

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

Minutes of Twenty-seventh Meeting

Date : 31 May 2017
Time : 2:30 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)
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 (HKIA)
Sr Lesly LAM	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr TAM Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Prof CHOY Kin-kuen	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Shuki LEUNG Shu-ki	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr CHOW Ping-tim	
Mr Derek HUNG	
Dr Edmund LEE	
Mr LEUNG Man-kwong	
Miss Christine AU	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), Development Bureau (DEVB)
Ms Kery KWOK	Senior Manager (Tourism) 31, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr David NGU	Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon (Acting), 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)
Ms Michelle YUEN	Senior Town Planner/ Yau Tsim Mong, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Larry CHU	Secretary

In Attendance

Miss Emily SOM Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 2, DEVB
Mr Michael CHIU Chief Executive Officer (Planning)1, LCSD

Absent with Apologies

Mr Andy LEWIS 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 Alan LO
Mr NGAN Man-yu
Prof Raymond FUNG
Mr WONG Yiu-chung

For Agenda Item 3

Mr Derek SUN Head, Planning & Development, West Kowloon Cultural District Authority (WKCDA)
Mr Patrick LAM Senior Traffic and Transport Engineer, WKCDA
Mr YM FU Planner, WKCDA
Mr Ringo MOK Chief Engineer/Kowloon 5, CEDD
Mr Caspar LAM Architect/3 (Kowloon), CEDD

For Agenda Item 4

Mr Patrick LAW Managing Director, Massive Leader Ltd
Mr Erik CHAN Project Manager, Massive Leader Ltd
Mr Ian BROWNLEE Managing Director, Masterplan Ltd
Mr Benson POON Senior Town Planner, Masterplan Ltd
Mr CH TONG Senior Associate, P&T Architects & Engineers Ltd
Mr Andrew FERRARIS Project Manager, Belt Collins International HK Ltd

For Agenda Item 5

Miss Tanna CHONG Assistant District Officer (Kowloon City), Home Affairs Department
Mr Gary WONG Senior Engineer / Kowloon District Central, TD
Miss Joyce LEE Engineer / Hung Hom, TD
Ms Kery KWOK Senior Manager (Tourism) 31, TC
Mr Nathan KONG Estate Surveyor / Yau Ma Tei West, Lands Department

For Agenda Item 6

Mr Noris NG Hin-lung Vice-chairman, Coastal Affairs Committee of the Tsuen Wan District Council
Mr Keith WU Long-chi Director (Education), Hong Kong Public Space Initiative

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting and informed Members that Ms Kery KWOK, Senior Manager of TC, attended the meeting on behalf of Ms Emily MO; Mr David NGU, Acting Chief Traffic Engineer of TD attended on behalf of Mr Simon LAU; and Ms Michelle YUEN, Senior Town Planner of PlanD, attended on behalf of Mr Lawrence CHAU.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 26th Meeting

- 1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 26th meeting on 26 May 2017. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated again on 29 May 2017. There being no further amendment, the draft minutes were confirmed at the meeting

Item 2 Matters Arising

- A. *Proposed Comprehensive Residential Development at Tung Yuen Street, Yau Tong, Kowloon (paragraph 3.21 of the minutes of the 26th meeting)*

- 2.1 **The Chair** said that the confirmed minutes of meeting in which Members' views on the proposed scheme were included would be conveyed to the Town Planning Board (TPB) for reference in accordance with usual practice.

[Post-meeting note: Members' views as recorded in the extract of confirmed minutes of meeting were passed to PlanD on 5 June 2017 for conveying to TPB.]

- B. *The Development of Hong Kong Palace Museum in the West Kowloon Cultural District (paragraph 4.23 of the minutes of the 26th meeting)*

- 2.2 **The Chair** informed Members that WKCDA would update the Task Force on the project under agenda item 3 of this meeting.

