

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

Minutes of Twenty-eighth Meeting

Date : 19 September 2017
Time : 9:30 a.m.
Venue : Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices,
333 Java Road, Hong Kong

Present

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Prof Becky LOO | Chair, Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing (Kowloon Task Force) |
| Mrs Margaret BROOKE | Representing Business Environment Council |
| Mrs Karen BARRETTO | Representing Friends of the Earth |
| Ms Connie CHEUNG | Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects |
| Dr Eunice MAK | Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners |
| Sr Francis LAM | Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors |
| Mr TAM Po-yiu | Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design (HKIUD) |
| Ir Victor CHEUNG | Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers |
| Ms Elsa MAN | Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong |
| Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN | Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour |
| Mr Ken SO | Representing the Conservancy Association |
| Ms Doris HO | Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB) |
| Ms Carmen YU | Senior Administrative Officer (Tourism) 2, Tourism Commission (TC) |
| Mr Simon LAU | Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon, Transport Department (TD) |
| Mr Raymond LEE | Chief Engineer/Kowloon 2, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) |
| Mr Michael CHIU | Chief Executive Officer (Planning) 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 Christine AU

Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB

Absent with Apologies

Mr Freddie HAI

Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects

Mr Alan LO

Mr NGAN Man-yu

For Agenda Item 5

Mr CK CHAN

Director, Lanbase Surveyors Limited

Mr Anson LEE

Town Planner, Lanbase Surveyors Limited

Welcoming Message

Mr Nicholas BROOKE, Chair of the Harbourfront Commission (HC), welcomed all to the meeting.

Item 1 Election of Task Force Chair

- 1.1 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** nominated and **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** seconded **Prof Becky LOO** to be the Chair of the Kowloon Task Force.
- 1.2 With unanimous support from Members, **Mr BROOKE** announced that **Prof Becky LOO** was elected as the Chair of the Kowloon Task Force. **Prof LOO** took over the chairmanship.
- 1.3 **The Chair**¹ informed Members that Ms Doris HO and Mr Simpson LO had taken over the post of Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands) 1 and Assistant Commissioner for Tourism 2 from Mr Thomas CHAN and Ms Emily MO respectively. She added that Ms Carmen YU, Senior Administrative Officer of TC attended the meeting on behalf of Mr Simpson LO. Mr Michael CHIU, Chief Executive Officer (Planning) 1, attended on behalf of Mrs Doris FOK. The Chair also welcomed Ms Connie CHEUNG, Dr Eunice MAK, Sr Francis LAM, Ir Victor CHEUNG and Ms Elsa MAN who attended the Task Force meeting for the first time.

Item 2 Confirmation of Terms of Reference

- 2.1 **The Chair** invited Members to consider the Terms of Reference (ToR) of the Task Force being tabled at the meeting, which was the same as the one for the previous terms and as the ToRs for the other two geographical Task Forces, except for the respective geographical coverage.
- 2.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** informed the meeting that he had made suggestions on the ToR at a previous meeting of Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (Kai Tak Task Force) for including the adjacent water body to the harbourfront areas. He requested the suggestion be discussed at the Commission.

¹ "The Chair" thereafter referred to Prof Becky LOO as the Task Force Chair.

Action

- 2.3 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** asked about the overlapping of pink line and blue line at Cha Kwo Ling on the map of ToR.
- 2.4 **Miss Christine AU** said that the pink and blue lines denoted the responsibility of the Kai Tak Task Force and Kowloon Task Force respectively. She added that to the left of the overlapped line would be the responsibility of the Kai Tak Task Force while to the right of the line would fall under the purview of Kowloon Task Force.
- 2.5 **The Chair** added that this might be a matter of spatial scale and the demarcation would become clearer when the map was zoomed in.
- 2.6 As regards Mr Paul Zimmerman's suggestion on the ToR, **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** said it was agreed at the meeting of the Kai Tak Task Force on 8 September that the ToR would be brought up to the Commission level for a review. In addition, how to feature the enhanced role of the Harbour Unit (HU) and closer involvement of the Commission in individual projects would also be discussed.
- 2.7 **The Chair** said that subject to the outcome of the review of ToR by the Commission, the current ToR was confirmed.

