

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

Minutes of Twenty-fifth Meeting

Date : 18 November 2016
Time : 4:45 p.m.
Venue : Conference Room (Room G46) at Upper Ground Floor,
Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre, Kowloon Park,
Tsim Sha Tsui

Present

Prof Becky LOO	Chair, Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing (Kowloon Task Force)
Dr NG Cho-nam	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
Mr TAM Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Prof CHOY Kin-kuen	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr Derek HUNG	
Mr WONG Yiu-chung	
Miss Christine AU	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), 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

Mr Nicholas BROOKE	Chair, Harbourfront Commission
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
Sr Lesly LAM	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Shuki LEUNG Shu-ki	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Alan LO Yeung-kit	
Mr NGAN Man-yu	
Mr CHOW Ping-tim	
Prof Raymond FUNG	
Dr Edmund LEE	
Mr LEUNG Man-kwong	

For Agenda Item 1

Mr Lawrence CHAU	District Planning Officer/ Tsuen Wan & West Kowloon, PlanD
Mr Philip CHUM	Senior Town Planner/ Sham Shui Po, PlanD
Ms Agnes TANG	Town Planner/ Sham Shui Po 1, PlanD

Action

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting and 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. She further informed Members that the draft minutes of the last meeting were under preparation and that would be confirmed together with the minutes of this meeting at the next meeting tentatively scheduled for February 2017.

Item 1 Draft Planning Brief for the Two “Comprehensive Development Area” Zones at the Lin Cheung Road Site, Sham Shui Po (Paper No. TFK/09/2016)

- 1.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives from PlanD to the meeting and invited Members to declare interest, if any. As background, she informed Members that the Task Force was consulted by PlanD on the amendments to the South West Kowloon Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) on 12 February 2014, which included rezoning of the Cheung Sha Wan Wholesale Market Phase II site near Lin Cheung Road to “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”), “CDA(2)”, “Residential (Group A)12”, “Government,

Institution or Community" ("G/IC"), "Open Space" ("O") and areas shown as "Road". The OZP amendments were subsequently approved in September 2014. The Government had prepared a draft planning brief setting out the broad development parameters and the planning and design requirements of the two CDA zones and the Metro Planning Committee of the Town Planning Board (TPB) agreed on 30 September 2016 for the Government to consult the Task Force on the draft planning brief.

- 1.2 **Ms Agnes TANG** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 1.3 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** expressed his views as below-
 - (a) he was glad to see that the future developer would be required to submit an urban design proposal as part of the Master Layout Plan (MLP) submission. He opined that the Task Force and the Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design should be consulted during the MLP stage;
 - (b) the developer might have difficulty to comply with the requirements in the draft planning brief as there were subjective elements involved. He suggested to set up a better coordination and facilitation mechanism within the Government to facilitate the developer to prepare the MLP submission in the future;
 - (c) he doubted the function of the 2.5m right-of-way connecting from the planned Road A to the waterfront through the boundary between the two "CDA" sites; and
 - (d) he enquired whether walkway between the hotel and the Cheung Sha Wan Wholesale Food Market (CSWWFM) would be included into the draft planning brief so that the future developer could design the space in a holistic manner; and
 - (e) consistency in the design of the two sections of the waterfront promenade should be achieved.
- 1.4 **Ir Prof CHOY Kin-kuen** enquired about the status and future use of the disused pier and whether it was structurally safe to allow public access on it.

1.5 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** raised the following comments and questions –

- (a) the development scale and the building height restriction as stipulated in the draft planning brief might be excessive which might impose visual impact to the surrounding;
- (b) how the stepped building height profile could be implemented as proposed due to the site limitations;
- (c) whether LCSD had agreed to take up the management and maintenance responsibility after the waterfront promenade in front of the residential development was completed, and if the hotel developer would be asked to take up the management of the disused pier. He opined that the different management model might give rise to interfacing issues; and
- (d) whether it would be financially viable to revitalise the disused pier.