Item 3 Progress Update on the West Kowloon Cultural District (Paper No. TFK/03/2017)

- 3.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives from the team to the meeting and invited Members to declare interest, if any. By way of background, she informed Members that WKCDA would like to update the Task Force on the progress of West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD) development including Xiqu Centre, Artist Square Development Area, Art Park and the proposed marine accesses. WKCDA would also join hands with CEDD to seek Members' comments on the proposed beautification works to the existing pedestrian subway across the junction of Austin Road West and Canton Road.
- 3.2 Upon the Chair's invitation, **Mr Derek SUN** updated Members with the latest development of WKCD while **Mr Ringo MOK** and **Mr Casper LAM** briefed Members on the proposed beautification works to the existing pedestrian subway at the junction of Austin Road West and Canton Road, with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 3.3 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** asked for more design details of the cover that would stretch over Austin Road as shown in the presentation.
- 3.4 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** expressed the following -
- (a) the design of the cover over Austin Road was not desirable and require further improvement as it would become the entry point to WKCD, and enquired whether WKCDA had given comments;
 - (b) he would like to have a copy of the public consultation report to understand the public views and suggestions on the location and other design and management details of the Hong Kong Palace Museum (HKPM);
 - (c) he opined that the HKPM was placed at inappropriate location. The proposed multi-purpose venue, as an event space, could be placed further away from public transport as people would be willing to walk the distance to attend events. To the contrary, HKPM should be located near public transport means for patrons' easy access;
 - (d) the area behind Xiqu Centre was currently occupied by exhaust pipes, ventilation fans, plant rooms, equipment and emergency accesses related to the Express Rail Link. He queried if these utilities would occupy the area for a

long time. In addition, he would like to have a plan of the major constraints of the site and an update on the long-term arrangement for these utilities;

- (e) he asked about the progress of providing a pedestrian link between WKCD and Kowloon Park across the Kowloon Park Drive; and
- (f) he supported the proposal to provide marine accesses and such accesses should be available for public use as soon as possible.

3.5 **Mr Derek HUNG** said that he was happy to see the proposed beautification works to the existing pedestrian subway at the junction of Austin Road and Canton Road, and was content with the arrangement of removing the cover of the existing subway which would be underneath the noise mitigation deck. On marine access, he supported the proposed landing point at the New Yau Ma Tei Typhoon Shelter (NYMTTS) and asked WKCD to explore opening one of the existing landing facilities at China Ferry Terminal for public use.

3.6 **The Chair** raised following comments and questions –

- (a) she asked details of the proposed marine accesses such as operator of ferry services and whether any temporary reclamation would be required and how to resolve implications in respect of the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO);
- (b) she was glad to hear that the construction of Xiqu Centre would be completed within 2017 and might be opened to the public in 2018. She asked whether the proposed beautification works to the existing pedestrian subway could tie in with the opening of Xiqu Centre; and
- (c) she appreciated the environmental friendly design of the noise mitigation deck and asked if LED light would be provided in the enhanced subway. She also asked the team to provide more signage along the way between Austin MTR Station and Xiqu Centre.

3.7 **Mr Freddie HAI** declared that he was involved in the HKPM project and **the Chair** ruled that he should refrain from giving comments on the HKPM project but could still participate in the discussion on other developments in WKCD.

3.8 In response to Members' comments, **Mr Ringo MOK** clarified that the cover above Austin Road was the existing noise mitigation deck and it was designed and constructed by the Express Rail Link (XRL) project. As for the proposed beautification works for the subway, CEDD would proceed to seek funding approval from the Legislative Council (LegCo) with a view to completing the works before the opening of Xiqu Centre. He added that LED lights would be used in the enhanced subway.

