. It would be important for the Task Force to state clearly its aspiration that the future seawall should be able to berth leisure vessels similar to the type in the New Yau Ma Tei Typhoon Shelter (NYMTTS).

2.9 In summing up, **the Chair** said that the Task Force would welcome berthing functions to be established at this particular seawall and asked PlanD to provide the Task Force with a response on the feasibility of including such a requirement in the planning brief. **PlanD**

*[Post-meeting note: PlanD advised that the concerned location was exposed to south-easterly wind and possible wave action, and the feasibility of mooring along this section of promenade would be subject to detailed study. It was therefore not appropriate to stipulate a mandatory requirement in the planning brief to require the provision of mooring facilities. Nevertheless, the planning brief did not preclude the provision of berthing facilities nor modification to the existing seawall subject to detailed study by future developer at the planning application stage. The views of Task Force together with concerned*

**Action**

*departments' comments were submitted to the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Town Planning Board (TPB) for consideration and the revised planning brief was endorsed on 20 November 2015.]*

C. Refurbishment of the Waterfront Promenade at West Rail Tsuen Wan West Station TW5 Bayside Property Development (paragraph 7.19 of the minutes of the 20<sup>th</sup> meeting)

- 2.10 In response to Members' comments on sharing the proposed cycle track with the emergency vehicular access (EVA) along the waterfront promenade at Tsuen Wan Station TW5 Bayside Property Development, **the Chair** reported that a written response provided by LCSD and CEDD was included in the minutes as a post-meeting note.
- 2.11 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that the cycle track could be integrated with EVA as long as the facilities could be cleared within 3 minutes in consideration of the "3-minute clearance rule" proposed by WKCDA. He considered that low kerbs and frangible bollards were not obstacles that would hamper the operation of EVA in case of emergency.
- 2.12 **Mr Dennis LO** replied that after taken into consideration the request from members of the Tsuen Wan District Council and the existing site constraints, the cycle track alignment was moved towards the hinterland to allow more space in the waterfront promenade for ferry commuters. He added that the proposal of integrating the 4-metre wide cycle track and 2-metre wide footpath with the 6-metre wide EVA had been considered. However, there would be a need to provide two pedestrian crossings across the cycle track. The bollards and railings to be provided at the crossings for road safety and the kerbs segregating footpath and cycle track might hamper the efficiency and safety of the operation of EVA. He clarified that according to the information provided by WKCDA, the "3-minute clearance rule" quoted by a Member was included in WKCDA's Street Performance Guidelines, and was not the requirement for EVA.
- 2.13 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** requested relevant departments to try minimise the proposed amount of facilities so that co-using of cycle track and EVA could become feasible. He also suggested

**Action**

that outdoor seating areas outside the Tsuen Wan West MTR station should be provided for alfresco dining.

- 2.14 **The Chair** suggested that departments could include more comprehensive information or explanation in their responses for Members' reference.
- 2.15 In response to the comment on outdoor seating, **Mrs Doris FOK** said that there was already a lot of outlets providing food and beverage to promenade users in this neighbourhood. She said that the 24-metre wide waterfront promenade would comprise EVA, greening strip, cycle track, children's playground and fitness station for the elderly. She added that there was also a light refreshment kiosk less than 2-minute walking distance from the waterfront in Tsuen Wan Park. However, its patronage was low. Further provision of catering or alfresco dining facilities at the waterfront promenade was not recommended due to lack of commercial viability. LCSD would closely monitor such demand.
- 2.16 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that LCSD should examine the locations where there would be potential for attracting critical mass for alfresco dining to be thrived along the Tsuen Wan waterfront. The location plan of F&B facilities inside the Tsuen Wan West MTR station should also be provided for Members before they could best comment on where outdoor dining area should be designated. He considered that the Tsuen Wan waterfront was one of the potential nodes for alfresco dining activities which could add vibrancy to the waterfront.
- 2.17 **The Chair** agreed that sufficient information were required for Members to be in a better position to form an opinion and she would like to focus this particular action area for further discussion in a future meeting of the Task Force.
- 2.18 **Miss Christine Au** said that she appreciated the report on "Food and Beverage on the Victoria Harbour Waterfront" prepared by students of the Worcester Polytechnic Institute. DEVB and relevant departments were trawling through the details of background information such as zoning, land status, infrastructure availability, etc. of the potential nodes recommended in the report including the Tsuen Wan waterfront. Members would be briefed on the findings in due course.