1.6 In response, **Mr Lawrence CHAU** said that –

- (a) an urban design proposal was required to be submitted along with traffic impact assessment (TIA), environmental impact assessment (EIA) and other technical assessments to form part of the MLP submission for TPB's consideration. Consistency in design of different sections of the waterfront promenade would be checked by the Government during the MLP stage. Detailed urban design considerations such as creating an attractive harbourfront with diversity were stipulated in page 11 of the draft planning brief;
- (b) the space between hotel development and CSWWFM would form part of the public road/pedestrian walkway and it would be constructed and managed by the Government;
- (c) the existing disused pier was maintained by the Port Works Division of CEDD and it was structurally safe;
- (d) a stepped building height profile was adopted and it would gradually decrease from the developments in the hinterland. It had taken into account development

intensity in the vicinity, design flexibility and air ventilation performance of the site concerned;

- (e) in accordance with the prevailing policy on public open space in private development (POSPD), the promenade fronting the "CDA" site (for private residential development) would be constructed by the developer and then surrendered to LCSD for management and maintenance and the arrangement had been agreed by LCSD; and
- (f) to allow flexible and diversified uses, the portion of waterfront promenade fronting the "CDA(2)" site (for hotel development) would be constructed and be managed and maintained by the developer, and there would also be a requirement to explore the provision of public landing facilities such as landing steps at the disused pier.

1.7 **The Chair** asked whether there was any precedent of allocating different sections of the waterfront promenade to two management agents. She opined that providing a pedestrian network including internal circulation and connections from the hinterland towards the waterfront should be a specific requirement in the draft planning brief to further enhance pedestrian connectivity in the area.

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

- (a) what were the permanent or temporary land uses of the sites in the vicinity as there were waste transfer station, sewerage treatment plant, government boatyards and CSWWFM near the site concerned;
- (b) the existing condition of the disused pier including whether there were any landing steps or bollards available on it and the loading capacity of the seawall. The requirement of replacing the seawall should be included in the draft planning brief if there was a need to further strengthen the loading capacity; and
- (c) the future developer might consider revitalising the disused pier as unnecessary as the cost for repair and maintenance would be expensive. He opined that the intended use of the disused pier should be decided as

early as possible in order to convert the entire "CDA(2)" site and the waterfront portion into an interesting place. He added that the pier was at an ideal location for a restaurant with suitable landing facilities for berthing of leisure vessels and provision of water taxi service.

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

- (a) it could be financially difficult for the hotel to take up management and maintenance of the promenade including the disused pier as the "CDA(2)" site was only allowed to provide around 1 000 m² of gross floor area (GFA) for retail activities. He considered the provision of retail facilities in the entire area including the hotel, the private residential and subsidised sale flat developments too restrictive;
- (b) as the residential development site was elongated in shape, he opined that the future developer might have difficulty to decide the orientation of tower blocks in order to comply with relevant building regulations; and
- (c) if the hotel developer had to include the disused pier in the MLP submission which would be subject to TPB's approval, the development time frame would be prolonged. He asked the Government to consider suitable measures to facilitate future implementation of the development.

1.10 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** said that -

- (a) the proposed development intensity was too excessive and not in line with the Hong Kong 2030 Planning Vision and Strategy, which suggested that major residential development should be located mainly in the New Territories;
- (b) a comprehensive plan for the harbourfront should be formulated. He considered it undesirable to plan individual sites each time without considering the future land uses and development time table of other sites in the vicinity;
- (c) the design of focal point of the waterfront as mentioned in the presentation was not clear;

- (d) diversity of uses should be provided in the proposed public open spaces;
- (e) the opportunity for enhancing water-land interface at the site should be seized, and the disused pier was valuable and should be revitalised;
- (f) there was no concrete mechanism to ensure that the urban design requirements as proposed in the draft planning brief would be fulfilled. He doubted if it would be sufficient to rely on TPB to exercise planning control over development mix, scale, design and layout of the development. Many design details should be dealt with separately instead of under the existing town planning framework. Otherwise, the vision of allowing innovation, diversity, vibrancy and enhancement of the harbourfront could not be achieved; and
- (g) further increase of development density in the urban areas would not be acceptable as the Strategic Development Commission and the latest "Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030" advocated a livable city as our ultimate goal.