3.9 **Mr Patrick LAM** responded as follows -

- (a) the team was working on the preliminary design of the footbridge across Canton Road which would lead to China Hong Kong City and Kowloon Park. However, its implementation would be difficult as the alignment would be segregated by Tsim Sha Tsui Fire Station;
- (b) improvement of signage, including some temporary measures, would be implemented covering both Kowloon and Austin MTR Stations. The team would continue to explore any room for further improving way finding after the completion of Xiqu Centre;
- (c) WKCD had been discussing with relevant government departments on the selection of marine accesses and the proposed three locations were selected having regard to public safety. The operational arrangement of water transport service would be further deliberated. In the meantime, WKCD might hire ad-hoc ferry services when there were large-scaled events; and
- (d) the team was conducting a technical study on the proposed marine accesses within WKCD including the preparation of Cogent and Convincing Materials report to justify possible temporary reclamation to satisfy the requirements of PHO.

3.10 **Mr Derek SUN** supplemented that -

- (a) the report for the public consultation exercise on HKPM had just been published and Members might download the report from the Authority's website. WKCD would engage the Task Force again when there were more design details; and

- (b) WKCDA had discussed with relevant Government departments and MTR Corporation Limited on integrating the utilities on the ground level so they would not occupy too much space.

3.11 **The Chair** asked the team to circulate the link of the report for the public consultation exercise on HKPM to Members for reference.

WKCDA

[Post-meeting note: the link - <http://www.westkowloon.hk/en/hkpmpublicconsultationreport> was circulated to Members on 13 September 2017.]

3.12 **Mr Freddie HAI** opined that the difficulty to satisfy the PHO requirements when implementing WKCDA's proposed marine accesses could be examples to demonstrate how the judgement of the Court of Final Appeal had stifled harbour development, since the requirement of "no reasonable alternative" could hardly be satisfied.

3.13 **Miss Christine AU** said that she was aware that WKCDA had commissioned a study to conduct the overriding public need test in respect of the proposed marine accesses. She supplemented that the Working Group on the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance under the Commission had reached consensus at the last meeting and a final report summarising Members' views and proposing the way forward would be prepared for Members' comments.

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

- (a) provision of piers may not require reclamation along the shoreline. He opined that the need for marine accesses should be established at the first place and then to explore whether reclamation would be required;
- (b) the proposed relocation of Tsim Sha Tsui Fire Station to facilitate implementation of the proposed footbridge to Kowloon Park was discussed in the past and he opined that the fire station should be reprovisioned within WKCDA;
- (c) he opined that some utilities could not be easily relocated and the proposed arrangement to use new structures or buildings to cover these utilities might not be feasible; and

- (d) he asked if there was any design standard applied for road structures in WKCD even though the noise mitigation deck was constructed under the XRL project.

3.15 **Mr Derek HUNG** raised the following comments and questions -

- (a) he asked if there would be any integration between the planned link from Xiqu Centre to Kowloon Park and the existing footbridge between Kowloon Park and China Hong Kong City;
- (b) Tsim Sha Tsui Fire Station was providing services at the existing location for a long time and it would not be easy to relocate it without affecting the provision of public services;
- (c) he was aware that the proposed Artist Square Bridge was not supported by LegCo's Joint Subcommittee to Monitor the Implementation of the WKCD Project (Joint Subcommittee) and how the team would address Joint Subcommittee Members' comments on the design and construction cost; and
- (d) he declared that he was a member of the owners' committee of one of the residential estates on top of the Kowloon MTR station.

3.16 **Mr Derek SUN** responded as follows -

- (a) the planned alignment for the pedestrian link to Kowloon Park might not be implemented in the imminent future. An alternative was to use the existing footbridge from Kowloon Park to China Hong Kong City and then walk from China Hong Kong City to WKCD;
- (b) WKCDA had been working closely with the Fire Services Department (FSD) to sort out the technical issues involved and FSD would strive to relocate ancillary facilities to facilitate works relating to WKCD development; and
- (c) the team was reviewing the design of Artist Square Bridge and getting prepared to address comments from Joint Subcommittee Members.