Item 3 Acknowledgement of Minutes of the Last Meeting

- 3.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the draft minutes of the 27th meeting were circulated to Members of the last term for comments on 13 September 2017. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated to Members again on 18 September 2017. Due to changes in membership, Members of the current term were invited to acknowledge the minutes.

Item 4 Matters Arising

A. Progress Update on the West Kowloon Cultural District (paragraph 3.11 of the minutes of the 27th meeting)

4.1. **The Chair** said that at Members' request, the link containing the report of the public consultation exercise on the Hong Kong Palace Museum was circulated to Members on 13 September 2017 for information.

4.2. **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** declared that he had direct interest in the WKCDA. **The Chair** said that she would make a decision on whether Mr BROOKE could participate in the discussion when specific initiatives were put up for deliberation in future.

B. Proposed Comprehensive Residential Development at Yau Tong Inland Lot 44 and adjoining Government Land, Yau Tong (paragraph 4.18 of the minutes of the 27th meeting)

4.3. **The Chair** informed the Task Force that a summary of Members' comments raised at the last meeting on the proposed comprehensive residential development at Yau Tong Inland Lot 44 and adjoining Government Land was sent to PlanD for conveying to the Town Planning Board (TPB) on 19 July 2017. She said that the letter was tabled for Members' reference.

4.4. **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that he would like to have a more in-depth discussion with TD on the traffic arrangement around the area of Sam Ka Tsuen Ferry Pier, in particular the pedestrian connection and the loading and unloading areas.

4.5. **The Chair** said that the comment related to the traffic arrangement had been duly reflected in the letter to PlanD and she was opened to have further communications on this particular area of the proposed development in future.

Item 5 Proposed Temporary School (Private Primary School) for a period of 5 years at G/F, 1/F and R/F of Cheung Kei Center Tower B, One Harbourgate, No. 18 Hung Luen Road, Kowloon (Kowloon Inland Lot No. 11111) (Paper No. TFK/06/2017)

5.1 **The Chair** welcomed the project team to the meeting and informed Members that the applicant proposed to convert G/F, 1/F and R/F of Cheung Kei Center Tower B at Harbourgate in

Action

Hung Hom into a temporary private primary school for a period of five years. Since the site was within an area zoned "Comprehensive Development Area (2)"(CDA(2)) on the Draft Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan, she said that the proponent had submitted a section 16 planning application to seek permission from TPB on the proposed land use. The applicant would like to brief Members on the proposal and seek Members' further views.

- 5.2 Upon the Chair's invitation, **Mr Anson LEE** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 5.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** asked the team to outline the other objections received during the consultation.
- 5.4 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** said that the presentation did not provide sufficient information and pictures for him to understand the environment around the proposed school and the interaction between school activities and the community.
- 5.5 **The Chair** had the following questions –
 - (a) would there be any long-term plan for the proposed school as the current plan was to operate it for five years and it might be disruptive to the primary students;
 - (b) it was mentioned in the PowerPoint that the proposed school would provide "opportunity to educate students to preserve the Harbour and Harbourfront area" and she wondered how this could be done; and
 - (c) she would like the team to illustrate further on how the proposed school could enhance the accessibility to the harbour and enliven the harbourfront area.
- 5.6 **Mrs Karen BARRETTO** asked whether children would be allowed to go to school by bicycle. She wondered if it would be a safe arrangement for a primary school which was built mainly by glass.
- 5.7 **Mr CK CHAN** responded as follows –
 - (a) the objections received were mainly related to traffic issues; and in response to those comments, the team had already submitted a proposal that was acceptable to TD;
 - (b) the proposed building was only a part of a much larger

Action

development with two office towers and two blocks of a similar kind. These buildings were planned and constructed in a way that provide easy access to the promenade from the premises;

- (c) safety would be taken into account in the operation and the submission would also be scrutinised by the Buildings Department for ensuring the safety of the building;
- (d) it was naturally believed that the teachers of the school would make good use of the promenade nearby to educate students about the preservation of harbour and harbourfront;
- (e) the applicant had already identified a suitable site for a permanent school. They were confident that there would be satisfactory arrangement for students to move to the permanent school when the current planning application expired in five years' time; and
- (f) due to safety concern and limitation of the urban environment, students would not be encouraged to cycle to school, and school bus would be arranged for them.