**DEVB**

**Action**

D. Advance Works of Cycle Track between Tsuen Wan and Tuen Mun (paragraph 10.16 of the minutes of the 20<sup>th</sup> meeting)

2.19 In response to a Member's request, **the Chair** invited CEDD to update Members on the progress of the advance works of cycle track between Tsuen Wan and Tuen Mun.

2.20 **Mr Dennis LO** briefed Members on the progress with the aid of a PowerPoint.

2.21 **The Chair** enquired if the Task Force would be consulted further on the detailed design of the proposed cycle track.

2.22 **Mr Dennis LO** responded that CEDD would work on the gazettal of the amended alignment first, and would consult the Task Force when the detailed design was available.

2.23 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that more information should be provided on the arrangement for dragon boats, how the cycle track would connect with adjacent roads and the land reserved for refreshment and cycle repair between Hoi Hing Road and the waterfront.

2.24 **Mr Dennis LO** explained that CEDD had consulted the Task Force in May 2014 on the overall alignment of the proposed cycle track and the current presentation was to update Members on the minor modifications to the alignment as compared to the one presented before. The two modifications included the repositioning of resting station near Tsing Tsuen Bridge and the amendment on the extent of entry-exit hub near Hoi Hing Road.

2.25 **The Chair** noted that the two modifications were the only changes since the last presentation in May 2014 and the detailed design was yet to be available. **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** added that he would like to be briefed on the connectivity of the entire cycle track.

2.26 **The Chair** asked CEDD to address the issues raised when consulting the Task Force again on the detailed design.

**CEDD**

**Item 3 Tsim Sha Tsui East and Tsim Sha Tsui West Action Areas - Updated Progress - Public Engagement Exercise of the Tsim Sha Tsui Waterfront Revitalisation Plan (Paper No. TFK/11/2015)**

- 3.1 **The Chair** informed the Task Force that public submissions expressing comments on the Tsim Sha Tsui Waterfront Revitalisation Plan received after the issuance of agenda and papers were tabled for Members' reference. **Miss Christine AU** reported that the followings were tabled - an email from Tsim Sha Tsui Residents Concern Group, a letter from Victoria Waterfront Concern Group and an email from Mary MULVIHILL, a local resident. **Miss AU** added that Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN requested to table his questions on the oral reply made by the Secretary for Home Affairs (SHA) on 4 November 2015 to a Legislative Council question. Mr ZIMMERMAN's questions and SHA's reply were also tabled.
- 3.2 **The Chair** welcomed **Dr Louis NG and Ms Elaine YEUNG** of LCSD to the meeting and invited Members to declare interest, if any.
- 3.3 **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.
- 3.4 **Mr Franklin YU** declared that his company had business dealings with the 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.
- 3.5 By way of background, **the Chair** said that the proponent, in response to the Task Force's request at the meeting on 1 September 2015, submitted a paper entitled "Enhanced Public Engagement Exercise for the Tsim Sha Tsui Waterfront Revitalisation Plan" which was circulated to Members on 14 September 2015. Members' further comments on the paper were relayed to the proponent for consideration. The proponent would like to update Members on the progress of the Phase 1 public engagement (PE) at this meeting.
- 3.6 **Ms Elaine YEUNG** introduced Paper No. TFK/11/2015

**Action**

including Phase 1 PE process and the major comments received. She added that the comments received and the conditions set for the Section 16 planning application by the TPB would be addressed. The revised design and the report of Phase 1 PE were expected to be available in January 2016. Phase 2 PE would be launched upon the formation of an Advisory Committee in early 2016. Separately, the repair and improvement works of the bridge structure of AoS commenced on 8 October 2015 and would be completed in the first quarter of 2018. Revitalisation of AoS would only start upon the completion of the repair and improvement works.