- 3.17 **Miss Christine AU** supplemented that PlanD and CEDD had presented to HC on the underground study which covered Kowloon Park, WKCD and Tsim Sha Tsui. The possibility to connect the area at the underground level would also be considered.
- 3.18 **Mr Freddie HAI** said that HKIA would not support the proposed underground development until more details could be provided for further discussion.
- 3.19 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** also raised concern over the potential impact of underground space development on Kowloon Park. He opined that it would be feasible to construct the proposed footbridge without relocating the fire station and the redeveloping cost could be borne by WKCDA. He asked for a more pragmatic solution as the proposed link was promised long time ago.
- 3.20 **The Chair** concluded that -
- (a) the Task Force asked WKCDA to look into feasible marine accesses and put them into operation as soon as possible;
 - (b) Members generally supported CEDD's proposed beautification works to the existing pedestrian subway at the junction of Austin Road West and Canton Road; and
 - (c) the team should refine and provide an integrated footbridge system and clear signage for pedestrians to find their ways to WKCD.
- 3.21 On the third point of providing a better footbridge system, **Mr TAM Po-yiu** was of the view that pedestrian links constructed by the private sector could provide more commercial elements as compared to the standard design of public footbridges and hence more preferable as an implementation option.

Item 4 Proposed Comprehensive Residential Development at Yau Tong Inland Lot 44 and adjoining Government Land, Yau Tong, Kowloon (Paper No. TFK/04/2017)

- 4.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives from the project team and invited Members to declare interest, if any. As background, she said that the Yau Tong Industrial Area was subdivided into five

smaller “Comprehensive Development Areas (CDA)” zones to facilitate early development. To guide the preparation of Master Layout Plans by proponents of individual “CDA” zones, a planning brief covering all the five sub-zones was endorsed by TPB on 20 November 2015. She informed Members that the current proponent submitted a section 16 planning application seeking TPB’s approval for the Master Layout Plan for the “CDA(5)” zone including a waterfront promenade.

- 4.2 Upon the Chair’s invitation, **Mr Ian BROWNLEE** and **Mr Benson POON** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 4.3 **The Chair** sought the proponent to clarify whether the proposed scheme would involve any minor relaxation of planning control, and if there were any additional planning gain in terms of the Harbour Planning Principles (HPPs) in particular if the width of the promenade could be wider than the standard that had been set in the planning brief.
- 4.4 **Mr Ian BROWNLEE** responded that the proposed scheme would not involve any relaxation of planning control and it would fulfil the requirements in the planning brief. Given various site constraints such as non-building area, vehicular access points and the requirement of providing commercial uses, the 15m-wide waterfront promenade was designed to include a pedestrian circulation zone, a public amenity and landscaping zone and an interface zone with a view to improving indoor/outdoor relationship.
- 4.5 **The Chair** asked PlanD to confirm if the proposal had fulfilled all the planning requirements and whether the promenade would be constructed by the developer and then surrendered to LCSD for management.
- 4.6 **Ms Michelle YUEN** said that the proposed scheme might have complied with the major parameters as set out under the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) concerned but TPB’s approval on a Master Layout Plan submitted by the proponent would still be required for a “CDA” zone. As required in the planning brief, a 15m-wide promenade should be constructed, maintained and managed by the developer until it was asked to surrender the promenade to the Government.
- 4.7 **Mr Freddie HAI** commented that it might not be the best arrangement to entrust the construction of the promenade to the private proponent while there was no definite timetable for the

Government to take over the management of the promenade. It would be undesirable for the proponent to meet the design requirements from LCSD while taking over management of the promenade even on a temporary basis. The proposed scheme including the promenade should be considered by TPB on its design merits without taking into account the requirements imposed by LCSD, as the department had no concrete time table to take over management of the promenade.

4.8 **Ms Michelle YUEN** said that the planning application was still under examination by relevant departments and had yet to be put up for TPB's decision. She would help reflect Members' comments on management to relevant departments for consideration.

