

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

Minutes of Twenty-sixth Meeting

Date : 14 February 2017
Time : 3:30 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 (Kowloon Task Force)
Mrs Margaret BROOKE	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr SO Kwok-yin	Representing the Conservancy Association
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Anthony CHEUNG	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr TAM Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design (<i>for Items 1 – 3 and 5</i>)
Mr Ivan HO	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design (<i>for Item 4</i>)
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	
Mr NGAN Man-yu	
Mr CHOW Ping-tim	
Prof Raymond FUNG	
Mr Derek HUNG	
Dr Edmund LEE	
Miss Christine AU	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Edward LEUNG	Senior Manager (Tourism) 2, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr Gary WONG	Senior Engineer/Kowloon District Central, Transport Department (TD)
Mr Raymond LEE	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

Mr Larry CHU
Kowloon, Planning Department (PlanD)
Secretary

In Attendance

Miss Emily SOM
Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 2, DEVB

Absent with Apologies

Mr Paul CHAN Yuen-king
Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Dr Peter Cookson SMITH
Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Sr Lesly LAM
Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr LEUNG Man-kwong
Mr WONG Yiu-chung

For Agenda Item 3

Mr Ryan CHEUK
Charm Smart Development Ltd.
Mr He Jian TONG
Charm Smart Development Ltd.
Miss Barbara REN
Charm Smart Development Ltd.
Mr Otto CHENG
Planning Team Limited
Mr John TSE
Planning Team Limited
Mr Kenneth NG
Kenneth Ng & Associates Ltd.

For Agenda Item 4

Dr William CHAN
Chief Operating Officer, WKCDA
Mr Derek SUN
Head, Planning & Development, WKCDA
Mr Rocco YIM
Executive Director, Rocco Design Architects Ltd.

Action

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting and informed Members that Mr Raymond LEE had taken over the post of Chief Engineer/ Kowloon 2 of CEDD. She further informed Members that Mr Edward LEUNG, Senior Manager of TC, attended the meeting on behalf of Ms Emily MO; and Mr Gary WONG, Senior Engineer of TD, attended on behalf of Mr Simon LAU.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 24th and 25th Meetings

1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 24th and 25th meetings on 9 February 2017. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated again on 13 February 2017. 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 3.37 of the minutes of the 24th meeting)*

2.1 **The Chair** said that the project proponents would consult the Task Force on issues such as management, daily operation and public safety of the enhanced Avenue of Stars in due course.

B. *Open Space Development at Hung Hom Waterfront (paragraph 5.18 of the minutes of the 24th meeting)*

2.2 **The Chair** informed Members that LCSD would consult the Task Force if required as requested at the 24th meeting. She added that in the 2017 Policy Address, the Chief Executive announced that the Government would spend a total of \$20 billion in the coming five years to launch 26 projects to develop new or improved existing sports and recreation facilities. Open space development at the Hung Hom waterfront was one of the projects included.

[Post-meeting note: The design of the project was supported by the Task Force at the 24th meeting. The Chair requested LCSD to inform the Task Force in case the promenade would need to be closed off during works period of the project. During the works period, temporary walkway would be provided to ensure connectivity between both ends of the promenade.]

C. *Proposed Barging Facility for Central Kowloon Route (CKR) at Kwai Yue Lane, Kwai Chung (paragraph 7.18 of the minutes of the 24th meeting)*

2.3 **The Chair** said that the Highways Department (HyD) had taken into account Members' comments and conducted an analysis to confirm that the shared use of the proposed barging facility at Kai Tak for disposing excavated materials generated from construction works of CKR in Yau Ma Tei would be feasible. They would no longer request for use of the proposed barging point in Kwai Chung.

D. *Draft Planning Brief for the Two "Comprehensive Development Area" Zones at the Lin Cheung Road Site, Sham Shui Po (paragraph 1.17 of the minutes of the 25th meeting)*

2.4 **The Chair** informed Members that the confirmed minutes of

the meeting in which Members' views on the draft planning brief were included would be conveyed to the Town Planning Board (TPB) for reference in accordance with usual practice.