- 3.7 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired about details of the repair and improvement works and the associated cost. He asked if LCSD had signed a contract with the New World Development (NWD) as the implementation agent of the repair and improvement works.
- 3.8 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** opined that the methodology adopted for the survey might not be catered for different target respondents. He enquired about the handling of conflicting comments received. From his personal experience of attending one of the focus group meetings for professional bodies, he believed that the attendees might not have fully understood all the technical information of the project and considerations of the proponent before providing advice.
- 3.9 **Mr SO Kwok-yin** concurred with Mr TAM Po-yiu and added that respondents to the survey might be led to an answer when they were given to compare the existing condition with the photomontage of the proposed design. He opined that the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines should be included in the questionnaire for respondents' reference. He commented that the participation rate of roving exhibitions and face-to-face interviews was acceptable but community engagement was not sufficient.
- 3.10 **Mr Franklin YU** expressed the following comments -
- (a) the comprehensiveness of the Phase 1 PE was not satisfactory, in particular the coverage of the focus group meetings ;
  - (b) members of the public should be allowed to express their opinions and vision on open ended questions in the

**Action**

questionnaire;

- (c) flexibility of adjusting the design by incorporating the comments received was limited; and
- (d) the public should be consulted on the revised design in Phase 2 PE along with the management and operational issues.

3.11 **Ms Elaine YEUNG** responded as below -

- (a) LCSD would invite NWD to provide details of the repair and improvement works;
- (b) the existing management contract with NWD would only expire in nine years' time. NWD would be responsible for maintaining and operating AoS; and
- (c) LCSD would take into account the experiences of Phase 1 PE and views expressed by Members today when planning Phase 2 PE.

3.12 **The Chair** enquired about the timetable of Phase 2 PE and emphasized that the Task Force should be given reasonable time to comment on the PE materials before its launch. If the timetable would not fit in with the meeting schedule of the Task Force, LCSD should still consult the Task Force through paper circulation.

3.13 **Ms Elaine YEUNG** replied that Phase 2 PE was expected to be launched in January 2016 until June 2016 under the leadership of an Advisory Committee to be formed. She added that LCSD would work with the Secretariat to seek Members' comments on the PE materials.

3.14 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** expressed the following comments -

- (a) he understood that NWD would only be responsible for minor maintenance works under the current management contract yet he considered that the proposed repair and improvement works involving modifying bridge structures would not be minor;
- (b) the proponent should organise at least two public forums to engage the general public. He suggested

**Action**

making reference to the public forums organised by the Conservancy Association or by Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour in the past;

- (c) he would like to have replies on some of his questions he raised in the last meeting which included marine accessibility and crowd control measures when water-related events were organised along AOS; and
- (d) the railings, which were categorised as “balustrade” in the questionnaire, should be categorised as “seating” as such function was being provided at the moment.

3.15 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** opined that it would not be ideal if the design could not be further adjusted during Phase 2 PE. Separately, he was doubtful about the idea of organising public forums as views from the general public could be very diverse. Professional bodies would be more helpful in helping the proponent in formulating a practical solution. He enquired about how to balance different views received during Phase 1 PE and asked the proponent to set out detailed reasons if any suggestion was decided not to be adopted.

3.16 **Mr Franklin YU** said that while he had already conveyed some of his comments during the focus group meeting for professional bodies, he would like to reiterate some views as follows -

- (a) the design should be harmonious with the future developments and existing premises in its vicinity;
- (b) the pedestrian connections from the hinterland to the waterfront and between the hubs at elevated level should be further enhanced;
- (c) more visual elements should be added along the waterfront to attract pedestrians walking from the Salisbury Garden to the Tsim Sha Tsui East Promenade;
- (d) suitable landscape forms should be put in place to provide unique scenery in different seasons;
- (e) using stairs as seating would be a good design as people sitting there would not be blocked by other users of the promenade, and vice versa. However, the width of the

**Action**

promenade should not be narrowed as a result;

- (f) seating with shades should be provided along the promenade with suitable intervals;
- (g) more tasteful photo-taking spots should be provided along the promenade;
- (h) a more in-depth analysis should be conducted on how to facilitate activities along the waterfront such as berthing of vessels, cycling, jogging, and fishing, etc.;
- (i) the management contract should include incentives for the management agent to provide attractive and user-friendly facilities; and
- (j) Phase 2 PE should be more comprehensive.

3.17 **Mr SO Kwok-yin** said that engagement with professional bodies would not be able to replace activities to engage the general public. He opined that more public forum should be organised and members of the public should be informed through publicity.

3.18 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** said that LCSD should be aware that Phase 1 PE was not sufficiently extensive. He suggested LCSD to take into account Members' comments and seek experts' advice before launching Phase 2 PE.