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

- (a) the Government should clearly state its commitment to take over management and maintenance of the promenade;
- (b) extending the canopy over the promenade to provide some shades was supported;
- (c) it was undesirable to provide vehicular access and a ramp near the waterfront promenade;
- (d) planting palm trees on the promenade would not be suitable as the species could not provide proper shade to pedestrians;
- (e) the railing along the waterfront should be set back or otherwise include bollards that would facilitate berthing of vessels and bring in more marine activities;
- (f) although the nearby concrete batching plant required marine access for delivery of materials, he opined that such land use should be relocated from the waterfront since the entire area was planned to be developed for commercial and residential uses in the long run; and
- (g) the road area to the east of the lot was important for water-related uses such as loading and unloading of fish produce, and this use should be taken into account to when planning public access to the future waterfront promenade.

4.10 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** raised the following comments and questions

-

- (a) the vehicular access could be provided at another location along Yan Yue Wai but not adjacent to the harbour;
- (b) it should be clarified whether the blue line as outlined in the PowerPoint presentation was the lot boundary;
- (c) the proponent should clarify the proposed traffic arrangement at the road area to the east of the lot; and
- (d) he would like to see the detailed layout plan for the ground level space fronting Shung Shun Street.

4.11 **Mr Ian BROWNLEE** responded that -

- (a) the land lease required the proponent to construct public open space at the area to the east of the lot. The planning intention was to enhance its current appearance and demarcate the entrance of the waterfront promenade. Half of the area concerned would be retained for water-related activities such as loading and unloading of fish produce;
- (b) the Marine Department had advised that the seawall was not planned for installing new bollards. Therefore, the requirement of providing additional bollards was not mentioned in the planning brief;
- (c) the team was advised to adopt the Government's standards when designing the railings along the waterfront due to public safety considerations;
- (d) the 15m width was not wide enough for including suitable facilities for many activities that may improve vibrancy of the waterfront;
- (e) the site concerned was Government land and it was sold through public land sale and not land exchange. He understood there was no room to change the vehicular access points stipulated in the land lease. A public car park was required to be provided on the ground floor while private car parking spaces would be provided on the basement floor. Accesses to the public and private

car parks would be segregated;

- (f) within the entire Yau Tong Industrial Area, owners of various waterfront lots would construct and manage its portion of promenade at different time frames and the Government would take over the management when the entire stretch of waterfront promenade was completed; and
- (g) since the lot was located at the eastern entrance of the entire stretch of promenade, the team had strived to make it a focal point having regard to site constraints and requirements in the planning brief.

- 4.12 **Mr Benson POON** supplemented that shopfronts of the proposed commercial area at the ground floor would face both Shung Shun Street and the waterfront promenade to attract more pedestrian flow.
- 4.13 **Ms Michelle YUEN** responded that the Government land to the east of the lot was required to be developed into part of the waterfront promenade according to the planning brief. Structures that were not proposed for the promenade would not be allowed in the area.
- 4.14 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** commented that the planning brief might be too rigid to require the provision of a car park at the hinterland part of the site. He also asked about the traffic arrangement and how vehicles could turn around at Shung Shun Street.
- 4.15 **Mr Erik CHAN** responded that a proposal to widen the road adjacent to the site concerned from two lanes to four lanes had been submitted to TD for consideration.
- 4.16 **The Chair** summarised that there were concerns from Members on the management of the promenade which could determine its design. The Task Force recognised that the proponent might have met the minimum planning requirements but would like to see additional gains in terms of harbourfront enhancement.
- 4.17 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** asked whether the existing bollards at the waterfront would be retained. He said that the proposed design of the promenade was not desirable and urged the team to make reference to the design of railing at the northern shore of NYMTTS, which was safe and could accommodate bollards along the seawall.

- 4.18 **The Chair** said that Members' comments including those related to the provision of landing facilities along the seawall would be included in the summary to be conveyed to TPB for consideration.

**the
Secretariat**

[Post-meeting note: Members' views were summarised and passed to PlanD on 19 July 2017 for conveying to TPB.]

- 4.19 **Ms Michelle YUEN** further clarified that the planning brief would only serve as general guidelines. The public car park was not required to be placed at the northern side of the site but it should not be placed on or above ground level of the waterfront portion.

