

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

**Minutes of Twenty-fourth Meeting**

Date : 22 September 2016  
Time : 9:00 a.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 (Kowloon Task Force)
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
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 Alan LO Yeung-kit	
Mr NGAN Man-yu	
Prof Raymond FUNG	
Mr Derek HUNG	
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 Simon LAU	Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon, Transport Department (TD)
Mr Tommy WONG	Senior Engineer/1 (Kowloon), 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**

Miss Christine AU Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB  
Miss Emily SOM Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 2, DEVB

**Absent with Apologies**

Mrs Margaret BROOKE Representing Business Environment Council  
Mr Paul CHAN Yuen-king Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects  
Dr Peter Cookson SMITH Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners  
Mr CHOW Ping-tim  
Dr Edmund LEE  
Mr LEUNG Man-kwong

**For Agenda Item 3**

Dr Louis NG Deputy Director of Leisure & Cultural Services (Culture), LCSD  
Ms Elaine YEUNG Assistant Director(Performing Arts), LCSD  
Ms Heidi CHU Chief Manager (Urban/Cultural Services), LCSD  
Mr David CHAIONG Chief Leisure Manager(Hong Kong West), LCSD  
Mr Jeff TUNG Senior Project Director, New World Development Company Ltd (NWD)  
Mr Daniel PANG Senior Project Manager, NWD  
Ms Fiona WAN Assistant General Manager - Public Affairs, NWD  
Ms Helen CHAN Senior Manager - Public Affairs, NWD  
Mr James CORNER Founder and Director, James Corner Field Operation  
Mr Jayyun JUNG Principal, James Corner Field Operation  
Mr Peter YAM Director, Ronald Lu & Partners  
Mr Terence YAU Director, CMW and Associates  
Mr Alexander M DUGGIE Managing Director, Urbis Limited  
Mr Joseph WONG Executive Director, Ho Wang SPB Limited

**For Agenda Item 4**

Mr Derek SUN Head, Planning & Development, WKCD  
Mr YC NG Head, Technical Services, WKCD  
Mr Eric NG Senior Civil Engineer, WKCD  
Mr Patrick LAM Senior Traffic and Transport Engineer, WKCD  
Mr YM FU Planner, WKCD

**For Agenda Item 5**

Mr Michael CHIU Chief Executive Officer (Planning)1, LCSD  
Mr CHAN Tsz-fung Senior Executive Officer (Planning)6, LCSD  
Mr HSU Ka-man District Leisure Manager (Yau Tsim Mong), LCSD  
Ms Brenda YEUNG District Leisure Manager (Kowloon City), LCSD

Ms Xenia KWAN	Senior Project Manager 334, Architectural Services Department (ArchSD)
Ms Louisa NGAI	Senior Landscape Architect/3, ArchSD
Ms Patty LAU	Landscape Architect/5, ArchSD
Mr Ray LEE	Project Manager 372, ArchSD

**For Agenda Item 6**

Mr LAM Cheuk-fung	Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Sewerage Infrastructure)4, Environmental Protection Department (EPD)
Mr Wallace LEE	Environmental Protection Officer (Sewerage Infrastructure)43, EPD
Mr Raymond SEIT	Senior Engineer / Consultants Management 4, Drainage Services Department (DSD)
Mr Glenn CHAN	Project Manager, Black & Veatch Hong Kong Limited
Mr Bandson LI	Project Engineer, Black & Veatch Hong Kong Limited

**For Agenda Item 7**

Mr Tony LOK	Chief Engineer 2/ Major Works, Highways Department (HyD)
Mr Raymond CHUNG	Senior Engineer 4/Central Kowloon Route, HyD
Ms Jacqueline TAI	Engineer 8/Central Kowloon Route, HyD
Mr Alan LOW	Technical Director (Engineering), Arup - Mott MacDonald Joint Venture
Ms Carmen CHU	Director (Transport Consultant), Arup - Mott MacDonald Joint Venture
Mr Franki CHIU	Director (Environmental Consultant), Arup - Mott MacDonald Joint Venture

**Action**

**Welcoming Message**

**The Chair** welcomed all to the meeting. She informed Members that Mr Alan LO and Mr NGAN Man-yu had joined the Task Force and attended the meeting for the first time. Mr Simon LAU had also taken over the post of Chief Traffic Engineer/ Kowloon of TD from Mr Wilson PANG. She further informed Members that Mr Edward LEUNG, Senior Manager of TC, attended the meeting on behalf of Ms Emily MO; and Mr Tommy WONG, Senior Engineer of CEDD, attended on behalf of Mr Janson WONG.

## **Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting**

- 1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting on 6 September 2016. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated again on 14 September 2016. There being no further amendment, the draft minutes were confirmed at the meeting.