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

- (a) Members' questions on details of the design would be addressed by NWD when the revised design was ready;
- (b) Members' other comments on pedestrian connectivity and activities along the waterfront would be relayed to the design team for consideration. He pointed out that the proponent was aware of views on reducing the building heights of hubs 2 and 3 to minimise the visual impact to the buildings behind;
- (c) arts and cultural activities would be mainly held at the Salisbury Garden and the proponent would seek the public's further views in Phase 2 PE;

**Action**

- (d) the landscape architect of the design team would take into account actual circumstances of the site and provide suggestions on how to create different scenery for different seasons and also to provide shades. The design team would not sacrifice the quality of facilities for lowering maintenance cost;
- (e) he noted the comments that the PE activities should cover a wider scope than professional groups. Phase 2 PE would be led by an Advisory Committee to be formed in early 2016; and
- (f) there would still be room for adjusting minor details of the design during Phase 2 PE.

3.20 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** added the following -

- (a) his earlier questions such as on crowd control measures and facilitating marine uses should be addressed;
- (b) he concurred with Mr Franklin YU that the hubs should be connected at elevated level to enhance pedestrian connectivity and provide additional public viewing space;
- (c) he enquired about the timetable and detailed activities of Phase 2 PE and requested that sufficient time should be allowed for the Task Force to provide input. The proponent should partner with the Task Force and other stakeholders in ensuring that the public was fully consulted during the process of decision making; and
- (d) he questioned the justification of signing a new management contract with NWD for a term of 20 years.

3.21 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** suggested the proponent to consider utilising portable facilities, e.g. food truck or movable stage, etc. to enable flexible use of space.

3.22 **Mr SO Kwok-yin** queried whether the proponent should conclude Phase 1 PE at this stage. He added that the Task Force should, through the media, proactively inform the public about its role in this issue instead of relying on individual members to answer media enquiries.

**Action**

- 3.23 **The Chair** enquired about the detailed composition of the Advisory Committee to be formed and the way forward after its formation.
- 3.24 **Ms Elaine YEUNG** responded that the Advisory Committee would be formed in early 2016 and it would comprise experts from relevant fields, representative from HC and other industry or community leaders.
- 3.25 **Dr Louis NG** reassured Members that their comments would be taken into consideration while the design team was fine tuning the design. Phase 2 PE would be launched in early 2016 and the PE plan would be submitted for Members' comments in due course.
- 3.26 **The Chair** concluded that there was room for the proponent to improve on the inclusiveness of some PE activities, the comprehensiveness and sufficiency of background information provided to the public during the engagement process, the design of the questionnaire and the survey method used, etc. The Task Force requested LCSD to provide a revised design with technical details and responses to major comments received from the public. LCSD should allow sufficient time for Members to comment on the programme and materials of Phase 2 PE before rolling it out. Phase 2 PE should reach out to the community in addition to professional groups. She confirmed that although Phase 1 PE was completed, Members' comments would still be invited on the revised design to be presented to the Task Force later.

LCSD

**Item 4 Progress Update on the West Kowloon Cultural District (Paper No. TFK/12/2015)**

- 4.1 **The Chair** welcomed the team to the meeting. **Mr Derek SUN** and **Mr Matthew POTTER** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 4.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** expressed the following comments -
- (a) WKCDA should outline the entire pedestrian route from Kowloon MTR Station to the Artist Square Bridge, and also to rationalise pedestrian connectivity at both elevated level and street level;

**Action**

- (b) the landing steps at NYMTTS was not convenient for slow-moving vessels, and WKCDA could explore enhancing the landing steps by adding shelter and seating, etc.; and
- (c) a separate study could be conducted on introducing permit and licencing system to transform the current passenger-carrying ferry services into water taxis.

**4.3 Mr Franklin YU** raised the following comments and questions -

- (a) the two landing steps would be required for WKCDA to berth both passenger carrying vessels and water taxis. He opined that the landing steps at NYMTTS might be more suitable for large vessels and the one to the south could be catered for water taxis. He concurred with improving the design for landing steps;
- (b) a water transport route between North Point and WKCD could be explored and the suggestion of operating a circular route around WKCD, Tsim Sha Tsui, Wan Chai and Central could also be considered; and
- (c) the Artist Square Bridge should be given some colour, while seating and refreshment kiosks could be provided on the bridge if technically feasible.

**4.4 Mr Nicholas BROOKE** said that the current status of the three proposed marine access points should be further reviewed, especially to improve its design. He suggested that the Task Force on Water-land Interface could work closely with WKCDA in establishing water transport routes between WKCD and other waterfronts including Kai Tak.