5.8 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opposed to the proposal as he opined that there should be active use along the harbourfront or retail services such as fishing equipment stores which could facilitate the existing activities on the promenade. He quoted the setting in Aberdeen as an example that primary school could not draw in more activities and new people to the waterfront but only vehicles and parents. He said that the proposal was running against the Harbour Planning Principles (HPPs).

5.9 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** asked about the progress of the nearby development in particular the open space near the ferry pier. He opined that the school use should sync with the pace of the nearby developments so that it would not stifle the vibrancy of the waterfront.

5.10 **Ir Victor CHEUNG** would like to know for how long this building had been built and how long it had been vacated.

5.11 Upon request of the Chair, **Mr Lawrence CHAU** said that the building was within a site zoned "CDA(2)" and the planning

Action

intention in the planning brief was to promote commercial and retail uses to enhance vibrancy of the waterfront promenade. Although the proposed temporary school use was different from the commercial use, it might not be a big problem given its temporary nature, if the traffic and other issues could be suitably addressed.

5.12 **Sr Francis LAM** commented as follows -

- (a) the primary students would unavoidably use the promenade very often and he asked if there would be any regulations or guidelines to guide the school through the use of promenade so that public enjoyment of the promenade would not be affected; and
- (b) he had concern on the safety of primary students when they were using the promenade.

5.13 **Dr Eunice MAK** opined that having a nicely designed school by the water could actually add vibrancy to the waterfront and she had seen such successful examples in other cities. Nonetheless, her main concerns were that -

- (a) there was a lack of playing areas and access to the outdoor areas for the young students; and
- (b) the interface between the school and public area might not be secure enough to separate the students and strangers, which might give rise to security and safety concern.

5.14 **Mr Ken SO** said that perhaps the application was not going against the HPPs but it just did not add value to the harbourfront. Instead of just searching for abandoned building as school, he commented that the fundamental question should be why the building was considered suitable for school use.

5.15 **Mr CK CHAN** made the following further responses -

- (a) the building was completed about a year ago and it had been vacant since then;
- (b) though the building was not purposely built for school but it had the advantages of being low-rise so that children did not have to move up high. It also had a

Action

decent rooftop and open area for students' activities;

- (c) as a responsible school operator, safety of students must be their utmost concern;
- (d) the suggestion on formulating guidelines for the students to use the promenade was a good one and the team would relay this comment to the operator for consideration; and
- (e) as the building was at a location with a very open surrounding, it would not have to mingle with a lot of other non-compatible activities. There were also a good degree of natural light and satisfactory ventilation. Accordingly, the location and the building were considered suitable for school use, at least on temporary basis.

5.16 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** followed up on his question about the development of the sites in the vicinity of the proposed school.

5.17 **Miss Christine AU** said that the Hung Hom waterfront promenade along the seawall was re-opened this year after renovation while the open space at Kin Wan Street would be enhanced by LCSD to provide basketball court, children's play area and seating areas, etc. For the site where the Hung Hom Ferry Pier Bus Terminus was currently located, it would be developed into an Urban Park as capital works project under the "\$500 million initiative" and this project would take more than five years to complete.

5.18 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** commented that a background paper should be prepared so that Members would understand what had been discussed and committed on the site and its neighbouring areas. He added that what had been discussed and agreed before was based on the assumption that this site would be used for retails or food and beverage but not school.