## **Item 2 Matters Arising**

- A. *The Tsim Sha Tsui (TST) Waterfront Revitalisation Plan (paragraph 2.17 of the minutes of the 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting)*

- 2.1 **The Chair** said that a joint design workshop organised by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) was held on 9 September 2016. The workshop invited various stakeholders to provide comments on the proposed design of the Avenue of Stars (AoS). She added that the opportunity for the project proponent to exchange views with various stakeholders under the same roof had been fruitful. LCSD would brief Members on the revised design under item 3 of this meeting.

- B. *Amendment to the Approved Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TW/31 on relaxing building height restriction for developing a community hall in Tsuen Wan (paragraphs 3.23 and 3.24 of the minutes of the 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting)*

- 2.2 **The Chair** informed Members that an inter-departmental meeting was organised by the Planning Department (PlanD) to explore the possibility of including more community facilities within the proposed community hall development to serve local residents. Separately, Members' views expressed on the amendment were summarised and conveyed to the Town Planning Board on 7 July 2016.

## **Item 3 Action Area: Tsim Sha Tsui East and Tsim Sha Tsui West Action Areas - Updates on the Avenue of Stars (Paper No. TFK/04/2016)**

- 3.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives from the project proponents to the meeting and invited Members to declare interest, if any.

- 3.2 **Mr Shuki LEUNG** informed the meeting that one of the project proponents, viz. New World Development, was a Member of his organisation (the Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong). **The Chair** considered that Mr LEUNG had no direct involvement in the project and could stay at the meeting and participate in the discussion.
- 3.3 **Mr James CORNER** presented the revised design of AoS while **Mr Jeff TUNG** briefed the Task Force on the progress of the revitalisation project, with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 3.4 **Mr Alan LO** considered that while the design had improved significantly in terms of functionality and the provision of amenities, he would like to see a more outstanding identity and character of AoS for it to become unique. Since various LED lighting features were already installed on buildings along both sides of the harbour, adding similar lighting features at AoS might not be as impactful as intended.
- 3.5 **Mr Derek HUNG** made the following comments -
- (a) the project was discussed since 2012 at various occasions including meetings of the Task Force and the Yau Tsim Mong District Council (YTMD), and he was happy to see that the proponents had incorporated comments raised by various stakeholders into the revised design in particular on increasing seating and improving accessibility, etc.;
  - (b) the paving to be used at AoS and Salisbury Garden should be coordinated;
  - (c) as suggested by the movie industry, movie elements should be further strengthened; and
  - (d) to minimise light pollution, he asked the proponents to make reference to the Charter on External Lighting promulgated by the Environmental Protection Department when setting the operating hours of the lighting features.
- 3.6 **Mr NGAN Man-yu** supported the revised design as it could meet public aspiration for a simple design. He was aware that more seating, shades and space for walking would be provided in AoS. He opined that the idea of using modern display

technology to tell a story about the site could be adopted at other promenades as well. He asked how to achieve a consistent design between the Tsim Sha Tsui East Promenade and AoS and also the connection to the Garden of Stars.

- 3.7 **Dr Louis NG** responded that the holistic revitalisation of the Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront would be taken forward by phases. The Art Square outside the Museum of Art (MoA) and Space Museum had been opened to the public. The enhancement of Salisbury Garden was in progress and expected to be re-opened in 2017. The renovation of MoA was expected to be completed in mid-2018. In order to achieve consistency and harmony in the overall design, colleagues responsible for the enhancement of the Hong Kong Cultural Centre (HKCC), MoA and AoS had met and maintained close liaison to align on the design and coordinate on the provision of facilities and signage. The design of AoS would be simple and modern. While it would emphasize functionality, it would also be able to offer more space for a variety of activities and events.
- 3.8 **Mr Jeff TUNG** supplemented that the project team would continue to communicate with the movie industry and incorporate more movie elements into the revised design.
- 3.9 **Mr James CORNER** made the following responses -
- (a) he opined that the location and the astounding harbour view would already provide a unique identity for AoS. A simple design without any imported or symbolic elements would be most suitable;
  - (b) he believed that having incorporated some unique elements, such as railing of a wave design, sitting cluster or balustrade seating, would also render the revitalised AoS more identifiable. A forward-looking approach would create a new identity for AoS as a simple but representative public open space;
  - (c) lighting was one of the tools adopted to provide highlights to AoS. Apart from ensuring public safety, the lighting features would be subtle with a low intensity and the timing of its operation could be adjusted. The design would not compete with other lighting features that were already available along the harbour and should not give rise to any light pollution;

- (d) the project team had kept up its engagement with the movie industry when formulating the design in the last few years and would continue to do so while taking forward the revised design; and
- (e) comment from Members and other stakeholders would be taken on board as far as practicable and a series of design studies would be commissioned in order to create a holistic and consistent design for the entire Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront.