**The  
Secretariat**

**4.5 Mrs Karen BARRETTO** suggested that the cover should flexibly shield the Artist Square Bridge from road traffic exhaustion while enabling natural light into the bridge.

**4.6 The Chair** had the following comments and questions -

- (a) WKCDA's efforts in considering water taxi and other water transport means to connect WKCD with Tsim Sha Tsui, Kai Tak and Hong Kong Island were appreciated;
- (b) WKCDA should look into the technical feasibility of

**Action**

connecting the Artist Square Bridge to the existing footbridge system;

- (c) the provision of elevator at the Artist Square Bridge should be considered in addition to the escalator to connect with the street level; and
- (d) WKCDA could consider replacing the fixed-angle panels with some “sun-responsive” ones on the exterior of the bridge, i.e. the angle of the panels would automatically adjust according to the sunlight, as she had experienced at the Queensland’s Gallery of Modern Art of Brisbane.

4.7 **Mr Franklin YU** supplemented that the angle of movable louver at the Artist Square Bridge should be further reviewed to prevent it from causing glare to drivers and other road users.

4.8 **Mr Derek SUN** made the following overall responses -

- (a) the team would gather further information on the proposed marine access points and explore to further enhance its design by taking into account the elements of accessibility, seating and shades;
- (b) WKCDA would be willing to form a closer partnership with HC through taking into account Members’ professional advice on harbourfront development and sharing WKCDA’s experiences in implementation;
- (c) ferry service for WKCDA’s own events could be arranged if required. WKCDA would further liaise with third party operators to extend their existing water tour services to include the WKCD;
- (d) WKCDA would liaise closely with the Government on the provision of suitable landing facilities in support of the territory-wide water taxis initiatives; and
- (e) WKCDA would continue the development effort of various projects. The Nursery Park will maintain opening for public enjoyment throughout the development period. A site used as temporary pet zone is also proposed near the typhoon shelter

**Action**

4.9 **Mr Gordon NG** responded to the comments on pedestrian connectivity as below –

- (a) on the routing from Kowloon MTR Station to the Artist Square Bridge, pedestrians could either go up from the concourse level to level 2 and then walked through the Elements mall to the Artist Square Bridge, or walked along the street-level footpath along Lin Cheung Road to the staircase leading to the Artist Square Bridge or the elevator inside the Elements mall in association with the operation of the staircase;
- (b) the project team has studied but did not recommend linking the Artist Square Bridge with the existing footbridge due to low pedestrian flow at that particular location; and
- (c) on the concern of traffic exhaustion, preliminary analysis concluded that air ventilation of the Artist Square Bridge could be better than ordinary footbridges.

4.10 **Mr Matthew POTTER** responded to the comments on design of the Artist Square Bridge as below –

- (a) the design team would explore if some colour could be used in the design but the bridge would not be too colourful as the surrounding environment would already have rich colour content;
- (b) the design team was coordinating with LCSD to increase landscaped features along the bridge. The visibility of plants and the width of the bridge could be improved;
- (c) the length of the bridge was less than 100 metres but the proposal of adding seating facilities along the bridge could be taken into consideration;
- (d) elevator would be provided at one end of the Artist Square Bridge for direct access from the Artist Square;
- (e) the suggestion of a movable cover could be interesting but might bring about higher construction and maintenance cost. The design team has already conducted extensive analysis to ensure that the fixed louver could provide adequate shade while also

**Action**

allowing sufficient day light to get in; and

- (f) any concern on the glare could be addressed by the solid portion of the roof which would be made by aluminium.

4.11 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** asked for more information showing the pedestrian route from Kowloon MTR Station to the Artist Square Bridge and the walking time needed. He echoed the Chair's comment on connecting the bridge with the existing footbridge system, and opined that the route should be extended to the nearby bus stop. He reiterated that pedestrian connectivity at street level could be improved by providing a direct access through pedestrian crossings so that pedestrians would not be required to use the footbridge system.

4.12 **The Chair** concluded that Members supported WKCDA to manage the proposed marine access points and appreciated the WKCDA's efforts in considering water taxis and other water transport means to connect WKCD with other parts of Hong Kong. The Artist Square Bridge would be important to improve pedestrian connectivity. She asked the design team to take on board Members' comments, in particular on the pedestrian-first focus within WKCD; and the connection between the Artist Square Bridge and the existing footbridge system.