Item 3 Proposed Comprehensive Residential Development at Tung Yuen Street, Yau Tong, Kowloon (Paper No. TFK/01/2017)

- 3.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives from the project proponents to the meeting and invited Members to declare interest, if any. By way of background, she informed Members that the Yau Tong Industrial Area "CDA" was subdivided into five smaller "CDA" zones to facilitate early redevelopment/development. To guide the preparation of Master Layout Plan by the proponents of the "CDA" zones, a planning brief was endorsed by TPB on 20 November 2015. The private proponent had submitted a section 16 planning application seeking TPB's approval for the Master Layout Plan for a comprehensive residential development including waterfront promenade at the "CDA(3)" site. They would like to seek Members' comments on the proposed scheme at this meeting.
- 3.2 Upon the Chair's invitation, **Mr John TSE** presented the proposed scheme with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 3.3 **The Chair** clarified with Mr TSE that the proposed 15-metre waterfront promenade was the minimum requirement and that landscaped area would be located on the ground floor.
- 3.4 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** expressed his views as follows -
 - (a) the proponent should include more information including plans in the paper to facilitate Members to understand the scheme;
 - (b) more details about landscaping along Shung Wo Path should be provided; and
 - (c) how the landscape design within the site concerned could complement with the adjacent sites should be provided.
- 3.5 **Ir Prof CHOY Kin-kuen** asked if there were any green building elements and noise barriers in the proposed scheme.
- 3.6 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** asked for details on the design of

seawall.

3.7 **The Chair** noted that the footbridge between two parts of the development was exclusive for residents and the width of promenade only met the minimum requirement. She opined that it could set an undesirable precedent for the nearby developments in terms of public enjoyment.

3.8 **Mr Otto CHENG** responded as follows -

- (a) the team had taken into account the planning brief including the design of approved application of a nearby site;
- (b) the promenade was divided into two parts and the team was asked to take into account the design of the neighbouring developments;
- (c) trees would be planted between buildings and on the promenade to provide shading, taking into account permeability;
- (d) the planning intention of the footbridge was to facilitate residents to gain access to the promenade without crossing Tung Yuen Street. The two-podium design of the footbridge has taken into account security and management needs;
- (e) the seawall would be beyond the scope of the project;
- (f) various technical assessments including the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) as required under the planning brief had been conducted and were being reviewed by relevant departments; and
- (g) noise barrier was not required and therefore would not be provided in the development.

3.9 **Mr Ryan CHEUK** supplemented that a BEAM Plus assessment would be conducted at a later stage as required in the submission to the Buildings Department (BD).

3.10 As regards his question on coherence with neighbouring sites, **Mr TAM Po-yiu** clarified that he would like to know how the design, materials and management of the proposed site would be made compatible with the neighbouring sites in addition to their landscaping alignment. He would also like to know the

area within the development that could be accessed by members of the public and areas that would be exclusively used by residents.

- 3.11 **Mr Otto CHENG** replied that the 15-metre promenade including the three-metre buffer area would be accessible by the public. Members of the public would be encouraged to gain access to the promenade via Shung Wo Path.
- 3.12 **Ir Prof CHOY Kin-kuen** asked the proponent to conduct the BEAM Plus assessment at this stage so as to calculate the plot ratio for seeking BD's approval.
- 3.13 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** raised some further questions -
- (a) whether the promenade would be public open space in private development;
 - (b) details on the quality of existing seawall; and
 - (c) whether the Government would require the proponent in the land lease to provide bollards and railings.
- 3.14 **Mr SO Kwok-yin** noted that the promenade area was small and facing a south-west direction. He opined that the proponent should further refine the landscape plan by considering the experience of future patrons of the promenade.
- 3.15 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** suggested that to promote consistency, similar materials as those used for the pavement of Shung Wo Path should be used for the promenade. He doubted if the trees could provide proper shading for future patrons of the promenade.
- 3.16 **The Chair** emphasised that HC and its Task Forces had been commenting on proposals based on the Harbour Planning Principles (HPPs). Fulfilling the requirements of the planning brief might not be sufficient from harbourfront enhancement point of view. She also pointed out that the Task Force put an emphasis on allowing the general public instead of just the residents to enjoy the harbourfront areas. She invited the proponent and PlanD to supplement on the condition of the seawall.
- 3.17 **Mr Otto CHENG** responded that -