3.10 In response to **the Chair's** enquiry, **Mr Jeff TUNG** responded that there was still room to fine tune operation details, such as the operating hours and intensity of the lighting features, and the project team would further consider Members' views.

3.11 **Prof Raymond FUNG** shared his views based on his involvement in the current design of the Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront –

- (a) the waterfront currently managed by LCSD was paved with cobblestones of a subtle colour to highlight the Victoria Harbour as the backdrop. He opined that the paving as proposed in the revised design was acceptable as it was subtle even though it would not completely match with the paving of the existing TST waterfront promenade;
- (b) taking photograph was one of the key activities for patrons of the TST waterfront. Therefore, the project team might wish to ensure that whatever lighting features to be installed thereupon should not affect patrons from taking photographs at the waterfront;
- (c) organisations providing sculptures would request for protection of their artwork. He considered that more user-friendly measures such as putting up of notices would be preferable over the erection of physical barriers such as fences; and
- (d) sufficient, consistent and clear signage should be provided along the entire stretch of the Tsim Sha Tsui promenade starting from the clock tower all the way to Hung Hom.

3.12 **Mr SO Kwok-yin** raised the following–

- (a) he considered that the revised design in general aligned with the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines and appreciated that the comments received during the public consultation were noted and acted upon. However, he opined that the previous public consultation was limited to professionals and asked whether the public would be engaged on the revised design again;
- (b) he recognised that the Victoria Harbour would be part of the identity of AoS and opined that the revised design might not be able to meet the expectation of some visitors as most movie elements would be moved to the Garden of Stars;
- (c) he suggested the project team to pay attention to potential light pollution generated by the lighting features and address the issue properly; and
- (d) he asked about the mechanism of awarding the management contract in the future.

3.13 **Dr Louis NG** responded that -

- (a) the proposed enhancement and repair of the AoS would be carried out in accordance with the existing management contract between LCSD and NWD, which would only expire after eight more years;
- (b) the team had been consulting the Task Force and the YTMDC on the design and the engagement would be an on-going process. Relevant organisations or stakeholders would be further consulted to gather their views on specific design and management issues; and
- (c) the project teams working on the AoS and Salisbury Garden project; Art Square and MoA project; as well as the HKCC project would work to ensure consistency among their respective designs.

3.14 **Mr Jeff TUNG** added that lighting for the promenade would be installed closer to the hinterland so that it would not affect patrons taking photos of the harbour. It was envisioned that some soft lighting would be incorporated into the railing to enhance the overall ambience. The project team would continue



to work with the industry to ensure that movie elements would still be prominently featured in AoS. They would also liaise with the industry to find out a suitable arrangement for displaying the sculptures.

- 3.15 **Mr James CORNER** acknowledged Members' aspiration on designing the waterfront under a holistic approach, in particular adopting a more consistent design for elements such as paving, lighting and furnishing. He also noted that signage and identity of AOS were key concerns of Members. He said that the design team supported the idea of including clear way-finding signage and an identity for AOS.
- 3.16 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** said that he appreciated the project team had listened to and worked to have incorporated a lot of the comments received during the design workshop. He echoed the view that the design should be unique and suggested that the Garden of Stars could be converted into a relaxing open place.
- 3.17 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** raised the following -
- (a) he had repeatedly asked for information on the overall cost estimate of the revitalisation project and crowd control measures, which were still not provided;
  - (b) the price range of the food and beverages (F&B) to be offered at kiosks along AoS should be provided;
  - (c) if NWD was promised to renew the management contract upon expiry;
  - (d) while YTMDC and relevant organisations were engaged, he opined that the general public should also be consulted on the revised design;
  - (e) moving some movie elements away from AoS could be acceptable but other locations such as the Centennial Garden in Tsim Sha Tsui East should also be considered;
  - (f) for the increase in number of seats as presented by NWD, he queried if the base number had included the existing railing which was being used for sitting; and
  - (g) if any drinking fountain would be provided along the promenade and would the kiosks serving F&B make use

of disposable containers. A sustainable planning approach would be necessary.

3.18 **Dr Louis NG** made the following responses -

- (a) the focus of the discussion at this stage would be placed on the revised design instead of the financial aspect of the project;
- (b) LCSD placed a lot of emphasis on management issues including pricing and type of F&B to be provided at carts, kiosks or restaurants along the AoS. It would adopt a holistic approach when drawing up the detailed design;
- (c) LCSD would work on the environmental and crowd control issues at AoS, Salisbury Garden, HKCC and Art Square seriously and holistically with the Police and relevant event organisers. As the works of AoS would be completed in Q3 of 2018, there was still time for further deliberations on such arrangements;
- (d) he clarified that NWD was a service provider which provided management service for AoS while the final authority on management issues still rested with LCSD; and
- (e) he considered it effective and appropriate to consult DC and relevant stakeholders such as the movie industry on the proposal.

