

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

Minutes of Twenty-third Meeting

Date : 2 June 2016
Time : 10:45 a.m.
Venue : Conference Room , 15/F, North Point Government Offices,
333 Java Road, Hong Kong

Present

Prof Becky LOO	Chair, Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing
Mrs Margaret BROOKE	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr SO Kwok-yin	Representing the Conservancy Association
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Freddie HAI	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Dr Peter Cookson SMITH	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Sr Lesly LAM	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr TAM Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Prof CHOY Kin-kuen	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Shuki LEUNG Shu-ki	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr CHOW Ping-tim	
Mr Derek HUNG	
Dr Edmund LEE	
Mr WONG Yiu-chung	
Mr Thomas CHAN	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Edward LEUNG	Senior Manager (Tourism) 2, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr Gary WONG	Senior Engineer/ Kowloon District Central, Transport Department (TD)
Ms Joyce LAU	Senior Engineer/1, 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
Miss Ingrid TJENDRO	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 2, DEVB
Miss Emily SOM	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 2 (Designate), DEVB

Absent with Apologies

Mr Paul CHAN Yuen-king	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Prof Raymond FUNG	
Mr LEUNG Man-kwong	

For Agenda Item 3

Mr Lawrence CHAU	District Planning Officer/ Tsuen Wan & West Kowloon, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Walter KWONG	Senior Town Planner/ Tsuen Wan, PlanD

Action

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting. She introduced four new co-opted Members who were at the meeting, namely Mr CHOW Ping-tim, nominated by the Tsuen Wan District Council (TWDC); Mr Derek HUNG, nominated by the Yau Tsim Mong District Council; Mr WONG Yiu-chung, nominated by the Kwai Tsing District Council; and Dr Edmund LEE, Executive Director of the Hong Kong Design Centre. She also welcomed Mr LEUNG Man-kwong, a co-opted member nominated by the Sham Shui Po District Council who was in absentia for joining the Task Force.

She further informed Members that Mr Edward LEUNG, Senior Manager of TC, attended the meeting on behalf of Ms Emily MO; Mr Gary WONG, Senior Engineer of TD, attended on behalf of Mr Wilson PANG; and Ms Joyce LAU, Senior Engineer of CEDD, attended on behalf of Mr Janson WONG.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 22nd Meeting

- 1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 22nd meeting on 18 May 2016, and received no comment from Members. There being no proposed amendment, the draft minutes were confirmed.

Item 2 Matters Arising

A. Five "Comprehensive Development Area" Zones at Tung Yuen Street and Yan Yue Wai, Yau Tong (paragraph 2.4 of the minutes of the 22nd meeting)

2.1 **The Chair** reported that PlanD had noted the views of the Task Force in respect of providing more water-land interface facilities along the waterfront concerned and would liaise with relevant proponents on the feasibility of providing mooring facilities during the planning application stage.

B. Advance Works of Cycle Track between Tsuen Wan and Tuen Mun (paragraph 2.13 of the minutes of the 22nd meeting)

2.2 **The Chair** informed Members that CEDD would complete the gazettal of the amended cycle track alignment first, and would consult the Task Force when the detailed design of the cycle track was available.

2.3 In response to the Chair's enquiry on the time frame, **Ms Joyce LAU** said that the public exhibition period of the gazettal had passed and no objection was received. The team would commence the design stage in due course and consult the Task Force again when the detailed design was available.

C. The Tsim Sha Tsui (TST) Waterfront Revitalisation Plan (paragraph 3.20 of the minutes of the 22nd meeting)

2.4 **The Chair** said that as informed by LCSD, the working session for Members to provide views on the revised design, which was originally planned to be organised before this meeting, would be postponed having regarded to the programme of the enhancement works concerned and the time needed for refining the design. She invited LCSD to report on the progress.

2.5 **Mrs Doris FOK** said that the project team was working on refining the design which was expected to be ready in September 2016. LCSD and New World Development (NWD) would jointly organise a workshop for Members to give views on the refined design before finalising the design for formal presentation to the Task Force.

- 2.6 **The Chair** said that she would expect an interactive platform which Members and at least some members of the general public could provide inputs for the project team to incorporate into the design instead of just a briefing.
- 2.7 **Mrs Doris FOK** said that the project team was working on a revised design after taking into account comments received during the public engagement (PE) exercise. Relevant stakeholders (including Kowloon Task Force members) could provide comments on the proposed design of the Avenue of Stars (AoS) in the coming workshop.
- 2.8 **The Chair** reiterated that the idea of having a public working session was to provide a platform for the project team to interact with its stakeholders as well as the general public so that their views could be incorporated into the revised design. **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** concurred with the Chair.
- 2.9 **Mr Derek HUNG** suggested organising a site visit in addition to the working session to facilitate Members to understand the site conditions.
- 2.10 **Mrs Doris FOK** said that she would discuss the suggestion with the project team, including the feasibility of organising a site visit.
- 2.11 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired about the programme of taking forward the revitalisation plan and the progress that was made so far.
- 2.12 **Mrs Doris FOK** responded that the construction works to enhance AoS would commence in 2018 and so there would still be time for discussing with Members on the design. She added that AoS was currently closed mainly for repairing the foundations of the bridge.
- 2.13 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** expressed that he was surprised to learn that the repair works had already commenced before the finalisation of the future design of AoS.
- 2.14 **The Chair** said that AoS was only part of the entire project

Action

where the foundations of the bridge would need to be repaired.