1.11 **The Chair** said that the Task Force as well as the Commission would continue to advise on harbourfront matters and Members' views from harbourfront enhancement perspective would be duly conveyed to TPB.

1.12 **Mr Derek HUNG** raised the following comments -

- (a) the building height at the site concerned was considered acceptable having regard to the development intensity of the sites in the hinterland. He opined that the development would help provide more public open space to the district and he considered that the provision of air corridors should be sufficient;
- (b) more specific details on accessibility and connectivity from the hinterland to the waterfront should be provided;
- (c) it would be important to ensure that the disused pier was safe for revitalisation;

- (d) whether “podium-free design” was the optimum design concept as compared with other options; and
- (e) whether it would be more appropriate to ask the future developers to manage and maintain the whole stretch of the promenade and open it for public use. The Government could play a more active role in coordinating design and construction of the two sections of the waterfront promenade to ensure a consistent design.

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

- (a) due to possible noise arising from CSWWFM, the hotel development was proposed for the “CDA(2)” site to serve as an environmental buffer to minimize nuisances to nearby residents;
- (b) pedestrian linkages would be provided to connect the future public open spaces and the waterfront promenade with the surrounding and inland areas as well as the MTR Nam Cheong Station;
- (c) CEDD had consulted the Task Force and taken into account comments received to improve the landscape design and connectivity of the public road A. The construction works commenced on 20 September 2016;
- (d) there were existing and future public housing developments in the vicinity. The Government dockyard, boatyards, refuse transfer station and sewage treatment works would be retained and they were not located immediately next to the sites concerned;
- (e) the disused pier was previously used by CSWWFM for berthing of barges and its structure should be safe for berthing. The future developer should be able to take up the management and maintenance of the public open space and landing facilities, if any, to be constructed on the pier in the future;
- (f) 1 000 m² GFA was the minimum provision that should be used for commercial purpose within the hotel site. ;
- (g) the Government would provide guidance to the future developer to prepare and submit MLP as far as possible

in order to facilitate the approval process and shorten the development programme;

- (h) the comments on how to further enhance the design of public open space would be considered;
- (i) a “podium-free design” was proposed as the sites were for residential use and hotel use, and it could improve air ventilation;
- (j) the design, construction, management and maintenance of public open space and waterfront promenade would be governed by existing POSPD guidelines; and
- (k) the seawall was maintained by the Port Works Division of CEDD.

1.14 **Mr Freddie HAI** added that there would be interface issues between the two sections of the promenade as the management model adopted by LCSD and the private developer would be different. Separately, the management agent of the promenade including the disused pier would be liable for public safety if the pier would be allowed for berthing. He opined that PlanD should sort out these issues and facilitate the future developer.

1.15 In response, **Mr Derek HUNG** recalled that the disused pier at the Hung Hom promenade was locked and he considered such arrangement undesirable as public enjoyment was restricted.

1.16 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** supplemented the following –

- (a) as the sewerage treatment plant, waste transfer station and government boatyards would not be relocated, he opined that the disused pier should be designed to cater for innovative uses which would bring vibrancy to the site;
- (b) the entire promenade should be handed over to the Government for management when the developers completed the construction works. Two sets of landing steps should be added at the north and south ends of the promenade with bollards added along the entire seawall at regular interval to facilitate berthing of vessels;
- (c) the planning brief should specify a requirement to provide commercial and retail activities on the ground

floor facing the waterfront. Outdoor seating which included those serving both customers buying food and beverage from retailers and non-customers should be provided;

- (d) the windows of the residential blocks and the hotel should have sound insulation function and it would then be feasible to allow bars and restaurants to operate at the waterfront; and
- (e) tree planting requirement should be specified to provide proper shades at the promenade.

1.17 **The Chair** asked PlanD to take into account Members' comments and suitably revise the draft planning brief. Members' comments would also be conveyed to TPB for consideration.

**the
Secretariat**

[Post-meeting note: Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN provided a PowerPoint on 19 November 2016 supplementing his comments raised at the meeting.]

Item 2 Any Other Business

2.1 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

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