3.19 **Mr Jeff TUNG** said that NWD, as the management agent, had been engaging the Police on the revised design and the Police had no adverse comment so far. He added that NWD, LCSD and the Police would continue to work closely to devise a detailed crowd management plan. Instead of becoming a lounging area for displaying static components, he said that the design team would work closely with the movie industry to incorporate interesting movie elements into the design, possibly through the use of technology.

3.20 **Mr James CORNER** responded that -

- (a) crowd control capacity would not be undermined by the revised design, especially as the new railings would further widen the promenade by 1.5 metre. Before the hosting of events, the Police would also put in place

temporary railings to provide some space between that and the balustrade for emergency access and passage. He understood that as a precautionary measure, the Police would only allow approximately 35 000 people to gather at AoS at any one time;

- (b) on seating, the range, quality and variety of seating would be improved as compared to the current provision. While the existing railings were not counted towards the number of existing seats, the revised design would increase the number of seating by 225%; and
- (c) the paving was designed to provide more than adequate drainage.

3.21 **Dr Louis NG** confirmed that the project would not involve any public expenditure and there was no commitment from the Government that the management contract would be awarded to NWD upon expiry of the current term.

3.22 **The Chair** said that as long as there was no unsafe element in the design, the crowd control arrangement could be discussed separately in the future especially she was aware that crowd control on the harbourfront was a topic that would be discussed at the upcoming Commission meeting.

3.23 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** raised some follow-up questions and comments -

- (a) the overall budget of the project should be made known to the public;
- (b) the price range of F&B services to be offered at AoS should be provided and his query on how much plastic waste would be generated had not yet been addressed;
- (c) whether there would be any other alternative location to display movie statues;
- (d) he was disappointed that the existing railing was not counted as seats and he would like to have more information on the exact number and types of seats to be provided along the revamped AoS;
- (e) on crowd control, a plan showing areas to be used by the public during water-based or land-based events should be provided to demonstrate that the design had taken

into account such needs;

- (f) the team should not only consult YTMDC and relevant organisations but also members of the public, and it was easy to collect views from the public through mobile apps or on the internet; and
- (g) he would object to the design if the above questions were not answered.

3.24 **Dr Louis NG** said that the consultation would focus on the revised design and hardware features for timely re-opening of AoS. He reiterated that there were still around two years before the works would be completed and the team would come back to gauge views from Members on management and other issues.

3.32 **The Chair** considered that issues related to pragmatic management and daily operation of AoS could be further discussed in the future. She concluded that -

- (a) the Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront including AoS, Salisbury Garden and the Hung Hom waterfront should be designed in a holistic manner, and the Task Force would continue to pay close attention to this area in its entirety;
- (b) AoS should be re-opened sooner for public enjoyment while Members should be provided with relevant information early for further discussion on issues such as management, daily operation, price range of F&B and public safety issues; and
- (c) She acknowledged that the team had provided a simple design with more greenery and shades, diversified seating and incorporated the latest technology into the design. She believed that Members had indicated general support over the revised design as it had incorporated most comments from the Task Force and the public. She asked the team to take into account Members' further comments when further refining the design, in particular on how to enhance movie elements in an artistic, elegant and subtle manner.

3.33 **Prof Raymond FUNG** asked whether the lighting features could be consistent all along from the clock tower to Hung Hom.

- 3.34 **Dr Louis NG** responded that depending on public reaction when AoS was re-opened, LCSD might consider gradually enhancing the seating and lighting arrangements at other parts of the waterfront.
- 3.35 **The Chair** commented that the team might also consult professional photographers in addition to the movie industry.
- 3.36 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** requested that the project proponents should provide post-meeting information on his questions that were not answered.
- 3.37 **The Chair** responded that the Task Force should be engaged on issues such as management, daily operation and public safety and instead of providing post-meeting information, she asked the team to report back to the Task Force when ready. **LCSD/  
NWD**

**Item 4 Progress Update on the West Kowloon Cultural District  
(Paper No. TFK/05/2016)**

- 4.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives from the West Kowloon Cultural District Authority (WKCD) and invited Members to declare interest, if any.
- 4.2 **Prof Raymond FUNG** declared that he was a Board Member of the WKCD. **The Chair** considered that Prof FUNG could stay at the meeting but refrain from giving comments.
- 4.3 **Mr Derek HUNG** declared that he was a member of the owners' committee of one of the residential estates above the Kowloon MTR station and also a member of the consultation panel of WKCD. **The Chair** clarified with Mr HUNG that he did not have any direct pecuniary interest on any development in WKCD. With his affirmation, the Chair ruled that he could still take part in the discussion.
- 4.4 **Mr YC NG** updated Members on the latest progress of the WKCD development with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 4.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that Wong Chuk Hang MTR station and the public transport interchange (PTI) at Heung Yip Road were integrated but demonstrated a significant contrast in terms of aesthetics. He would like to have more details on the design of underground facilities such as parking spaces and PTI to ensure that these facilities would not be constructed only to the minimal standard set by the Highways Department (HyD).