- (a) the 15-metre promenade was required under the Planning Brief while the three-metre set back would be compulsory. Only the 15-metre promenade would be surrendered to the Government if requested;
- (b) the site had a relatively small waterfront as compared to nearby CDA sites but the team was trying their best to work out a coherent design. Hard paving would be used at the promenade;
- (c) the design of railing would be provided to the satisfaction of relevant departments but the team would not cover the seawall;
- (d) the landscape design including the positions of trees and sitting areas would be flexible for adjustment but the current design could provide reasonable openings at various locations; and
- (e) upgrading of Shung Wo Path was beyond the project scope as it was public road.

3.18 Upon the Chair's request, **Mr Lawrence CHAU** clarified that 15 metres was the minimum requirement under the planning brief for the waterfront promenade. The promenade would be surrendered to the Government upon completion together with the seawall. The seawall would then be managed and maintained by the Government.

3.19 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** said that the lay-by around the corner of Tung Yuen Street and Yan Yue Wai might not be necessary as the site would no longer be used for industrial purpose. Tung Yuen Street could be narrowed to provide wider pavement for public enjoyment.

3.20 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that the Government should set up its overall strategy for enhancing the seawall at the area to provide future marine uses at the site. He requested the Government to take a more proactive approach in coming up ideas for enhancing water-land interface facilities in this area where there had been lots of marine activities and boats on seawall historically.

3.21 **The Chair** said that marine use was a broader issue and she asked PlanD to look into the matter and provide more information on marine uses for the entire area. Taking into Members' comments, the Chair concluded that the Task Force

had reservation on the proposal and could not support the scheme. Members' comments would be summarised and conveyed to TPB for consideration.

**the
Secretariat**

Item 4 The Development of Hong Kong Palace Museum in the West Kowloon Cultural District (Paper No. TFK/02/2017)

- 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 Member of the Development Committee of WKCD. **The Chair** considered that Prof FUNG could stay at the meeting but refrain from giving comments.
- 4.3 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** said that the company he was employed was involved in the master planning team of West Kowloon Cultural District, but he had no personal involvement in the project. The Chair noted the declaration and ruled that Mr CHEUNG could stay and take part in the discussion.
- 4.4 **Mr Derek HUNG** declared that he was a Member of the Consultation Panel of WKCD and a Member of the owners' committee of one of the residential estates above the MTR Kowloon Station. As Mr Hung did not have any direct pecuniary interest in the project, **the Chair** ruled that he could take part in the discussion.
- 4.5 As background, **the Chair** said that WKCD was conducting a six-week public consultation for the proposed Hong Kong Palace Museum (HKPM) and they would like to seek Members' views on the design and operation of HKPM.

[Post-meeting note: The public consultation period was subsequently extended from six weeks to eight weeks.]

- 4.6 **Dr William CHAN** and **Mr Rocco YIM** introduced the background and design concept of HKPM, with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 4.7 **Mr Ivan HO** commented that there was no single formula to come up with a desirable urban and architectural design. It was a continuous process that involved interactions with the neighbouring developments. The evolution of planning and development of WKCD in the recent 20 years was a normal

phenomenon. He opined that the design of HKPM had in general fulfilled HPPs in terms of place-making, connectivity and accessibility. While relevant professionals could provide comments on the architectural design and cultural aspects of HKPM, he would reserve his comments particularly to those more relevant to the waterfront -

- (a) for the façade of HKPM that was facing to the west, the setting sun especially the heat must be taken into account;
- (b) the windy condition at the waterfront should also be addressed;
- (c) the odour problem in the nearby typhoon shelter should be improved; and
- (d) the connectivity over a vehicular road between WKCD and the Elements should be enhanced.

He asked the project team to update the Task Force when an architectural design was available.