Item 5 Proposed Extension of Short Term Tenancy for Fee-paying Public Car Park at (i) Wa Shun Street, Hung Hom, Kowloon, and (ii) the Junction of Bailey Street and Sung Ping Street, Hung Hom, Kowloon (Paper No. TFK/05/2017)

- 5.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives from proponent departments to the meeting and invited Members to declare interest, if any.
- 5.2 **Mr Freddie HAI** declared that he was the project architect of the hotel site adjacent to the site concerned. **The Chair** decided that there was no direct conflict of interest and he could stay and participate in the discussion.
- 5.3 As background, **the Chair** informed Members that proponent departments sought this Task Force's views on opening two short-term tenancy (STT) coach parking areas at Wa Shun Street and Bailey Street in Hung Hom in mid-2016. The Task Force accepted the proposal for one year fixed term having regard to strong aspirations from the local District Council to address parking demand and illegal parking problem in the district. Since the preparation for permanent development at the sites concerned would take some time to commence, the departments would like to report back to the Task Force on the effectiveness of the proposal and seek Members views on extending the two parking areas for two to three years to tie in with the commencement of future development. She informed Members that eight letters were received appealing for HC's support for extending the coaching parking areas at the sites concerned and they were tabled for Members' references. The letters were from (i) Hon Starry LEE, LegCo Member and Member of Kowloon

City District Council (KCDC); (ii) Hon YIU Si-wing and Hon Frankie YICK, LegCo Members; (iii) Mr PUN Kwok-wah, Chairman of KCDC; (iv) Mr KWAN Ho-yeung, Mr LAM Tak-shing and Mr NG Po-keung, Members of KCDC; (v) Hung Hom Area Committee; (vi) To Kwa Wan Area Committee; (vii) Mr NG Fan-kam, Chairman of the Working Group on Concern about the Problems caused by Coaches in the District of KCDC; and (viii) Travel Industry of Hong Kong.

- 5.4 Upon the Chair's invitation, **Mr Gary WONG** briefly introduced the paper.
- 5.5 **Mr Derek HUNG** commented that it was reasonable to support the proposed extension so as to fully utilise land resources pending long-term development, especially the proposal could ease the illegal parking problem in Tsim Sha Tsui East.
- 5.6 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** objected to the proposal and raised the following comments –
- (a) the site at Bailey Street should not be used for both private cars and coaches if the parking need mainly came from coaches. The site area could be reduced to accommodate the parking demand from coaches and the remaining area should be handed over to LCSD to commence the works for extending Hoi Sham Park;
 - (b) the provision of coach parking facilities would attract coaches to travel to the areas concerned which would affect nearby traffic condition;
 - (c) he asked if permanent solutions could be provided after two years as the consultancy study to review the territory wide parking problem for commercial vehicles was only commenced in 2017; and
 - (d) when TD was asked to include coach parking facilities in the redevelopment at the former Middle Road car park near Sheraton Hotel, it advised that there was no such need. It was not acceptable to extend the two coach parking areas because the problem was underestimated by TD.
- 5.7 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** said that it was acceptable to use the sites as coach parking areas but the progress of long-term development

should be closely monitored.