- 4.6 **Mr Derek HUNG** said that the design of the Artist Square Bridge (ASB) was innovative and he was glad to see that the staircases of the bridge were incorporated into the nearby building. He considered it not desirable to construct temporary pontoon or pier right next to China Ferry Terminal as it would narrow down the fairway. He asked WKCDA to engage experts to further explore the most suitable location for marine access having regard to the need to provide water transfer service with Kai Tak Cruise Terminal.
- 4.7 **Mr Derek SUN** responded that the majority of the comprehensive basement was currently used for the construction of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link (XRL). The team targeted to start working on the design of the basement in early 2017 and the works could only commence after the completion of the XRL project. The concept of placing public roads and car parks underground was to create a vehicle-free ground level environment for the public to enjoy. While public roads were required to be built according to HyD's standard, he believed that there would be room for improving the design involved. The overall design of the comprehensive basement would be presented to the Task Force for comments when ready.
- 4.8 On marine access, **Mr YC NG** said that the Marine Department had been consulted and its comments had been incorporated when proposing the possible location for the pier.
- 4.9 **The Chair** thanked the team for updating the Task Force on the progress of WKCD development and asked them to present the design of the comprehensive basement and provide more details on the proposed marine access point to the Task Force when ready.

**Item 5 Open Space Development at Hung Hom Waterfront (Paper No. TFK/06/2016)**

- 5.1 **The Chair** welcomed the representatives from LCSD and ArchSD to the meeting and invited Members to declare interest, if any.
- 5.2 **Mr Freddie HAI** declared that he was the architect of one of the private developments at the Hung Hom waterfront. **The Chair** considered that the agenda item was about the design of the

open space development and Mr HAI had no direct personal interest on this particular project. He could stay and participate in the discussion.

5.3 **Mr Michael CHIU** introduced the scope and background of the project. **Ms Louisa NGAI** briefed Members on the preliminary design of the project with the aid of a PowerPoint.

5.4 **Prof Raymond FUNG** expressed appreciation to the team on their efforts made to enhance this part of the harbourfront. While he recognised that different strip of areas might have different architectural feature and design, he asked if the proposed Hung Hom waterfront could be physically linked to the Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront promenade. **The Chair** responded that the Hung Hom waterfront and the Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront were currently connected through a footbridge spanning across the Hung Hom MTR station.

5.5 **Prof Raymond FUNG** supplemented the following -

- (a) a similar or compatible colour as used for the Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront promenade could be used for paving of the Hung Hom waterfront in order to achieve consistency;
- (b) incorporating history of Whampoa Dock into the design in an implicit and subtle manner was supported; and
- (c) thematic planting was a trend in recent years and he opined that the project team should take the opportunity to plant more trees of the same type of trees already on the promenade to create a thematic planting area.

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

- (a) the programme for developing the urban park at the existing bus terminus to the northeast of the project site should be provided;
- (b) was any analysis conducted on the activities of the existing uses of the waterfront promenade and future users such as those from nearby hotels and offices so that their needs would be taken into account when planning the provision of facilities at the public open space and the waterfront promenade;

- (c) whether any angling facilities such as hook holders and seating would be provided for anglers;
- (d) cycling and skate-boarding should be allowed and a dog-walking trail should be provided. Drinking fountain which were able to refill water bottles should be provided;
- (e) shades should be provided on the viewing platform;
- (f) marine uses such as landing steps should be provided near the Harbourfront Horizon or the office development;
- (g) he enquired if F&B kiosks would be available and whether visitors would be allowed to eat and drink along the waterfront. Seats should be provided near the pier for customers buying food and beverage from kiosks inside the pier, which would be more affordable;
- (h) a real crane or an abandoned anchor could be incorporated as a landmark to feature history of the site; and
- (i) access points could be seamless and continuous to integrate with the nearby road pavement.