- 2.15 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** asked if the repair works which were being carried out at AoS would have any bearing on the overall design of the project.
- 2.16 **Mrs Doris FOK** responded that the works would mainly involve repairing the foundations of the bridge and it would not affect the overall design of the revitalisation plan.
- 2.17 **The Chair** concluded that Members were disappointed that the project team had to postpone the workshop due to the need to allow more time for working on the revised design. The Task Force hoped that at least part of the workshop to be organised would be opened to the public. Moreover, LCSD should explore to organise a site visit to the Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront to understand the latest site conditions and scope of works. The proponent should also consider to provide Members with a draft revised design of the revitalisation plan for reference before the visit.

LCSD

[Post-meeting note: LCSD organised a design workshop on 9 September 2016.]

D. Tsuen Wan Waterfront

- 2.18 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that he noted a letter from the Coastal Affairs Committee (CAC) of the Tsuen Wan District Council (TWDC) inviting HC to attend a meeting of the Committee on 6 May 2016 to discuss the development of waterfront promenade along the Tsuen Wan waterfront. He said that he was not able to attend the meeting as he just received relevant information on the day of the meeting concerned. **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** would like to receive such invitation earlier so that he could respond to the invitation positively.
- 2.19 **The Chair** said that the subject and the arrangement to handle similar invitations addressed to the Chair of the Harbourfront Commission would be discussed under Any Other Business (AOB).

Item 3 Amendments to the Approved Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TW/31 (Paper No. TFK/03/2016)

- 3.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives from PlanD to the meeting and invited Members to declare interest, if any.
- 3.2 **Mr Freddie HAI** declared that he was involved in the TW5 Bayside residential development project around ten years ago. **The Chair** considered that the proposed amendments were about a specific Government, Institution or Community (G/IC) site which only happened to be in the vicinity of TW5. Mr Hai could still take part in the discussion since there was no conflict of interest.
- 3.3 **PlanD** briefed the Task Force on the amendment with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 3.4 **Mr Freddie HAI** said that he had no in-principle objection to the amendment but raised the following for consideration from practical point of view -
 - (a) from the architectural point of view, considering the long span structures necessary for a community "hall", the structural zone alone might have taken up a lot of building height already. An imposed height limitation for a three-storey community hall might not be adequate to actually accommodate a decent three-storey community compound with a decent size hall. It would be advisable to allow for a greater height buffer;
 - (b) it was noted that the design of the community hall had to accommodate car-parking spaces and drainage reserve too. After taking into consideration of such constraints, it was considered that the remaining space available for the building might not actually be adequate for a three-storey community hall to serve the community needs at all. In this connection, while the proposed building was modest in scale and was a deep contrast in height with the adjacent residential development anyway, there would not be any significant visual impact or air ventilation impact to the surrounding environment even if the community hall was built to four or five storey-high. A higher building height restriction (BHR) should be allowed to enhance design flexibility; and

Action

- (c) as the site concerned was rather remote from the town centre of Tsuen Wan, the Home Affairs Department (HAD) should work with LCSD to better integrate the community hall with the adjacent Tsuen Wan Park (the park) to allow an extra entrance to the community hall to facilitate users accessing from the Tsuen Wan West MTR station via the park.

3.5 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** raised the following question and comments -

- (a) the reason Members were not briefed on Item A of the amendments;
- (b) accessibility to the community hall at both the ground and elevated levels should be enhanced so that the future development could be better integrated with the surrounding environment; and
- (c) whether in-situ reprovisioning of the existing community garden could be considered.

3.6 **Mr CHOW Ping-tim** expressed the following comments, which had been conveyed to PlanD when TWDC discussed the amendment concerned -

- (a) the footbridge system plan for Tsuen Wan was well developed and connections at the elevated level between the community hall and City Point as well as Chelsea Court should be materialised as early as possible;
- (b) he echoed other Members' view in building a taller community hall in order to provide more public car parking spaces in the district; and
- (c) the design of the community hall should be compatible with the park and the adjacent sports centre, which was under construction.