5.19 In conclusion, **the Chair** said that it was the first time to have a school proposed within the harbourfront areas in Kowloon side. The Task Force welcomed school that could bring about a diversified and vibrant harbourfront but Members generally shared the following concerns -

- (a) the school had to be well-designed with play area and

Action

good integration with the neighbouring areas;

- (b) suitable measures and guidelines should be put in place to ensure security and safety;
- (c) the proposed school might give rise to vehicular traffic issues; and
- (d) the building was not specifically designed for the purpose of school use.

**The
Secretariat**

She said that a summary of Members' views would be sent to PlanD for conveying to TPB for reference.

[Post-meeting note: the letter summarising Members' views to TPB was issued to PlanD on 21 September 2017.]

Item 6 Enhancement of the Tsuen Wan Waterfront

- 6.1 **Ms Elsa MAN** declared that Members of REDA might have developments near the subject Tsuen Wan area but the interest might not be direct.
- 6.2 **The Chair** said that unless Ms MAN or her company had a development project near the subject site or had direct interest in the proposal, she could stay and participate in the discussion of this item and give comments based on the HPPs.
- 6.3 As background, **the Chair** informed Members that HC agreed to fund a minor works project through the \$500 million dedicated funding to further enhance the Tsuen Wan waterfront. In response to an invitation, Harbour Unit attended the meeting of Coastal Affairs Committee (CAC) of the Tsuen Wan District Council (TWDC) on 7 July 2017 and briefed CAC Members on the proposed project. CAC Members supported the initiative and provided detailed comments on areas that quick improvements would be needed. Harbour Unit would like to report CAC's views and the proposed way forward through a PowerPoint presentation.
- 6.4 Upon the Chair's invitation, **Miss Christine AU** made a presentation with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 6.5 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** had the following questions and comments -

Action

- (a) he would like to know the project scope and degree which Members could comment on, taken into consideration the time and budget constraints;
- (b) the visual impact of the proposed facilities such as covered walkway, and he opined that there should be a featured theme for these facilities to avoid standardised and dull design; and
- (c) he had no in-principle objection to the proposal but he would need some time to consult HKIUD and to give some more thoughts on the implementation details before giving specific comments.

6.6 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** commented that focus should be placed on carrying out a good place-making process by a team which included the processes of envisioning, drafting and finalising the plan and staged implementation, rather than just rushing through the process to get things done.

6.7 **Sr Francis LAM** suggested displaying some urban artworks to feature the promenade and adding greenery elements to the design of the proposed covered walkway to enhance the visual effect.

6.8 **Ir Victor CHEUNG** asked about the project's budget and he would like to see the incorporation of sustainability elements, such as solar-powered lamp post, into the project.

6.9 **Mr Ken SO** pointed out that it was the software (i.e. activities) that could bring about vibrancy to the waterfront and he asked if TWDC had any planned activities that could be carried out at the waterfront areas after all those infrastructures were built.

6.10 **The Chair** considered that it was a new opportunity for HC and HU to demonstrate through this project a feasible approach in realising common vision. In order to turn this piece of harbourfront areas iconic, she suggested that the design process could be combined with the stage of defining the scope of works so that DC's district views and HC's holistic views could be balanced during the co-creation process from the outset.

6.11 **Miss Christine AU** responded that -

- (a) the purpose of the dedicated \$500 million was to do

Action

something different and to enhance the role of HC as project proponent. The identified projects, in particular this project, would be the pioneer in putting words into reality;

- (b) she was opened to the suggestion on enhancing the process of views exchange so that creativity could be engendered and she also pointed out that communication should be continuous throughout the whole process but not just limited to the initial stage;
- (c) she reminded the meeting that what the DC specifically wanted was some very basic and conventional hardware such as toilets and covered walkway;
- (d) she was glad to hear the idea about displaying artworks which echoed with what exactly this year's City Dress-up Public Art Competition was doing; and
- (e) the budget limit for a district minor works project would be \$30 million.

6.12 **Dr Eunice MAK** expressed concern over the tight timing for the project as the envisioning process and communication with DC might take longer time than expected.