5.7 **Mr Freddie HAI** expressed the following -

- (a) photo 3 on slide number 5 of the PowerPoint might not fully reflect the fact that the Hung Hom waterfront promenade was directly exposed to sun all day long until sunset. He suggested planting more trees along the waterfront which could provide shades especially near seating areas;
- (b) the existing footbridge connection between the Hung Hom waterfront and Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront as well as the pier area in front of Hung Hom MTR station should be further enhanced in the future;
- (c) accessibility from Harbourfront Horizon to the waterfront could be improved although it might involve complicated land ownership issue and negotiation with the private developer;



- (d) there should be an overall review on the design and detailed uses of the three open spaces in the vicinity including the Kin Wan Street open space, the open space at the bus terminal and the open space adjacent to the office development to avoid duplication of their functions;
- (e) he echoed Mr ZIMMERMAN's views that there should be more retail kiosks at the promenade near Harbourfront Horizon;
- (f) provision of parking spaces should be considered to facilitate some members of the public to gain access to the promenade; and
- (g) connectivity between the Kin Wan Street Market and the promenade should be improved.

**5.8 Mr Michael CHIU responded as below -**

- (a) the bus terminal was expected to be relocated underneath the nearby hotel development in 2018. The vacated site would then be developed into an urban park according to the zoning;
- (b) according to LCSD's observation, popular uses on the Hung Hom waterfront promenade included jogging, sun bathing and picnic purpose;
- (c) there were approximately 50 000 residents in the vicinity and a few primary and secondary schools. The development of open space at the Hung Hom waterfront would mainly address the needs of local residents and also attract patronage from nearby districts;
- (d) LCSD received continuous complaints against allowing dogs on the promenade. Ways to facilitate fishing was discussed but not agreed among participants of the value management workshop due to public safety concern;
- (e) the team would further explore opportunities to provide kiosks selling affordable F&B along the promenade, taking into consideration hygiene and provision of retail facilities nearby; and

- (f) parking spaces would be available for promenade users at the nearby "CDA" site.

5.9 **Ms Louisa NGAI** further responded that they would further look into the feasibility of incorporating thematic planting after surveying the existing trees and taking into account other site constraints.

5.10 **Mr NGAN Man-yu** enquired about the need to close the waterfront promenade during the construction period. He also asked the team to improve the connectivity from the Hung Hom MTR station to the waterfront.

5.11 **Mr SO Kwok-yin** expressed the following -

- (a) pedestrian connectivity from the Hung Hom and Whampoa MTR stations to the waterfront should be improved;
- (b) the proposed open space should serve more than a park. Fishing should be allowed at the waterfront as he understood that fishing would normally be permitted at venues under LCSD's management;
- (c) the existing trees at the proposed site was large enough and of the right species. He hoped that these trees could be retained and similar trees could be planted to provide more shades;
- (d) the existing railing along the promenade was not in good condition and its design should be improved. He considered that the design should be further reviewed holistically from the overall harbourfront enhancement perspective; and
- (e) the theme of shipyard should become more prominent in the design concept.

5.12 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** supplemented the following-

- (a) there were public open spaces which were planned closer to the residential areas nearby. He anticipated that those open space should be more passive while the proposed sites could be developed for more active uses such as providing space for skateboarding;

- (b) fishing and cycling should be allowed and members of the public should be encouraged to share the space with other users. He reiterated that fishing should be allowed along the entire stretch of the promenade instead of a particular zone and the area of lawn could be reduced to widen the promenade for the use of cyclists; and
- (c) lean bars could be installed along the promenade to serve as railing and for seating purpose.

5.13 **Mrs Doris FOK** clarified that under the prevailing policy, fishing was allowed along the promenade under LCSD's management as long as anglers would not cause nuisances to other users.

5.14 **Mr Michael CHIU** added that -

- (a) jogging was a popular activity along the Hung Hom promenade but he had no information whether joggers were local residents or from other districts;
- (b) LCSD would repair the existing railing as soon as possible;
- (c) the promenade would not be completely closed during the construction period; and
- (d) ArchSD would study the feasibility of installing lean bars.

5.15 **Ms Louisa NGAI** supplemented that replacement of railing had been included in the project scope. The team would take into account Members' comments when drawing up the detailed design.

5.16 **Prof Raymond FUNG** commented that enhancing the harbourfront and its accessibility was one of the key missions of HC and he opined that the Task Force should not solely focus on the design of a particular location but to review measures to enhance the harbourfront as a whole. He concurred with Mr ZIMMERMAN that the Government should not give up the vision to encourage shared use along the waterfront. Quoting the importance attached to cycling in Nordic countries as an example, he opined diversity should be preserved along the waterfront to demonstrate Hong Kong as a harmonious society.

5.17 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** asked if the old Hung Hom ferry pier was

covered in the project scope and how it would be dealt with in the future. **The Chair** responded that she understood the ferry pier was not covered in the project scope and could be discussed separately.

- 5.18 **The Chair** asked the project team to take into account Members' comments and engage the Task Force again when a detailed design was available.