3.7 **Mr Lawrence CHAU** made the following responses -

- (a) the proposed three-storey BHR of the community hall was formulated taking into account various planning considerations including its location within the harbourfront area and adjoining to Tsuen Wan Park and

Action

the nature of community hall use. HAD confirmed that the three-storey BHR would allow sufficient space for provision of necessary facilities at the community hall to meet district needs;

- (b) the suggestions of integrating the design with the park, providing more public car-parking spaces and improving elevated connections could be further explored at a later detailed design stage;
- (c) a well-integrated footbridge network was planned and being implemented in Tsuen Wan. PlanD would further discuss with TD on whether any new footbridge connection to the community hall would be necessary;
- (d) whether the existing community garden would be reprovisioned at other temporary government land or within the proposed development were being studied by HAD and would be confirmed in later stage; and
- (e) the site under item A of the amendments fell outside of the harbourfront areas.

3.8 **The Chair** said that should there be any inadequacy of community facilities such as nursery and library in the district, the team could consider relaxing the development potential of the proposed community hall to serve the needs of the community.

3.9 **Mr Lawrence CHAU** responded that there were other opportunities to develop community facilities within the district. For example, a G/IC site near Tsuen Wan Town Hall, which was relatively close to the city centre, could be utilised upon redevelopment.

3.10 **The Chair** considered it more desirable to decentralize and accommodate community facilities such as nursery and elderly day-care centre near local residents rather than concentrating them all at the city centre.

3.11 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** enquired if the community garden could be relocated to the rooftop of the community hall and open to the public.

Action

- 3.12 **Mr Shuki LEUNG** opined that an integrated community hall with diversified uses would add vibrancy to the harbourfront. He supported relaxing the BHR of the site concerned to allow flexibility to bring in cultural, art, social and environment-friendly activities to the local community.
- 3.13 **Mr Derek HUNG** supported increasing the development potential of the community hall to four or five storeys in order to allow for more effective use of the site concerned. He did not anticipate strong objection from the community on relaxing the BHR further as it would not pose unacceptable visual and air ventilation impact to its vicinity. He enquired whether the provision of public car parking spaces for both goods vehicles and private cars would be sufficient.
- 3.14 **Mr Freddie HAI** made the following comments -
- (a) while noting that the specified BHR was certain number of storeys instead of a definite measurement of height, he enquired whether any mezzanine floor would be counted towards the number of storeys. To illustrate this, he raised the example that there could be rooms that would not need high ceiling but happened to be next to the hall, such as toilets. For better utilisation of space, a mezzanine floor above such rooms would usually be inserted to take advantage of the redundant height. PlanD should clarify under such circumstances if the mezzanine floor would be counted as “one floor” under the BHR definition;
 - (b) PlanD should re-consider if it was necessary to restrict the proposed development to three storeys and whether any further relaxation of BHR would be feasible;
 - (c) footbridge could enhance pedestrian connectivity at an elevated level but reducing pedestrian flow and vibrancy on the ground level. If possible, he inclined to encourage pedestrians to walk on the ground level to maintain a vibrant streetscape; and
 - (d) sports complex, public park and community hall could be an ideal combination to form an integrated community cluster and he would like to see more of such integration in the harbourfront areas. He urged PlanD to liaise with LCSD in this regard.

3.15 **Mr Lawrence CHAU** responded as follows -

- (a) the feasibility of re-provisioning the existing temporary community garden within the community hall were being explored by HAD and would be confirmed during the later detailed design stage;
- (b) PlanD would work with other relevant departments to consider the need to provide additional community facilities such as public car parking spaces and footbridge connections within the site;
- (c) the existing and planned footbridge network was to ease the congestion of pedestrians at the street level. PlanD would continue to work closely with TD to examine whether footbridge connections would be required for the proposed development;
- (d) the proposed provision of car parking spaces within the site concerned would only cater for the needs of the community hall. Members' suggestion on providing more public car parking spaces would be suitably considered;
- (e) it was an established practice to use number of storeys as BHR for G/IC sites if the proposed development would be less than 13 storeys. Such practice would provide more design flexibility as there would be no restriction on the height of each floor; and
- (f) mezzanine floor would be counted towards the measurement of building height. The three-storey BHR should be sufficient for serving the space requirements as confirmed by HAD and Architectural Services Department (ArchSD).

3.16 **Mr Freddie HAI** suggested inviting social enterprises to operate some small-scale commercial uses at the ground floor of the community hall.

3.17 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** expressed the following views -

- (a) the design of the community hall should be provided so that Members could offer more comprehensive

comments;

- (b) while he had no strong view on the number of storeys to be stipulated as the BHR, the ground floor should be designed to allow visual permeability and better integration with the park; and
- (c) while he echoed the view that the community garden could be re-provisioned on the rooftop of the community hall, another location could also be identified for temporary re-provisioning before completion of the community hall.