**Item 5 Proposed Animal Welfare Centre for the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (Hong Kong) at Cheung Fai Road, Tsing Yi (Paper No. TFK/13/2015)**

5.1 **The Chair** welcomed the project team to the meeting. **Dr Fiona M WOODHOUSE, Mr CHAN Tat-choi, Ms Angie PEI and Mr Ted LAM** briefed Members on its planning application to construct an animal welfare centre in Tsing Yi with the aid of a PowerPoint and highlighted the major changes that had been made to the scheme since it was last presented to Members in 2012.

5.2 **The Chair** pointed out that the increase in plot ratio from around 1.4 to 2.79 would be substantial. She also asked the project team to elaborate on public enjoyment elements to be provided with the proposed scheme.

5.3 **Mr Franklin YU** enquired about the reason of increasing the

**Action**

plot ratio and commented that the increase in the building height might create visual impact to the buildings behind if the proposed scheme was higher than the highway structure behind.

- 5.4 **Dr Fiona M WOODHOUSE** said that there were open areas to be provided at different levels of the building for public access. She added that the animal educational centre on the fourth floor would be used to do vocational training.
- 5.5 **Mr CHAN Tat-choi** supplemented that the project itself was designed for public service. There would be pet garden and landscape area on the ground floor and the roof for pet owners, animal lovers and volunteers. He understood that the Lands Department (LandsD) reduced the site area for better utilisation of the site concerned. The project team has made necessary adjustments according to the reduced site area and he considered the current plot ratio to be reasonable.
- 5.6 **Ms Angie PEI** clarified that the proposed building would not be higher than the highway structure behind.
- 5.7 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** enquired about the reaction from the local community.
- 5.8 **Dr Fiona M WOODHOUSE** said that the Kwai Tsing District Council (KTDC) was consulted in 2012 and it generally supported the proposal. Their major concern on accessibility has been addressed. She considered that the current scheme was essentially the same as the one presented to KTDC before and it might not be necessary to consult the DC again.
- 5.9 **Mr CHAN Tat-choi** supplemented that KTDC was in transition to its new term and emphasised that the DC did not object to the original proposal.
- 5.10 **The Chair** considered that the changes made to the current proposal especially in building height and plot ratio were substantial. She understood the intention of better utilising land resources but pointed out that the proposed development and design in a harbourfront site had to comply with the Harbourfront Planning Principles and Guidelines.

**Action**

- 5.11 **Mr SO Kwok-yin** asked if the proposed facility would be opened to the public and the ways to access to the site given its rather remote location.
- 5.12 **Dr Fiona M WOODHOUSE** responded that the proposed centre would be opened to the public for school visits, people and local community who would like to adopt pets or those who would like to use the services. It was envisaged that the traffic would not be very heavy.
- 5.13 To supplement, **Mr CHAN Tat-choi** said that people carrying pets would normally need to travel by taxi or use private vehicles. According to past experiences, there should not be any peak hour for their services. Should the need for increasing public transportation service arise in the future, provision of shuttle bus service could be explored.
- 5.14 **The Chair** asked the project team to take into account Members' comments when taking the proposal forward. Members' views expressed at the meeting would be conveyed to TPB for their reference when considering the relevant planning application.

*[Post-meeting note: The discussion of the meeting was summarised and conveyed to TPB on 17 November 2015.]*

**Item 6 Road and Infrastructural Works at the Lin Cheung Road Site, Sham Shui Po (Paper No. TFK/14/2015)**

- 6.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives from CEDD. **Mr WAN Man-leung** and **Mr CHAN Chuen-lung** briefed Members on the alignment and landscaping design for the new public road and associated pedestrian walkways within the Cheung Sha Wan Wholesale Food Market Phase 2 site with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 6.2 **The Chair** said that she was happy to see improvement in the area subsequent to the Task Force's site visit to the Cheung Sha Wan Wholesale Food Market Phase 1 in 2010.
- 6.3 **Mr Franklin YU** opined that the design of pedestrian link was too functional as a conventional footpath. He opined that the streetscape design of the road, especially along the part from

**Action**

Nam Cheong MTR Station to the waterfront, should be further enhanced to the standard of a waterfront open space.

6.4 **Mr SO Kwok-yin** enquired on the consideration behind the selection of tree species as the selected species would not be able to provide shade to pedestrians.