**LCSD/  
ArchSD**

**Item 6 Lei Yue Mun Village Sewerage Project (Paper No. TFK/07/2016)**

- 6.1 **The Chair** welcomed the project team to the meeting and invited Members to declare interest, if any. She informed Members that EPD and DSD would like to brief Members on their project to develop public sewerage in Lei Yue Mun Village and implement other measures to minimise polluted flow from discharging into the harbour, with a view to improving the water quality near the Village.
- 6.2 **Mr CF LAM** briefly introduced the background of the project and **Mr Glenn CHAN** briefed Members on the preliminary design of the sewerage system with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 6.3 **Ir Prof CHOY Kin-kuen** supported the project and asked the team to come up with a better planning so that the impact to visitors and restaurants in Lei Yue Mun could be kept at a minimum.
- 6.4 **Mr SO Kwok-yin** asked the project team to be mindful of not damaging the "fung-shui" tree near the Tin Hau Temple when implementing the underground construction works.
- 6.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** raised the following comments and questions –
- (a) promotion to attract more tourists to the Lei Yue Mun Village should be put on hold until the sewerage improvement project was completed;
  - (b) how many restaurants would be directly connected to the main sewerage system and any incentive would be provided for restaurants to complete the connections;
  - (c) if a pipe should be planned under the surface drainage

so that sewage could flow into a separate sewer; and

- (d) how often the dry weather flow interceptor (DWFI) could intercept polluted flow and how often sewage would go directly into the harbour during rainy season.

6.6 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** asked what structures of the sewerage system would be permanent and how restaurants could be connected to the system.

6.7 **Mr Freddie HAI** expressed his appreciation of EPD and DSD's initiative and efforts to improve the living environment of the area. He reminded the project team to take into consideration the rainy and tourism seasons of the Lei Yue Mun Village when drawing up the implementation schedule.

6.8 **The Chair** asked if the enhanced sewerage system could ease the odour problem at the Lei Yue Mun Village.

6.9 **Mr CF LAM** thanked Members' support and responded as follows -

- (a) it was the team's first priority to minimise the impact of works to the environment, restaurant operators and visitors. In this connection, relevant stakeholders had been consulted with a view to devising an appropriate implementation timetable. Various means would be provided to facilitate smooth pedestrian movement through the village during construction;
- (b) a tree expert had been engaged in the project to make sure that rare and precious trees could be properly preserved;
- (c) the team would work closely with the Tourism Commission to devise coordinated implementation with its Lei Yue Mun enhancement plan and other tourism promotion efforts; and
- (d) the team would strive to complete the project timely, subject to funding approval.

6.10 **Mr Glenn CHAN** supplemented that the odour problem in the nearby typhoon shelter could be improved by the proposed DWFI while the odour at the Village could be eased by diverting sewage from the Village to the proposed trunk sewer

along the waterfront. It was a requirement under the Water Pollution Control Ordinance that all nearby residents and restaurants should connect their sewage discharge to the proposed sewerage system once available. It was expected that 18 restaurants would be connected to the proposed system.

- 6.11 **Mr CF LAM** added that the proposed sewerage system would mainly cover nearby restaurants while the connection with residential areas located on the hill would be subject to further feasibility study having regard to geographic conditions and underground constraints. As it might not be practicable to connect the sewerage system to each and every residential household, DWFI was put in place to prevent sewage from discharged directly into the harbour as far as possible.
- 6.12 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** would like the team to clarify the number of households to be connected to the proposed sewerage system and the number which its sewerage was dealt with by surface channel. Separately, he opined that local residents and restaurant operators should not be discontent about the impact of the works as it would be an asset to further improve their living and business environment and boost up local tourism. **The Chair** responded that the project team had replied that every household would be required to connect to the sewerage system if feasible.
- 6.13 **The Chair** concluded that the Task Force unanimously supported the project. She asked the team to minimise the impact of works to the environment, residents and restaurants operators and assist households to connect to the sewerage system as far as practicable.

**Item 7 Central Kowloon Route - Proposed Temporary Government Land Allocation for Temporary Barging Facility at Kwai Yue Lane, Kwai Chung (Paper No. TFK/08/2016)**

- 7.1 **The Chair** welcomed the project team to the meeting and invited Members to declare interest, if any. By way of background, she informed Members that HyD would now like to seek Members' views on the proposed temporary land allocation for a site in Kwai Chung near Rambler Channel Public Cargo Working Area as a barging point. The barging point would be used for transporting some of the excavated materials to disposal sites and mud pits by sea to facilitate construction of the Central Kowloon Route (CKR). Some

Members were briefed on the proposal at an informal session on 31 August 2016 and shared their initial views with the project team. She invited HyD to present an enhanced proposal after taking into account Members' initial views.

7.2 **Mr Tony LOK** said that some views expressed at the informal session had been addressed in the proposal to be presented at the meeting and **Mr Raymond CHUNG** briefed Members on their proposal with the aid of a PowerPoint.