4.8 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that the overall design of HKPM should be able to meet the HPPs from the perspective of urban design. On the other hand, he had the following comments and questions from a broader perspective-

- (a) the Task Force was briefed on the progress of WKCDA on 22 September 2016 but the changes presented today were not covered. The Task Force and the community should be briefed timely on major changes such as the replacement of the Mega Performance Venue (MPV) by the multi-purpose exhibition hall; the “disappearance” of Medium Theatre II from the development schedule; and the merging of Centre for Contemporary Performance into the Lyric Theatre Complex;
- (b) other architects should have an opportunity to bid for the design of HKPM as there could be some other design options available;
- (c) if there were other options on the location for HKPM or it was simply for replacing the MPV;
- (d) if HKPM could house artefacts from all over the world or limiting to the collection from the Palace Museum in

Beijing;

- (e) if the proposed access road was new and how to gain access to the site on the approved development; and
- (f) the pedestrian connection from WKCD to the surrounding area especially Tai Kok Tsui should be improved; and
- (g) if there would be a specific body to manage the site and how public enjoyment could be allowed.

4.9 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** expressed the following comments from an urban design point of view -

- (a) integration between HKPM and the Art Park was not sufficient;
- (b) weather protected linkage should be provided to facilitate patrons walking to HKPM on rainy days;
- (c) the location of HKPM was not entirely convenient and there might be other better options;
- (d) the building bulk of the Exhibition Centre appeared to be extensive and HKPM might have to share the forecourt with the Exhibition Centre. More information should be provided to demonstrate how the two developments could better integrate; and
- (e) he noted that the restaurant, outdoor dining area and the main exhibition hall were facing to the west and the design team should consider an innovative design to address heat and windy situation while providing a spot for taking pictures of the beautiful sun set scene.

4.10 **Mr Derek HUNG** said that local residents generally supported the proposed HKPM. He supplemented the following comments -

- (a) the design of HKPM should be compatible with the surrounding developments;
- (b) details and development parameters of the Exhibition Centre should be provided;
- (c) he appreciated the team's efforts to further improve

accessibility to WKCD by providing a footbridge and a vehicular access for connecting WKCD with the Elements and the International Commerce Centre; and

- (d) the proposed location for HKPM might involve the least change to the approved Development Plan. He considered that putting HKPM on the western side of WKCD might echo with developments that featured oriental culture (e.g. Xiqu Centre) on the eastern side.

4.11 Though the consultation process was not transparent enough, **Mr CHOW Ping-tim** supported the proposed HKPM and opined that the proposed location was acceptable as it might bring in streams of people to WKCD. On the design, he would like to see the blending of Chinese and Western styles to make HKPM a more iconic building. In terms of transportation, he opined that the information was not sufficient for Members to comment.

4.12 In response, **Dr William CHAN** said that -

- (a) implementation of the proposed public road across the Western Harbour Crossing was not anticipated before the expiry of the tunnel franchise in 2023. Discussion was being held with Government on the implementation of the connection to Route 3;
- (b) the team would explore providing transportation within WKCD such as electric cars or environmentally friendly buses;
- (c) the deliberation on the way forward of the MPV had been ongoing for some time. The proposal to develop a medium-sized flexible venue of the MPV was finalised after the Government's commitment to the development of Kai Tak Sports Park; and
- (d) on location, HKPM could attract more people to the western side of WKCD and complement with M+ . There were site constraints to put HKPM on the other part of WKCD due to the terminus structure of the Hong Kong section of the Express Rail Link.

4.13 **Mr Derek SUN** supplemented that WKCDA had been updating the Task Force almost once every two meetings about the implementation progress of the overall development plan and design of individual developments. The Task Force was also

consulted on topical issues such as marine-related facilities. He agreed with Mr Ivan HO that the development of WKCD was an evolving process and WKCDA would continue to update the Task Force on the progress of implementing the entire development plan and individual projects.