- 5.8 **The Chair** said that the Task Force had to carefully consider the views of the District Councils and the local community under the stakeholder engagement principle of the Harbour Planning Principles (HPPs). However, there were also other HPPs on public enjoyment, etc. One key consideration was that the proposed extension should not affect or cause any delay to the delivery of the long-term intended use of the sites concerned. She asked LCSD to update Members on the development plan.
- 5.9 **Mrs Doris FOK** responded that part of the proposed site at Bailey Street is included as part of the Hoi Sham Park Extension project, being a project included in the five-year plan as announced in the 2017 Policy Address. The proposed extension of coach parking areas should not affect its development programme. A clause would be included in the terms of the STT so it could be terminated when funding was available to commence such works.
- 5.10 **The Chair** enquired about the notice period to terminate the STT.
- 5.11 For the site at Bailey Street, **Mrs Doris FOK** responded that the STT would be one year certain and renewable quarterly thereafter.
- 5.12 As for the site at Wa Shun Street, **Miss Christine AU** responded that the long-term development would be an urban park and implementation details of the project would be subject to further discussion with HC.
- 5.13 Upon the Chair's enquiry, **Mr Gary WONG** clarified that both STTs were proposed to be extended for one year and quarterly thereafter.
- 5.14 To strike a balance between Members' views and local needs, **the Chair** concluded that the proposed one year extension for both STTs was acceptable. After the expiry of the one-year fixed term, any further extension would be subject to consultation with the Task Force. She urged TD to expedite its consultancy study on territory-wide parking need for commercial vehicles and focus on looking for long-term solutions to address parking demand from coaches in order to support tourism activities.

Item 6 Any Other Business

- A. *Outcome of the Tsuen Wan Promenade Place-making Project and Introduction of Tsuen Wan Waterfront Event Space*
- 6.1 **The Chair** welcomed Mr Noris NG, Vice-chairman of the Coastal Affairs Committee (CAC) of Tsuen Wan District Council (TWDC) and Mr Keith WU, Director (Education) of the Hong Kong Public Space Initiatives (HKPSI) to the meeting. She further informed Members that CAC had organised a Tsuen Wan Promenade Place-making Project (the Project) in January 2017 jointly with HKPSI. As a close partner of the Task Force, Mr NG and Mr WU would share the outcome of the Project with Members.
- 6.2 Upon the Chair's invitation, **Mr Noris NG** and **Mr Keith WU** introduced details of the Project with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 6.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that the Tsuen Wan waterfront was strategically located and he was glad to see that this part of the waterfront was being activated. He asked if there was a systematic mechanism to encourage and promote future enhancements and TWDC's strategy to bring in more vibrant uses to the waterfront.
- 6.4 On holding events at the waterfront, **Dr Edmund LEE** commented that TWDC might observe patrons' preferences and take forward the place-making process having regard resident's and user's needs, and public views received from the experimental platform.
- 6.5 **Mr Freddie HAI** echoed with Dr Lee's views and added that HC and its Task Force would focus on planning of the area concerned instead of participating in organising temporary events that would be held at the waterfront. He observed that efforts had been spent on brand building and opined that the local community could participate more in planning the waterfront at a macro level.
- 6.6 **Mr Noris NG** responded that –
- (a) Tsuen Wan was not a district that had many tourist

attractions like Tsim Sha Tsui and therefore there were not many waterfront features and street furniture to attract visitors. TWDC would like to make it a vibrant place gradually; and

- (b) CAC was trying to realise the conceptual idea agreed by TWDC members and converting public views collected through the Project into a planning vision and basic design concepts for the Tsuen Wan waterfront.

6.7 **Miss Christine AU** said that TWDC was one of the pioneers in seeing the potential benefits of harbourfront enhancement and was now in the process of searching for its own uniqueness and identity. She said that HC would continue to work closely with TWDC to see how best to enhance the Tsuen Wan waterfront. One of the six projects agreed by HC to be funded by the dedicated funding earmarked for harbourfront development would cover the Tsuen Wan waterfront.

6.8 **Mr Freddie HAI** supplemented that TWDC might wish to conduct studies and researches to identify land uses and a management model that would be suitable for the local community so that the Task Force could help take forward planning and design of the harbourfront areas.

6.9 **The Chair** said that collaboration with local communities could be elevated to a new level and the Task Force would be willing to work further with relevant DCs in the process.

6.10 As a Member of TWDC, **Mr CHOW Ping-tim** said that close communication between the Task Force and TWDC would be helpful and should be strengthened.

B. Date of Next Meeting

6.11 **The Chair** informed Members that this was the last meeting under the current term of HC. She thanked Members for their dedicated service to the Task Force in the last two years.

6.12 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

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