7.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** raised the following -

- (a) if there would be any measures to monitor the behaviour of the trucks such as speeding;
- (b) whether the proposed barging point was an existing facility or a new one; and
- (c) if there would be any control to minimise potential noise and air pollution to be generated by the operation of the barging point and the trucks transporting the wastes.

7.4 **Mr Freddie HAI** asked whether the temporary barging point in WKCD was already closed. He suggested the team to consider using barging facility which was closer to the CKR construction site. The proposed site was far from the construction site and would generate traffic and environmental impact to nearby areas.

7.5 **Mr WONG Yiu-chung** said that residents near the proposed location were concerned about the noise and air pollution to be generated by the barging facility. He pointed out that the other options were not presented to the Kwai Tsing DC earlier. He asked the project team to consider using the barging point at Nam Cheong.

7.6 **The Chair** said that she was aware that another temporary barging point would be proposed at Kai Tak. She asked whether the one in Kai Tak would be sufficient to cope with the needs of the whole project.

7.7 **Mr Tony LOK** responded the following-

- (a) the proposed barging point was formerly a barging facility used by other projects;

- (b) the barging point at Nam Cheong would be phased out in the first half of 2017 to facilitate residential development while the one at WKCD had already been dismantled;
- (c) the travelling distance from the construction site in Yau Ma Tei to the proposed barging facility in Kai Tak was about the same as to Kwai Chung. After considering road traffic condition of the two routes, having two separate barging points were considered more appropriate; and
- (d) a maximum of 10 vehicles per hour was expected to travel between the construction site and the proposed barging point during non-peak hours during the construction period from 2017 to 2021.

7.8 On environmental impact, **Mr Franki CHIU** responded that Grand Horizon would be the nearest residential development to the proposed barging point. Environmental Impact Assessment was conducted to ensure that the environmental impact would be acceptable. He also emphasised that an on-site environmental team would be set up to handle relevant complaints and implement suitable mitigation measures.

7.9 **Ms Carmen CHU** added that other monitoring measures such as those proposed to deal with speeding of the trucks would be incorporated as requirements for contractors to comply with.

7.10 **Mr Freddie HAI** reiterated that he had concern over having a barging point that was remote from the construction site. He quoted Wan Po Road at Tseung Kwan O as an example to demonstrate that environmental impact of trucks could be difficult to be monitored and mitigated. Moreover, he doubted whether the barging facility at WKCD had been dismantled as there were still works in progress at WKCD and a barging facility would be needed.

7.11 **Mr Tony LOK** clarified with the aid of a photo that the barging facility at WKCD had already been dismantled for the purpose of carrying out piling works for future development.

7.12 **Mr WONG Yiu-chung** asked if it would be possible to extend the term of the existing barging point at Nam Cheong.

7.13 **Mr Lawrence CHAU** clarified that the site in Nam Cheong



would be disposed for residential development after phasing out of the barging facility in the first half of 2017.

- 7.14 **The Chair** said that the Task Force Members were still concerned about the proposed barging point as it was far from the construction site. Although the team stated that they had already considered various options and was willing to consider incorporating mitigating measures, detailed justifications and supporting data/information (such as the usage rates of alternative barging points, the actual volume and time of expected truck traffic associated with the barging operation, and noise impacts to nearby residents) had not been presented to the Task Force for members to consider.
- 7.15 **Mr Tony LOK** replied that the team was aware that the proposed barging point was not close to the construction site. However, the proposed location was considered the most desirable among other options after conducting a thorough site search exercise.
- 7.16 **Ms Carmen CHU** added that if only the proposed barging facility in Kai Tak was adopted, the traffic to be generated by the trucks might aggravate the congestion at Waterloo Road and Argyle Street.
- 7.17 **The Chair** noted the views but she considered that the project team should take Members' concerns into consideration and provide more detailed information so that Members could consider the matter from a holistic perspective.
- 7.18 As the project team would also consult the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development on the proposed barging facility in Kai Tak, **Miss Christine AU** suggested and **the Chair** agreed that the team might present a more detailed paper with analysis on whether the barging point at Kai Tak alone could serve the needs of CKR works. This Task Force would re-consider this proposal, should the barging point at Kai Tak be considered insufficient.

## **Item 8 Any Other Business**

### **A. Action Area**

- 8.1 **The Chair** reported that the revised Action Area Table setting

out the latest developments in the harbourfront areas was circulated to Members on 14 September 2016. She invited Members to raise to the Secretariat any Action Area that they would like to discuss at the next Task Force meeting.

B. Date of Next Meeting

8.2 **The Chair** said that the next Task Force meeting would be tentatively scheduled for late November 2016.

8.3 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

**Secretariat  
Task Force on Harbourfront Developments  
in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing  
February 2017**