3.18 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** asked if there would be any commercial elements such as kiosks or restaurants available within the community hall and whether any outdoor seating would be proposed. He opined that the footbridge network within the district was not user-friendly for visitors from other districts and he enquired if PlanD had any plan to devise an overall walkability plan for Tsuen Wan.

3.19 **Mr Ken SO** agreed that the rooftop of the community hall should be used to re-provision the existing community garden and asked if developing an underground carpark at the site concerned would be feasible.

3.20 **Mr CHOW Ping-tim** made the following comments -

- (a) the existing management of community hall was rather rigid. The rooms in the community hall would be allocated to local organisations under HAD's discretion. To avoid complicating its management, he understood that HAD would be reluctant to explore a joint facility to be shared out with other government departments; and
- (b) as the site concerned was located in the eastern part of Tsuen Wan, which was close to the industrial area and far away from the city centre. He did not agree with TD's assessment that footbridge connection was not required to allow easier access to the community hall.

3.21 **Dr Edmund LEE** considered that the proposed development could be designed to be more than a traditional community hall. He opined that holistic design planning of the areas should encourage an urban healthy lifestyle and community

Action

participation, taking into account both functional needs and the surroundings. Supporting amenities and other elements such as food trucks etc. could be considered as an integral part of the overall design and experience-based delivery to encourage public usage and enjoyment.

- 3.22 **Mrs Karen BARRETTO** said that she had no objection to the amendment but was of the view that the community garden should be reprovisioned before the construction works of the community hall commenced.

- 3.23 In response, **Mr Lawrence CHAU** said that PlanD would convey Members' comments to HAD and ArchSD for them to take into account during detailed design stage.

PlanD

[Post-meeting Notes: An inter-departmental meeting between PlanD, HAD, ArchSD, TD, LCSD and Social Welfare Department was held on 15 July 2016 to discuss Members' comments on the community hall. HAD together with other relevant departments would explore the possibility to include some community facilities within the development to serve local residents. TD advised that there was at-grade crossing nearby and footbridge connection to the community hall was therefore considered unnecessary. The planned footbridge network in Tsuen Wan was comprehensive and well-integrated and a section of the planned footbridge would pass through another side of Wing Shun Street just opposite to the community hall. In addition, ArchSD advised that there was a level difference between the community hall and the planned footbridge. Regarding public vehicle park, ArchSD advised that it would be technically difficult to provide an underground carpark or public carpark at ground level due to site constraints.]

- 3.24 In conclusion, **the Chair** said that the Task Force in general supported the proposed land use. Members opined that the site utilisation including the BHR could be further optimised by incorporating other community facilities and suitable provision of car parking spaces into the development. The planning should preserve some flexibility to facilitate future building design in the future. Connectivity with the park and the elevated walkway system could be further explored. Ways to continue with the existing community garden should also be looked into. Members' views would be summarised for the Town Planning Board's reference when considering the amendment.

**The
Secretariat**

[Post-meeting note: Members' views were summarised and conveyed to

the Town Planning Board on 7 July 2016.]

Item 4 Any Other Business

A. Tsuen Wan Waterfront

- 4.1 **The Chair** reported that the Commission Chair received a letter from CAC of TWDC, which was also copied to her. The letter invited the Commission to attend the third meeting of CAC on 6 May 2016. She said that the Harbour Unit attended the CAC meeting.
- 4.2 On the Chair's invitation, **Miss Christine AU** reported that the Harbour Unit attended the CAC meeting on behalf of the Development Bureau and the Task Force to discuss a proposal submitted by several TWDC Members on developing a waterfront promenade from Tsuen Wan West MTR station to Tai Lam. The proposal was tabled for Members' reference. She reported the discussion of the CAC meeting with the aid of a PowerPoint and said that the Harbour Unit would maintain communication with TWDC and report their feedback to the Task Force as appropriate.
- 4.3 **The Chair** said that the Harbour Unit had been serving as a bridge between HC and DCs and relevant DC Members were also co-opted to respective geographical Task Forces to give views from local perspective. She recommended and Members agreed that –
- (a) the Task Force would continue to strengthen collaborations with relevant District Councils and clarifications should be sought from CAC in the future on whether they intended for their invitation to be extended to individual Task Force Members for attendance at their meeting; and
 - (b) the Task Force would welcome CAC to put forward items for discussion at the Task Force meetings when detailed proposals were available.

B. Action Areas

Action

4.4 **The Chair** invited Members to raise to the Secretariat any Action Area that they would like to discuss at the next Task Force meeting.

C. *Date of Next Meeting*

4.5 **The Chair** said that the next Task Force meeting would be tentatively scheduled for September/October 2016.

4.6 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

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