4.14 In respect of architectural design, **Mr Rocco YIM** made the following responses -

- (a) the presentation only covered the design of internal organisation, the arrangement of space and its broad functions as well as the interaction between HKPM and the surrounding environment. He emphasised that the future architectural design of HKPM would not be anonymous as currently shown as conceptual massing in the presentation;
- (b) he would take into account Members' comments such as sunshine and windy condition when preparing an architecture design while the odour problem would not be resolved under this project because it was a district issue;
- (c) the Exhibition Centre was planned at an early stage of planning for WKCD development. Its size and location as shown in the presentation were up to date to reflect the latest requirement; and
- (d) on the integration between HKPM and the Art Park, he pointed out that the design of Art Park had been finalised and its construction works were already in progress before he started preparing the design for HKPM. While he would not drastically change the design for the Art Park, he had taken into account the existing designs of the Art Park as well as other neighbouring projects to make the design of the district an integrated whole. The main entrance of HKPM would have to take into account the Freespace and the many trees within the Art Park, making a direct entrance from the Art Park into HKPM not desirable.

4.15 **Dr William CHAN** supplemented that the exhibits of HKPM would focus on but not be limited to the collection of the Palace Museum. There would be a footbridge connecting Elements shopping mall to the Artist Square and then to M+. The team would take note of Members' comments on providing a continuous access to HKPM.

4.16 **Mr Alan LO** commented that the demarcation of public and paid areas within HKPM was not clearly indicated in the presentation. Some seating could be provided within HKPM for public use free of charge. He also asked if any cultural-related activities could be organised in the development.

4.17 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** further commented that -

- (a) the design of the access road would be unattractive if adopting existing highway standards. He requested for a briefing to better understand the design of other facilities in the vicinity;
- (b) he was not convinced of the reasons provided by WKCD on choosing the current location for HKPM. As the sites to develop the Medium Theatre II and the Centre for Contemporary Performance were still works areas, there should be still flexibility for considering other options for the location of HKPM;
- (c) while he asked which Hong Kong artists' work would be exhibited at HKPM, **Dr William CHAN** and **the Chair** clarified that artefacts beyond the collection of the Palace Museum could also be considered for exhibition at HKPM; and
- (d) the planned MPV would not be developed in WKCD as the Kai Tak Sports Park would also provide space for performance and entertainment events. He said there was no discussion on this before and asked if the requirements for Kai Tak Sports Park to provide such function were included in the design specifications of the project. He said that the Kai Tak Sports Park should not become another Hung Hom Coliseum or AsiaWorld-Expo which were ill-suited for shows and performances.

4.18 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** said that his concern on connectivity was not fully addressed by WKCD. In terms of design, he opined that the design of the Art Park could be modified to be compatible with the design of HKPM as the design of a park should have more flexibility to be fine-tuned. He agreed Members' comments that more space for free public access should be provided.

4.19 **Mr Ivan HO** opined that the current proposed location for HKPM was reasonable. He said that the original planning of a MPV at the location concerned was not appropriate from the urban design's viewpoint. A performance venue would attract pedestrian flow at a short period of time. It would be unnecessary to provide design options for the Task Force to comment. The design team should have already gone through a thorough process before coming up with the best design for presentation.

4.20 **Dr Edmund LEE** commented that WKCD was an important harbourfront area and he would like to see an integrated design for place-making and visitor experience, and to attract more people to the area.

4.21 **The Chair** made the following comments -

- (a) WKCDA should come back to the Task Force to brief Members on a holistic connectivity plan for the entire WKCD;
- (b) the enquiry on the functions of the Kai Tak Sports Park could be conveyed to and discussed at the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development in the future; and
- (c) the concept of courtyard was sensible and the team might further enhance its design and adding more elements of the Palace Museum along the way from the eastern side to HKPM at the west, with a view to creating a new iconic attraction.

4.22 **Dr William CHAN** responded that WKCDA would brief the Task Force separately on the overall connectivity. The team would take into account Members' comments when preparing a holistic and inclusive design for HKPM.

4.23 **The Chair** thanked the team for briefing the Task Force and invited them to update the Task Force again should there be any significant progress made on the project.