6.13 To deal with the project in a pragmatic way, **Mr TAM Po-yiu** suggested that a working group be established with relevant representatives from professional institutes and one or two DC Members to steer the project.

6.14 **Ms Connie CHEUNG** had the following comments -

- (a) improvement for streetscape and the existing street furniture could be a fast and economical place-making project. Ecological elements could also be incorporated;
- (b) no objection to discuss the details at a new Working Group; and
- (c) covered walkway could be intrusive to the visual effect and tree canopy might be considered as an alternative to provide shading.

6.15 **Mr Lawrence CHAU** commented that the adjacent areas to the waterfront promenade such as Chai Wan Kok, which was an

Action

industrial area at the northern end of the promenade, should be taken into account when contemplating the design of the project. He said that while the industrial area was being revitalised to become more like a business district and in particular one of the industrial buildings on Pak Tin Par Street was being converted into a design and exhibition centre with commercial uses, the pedestrian connectivity to this part of Tsuen Wan should be improved to create synergy effect. He further suggested that the industrial element could be incorporated into the design of the promenade and the manufacturing industry sector could also be engaged in the process.

- 6.16 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** pointed out the importance of getting the public participation and engagement right and organised at the beginning.
- 6.17 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** emphasised that there was no need to rush through the proposed project as people had been using the promenade already. He opined that the first bit of the money should be utilised to employ a consultant for drawing up a broad-brush plan and vision with sufficient public engagement. The implementation could then be done by phases by selecting quick-win projects from the broad plan.
- 6.18 **The Chair** considered that it was a more traditional way to engage a consultant first to draw up the visionary plan. As the size of Kowloon Task Force was not really large and it had already comprised necessary expertise, she suggested that a workshop be organised in the coming month with attendance from Kowloon Task Force and TWDC to initiate the place-making exercise, to brainstorm about the unique features of the Tsuen Wan waterfront, and to identify the opportunities for enhancements. She suggested that a facilitator to lead the discussion of the workshop would be very helpful, and this role might be served by a Task Force member.
- 6.19 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** objected to this process if it meant to make decision on the vision and plan by the Task Force and DC without asking the community. He was of the view that the Task Force should be the guardian of the process instead of the guardian of the project details.
- 6.20 **The Chair** clarified that the suggested workshop was just the beginning of the whole process for setting out the framework for subsequent public engagement. She emphasised that stakeholder

Action

engagement was one of the very important HPPs and the Task Force would definitely continue to be the guardian of the process. Time and budget were major considerations, too.

6.21 **Miss Christine AU** supplemented that TWDC would partner with the Task Force throughout the process and DC with its elected composition was representing local aspirations. She said that the initial discussion between the Task Force and TWDC as suggested by the Chair was an important dialogue before going on with the place-making and public engagement strategy.

6.22 **The Chair** emphasised that the Task Force and DC would be the “facilitator” instead of “dictator” of the process. To sum up, she asked the Secretariat to organise the workshop for the Task Force and TWDC and issue the invitation email in the coming month.

**the
Secretariat**

[Post-meeting note: an informal workshop was organised on 24 October 2017 for Kowloon Task Force to deliberate internally on the proposed way forward before reaching out to TWDC. Subsequently, the exchange session with TWDC was held on 2 November 2017.]

Item 7 Any Other Business

A. Action Areas

7.1 **The Chair** reported that the updated Action Area Table setting out the latest developments in the harbourfront areas was circulated to Members on 15 September 2017. She invited Members to raise to the Secretariat any action area that they would like to discuss at the next meeting.

B. Date of Next Meeting

7.2 **The Chair** said that the next Task Force meeting was tentatively scheduled for November/ December 2017.

C. Any Other Business

7.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** asked if a list of committed and planned projects of the Tsuen Wan action area could be provided for Members’ reference.

[The harbourfront enhancement initiatives in Tsuen Wan Action Area were included in the presentation to TWDC at the exchange session held on 2 November 2017.]

Action

7.4 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:05 a.m

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