6.5 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** made the following points –

- (a) he wondered if the capacity of the road would be able to support pedestrian flow and traffic needs arising from the six nearby development sites;
- (b) it was not ideal to replace greenery by traffic lay-by which could be accommodated within one of the six sites;
- (c) he enquired about the details on planning, design and implementation timetable of the waterfront promenade; and
- (d) he agreed that trees could be planted at both sides of the road to cover wired fence and vehicles parked at the road.

6.6 **Mr CHAN Chuen-lung** responded that –

- (a) the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) and street path analysis were conducted, to allow vehicles up to 12.8 metre long to enter the road;
- (b) the TIA revealed that the capacity of the road including pedestrian pavement would be able to cope with the traffic needs during peak hours;
- (c) some shrubs could be planted at an area that would be transformed into a bus stop in the future to meet local needs;
- (d) the pedestrians would not be restricted to walk along the two paved lanes but the entire width;
- (e) the team would continue to liaise with LCSD with a view to selecting suitable tree species for planting along the road; and

**Action**

(f) the waterfront promenade would be planned, designed and constructed by the future developer of the adjacent comprehensive development sites.

6.7 **Mr Lawrence CHAU** said that the planning brief concerning the waterfront promenade was under preparation.

6.8 In response to Mr TAM Po-yiu, **Mr CHAN Chuen-lung** added that the areas shaded in grey in the slide were pedestrian pavement and for the sake of road safety, they would not be covered by landscape features.

6.9 **Mr Franklin YU** said that Hong Kong Park and Tamar Park had provided good examples of designing a pedestrian link up to the standard of a waterfront open space.

6.10 In conclusion, **the Chair** asked the team to refine the design by adopting a more people-oriented approach and consider further on the species of trees. To review the proposal holistically, she invited PlanD to brief Members on the planning brief concerning the promenade when it was ready.

**PlanD**

6.11 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** enquired if the team would consult the Task Force again with a revised design.

6.12 **Mr WAN Man-leung** said that he would work with relevant departments to take on board Members' comments into the design as appropriate. If necessary, he would attend Task Force meeting to present the revised design.

**CEDD**

*[Post-meeting note: The revised design provided by CEDD was circulated to Members for further comment on 4 February 2016. No comment had been received by the prescribed deadline.]*

**Item 7 Any Other Business**

A. Cycle track in Tsuen Wan Waterfront

7.1 **The Chair** said that there had been some discussion on the cycle track in Tsuen Wan Waterfront at the beginning of the meeting under the section of "matters arising". She suggested that this item might be further discussed at future meetings when

sufficient information was ready.

B. Date of Next Meeting

7.2 **The Chair** said that the next Task Force meeting would be scheduled for January/February 2016.

C. Handling of Media Enquiry

7.3 In response to Mr SO Kwok-yin's earlier comment on HC's approach in handling media enquiries, **the Chair** invited the Commission Chair to give Members some insights.

7.4 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** said that HC and its Task Forces had all along been operating on a transparent basis whereas all meeting materials were available on HC's website. Members should have the freedom to express their own views on personal or professional capacities while Chairs (of the Commission and Task Forces) would be expected to present overall views of the Task Forces to the media.

7.5 **Miss Christine AU** said that the role of the Secretariat was mainly to facilitate communication between project proponents and Members of HC and its Task Forces, but it would also stand ready to provide factual information such as meeting dates and minutes whenever Members deem useful. She noted that some Members were approached by the media on the issue of Tsim Sha Tsui Revitalisation Plan in the past few months, and echoed the Commission Chair's view that Members should state clearly to the media in what capacity they were providing their comments with. She understood that the Task Force Chairs were frequently invited by the media to speak on behalf of the Task Forces and the Secretariat would be prepared to render any support deemed necessary.

7.6 **Mr SO Kwok-yin** said that it would be difficult for Members to express the views of Task Force on a particular issue in between meetings when there were no confirmed minutes for reference. He opined that the Task Forces might play a more proactive role in stating their stance on some controversial topics.

7.7 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** suggested that the Secretariat might issue a line-to-take for Members to get the message right across the media, if considered helpful.

**Action**

- 7.8 In summing up, **the Chair** appreciated the continuous support provided by the Secretariat to HC and its Task Forces' Chairs on various media enquiries and interviews. As a transparent advisory body, she agreed that the Task Force might need to state its position on some issues and the Secretariat might provide a line-to-take for Members' reference, where necessary.
- 7.9 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

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