WKCDA

Item 5 Any Other Business

A. Harbourfront Enhancement in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing

- 5.1 **The Chair** informed Members that in the 2017 Policy Address, the Chief Executive announced that the Government would first partner with the Harbourfront Commission and implement harbourfront enhancement initiatives through a dedicated team with dedicated funding. The aim was to further extend the waterfront promenade along both sides of the Victoria Harbour, beautify areas in the vicinity and improve accessibility of the waterfront. The Government had earmarked \$500 million for taking forward harbourfront development initiatives. The Commission had invited its Task Forces to consider projects proposed to be funded under the dedicated funding.
- 5.2 **Miss Christine AU** said that Paper No. HC/01/2017 had been tabled for Members reference and she briefed Members on the projects proposed for Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing, with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 5.3 **The Chair** said that Members might take a further look of the action area tables of the Task Force to see if there would be any other area, implementation of which might yield even more benefits to the general public from the perspective of HPPs. She suggested setting a deadline for Members to get back with their proposals to this Task Force.
- 5.4 **Miss Christine AU** said that it would be useful if Members would have a brief discussion at the meeting and write to the secretariat on any other proposals before the next Task Force meeting so that the Commission could conclude the initiatives at its next meeting.
- 5.5 **The Chair** said that Members might write to the Secretariat within three weeks if there were any other proposals and invited Members' comments on the two projects presented.
- 5.6 **Dr Edmund LEE** said that it might be an opportunity to further examine how the projects could be planned and executed with user-centred research and design, and co-creation with the community.
- 5.7 **The Chair** asked if the dedicated funding could be used for purposes other than works.
- 5.8 **Miss Christine AU** responded that two consultancy studies were proposed to be funded by the \$500 million as presented at

the last Commission meeting. One of them was a consultancy study for the formulation of a new model to plan, manage, operate and maintain future integrated harbourfront developments. She said that the scope of the study echoed with Dr Edmund LEE's initiative.

- 5.9 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** opined that the provision of a \$500 million dedicated funding should not affect further discussion of the establishment of a statutory Harbourfront Authority in the future.
- 5.10 **The Chair** pointed out that the dedicated funding could speed up some projects to be implemented by LCSD instead of major works that might affect future planning.
- 5.11 **Mr Derek HUNG** said that he would prefer using the dedicated funding to implement enhancement at the proposed locations first rather than waiting for the establishment of HFA.
- 5.12 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** had the following comments -
- (a) it would be desirable to make use of the dedicated funding to enhance the existing waterfront pedestrian walkway at Tsuen Wan Waterfront. The proposed urban park at Hung Hom Ferry Piers could be implemented by LCSD;
 - (b) the enhanced Tsuen Wan promenade could be an appropriate site for trying out a new management model;
 - (c) a place-making approach including engagement with the community should be adopted for the Hung Hom project without mobilising the \$500 million; and
 - (d) relevant District Councils (DCs) should be engaged and the overall public engagement process should make reference to the model adopted by the District Urban Renewal Forum.
- 5.13 **Miss Christine AU** said that the current approach would provide flexibility for the Commission to play a more active role in taking forward harbourfront enhancement initiatives. Working groups could be set up under the Commission and the Task Forces once the list of projects were confirmed, to take

forward planning, design, public engagement and implementation processes, with the support of a dedicated team with dedicated funding. The Secretariat would welcome new ideas from Members.

- 5.14 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** enquired about the details of the working groups to be established under Task Forces and said that Members who sat on the Task Forces voluntarily might not have time to take part in implementation of the projects including the engagement processes.
- 5.15 **Miss Christine AU** responded that a dedicated team would support the implementation of projects. The future working groups might be similar to the working group set up for the Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas to monitor the works and study process.
- 5.16 **The Chair** concluded that more information on how to take forward the finalised recommended projects to be funded by the dedicated funding should be prepared for Members' consideration.

[Post-meeting note: Members were invited to submit ideas/ comments on projects to be implemented to the Secretariat by 7 March 2017 and no return had been received from Members of this Task Force by the designated deadline.]

B. Date of Next Meeting

- 5.17 **The Chair** said that the next Task Force meeting would be tentatively scheduled for May 2017.
- 5.18 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

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